The Anglican Eucharist 1900-1967: an historical survey of the theological and liturgical developments during this period with particular reference to the catholic and evangelical wings of the Church of England

Hine, Pauline M.

THE ANGLICAN EUCHARIST 1900-1967

An historical survey of the theological and liturgical developments during this period with particular reference to the catholic and evangelical wings of the Church of England.

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM IN JULY 1970.

BY

PAULINE M.HINE B.A.(HONS), Dip.Theol.

S.JOHN'S COLLEGE, DURHAM.

ABSTRACT

The Anglican Eucharist 1900-1967

An historical survey of the theological and liturgical developments in this field in the Church of England with particular reference to the catholic and evangelical wings of the Church.

Theories concerning Eucharistic Sacrifice are considered particularly those of the 'Heavenly Session' school of thought, Spens, Hicks, Mascall, and the conservative evangelicals together with the modifications of Lampe and C.F.D.Moule. Various semi-official doctinal statements of the Church of England are also noted. Theories of Eucharistic Presence are also presented including those of O.C.Quick and William Temple in addition to those which could be more clearly distinguished as 'catholic' or 'evangelical'; an appendix relates all these theories to the practice of Reservation and Extra-liturgical Devotions. The theology of the Body of Christ, the Church, is considered in relationship to the Eucharist and with this the emerging theology of the laity. The rediscovery of the cosmic significance of the Eucharist is particularly noted in its relationship to current Roman Catholic and Orthodox thought.

There is a survey of the Liturgical revision in the Church of England throughout this century with special reference to the question of Reservation, the 1927/8 Prayer Book debates and the emergence of Series II. Reference is made to the Liturgy of the Church of South India and revision throughout the Anglican Communion as a whole. These liturgical revisions are then placed in their background of the European Liturgical Movement and the development of the Parish Communion Movement in the Church of England. Finally liturgy and theology are seen in relationship to ecclesiastical architecture, which is shown to have changed considerably to embody the new understanding of the Eucharist as corporate action and the Liturgy which has been designed to translate this into terms of worship.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

The study of the Anglican Eucharist in the first sixty-seven years of this century clearly demonstrates that such theology cannot be seen in isolation, it must be considered in relationship to sociology, liturgy and architecture. Further, Eucharistic developments in the Church of England can also not be studied in isolation but in the context of a liturgical movement which has not been bound to one denomination but grew up in the Roman Catholic Church while developments in the Anglican Church were independently beginning to point in the same direction. The influence spread to the Non-Conformist churches in England and in other countries.

The Eucharist has come to be seen as in the days of the e early church - as the corporate action of priest and people together with and dependent on Christ, God the Father and the Holy Spirit. There has been a new awareness of what the Pauline teaching on the Body of Christ really means and a new theology of the laity has emerged. This has affected Eucharistic theology, Among more catholic-minded Anglicans there has been much more emphasis on the whole Church offering Christ's sacrifice, and with it their life and work from each day of the week, not just the priest offering the sacrifice. Evangelicals too have come to an understanding that we can share in Christ's sacrifice by obedience and suffering.[1] There have been signs that the old differences between catholics and evangelicals over Eucharistic Presence may be growing less. In 1930 V.F.Storr could state,

'in the Evangelical wing of the Church a new feeling for sacramentalism is arising', [2]

and this is surely evident in the writings of G.W.H.Lampe in the 1950's who spoke of the consecrated elements in terms of 'dynamis' and 'energeia'. Other theologians have tried to make the doctrine of the Real Presence by explaining it in terms of modern philosophies. Anglicans have also participated in the new understanding of the cosmic significance of the Eucharist

both in their own writings and in the attention they have given to the works of Teilhard de Chardin and Orthodox theologians such as Alexander Schmemann.

Theology and liturgy have been increasingly linked together, Mascall with considerable justification attributes this to the work of Dom Gregory Dix,

'The close connection that now exists between theologians and liturgists in the Anglican Church is largely Dix's legacy.' 3

Dix's reassertion that the early Church saw the Eucharist as corporate action and the Liturgy itself having a fourfold pattern had effect on liturgical revision throughout the Anglican Communion and even outside it in the years that followed the publication of The Shape of the Liturgy (1945). Dix was both liturgist and theologian and deeply concerned not only with how worship was conducted but with the whole question of what worship was all about.

Gabrial Hebert in the 1930's had introduced the Anglican Church to the sociology of Liturgy. He did much to inform his readers about what was happening in Europe and to deepen their awareness that the Liturgy must be seen in the light of its social and economic implications, and in its surroundings of the visual arts which could be used to embody these themes. It was Hebert and his friends who helped to promote the Parish Communion Movement thereby restoring the Eucharist as the central communal act of Sunday worship for Anglicans - an achievement that has done much to break down the formidable barriers of churchmanship which existed in the earlier years of the century. The study of the Liturgy is no longer the persuit of the more catholic-minded Anglicans only, the evangelicals have produced many fine scholars in this field. Liturgical revision throughout the Anglican Communion has done much to embody these ideals of worship.

Finally, after a slow start, architecture has caught up with liturgical and theological developments and all three facets are studied in conjunction with each other. Church buildings are now designed to fit the Liturgy, in new churches

the altar is visible to all, not tucked away at the end of a long chancel as was so often the case in the Victorian era. It is frequently placed in such a way that westward celebrations are possible, that the family of God may feel that they are gathered together round the family table for the family meal. The more corporate worship has become the more simple it must become also, ceremonial and church furnishings have been considerably modified and are now designed in such a way that purpose rather than ornamentation is foremost. Divergences still remain and will no doubt continue, yet these developments have brought the Anglican Church to a greater unity in itself by the end of this period than was possible throughout the early years of this century.

Footnotes

1. cf. especially C.F.D.Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ.(1956).
2. V.F.Storr, 'Anglican Eucharistic Theology Today', p.312 in The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion, ed. A.J.Macdonald. (1930).
3. In Theology, Nov. 1960. p.4.

CHAPTER I

THE EUCHARIST AND SACRIFICE

At the beginning of the century the range of opinion on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist was very wide, it varied from the near 'memorial' approach of some Conservative evangelicals to a belief in the full Roman Catholic doctrine held by some ultra-catholics. Since that time a fierce war of words has been waged, and there have been valuable gains - the medieval equation of sacrifice and death has been almost abandoned, and from all shades of churchmanship has come the realisation that a more dynamic approach to the question of sacrifice is to be called for, in all this has brought the Church of England nearer to a united doctrine than has been possible for the last hundred years.

The belief that the Eucharist was a sacrifice dates from Clement of Rome who writes of the bishops offering the gifts, and by the second century we find the Didache using Malachi 1:11[1] containing the word θυσία which was the common word for sacrifice in the Greek-speaking world.

The sacrificial nature of the Eucharist was reasserted in English theology during the seventeenth century, a recent study by an American Jesuit, E.P.Echlin, The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective (1968) has shown this to be so by illustrations from the writings of Laud, Cosin and Matthew Wren. In the nineteenth century it was to be found not only in the writings of the Tractarians and their successors but in official statements of Anglican doctrine, for example in the reply of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan to Leo XIII's Apostolic Letter on Anglican Orders of 1897, where we find the following passage,

'we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and we do not believe it to be a "nude commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross", an opinion which seems to be attributed to us ... But we think it sufficient ... to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point in the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who

is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of our sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice'.[2]

The belief of the Tractarians and their successors in the Eucharistic sacrifice on the whole was more Roman in expression, though it was also based on their heritage from the High-Churchmen of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It gained increasing support after Kidd's attempt to prove the catholic orthodoxy of Article XXXI,[3] by suggesting that the condemnation of the 'missarum sacrificium' did not necessitate the condemnation of the 'missae sacrificium', and that 'vulgo dicebatur' did not include the statements of theologians. He insisted that what the Reformers had really meant to condemn in this was the concept of sacrifice equals death which had been prevalent in the late Middle Ages.[4] Dix was later to point out that though this notion was widely held at the time it did in fact have its refutation in the Liturgy itself, for there was a commemoration of our Lord's resarrection and ascension as well as of His death in the prayers 'Unde et memores', 'Supplices te rogamus', which were always used, and in the 'Suscipe sancta Trinitas' that was also well-known.[5] Kidd's reasoning was accepted by many including Gore, Darwell Stone, Bicknell, Srawley, Hicks, Mascall and Dugmore, of these E.J.Bicknell's The Thirty-Nine Articles (1919) has had a tremendous influence, having become a standard text-book for generations of Anglican ordinands.

The attention given to Eucharistic sacrifice was accompanied by an increased Incarnationalism, for many catholics by the turn of the century the whole of Christ's life was seen as sacrificial, not just His death on the cross, as may be illustrated by the following quotation from P.N.Waggett's book

The Holy Eucharist (1906),

'the Incarnation itself from the first is an offering, because it is the bringing of the creature into the great stream of the Son's love towards the Father by the Holy Spirit. Now in the Incarnation the creature also is offered by the same Spirit to the Father and the whole life of Christ, from the Conception to the end, is one of effectual sacrifice'.[6]

The Church was regarded as in some sense an extension of the Incarnation, and it is in the Church - the Body of Christ - that Christ's sacrificial life was believed to be continued on earth, the Church which offers herself to the Father in union with Christ's sacrifice which He offers as Head of the Body. As L.S.Thornton expressed it,

'we are incorporated into His sacrificial life in baptism, and so become members of His worshipping community. The worshipful life of that community is the organ of Christ's sacrificial self-offering and self-giving here on earth. At the heart of the Christian community is the eternal sacrifice of our great high priest, which has once for all been offered for the sins of the world. Herein lies the abiding significance of the other great sacrament, the Holy Eucharist, or Holy Communion. It is the means through which our Lord's sacrifice is perpetually offered to the Father for man's salvation, in and through the worshipping fellowship of the redeemed'.[7]

For those who accept this approach any suggestion that we can offer the sacrifice of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies' except together with and in His sacrifice, even as a response to His death on Calvary, is repudiated as approaching Pelagianism.[8] It is unfortunate that both catholics and evangelicals have developed the habit of branding each other as Pelagian, when neither group is on its own premises. The evangelical offers himself in response to God's gifts to him of the benefits of the Lord's Passion - he could not offer himself without the Passion or its fruits. The catholic offers himself in the Eucharist with Christ as members of His Body, and yet he also could not presume to offer himself apart from Christ's own offering, and the grace which he has received in entering into the Body of Christ, grace which is the true fruits of Christ's sacrifice.

The Heavenly Session

One of the most influential ways of interpreting this continued sacrifice of Christ has been the concept of the Heavenly Session, an idea which can be traced back as far as Richard Field.[9] It was well-known and accepted in the eighteenth century as can be seen from the illustration of the earthly altar with the priest standing beside it and the heavenly altar with Christ standing beside it with the references Heb. 9:11,23 and 7:25 round His head which is to be found in Charles Wheatley's Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer[10] - a standard text-book of those times. It was also to be found in the hymns of Wesley and Bright.[11] At the turn of the century it could well be described as the 'current interpretation' of the catholic-minded Anglicans, numbering among its supporters Brightman, Puller, Gore, Moberly, Waggett, Newbolt, Darwell Stone, Gayford and Bicknell.[12]

The clearest and fullest example of this approach is to be found in the theology of Charles Gore. Christ's sacrifice was offered once in death and in the power of that sacrifice He lives in heaven as our High Priest and Intercessor, the 'continually accepted propitiation for our sins to the end of time'.[13]
But he believed Hebrews taught that the atonement was not accomplished on Calvary but at His entrance into heaven, and 'His propitiation and His intercession' - His heavenly work - are identical, and both are accomplished by His continual presentation of Himself for us.[14] His work is linked to us in the Eucharist, which Gore asserts to be unquestionably a sacrifice, and can be seen as such not only by Christians, but by the investigations of social anthropologists.[15] It is however a sacrifice not involving a death, the death is commemorated not renewed or repeated, and there is no destruction of Christ involved or shedding of blood.[16] The only destruction is strictly symbolic. Neither is it a sacrifice for atonement,[17] but of thanksgiving, praise and self-dedication.[18] The Eucharist is related to the heavenly offering primarily by

being consummated in communion for,

'only by communion can we in any effective sense share that eucharistic sacrifice, so far as that sacrifice is not merely human effort, but is identified with Christ's offering, and attains thereby its spiritual validity'.19

Although he recognised the importance of the Church's offering being accepted with Christ's self-presentation when it is offered in heaven,[20] and the consecration of the elements that they might become through the operation of the Holy Spirit the Body and Blood of Christ,[21] yet these are not fulfilling the act of sacrifice apart from communion. The concept of communion consummating the sacrifice was bound up with Gore's theology of the Body of Christ - the Church. We can only offer Him in sacrifice if we offer ourselves with Him, if we share His sacrifice both 'actually and morally'.[22] The mystical Body of Christ becomes one with the glorified ascended Lord in this sacrifice for,

'the sacrifice is the sacrifice of the whole Body, and the communion is the communion of the whole Body'. 23

He is our High Priest, and we as His Body share in His priesthood.[24] Gore's eucharistic theory is based on Hebrews, and the effect that the teaching of Hebrews had on the early Fathers, for he believed that Hebrews had led the Fathers to focus their concept of Eucharistic sacrifice,

'upon the background of Christ's continual intercession and presentation of Himself in heaven, and not simply upon that of the Cross'. 25

Darwell Stone when propounding a very similar theory to that of Gore, although inferior for he did not stress to such a degree the importance of communion as consummating the sacrifice, went to even greater lengths to fit the theory to his interpretation of the texts in Hebrews.[26] Hebrews had been traditionally used by evangelicals to supply 'proof-texts' that Christ's work was finished, so naturally this interpretation was hotly challenged by men like Dimock and Tait, and continues to be.[27] Without carrying out here a detailed exegesis of the many passages in Hebrews involved in the dispute, there are some things which must be said. The value of Hebrews in

Eucharistic controversy is affected considerably by the date and nature of the book. Those who postulate an early date - before the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., usually see the author's main intention as a comparison between Christ's sacrifice and the Jewish sacrificial system proving the superiority of that of Christ, and not dealing with the Eucharist at all. If however a later date for Hebrews is accepted when the Liturgy was more established it seems likely that the author could have been thinking about the Eucharist. Current Biblical criticism inclines towards the later date.[28] The Heavenly Session of our Lord is an idea that has found acceptance even outside Anglicanism, for example in the work on Hebrews of W.Manson, the Presbyterian scholar, (who interestingly enough accepts an early date for the book); he commented on Heb. 8:3-6 that,

'The qualifications of Jesus for the office, the perfecting of His person as priest, had to be made on earth, but His actual 'liturgy', His ministry of sacrifice, is a transcendent one, and belongs to the New Covenant, of which it is the mark.' 29

The catholic argument has also been based on other texts such as Revelation 5:6 which states of our Lord in heaven that He is,

'a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain',

which points strongly to our Lord's presence in heaven as the presence of a sacrifice, but this text has been used very little in the controversies.[30]

Apart from the use of Hebrews and Revelation other ways have been found to express the concept of the Heavenly Session which also stress the relationship of events in time and eternity as simultaneous rather than in sequence, as in the following passage from W.L.Knox,

'from the human point of view the Incarnation and the Atonement are incidents in history; yet they cannot be incidents in the history of God, to Whom every moment of time is equally present, just as is every point of space. From the divine point of view the fact of the Atonement is the love of God for man, which is so deep that He was willing to become man and die on the Cross for our salvation. That He did so is a fact of history; yet none the less it is also an eternal fact which has existence apart from the order of time. Thus self-sacrificing and atoning love is an element in the eternal nature of God, quite apart

from the realisation of that love in the atonement for the sins of man on Calvary', 31

and he went on to add,linking this to the Eucharist,

'the offering of Calvary could necessarily be offered only at one time and in one place; but the atonement as an eternal fact is necessary to the whole of mankind at every moment of life. In the Eucharist we have then the eternal sacrifice in a form in which it can be pleaded by all men at all times; for in it the Son offers to the Father that sacrifice which it is His eternal nature to present for the sins of mankind. Thus Calvary and the Eucharist are different modes of presenting in the world the one eternal fact; the former is its supreme manifestation in the temporal order, the latter is its local and partial manifestation for the particular needs of individual Christians. The ultimate fact is beyond either, for it is an element in the eternal nature of God. We can rightly regard Calvary as the offering of the one Sacrifice, and the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as its local application; but our conception, though true as far as it goes falls short of the eternal truth, which is ultimately beyond our understanding'. 32

He believed that this idea was to be found in Hebrews but saw the text Revelation 5:6 and the general approach of the author of Revelation as being one of 'greater penetration' in showing 'the timeless nature of Calvary'.[33] He says little concerning the importance of communion, he appears to see the offering of the sacrifice as bringing upon us the benefits of the sacrifice rather than the actual reception of His Body and Blood conferring these,[34] neither does he appear to think in terms of our communion being the consummation of the sacrifice.

The cross often appears to be minimised, as in the theology of Gore who denied that the atonement even began with the Cross, stating rather that it began with the entry of our Lord into heaven. Most writers have however made a clear distinction between the once-for-all event of the Cross and His continued offering which He makes in the power of that event, Gayford actually made the suggestion that our Lord's priestly work in heaven be referred to as 'offering' and not as 'sacrifice' to avoid this confusion, although he insisted that it should still be understood,

'that these were two parts of one undivided act'. 35

Ramsey also tried to remove the difficulty by speaking of the

exercise of His heavenly priesthood being His 'spirit of self-offering'.[36] There is no suggestion of a repetition of Calvary.

An objection voiced when these ideas were current was that the whole idea depends on a belief in Transubstantiation,[37] or at least it leads to our being concerned,

'in securing the Real Presence of Christ with us on an earthly altar, rather than our real presence with Him at the right hand of God'. 38

This is half true, for this approach to Eucharistic sacrifice would be almost impossible unless it was also held that in the consecrated elements we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, though a belief in Transubstantiation would not be necessary, an alternative doctrine of the Real Presence would be sufficient. The second point however was not valid, for surely the whole purpose of this explanation was to emphasise our unity with the worship of heaven, and indeed it might be said that we would be more likely to realise our presence with Him there in this way than from the evangelical approach which would see Him seated at the right hand of God His work finished, with us on earth receiving the benefits.

It has also been suggested that the concept of the Heavenly Session finds no place in Pauline theology. This is not strictly true, for S.Paul in Romans 8:34 speaks of Christ,

'who is at the right hand of God, who intercedes for us'.

The word used for 'intercedes' here, ἐντυγχάνει, is the same as that found in Hebrews 7:25,

'He always lives to make intercession for them'.

In addition to this there is of course the whole Pauline teaching on the Body of Christ.

Catholics have contended that the institution of the Eucharist as described in the New Testament clearly demonstrates it can be nothing else but a sacrifice, as Puller stated,

'the whole account of our Lord's institution of the Eucharist implies the sacrificial character of that rite'. 39

He continued by pointing out that bread and wine were recognised as sacrificial instruments, our Lord blessed and

consecrated them and identified them with His own Body and Blood, and spoke of the proceedings in such a way that He showed He was inaugurating a new covenant, he sees the word ἀνάμνησις as sacrificial also (he does not discuss ποιεῖν). He has been echoed by many others and the words ποιεῖν and ἀνάμνησις have been the topic of much heated discussion, as to whether or not they are sacrificial.[40] Without entering into these discussions it is fair to say that ποιεῖν was often used for 'to sacrifice' as well as for 'to do', and the arguments of Abbott (the most quoted evangelical on the subject) are far from convincing, for after denying that ποιεῖν was ever used for 'to offer' in the Septuagint, which anyway does not appear to be true, he goes on to say,

'the usage of the LXX does not determine that of the N.T.'[41]

The arguments that suggest ἀνάμνησις was sacrificial are not so convincing. To take ἀνάμνησις in the sense of making a new sacrifice would be impossible but no catholic believed that Christ was killed again in the Eucharist, but the word seems to fit quite well with the catholic concept that the sacrifice of Christ is 'made present', 'recalled','energized in the Church' and other such expressions. In this sense it has been understood by Protestant theologians outside the Anglican Communion such as D.M.Baillie and C.H.Dodd.[42] Taken with all the other indications that the Eucharist is in some sense sacrificial these arguments for a sacrificial interpretation of the words cannot be easily discounted, indeed as Dix reminds us the Eucharist in the early Church was always thought of as something 'done', a 'corporate action', rather than a reminder 'said' or 'heard'.[43]

Sir Will Spens

Some catholic-minded theologians have not been quite so dominated by the theme of the Heavenly Session, among these is Sir Will Spens who follows the footsteps of the non-jurors, especially John Johnson, and in many ways appears to give modern versions of their theories. Spens believed that the

New Testament clearly taught the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist; while not dwelling on particular words used, he asserts that surrounded by Jewish and Pagan sacrifices S.Paul would have otherwise been much more guarded in his language had he not believed the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, and as for the words of John 6 these would have to be pronounced, 'unaccountably misleading, and provocative'.[44] Spens' interpretation of Eucharistic sacrifice is very like that of the Roman Catholic theologian de la Taille,[45] although he was not dependent on him. Pere de la Taille saw the Last Supper as the oblation, the Cross as the immolation, and the Eucharist as the new oblation, all three being integral part of the one sacrifice, since the Eucharist could not be a new immolation it had to be the oblation after immolation as the Last Supper was the oblation before immolation. Spens' theory is very like this except that he does not refer to the Eucharist as a 'new oblation' but prefers to use the term 'consecration', the reason being that to use the word 'oblation' would present difficulties with the Prayer Book words of consecration,'who by His one oblation of Himself once offered'.[46] He defines sacrifice as,

'an act of worship having three parts; first, the giving of something to be destroyed or of a victim to be killed; secondly, the destruction or the killing of the victim; thirdly, some further act or acts or some manner of performing these first two actions which gives them a religious significance'. 47

He sees the Eucharist as the third part of the sacrifice of Christ, not a separate sacrifice from Calvary, but to

'supply a necessary element in the sacrifice of Calvary by expressly investing our Lord's death before God and man with its sacrificial significance', 48

in fact he goes on to say,

'the sacrifice of Calvary was complete, final, perfect; but only because the Eucharist had been instituted by which our Lord had made Himself acknowledgeable and appropriable, as our sacrifice'. 49

The purpose of instituting this sacerdotal act was that we should be partakers not only in the fruits of the sacrifice, but in the sacrifice itself and the offering of it.[50] As this

sacerdotal act - the Eucharist - is part of the sacrifice it can be equally called a sacrifice with the Cross.[51] This act is vital to the sacrifice for it expresses the need for propitiation, and acknowledges the nature of sin and its consequences.[52] Indeed as Spens speaks of Christ's sacfifice as propitiatory so he also appears to regard the Eucharist as propitiatory, although he never explicitly makes this point he gets very close to it.[53] Christ is seen to be priest both at the Last Supper and Calvary, and also at the Eucharist, and as we share in His sacrifice so we share in His priesthood,[54] Spens' ideas here are very like those of Gore. Such teaching on the Eucharist does not appear to necessitate a doctrine of Real Presence in the consecrated elements, though Spens did hold such a belief.[55] This theory avoids the equation of sacrifice with death, in fact Spens stresses particularly that the Eucharist does not involve any new immolation,[56] yet it does not derogate from the finality of the historical action of Calvary. The difficulty arises when he writes of the sacerdotal acts of the Eucharist as being a sacrifice in the same sense as Calvary, which raises the question as to whether a sacerdotal act can be called a sacrifice.

F.C.N.Hicks

Bishop Hicks' theory, which bears some relationship to that of Spens, had far reaching effects. It first appeared in the 1930's in a book entitled The Fullness of Sacrifice, and again in 1938 in the Appendix to The Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, besides having the approval of this conference, it was also approved by the Lund Conference of 1952, the Minneapolis Conference of 1954, and the Lambeth Conference of 1958.

In the first part of the book he dealt with the concept of sacrifice in the Old Testament, his theories being largely based on those of S.C.Gayford[57] to whom he acknowledges his debt.[58] he based his ideas of New Testament and Eucharistic

sacrifice very carefully on those of the Old Testament because he believed that it was our Lord's practice to use these and to give them new meaning.[59] Firstly, he had to remove the difficulty imposed by the apparent denunciations of sacrifice by the prophets and by Christ Himself. In answer he insisted that what they condemned was sacrifice which lacked ethical content and which had become formal and external, the mission of the prophets and to a greater extent of our Lord was to fulfil not to destroy, and he gave the example of Ezekiel who provided a detailed account of sacrifices so that they could be restored on Israel's return from exile.[60] He then went to great lengths to show that Christ and S.Paul used sacrificial and cult-type language to a considerable degree, and pointed to the fact that although Christ said that the Temple would be destroyed, He upheld the eternal validity of the Law.[61]

From his study of Old Testament sacrifice he asserted that the death of the victim was not in itself a sacrifice, but the first stage in the sacrificial process, which released the blood thought of as containing the life of the victim. This, representing the life of the offerer, was dedicated to God who accepted and transformed it. The culmination was the sacrificial feast, for here we receive the life and 'God and man become one'.[62] This could of course only be fulfilled by the death of the victim, the sacrificial death of Christ, and in our partaking of His blood in the Eucharist. Hicks agreed with Milligan[63] that all the New Testament writers see salvation as coming through the 'blood' of Christ, and not through His 'death', and denied that the words 'blood' and 'death' are synonymous. He paraphrased our Lord's words in John 6:52-9 to bring this out more clearly,

'"You are held in the limitations of your own sacrifices. For the true sacrifice you need what they cannot give. You eat the flesh: you know, up to a point, what that ought to mean, for what your sacrificial victims are worth; but you cannot drink the blood. But the climax, the meaning, the purpose, of sacrifice is life. That is what my sacrifice will

give, and alone can give. Except ye eat the flesh of the sacrifice of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye cannot have life in yourselves: " the flesh of representative manhood, in which - for flesh has the sense of the common nature shared - they will realise their corporate unity alike with all the children of God and with their Father; and still more the blood, which is the Life of mankind,and will be theirs, not in mere outward sprinkling, but in themselves by the act of drinking. It is to be, in the experience of perfect sacrifice, not the flesh only but the blood: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."' 64

He believed also that early Christian authorities thought the same concerning the blood of Christ, among them the Didache, Clement and Irenaeus.[65] Hicks was not the first to make this claim about the significance of blood in sacrifice, it is also to be found in the writings of McLoud Campbell, Bushnell, Westcott, and to some extent in Moberly,[66] but he was the first twentieth century writer to use it. His claim has been contested, particularly by Farrer in his essay in The Parish Communion,[67] where he maintains that Hicks can produce little evidence from the text of the Old Testament in support, and asserted that the blood definitely signified death sacrificially, and the presence of the chalice in the Eucharist was indeed a reminder that we proclaimed our Lord's death until His second coming in the Liturgy.[68] Hicks' theory today is supported by Mascall,[69] and others who found Farrer's arguments not sufficiently convincing.

Hicks drew a close parallel between Old Testament sacrifice and the sacrificial work of Christ in the following manner,

1. The drawing near of the sinner with his victim is paralleled by the prodigal son nearing his father's house, and the good shepherd returning with the lost sheep.
2 & 3. The sinner identifies himself with the victim by placing his hand upon its head, and the victim is killed by the sinner on whose behalf it is offered, not by the priest, so Caiaphas prophesies that one man should die for the people and sinners kill Christ.
4. The priest takes the life, voluntarily surrendered, into God's presence and atonement is made; Christ the Priest

and Victim enters into the heavenly sanctuary bringing with Him His blood, His life released.

5. The offering is accepted by God and transformed, so in heaven Christ pleads for us, His body that was offered in obedience is accepted and transformed.

6. There is a meal which completes the sacrifice, in which the worshipper feeds on the sacrificial victim offered in heaven; in the Eucharist Christ gives His manhood to His people in His Body and Blood, His and their eternal life.[70]

Not one of these stages is in itself the sacrifice, but all together constitute the sacrifice, each being sacrificial.[71] Hicks followed a traditional 'Heavenly Session' approach based on Hebrews,[72] and saw Christ's priestly work only beginning after His death when He had entered the heavenly sanctuary.

He says little on the subject of Eucharistic Presence except to indicate that he believed in a Real Presence of the glorified Body and Blood of Christ;[73] his theory would necessitate such a presence. The link between the risen Body of Christ and the mystical Body of Christ is also brought out, though not to the degree it might have been considering the strongly Incarnational approach of the work. We enter His sacrifice by following Him in obedience and self-surrender, and because we are His Body it is He that is offered in these, so in a sense 'His offering of Himself continues',[74] and what we offer is not just confined to the elements present at each celebration, but we offer in the Eucharist symbolically,

'what has been gathered, offered, achieved in street and field, in factory and school and playground and home'. 75

Hicks has been accused of overstressing the analogy between Old and New Testament sacrifice and underestimating the importance of Calvary in the sacrificial process, but his theory appears to give much better grounds than that of Spens for calling the Eucharist a sacrifice in seeing it as the final stage in the whole sacrificial action, whereas for Spens it had been a sacerdotal act investing Christ's death with its significance.

E.L.Mascall

Mascall followed Hicks' theory but developed it in several ways. His definition of ἀνάμνησις as 'a recalling, a representation, a sacramental instantation'[76] is not new, that this action opens the door into heaven is a concept also found in Hicks and others as well,[77] but Mascall sees it as more than our joining in heavenly worship, more than even our being present at the Last Supper and on Calvary even, for in the Eucharist,

'the whole mystery of man's creation, fall, redemption and restoration is, as it were, focused in one moment of time'. 78

This is the beginning of a realisation of the cosmic significance of the sacrifice. So, he states of the writer to the Hebrews, there was no need for the mention of the Eucharist in connection with the priestly work of Christ, for in his theology the Eucharist was,

'not another incident in the Messianic biography ... it was something in which the whole biography, the whole life of self-oblation to the Father ... was made present, not as a new event in history, but as a permanent reality communicated to the Church under the sacramental signs',

by which,

'everything that the epistle describes is given to us in the Eucharist'. 79

This eternal sacrifice is not propitiatory, but an act of homage.[80]

For him the inter-relation of the three 'modes' of the Body of Christ - natural, mystical and sacramental[81] - is such that,

'in offering the Eucharist we offer ourselves, or, to express it more accurately, Christ offers us as members of His Body', 82

and the Eucharistic elements also become one with His Body,

'the consecration of the Eucharist, while appearing to us as a coming down of the ascended Christ from heaven on to our altars, is in essence the taking up of this, that and the other portion of bread and wine to become identified with the Body in heaven'. 83

We enter the mystical Body of Christ through Baptism - the

'actual participation' in His death and resurrection (Rom 6:3-11), God has raised us up with Him so we too may sit in the heavenly places (Ephes 2:6), we are sons again (Gal 4:4-7),

'the Church's offering is made, not just by us who are its members or just by Christ who is its Head, but by Head and members together, membra cum Capite', 85

'the whole Christ, Head and members, offering the whole Christ to the glory of God the Father'. 86

In the Holy Sacraments we are 'elevated into the life of the Holy Trinity',[87] and are maintained in this life by the Eucharist.

He linked the Eucharistic offering to our life in the world, pointing out even more clearly than did Hicks,

'the Body which appears in its sacramental form upon our altars is the same Body which in its mystical form is at work in the world and of which we are members. In a quite true sense, therefore, what Christians do in the world, in their work and in their play, is identical with the offering made upon the altar, and with the act of worship made by Christ in heaven'. 88

This theory drew much from Hicks, and avoids many of the usual pitfalls. He has been criticised however, for not preserving a clear enough distinction between Christ and the Church as His Body.[89]

Conservative Evangelicalism

This line of thought within the Church of England sees the death of Christ as penal substitution, a ransom and propitiatory, and in no real sense as serving as an example to us.[90] We are not able to share in His sacrifice, we can only respond to it, because it was a once-for-all sacrifice and can never be thought of as a continuous process or as a past event that can be so recalled into the present that we may share in it now, indeed

'it is intolerable to think of this necessary payment of ransom as going on continually or eternally'. 91

The denial of any 'continuing' aspect of Christ's sacrifice was largely bound up with a medieval understanding of sacrifice - for this would seem to necessitate a repetition of Christ's

death. Calvary is seen as a sacrificial event in time and not in eternity, only the effects of the event and not the event itself are eternal, as Tait expressed it,

'the perpetuity of the sacrifice applies equally to the time which preceeds the historical act, and the time which follows it. It is the perpetuity of efficacy and not that of process'. 92

The Eucharistic sacrifice could not be identical with that on Calvary,[93] the Eucharist is rather the means whereby the benefits achieved by this event are 'by faith appropriated and enjoyed'.[94]

The Eucharist was seen rather as 'a sacrament of a sacrifice',[95] the distinction being that,

'in a sacrifice we give, we yield up; in a sacrament we receive, we appropriate'.[96]

This antithesis seems rather forced as even on an evangelical understanding of the Eucharist there is no 'receiving' without some 'giving', for they believe we give both a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and the sacrifice of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies'. It has also been described in such terms as a feast upon a sacrifice,[97] a token of the covenant,[98] the effectual signs to which the promises of the covenant are attached, like 'the sealing of a title-deed', 'the giving of the marriage ring', 'the crowning of the sovereign',[99] ' a pledge and assurance to us', 'a symbol in a visual sphere of eternal truths in the invisible spiritual sphere',[100] it is 'Christ Himself in representation, not re-presentation, symbolically, not hypostatically, offered to view - not as making, but as having once made for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world'.[101] Dimock conceeded a little more by using the analogy of 'the showing of a receipt already paid',[102] for this implies a definite pleading of Christ's sacrifice[103] - though a pleading of it as a completely accomplished act. Though this pleading is only 'at greater length and more impressively' than our pleading of it every time we end a prayer saying 'through Jesus Christ'.[104]

It has been likened often to the Jewish Passover, as by two

present-day evangelicals, J.A.Motyer[105] and E.M.B.Green.[106] Motyer sees the Eucharist as calling to rememberance the once-for-all event of Calvary in the same way as the annual Passover prolonged in Israel the effects of the original Passover. He believed that this was Jesus' intention by His use of the phrase 'the blood of the Covenant' and the Passover word 'remembrance'.[107] Green makes the comparison in a slightly different way stating that both Passover and Eucharist have a past significance in that they are memorials of a great deliverance, and the beneficiaries share in the without participating in the original sacrifice, they have a present significance in that both strengthen God's chosen for their journey and increase the bond of fellowship between the participants, and they have a future significance, as the Passover looked to the great feast of the last days so the Eucharist looks forward to the Parousia. The strength of this comparison has been increased by the fact that modern scholarship, both inside and outside the Anglican Communion, has accepted that the Passover meal was the basis of the Last Supper.[108] Like most analogies used in Eucharistic theology it cannot be pushed too far or else it defeats its purpose, for although each annual Passover was a remembrance of the first it did involve making an actual sacrifice of an identical nature to the first, and repeating in full the same consequent ritual actions, a danger seemingly unrealised by those who used the analogy.

Yet there remains besides the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' the sacrifice of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies', this must be for the evangelical a responsive sacrifice. 'Ourselves', wrote Tomlinson, are 'the only things we have of our own to offer to God', and this offering,

> 'depends for acceptance upon that Great Sin Offering which, more than 1,800 years before had been accepted by the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world'. 109

Indeed to presume to offer the sacrifice of ourselves, 'in union with His offering, would be rank Pelagianism',[110] This is the

theology of Cranmer and his fellow reformers - Cranmer intended to emphasise this by moving the Prayer of Oblation to the end of the service so that it would serve as a response after the reception of the consecrated elements. 'Catholic' interpretations of the Prayer Book such as were current in the early years of the century were repudiated in such books as A.J.Tait's Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-Nine Articles (1910), E.A.Knox's Sacrifice or Sacrament (1914), and W.H.Griffith-Thomas' A Sacrament of our Redemption (rev.edit.1920).

Although many would still accept the above stated position there are others who would still call themselves conservative evangelicals who would question such beliefs. G.W.H.Lampe, for example, is one who would not accept that Christ made 'satisfaction' for our sins, and says of the Reformers' theory (still held by many) that,

> 'the free grace of God to sinners was still inhibited by the prior demand that compensation for sin must be paid before God can forgive. They failed to realise that forgiveness after satisfaction has been fully made is no forgiveness at all, even though in this case it is God, the forgiver, who undertakes to pay compensation to himself. They envisaged a dichotomy in God, justice being set against love'. 111

Likewise he denies the validity of theories of penal substitution as they demand the impossible - God inflicting retributive justice, which is blasphemy, and postulates a God who demands revenge.[112]

In this Lampe followed C.F.D.Moule who had attempted to find a doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice acceptable to both catholics and evangelicals in his book The Sacrifice of Christ (1956). He rejected any idea of Christ's death as 'propitiatory' and denied that ἱλαστήριος and ἱλασμος do mean 'propitiation' in the New Testament,[113] this being fully in accord with modern Biblical scholarship.[114] He believed that it was possible for us to share in Christ's sacrifice in two ways, by obedience and by suffering. We share in His obedience because there is a sense in which Christ offers up His obedience through our obedience.[115] We share in His suffering too, states Moule, basing his argument on Colossians 1:24 for,

'to be in Christ is of course to share Christ's sufferings, and there are always more of them in the future for each one of us ... it means that there is a quota of sufferings which the whole Church, the corporate Christ, has to exhaust before God's plan of salvation is complete ... Thus "the afflictions of Christ" are both Christ's historical sufferings, and the corporate Christ's the Christian Church's afflictions'. 116

Although such a quantative approach was rather unfortunate, Moule seemed here to be producing a fairly catholic doctrine of the mystical Body of Christ.

Moule's treatment of the word ἀνάμνησις is also very interesting, although he rejects any idea of 're-sacrificing'[117] - he does not seem to have entirely lost the notion of sacrifice equals death - in a later work he sees it as meaning something more 'dynamic' than remembrance, rather 'to be united with him as really present',[118] not in the sense that we present Christ to God, but it is a 'being presented to God in Christ',[119] though for him 'in Christ' is a union of fellowship and not identity, which distinguishes his theology from those of a more catholic persuasion.[120]

Though Lampe and Moule may be more advanced than many evangelicals there are few of that school who would today hold the nearly 'memorial' theory of their fathers.

Modern research both in the field of Biblical criticism and Patristics lends support to those who would see the Eucharist as in some sense a sacrifice. Alan Richardson, who is neither a catholic or an evangelical, summed up the present position in these words,

'In the Church of the Apostolic Fathers and of the Ante-Nicene and Nicene Fathers the Eucharist is everywhere spoken of as a sacrifice. Sacrificial phraseology is habitually employed in connection with it. There are no exceptions to these statements, and it cannot be seriously denied that the Fathers of the ancient Church understood the apostolic tradition of the Eucharist in this way. The burden of proving that their unanimous interpretation of the scriptural evidence was wrong rests upon those who would deny any form of the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice. If they were wrong, then we are faced with the quite incredible proposition that all the teachers of the Church from the time of S,Clement of Rome or S.Ignatius of Antioch were in error until the true doctrine was revealed to the Protestant reformers. If they were mistaken about such a

matter as this, it would be surely impossible to believe that the Holy Spirit guides the Church into all truth ... That the Eucharist is the Christian sacrifice, that the oblations of the royal priesthood are offered in it, and that Christ himself is the high priest of our offerings - these doctrines are clearly taught in S.Clement of Rome, S.Ignatius of Antioch, S.Justin Martyr, the Didache, S.Irenaeus, Tertullian, S.Clement of Alexandria, Origen, S.Athanasius - where shall we stop? It is remarkable how frequently and how unanimously the words of Malachi are treated by patristic writers as a prophecy that has been fulfilled in the institution of the Eucharist: 'From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same my name shall be great among the gentiles; and in every place incense and a pure oblation are offered' (Mal 1:11). It is unlikely that the unanimous tradition of the post-apostolic Church has misrepresented the teaching of the apostles or that there could be any other valid interpretation of the somewhat scanty and obscure evidence of the New Testament concerning the apostolic doctrine of the Eucharist'. 121

Doctrinal Statements

The 1922 Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England realised that there were several differing views on Eucharistic sacrifice in the Church and attempted to see how far these positions were reconcilable. They summarised the main ways of looking at the connection between Eucharist and sacrifice as follows:

'1. Through stress upon the union of ourselves with Christ in the act of communion, and in that union the offering of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" and of "ourselves, our souls and bodies".

2. ... through emphasis on the fact that in the Eucharist we repeat the words and acts of Christ at the Last Supper - words and acts whereby it is held that He invested His approaching Death with the character of a sacrifice.

3. ... through the insistence that the rite is a representation before the Father of the actual sacrifice of the Cross.

4. ... through the doctrine of the Heavenly Altar, in which we join with the perpetual offering by Christ of Himself, and share the Life of Christ crucified and risen.'

They pointed out that these concepts are not mutually exclusive,

though they admitted that there were many in the Church who would not be prepared to accept them all, however the Commission came to the conclusion that 'all of them should be regarded as legitimate in the Church of England', and that the Eucharist could be rightly described as a sacrifice as long as it was understood as a sacrifice 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".' 122

Although reports of the Lambeth Conferences are in no way way binding on the Anglican Church, their doctrinal statements are very significant. In the Report of the Lambeth Conference 1958 there were some very interesting statements concerning Eucharistic sacrifice which indicated that a large part of the Church must have accepted a fairly catholic standpoint on the subject.

It did not deny that the Cross was a sacrifice, but it no longer limited Christ's redeeming work to the Cross as an historical event, asserting that

'If the redeeming work of Christ was limited to the Cross as a past act of time, we can only be thought of as entering into this wholly past action either by remembering it or repeating it. This partly explains the quarrel at the time of the Reformation. But we are now in a different climate of thought.' 123

This clearly indicates a change of approach to the nature of sacrifice, it is no longer thought of as being equated with death as the catholics believed the Reformers held and as many evangelicals in the early years of this century still appeared to hold. This statement from Lambeth is suggestive of a form of 'Heavenly Session' theory.

The Conference also believed that there was a way in which we offer Christ's sacrifice together with our own responsive sacrifice,

'We ourselves, incorporate in the mystical Body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer, Christ with us offers Himself to God.' 124

They also endorsed the words of A.G.Hebert in Ways in Worship which re-affirmed that there was no 're-immolation' or 'sacrifice additional to His one Sacrifice', and it was in no

sense propitiatory, but that Christ as high priest and the Church as members of His Body 'present before God His sacrifice' and are 'offered up in Sacrifice through their union with Him', further,

'We offer it only because He has offered the one Sacrifice, once for all in which we need to participate.' 125

The third significant fact in the Lambeth Report is that it seems to emphasise the sacrifice aspect as being more important than the communion aspect, although this may well not have been the authors' intention, but they did set out to show that communion should be a consequence of sacrifice - our sacrifice and His - rather than our sacrifice being a response to communion. This can be seen from the above quoted passages and also from their desire to stress the Offertory, concerning which they made the following recommendations,

'The Offertory, with which the people should be definitely associated, to be more closely connected with the Prayer of Consecration'. 126

This report has not escaped evangelical criticism, particularly by Packer in his introduction to the report of the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen of 1961 where he refused to accept that the sacrifice of Calvary is in any sense a continuing event as Lambeth implied.[127] Further he refused to accept the other points made by Lambeth - that we can in any sense offer Christ's sacrifice in union with Him - insisting that our sacrifice must be responsive after having received the fruits of His once-for-all sacrifice in communion,[128] and following on from this he condemns the stress on the Offertory,[129] and anything that makes communion appear secondary to sacrifice.[130]

Yet Lambeth 1958 was not standing on its own, most of the ideas expressed were found as we have seen in Anglican divines of the seventeenth and eigtheenth centuries, revived again by the Tractarians and their successors, and even stated in a less developed form in the Report of the Lambeth Conference for 1930, where it was stated that,

'the Church teaches that in the Eucharist the worshippers commemorate, present and claim their part in the Sacrifice made once for all upon the Cross'. 131

CHAPTER I : FOOTNOTES

1. Didache 14:1
2. F.Temple and W.Maclagan, The Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations. (1897). p.35.
3. B.J.Kidd, The Later Medieval Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1898).
4. Whether this was so is still disputed, see especially F.Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. (1960). and an attempt to refute his ideas by A.A.Stephenson, in Theological Studies. Vol. XXII (1961).pp.588f.
5. G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy. (1945).pp.621-3.
6. Ibid. p.32.
7. L.S.Thornton, The Doctrine of the Atonement. (1937).p.157.
8. e.g. A.M.Ramsey, Durham Essays and Addresses. (1956).p.18.
   E.L.Mascall, The Recovery of Unity. (1958).p.144.
   G.Dix, op.cit. pp.666,731.
9. R.Field, Of the Church. (1606-1610). Appendix to Book III entitled 'An answer to Mr Brerely's objection concerning the mass publicly used in all churches at Luther's appearing'.
10. 3rd edit. 1720. This illustration appears in G.Every, The High Church Party 1688-1718. (1956). Facing p.145.
11. e.g. 'With solemn faith we offer up
    And spread,O God, before Thine eyes
    That only ground of all our hope,
    That precious,once-made sacrifice ...
    As it were slain behold Thy Son ...'

    John Wesley. Hymns A & M. 720.

    'One offering, single and complete,
    With lips and hearts we say;
    But what He never can repeat
    He shows forth day by day.
    ... So He, who once atonement wrought,
    Our Priest of endless power,
    Presents Himself for those He bought
    In that dark noontide hour.'

    William Bright. The English Hymnal. 327.
12. Among the main works on the subject were:
    F.E.Brightman, The Eucharistic Sacrifice.p.2.

R.C.Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood. (1897).p.246.
R.C.Moberly, 'Communion with the Atonement', J.T.S. (1901). pp.321-49.
F.W.Puller in Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice. (1900). pp.20-1, 102. ed. W.Sanday.
P.N.Waggett, The Holy Eucharist. (1906). pp.33-4.
C.Gore, The Body of Christ. (4th edit. 1907). pp.249-61.
W.C.E.Newbolt, The Sacrament of the Altar. (1908).p.157.
Later works approaching the matter in a similar way include:
S.C.Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood. (1924).pp.146-52.
D.Stone, The Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1920). pp.6-8.
E.J.Bicknell, The Thirty-Nine Articles. (2nd edit. 1925).p.144.
O.C.Quick, The Christian Sacraments. (1927). pp.198,200.
G.Dix, op.cit. in overall impression.

13. C.Gore, op.cit. pp.183-4.
14. Ibid. pp.252-3.
15. C.Gore, The Holy Communion. (1928). pp.33-4.
16. Op.cit. pp.174-5, 180-2.
17. Ibid. p.164.
18. Ibid. p.171.
19. Ibid. p.201.
20. Ibid. p.185.
21. Ibid. p.192.
22. Ibid. pp.200-1.
23. Ibid. p.213.
24. Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice. p.25.
25. Op.cit. p.308. The word 'simply' did not appear in the first edition (1901), but was a modification which appeared in the second and all subsequent editions.
26. D.Stone, The Holy Communion. (1904). pp.31-4.
27. Particularly in:
N.Dimock, Our One Priest on High. (1899).
A.J.Tait, The Heavenly Session of our Lord. (1912).
A modern critic is:
R.V.G.Tasker, 'The Priestly Work of Christ', in Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1962). ed. J.I.Packer.

28. e.g. R.H.Fuller, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament. (1966). p.150.n.2.
29. W.Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews. (1951).p.126.
30. Darwell Stone used it, op,cit. p.34.
31. W.L.Knox, The Catholic Movement in the Church of England.(1923). p.70.
32. Ibid. p.71.
33. Ibid. p.70.
34. Ibid. pp.68-9.
35. S.C.Gayford, op.cit. p.154. This distinction was also made earlier by H.B.Swete in The Ascended Christ. (1910).p.47.
36. A.M.Ramsey, The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. (1948). p.94.
37. N.Dimock, Missarum Sacrificia. (1896). p.231.
38. E.A.Knox, Sacrifice or Sacrament. (1914). p.92.
39. Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice. p.135.
40. The formative works on the subject were written in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of this century and are still quoted today, especially those by the evangelicals Plummer and Abbott.
    The basic evangelical arguments are to be found in:
    T.K.Abbott, Do This in Remembrance of Me. (1898). This is an enlarged version of an essay in T.K.Abbott, Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments. (1891).
    A.Plummer, S.Luke. I.C.C. (5th edit. 1922). pp.477f.
    J.T.Tomlinson, A Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. (2nd edit. 1908).
    These same arguments were put forward by E.M.B.Green and T.Hewitt in their essays in Eucharistic Sacrifice. pp.69,93-4.
    The catholic arguments were first advanced by:
    W.E.Scudamore, Notitia Eucharistica. (1872). p.622.
    E.F.Willis, The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist. (1878).
    They were followed by many including:
    C.Gore, The Body of Christ. pp.312ff.

W.C.E.Newbolt, The Sacrifice of the Altar. pp.160-2.
S.C.Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood.
(He clearly sees ποιεῖν as 'to offer', but is not so definite on the meaning of ἀνάμνησις).

41. T.K.Abbott, op.cit. p.35.
42. D.M.Baillie, The Theology of the Sacraments. (1957). p.105.
C.H.Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.(1936). pp.234ff.
43. G.Dix, op.cit. p.12.
44. W.Spens, 'The Eucharist' in Essays Catholic and Critical. (2nd edit. 1929). pp.431ff.
45. As in Mysterium Fidei. (2nd edit. 1924). E.T. 1941.
and The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion. E.T. 1930.
Spens recognised these similarities, op.cit. p.433.
46. W.Spens, The Christian Sacraments. (Theology offprint 1929).p.3.
47. Ibid. p.5.
48. Ibid. p.2.
49. W.Spens, Belief and Practice. (1915). p.180.
50. The Christian Sacraments. p.6.
51. 'The Eucharist'. p.438.
52. Ibid. p.435.
53. The Christian Sacraments. p.5.
54. 'The Eucharist'. p.438.
55. Belief and Practice. pp.158ff.
56. 'The Eucharist'. p.433.
57. S.C.Gayford, op.cit.
58. F.C.N.Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice. (1930). p.viii
59. Ibid.p.10.
60. Ibid. p.62-107.
61. Ibid. p.203.
62. Ibid. p.14.(3rd edit. 1946).
63. W.Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord. (3rd edit.1884). pp.274-304. Cited by Hicks,(2nd edit.1938). pp.241-2.
64. Hicks, op.cit. pp.245-6.
65. Ibid. pp.272-9.

66. J.McLoud Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement. Ch.viii.(1896).
H.Bushnell, Forgiveness and Law. (1874). pp.66-72.
B.F.Westcott, The Historic Faith. (1900). note viii.
R.C.Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood. (1897).
67. A.M.Farrer,'The Eucharist and the Church in the New Testament', in The Parish Communion. ed. A.G.Hebert. (1937).
68. Ibid. pp.89-90.
69. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi. (1965 edit). p.88.
Mascall also cites an American Episcopalian who came to the same conclusion as Hicks, R.K.Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. (1952). p.44.
70. Hicks, op.cit. pp.249-50.
71. Ibid. p.251.
72. Ibid. p.238-9.
73. Ibid. p.347.
74. Ibid. p.337.
75. Ibid. p.338.
76. E.L.Mascall, Christ, the Christian and the Church.(1946).p.168.
77. Op.cit. pp.162,198. cf.Hicks, op.cit. pp.344-5.
78. Ibid. p.172.
79. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi. (1953 edit.) p.109.
80. Ibid. p.32.
81. Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.162.
~~82. The Recovery of Unity. p.141.~~
82. Ibid. p.162.
83. Ibid.p.162.
84. Corpus Christi. (1965 edit.) p.103.
85. Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.164.
86. The Recovery of Unity. p.141.
87. Corpus Christi. (1953 edit.) p.12.
88. Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.162.
89. This criticism was made by H.E.W.Turner in Word and Sacrament, (1968). ed. R.R.Williams. p.11.
90. This approach to atonement theology is well illustrated by a recent evangelical work, L.Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross.(1955).

91. A.M.Stibbs, Sacrament, Sacrifice and Eucharist. (1961).p.35.
92. A.J.Tait, The Nature and Function of the Sacraments.(1917).p.89.
A.J.Tait, The Heavenly Session of Our Lord. (1912).p.147.
93. W.H.Griffith-Thomas, A Sacrament of our Redemption. (2nd edit. 1920). p.94.
94. A.M.Stibbs, The Finished Work of Christ. (1954).p.20.
95. Griffith-Thomas, op.cit. p.101.
96. Ibid. p.101.
97. e.g. H.C.G.Moule, The Supper of the Lord. (N.D.). p.19.
98. A.J.Tait, The Nature and Function of the Sacraments.p.19.
99. Ibid. p.15.
100. H.B.Gooding, 'The Church - The Ministry - The Sacraments', in Liberal Evangelicicalism. ed. T.G.Rogers. (1923). pp.161-2.
101. N.Dimock in The Doctrine of Holy Communion and its Expression in Ritual: Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace in October 1900. ed. H.Wace. (1900). p.11.
102. N.Dimock, Missarum Sacrificia. pp.235f.
103. See also N.Dimock, op.cit. pp.228ff.
104. H.B.Gooding, op.cit. pp.163-4.
105. J.A.Motyer, 'Priestly Sacrifices in the Old Testament', in Eucharistic Sacrifice. pp.29ff.
106. E.M.B.Green, The Holy Communion - Doctrine in Dispute.(1963). pp.14ff.
107. Op.cit. p.42.
108. J.Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. (E.T. 1955). has been very influential.
109. J.T.Tomlinson, The Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. p.45.
110. E.M.B.Green, op.cit. p.9.
111. G.W.H.Lampe,'The Atonement: Law and Love', in Soundings ed. A.R.Vidler (1962). p.185.
112. Ibid. p.87-9.
113. Op.cit. p.46.
114. e.g. C.K.Barrett commenting on Romans 3:25 concluded that ἱλαστήριον cannot be translated 'propitiate' but means

rather 'expiate'. C.K.Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. (1957). pp.77-8.

115. Op.cit. p.45.
116. Ibid. p.35.
117. Ibid. p.53.
118. In The Parish Communion Today. (1962). ed. D.Paton. p.91.
119. Ibid.p.92.
120. Op.cit. p.58.
121. A.Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. (1958). pp.380-1.
122. Doctrine in the Church of England. (1938). p.162.
123. Report of the Lambeth Conference 1958. (1958). 2.83.
124. Ibid. 2.84.
125. Ibid. 2.85. quotation from A.G.Hebert in Ways of Worship.(1951).
126. Ibid. 2.81.
127. Eucharistic Sacrifice. ed. J.I.Packer. p.4.
128. Ibid. p.8.
129. Ibid. p.9.
130. Ibid. p.8.
131. Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930. p.82.

CHAPTER II

THE EUCHARIST AND PRESENCE

The controversy among Anglicans over the nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist follows in logical sequence from their differences of opinion as to what is the nature of a sacrament. Beliefs range from seeing our Lord as giving bread and wine, set apart for a particularly symbolic use, to His people to a belief in our Lord's presence in the consecrated elements approximating in varying degrees to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. Behind this is the decision to regard the Eucharist as primarily either done or said, effective or declaratory, instrumental or symbolic, a means of grace or a sign of grace.

The Prayer Book terms the sacraments 'effectual signs',[1] and though it repudiates Transubstantiation, it declares that by faith we do indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ but 'only after an heavenly and spiritual manner'.[2] The rubric on kneeling at the end of the rite denies in its 1662 form that there is,

'any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood', for these are'in heaven', and,

'The Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances'.

This rubric was not found in its present form until 1662, before this it had read as a denial of Christ's 'real and essential presence'. The author of the change was probably Dr Peter Gunning - later Bishop of Ely - a man who was known to have strong catholic sympathies.[3] It is very likely that Gunning did ~~not~~ intend to assert a belief in a presence in the consecrated elements by this change, as Bishop Burnet testified in his History of the Reformation in the Church of England. Evangelicals hold a different view, and maintain that the change of wording was due to a different terminology employed by seventeenth century theologians in which 'real

and essential presence' if denied was to assert a Zwinglian concept of the Eucharist, and not that of the Reformers who believed Christ was really received by the faithful. Tait pointed out that had any change from the Reformers' beliefs concerning the nature of the consecrated elements been intended the 1662 rubric would not have stated that Christ natural Body and Blood are 'in heaven and not here', and cannot be 'at one time in more places than one'.[4] The hypothesis concerning Gunning and his motives seems the most tenable of these two explanations for the change, for it would be possible to hold even the doctrine of Transubstantiation and maintain that Christ's Body was not corporally present. Another supporting factor for the explanation that Gunning intended a change in doctrine is that there is no other conceivable reason why the rubric, which had been dropped in Elizabeth's Prayer Book, should have been reintroduced. Gunning's views however cannot be taken as the doctrine of the Church of England as a whole, in fact it seems unlikely that the rubric was generally interpreted in this way even at that time, and certainly does not appear to have been so interpreted between this period and the Oxford Movement.

The Articles' apparent repudiation of Transubstantiation has been questioned by some, but on doubtful reasoning. Lacey was one who suggested that the 'Transubstantiation' repudiated by the Article was the doctrine popularly held in the sixteenth century, a corruption of the scholastic formulation,

> 'Transubstantiation as taught by the greatest scholastics, before the aberrations of Scotism, was a simple reduction of the words "This is my Body" to the terms of Aristotelian logic, and it seemed to be the only form of the statement by which grave errors could be excluded ... By the use of Aristotelian Categories, which are merely a common sense analysis of perception, the Real Presence was restricted to the category of pure being, or substantia, the categories of place and time and extension and like being ruled out ... If anyone desires a definition of spiritual presence, here it is, and it would be hard to find one better suited to the purpose ... Construing the Article, therefore, in a reasonably benevolent way, we must assume that the "transubstantiation" condemned by it is not that which was taught by the great scholastics and retained in

the best traditions of Latin theology'.[5]
This hypothesis goes against the natural sense of the Article, and the rest of the Prayer Book teaching on the Eucharist, which seems to have a Receptionist outlook. The 1662 Book did conceed a slightly more catholic interpretation apart from Gunning's ammendment, as it provided for additional consecration which would seem to be unnecessary unless the words of Institution effected some change in the elements (the importance of consecration is stressed in Jewel and other early seventeenth century writers). The wording of the Exhortation to communion in the service was also changed, in the 1552 Book it stated that Christ was given,

'to be our spiritual fode and sustenaunce, as it is declared unto us, as wel by Goddes word as by the holy Sacramentes of His blessed body and bloud',

but the 1662 version says that Christ is given,

'to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament',

no longer treating word and sacrament as identical in the way they give Christ to be our spiritual food. The 1662 Book also has the rubric which refers to the priest saying the 'Prayer of Consecration', a term not used even in the 1549 Book.

Receptionism

Receptionism seems to be the Prayer Book doctrine - Christ's presence in the souls of the faithful communicants rather than in the consecrated elements themselves - His presence is objective but essentially spiritual and can in no way be associated with a physical place or a material object. Dimock traced this teaching through the centuries in the writings of Latimer, Ridley, Jeremy Taylor, Hooker and Waterland.[6]

The sacramental principle involved is that the relationship between the sign and the thing signified is one of concurrance and not of identity, the sacraments are efficacious signs, signs to which promises are attached and which convey the promises in the action itself rather than in the elements used

in the action. Images often used by twentieth century Receptionists are the 'kiss' as the sacrament of love, and the placing of the ring on the finger at a wedding.[7] That which is material is used for the purposes of divine will and affection, just as the kiss and ring are used as expressions of human will and affection. The same may be said of another image - that of the title-deed to an estate which conveys the property though the deed is not the estate itself; this image, revived by Griffith-Thomas,[8] had been used in earlier Anglican apologetics. To this end also the 'investiture image' of S.Bernard was also resurrected,[9] though it had been discredited by Aquinas.[10] The 'effectual sign' is though adequate to convey the divine gift, there is no need for the sign to become that which it conveys, it is enough that the signs are 'pledges and seals' of divine grace - those who receive them with faith receive them as guarantees that God will effect that which He has promised.

Consecration is not without importance for the Receptionist, it signifies that the bread and wine have been set apart for a sacred use, but it does not make them 'tabernacles of the Presence'.[11] It is a setting-apart in the same way as the consecration of a church, a grave-yard, a holy-table, or a font.[12] Receptionists have always held that had any change in the nature of the elements taken place signified by the words 'This is my Body', the Greek word used would have been γίνεται not ἐστιν , as for the water changed to wine in John 2:19.[13] Dimock[14] and others believed that there and in John 6 Jesus was speaking on a purely spiritual level, and they can claim some support for this from S.Augustine,[15] thereby making the key to understanding all our Lord's eucharistic utterances 'spiritualiter per fidem', for the Lord's Supper is,

'a thing of spiritual understanding, spiritual perception, spiritual desire, spiritual satisfaction, spiritual receiving, spiritual eating, spiritual appropriation, spiritual digesting'.[16]

Indeed, it is asserted that Jesus could not have meant that His followers could literally drink His Blood and eat His Body, as

the idea of drinking blood would be a deadly sin to a Jew,[17] yet the Gospel account states that these words did offend the Jews and even caused some of Jesus' followers to leave Him, and He still did not modify them or explain that they were to be understood in a spiritual way, as catholics have pointed out.

The difficulty of John 6 can be removed if it is denied that the passage refers specifically to the Eucharist, Harris does do this,[19] it is a solution found in Waterland and Jeremy Taylor. Griffith-Thomas describes the relationship between John 6 and the Institution Narrative as that of 'a universal truth to a particular application',[20]

...'It is not that the discourse refers to or explains the Supper, but that the Supper refers to and amplifies the discourse'.[21]

Although S.John places this discourse chronologically some time before the Last Supper occured, there is no other real reference in his Gospel to the Eucharist. Modern Biblical scholarship holds that it was not S.John's principle to repeat the other Gospels and in this way explains his lack of Institution Narrative, but also points out that the Gospel does not contain the ipsissima verba of our Lord but rather a meditation upon them, so it seems highly probable that he was influenced by many years of the Church's growth in Eucharistic practice and understanding according to more catholic-minded Anglicans.

Another passage which has presented difficulties for the Receptionist is I Corinthians 11:27,

'Whoever, therefore, eats the bread and drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the Body and Blood of the Lord'.

Hanley Moule however found a way of interpreting this which overcame the difficulties when he stated that,

'one who trifled with the Christ-given emblems of the Passion, and so with the Passion, he would "eat and drink judgement to himself". In other words, his eating and drinking would but aggravate his guilt. He "crucifies the Son of God afresh". He does not "distinguish the Body"; the Meal is to him just a meal, not the Ordinance meant as it were to show him his Saviour slain for him'. 22

The Receptionist believes that we can in no sense have

any 'physical' contact with the Body and Blood of Christ. A text used to confirm this is John 20:17 where Jesus says to Mary Magdalene,

'Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father'.

This is claimed to show that,

'physical contact, as the attempted expression of faith and devotion based on the conception that the Lord would remain among the disciples in His Resurrection body, was rejected'. 23

By 'physical' contact the Receptionist means the belief that Christ is actually present in some way in the consecrated elements when they are received, and that He can be 'visited' in the Tabernacle. Catholics have asserted that this is not a good text to use for our Lord told S.Thomas to touch Him before the Resurrection. His words to Mary Magdalene seem to suggest He wanted her to do something else at the moment, He indeed went on to give her a message for the disciples. Further he said that she must not cling to Him as He had not ascended to the Father, she could not have Him to herself, by the very fact that He ascended to the Father all could cling to Him. Any attempt to connect this passage to Eucharistic theology seems rather futile.

Christ, for the Receptionist, is seen rather 'at' than 'on' the Holy Table. Some, like Tait, would say He was present 'in the Spirit', indeed as 'the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ',[24] and that the spiritual presence of the Lord referred to at the Holy Communion by the Prayer Book is

'not presence in the body of the Resurrection, but presence in the Holy Spirit'. 25

This is based on Christ's assurance that He would send them 'another Paraclete' in S.John's Gospel. Nowhere in the accounts of the institution of the rite, or in S.Paul's references to the Blessed Sacrament however is there any mention of the Holy Spirit in connection with the rite. Such an interpretation seems bound up in the evangelical approach of seeing the Lord present with His people now only in the form of the Holy Spirit, and could very easily lead to dangerous equating of the risen Lord with the Holy Spirit which would in no way be intended.

Because the Receptionist believes that the Body and Blood of Christ is received in an entirely spiritual manner, they can and do assert that it is the crucified Christ which we receive,

'not Christ as He is now, but Christ's Body and Blood as separated in Sacrificial Death for our sins ... thus we are made partakers of the Crucified Body directly, and of the glorified Body consequently'. 26

Dimock, in stating this, followed in the mainstream of Anglican post-Reformation thought, and could quote Waterland and others in support. The text of the Institution Narrative lends support to this, at least at first sight, for Jesus speaks of His Body and Blood separately, in an earthly state, and in the separation of sacrificial death. This interpretation would see Christ rather as He was than He is now, and not see the Body and Blood as having passed through sacrificial death to subsequent glory, indicating that the Body and Blood of Christ can still somehow exist in their former state.

The sacrament is a constant proclamation of Christ's death rather than a present expression of His life and activity and a proclamation of His glorified presence, which means that for the Receptionist there is no parallel between the Eucharist and the Incarnation, and for them anyone who asserted such a parallel would be guilty of Appolinarianism,[27] for they do not say we receive the full humanity of Christ even spiritually. A further argument against this Eucharist/Incarnation parallel is that it would involve a retrogressive step in God's relationship with mankind, after His total assumption of human personality.[28] To them the whole idea is just incredible, as Dimock stated,

'Will it be contended that these plain unlearned men (the apostles) would naturally understand from their Lord's words that what each now held in their hands was to be to him that which he was to address as his Master or to adore as having under its form the very presence of his Lord? What! Christ' . whole and entire in each piece of broken bread, just now in the hands of Christ Himself, and now in the hands of the Twelve, - while yet Christ, in His own proper form is there before their eyes?' 29

What then for the Receptionist is the purpose of Holy Communion? It seems excellently summarised in the following passage of Soames,

'The visible objects of bread and wine, and the physical acts of eating and drinking the bread and wine, are supposed to help us to perform, by the exercise of a living faith, the spiritual acts of eating and drinking in our hearts the spiritual food of "the Body and Blood of Christ".' 30

He then goes on to compare this with the attitude of a catholic to a crucifix,[31] though this would in fact be nearer to Zwinglianism than to Receptionism. It is also the great ordinance of fellowship, and those who reject it, 'cut themselves off from the life of society and are disloyal to the commands of the Divine Founder'.[32] Yet one danger implicit in this theory and which Receptionists never seem to face is that the Eucharist becomes easily a collection of individual acts of communion, rather than a realisation and reception of Christ in the midst.

Most theologians cited here wrote in the earlier part of this century, though they are all much quoted by Receptionists today. As far back as 1930 however V.F.Storr could assert that,

'in the Evangelical wing of the Church a new feeling for sacramentalism is arising'. 33

Although a Receptionist, he refused to see the sacrament in a static way, but as dynamic, conveying something living, active, and forceful to the believer. This new approach was slow to develop and not until G.W.H.Lampe's essay in Ways of Worship (1951) is Storr's hope again reasserted. Lampe accepted the term 'effectual signs', and the similies of the ring and the crozier used by Waterland, yet denied the elements were,

'static pictorial illustrations of the absent Body and Blood of Christ',

asserting rather that,

'they are dynamic, conveying to the believer the full dynamics of the reality which they signify', 34

he will not speak of 'presence' in the consecrated elements, but of 'energeia' and 'dynamis'. He even writes of the 'activity' of Christ 'in the Eucharistic elements', though by this stage he seems to have departed from the Receptionist position he

claims and contradicted his own acceptance of the ring and crozier similies, for though the ring and the crozier convey realities, ot it could be said they convey 'dynamis' or the 'energeia', they are not themselves the 'dynamis' or the 'energaia', they are static and not active.

Modern Philosophies: O.C.Quick and W.Temple

A belief in the 'Real Presence' in the consecrated elements in the Anglican Church has been facilitated by modern philosophies. Quick pointed out that the modern schools of realism, idealism, and pragmatism had put into dispute even what was meant by 'reality',[36] and this effects us when we speak of 'reality' applied to the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, and the 'reality' of bread and wine; what constitutes 'reality' has often come to depend on our understanding, our use of objects, and the values which we place upon them. Many philosophical systems would deny the possibility of the clear-cut distinction between 'substance' and 'accidents' of the Aristotelian metaphysic. Any idea of the heavenly Body of Christ occupying space has finally disappeared and with it the problem of how He could be in heaven and on our altars at the same time, His Body is not 'local, spatial or material' - it is rather an instrument through which He carries out His redemptive work.

This realisation produced some interesting conclusions in Quick's own theology. In many ways his theology was very evangelical, he frequently placed his emphasis not on the essence of the elements but on what God was doing through them. Yet on the whole he tended far more to Virtualism than to Receptionism, for though he never saw Christ's presence in the elements as material things, he could see the presence of Christ becoming efficacious through them,

'as they are within the process of a certain action which takes them up into himself, uses them as its instruments, and expresses itself in them', 37

and he could speak of the elements as having the 'virtue' of Christ's Body and Blood,

'in as much as they are vehicles of Christ's gifts to the soul, though they cannot be ontologically identified with that which they convey'. 38

Because of the changes brought about by modern thought he could say,

'the doctrine of Virtualism may become indistinguishable from that of the Real Presence or even of Transubstantiation. For if the elements have by the virtue of solemn consecration the power of effecting through Christ's use of them, His self-communication to human souls, that will be the same thing to us as to say that the elements are themselves changed, so as to be really vessels of Christ's presence and action. Even if we choose to call such a doctrine by the name of Transubstantiation, it will not be easy to quarrel with us. For, though we shall assert that the elements remain physically what they were before, it is not clear that even Transubstantiation demands any physical change, if by physical reality we mean, as most physicists do mean, only that which is ultimately perceptible to the senses. We shall then be only disputing the Roman theory, in so far as it would compel us to allow the existence of non-perceptible substance in material objects other than the consecrated bread and wine'. 39

He believed that the doctrine of Transubstantiation contained nothing that the Church of England need condemn,[40] though he would not advocate its use, and he allied himself with those who interpreted Article XXVIII as being only a refutation of popular misrepresentations of the doctrine when he asserted that what the Reformers condemned in the doctrine was not to be found in it as expressed by S.Thomas,[41] the things condemned were that it encouraged a carnal notion of the presence, and that it contradicted the evidence of the senses. Quick's own clearest divergence from Roman doctrine was his refusal to recognise any 'Real Presence' outside the context of the Eucharistic rite, at the most he would only concede a dormant presence in the elements reserved.[42] His use of various modern philosophies in interpreting doctrine could indeed make Virtualism and Transubstantiation seem almost at one, but it raised the question of whether it is legitimate to interpret a doctrine such as Transubstantiation which is so bound up with one particular philosophy in the terms of other philosophies and still call it by the same name. If we can no longer talk of 'substance' and 'accidents' can we still use the

term Transubstantiation?

William Temple tried to do something similar in his own Eucharistic theology. He believed in a doctrine of 'Convaluation' or 'Transvaluation', but was content to use the term 'Transubstantiation' basing his use of the word on the equation,

substance = value + existence, [43]

> ''Value' is the element in real things which both causes them to be, and makes them what they are, and is thus fitly called 'Substance' in so far as this is other or less than their totality.'

He thought it was possible to use 'Transubstantiation' to mean 'Transvaluation' which would make the objection which he had to the term - that it appeared to deny the continued existence of the substance of bread - cease to exist.[44] This would mean, interpreted into a word of his own coinage, 'Convaluation',

> 'The Bread still has the value of Bread; it has also the value of the Body of Christ'. 45

This seems to be an abuse of the term Transubstantiation which was deliberately defined to deny that the substance - or in Temple's terms the inherent value of the bread - existed after consecration. Consubstantiation is in fact much closer to Temple's theory, yet even he points out the impossibility of such a term as it suggests that the accidents could inhere in two substances at once.[46] Temple's theory was in fact more a form of Virtualism, for he saw the Eucharist as an

> 'expressive, not arbitrary symbol; that is to say, the spiritual reality signified is actually conveyed by the symbol'. 47

Indeed he was dangerously close to the Appolinarian heresy of those who draw too close a parallel between the Incarnation and the Eucharist when he stated,

> 'The Eucharistic Bread is His Body for the purpose for which it is consecrated, which is Communion, in exactly the same sense as that in which a physico-chemical organ was once His Body; it is the vehicle - the effective symbol - of His personality'. 48

The corollary from this, as from Quick's theory, is that there could be no more than a dormant presence in any elements reserved.

Temple is also thinking along Virtualist lines when,

although not denying the objectivity of the 'Value', he stated,

'This value, like all values, is only fully actual when it is appreciated.' 49

Those who hold a more catholic view of the Real Presence would assert that the 'value', if they used the term, was fully actual objectively, and not only fully actual subjectively when received with faith.

The 1922 Commission on doctrine also suggested that one might equate the term 'value' with 'substance', using the analogy of a pound-note which has the value in currency of a pound sterling.[50] This analogy would run into even more difficulties than did Temple if it was used to express 'substance'.

The Real Presence

A belief in the Real Presence in the consecrated elements themselves was revived by the Tractarians. Archdeacon Denison, brought before the Archbishop's Court in 1865, insisted that Christ was so present, and that all, faithful and unfaithful, did indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ when they received the consecrated elements.[51] When judgement was given against Denison a letter of protest was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Pusey, Keble, Bennett and others who upheld Denison's beliefs.[52] Keble wrote his book On Eucharistic Adoration in defence of Denison, and in it he wrote of the

'Real objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that to be both eaten and worshipped, in Holy Communion.' 53

Bennett himself was brought before the ecclesiastical courts in 1872 over his own Eucharistic beliefs, and neither the Court of Arches, nor on appeal the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, condemned him for teaching his congregation,

'to adore, Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ', and,

'the real and actual presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches'. 54

By not condemning it, they held it to be a legitimate doctrine which could be held in the Church of England. And indeed the

Archbishop of Canterbury asserted its legitimacy in his charge of 1898 when he stated,

'the Church nowhere forbids the ... doctrine that there is a Real Presence in some way attached to the elements at the time of consecration and before reception'. 55

In 1900 the English Church Union under the chairmanship of Lord Halifax drew up the following statement, and asked its members for their assent to it:

'We, Members of the English Church Union, holding fast to the Faith and teaching of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church - that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the Bread and Wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, become, in and by Consecration, according to our Lord's Institution, verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Christ, and that Christ our Lord, present in the same Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar under the forms of Bread and Wine, is to be worshipped and adored - desire, in view of the present circumstances, to re-affirm, in accordance with the teaching of the Church, our belief in this verity of the Christian Faith, and to declare that we shall abide by all such teaching and practice as follows from this doctrine of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.' 56

In 1937 both Houses of Canterbury Convocation upheld the teaching of the Real Presence when they accepted the report of a conference of Anglican and Rumanian theologians held in 1935 in Bucarest as being 'a legitimate interpretation of the faith' held by the Church of England. This report stated,

'In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (metabole) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? That is a mystery.

Those who receive the Eucharistic Bread and Wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord.' 57

The main characteristics of the theology of those who believe in the Real Presence are as follows:

1. That such a Presence is the only legitimate explanation of the relevant Biblical texts, and as such was recognised by the Fathers. John 6 is always interpreted as referring to the Eucharist, not merely as a general statement of which the Eucharist is a particular expression.
2. That a change in the nature of the elements is effected by Consecration (some believed our Lord's words alone sufficed others preferred the addition of an epiclesis).

3. Frequent parallels, though of varying degrees, are to be found between the Eucharist and the Incarnation.
4. The nature of the Eucharistic Body is not that of our Lord in a state of crucifixion, but rather His glorified Body which has passed through crucifixion, the Resurrection and the Ascension, though it is sometimes spoken of as His 'Sacramental' Body to distinguish it from His 'Natural' Body.
5. The Presence is entirely objective and lasts as long as the consecrated elements remain (even those who would suggest that the Presence is dormant in the reserved elements would never advocate reconsecration). It is received by all who receive the consecrated elements, though those who receive without faith are believed only to receive the 'res sacramenti' and not also the 'virtus sacramenti' as do the faithful.

Bishop Charles Gore

Gore's book The Body of Christ first appeared in 1901 and it was largely the product of his thought in connection with two important conferemces he had attended in preceeding years, the Oxford Conference on 'Priesthood and Sacrifice' of 1899, and the Fulham Conference on the Eucharist of 1900. This was his most important work in the field.

He held to a Real Presence in the consecrated elements (although he nowhere laid stress on a 'moment' of consecration in the rite) based on his interpretation of the Scriptures, particularly of John 6,[53] and on the Fathers.[54]

Following in the footsteps of many Tractarian writers he saw a strong relationship between the Incarnation and the Eucharist, but he saw the Eucharist as an instrument for extending the Incarnation in Christ's Body the Church, rather than as a direct parallel to the Incarnation, thereby avoiding the danger of Appolinarianism. He did say that in the Eucharist as in the Incarnation the lower and material was taken up into the higher and heavenly, but he saw this as typical of God's

work in the whole of Creation and necessary because of the nature of man which inter-relates the physical and the spiritual.[60] He did particularly stress that the union of the natural and supernatural in the Eucharist was different from the union of the two in the Incarnation.[61]

The Body of Christ that we receive must, for Gore, be His glorious Body. He refused to accept that we could partake of His crucified Body in any way except by an act of memory,[62] though it was true that the glorified Body which we receive was indeed that same Body which had been crucified, one Body only exists not two,[63]

'If there be thus, as the Christian Church so constantly believed, a real communication to us of the flesh and blood of Christ, it must be the "flesh" and "blood" of the glorified Christ, for no other exists. These mysterious things are given to us in the Eucharist under conditions which recall a past state - the state of sacrificial death. It is our Lord as dying that faith recalls: it is His death for us that we "proclaim till He come" (I Cor 11:26) in the breaking of bread. But those very words of S.Paul, "till He come", suggest that He is no longer dead, that He is alive and in heaven. The person who now feeds us with His very own life, divine and human, is He who is set before us in a vision of the Apocalpse as a "Lamb as it had been slain", but alive for ever more in the heavenly places.' 64

It is not just one aspect of our Lord that we receive, it is the whole Christ that we might become the whole Christ.[65]

Gore begins to say something new when he deals with the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. He rejects Transubstantiation on the following grounds:

1. It is against the whole principle of the Incarnation.
2. It forces the Church to accept an outdated philosophical theory.
3. By focusing too much attention on the elements it detracts from the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, and leads to all manner of extra-liturgical devotions which increase this.[66]

He then propounded his own theory which he claimed showed an objective Presence[67] of Christ without falling into any of these dangers. His approach to the question can best be illustrated

by the following passage from The Body of Christ ,

'The trees and flowers do not depend on my mind for their existence, but on the action of that common reason in which all men more or less effectively share, but which, at bottom, has its origin in divine reason. Upon mind in general, however, the existence of the world as we know it depends; and for irrational creatures - such as in no way share in reason- it cannot in any real sense be said to exist; for existence on analysis proves to mean a relation to mind. So the spiritual presence of Christ in His Body and Blood rests not on the precarious faith of any individual, but is so relative tothe faith of the Church as a whole - that common faculty which rests at the bottom on the activity of the Holy Ghost - as that apart from faith, or for one who in no way shares in it, it can no more in any intelligible sense be said to exist for what is quite without reason.' 68

This theory is based on an idealistic form of philosophy which was current among English theologians at the time of Gore. In this philosophy objects do not exist apart from 'common reason', when this is translated by Gore into terms of the Sacraments and the Church the equivalent of 'common reason' becomes the 'common faith' of the Church and this must be expressed in the participation of the Church (or each congregation as representative) in the actual Eucharistic rite - hence he condemns all extra-liturgical devotions (which he regards as individualistic)[69] and all celebrations in which the whole Body does not communicate.[70]

Mascall has pointed out some very interesting logical out-workings of this theory, which would lead to two possibilities, neither of which would have been Gore's intention, when he stated that if,

'we denied that the mind plays any part in constituting the physical object but merely apprehends the existence of an object already constituted, then the parallel argument would assert that faith plays no part in constituting the reality of the Eucharistic Presence but only apprehends it as something already existing. And then, presumably, extra-liturgical devotion would be legitimate, if not indeed obligatory. If, at the other extreme, we held that physical objects are entirely constituted by the mind of the individual percipient (without any reference to God's mysterious 'common reason in which all men more or less effectively share'), the parallel argument would assert that the Eucharistic Presence exists entirely in the mind of the faithful communicant. And then we should be receptionists, if not indeed Zwinglians'. 71

The real difficulty with Gore's theory is that it replaced one philosophical theory with another and indeed with one that was to have a far shorter life than the Aristotelian metaphysic, which is an extraordinary thing for Gore to have done for he condemned Transubstantiation as,

'a verbal incumbrance due to an inopportune intrusion into the Church doctrine of a temporary metaphysic'. 72

Sir Will Spens

Spens was another who believed from his study of the Biblical texts and of the Fathers that our Lord's words concerning the Eucharist and its relationship with His own Body and Blood involved far more than 'didactic symbolism' or purely spiritual reference.[73]

He too saw the link between the Eucharist and the Incarnation, seeing both our Lord's natural Body in His earthly life and the consecrated elements as 'an objective expression of His being', both being so 'by the operation of Divine Will', and in fact, he asserted, the Eucharistic Body and Blood mediate,

'a far more intimate relation with our Lord than did His natural body to His first disciples'. 74

Hence he deduced that if we should kneel to Christ on earth, we should do so to His Eucharistic presence,[75] both are dirctly related to Him by their direct dependence on His being and nature. He carefully avoided stating the relationship between the Incarnation and the Eucharist in such a way as to be guilty of Appolinarianism.

When discussing the manner in which our Lord is present in the consecrated elements he does not use the traditional terminology, but uses a philosophical basis which saw an object as giving a complex of opportunities for experience. In terms of the Eucharist this means that the elements through consecration have their 'complex of opportunities for experience' dependent on,

'a law which directly determines the actualisation of essential elements in our Lord's nature',

causing,

'a relation (to) exist between the object and our Lord as to justify our identifying the object with Him'. 76

The bread and wine increase their 'complex of opportunities' by gaining new properties which

'they do not annihilate the natural properties of giving sustenance and refreshment, yet so supersede these that we can rightly speak of the objects themselves as wholly changed and transfigured'. 77

And he quotes Theodoret in support,

'They remain in their former substance and shape and form, and are still visible and as they were before; but they are apprehended as what they have become, and are believed and adored as being what they are believed to be.' 78

At first this seems to be like a modern version of Consubstantiation, rather than of Transubstantiation, particularly when he quoted Theodoret, though he carefully avoids the term and with it the consequential philosophical difficulties of having two substances and only one accidents. It seems from his own writings however, that the 'complex of opportunities, given by the bread and wine are so superseded by their new status that he comes much nearer to a translation of Transubstantiation into a new philosophical framework. He avoids the pitfalls of Quick and Temple by not attempting to fit the actual term 'Transubstantiation' with all its Aristotelian overtones into his newer philosophical definitions. His terminology was completely free of crude materialisms and went a long way to prevent any concept of a localised presence, which Transubstantiation nearly always suggests when it varies but a little from its pure scholastic form.

Faith has an important part to play in the Eucharist, for though all had the chance to realise this 'complex of opportunities' only those with faith could do so fully and appropriate the grace available to them by these means, the whole Eucharistic experience is brought about 'by the operation of Divine Will', and ,

'our Lord's will determines, not that all who receive the

Holy Gifts receive grace; but that all who receive the Holy Gifts are enabled to receive grace, if they feed in their hearts with faith'. 79

Transubstantiation

Some Anglican theologians, again basing their theology on their interpretation of the Scriptures and of the Fathers, have been prepared to accept fully the doctrine of Transubstantiation with its accompanying Aristotelian metaphysic.[80] Those who have done so have however accepted it in its pure scholastic form totally free from later accretions.[81] Others, while accepting the basic doctrine, refused to use the actual term 'Transubstantiation' because of its dangerous overtones, asserting that although it is acceptable to the philosopher, it had led and always would lead to harmful misrepresentations among ordinary people.[82]

The strong supporters of Transubstantiation in the earlier years of this century were Stone, who in all matters but especially in Eucharistic doctrine had great Roman sympathies,[83] Lacey and Wilfred Knox. Yet they were not without wider support, for Brilioth said with considerable justification that the English Church Union's Declaration of 1900[84] was,

'practically a popular version of transubstantiation'.[85]

Transubstantiation was condemned by Article XXVIII. Those who support the doctrine point out that by the time of the Reformation it existed in many versions, most of which did lead to false notions and were truly worthy of condemnation. They insisted that it was these false notions which were condemned and not the doctrine according to Aquinas. Stone says of the use of the word in the Article,

'the word "Transubstantiation" is probably used to denote a carnal form of the doctrine which would be contrary to the Council of Trent itself, and denied by every educated theologian; for one of the reasons for the repudiation is that "Transubstantiation" "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament", and this would not be true of the doctrine of Transubstantiation as held by the theologians'. 86

It seems difficult to believe that one as learned as Cranmer

could not distinguish between Aquinas and later misrepresentations of his teaching; Cranmer's other writings show that he did not believe in the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements,[87] only the spiritual presence of Christ in those who received the Sacrament worthily.[88]

E.L.Mascall and Neo-Thomism

Mascall upholds the teaching of Aquinas but insists that it needs supplementation, particularly in its discussion of the way in which sacramental causality acts.[89] For him it is not enough to believe that through divine power the accidents of bread and wine continue to exist but the substance is that of the Body and Blood, rather it must be said that the bread and the wine no longer have the status of substance but have the status of sacramental signs of the Body and Blood of Christ - they lose nothing when they cease to have substance, rather they gain something - the status of being sacramental signs. The Body and Blood have indeed raised their status giving them, 'a higher and not a lower metaphysical reality',[90] for the status of being a sacramental sign is higher than the status of substance. Mascall always sees a sacramental sign as a sign of a reality that is present and not of one that is absent.[91] It is true that Aquinas did not see sacramental causality in this way, but working on strict Aristotelian lines he would not have been likely to do so as it involves saying either that the substance of bread and wine is absorbed into the reality of the Body and Blood thereby forming a 'sacramental sign', or else one must say that the 'sacramental sign' of the Body and Blood being of far higher status than the substance of the bread and wine replaces it, although it is the divine will that the accidents of bread and wine remain. Mascall may well use the concept of a 'sacramental sign', although he cannot logically say that the bread and wine lose nothing in status by becoming a 'sacramantal sign' he could say they gain far more than they lose.

Mascall's comments on the theories of Gore, Temple and Spens are intersting, he does not deny their validity but concludes for himself that he,

'would wish to argue that transvaluation, transignification, and transfinalization are all valid consequences of transubstantiation and should not be made substitutes for it'. 92

CHAPTER II: FOOTNOTES

1. Article XXV.
2. Article XXVIII.
3. K.N.Ross, Adoration of the Holy Sacrament. (N.D.). p.7.
4. A.J.Tait, Sacrament and Presence. (N.D.). pp.24-5.
5. T.A.Lacey, The Anglo-Catholic Faith. pp.127-8.
6. N.Dimock, Notes on the Round Table Conference. pp.5-7.
7. A.J.Tait, The Nature and Function of the Sacraments. p.3.n.1.
8. W.H.Griffith-Thomas, A Sacrament of our Redemption. p.90.
9. H.C.G.Moule, Outlines of Christian Doctrine. (N.D.). pp.242-3.
10. Aquinas, Summa. iii.,lxii,i., par.3.
11. A.J.Tait, Sacrament and Presence. p.10.
12. Ibid. p.62.
13. e.g. W.H.Griffith-Thomas, op.cit. pp.19-20.
14. N.Dimock, op.cit. p.18.
15. De Doctrina Christiana. Lib.iii., cap.xvi.
16. N.Dimock, op.cit. pp.24-5.
17. G.H.Harris, 'The Place and Purpose of the Holy Communion in the Christian Life', in Essays in Liberal Evangelicalism, ed. T.G.Rogers.
18. John 6:60-1,66.
19. Op.cit. pp.275-7.
20. Op.cit.p.11.
21. Op.cit.p.12.
22. H.C.G.Moule, The Supper of the Lord. p.23.
23. A.J.Tait, Sacrament and Presence. p.39.
24. Ibid. p.34.
25. Ibid. p.42.
26. Fulham Comference Report. p.12.
    Dimock was supported in this statement by W.H.Barlow, ibid.p.12, and H.C.G.Moule, ibid.p.44.
27. A.J.Tait, The Nature and Function of the Sacraments. pp.53-4.
28. H.B.Gooding, 'The Church - The Sacraments - The Ministry', in Liberal Evangelicalism, ed. T.G.Rogers. p.158.
29. N.Dimock, On Eucharistic Worship in the English Church.pp.99-100.

30. W.H.K.Soames, What does the Church of England say about the Real Presnce and Adoration? (1898). p.46.
31. Ibid. p.45.
32. A.J.Tait, op.cit.p.47.
33. V.F.Storr, 'Anglican Eucharistic Theology Today', in The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion, ed.A.J.Macdonald. (1930). p.312.
34. G.W.H.Lampe in Ways of Worship, ed.P.Edwall, E.Hayman, & W.D.Maxwell. (1951).p.199.
35. Ibid. p.200.
36. Farnham Conference on Reservation. pp.25-7.
37. O.C.Quick, The Christian Sacraments. p.225.
38. Ibid. p.206.
39. Farnham Conference on Reservation. pp.26-7.
40. Ibid. p.39.
41. Ibid. pp.22-4.
42. Ibid. p.32. cf. also The Christian Sacraments. p.221.
43. W.Temple, Christus Veritas. (1924). p.15.
44. Ibid. p.247.
45. Ibid. p.248.
46. Ibid. p.247.
47. Ibid. p.239.
48. Ibid. p.252.
49. Ibid. p.240.
50. Doctrine in the Church of England. p.175.
51. A.Härdelin, The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist. (1965). p.175.
    See also G.A.Denison, The Real Presence. (1853). pp.57,64.
52. A.Härdelin, op.cit. p.176.
53. J.Keble, On Eucharistic Adoration. (3rd edit. 1867).pp.19,71.
54. Quoted in W.Spens and A.E.Taylor, 'The Real Presence', in The Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress 1927. pp.110-111-
55. Quoted in W.H.K.Soames, op.cit.p.5.
56. Viscount Halifax, Proposals for Mutual Explanation: Eucharistic Doctrine. (1900). p.20.

57. Quoted in E.L.Mascall, Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.179.
58. Fulham Conference. p.20
59. J.Carpenter, Gore;A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought.(1960).p.230
60. The Body of Christ. (1907 edit.). pp.39-40.
. Also Fulham Conference. p.21.
61. Ibid. p.47.
62. Fulham Conference. p.44.
63. Ibid. p.51.
64. The Body of Christ. p.66.
65. Ibid. p.60.
66. C.Gore & J.E.Watts-Ditchfield, Reservation. pp.32-3.
See also The Body of Christ. pp.120-2.
67. The Body of Christ. p.74.
68. Ibid. pp.152-3.
69. Ibid. p.viii.
70. Ibid. p.136.
71. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi. p.243.
72. The Body of Christ. p.120.
73. e.g. W.Spens, Belief and Practice. p.161.
74. Ibid. p.178.
75. Ibid. p.178-9.
See also W.Spens, 'The Eucharist', p.444 in Essays Catholic and Critical, ed.E.G.Selwyn.
76. W.Spens & A.E.Taylor, 'The Real Presence'.p.118 op.cit.
77. The Eucharist. p.429.
78. Dialogue II, P.G. lxxxiii., 165-8.
79. Belief and Practice. p.150.
80. e.g. D.Stone, The Holy Communion. pp.28-9,68.
D.Stone, The Eucharistic Sacrifice. pp.33-4,82,
W.L.Knox, The Catholic Movement in the Church of England. p.65.
81. e.g. T.A.Lacey, The Anglo-Catholic Faith. p.127.
82. e.g. W.C.E.Newbolt, The Sacrament of the Altar. pp.66-7.
83. F.L.Cross, Darwell Stone. (1943). p.66.
84. Cited earlier in the chapter.

85. Y.Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic. trans. A.G.Hebert. (1930). p.217.
86. D.Stone, English Church Review. Nov. 1910. Vol.I. p.512. See also T.A.Lacey, op.cit. p.128.
87. T.Cranmer, Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. ed. J.E.Cox. (Parker Society, 1844). I.89-91.
88. Op.cit. Answer to Gardiner. p.3.
89. Corpus Christi. p.219.
90. Ibid. p.225.
91. Ibid. p.220.
92. E.L.Mascall,'Eucharistic Doctrine after Vatican II: Some Anglican Anticipations', C.Q.R. Vol. CLXIX. (1968).

All references to C.Gore, The Body of Christ, are to the 1907 edition unless otherwise stated, and likewise the references to E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi, are to the 1965 edition.

APPENDIX

RESERVATION AND EXTRA-LITURGICAL DEVOTIONS

Article XXVIII of the Prayer Book appears to condemn Reservation, yet by the early years of this century it was widely known and there were many attempts to justify this practice. The authors of the Prayer Book had asserted that their work was based on the teaching of the Bible and the early Fathers,[1] the supporters of Reservation could show that Justin Martyr in the second century regarded it as the normal practice among early Christians , and the Apostolic Tradition of the third century referred to the current practice of reserving at home enough bread to communicate on weekdays from the Sunday celebration.[2]

They also contended that it had never been forbidden in the Church of England. Darwell Stone insisted that it was the duty of all parish priests and pointed to the unrepealed Constitutions of John Peccham, promulgated at the Council of Reading in 1279 and the Council of Lambeth in 1281, which ordered Reservation in all parish churches.[3] Lacey denied that the Prayer Book did forbid it, and his approach was followed by others. Firstly he dealt with Article XXVIII which said that

'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped'; he pointed out that technically all this says is that Christ did not order these things, not that He forbade them.[4] Secondly, he asserted that provision made for the communion of the sick in the Prayer Book was not always suitable, so the parish priest might be forced to resort to other methods.[5] Thirdly, he discussed the rubric at the end of the Holy Communion Service which demands that any remaining consecrated elements be consummed; he admitted that if this was literally obeyed it would prevent Reservation, but he produced evidence that the elements had been taken to the sick during or immediately after the service from the time that the Prayer Book was first

issued.[6] Bishop Frere also produced evidence for Reservation in theElizabethan period and in the seventeenth century, although communion in these instances was given on the same day as the celebration.[7] Frere said of the Reformers that they,

'evidently did not object to Reservation itself; that the Sacrament should be reserved and administered to the sick subsequently to the celebration was admitted by them. They could hardly have done otherwise in view of the history of the custom of the Christian Church. What they objected to, therefore, and abolished as far as they could, was the misuse of the Reserved Sacrament; and they were anxious in getting rid of abuses so as to restrict Reservation as to be sure that they should never return. In other words their objection was a practical one, rather than a theological one'. 8

Resrvation was supported by many who held differing views concerning the Real Presence. Some who believed in the validity of Reservation saw the presence of Christ as in no sense 'active' during the period when the consecrated elements were reserved, for example O.C.Quick who wrote,

'they are not, during the interval of reservation, in the actual use of that purpose (Holy Communion), not outside that use can they express the meaning which is theirs within it. Their holiness then, while they are reaerved, is real but negative'. 9

He said of extra-liturgical devotions that,

'it is hard to find any justification ... for Devotions expressly directed to the place where they lie'. 10

Others who opposed extra-liturgical devotions included Gore and Freestone who both insisted that these were products of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.[11] Though Freestone admitted that adoration was given to Christ's presence in the Reserved Sacrament as early as the eleventh century, two centuries before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was formulated, he believed it grew up as a reaction to Berengian ideas - the ideas that led to the formulation of the doctrine.[12] Darwell Stone made much of this in his criticism of Freestone, pointing out that,

'the distinctive feature of Tarnsubstantiation is not the assertion of the presence of Christ, but the assertion that the substance or underlying reality of the bread has been so converted into the substance of the Body of Christ that the substance of bread has ceased to be; and the emphasis in the records of the cultus is always the presence of Christ, not

the absence of the substance of bread'. 13

He doubted that such a complicated technical doctrine could have any affect on public worship. Historically speaking it seems that the doctrine was to a large extent a philosophical expresssion of what had come to be held as popular belief.

It is possible to base devotion to Christ in the consecrated elements on other philosophies than that of Aristotle, as Stone would agree.[14] Sir Will Spens came to this conclusion from his own philosophical basis and asked,

'when a complex of opportunities for experience, which constitutes an object, exists as a complex in immediate dependence on a law which directly determines the actualization of essential elements in our Lord's nature, does such a relation -ship exist between that object and our Lord as to justify our identifying the object with him, as far as such identification is involved in directing to the object those acts by which we express our adoration? In brief when we genuflect are we guilty of idolatry?' 15

He strongly supported such worship.

Gore and others who held similar views would accept adoration of Christ's presence in the consecrated elements during the rite, but not outside it.[16] Others saw extra-liturgical devotions as extensions of the adoration given within the rite. Spens said of this adoration of Christ,

'if our Lord was present in His glorified Body, when we knelt before it in our worship of Him, we should not be giving to the Body in itself that worship which may be properly paid only to the divine person, but we should be so far identifying the object with the person that our worship of the person found expression in relation to the object. If the Eucharistic body and blood are no less directly related to Him in that they are no less directly dependent on His being and nature, and if they mediate an even more intimate relation than did His natural body, then a similar attitude is justified, and our Eucharistic adoration finds natural and proper expression in acts related to the sacrament'. 17

This is particularly true of the Reserved Sacrament because,

'if the Reserved Sacrament is capable of giving Communion, precisely the arguments as to the Eucharistic adoration ... apply in the case of the Reserved Sacrament. Further, when this finds expression in devotional practices, what is involved is simply the transposition - in time, though not in thought, and for convenience though not in principle - of elements which are intrinsic parts of the Eucharistic rite'. 18

Darwell Stone was among those who adopted this line of approach: he said of worship given to our Lord in extra-liturgical devotions,

'if it differs at all from the worship which would be His if He were to manifest His visible presence, the difference is not because of anything in Him but only because the soul might attain to something higher if the sight of the Lord were vouchsafed', 19

On this basis, Stone, Spens and many other catholics believed that extra-liturgical devotions were not only permissable, but should be encouraged. Most would rather that they were not imposed but were freely tolerated.[20] Stone himself was not in favour of Exposition, as he doubted that there was more to be gained spiritually in seeing the Host than in knowing it was there.[21]

More extreme catholics saw such devotions as the duty of Christians as a logical conclusion from their Eucharistic beliefs. Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, condemned the view that they were 'luxuries' and 'extras',[22] they represented the 'truth' realised in Christ's mystical Body, the Church, which had,

'deepened down the ages her sense of her Lord's presence within her and about her; and as she came to a clearer apprehension of it and its twofold mode, she naturally began to value these expressions of Him more than in the past'. 23

Thornton said the same,

'it is not then a question of spiritual luxuries, but of the honour due to our Lord Himself'. 24

Similar expressions are to be found in the writings of E.L.Mascall who stated that,

'if the incarnate Lord is present in the Reserved Sacrament in any way but a purely metaphorical sense, it is surely both lawful and desirable that His disciples should worship Him there'. 25

He goes so far as to say that any who would deny such worship must,

'write off the whole history of devotion to the sacred humanity as a sheer mistake'. 26

Mascall's highly sacrificial view of the Eucharist led him to see these devotions as the adoration we should like to give to

Christ during the Eucharistic rite, but because this is primarily a sacrifice to God we cannot;

'the nature of the Liturgy (is) Christ's offering to the Father of Himself and His mystical Body, and (as we) no longer think of the Eucharist as primarily our own worship of Christ, it would seem to be more, rather than less, desirable that our devotion to Christ outside the liturgical action should be maintained and developed'. 27

In fact,

'we can hardly be wrong if we see the extra-liturgical cultus of the sacramental presence as one of God's many good gifts to His household the Church'. 28

Mascall's theology represents the furthest development of Anglicanism in this direction, and minimises devotion towards our Lord in the Eucharist more than most catholics would.

The most extreme form of extra-liturgical devotion is Benediction, which involves the blessing of the congregation by the priest with the Host in a monstrance and is a practice adopted by some Anglicans from the Roman Catholic Church. Mascall has attempted an apologia for it for the Church of England, for he insists that if the Blessed Sacrament is to be adored it should be done not just by the pious, the sacrament being half-hidden in a side-chapel[29] as this is likely to encourage the distortions of doctrine catholics are so anxious to prevent, he therefore recommended that the Sacrament be reserved in a central position and acts of congregational worship take place. He points out that devotions stress our adoration of God, but he believes Benediction encourages sounder doctrine for it is manward and not Godward, the blessing of the people with the Host reminds them of the fact that in our relationship with God it is he who takes the initiative,[30] and by being congregational it does much to avoid subjectivism.[31] He believed also that such an emphasis did much to avoid the dangers of immense localization which are seen by many to be implied in the cultus.[32]

The objection has been raised that there is a danger of giving the impression that Christ dwells in the Tabernacle to the exclusion of His presence elsewhere,[33] this may be true in

popular faith though certainly not in catholic theology.[34] Another objection is that Reservation especially with accompanying devotions obscures the proper use of the Lord's Supper,[35] catholics have insisted in answer to this that where such devotions are practised the laity make their communion more frequently than where they are not, W.L.Knox insisted that such devotions helped people to benefit more from their acts of communion.[36] Reservation itself, apart from extra-liturgical devotions, is not acceptable to any theologian who does not believe in some form of Christ's presence in the consecrated elements.

APPENDIX: FOOTNOTES

1. Concering the Service of the Church.
2. G.Dix, The Apostolic Tradition. (1937). p.58.
   . Also G.Dix, A Detection of Aumbries. (1942). pp.8-9.
3. D.Stone, The Holy Communion. (1904). pp.88,133.
   Council of Lambeth. Cap.I.
4. T.A.Lacey, Reservation. (1899). p.26.
   . Also W.Lockton, The Remains at the Eucharist. (1920). pp.251-2.
5. Ibid. p.39.
6. Ibid. p.52.
7. Walter Howard Frere. ed. J.H.Arnold & E.G.P.Wyatt. (1940).p.171.
8. Ibid. p.172.
9. O.C.Quick, The Christian Sacraments. (1927). p.225.
10. Ibid. p.225.
11. W.H.Freestone, The Sacrament Reserved. (1917). p.266.
    . Also C.Gore, in Reservation. pp.1-2.
12. Ibid. pp.258-60.
13. D.Stone, in Reservation. pp.60-1.
14. Ibid. p.61.
15. W.Spens & A.E.Taylor, 'The Real Presence: Theologically and Philosophically Considered', p.118 in Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress 1927. ed. C.S.Gillett & K.Ingram.
16. C.Gore & J.E.Watts-Ditchfield, Reservation.(1917). p.41.
17. W.Spens, 'The Eucharist', p.444 in Essays Catholic and Critical. ed. E.G.Selwyn . (1920).
18. Ibid. p.445.
    Also L.Thornton, 'The Reserved Sacrament: Its Devotional Aspect', p.173, in Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress 1927.
19. D.Stone, The Reserved Sacrament. (1917). pp.90-1.
20. D.Stone, in Reservation. p.64.
21. D.Stone, op.cit. p.102.
22. F.Weston, The Fulness of Christ. (1916). pp.264-6.
23. Ibid. p.266.
24. L.Thornton, op.cit. p.176.
25. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi. (2nd edit. 1965).p.263.

26. Ibid.p.268.
27. Ibid.p.268.
28. Ibid.p.268.
29. Ibid.p.264-5.
30. Ibid.p.266.
31. Ibid.p.265.
32. C.Gore in Reservation. p.4.
33. e.g. A.J.Tait in Reservation. p.94.
34. e.g. T.A.Lacey, The Anglo-Catholic Faith. (1926).p.175.
35. e.g. A.J.Tait, op.cit. p.96.
36. W.L.Knox, The Catholic Movement in the Church of England. (1923). p.74.

CHAPTER III

THE EUCHARIST AND THE BODY OF CHRIST

The Social Nature of the Eucharist.

The early years of this century saw the age of Christian socialism particularly among more catholic-minded Anglicans. This was largely the result of a sacramental teaching with a strongly ethical content. Christ was seen in the poor and in all who were in need, and to serve Christ in such was an act of worship, not in a patronising way but as an act of humility. All men were bound to each other by the sharing of Christ at the altar, and it was Christ from the altar that they carried out to meet Christ in the streets. This was well exemplified in the lives of the great 'slum' priests - Lowder, Wainwright, Dolling, Stanton and others. As was written of Father Wainwright, the Vicar of S.Peter's, London Docks, he

'never missed his own offering of the Holy Sacrifice nor the hour of devotion which followed it. Then he went out to find Christ in His poor.' 1

This same understanding was to be found in the words of Bishop Frank Weston to the 1923 Anglo-Catholic Congress,

'You cannot claim to worship Jesus in the tabernacle if you do not pity Jesus in the slum ... You have your Mass, you have your altars, you have begun to get your tabernacles. Now go into the highways and the hedges, and look for Jesus in the ragged and the naked, in the oppressed and the sweated, in those who have lost hope, and in those who are struggling to make good'. 2

The social implications of the Eucharist find an important place in the theology of Charles Gore. For him the Eucharist created a bond among men overcoming all national and class boundaries,

'I wish you to think of it as constituting the great fellowship which knows no boundaries and no limits, which desires to embrace all men in its great and glorious communion, but which in every place and every time, in every congregation, demands the realisation of fellowship.' 3

He believed that this very social character of the sacrament was the best argument for belief in the Real Presence as opposed

to a Receptionist or Virtualist doctrine which he considered to be too individualistic.[4] He upheld the social nature of the Eucharist as being the true teaching of the Fathers and to be found in the earliest liturgies and quoted the Didache in support,

'As this bread was once scattered upon the mountains, and, having been gathered together became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom'. 5

It was above all the 'sacrament of fraternity'.[6]

The Church as the Body of Christ.

Later these beliefs came to be expressed in the terms of the inter-relationship of the sacramental Body of Christ and the Church as the Body of Christ. Mascall says much the same as Gore and Weston only in a different way in the following passage from Christ, the Christian and the Church,

'far from Eucharistic worship being a matter merely of the sanctuary and the sacristy, it is of direct relevance to the world in which Christians live and work and love and die. For the Body which appears in its mystical form upon our altars is the same Body which is at work in the world and of which we are members. In a quite true sense, therefore, what Christians do in the world, in their work and in their play, is identical with the offering made upon the altar and with the act of worship made by Christ in heaven'. 7

Mascall did point out the danger of just seeing the Eucharist in its social context - although the Eucharist is supreme in the way it should make us realise our involvement with the world - this is not its primary function. The Eucharist exists, he believed,

'to make and preserve and extend the Body of Christ, the Holy people of God', 8

- to extend the new creation. The Church and the Sacraments only have social implications because 'the Church itself is a divine and supernatural society'.

The Roman Catholic Church began to realise afresh the implications of the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ - the Church- in the early years of this century, for it was this theology that lay behind the liturgical movement. Dom Lambert

Beauduin saw the Eucharist as helping men to realise their fraternal relationship with each other by recovering a sense of organic unity with each other and with our Lord because they are the Body of Christ.[9] This understanding was later developed by H.de Lubac, E.Mersch, H.Kung and Y.Congar. Not only did the Anglican Church also think along these lines, but also the non-conformist churches as may be illustrated by the book by the Methodist Newton Flew, Jesus and His Church (1938). The sacraments have gradually come to be seen in other terms than those of the individual, the Eucharist is no longer seen as the focus of individual devotion.

There was a new understanding of the closeness of our identity with Christ in His Body the Church. L.S.Thornton stated this relationship vividly in the following passage,

'There is only one Body of Christ. But it has different aspects. We are members of that Body which was nailed to the Cross, laid in the tomb and raised to life on the third day. There is only one organism in the new creation; and we are members of that one organism which is Christ.' 10

J.A.T.Robinson also brought this out in his study of the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ, The Body (1952), the only major study of this aspect of Pauline theology by an English theologian. In this he followed E.Mersch in stating that when S.Paul was converted he realised that the Church which he had been persecuting was Christ Himself, and to see a Christian was in a sense to see Christ.[11] E.L.Mascall seeing this in terms of the liturgy can speak of the unity of Christ and His members as such that 'The whole Christ offers the whole Christ',[12] for the whole liturgy is 'the act of Christ in the Corpus Mysticium'.[13] He contended that

'The Christian is recreated into Christ ... In the order of supernature he is identified with the Saviour in everything except his indestructable and inconvertible personal individuality'[14]

and agreed with de Lubac that Pauline theology suggested that Christ was,

'a medium, an atmosphere, a world where man and man, are in common and unity'.

Such expressions have not gone uncriticised, F.W.Dillistone

suggested that by them,

'the New Testament emphasis on personal relationship through faith ... is in danger of being swallowed up altogether within the amorphous pantheistic "medium" of a vague Divine-humanity', 15

and H.E.W.Turner has pointed out that Mascall's incorporation theology,

'takes no account of the unilateral dependence which, even in incorporation, governs the relation of the members to the head'. 16

The Church was seen as the fulness of Christ, Thornton's interpretation of the Pauline epistles led him to conclude that,

'the Church is like a wine-cup into which the life of Christ flows. The mystical Body is the fulness of Christ because it is like a chalice into which the precious blood of Christ is poured'.17

Farrer said much the same of the Church when he wrote of the Church as,

'the overflow of His glorious Body. It is the overflow upon us of the powers and spirit of the Risen Manhood, by which we are made members of Him who is our head.' 18

He based his conclusions, as did Thornton, on a detailed exegesis of the relevant Pauline passages.

J.A.T.Robinson expressed our relationship as members of the Body by using the analogy of a company in which we have shares,

'What is 'given for me' is a share in a company, my share with my own unique name upon it, but something that bears interest for me only as the company flourishes', 19

Mascall saw the Eucharist as more than the 'overflow' of Christ's glorious Body, and as a wine-cup of grace which has overflowed beyond the boundaries of the visible Church into the whole of creation to which it gives new life and purpose,

'It brings under the eyes of God all human misery and suffering, it claims for God every act of human love, it pleads God's mercy for every act of human selfishness and hate, it claims all God's creation as His possession.' 20

As we saw in the chapter on 'The Eucharist and Sacrifice' there has grown up a strong notion of our offering of our obedience, our suffering, and our own self-sacrifice in the Eucharist in union with His offering by virtue of the fact we are His Body and are presented to God in Him.

Evangelicals saw the Eucharist as a bond of unity among fellow Christians and with Christ, but on the whole were wary

of 'incorporation' language.[21] The new realisation of the implications of the doctrine of the Church as Christ's body has in recent years gradually affected evangelical theology. C.F.D. Moule, when writing of Christians as members of the Body of Christ however asserted that the Pauline phrase 'in Christ' was intended to convey a belief in union of fellowship and not of identity.[22] F.W.Dillistone would agree with this, for though he could say that the Church was in some sense 'the extension of the Divine Incarnation'[23] because she was the Body of Christ, and that this extension was to be seen in her dependence on and derivation from Him, and in her identification with Him in extending His ministry, self-identification with the world and self-surrender to God,[24] a unification of purpose without any surrender of the individuality of her members. G.W.H.Lampe is less cautious in his use of language, and considers that there is a dual consecration in the Eucharist,

'There is the consecration of the elements to be received as the Body and Blood of the Lord, and there is a second consecration as Christ, when He is sacramentally received by the worshippers, renews their consecration as the Body of Christ. They are transformed from a random collection of individuals into a single corporate whole which embodies and manifests the Catholic Church in a single place and at a given moment of time. The Church is, in fact, renewed and realised afresh in each Eucharist.' 25

The emphasis on the role of the whole Church in the Eucharist led the more catholic-minded to see the celebrant much more in terms of the representative of the congregation than they had done formerly,

'the minister in the Eucharist will be, not only the representative of the local group, but the organ of the one universal and historic society, so that the rite proclaims the dependence of the local community upon the one family of God'. 26

A.M.Ramsey declared that the Church was Apostolic because it was 'sent by the one Redeemer in the Flesh' and Catholic because it is 'living one universal life', indeed

'By his place in the Body of Christ the Christian finds the death and resurrection active around and through him', 27

Celebrations of the Eucharist were no longer seen as individual acts, but as the worship of the whole communion of Saints, this

led to a more objective approach to the rite and to one which relied less on personal faith and experience. A.G.Hebert's words as far back as 1932 were that,

'Every Mass is a Mass of the whole Church, and ideally and really the whole Church is present at every celebration',

and,

'as the whole Church embraces the departed and the Saints whose crown is won as well as the Church on earth, there can rightly be a Requiem Mass because they are in Christ, and in Communion we have fellowship with them in Him. Thus the Eucharist embraces all the lives and all the needs, the strivings, the self-offering, the thanksgiving, of all Christians everywhere'.28

These statements are very similar to the words of Teilhard de Chardin in Le Milieu Divin,

'All the communions of a life time are one communion. All the communions of all men now living are one communion. All the communions of all men, present, past and future are one communion.' 29

In the 1940's koinonia became a key-word deepening the whole concept of fellowship through L.S.Thornton's The Common Life in the Body of Christ, and Dix brought this to bear on the liturgy when in The Shape of the Liturgy he stressed the nature of the Eucharist as a corporate activity and not an occasion for individual piety. Indeed Dix pointed out that the Anglican Liturgy has always clearly indicated the link between the mystical Body of Christ and the Body of Christ- the Church - for it stated that the 'res' of the sacrament is that

'we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of thy Son which is the blessed company of all faithful people'. 30

These attitudes to worship and theology found a place in the Report of the Lambeth Conference 1958 (2.80), and The Report of the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Montreal 1963 (22.8), and in the Constitutions on the Sacred Liturgy of Vatican II 1963 (14).

The liturgy came to be seen not just as the unifying act of the Church - the Body of Christ, but as a meaning for the whole of life, as A.M.Ramsey expressed it

'The Christian does not share in the Liturgy in order to live aright; he lives aright in order to share in the Liturgy. For the Liturgy is not an exercise of piety divorced from

common life, it is rather the bringing of all common life into the sacrifice of Christ. The bread and wine placed upon the altar are the gifts of the people betokening the food and work and toil and livelihood of man, brought to Christ to bless and to break to the end that all creation may be summed up in His death and resurrection, to the glory of God the Father.' 31

The Christian who lives the life of the Liturgy is truly the new creation. Dix sets this 'Eucharistic Man' against the 'aquisitive Man' and the 'Mass-Man' of non-Christian society, it is this man who gives of the products of his work and rejoices with his fellows in 'the worshipping society which is grounded in eternity',

'It is the divine and only authentic conception of the meaning of all human life and its realisation is in the Eucharist'. 32

The Eucharist was no longer something 'said' by the priest and 'heard' by the laity, it was an action, the 'Christian action', in which both priest and people played their part together. It was Dix who 'rediscovered' the Eucharist as something 'done' from his study of the primitive Church. As J.A.T.Robinson so forcefully expressed this same point in Liturgy Coming to Life,

'The Eucharist is the Christian action, the heart of all Christian action in the world, because it mediates and makes present, in all its efficacy and power, the great saving act of God in Christ ... where we are united with His act, and where what He has done for us is renewed within us for transmission to the world. This is the crucible of the new creation.' 33

The Eucharist has come to be seen in a new and fuller relationship to the other sacraments and works of the Church, it is

'the divine act into which all prayers and praises are drawn. The divine office and all other Christian services are links between one Eucharist and the next, and the private prayers of all Christians are (however unconsciously) a part of the Body's one offering of which the Eucharist is the centre. Here also Holy Matrimony and Ordination find their true context and climax; and here also every worshipful thought and deed and word of men is gathered up and explained, since here the Christians, with all they have and do and desire are offered in union with the death and resurrection of Jesus and the one family of God.' 34

With the Sacrament of Baptism the Eucharist is seen to have very special links, J.G.Davies suggests that this relationship

is that Baptism is an ordination to the priesthood of all believers and an admission to the covenant community, the Eucharist is a continual renewal of both priesthood and covenant. Both have a basic pattern of life and death running through them. Baptism also puts us under the obedience of Christ and this obedience is renewed in the Eucharist. Further he stated that both sacraments have a distinctly eschatological nature. Davies was not content to link these sacraments to each other alone, but he believed they both had links with the mission of the Church, Baptism initiates us into this mission and the Eucharist renews our commitment to it.[35] The importance of the connection between worship and mission especially of the Eucharist has been developed more by Roman Catholics than by Anglicans during this period. The Parish Communion has only two small references to mission, and even in liturgies as recent as Series II there is little reference to it. The Eschatological emphasis of the sacrament is also one that has been little developed. L.S.Thornton did give some attention to it however stating that,

'every Eucharist is an anticipation (foretaste) of the messianic banquet in heaven', 34

and Dix did draw attention to its importance in The Shape of the Liturgy. Again there is little mention of this in Series II.

The effect of these theological developments has been the consideration of the role of the laity in a new light. There is a deeper understanding of the λαος as the people of God, and of the liturgy as the worship of the people of God. Worship is the act of the whole congregation - a corporate act, a dialogue of the whole, and not just of the priest, with God, It has become increasingly related to the needs of the whole congregation and the world. The development of the theology of the laity began in the 1930's through such books as A.M.Ramsey's The Gospel and the Catholic Church (1936), and was furthered in the 1940's particularly by L.S.Thornton's The Common Life of the Body of Christ (1942). Theology was here running parallel to the spread of the liturgical movement, each receiving encouragement

from the other. Evangelical theology also followed suit, notably in F.W.Dillistone's The Structure of Divine Society (1951). By the late 1950's and the early 1960's this theology had filtered down to the congregational level in paperback form, Kathleen Bliss' We the People pointed out that 99.5 of the Body of Christ was not ordained and pleaded for greater theological education of the laity and a greater sense of fellowship one with another, and J.A.T.Robinson's The New Reformation?, which had a very important chapter entitled 'Towards a Genuine Lay Theology', found a wide public. Robinson's essay in Layman's Church also had some very important things to say, in it he tried to abolish the idea of the laity as helpers of the clergy and put in its place an idea of the clergy as helpers of the laity - in doing so he owes much to Hans Rudi Weber.[37] He called for a proper realisation of the laity in the Church, the Body of Christ, not as being second-class citizens in the Kingdom because they have a secular occupation,[38] but as being an integral part of the Body not superior or inferior to the ordained members, both fulfilling their essential function of serving the Kingdom either through the structures of the world or the structures of the Church.[39] There was a new realisation over all of what divine vocation and the priesthood of all believers really meant - that there was a real ministry of the laity. The Bishop of Wakefield writing in The Franciscan (Winter 1964-5) stressed this important truth,

> 'as soon as you take the layman's part in the liturgy, or the layman's liturgy, seriously, you must take his function as a churchman in the world seriously. You cannot separate the two. The whole of life is to be absolved and offered and accepted and given back and blessed. You go to the altar from the world and from the altar to the world.'

Series II has several important and very definite references to the Church as the Body of Christ as well as its overall intention for a very full lay participation. The new additions to the rite are the distinctly Pauline references of Section 22,

'We are the Body of Christ. By one Spirit we were all baptized into one Body. Endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'

and Section 27,

'The cup of blessing which we bless,
is it not a sharing of the Blood of Christ?
The bread which we break,
is it not a sharing of the Body of Christ?
We being many are one bread, one Body,
for we are all partakers of the one bread.'

The Cosmic Significance of the Eucharist.

Gradually the Eucharist has come to be seen not only in relationship to redeemed mankind but to the whole of God's creation. Lional Thornton was one of the first Anglicans to develop this concept, in The Incarnate Lord (1928) he drew the analogy between the Incarnation and the evolutionary process by which preceeding forms of existence are absorbed into each new and superior stage,

'As the series is taken up into the human organism, so in Christ the human organism is taken up on to the level of deity.' 40

He saw the next stage of evolution in terms of a social development in which all humanity was bound together in love and became truly the mystical Body of Christ. William Temple also thought along these lines. He started from a strongly Incarnationalist position and saw the Eucharist as an expression of the dialectical unity of spirit and matter in the redeeming of the world brought about by the incarnate Son of God, therefore he insisted that the Eucharist be thought of in terms of the creation as well as of redemption pointing out,

'We think of the Holy Communion in association only with God's act in Redemption; we must also think of it in connection with His act in Creation . Then the power that guides and sustains us will be indeed the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.' 41

Orthodox theology has considerably influenced certain Anglican theologians in this field. The Orthodox Church sees the whole cosmos as being redeemed, not just mankind.[42] S.Paul in Romans 8:21 said that 'the creation itself will be set free

from its bondage', but such an idea has had little influence on the thought forms of the West, particularly in Western Eucharistic theology. E.L.Mascall acknowledges his debt to Orthodox theology when he saw the Eucharist as 'a real presence of the Last Day' where,

'the whole mystery of man's creation, fall, redemption, and restoration is, as it were, focused in one moment of time'. 43

Mascall appears throughout his works to hold a theory of progressive organic evolution similar to that of Thornton. J.G.Davies also acknowledges his debt to Orthodox thought and in particular to Alexander Schmemann, as in the following passage from Worship and Mission,

'the relationship of the Eucharist, as a special cultic act, to the whole of life is that of a particular to the universal, that through the former the whole may be sanctified and recognised as subject to the divine sovereignty. 'The world' according to Schmemann, 'was created as the "matter", the material of an all-embracing Eucharist, and man was created as the priest of this cosmic sacrament'. 44 The Christian Eucharist declares the Eucharistic nature of the entire world. So when we communicate and participate in Christ, and hence in his mission, we share in his fulfilment of the purpose of creation. Christ, as mediator, is as much the representative of the world of men as he is of God; his Eucharistic presence brings the world into the heart of Christian worship and so it is sanctified.' 45

For Davies therefore the Eucharist is not just the reconciliation of man to God but the reconciliation of the whole of creation to the Creator, 'the feast of the world's reconciliation'.[46]

Thornton and Davies also have links with the theology of Teilhard de Chardin. Thornton's belief in social evolution leading to the binding together of humanity in love as Christ's mystical Body is echoed in much of Teilhard de Chardin's writings, while Davies gets much closer to such passages of his as this from The Mass on the World,

'over every living thing which is springing up, to grow, to flower, to ripen during this day say again the word: This is my Body. And over every death-force which waits in readiness to corrode, to wither, to cut down, speak again your commanding words which express the supreme mystery of faith: This is my Blood.' 47

This theology is essentially a rediscovery for S.Irenaeus writing in the second century could refer to the Incarnation as a 'recapitulation' - a summing up, a drawing together of the whole of creation into a new creation.

These new insights are not confined to catholic-minded Anglicans, they are also found in the writings of F.W.Dillistone. he pointed out that in the twentieth century there has been a new awareness of the created order, and the universe is seen now as 'a single living wholeness', 'a vast organism', and this leads us to realise,

'If a new principle of life from beyond (this created order) did in fact enter this space-time universe it was bound to set in motion waves of force stretching out to its very limits. But more. If this incapsulated life succeeded in reversing what must otherwise be regarded as an inexorable law of the whole - the law of dissolution, decay, and death - then again the effects must be felt in every part of the universal organism.' 48

He saw the Eucharist as constantly renewing these effects,

'whenever the pattern of his coming is re-enacted, either in concrete historical event or in dramatically symbolic way, new energies are released which give a foretaste of the ultimate reconciliation which the Christian believes to be the goal of the whole movement of human history.' 49

CHAPTER III: FOOTNOTES

1. L.Menzies, Father Wainwright - A Record. (1947). p.36.
2. H.Maynard-Smith, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar. (1926). p.302.
3. C.Gore, The Holy Communion. (1928). pp.51-2.
4. C.Gore, The Body of Christ. p.95.
5. Op.cit. p.328. Didache 9:4.
6. Ibid. p.328.
7. E.L.Mascall, Christ, the Christian and the Church. (1946).p.162.
8. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi. p.45.
9. A good summary of his teaching is to be found in La Pieté de l'Eglise, principes et faits. (1914).
10. L.S.Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ.(1942).p.298.
11. J.A.T.Robinson, The Body. (1952). pp.57-8.
    E.Mersch, The Whole Christ. p.104.
12. Corpus Christi. p.183.
13. Ibid. p.78.
14. Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.111.
15. F.W.Dillistone, The Structure of Divine Society. (1951).p.181.
16. In Word and Sacrament ed. R.R.Williams. (1968). p.11.
17. Op.cit. p.330.
18. A.M.Farrer, 'The Eucharist and the Church in the New Testament', p.80 in The Parish Communion, ed. A.G.Hebert. (1937).
19. J.A.T.Robinson, Liturgy Coming to Life. (1960). p.69.
20. Corpus Christi. p.47.
21. H.C.G.Moule, The Supper of the Lord. (N.D.). p.54.
    H.B.Gooding, 'The Church - The Sacraments - The Ministry', p.164 in Liberal Evangelicalism, ed. T.G.Rogers. (1923).
22. C.F.D.Moule, The Sacrifice of Christ. p.58.
23. Op.cit. p.232.
24. Ibid. p.246.
25. G.W.H.Lampe in Ways of Worship, ed. P.Edwall, E.Hayman and W.D.Maxwell. (1951). pp.200-1.
26. A.M.Ramsey, The Gospel and the Catholic Church. (1936). p.60.
27. Ibid. p.45.
28. A.G.Hebert, Intercommunion. (1932). pp.64-5.
29. P.Teilhard de Chardin, Le Milieu Divin. (E.T.1957). p.124.

30. G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy. p.250.
31. A.M.Ramsey, op.cit. p.119.
32. G.Dix, op.cit. pp.xviii-xix.
33. A.M.Ramsey, op.cit. p.118.
34. J.A.T.Robinson, Liturgy Coming to Life. p.16.
35. J.G.Davies, Worship and Mission. (1966). p.92.
36. L.S.Thornton, op.cit. p.337.
37. Layman's Church. (1963). p.17.
38. Ibid. p.19.
39. Ibid. p.22.
40. L.S.Thornton, op.cit. p.255.
41. W.Temple, The Hope of a New World. (1940).p.69.
42. N.Zernov, The Church of the Eastern Christians. (1942).pp.39-40.
43. Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.172.
44. A.Schmemann, For the Life of the World. (1963). p.5.
45. J.G.Davies, Worship and the Mission. p.96.
46. Ibid. p.101.
47. P.Teilhard de Chardin, Hymn of the Universe. (E.T. 1965). p.23.
48. F.W.Dillistone,'The Atonement and the Sacraments', C.Q.R.(1958). Vol. CLIX. p.201.
49. Ibid. pp.202-3.

CHAPTER IV

LITURGICAL REVISION

The Early Years of the Century

The first three decades of this century saw a greater divergence of Eucharistic worship than had ever existed before in England. There were three main schools of thought - the evangelicals who followed the traditional Prayer Book usage with no additions, the Dearmer school which added pre-Reformation ceremonial and vestments to the Book insisting that this was in obedience to the Ornaments Rubric, and the Anglo-Papalists of the Society of S.Peter and S.Paul (S.S.P.P.) who emulated the most advanced Roman practices. Between these positions there were many variations.

Literature was of the greatest importance in spreading these views. Dearmer's Parson's Handbook which was first published in 1899 ran into many editions; this school of thought was also promulgated by the publications of the Alcuin Club, which had commenced its series with J.T.Micklethwaite's The Ornaments of the Rubric in 1897. The Warham Guild was founded in 1912 by Dearmer and others as a centre for their activities and numbered among its early supporters the liturgists F.C.Eeles, F.E.Brightman, and W.H.Frere. The Dearmer school followed a long tradition for the High Churchmen of the eighteenth century had believed that the rubrics were tolerant of all liturgical practices prior to the Reformation unless these were specifically forbidden by the Prayer Book;[1] this opinion had been voiced again by W.J.E.Bennett in the early years of the Oxford Movement.[2] The S.S.P.P. founded in 1911 was committed to bring the Church of England fully into line with Roman Catholic liturgical practices. It gained support in its early days from Ronald and Wilfrid Knox (the sons of the staunchly evangelical Bishop of Manchester), and N.P.Williams. In their churches services such as extra-liturgical devotions to the Blessed Sacrament were common-place, particularly Exposition and Benediction. The use of various translations of the Latin Missal

were not unknown. Books containing 'additions' to the Prayer Book were to be found in the nineteenth century, for example P.G.Medd, The Priest to the Altar (1861) which contained prayers from the Sarum rite, and Orby Shipley's The Ritual of the Altar (1870) which contained Roman additions including Votive Masses, Masses for the Dead, and added to the 1662 rite the Asperges, Preparation, Gospel Ceremonies, Offertory, Canon and Last Gospel; H.G.Morse's Notes on Ceremonial (1st edit. 1876, 5th and final edit. 1911) contained much the same but from the sarum usage. Knott's first English Missal appeared in 1912 compiled by H.W.G.Kenrick, the Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hoxton; this gave the complete 1662 and Missale Romanum rites. The S.S.P.P. produced their own Anglican Missal in 1921 which was superior to Knott's in the quality of its translations, however they printed the Roman and 1662 rites as a composite form not separately, they also included seven different alternatives for the Canon. Both Missals ran into several editions, the last edition of the Anglican Missal (1939) contained the 1549, 1662, and 'Interim' rites with the Gelasian Canon interwoven in the last of these, and the latest edition of the English Missal (1958) gave 1662, and the Roman rite with interpolations of the 1662 Prayers for the Church, of Humble Access, of Consecration/Oblation, and of Thanksgiving, together with the Roman Canon and order for administration in Latin.[3] Guidance for the implimentation of these rites was to be found in such books as Ritual Notes (for interpreting the Prayer Book after Western usage), first published in 1894, and Martin Travers' Pictures of the English Liturgy - Low Mass (1916) and The Celebration of High Mass (1922). They also used the Roman work, Adrian Fortescue's Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described (1917), which followed all the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

The Swedish scholar Brilioth explained the attitude of the more catholic-minded Anglicans with great insight when he wrote,

'Their ritual excesses were but the expression of longing desire for a form of worship which might embody a more whole-hearted devotion than the respectable and restrained forms of the traditional service. This longing could only find its satisfaction

in the sacrament of the altar, in frequent communion and adoration of the Lord present in the sacrament. To show Him the most boundless devotion became a religious duty, which only became more glorious when spiritual and civil powers in alliance sought to prevent it.' 4

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline reporting in 1906 found many instances of the use of Roman ceremonial and liturgical practices as well as more minor infringements of the Prayer Book, and they were forced to conclude that the laws that governed public worship were inoperable and indeed under prevalant opinion they were too narrow.

During this period there was also some demand for the restoration of the 1549 rite, among those who desired this were T.A.Lacey,[5] W.H.Frere,[6] and N.P.Williams.[7] Many who did not desire the whole 1549 rite were in favour of the restoration of the Canon of the Eucharist, and looked to Overall's Canon for support. The seventeenth century bishop had said the Prayer of Oblation immediately after the Prayer of Consecration and before the Communion of the people. As his chaplain Cosin later wrote,

'I have always observed my lord and master Dr Overall to use this oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the sacrament, to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God, that by the merits of Christ's death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive mercy ... We ought first to send up Christ to God, and then he will send him down to us.' 8

Laud had followed this order in his 1637 Scottish Prayer Book. This order also found approval in the eighteenth century from John Sharp,[9] Charles Wheatly,[10] and Thomas Wilson,[11] and it was followed in the 1764 Scottish rite and the 1795 American rite. Canterbury Convocation Lower House voted for the placing of the Prayer of Oblation, the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Humble Access before the Communion of priest and people, this was also accepted by Canterbury's Upper House and York's Lower House in 1918, but it was opposed by York's Upper House. Frere's ideal was the order of Comfortable Words, Prayer of Humble Access, Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, Prayer of Consecration, Prayer of Oblation, Lord's Prayer, and Communion

- this was the very form that the so-called 'Interim' rite was to take.[12]

The Question of Reservation

The question of Reservation in the Church of England has been largely a twentieth century issue. The early Tractarians - Pusey, Bright, and Liddon believed in Reservation for the communion of the sick, but not for any devotional purposes. They saw in this form of Reservation the fulfilment of a particular need in certain circumstances, but it seems unlikely that any of them envisaged perpetual Reservation. This came later when the ritualistic side of the Movement had developed, particularly with the emergence of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in 1862 which was founded largely through the offices of T.T.Carter of Clewer, its first Superior-General. In 1872 a group of C.B.S. Tertiaries established a community known as 'The Community of Reparation to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament'. Part of their work was to be that of perpetual adoration, their chapel, built in 1873, was designed for this and had a tabernacle, and their office contained the rite of Benediction.[13] The tabernacle was sanctioned by Bishop Wilberforce of Winchester.[14] The first parish church known to have perpetual Reservation was S.James-the-Less,Liverpool, in 1875,[15] they introduced Benediction the same year. The C.B.S. rite is a straightforward translation of the Latin rite.[15]

By the end of the nineteenth century Reservation for the sick, and for other purposes had become so widespread that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York felt the need to make public statements on Reservation in the Church of England. Before these statements were published however, T.A.Lacey produced a lengthy pamphlet[17] in the form of a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury arguing forcefully that Reservation should be permitted on the grounds that it was a custom dating from the early Church, and was legal in the Church of England, the Prayer Book prohibitions not having the meaning that was usually

imputed to them. This work was the first really scholarly defence of Reservation. Lacey's arguments made no impact on the Archbishops; their pronouncements, published in 1900, condemned Reservation in the Church of England. Dr Frederick Temple was slightly more open to change than his fellow archbishop, for though he concluded his statement by saying,

'After weighing carefully all that has been put before us, I am obliged to decide that the Church of England does not allow Reservation in any form, and that those who think it ought to be allowed, though perfectly justified in endeavouring to get the proper authorities to alter the law, are not justified in practising Reservation until the law has been altered', 18

he stated earlier that in his own opinion Reservation for the communion of the sick,

'was quite consistent with the Christian faith, and there was nothing in it that was wrong in itself'. 19

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline's report of 1906 upheld the Archbishops, and described 'reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration', 'Corpus Christi Processions with the Sacrament', and 'Benediction with the Sacrament', as 'clearly inconsistent with and subversive of the teaching of the Church of England'.[20]

During the first two decades of this century Reservation increased rapidly. As a result of the Oxford Movement people had become used to receiving their communion frequently, and the First World War increased the need for Reservation for the sick. The War also led to the Blessed Sacrament becoming even more a focus for private devotion and public services. The bishops at first opposed this strongly, but the pressure was such that some, notably Winnington-Ingram of London in whose diocese were a large number of catholic churches, capitulated, at least to the extent of allowing Reservation in an unlocked chapel so that private devotions were possible.[21] Until this the bishops were guided in their actions by a draft rubric, drawn up by the Upper House of Convocation in 1911 which allowed Reservation but only in so far as it enabled the sick to receive the consecrated elements later on the day of the celebration.[22]

In 1917 a 'Memorial' signed by nearly a thousand priests was presented to the Archbishops, this asked that the faithful might have access to the Reserved Sacrament, and contained a refusal to obey any regulations (referring to the 1911 draft rubric) which forbade adoration.[23]

1917 saw the publication of three important works on the subject, Gore's talk to the clergy of the Chelmsford diocese, Freestone's The Sacrament Reserved, and Stone's The Reserved Sacrament; all were by catholics, yet Stone's conclusions were far more 'advanced'. Gore and Freestone, both Mirfield men, wanted full sanction given by the bishops to Reservation for the sick largely for practical reasons, and both denied the value of extra-liturgical devotions to the Blessed Sacrament asserting that these were the results of the doctrine of Transubstantiation which they firmly repudiated.[24] Darwell Stone however denied that the adoration of the elements was due to the promulgation of this doctrine, and based his claim that all parish priests had a duty to reserve the Sacrament on the Constitutions of John Peccham. Archbishop of Canterbury in the thirteenth century, which had never been repealed at the Reformation.[25] This argument was to figure in many of the pamphlets published during the next few years on Prayer Book revision.[26]

The Bishop of Winchester, F.T.Woods, called a conference of distinguished clergy and lay theologians at Farnham in 1926. The purpose of this conference was not to discuss Reservation in general, but to consider the theological implications of the use of the Reserved Sacrament for 'Devotions'.[27] The views represented ranged from the ultra-catholic of Darwell Stone, the moderate catholic of Gore and Quick, to the conservative evangelical of A.J.Tait. No attempt was made to reach an agreed statement, it was rather a forum for the exchange of views. These discussions showed a great divergence of opinion among Anglican theologians. Reservation was to play an important part in the Prayer Book debates of 1927/8.

The 1928 Prayer Book

The 1906 Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline recommended that the Prayer Book should be modified to,

'secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seemd to demand'.

The revision movement proceeded slowly. Archbishop Davidson did form an advisory committee on liturgical questions as far back as 1912, this included W.H.Frere, F.E.Brightman and P.Dearmer as well as leading evangelicals, however it faded into oblivion after 1915. The movement gained new impetus after the First World War ended and much was done through the agencies of W.H.Frere and the evangelical Bishop Drury of Ripon who worked together on proposed changes from 1919 until Drury's death before the great 1927/8 debates.

The Church had mixed feelings on the subject of revision, by October 1925 the Archbishop of Canterbury had received over 800 different memorials on the subject including a petition organised by the evangelical Bishop Knox of Manchester containing over 305,000 signatures demanding no revision at all.[28] Not all evangelicals were opposed to revision, but most were only prepared to accept a non-doctrinal revision, as had taken place with the Prayer Book in Ireland.

The Church Assembly Committee produced a bookmindicating their proposed changes known as N.A. 84 The Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure (1923).Meanwhile three other preposed books had been submitted for Church Assembly's consideration. The 'Green Book' was the first of these appearing in 1923, it was the work of the English Church Union and in particular of Darwell Stone. The 'Grey Book' was the next also in 1923, this originated in the 'Life and Liberty' movement, prefaced by William Temple it was largely the work of Percy Dearmer, F.R.Barry, and R.G.Parsons, in theology it was modernist and in sentiment liberal. The third of these attempts was the 'Orange Book' of 1923-4 which owed much to Frere and was an attempt to harmonise

the previous two books with the proposals of the Church Assembly Committee.

The main changes in the Book produced in 1927 were in the Holy Communion Service. The Book contained the 1662 and an alternative rite, this included an epiclesis largely due to the efforts of W.H.Frere who had been influenced by his study of ancient liturgies to think that this was an essential part of a sufficient rite. The epiclesis was in fact modelled on that in the liturgy of S.Basil, and the anamnesis on the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus. The optional use of the Benedictus Qui and the Agnus Dei was also permitted, both of which, Sir William Joynson Hicks later told parliament, encouraged a belief in Transubstantiation.[29] The Canon in the alternative version permitted the use of the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer before the administration of Communion, thus restoring the traditional 'Western' form of the Canon. Evangelicals were heated in their opposition to this position of the Prayer of Oblation as it seemed to contradict their whole theology of self-oblation. Vestments were allowed, and so was Reservation and the use of wafer-bread. Prayer for the dead was included in this alternative rite. The First World War had done much to remove the old opposition to Prayer for the Dead and Reservation, as many had come to see these as fulfilling a real spiritual need. Fasting before Communion was also referred to in a new rubric which declared it to be the 'ancient and laudable custom of the Church' but insisted that the decision whether or not to fast was to be left 'to every man's conscience in the sight of God' and not to be enforced.

All these innovations were the subject of much debate. The epiclesis came under attack from both catholics and evangelicals, the catholics opposed it as it was out of line with the whole Western tradition which saw the 'moment of consecration' at the words of institution and saw no need for further consecration,[30] evangelicals objected to it as an unnecessary addition to the rite,[31] and both asserted that the conception of the Holy Spirit

transforming bread and wine by sanctifying them was unscriptural. Frere's original intention in suggesting an epiclesis was to emphasise the Catholic Church's belief in consecration as being a reality, and to avoid the scholastic inclination to see a 'moment of consecration',[32] therefore he suggested that the epiclesis come after the narrative of institution rather than in the preamble.[33] Evangelicals believed that the alternative rite by its additions conveyed an underlying notion of Real Presence in the consecrated elements and of memorial sacrifice, though few went as far as Sir William Joynson Hicks their chief parliamentary spokesman on the issue, they could further point to the permitted use of vestments as lending support to their contention.[34]

The real cause of difficulty was the question of Reservation. The regulations restricting Reservation were circularised along with the proposed Prayer Book and were clearly designed to prevent any extra-liturgical devotions. They allowed perpetual Reservation for the communion of the sick with the bishop's permission but this was only to be granted in places of real necessity and on the strict conditions that there were to be no ceremonies or services in connection with the Sacrament so reserved. Such Reservation was to be in an aumbry, not above or behind the Holy Table, and in both kinds, and there was to be no exposition apart from communion.[35] These rubrics were drafted by Cyril Garbett who was then Bishop of Southwark, he tested them thoroughly for loopholes with his own domestic chaplain, and then sent them for further testing to Mervyn Haigh, the principle chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson.[36] The rubrics were strongly opposed by the more catholic element within the Church. One thousand four hundred members of the Federation of Catholic Priests stated that if the measure was passed they would feel justified in continuing,

'Communion from the Reserved Sacrament of the whole, as well as of the sick; corporate devotions before the Reserved Sacrament; Reservation in one kind: Perpetual Reservation in spite of the prohibition of the diocesan bishop.' 37

Davidson himself did not believe in Reservation,[38] but agreed to the proposed rubrics as he saw the catholic element was too strong to be destroyed,[39] however he made it clear that if the Prayer Book was accepted he would insist on the restrictions of the rubric to the letter,[40] and as far as he was concerned Reservation would be the exception rather than the rule.[41] In fact the only section of the Church that agreed with the proposed rubrics was the moderate catholics. Bishop Frere wrote of the rubrics that,

'the parish priest in his pastoral office is bound up too tight, the bishop as administrator is fettered, and the laity have their privileges unfairly curtailed'. 42

In spite of all this the 1927 Book passed Church Assembly by 517 votes to 133, it was left to the House of Commons to reject it which they did by a vote of 238 to 205. When the Book was re-introduced the following year some modifications had been made. The regulations concerning Reservation were now incorporated as rubrics and made it clear that no hanging pyxes or tabernacles would be allowed,[43] and the rubric on kneeling was added at the end of the alternative order for Holy Communion. These additions did nothing to placate evangelical opposition and they alienated catholics still further, some like Dr Kidd who could just accept 1927 refused to accept 1928.[44] F.E.Brightman said of the Book,

'on almost every page of it I find something irritating, something inexact or untidy or superfluous or ill-considered or unreal'. 45

Yet this book also passed Church Assembly, though with a smaller majority - 396 votes to 153. Before it reached the Commons a statement was issued by the Central Council of Catholic Societies composed of the English Church Union, the Federation of Catholic Priests, the Anglo-Catholic Congress, and the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament affirming belief in the Real Presence, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the rightfulness of adoration of Christ as present in the Reserved Sacrament; it was accompanied by a letter signed by Darwell Stone and 2,000

other priests.[46] This Book was again rejected by the Commons, this time by a vote of 266 to 220. It was an impossible attempt to combine liturgical revision with clerical discipline. Colin Buchanan commenting on the failure of the Book well summarised the feelings of the opposing groups, stating that the evangelical opposition was due to,

'a spurious pretence at a discipline being used to conceal changes of doctrine',

while that of the catholics was due to,

'the iron hand of discipline in the velvet glove of liturgical revision'. 47

There has only been one real study of the 1928 Book, the problems involved and the reason for its failure, and that is W.K.Lowther Clarke's The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered (1943).

Although this revision of the Prayer Book was rejected by Parliament the bishops decided as a body to give their consent to its unofficial use in their dioceses in July 1929, which meant that any church could use the Book as a whole or in part with the P.C.C.'s consent. It was also a guarantee that no clergy would be prosecuted in an ecclesiastical court for using the Book. In fact it was used in many parishes until the advent of Series II, in practice however the parts used were largely the non-controversial parts, such as the Baptism and Marriage services. The Alternative Order for Holy Communion was used in some churches, although the Canon containing the epiclesis was rarely adopted. Series I is broadly 1928 except the Prayer of Consecration and served to legalise what was in fact the usage of many parishes. All copies of the Book included the note that,

'The publication of this Book does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorized for use in churches.'

By this policy vestments were now allowed in churches with episcopal sanction. These had been a source of contention from their introduction in the late nineteenth century, the Privy Council's judgement in the Ridell case of 1857 had declared them to be legal and in accordance with the Ornaments

Rubric, though the Purchas judgement of 1870 and theRidsdale judgement of 1877 had declared them to be illegal. Archbishop Tait had been strongly opposed by Bishop Wilberforce when he suggested that this rubric should be changed to make them unquestionably illegal in 1879.[48] By 1881 so many churches used vestments that coercion was no longer a practical possibility.[49] The Report of the Royal Commission for Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906 admitted this situation, and that it was recognised by the episcopate, when it stated that,

'None of the present bishops has taken any steps for the general prohibition of these vestments in his diocese; nor has any bishop now in charge of an English diocese required that their use should be relinquished.' 50

The 1928 Prayer Book permitted for Holy Communion the wearing of,

'a surplice with stole or with scarf and hood, or a white alb plain with a vestment or cope'.

Evangelicals even up to the present day have always opposed the wearing of vestments because of their doctrinal significance, they are believed to suggest that the Eucharist is a Mass in English, with the Mass doctrines of the Real Presence and Sacrifice. As Bishop Knox expressed it,

'Vestments mean the Mass, and the Mass means the whole system of Roman theology.' 51

Their legality was not made official until the Vesture of Ministers Measure of 1964 which permitted,

'with the cassock either a surplice with scarf or stole, or a surplice or alb with stole and cope, or an alb with the customary vestments', 52

though it was stated in the preface to the Measure that the Church of England,

'does not attach any particular doctrinal significance to the diversities of vesture which may lawfully be worn'.

Some bishops tried to enforce the 1928 restrictions on Reservation including Winnington-Ingram of London. In 1928 there were 170 priests in his diocese who reserved the Blessed Sacrament, and when he tried to enforce his authority twenty-one of these protested strongly, (there were a considerable number of others who had decided to ignore his rulings but who did

not openly protest).[53] A synod of the diocese of London held in October 1928 rejected the bishop's proposal to follow the new rubrics by 655 votes to 292.[54] This gave the twenty-one more ammunition and an exchange of letters which they had with their bishop was later published.[55] They based their arguments on the fact that the Church of England was part of the Catholic Church,[56] and that their practice in this respect was in accord with the 'essential, fundamental belief' of the Catholic Church. Winnington-Ingram gave the usual replies to this kind of argument, but in practice he soon gave up the attempt to enforce obedience, The last attempt to suppress Reservation was made by Bishop David of Liverpool in 1929 with very little success.[57]

Since that time the clergy have been left to follow their own inclinations. Perpetual Reservation is now the normal practice in many churches, often in aumbries in side-chapels so the faithful may kneel close by for private worship if they wish to do so, yet in a manner that no-one feels obliged to take any part in this form of devotion. Faculties for tabernacles in more catholic churches are usually granted. The Report of the 1922 Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England, published in 1938, pointed out the errors which could arise from 'Devotions' but its members were unable to agree over the permissability of these in the Anglican Church,[58] however they did agree on the validity of using the Reserved Sacrament to give sacramental communion.[59] Today evangelicals and catholics are as divided as ever on the doctrinal questions involved.

The Intervening Years

After the failure of the 1928 Book to gain parliamentary approval the zeal for Prayer Book revision flagged for many years. An evangelical, Albert Nichell, did produce in 1929 a suggested Eucharistic rite which was far ahead of its time in many ways for it was intended for a 'westward' celebration, and provision was made for an Old Testament lesson to be included

with the Epistle and Gospel,[60] but for the Church of England the 1930's and the 1940's was a period of liturgical aridity.

This was not so however for the rest of the Anglican Communion. The twentieth century saw the beginning of local rites all over the world. The Lambeth Conferences had from early days urged the reform of the Prayer Book in the Anglican Communion overseas, particularly in the Conference of 1908 which had laid down principles for revision including the adaption of rubrics to suit present customs, additions for enrichment, and more alternatives and elasticity generally in forms of worship.[61] Following this revision started in Scotland and Ireland in 1909, in Canada and S.Africa in 1911, in America in 1913, and in Zanzibar in 1910. The Swahili rite for Zanzibar produced by Bishop Frank Weston was virtually a translation of the 1549 English rite. Resolution 36 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 further encouraged diversity to suit the needs of the Church in these areas as it stated,

'liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity'. The 1920's saw revised rites come into use in America (1929) and Scotland (1929) both of which were based on the Scottish Prayer Book of 1764. Frere's liturgical ideas influenced the rite prepared for Zanzibar, Nyasaland and N.Rhodesia which grew up between 1922 and 1929, though this rite only found acceptance fully in N.Rhodesia; this rite contained an epiclesis. The epiclesis was also a feature of the S.African rite of 1929 which was largely influenced by the 1928 English Book, here again much was owed to Frere who was acting as one of the principle advisors to the S.African revision committee. As in his suggestions on English revision he insisted that an epiclesis should make the reality of consecration explicit while avoiding the idea of a 'moment of consecration'. Neither his suggestions nor the formula finally agreed upon really fitted these requirements.[62] All four liturgies included self-oblation in the Eucharistic Prayer, in the Scottish and American liturgies this preceeded the anamnesis, but in the other two, as in the 1928 Book,

it followed the anamnesis. All rounded off the Canon with the Lord's Prayer before the Communion though some added other Prayer here as well, particularly the Scottish rite which put the Invitation, Confession and Absolution, and Comfortable Words at this point.

In England meanwhile the impetus for revision was lost for a while after the failure of the 1928 Book, it was not until 1938 that a conference was called to prepare a new liturgy and the war soon put an end to these discussions. There was an attempt to get Convocations' approval for the use of the 'Interim' rite in 1942, though this was passed by the Upper Houses of both Convocations, the Lower Houses refused to accept it.

In 1945 Dom Gregory Dix's monumental work The Shape of the Liturgy appeared, which gave liturgists many new insights. Dix's insistence on seeing the Liturgy as being centered on a four-fold act - taking, giving thanks, breaking, and distribution, was to have far-reaching effects. His emphasis was on the underlying primitive structure of the Eucharist rather than on any underlying primitive prayer as had been sought by Frere and others. For Dix the Eucharist was essentially action rather than words. These theories have influenced liturgical reform in the Anglican Communion from that time. They have never gone completely unchallenged, for example G.A.Michell has contended that the liturgy in the primitive Church had a two-fold and not a four-fold shape, consisting only of consecration and communion.[63] Dix's theory that the Offertory was the first part of the Eucharistic action has also been heavily criticised. E.L.Mascall is one who has contended that the Offertory is not a separate action but rather an integral part of the Eucharistic Prayer itself.[64]

The Church of South India produced a Eucharistic rite in 1950 which was approved for general use in 1954, this was a great advance on anything produced up to that time in the Anglican Communion. It was designed for considerable

congregational participation, to facilitate this the intercessions were rendered in the form of a litany, and congregational responses are to be found throughout the service even during the Prayer of Consecration. Dix's four-fold shape can be clearly distinguished; there is a special prayer designed to identify the Offertory, which comes before the Sursum Corda, with the act of 'taking'. The traditional 'Western' shape of the Canon is here ending with the Lord's Prayer before Communion, and a separate fraction is provided. The rite also contains an Old Testament lesson in addition to the Epistle and Gospel. This was the first of the new rites clearly designed to emphasise the Eucharist as the corporate action of the whole community, its flexibility was tremendous even allowing for extempore prayer. It had a very significant influence on later Anglican revision.

The Lambeth Conference of 1958 set up a sub-committee which made suggestions for Prayer Book revision aimed at recovering the worship of the primitive Church. They recommended the following features:

1. Shorter and fewer exhortations.
2. Shorter and simpler corporate expressions of penitence.
3. Greater use of litanies for intercessions, adoration, and thanksgiving.
4. The Prayer for the Church to be divided up by congregational responses or turned into a proper litany.
5. The Offertory to become more congregational and linked to the Prayer of Consecration.
6. The Prayer of Consecration should contain thanksgiving for the Resurrection, Ascension and future coming of Christ as well as for the Crucifixion.[65]

They also hoped to end the controversy over consecration by insisting that in our fuller understanding of Jewish thought blessing and thanksgiving over something are really the same, hence the consecration comes through thanksgiving,[66] and here they quoted L.Bouyer, the Roman Catholic theologian, in support,

'To bless anything and to pronounce a thanksgiving over it are not two actions but one.' 67

It is interesting to note that all Lambeth's suggestions had already been put into practice in the C.S.I. rite.

Lambeth 1958 was too late to effect the revisions of Canada, the West Indies, Japan and India which appeared in 1959-1960. All of these separated the Offertory from the Prayer of Consecration by an intercession, the Indian rite alone though used the form of a litany for its main intercessions. India also differed from the others by mentioning the Incarnation as well as Calvary in the Prayer of Consecration.

The next few years saw some very interesting experimental liturgies putting Lambeth's and other ideas into practice, although these rites were designed to stimulate discussion rather than to be used for worship. Two English products were G.Cope, J.G.Davies and D.A.Tyler, An Experimental Liturgy (1958) anticipating the conclusions of Lambeth, and that of C.K.Sansbury published in the C.Q.R. (1960) which was an embodiment of Lambeth's suggestions. Following the Pan Anglican Congress in Toronto in 1963 a sub-committee drew up another such rite, this was largely the work of L.W.Brown who was the convenor of the C.S.I. Liturgical Committee in the early 1950's, this rite took a form similar to that of C.S.I..[68]

In 1964 L.W.Brown was the man behind the new Liturgy for Africa - an attempt by the Archbishops of the African Communion to produce a liturgy that could be used for the whole country, however it has only found real acceptance in the Province of Central Africa which authorised it for experimental use for three years in 1966. This rite places the Confession and Absolution before the Service of the Word and gives it in three forms one of which is very like the Roman preparation of priest and server. Again there is an Old Testament lesson in addition to the Epistle and Gospel, and the intercessions are in the form of a litany which could be led by a layman. A prayer and congregational response accompanies the Offertory which as in the C.S.I. rite immediately precedes the Prayer of

Consecration, which is broken up by responses from the laity. The Canon is completed by the Lord's Prayer before Communion. As in the C.S.I. rite there are no prescribed manual acts, again following Dix's emphasis that there should be no 'moment of consecration'. Both C.S.I. and the Liturgy for Africa contain an epiclesis, but the Holy Spirit in both is invoked on the worshippers and not on the bread and wine. The C.S.I. rite still retained the final blessing, but this is abolished in the African rite as for its composers it

'would seem trivial compared with the supreme blessing of receiving the Lord in his sacrament'. 69

The Church in Wales produced a revised liturgy in 1966. This follows the African pattern of having the Confession and Absolution early in the service, and again follows the new order by including an Old Testament lesson and turning the intercessions into a litany - though this is basically the 1928 Prayer for the Church. The Offertory is only accompanied by a short sentence but it has a separate heading and comes immediately before the Prayer of Consecration. The Prayer of Consecration is more traditional than Series II in that it keeps the 'once-for-all-ness' phrases of 1662 and still retains the manual acts, but it also contains an anamnesis similar to Series II. The Canon is completed by the Lord's Prayer before Communion. There is a blessing before the dismissal.

These developments were intimately linked to the whole liturgical movement, the liturgy was no longer seen as the peak of private devotion but as a corporate act of the whole Body of Christ, the laity were to participate fully in the rite as a community and not as individuals. These liturgies emphasised this new understanding of the place of the laity in the Church's worship, God's people frequently receiving heavenly Food for their journey and on this journey and through this Food increasingly realising their corporate vocation as the Body of Christ.

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York established a liturgical commission for the Church of England in 1955 to

secure a revision of the whole Prayer Book. This commission contained many distinguished liturgical scholars, among them R.C.D.Jasper, D.E.W.Harrison, H. de Candole, and B.J.Wigan; two others A.H.Couratin and E.C.Ratcliff were to serve the commission from 1955 to 1967 and saw the whole progress towards Series II. Not all the Church of England was keen on radical revision; the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen meeting in 1958, but after the Lambeth Report for that year was published, demanded that any revision should be,

'Conservative and maintains that the 1662 Book of Common Prayer should remain the basic pattern.' 70

Before the Church of England could really take up these suggestions for herself she had to legalise her current liturgical practices. This was done in a series of Measures which had parliamentary approval. The first of these was the Vesture of Ministers Measure 1964 which among other things legalised vestments for the Eucharist, the Prayer Book (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 1965 which among other things allowed the use of either leavened or unleavened bread for the rite, and of even greater significance was The Prayer Book (Alternative and other Services) Measure 1965 which gave permission for any service approved by two-thirds of each House of Convocation and the House of Laity to be used experimentally for seven years with the further provision that this permission could be extended for seven more years. This last measure was used to legalise the use of a modified version of the 1928 Prayer Book known as Series I which appeared in 1966. The Archbishop of Canterbury said of Series I that,

'it is necessary to give legality to such current practice as is widely desired and congruous with the doctrine of our Church'.
...'The passing of the Alternative Series will not be a measure of Prayer Book revision, but rather a measure of current authorisation bringing a reasonable tolerance, a reasonable order, and a good deal less confusion than exists in our Church at present'. 71

Series I was authorised for use for seven years from November 1966.

This rite kept the most widely used features of the 1928 Book, but did include some other revisions. It allowed the use of the Gloria before the Collect for the Day rather than confining it to the end of the service and legalised the shortened summary of the Law and the Kyries in English or Greek as alternatives to the Commandments as in 1928. An optional Old Testament lesson was introduced and the sermon was put back before the Creed. The Prayer for the Church was allowed in the 1662 or the 1928 form and it was split up to form a litany in accord with the suggestion of Lambeth 1958, thus the intercession for the departed from the 1928 rite was retained and caused difficulty with the evangelicals when Convocation was asked to accept the service. The long exhortation had become virtually an appendix at the end of the printed rite. The Confession and Absolution had an alternative and simpler form again in line with Lambeth 1958. A versicle from I Chronicles 29:11 is included which allows some form of 'taking' before the Sursum Corda. The Prayer of Oblation can follow the Prayer of Consecration either in its full or shortened form before Communion and the Lord's Prayer is placed before the Communion, but can be said in its old place afterwards. The Preface may be again made part of the Prayer of Consecration as in 1928, not separated by the Prayer of Humble Access as in 1662, by using the Prayer of Humble Access in its alternative place before the Sursum Corda. The optional use of the Agnus Dei is allowed as in 1928 before Communion. The many alternatives allowed legalised most practices currently at use in Anglican churches.

Series II

Series II which appeared in 1967 was intentionally a much more radical revision than Series I. Everything which preceeded the Collect for the Day was optional, for indeed most of these features had their origin in vestry prayers or private devotions, and both rites have optional Old Testament lessons and a sermon

immediately after the Gospel and before the Creed. The Creed is retained in Series II though it need only be used on Sundays and Holy Days. Canon Couratin pointed out quite rightly that the Creed really belongs to the Baptismal rite and was only introduced into the Eucharist in the Middle Ages as a safeguard against heresy, Rome not using it until the eleventh century and then only under imperial pressure.[72]

Next came the Intercessions consisting of bidding, silence, versicle and response, and collect which were based on the Solemn Prayers of the fifth century.[73] In all they are fully in accord with Lambeth's suggestion that the intercession should be fully congregational. Indeed these can be and often are led by the laity, it is even possible to introduce extempore prayer at this point.

There is a new simple Confession and Absolution, and the Comfortable Words and the Prayer of Humble Access follow this as options, thus Lambeth's requirements for shorter and simpler expressions of penitence are satisfied. There was a considerable debate as to the best position for the penitential section and a position earlier in the rite was suggested, however it was kept in its present place mainly because people were used to having it there.

The central part of the service is divided into four sections - the Preparation of Bread and Wine, the Thanksgiving, the Breaking of Bread, and the sharing of the Bread and Wine. This does at first sight seem to echo Dix's four-fold shape ofthe liturgy, however Canon Couratin points out this is not so for the first section is not termed 'Offertory' as Christ's actions at the Last Supper involved no real 'taking' of bread in such an elaborate way, but rather picking up some from that which was already set on the table before Him, and thus there can be no real equivalent in an Offertory procession.[74] Hence the rite contains no Offertory prayers.

The Sanctus is retained in the same place linking the Preface to the main body of the Prayer (as the alternative forms of 1928 and Series I). Some members of the liturgical

commission, particularly E.C.Ratcliff, A.H.Couratin and R.C.D.Jasper were in favour of moving the Sanctus to the end of the Prayer. Ratcliff believed that the Sanctus had come as the conclusion of the whole Anaphora in the original version of the Apostolic Tradition,[75] and wanted to see Series II follow the same pattern. Couratin thought likewise seeing the Eucharistic Prayer as being a series of thanksgivings suitably ending with the unification of heavenly and earthly worship in the Sanctus.[76] Both hoped that the Sanctus would be restored to this position in a future revision. R.C.D.Jasper suggested a compromise - that permission be given for the Sanctus to be repeated at the end of the Prayer.[77] The original draft order of 17th December 1965 and the Commission's final report of 26th April 1966 contained the phrase,

'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup',

the Steering Committee then produced the alternative on July 7th 1966,

'Accept, we pray thee, this our duty and service which we with all thy holy people offer unto thee.'

After considerable debate in the Joint Convocations, the text was amended on 12th October 1966 to contain the two following alternatives at the suggestion of Canon J.P.Hickinbotham,

'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup',

and 'we give thanks to thee over this bread and this cup'. The House of Laity refused to accept the use of alternatives and an anamnesis similar to that of 1549 was substituted and accepted by Convocations and the House of Laity on 25th April 1967. Canon Couratin and others who supported the Commission's phrase did so on the authority of the Fathers; among the many passages which they could quote in support were I Clement 36:1, 44:4, Ignatius of Antioch to the Ephesians 5:2, and to the Philadelphians 4:1, and Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho 41,[78] as well as from fourth century liturgies such as the Sacramentary of Serapion, the Testamentum Domini, and the de Sacramentis of S.Ambrose. The solution acceptable to both Convocations and the House of Laity was the sentence,

'Wherefore, O Lord, with this bread and this cup we make the memorial of his saving passion, his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension into heaven, and we look for the coming of his kingdom.'

The root of the word 'memorial' is the Greek 'anamnesis' and modern Biblical scholarship would interpret this as meaning to make a memorial before man rather than God, Douglas Jones interprets the word as found in I Corinthians 11:25 as,

'the appropriation of his death and endless life and all the benefits thereof'. 79

This was acceptable to the leading evangelical member of the Commission C.O.Buchanan[80] and to most evangelical opinion. Roger Beckwith says of the expression,

'though not entirely unambiguous, (it) may be the best on which to agree for the present'. 81

As in Series I alternative the Lord's Prayer is said before the administration of Communion. After this comes a shortened Prayer of Thanksgiving or a Prayer of Self-dedication, followed by the dismissal with an optional Blessing. The congregation participate in the Prayer of Consecration by saying the Sanctus, replying 'Amen' at the end, and saying the Lord's Prayer together, they may also join in the short options that are included in this section.

The rite has many things to commend it, a few points which are worthy of special mention are the freedom for experimentation as such rubrics as there are are very flexible, any version of the Bible can be used for the lessons, and the Sermon now placed after the Gospel gives better continuity, the Canon has been restored to its traditional 'Western' shape, and many prayers which are not essential to the rite now become optional though not entirely discarded. The Commission was very careful in its use of language so that the service could be used by most clergy with a clear conscience.

There were also criticisms. Julian Charley pointed out that the lack of rubrics makes the doctrine more ambiguous for the position of the minister is no longer specified, there is no requirement that the manual acts be seen by the

people, or that the bread and wine be placed in their hands, and the Black Rubric has also disappeared.[82] He also pointed out illogicalities like the Commission's intention to make consecration by thanksgiving and not by the Institution Narrative accompanied by certain manual acts, yet for extra-consecration they make no provision at all, hence the traditional method is still used in practice - the central part of the Prayer of Consecration omitting the thanksgiving which preceeds it.[83] The stress on the Incarnation, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord as well as on His Crucifixion is in line with Lambeth 1958's doctrine on Eucharist and sacrifice, however many evangelicals question Lambeth and dislike the loss of the centrality of the Cross in the Prayer of Consecration, especially the 1662 first sentence asserting the 'once-for-all -ness' of Christ's sacrifice.[84] The loss of eschatological reference has also been noted, we now 'look for the coming of His kingdom' rather than waiting for 'His coming again'; evangelicals and some catholics regard this as a concession to liberal scholarship.[85] Another difficulty has been the direct petition for the departed in the Litany in the Appendix, the House of Laity demanded that it should be reconsidered when the rite is revised, Colin Buchanan found it necessary to express his dissent from the commission over this.[86] He did find it possible to accept the shorter form of the words of administration given as an alternative to the 1662 words as they were Biblically based,[87] however many evangelicals find themselves forced by conscience to use the 1662 words.

No-one, in these liturgical debates, suggested that an epiclesis should be used. Dix, in The Shape of the Liturgy, had deleted the epiclesis from the Apostolic Tradition, and Ratcliff, Couratin and Nichell have been among the scholars who have followed him in seeing the epiclesis as less primitive than was supposed in 1928.[88] The issue however, is not completely dead for C.E.Pocknee has sprung to the defence of the epiclesis as recently as 1968,[89] with some support as

J.H.Srawley in the revised edition of his Early History of the Liturgy (1947) asserted that the earliest manuscript of Hippolytus did have such an invocation, and Dom Sipriano Vaggagini, a member of the Vatican Liturgical Commission, in The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform (1967) stated that this invocation was consecratory. Jungmann and Hanssens in their studies of the Apostolic Tradition also disregarded Dix's hypothesis. H.Chadwick when he revised and corrected Dix's The Apostolic Tradition (1968) did not accept it either. The Liturgical Commission seems to have been much influenced by the theories of Dix and Ratcliff at this point.

In July 1967 Series II received the consent of the joint Convocations and the House of Laity for a trial period of four years which will end in July 1971 when further revision will no doubt take place, particularly in the form of language used.

CHAPTER IV: FOOTNOTES

1. G.W.O.Addleshaw, The High Church Tradition. (1947).p.144.
2. W.J.E.Bennett, The Principles of the Book of Common Prayer Considered. (1845).
3. An interesting account of such publications is:
   J.M.M.Dalby, 'Anglican Missals', C.Q.R. (1967).Vol.CLXVIII.
4. Y.Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice. p.22.
5. T.A.Lacey, Liturgical Interpolations. (1899). p.21.
6. W.H.Frere, Some Principles of Liturgical Reform. (1911).pp.191f.
7. N.P.Williams (Didascalus), Decently and in Order. (1916). pp. 4,15.
   Also the conclusions of Lord Halifax's Hickleton Conference to be found in,
   A.Riley, Prayer Book Revision: The Irreducible Minimum.(1911).p.9.
8. J.Cosin, Notes and Collections on the Book of Common Prayer, Works, Ist Series, 1855. V.pp.114f.
9. T.Sharp, The Life of John Sharp. (1825). I. p.355.
10. C.Wheatley, Rational Illustration. (1848 edit.) 6.22.3.
11. T.Wilson, Sacra Privata, Works. (1860). V.p.73.
12. W.H.Frere, Some Principles of Liturgical Reform. (1911).
13. P.F.Anson, The Call of the Cloister. (1964 edit.). pp.429-31.
14. C.E.Pocknee, 'reservation in the Church of England', a supplement to A.A.King, Eucharistic Reservation in the Western Church . (1965). p.244.
15. Ibid. p.246.
16. The Manual of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.pp.43-6.
17. T.A.Lacey, Reservation. (1899).
18. F.Temple, The Archbishop of Canterbury: On the Reserved Sacrament. (1900). p.12.
19. Ibid. p.6.
20. Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. (1906). Sections 397, 398.
21. G.K.A.Bell, Randall Davidson. (2nd edit. 1938). pp.810-11.
22. Ibid. p.805.
23. Ibid. p.811. The 'Memorial' stated in its opening paragraph,

'It being understood that an attempt is about to be made to deny to the faithful the right of access to the Reserved Sacrament for the purpose of devotion, we the undersigned think it our duty to state our conviction that compliance with such a restriction cannot be rightly demanded and will not be given. However the restriction may be qualified or explained, it will be understood to involve a denial of the duty to give our Lord the adoration which His Sacramental Presence demands wherever and whenever vouchsafed. And the circumstances of the English Church at the present time increase the sense of obligation which we should even otherwise feel to refuse aquiescence.'

Quoted from B.Pollock, Holy Communion and Reservation.(1917). pp.vii-viii.

24. C.Gore &J.E.Watts Ditchfield, Reservation. (1917). pp.32-5.
. W.H.Freestone, The Sacrament Reserved. (1917). p.266.
25. D.Stone, The Reserved Sacrament.(1917). p.88.
26. S.C.Carpenter, Winnington-Ingram. (1949).p.205.
27. Reservation, ed. F.T.Woods. (1926). Introduction p.iii.
28. H.Davies, Worship and Theology in England.1900-1965. (1965)p.298.
29. R.R.Osborn, Holy Communion in the Church of England.(1949).p.115.
30. S.C.Carpenter, op.cit. p.205.
31. J.Wilkinson, 'Liturgy in the Twentieth Century', in Eucharistic Theology Then and Now. (1968).p.92.
32. W.H.Frere, The Anaphora. (1938). p.176.
33. Ibid. p.196.
34. E.A.Knox, Does the Deposited Book change the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper? (1927). pp.6,8.
35. In a letter of Frere to Canon Cooper, then Chancellor of Truro Cathedral, on the Prayer Book, written on 14th March 1928. Quoted by G.Dix, in 'The Liturgist', p.139, an essay in Walter Howard Frere, ed. C.S.Phillips. (1947).
36. C.Smyth, Cyril Foster Garbett. (1959). p.195.
37. A.Hughes, The Rivers of the Flood. (1961). pp.93-4.
38. S.Dark, Archbishop Davidson and the English Church.(1929).p.118.
39. Ibid. p.163.
40. Ibid. p.225.
41. Ibid. p.233.
42. The Book of Common Prayer with the Additions and Deviations

proposed in 1928. p.465.

43. F.L.Cross, Darwell Stone. (1943). p.197.
44. Ibid. p.197.
45. F.E.Brightman, 'The New Prayer Book Examined', C.Q.R. July 1927. p.219.
46. Cross, op.cit. p.199.
47. C.O.Buchanan,'Prayer Book Revision in England 1906-1965', in Towards a Modern Prayer Book, ed. R.T.Beckwith.(1966).p.12.
48. W.J.Sparrow Simpson, The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845. (1932). p.91.
49. Ibid. p.102.
50. Quoted from T.A.Lacey, Facts and Prospects. (1906). pp.14-5.
51. e.g. T.Hewitt, Eucharistic Vestments.(1957). pp.8-9.
    L.F.E.Wilkinson, Scarf or Stole? (1953).
    E.A.Knox, Sacrifice of Sacrament. (1914). p.vii.
52. Ibid. Ib.
53. A.Hughes, op.cit. p.93.
54. Ibid. p.93.
55. C.P.Shaw ed. The Transactions of the Twenty-One. (1930). Shaw was at this time Superior-General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.
56. Obedience: A Plea for Catholic Order. (1929). p.2.
57. C.E.Pocknee, op.cit. p.248.
58. Doctrine in the Church of England. (1937). pp.185-9.
59. Ibid. p.183.
60. In The Churchman, January 1929.
61. Resolution 27. From R.T.Davidson, The Six Lambeth Conferences. (1920).
62. R.C.D.Jasper, W.H.Frere - His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction. p.208.
63. G.A.Michell, Landmarks in Liturgy. (1961). p.41.
64. E.L.Madcall, in Parish and People, Autumn 1957.,p.11.
65. Report of the Lambeth Conference 1958. 2.81.
66. Ibid. 2.85.
67. L.Bouyer, Life and Liturgy. p.120.

68. Prayer Book Studies XVII: The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper. (1966).
69. L.Brown, Relevant Liturgy. (1965). p.63.
70. Reported in The Churchman, Vol.LXXII December, 1958.p.148.
71. Report of the Proceedings of the Liturgical Conference 1966. pp.2,33,
72. A.H.Couratin,'The Methodist Sunday Service', p.34 in The Church Quarterly. Vol.II. July, 1969.
73. Ibid. p.33.
74. Ibid. p.34.
75. E.C.Ratcliff,'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora I & II', J.Ec.H. Vol.I. Nos. 1&2. pp.36f,125ff.
76. A.H.Couratin, 'Notes on the Roman Sanctus', J.Ec.H.(1951). pp.19-23., also 'The Sacrifice of Praise',Theology.Aug.1965 pp. 285f.
77. R.C.D.Jasper,'Gore on Liturgical Revision', C.Q.R. Jan-Mar.1965. p.34.
78. A.H.Couratin, 'The Methodist Sunday Service', op.cit. p.34.
79. D.Jones, 'Anamnesis in the LXX and the Interpretation of I Corinthians 11:25', J.T.S. Vol. VI. Oct. 1965.p.190.
80. C.O.Buchanan, A Guide to the Second Series Communion Service. (1968 edit.) p.29.
81. C.O.Buchanan & R.T.Beckwith,'This Bread and This Cup', Theology, Vol. LXX. June, 1967. p.271.
82. J.W.Charley, 'The Draft Order for Holy Communiom', p.66 in Towards a Modern Prayer Book, ed. R.T.Beckwith.
83. Ibid. p.67.
84. e.g. H.E.W.Turner, 'Holy Communion, Series II:A Theological Critique', Theology. Vol. LXXII. Nov. 1969. pp.492-3.
85. Ibid. pp.493-4. Also C.E.Pocknee,'The Eucharistic Prayer in series II', The Catholic Standard. May 1970.
86. A Guide to the Second Series Communion Service. p.6.
87. Ibid. p.30.
88. See G.A.Nichell, Landmarks in Liturgy. (1961). pp.76-89.
89. C.E.Pocknee, 'The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic Prayer', C.Q.R. April-June, 1968. pp.216f.

CHAPTER V

EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP

The Pattern of Worship in the First Three Decades

In the early years of this century there were two different patterns of worship clearly established in the Church, those of Low or Middle Churchmanship celebrated Holy Communion at 8a.m. and Morning Prayer with Sermon at 11a.m., this latter service was followed by Holy Communion once a month unless there was an evening celebration, and the more catholic churches had a said Low Mass at 8a.m. at which most of the congregation communicated fasting, and a choral High Mass at 11a.m. at which only the celebrant communicated, the common belief being that the people came at 8a.m. to make their communion and at 11a.m. to worship. Those who rejected Holy Communion as the central service did so on the grounds that few in their opinion would communicate and Morning Prayer was something in which all could participate.[1] The catholic pattern evolved through an insistance on fasting communion, this made it impossible for the congregation to be communicated at 11a.m. - the traditional 'holy hour' for the main Sunday service.

During this period on the Continent there was a new awakening in the Roman Catholic Church concerning the nature of the Eucharist as a corporate activity. This began in the late nineteenth century and was fostered greatly by Pius X (1903-1914) who issued an encyclical soon after he became Pope stressing the need for more congregational participation in the services and sacraments, he followed this in 1905 by a decree calling for more frequent communion. These ideas were spread also by the works of Dom Lambert Beauduin who linked the liturgical revival with a greater theological understanding of the Church as the Body of Christ. He even proposed the introduction of the Mass in the vernacular. Beauduin was Abbot of Mont-Cesar, Louvain which, with another

great Benedictine Abbey Maria Laach in Germany, became an important centre of ideas in the early days of the movement. The Abbot of Maria Laach, Odo Casel, was editor of the influential Ecclesia Orans, and took a large part in the writing of the series Jahrbuch fur Liturgiewissenschaft . Maria Laach also produced Romano Guardini, whose Spirit of the Liturgy was widely read. By 1925 the Movement had spread all over Europe and to America. Two valuable studies of the Movement are J.H.Srawley's The Liturgical Movement (1954), and E.Koenker's The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (1954). The Liturgy was intended to be seen both as the Church's worship and as her witness to the world, therefore it had to become both better-known and better-lived. Communion became increasingly more central and was regarded as an integral part of the Mass, and extra-liturgical devotions to the Blessed Sacrament have gradually decreased throughout the century, though more in Europe than in England. In the succeeding years came 'westward' celebrations, dialogue Masses, Offertory processions of the laity, and the entire Mass beeame audible, finally after Vatican II the Mass was authorised in the vernacular. The writings of supporters of the movement have found a wide audience in England, as have the works of Continental Reformed theologians who have been influenced by the new Roman thought. The Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches wassto give great stimulus to the Movement in the 1940's. Continental theologians lectured in England to an ever-increasing number of Anglican clergy; one of the most valuable contributions was by the French Reformed theologian Jean Daniel Bénôit who gave a series of lectures on the movement to the clergy of the diocese of London which was later published under the title, Liturgical Renewal: Catholic and Protestant Developments on the Continent (1958).

Many Anglican clergy did not feel content with the pattern of worship which had become established, largely because it destroyed worship as a corporate activity. There had been a few

attempts in the nineteenth century to make the 8a.m. celebration the central act of worship. Fr. Bennett of Frome made it choral, and at S.Columba, Seaton Burn a sermon was added in 1870, Fr Burn of All Saints, Middlesbrough established a form of People's Eucharist in 1893, he had said celebrations at 7a.m. and 8a.m. but his 9a.m. celebration was sung to Merbecke and was often a High Mass, it included hymns and a five minute sermon, from its early days there were about a hundred communicants at the service. Fr Burn intended it to be primarily for parents with children, it was also timed so that fasting communion was possible and so the wives had time to cook the dinner afterwards.[2] Cosmo Lang was to plead for a'parish communion' in 1905 when he was Bishop of Stepney. It was not just a High Church idea, right from the start it had a staunch supporter in Wilson Carlisle, the evangelical founder of the Church Army. The movement slowly gathered momentum. The Report of the Archbishops' Commission The Worship of the Church published in 1918 called for Holy Communion to become the central act of public worship because it was,

'definitely ordained by Christ, and therefore has a greater claim on the observance of Christians than any other service which can be devised',

and,

'the Communion Service makes less demand for intellectual effort and satisfies more directly the spiritual impulses than such services as Morning and Evening Prayer'. 3

All this serves to indicate that a liturgical renewal was growing up in England alongside the Roman Liturgical Movement on the Continent, and although England was to be increasingly influenced by these Continental developments her own renewal was not dependent upon them. However these developments were not sufficiently advanced to have much impact on the 1927/8 Prayer Book revision schemes.

It has been said that the rise of ritualism in the Anglican Church broke the ground ready for liturgical revival, this opinion is held by the American scholar Massey H.Shepherd, who asserted that ritualism,

'finally succeeded in 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 over intellectualized and formalized use of the Prayer Book into which the Anglican churches had largely withdrawn after the separation of the dissenting bodies. Ritualism also fostered a new interest in the study of liturgiology'. 4

The Parish Communion Movement

It was the 1930's which really saw the beginnings of the Parish Communion movement, and it owed much to the writings of Fr Gabriel Hebert. In 1935 his Liturgy and Society appeared and this opened a new field in the study of liturgy - the sociology of liturgy. In this book he drew attention to the theological and liturgical developments on the Continent, and stressed the increasing realisation of the Church as the Body of Christ and of its missionary function in the home field. Soon after this came Brother Edward's Sunday Morning - The New Way which called for a Eucharist in which the whole congregation could participate as a central act of worship. This book encouraged Fr Hebert to edit a collection of essays entitled The Parish Communion (1937). Before the publication of these books a parish communion - sung with a sermon and many of the congregation communicating was developing in some parishes, but the influence of these books caused the movement to become far more widespread. Hebert's book was not intended to have a 'party' line, and it advocated for all churches, whether in town or country, a celebration each Sunday at 9a.m. or 9.30a.m.. New groups sprang up such as 'Associated Parishes' and 'Parish and People' which encouraged further growth. The 'Parish and People' movement came into existence in 1949, and its aims were,

'the study and dissemination of the principles underlying the Church's corporate worship, (i.e the Liturgy) and the application of these principles in the life of the parish and the world (i.e. liturgical action)'.

Fr Hebert himself was very influential in the movements' early

days. Its magazine Parish and People was a forum for liturgical discussion, particularly over liturgical experiments, and it did much to stimulate the adoption of the Parish Eucharist all over England. Under its auspices many conferences were held, both on local and national scales, and in 1962 a conference was held at Swanwick to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the movement, this testified how widespread its influence had become in all parts of the country and among all shades of churchmanship.[5]

The time for the Parish Communion was usually 9.30a.m. or 10a.m. so fasting if desired was a practical possibility - especially as the service was usually followed by some form of refreshment. The addition of a sermon won over many of the defenders of the traditional Morning Prayer. This meant that such a service was acceptable to the majority of the Church of England.

The study of the history and theology of worship no longer remained the pursuit only of the more catholic-minded, Bowles, Bromily, Dillistone, Harrison and MacDonald are just a few of those who have contributed to the growing understanding of the Eucharist's true nature. Evangelicals came to realise that,

'in the purest days of the Church's faith and worship the Lord's Supper was regularly received by all practising Christians on theLord's Day: that it was in fact the one really central and distinctive act of Christian worship which bound them to their Lord and to one another'. 6

The Evangelical Conference at Keele in 1967 confirmed their approval of the movement stating that,

'We determine to work towards the practice of a weekly celebration of the sacrament as the central corporate service of the Church.' 7

All are agreed over many of the advantageous features of this form of worship especially the congregational participation in the singing of the service, the increased emphasis (by means of the sermon) on the Ministry of the Word at the Eucharist, the growing realisation of the Church as a family gathered together for the family meal, and being members one of another

and of Christ. Communion becomes a corporate activity instead of a series of individual acts. By the very nature of the service ceremonial has had to be simplified and this, combined with all the other factors, has helped to unite parties and movements within the Church.[8]

There have been two sources of difficulty. The first of these concerns the introduction of Offertory processions - where at a given point in the service members of the congregation proceed from the rear of the church to the chancel steps carrying the elements used in the service. Ideally this was designed as an aspect of congregational participation - the elements symbolizing the labours of the congregation being used for God's purposes, as E.L.Mascall expressed it,

'the offertory is the preparation for the oblation, and not the oblation itself'. 9

Some evangelicals though have condemned it as being Pelagian suggesting that we can contribute something towards Christ's sacrifice and therefore to our own salvation, as does E.M.B.Green,[10] and also that,

'the conception of an Offertory of the bread and wine is inseparable from the conception of the sacrament itself being in some sense a sacrifice of material elements to God'. 11

Others such as de Satge[12] and Buchanan[13] approve of it. The second difficulty concerns the increased use of the 'westward' position to celebrate Holy Communion. Ideally the celebrant by facing the congregation makes them feel more fully a part of the Eucharistic action and stresses the concept of the sacrament as a family meal with the altar as the table round which the family gathers; it is also probably the most primitive position.[14] God is no longer worshipped as someone 'out there' which was often felt to be the danger of the eastward position, rather our attention is fixed on a central position where,

'the Christ stands among his own as the breaker of bread'. 15

It also helps to break down the barriers of churchmanship as it is acceptable to catholics and to many evangelicals, as it

answers the latter's objection to the eastward position - that the manual acts could not be seen. Some evangelicals cannot accept it though as they believe it makes the clergy appear as a presiding hierarchy and thus usurp Christ's place as head of the table; and they further point out that the 'dramatic acts' - the elevation and the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice can be performed even more effectively from this angle than from the eastward position. Among those who condemn the westward position are J.A.Motyer, A.M.Stibbs, and J.R.W.Stott,[16] although it was accepted by other really conservative evangelicals such as P.E.Hughes.[17]

The Parish Communion Movement has opened the door wide for further liturgical experimentation. In some parishes 'house churches' have been tried, where groups meet in homes for celebrations of the Eucharist round a family meal-table in addition to the formal Sunday celebrations in the parish church. The congregation read the lessons, and lead the intercessions and the bread used is the same as the family eats daily. E.W.Southcott did much to popularise this by his experiments in Halton, Leeds in the 1950's, his chief intention was to make the people realise that they did not just go to Church but that they were the Church.[18] Similar experiments have been tried in the universities where lecture-rooms have taken the place of chapels for many years, the congregation gathers round a table which is used for an altar, ordinary bread is used and the chalice and paten are often passed round the congregation each person communicating their neighbour, sometimes the priest will celebrate in his normal clothes.[19] This is all designed to give the group a greater sense of being the living Body of Christ. An earlier and more conservative experiment of this kind by J.A.T.Robinson at Clare College, Cambridge formed the substance of a book, The Liturgy Coming to Life (1961). The new insights gained in this movement and the desire for further experimentation have been fully recognised in the liturgical revision which produced Series II.

The Setting for Worship

In the early years of this century two kinds of churches stood out clearly from the rest - those of the Alcuin Club and the Warham Guild, and those of the followers of the Society of S.Peter and S.Paul.

The Alcuin Club publications were very expensive, and it was Percy Dearmer's Parson's Handbook which popularised the movement. In 1900 Dearmer became vicar of S.Mary the Virgin, Primrose Hill, London and he transformed the church according to these ideas - among the changes introduced were riddel curtains and a dorsel for the altar, and very full Gothic vestments, all representations of Christ in the church showed Him vested and crowned. Other fine examples of Warham Guild altars are still to be seen at Maidstone Parish Church,Kent, Princes Risborough, Bucks, and Wookey Hole, Somerset. The influence of this group has affected many parish churches all over England and many cathedrals, indeed it has spread overseas to our then colonies and can be seen as far away as South Africa, Canada and India - the high altar of Capetown Cathedral being a particularly striking example. Everying was just as it was believed to have been in the second year of the reign of Edward VI to donform to the Ornaments Rubric - it was nicknamed 'British Museum religion', as J.T.Micklethwaite wrote comparing the 'English' use to current fashion in church furnishing,

> 'The substitution of foreign ornaments is mischievous from the countenance it gives to those who profess to see in the present revival within the Church of England only an imitation of the Church of Rome. And we do not want the things, our own are better.' 20

Colin Dunlop attempted an apologia for these ideas in What is the English Use? (1923) in which he justified these ideas as being in obedience to the Prayer Book and the legal precepts laid down by the rubric, and also because they supplied the need for an aesthetically satisfying ceremonial and church furnishing, and asserted that the nickname 'British Museum religion' was totally unjustified. He pointed to current fashions in ultra-catholic church furnishing as showing the

'eighteenth century bad taste' condemned by the Roman Catholic author on Roman ceremonial Dr Adrian Fortescue.[21] In fact he was pleading for the Prayer Book to be used in its entirety for he contended that the practice of ultra-catholics (except for those few who actually used the Roman Missal) was to mix up both rites and thereby produce something totally unsatisfactory.[22]

The S.S.P.P. was founded in 1911 largely to combat the ideas of Dearmer's followers and to encourage the reunion of the Church of England with the Church of Rome by introducing Roman furnishings and to some extent Roman rites to their churches. For them Baroque furnishings were a must, and with them full Continental piety. Their altars were adorned with massive crucifixes, tabernacles, thrones for Exposition, and monstrances for Benediction. Vestments were the Latin 'fiddle-backs' and albs resembled 'Victorian lace curtains'.[23] All altar fittings were heavy and gilded. Two early examples were S.Michael, Plymouth (1913) and S.Thomas, Oxford (1917). Most of the others were in London, though S.Martin and S.Bartholomew, Brighton, S.Margaret, Liverpool and S.John the Baptist, Tue Brook, and S.Michael, Edinburgh must be mentioned. The great architect of this school was Martin Travers- he renovated S.Augustine, Queen's Gate, London in this manner also S.Magnus the Martyr, London Bridge, Compton Beauchamp, Berks and the Church of the Good Shepherd, Carsholton; another of his remarkable works was the transformation of the ballroom into a Baroque chapel in the large house that became Nashdom Abbey. The most fascinating example of this school though is the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham, built in 1931 it is an imitation of the Holy House of Loreto, and there is a Baroque altar for every mystery of the Rosary.

On the whole though Anglican architecture followed a modified mock-gothic style until the 1950's with a few more contemporary exceptions. A book published in 1956 entitled Sixty Post-War Churches[24] shows some churches that were designed to act as church halls as well, but even these are

very traditional with altars firmly placed at the east end and many had large chancel arches which had the mental if not the visual effect of cutting the church in two parts.

Yet in this sphere also the Continental Liturgical Movement was to influence the Church of England. Along with the new emphasis on the Eucharist as a corporate activity had come a desire for more simplicity in worship and in all that accompanied it. A formative book in encouraging simplicity in altar furnishing was Der christliche Altar by J.Braun S.J. (Munich 1924). In the succeeding years Roman Catholic churches in Europe began to use nave altars, leaving their tabernacles on the old high altars or on side-altars, some even had central altars, and the westward position became very common. Gothic vestments replaced Latin ones and even candles were radically reduced in number, sometimes they were placed on the foot-pace and the altar itself was bare except for the sacred vessels. The first central altar in England was at the Roman Catholic Church of the First Martyrs, Bradford (1935).

Just before the Second World War Anglican churches came under this influence - at first very cautiously. John Keble Church, Mill Hill designed by Martin Smith and built in 1936 had a nave wider than it was long, the altar was visible to the whole church, though it was still cited against the east wall. There was a real breakthrough in S.Philip, Cosham (1938) designed by Sir Ninian Comper on a fourth century plan; the church was rectangular with a freestanding altar under a ciborium - it was a building deliberately designed to make the altar the main focus, and to facilitate as much lay participation as possible in the Eucharist. S.Aidan's theological college chapel, Birkenhead, had one of the first central communion tables in England. Although progress was slow nearly all churches built in the late 1950's and the 1960's seem to be designed for a westward celebration and central altars though not common are to be found in some places. Seating semi-circular to the altar is also popular as at Rankswood, Worcester and S.Mary, Peckham.

One interesting example of modern liturgical planning is S.Paul, Bow Common, London - built between 1956 and 1960 with a central altar, completely bare but with two candles on the footpace, and a lantern window over the altar. It has been said that the church,

'may be seen as a pattern of relationships, which are significant because of their function in the context of the actual liturgy; a liturgy seen as a movement towards the place of the altar and communion, a movement towards the light. In this church the movement is inwards through the dark porch, past the font, through the procession to the place of the ministry of the word - synaxis - into the light of the sanctuary'.[25]

In older churches the high altar is often virtually abandoned and a nave altar is in use even for the main Sunday celebration, and there is a great stress that all furniture and decoration should have strict liturgical functions and no longer be ends in themselves.[26]

Architects and Church authorities have both come to realise that the relationship between architecture and worship needs detailed study. Dr William Temple when Archbishop of Canterbury was inspired to establish a centre for the study of worship and the arts by the work of Dix and others, however this project was not developed. It was not until about 1960 that a start was made in this direction when the Department of Extra-Mural Studies at the University of Liverpool held a conference on worship and architecture and they have followed this by other conferences on the subject. The papers at these conferences showed that both architects and theologians have developed together a real grasp of what the Liturgical Movement and the Doctrine of the Body of Christ really mean; they were also ecumenical having papers from Roman Catholics and Non-conformists as well as by Anglicans.[27] About this time also the Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture was established at the University of Birmingham.

Architecture has now caught up with theological and liturgical development. The people are taught that they are the Body of Christ in the world, and in more catholic theology there is an increased emphasis on the part they have to play

in offering Christ's sacrifice. The redesigned liturgy helps them to participate more fully in the service, and the Parish Communion Movement has enabled them to make this act as families together realising that they are all God's family, and making a corporate communion their central act of worship. The new architecture led to an increased focus on the altar and on communion as the centre of worship, the congregation see what takes place at the altar and sometimes even gather directly round it, over all the unity of priest and people is emphasised.

CHAPTER V: FOOTNOTES

1. W.H.Griffith Thomas, A Sacrament of our Redemption. p.117.
2. T.G.Fullerton, Father Burn of Middlesbrough. (1927). p.107.
3. The Worship of the Church. (1918). p.15.
4. M.H.Shepherd, The Liturgical Renewal of the Church.(1960).pp.46f.
5. A collection of essays was published to mark this event, The Parish Communion Today, ed. D.Paton. (1962).
6. F.Colquhoun, The Living Church in the Parish. (1952).
7. Keele '67. (1967). para.76.
8. A useful comment on the effects of the Parish Communion Movement is to be found in, A.M.Ramsey, Durham Essays and Addresses. pp.15-21.
9. E.L.Mascall, The Recovery of Unity.(1958). p.150. also, G.Every, 'Offertory and Oblation', Theology. Vol.LX.(1957).
10. E.M.B.Green, The Holy Communion. p.28.
11. D.Robinson,'Eucharist and Offertory', The Churchman.(1961) Vol.LXXV. p.39.
12. J. deSatge in The Parish Communion Today. p.67.
13. C.O.Buchanan, 'Liturgical Reform in Anglicanism', Concilium Vol. II. Feb. 1969 p.55.
14. B.Minchin, The Celebration of the Eucharist Facing the People. (2nd edit. 1954). p.11.

    The same was asserted by evangelical writers:
    J.T.Tomlinson, The Liturgy and the Eastward Position.
    A.Mitchell,'The Position of the Minister at the Lord's Table', The Churchman. Jan. 1926.
    P.E.Hughes, The Position of the Celebrant at the Service of Holy Communion. (1957). p.13.
15. J.A.T.Robinson, Honest to God. (1963). p.89.
16. J.A.Motyer, A.M.Stibbs & J.R.W.Stott, Why I Value the North-Side Position. (1963).
17. P.E.Hughes, op.cit. p.14.
18. E.W.Southcott, 'The House Church', Theology. Vol.LVI.1953. pp.169-70.
19. The author has participated in such services at the universities of Southampton, Reading and London.

20. J.T.Micklethwaite, The Ornaments of the Rubric.(1897). p.62.
21. Ibid. p.15.
    cf. A.Fortescue, The Vestments of the Roman Rite. (N.D.).
22. Ibid. p.28.
23. P.F.Anson, Fashions in Church Furnishing 1840-1940.(1965 edit.) p.320.
24. Sixty Post-War Churches. (1965).
25. e.g. The Modern Architectural Setting of the Liturgy. (1964). ed. W.Lockett.
    This covers the papers read at the 1962 Conference and includes contributions from F.W.Dillistone, J.G.Davies, Charles Davies, Frederick Gibbard and G.G.Pace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBOTT,T.K. Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments. (1891).

ADDLESHAW,G.W.O. The High Church Tradition. (1947).

ANSON,P.F. The Call of the Cloister. (rev.edit. 1964).

ANSON,P.F. Fashions in Church Furnishing 1840-1940. (1960).

ARNOLD,J.H. &WYATT,E.G.P. eds. Walter Howard Frere. (1940).

BAILLIE,D.M. The Theology of the Sacraments. (1957).

BARRETT,C.K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.(1957).

BEAUDUIN,L. La Piété de L'Eglise, Principes et Faits. Brussels. (1914).

BECKWITH,R.T. Towards a Modern Prayer Book. (1966).

BELL,G.K.A. Randall Davidson. (2nd edit. 1938). Oxford.

BENNETT,W.J.E. The Principles of the Book of Common Prayer.(1845)

BENÔIT,J.D. Liturgical Renewal. (1958).

BICKNELL,E.J. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. (1919). Rev. H.J.CARPENTER. (3rd edit. 1955).

BLISS,K. We the People.(1963).

BOUYER,L. Life and Liturgy. (1954. E.T. 1956).

BRAUN,J. Der christliche Altar. (1924). Munich.

BRIGHTMAN,F.E. The Eucharistic Sacrifice. (n.d.). (An address to the C.B.S., later privately printed.)

BRIGHTMAN,F.E. 'The New Prayer Book Examined',C.Q.R. 1927 Vol.104.

BRILIOTH,Y. Eucharistic Faith and Practice,(E.T. 1930).

BROWN.L.W. Relevant Liturgy. (1965).

BUCHANAN,C.O. & BECKWITH,R.T. 'This Bread and this Cup', Theology. 1967. Vol.LXX.

BUCHANAN,C.O. A Guide to the Second Series Communion Service. (1968 edit.)

BUCHANAN,C.O. MODERN ANGLICAN LITURGIES 1958-1968.(1968). Oxford.

BUCHANAN,C.O. 'Liturgical Reform in Anglicanism', Concilium. 1969. Vol.II.

BURNET,G. History of the Reformation in the Church of England. (1679-1715).

BUSHNELL,H. Forgiveness and Law. (1874).

CAMPBELL,J.MCLOUD The Nature of the Atonement. (1856).

CARPENTER,J. Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought. (1960).

CARPENTER,S.C. Winnington-Ingram. (1949).

CHADWICK,H. Revised and corrected edition of G.DIX The Apostolic Tradition. (1968).

CLARK,F. Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. (1960).

COLQUHOUN,F. The Living Church in the Parish. (1952).

The Manual of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament.(1954 edit

COPE,G.DAVIES,J.G. & TYLER,D.A. An Experimental Liturgy. (1958).

COSIN,J. Notes and Collections on the Book of Common Prayer. Works. 1st Series. (1855). Oxford.

COURATIN,A.H. 'Notes on the Roman Sanctus', J.Ec.H. 1951.Vol.II.

COURATIN,A.H. 'The Sacrifice of Praise', Theology. 1955.Vol.58.

COURATIN,A.H. 'The Tradition Received', Theology. 1966. Vol.69.

COURATIN,A.H. 'The Methodist Sunday Service', The Church Quarterly. Vol. II. 1969.

CRANMER,T. Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. ed.J.E.COX. Cambridge. (1844).

CROSS,F.L. Darwell Stone. (1943).

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

DALBY,J.M.M. 'Anglican Missals', C.Q.R. 1967. Vol. CLXVIII.

DARK,S. Archbishop Davidson and the English Church. (1929).

DAVIDSON,R.T. The Six Lambeth Conferences. (1920).

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

DAVIES,J.G. Worship and Mission. (1966).

DE LA TAILLE MYSTERIUM FIDEI. (E.T. 1941).

DE LA TAILLE The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion. (E.T.1930).

DEARMER,P. Parson's Handbook. (1899).

DENISON,G.A. The Real Presence. (1853).

DILLISTONE,F.W. The Structure of Divine Society. (1951).

DILLISTONE,F.W. 'The Atonement and the Sacraments', C.Q.R. 1958 Vol. CLIX.

DIMOCK,N. Missarum Sacrificia. (1896).

DIMOCK,N. Our One Priest on High. (1899).

DIMOCK,N, Notes on the Round Table Conference. (1901).

DIMOCK,N. On Eucharistic Worship in the English Church. (Memorial edit. 1911.)

DIX,G. The Apostolic Tradition. (1937).

DIX,G. A Detection of Aumbries. (1942).

DIX,G. The Shape of the Liturgy. (1945).

Doctrine in the Church of England. (1938), The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922.

DODD,C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. (1936).

DUNLOP,C. What is the English Us6? (1923).

ECHLIN,E.P. The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective. (1968). New York.

EDWALL,P. HAYMAN,E. & MAXWELL,W.D. Ways of Worship. (1951).

Eucharistic Theology Then and Now. (1968). S.P.C.K. Collection.

EVERY,G. The High Church Party 1688-1718. (1956).

EVERY,G. 'Offertory and Oblation', Theology. 1957. Vol. LX.

FIELD,R. Of the Church. (1606-1610).

FLEW,N. Jesus and His Church. (1938).

FORTESCUE,A. Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described. (1917).

FORTESCUE,A. The Vestments of the Roman Rite. (n.d.).

FREESTONE,W.H. The Sacrament Reserved. (1917).

FRERE,W.H. Some Liturgical Principles. (1911).

FRERE,W.H. The Anaphora. (1938).

FRERE,W.H. WALter Howard Frere: His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction. ed. R.C.D.JASPER. (1954).

FULLER,R.H. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.(1966).

FULLERTON,T.G. Father Burn of Middlesbrough. (1927).Middlesbrough

The Fulness of Christ. (1950). A Report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

GAYFORD,S.C. Sacrifice and Priesthood. (1924).

GILLETT,C.S. & INGRAM,K. eds.
Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress 1927. (1927).

GORE,C. The Body of Christ. (1901).

GORE,C. The Holy Communion. (1928).

GORE,C. & WATTS DITCHFIELD,J.E. Reservation. (1917).

GREEN,E.M.B. The Holy Communion - Doctrine in Dispute. (1963).

GRIFFITH-THOMAS,W.H. A Sacrament of our Redemption.(2nd edit. 1920).

GUARDINI,R. L'Esprit de la Liturgie. (1930). Paris.

HALIFAX, 2nd VISCOUNT (CHARLES LINDLEY WOOD)
Proposals for Mutual Explanation: Eucharistic Doctrine. (1900).

HAMMOND,P. Liturgy and Architecture. (1960).

HÄRDELIN,A. The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist. (1965). Uppsala.

HEBERT,A.G. Intercommunion. (1932).

HEBERT,A.G. ed. The Parish Communion. (1937).

HEWITT,T. Eucharistic Vestments. (1957).

HICKS,F.C.N. The Fulness of Sacrifice. (2nd edit, 1938).

HICKS,F.C.N. Appendix to The Second World Conference on Faith and Order. ed. L.HODGSON. (1938).

HUGHES,A. The Rivers of the Flood. (1961).

HUGHES,P.E. The Position of the Celebrant at the Service of Holy Communion. (1957).

JASPER,R.C.D. 'Gore on Liturgical Revision', C.Q.R. 1965. Vol. 166.

JEREMIAS,J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. (E.T. 1955).

JONES,D. 'Anamnesis in the LXX and the Interpretation of I Corinthians 11:25'. J.T.S. 1955. N.S. Vol.VI.

KEBLE,J. On Eucharistic Adoration. (3rd edit. 1867).

Keele '67. (1967) ed. P.Crowe.

The National Evangelical Congress Statement.

KENDRICK,H.W.G. (Compiler). The English Missal. (1912).

KIDD,B.J. The Later Medieval Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1898).

KNOX,E.A. Sacrifice of Sacrament. (1914).

KNOX,E.A. Does the Deposited Book change the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper? (1927).

KNOX,W.L. The Catholic Movement in the Church of England.(1923).

KOENKER,E. The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church. (1954). Chicago.

LACEY,T.A. Liturgical Interpolations. (1899).

LACEY,T.A. Reservation.(1899).

LACEY,T.A. Facts and Prospects. (1906).

LACEY,T.A. The Anglo-Catholic Faith. (1926).

Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930.

Report of the Lambeth Conference 1958.

LAMBURN,E.C.R. & CAIRNCROSS,H. Ritual Notes. (1894).

LAMPE,G.W.H. 'The Atonement: Law and Love', in Soundings ed. A.R.VIDLER. (1962). Cambridge.

Report of the Proceedings of the Liturgical Conference 1966.

LOCKETT,W. ED. The Modern Architectural Setting of the Liturgy. (1964). Papers read at a Conference held at Liverpool, September 1962.

LOCKTON,W. The Remains at the Eucharist. (1920). Cambridge.

LOWTHER CLARKE,W.K. The Prayer Book of 1928 Considered. (1943).

MAGUIRE,R. & MURRAY,K. Modern Churches. (1965).

MANSON,W. The Epistle to the Hebrews. (1951).

MASCALL,E.L. Christ, the Christian and the Church, (1946).

MASCALL,E.L. The Recovery of Unity. (1958).

MASCALL,E.L. Corpus Christi. (1965 edit.)

MASCALL,E.L. 'Eucharistic Doctrine after Vatican II: Some Anglican Anticipations', C.Q.R. 1968 Vol.CLXIX.

MAYNARD SMITH,H. Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar. (1926).

MEDD,P.G. The Priest to the Altar. (1861).

MENZIES,L. Father Wainwright - A Record. (1947).

MERSCH,E. The Whole Christ. (E.T. 1951).

MICHELL,G.A. Landmarks in Liturgy. (1961).

MICKLETHWAITE.J.T. The Ornaments of the Rubric. (1897).

MILLIGAN,W. The Resurrection of our Lord. (1881).

MINCHIN,B. The Celebration of the Eucharist facing the people. (2nd edit. 1954.)

MITCHELL,A. The Position of the Minister at the Lord's Table. The Churchman 1926.

MOBERLY,R.C. Ministerial Priesthood. (1897).

MOBERLY,R.C. 'Communion with the Atonement', J.T.S. 1901.Vol.II.

MORRIS,L. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. (1955).

MORSE,H.G. Notes on Ceremonial. (1876).

MORSE BOYCOTT,D. The Secret Story of the Oxford Movement. (1933).

MOTYER,J.A. STIBBS,A.M. & STOTT,J.R.W.
Why I Value the North-Side Position. (1963).

MOULE,C.F.D. The Sacrifice of Christ. (1956).

MOULE, H.C.G. Outlines of Christian Doctrine. (1888).

MOULE, H.C.G. The Supper of the Lord. (1912).

MACDONALD,A.J. ed. The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion. (1930). Cambridge.

NEWBOLT,W.C.E. The Sacrament of the Altar. (1908).

Obedience: A Plea for Catholic Order. (1929).

'Findings of the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen' (September 1958) The Churchman. 1958. Vol.LXXII.

PACKER,J.I. ed. Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1962).
(Papers from the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen 1961).

PATON,D.M. ed. The Parish Communion Today. (1962).
(The Report of the 1962 Conference of Parish and People).

PHILLIPS,C.S. ed. Walter Howard Frere. (1947).

PLUMMER,A. S.Luke. I.C.C. (5th edit. 1922).

POCKLEE,C.E. 'Reservation in the Church of England and the Anglican Communion since 1549 until the Present Century', a supplement to
KING,A.A. Eucharistic Reservation in the Western Church.(1965

POCKNEE,C.E. 'The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic Prayer', C.Q.R. 1968. Vol. 169.

POCKNEE,C.E. 'The Eucharistic Prayer in Series II - A Critique', The Catholic Standard. Vol.6. May 1970.

POLLOCK,B. Holy Communion and Reservation. (1917).

Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England. (1957).
(A Memorandum of the Church of England's Liturgical Commission).

PROCTER,F. & FRERE,W.H. A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. (1902).

QUICK,O,C. The Christian Sacraments. (1927).

RAMSEY,A.M. The Gospel and the Catholic Church. (1936).

RAMSEY,A.M. Durham Essays and Addresses. (1956).

RAMSEY,A.M. The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. (1948).

RATCLIFF,E.C. 'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora I & II', J.Ec.H. 1950. Vol.I.

Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.(1906).

RICHARDSON,A. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. (1958).

RILEY,A. Prayer Book Revision: The Irreducible Minimum.(1911).

ROBINSON,D. 'Eucharist and Offertory', The Churchman.1961 Vol.75.

ROBINSON,J.A.T. The Body. (1952).

ROBINSON,J.A.T. Liturgy Coming to Life. (1960).

ROBINSON,J.A.T.(and others) Layman's Church. (1963).

ROBINSON,J.A.T. Honest to God. (1963).

ROBINSON,J.A.T. The New Reformation. (1965).

ROGERS,T.G. ed. Liberal Evangelicalism. (1923).

ROSS,K.N. Adoration of the Holy Sacrament. (n.d.)

SANDAY,W. ed. Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice. (1900).Report of a Conference held at Oxford, December 1899.

SCHMEMANN,A. For the Life of the World. (1963).

SCUDAMORE,W.E. Notitia Eucharistica. (2nd edit. 1876).

SHARP,T. The Life of John Sharpe. (1825).

SHAW,C.P. The Transactions of the Twenty-One. (1930).

SHEPHERD,M.H. The Liturgical Renewal of the Church. (1960). New York.

SHIPLEY,O. The Ritual of the Altar. (1870).

Sixty Post-War Churches. (1956).

SMYTH,C. Cyril Foster Garbett. (1959).

SOAMES,W.H.K. What does the Church of England say about the Real Presence and Adoration? (1898).

Society of S.Peter and S.Paul. Anglican Missal. (1st edit.1921).

SOUTHCOTT,E.W. 'The House Church', Theology. (1953). Vol.56.

SPARROW-SIMPSON,W.J. The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845. (1932).

SPENS,W. Belief and Practice. (1915).

SPENS,W. 'The Eucharist', in Essays Catholic and Critical. ed. E.G.SELWYN. (1926).

SPENS,W. The Christian Sacraments. (Theology Reprint 1929).

SRAWLEY,J.H. Early History of the Liturgy.(Rev. edit.1947). Cambridge.

SRAWLEY,J.H. The Liturgical Movement. (1954).

STIBBS,A.M. The Finished Work of Christ. (1954).

STIBBS,A.M. Sacrament, Sacrifice and Eucharist. (1961).

STONE,D. The Holy Communion. (1904).

STONE,D. The Reserved Sacrament. (1917).

STONE,D. The Eucharistic Sacrifice. (1920).

SWETE,H.B. The Ascended Christ. (1910).

TAIT,A.J. Lecture Outlines on the Thirty Nine Articles.(1910).

TAIT,A.J. The Heavenly Session of Our Lord. (1912).

TAIT,A.J. The Nature and Function of the Sacraments. (1917).

TAIT,A.J. Sacrament and Presence. (n.d.).

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN,P. Le Milieu Divin. (1957, E.T. 1964).

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN,P. Hymn of the Universe.(1961,E.T. 1965).

TEMPLE,F. & MACLAGAN,W. The Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations. (1897).

TEMPLE,F. The Archbishop of Canterbury: On the Reserved Sacrament. (1900).

TEMPLE,W. Christus Veritas. (1924).

TEMPLE,W. The Hope of the New World. (1940).

THORNTON,L.S. The Incarnate Lord. (1928).

THORNTON,L.S. The Doctrine of the Atonement. (1927).

THORNTON,L.S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. (1942).

TOMLINSON,J.T. The Catholic Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice. (2nd edit. 1908).

TOMLINSON,J.T. The Liturgy and the Eastward Position. (n.d.).

TRAVERS,H. Pictures of the English Liturgy - Low Mass. (1916).

TRAVERS,H. The Celebration of High Mass. (1922).

TURNER,H.E.W. 'Holy Communion, Series II: A Theological Critique', Theology. 1969. Vol.LXXII.

VAGGAGINI,S. The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform. (E.T. 1967).

WACE,H. ed. The Doctrine of Holy Communion and its expression in Ritual. (1900).

(Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace in October,1900).

WAGGETT,P.N. The Holy Eucharist. (1906).

WESTCOTT,B.F. The Historic Faith. (1900).

WESTON,F. The Fulness of Christ. (1916).

WHEATLEY,C. Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. (3rd edit. 1720).

WILLIAMS,N.P. (DIDASCALUS) Decently and in Order. (1916).

WILLIAMS,L.F.E. Scarf or Stole. (1953).

WILLIAMS,R.R. ed. Word and Sacrament. (1968).

WILLIS,E.F. The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist.(1878).

WILSON,T. Sacra Privata, Works. (1860).

WOODS,F.T. Reservation. (1926).

(Report of a Conference held at Farnham Castle October, 1925).

The Worship of the Church. (1918).

(The Report of the Archbishop's Second Committee of Enquiry.)

YERKES,R.K. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. (1952). New York.

ZERNOV,N. The Church of the Eastern Christians. (1942).

ABBREVIATIONS

J.T.S. Journal of Theological Studies.

J.Ec.H. Journal of Ecclesiastical History.

C.Q.R. Church Quarterly Review.