

Part Two

GENERAL LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BOOK

THE ANCESTRY OF THE PRAYER BOOK

I. LITURGICAL LIFE AND GROWTH

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER is the product of a long evolution. Its roots reach back into both Jewish and pagan worship. It carries marks of every age of Christian history. It gathers up much of the best of the past, and adapts it to the present needs of Christian worship.

But it has achieved its present form through no mere eclectic method. It is not a manufactured article, but an organic growth. For any adequate understanding of the Book, it is therefore necessary first to see it in relation to the whole process of liturgical development. Only then can we rightly appraise its distinctive characteristics, and the principles that have made it what it is.

2. THE FORMING OF ORDERS OF WORSHIP

Early Christian worship must have been quite spontaneous in origin and method. There were at first no formal order, no settled prayers, nor any fixed place of meeting. The Christians gathered in private houses; they met in the synagogues with other Jews; they used the Temple as a place for prayer and preaching. But it is clear from the accounts in Acts that it was not long before their distinctive needs began to separate them more and more from their Jewish

brethren. The beginning of that distinction is indicated in Acts 2:46, where it is stated that they "continued daily with one accord in the temple," and also "breaking bread from house to house."

The process of creating any kind of formal order must have been very gradual. The New Testament picture of the Christians gathered for worship, as we find it for example in Corinthians, shows us a most informal and at times almost disorderly group. All took part as they were moved. Some prayed; some preached; some spoke with tongues. They sang hymns;¹ they transacted what business had to be done. It was a family gathering: and like a family, the chief sign and symbol of their unity was the Breaking of Bread, and the friendly meal or *Agapé*² which accompanied it. Neither the Temple nor the Synagogue could be used for such worship. There were also wonted ceremonies for the initiation of new adherents into their fellowship, and for the commissioning of new leaders in their community; and a little later there is some trace of a systematic care of the sick.³ Marriage also, in the light of the words of the Lord, was accepted as a divine institution; and the Burial and Resurrection of Christ had given an added significance to the burial of the dead: but both, in Jewish practice, were necessary actions rather than religious rites; the New Testament gives us no information that they were treated otherwise by Christians in apostolic times; and it was much later when the Church adopted and adapted Roman customs of marriage, and evolved its own rites for the burial and commemoration of the dead.

Two factors moulded the early forms of Christian worship.

¹Acts 16:25 (R.V.); Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16. Forms which may have been so employed occur in Rom. 13:11-12; Eph. 5:14; 1 Tim. 3:16; 2 Tim. 2:11-13.

²*i.e.*, "Love-Feast;" cf. Jude 12.

³James 5:13-16.

On the one hand was the ordinary synagogue worship in which all had been trained, and which contributed the idea of an ordered liturgical service, and the use of the Jewish Scriptures, hymns, and prayers, as a model for their own. On the other, were the ideas and actions necessitated by their new religious experience.

The forms of the synagogue service of the first century are not certainly attested; but the rabbinical writings of the first to the third centuries probably represent them with sufficient accuracy for our purposes. From the great storehouse of the *Mishnah*, modern scholars have inferred some such outline as this:⁴ (1) the *Shemá*, an extended profession of faith in the words of Deut. 6:4-9, 11; 11:13-21; and Num. 15:37-41; (2) the so-called *Eighteen Benedictions*, a chain of prayers comprising a very comprehensive General Intercession, both in scope and detail offering striking coincidences with the Christian "Prayers of the Faithful," whose parent it unquestionably was; (3) readings from the Law, and the Prophets; (4) a benediction; and (5) a sermon.

But when we compare this scheme with the early Christian "Common Prayers," whether used separately,⁵ or as a *Pro-Anaphora* introductory to the offering of the Eucharist,⁶ we see that though the Christian service covers substantially the same ground as the Jewish, it is not a copy in either content or order. For centuries the *Pro-Anaphora* did not include a profession of faith; on the other hand it did include the use of psalmody,⁷ which was no part of the Synagogue ritual, though it was a feature of the daily services in the Temple. And the order of parts was quite independent. The

⁴Paul V. Levertoff, "Synagogue Worship in the First Century," in *L. & W.* 60 ff., esp. 76 ff.

⁵*Apostolic Constitutions* viii. 36-39 (*P.G.* I. 1137 ff.; Funk I. 543 ff.); *Pilgrimage of Etheria* 24 (Heræus 28 f.; McClure 45 f.).

⁶P. 160.

⁷P. 159.

fact is that all these elements are really inevitable in any general service in any religion: and it seems that the Church evolved its own devotions out of this accustomed material, but freely and creatively under the inspiration of its own religious impetus.

The distinctively Christian elements in this common worship were the Lord's Prayer,⁸ and the Lord's Supper, called in the Acts the "Breaking of Bread."⁹ The probable nature of the latter observance in primitive use, and the manner in which a meal of fellowship was converted to a sacrificial action, will be discussed in Chapter VIII.

Congregational worship, however, necessarily settles down to some sort of agreed order of procedure. This tendency was perhaps accelerated by the fact that from the first the Christian observances were *rites* as well as services; they were actions, in which something was done as well as said. During the first two centuries, as Dr. Fortescue remarked, the dominant characteristic of the Liturgy (we may add, of other rites as well) was "somewhat free improvisation on fixed themes in a definite order."¹⁰

But striking devotional phrases have the quality of lingering in the mind, and of being used again, both by the author and by his hearers. From the first, there was a tendency to settle upon a form of words, as well as upon an order of thought. St. Clement of Rome at the end of the first century concludes his first letter to the Corinthians with a long prayer perfectly exemplifying the solemn style of the historic liturgies,¹¹ and some of his very expressions survived in later use.

⁸The use of the Lord's Prayer in private devotion is attested early in the second century by the *Didaché* (c. 8); but it was not used in the eucharistic Liturgy until the fourth century: cf. p. 173 below.

⁹Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7. ¹⁰Art. "Liturgy," in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, IX. 308.

¹¹C. 59-61: Quasten, *Monumenta* [Bib. 14], 331 ff.; quoted in translation, Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church* [Bib. 16], 168.

Another very early example, now dated about the second quarter of the second century, was the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,¹² in Syria. This prototype of the "Church Orders" was a tractate of instruction, chiefly along ethical lines, for initiates into the Faith—a sort of primitive "Confirmation Manual";—but incidentally it gave definite forms for Baptism and the Communion, as we shall see.

About the year 148, we have a careful and objective description of the same two rites in the *First Apology* of St. Justin Martyr, a reasoned explanation of Christian faith and practice addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius.¹³ This description is sufficiently accurate and comprehensive as to apply quite recognizably to any historic form of the rites down to the present day; the essential order and detail are all there. Justin implies a Trinitarian form for administering Baptism, and a liturgical narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist: but he does not quote any of the other words of the latter rite, intimating that the Thanksgiving was made "at length,"¹⁴ and "according to the ability" of the celebrant.¹⁵ Evidently in his time the service was not a settled form of words, though it was an established procedure; though *extempore*, it was not aimlessly spontaneous.

In the Early Church, therefore, we have the formative stages of a process which has endured throughout Christian history. For one lifetime after another, men brought the best powers of their minds to the worship of God, "to render thanks for the great benefits they had received at his hands, to set forth his most worthy praise, . . . and to ask those

¹²Discovered 1873 by Metropolitan Bryennios, who first published it in Constantinople, 1883; translation in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (N. Y., 1890), VII. 377 ff. Usually cited as the *Didaché*.

¹³Justin was a Gentile, born ca. 100 near Sychem in Syria, converted to the Christian faith about 130; a trained professional philosopher, and a Christian priest.

¹⁴εὐχαριστῶν . . . ἐπὶ πολλῷ ποιεῖται, c. 65 (P.G. 6. 428).

¹⁵ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, c. 67 (P.G. 6. 429).

ANCESTRY OF THE PRAYER BOOK

things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul." By the principles of survival in an organic evolution, the simplest, most universal, and most affecting thoughts and expressions became established in wonted use, and lived on after the death of those who first gave them utterance, until they became fixed Liturgies—which, long before they were inscribed upon rolls of parchment, were written in the hearts of the faithful.

3. THE FIXATION OF REGIONAL RITES

One important influence in the fixing of ritual texts appeared in those interesting circular letters covering questions of discipline and worship known as the "Church Orders." The precursor of these was the *Didaché*. Subsequent examples eliminated the didactic element of the *Didaché*, and enlarged the scope of the treatise to cover the whole internal regimen of the Church, including Holy Orders. The "Church Orders" were thus a sort of "consuetudinary" of their times, recording the formative stages of customary regulations and ritual in days before Canons were enacted, or the Liturgy fixed.

The first systematic and measurably complete of these treatments was the *Apostolic Tradition* of St. Hippolytus, leader of the Greek-speaking party in Rome, and eventually their schismatic bishop; pupil of Irenæus, and, as Dr. Cheetham aptly says, "the most remarkable man of letters produced by the Church of Rome in the first three centuries."¹⁶ He was martyred probably shortly after his exile in 235. His liturgical writings may be dated about the year 217.¹⁷ Coming toward the end of the period when Greek was used as the language of the Roman Church, his voluminous writings

¹⁶*Church History: Early Period* (Macmillan, London, 1905), 83.

¹⁷Easton, *Apostolic Tradition* [Bib. 7], 25, 63.

FIXATION OF REGIONAL RITES

fell into neglect, and have been largely lost. But the *Apostolic Tradition* was circulated throughout the Church, and, as we shall see, exercised a formative influence on the rites of many centers. The end of its pilgrimage was in Abyssinia, which it reached about the tenth century in a translation from a secondary Arabic version, where it was incorporated in the Ethiopic *Synodos* or Book of Canon Law, and where its Liturgy eventually ousted the parent Alexandrian order as the normal liturgy of the Church. Thus it was the strange and romantic destiny of this earliest standard liturgical text to have survived in constant use in the heart of Africa to the present day!

The *Apostolic Tradition* exists in five versions, Latin, Bohairic, Sahidic, Arabic, and Ethiopic, besides some important fragments of the original Greek embedded in the *Apostolic Constitutions*; and by the revolutionary researches of Dom Connolly¹⁸ and Dr. Schwartz¹⁹ it has been identified as the lost work of Hippolytus.²⁰

The *Apostolic Tradition* contains not only detailed rubrical and quasi-canonical directions, but specimen texts, for Baptism, Ordinations, and the Eucharist; as well as some valuable information for the development of the Church's Common Prayers. Hippolytus intimated that the forms of prayer are still free—using Justin's exact phrase, that they should be "according to the ability" of the celebrant:²¹—and he gives his liturgical forms as examples of the manner in which he himself was accustomed to conduct the rites; perhaps by implication of the way he considered they ought to be conducted.

¹⁸*The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* [Bib. 6].

¹⁹*Ueber die pseudoapostolische Kirchenordnungen* (Strassburg, 1910).

²⁰Translated in a critical text with admirable introduction and notes by Burton S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge, 1934).

²¹§ 10.3-6; Easton, *op. cit.*, 39.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of these texts for the study of Christian rituals. They are properly *basic*, for they furnished the crystallizing center around which all the national rites "froze" into their definitive forms. The whole of liturgical history has had to be rewritten in the light of them; and such a reconstruction is offered in the present work.

In the matter of the baptismal rites, the witness of Hippolytus for this period is corroborated by that of Cyprian and Tertullian; but for the Eucharist and for Ordination, the *Apostolic Tradition* is indispensable, standing alone in the third century, which is the most obscure period of liturgical history. In this formative epoch, when the Christian services were in general settled as orders, but not yet fixed as texts, definite allusions in the Fathers are exceedingly scant.

About the middle of the fourth century, however, the fullest and most elaborate of all the "Church Orders," the *Apostolic Constitutions*, furnishes us with a complete text of the Eucharist as celebrated in the region of Antioch, very amply confirmed in manifold detail by the writings of St. Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Jerusalem; as well as orders of Baptism and prayers of Ordination slightly elaborated from the actual text of Hippolytus; some notes on penitential discipline, and the Christian Year; directions and forms for Common Prayer; the blessing of the Oil for the Sick, and an account of the Burial and Commemoration of the Dead.

From about the same time, we have the *Sacramentary* or Book of Prayers of St. Serapion, contemporary of St. Athanasius, and Bishop of the rural diocese of Thmuis in the Nile Delta. Serapion's work is not a "Church Order," as it contains no canonical matter, and a minimum of rubric. It consists of the text of the officiant's prayers for much the

same rites and services as those of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Certain peculiarities of arrangement just disqualify it from the status of an official "Sacramentary"; it looks more like the notes of an interested visitor.²²

As we shall see later, it was during this fourth century that the texts of the great families of eucharistic liturgies took the definite forms which they still maintain. There were a few types, and not as many liturgies as there were individual congregations: because any rural town looks toward some larger center which it calls "The City"; and though no autocratic organization existed at this period, and though also throughout history there has been surprisingly little attempt on the part of the great sees to impose conformity in the matter of rite, yet the suburban churches showed themselves eager to copy the usage of outstanding and influential centers. Hence the growth of the historic liturgies has always been on a regional basis, in provincial types.

The tendency to differentiation was, however, counter-balanced to a considerable extent by the free exchange of ideas, expressions, and ceremonial between the various provinces by the agency of individual churchmen as they traveled back and forth, so that a particularly poignant phrase or edifying custom originating in one part of the world might be readily incorporated into the still elastic order of a number of other rites. This influence indeed has never altogether ceased, and probably never will, though subsequent conditions have much restricted its operation. But it was particularly active throughout the first four centuries, while the communion of the Church remained un-

²²Ed. F. E. Brightman in *J.T.S.* I. 1, 2; F. X. Funk, *Didascalia* [Bib. 11], II, 158 ff.; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 48 ff.; tr. Wordsworth, *Bishop Serapion's Prayer Book* [Bib. 12].

broken, and while Greek was alike the universal language of the intelligent classes throughout the Empire, and the common medium of the Church's worship everywhere.

But though in the formative period every center showed itself ready to welcome desirable new features, and to utilize luminous new phrases of devotion, yet both were incorporated into the already established framework of the local order, which from the first obstinately preserved its own genius by resisting modification of its essential structure and arrangement.

It was in the fourth century also that the Church first came forth into the light of day, as first a permitted and then an established religion. It ceased to be a secret and persecuted association, hiding under the cover of night, or in the everlasting darkness of the Catacombs. For the first time it built churches, and developed public ceremonies, which became increasingly elaborate, incorporating many survivals from the ancient pagan world.²³

Yet already in the fourth century this tendency to *enrichment* of the worship of God, which has remained one of the formative forces in liturgical growth, encountered the opposite principle of *simplification*, which was necessarily evoked by the inordinate lengthening of the services which unrestricted enrichment entails. We shall see later how this was effected in the case of the eucharistic liturgy; how the two chief surviving rites Eastern and Western, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom and the Roman Mass, prevailed over their rivals because they were the briefest forms in use; and how in our time these contrary tendencies for enrichment and

²³Limitations of space in this book have precluded our discussing the influence of the Mystery Religions, which unquestionably contributed many terms and ritual details to the Christian orders of worship, but which in the opinion of both authors had no formative effect upon the fundamental ideas of the Christian sacraments.

simplification have been harmonized and made to work together by the application of a third principle of *flexibility*, in the form of free choice between prescribed alternative forms, which was unknown in the early ages of the Church.

4. MEDIEVAL SERVICE-BOOKS

By the beginning of the fifth century, the fixation of the texts of the great liturgies was virtually complete. The many subsequent elaborations were in unessential details, and did not affect the fundamental characteristics of the rites.

From our earliest knowledge of them, after this fixation of the text, the service-books of all branches of the Church were on an entirely different basis from anything with which we are now familiar. There was no such thing as a complete Prayer Book, comprising all the public offices of the Church, since the great elaboration of the services then in use made that a physical impossibility. Indeed, that remains true in the Greek and Latin communions to this day. But before the invention of printing, the sheer bulk and cost of manuscript volumes prevented even the supplying to each of the numerous participants in each service of a complete text of that service: and like the actors in a play, they were provided with "part-books," containing their own portions in full, and the "cues" for the place of those parts in the whole. In other words, there were no comprehensive books for a given service, but instead there were books for a given officer in one or even all services.

Thus the "Sacramentary" contained the bishop's prayers, not only for the Communion, but for the other Sacraments and rites. The deacon, subdeacon, master of ceremonies, and choir, had their supplementary books for the various offices.

In the West, the landmarks are the three oldest Sacra-

mentaries. The "Leonine" Sacramentary,²⁴ discovered in 1735, is a fragmentary and badly arranged collection covering three-quarters of the year, containing the proper prayers for the Eucharist, ordinations, requiem and nuptial masses, but lacking the Canon of the mass, and the baptismal services. It is purely Roman, and in its present form dates from the early part of the seventh century.

The "Gelasian" Sacramentary²⁵ represents the original use of Italy outside of Rome; and is the form in which the Roman type of services first invaded Gallican territory. It is a comprehensive collection, covering all the offices of the Church. It is arranged on a different basis from the pure Roman books, for it divides the moveable from the immovable feasts in the use of the Liturgy, and segregates the "occasional offices" from both, instead of fitting all together with some considerable awkwardness into the dates of the secular calendar. It belongs to the end of the seventh century.

The "Gregorian" type²⁶ dates from the pontificate of Hadrian (784-791), who at the request of Charlemagne sent his official book as a pattern for the French churches. Its Calendar was on the same old Roman basis as the *Leonianum*; and it contained only the solemnities observed by the Roman court. For parochial use, it needed much supplement; and it is therefore found combined with varying appendices drawn largely from the "Gelasian" books, in the "Mixed Sacramentaries" of the next two centuries. Ultimately, it was the "Gelasian" order of text and Calendar which prevailed in the modern Missals.

Beginning in the ninth century, however, a different arrangement of service-books began to appear, giving com-

²⁴Ed. C. L. Feltoe, *Sacramentarium Leonianum* [Bib. 22].

²⁵Ed. H. A. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* [Bib. 27].

²⁶Ed. H. A. Wilson, *The Gregorian Sacramentary* [Bib. 28]; H. Lietzmann, *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* [Bib. 23]; K. Mohlberg, *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber Sacramentorum der römischen Kirche* [Bib. 25].

plete texts of given offices, instead of part-books for particular officiants. The first of these were the Bishop's services, segregated into the "Pontifical." Before the year 1000, the medieval multiplication of celebrations of the Communion, particularly as requiems, had brought about the invention of the new rite of "low mass"—utterly unknown in the early ages, and still regarded as a radical impossibility in the Eastern Churches—with the celebrant as the only minister: and for his use, all the part-books for the performance of the Liturgy were consolidated into the "Missal." By the eleventh century, the missionary travels of members of the monastic orders made it frequently impossible for them to participate in the rendition of the Divine Service in the chapter; and the demand for a portable book containing a shortened but complete version of the Offices resulted in the "Breviary." By the thirteenth century, the occasional offices for parochial use were brought together into the "Manual" or Hand-Book (modern, *Rituale*.) The choir-books, directories of service, Epistle- and Gospel-books, and the like, maintained a separate existence for use as needed.

5. AT THE REFORMATION

The English service-books at the time of the Reformation were exactly of the type then prevalent in Northern Europe. They represented the result of a long process of mutual assimilation between the distinctive Roman use, and that of the rest of Europe.

As we shall see more particularly in the case of the Communion, it appears that the Western churches early developed a characteristic form of the services, marked by variability of parts in accordance with the Christian Year; and that in the fourth century Rome brought this process to a sudden end by fixing the greater part of its rites abso-

lutely in invariable form, and by discouraging innovations thereafter; while outside the vicinity of Rome ritual elaboration went on unchecked. This was the origin of the conflict between the historic Roman and "Gallican" uses. The latter is found in a "pure" form and in fullest development in the essentially identical rites, the Gallican proper in France, and the Mozarabic in Spain.

But as the influence of Rome increased, there was a voluntary movement in "Gallican" regions to conform to Roman standards. Of their own motion France and Spain adopted the Roman order, to the complete extinction of the ancient French use, although the Mozarabic still exists as an endowed survival in a few churches. It appears that originally the "Gallican" rite prevailed in the British Isles, and in North Italy, from the existence of "mixed" books of the Celtic and Ambrosian rites and the Sacramentary of Bobbio, in all of which a "Gallican" framework is adapted around the Roman Canon of the Mass.²⁷ This general adoption of the Roman rites was much facilitated by the liberal incorporation of impressive ceremonies and eloquent devotional forms from the "Gallican" orders into the once rigid and meagre outlines of all the Roman offices.

The original British and Irish churches drew their Christianity from Gallican missions, and unquestionably derived their liturgies from the same source. The Roman mission came to Britain with no purpose to impose their own rites upon the British and Celtic Christians with whom they would inevitably come into contact. "Take," said Gregory to Augustine, "whatever you may find which would be pleasing to God, and good, religious, and right, and use it."²⁸ Yet in the competition of the two types, the same influences of the simplicity and practicality of the Roman service, and

²⁷See Chapter VIII, notes 29 to 33. ²⁸Bede *H.E.* i. 27. 2 (*P.L.* 95. 58 f.).

the prestige of the Apostolic See, operated in England as in other "Gallican" regions; and at Whitby (664) and Cloveshoo (747), the Celtic missionaries had to yield.

But Gallican influences were not dead. Intercourse with North Europe continued to be more frequent than that with Rome: and though the services of the various English uses at the Reformation were Roman in fundamental order and content—just as were the German rites, for example—yet they belonged to the North-European type as distinct from the Italian, in the matters of the Calendar, the liturgical Lectionary, and many surviving "Gallican" ritual details which had never been adopted at Rome.

There was, however, no national uniformity in England, but instead a system of diocesan "Uses," of which Salisbury (better known under its old Latin name of *Sarum*), Hereford, and York were the chief. Of these *Sarum* was by far the most important. From the time of Bishop Richard Poore three centuries before the Reformation, that great cathedral foundation had led the way in liturgical matters, until it was the standard almost throughout England, Wales, and Ireland.

In addition to the official service-books to which allusion has been made, there had gradually come into existence many books of private devotion. The Psalter, the Creeds, the Lord's Prayer, schemes of Hour Services following in the main the plan of the Breviary, were used in varying ways. These books were called Primers. They were first in Latin; later, with English supplements, they were popular and widely used, had great educational value, and afterward exercised considerable influence in the formation of the English Prayer Book.²⁹

²⁹*Cf.* W. H. Frere, *Edwardine Vernacular Services before the First Prayer Book*, in *J.T.S.* I. 2 (January, 1900), 229.

III

THE FORMING AND FIXING OF THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK

I. THE REFORMATION

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION which we call the Reformation was only the expression in the field of religion of the general social movement which began modern times. The breakdown of feudalism, the rise of nationalities, the revival of learning, the invention of printing, the discoveries of new continents and of new ways to the old, all had their share in the making of a new world. It was to be a world in which *individualism* was the dominant note, and *freedom*—spiritual, political, and social—the dominant ideal. It was a world in which the change in the ideals controlling men's conduct is comparable only to that through which we are living today. The times cried for reform and readjustment; but sadly enough the official Church, entrenched in age-old power, was unready. Men like More and Erasmus were voices crying in the wilderness. The reformation for which they had worked and prayed became in fact a revolution.

In this trying time England was fortunate. The break with Rome was primarily political; and political motives continued largely to control the extent and the manner of such doctrinal and liturgical changes as were authorized. Though this attitude has often been challenged from the standpoint of both extremes alike, whose eager proponents were unable to see anything but a mere time-serving in its

MOVEMENT FOR RITUAL REFORM

middle position of moderation, the fact remains that this despised method of "practical politics" enabled the Church of England to accomplish a rational reformation, without such radical sweeping away of the past as occurred on the Continent or in Scotland. The Church kept its Catholic order, the substance of its Catholic liturgies, the continuity of its Church life in parish and diocese, while embracing a deep conviction that the new age must discard outworn superstition, and seek simplicity and genuineness in its worship, and scriptural authority for its teaching. The alterations were made with conservative deliberation. It was a generation after the break with the papal authority before the liturgical reform was measurably complete in the Elizabethan Prayer Book, and a century more before all the contrary tendencies received a definitive stabilization in the English standard Book of 1662.

2. THE GENERAL MOVEMENT FOR RITUAL REFORM

The demand for a reformation in the field of worship, as well as in those of doctrine and discipline, was active everywhere in the sixteenth century, within as well as without the Roman Communion. The Missals and Breviaries had assumed formidable proportions, immensely elaborate in detail, and proportionately difficult of use; moreover they varied from diocese to diocese, over two hundred different Missals having been printed before the Reformation. There was obvious need of greater simplicity, uniformity, and the fixing of comprehensive standards to eliminate quantities of complicated and unnecessary detail, and to clarify the essential meaning of the various offices, which had been obscured by their innumerable subsidiary and often superstitious accompaniments.

ORIGIN OF THE PRAYER BOOK

One such attempt was made with papal authorization in the revised Breviary of the Spanish Cardinal Quiñones, General of the Franciscans. His first draft of 1535 appeared in six editions, and his second in 1537 enjoyed a hundred more in the next thirty years. Both forms were a drastic simplification of the Hours, ostensibly for the private use of the clergy, but actually embodying a stringent criticism of the medieval offices. Quiñones' chief objective was the restoration of the continuous recitation of the Psalter, and the reading of Holy Scripture, uninterrupted by the incidence of festivals of the Saints, and the suppression of the cluttering of anthems, responds, hymns, etc., which broke up and obscured that prime purpose of the offices. Cranmer's Preface to the First English Prayer Book, dealing as it does almost exclusively with the Choir Offices, is little else but a free translation of Quiñones' preface to his work; indeed the Cardinal enunciated all of Cranmer's guiding principles, and even enumerated the examples of detailed abuses which are such a striking feature of Cranmer's Preface.¹

Rome considered that Quiñones' revision was too sweeping, and too close to Reformation standards. Moreover, it was threatening to supplant the public offices, and actually for a time made its way into choir in Spain—a use for which it was never contemplated or authorized. It was therefore suppressed at the promulgation of the Breviary of the Council of Trent in 1568. Its underlying principles, however, as to the use of the Psalter and Scripture were finally incorporated in the Breviary of Pius X in 1913.

The Protestant groups on the Continent made a much more radical breach with tradition. Their tendency was to supplant rather than to revise the ancient services. In Luther's orders, his Litany was a really magnificent composition, col-

¹E.R. I. 34 ff.

MOVEMENT FOR RITUAL REFORM

lecting much of the greatest value in the rich "Gallican" tradition of Northern Europe; his offices for Baptism, Marriage, and Burial were also intelligently conservative, though much simplified; but for the Eucharist, while he kept the unessential framework of the rite, he abolished the essential Canon, substituting the reading of the scriptural narrative for the vital Prayer of Consecration; and the daily offices as such, with very little regulation or even suggestion, were remitted to the discretion of the minister. The Calvinistic orders were similar in character, but even slighter in prescribed content. In both, the celebration of the Sacraments tended to be overshadowed by the preaching of the Word. In the sketchy outlines of the general services devised for the latter purpose, some few features were salvaged from the Breviary, but the required order of use of Psalter and Scripture was abandoned: and the services for the most part replaced the old Hours with a plan based on the so-called "Prone" or vernacular devotions formerly customary at High Mass. Both Calvinistic and Lutheran services added many hortatory and penitential elements.

The Calvinistic orders affected the English revision through the liturgies of refugee congregations in England, and the influence of visiting divines from the Continent. Cranmer also during his stay in Germany had acquired some first-hand acquaintance with the regional Lutheran schemes; and besides Luther's writings, he took some suggestions from the *Consultation* of Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne. Hermann espoused the cause of the Reformation, and his book was a draft scheme for the revision of the Liturgy, composed in conference with eminent men of like mind, and published in 1542. For services within the Roman Communion, it was of course an impossibility, and Hermann was removed from his see in 1547; but as a Protestant docu-

ORIGIN OF THE PRAYER BOOK

ment it was learned, able, and moderate, and such portions as Cranmer adopted were a real contribution to the English rite.

3. PRELIMINARY MOVES

In England itself reforms of various kinds were slowly accomplished. Coverdale's translation of the Bible was authorized in 1535. Special Injunctions were issued as to the teaching of the people. The "*Bishops' Book*" of 1537, and its amended successor, the "*King's Book*" of 1543, furnished doctrinal instruction. The reading of a chapter of the Bible in English² was required at Matins and Evensong in 1543. Sentiment was growing against many accompaniments of the services which were deemed superstitious.

In 1544 the Litany, the first complete office in English, the work of Cranmer, was set forth under royal authority. Other changes were in the making when the death of Henry VIII and the accession of Edward VI in January 1547 gave an opportunity for a more rapid and comprehensive dealing with the whole matter. The boy King was definitely Protestant. The Reform party was in control. Royal Injunctions were put forth, requiring among other things the reading of the Epistle and Gospel in English at High Mass, with curtailment of the Hour Services.

In 1548 a Royal Proclamation set forth the *Order of Communion*. This *Order* directed that after the Priest's Communion in the Latin service, "without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order be provided)," the Communion be administered to the people in both kinds, with appropriate devotions in English.³ This was a quite illogical but typically English way of moving forward.

²The version was Coverdale's "Great Bible" of 1539; which still remains the underlying liturgical version of the Scriptures in the Prayer Book.

³*Cf.* p. 180.

THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK

4. THE FIRST ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK

A complete Prayer Book in English was issued in 1549. Imposed by act of Parliament, it has been much debated whether it was authorized by the synods of the Church. While the records are defective and the evidence somewhat conflicting, it seems undeniable that the Church approved it in some form.⁴

Much of the services had appeared in English in tentative use during the period of change;⁵ recourse was had to the English versions of the Primers;⁶ and a group of bishops and other scholars conferred and assisted in the draft: but the plan and most of the execution were unquestionably Cranmer's. His was the guiding and deciding hand, his the consistent mold of doctrine, his the masterly distinction of style which no subsequent pen has been able to equal, and which ranks his Prayer Book with the greatest liturgies of all time.

Except for the Ordinal, which was published separately the following year, the First Prayer Book gathered into one volume all that Cranmer and his assistants felt was essential in the various medieval offices, and the less complete revisions already undertaken. Thus the new ritual had the cardinal merit, perhaps the primary purpose, of *availability*, in simplicity of use by the clergy, and intelligibility to the people. For the first time in a thousand years in the West, all the services were in a language understood by the laity, for whose benefit they were originally composed; and they were so designed as to enlist once more the people's participation in their performance, as had been the case in the primitive days of the Church—thus giving liturgical expression to the Reform.

⁴Proctor and Frere, 50 ff.

⁵*Ibid.*, 40.

⁶Notably for the peculiar form of the Apostles' Creed in the Baptismal Office.

mation movement to revive the New-Testament teaching of the priesthood of all believers.

In the matter of doctrine, the services were perhaps not so much reformed as clarified. The reading of the Scriptures in English was given a primary place in worship, affording a greatly broadened basis for the Church's teaching. The Sacraments and other rites were divested of such ceremonies—whether medieval or ancient; Cranmer did not have the data to discriminate—as tended to distract the mind from the essential meaning of the rites. The ritual language was minutely and, on the whole, most intelligently censored to preserve true Catholic doctrine, and to remove medieval accretions and misconceptions of the primitive and universal faith.⁷

Finally, the First Prayer Book led the movement for uniformity of rite, against the chaos of medieval local customs, setting the precedent afterward followed by the Council of Trent. "Now from henceforth," says the Preface to the Book, "all the whole realm shall have but one use."

The creators of the new book were aware of the significance of their work. Yet they could hardly have realized all that it would mean for the future in England, and in wide lands of which they had heard but fantastic rumors, and in nations yet unborn; "for in its purification of doctrine, in its simplification of the services, above all in its use of the English tongue, it was and is the *fons et origo* of all subsequent versions of the Book."⁸

5. THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK, AND THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT

Changes of such magnitude could hardly be accepted without disturbance. Looking back upon those turbulent times,

⁷Cf. p. 184.

⁸F. T. Woods, *The Prayer Book Revised* (Longmans, London, 1927), 19.

it is now clear that Cranmer correctly interpreted the mind and the needs of that day, in that the great inarticulate majority of the English Church accepted his work without protest, and tacitly adopted its basic principles as a finality of English worship for all future generations. In only one quarter of the country was there any organized conservative opposition: in Devon a protest was fomented which bears the stamp of reactionary clerical leadership, since it hotly espoused some abandoned details which were least defensible, least valuable and intelligible to the lay mind. And this movement actually broke out into armed insurrection, and was firmly put down by force. Cranmer expected and had nerved himself to deal with opposition from that side: indeed, he was all too ready to act at the first hint of such antagonism, and remorselessly silenced and removed conservatives of great ability and excellent spirit, who might have given him reluctant but valuable support. But he was totally unprepared for the unwillingness of the members of his own party of reform to stop short of any extremes, to abide by any settlement, or to submit to any control.

Such a situation, however, seems to be inherent in the progress of all revolutions. Not only the renunciation of former rulers, but also the breach with established custom, for a time completely upsets the prevailing equilibrium between the eternally opposed principles of authority and liberty, and between the conservative and the progressive spirit. It is extremely easy to condemn the blind obstinacy of the partisans of the old order, the heady excesses of the enthusiasts of the new, the follies of both in their treatment of each other. It has not proved easy at all for historians to assay the various periods of conflict without a sympathetic bias and animus of their own, to discern permanent needs of the human spirit under the extravagant expressions of particular controversies,

and to draw from them the lessons which we need today for our still unsolved problems of conciliation and comprehension.

The restiveness of the English leaders of reform was further incited by Genevan influences, notably by Bucer and Peter Martyr, Continental divines who had sought refuge in England, and had been honored by chairs of divinity at Cambridge and Oxford. Both pressed for a further revision in the direction of Calvinistic standards.

The Second Prayer Book accordingly was passed by Act of Parliament in 1552, and imposed by another Act of Uniformity. Convocation seems to have had little to do with authorizing it, beyond considering some minor points in desultory debate. Cranmer claimed in his Preface that the First Book had been all that any reasonable person could desire, and that the objections to it had arisen from the contentiousness of unreasonable men. This seems to represent his settled conviction; certainly to an extent that has not been at all realized, he avoided making real modifications of doctrine in the Second Book.

The greatest controversy centered around the Communion: and Cranmer's manner of handling that problem is typical of his objectives in the whole book. As we shall see later,⁹ the very extensive alterations which he made in the order of that service to render it more conformable to Protestant views of the Sacrament are not less striking than the minute pains which he took to ensure that no element of value was actually removed from the rite.

Some further externals and accessories were dropped, notably the eucharistic vestments, and the exorcism, anointing, and chrysom in Baptism. For the rest, all prayers for the dead

⁹P. 187 f.

were abolished; and new penitential beginnings of the daily offices and the Communion seem designed further to supplant the use of private confession.

The new book was no happier than the old in quieting controversy. It was a hot, heady, intolerant time. The new wine was still in ferment, and declined to be confined by any bottles, new or old: many men were in a mood to quarrel with any ordinances of worship whatever which were imposed and required. Indeed, great issues were at stake, of which these liturgical and doctrinal disputes were only symptoms. Men fought with bitter recrimination over such seemingly unessential questions as kneeling at Communion or the use of the sign of the Cross. They were really fighting to establish the principles which should guide the Church and people of England as they moved on into the new age.

The frail young King died. Mary, who had successfully resisted every attempt to detach her from her divorced mother's religion, came to the throne. There was a swift overturning of the Protestant régime. There were persecutions and martyrdoms. There was the unpopular Spanish marriage. The nation breathed more easily when Mary's short reign ended and Elizabeth came to the throne.

It was fortunate for England that the new Queen was no zealot. Her ability as a moderator between warring factions appears in the fact that to this day there remains uncertainty as to her exact religious opinions. She had an open and independent mind. It is clear that she was a sincere Protestant, definitely rejecting papal claims, and disliking distinctively papal ritual.¹⁰ Her personal preference inclined her to the dignity and even splendor of the historic traditions of worship. Political considerations drove her increasingly to the

¹⁰Proctor and Frere, 97.

new ways. She held the two in balance, determined to enforce uniformity, but realizing that both sides must find at least a measure of satisfaction.

The Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 adopted the Second Book of Edward VI as its practical basis, with some additional provisions for the Lectionary, and with the significant compromises with the First Book of combining the Sentences of Administration of the Communion of the two books to their present forms, and of appending the "Ornaments Rubric" authorizing the ornaments of church and minister which were allowed in the second year of Edward VI.¹¹ Thus the Queen and her advisers opened the way for that policy of comprehensiveness which, in theory if not always in practice, has ever since been characteristic of the Church of England.

The "Elizabethan Settlement" made its way rapidly. The people were apparently ready for it; and only a small number of clergy were deprived because of unwillingness to accept it. The persecutions of the Marian reaction had definitely fixed the Protestant position of the nation; and this was confirmed by the Pope's order in 1562 prohibiting Roman Catholics from attending the services of the Church of England, followed in 1570 by his Bull of Excommunication and Deposition against Queen Elizabeth. The separation of England and Rome was now complete.

6. THE JACOBEOAN PRAYER BOOK

Though the sobering experiences of the days of "Bloody Mary" had disposed all parties to accept the formal Elizabethan "Settlement" as a measure of peace for the time, there remained the ineluctable conflict between liberty and authority, independency and uniformity. During the following

¹¹E.R. I. 127.

century, this conflict was cast in the mold of a struggle for domination between Genevan and English ideas of the Church. The Calvinistic system of belief and worship had swept the field in Scotland; and Scottish Presbyterian influence fed the fires of discontent in the sister nation.

On the accession of King James VI of Scotland to the English throne in 1603 as James I of the United Kingdom, the Calvinistic party assumed that a great victory lay within their reach. They presented to the King the pretentiously styled "Millenary Petition," so called from its supposed thousand signers, alleging grievances against the worship, ministry, support, and discipline of the Church. The King appointed a conference at Hampton Court. Like practically all Scotchmen, he was a keen amateur theologian; but he had conceived a personal dislike for the contentious spirit of the churchmen of his native land, and had resolved to espouse the Episcopal side. The Conference gave him exactly the opportunity which he desired to assert his royal prerogative to the English hierarchy, and to put his unruly countrymen firmly in their place. Under his own resolute presidency, the deliberations were not allowed to get out of hand for a moment, but were strictly confined to the announced *agenda*. The Presbyterians' hope had been to turn the first concessions into a vantage-ground for the general reorganization of the Church. This died at the opening of the Conference; and thereafter they argued their points perfunctorily, and accepted the resulting relaxations without gratitude.

The "Jacobean" Prayer Book of 1604 was issued by royal Letters Patent, and passively accepted by Convocation, whose Canon 80 of the same year ordered the book provided for use in the parish churches. The results of the Hampton Court Conference were represented by a slight reduction in Lessons from the Apocrypha; the withdrawal of Lay Baptism in

emergency; an explanatory "*or Remission of Sins*" appended to the title of "*The Absolution*," and a like gloss to the title of the Confirmation Service; and the addition of the matter on the Sacraments to the Catechism.¹² The supplications for the Royal Family in the daily offices and the Litany, and four Special Thanksgivings, were also inserted in this book.

7. THE SCOTTISH PRAYER BOOK OF 1637

In Scotland itself, a temporary use of the Second English Prayer Book beginning in 1557 was halted after the return of John Knox from exile in 1559; and Knox's form of Calvin's directory of worship under the title *The Book of Common Order* became the Scottish standard. King James restored the lapsed episcopate to Scotland in 1610, and began forceful endeavors to bring the country into line with England in the matter of rite. A half-hearted attempt toward compliance was made in a draft of 1619, inserting a few English forms in Knox's Order; but it was not printed. Under Charles I the matter was revived in 1629, with conferences between Bishop Maxwell and Archbishop Laud. Laud at first was not interested, wishing the Scotch to have the English book; but the Scottish bishops proceeded with the English book as a basis, modified in a Presbyterian direction. In 1635, with the work virtually complete and partly in print, Laud suddenly awakened to the liturgical opportunity, and reopened the matter vigorously, with the able assistance of Maxwell and Wedderburn.

The resulting book was authorized by Royal Warrant, Act of the Scottish Privy Council, and Royal Proclamation, in 1636, for use the following year. Undoubtedly it would now be known as the "Laudian," rather than the "Scottish,"

¹²Generally attributed to Bishop Overall, then Dean of St. Paul's, but largely derived from the Catechism of his predecessor, Dean Nowell.

Prayer Book—since it perfectly expressed Laud's churchmanship, and the Scotch at that time would have none of it; attempts to use it were broken up by rioting—if it were not for the fact that the process of its making had founded a Scottish school and tradition of liturgical scholarship which to this day has not ceased to be one of the most eminent and respected in the Anglican Communion. Also, the Episcopal Church of Scotland subsequently adopted the Book of 1637, and, as we shall see, has continued to improve upon it to the present time.

Frequent reference will be made hereafter to the Book of 1637 in the history of the various offices. It may suffice here to say that in many respects this Book revived unwisely abandoned excellencies of the First Prayer Book of 1549; in many more it adorned the services with judicious enrichments, and made them more available with exact and illuminating rubrics. This Book has been the prime fount of inspiration for all subsequent Prayer Book revisions to this day. Not only did it contribute a great deal of valuable detail to the Book of 1662: it was sufficiently in advance of its age that there remained many more matters whose essential *rightness* was recognized only recently, and which were adopted into all the revisions of the last decade.

8. THE GREAT REBELLION

Meanwhile in England affairs in Church and State were approaching a crisis. King Charles I carried to their logical extreme the Tudor tendencies to autocracy, attempting to govern the realm in the manner of a modern dictator, rather than as the constitutional monarch of a free people. Laud, his Primate, reflected the same spirit, pouring oil on the flames of discontent by compelling conformity with a high hand.

The convening of the Long Parliament at the end of 1640 saw the battle joined. The Lords tried a back-fire, by appointing a committee to consider concessions as to the "*Innovations*," as the Calvinistic party called all the ritual details to which they took exception. The list is interesting because of the real indifference of the matters complained of: about two-thirds of them have been subsequently authorized in some form in later Anglican books, without appreciably altering the "proportion of the faith."¹³

But it was now too late for concessions. Determined demands were made for the abolition of altars, organs, vestments, the hierarchy, and the imposition of any rites and ceremonies. Episcopacy was abolished in 1643; in 1645 the Primate was executed, and the Book of Common Prayer was outlawed under severe penalties.

For the next fifteen years the only permitted form of prayer was the "Directory of Public Worship," an abridgment of Knox's Genevan scheme. It was an Order, not a Prayer Book, offering skeleton suggestions for the conduct of the services, with a few model forms of prayer.¹⁴ In this interim the loyal clergy got the Prayer Book formulæ by heart, and used them in substance if not in form, or devised equivalent services for themselves. The latter course was taken by Sanderson and Jeremy Taylor.¹⁵ Their rituals contributed the use of Psalms 39 and 90 to the Burial Office of 1662; and Taylor's recourse to the Liturgy of St. James was a precursor of the move to conform to some primitive features of the Eastern rites which eventually has had important effects upon the structure of most Anglican liturgies.

¹³Proctor and Frere, 153 f.

¹⁴In one respect the Directory was actually superior to the current Prayer Book rite, in that it provided for a clear Invocation in its proper place after the Institution at the Communion; cf. Proctor and Frere, 160.

¹⁵Cf. *E.R.* I. cxc.

9. THE RESTORATION

After Cromwell's death, the reaction of the English people from the dictatorship of the Commonwealth made inevitable the restoration of Charles II as King, and equally so the restitution of the Church of England. Both Church and State turned with relief to constitutional order as the only possible safeguard of the people's liberties.

As soon as negotiations began with the exiled Prince, the use of the Prayer Book was spontaneously and very generally revived. Five editions of the Book of 1604 are known to have been printed in 1660.¹⁶ The Presbyterians fought a losing battle, first against any official restoration of the Book, next against its imposition as required without alternative, last against detailed forms and expressions. The King was sympathetic, and issued general declarations of amnesty, and an interim declaration of toleration; and every opportunity was given for the defeated party to be heard.

The Savoy Conference brought the issue to its conclusion. This consisted of forty-two divines, evenly representing the two parties, in session for nearly four months in 1661 at the residence of the Bishop of London at the "Savoy Hospital." Under Baxter's leadership, the Presbyterians presented a long list, known as the "Exceptions of the Ministers," comprising every extant objection to the Book of 1604. The "Exceptions" were carefully considered but firmly dealt with by the Bishops. Many amendments in detail were conceded: and indeed credit should be given to the penetrating lucidity of the Presbyterians, a legitimate inheritance from Calvin himself, which pointed out many expressions which fell short of being just and apposite. But their really substantive objections to any required Liturgy, or to what the Bishops held

¹⁶Blunt, *Annotated B.C.P.* [Bib. 125], 28.

to be essentials of the historic faith and worship of the Universal Church, were refuted and disallowed in no conciliatory spirit.¹⁷

Whatever views one may hold of the points at issue, whether liturgical or doctrinal, one cannot but sorrow that at that critical moment these two groups of able and Christian men could find no way of agreement. Hitherto, both parties were within the communion of the Church: and it surely seems as if that Church could and should have been kept or made broad enough to continue to contain them. But after this failure of mutual adjustment and understanding, it must be recognized that the Church of England was no longer the Church of all the English people. Something was wrong then, which we to this day have still to set right.

Meantime, proceedings for a new Prayer Book were begun in Parliament, and Convocation appointed a committee of bishops, of which Cosin, Wren, and Sanderson were the guiding spirits. The work was done in a month; which is not quite so surprising as it seems, as the committee consisted of only seven, and the three bishops named had long been students of the liturgy, and had systematic drafts of changes which they had been accumulating for years. The work was passed by both houses of both Convocations; received further modifications in Parliament; and was again adopted as amended by the Convocations. This therefore was the first Prayer Book which had the fullest and most unquestioned synodical authorization. A committee of Convocation supervised its printing; some copies of this edition were corrected by hand and certified under the Great Seal; and these *Scaled Books* were the first examples of an authenticated Standard Book of Common Prayer.

In the Book of 1662, there were some 600 changes; of

¹⁷Proctor and Frere, 172 ff.

which the most important will be noted under the history of the respective offices. It embodied six new prayers, four new Collects, new offices for Adult Baptism¹⁸ and for use At Sea.¹⁹ The Bible quotations, except for the Psalter, the Decalogue, and the Comfortable Words and some Offertory Sentences, were according to the Authorized Version of 1611. The detailed changes in text and rubric of the services were all with the object of greater clarity and practicality, ignoring on the one hand Puritan demands for changes in fundamental sense and use, and on the other not going beyond the Book of 1604 to revive more ancient features, save as they were brought to the attention of the revisers in the Scottish Book of 1637—and even that was conservatively employed. In filling in details, and making explicit an inadequate rubric, they naturally suffered at times from too brief a perspective of historical knowledge.

All this minuteness effectively brought the Prayer Book of 1662 up to date, and made it adequate for the needs of a modern age. It has remained the standard in continuous use for over 270 years in England. It may be noted that in the matter of language, it has been the greatest of all conservative forces to stay the natural degeneration of the English tongue—even more than the Bible, because of its constant corporate use, and that in spoken form. Thus although Shakespeare, and even later authors, used many words which are now obsolete, so that at times they actually speak in a dead language, there are not over two or three words in the Prayer Book which are of doubtful meaning to the ordinary user today.

¹⁸This was necessitated by the accumulated neglect of that Sacrament under the Commonwealth, and was also prompted by an awakening sense of responsibility for missionary work among the natives in the American colonies.

¹⁹This was a result of the founding of the British Navy by Cromwell, and the consequent rise of England's illustrious Merchant Marine.

IV

THE PRAYER BOOK FOR THE LIFE OF TODAY

I. REVISIONS

WE HAVE TREATED the story of the Prayer Book through 1662 as one of arriving at a stable "Reformation Settlement" of a Protestant liturgy. Developments since have had the purpose of adapting that liturgy to contemporary needs, under changing conditions, with a growing knowledge of liturgical history and principles, and with a continually increasing desire to make the Church impartially comprehensive. These developments are essentially a history of the Revisions. This division of time is not altogether accurate, since one of the greatest founts of inspiration for what we may call modern modifications of worship was the Scottish book of 1637. There were forward-looking moves before 1662. But after 1662, the liturgy has been fixed in its parent country; while the American books, which we now approach, began with a revision, and have twice improved that revision,—leading the way which has been followed by most other branches of our communion in the last decade.

2. A "BROAD-CHURCH" DRAFT

Six years after the establishment of the standard of 1662, the heads of the Church of England, under the leadership of Archbishop Tillotson, were moved to seek a greater relaxation, in order not to drive out of the Church altogether

A "BROAD-CHURCH" DRAFT

those whose consciences would not permit them to accept the Prayer Book as it stood. Parliament, however, would have none of the proposals. Further attempts were defeated on account of the threat of Romanism under James II, who attempted to play off Romanists and Dissenters against the Church, so that concession in any direction was regarded as dangerous.

After the accession of William of Orange, the project was revived; and a commission in 1689 drafted 598 alterations—virtually as many as in 1662. But the clergy and laity united against the Bishops, in sympathy with the voluntary sacrifices of the "Nonjurors," of whom we shall speak presently; so the matter was never even submitted to Convocation. Then from 1717 to 1852 the Convocations were silenced by royal authority; during which time nothing of any kind could be done with the Prayer Book.

This draft of 1689 was made in the form of an interleaved Prayer Book. There is record of only two copies of this book. One of them was lost by lending, and the other disappeared for many years. Finally discovered in the Lambeth library, it was printed as a parliamentary document in 1854. Perhaps the lost copy made its way to America, though of this there is no information, and no such copy is now extant. Yet in some manner it seems to have been known to the makers of the first American Prayer Book, as the Preface then adopted, and still retained, alludes specifically to "this great and good work."

Some features from these proposals of 1689 which were embodied in the first American book exactly a century later, were the removal of lessons from the Apocrypha on Saints' Days, the use of the *Gloria Patri* at the end of the whole portion of Psalms, the substitution of Psalms for the Canticles at Evening Prayer, the placing of the Psalm *Jubilate*

before the *Benedictus*, and a shortening of the Litany before the Communion.

3. THE NONJURORS

At the British "Revolution" of 1689, which peaceably deposed the Roman-Catholic King James II and called to the throne the Protestant Prince William of Orange by parliamentary authority, many of the Tory party, most unfortunately for themselves and for the good of the realm, took the narrow view that their oath of allegiance to the King bound them to the individual, rather than his office. Archbishop Sancroft, eight bishops, and 400 priests, refused to take a new oath to the new King, and were ejected from their benefices. This exiled the heart of the conservative party, and, as it happened, those most loyal to the Church itself, and gave control to the "Erastian" faction, which tended to conceive the Church as a subsidiary function of the State.

After Sancroft's death, the schism was perpetuated by the ordination of new bishops and clergy, and endured for more than a century. Soon some of them availed themselves of their freedom from State control to revert to the use of the Communion Office of 1549. In 1718 they published their own office, based upon the First Prayer Book, but modified from a study of the Greek liturgies. The book of 1718 embodied some ancient ceremonies known as *The Usages*, namely the Mixed Chalice, Prayers for the Dead, and prayers of Oblation and Invocation, in the Communion. Other distinctive *Usages* of the Nonjurors which began to be current about this time comprised triple immersion at Baptism, the use of chrism at Confirmation, and the Unction of the Sick. This group issued virtually a complete Prayer Book in 1734, which continued to be printed to the end of the century.

4. THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

Similar conditions to those of the Nonjurors faced the "faithful remnant" in Scotland. At the time of the Revolution, the Episcopal following in the northern kingdom was practically as strong as the Presbyterian. The former indeed was actually the Established Church of the land, though it remained non-liturgical. King William offered the Episcopalians his support in exchange for their allegiance; this being refused, the Episcopal Church was disestablished in 1689, and its members treated as "Nonjurors."

After the Disestablishment, the Church gradually turned to liturgical forms of prayer. Their own book of 1637 was hard to obtain; but quantities of the English book were sent by sympathizers in the southern kingdom. The Scottish Communion Office of 1637, however, was increasingly printed separately from 1724 on; it was adopted by the Bishops in 1731, and successively revised in 1735, 1755, 1764, 1911, and 1929. The example of the English Nonjurors encouraged its use, and eventually effected modifications toward conformity with their own rite. This movement was reënforced by the publication of Bishop Rattray's *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* in 1744, bringing a direct knowledge of the Greek standards. These influences made available a better understanding of the organic order and significance of the primitive Christian Liturgy than Cranmer had possessed, and made it possible actually to improve upon the rite of 1549; so that the Scottish Consecration Prayer has been freely acclaimed by many English liturgologists as the most perfect in Christendom.

5. THE FIRST AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK

The birth of the new American nation made inevitable a radical correction of the State Prayers. It also raised questions of the whole canonical and disciplinary position of the Church, including those of its formularies of worship, and presented a challenge to review the fitness of those formularies for its missionary needs in the New World.

The representatives of seven "southern" States (*i.e.* those outside New England) met at a "General Convention" of the nascent American Church, and issued a draft of a Prayer Book, "*as revised and proposed to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at a Convention of the said Church in the States of New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South-Carolina, held in Philadelphia, from September 27th to October 7th, 1785.*"¹

This revision followed closely the lines of the English project of 1689, whose principles were discussed in much detail in its Preface. It has been fashionable to deprecate the "Proposed Book" of 1785, and to minimize its possible use, and its influence upon the Prayer Book of 1789. It is true that this draft fell rather under a cloud. The English Bishops were frightened at the prospect of giving the Episcopate to the American Church if this book were to become its standard, for it eliminated two of the historic Creeds, and mutilated the third. It does, no doubt, represent a sort of low-water-mark of churchmanship, bearing marks of Puritan and even Unitarian influences. A century later the Reformed Episcopal Church found it accorded perfectly with their views, adopted it in 1873 as their first Liturgy, and reissued it just as it stood. Yet the book of 1785 fairly enough repre-

¹The authors of this Book were Dr. William White of Pennsylvania, Dr. William Smith of Maryland, and Dr. C. H. Wharton of Delaware.

sented the state of liturgical knowledge at the time; it was animated by a spirit of comprehensiveness which was wholly admirable; and it contributed several valuable features to the First American Book of four years later. Besides those mentioned on p. 111 below, these comprised the admission of parents as sponsors, and the omission of the sign of the Cross if desired, at Baptism; the abridgment of the Marriage Service; the Visitation of Prisoners, taken from the Irish Book of 1711; the curtailing of the Communion Service; and an office for Thanksgiving Day. Indeed, as Dr. Huntington pointed out, the *Proposed Book* was in some points more "churchly" than that finally adopted: giving the *Venite* and the *Benedictus* in full, and retaining the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*.²

The first authentic General Convention met in Philadelphia on October 2, 1789. Bishop Seabury had been consecrated at Aberdeen on November 14, 1784, and White and Provoost in London on February 4, 1787. With these Bishops, Convention was organized in its two Houses, adopted a Constitution, and set to work on the Prayer Book. The task was completed in two weeks! However, it had the advantage of the thorough discussions of the draft of 1785; and it represented the judgment of experienced men, who had long had under consideration the changes which would be desirable for the work of the Church in America.

The Prayer Book of 1789 carried out a quite minute revision of the Book of 1662 to remove obsolete words and improve smoothness of phrase. In this, as in major matters, the aim was not doctrinal, but practical. The only changes of any possible doctrinal significance were the dropping of the "Athanasian" Creed, and perhaps the adoption of the Scottish Prayer of Consecration. The latter was the result of

²*A Short History of the B.C.P.* [Bib. 79], 53.

a Concordat between Bishop Seabury and the Scottish bishops at the time of his consecration, he undertaking if possible to secure the adoption of the Scottish Canon in the American Church. He had issued a Communion Office for his diocese of Connecticut in 1786, differing only slightly from the Scottish of 1764; and the Consecration Prayer from this form was adopted unanimously in 1789, although the question of the Scottish order of the rest of the Canon does not seem to have been raised.³

The old unaccountable Puritan prejudice against the use of the Gospel Canticles in the daily offices was allowed to have effect. For the rest, there were a few new special prayers, and a new Lectionary making for the first time full proper provision for the Sundays; and the rubrics throughout were made more exact and flexible, especially for the abbreviation of services used in combination. Other variants of a like practical aim will be discussed under the several offices.

An American Ordinal was issued in 1792; in 1799, an office for the Consecration of a Church, from Bishop Andrewes' order of 1620, and a Prayer for Convention added, taken from a paragraph in the Homily for Whitsunday; an office for the Institution of Ministers, composed by Dr. William Smith of Connecticut, was authorized in 1804 and revised in 1808; thirty-eight of the Thirty-nine Articles were adopted in 1801.

In 1811, the Church established the present system of amending the Prayer Book by the action of two successive General Conventions. The only change so made before 1892 was the alteration of "north" to "right" side of the Table in the rubric immediately before the Communion, which was effected in 1835.

³*I.e.*, the Prayer for the Church and the Confession, Absolution, etc., following the Prayer of Consecration in the Scottish rite; *cf.* p. 210 f.

6. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The nineteenth century saw a world-wide industrial revolution, accompanied by profound changes in the social order, and in the mobility, complexity, and rapidity of living of all peoples. In both England and America, these changing conditions came more and more into conflict with an Anglican order of worship which was only too complete, and too inflexibly lengthy. The "accumulation" of Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion, originated by Archbishop Grindal in 1571, had come to be regarded as of universal obligation; and its two hours of unbroken attention, tolerable perhaps in the sixteenth century, proved an impossible handicap for the work of the Church in the nineteenth. A routine adapted to a settled population in established parishes was wholly unsuitable for the use of Sunday Schools, of missions to Negroes and Indians, or the evangelist on the frontiers of civilization or in the city slums. These varied needs were more urgently felt in America, and the pressure for adaptation of the liturgy began earlier than in England.

In 1826, Bishop John Henry Hobart, who with Griswold of Massachusetts and Meade of Virginia was bringing new life to the Church, proposed and carried through one General Convention provisions for shortening the services; but the following Convention failed to ratify the action.

Others, however, were thinking along the same lines: how could the Episcopal Church be better equipped to meet the needs of a rapidly developing nation? In 1853, under the leadership of the Rev. William Augustus Muhlenberg, a group of forward-looking men deeply concerned with the cause of Christian unity, and with the immediate purpose of making the Church more comprehensive, presented to the House of Bishops a notable Memorial advocating greater

flexibility and variety in liturgical use. The Memorial was ahead of its time. It fell before the wall of satisfied conservatism. The only substantive result was a "Declaration" by the Bishops, that Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Holy Communion were distinct services, which might be used separately or together; and that on special occasions the clergy might use any parts of the Bible or Prayer Book, or the Bishops might prescribe particular forms of service.

The only other change before the revision of 1892 was a slight modification of the Lectionary in 1877. In England, the Lectionary was revised in 1871, and shortened services were allowed by the Act of 1872.

Meantime, another important factor had been at work in both countries—the revival known as the "Oxford Movement." This movement, which was in fact complementary to the Evangelical revival which preceded and continued parallel to it, contemplated neither subverting nor supplanting the current doctrinal and liturgical formularies of the Church. It aimed to restore to the Church of England a realization of its living continuity with the Catholic Church of the ages, and to develop the real meaning of its standards in the light of history. Inevitably, this historical method gave new life to the neglected study of Liturgics.

Most of the old Anglican books on the subject were homiletical and polemical, circumscribed by a lack of any real knowledge of any liturgy but their own. The genetic and comparative researches which began with Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ* (1833-41) changed all that, and opened up a wide field of ecclesiastical scholarship which even yet has hardly begun to be explored, and which yielded rich returns throughout the nineteenth century. It began to appear that there was much to be learned from the worship of other Churches, and that not all the changes in our own at

and since the Reformation had been undeniable improvements. Such revision of the Liturgy as might best adapt it to those qualities of human nature which are changeless, was seen to involve in some cases a return to ancient landmarks.

"Who once hath seen how far above
The sought-for is the foregone store,
Should haste him to his earlier love,
And seek again what he foreswore."⁴

To a considerable degree the fruits of these learned labors were advertised, dramatized, and popularized by the bitter controversies over ceremonial. Just as in the Reformation and other periods of rapid change, trivial matters (such as the Eastward Position, or the eucharistic candles) came to symbolize deep divergencies of view, unreasoning fears on the one hand, and unreasoning faiths on the other. The late sixties and early seventies saw this ceremonial controversy reach and pass its culmination.⁵ The time came when sober second thought set itself to consider what permanent use could be made of what had been learned; and the task of revision could be undertaken with greater liturgical knowledge than any former revisers had ever possessed.

In 1877 Dr. William R. Huntington moved in General Convention to appoint a Joint Commission to consider "what changes, if any, are needed in the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer to remove difficulties of interpretation, to amend the Lectionary, and to provide by abbreviation or otherwise for the better adaptation of the services of the Church to the wants of all sorts and conditions of men." This eminently rational and practical proposal was tabled;

⁴Horace *Ep.* i. 7. 96-7.

⁵*Cf.* S. D. McConnell, *History of the American Episcopal Church* (Whittaker, N. Y., 1899), 390 ff.

but three years later Dr. Huntington introduced a resolution equipped with a certain sentimental appeal, proposing a Joint Commission to consider "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 national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, in the direction of Liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use."

The Commission was appointed; and began its labors by adopting these significant resolutions:

Resolved, That this Committee asserts, at the outset, its conviction that no alteration should be made touching either statements or standards of doctrine in the Book of Common Prayer.

Resolved, That this Committee, in all its suggestions and acts, be guided by those principles of liturgical construction and ritual use which have guided the compilation and amendments of the Book of Common Prayer, and have made it what it is.⁶

This undertaking not to alter doctrine, and an assurance which Dr. Huntington had given General Convention while his original resolution was being debated, that the Communion Office would not be revised,⁷ ensured that the changes would not be great. Those proposed were exhibited in the *Book Annexed* of 1883 and 1886, showing how the entire Prayer Book would appear if all were adopted. Partisan suspicion⁸ and the intense conservatism of the Church slowed up consideration of the matter so that the revision was not completed until 1892, and limited the alterations to a somewhat meagre list.

The gains in *flexibility* were confined to some shortening of Morning and Evening Prayer and the Communion on occasion; the adoption, in a general rubric, of the Bishops'

⁶Huntington, *op. cit.*, 135 f.

⁷*Ibid.*, 135.

⁸*Ibid.*, 159.

Declaration of 1856 as to the separate use of the services; a revised Lectionary with some options as to its use; and further Proper Psalms and Selections of Psalms. The *enrichments* included provision for the festival of the Transfiguration, and for early celebrations of the Communion on Christmas and Easter; the restitution of a Penitential Office; the restoration of the Gospel Canticles, and of the full list of *Preces* at Evening Prayer; additional forms for the Occasional Prayers, and the Burial Office; and a presentation of candidates and a Lesson at Confirmation.

The real achievements of this revision were the partial destruction of the fetich of Uniformity,⁹ and the better education of the whole Church in liturgical principles through the comprehensive discussions during the twelve years that the work was in the making. And as soon as it had been demonstrated that such a revision could be achieved without realizing any of the fears which had attended its progress, and indeed with an increased harmony and efficiency of the Church, it became inevitable that some of the "unfinished business" of 1880-92 should be taken up again in a further adaptation of our standards of worship to new knowledge and new needs.

7. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

While the nineteenth century opened to the eyes of our Church the great field of a comparative knowledge of the texts of the historic liturgies of the world, the twentieth set itself with increasing success to the evaluation of the enormous mass of that material. The process is still far from complete. Hitherto, the study has fallen in the lines of the ancient conflict between Eastern and Western standards of doctrine, discipline, and worship. What has been needed is

⁹McConnell, *op. cit.*, 409.

a complete account of the origin and evolution of Christian worship, in order to find its essential meaning in its ultimate sources, and to make it possible to assay the value of competing forms symbolizing historic "positions" by assigning them a place in a comprehensive scheme of historic evolution which shall account for them. In the battle of East and West, Scotland, America, South Africa and most other missionary regions, and finally England, have espoused the Eastern side. But the reluctance of the Catholic party in England to accept the new alternative Communion Office of the *Deposited Book* is evidence of the great importance of a definitive solution of the immemorial enigma of the Roman Canon, in particular.

It is only very recently that the identification of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and the assimilation of the perplexing testimony of the *Didaché*, have furnished us with the primal starting-point for such a general reconstruction of the evidence: a brief outline of which, to the best of present knowledge, is sketched in this book. Even this was not generally available for the several revisions completed in the last decade; though some portions of it had their effect, especially in England and her overseas missions: and it may be fairly said that America was intuitively on the right track, and has none of its work to undo.

8. THE AMERICAN PRAYER BOOK OF 1928

Many factors combined to set in motion the revision of 1928. The work of 1892 was obviously incomplete; but even so it had made the Church realize that the Prayer Book was not absolutely unchangeable. Many new emphases had appeared in the life and thought of Church people. They looked at the problems of health, the social order, international relations, missionary work, and the interpretation of

the Bible, in a way greatly different from that of previous generations. They were surer of God's love, and less dogmatic about his wrath. They were increasingly eager to make worship more beautiful, and thus more worthy. They were equally determined to make their Church's worship available for "all sorts and conditions of men," and in all kinds of places. They wanted enrichment—a constant spring of liturgical growth throughout history—and they wanted its contrary, brevity, even to the point of making mere skeletons of some of the offices upon occasion.

To satisfy these demands, revision had to turn to the past as well as to the future: fearlessly restoring elements of beauty and indeed of faith, which had been lost through the bitterness of controversy, as well as framing or finding new prayers for new needs; and pressing to the utmost the peculiarly Anglican principle of flexibility, which entrusts the minister with large discretions of choice in the conduct of the services.

The actual process of revision began in 1913. A Memorial from the Diocese of California¹⁰ resulted in the appointment of a Joint Commission of bishops, presbyters, and laymen, to report on the "revision and enrichment of the Prayer Book," with express instructions, copied from the procedure of the Commission of 1880, "that no proposition involving the Faith and Doctrine of the Church be considered or reported."

In a strict sense, this stipulation was quite impossible of fulfilment, since one cannot so much as alter the punctuation of the Lord's Prayer without affecting the "proportion of the faith": and a narrow adherence to this restriction would

¹⁰In the 1912 Convention of the Diocese of California, on motion of the Rev. Clifton Macon a committee had been appointed, and had worked for more than a year sounding Church sentiment and collating suggestions which came from all over the country. In consequence, at the next session the Diocese addressed this Memorial.

have limited the revision to as purely a *literary* significance as that of 1892. Dropping a prayer which intimated that disastrous weather was a direct divine retribution for sin, was certainly quite as much an alteration of doctrine as was the insertion of a prayer for the Departed. Yet the Commission proposed, and Convention approved, exactly these changes, and many others: wisely interpreting the "Faith and Doctrine of the Church" as referring to the permissible bounds of Anglican orthodoxy, and consequently exploring and developing our inherited liberties in every direction—to the great enlargement of the inherent comprehensiveness of the Church.

The Commission was appointed in 1913.¹¹ The work was completed in 1928. At four General Conventions, the reports (which were so considerable as to be issued in book form) were debated with thoroughness, and with varying fortunes. The appointment of the Commission had met with no serious objection; but its recommendations at once met not only criticism in detail for doctrinal reasons (*e.g.* in the case of prayers for the Departed), but also conservative unreadiness to make any change at all. Yet steady progress was made. The Deputies took the lead in 1916 and 1919; the Bishops in 1922, when they devoted a whole week preceding the opening of General Convention to a consideration of the

¹¹The Commission as appointed in 1913 consisted of: Bishops Whitehead of Pittsburgh, Walker of Western New York, Sessums of Louisiana, Nelson of Atlanta, Williams of Nebraska, Burgess of Long Island, and Johnson of Los Angeles; the Rev. Messrs. Samuel Hart, Edward L. Parsons, John W. Suter, H. R. Gummey, L. M. Robinson, H. B. St. George, and J. R. Moses; and Messrs. G. W. Pepper, T. W. Bacot, C. G. Saunders, H. W. Mabie, R. H. Gardiner, F. J. McMaster, and E. P. Bailey. During the fifteen years of the life of the Commission there were many changes of its personnel. It may suffice to mention that Bishop Whitehead served as Chairman until his death in 1922, succeeded by Bishop Slattery of Massachusetts, who had been appointed to the Commission while still a presbyter; and that the Rev. Dr. Hart, first Secretary, resigned almost immediately, and was succeeded by Dr. Moses, who served until his death in 1916, when the Rev. Dr. Suter was elected in his place and served continuously until the work was completed.

Revision Commission's Report. In that year also, mere conservative inertia seemed to cease. Action on the Report went rapidly forward. The work was finished at the Convention of 1925, and final ratification took place in 1928. In order not to delay further putting into the hands of the people a Prayer Book containing the changes adopted, final *minutiae* were entrusted to the Commission under a grant of general editorial discretion.¹²

Many *enrichments* were made: a new Canticle, Prayer for the President, and proper "Invitatories" to the *Venite*, in Morning Prayer; an alternative Absolution in Evening Prayer; suffrages in the Litany; three new Proper Prefaces in the Communion, and intercessions for the Departed in the Communion and the Burial Offices; an entirely new service for the Burial of a Child; new devotions, with a prayer for the Anointing or Laying on of Hands, in the Visitation of the Sick; added questions at Baptism and Confirmation; sections on the Church and the Ministry in the Offices of Instruction, which were to take the place of the Catechism; supplementary prayers at a Marriage; many new Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for liturgical days old and new; and a doubling of the number of Occasional Prayers. A supplement of new prayers was added to the offices for Family Prayer, which were also provided with brief alternative forms, and the whole moved to the back of the book, thus making it technically out of the Prayer Book, so that additions or alterations might be made at any General Convention.

New *flexibility* was given by a new Lectionary, with further options as to its use, and by far greater liberty as to the Psalter,

¹²The only important exercise of these powers was the amendment of the Prologue to the Lord's Prayer following the Prayer of Consecration to a traditional form, in lieu of the weak and unliturgical phrase previously sanctioned by Convention.

now specifically adapted in an optional table to all Sundays as well as other festivals, supplanting the aimless dictation of the day-of-the-month in the Sunday offices. There was an almost too complicated freedom in the use of the Daily Offices and the Litany, separately or in combination with other services, varying from the baldest brevity to the utmost elaboration. There were some further provisions for shortening the Communion, Confirmation, Marriage, and Ordination services. The rubrics throughout the book were minutely revised for both definiteness and liberty. The Baptismal orders were consolidated, and vastly simplified in use.

Liturgical *amendments* included the optional restoration of the Lord's Prayer to its proper place in Morning and Evening Prayer. The Lord's Prayer and the "Humble Access" were appended to the Consecration of the Communion—though the revision rightly rejected the liturgically faulty position of the Intercession and the Confession in the Scottish Book, and did nothing to review the Consecration Prayer, or to adjust the somewhat unsatisfactory use of some elements at the beginning and ending of this Office. The system of Proper Sentences in the Daily Offices was extended; and a consistent policy adopted as to the manner of printing and using the Lord's Prayer.¹³ The Offices for those At Sea and for the Visitation of Prisoners were eliminated.

Space has not permitted us to follow in detail the interesting process of revision, making a comparison of the four Reports with the Convention's completed work. But two observations seem pertinent.

During the period of revision, there was constant criticism of the method required by the Constitution of the Church. It was asserted that General Convention was incompetent to judge in these matters, that its criticism was futile, and

¹³Cf. p. 140 f.

that the only proper way to deal with liturgical revision was to leave it in the hands of experts. The 1928 revision, so it seems to these writers, throws a good deal of light on this matter. If the Church wants rapid revision, or if it wants chiefly what may be assumed to be "historically" correct, the experts can do it. If it wants on the other hand a Book which will commend itself to the great bulk of Church people, which is practical, and therefore *liturgically* correct, the method followed was thoroughly sound. A comparison will, we believe, show that the finished Book of 1928 is better than any of the Reports, if adopted in full, could have made it. Some minor proposals of value were lost; but widespread study and discussion saved the Church from some grievous mistakes.

The other observation has to do with the future. The Church has now at last recognized that while it cannot issue new books for its entire membership every few years, liturgical change is inevitable. General Convention has constituted a permanent Liturgical Commission, not to impose changes, but to collate and appraise proposals for revision, to bring them before Convention when the time seems appropriate, to recommend or prepare offices for special occasions not provided for in the Prayer Book, and to experiment and to guide in liturgical development. This Commission prepared the Lectionary which is now being tested throughout the Church. It has in preparation a Book of Offices for special occasions. But perhaps its chief value is that its appointment is recognition of the fact that worship is an ever-growing, ever-changing thing. Further revision is inevitable. There will be provision for a shorter Communion Service, and for the elimination of some of the phrases in that great Office which grow less and less congenial to our modern ears. There will certainly be less em-

phasis on eschatological conceptions and phrases which few people now accept, and greater emphasis upon the process of salvation in this world—including the responsibility of the Church for the Christianizing of the whole social order.¹⁴ Along these and other lines, the careful study and consistent criticism not only of liturgical scholars, but of clergy and laity, is most important. Worship concerns us all.

9. OTHER RECENT ANGLICAN REVISIONS

The last two American revisions may legitimately be credited with having helped to inspire like movements in all other branches of the Anglican Communion (save conservative Australia and New Zealand): though on the other hand the latest American book owes much to the indefatigable efforts especially of English and Scottish scholars, who assembled a great mass of available material during the concurrent process of their labors.

The Canadian revision from 1911 to 1922 was very conservative, and resulted in a Prayer Book essentially comparable to our Book of 1892: concerning itself chiefly with the Daily Offices and supplemental prayers, and leaving the Communion almost entirely untouched.¹⁵

The Episcopal Church of Scotland revised its Communion Office in 1911, and from 1918 to 1929 reviewed the whole Prayer Book on lines of flexibility and enrichment.¹⁶ This recension originated many of the features adopted in the English Book of 1928.

In England, the process of revision went on from 1906 to 1920 in Convocation. After this, the erection of the new

¹⁴See C. C. Morrison, *The Social Gospel and the Christian Cultus* (Harpers, N. Y., 1933), for an illuminating discussion of the relation of the Church's social responsibility to its orders of worship.

¹⁵Cf. W. J. Armitage, *The Story of the Canadian Revision of the Prayer Book* [Bib. 71].

¹⁶W. Perry, *The Scottish Prayer Book* [Bib. 81].

Church Assembly necessitated submission of the results to that body. Groups of scholars representing parties in the Church offered books of further suggestions. The work was finally completed in 1927, and submitted to Parliament. There it was defeated, after debates largely concerned with the matter of Reservation. The English "*Deposited Book*" of 1928 is in general comparable with the American Book of the same year, the order of whose consecratory Canon at the Eucharist it adopts; though in some respects it represents a still more advanced stage of development, a fuller liturgical knowledge, and a larger liberty. In the last particular indeed it is peculiar, permitting the new offices as alternatives to the old in any parish. Though rejected by Parliament, many parts of it are widely used in the English Church, with consent of the Bishop and the Parochial Councils.

The missionary dioceses of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, free from State control, and exempt from constitutional inflexibilities, have tried a great many experiments toward fitting the Anglican tradition to local requirements. Some exceedingly interesting moves have been made to assimilate native customs and ceremonial, exactly as the historic liturgies did at their inception, and indeed through much of their history. Many of these regional rites, fostered by "High-Church" societies, are strongly Romanized, accommodating Latin private prayers and subsidiary ceremonies to an Anglican public order and framework. In spite of this, it is interesting to note that virtually all the missionary "Uses," with hardly an exception, have adopted or approached the Scottish-American type of an "Eastern" Canon of the Eucharist.¹⁷

¹⁷L. & W. 796 f., 816-833.