

Abstract

“RESPONSIVE RATHER THAN EMERGENT: INTENTIONAL EPISCOPAL
LITURGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY”

NINA RANADIVE POOLEY

Project under the direction of The Rt. Rev. J. Neil Alexander

With the rise of emerging churches greater attention has been paid to the liturgy of The Episcopal Church; rather than attempt to be emergent, The Episcopal Church is positioned to continue its long standing tradition of liturgical adaptation to be responsive to the needs of the 21st century. An understanding of the Anglican tradition of liturgical adaptation provides Anglican principles of liturgical change and a firm foundation for crafting responsive liturgy.

The paper begins with an in-depth look at the emerging church phenomenon and what the issues raised by the emergence of these communities have to teach those in mainstream liturgical traditions about the changing needs of contemporary culture. Following this introduction to emerging churches is a discussion of liturgical inculturation inherent in the development of early Christian liturgy primarily through the expertise of Anscar Chupungco and the work of the liturgical movement leading up to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of Vatican II. From this look at early liturgical development the paper then considers the development of Anglican liturgy, specifically the ways in which Anglican liturgy has been adapted throughout history to meet the changing needs of the world. The purpose of this exploration is to show that not only is liturgical adaptation

inherently Anglican, but also to discover the foundational Anglican principles for liturgical change.

With these principles established, the paper proposes a tool or outline for clergy who wish to offer liturgy that is responsive to the world and is still in-keeping with the liturgical principles of The Episcopal Church. This tool serves as a guide to evaluate new liturgies that are coming from other sources, such as Emerging Churches, as well as provides a guideline for those wanting to craft liturgy for their parishes in a manner that is both responsible to the tradition of the church and responsive to the needs of the 21st century. As the weekly Eucharist is the most frequent rite celebrated in the majority of parishes within The Episcopal Church at this moment in our history, this endeavor focuses on the eucharistic rite in particular. The paper concludes with an appendix that includes some practical ways in which these liturgical principles have been applied successfully.

Approved _____ Date _____

**Responsive Rather than Emergent:
Intentional Episcopal Liturgy for the 21st Century**

by

Nina Ranadive Pooley

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Theology of the University of the South
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Ministry

May, 2014

Sewanee, Tennessee

Approved _____ Date _____

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter One: Emerging Church	8
Chapter Two: Liturgical Adaptation Across the Generations	28
Chapter Three: Anglican Liturgical Reform	46
Chapter Four: The Ground on Which We Stand, The Prayer Book in America	77
Chapter Five: Intentional Liturgy for the 21 st Century	98
CONCLUSION: A Tool for Adaptive Liturgy	120
Appendix A: Practically Speaking, Applications that Work	124
Appendix B: The First Act of Uniformity 1549	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

INTRODUCTION

In the last several years a great deal of press and energy have been spent on being a relevant church and having contextual liturgy for a changing age. In her book, *The Great Emergence*, Phyllis Tickle argues that we are at a major shifting point in Christian history, one that happens every 500 years, and the next reformation of the church is upon us.¹ Whether or not this is true, it is clear that between the declining numbers in mainline Protestant denominations and the appearance of emerging churches, there is a great deal of attention being paid to our practice of liturgy. How-to books titled with emerging church buzz-words are marketed to semi-desperate parish priests, with images and ideas that make it all seem so simple. Church as coffee shop; church as a living room with couches; church as a place to create art; church that is not really churchy - don't worry. While I do not have a particular fight to pick with any of these ideas, it seems to me that it is both a lot more difficult than people are implying, and that we are missing the point. How those of us in the traditional church respond to the changing times and demographics of this day and age, speaks to the core of what it is we are called to do and become as a people of God. It is not an issue of marketing or repackaging as many of the slick, glossy, easy-to-read paperbacks might lead us to believe. It is an issue of identity, of knowing who we are as Episcopalians, and how we came to worship in this particular way. "Emerging Church" may be the genre of latest the catch-words, but this is not a new place for the Anglican tradition. Arguably this is where we have always been: living in our given moment of history, doing our best to apply the lessons and practices of our

¹ Phyllis Tickle, *The Great Emergence: How Christianity is Changing and Why*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2008), 13-26.

tradition in faithful ways to our present, in the sure and certain hope of God's faithfulness into the future.

But it is not as simple as it seems. Those of us in liturgical traditions know that in any liturgy there is more going on below the text than is obvious at first glance. Before we can begin to practice good liturgy, and well before we can reform liturgy, we have to understand its development. How the liturgy was shaped by the events of history, and how over time this liturgy has shaped and been shaped by the worshiping community. For those of us in the Anglican tradition, it is important to recognize the history and context of that particular tradition, not as a way of being exclusive or elitist but to answer the questions that arise whenever Anglican liturgy is planned and considered.

For example, when to explain something so that it is fully understood by the people, and when to let the symbol and mystery speak for themselves? The question is essentially Anglican, walking that center between Protestant reformers and Catholic sacramentalists. Understanding that middle ground is crucial in presiding over worship. The tension is valid in any given Sunday's liturgical celebration, but it seems even more important to grasp if we are evaluating "emerging liturgies," and particularly when we are interested in liturgical reform. Understanding the core principles of Anglicanism and the principles of liturgical change within our tradition seem essential if we are to engage in liturgical reform in our own time.

It is my hope that this paper will serve as a tool for clergy who wish to offer liturgy that is responsive to the world and is still in-keeping with the liturgical principles of The Episcopal Church. This tool will provide a way to evaluate new liturgies that are coming from other sources, such as emerging churches, as well as provide a guideline for

those wanting to craft liturgy for their parishes in a manner that is both responsible to the tradition of the church and responsive to the needs of the 21st century. As the weekly Eucharist is the most frequent rite celebrated in the majority of parishes within The Episcopal Church at this moment in our history, this endeavor shall focus on the eucharistic rite in particular.

Some Background

The church I serve is relatively young, and was created by The Right Reverend Harold “Hoppy” Hopkins and a dedicated group of Episcopalians who wanted to grow an intentional church. The principles they put forward as the grounding of their faith community include a new way of doing liturgy, a more inclusive and welcoming parish, a community that recognizes the church as the community not as the building, and one that is not led so much as coached and encouraged by the ordained members serving it. I have spent the last six years doing my best to meet those goals, and this paper is a response to meeting the goal of creative, responsive liturgy in a manner that is careful to respect our liturgical tradition. Over the years and seasons of trial and error I have found that there are liturgical principles I follow in order to craft intentional liturgy that flows well, holds together in an integrated way and hopefully is a faithful articulation of the Gospel. This paper is a response to my wanting the opportunity to do the deeper research into our liturgical history and traditions, to better understand the way in which liturgy changes and responds to the changing needs of the worshiping community, and to in turn be able to be a better liturgist for this community.

Looking beyond the needs of this parish I would like to be in a better position to assist the clergy and the people of our diocese. In the Diocese of Maine we are on the edge of ministry in the 21st century, pushed here by the economic and demographic realities of our state, and thus reflecting in some very real ways the future of the greater church. Positioned here on the edge we have realized that we need to pay attention, careful attention, to what we do, why we do it, and for whom we do it. One of the pieces of this discernment is liturgical. I have been asked to work with our bishop and a few others to give clergy day addresses on emerging church, on liturgy for all, on crafting intentional liturgy, and other similar topics over the last few years.

The clergy here in Maine are mostly of retirement age and are serving the church in a part-time capacity. They are the ones out in the rural churches who are having to find ways to survive, and they want to know more about what's happening in the emerging church conversation, and how to extend our liturgy in a way that it might speak to the 21st century, perhaps even speak outside the walls of the church. I recognize that liturgy is only a small part of what we all need to be intentional about to re-craft our church for this century, but it does speak loudly of who we are and why we do the mission we do. Our liturgy defines us as more than a helpful non-profit, and meaningful liturgy is something the world beyond our doors is longing for, as demonstrated by the emergence of the emerging church communities.

Assumptions and Limitations

This paper is predicated on the assumption the emerging church has something to teach us, even if we choose to remain inside the church. When Dr. Tony Jones came to

speak at Sewanee in the summer of 2010 it was very clear that he disagrees with that assumption. He believes the traditional church cannot do the work that is being done outside it by these emerging worship communities. He was adamant that emerging churches define themselves against the traditions they arise from, as they are responding to what is broken in the traditional church, thus what they do cannot be done in a traditional church. I disagree with him and this paper is in part a response to that disagreement, and as such is based in my assumption that emerging churches can teach and inform the traditional churches. Also, a greater assumption is that traditional church liturgy can grow and change in such a way that we can be true to our tradition while being responsive to the needs of a changing world.

My hope that emerging churches have something to teach us about our liturgy is based on the assumption that we can define, at least in part, what is meant by emerging church. In our class discussion in *The Emerging Church in Anglican Perspective*, there was a great deal of confusion about how to define emerging church. It was clear from the breadth of the literature we read that that the term is used to describe a collection of very different expressions of worship which have emerged in response to their particular communities. The level of frustration in the classroom was palpable and was often expressed in ways that seemed defensive. That was particularly evident when Dr. Jones presented to the Advanced Degrees Program and came to speak with our class. It was also clear that the response is common. His presentation to the ADP was “Everything You Thought About Emergence is WRONG: The Top 10 Things the Emerging Church is NOT.”²

² More on this presentation in Chapter One: Emerging Church.

When I returned from that summer of study, I was asked by my bishop to present something from that course to our clergy as part of Clergy Day Continuing Education. Their response was similar to that of the class in Sewanee. The amount of frustration expressed when trying to define the emerging church was matched by the amount of energy spent defending against it in both forums. For our purposes, I use broad strokes to give some shape to the conversation about emerging churches and their worship, without attempting to delineate their boundaries too much. From my limited work in this topic, I believe the conversation between emerging churches and traditional liturgy has shown that traditional liturgy has something to offer the world that the world both wants and needs. It is my contention that we need not define and defend against emerging church liturgies so much as be open to what those liturgies reflect back to us about our traditional liturgy and ways in which we can be more intentional.

The greatest assumption made in this thesis is that churches are interested in liturgical change; that those of us in traditional churches are interested in engaging the worshiping needs of our community within the church, and hopefully the needs of the community beyond the walls of the church. This thesis is an attempt to investigate and then propose a way in which that kind of responsive liturgy is possible to do while remaining within our tradition.

I have done some work creating new liturgies, with the encouragement of my bishop and the congregation I serve. In that process it has become clear that we need some guidelines and a firm foundation on which to stand while being creative liturgists. The breadth of the liturgies emerging from beyond the traditional church illustrate that not all liturgy is good liturgy and often what is interesting and cool is unclear at best on

the theology underlying it. As Anglicans, we can do better than that, we have been at this much longer than emerging communities and we have the tools and the foundation that so many of those communities lack. We might be those best positioned to create truly solid, innovative, responsive liturgy for the 21st century.

In summary, it is the purpose of this paper to first describe briefly the light being shown on our liturgy by emerging churches, then broaden that discussion by looking at the work of liturgical inculturation as our liturgy developed, review the development of Anglican liturgical principles and the principles of adaptation inherent in that development, with a goal of outlining the basic liturgical principles of liturgical change. Given this background work, to provide a starting point for those of us within the box who are looking to craft responsive, intentional liturgy without inadvertently throwing the baby out with the bath water.

Doing what we do well, knowing that it is valuable to the world, and crafting it intentionally in a responsive manner are the foundations of liturgy for the future of the church. It does not need to betray the liturgy of our past to do that, it can be grounded in the liturgical principles of our tradition and still be responsive to the world at any given moment. The key is to be grounded in who are liturgically and be intentional in our response to the world.

CHAPTER ONE: EMERGING CHURCH

In the last several years, there has been a great deal of discussion about the emerging church. There has been a lot of press about it, both inside traditional churches and beyond. The catch phrase “Emerging Church” is selling a lot of glossy covered books and often raises the hackles of those within mainline churches. The rhetoric between those within the traditional church and those who are invested in the ideas proposed by emerging church communities is often heavily weighted and defensive from both sides. Yet there is something to be gained from exploring what emerging churches can teach us about ourselves as traditional churches and what they can tell us about the needs of the world beyond the walls of our parishes.

Because emerging churches are reacting in some ways to what they see in the traditional churches they seem to be on the defensive when they talk about what they do. Perhaps that is due in part to the way in which traditional church people have confronted some of the people leading emerging churches. Perhaps that is the nature of being a new thing, having to constantly explain and defend; perhaps that is the protest in the Protestant. For many would equate what is happening right now with the emerging churches with the Protestant Reformation. Phyllis Tickle is convinced that the emerging church is following in the footsteps of Martin Luther’s nailing of the 95 theses on the church door at Wittenberg.¹ Much of the writing that has been done on the emerging church reads like polemic against the traditional church.

¹ Phyllis Tickle, foreword to *A Generous Orthodoxy*, by Brian McLaren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 9-11.

For the most part, it is this polemic against the traditional church that makes it difficult for many of us to engage the ideas espoused by those in the emerging church ‘movement.’ They are doing something else which is a commentary on what we are doing, implying that what the traditional church is about is somehow wrong, or has at least missed the mark. It is easy to get defensive when confronted by living criticism of the mainline church. So it is useful to keep in mind that we are not engaging the enemy, rather we are trying to learn something about ourselves from the perspective of those on the outside. By paying attention to what is happening outside of our traditional churches, we might be better informed about our own assumptions and blind spots. A careful look at what is happening in and through emerging churches affords us the opportunity to take a hard look at what we are doing, to gain insight and resources so that we might become better at what we do.

What Exactly Are Emerging Churches?

When discussing emerging churches, it is important for us to realize that we are not talking about a clearly defined movement, or a plan with carefully chosen leadership and one agenda. This term emerging church is our way of describing something that has happened, in various forms, spontaneously, independently, and in reaction to the events and opportunities of any number of factors peculiar to a particular location. These communities are varied in their approach, in their theology, in their responses to the different denominational churches. They have emerged out of different contexts, and yet their emergence speaks to a greater context in which we all find ourselves. Understanding their theses nailed to the door may lead us to understand the greater story. So that we can

also respond to the new context in which we find ourselves, as the role of church in our society has changed so dramatically in the past two generations. In that learning there may be paths to discovering our way to being the church of the next generations.

Dr. Tony Jones was the lecturer for the Advanced Degrees Program at the School of Theology in 2010. He had been asked to speak on his experience as a founding member of an emerging church, Solomon's Porch in Minneapolis. While those gathered were expecting Jones to lecture on exactly what is meant by the terms "Emerging Church and Emergence," he rather spent that time carefully delineating what the emerging church is not. And while it was frustrating to have a person deeply invested in what is happening in emerging churches not provide any hard and fast answers, it made sense that Jones would want to dispel what he sees as misperceptions about the nature of emerging churches. Jones styled his lecture in the form of a top ten list from David Letterman, a list that counts down from the 10th to the 1st most important. The numbered points are drawn directly from Jones' lecture, and the comments following them attempt to flesh these ideas out more fully.

Everything You Think about Emergence is WRONG ²

10) Emergence is trying to put the conventional church out of business.

Because these communities arose in response to events and needs they feel were not being addressed in conventional churches, they are often considered to be against traditional church or anti-denominational. Yet it may be closer to the truth to say they do not consider themselves to be the same type of institution as a more traditional church.

² Tony Jones was kind enough to send me a link to this presentation for the purpose of including it in this paper. You can find it here: <http://www.slideshare.net/jonestony/everything-you-think-about-emergence-is-wrong-3008565> (accessed on December 2, 2013).

They are trying to do something completely new. It seems arrogant on the part of more traditional churches to assume that these new communities exist to disrupt the work of traditional churches, or that they are at all interested in the impact they might have on other communities.

9) *Emergence is anti-denominational.*

A great deal of the identity of individual emerging churches seems to be dependent on their being a unique, newly created community. Thus they are not denominational, nor would they be drawn to a denominational type of association with each other.

8) *Emergence is a new way to “do church.”*

While it may be easy for us to see the work of emerging communities as a new way to do church, it would be an oversimplification of what they are doing. For the most part these communities see themselves as doing something other than ‘church’. They are completely other, not a new spin on the old model. From Dr. Jones’ perspective, you cannot truly engage the emerging church within the context of a traditional church. Yet the people involved in the earliest parts of this emergence in the United Kingdom have come to believe that there is room to explore the gifts and vision of emergence in a new stand-alone creation, as well as within the traditional church. Jonny Baker of the Grace Community in London (which is affiliated with St. Mary’s Anglican Church, Ealing) is very clear on that point and makes it part of his vocation to provide resources for use within the traditional church as well as lead an emerging worship community.³

³ See Jonny Baker’s blog for more on this, particularly his series of Worship Tricks. <http://jonnybaker.blogs.com/> (Accessed on November 19, 2013)

7) *Emergence has a spokesperson.*

Because this is not a movement with any kind of solidarity or over arching mission, there is no leader of the emerging church *per se*. Each community has raised up leadership in their own way, and while there are people in each of the many communities who are becoming well known voices in the conversation, they do not claim to be the spokespeople of the movement. They may write on the subject, and even do speaking tours about emerging communities, but they do so with the caveat that they do not speak for the movement but as individuals invested in what their particular worshipping community is doing, and in conversation with others doing the same.

6) *Emergence doesn't appreciate church history.*

The people speaking on behalf of their own emergent experience and interest are for the most part highly educated, and deeply invested in church history and theology. It is their depth of knowledge that sets them apart from just another worship fad, or new packaging for church.

5) *Emergence is confined to the American church and white guys.*

Dr. Jones clearly articulates his belief that the emerging church conversation is an international one. Yet from the smattering of exceptions he provides in his book and in the lecture to combat this misconception, it seems possible to change the statement and arrive at what is likely to be a truth of the movement. If we broadened the statement slightly, to “Emergence is primarily found in North America and the United Kingdom, and primarily led by white guys” we would have most of the players in that net. This is a not a criticism of the emerging church conversation, but it reflects a greater issue. The rise of emerging church communities is in part a response to living in a postmodern

world. To be actively responding to postmodernism a culture has to have once experienced modernism, and this is more the case of the western first world experience.

4) Emergence does not believe in authority.

Jones' point is that emerging communities, are not against authority, rather they have a very different understanding of where authority is derived. The community is the locus of the authority, of the experience, of their expression of worship. The flattening of the power structures from top down to a more horizontal sharing of tasks is an important value in emerging communities. When Jones addresses this new understanding of authority, he talks a great deal about postmodernism. As these communities identify themselves as responding to postmodernism, a fuller discussion of postmodernism is warranted later in the chapter.

3) Emergence is a reformation of evangelicalism.

While it is true that a great deal of the people involved at the core of this conversation have come out of an evangelical background and thus are responding in part to that tradition, Jones argues that there are people and communities involved in the emergence conversation who come out of a variety of religious traditions. In trying to create something new, they feel they are moving past simply reforming any tradition, evangelicalism or another.

2) Emergence only appeals to younger people.

The emerging communities are mostly made up of people in their thirties and forties, so not particularly young. At this point in the presentation Jones shows a slide of Phyllis Tickle, who is very much a fan of emerging churches, and an articulate voice in the emerging conversation. Jones' point is that she is not a young person, so emergence

appeals to all ages. While Phyllis Tickle is not necessarily a typical representative of her generation, the more important point Jones is claiming is that emergents are not intentionally aiming to attract young people exclusively. It is difficult to argue with that statement, though there is an underlying emphasis in some of the writing from these communities that emerging ways are more appealing to younger people than more traditional models of church.

1) Emergence is just about theological debates and publishing contracts.

Those at the heart of the emerging conversation are deeply theological in their approaches to this work. Whether or not they can articulate the theology as it is expressed in their worship settings and experiences remains to be seen. (Jones was not able to do that when pressed in the classroom conversation. Though he clearly thinks theologically about what he is doing, his community's actions are still feeling around for theological underpinnings for some of what they are doing.⁴) Obviously Jones' objection to this misconception is slightly personal, he does make money touring, speaking and selling books because emergence is a hot topic right now. But his point is more that these communities arose as a response to need to be together in conversation and worship in ways that had not been available to them before. The movement came after the communities themselves.

So What is Emerging Church?

Before we can understand what the emerging church is in earnest, we need to explore the weighty concept of postmodernism which is used within the emerging

⁴ Tony Jones' community is called Solomon's Porch, you can read more about it here: <http://www.solomonsporch.com/> (accessed on December 29, 2013).

conversation as a way to express their vantage point, the perspective through which they and their communities view the world. An inherent problem in claiming postmodernism as their underpinning, is the fact that postmodernism is a complex and sometimes contradictory concept. It is mired in its own historical, political and socioeconomic origins, so to pick it up out of that context and use it for other purposes is problematic. For instance, three dictionary definitions of the term yield very different descriptions:

Compact Oxford English Dictionary: “a late 20th -century style and concept in the arts, architecture, and criticism, which represents a departure from modernism and is characterized by the self-conscious use of earlier styles and conventions, a mixing of different artistic styles and media, and a general distrust of theories”⁵

Merriam-Webster: Either "of, relating to, or being an era after a modern one", or "of, relating to, or being any of various movements in reaction to modernism that are typically characterized by a return to traditional materials and forms (as in architecture) or by ironic self-reference and absurdity (as in literature)", or finally "of, relating to, or being a theory that involves a radical reappraisal of modern assumptions about culture, identity, history, or language".⁶

Random House Dictionary: “noting or pertaining to architecture of the late 20th century, appearing in the 1960s, that consciously uses complex forms, fantasy, and allusions to historic styles, in contrast to the austere forms and emphasis on utility of standard modern architecture.”⁷

There is a great deal represented by this term postmodernism. It has a colorful and varied past, and a full discussion of it is beyond the scope of this paper.⁸ But we have to

⁵ <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/postmodernism?view=uk>
Oxford Dictionaries "postmodernism". Oxford Dictionaries (accessed December 2, 2013).

⁶ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/postmodernity> (accessed December 2, 2013).

⁷ Dictionary.com Unabridged. Random House, Inc. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/postmodern>
(accessed December 2, 2013).

⁸ For more study on the complexity of postmodernism see James Smith, *Who's Afraid of Postmodernism?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), or the more ambitious and thorough work, by Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: Bellknap, 2007).

start somewhere in order to engage the work of emerging churches. So for our purposes, let us begin with the third definition in the Merriam-Webster dictionary: "of, relating to, or being a theory that involves a radical reappraisal of modern assumptions about culture, identity, history, or language". The people talking about emergence as postmodern are doing so in this context, a reappraisal of our modern assumptions about ourselves, and particularly ourselves as Christians. For example, they are questioning language and how it is used. At Tony Jones' community, Solomon's Porch, they call their sanctuary space a "living room" and their worship is a "worship gathering" instead of a worship service, and their endeavor together, a "holistic, missional, Christian community" rather than a church. Jones writes, "Though it may seem faddish, it's actually a nod to a postmodern understanding of language. In that view, language doesn't just point to things; language does things. It makes things happen, particularly in the minds of those who are using the language."⁹ Therefore we expect to see emerging churches call into question language and identity, as well as assumptions about culture. And Jones' community does just that, intentionally responding as postmodern people.

If we want to go a little farther, we might choose to be truly emergent in our approach to emergence, and consider the definition of postmodernism in the Urban Dictionary, an on-line, open source collection of definition entries, assembled and edited by those online who wish to participate, and then allowing people to agree or disagree with each definition as it is listed.

Here is the definition of postmodernism in the Urban Dictionary:

A reaction to the work of Modern philosophers, most of whom created vast systems of meaning founded upon one central concept. In many religions, the central and

⁹ Tony Jones, *The New Christians: Dispatches from the Emergent Frontier* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008), 215.

beginning premise is some supreme being or concept. The postmodernist critique removes that central concept, it "de-centers" the system of meaning. Postmodernism points out that all systems of meaning are in constant negotiation and flux, therefore claims of transcendent morality are suspect. Furthermore, postmodernism critiques all claims of "objective" truth by revealing that human subjectivity always exists in every truth proposition. Due to the pervasive effects of subjectivity, postmodernist critiques are critical of all sweeping claims concerning social policy, truth, justice, morality, and ethics. Finally, postmodernism is a school of thought which examines the traditional "either/or" dichotomies in modern philosophy, and reveals that these supposedly neutral dichotomies actually favor one side over the other. (Good/Evil, Above/Below, Male/Female)¹⁰

From this definition we have a view into what Brian McLaren is doing in his book, *a Generous Or+hodoxy: Why I am a missional + evangelical + post/protestant + liberal/conservative + mystical/poetic + biblical + charismatic/contemplative + fundamentalist/calvinist + anabaptist/anglican + methodist + catholic + green + incarnational + depressed-yet-hopeful + emergent + unfinished CHRISTIAN*¹¹. The book is his careful walk through each of these descriptors in his subtitle, how they do and do not speak to how he defines himself in this postmodern era. McLaren is articulating a reframing of the all or nothing approach traditionally understood by these terms and dichotomies. Which is not to say that emergents do not take these terms or what they represent seriously, just that they see ways in which each is a helpful descriptor of a more generous, wider ranging theology and ecclesiology.

Our dabbling in the Urban Dictionary brings us to another aspect of postmodernism claimed in the emerging church conversation, that of finding truth through an open source method. Which is to say that these communities value first and

¹⁰ The Urban Dictionary can be found here: <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=postmodernism> (accessed December 2, 2013).

¹¹ Capitalization and punctuation are intentional on McLaren's account, and so maintained here. Brian McLaren, *A Generous Orthodoxy*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004).

foremost the input of the community in all aspects of their life together. Rather than a top-down authority structure, emergence values a more level playing field wherein the authority comes from the group, the process is open to all, and all aspects of the community's life are open equally to all. Tony Jones describes it as a Wikipedia approach to church, wherein the information is assembled by the community for the community, edited by the community as it sees fit, rather than the property of a handful of specially trained experts. Obviously how this works is going to vary from community to community.

We could argue that even though they claim a flat, leaderless model, there are identifiable leaders in each community who are, among other things, the voices in this emergent conversation. Tony Jones bills himself on the Solomon's Porch website as the community's theologian and Doug Pagitt as their pastor. In McLaren's community, Cedar Ridge Community Church, he was the Senior Pastor until he stepped down. When Karen Ward was with the Church of the Apostles, she was Vicar in charge, and this church exists under the authority of both the local Episcopal and Lutheran Bishops. All that said, there is an intentional move in these communities to allow communication, decision making, liturgy, and theology to come from the community.

Finding Landmarks

In his book *The New Christians; Dispatches from the Emergent Front*, Jones writes, "The emergent response to pluralism is always *ad hoc*, always contextual, always situational. It does not lend itself to tidy books or simple blog posts. It means that emergent churches look quite different from each other. They share little in the way of

leadership structures or church architecture or forms of worship. What they share is an ethos, a vibe, a sensibility. And that's squishy."¹² Recognizing that this is not an organized movement, is it possible to find some distinct landmarks that will help us to identify an emerging church when we come across one? There will be variations from community to community, but there are some core hallmarks that identify them as emerging communities.

For our purposes, these are communities that emphasize the inclusion of people seeking church, but also those recovering from church. The community is grounded in biblical ideals but there is not an emphasis on creedal statements. Their worship often incorporates ancient traditions but does so in more contemporary contexts. Their conversation, preaching, and leadership are more permeable. Most important to our conversation, is these communities are intentionally examining theology. This is not a 'church light' *per se* experience.

In his book, Jones makes several claims that are foundational to emerging communities. He calls them dispatches and they come flying into the conversation as he discusses his understanding of emerging churches. He has twenty, too many for the breadth of this paper, but here are a few from the middle chapters of his book to give us a flavor. Dispatch 6: "Emergents see God's activity in all aspects of culture and reject the sacred-secular divide."¹³ Dispatch 10: "Emergents believe that theology is local, conversational, and temporary. To be faithful to the theological giants of the past,

¹² Jones, *The New Christians*, 39. Warning: this book is written about emergence in a style that is emergent, and it may drive you crazy. Jones shares stories from conversations and emails, throws in a dispatch every so often, and responds to criticism along the way.

¹³ Jones, *The New Christians*, 75.

emergents endeavor to continue their theological dialogue.”¹⁴ Dispatch 11: “Emergents believe that awareness of our relative position – to God, to one another, and to history – breeds biblical humility, not relativistic apathy.”¹⁵ Dispatch 12: “Emergents embrace the whole Bible, the glory and the pathos.”¹⁶ Dispatch 13: “Emergents believe that truth, like God, cannot be definitively articulated by finite human beings.”¹⁷

Surprising Discoveries

The most surprising discovery about emerging churches is the firm theological bedrock upon which the emergent conversation stands. These are not people offering a watered down version of Christianity, or an easy, happy-clappy experience of worship. This is not contemporary worship of the mega church model, or even a seekers’ church. This movement is based on biblical principles that then move outward, asking what does the Spirit call us to be and do in this time and this place? Taking a careful look at the constructs of whatever denomination(s) of their origin, with a critical eye on the assumptions of a particular tradition, these communities are endeavoring to live deeply into their call to be Christian.

The second most surprising discovery is the fact that while there is a great deal of information out there, (books, blogs, online forums, gathering conferences, and a bevy of speakers willing to be paid to discuss emerging churches) the molding, shaping and becoming of this greater community is still in process. To pay attention to the

¹⁴ Jones, *The New Christians*, 111.

¹⁵ Jones, *The New Christians*, 115.

¹⁶ Jones, *The New Christians*, 144.

¹⁷ Jones, *The New Christians*, 153.

conversations happening within this forum is to learn a great deal about being intentional in thought, word and deed as a worshiping community. There is value for the more traditional church in participating in this conversation, wherever we might stand on some of the individual topics.

Why This Matters

How might this conversation about emerging churches change our perspective within a more traditional church setting? What resources have we discovered, or might we discover which might change how we do church here and now? Having been involved in several venues where we have attempted to lead people through the ideas of emerging church, what stands out most is how difficult this conversation is. Most are exercises in frustration for gathered clergy who want to be offered a monolithic explanation of this new movement. Most find the greatest certainty in this conversation is our being certain that we are uncertain about the emerging church. But there seem to be four concepts that seem to be consistent across the broad spectrum that is the emerging church.¹⁸

1. Postmodern – whether the community understands this fully or uses the term in its original meaning or not. They are questioning the assumptions of what has come before.
2. Ritual – all of the communities have a deep attachment to the rituals they have chosen, each is committed to and feels somewhat defined by their rituals, even if there may be no clear rationale as to why this particular ritual has been chosen over another.
3. Relational – in this postmodern culture relationship is the highest value. In looking at the communities it is interesting to note that the members of each community seem to hold

¹⁸ William Brosend, class conversation, July 9, 2010: Course: *The Emergent Church in Multiple Perspectives: The Homiletical, Ecclesial, Liturgical, and Unknown Implications of What's Next*, The Advanced Degrees Program, The School of Theology, University of the South: Sewanee.

very similar values, and seem to be of a club of like-minded people. A Seinfeld or Friends type of community, where you are known well, but by a handful of people within a relatively closed system. The emphasis on being relational tends to build interpersonal relationships rather than a communal relationship.

4. Autonomous – perhaps in reaction to the mega church stream in which many of the leading voices of emerging churches were raised, these communities are fiercely autonomous. Congregational to the core, there is resistance to any kind of hierarchy or leadership style.

For the traditional church there is a great deal to be gained in paying attention to these core values or themes emerging in response to our times. If we are able to reframe these to reclaim our own foundation, we might well find them the way forward, the path to becoming the church of the 21st century.

1. Postmodern – Contemporary (or Responding Contextually)

Looking at the emerging church value of being postmodern, we of the traditional church learn that there is truth to the idea that postmodern influences are there, whether we are aware of them or not. And rather than stand there, in an attempt to simply reflect a postmodern mindset, we can move to being radically contemporary, or to respond contextually. The emerging church conversation highlights the importance of our understanding and responding to the situation of the people whom we serve and the greater community. Our need to be aware of what is going on in our communities and to find ways to adapt as a church so that we are responsive to the need and situation of that community.

2. Ritual – Sacramental

Emerging churches are interested in rituals and each community claims their own, though often without a deep understanding of the underlying theological ideas beneath the ritual acts. From this we learn the importance of being very clear on why we do what we do in any liturgical act. In understanding and articulating the deep theological tradition beneath our sacramental acts, we express our conviction that liturgy is more than theater. The inward and spiritual grace within is a truth expressed through the outward and visible act. When we are enacting the sacramental acts of our liturgy we are calling forth and recognizing the sacred in the profane. What the emerging conversation teaches us is that there is a hunger in our society for just that. We have precisely what the greater world is hungering for, we need to learn to explain what we are doing in clear ways and to allow others access to it.

3. Relational – Missional

In our traditional settings, we have long recognized that we are in relationship on two different levels, with those whom we worship and work, and with those we are called to serve in the world. The danger of the emerging emphasis on being relational is that it might exist without the tie-in to being missional, and yield therefore a fraternity house ecclesiology. While it is tempting for any community to want to gather with other like-minded people, the missional character of our call as Christians sends us out into the world. The impetus for our gathering in community is to glorify God and to serve the world, to be in community together, and through that community to become a member of the body of the faithful. To lose sight of the qualifiers of race, class, gender, and the individuality that separate us from one another and those in need in the world. With a

eucharistic focus to our worship, it is in our very fabric to come and be fed, go out and feed week after week.

4. Autonomous – Connected

As Episcopalians we have something very different to offer the postmodern conversation that holds autonomy in such high regard. We know that we are a part of something greater than ourselves. Even as we live and work and worship within a specific context, we are greater than what happens on our block or in our country. We gather together in worship of a God so much greater than ourselves, in a community that is greater than the sum of those gathered. The way The Episcopal Church is structured articulates the importance of being connected to one another. As parishes that belong to a diocese, we are not independent or unique institutions, so much as a variety of expressions of The Episcopal Church in a variety of locations. Rural or urban, rich or poor, pastoral sized or corporate sized, we are held to a communal responsibility. We learn and grow through those connections, be they regional or global, and we are part of an extended community. We may not agree or always understand each other, but we are connected to others in the Anglican Communion.

What Emerging Churches Tell us About Ourselves

As the traditional church and particularly The Episcopal Church finds its way toward becoming the church of the 21st Century, there is a great deal to be gained from emerging church concepts and experiences. The four areas of focus as articulated above are a sure sign that we are more readily positioned than we might realize, to meet the

needs of those who are beyond the walls of our church (and maybe some unexpressed needs of the community we are already serving).

As we look to learn from emerging churches when it comes to worship, it is important to recognize that the worship in these churches varies greatly. Karen Ward might create mayhem in the chairs, tipping them every which way to symbolize the chaos of creation. Tony Jones' church might sit on couches with someone 'preaching' from a stool in the middle of the room, slowly turning so that everyone is being addressed, and included. In another emerging church, there may be artists painting during the 'service;' the music may be played by local people, even written by members of the congregation. The preaching may be a shared task among several people, who are chosen or volunteering to do so. Or it may be the work of a group that meets weekly and digs into a passage together and then elects someone to speak about it for the congregation. Yet some emerging churches have a more standard set up, with one or two members who are in charge of preaching. What they share is that at its core, the worship is more experiential than didactic, more likely to invite participation from the group, more inclusive of people coming from a variety of church experiences.

If we are interested in some specific suggestions that might move our worship toward what is happening in emerging churches we can look to some of the resources available. In print there are several, one of the most popular is Dan Kimball's *Emerging Worship: Creating Worship Gatherings for New Generations*.¹⁹ But my personal favorite is Jonny Baker's *Curating Worship*.²⁰ In it Baker takes on a whole new methodology for

¹⁹ Dan Kimball, *Emerging Worship Creating Worship Gatherings for New Generations* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004).

²⁰ Jonny Baker, *Curating Worship* (London:SPCK 2010).

the creating of worship services. He takes us through the kind of thinking, skill and disciplines involved in good curation, which is a focus on working back stage to pull together artful expressions which together create worship inviting God to be center stage, rather than the worship leader.

Baker's attention to how we lead worship and what that leadership looks like is as much a statement about leadership in the emerging church as it is about worship. He explains:

Curation... blows apart the notion of someone up front leading, and opens up a very different kind of imagination. . . . This is because it affords this very rich and different way of thinking about leadership. A worship curator makes a context and a frame for worship, arranging elements in it. The content is provided by other people.²¹

An important aspect of considering taking on worship ideas or tricks that we see in emerging church settings, is to recognize they need to be relevant to our settings. What the emerging conversation is emphasizing is the need to respond to the people, culture and issues of our particular situations. Just doing some emerging church stuff does not make us emergent or responsive. We may miss the point entirely. For example, on Jonny Baker's blog he has to date a three-volume set of worship tricks he has compiled as people have sent in ideas, or as their community, Grace, has found its way in the emerging movement. He calls them worship tricks because they are not the point of worship, but news ways to engage in worship, ways in which to shift our way of thinking about something. It is the shift in thought, not the trick that is important, once the shift happens, you let go of the trick, it is holding onto the shift that matters. Baker explores the idea behind what curating, done well, offers:

²¹ Jonny Baker, *Curating Worship*, Introduction, xiv.

Worship curation, drawing inspiration from the world of contemporary art, creates spaces: for encounter, for experience, for reflection, to change speeds, for prayer, for questions, for exploration, for meditation, for provocation, for moments of epiphany. Creativity and imagination are brought to bear to open up encounters between God, art, worship and the people.²²

It may seem like a lot to consider, and yet, it is not that difficult to create space that is different in feel, that refocuses our congregations on what is focal that particular week or season, to foster a more inclusive, less didactic feel in our worship settings. It is in our best interest to make our worship an event in which people participate fully, rather than something they sit and view as audience members. Opening our worship planning and even our preaching styles to others so that more people are involved stands firmly on our understanding of ourselves as the priesthood of all believers.

The path ahead for the traditional church is informed by the emerging church conversation. The experiences of these worshiping communities can teach us how the strength of the church can meet the needs and challenges of contemporary society. The point is not to become an emerging church, but to become a new creation as a worshiping and missional community, which is responsive to the needs and the language of the culture in which we work and serve. In order to move toward liturgical adaptation and revision in our own right, we need to invest some energy into understanding where we in The Episcopal Church have come from liturgically.

²² Jonny Baker, *Curating Worship*, 7.

CHAPTER TWO: LITURGICAL ADAPTATION ACROSS THE GENERATIONS

The work the emerging churches are doing is not new, nor is our response to their work. The idea of liturgical change has been with us from the beginning. No liturgy is created in a vacuum. As the means to praise God and to express the message of salvation by a particular people who live in culture and history, liturgy is connected to, and influenced by, the culture and history of its time. While it may sound novel when spoken about in emerging church circles, being responsive is fundamental to the nature of liturgy. Liturgy responds to the surroundings in which the worshipers find themselves, sometimes consciously choosing to be of the culture, sometimes choosing to be counter cultural, and often adapting the cultural precepts to serve the needs of the worshipping community. We see this from the earliest moments of Christian liturgy.

History of the Earliest Churches and their Liturgy

The earliest Christian churches were influenced by the Jewish liturgical traditions of their times. (Arguably, this is a much more permeable and organic process of influence between early Christianity and tannaitic Judaism, as these two religions took shape at the same time under the same conditions of oppression.¹) For the purposes of our exploration of the development of Christian liturgy, we will focus on what informed the new Christian communities as they enacted their faith in worship. Liturgical scholarship of the

¹ For a full discussion on this, see Israel J. Yuval, 'Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue', in Paul F. Bradshaw & Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds, *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times* (Notre Dame 1999), pp. 98-124. Also Paul Bradshaw, 'Jewish Influence on Early Christian Liturgy: A Reappraisal', in *Jewish-Christian Relations*, and available online at: http://www.jcrelations.net/Jewish_Influence_on_Early_Christian_Liturgy__A_Reappraisal.3217.0.html?seArchAutor=Bradshaw%252C%2BP%252F%20Paul%20Hoffman%20eds%201999%20Passover%20and%20Easter%20Origin%20and%20History%20to%20Modern%20Times%20pp.%2098-124 (accessed on March 11, 2013).

1940s and 1950s posited that the early Christians followed the pattern Jesus established at the events of the last supper: take, bless, break, share. In his book, *The Shape of Liturgy*,

Gregory Dix argued that the Last Supper followed a pattern of ritual action:

The New Testament accounts of that supper as they stand in the received text present us with what may be called a “seven-action scheme” of the rite then inaugurated. Our Lord (1) took bread; (2) “gave thanks” over it; (3) broke it; (4) distributed it, saying certain words. Later He (5) took a cup; (6) “gave thanks” over that; (7) handed it to His disciples, saying certain words. . . . With absolute unanimity the liturgical tradition reproduces these seven actions as four: (1) The offertory; bread and wine are “taken” and placed on the table together. (2) The prayer; the president gives thanks to God over bread and wine together. (3) The fraction; the bread is broken. (4) The communion; the bread and wine are distributed together.

In that form and in that order these four actions constituted the absolutely invariable nucleus of every Eucharistic rite known to us throughout antiquity from the Euphrates to Gaul.²

Most contemporary liturgical scholarship argues strongly against Dix, both about his adamant claims about the four-fold structure of the Eucharist³, and his need to tie the origin of the Eucharist so tightly to the Last Supper. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson place a greater emphasis on the culture of the time and the other meals shared by Jesus and his followers, including the great feedings. For the purposes of liturgical adaptation, our interest lies in the influence of Jewish rite and ritual and the influence of Greco-Roman meal customs on the meal that becomes the Eucharist.⁴

R.T. Beckwith writes:

Christ regularly took part in the sabbath-day services of the synagogue and taught there, and wherever his disciples carried the gospel we find them associating

² Gregory Dix, *The Shape of Liturgy*, (London: Dacre, 1945), 48.

³ Gordon Lathrop argues against Dix’s understanding of a four-fold action over the bread and wine, for a single act of Thanksgiving. See Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), footnote 24, 47.

⁴ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 1-24.

themselves with the synagogue for as long as they are allowed to, and trying to found the local church on a Jewish nucleus. It seems probable, therefore, that when a local church first had to separate from the synagogue, as in Acts 19.8f, it regarded itself as a synagogue, like the congregations called 'synagogues' in Jas. 2.2 and the Shepherd of Hermas, and modeled its worship on what it had been used to in the synagogue, though with the addition of the Christian sacraments and charismata, and with an increasing tendency to meet for worship on the Lord's Day rather than the sabbath.⁵

The early Christian churches not only had to define themselves through and sometimes against the Jewish traditions of their time, but they also had to establish themselves against the paganism of the surrounding Greco-Roman culture. Some of this stemmed from a will to protect their monotheism, and some was to be seen as distinct from their pagan neighbors.

One of the most important voices in the study of liturgical adaptation is that of Anscar Chupungco, a Filipino Benedictine monk, ordained priest and noted liturgist and theologian. In his text, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, Chupungco describes the process and the influences on the apostolic church:

One can describe the **apostolic Church** as a convergence of three strong currents. The first was the pervasive movement to imbue the Jewish cult with the mystery of Christ. The traditional form, especially the synagogue, was not rejected, but centered on the person of Christ. This attitude of not destroying but of rectifying, ennobling and reorienting the traditions of the chosen people characterized early Christianity's approach to adaptation. . . . Although the apostles shook off the burden of Mosaic law and adopted the language of Hellenistic Christians, they scrupulously guarded those traditions which constituted a vital link with the original revelation of God to his people Israel.

The second current was activated by the spirit of openness to the new situation brought about by the conversion of pagans. If the Christian message was to be shared outside of the confines of Judaism, accommodations had to be made. It was a major step, one to which the apostles did not easily accede, thoroughly steeped as they were in their traditions. It took divine intervention and a council of

⁵ R.T.Beckwith, "The Jewish Background to Christian Worship," in *The Study of Liturgy*, Revised Edition, Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold and Paul Bradshaw, Eds., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 71.

the apostles and elders of the early Church to surrender to the inevitable. But it set a guiding principle for later adaptations.

The third current was conditioned by a tenacious disdain of pagan religions. This current sprang from Israel's ardent zeal for monotheism in a polytheistic world. As long as Christianity was still a movement within Judaism and as long as its members were recruited from pagans who attended the synagogues, the climate of hostility to pagan feast and rituals persisted. But as soon as Christianity had to settle in a non-Jewish milieu, it had to adapt and transform whatever was good and noble in paganism.⁶

Church of the Persecutions

The church in the times of early persecution, found it was both working from a Jewish framework and imbuing that context with their new understanding of salvation history. For this fledgling group of new Christians, it was imperative that the events articulated in the Hebrew scriptures were understood to be realized in the mystery of Christ. The early church needed to ground itself firmly in the mainstream of salvation history. Interestingly, while establishing themselves within Judaic salvation history, the members of the early church found themselves worshiping in Roman homes. And it was in these Roman homes that the apostolic practice of celebrating the breaking of bread was institutionalized. Chupungco explains that rich Roman families offered their homes to the congregations, and these homes were relatively easy to adapt to the activities needed by the churches. Called *domus ecclesiae*, these housed the worshiping communities of the early church. By the early 200s, Rome had up to forty of these worshiping communities. Because they were immersed in this Greco-Roman culture, this period in the church's early history also saw the first attempts to express the apostolic tradition in the language and rituals of paganism.⁷ Being able to extend the church beyond the Jewish cult and into

⁶ Anscar J. Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, Limited Edition by special permission of Paulist Press, originally published 1982, (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 9.

the larger culture of the Greco-Roman world becomes an enduring principle throughout the church's development. It is at this earliest stage in the church's life that ritual formation occurs, rooted in the Jewish cult and profoundly influenced by the surrounding Greco-Roman culture.

This is an interesting time in the history of liturgy. While there were outlines for the eucharistic prayer, the length of the prayer and the formulation of the prayer were left to the discretion of the presider. As Bradshaw and Johnson point out: "there was no standardized pattern in these early centuries. Prayers might be bipartite or tripartite; might focus on creation or redemption, or both; might pray exclusively for those participating in communion or interceded more widely."⁸ The extemporaneous nature of early church liturgy fostered the development of local custom and language, and incorporated the culture of the worshiping community.

Adaptation After the Edict of Milan

After the Edict of Milan things were to change quickly for the church. The church found it was relatively free at last from persecution and, later in the fourth century under Theodosius, a state religion. The principal source of liturgical inspiration is still scripture, but the attitude toward the pagan cult slowly changes from antagonism to acceptance, as the church adapts to a post-persecution environment. Chupungco notes two methods of adaptation:

One was substitution, the other assimilation. The former was carried out by replacing pagan cultic elements with Christian ones, in such a way that these

⁷ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 12.

⁸ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 44.

practically abolished them. In the case of pagan feasts, the Church instituted new feasts celebrating events of salvation history in place of and in opposition to the pagan festivals.⁹ . . . By the method of assimilation the Church adopted pagan rituals and gestures into which could infuse a Christian meaning.¹⁰

The Christian church would utilize these two methods of adaptation as it encountered a variety of pagan religions in subsequent generations. Whether that be the culture of the Greco-Romans, the Saxons, Celts or the Picts, substitution and assimilation would be widely used to incorporate new peoples into what becomes Christendom.

The Establishment of the Roman Rite

By the seventh century, there were a variety of liturgical rites being celebrated in the west: the Gallican Rites, the “Mozarabic” Rite, the Ambrosian Rite and the Roman Rite (the local rite of the diocese of Rome). By the end of the next century, the liturgy of Rome becomes normative for western Christianity. Bradshaw and Johnson summarize it this way:

There were different forms of eucharistic rites in the various regions of the West, but it was the Roman Rite that came to form the foundation of all later medieval practices and which, by the eighth century, had acquired substantially the pattern that it was to retain until the end of the Middle Ages and beyond.¹¹

The evolution of the Roman Rite from local rite to the rite of the western church has a great deal to do with the rise of Charlemagne. In the year 800 the west officially broke ties with the east when Pope Gregory III crowned Charlemagne emperor.

Gary Macy writes:

⁹ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 23.

¹⁰ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 24.

¹¹ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 230.

Charlemagne was chosen by the papacy to restore order and Christianity to western Europe. . . . One of Charlemagne's first orders of business was the preaching and teaching of Christianity to his people. For this purpose, he imported to his court the best scholars to be had and even borrowed the pope's own mass book so that copies could be made and sent out to all the bishops.¹²

While absolute liturgical uniformity was never achieved in the west, the core of the Roman Rite is well established by the end of the eighth century. From Chupungco's perspective, this liturgy is characterized by its simplicity, brevity and sobriety.¹³ The core rite maintains its essential feature even as it is subjected to the accumulation of new elements in the coming centuries. In some ways it is the simplicity and brevity of the core Roman Rite that leave it vulnerable to modifications and adaptation, as well as the accumulation of repetitions and unnecessary additional acts and text.

For example, when the Roman Rite migrated to the Franco-Germanic people in the eighth century the simple and brief liturgy was quickly adorned with more drama and ceremonials. Chupungco describes the changes, "Prayer texts once direct and simple were adorned with a flourish and approached verbosity."¹⁴

Arguably it is the same simplicity and brevity that allow the core of the rite to remain intact within the addendums, and provide relatively easy reclamation of that core when the liturgy grows too bulky. This happens in the twelfth century when Roman liturgists successfully remove some of the worst excesses of the Baroque liturgy. But again the simplicity and brevity of the core Roman Rite creates a situation ripe for adaptation. The emphasis being placed on the Eucharist in the church of the twelfth

¹² Gary Macy, *The Banquet's Wisdom: A Short History of the Theologies of the Lord's Supper* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 68-69.

¹³ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 25.

¹⁴ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 27.

century led to a different kind of excess in the liturgy. The moment of consecration was dressed with the use of bells and candles, and multiple gestures of reverence.¹⁵

The Late Middle Ages to the Eve of the Reformation

The fourteenth, fifteenth, and the beginning of the sixteenth century are the waning years of the Middle Ages, though liturgically they add one significant feature to the conversation of adaptation of liturgy. It is during these centuries that the dramatization of liturgy in the form of liturgical plays becomes an important part of public worship. Performed before or even during the Mass, these plays took their text from the Divine Office and the Mass, or liturgical feasts, with an emphasis on creating a drama that would be engaging to the people. Often seen by the church as a catechetical tool, these plays were meant to instruct people on the events being celebrated and commemorated by the liturgy. Unfortunately they did little to deepen people's understanding of the liturgy itself, tending instead to draw attention away from the liturgy, particularly when they were happening during the Mass itself.

Chupungco writes a compelling description of the state of worship and the liturgy on the eve of the Reformation:

Religious and liturgical life seemed to flourish: chapels and oratories were built by guilds and rich families, but they were intended for their own worship; there was strong popular piety, but it was subjective and individualistic and with little reference to the ecclesial community; the liturgical year received great attention, but the mystery it celebrated (with emphasis on Christmas and the passion) was more of a past event to be contemplated than a present mystery to be participated in. With such a state of affairs there was hardly any possibility to celebrate the liturgy, for there was no longer any sense of the worshiping community nor the presence of the liturgical mystery. . . . The preceding centuries, especially from the tenth to the thirteenth, carried the germ of this unhappy situation: a clerical liturgy,

¹⁵ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 30.

ignorance of the nature of liturgical act, allegorical theology or its opposite (an exaggeratedly realistic theology or “transubstantiation,” for example), and the lack of harmony between liturgical language and the popular linguaggio, and between liturgical rites and contemporary culture. History teaches us that when the liturgy is not adapted to the times, does not respond to its demands and lacks solid theological basis, autumn is just around the corner.¹⁶

The Reformation

As we will see in greater detail in the next chapter, the events of the mid sixteenth century will reshape the church entirely. What emerges from this era of increased nationalism, decreased papal control of western Europe, and the rise of the printing press, will be a reformed church. The liturgy of the church will undergo careful scrutiny and be reconsidered and reshaped until it emerges a new creation in many ways. This is true for the Roman Catholic liturgy as well as the ‘new’ Protestant liturgies that are birthed in the Reformation. For Anglicans, it is time to turn to the formation of Anglican liturgy specifically, but first a quick look at what happens to the Roman rite.

Like the Reformers, the Roman Catholic Church was also undergoing its own reformation and creation. In various sessions of the Council of Trent the Roman Catholic Church considered a great many of the same issues with which the reformers were wrestling. While the principal aim of the Council was to address abuses and institute reforms, they had to address the reform of liturgical books as well. In Session Twenty Two the Council paved the way for the institution of a single, corrected liturgy that would be closer to the form the church felt it had received from the early church. It was the liturgical goal of the Council that there be one uniform liturgy for celebrating the Eucharist across the church. This call was taken up by Pope Pius V, under whom both the

¹⁶ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 33.

new Roman Breviary (1568) and the new Roman Missal (1570) are produced. This Missal becomes the single missal of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1588 Pope Sixtus V instituted the Congregation of Sacred Rites, a curial congregation who were tasked with enforcing liturgical uniformity in usage across the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁷ Chupungco writes:

With the establishment of the Sacred Congregation of Rites by Sixtus V in 1588 the centralizing effort of Trent was realized, free development of the liturgy in local churches was ended, and the liturgy came to a standstill. Centuries rolled on, cultures evolved, and new missionary situations arose, but the liturgy of the Roman Church remained inflexible and oblivious of all these factors. . . . Trent's achievements in liturgical reform became a disadvantage in later centuries, because the reform intended for a particular moment in the life of the Church was canonized for the succeeding generations. Trent was the best answer to the problems of the time, but it could not be expected to be the best answer to the problems of all times.¹⁸

While we will soon turn our attention to Anglican liturgical history specifically and the principles of adaptation that are historically inherently Anglican, our overview of the earlier history of liturgical development provides a broader understanding of how liturgical adaptation is historically part of our tradition. It also allows us a glimpse of the nature of liturgical revision and adaptation. If the liturgical upheavals of the Reformation are any indication, there is a need to remain open to liturgical adaptation, lest rigidity attempt to freeze a natural process that evolves and continues to respond to its historical and cultural setting. Chupungco writes:

¹⁷ For a more in-depth look at the reformation in the Catholic church, see Bradshaw and Johnson's chapter, "The Protestant and Catholic Reformations," in *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 282 – 292.

¹⁸ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 34.

Adaptation is an on-going process which cannot be halted, because the life of the Church and the evolution of cultures are in perpetual motion. But this does not mean that changes in the liturgy are to be left to chance or blind fate. The liturgy, like the faith and the life it celebrates, is bound to history. It is bound to its Jewish origin, reinterpreted by Jesus Christ and faithfully transmitted by the apostles to the Church. And although bound to Judaism, it did not hesitate to borrow, at an early stage, from the riches of the Greco-Roman world. In every epoch the liturgy incarnated itself for good or ill in the culture of the period, sometimes with great benefit, at other times with consequent loss of authenticity.¹⁹

Careful attention to the liturgy, to our desire to adapt it, as well as the integrity of the rites themselves, with the added understanding of their historic development all need to be taken into account before we reform, reshape, or adapt the rites of our church.

Principles for Liturgical Inculturation

Having laid the historical groundwork for adaptation, Chupungco then begins a profound and lengthy discussion of the principles of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. As the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, was the first text promulgated by the Second Vatican Council and was issued December 4, 1963.²⁰ It is interesting to note that the U.S. Bishops' Committee on Divine Worship marked the 50th anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* this September. Their statement, "Stewards of the Tradition – Fifty Years After Sacrosanctum Conciliar," was released September 2013.²¹

¹⁹ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 41.

²⁰ Available in its entirety through the Vatican Archives online at: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html (accessed on October 7, 2013).

²¹ Their complete statement can be found online on the website of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops: <http://www.usccb.org/about/divine-worship/stewards-of-the-tradition.cfm> (accessed on September 29, 2013).

While we are not beholden to the work of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, it is an articulation of liturgical ideals that came to fruition through the classical liturgical movement of the fifty to sixty years prior to Vatican II.²² *Sacrosanctum Concilium* provides a comprehensive view of liturgical reform that has shaped the Roman Catholic Church for the last fifty years and influenced all of us worshiping in liturgical traditions.

For the purposes of our exploration into Anglican liturgical adaptation it makes more sense to turn to the principles that Chupungco extracts from his work with *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that apply to adaptation. Keeping in mind that Chupungco spent a great deal of his life teaching and applying liturgical adaptation, we will only have the opportunity to brush the surface of his work.²³ In his detailed description of adaptation, Chupungco delineates three areas of consideration for adaptation: theological, liturgical and cultural.

The Theological Principle of Adaptation

Adaptation for the reason of being novel or trendy is doomed from the outset. Even expedience fails as an anchoring principle for this kind of liturgical change. Neither being new for the sake of new, nor expedience for practical purposes is weighty enough to be a founding principle that guides liturgical adaptation. Adaptation should be grounded in the very nature of what it means to be the church. Chupungco writes:

The main reason must be sought in the nature of the Church as the prolongation in time and space of the incarnation of the Word of God. In the final analysis, the

²² Chupungco, *Liturgies of the Future*, Limited edition by special permission of Paulist Press originally published 1982, (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 6.

²³ To engage his work in full, read the entire text, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, (1982), and see his more extensive works: *Liturgies of the Future: The Process and Methods of Inculturation* (1982), and its sequel: *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiosity, and Catechesis* (1992).

mystery of the incarnation is the theological principle of adaptation. The Word of God, in assuming the condition of man, except sin, bound himself to the history, culture, traditions and religion of his own people.²⁴

The church, its people, and its worship live in a particular time and culture; we are bound to in the history and culture of our own day. Our expression of worship, our praise and thanksgiving, reflect our lives and our thanks from a particular of time and place. If we are to be an outward expression of God's incarnational grace, our worship needs to reflect that central mystery of incarnation in her liturgy. Chupungco argues that the mystery of the incarnation lives on through the church, whenever the church is able to assume the social and cultural conditions of the people, and that being the Word of God, the church has a theological imperative to adapt and change as the culture of the people continues to change.²⁵ As he notes, because the people and culture will continue to change, adaptation of the church and its liturgy to reflect and speak to and of the culture in which it lives will be an on-going, living process.

And since no culture is static, the liturgy will be constantly subjected to modifications. In this sense the incarnation of the Church's worship will be an on-going process. While its basic content must remain unvaried, its structure, language and symbols will have to bear the mark of each culture.²⁶

The Liturgical Principle of Adaptation

Liturgical adaptation is based on principles derived from the nature of the liturgy itself. Certain conditions set down by the liturgy have to be observed (here is where emerging church seems to fly too far a-field). The ultimate purpose of the liturgy is to

²⁴ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 58.

²⁵ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 59.

²⁶ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 62.

worship God, to facilitate the vertical line reaching from humanity to God. A liturgy that does not connect both God and humanity misses the point completely. A liturgy that leaves out the worship of God is a self absorbed and pointless liturgy. A liturgy that leaves out the possibility of a personal encounter with God is an empty ritual engaging no one. Christian liturgy has its own imperatives, the primary of which is the gathering of the people to worship God. Chupungco writes, “It is her vocation to proclaim the greatness of God, to worship him and, by this act of worship, to manifest herself to the world as the community of the redeemed.”²⁷ He also outlines other liturgical principles grounded in the very nature of Christian worship. While education is valuable and present at each liturgical celebration, the liturgy is primarily worship and catechesis second. At the center of every liturgical celebration is the paschal mystery. It is through the liturgical year, that the church unfolds and makes present that mystery on earth.²⁸

In looking at liturgical prayers in particular, Chupungco explains the purpose and need for grounding the prayers in christocentric language. The conclusion, “through Christ our Lord,” is an outward expression of being grounded in that place of salvation through Christ.²⁹ And the inclusion of the Holy Spirit in prayer includes the work of sanctification into the core of the liturgy. Gail Ramshaw would argue that prayers can be framed within the history of God’s saving work without using language that is androcentric and limiting of both the Triune God and the worshipping community.³⁰ Given

²⁷ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 64.

²⁸ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 66.

²⁹ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 67.

³⁰ Gail Ramshaw, *Liturgical Language: Keeping it Metaphoric, Making it Inclusive*, (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 18-24, 35-40.

the christocentric orientation of the church, it is important that the liturgy expresses salvation history and the process of humanity's encounter with God and the on-going work of the Spirit in our daily lives.

Chupungco adds two important liturgical principles that are imperative in Christian worship: the primacy of scripture and the need for active participation by those worshipping. With these two principles Chupungco and *Sacrosanctum Concilium* find a receptive audience with those involved in emerging church liturgy. As we saw in the last chapter, emerging churches also stress the importance of scripture, as does our tradition, so here is one principle that most involved in the current conversation about liturgy might agree upon. How scripture is used varies greatly between traditions, as does what portions of scripture find their way into the liturgy. But the primary principle that liturgy be grounded in scripture seems like a safe bet across traditions and for liturgical adaptation into the future. The importance of active participation is described in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* section 41:

full, conscious and active participation in the liturgy is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy and is the right and duty of the Christian people by reason of their baptism.³¹

The last liturgical principle for adaptation is more difficult for emerging churches to come to terms with, and is perhaps the initial point of departure for many of them from traditional liturgy, that of the importance of the existing rites. Chupungco values the

³¹ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 41, Available through the Vatican Archives online at: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html (accessed on October 7, 2013).

Roman Rite, and it is that rite to which he is referring when he emphasizes that liturgical creativity should draw its inspiration from the existing rites of the tradition. He writes:

Adaptation means conveying these things according to the thought and language patterns of the people. This is not a betrayal of tradition; it is the sowing of the seed of divine revelation on native soil where it will eventually take root and grow according to the existing natural conditions.³²

For our purposes, this is an interesting idea. If liturgical adaptation is inspired by the tradition, for us the existing liturgy of the Anglican tradition, then liturgical adaptation is not a break with the tradition but an extension of the tradition into a new time and place.

The Cultural Principle of Adaptation

Which brings us to the last category of principles for adaptation, that of cultural adaptation. By this, Chupungco means to define culture and to take this conversation out of the context of primarily mission work and into the mainstream of liturgy. Through liturgical adaptation that takes any culture into account the church might meet the needs of a changing world. Rather than be boxed in by a narrow understanding that he is speaking only to those working in the mission field, Chupungco sites *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (sections SC 37-40 and SC 4) as supporting the idea that liturgy be made available and relevant to every culture. Chupungco then defines culture as:

the sum total of human values, of social and religious traditions and rituals, and of the modes of expression through language and the arts, all of which are rooted in the particular genius of the people.³³

It is his contention that liturgy must then reflect the life of the people who are at worship, the values and traditions which have shaped them over generations, so that people can

³² Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 73.

³³ Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, 75.

claim the worship as their own. From this perspective of ownership, people can then engage most fully into the vertical line between themselves and God. Allowing for authentically and genuine worship by the community gathered.

Liturgical Inculturation in Conclusion

We have considered the liturgy of the church as it developed over time, within and against the cultural situations, bound to history and place, of and by the people worshipping God. Through our quick trip through liturgical history, we see that liturgical adaptation is a fundamental element of our liturgy from the inception of the Christian church. Across the generations a variety of cultural and historic pressures have affected the liturgy of the church for better or for worse. It seems a good first step in our exploration to admit that our liturgy has been adapted and changed from the beginning, so consideration of how we might join in that work in our own time is a faithful endeavor and not a radical move. It is valuable to work within the tradition so that our liturgy continues to reflect the incarnation of God in the world, speak the Word and lift up authentic praise to God. That said, there are principles that need to be upheld, and Anscar Chupungco's work on liturgical adaptation has begun to outline those for us. First, the core of worship is the vertical line reaching from humanity to God, and good liturgy includes both members of that conversation.

A close second, Christian worship is by its nature christocentric, locating us within God's work of salvation, and grounded in the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ. The inclusion of the Holy Spirit in the liturgical prayers lays claim to our sanctification in our daily lives and work. Also, liturgy should be based in Scripture and

allow for authentic participation by those worshiping. And liturgical adaptation is inspired by the tradition, and does not drop in from nowhere. As a continuation of the growth and constant development of the liturgy is a faithful process, it relies upon what has come before. As liturgical adaptation is part and parcel of the incarnation of Jesus Christ in our world, part of the worship of a people bound to time and place in history, the liturgy is constantly in a process of renewal and adaptation. No adaptation is ever the final word, but a phrase in a conversation that continues to respond to the culture of God's people and their need to speak authentically in their praise of God.

CHAPTER THREE: ANGLICAN LITURGICAL REFORM

We begin liturgical adaptation in the Anglican tradition by understanding our tradition, remaining true to it, and working from that core. In *Beyond East and West*, Robert Taft articulates the Christian tradition as more than an inert past, but a dynamic principle at the core of the mission of the church:

Tradition is not history, nor is it the past. Tradition is the church's self-consciousness now of that which has been handed on to it not as an inert treasure, but as a dynamic principle of life. It is the church's contemporary reality understood genetically, in continuity with that which produced it. The very basis of the church's ideal is to represent faithfully and reinterpret for each new circumstance and age, the will and the message of its founder not only at its point of origin, but at every moment of the continuum at which that will and message have been manifested.¹

Being well grounded in our tradition requires an investment in understanding our history: the history of our liturgical practices, the history and structure of the liturgy itself. Taft continues, "To think that one can construct a theology of some aspect of that tradition without a profound knowledge of its history is an illusion. . . . One understands Christian liturgy only by knowing what it is and has been, just as one learns what English literature is only by reading it."²

Studying our liturgical history and the events that shaped it is not intended to imply that the past is better, more sacred, or more 'orthodox'. As Taft describes it, a study of the past plays a role in freeing us for the present and the future:

¹ Robert Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 2nd rev. and enl. ed., (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997), 290-291.

² Robert Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 290-291.

The past is always instructive but never normative. What its study, like all study, should provide is understanding, an understanding that challenges myths and frees us from the tyranny not just of any one slice of the frozen past, but also from the tyranny of the latest cliché, so that we can move ahead to solutions suitable for today in faithful freedom, faithful to living tradition that is always indebted to but free of the past.³

Which for one, means that we value the tradition without being so reverent of the tradition that we lose sight of the fact that it is God we are gathered together to worship – not the tradition, nor its practices. And on the other hand it means we can rely on the core of our tradition to keep us from getting swept up with every wave of whatever is new and claims to be relevant.

We have a pastoral responsibility to the worshiping congregation we serve to have sufficient knowledge about the liturgy itself as well as the congregation, its history and experience.⁴ From that foundation we are then able objectively and carefully to begin to consider crafting liturgy. Creating intentional liturgy should not be a fad, or a fear response. Done well and from a deep and abiding understanding of liturgical formation in our tradition, it is a faithful expression of our responsibility of presiding with the people in our given moment in history. Before we can begin to discover appropriate ways in which to create liturgy, or even to evaluate new liturgies as we find them, we need to comprehend the foundation upon which our Anglican liturgical tradition stands.

The Beginning of Anglican Liturgical Reform

Our Prayer Book was born and shaped in the crucible of the political and religious struggles of the late western Middle Ages. The medieval church was encumbered by

³ Robert Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 291.

⁴ Aidan Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style*, (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982), 9.

politics, and the liturgy was voluminous, unwieldy, and in Latin. The Roman Rite was being used across the west in ways that had changed considerably over the centuries. Robert Taft, in his discussion of the importance of studying the structures of liturgy, describes the process that happens to a liturgy over time. In his argument that the structure of a rite outlives the meaning of a rite he explains:

For in the history of liturgical *development*, structure outlives meaning. Elements are preserved even when their meaning is lost (conservatism) . . . or when they have become detached from their original limited place and purpose, acquiring new and broader meanings in the process (universalization). And elements are introduced which have no apparent relationship to others (arbitrariness).⁵

While there were specific factors at work that affected the Roman Rite in the west, Taft's explanation of liturgical development describes the process that allowed the rite to swell and change, until it seemed to the reformers that the core of the rite was lost to those who were participating. In particular, at this point in history lay people had very limited participation in the eucharistic rite. They received communion rarely and when they did, they only received in one kind. The main act of lay participation was adoration of the consecrated elements, as those elements were elevated by the priest. Theologically, each mass was considered to be a sacrifice in itself, distinct and in addition to the sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ on Calvary.⁶ There was a great deal that was ripe for reform in the practice of the Roman Rite. So it is no wonder that as nations came into their own and began to pull away from Rome's authority, the time was right for religious reform as well.

⁵ Robert Taft, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," *Worship* 52, no. 4 (July 1978), 315. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials*, EBSCOhost (accessed on July 12, 2013).

⁶ R.C.D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed., (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 177-180.

The reformers responded to the liturgical issues directly, particularly to the eucharistic misunderstandings they perceived in the Roman Rite. As Gregory Dix describes it, the reformers “looked upon a Church plagued with a multitude of real superstitions, some gross and wholly evil in their effects, some merely quaint and fanciful, but all equally irrelevant to the Christian religion.”⁷

The primary goals of the early reformers are articulated in Luther’s *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* in 1520:⁸ There was a need for a vernacular liturgy, the Last Supper to be understood as the standard for every eucharistic celebration, Eucharist to be received in both kinds by the laity, and an end to the Roman Rite’s doctrines of transubstantiations and sacrifice of the Mass.⁹ While Zwingli, Luther, Bucer, Calvin, Hermann, Knox, and Cranmer each had particular responses to the flaws they perceived in the Roman Catholic Church and its liturgical practices, these reformers were influential to one another. There was an interchange of ideas as, through a process of trial and error, liturgical reformation came to western Christianity.

This reformation was nurtured and sustained in no small part by the Gutenberg revolution, as the invention of the moveable type printing press made the mass production of pamphlets and books a reality. Aidan Kavanagh articulates both the state of the medieval liturgy and the effects of the printing press:

Western liturgy at the end of the Middle Ages was seriously hypertrophied, which means that there was simply more of it around than any but ecclesiastical experts could bear. With only a few exceptions, even these knew relatively little about the

⁷ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of Liturgy*, (London: Dacre Press, 1945), 627.

⁸ Electronic text made available by Robert Smith for Project Wittenberg, and available online: <http://www.lutherdansk.dk/Web-Babylonian%20Captivitate/Martin%20Luther.htm> (accessed on July 22, 2013)

⁹ Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 189.

liturgy itself; thus they often overcompensated in their attacks on it or defense of it. The liturgy was inexorably brought into disrepute by both sides in the debate between new devotion and learning and the old, between Reformers and Catholics.

But an even more important development than liturgical hypertrophy was Europe's unavoidable slide into textual absorption, something stimulated by the invention of printing. . . . The technology of printing helped to blow apart a moribund medieval world, unleashing forces which the modern world copes with uneasily still. . . . God's Word could now for the first time be visualized by all, not in the multivalency of a "presence" in corporate act or icon, but linearly in horizontal lines which could be edited, reset, revised, fragmented, and studied by all – something which few could have done before.¹⁰

Later in the same chapter, Kavanagh continues to describe how these two factors

intertwined to create a situation that was ripe for liturgical reform:

Liturgical hypertrophy and the invention of printing by movable type were not, of course, the only factors involved in the reform movements of Catholics and Protestants during the sixteenth century and after. But when one tries to account for the fate of rite and symbol in Reformation and Counter-Reformation churches, the combined effects of liturgical hypertrophy and printing technology cannot be ignored safely. The two factors meshed. The technology of printing made it possible to put the texts of pruned liturgies into the hands of worshipers very quickly indeed for the first time ever and at a decreasing cost. This rendered the extensive, complex, and expensive libraries of liturgical books which were needed for a full celebration of the old liturgy obsolete in one stroke, as Archbishop Cranmer noted in the preface of the new English Book of Common Prayer of 1549.¹¹

Our main concern is with the advent of Anglican eucharistic liturgy but it is important to keep in mind that this liturgy did not arise in a vacuum. By the time Cranmer and other like-minded clergy were setting about to reshape the church in England, a great deal of reforming work had been done on the continent and there were both people and texts with which they would consult.

¹⁰ Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology: the Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1981*, (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984), 103-104.

¹¹ Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 105.

The Stage is Set

The Church of England arose specifically from the events of the English Reformation: a long process that began with Henry VIII's move to remove England from Papal authority in 1534, and ended with the firm placement of William and Mary on the throne in 1688.

While Henry made some changes to the liturgy and the church, they were not reforms of the church so much as reforms of the politics involved in the authority over the church. Henry established a church and a country that were independent from Rome, (and over which he was Supreme Head¹²) but he maintained a theology that was primarily Roman Catholic. The only true revisions to the liturgy during this time allowed for the readings from the Bible in English at Morning and Evening prayer (authorized in 1543), and a form of the Litany to be spoken in the vernacular (authorized in 1544).

The Emergence of A Book of Common Prayer: The Order of the Communion, 1548

After Henry's death in 1547, his son Edward VI came to the throne, and liturgical revision truly began to be implemented in England. Influenced by the Continental Reformers such as Zwingli, Luther, Hermann, Calvin and Bucer, (and the reformed breviary of Roman Catholic Cardinal Quinoñes), Archbishop Thomas Cranmer seized the opportunity to respond to the primary concerns of the Reformation.¹³ At Edward VI's

¹² Through the Act of Supremacy, 1534, Henry declared himself to be "the only supreme head on earth of the Church in England" and that as such, he was entitled to "all honours, dignities, preeminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity". Full text available online, under British History, David Ross and Britain Express <http://www.britainexpress.com/History/tudor/supremacy-henry-text.htm> (accessed August 5, 2013)

¹³ Marion Hatchett, "The Anglican Liturgical Tradition", in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed., (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 53.

coronation Cranmer hailed him as the “second Josiah” and explained: “I shall most humbly admonish your royal majesty what things your highness is to perform.”¹⁴

Under Cranmer’s guidance, it was ordered that the Epistle and the Gospel at the Eucharist were to be read in English (as declared in the 22nd of Edward VI’s Injunctions, 1547)¹⁵. Later that same year came a proclamation for the inhibition of preaching. Instead, one of twelve homilies prepared by Cranmer would be read each Sunday¹⁶. The stated purpose was that the King:

minding to see very shortly one uniform order throughout this his realm, and to put an end to all controversies in religion, so far as God should give grace (for which cause at this time certain bishops and notable learned men, by his highness' commandment, are congregated) hath by the advice aforesaid [i.e., of the Protector and the Council] thought good ... at this present and until such time as the said order shall be set forth generally throughout his Majesty's realm, “to prohibit all preaching,” to the intent that the whole clergy in this mean space might apply themselves to prayer to Almighty God for the better achieving of the same most godly intent and purpose.¹⁷

In effect this inhibition on preaching removed from the clergy the opportunity to preach dissent within the context of the service itself.

In December 1547 both Parliament and Convocation passed the Act against Revilers and for Receiving in Both Kinds, a requirement that communion be received in both kinds by the people.¹⁸ In March 1548, “The Order of the Communion” was

¹⁴ Bard Thompson, ed., *Liturgies of the Western Church*, 2nd ed., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 228.

¹⁵ Colin Buchanan, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, Grove Liturgical Study 35 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1983), 8.

¹⁶ Colin Buchanan, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, 11.

¹⁷ H. A. Wilson, introduction to *The Order of the Communion*, British Museum copy, p xxii. <http://archive.org/details/orderofcommunion00chur> [accessed on July 15, 2013] See Wilson’s introduction for a truly exhaustive description of the process leading to the Order for Communion.

authorized to facilitate this broadened communion and was produced by a commission of bishops and scholars (including Cranmer). As a quick response to the need for a new eucharistic liturgy, the Order was an English insert to be used within the Latin Mass. It included those portions of the rite that were deemed important for the people to hear in their own language: a set of prayers of preparation, exhortations, the confession and absolution, followed by Comfortable words from Scripture, the prayer of Humble Access said by the priest, words of administration, and a benediction said over those who had communicated.¹⁹

The Order of the Communion not only provided for communion in both kinds for the people, it also established a single rite to be used across the realm. The proclamation that introduced the Order explained that the King felt it to be:

most godly and agreeably to Christ's holy institution enacted that the most blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ should from henceforth be commonly delivered and ministered unto all persons within our Realm of England and Ireland, and other our dominions, under both kinds, that is to say, of Bread and Wine, . . . lest every man phantasyng [fantasizing] and devising a sundry way by himself, in the use of this most blessed Sacrament of unity, there might thereby arise any unseemly and ungodly diversity: Our pleasure is, by the advice of our most dear uncle the duke of Somerset, governor of our person, and Protector of all our Realms, dominions, and subjects, and other of our Privy Council, the said blessed Sacrament be ministered unto our people only after such form and manner as hereafter, by our authority, with the advice before mentioned, is set forth and declared: . . . that they may so come to this holy Table of Christ, and so be partakers of this holy Communion, that they may dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them.²⁰

¹⁸ Cheslyn Jones, et. al., ed., *The Study of Liturgy*, Revised Edition, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 310. For the text of the Act, see Colin Buchanan, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, 13.

¹⁹ J. Robert Wright, "The First Prayer Book of 1549," in *But One Use*, (New York: St. Mark's Library, 1999), 6-10. Currently available through Project Canterbury 2002: <http://anglicanhistory.org/essays/wright/1549.pdf> (accessed on July 20, 2013).

²⁰ Taken from a reprint in *The First Book of Common Prayer and The Ordinal of 1549 together with The Order of the Communion, 1548*, by HB Walton & PG Medd, (London: Rivingtons, 1869). See link:

The proclamation went on to propose that reform of liturgy was something to be expected from “time to time” as it was deemed needed for reformation, glorifying God, edifying the people and the advancement of true religion:

And also with such obedience and conformity to receive this our ordinance, and most godly direction, that we may be encouraged from time to time further to travail for the reformation, and setting forth of such godly orders, as may be most to God's glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion.”²¹

The Order began the process that would lead to the Anglican understanding that worship should be uniform throughout the church. The work toward a single, common rite for the entire realm will continue, as the Order of Communion 1548 is followed quickly by the First Act of Uniformity.

The Emergence of A Book of Common Prayer: The Act of Uniformity, 1549

The Act of Uniformity of 1549 created a completely new situation for the Church of England. In it Parliament endorsed and made official the shift from a variety of local uses to one use across the land. The text of the Act of Uniformity began by outlining how the local uses, such as that of Sarum, York, Bangor and Lincoln, and the variety of ways in which rites were administered, were of concern to the realm and the king. And that in his wisdom and with good counsel, the king had appointed:

The Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned and discreet

<http://archive.org/details/firstbookofcommo00waltuoft> (accessed on July 15, 2013). For a printed text of the Proclamation, see Colin Buchanan, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, 14.

²¹ Walton and Medd, *The First Book of Common Prayer and The Ordinal of 1549 together with The Order of the Communion, 1548*. For a printed text of the Proclamation, see Colin Buchanan, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, 14.

bishops, and other learned men of this realm, **to consider and ponder the premises; and thereupon having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages in the primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient and meet order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the sacraments, to be had and used in his majesty's realm of England and in Wales;** the which at this time, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement is of them concluded, set forth, and delivered to his highness, to his great comfort and quietness of mind, **in a book entitled, 'The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the Use of the Church of England'.**²²

The men gathered to do this work were to consider what should be altered and what should be retained, that this book would provide “the one and uniform rite and order in such common prayer and rites and external ceremonies to be used throughout England and in Wales.” Lest there be any confusion, the Act then went on to clarify, that it would be a required rite:

that all and singular ministers in any cathedral or parish church or other place within this realm of England, Wales, Calais, and the marches of the same, or other the king's dominions, **shall, from and after the feast of Pentecost next coming, be bound to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, commonly called the Mass, and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the same book, and none other or otherwise.**²³

The Significance of the Act of Uniformity

With the Act of Uniformity came a major shift in worship in the Church of England. This Act of Parliament made official and universal the ideas set forth in the Royal Proclamation that introduced the Order of the Communion a year prior. As seen in

²² Emphasis mine. Full text found in the Appendix. Text made available online at http://www.tudorplace.com.ar/Documents/first_act_of_uniformity_1549.htm (accessed on July 14, 2013). Link originally utilized was through Charles Wohlers and Justus Anglicans: http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549.htm a much more credible resource. But their link to this text is currently down.

²³ Emphasis mine. Full text found in Appendix B, 131.

the emphasized portions of the text of the Act above, there would now be, by law, a single use for the worship of the realm. After centuries of local uses, English clergy were now bound to use this one text and none other in all their “common and open prayer.” This was a very different way of engaging worship, and it removed the sense of local usage from the liturgy. Liturgy was in some ways narrowed, there was now only one ‘right’ way to worship; and yet arguably liturgy was also broadened by the understanding that this one rite was universally applied. Everyone was to be engaged in and with the same rite, lay and clergy alike. (This extended to the Daily Offices as well.) The liturgy was meant to establish one language, that of the English spoken in the city of London, as a way to unite the realm.²⁴ Likely a welcomed change for some, and certainly a painful one for others in the realm, this Act ushered in a watershed moment in Anglican liturgical development. The Act made official the first Book of Common Prayer; Kavanagh argues it was a shift that would affect all of Western Christianity:

The step was momentous because it confirmed many on both sides of the schism [Reformers and Catholics] in a notion of *orthodoxia* not as a sustained life of “right worship,” but as “correct doctrine” to be maintained by centralized ecclesial authority having exclusive power to enforce an absolute standard in liturgical texts by law. This was something unheard of in western Christianity prior to the English Act of Uniformity of 1549, the direct effect of which was to establish as the only liturgy allowed in England that contained in *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England*.²⁵

Thus, with the rise of the sixteenth century Reformation, stress was placed on correct doctrine being the determining factor for liturgical form. What people believed

²⁴ Marion Hatchett, “The Anglican Liturgical Tradition”, in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed., (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 51.

²⁵ Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 81.

suddenly dictated how they prayed, rather than the other way around. In Kavanagh's book, *On Liturgical Theology*, he argues that primary theology happens when the liturgy is experienced by the worshiping community and secondary theology follows from there, as the people then reflect on that experience. As Kavanagh describes it, "the adjustment which the assembly undertakes in response to the God-induced change it suffers is a dynamic, critical, reflective, and sustained act of theology in the first instance, of *theologia prima*."²⁶ He argues that all reflection on this sustained act of theology is then *theologia secunda*. This construct of methodology in liturgical theology has been attributed to the fifth century monastic, Prosper of Aquitaine, who wrote that the law of worship (*lex orandi*) established the law of belief (*lex credendi*).²⁷ Thus the liturgical act of worship is primary, and reflection on the experience then serves to shape and give meaning to further experiences of the liturgy. In practice this would mean that primary theology should be the liturgy itself as engaged by the people, and secondary theology would then arise as that liturgy is interpreted, and lastly doctrines would be then be established. But when the Act of Uniformity dictated a single order for worship, as determined by those in power, that liturgical construct was turned around. Rather than allowing engagement in the liturgy to form the theological understanding of the people, liturgy was being determined and directed by that secondary theology. Right doctrine became the prevailing understanding of what it meant to be orthodox, and that right doctrine determined the very structure, context and practice of liturgy. Kavanagh writes,

²⁶ Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 77

²⁷ Daniel Van Slyke, "Lex orandi lex credendi: Liturgy as Locus Theologicus in the Fifth Century?" *Josephinum Journal of Theology*, Volume 11, Number 2 (Summer/Fall 2004): 130-151. For a full discussion of how this phrase is attributed and what it might mean, as well as a translation of the portion of Chapter 8 of the *Indiculus*, in which it occurs see: <http://www.pcj.edu/journal/essays/vanslyke11-2.htm> (accessed on July 23, 2013)

“The primary theological act which the liturgical act had once been now began to be controlled increasingly by practitioners of secondary theology whose concerns lay with correct doctrine in a highly polemical climate.”²⁸ Taft discusses this same inversion from the viewpoint of liturgical structure, “In the Reformation period structure was bent to serve theology. *Legem credendi statuât lex supplicando* was turned around, and theology determined rather than interpreted liturgical text and form.”²⁹

The First Prayer Book 1549: An Interim Measure

As mentioned in the Act of Uniformity, the king had commissioned the creation of this one use, *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England*. Primarily written by Cranmer, the Book of Common Prayer continued the reforms begun in the Order of the Communion. The 1549 BCP contained a full set of services in addition to the Eucharist, which was titled: “The Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion Commonly Called the Mass.” Given that no substantial changes were made to the outward appearance of the service (no changes to vestments, altar, or other furnishings) and the fact that it retained the general pattern of the traditional rite taken from the Latin Mass, this eucharistic rite may have felt somewhat familiar to the congregations. It is possible some believed it to be the Latin Mass translated into the vernacular, as it was promoted to be. If Taft’s emphasis on liturgical structure is to be believed, the majority of the people might have found the transition an easy one to make,

²⁸ Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 109. For his full discussion on the taxonomy of primary theology see 73 – 110.

²⁹ Taft, ‘The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology,’ *Worship* 52, no. 4, 316.

as the structure of the rite was similar in shape to the Roman Rite. As the Order of the Communion had already made the move to communion in both kinds, it is conceivable that receiving the Eucharist under the 1549 book would have felt similar to the Roman Rite. The 1549 book required unleavened wafer bread to be used, and people received communion kneeling as the priest put the wafer directly into their mouth. Arguably, for those who had not understood the Latin previously, the changes in the text would not have been noticed. While Cranmer is cited as being willing to defend the text as the translation of the Latin Mass,³⁰ it was not that. In the eucharistic prayer alone he had made some distinct and significant changes. All references to the sacrifice of the Mass were removed, so the offertory was that of almsgiving, and the offering mentioned was of “ourselves, our souls and bodies,” and the “sacrifice of praise.” Priests were forbidden to elevate the bread and the wine, to celebrate private mass, or to celebrate the Eucharist if they themselves were to be the only recipient.³¹ Because the Book of Common Prayer 1549 was carefully worded to bear that middle ground between the Roman Rite and the Reformers, Cranmer’s eucharistic text could be interpreted widely. The focus of the 1549 Book seemed to be a single use but not necessarily a single interpretation. J. Robert Wright notes that while there was ambiguity both in interpretation and in the reasons given for introducing the book in the first place, there was no ambiguity about the expectation that this “one use” be followed throughout the realm:

³⁰ Edward C. S. Gibbons, introduction to *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth*, JM Dent & Sons, (London, 1910). Under Introduction, section IV. Made available through Justus.Anglican.org. http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549&52_Intro.htm (accessed July 10, 2013).

³¹ Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), 272-273. See also Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: New and Reformed*, 232-243.

The Book was clearly capable of differing doctrinal interpretations, and this is especially interesting since no specific reformed doctrines other than the removal of “some things untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious” were given in the Preface as the reasons for introducing the 1549 Book in the first place. Nevertheless, howsoever mixed this Book’s intentions may have been, howsoever subject to continuing development its author’s theological convictions were, everyone was now expected to follow “but one use” and certain of its legacies were now fixed and would remain.³²

Foundational Principles of the 1549 Prayer Book and Act of Uniformity

Which brings us to the principles that are the legacy of the 1549 Prayer Book and the Act of Uniformity that establishes it as the single prayer book of the Realm. The primary foundations for the Anglican prayer book are four fold. That Anglican liturgy be grounded upon Holy Scripture, agreeable to the practice of the Ancient Church, unifying to the realm, and designed for the edification of the people.³³ (The fourth principle was primarily concerned with people being able to hear and understand the Holy Scriptures in their own language, and thereby be able to participate in the rite fully. Which is where our conversation about use of language and inculturation began, at least for the Anglican tradition.)³⁴

³² J. Robert Wright, “The First Prayer Book of 1549,” in *But One Use*, New York: St. Mark’s Library, 1999), 13-14. Currently available through Project Canterbury 2002: <http://anglicanhistory.org/essays/wright/1549.pdf> (accessed on July 20, 2013).

³³ Marion Hatchett, “The Anglican Liturgical Tradition”, in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed. (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 47-77. The first few pages discuss these four principles in the documents cited, and the remainder of the chapter is an extensive survey of how these principles are then applied in the development of Anglican prayer books.

³⁴ J. Neil Alexander, “Embrace the Happy Occasion: Prayer Book Revision in Light of Yesterday’s Principles, Today’s Questions, and Tomorrow’s Possibilities,” in *Leaps and Bounds: The Prayer Book in the 21st Century*, Paul V. Marshall and Lesley A. Northup, editors, (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1997), 187.

The Prayer Book Meets the Road

In practice, this was a huge shift. While a full survey of the historical and political upheaval of this time period is beyond the scope of our discussion, it is important to keep in mind that the Book of Common Prayer 1549 affected the day to day lives of the people of England from the moment it came into use. While some places began using the new rite earlier, it officially went into effect on Whit Sunday, June 9, 1549. Cranmer himself celebrated that Sunday at St. Paul's Cathedral, where they had been using the rite since the beginning of Lent. For some parishes, like St. Paul's in London, it was a relatively smooth transition, but for others it was a painful and dramatic adjustment. Gregory Dix describes the suddenness of the change, "With an inexcusable suddenness, between a Saturday night and a Monday morning at Pentecost 1549, the English liturgical tradition of nearly a thousand years was altogether overturned."³⁵

As Dom Gregory's rather dramatic statement implies, the change seemed sudden. There were revolts as early as the Monday following the implementation of the Book of Common Prayer. These came from the most conservative quarters, the most famous of which is probably the petition of protest and armed resistance in Devon. The petition read:

We demand the restoration of the Mass in Latin without any to communicate, and the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament: Communion in one kind, and only at Easter: greater facilities for Baptism: the restoration of the old ceremonies—Holy bread and Holy water, Images, Palms, and Ashes. We will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game; but we will have our old service of Matins, Mass, Evensong and processions in Latin, not in English.³⁶

³⁵ Gregory Dix. *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 686.

³⁶ Wright, *The First Prayer Book of 1549*, 4.

In the written royal message to those rebelling against the prayer book it was noted, "It seemeth to you a new service, and indeed it is none other but the old: the selfsame words in English which were in Latin, saving a few things taken out."³⁷ On the ground, the royal response was more violent than that, with rebellions crushed and rebels executed.³⁸ Greater changes still were coming for the Church of England under Edward's second prayer book, and these changes would not be in the direction of the conservatives in Devon, Norfolk, or elsewhere in the realm.

The Second Prayer Book 1552: The Pendulum Swings Protestant

The first Book of Common Prayer was followed three years later by a second Book of Common Prayer, in 1552. The debate continues about whether this was Cranmer's original intention and the 1549 was simply an interim measure, or whether the use of and reaction to the 1549 book precipitated the continued reinvention of the liturgical rites as seen in 1552. Either way, Cranmer made significant changes in his second prayer book.

The 1552 BCP was introduced by the Second Act of Uniformity, passed in April 1552, which mandated the use of the second Book of Common Prayer. The Act of 1552 describes the former book as "a very godly order set forth by the authority of Parliament, for common prayer and administration of the sacraments, to be used in the mother tongue within the Church of England, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church,

³⁷ Edward C. S. Gibbons, introduction to *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth*, Introduction, section IV.

³⁸ The prayer book rebellion was more complex than the title implies, though liturgical changes were in part responsible. Other concerns included taxation, the disappearance of the Cornish language, the role of local lords in the managing of lands and people, and repercussions from the dissolution of the monasteries and other changes made under Henry VIII.

very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm.”³⁹ And it almost apologizes for the book which was about to be implemented in its stead, explaining that it was required, “because there has arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministrations of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any worthy cause.”⁴⁰

How the Second Prayer Book Differed from the First

In the Prayer Book of 1552 the Eucharist was titled, “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion.” This eucharistic rite allowed very little room for ambiguity, the essence of the Eucharist was now understood and presented clearly as the eating of bread and drinking of wine with thanksgiving and remembrance of Christ’s death.⁴¹

The distinct and radical revisions made by the 1552 Prayer Book were obvious to conservative bishops and commoners alike. Clergy were now only to vest in surplice and cassock, and the stone altars were replaced by large wooden dining tables, set up lengthwise in the chancel or in the body of the church. In the 1552 eucharistic liturgy the structural units were moved: the Ten Commandments were added to the beginning of the service, the Gloria moved from this spot to after Communion, the exhortation to communion was moved from after the sermon to after the prayers for the Church

³⁹ For more on the text and implications of the Second Act of Uniformity, see Gibbons’ introduction to *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth*, cited above.

⁴⁰ Gibbons’ introduction to *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth*, cited above.

⁴¹ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 273.

Militant, the exhortation to Communion was then followed by the invitation to confession, the confession, the absolution and the comfortable words. After which there was a preface, the Sanctus and the prayer of Humble Access, and the prayer for worthy reception, which included the institution narrative. Notably, the institution narrative was followed immediately by the Communion. In this way the people received the bread and wine as soon after hearing the command of the Lord to do so as possible. The Lord's Prayer was repeated after communion, and was followed by a Prayer of Oblation or Prayer of Thanksgiving, and then the singing of the Gloria as a thanksgiving to God by those who had received communion, followed by the final blessing.⁴²

Results of the Changes to the Eucharistic Rite

By restructuring the liturgical elements in the rite, Cranmer created a much more penitential liturgy. People were first convicted by the reading of Ten Commandments, then the Gospel addressed their sinful state, they offered alms just after the sermon was preached (alms were purposefully not given in close proximity to communion), the people confessed and received communion, after which they sang for joy, for though undeserving, they had by the grace of God been made worthy to receive. Because the institution narrative was immediately followed by the act of communion the anamnesis was built right into the action of the rite, as the people remembered what Jesus did, they did what he commanded of them and received the bread and then the wine. The elements remain bread and wine, they were not to be understood as the body and blood of Christ in

⁴² See Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 274, for a chart that clearly illustrates how the two Eucharistic liturgies are structured and how the structural units are manipulated in 1552 to create a rite that has a different theology.

reality. The prayer that introduces the words of the institution narrative makes this explicit:

O GOD our heavenly father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only son Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, **a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again:** Hear us (O merciful father) we beseech thee; and grant **that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine,** according to thy son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, **in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood:** who in the same night that he was betrayed: took bread, . . .⁴³

No longer was there any ambiguity about the real presence of Christ being in the bread and the wine, the elements were creatures of bread and wine taken in remembrance. This is also illustrated in the prayer of thanksgiving immediately following the communion, that states:

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, **with the spiritual food** of the most precious body and blood of thy son our saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and heirs, through hope, of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and Passion of thy dear son. We now most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works, as thou hast prepared for us to walk in: through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the holy ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.⁴⁴

It is clear in the eucharistic rite of 1552 that the request was for God to do work upon the people themselves and not on the bread and the wine. The bread could be household

⁴³ Text made available online through The Society of Archbishop Justus as [JustusAnglicans.org](http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm), http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm (accessed on July 17, 2013). Emphasis mine.

⁴⁴ Text made available online through The Society of Archbishop Justus as [JustusAnglicans.org](http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm), http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm (accessed on July 17, 2013). Emphasis mine.

bread, it was to be delivered at communion into the hands of the communicants, and whatever of the eucharistic elements were left over were for the curate's use at home. There was no longer any sense of the Eucharist being a sacrifice, instead the people were offering themselves, their souls and bodies, as an offering to God. In addition, a Declaration on Kneeling was added (just before printing so it is printed in black, earning the name the Black Rubric). Its purpose was to explain that the posture of kneeling while receiving communion was an act of humility, rather than an act of reverence to the elements themselves, lest there be any confusion. Within the rubric the authors were clear to assert that Christ's presence was a spiritual one, available to the worthy recipient; the substance of the bread and wine were unchanged. As such the Declaration on Kneeling is sometimes called the Doctrine of the Real Absence.⁴⁵ The text of the Declaration on Kneeling 1552, or The Black Rubric:

Although no order can be so perfectly devised, but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinance, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part: And yet because brotherly charity willeth, that so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away: therefore we willing do the same. Whereas it is ordained in the book of common prayer, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion: which thing being well meant, for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the holy Communion might else ensue: Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the Sacramental bread and wine, remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our saviour Christ, they are in heaven

⁴⁵ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 277.

and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's natural body, to be at one time in more places than one, at one time.⁴⁶

Cranmer's reordering the structural pieces of the rite, in combination with the reformed text, and the last minute addition of the Black Rubric, serve to create a very Protestant prayer book.

Implications of the 1552 Prayer Book

Should Edward VI have lived a long life and this process of reform have stopped here, we would be a very different church. For the church of the 1552 BCP was a place where conservative Bishops like Stephen Gardiner were certainly not able to nuance the text and shape of the liturgy to their Catholic understanding of eucharistic theology. The liturgical theology of the 1552 Prayer Book was a theology of the more radical reformers, and it left little room for those dissenting from their views. If history had been kinder to Edward it is possible we would look a great deal like any other reformed church. But with Edward's death on July 6, 1553, the usage of the 1552 Prayer Book was short lived. Under Mary, the Roman Catholics had the opportunity to return the country to the Latin Mass, and all that entailed. It's hard to imagine what these years were like for the people of England – without even considering the political violence and instability of the time, the liturgical upheaval alone must have been staggering.

⁴⁶ This version of the text is made available online through The Society of Archbishop. http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm (accessed July 15, 2013) For a full discussion of the concerns and confusion that birthed this rubric so close to the printing of the prayer book, see Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church*, 242-243.

Mary Takes the Throne: The Pendulum Swings Roman Catholic

From the radical changes made under Edward's prayer books to Mary's attempt to return England to the Roman Catholic Church, the experience people had in their parishes shifted from one extreme to the other. With Mary on the throne, the vestments of the clergy returned to their grandeur, the tables were destroyed as the Eucharist returned to the east facing altars. The language of the Eucharist returned to Latin, the host was again elevated, the wine no longer offered to the people. While it is certain some were pleased to go back to their Roman Catholic practices, its easy to imagine that there would have been a great deal of confusion. The changes made by the reformers in 1552 had drawn a certain amount of the underlying theology of the Latin Mass into question. How many times a year should a person take communion? Was it necessary to say one's confession before a priest? While both Roman and Reformed stressed the importance of confession prior to receiving communion, the 1552 Prayer Book gave people the option of making their confession to God directly. Now that the Roman Catholic church was again the church of the realm, what did that do and say to those who had received communion under the 1552 Prayer Book and had confessed without a priest? And that pales when compared to the debate between Roman Catholic and Reformer on the theology of the Eucharist itself. Were people to worship the elevated host as the body of Christ? Why had they been required to receive both bread and wine under the Prayer Books, and what exactly were they receiving when they did? By the second prayer book of Edward's realm, these were merely bread and wine and never the body and blood of Christ in reality, as clearly indicated by the Black Rubric in 1552. When Mary took the throne, Christ was suddenly present corporally in these same elements. Which was it, bread in

remembrance or Christ re-sacrificed? The issues were very serious, the consequences dire, and the people were caught in the midst of it all.

The Elizabethan Settlement: The Middle Way

Like Edward's, Mary's reign was short-lived, as were the Roman Catholic reforms she brought to the church. Mary's death in 1558 ushered in the reign of Elizabeth and the swing back again toward the Protestant reformers. In the years between the Act of Supremacy which made Henry VIII the head of the English Church, to 1558 when Elizabeth became queen regent, the Church of England had been in succession: Roman Catholic prior to Henry's removing the Church from Rome, slightly reformed so that it was a version of English Catholic under Henry, Protestant and quite reformed under Edward, then Roman Catholic under Mary. As the Protestant Elizabeth took the throne, the nation and church were once again braced for change. But Elizabeth and her council were careful in their approach, and reverted to something familiar to the people. They chose to revise the 1552 Prayer Book rather than implement radical reforms. Thus Cranmer's 1552 Prayer Book was modified slightly and became the 1559 Book of Common Prayer and the liturgy of the realm. The revisions were small but significant. While it was true the liturgical theology was swinging once again from Roman Catholic to Protestant, the few changes made to Cranmer's 1552 (very Protestant) prayer book had the effect of stopping the pendulum mid way. Two essential changes were implemented to the eucharistic rite as the 1552 Prayer Book became the 1559 Prayer Book. The Black Rubric was eliminated, and the words of administration were modified so they included both the 1549 text and the 1552 text. While it created a paragraph of text to be said by the

priest over each communicant in both kinds, it also created the room for both Roman Catholic and Protestant understandings of eucharistic theology. The words of administration were now, for the bread: “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. (1549) Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.” (1552) And for the wine: “The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. (1549) Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.” (1552) The combination of both the 1549 and 1552 words of administration created the room for both Roman Catholic and Protestant eucharistic theologies to live side by side within the same church, even side by side at the same rail.⁴⁷

These changes were clearly politically motivated to provide the new Queen the stability afforded by calming the constant conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Yet in the process the Elizabethan Prayer Book established the core of Anglicanism: a single common text in the vernacular, with a wide middle way between Roman Catholic and Protestant, the effect of which is pastoral sensitivity to local usage. While conflicts over the prayer book continue throughout Elizabeth’s reign, this period of almost a hundred years of relative stability and usage of the 1559 Prayer Book proved a firm foundation for Anglican identity that will serve the church through further conflict and debate. This Prayer Book would walk the middle way between Roman Catholic and Protestant under Elizabeth I, then the middle way between high church Laudians and

⁴⁷ Bradshaw and Johnson comment that these two changes (the elimination of the Black Rubric and the combined words of administration) serve to make the doctrine less narrow (277). Though Kavanagh might argue that what really happened is the liturgy was widened, which in turn allowed the doctrine to widen.

Puritans under James I (1603), and eventually the middle way between Anglicans and Puritans and the restoration of the prayer book when Charles II retook the crown (1660).

A Step Back Toward Orthodoxy

In the initial prayer book of 1549, Cranmer began to implement measures to craft a uniquely Anglican liturgy, and while it was a huge step from simply inserting an English text into the Latin Mass as he had with the Order of the Communion the year before, it was only an interim measure (whether this is Cranmer's plan from the outset or not). The following prayer book of 1552 went hard to the side of the reformers, allowing little room for ambiguity in interpretation or practice. Here we have the concerns voiced by Kavanagh at their most extreme. *Orthodoxia* had become doctrine determining liturgy, rather than interpreting it. One could argue that with the advent of the 1559 Prayer Book under Elizabeth, we have a step back toward *Orthodoxia* as right worship that can then be interpreted by theology. By allowing for a range of interpretations while holding one liturgical rite as common, the Church of England under Elizabeth established unity in liturgy while not enforcing absolute uniformity in doctrine. When uniformity needed to be enforced it would be the parish clergy and the bishops who were held to account. So that while all the people of the realm were subject to worship under the prayer book, their interpretation of the theology therein was not subject to scrutiny or punishment.

In the preface to *The Works of Richard Hooker*, William Haugaard writes about Elizabeth's legacy to the church and the realm:

“The essential elements of the religious settlement negotiated at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth Tudor (b. 1533; reigned 1558-1603), were the 1559 Prayer Book, the liturgy within which English men and women regularly worshiped, with its prescribed lections from the vernacular Bible; the Supremacy Oath,

tendered on appropriate solemnities to the clergy, which assured independence from papal authority and teachings; and the Queen's Injunctions, which regulated details of worship, teaching, and administration of church affairs. Four years later the clerical convocation produced the Thirty- nine Articles of Religion, which in 1571 received royal assent and were clothed with enforcement procedures by convocation and parliament, setting doctrinal boundaries for those who shouldered official teaching and disciplinary responsibilities in the church. Except for the few modifications in the vestiarian requirements for clerical garb promulgated (with the queen's tacit approval) by bishops of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1566, these constituted the Elizabethan settlement of religion.”⁴⁸

The Elizabethan Prayer Book, the “Elizabethan settlement of religion,” and the subsequent near one hundred years following, establish the Anglican tradition at its core. What we have by the time of the end of Elizabeth’s reign is a long, formative history of worship under one prayer book, and the primary theology is that of worship, as interpreted by those worshipping communities. The secondary theology of those defending this prayer book is also firmly in place, with Jewel and Hooker as the main theologians of this era.

George Wayne Smith writes,

The BCP 1549... sets forth principles that continue as hallmarks of our way to Christian worship and life: worship in the vernacular; a book for priest and people, not just priest; word and sacrament; simplicity, directness, plain speaking wherever possible; worship as a source for learning how to be a Christian; continuity with the past shaped to meet current needs.⁴⁹

The Ground on Which We Stand

From this careful look back at the very beginning of liturgy in the Anglican tradition, we have a foundation on which to stand. We have now an understanding of

⁴⁸ William P. Haugeard, preface to *The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker*, W. Speed Hill, general editor ; John E. Booty ... [et al.], contributing editors, (Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1993), 8.

⁴⁹ George Wayne Smith, *Admirable Simplicity: Principles for Worship Planning in the Anglican Tradition*, New York, Church Hymnal Corp., 1996), 8.

Anglican liturgical principles, where they originated, how they were tested, and an appreciation for the nature of Anglican theology as primarily liturgical theology - not confessional, not doctrinal, but liturgical. Certainly changes will be made to the Book of Common Prayer over time, in response to the conflicts and varying theological positions of different eras. But the changes will be moderate, focusing on maintaining the middle way, and the importance of unity of worship without absolute uniformity of doctrine. The next prayer book revision came about after the Protestant revolution in England. After the overthrowing of the monarchy and the institution of a Directory for Worship for a time, the monarchy was restored under Charles II and we return to the prayer book and to prayer book revision.

One More English Prayer Book: the BCP 1662

We see Anglican principles in action in the revision process that created the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. The 1662 Prayer Book is essentially the Elizabethan Prayer Book with a few changes. Like the changes made to the 1559 book, these changes were small but significant. The middle ground this time lay between Presbyterian Puritans and the remaining Laudian bishops. For the most part the changes made leaned to the more conservative Anglican camp, though only a few of the changes from the failed 1637 Scottish book were adopted. Other small but workable concessions were made toward the Puritans, thus neither camp got the book they had hoped for, but there was room for both. The prayer before the communion was now titled, "The Prayer of Consecration," and the manual acts at the words of institution were reinstated, so the priest elevated both bread

and wine at the appropriate moments in the institution narrative, as well as broke the bread when the narrative described Jesus breaking the bread.

In addition, the final rubrics now instructed the curate to take home for his use only the unconsecrated bread and wine. This implied either that there was in fact something happening to the consecrated bread and wine during the eucharistic prayer; or that people might assume as much and thus, it should be handled carefully, lest it be worshiped. The ambiguity here opened the door for either interpretation:

“And if any of the Bread and Wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use: but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.”

In deference to the Puritans the Black Rubric from 1552 was reinstated, though a simple textual change broadened its meaning enough to be ambiguous to both sides of the argument. Originally in the 1552 Prayer Book the rubric said: “It is here declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any **real and essential** Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.” For its inclusion in the 1662 prayer book the sentence was changed to read: “It is here declared, that thereby no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any **Corporal** Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.” With these changes in 1662 we have a prayer book that will serve the Church of England for centuries, and this book becomes the basis for the prayer books used in other provinces of what will become the worldwide Anglican Communion.

Anglican Liturgical Reform In Conclusion

The core of Anglican theology is primarily a liturgical theology, one that is understood as it is expressed in the liturgy of a corporate people first and foremost, not as defined in doctrines or as experienced through personal conversion. In the Anglican tradition, one is Anglican by virtue of praying the common prayers, by practicing Anglicanism. After all the doctrinal concerns of the Reformation, we are back to a place where *orthopraxis* or right worship is the core of what it means to be orthodox. We have, in a manner of speaking, backed into Aidan Kavanaugh's *orthodoxia* – the idea that being orthodox comes from a life lived in right worship in community.

We are a community of common prayer, a liturgy that was carefully crafted and hard-won over the centuries. While there is unity in the text and shape of the liturgy, since the time of the Elizabethan book there has been a wide middle way for interpretation of the liturgy. Even earlier in our liturgical development, when Edward introduced the first prayer book, we see the underlying Protestant understanding that from time to time, liturgy is ready for reform. There are ways to go about that reform that allow the liturgy to be open and yet unified. From the outset it has been important that Anglican liturgy be grounded in Holy Scripture, in keeping with the practices of the ancient church, somehow unifying to the realm, and designed for the edification of the people.⁵⁰ Within these foundational principles we see the importance of liturgy in the vernacular, and participation of the laity in the liturgy, as well as the understanding that the eucharistic liturgy belongs to both clergy and laity.

⁵⁰ Marion Hatchett, "The Anglican Liturgical Tradition", in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed. (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 47-77. The first few pages discuss these four principles in the documents cited, and the remainder of the chapter is an extensive survey of how these principles are then applied in the development of Anglican prayer books.

We then add to these principles the Elizabethan wide middle way: the prayers are in common, but there is a certain wideness to the theological interpretation of the rites. The value placed on walking that place between two conflicting understandings is a theology in its own right. It is the tangible expression of our realization of the vastness of God and our limited ability to understand all that is possible with God. We may not always understand one another, and we certainly may not always agree, but we are Anglican because we worship together in the wide middle way created for us in the common prayer of our prayer books. We are defined through our participation in Anglican liturgy.

Given that we are defined by and know we are Anglican primarily because we participate in Anglican rites, any reform has to tread carefully, lest in creating liturgy that is contextual we so redefine ourselves that we are no longer people of common prayer. As daunting as that seems, reform is also part of our tradition. We see that in the development of the prayer books and the ways in which the reformers changed and did not change the rite. Before those of us celebrating in The Episcopal Church endeavor to do something similar, we will need to take a closer look at the principles of liturgical reform in Anglicanism and in the development of The Episcopal Church's 1979 Book of Common Prayer.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE GROUND ON WHICH WE STAND; THE PRAYER BOOK IN AMERICA

The Establishment of the First American Prayer Book

Essentially the prayer book that comes to the colonies is the Church of England's 1662 Book of Common Prayer. It is in the colonies that what will become the American Prayer Book develops and forms. While it might have been easier for the Episcopalians of the colonies, had they been able to adopt and use the BCP 1662 whole cloth, the circumstances of the American revolution would not allow them that luxury. By the end of the American revolution the need for a new prayer book was obvious and immediate. When The Episcopal Church turned its attention to prayer book revision there was a great deal in the mix. There were Irish editions of the 1662 English Prayer Book with supplemental additional offices. With an increase in interest in Eastern liturgies many were looking to two prayer books which had included material from Eastern rites: the first Book of Common Prayer 1549 and the Scottish book of 1637. These had been adapted further by the Scottish Non-Jurors, who eventually published as a series of "Wee Bookies," which were editions of the eucharistic Office of the 1637 Prayer Book, modified somewhat to be used with the 1662 Prayer Book.¹ The situation inherited by The Episcopal Church was complex and reflected a wide variety of viewpoints, but the timing of the revolution and newly independent church wouldn't allow the church in America the luxury of waiting.

¹ Marion Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, (Seabury Press: New York, 1982), 3- 4.

Marion Hatchett describes the spectrum of opinion at the time of the first state and interstate conventions, as they attempted to deal with a revision of the prayer book for use by Episcopalians in America:

Some wished to reprint the 1662 book, with no revisions but those made necessary by the changed political situation. Others wished to use this opportunity to excise from the Prayer Book certain elements to which exception had been taken since the early days of Puritanism. Some felt the need for some supplementary Offices, such as those contained in Irish printings of the book. Others wished to enrich the eucharistic liturgy along Eastern-Non-Juror-Scottish lines. Many were sympathetic to certain proposals reiterated in Latitudinarian publications, and some even wished a revision which would eliminate references to the Trinity and address all prayers to the Father.”²

For the purposes of looking at prayer book revision in our own day, it is interesting to note that in the midst of all of these opinions, certain principles came to the forefront. In 1782, William White wrote an anonymously published pamphlet, “The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered.” In it he addressed the revision of the liturgy:

As to divine worship, there must no doubt be somewhere the power of making necessary and convenient alterations in the service of the church. But it ought to be used with great moderation; otherwise the communion will become divided into an infinite number of smaller ones, all differing from one another and from that in England; . . .³

From White we hear articulated both the importance of being able to make changes in the liturgy, and the need to do so with care and moderation, lest the communion become divided beyond recognition as a universal church.

² Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 4.

³ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 39, footnote 13 of chapter two: which credits a reprinting with notes by Richard G. Salomon, in *Historical Magazine*, XXII (December, 1953), 454-455.

On August 13, 1783 a convention of clergy met in Annapolis, Maryland to address the need to protect property. At that convention they agreed to “certain fundamental Rights & Liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland.” The fourth of these principles lays the groundwork for the changes that will take place in the creation of the first prayer book for the church in America:

That as it is the Right, so it will be the Duty, of the said Church, when duly organized, constituted and represented in a Synod or Convention of the different Orders of her ministry and People, to revise her Liturgy, Forms of Prayer & publick worship, in order to adapt the same to the late Revolution, & other local circumstances of America, which it is humbly conceived may and will be done, without any other or farther Departure from the Venerable Order and beautiful Forms of worship of the Church from whom we sprung, than may be found expedient in the Change of our situation from a *Daughter* to a *Sister Church*.⁴

This principle declares the right of The Episcopal Church to adapt the liturgy as the appropriate authorities see fit, and the importance of maintaining a continuity of worship with what has come before. And the principle establishes The Episcopal Church as in relationship with but not dependent upon or beholden to the decisions of the Church of England.

The convention of the ‘Southern States’ in Philadelphia in 1785 resolved not only that a commission be appointed to consider those liturgical changes that would render the liturgy consistent with the American revolution, but also “further alterations in the Liturgy, as it may be adviseable for the Convention to recommend to the consideration of the Church here represented.”⁵ From this commission the first proposed American Book of Common Prayer arises; it is entitled *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration*

⁴ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 40, originally printed in W. S. Perry, *The History of the American Episcopal Church 1587-1883* (2 volumes; Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1885) II, 3-5.

⁵ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 52.

of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies, As Revised and Proposed to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Proposed Book of 1786 is of note to our study for two reasons. The first is the preface written by Smith, which included quotations paraphrased from the Preface of the 1662 Book and from the Council of Trent. The second is its introduction of the concept of trial use for a prayer book revision. The preface begins:

It is a most invaluable part of that blessed ‘*liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free*’ – that, in his worship, different *forms* and *usages* may without offence be allowed, provided the *substance of the faith* be kept entire; and that, in every church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to *doctrine* must be referred to *discipline*; and therefore, by common consent and authority may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, ‘according to the various exigencies of times and occasions.’⁶

Here is established the founding principle of liturgical change for The Episcopal Church: that which is not doctrine can be changed as is seen to be most convenient for the edification of the people.

The fact that this book is entitled as “Revised and Proposed for Usage . . .” creates a foundation for prayer book revision. Putting out prayer books for “trial usage” will become a tool for revision in several of the provinces of the Anglican Communion and in The Episcopal Church in particular. The Preface of the Proposed Book of 1786 closes with these words:

It is far from the intention of this Church to depart from the Church of England, any farther than local circumstances require, or to deviate in any thing essential to the true meaning of the thirty-nine articles; ...

And now, this important work being brought to a conclusion, it is hoped the whole will be received and examined by every true member of our church and

⁶ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 75, Preface to *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies, As Revised and Proposed to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, certification dated April 1, 1786.

every sincere christian with a meek, candid and charitable frame of mind; without prejudice or prepossessions; seriously considering what *christianity* is, and what the truths of the gospel are; and earnestly beseeching Almighty God, to accompany with his blessing every endeavour for promulgating them to mankind in the clearest, plainest, most affecting and majestic manner, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our blessed Lord and Saviour.⁷

The proposed book led to the editing and eventual adoption of the first Book of Common Prayer for The Episcopal Church. This happened through the work of the Philadelphia Convention of 1789 and the editorial committee charged with its printing. This book would include the revised form of the eucharistic Prayer from the Scottish Communion Office. The very first edition of the prayer book for the church in America was adopted and ratified, required for usage “from and after” October 1, 1790. *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, According to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: Together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David*, was well received throughout the church. This was mainly because so many bishops had been involved in the revision, and much of what was found objectionable in the trail use of 1786 had been revised for the 1789 book.⁸

Subsequent Prayer Books for the Episcopal Church

While the development of the Book of Common Prayer 1789 for the Protestant Episcopal Church in America was a process influenced by trial usage, the church was quick to establish the centrality of the approved book. At the Convention of 1808 an addition to Article VIII was proposed and then adopted in 1811:

⁷ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 77, spelling and italics original.

⁸ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 134.

No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or other offices of the Church, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every diocese or State, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention.⁹

The Prayer Book of 1789 was not to be changed quickly or without a great deal of consideration by the entire church.

It is not until 1880 that a committee appointed to begin looking at prayer book revision again. This would lead to the Prayer Book of 1892. The resolution stated that a committee:

be appointed to consider, and report to the next General Convention, whether, in view of the fact that this Church is soon to enter upon the second century of its organized existence in this country, the changed conditions of the national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use.¹⁰

In many ways, this establishes the pattern for future prayer book study and revision in The Episcopal Church. The same concern for appropriate response to a changed national life calls out to the church in the mid 20th century for a change from the then approved 1928 BCP. Certainly “the changed conditions of the national life” from 1928 to the mid 1950’s demanded adequate liturgical responses to a quickly changing world. In 1941, William Palmer Ladd of Berkeley Divinity School wrote:

Our Book of Common Prayer is the best in the world. For four centuries it has exercised an incalculable influence for good throughout the English-speaking world. To find fault with it is an ungracious task. Yet we must remember that its great value is due to the fact that originally it was an adaptation of older services to the needs of its own day. That adaptation was made 390 years ago. Since then the world has changed. Controversies that influenced the old compilers and revisers are now dead. The needs of the twentieth century are not those of the sixteenth. And

⁹ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 135.

¹⁰ Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*, 143.

liturgical science has made enormous progress, even in the last twenty-five years. The time for reconsideration seems ripe”¹¹

Coming out of the same liturgical movement as the liturgical revision of Vatican II, Anglicanism also strove to meet the changing needs of the people of the church. The Lambeth Conference of 1958 addressed prayer book revision, in Resolutions 73-75. Of interest to our study, Resolution 74 points out the core features of the Book of Common Prayer which are essential to safeguard unity as: the use of canonical Scriptures and Creeds, Baptism, Confirmation, Communion, and the Ordinal. The same resolution also argues that the primary motivation for liturgical reform is a recovery of the worship of the early church, as was the goal of the earliest prayer books of the Church of England.¹²

From the 1968 Lambeth Conference, the Resolution on The Contemporary Life of Prayer affirms that the primary role of the church is to glorify God by leading all people to a life in Christ, and encourages the whole church to deepen its life of prayer. With this as the groundwork, Resolution 4 states: “To this end the Church should search to discover those forms of spirituality and methods of prayer, both corporate and personal, which meet the needs of men and women today...”¹³

The Lambeth Conference 1978 takes this a step further, explicitly pointing out that worship should happen in the context of the culture in which the church finds itself across the world, in its Resolution 76 on Cultural Identity:

¹¹ William Palmer Ladd, *Prayer Book Interleaves*, 107, as reprinted in *Liturgical Change: How Much Do We Need?*, by Leonel Mitchell, (Seabury Press: New York, 1975), 5.

¹² Lambeth Conference Archives, Resolutions from 1958, Resolution 74 <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-74.cfm> [accessed on October 28, 2013]

¹³ Lambeth Conference Archives, Resolutions from 1968, Resolution 4 The Contemporary Life of Prayer, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1968/1968-4.cfm> (accessed on October 28, 2013).

The Conference recognises with thanksgiving to God the growth of the Church across the world and encourages every particular Church to strengthen its own identity in Christ and its involvement with the community of which it is part, expressing its faith through the traditions and culture of its own society except where they are in conflict with the essentials of the Gospel.¹⁴

The Formation of the Book of Common Prayer 1979

We see these same issues addressed in The Episcopal Church through the prayer book studies of the 1950's and 1960's. While the early prayer book studies argued for the revision of the 1928 rite, by the Prayer Book Study of 1966, the argument for revision was no longer the main issue, instead the authors stated their principle for revision: "Any adequate revision must be sufficiently imaginative regarding the various ways and the various settings in which the liturgy is celebrated in our congregations."¹⁵ This same Prayer Book Studies volume presented *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*, which began the important work of reordering eucharistic worship so that it would conform more closely to the rite of the early church. While there would be objections when the eucharistic prayers were introduced from this study for trial use, the reordering of the eucharistic structure was relatively well received. By the trial use in 1967, the basic elements of eucharistic worship are established: 1) a proclamation of the Word of God through scripture; 2) a prayer of intercession (removed from the liturgy of the Lord's Table, as it is found within the eucharistic prayer in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer); and 3) the Liturgy of the Table.

¹⁴ Lambeth Conference Archives, Resolutions from 1978, Resolution 36: Cultural Identity, <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1978/1978-36.cfm> (accessed on October 28, 2013).

¹⁵ *The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper* (Prayer Book Studies XVII), New York: Church Pension Fund, 1966, Introduction, page 12. Authorized for trial use by the General Convention of 1967.

During the trial usages of worship text at the advent of the 1979 Book of Common Prayer, Leonel Mitchell reflected on the principles set forth by Vatican II's *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (21, 23). He writes:

The “immutable elements divinely instituted” in Christian worship are few indeed. From Christ himself come the use of Bread and Wine for the Holy Communion, and water for Baptism, and the original text (not the English translation) of the Lord's Prayer. Almost everything else is within the authority of the Church to change.¹⁶

Mitchell concedes that there are elements of the Eucharist that are so universal, that to break with them would be a significant break with Christian worship of past generations. The traditional outline of Christian worship, since the second century, includes the following elements.¹⁷

1. Readings from Scripture: Most recently this has included Old and New Testament with the reading of the Gospel occurring last.
2. Preaching: An exhortation to the congregation about the Scriptures.
3. Common Prayer: The offering of prayers for the church and the community.
4. Offertory: Placing both bread and wine, with other offerings on the Holy Table.
5. Thanksgiving: Following the example of Jesus, thanks are offered that the people gathered might partake in his blessed body and blood.
6. Fraction: The one loaf is broken to be shared.
7. Communion: The eating and drinking of the bread of life and cup of salvation.

¹⁶ Leonel Mitchell, *Liturgical Change: How Much Do We Need?*, Seabury Press: New York, 1975, 13.

¹⁷ This basic structure can be found outlined in detail in “The Structure and Contents of the Eucharistic Liturgy and the Daily Office,” a document prepared for the Liturgical Conference held in connection with the Lambeth Conference of 1968, by the Right Reverend Leslie Brown and the Reverend Canon Ronald C. D. Jasper. As cited in *The Holy Eucharist: The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion*, Prayer Book Studies 21, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1970), Appendix Two, 35 – 41.

This outline is established as early as 150 CE, in the First Apology of Justin Martyr:

On the day called Sunday there is a meeting in one place of those who live in the cities or the country, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits. When the reader has finished, the president in a discourse urges us and invites us to the imitation of these noble things. Then we all stand up together and offer prayers. And, when we have finished the prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the president similarly sends up prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the congregation assents, saying Amen; the distribution of the consecrated elements takes place and they are sent to the absent by the deacons. Those who prosper, and who so wish, contribute, each as much as he chooses to.¹⁸

Thus grounded in the essential structure and components of the early Christian church, Mitchell contends that it is the church's task at any given time to evaluate the liturgies being used by the church and ask whether or not they are meeting contemporary needs:

Do they do what we wish them to do? Do they say what we wish them to say? If not, how can they be changed to do a better job of presenting the lives of God's people today to him in worship?¹⁹

When evaluating contemporary worship, Mitchell suggests we use the following criteria: clarity, "corporateness," flexibility, celebration, and continuity. Clarity: what a worshipper is doing and why should be clear to them. "Corporateness:" as common prayer, the liturgy involves participation of all gathered and is not the sole property of the clergy. Flexibility: though the Book of Common Prayer attempted to simplify the complex medieval liturgies, the current liturgy can allow for a certain amount of variability particular to the context or the occasion (now that our technology can put that varied service into people's hand, again making it easy to follow). Celebration: the

¹⁸ Justin Martyr I Apology 67

¹⁹ Leonel Mitchell, *Liturgical Change: How Much Do We Need?*, 17.

Gospel is the good news of Jesus Christ and every Eucharist celebrates the Resurrection, that should come through in the way in which we preside at the eucharistic celebration.

Continuity: All new forms of liturgy should be clearly coming from the tradition, they are a continuation of our worship throughout the ages, even as they infuse old symbols with fresh images making them real to the current congregation.²⁰

Mitchell's emphasis on the foundational components of the liturgy as practiced in the second century while encouraging liturgical revision that speaks in the vernacular of the present, is the essence of the work leading up to the BCP 1979. The Book of Common Prayer born from the trial uses takes final form, being approved by General Convention 1978, and printed as the Book of Common Prayer 1979.

The Book of Common Prayer 1979

The changes that were tested in the Prayer Book Studies and eventually formed the Book of Common Prayer 1979 were extensive. For the purposes of our study of eucharistic liturgy we will confine ourselves to those changes articulated by the BCP 1979's eucharistic rites, recognizing that they do not stand on their own. The Holy Eucharist in this prayer book is the central rite, but it clearly stands within the body of the whole scope of worship. Morning and Evening Prayer provide a foundation for both corporate and individual prayer that supports the Sunday liturgy. The core of our identity as Christians is grounded in the rite of baptism, and the Eucharist is the climax of initiation into the Body of Christ. Like baptism, the Eucharist is grounded in the Paschal Mystery and is expressed in its fullest in the context of the Great Vigil of Easter.

Mitchell argues:

²⁰ Leonel Mitchell, *Liturgical Change: How Much Do We Need?*, 19-20. Spelling original.

“Yet every Lord’s Day is the celebration of the resurrection, and it is the Sunday eucharist which gives its paschal character to Sunday, for it is in the eucharist that the Church proclaims and lives out the Paschal Mystery of Jesus’ dying and rising again. Easter, the Lord’s Day and the celebration of the eucharist are inextricably bound together.”²¹

The Great Thanksgiving, as the BCP 1979 designates the Eucharist, begins its departure from the prayer books that preceded it first and foremost in the variability of the texts offered. Prior to 1979 the majority of Episcopalians and other Anglicans had a single form of the eucharistic rite. The 1979 BCP introduced several forms of the eucharistic prayer. This is not unique to the BCP 1979, but a response to the liturgical movement in the west, reflected by the work of the Second Vatican Council and other liturgical reforms in western churches.

Mitchell describes the eight alternative eucharistic prayers included in the Book of Common Prayer 1979:

... two in Rite One, four in Rite Two, and two in An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist. Six of these prayers have a common structure, that adopted by the First American Prayer Book of 1789 from the Scottish Nonjurors who found it in the liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions (Book 8) and the Liturgy of St. James. The structure is called West Syrian by students of comparative liturgy. The other two prayers (Eucharistic Prayer C and Form 1) contain the same elements but follow the structure of the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Mark, which is also the structure of the eucharistic prayers of the Alternative Service Book in the Church of England and of the new Roman Catholic Eucharistic prayers. The Episcopal Church has an historical commitment to the West Syrian-Scottish form of Eucharistic prayer, and the inclusion of two prayers in another structure can be seen as not only a recognition of the validity of other structures but also a reaching out to both Roman Catholics and English Anglicans.²²

²¹ Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing, A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1985), 128-129. Capitalization original.

²² Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing*, 152. Capitalization original.

Mitchell goes on point out an interesting principle inherent in the offering of several eucharistic prayers within one prayer book. Once there are several choices of prayers, no single prayer needs to attempt to say everything that can be said in a eucharistic prayer. Thus with a variety of prayers available, each can focus on a particular emphasis, with the understanding that together they present a complete and balanced eucharistic theology.²³

Mitchell describes the particular gifts of the variety of the eucharistic texts in the 1979 BCP:

All of the Eucharistic prayers in the 1979 BCP begin with thanksgiving to God, thus giving them their name as The Great Thanksgiving. Eucharistic Prayers A and B allow for a variable proper preface, providing the opportunity over the course of the liturgical year to give thanks for a wide variety of God's gifts and acts for Creation. Eucharistic Prayers C and D take a different approach, each without proper preface, but offering a much more extensive thanksgiving for creation in their set narrative. The wide and full thanksgiving for creation which is now understood as part and parcel of our Eucharistic prayers can be seen as a reaction to the very narrow scope of Eucharistic Prayer I. This Eucharistic prayer dates back to the American Prayer Book of 1789, and was in turn drawn from Cramner's Eucharistic Prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book. It begins by giving thanks for the crucifixion, leaving out any thanksgiving for creation. Influenced as it is by the theology of the late middle ages, this prayer focuses almost exclusively on the atonement and the consecration of the elements. Eucharistic Prayer II is the Standing Liturgical Commission's revision of Eucharistic Prayer I, and it includes a thanksgiving for creation in its first sentence after the Sanctus.²⁴

Bradshaw and Johnson describe it this way:

... the 1979 Book of Common Prayer of TEC has four prayers in its modern-language version of the Eucharist...: Prayer A is an adaptation of the prayer used in earlier American Prayer Books; Prayer B draws on patristic and biblical texts, including, in part, the early Eucharistic prayer found in the so-called Apostolic Tradition attributed to Hippolytus; Prayer C is a modern composition that on the one hand adheres to the Eastern tradition of telling the story of salvation history expansively and not making use of proper prefaces to do so, but on the other hand

²³ Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing*, 153.

²⁴ Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing*, 153 – 154.

places its epiclesis for consecration of the Eucharistic elements before rather than after the institution narrative and also draws on much contemporary imagery ..., and Prayer D is the so-called Common Eucharistic Prayer, an adaptation of the classic EgBAS [Egyptian version of The Anaphoras of St. Basil of Caesarea] that was produced in 1975 for ecumenical use in conjunction with the Consultation on Church Union and in parallel with the equivalent Roman Catholic prayer.²⁵

Together these prayers reflect a shifting view and a shifting eucharistic theology that includes: a broader understanding of God's creation, a move from a strict focus on the atonement to thanksgiving for all of God's saving acts in history, an understanding that the entire eucharistic prayer is consecratory, not only the words of institution. This includes an emphasis on the epiclesis as essential to the overall consecration of the elements and the community there gathered, as well as an understanding of the church as sacramental in its entirety not just in the dominical words. Add to this shift in theology an emphasis that the worship and the consecration are an act of the whole community, and it is the participation of the whole that consecrates.

For the purposes of liturgical revision for the Eucharist, the primary gift of these multiple prayers in the BCP 1979 is their ability to honor both past and present. The work of these prayers is intentionally two-fold: to retain or even return to the earliest prayers and structures of the faith as seen through ancient forms and prayers, while allowing for a wider theology which has developed within the church and the body of the faithful. This happens through a careful liturgical effort to honor the structure and theology of the Eucharist as received from the past, while allowing it to develop and evolve so that worship also reflects the new context of God's people in a contemporary world.

²⁵ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies*, 320-321. Capitalization original.

Liturgical Change Beyond the BCP 1979

Liturgical change that honors the past while working to also include the present is necessarily an on-going task. As the world change and the needs of the worshipping people change, so does the liturgy. After all of the work that went into the creation of the BCP 1979, the church continued to use the principle established in the first Book of Common Prayer of The Episcopal Church that began with a proposed book for trial use. Once again materials created and distributed for trial use are utilized to test and work through liturgical change. Successfully leading to the adoption of the Prayer Book of 1789, as well as successful in developing the liturgies of the BCP 1979, trial usage has become a standard vehicle to test the waters for liturgical change.

The years following the BCP 1979 found an increased amount of attention paid to liturgical language. This conversation began in earnest in the 1980's and three General Conventions reflected on the issues of language, each producing materials for study and trial use. From the Preface to Supplemental Liturgical Text, *Prayer Book Studies* 30:

The language of Christian liturgical prayer springs from the deep wells of Scripture, tradition, and human experience – constantly changing and complex. The liturgies of the Church have always drawn from many sources to communicate and celebrate the truth of our lives in Jesus Christ in the clearest, most compelling way possible. The effectiveness and durability of prayer is contingent upon how well its images, words, and metaphors convey both the depth and mystery of the Gospel, and the voice and heart of the worshipping community. The common prayer of the Church emerges from the faith community and in turn, the community is formed and shaped by that prayer.²⁶

The Commission continues:

Nowhere is the sensitivity to the basic truth that every human being is created in the image of God as important as in the liturgy of the Church. The Gospel's call – and the Church's commitment – is to speak the word of grace and, in turn, to give voice

²⁶ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Text, Prayer Book Studies* 30, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989), 3.

to those who receive it. These services are part of the Church's age-old effort to raise up ever-new forms of prayer and praise from every corner of life. They seek to offer new ways of speaking the old truths: an invitation to venture into the deepening prayer life of the Church and into the renewing streams of salvation.²⁷

Only a few years later, the Standing Liturgical Commission commented in the preface to their *Supplemental Liturgical Materials 1991*, that the principles of the original prayer book studies had been tested and proved, and they are:

remaining faithful to the familiar forms of Anglican worship; drawing 'new' prayer material directly from biblical and other traditional texts; seeking balanced rather than 'neutral' language and imagery for speaking of God.²⁸

Using Supplemental Materials for Worship

Also in the preface to *Supplemental Liturgical Materials, 1991*, the Standing Liturgical Commission carefully outlines the breadth and scope of the use of the materials in worship:

The worship materials contained in this book provide possibilities for expanded worship, but this is always intended to mean their use within the structure, scope and context of the Book of Common Prayer. The shape of common worship, using these materials, should be easily recognizable as "Episcopal". They should display the structure which identifies the liturgies as belonging to our historical common experience, even as they allow for equally important variations in tone and experience. Specifically, . . . the traditional shape of the Eucharist (the gathering, the proclamation of the Word and the prayers of the people, followed by the fourfold taking, blessing, breaking and giving of bread and wine) should be retained as resources from this volume and from the Book of Common Prayer are combined.

Finally, and importantly, according to the enabling resolutions at each Convention, these materials are permitted for use "always under the direction of the diocesan bishop or ecclesiastical authority."²⁹

²⁷ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Text, Prayer Book Studies 30*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989), 3-4.

²⁸ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991), 5.

²⁹ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991), 7-8.

The Commission outlines the use of the materials in terms of range, frequency and duration. These principles lay the groundwork for the best use of any supplemental materials as we look to new usages and new rites within our church. Range is how much of the supplemental materials are used from the use of options for a single portion of the liturgical rite, to the use of all of a supplemental rite. Frequency describes how the use of new prayers has in the past facilitated familiarity with the prayers. One suggestion is the use of new texts in a regular rotation of services, so congregations can “simultaneously experience new prayers and maintain continuity of community worship life.”³⁰ Duration is an expression of the importance of extended exposure to new materials to afford them the best chance at being integrated into the community’s life of worship. And lastly, the commission addressed issues of practicality:

Whatever the range, frequency, and duration of use, the development and printing of worship pamphlets for services will make possible this repeated use without the necessity of repeating their production. Care for the appearance and quality of such “pew pamphlets” will be important in their assisting in (rather than distracting from) worship. Booklets should have a clear typeface, uncluttered graphics and be made of durable materials.³¹

This is interesting to us in a time when we take for granted the possibility of printed worship texts. How often do we consider the way in which they are printed, the materials used and the way the overall quality of experience for the congregation?

The Legacy of the BCP 1979 to Further Liturgical Revision

Clayton Morris claims that the process used in the development of the BCP 1979 forever changed our understanding of liturgical planning. We could argue that the process

³⁰ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991), 9.

³¹ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, 9.

of liturgy proposed for trial use was established from the birth of The Episcopal Church and with the proposed first Prayer Book of for the church in America, in 1789. Morris is articulating a more specific argument about process specific to function. Because the trial usages before the BCP 1979 were often expressed to congregations in the form of weekly printed leaflets, our understanding of liturgy as something fixed and bound began to change. In the decade that passed between the first trial-use text and the final publication of the BCP 1979 congregations and liturgy planners became to rely upon the flexibility and specificity of the weekly printed leaflet. Once our understanding began to shift to weekly adaptations and applications of the liturgy, our understanding of liturgy as fixed and bound within the covers of the BCP changed forever. Morris articulates the shift in understanding:

This shift, encouraged by the experience of “trial use,” introduced a new notion into the lives of Christians who had been used to a liturgy “fixed” in print and contained in a venerable book. As congregations began using liturgies variously printed in disposable pamphlets, the sense of the permanence of the liturgy gave way to a more fluid image of the Church’s liturgical texts. ... One imagines that never again will it be possible to think of the Church’s liturgy as something so static that it can be held safely between the covers of a book.³²

Eighteen years after Morris’ article, we could argue that this is the best foundation the church could have laid for the coming of the 21st century wherein printed and bound texts of any kind are seen as too static. Where books from the library are delivered online to readers and laptops, and often print is suspected of being too set, too rigid, or at least too costly in terms of resources. When communication is happening at a mind boggling pace, where people have the ability to respond in real time to any broadcasted event, and live out loud to an audience of friends and family and others through social media. A

³² Clayton L. Morris, “Prayer Book Revision or Liturgical Renewal?”, in *A Prayer Book for the 21st Century*, (New York: Church Publishing, 1996), 245.

church already positioned to utilize less static worship materials, and no longer strictly beholden to a bound book, is more likely to leap the chasm to more dynamic forms of liturgical resources.

Given the liturgy of the pamphlets to which Morris is describing, and even more now that we are moving further away from bound resources as a culture, Morris asks (and answers) the ultimate question:

Are Episcopalians really the People of the Book? Yes and no. Episcopalians are Christians whose denominational identity is most clearly and accurately articulated in liturgy. But a quick look at the history of Anglican liturgy in the American Episcopal Church suggests that there have always been collections of the texts available regionally in the Church. Liturgical unity has never been absolute liturgical uniformity.³³

As we saw in use of the Elizabethan book, it is precisely knowing the difference between unity of worship and uniformity of practice that has allowed the church to maintain the breadth of her stance as both Roman Catholic and Reformed. That same knowledge will now allow The Episcopal Church to retain our identity of people of common worship, even without absolute liturgical uniformity. In his article, Morris describes the common experience on any given Sunday:

It can be safely assumed that worshipers gathering on any Sunday morning across the country have in hand a variety of printed resources. Some hold the Book of Common Prayer 1979. Others have translations of The Book of Common Prayer into other languages. A few read from copies of The Book Common Prayer 1928. As they enter the worship space, many are handed leaflets which contain everything they need to read in the course of the liturgy. Some of these leaflets contain texts reprinted from the current, authorized prayer book. Others contain materials authorized as Supplemental Liturgical Materials. Still other leaflets contain materials “borrowed” from other resources or authorized materials edited by the local liturgical leaders. And finally, one imagines a few congregations using leaflets which contain materials crafted by local clergy or liturgy planning teams.³⁴

³³ Morris, 246.

³⁴ Morris, 248-249.

Truthfully, this is the current state of worship in The Episcopal Church in at least some of dioceses across The Episcopal Church. With the exception of the use of the 1928 Prayer Book, it is certainly the case in the Diocese of Maine at this time. Morris argues that it has always been the case within the church, and:

if a dispassionate consideration of the Church's liturgical habit and heritage is possible, one realizes, perhaps, that experimentation of the kind alluded to here is a source of creative energy which eventually produces new texts which can, in turn, be made available to the entire Church.³⁵

One of the most interesting proposals that Morris makes is his view of what a revised Book of Common Prayer would look like:

It should be a library of resources, some in English, others in an increasing variety of global tongues. This library will contain much that is familiar, old liturgies as well as new rites on the cutting edge of new inquiry. It will be a growing library, with provision for adding new materials as they are developed and, perhaps, removing materials whose usefulness has waned. Its use will be guided by carefully wrought guidelines approved by General Convention.³⁶

Those of us currently serving as worship leaders are confronting the immediate need for new materials which speak to the needs of God's people in a quickly changing world, awaiting, as Morris suggests, the guidance of the "carefully wrought guidelines approved by General Convention." While the Standing Liturgical Commission of The Episcopal Church has done some outstanding work on Same Sex Blessings (timely for those of us in states for which same sex marriage is legal), "carefully wrought" guidelines for liturgical renewal and revision of our Sunday celebrations of the Eucharist are not presently available, let alone approved by General Convention. How do we proceed in

³⁵ Morris, 249.

³⁶ Morris, 250.

the meanwhile? As the situation of The Episcopal Church is not unique but rather reflects the liturgical issues experienced across a large portion of the Anglican Communion, a great deal of work to this end has been done by the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation. In the next chapter, we turn our attention to the foundational principles expressed in their work, as well as the principles within our history of liturgical revision over the course of centuries, to guide us toward liturgical renewal and revision in our given context.

CHAPTER FIVE: INTENTIONAL LITURGY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

As we look to liturgical adaptation in our own time, it has been helpful to look to the ways in which the church has adapted and formed liturgy from the very first days of Christian worship. We have followed the development of Christian liturgy through the middle ages and up to the time of the Reformation. We have studied the beginning of Anglicanism and the creation of the first prayer book, walking the ground between Roman Catholic and Reformation ideals. We have seen how those principles of adaptation became foundational for The Episcopal Church. Through it all, we have seen that liturgical revision is part of our DNA as Christians and as Anglicans in particular. To engage in liturgical renewal is to be true to our identity.

Liturgical adaptation is founded in and supported by the theological principle of the mystery of the incarnation. When God came into the world in all the particularity of humanity, God sanctified all the particulars of human history and culture. We in our liturgy are called, convicted even, by God's incarnation in Jesus to respond to the particulars in our own time and culture. So that people can worship God fully from their own context.

Adaptation and the Early Church, through the Eve of the Reformation

From our study of the formation of the early church and its liturgy, we have seen that liturgical adaptation is inherent in Christian worship, from the very earliest moments in our history. The earliest Christians strove to establish themselves in the salvation history of their Jewish heritage while setting themselves apart from paganism. Once they

were more established within a pagan culture, they began to look for ways to use pagan images and language to reach their neighbors and share the story of God's salvation with the Greco-Roman world.

As Anglicans who place a high value on continuity with tradition, it is important to know our tradition and learn from it even as we work to revise our liturgy. We learn a great deal about the foundations of our liturgy from the early church. As we turn toward revision, we take with us some specific foundational principles from the early church. First and foremost, our liturgy is christocentric. Our worship grounds us in God's work of salvation, and the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ. With the inclusion of the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies our daily lives, we see the development of our Trinitarian theology expressed in our liturgy. Worship creates a vertical line reaching from humanity to God, and should involve both members of the conversation. Our worship is grounded in scripture, and follows a primary structure that was established by the second century. We see the importance of both scripture and structure illustrated again and again the development of our liturgy over the generations.

The Birth of Anglican Liturgy

Our investigation of the beginning of the Anglican tradition and its liturgy showed a return to the foundational principles of the early church, in conversation with other Reformation ideals such as the value of having both liturgy and scripture be in the vernacular and thus accessible to the people. This in combination with the new found power of the printing press, allowed the church to put new liturgies revised and updated into the hands of the people (or at least into the hands of clergy on behalf of the people)

much more quickly than before. This allows for the possibility of changing the liturgy, from one prayer book to another, in a relatively timely fashion.

Interestingly, we are once again in a situation where the rapid change in current technology changes the lay of the land. It is now possible to change the liturgy for every worship service. At low cost and with reasonably little energy, the text can now be created, assembled, printed and distributed so each worshiper has the liturgy from beginning to end in her hands. Similar to the advent of the printing press, this capacity for almost immediate revision has changed the expectations of the worshiping community.

It is from the 1549 Prayer Book (and the Act of Uniformity that establishes it as the single prayer book of the Realm) that we draw the primary foundations of Anglican Common Prayer. The primary foundations are four fold. That Anglican liturgy be: grounded upon Holy Scripture, agreeable to the practice of the ancient church, unifying to the realm, and designed for the edification of the people.¹

We then add to these four foundational principles of Anglicanism the wide middle way as established by the Elizabethan Prayer Book. While the prayers are held in common, there is latitude to their theological interpretation. This breadth has allowed Anglicanism to walk the middle ground between conflicting understandings in theology throughout history, and is a theological statement in itself. There is room to disagree and yet worship together, and Anglican prayer affords a certain amount of interpretation as we maintain middle ground.

¹ Marion Hatchett, "The Anglican Liturgical Tradition", in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed. (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 47-77. The first few pages discuss these four principles in the documents cited, and the remainder of the chapter is an extensive survey of how these principles are then applied in the development of Anglican prayer books.

The Episcopal Church and Principles for Liturgical Change

After looking at the development of the Anglican prayer books we turned our attention to the development of the prayer books for the church in America as we considered how that process established principles for liturgical change. From the early days of the colonial church, we heard articulated the importance of being able to make changes in the liturgy, while needing to do so with care and moderation, lest the communion become divided beyond recognition as a universal church.²

As The Episcopal Church declared her independence from the Church of England, she asserted her right to adapt the liturgy as the appropriate authorities saw fit, while maintaining a continuity of worship with what has come before. This continuity is valued, but the relationship with the English church now becomes one of a choice on the part of the church in America. The Episcopal Church will now be in full control of her decisions, no longer dependent upon or beholden to the Church of England. This has profound effect on her ability to revise liturgy for use in the newly formed Episcopal Church.

From the preface of the proposed book of 1786 we hear the foundational principle for of liturgical change for the new church in America: that which is not doctrine can be changed as is seen to be most convenient for the edification of the people. That principle, combined with the way it was introduced, as proposed for use before it was approved, lays the groundwork for liturgical adaptation at the national church level for The Episcopal Church and the foundation of prayer book revision. Putting out prayer books

² See Chapter Four: The Ground on Which We Stand; The Prayer Book in America, 77 for full discussion. Original citation: Marion Hatchett, *The Making of the American Prayer Book*, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982), 39, footnote 13 of chapter two: which credits a reprinting with notes by Richard G. Salomon, in *Historical Magazine*, XXII (December, 1953), 454-455.

for “trial usage” will become a tool for revision in several of the provinces of the Anglican Communion and in The Episcopal Church in particular.

When The Episcopal Church began to look again to liturgical revision, the resolution in 1880 to propose that revision gave us a sense of when it becomes time for revision, when:

the changed conditions of the national life . . . demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use.³

We see most of these principles at work in the development of the Book of Common Prayer 1979. The importance of returning to the worship of the early church, and the structure inherent therein becomes a primary liturgical concern. From the liturgical movement that gave us the work leading up to the BCP 1979, we see emphasized the importance of being grounded in scripture, the importance of structure, the need once again to put the liturgy in the vernacular, and the importance of the participation of the worshipping community. The multiple eucharistic prayers included in the BCP 1979 provide a breadth of worship. The work of these prayers is intentionally two-fold: to retain or even return to the earliest prayers and structures of the faith as seen through ancient forms and prayers, while allowing for a wider theology which had developed within the church and the body of the faithful.

Our Own Process of Liturgical Adaptation

Our time spent focusing on our tradition of liturgical adaptation and revision has been helpful, though it raises some fundamental questions of identity. How do we

³ Hatchet, *The Making of the American Prayer Book*, 143.

maintain our identity as people of common prayer while attending to the changing needs of the people in their shifting context? How will liturgical adaptation affect our common prayer across the Anglican Communion?

As Clayton Morris noted on any given Sunday across The Episcopal Church there are a variety of texts being used: some worshipping communities using the 1979 Book of Common Prayer (in book form), some using the 1928 Prayer Book, some using worship guides or booklets.⁴ Sometimes the liturgy is traditional, sometimes it is drawn from the supplemental worship texts of *Enriching Our Worship*, sometimes it includes liturgy drawn from other sources, and occasionally it includes worship written in part by the local community. For Anglicans visiting from other areas of the communion, what creates the sense of familiarity with the worship has a great deal more to do with the structure of the rite than the particular texts. Can this disparity in worship still function to hold us together as a people of Common Prayer? What does the way we are currently worshipping and the further development of contextual prayer do to our identity as Anglicans?

The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC) addressed these issues extensively at their meeting in Dublin in 1995. Rather than concern ourselves with the loss of the prayer book as our source and icon of unity, the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation suggests that it is possible to claim a new icon of unity. They write:

In the future, Anglican unity will find its liturgical expression not so much in uniform texts as in a common approach to Eucharistic celebration and a structure

⁴ See Chapter Four: The Ground on Which We Stand; The Prayer Book in America, 95 for full discussion. Original citation: Clayton L. Morris, "Prayer Book Revision or Liturgical Renewal?", *A Prayer Book for the 21st Century*, 248-249.

which will ensure a balance of word, prayer, and sacrament, and which bears witness to the catholic calling of the Anglican communion.⁵

Arguably these major identifiers of Anglican liturgy articulate the four principles already established in the creation of the first Anglican prayer book. Those primary foundations are four fold. That Anglican liturgy be: grounded upon Holy Scripture, agreeable to the practice of the ancient church, unifying to the realm, and designed for the edification of the people.⁶ As we move toward our own revision and adaptation while wanting to retain our identity as Anglicans, it is helpful to organize our thoughts around the founding principles, with an eye to what still identifies our worship as particular to Anglicanism. What does this look like as we work toward liturgical revision? We have learned a great deal from our own tradition that suggests we have a lot to offer a changing world, while maintaining the core of our identity as Anglicans.

The Four Core Principles Meet the 21st Century

Grounded in the Holy Scripture

Our firm foundation in the biblical text is one way in which we maintain our continuity with our tradition. How much scripture we choose to include in our worship matters. The inclusion of more of the scriptural text is a reform ideal, and an emerging church ideal as well. We have seen some of that explored in the Revised Common Lectionary's offering two tracks of the lectionary, providing the opportunity to read through an entire text over the course of several weeks. There is value in reading through

⁵ David R. Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, Dublin, Eire, 1995, Grove Worship Series 135 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1996), 7.

⁶ Marion Hatchett, "The Anglican Liturgical Tradition", in *The Anglican Tradition*, Richard Holloway, ed. (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984), 47-77.

an entire book, even the difficult and boring parts. If changes are to be made to the readings, they would be made in the interest of having more not less, allowing for the reading of an entire text, or even selecting portions of the text omitted by the lectionary and focusing on those (often considered to be problematic texts). When there are options in the lectionary, there is value in choosing the text less likely to have been heard before. It is worth our time to engage the texts seriously and as completely as we are able, and to feel free to do so with the parish in the liturgy and in the sermon, as well as in the classroom.

Part of our being grounded in Holy Scripture is our recognition that the biblical texts are inherently valuable. Our need to revise or adapt liturgy is not because the texts are somehow too archaic to speak to us. Rather, liturgical adaptation is meant to allow people to address God from all aspects of their lives in their current context. We adapt liturgy because given the appropriate liturgical framework, the biblical message reaches our given context. Mitchell writes in the introduction to his book, *Praying Shapes*

Believing:

God does not change, and the Gospel which we preach does not change. It is the same Gospel which Peter and Paul proclaimed. But we change and the world changes, and we approach God with new problems and new questions. The language of theology must be able to hear and respond to these new experiences without changing its age-old witness to the Eternal and Unchanging God.⁷

As we add additional liturgical material, we consciously choose material or write material that is steeped in the scriptures. In many ways what needs to be said, taught, understood has already been spoken by the prophetic voices of our biblical tradition.

⁷ Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing: A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1985), 3.

When we create new prayers we do so by grounding ourselves first in the biblical story that expresses that particular petition, need, or desire. For example, the post communion prayer from the Scottish Episcopal Church's eucharistic liturgy articulates the parable of the lost son in ways that speak to anyone who has ever felt lost. "Father of all, we give you thanks and praise that when we were still far off you met us in your Son and brought us home. . . ." We do not need to know the story to feel the pull homeward expressed in the prayer, but as we learn more about scripture, the prayer continues to unfold. The reverse is true as well, the more we pray the prayer the more the parable itself unfolds for us within our lives.⁸ Liturgy steeped in the scriptures is part of our DNA as Anglicans thus the texts written for our worship as the church of the 21st century should begin and end with their foundation firmly planted in the scriptures.

Agreeable to the practices of the Early Church

As we have seen from our look at our liturgy throughout history, structure plays a huge role in the eucharistic rite. As far back as Cramner's two prayer books we have seen the ways in which structure articulates theology, and how a change in structure can shift the focus and meaning of the eucharistic rite. We saw the importance of structure underlined again when The Episcopal Church adopted the Scottish-West Syrian eucharistic structure. We see it expressed more recently when the liturgists of Vatican II through *Sacrosanctum Concilium* made a conscious choice to return to the practices of the early church. The liturgical movement reclaimed the structure established by Justin Martyr in the second century.

⁸ The Scottish Episcopal Church, *Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers* (Edinburgh: the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1996), page 21, Section 24, prayer b. http://scotland.anglican.org/media/liturgy/liturgy/scottish_liturgy_1982_a4.pdf (accessed on December 9, 2013).

As we move forward toward further liturgical renewal across the Anglican Communion, the IALC affirms the importance of structure for the eucharistic rite. In an attempt to clarify and adopt a common structure for the Eucharist, they recommend this basic structure for Sunday assembly:⁹

1. Gathering God's People. The people of God gather as an assembly to draw near to God and to celebrate new life in Jesus Christ.
2. Proclaiming and Receiving the Word of God. The scriptures are read and the word of God is celebrated in song and silence, reflection, preaching, and response.
3. Prayers of the People. The people of God, as the royal priesthood, intercede for the world, the church, the local community, and all in need.
4. Celebrating at the Lord's Table. The assembly offers praise and thanksgiving over the bread and wine and partakes in the body and blood of Christ.
5. Going out as God's People. The assembly disperses for a life of faith and service in the world.

Liturgical scholars like Taft and Dix would argue that it is the structure that provides the sense that all is right with the worship. If the liturgy follows the structure that the worshiping assembly is accustomed to, the texts can change without causing much distress. As we move forward toward changing our current liturgies, it is wise for us to realize that the structure is more than just an order of events, the structure is a theological statement in itself. That the liturgy of the word is balanced by the liturgy of

⁹ David R. Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*, Grove Worship Series 135 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1996), 22-23.

the table and they hinge at the peace matters, and shapes our experience and thus is primary theology.¹⁰ Given the importance of liturgical structure, it seems reasonable to utilize the Order for Worship in the Book of Common Prayer 1979 as a foundational tool for creating new eucharistic liturgies. As it maintains the structure that is comfortable for those who are used to the BCP 1979, and it is a structure that is clear and defined, it creates a safe foundation for everyone in the worshiping congregation. If we want to do something responsive and “new” it makes sense to hang it on the framework provided by the Order for Worship. In virtually all circumstances a very careful and clearly articulated structure is the key to a liturgy that will be well received, flow easily, and ultimately function to connect people to God and God to the people. One of the most fundamental skills a liturgist can bring to working with new liturgies is a clear and profound understanding of the structures of the worship service, why those structures exist, and what they articulate theologically.

Unifying to the Realm

While we may not think in terms of a liturgy being unifying to the realm, it is from this sense of the liturgy holding everyone together that we find our core as Anglicans. The Elizabethan Prayer Book establishes a unity of prayer without uniformity in practice. This becomes a defining Anglican principle, that unity of worship supercedes uniformity of belief. In our own day the wide middle way continues to be the path forward even as we look to adaptation. The liturgy needs to allow for some ambiguity without being anything goes. For that to be possible the ambiguity needs to be carefully crafted, intentionally leaving a little room for interpretation within the tenants of our

¹⁰ Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 109. For his full discussion on the taxonomy of primary theology see 73 – 110.

theology. This allows for liturgy that is unifying without implying absolute uniformity of belief.

As we look to liturgical change, it may not be the English understanding of realm, but our own understanding of the church that is at stake. If we want to maintain a relationship with the more traditional church while we are creating new liturgies for an under represented population (or even a population which will always be beyond the walls of a traditional church), we can learn a great deal from this idea of walking the wide middle way. Unifying to the realm speaks to a balanced approach to adaptation. Particularly for those of us who serve the traditional church, even as we look to create liturgies for those who may not be in the building, it is necessary for us to walk carefully between newer texts and beloved traditional liturgies.

When walking the middle way of introducing new liturgies within the church, faithful adaptation is a balance between not holding the traditional elements of the liturgy too tightly, nor doing new for the sake of being new. This is truly a walk of the Elizabethan wide middle way. Doing something new for the sake of new has always been frowned upon in the Anglican tradition, from our earliest prayers. Choosing what of our tradition we retain and what we can change becomes an on going discipline of a faithful liturgist. It is helpful to see tradition in a more dynamic sense than we tend to. Taft articulates it well:

Tradition is the church's self-consciousness now of that which has been handed on to it not as an inert treasure, but as a dynamic principle of life. It is the church's contemporary reality understood genetically, in continuity with that which produced it. The very basis of the church's ideal is to represent faithfully and reinterpret for each new circumstance and age, the will and the message of its founder not only at its point of origin, but at every moment of the continuum at which that will and message have been manifested. We study the history of tradition not because we are interested in reviving a dead past, but in order to

promote a contemporary understanding of Christian life in terms of its origins and evolution. . . . The past is always instructive but never normative. What its study, like all study, should provide is understanding, an understanding that challenges myths and frees us from the tyranny not just of any one frozen slice of the past, but also from the tyranny of the latest cliché, so that we can move ahead to solutions suitable for today in faithful freedom, faithful to living tradition that is always indebted to but free of the past.¹¹

It is difficult for a passionate liturgist to admit, but the liturgy is not the point. It is a carefully crafted vehicle, but not an end in itself. The worship of God in authentic ways is the point, always. Most of us have experienced worship that seems to worship the tradition, focusing too much on maintaining traditional ritual elements, drawing attention to the liturgical piety, which in fact trivializes the ritual and the worship. Self consciously traditional liturgy is often more about the liturgy and maintaining a tight grip on tradition than it is about glorifying God. The same can be said about those who pride themselves on throwing out the traditional liturgy, who seem to worship in defiance of the traditional rites. Both extremes place the liturgy in whatever form that takes, either highly traditional or incredibly modern, above the worship of God for sake of the hearts and souls of the people there gathered and the world for which they pray. The point of the liturgy is neither the overly pious censing of the altar nor the radically rocking praise band. The point is the vertical axis between God and the people, and making a genuine and heartfelt connection that radiates God's salvation to a broken world. The wide middle way between the extremes of doing tradition for the sake of tradition and doing new for the sake of being new is a faithful Anglican liturgical stance. Kavanaugh articulates the danger of being new for the sake of new:

¹¹ Robert Taft, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, (Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, 1997), 290-291.

Creativity of the Spontaneous Me variety condemns rite and symbol to lingering deaths by trivialization, bemusing those who would communicate by rite and symbol to a point where they finally wander away in search of something which appears to be more stable and power-laden.¹²

On the other side, Ruth Meyers describes how important it is that liturgy continue to find ways to speak from the changing human context:

Christian teaching about the incarnation asserts that God meets us in our historical particularities, in the context of our limited human understanding. As language and cultures change over time and in different places, Christian worship must continue to find new ways of articulating the mystery of God who is revealed in the person and work of Jesus. Continuity with received tradition is crucial, as is sensitivity to the experiences of the contemporary worshipping community.¹³

The balance between the tradition and the needs of our changing context is a difficult but important one to maintain. Certainly unifying to the realm has taken on new dimensions in our current context.

Edifying to the People

As mentioned earlier, from the discussions around the first Prayer Book in The Episcopal Church we have the principle that which is not doctrine can be adapted and changed in order that it be edifying to the people. From a liturgical standpoint this could be as simple as providing liturgy that is in the language of the people, or as complex as finding ways to teach through the liturgy. As much as Kavanagh would argue against it, liturgy can be a vehicle for teaching, though teaching should not be the purpose for the liturgy. As we enter an era where the majority of people are truly “unchurched” we need

¹² Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 102.

¹³ Ruth Meyers, “One Bread, One Body,” in *Our Thanks and Praise: The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, ed. David Holeton, (Ontario: Anglican Book Centre, 1998), 97.

to recognize how much of what we are doing implies that the people worshipping be “in the know.”

Much as the printing press allowed for liturgical change in the reformation, so current technology allows us to provide worship tools that teach as well as guide through a worship service. The information need not be overbearing nor lengthy, but information that assumes nothing is always helpful to those who are new to a worship service (and often edifying to those who have worshiped in the tradition for years as well).

The further from the church proper we find ourselves, the less we can assume and the more information we should be willing to provide. “Ashes to Go” is a great way to get out into the greater community and bring our rites to a needy world, but to assume that everyone who walks by will understand what we are doing is at best foolish and at worst arrogant. Having an explanation about how this practice has been important to people over generations and why we find it important to our own lives makes this accessible to people, which is the point of the venture. Having a small card that holds a sentence or two about Ash Wednesday and the prayer prayed as ashes are imposed is edifying to the people and very much in keeping with our Anglican liturgical roots. Having our contact information on the other side makes the point clear, this is about relationship and connection, between us and between ourselves and God. This is more than a ritual, this is rite, it enacts what it portrays.

Within the church walls, we can do the same. In our diocese there is constant murmuring about the Nicene Creed. Rather than slog through it week after week with a shrug and an excuse about it being required, we can do better. In our worship booklets we include some education in the pages after the liturgy. About the season, about the

portions of the liturgy that may have changed for this season, about the worship materials utilized, and about the portions of the liturgy with which some people may be struggling. A brief explanation of the history of the Nicene Creed, its origination and purpose and how it ties us to the Eastern Church is edifying to the people, and (other than perhaps including an asterisk indicating that there is explanation in the end pages) is not at all clunky to include. It changes nothing in the liturgy but provides edification and an entry into further discussion with the clergy, which is a good thing.

Should there be Episcopal provision for the utilization of liturgies from beyond The Episcopal Church, an explanation of what has been chosen, what it offers, and a brief introduction to the church in the Anglican Communion from which the liturgy comes is appropriate and necessary. The end pages of the worship booklet provide that opportunity.

The Application of Liturgical Principles

Before we set out to adapt or craft liturgy, we need to consider how these ideas work in their application. What is it that we are expressing in new language? What core theological principles are we finding new ways to proclaim? Given our principle that all which is not doctrine can be changed, the reverse is also true. All that is doctrine needs to be retained. The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation put forth the following as core doctrinal themes that bind us together across the Communion and should be expressed through our liturgy. For the purposes of our exploration, we look to the task

force that worked on eucharistic theology. The following are the doctrinal and theological core principles as outlined by the IALC for the eucharistic prayer.¹⁴

1. The Doctrine of the Trinity: it is important that the eucharistic rite reflect the full expression of our Trinitarian faith.
2. Thanksgiving and Blessing: the entire eucharistic rite should be grounded in thanksgiving, so that “thanksgiving permeates every aspect of it.”¹⁵
3. The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist: the Risen Lord is present throughout the eucharistic celebration, and in particular the mystery of Christ’s presence is recognized and celebrated in the whole sacramental action in which the bread and wine is taken, blessed, and shared by the gathered faithful. This encounter is more than a remembering, it is an encounter, through grace, with the Risen Lord.
4. Sacrifice: this section tackles the difficult issues of sacrifice and atonement, as well as eucharistic sacrifice as appropriate to the eucharistic prayer, and separate from the atonement, and representative of an offering of our selves and our sacrifice of praise. This is separate from the single atoning work of God through the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, for the redemption of the world.
5. Memorial: Memory, Time and Redemption: memory in the eucharistic prayer serves as a dynamic concept that both looks back to the events of the last supper, the cross and the resurrection, as well as looks forward to the end of time. “It means that the Lord’s Supper is both a part of time and history and also a window

¹⁴ David R. Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*, Grove Worship Series 135 (Nottingham: Grove Books, 1996), 9-19.

¹⁵ Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, 11.

into eternity, because God's view on us is one that sees history whole, and not partial."¹⁶

6. Creation, Recreation, and Eschatology: at the Eucharist the church is a microcosm of the creation of the Triune God, celebrates and gives voice to creation as it celebrates and participates in God's redemption of creation, and new life in the Spirit.

As we have said before, the purpose of liturgical adaptation is to allow the liturgy to be a vehicle for the authentic worship of a given community from its own context. It seems important to keep our focus on what it is we are attempting to communicate. These themes are core to our theological identity as Anglicans and provide solid moorings for our liturgy. Does the liturgy we have created or adapted speak clearly to these core theological principles? Given the opportunity to craft liturgy that speaks to and for the people from a particular context, it is important that what we are articulating is true to our core theological principles. Celebrating Creation is not a new fad, it may be a new articulation for our church but it is an expression of theology that is foundational to being Anglicans. Recognizing Mitchell's comment about the eucharistic prayers of the BCP 1979, no single prayer can speak everything that can or should be said, it is possible that any given moment in any given liturgy may only express some of the principles. Though most liturgies touch on all of these in some way, it is possible to take a season to explore several of the principles more completely in our worship. For example, setting aside several weeks of the Season after Pentecost to focus on Thanksgiving and Blessing and

¹⁶ Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, 17.

crafting a liturgy that allows a congregation to focus on those themes in a rich and intentional way.

The Experience of the Worshiping Community

Our careful attention to the ways in which we are articulating the core doctrine of our theology is balanced by our equal attention to the experience of the worshiping community. Louis Weil is incredibly helpful here, particularly in his book, *Liturgical Sense*. While the structure is vital, the liturgy needs to feel integrated and whole. It cannot come across as a laundry list of structural parts, it is rather the combined worship of the gathered community.¹⁷ The worshiping community should feel the balance of word, prayer and scripture; the liturgy should live out the equal importance of the liturgy of word and table.

Coming from a culture that is pervaded by literalism, the worshiping community needs the subversive symbols of an authentic liturgical act. Weil writes:

When the fundamental symbols expressed in an authentic liturgical act take root in our daily lives, those symbols have the power to touch the deepest levels of our humanity, leading us into a path of transformation.¹⁸

The liturgy should express our core value of corporate worship, particularly the full participation of the gathered body in the Eucharist, as it reflects our understanding of the very nature of what it means to be the Church.¹⁹ Full participation of the gathered

¹⁷ Louis Weil, *Liturgical Sense: The Logic of Rite*, (New York: Seabury Books, 2013), 55.

¹⁸ Louis Weil, *Liturgical Sense*, 64.

¹⁹ Louis Weil, *Liturgical Sense*, 62.

community as con-celebrants in the Eucharist pulls us out of our myopic focus on self and opens to us participation in community and in the life of Christ.²⁰

Lay participation in the liturgy is a foundational reform ideal and true to the core of our liturgical tradition. Yet it doesn't mean personal, individual participation as in having your personal conversion experience. Rather our focus is participation of the laity as a whole, or as individuals might participate to create something which reflects or contributes to the whole body of the worshipping faithful. So the individual reflections we often see in emerging churches would be too specific to the individual, too "all about me" to be Anglican. In the preface to *Supplemental Liturgical Materials, 1991*, the Standing Liturgical Commission carefully outlines the breadth and scope of the use of the materials in worship:

Anglicanism has historically understood worship as the experience of the gathered community. Worship which is formed by the Book of Common Prayer makes what would otherwise be an individual experience, or experience of a collection of individuals, a common experience, one "greater than the sum of its parts."²¹

This feeling that we are worshipping together as a corporate body is in some ways unique to the Anglican tradition, and it offers an alternative to the overwhelming sense of isolation so prevalent in the current culture. That we worship together as one people is what binds us as a people of common prayer, rather than individuals who happen to be saying the same words at any given moment.

Part of our awareness of the worshipping experience is our attention to language. As the Standing Liturgical Commission also commented in the preface to their

²⁰ Louis Weil, *Liturgical Sense*, 62.

²¹ The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991), 8-10.

Supplemental Liturgical Materials, 1991, the principles of the original prayer book studies had been tested and proved, and they are:

remaining faithful to the familiar forms of Anglican worship; drawing ‘new’ prayer material directly from biblical and other traditional texts; seeking balanced rather than ‘neutral’ language and imagery for speaking of God.”²²

How we speak about God, how open the language, how much it invites others to engage and pray is an issue of both who we are – an inclusive and encompassing community, as well as our understanding of the nature of God – too large to be contained in our limited vocabulary. Our search for more expansive language for God and our relationship with God is an on-going act of theology. Marilyn McCord Adams is famous for saying: “God is very, very big, and we are very, very small.”²³ Our language about God should attempt to express the vastness of God as well as the myriad of ways in which the incarnation of God in the world took on the particularities of humanity.

As we move into the daily application of these ideas for liturgical change, we need to also keep in mind the quality of worship materials. How does ease of use balance with flexibility or provide the ability for people to look up from their text and experience worship? Is the worship booklet tactile? Does it allow space for the more subtle aspects of worship, does it open a congregation up to elements of silence? Do the spacing and the presentation of the material speak to the liturgical values? Is it inviting and inclusive? Is

²² The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991), 5.

²³ Marilyn McCord Adams, “Face to Faith,” in *The Guardian*, (May 15, 2009), available online: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2009/may/16/conference-faith-religion-institute-education> (accessed on December 26, 2013). For her full discussion of the “Size Gap” see her book, *Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1999).

it engaging and worth the time and attention of those who created it as well as those who are using it for worship?

Lastly, there is the ecumenical issue. In keeping with our understanding that unity of worship is more valuable than a uniformity of practice, how does our worship invite and include our ecumenical brothers and sisters? In this day and age when economically depressed areas are seeing an increased instance of church closings, the openness of a liturgy for those who may be from other traditions seems more than an issue of hospitality, it is an effort to include everyone into the body of the worshiping community.

IN CONCLUSION: A TOOL OF ADAPTIVE LITURGY

Whether we are evaluating a liturgy that we discovered in an emerging church setting, or another liturgy that speaks to us, or we are crafting our own, there are certain basic principles that guide our way. While the list is not exhaustive, these are helpful core principles for our work in adaptive liturgy.

Structure: Does it follow the accepted structure of the rite? If not, why not? And what does that structural shift articulate? Is the point of the shift important enough to warrant the change in structure? Arguably the liturgy of the palms just before the liturgy of the passion alters the structure of the eucharistic rite on Palm Sunday, but it is done intentionally and with theological purpose. If we are following the traditional structure of the eucharistic prayer in The Episcopal Church, we need to note that inclusion of an epiclesis is important for us theologically and liturgically. (That becomes important when considering importing a eucharistic rite from somewhere else in the Anglican Communion, for many churches in the Communion follow the Church of England's rite which did not traditionally include an epiclesis.)

Balance: Does the liturgy maintain a balance of scripture, prayer and sacrament? For example, a change to the amount of scripture included warrants a close look at how that affects the overall balance of the entire rite.

Theology: That which is not doctrine can be altered, how does this new expression of the liturgy express the theology of the tradition? Keeping in mind that not every liturgy needs to express all of the theology of the church, there is still a need for every liturgy to be well grounded in the theology of the church. Looking to the eucharistic theology as outlined by the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation is helpful as a guide for eucharistic doctrine.

Integrity: Does it hold together as a whole? Or does it feel like a laundry list of liturgical elements? If the liturgy has been drawn from a variety of resources, this is a particular issue. If a liturgy is being crafted to express a particular theological theme, the theme can become a tool for providing unity between the elements.

Accessibility: Is it expressed in language that is understood by the people? As we saw from the work of Anscar Chupungco, the primary goal of liturgical adaptation has been to provide worship that is in the language and culture of that particular worshipping community. Which does not necessarily imply that the language of the rite is colloquially casual, but that it is understood and accessible to the worshipping community.

Beauty: While being in language of the people invites greater participation, it need not be flat or so common place that it is unrecognizable as Anglican prayer. The prayer of the church should maintain the rhythm and poetry of our Anglican tradition. Prayer is our best effort of communicating our praise and petition to God and should reflect our best. Within our tradition corporate prayer has structure and rhythm, and it is beautiful.

Purpose: What is the point of this endeavor? Whether we are considering bringing in a new liturgy from another source or we are crafting our own, what is the point? Liturgical adaptation is grounded in the theology of the incarnation and as such is a theological act. It matters, it weighs in, and it needs to be taken seriously. There are good reasons, drawn from our own tradition, to engage in liturgical adaptation. When we are in the midst of it, there is merit in stepping back and checking in to be sure we are being purposeful and not just creating something new for the sake of being new. This is where the fundamentals from the creation of the prayer book are helpful. Is it grounded in Holy Scripture? Agreeable to the practices of the early church? Unifying to the realm? Edifying to the people? We have discussed at length how these concepts are expressed for us in the 21st century; how does this particular liturgy measure up? Does this liturgy matter to the gathered body of the faithful? Will this liturgy invite people to engage theological concepts that are transformative? (That could be a focus on Thanksgiving and Blessing, or the concept of Reconciliation, or upholding the value of Creation, or a liturgy speaks to Justice and Mercy, among other core theological themes.)

Emerging: If this is a liturgy that strives to be welcoming to those beyond the traditional walls of the church, is it written in such a way that others can easily engage with the worship? And is it then offered in places where those people are likely to be? (Or is this just an exercise in being welcoming for our own sake?) Because it is often difficult to create liturgy for those who are not in the room, there is a lot to be gained by spending time with a variety of emerging church liturgies if we can get our hands on some. Better yet, take the time to visit a community that is worshiping in ways that are truly inviting to

people beyond the traditional church community. It is easier to write a ‘low barrier’ liturgy from this widened perspective.

Intention: Finally, how we curate this worship will matter in some ways more than the liturgy itself. If we are uncomfortable or anxious the worshiping community will be as well. If the decision to create or adopt a new liturgy is made faithfully and carefully for reasons that are well within our tradition, and important to the gathered community, then there is nothing to be anxious about. Liturgical adaptation for these reasons is well within our tradition and is a faithful expression of Anglicanism.

Whether our liturgy is traditional or created specifically for this community, our worship should be simple, straightforward, intentional, corporate and participatory, balanced, joyful and reverent. Every liturgy is an act of worshiping together, not performing worship for others. Through it all we are invested and faithful, offering worship that is exciting and engaging and invites the participation of the gathered community. As Bishop Stephen Lane often says in the Diocese of Maine, “I want Episcopalians to be excited about worship, to anticipate worship, to expect that God might show up on Sunday.”¹

¹ Stephen Lane, Bishop of Maine, Convention Address to the 194th Diocesan Convention, available here: <http://www.episcopalmaine.org/images/diocese/convention/2013bishopaddress.pdf> (accessed December 30, 2013). Specific excerpt below:

“Clergy need to focus their time and attention in developing relationships with congregants and communities and in helping Christians prepare to live out their faith in the 21st century. Lay leadership needs to focus on organizing the faith community for ministry. Critical to that work is offering worship that is engaging and life changing. I want Episcopalians to be excited about worship, to anticipate worship, to expect that God might show up on Sunday. I want Episcopalians to be challenged, inspired and moved. I want clergy to feel free to try new approaches and new music and to increase the participation of the people in worship. I want all of us to stop looking down at books and look up to God and at each other.”

Appendix A

Practically Speaking, Applications that Work

Intentional liturgy is hard work; it takes more work than opening the prayer book, and in order to make that worth it, here are some practical suggestions as you get started.

Resources

In The Episcopal Church we have resources for liturgical adaptation already available to us. Begin by using those at hand, and research those being used in the Anglican Communion. Since the Book of Common Prayer 1979 we have had the choice to use the Gloria or another song of praise, make this an active choice. We already have permission to use supplemental worship materials and there is a lot available. The eucharistic prayers of *Enriching Our Worship* are not as clunky as some have claimed, but like all liturgy, you will need to practice in order to not fumble your way through it. Depending on the amount of liturgical freedom allowed by the Episcopal presence in your diocese, there is a vast array of Anglican liturgy available from across the Anglican Communion. Be careful if you decide to import any of this whole cloth, liturgy is often copyrighted and should be a product of that particular people and their experiences. Know what you are importing, why it was written, be aware of its history and its theology before you decide to take it on.

Practice

Practice the liturgy and print the prayers with the line breaks where your natural speaking rhythm finds them most comfortable. Then be that non-anxious presence you were taught about in seminary. There will be times that are not as smooth as when you were leading worship by rote, but you will be invested in this intentional liturgy differently as well. There will be times when it clunks along. Be sure to make a note of what did not work, see what you can do to fix it in the short term, and definitely make a note for future planning. Give yourself and the worshiping congregation a chance to get used to it. Consider how it feels toward the last weeks of the season and then make your decisions moving forward.

Plan by Season

Intentional liturgy takes time and work, therefore it is easier to do by season. Seasonal booklets ease the week-to-week burden of production, provide a reasonable way to hold down costs and be sensible about resources, and are a great way to educate about the season. Crafting a liturgy for a season and then worshipping with it gives the congregation an opportunity to become accustomed to the rhythm of it, and lets everyone know this is a limited run. This is not a forever decision.

Seasonal booklets provide the opportunity to teach without making teaching the point. The color of the season is used for the booklet cover, the theme of the season is overt and printed on the cover, the back pages are available for further explanation, a guide to newcomers, whatever seems necessary and appropriate. Each week the lessons and selected hymns and other information are available on a single sheet of printed paper,

which can be tucked into the booklet. At St. Bartholomew's we have chairs rather than pews, and thus have no bookracks. We have found it reasonable for people to juggle one book, but not two. On any given Sunday worshipers use a booklet with the weekly insert and the hymnal. It is possible to include everything we need in the supplemental worship materials, but we have found that to be excessive in terms of cost and preparation time. Currently, we produce a booklet every season, which can be as often as every five weeks or so, or during the Season after Pentecost, can go many months. We print a single page insert and use *The Hymnal 1982*, or *Wonder, Love and Praise*. Again, because handling more than one book is problematic all the hymns are drawn from one hymnal for each Sunday. Our booklets are printed on regular copy paper with card stock for the cover. They hold up reasonably well for many months at a time. We have found it helpful to print the inserts on a light color copy paper, so they are easily accessible even when people tuck them into the booklet or hymnal. We change the color of the insert every week, so it is also easy to see if the insert is the correct one (and not one inadvertently left from last week).

Be Open

Intentional liturgy means we are making choices for particular reasons, be willing to explain your choices, should someone ask. For the most part people are reassured to learn that you are doing this intentionally, that you are wrestling with the pieces, that you care this much about their worshiping experience. Include those who are interested in being involved. A liturgy of the people should include those people in its creation. Be open

with the parish about what you are doing, and the choices you are making. Be open to feedback about how it is going from their perspective.

Relax

Give yourself permission to make mistakes, because you are going to make them, that is a given. Relax, breathe and give yourself a break. The point is not to be a perfect worship leader, the point is to worship with integrity. Again, people will be generous with you if you are able to admit to mistakes without being obsessed about them, and if you are focused on what is truly important, which is the authentic worship of the gathered community, not a perfect performance of liturgy.

Keep it Temporary

Responsive liturgy is necessarily temporary; the point is to be nimble, well positioned to respond. Be clear with everyone that the liturgy is temporary, it moves with the season.

The temporary nature of seasonal liturgy allows everyone some room. At St.

Bartholomew's, if you are not a fan of this particular seasonal choice, it is okay, it will change. If you are a fan, do not get too attached, because it will change. In some ways this is our wide middle way in action – on any given Sunday someone is thrilled with the choices, and someone else is being patient and generous with their friends, allowing us to worship in a way that is not their cup of tea. But we are all in it together and we appreciate where everyone is coming from; we move from traditional to non-traditional liturgy over the seasons throughout the year.

Be Intentional

Not all your choices are about doing a new thing, sometimes the choice involves honoring the past. For instance, a choice to do a traditional season is an active choice, not default. That season should be as intentionally crafted as any other. Reclaim what is being lost, the importance of silence, for example. Pull things forward that are becoming lost to your parish, and incorporate them. In our parish what is being lost is the language of Morning and Evening Prayer. We include the canticles from Morning Prayer in our Sunday morning worship, by including the *Jubilate* or the *Venite* instead of the *Gloria* at various points during the year. We have been known to incorporate *the Song of Simeon* as the Post Communion Prayer during Advent. Reclaiming the prayers of the offices has become an important liturgical theme for us.

Holy Days are Unique Opportunities

Stand-alone bulletins are helpful for single services, and allow the liturgy to be specific to that particular day and celebration. You can craft these services carefully for the day. For example, on Palm Sunday we took the assigned second lesson in the liturgy of the passion, Philippians 2:6-11, and put it in the place of the creed, so the whole congregation had the opportunity to speak this ancient Christian hymn about the nature of Christ.¹ If your church does a lot of baptisms you may find that it is helpful to produce a booklet for those services. We have found that it is easier for most people to navigate a booklet than the BCP (and particularly for those joining the community specifically for the baptism). Our baptismal booklet functions like a seasonal booklet, with an insert that

¹ We are not the first to do this, it is included in Common Worship, Church of England, as one of the accepted creeds. Found here: <http://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/newpatterns/contents/sectione.aspx> (accessed on December 26, 2013).

holds the specific information for the day. People then have in hand the booklet with insert, and the hymnal.

Incorporate Themes for the Seasons

Within the liturgical season, select themes on which to focus. The list of themes from the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation is a good place to begin if you need some ideas. Because these are selected from the core of our theology, they should be readily articulated throughout the liturgy. When it is working well, you will notice that week after week you will hear the theme articulated in the lessons, and then hear the words in the eucharistic prayer reverberating with the same theme. Themes such as Creation, Reconciliation, Thanksgiving, Generosity, What it means to be created in the image of God: a people of Service, a people of Justice and Mercy, a people of Peace. The core of our theology comes to the forefront when we are intentionally committed to articulating it.

If you are intentional about the rest of the life of parish around the same theme, it works incredibly well. The community walks through the season gaining a deeper understanding of these core theological ideas in their education program, in the parish mission project, in a dinner celebrating the theme. Week after week, praying this theme together, becoming a people who are: thankful, generous, forgiving and forgiven, and praying them together with a depth of experience. This is primary theology in action. For example last year we explored the concept of reconciliation in Lent, with a liturgy that focused on reconciliation and forgiveness. Alongside this we offered adult education opportunities such as reading Michael Battle's *Practicing Reconciliation in a Violent*

World, and an art group experiencing the exercises of Michael Sullivan's *Windows into the Light: A Lenten Journey of Stories and Art*, which allows people to delve into their own stories and address hurts and losses through art. The Children's Sunday School curriculum focused on themes of forgiveness, centered around the parable of the Prodigal Son. (Assigned in the lectionary texts for Lent of 2013.)

Collaborate

There is a great deal of joy to be had in the work of creating intentional liturgy, and as we are colleagues (and leading church is not a competitive sport), we are all in this effort together. Find others who are interested in this venture, collaborate with them to craft seasonal liturgy, or a liturgy for a clergy day, and to share resources you have found helpful. Be willing to hand out your seasonal booklet at a clergy meeting (and print more than you think you will need on Sundays because people visiting will routinely take them home to their parishes). When something is working well, share it. When something has not worked well, share what you learned from it, so others can learn from your experience.

Be Joyful

The purpose of our liturgy is to glorify God and to share the hope that is within us with the world. To connect God and God's people in ways that are transformative for those worshiping, and through them, transformative for the whole world. It starts with expressing that hope in joyful appreciation for the opportunity to do this work with the

gathered faithful. Be joyful in your expression of the liturgy, reverently joyful, worshiping God with awe and wonder and joy.

Appendix B

The First Act of Uniformity 1549¹

(2 & 3 Edward VI, c. 1)

Where of long time there has been had in this realm of England and in Wales divers forms of common prayer, commonly called the service of the Church; that is to say the Use of Sarum, of York, of Bangor, and of Lincoln; and besides the same now of late much more divers and sundry forms and fashions have been used in the cathedral and parish churches of England and Wales, as well concerning the Matins or Morning Prayer and the Evensong, as also concerning the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass, with divers and sundry rites and ceremonies concerning the same, and in the administration of other sacraments of the Church: and as the doers and executors of the said rites and ceremonies, in other form than of late years they have been used, were pleased therewith, so others, not using the same rites and ceremonies, were thereby greatly offended; And albeit the king's majesty, with the advice of his most entirely beloved uncle, the lord protector, and other of his highness's council, has heretofore divers times essayed to stay innovations or new rites concerning the premises; yet the same has not had such good success as his highness required in that behalf: Whereupon his highness by the most prudent advice- aforesaid, being pleased to bear with the frailty and weakness of his subjects in that behalf, of his great clemency has not been only content to abstain from punishment of those that have offended in that behalf, for that his highness taketh that they did it of a good zeal; but also to the intent a uniform quiet and godly order should be had concerning the premises, has appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned and discreet bishops, and other learned men of this realm, to consider and ponder the premises; **and thereupon having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages in the primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient and meet order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the sacraments, to be had and used in his majesty's realm of England and in Wales;** the which at this time, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement is of them concluded, set forth, and delivered to his highness, to his great comfort and quietness of mind, in a book entitled, 'The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the Use of the Church of England':

Wherefore the lords spiritual and commons, in this present parliament assembled, considering as well the most godly travail of the king's highness, of the lord protector, and of other his highness's council, in gathering and collecting the said Archbishop, bishops, and learned men together, as the godly prayers, orders, rites, and ceremonies in

¹ Text made available online at http://www.tudorplace.com.ar/Documents/first_act_of_uniformity_1549.htm accessed on July 14, 2013. Link originally utilized was through Charles Wohlers and Justus Anglicans: http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549.htm a much more credible resource. But their link to this text is currently down. Emphasis is my own. Original spelling and capitalization maintained.

the said book mentioned, and the considerations of altering those things which be altered and retaining those things which be retained in the said book, but also the honour of God and great quietness, which by the grace of God shall ensue upon the one and uniform rite and order in such common prayer and rites and external ceremonies to be used throughout England and in Wales, at Calais and the marches of the same, do give to his highness most hearty and lowly thanks for the same; and humbly pray, that it may be ordained and enacted by his majesty, with the assent of the lords and commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular person and persons that have offended concerning the premises, other than such person and persons as now be and remain in ward in the Tower of London, or in the Fleet, may be pardoned thereof; and that all and singular ministers in any cathedral or parish church or other place within this realm of England, Wales, Calais, and the marches of the same, or other the king's dominions, shall, from and after the feast of Pentecost next coming, **be bound to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, commonly called the Mass, and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the same book, and none other or otherwise.** And albeit that the same be so godly and good, that they give occasion to every honest and conformable man most willingly to embrace them, yet lest any obstinate person who willingly would disturb so godly order and quiet in this realm should not go unpunished, that it may also be ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid that if any manner of parson, vicar, or other whatsoever minister, that ought or should sing or say common prayer mentioned in the said book, or minister the sacraments, shall after the said feast of Pentecost next coming refuse to use the said common prayers, or to minister the sacraments in such cathedral or parish church or other places as he should use or minister the same, in: such order and form as they be mentioned and set forth in the said book; or shall use, wilfully and obstinately standing in the same, any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of Mass openly or privily, or Matins, Evensong, administration of the sacraments, or other open prayer than is mentioned and set forth in the said book (open prayer in and throughout this Act, is meant that prayer which is for other to come unto or hear either in common churches or private chapels or oratories, commonly called the service of the Church); or shall preach, declare, or speak anything in the derogation or depraving of the said book, or anything therein contained, or of any part thereof; and shall be thereof lawfully convicted according to the laws of this realm, by verdict of twelve men, or by his own confession, or by the notorious evidence of the fact: shall lose and forfeit to the king's highness, his heirs and successors, for his first offence, the profit of such one of his spiritual benefices or promotions as it shall please the king's highness to assign or appoint, coming and arising in one whole year next after his conviction: and also that the same person so convicted shall for the same offence suffer imprisonment by the space of six months, without bail or mainprize: and if any such person once convicted of any offence concerning the premises, shall after his first conviction again offend and be thereof in form aforesaid lawfully convicted, that then the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment by the space of one whole year, and also shall therefore be deprived ipso facto of all his spiritual promotions; and that it shall be lawful to all patrons, donors, and grantees of all and singular the same spiritual promotions, to present to the same any other able clerk, in like manner and form as though the party so offending were dead: and

that if any such person or persons, after he shall be twice convicted in form aforesaid, shall offend against any of the premises the third time, and shall be thereof in form aforesaid lawfully convicted, that then the person so offending and convicted the third time shall suffer imprisonment during his life. And if the person that shall offend and be convicted in form aforesaid concerning any of the premises, shall not be beneficed nor have any spiritual promotion, that then the same person so offending and convicted shall for the first offence suffer imprisonment during six months, without bail or mainprize: and if any such person not having any spiritual promotion, after his first conviction shall again offend in anything concerning the premises, and shall in form aforesaid be thereof lawfully convicted, that then the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment during his life.

II. And it is ordained and enacted by the authority abovesaid, that if any person or persons whatsoever, after the said feast of Pentecost next coming, shall in any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words declare or speak anything in the derogation, depraving, or despising of the same book or of anything therein contained, or any part thereof; or shall by open fact, deed, or by open threatenings, compel or cause, or otherwise procure or maintain any parson, vicar, or other minister in any cathedral or parish church, or in any chapel or other place, to sing or say any common and open prayer, or to minister any sacrament otherwise or in any other manner or form than is mentioned in the said book; or that by any of the said means shall unlawfully interrupt or let any parson, vicar, or other ministers in any cathedral or parish church, chapel, or any other place, to sing or say common and open prayer, or to minister the sacraments, or any of them, in any such manner and form as is mentioned in the said book; that then every person being thereof lawfully convicted in form abovesaid, shall forfeit to the King our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, for the first offence ten pounds. And if any person or persons, being once convicted of any such offence, again offend against any of the premises, and shall in form aforesaid be thereof lawfully convicted, that then the same persons so offending and convicted shall for the second offence forfeit to the King our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, twenty pounds; and if any person after he, in form aforesaid, shall have been twice convicted of any offence concerning any of the premises, shall offend the third time, and be thereof in form abovesaid lawfully convicted, that then every person so offending and convicted shall for his third offence forfeit to our sovereign lord the King all his goods and chattels, and shall suffer imprisonment during his life: and if any person or persons, that for his first offence concerning the premises shall be convicted in form aforesaid, do not pay the sum to be paid by virtue of his conviction, in such manner and form as the same ought to be paid, within six weeks next after his conviction, that then every person so convicted, and so not paying the same, shall for the same first offence, instead of the said ten pounds, suffer imprisonment by the space of three months without bail or mainprize. And if any person or persons, that for his second offence concerning the premises shall be convicted in form aforesaid, do not pay the sum to be paid by virtue of his conviction, in such manner and form as the same ought to be paid, within six weeks next after his said second conviction, that then every person so convicted, and not so paying the same, shall for the same second offence, instead of the said twenty pounds, suffer imprisonment during six months without bail or mainprize.

III. And it is ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every justices of oyer and terminer, or justices of assize, shall have full power and authority in every of their open and general sessions to inquire, hear, and determine all and all manner of offences that shall be committed or done contrary to any article contained in this present Act, within the limits of the commission to them directed, and to make process for the execution of the same, as they may do against any person being indicted before them of trespass, or lawfully convicted thereof.

IV. Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every Archbishop and Bishop shall or may at all time and times at his liberty and pleasure join and associate himself, by virtue of this Act, to the said justices of oyer and terminer, or to the said justices of assize, at every of the said open and general sessions to be holden in any place within his diocese, for and to the inquiry, hearing, and determining of the offences aforesaid.

V. Provided always, that it shall be lawful to any man that understands the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew tongue, or other strange tongue, to say and have the said prayers, heretofore specified, of Matins and Evensong in Latin, or any such other tongue, saying the same privately, as they do understand;

VI. And for the further encouraging of learning in the tongues in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, to use and exercise in their common and open prayer in their chapels (being no parish churches) or other places of prayer, the Matins, Evensong, Litany, and all other prayers (the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass, excepted) prescribed in the said book, in Greek, Latin, or Hebrew; anything in this present Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

VII. Provided also, that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible, at any due time, not letting or omitting thereby the service or any part thereof mentioned in the said book.

VIII. Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the books concerning the said services shall at the costs and charges of the parishioners of every parish and cathedral church be attained and gotten before the feast of Pentecost next following, or before; and that all such parish and cathedral churches, or other places where the said books shall be attained and gotten before the said feast of Pentecost, shall within three weeks next after the said books so attained and gotten use the said service, and put the same in use according to this Act.

IX. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person or persons shall be at any time hereafter impeached or otherwise molested of or for any of the offences above mentioned, hereafter to be committed or done contrary to this Act, unless he or they so offending be thereof indicted at the next general sessions to be holden before any such of the justices of oyer and terminer or justices of assize, next after any offence

committed or done contrary to the tenor of this Act.

X. Provided always, and be it ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and singular lords in the Parliament, for the third offence above mentioned, shall be tried by their peers.

XI. Provided also, and be it ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the Mayor of London, and all other Mayors, bailiffs, and other head officers of all and singular cities, boroughs, and towns corporate within this realm, Wales, Calais, and the marches of the same, to the which justices of assize do not commonly repair, shall have full power and authority by virtue of this Act to inquire, hear, and determine the offences abovesaid, and every of them yearly, within fifteen days after the feasts of Easter and St. Michael the Archangel, in like manner and form as justices of assize and oyer and terminer may do.

XII. Provided always, and be it ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and singular archbishops and bishops, and every of their chancellors, commissaries, archdeacons, and other ordinaries, having any peculiar ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall have full power and authority by virtue of this Act, as well to inquire in their visitations, synods, and elsewhere within their jurisdiction, [or] at any other time or place, to take accusations and informations of all and every the things above mentioned, done, committed, or perpetrated, within the limits of their jurisdiction and authority, and to punish the same by admonition, excommunication, sequestration, or deprivation, and other censures and process, in like form as heretofore has been used in like cases by the king's ecclesiastical laws.

XIII. Provided always, and be it enacted, that whatsoever person offending in the premises shall for the first offence receive punishment of the ordinary, having a testimonial thereof under the said ordinary's seal, shall not for the same offence again be summoned before the justices; and likewise receiving for the said first offence punishment by the justices, he shall not for the same offence again receive punishment of the ordinary; anything contained in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Marilyn McCord, "Face to Faith," in *The Guardian*, May 15, 2009.
<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2009/may/16/conference-faith-religion-institute-education> [accessed on December 26, 2013]
- _____, *Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God*, New York: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Alexander, J. Neil, "Embrace the Happy Occasion: Prayer Book Revision in Light of Yesterday's Principles, Today's Questions, and Tomorrow's Possibilities," in *Leaps and Bounds: The Prayer Book in the 21st Century*, Edited by Paul V. Marshall and Lesley A. Northup, 177-190. Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1997.
- The Anglican Consultative Council, "The Book of Common Prayer, Prayer Book Revision," Resolution 74, in Resolutions from 1958, The Lambeth Conference Archives, London: St. Andrew's House, 1958. Available online: <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-74.cfm> (accessed on October 28, 2013).
- _____, "The Contemporary Life of Prayer," Resolution 4, in Resolutions from 1968, Lambeth Conference Archives, London: St. Andrew's House, 1968. Available online: <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1968/1968-4.cfm> (accessed on October 28, 2013).
- _____, "Cultural Identity", Resolution 36, in Resolutions from 1978, The Lambeth Conference Archives, London: St. Andrew's House, 1978. Available online: <http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1978/1978-36.cfm> (accessed on October 28, 2013).
- Baker, Jonny, *Curating Worship*. London: SPCK, 2010.
- Beckwith, R. T., "The Jewish Background to Christian Worship," *The Study of Liturgy*, Revised Edition, Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold and Paul Bradshaw, Eds., 1992.
- Bradshaw, Paul, and Maxwell Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Bradshaw, Paul, "Jewish Influence on Early Christian Liturgy: A Reappraisal", in *Jewish-Christian Relations*, and available online at: http://www.jcrelations.net/Jewish_Influence_on_Early_Christian_Liturgy__A_Re

- appraisal.3217.0.html?searchAutor=Bradshaw%252C%2BP%20Paul#37 (accessed on March 11, 2013).
- Brosend, William, *The Preaching of Jesus: Gospel Proclamation, Then and Now*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010.
- Brown, Leslie and Ronald C. D. Jasper, "The Structure and Contents of the Eucharistic Liturgy and the Daily Office," as cited in *The Holy Eucharist: The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion*, Prayer Book Studies 21, New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1970.
- Buchanan, Colin, ed., *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, Grove Liturgical Study 35, Nottingham: Grove Books, 1983.
- Anscar J. Chupungco, *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, Limited Edition by special permission of Paulist Press originally published 1982, Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006.
- _____, *Liturgies of the Future*, Limited edition by special permission of Paulist Press originally published 1982, Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006.
- _____, *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiousity, and Catechesis*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Committee on Divine Worship, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, "Stewards of the Tradition – Fifty Years After Sacrosanctum Concilium," Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2013. Available online: <http://www.usccb.org/about/divine-worship/stewards-of-the-tradition.cfm> (accessed September 29, 2013).
- Dix, Gregory, *The Shape of Liturgy*, London: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Gibbons, Edward C. S., Introduction to *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward the Sixth*, London: JM Dent & Sons, 1910.
http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549&52_Intro.htm
(accessed on July 10, 2013).
- Hatchett, Marion, "The Anglican Liturgical Tradition," in *The Anglican Tradition*, Edited by Richard Holloway. 47-77. Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1984.
- _____, *The Making of the American Prayer Book*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.
- Haugaard, William P., Preface to *The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker*, W. Speed Hill, general editor ; John E. Booty ... [et al.], contributing editors. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1993.

- Holeton, David R., ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, Dublin, Eire, 1995, Grove Worship Series 135, Nottingham: Grove Books, 1996.
- Jasper, R.C. D., and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold, and Paul Bradshaw, Editors, *The Study of Liturgy*, Revised Edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Jones, Tony, *The New Christians: Dispatches from the Emergent Frontier*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.
- Kavanagh, Aidan, *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style*, New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1982.
- , *On Liturgical Theology: the Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1981*, New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1984.
- Kimball, Dan, *Emerging Worship: Creating Worship Gatherings for New Generations*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- Lathrop, Gordon, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology, Paperback edition*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Ladd, William Palmer, Prayer Book Interleaves, 107, as reprinted in *Liturgical Change: How Much Do We Need?*, by Leonel Mitchell, Seabury Press: New York, 1975.
- Lane, Stephen, “Address to the 194th Annual Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Maine,” The Episcopal Diocese of Maine, 2013. Available online: <http://www.episcopalmaine.org/images/diocese/convention/2013bishopaddress.pdf> (accessed on December 30, 2013).
- Macy, Gary, *The Banquet’s Wisdom: A Short History of the Theologies of the Lord’s Supper*, New York: Paulist Press, 1992.
- McLaren, Brian D., *A Generous Orthodoxy*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- , *Everything Must Change: When the World’s Biggest Problems and Jesus’ Good News Collide*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2007.
- Meyers, Ruth, “One Bread, One Body,” in *Our Thanks and Praise: The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, ed. David Holeton, Anglican Book Centre: Toronto, Ontario, 1998.

- Mitchell, Leonel L., *Liturgical Change; How Much Do We Need?*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1975.
- _____, *Praying Shapes Believing: A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1985.
- Morris, Clayton L., "Prayer Book Revision or Liturgical Renewal?", in *A Prayer Book for the 21st Century*, Edited by Ruth Meyers, for The Standing Liturgical Commission, New York: Church Publishing, 1996.
- Pope Paul VI, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Vatican City: Vatican Publishing House, 1963. Available in its entirety through the Vatican Archives online at:
http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html (accessed on October 7, 2013).
- Ramshaw, Gail, *Liturgical Language: Keeping it Metaphoric, Making it Inclusive*, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- The Scottish Episcopal Church, Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers, Edinburgh: the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1996. available online:
http://scotland.anglican.org/media/liturgy/liturgy/scottish_liturgy_1982_a4.pdf (accessed on December 9, 2013).
- Smith, George Wayne, *Admirable Simplicity: Principles for Worship Planning in the Anglican Tradition*, New York, Church Hymnal Corp., 1996.
- Smith, James K.A. *Who's Afraid of Postmodernism?* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Smith, Robert, Wesley Smith and Lucas Smith, Editors, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," by Martin Luther, for *Project Wittenberg*, link:
<http://www.lutherdansk.dk/WebBabylonian%20Captivitate/Martin%20Luther.htm> (accessed on July 22, 2013). *Project Wittenberg* and corresponding database found here: <http://www.ProjectWittenberg.org/>
- The Standing Liturgical Commission, *Supplemental Liturgical Text, Prayer Book Studies 30*, New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989.
- _____, *Supplemental Liturgical Materials*, New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1991.
- Taft, Robert, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," *Worship* 52, no. 4 (July, 1978): 314-329. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials*, EBSCOhost (accessed on July 12, 2013).

- _____, *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 2nd rev. and enl. ed., Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: Belknap, 2007.
- Thompson, Bard, Editor, *Liturgies of the Western Church*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Tickle, Phyllis, *The Great Emergence: How Christianity is Changing and Why*, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2008.
- Van Slyke, Daniel, "Lex orandi lex credendi: Liturgy as Locus Theologicus in the Fifth Century?" *Josephinum Journal of Theology*, Volume 11, Number 2 (Summer/Fall 2004): <http://www.pcj.edu/journal/essays/vanslyke11-2.htm> (accessed on July 22, 2013).
- Walton, HB, & PG Medd, Editors, *The First Book of Common Prayer and The Ordinal of 1549 together with The Order of the Communion, 1548*, London: Rivingtons, 1869. <http://archive.org/details/firstbookofcommo00waltuoft> (accessed on July 15, 2013).
- Weil, Louis, *Liturgical Sense: The Logic of Rite*, New York: Seabury Books, 2013
- Wilson, H. A., Editor, *The Order of the Communion, 1548: A facsimile of the British Museum copy C. 25, f. 15.*, London: Harrison and Sons, 1908. <http://archive.org/details/orderofcommunion00chur> (accessed on July 15, 2013).
- Wohlens, Charles, Web Editor, online texts: The Book of Common Prayer, England, for *The Society of Archbishop Justus*, Peter Owen and Richard Mammana, directors, online texts of historical prayer books found at: <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/england.htm> (accessed on August 5, 2013).
- Wright, J. Robert, "The First Prayer Book of 1549," essay originally included in *But One Use*, the General Seminary Library's catalogue of an exhibition to commemorate the 450th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer, New York: St. Mark's Library, 1999. Currently available through Project Canterbury 2002: see pages 1-23, <http://anglicanhistory.org/essays/wright/1549.pdf> (accessed on July 17, 2013).
- Yuval, Israel J., "Easter and Passover as Early Jewish-Christian Dialogue", in Paul F. Bradshaw & Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds, *Passover and Easter: Origin and History to Modern Times*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.