

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Eucharistic liturgies of the Church of England 1945-1980

Thesis

How to cite:

Cassidy, James Michael (1981). Eucharistic liturgies of the Church of England 1945-1980. MPhil thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1981 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000fc7f>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

UNRESTRICTED

EUCCHARISTIC LITURGIES

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

1945 - 1980

JAMES MICHAEL CASSIDY

LICENCIATE IN SACRED THEOLOGY

Thesis presented to the Open University
in fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Philosophy.

Religious Studies.

May 1981

Date of submission: 5.5.81

Date of award: 2.9.81

ProQuest Number: 27777422

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 27777422

Published by ProQuest LLC (2020). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the development of Anglican Eucharistic theology from 1945 to the present day as shown by the texts used for the Service of Holy Communion. Both authorized and unauthorized Orders as well as official publications are used as primary sources.

In order to gain insight into the meanings of the texts, the debates of the Convocations, the National Assembly of the Church of England, and the General Synod which concerned the Orders are looked at very closely. The writings of the members of the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod are given special consideration. Also used are the various books and pamphlets which appeared as commentaries on the new Orders (often before authorization), especially where they reflected the position of the Catholic or Evangelical wings of the Church of England.

The thesis shows how the Church of England progressed towards the Alternative Service Book and shows how the theological emphases of the Church of England moved, or were perceived to move.

The conclusion is drawn that the Church of England has developed from the Book of Common Prayer, fixed in what might be called 'the Cranmerian position', to the Alternative Service Book which deliberately allows individuals to take part in the Eucharistic Mystery with varying insights into its theology.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	page	3
BEFORE 1966	page	11
SERIES 1	page	18
SERIES 2		
HISTORY	page	34
COMMENTARIES	page	67
CONCLUSION	page	89
SERIES 3		
HISTORY	page	98
COMMENTARIES	page	114
CONCLUSION	page	131
ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK		
HISTORY	page	140
INTERPRETATIONS	page	158
CONCLUSION		
SURVEY	page	165
A DRAWING TOGETHER	page	193
NOTES	page	203
BIBLIOGRAPHY	page	248
APPENDICES	page	261

INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY

This work will trace the development of the Church of England's Eucharistic Liturgy from 1945 to the present day. The aim will be to ascertain the development of its eucharistic theology as expressed in its Liturgy.

The method will be to examine the formulae and formulation of the central part of the services for Holy Communion (excluding such parts as the Confession, Creed and so on). The various proposals which preceded them will be examined as well as the texts which were authorized for public use. In order to find the meaning of the texts the primary source will be the changes made in the drafts. (1) The debates of the Convocations, Church Assembly and General Synod will also be used, for the Liturgical Commission and its Revision Committees worked as part of the Church represented in these assemblies and had their work examined by them. The members of these representative bodies also gave their own interpretations of the texts presented to them. A third source will be the various commentaries on the texts. These will show the meanings drawn out of the texts by representatives of various parties and individuals within the Church of England.

In conclusion the texts of the Alternative Service Book will be compared with the preceding Rites in order that the development in the understanding of the Eucharistic action may be made clear.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The legal processes of the Church of England will take up a part of this work, therefore it is necessary that the history of the procedure be explained. At first new Orders of Holy Communion were authorized by the 'Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure 1965' which permitted authorized Alternative Orders to be used in parishes with the approval of the Parochial Church Council. The Orders had to be passed for use by two-thirds majority of i) all the Houses in the Convocations and ii) the House of Laity of the National Assembly. After the Synodical Government Measure of 1969 the General Synod had authority to approve forms of Service. Before this only the Convocations, not the National Assembly, had authority to pronounce on matters of theology and so authorize new liturgical texts. The new services were initiated by the Church of England Liturgical Commission which was set up in 1954 to consider all matters of liturgical concern which were referred to it, and to make reports. In the beginning it had twenty five members, all clergy; later there was a constant, although small, lay presence.

The Liturgical Commission has the task of presenting to the Synod (which took over many of the functions of the Church Assembly) proposals for new services. They are then modified in the light of comments made - or defended. The first publication of the Commission was a report presented to Archbishops in 1957 in preparation for the Lambeth conference of 1958. (2) It looked at the approach to revision of the 1662 Prayer Book, gave a brief survey of Eucharistic theology (3) and offered six principles for Prayer Book revision. Briefly these principles were: the revision should be conservative, lest ordinary worshippers be distressed; it should not be repugnant to Scripture, and thus within the competence of the Church; it should give expression to new insights; be related to the modern world; be a joint work of the main schools of thought; all this was to be done so that the worship of God in the Church of England be richer and more worthy. (4) The Commission proposed questions about revision but did not answer them. In view of subsequent controversy its statement, "...it should surely not be difficult for those who share the same Anglican heritage to agree on the elements which they believe should be included in any revised Eucharistic liturgy in the Anglican Communion" (5) makes interesting reading.

In 1958 the Convocation of Canterbury set up a Committee to consider the report. Also in that year the Lambeth Conference met, and a sub-committee produced the part of the report 'Progress in the Anglican Communion' dealing with the Book of Common Prayer. (6) The report is part practical, part theological. It accepts change, and also suggests a uniform rite for the whole Communion (at least after a period of experiment in the different provinces). (7) It gives brief notes on the Eucharist, Sacrifice, Epiclesis and Consecration. However, they were so worded as to be open to many interpretations. (8)

In the last year of the 1950's the Church Assembly was asked to consider a Motion which asked the Bishops to enforce literally the 1662 rite. The debate did not take place. However, the Archbishop of Canterbury said that the Bishops had tried to see that nothing contrary to the 1662 rite, or the 1928 rite was used. (9)

After this all was quiet until 1962 when four Measures were introduced. These were the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure, the Prayer Book (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure, the Vesture of Ministers Measure and the Holy Table Measure. (The only other liturgical debate in the period 1945-1958 resulted

in a decision of the Convocations in 1954 that the westward position was possible at the celebration of Holy Communion.) Of the four Measures introduced in 1962 the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure had little debate and was passed in 1966; the Archbishops made 1st. May 1966 the date on which the Measure would come into effect. There had been long debates on the other Measures, especially that concerning the Vesture of Ministers and the Prayer Book (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure, which among other items authorized the use of Latin in the worship of the modern Universities. Later the Synod debated the Worship and Doctrine Measure to tidy up the revision process, relating it to the Synod rather than to the Convocations and the Assembly and to give permanence to what was approved.

In a debate on the Measure Bishop Stopford of London said, "Basically what we are doing in this Measure is to go to Parliament and ask that the Church of England, through its constitutional assemblies should be given permanently the right to order its own worship."(10) This Measure also involved the Declaration of Assent and the Act of Uniformity; for by these Anglican priests had to use Services permitted by 'lawful authority'. The subject of this 'lawful

authority' had been under discussion since the Prayer Book debate of 1928; only with the passing of the Measure in 1974 was the matter settled.

The first two Alternative Services, Series 1 and Series 2, were introduced in 1966 into the Church Assembly. However, before we progress to look at them it will be useful if the state of play which existed before 1966 is examined.

BEFORE 1966

Between the rejection by Parliament of the 1928 Prayer Book and the passing of the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure there were published for the use of Anglican Clergy two Altar Missals: 'The Anglican Missal' and 'The Altar Missal'. They were first published before 1939, but were reprinted during the time under discussion. (1)

They adopted for the Communion Service what was called the 'Interim Rite', that is the original 1549 position of the Prayer of Oblation after the Institution Narrative, followed by the Our Father and the Distribution of Communion. This form seems to have been published first in modern times in 'The Anglican Missal' of 1921, although it was suggested by W. H. Frere in 1911. (2) The 1928 Prayer Book used a similar revision, inserting a new text in the Prayer of Oblation.

This adjustment of the texts changes the emphasis of the liturgical action. The Prayer of Oblation says, "O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole church may obtain

remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves...to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction..."

When this prayer is joined to the Institution Narrative the phrase "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving..." can relate not to the reception of Holy Communion but to the actual anamnesis. Rev G.J. Cuming in 'A History of Anglican Liturgy' gives a brief survey of the Prayer and its location, saying that it was put immediately after the Reception in the 1549 Book at the behest of Zwingli. (3) The prayer had been after the Institution Narrative in the 1549 Book, and it was put back there by John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's in the time of James I, who used the Prayer of Oblation "in its right place, when he had consecrated the sacrament, as being the true public sacrifice of the Church...and when that was done, he did communicate the people, and so end with the Thanksgiving." (4) When the Prayer was introduced after the Institution Narrative in Scotland in the Christ Church Book of 1637 the Scots said it was there "for no other end but that the memorial and sacrifice of praise mentioned in it may be understood

according to the popish meaning...not of the spiritual sacrifice, but of the oblation of the body of the Lord."

(5)

The Prayer of Oblation was also put before the Distribution in the eighteenth Century Books of the Non-jurors, the Episcopal Church in Scotland and also the Episcopal Church in America. (6) It had also been changed from its 1662 position in proposals submitted by the Lower House of Convocation in 1914. (7) In a somewhat enlarged form it was put after the Institution Narrative in the 1928 Book which was "not inconsistent with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England." (8)

The Prayer of Oblation, then, has been movable in the history of the Communion Service. This movement seems to vary with the type of theology of the composers of the Order and their desire (to a greater or lesser degree) to revert to the more historical form. The growth of liturgical studies in the wake of Frere helped the changes, and provided a justification for them. If the Prayer is after the Reception then the concept appears to be that the "sacrifice of praise" is dependent on the act of the individual. Whereas if the Prayer is immediately after the Institution Narrative

then the sense seems to be that the acts of recalling and thanking by the community are the "sacrifice of praise". This idea is closer to that of orthodox Roman Catholic theology. (Cf. "sacrificium laudis" in the Roman Canon at the 'Memento' of the living which refers to the offering of the gifts in the context of the anamnesis - it is before the actual Institution Narrative.) This closeness would be the reason why the two Missals use the 'Interim Rite', both of them being in varying degrees Anglo-Catholic. Dom Gregory Dix had suggested that to change the position of the Prayer was to lay oneself open to the charge of Pelagianism. (9) However, C.L.Berry in a detailed study of the Prayer said that the words, from St. Paul, could not be Pelagian, (10) but he considered that the Prayer was more suitably an Offertory prayer. (11) It must be pointed out that the prayer is concerned with prayer offering the offerers, not the gifts.

Buchanan in his booklet 'What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?' (12) also brings in the idea of the Interim Rite being reminiscent of the Roman Missal, ("echo" is his word). (13) He says that it presents a development of Cranmer's theology whose understanding of 'Do this...' "is clear - we are to eat the bread and drink the cup." (14) However, Cuming observes that Cranmer

"did not intend the 1549 Canon to express exclusively any doctrinal position. It was a first step, following the precedent of the other Reformers, who all began with a conservative position ...the service itself is deliberately ambiguous." (15) Buchanan develops his argument saying that for Cranmer the anamnesis was the reception. (16) Dix also believed this of Cranmer, (17) who, as was noted above, held that when the prayer was before Communion it preached Pelagianism: 'we offer ourselves'. (18) However, G.A.Lewis Lloyd in a brief article suggested that one should move away from intricate textual criticism [of the words] and turn to the meaning "which the normal instructed worshipper attaches to them." (19) More theologically he says that the offering of oneself is as part of the Eucharistic Body of Christ. (20)

Therefore, the Interim Rite was a compromise: part Reformed, from Cranmer, part possibly Catholic; a hybrid from 1549, the Non-jurors and the Catholic wing. Its theology of sacrifice was vague, but this was its attraction. It did not depart from the historical Anglican texts, it had a legitimate background, and this too was attractive. As with Series 1, which will be discussed next, it was a step in the development of the theology of the Eucharist - an opening after the closed

position of 1662.

SERIES 1

Series 1 Holy Communion (unlike other revisions up to the Alternative Service Book it was given the title 'The Lord's Supper' as in the Book of Common Prayer) was introduced into the Convocation of Canterbury by the Archbishop of Canterbury on May 6th. 1966 saying, "The Series is not new or exciting. It is not the work of revision so much as a work of current authorisation."

(1) Its principle was that it offered legality to the Interim Rite as well as providing a number of variations; permutations on the 1662 and 1928 rites. These can be described as follows:

a) 1662, with optional Lord's Prayer, fraction and Lamb of God before administration.

b) 1662 with 1662 Prayer of Oblation, with the first part of the 1928 anamnesis.

c) 1662 with 1662 Prayer of Oblation, with 1928 anamnesis as in b), but excluding the self-offering.

The options not used before the administration (excluding the 1928 anamnesis) can also be used after the Reception. (2)

However, before the Liturgy was debated in either the Convocations or the Church Assembly there was held a two day debate, a Liturgical Conference, in the preceding February to discuss both Series 1 and Series 2. (3) The majority of speeches from the floor dealt with the language used in worship: whether in the revisions it should be 'modern' or 'traditional'. The actual theology involved was not, it seems, of much interest to the participants. Nevertheless, minor revisions were made because of suggestions made at the Conference.

The variations included the placing of the 'Glory be to God on High' before the Collect; alternative proclamations to the Gospel; the alternative of placing the bread and wine on the Table either before the 'Sursum Corda', or before the Intercessions, which was the only place given in the first draft. (This last change was directly introduced at the Convocation of Canterbury.) (4) Also, it was made possible for the Prayer of Humble Access to be said either before the 'Sursum Corda' or before the Institution Narrative. There was also added a proper Preface for use on Sundays. (5)

The main argument in the discussion on Series 1 in the Convocation of Canterbury was about the endings permitted for the Prayer of Consecration. In his introduction of the Rite to the Convocation the President (the Archbishop of Canterbury) suggested that the option of saying the full Prayer of Oblation after the Consecration be deleted, leaving the shorter version of the ending, and the self-offering to be said after the Reception. (6) The debate which followed referred more to customary practices rather than the theology behind them. (7) Only Rev. M.A.P.Wood mentioned the principles involved, "There are many people who felt that the offering of a sacrifice of praise within the setting of the Canon could be open to mis-construction. One could turn to Hebrews xii, and recognise that there were strong scriptural grounds for a clear doctrine of the sacrifice of praise and the sacrifice of thanksgiving." (8) Later at the end of the debate, after the either/or ending of the Prayer of Consecration had been passed by Convocation Wood continued the discussion, saying, "...if the alternative Order for Holy Communion is passed it does a grave disservice to Evangelicals...If the service is passed with the Prayer of Oblation attached to the Prayer of Consecration, unless His Grace could give a measure of redress, people would not be able to use the alternatives at all,

because it would offend their consciences." (9) To this the Archbishop of Canterbury replied, "I do not think it will be a severe problem for anyone who reads the rubric 'The Prayer of Consecration may end here, in which case the people shall answer, Amen.'" (10) And so Series 1 was carried in the Convocation of Canterbury. There was very little debate in the Convocation of York which was held the following day. (11) The Convocation of the Northern Province likewise rejected the Liturgical Commission's idea of not permitting the options after the Institution Narrative. (12) It was thought better that the Interim Rite be left untouched, at least at the beginning. (13)

The subsequent debate in the Church Assembly (7th. Nov. 1966) (14) was longer than the debates in the Convocations, the Evangelical position being explained at some length, (15) but few of the speeches really bothered with theology. A motion to delete the alternative endings of the Consecration Prayer was defeated by 82 votes to 170. (16) A proposal "that the Liturgical Revision Steering Committee be requested to reconsider this form of service with a view to securing the amendment of the two alternative endings to the Prayer of Consecration so as to make it unambiguously clear that man's offering of himself contributes in no

way to his own salvation" was rejected. (17) Also rejected was a motion to reconcile the alternative endings. After a long debate in which the speeches seemed to come from prepared positions and be shown to other prepared positions, without a true exchange, Series 1 was approved by 174 votes to 79. (18)

In looking at Series 1 and its subsequent revision a progression can be seen. In the 1966 version the options were authorized to cover the accepted usages in the Church of England, these show the tension Evangelical-Catholic. The second option of the endings is geared towards the Evangelicals, finishing before the mention of 'sacrifice' and 'pardoning our offences'--ideas which could be construed in the (Roman?) Catholic sense, whether or not that was the intention of Cranmer in 1549. (The first option was discussed above as the 'Interim Rites').

It is interesting to note that the Anglo-Catholic 'Church Union' published through its Church Literature Association their version of 'The Order of Holy Communion, ordered 1662, modified 1928, reshaped 1966'. The adaptation is anonymous, but notes were supplied by Rev. K.N. Ross, a member of the Liturgical Commission, Vicar of All Saints, Margaret St. London, a noted

Anglo-Catholic Church. The first and second editions of the booklet are essentially the same, but a third edition, (1967? - there is no date in any of them), deletes the title 'The Service of the Lord's Supper' which had been placed before the admonition "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent..." (the alternative being omitted), and it also deletes the 'Comfortable Words' and the Prayer of Humble Access before the Offertory.

However, the most interesting choice made by the editor is that of the shorter ending of the 'The Thanksgiving' (not 'The Consecration' as in the legal text). He put an abbreviated version of the self-offering, and the optional prayer (in Series 1 from the 1662 Book) "Almighty and ever-living God, we most heartily thank thee..."

Another 'private' version of Series 1 is also in the present author's possession. It is duplicated on stiff card, being a scissors and paste compilation from the official text published by SPCK. It has no printer's name, and no indication of the Church which produced it. The text omits the preliminary 'Our Father', gives the 'Kyrie eleison', the 'Glory to God', the Creed and the Intercessions. The prayer "You that do truly and earnestly repent..." is given, not in the

alternative, and the subsequent prayer "Almighty God, Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ..." is also printed, but with no indication that it is to be said by the People as well as the Minister, as is the direction given in the legal text. The Prayer of Humble Access is put immediately after the 'Comfortable Words'. The title 'The Consecration' is kept, and the longer version of the ending of the prayer after the Institution Narrative is used. After Communion only the prayer "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank you..." is provided.

The purpose of these compilations seems to have been two-fold. They helped the congregation to follow the Minister, and also made clear his own preferences. (Subject, of course, to the agreement of his Parochial Church Council, for the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure specified in its clause 3 that this agreement was necessary before any Alternative Service be introduced.) In view of the variations made by the editors of these works it is useful to remember that clause 5 of the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure permitted "variations not of substantial importance" to be made by the Minister at his discretion. But we can ask the question: if the variations are not important why should the Minister

bother?

Theologically the crucial difference between the booklets is in the choice of ending after the Institution Narrative. The Vicar of All Saints chose the shorter ending rather than the longer preferred by the other compiler. The evidence of the books shows that the dividing line Catholic/Evangelical is not clear-cut.

The Evangelical view of Series 1 was admirably summarized by Rev. R.T. Beckwith, the Librarian of Latimer House, Oxford, in a pamphlet which formed part of the 'Prayer Book Reform Series', entitled 'Prayer Book Revision and Anglican Unity.' (19) He says that the 1549 form, used in Series 1 is able to be interpreted as meaning not that praise and thanksgiving are being offered, (and indeed, there are no words of praise and thanksgiving in the whole Consecration prayer;) but that bread and wine are being offered in a spirit of praise and thanksgiving. This can, he says, lead to a belief that there is a literal offering of Christ's body and blood, a development which he attributes to the Oxford Movement. The Oxford Movement is also given responsibility for reviving St. Augustine's idea that "since the church is the body of Christ therefore the

self-offering of the Church is an offering of the body of Christ." He then develops this further, saying that one can so identify the offering of bread and wine (Christ's body and blood) not only with the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but also with the offering of ourselves, our souls and our bodies. He complains that in 1549 the words 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' were associated with the words of praise and thanksgiving which interpret this phrase. But in Series 1 there are no words of praise and thanksgiving to interpret this phrase. (The 1549 version had before the Institution Narrative: "And here we do geue unto thee moste high praise, and heartie thankes, for the wonderfull grace and vertue, declared in all thy saintes, from the begynning of the world...")(20)

Beckwith says, "The 1549 Prayer Book, as a stage in the reforming movement, was a desirable advance on what had preceded it, and actually lent itself to a Reformed interpretation. These modern variations, [Series 1 and others] however, being a stage in a counter-reforming movement, which has revised teaching dangerously approximating to the doctrine of the mass, are an undesirable retreat from what preceded them, and naturally lend themselves to an unreformed interpretation." (21)

When Series 1 was revised ten years later only the longer ending of the Institution Narrative was given for the 'Thanksgiving' (not 'Consecration' as in 1966), but the self-offering was deleted. (22) ("And here we offer and present... thy grace and heavenly benediction.") (23) These variations, together with a note of praise introduced after the Sanctus (The Prayer begins "All glory be to thee..."), and the deletion of the parentheses around the phrase "by his one oblation of himself once offered" seem to have been approved without any debate. (24)

As in the original Series 1 the complete Prayer of Oblation is available to be used after the Reception at the discretion of the Minister. The revision also added an epiclesis, put in at a late stage. (25) It is before the words of Institution, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that * by the power of the Holy Spirit * we receiving these creatures of bread and wine..." The words between the asterisks are those inserted. (The words also necessitated the full stop before 'Hear us...' in order to make the longer sentence manageable.)

Before 'The Consecration' Series 1 inserted part of 1 Chronicles 29.11 and 29.14 "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power, And the glory, and the witness, and the majesty. All that is on heaven and earth is thine. All things come of thee, O Lord, and of thine own do we give you." (26) This was able to be said after the elements had been placed on the Holy Table. Although this had been omitted from Series 2, after the first 1965 draft, it was restored in Series 1&2 Revised. At the end of the revision process (1975) just before the final approval the Bishops added a rubric after the heading 'The Preparation of the Bread and Wine', and before the rubric directing the bringing of the bread and wine to the table. It read, "The priest begins the offertory, A hymn may be sung, verses of Scripture may be read and the offerings of the people may be collected and presented if this has not already been done." (27) As we shall see this introduced a controversial term for the first time into the approved texts.

The individual parts of Series 1 and Series 1 Revised have been discussed above. It is now time to locate them in the context of the development of Anglican Eucharistic theology.

Series 1 was the legalising of various formulae already embraced by the 'comprehensiveness' of the Anglican Church. It developed from a series of partisan options based on 1549, 1662, and 1928, to a service which can best be described as being in the 'moderate Reformed' tradition, preserving the breadth of interpretation of 1549. This breadth, and the *raison d'etre* of the Rite were acknowledged by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his speech cited above. (28)

In Series 1 all was possible - from a bare repetition of the Institution Narrative followed by the Reception, without the Oblation even after the Reception, as in 1662, repeating 1552, to a Rite which included the Oblation in the traditional High Church sense. - This is no liturgical or theological development, it seems to me, but rather a legalisation of what could be called ritual anarchy.

In Series 1 Revised, however, the theological options are eradicated. After the Institution Narrative the Prayer of Oblation is obligatory. However, because the Self-Offering is omitted from the text it is questionable if the prayer is still "of Oblation". In the prayer, as revised, the Father is besought to accept "this our sacrifice of praise", "our bounden duty and

service" so that sins may be remitted, and partakers of Holy Communion may be "fulfilled with thy grace and benediction". But no longer are the congregation's souls and bodies offered "to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice", for this crucial phrase has been omitted.

So we can say that the Godward movement by the Congregation is confined to the offering of praise. The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is performed and of course this includes the action towards God, but the inner meaning is left 'wrapped up' in the word 'sacrifice'. Perhaps one could ask if this is ever 'unwrapped' in sermons or teaching, if we may continue the metaphor. So far as the explicit words go the conclusion is that the prayer moved away from the High Church position.

In view of the High Church leanings one can state that the traditional Roman Canon and Offertory of the Mass are devoid of any explicit mention of self-offering. The explicit offering is of the bread and wine so that they may be the "sacrificial gifts" and be "a holy, pure and unblemished sacrifice." (29) Therefore the question can be posed: did the basic Anglican Liturgy bring to the surface the implicit

self-offering in the Roman Canon in order to draw attention away from the fact that the bread and wine were no longer the sacrificial gifts? (30)

It seems that one is left in Series 1 Revised with what can be described as a compromise. The self-offering is omitted, but the word 'sacrifice' is retained. But the "this" in the phrase "this our sacrifice and praise" is left with a vague relationship to the Institution Narrative - it could possibly refer to the Reception as well, a notion attributed to Cranmer. (31)

However, Series 1 was never intended to be definitive, and its revision and further authorisation was, perhaps, a consolation to the people who had not moved on to the other Series. Its strength was that it took the first steps to a different structure as opposed to the Book of Common Prayer, and grasped the fact that the short Canon of Cranmer was able to be changed without the obvious losing of all the insights of the Reformers. Series 2 was the real innovation, and we shall now examine this, and see if the eventual Cranmerian tone of Series 1 was maintained.

SERIES 2

HISTORY

Series 2 had a most varied history. Although the debates and proceedings of the Liturgical Commission are locked away in confidential archives, thanks to the work of Buchanan (1) we can trace the development of the Liturgy through six revisions, and eleven months of debate, both public and private, until it saw the light of day as authorized for experimental use.

I will not give a history of the debate, this has already been done in Buchanan's book; rather I will examine the theology behind the changes. However, Dr. Jasper, the chairman of the Liturgical Commission, in his introduction to the draft says, "We have also, where matters of Eucharistic doctrine are involved, tried to produce forms of words which are capable of various interpretations... Only by using such language as does not require any one interpretation can we produce a liturgy which all will be able to use, and which each will be able to interpret according to his own convictions." (2) This statement indicates that the public debates of the Church of England will have to be examined to see what interpretation each school of

theology put on the texts. Mere textual criticism will not suffice, the man in charge of the composition has ruled that out when he said that many meanings are able to be carried by the form of words used.

There were four editions of the Rite published: 'A Draft Order for Holy Communion, An Interim Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission printed with the permission of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York', dated June 1965, bound in with other Alternative Services, and then 'Alternative Services, Second Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity, 1966'. This was followed by 'An Order for Holy Communion, The Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York as amended and accepted by the Convocations on 12th. Oct. 1966, and to be presented to the House of Laity of the Church Assembly.' Finally appeared 'Alternative Services, Second Series, An Order for Holy Communion.' (1967). However, when we examine the prayer which follows the Institution Narrative we have to cope with two other revisions of the text. Buchanan gives the six texts in his book. (3) They are laid out in Appendix I below.

VERSION I JUNE 1965 LITURGICAL COMMISSION DRAFT ORDER

The first version of the Order had two commentaries, one by Jasper as an introduction (4) and also one by Canon Couratin the reputed composer of the original draft in his speech at the 1966 Liturgical Conference, which was published later. (5)

Jasper's commentary says that the Preface and the Prayer of Consecration were thought of as two parts of one whole; the Preface being the Thanksgiving for God's works. Of the second part he says that, "we have tried to compose a prayer which expresses the Eucharistic Memorial and is centred on the Narrative of the Institution, upon which the Memorial is based. Inevitably no one will find here exactly what he wants to say. But we hope that everyone will find here a prayer which with some self sacrifice he can use; and will allow to others the same liberty of interpretation that he claims for himself." (6) Specifically of the phrase 'may be unto us' said over the bread and wine before the words of Institution, Jasper says, "This phrase can be used by Anglicans of all schools of thought to express their view of the Eucharistic presence." (7) He concludes his introduction to the draft by saying that its purpose was to "provide the

Church with some indication of the lines on which we have been working during the past few years." (8)

Couratin in his speech to the Liturgical Conference referred to above appealed to the early Church and then to the varying traditions. Like Jasper he says that the Commission tried to produce a rite capable of being either Catholic or Reformed. The offering of the bread and wine may be taken to mean "no more than we put the bread and the cup at God's disposal so that we may use it to feed those who receive with faith." (9) This, he admits, is capable of more than one interpretation, "but it does not assert the fully developed doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." Here Couratin appealed to Hippolytus, Justin and Clement.

Speaking of the words before the Institution Narrative he said that the words used over the bread and cup, 'may be unto us the body and blood of Christ', came from Cranmer's 1549 liturgy. (10) "This", he continued, "fell short of the language of the Catholic Churches. The Latins pray that the oblation may become, or may be made unto us the body and blood of Christ. The Greeks ask God to make the bread into the body, changing it by the Holy Spirit. The prayer that the bread and wine may be unto us the body and blood is evenly poised between

the subjective and objective interpretation, and as such I suggest that we should be able to use it." Again we have the idea put forward, that each member of the Church of England has to find the emphases at each Communion Service, and ascertain the location of the 'balance' on which the Service rests. Significantly Couratin concluded his speech by telling the Conference that the man responsible for drafting the Order had sought guidance from his Archbishop about the ambiguities. The Archbishop of Canterbury who was in the chair interjected briefly: "Would you explain which Archbishop?" and assured the meeting that it was not he. Couratin resumed, saying that the Archbishop in question, whom he declined to name, had said, "Live and let live."

Here are laid out the tensions of a Church which boasts of being comprehensive, of being Catholic and Reformed. Couratin on the Catholic side stressed the Fathers, but they were not enough. In spite of the fact that the members of the Liturgical Conference (and so members of the Church Assembly) spent the rest of the Conference talking about the style of language, the split Catholic/Evangelical remained. The Conference did not use its opportunity to forge a link between the two positions.

In view of the wide spread of meaning possible to be read into the language of the first draft of the Order it is manifestly impossible to draw any conclusions of a theological nature from it. It seems to have been designed to be all things to all men.

VERSION II APRIL 1966 LITURGICAL COMMISSION'S FINAL
REPORT

In spite of the ambiguities, and the appeal to the Fathers and to Cranmer this version appeared with a 'Note of Dissent' from Buchanan. It read, "In joining with the Commission in generally commending this Report, I reluctantly dissent from the penultimate paragraph of ¶ 24. Inquiry has shown that the phrase 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup' is unacceptable to many Anglicans..." (A footnote in the similar Oct. 1966 version says that this was written before the alternatives were provided). (11)

There were also two changes in the text. The first one came in the Introductory section, (12) where part of Couratin's speech to the Liturgical Conference (13) was inserted in place of the sentence, "This phrase [may be unto us] can be used by Anglicans of all schools of thought to express their views of the Eucharistic presence" (14) so that the revised version reads, "This [we offer unto thee this bread and this cup] need mean no more than 'we put this bread and this cup at God's disposal' so that he may use it to feed those (15) who receive with faith. It can, of course, be interpreted to mean something else; but it does not assert the

fully developed doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. (16) It confines itself to the simple language of the first two centuries. This is the way in which Hippolytus and Irenaeus and Justin talked, and it is a way of talking which goes back to New Testament times, for Clement used this way of talking too. (17) It is going to be difficult to maintain the Anglican appeal to antiquity if we are not prepared to talk like this, if we are not prepared to offer the Bread and the Cup to the Father. Each may use the phrase with his own interpretation, and no one need try to force his own interpretation on other people." (18)

Obviously the insertion of the speech was to support the use of the Order, (against Buchanan and the other Evangelicals?) and to open up avenues for discussion.

The text of the prayer after the Institution Narrative was also changed, by two additions: 'and grant that we may so eat and drink these holy things...' and 'that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing.' (19)

The words 'eat and drink' underline that the Eucharist was instituted to be eaten and drunk, not reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. (20) The word 'things' does not tell us if the 'things' are to be thought of as the (holy) bread and wine, consecrated bread and wine, or even the Body and Blood of Christ.

The use of the subjunctive 'may be filled' from 1552 is also capable of varying interpretations - may be filled through the offering of the Sacrament, or the act of remembering, or through the faith of the recipient?

In a chapter in a later book Buchanan reveals the theory of Couratin and Ratcliff behind this version of Series 2. (21) Using Exodus 24 as a base (in which the elders offer sacrifice, are sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, ascend the mountain, see God and finally eat and drink with him) - which is what they consider their second century authors and authorities to have done, (and we have noted that Couratin's appeal to Hippolytus and Irenaeus found its way into the Introductory section); they wished the Institution Narrative to be followed by the Oblation in the anamnesis paragraph, leading to a reference to eating and drinking in God's presence, concluding with the

Sanctus. Buchanan observes that the text reads fluently without the Sanctus, and is closer to Hippolytus if so changed. (And indeed from the first published draft of Series 2, right through to Rite B in the 1980 Alternative Service Book, which is its linear descendent, the people have the option of reciting or singing the Benedictus after the doxology at the end of the Thanksgiving.)

This second draft then, as far as the changes in the text are concerned, left all the options open, but not as regards the offering of the bread and wine. In spite of the vagueness, the 'live and let live' philosophy recommended, Buchanan publicly dissented. He also wrote a pamphlet explaining the reason for his dissent. (22) The crucial point is that as an Evangelical he wished to follow the words of Scripture exactly as they are recorded. Therefore, the words of Institution 'Do this in memory of me' mean to Buchanan the acts of eating and drinking. He does not see the traditional act of offering as fulfilling the Dominical command. He says, "...what are we in fact to say or do 'in remembrance of Him'? The traditional answer in liturgy from Hippolytus onwards was 'we offer...' But this, as Cranmer said, is not what our Lord commanded. 'Offering' is not one of the instituted acts of Christ,

and is, therefore, an intrusion." (23) Buchanan says that it was Cranmer's clear intention in 1552 (and unclear in 1549) that the remembering of our Lord's command, for him the anamnesis, is in the eating and drinking. (24)

Buchanan is at pains to underline the fact that in the Sacrament the complete action is from God to us, the elements are at God's disposal, men cannot offer anything to God. He wishes to avoid the idea of a 'eucharistic sacrifice' which links "an offering of ours with this bread and this cup...most such modern doctrines seem to me to be defective in just the very point of wanting to ensure that we have something to offer God which is peculiar to a Communion service." (25) About the words of Hippolytus he says, "Hippolytus obviously used the words as innocent of all offences (as the ante-Nicenes did in their sub-Trinitarian statements about God), but that does not mean in either case we can. The innocence is lost when they are imported into our present context." (26) The offering is a "doctrinal novelty." (27)

The text having been published by the Liturgical Commission on 29th. April 1966 was debated by the two Convocations, Canterbury on 10th. May, York on 10th. and 11th. May. The members of the Convocations had been given a copy of Buchanan's booklet before the debate. The discussion at the Convocation of York did not contribute much to the debate. However, a Rev. K.W.Coates revealed that 77 out of 80 clergy in Liverpool diocese declared that they found the words 'We offer unto thee this bread and this cup' "unacceptable to the conscience of many clergy and lay people who might otherwise wish to make use of the service." (28) After an inconclusive debate the Convocation decided to defer any further consideration of the Order until the following October, and ask the Liturgical Commission to take note of the debate. (29)

The Convocation of Canterbury, which had the advantage of having Jasper as a member, had a more theological debate. In his introductory speech he revealed a bit of the background to the debate in the Liturgical Commission itself. He said that at the last meeting the form of words had been agreed to by everyone, including those on the Evangelical side, except Buchanan. No other form of words was able to satisfy the other members to the same extent. He said,

"...for while Mr. Buchanan could say that any form of words describing a Godward action was equally unacceptable to a great many others... The words could be justified on a number of counts, and the Commission tried using this form to get behind the Reformation controversies; they did reflect, as best they knew it, primitive practice, and it was to primitive practice that they had been encouraged to look." Speaking of the old liturgies he asked the rhetorical question: was it true that, "the Holy Spirit did not blow until it blew on Cranmer and his friends in 1552?" (30)

The Venerable C.W.J.Bowles, Archdeacon of Swindon, also a member of the Commission, seconded Jasper's motion that the report be considered. He underlined the importance of tradition in the Anglican Church. He also said that the offering of the bread and the cup was an action of thanksgiving, and that various texts of the Communion Service acknowledged the grace of God given to those who are saved. He suggested that the words took their meaning from the actual context, not just from their source in Hippolytus, and in the Report the words, "were...used in the context of thanksgiving and the assurance of God's grace." (31)

Later in the debate Prebendary G.B. Timms suggested that a form of words be included in the prayer to make clear that a memorial - an anamnesis - was being made "before God of the saving act of his Son dramatically represented by the efficacious symbols which he himself instituted." (32) He suggested the words which were put forward, among others, by Buchanan: "We...do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make." (33)

The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Dr. Leslie Brown) made the suggestion that outside contributions be invited to resolve the difficulty. (34) This idea was taken up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, (35) and welcomed, albeit cautiously, by Jasper. (36) Further debate was postponed until the following October. (37)

The debates as given here show, I think, the divisions and the tensions yet again. They also show the sources to which each was appealing. The concept of Jasper and the Commission is also brought out - to get behind the controversies. But they were stymied by the appeal to Scripture and the refusal to countenance anything else; even the Fathers of the Church. The

addition of the words 'and grant that we may so eat this bread and drink these holy things' was a step forward, and the words remained in the final version.

This second version, then, was an important stage in the revision process. Clear lines were drawn, the negotiating positions were taken, and it is more from this document than the former version, that we can trace the final version. Nevertheless, the theology is unclear, its basis seems to be compromise. However, the eating and drinking of the holy things is fundamental to the Rite, as it was to Cranmer.

VERSION III JULY 1966 STEERING COMMITTEE GROUP TEXT

VERSION IV OCTOBER 1966

---TEXT AS AMENDED BY CONVOCATIONS TO BE RECOMMENDED TO
THE HOUSE OF LAITY

In October the two Convocations met together for two days, the 10th. and the 11th. The Report of the meeting, as well as appearing in the usual forms was also published as a separate document, showing the importance given to the meeting. (38) The two day debate is difficult to precis because of its length. However, the main points will be highlighted.

The two texts, Versions III and IV,, as well as the preceding version, were used. Texts II and IV are the same except for the option 'we offer unto thee', Text III was a new draft made by the Group set up at the end of the May Convocations at the suggestion of the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich. However, when the two Convocations met in Church House the Archbishop of Canterbury said that some of the members of the Steering Committee had expressed hesitation about this version (III), so the Bishops, as a house, wished to recommend the form in the Liturgical Commission's Final Report (II). (39) Jasper proposed that version, as he had done in the previous meeting of the Convocation, later the

Bishop of Chelmsford proposed the Steering Committee Group's version. (40)

After an inconclusive first day's debate the Archbishop of Canterbury gave a summary which was a model of diplomacy. He supported the Liturgical Commission's work, and re-iterated basic Anglican teaching, "We are obliged as Anglicans to be scriptural...in Holy Scripture our Lord gave us this rite and commanded its use, and made great promises in connection with its use. He did not prescribe the words to be used ...In fact we have in the Scriptures no actual account of the words used in an eucharistic service. The Liturgical Commission in finding the words to be used, went, in the main, to words used in the pre-Nicene Church. That, I think is an entirely Anglican procedure - to be faithful to scriptural doctrine as far as possible and to use the words of the early Church in praying to God in obedience to that doctrine... But these words 'we offer' are associated with many developments and derivations in theology in the Christian West and in particular the words of offering were in the developed Roman rite associated with particular kinds of doctrine." (41)

He concluded his speech by suggesting that the members of the Convocations had a good night's sleep, and sent them on their way with four possibilities to choose from:

- a) the Liturgical Commission's text
- b) the Liturgical Commission's text with a variant - perhaps with the 1662 prayer, perhaps with: 'we give thanks unto thee over this bread and this cup' instead of 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup'
- c) a minimal phrase being used, e.g. 'we do this at thy command'
- d) a reformulation.

On the resumption of the debate the Bishop of Oxford introduced the Steering Committee Group's work. The introduction was a low-key affair, and he concluded by saying that if his text was not accepted he hoped there would be an alternative formula available at the crucial point. "He hesitated to make any suggestions, but it seemed to him that one simple possibility would be to allow 'we give thee thanks over this bread and this cup' instead of 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup.'" (42) The ensuing debate was rather vague, and during the morning the Archbishop of Canterbury recalled

the options which seemed available. (43)

Jasper in a reply to a speech said that he objected to the new version because of the words 'we do this in obedience to your command.' He said that the most significant point was that it was done in remembrance of the Lord; it was something essentially dynamic. He supported the use of alternatives as a modest way out of the difficulties, he thought that there was no one, tidy verb to use. (44)

When the Convocations resumed after lunch they sat in Committee, a private, unreported session, to take a series of informal votes on the options available. (45) The text proposed by the Steering Committee Group was then rejected. (46) After further debate the proposition that there should be an option available was passed, the Archbishop of Canterbury remarking that the words 'to offer' and 'to give thanks' were nearly identical in essentially biblical thought. (47)

The Convocation debate was not noteworthy for its theology or level of debate, there were no new ideas or insights, the basic theology had been proposed in Canon Couratin's speech at the Liturgical Conference and in Buchanan's booklet. The House of Laity, sitting

separately, had their debate on 17th. February, at the end of the Spring Group of Sessions of the Church Assembly. They toyed with the Order, spoke about the large number of permissive rubrics ('may'), and dwelt at length on prayers for the Queen and the Dead, but did not touch the topic which had caused all the debate in the Convocations. They decided to continue the debate on 26th. April, (48) after another Liturgical Conference had been held on the preceding day.

The allowing of a choice between two texts in this version was a novelty. The offering was also optional. But what does 'we give thanks to thee over this bread and this cup' mean? What is the burden of the preposition? Also, the 'duty and service' may refer to the giving thanks, rather than the offering, which, of course is more acceptable to the Evangelicals. (Unless duty and service are applied to the eating and drinking.)

Nothing seems to have been written on the text proposed by the Steering Committee Group, it seems to have been quietly dropped from view. It had several unique touches (at least as far as Series 2 goes) - the mentioning of the sacrifice on the Cross, the recalling of the command, the offering of the people, and the

invocation of the Spirit as a unifying force. The 'duty and service' is offered, the Lord is not just asked to accept it as in the other texts; but again, of what this consists is left vague.

It seems probable that this text was not used because it was not all that different from the one proposed, and with the suggestion that two phrases may appear as alternatives this showed what appeared to be an easy way out of the impasse without any need to reflect on a new text, which was not substantially different from what had preceded it, in spite of its special verbal flourishes.

VERSION V APRIL 1967 STEERING COMMITTEE GROUP TEXT

VERSION VI JULY 1967 FINAL REVISION, AUTHORIZED TEXT

The Liturgical Conference which preceeded the final debate began with an introduction from the Dean of Bristol, Very Rev. D.E.W.Harrison, Vice-chairman of the Liturgical Commission, who referred to the divisions in the Church: "the difficulty, I know, for some Evangelicals lies precisely in the fact that the words 'we offer this bread and this cup' said after the institution may be interpreted - let us be honest, will be interpreted - by Anglicans of a different school as combining what Cranmer said should be kept separate - the sacrifice of our Lord's passion and the responsive sacrifice of the Church... I make the point that neither is my Anglo-Catholic brother bound by my interpretation, nor I by his... And this is the crux, for this present moment in the Church of England: Must I not only say what I believe to be true, but also prevent my brother from saying what he in conscience believes should be said." (49) The Dean was also to introduce to the Conference a memorandum which gave the text which I have called 'Version V'; however, he contrived not to mention the revision in his speech. It was left to Canon Hickinbotham to mention it, and to point out that the phrase 'we pray thee to accept this

our duty and service' could be taken as implying both options which had been deleted from the revision: offering/giving thanks. (50) This was obviously a medium way, and it was mentioned that the service was, after all, only for temporary, experimental use. (51)

After lunch four questions were posed to the Conference, the votes being recorded in the same manner as would be taken in a definitive vote by the Convocations and the House of Laity. The figures make interesting reading: to the proposition: "would the Conference agree to 'we offer unto thee' as the only form of words?" the Convocations agreed by an overwhelming majority, but the laity only did so by 101 - 86, a bare majority of 54.5%. To the question, "would the Conference agree to 'we give thanks to thee' as the only form of words?" the answer was a resounding 'no' from both bodies.

To the question: "would the Conference agree to alternatives in the Prayer of Consecration on the understanding that they are only there for three years and that every effort will be made in that time to find acceptable words?" the Convocations responded positively by a small majority, 115 - 106 (54%).

Finally the Conference was asked if it would prefer the option proposed to the Conference. The Convocations rejected it 104 - 116 (53%), but in the House of Laity it was carried with a substantial majority. (52)

At this impasse Jasper spoke, having done a little 'homework', and produced a formula which would involve minimum change, as a "possible stopgap solution." (53) (This text is given as Version VI). At this point the Conference grew confused. There were protests at the suddenness of the introduction of the text. There was a brief speech against it because it omitted offering, and put the idea of the bread and wine before that of the memorial of the passion, death and resurrection. (54) There was an attempt by the Bishop of Exeter to go back to the form 'we offer unto thee' and he asked that a vote be taken to ask if the House of Laity would change its mind as to its suitability in view of the support which it had received in the Convocations. It was accepted by a bare majority: 93-89 (51%). (55)

The Chairmen were then forced to cut short the debate to allow for further discussion, and only a brief airing was given to the two topics of Baptism and Confirmation. After an adjournment a vote was taken on the acceptability of sending Jasper's text to the

Convocations and the House of Laity of the Church Assembly for further discussion. This was agreed to by both sections of the Conference by substantial majorities without further debate --perhaps the members were 'punch-drunk' by this time, for although they were offered more time the offer was not taken. (56)

The following day the Convocations of Canterbury and York met together. Jasper introduced his 'stop-gap' as makeshift, regretting the passing of the words 'we offer unto thee'. The Report of the Joint Sessions continues, "But he was sufficiently realistic to know that if these words were not to be accepted it would be necessary to find something else that would be. It was also clear that the alternatives were likely to meet with no better success than the original proposals. This meant that they were passed with a Communion Service with a horrible gap in the middle, and this was likely to produce increasing controversy...in fact the whole service was in jeopardy." (57)

He continued, saying that there were no precedents for the words he used, but the words 'this bread and this cup' gave weight to the idea of anamnesis in a form which could be used by both sides, "with a fairly clear conscience. For example, it could be said that with

this form of words they could eat bread and drink wine in thankful remembrance of what Christ had done for them, and thankful for the gifts he had given to them; or they could use the idea of anamnesis in its richer meaning and feel that here was something which was brought into the present and actualized here and now... [the words used] would be something able to be used conscientiously by nearly everybody, if not everybody within the Provinces of Canterbury and York over the experimental period while there was a time in which feelings could cool..." (58)

An Evangelical rose to give grudging acceptance to the new formula; Rev. R.P.P. Johnston said that "like Dr. Jasper they might feel that the words were not ideal; but they realised that there must be a great deal of give and take in this matter. In the spirit in which they were put forward he urged that the words be accepted unanimously by the Synods." (59) Dr. T.G. Jalland said that he accepted the words "because it was so often suggested that the sacrifice was being made largely on one side." (60)

After the laudatory short speeches the motion to accept the new formula was put and carried unanimously by the Bishops and by substantial majorities in the Lower Houses. (61)

The meeting of the House of Laity of the Church Assembly to consider the text was held on July 7th. In introducing the text Chancellor W.S.Wiggleworth said, "Some form of this kind is necessary to let the service go forward for trial, and without something like this the House of Laity is not likely to approve what the Convocation is likely to approve, or vice versa. In adopting the words...Convocation realised, and this house will equally realise, that one side is being asked to give up the specific reference to 'offering' and the other to make this 'memorial'..." (62) He further underlined that the Service was temporary. (63)

In the debate (64) which followed only the Anglo-Catholics urged rejection of the formula, perhaps feeling betrayed. Two people objected because the words were capable of several interpretations. Hooker was quoted by one speaker: "Take, therefore, that one thing all agree and then consider by itself whether what raises any question should not rather be left as superfluous, even though urged as necessary. What those

elements are in themselves it signifies not. It is enough to me who takes them through the body and blood of Christ." (65) It was ascertained that the Liturgical Commission had met and had unanimously approved Jasper's formula. (66) The final vote in the House of Laity was 185 - 8 in favour, with 15 abstentions, (89% in favour, 3.8% against, 7.2% abstaining.)

Before moving on to consider the final version it will be useful here to give a quick glance to Version V which made a brief appearance. The text is the same as the preceding version, but has the controversial section omitted. In other words the way was left open for a further revision which also omitted the difficult phrases, which turned out to be Jasper's solution. Perhaps the phrase 'we make the memorial' was part of the give and take, the other part being the omission of the 'offering', a quid pro quo being necessary to satisfy honour. Because this Version V differs so little from what went before it seems otiose to repeat all the comments made on Version IV.

The final version of Series 2 aroused a great deal of interest and attracted several commentaries and articles. Before we look at these, and the theology behind the order, it will be well to take stock.

Deliberately the Liturgical Commission set out to produce a text which would be acceptable to all. This much has been constant throughout all the revisions and debates; from the Introduction to Version I to the final proposals (cf. Introduction to first draft, "We have...tried to produce forms of words which are capable of various interpretations." (67) and Jasper's final speech mentioned above on the possible dual meanings for "this bread and this cup".)(68) Because of the deliberate vagueness and imprecision it is difficult to tease out ideas - does one take a 'minimalist' or a 'maximalist' point of view? - All are allowed by express permission of the composers and passed by the Assembly. To the question 'how is the memorial made?' no answer is forthcoming; 'what is the Sacrifice of praise?' is a question without an authoritative reply.

Buchanan, after the final approval of the Order, published a booklet explaining Series 2. (69) This will be discussed later with the other commentaries; however, as an appendix he gives 'Sources of the New Service'. The part dealing with 'The Thanksgiving' is interesting.

Of 'Sacrifice of Praise' he writes, "Roots in O.T. animal sacrifice, Reinterpreted in N.T. Heb.13.15. In Roman Canon...refers to the eucharistic sacrifice. In 1549 (in Prayer of Oblation at end of canon) refers to thanksgiving offered in canon, or more generally, to the whole service. In 1552 (in Prayer of Oblation now after Communion) refers to post Communion thanksgiving, or more generally to the whole service. In this service refers to praise in Preface or Sanctus." (70)

For '...may be unto us...' he says, "From petition for consecration, 1549. For 'Anamnesis' - "Traditional, at least since Hippolytus. Changed into administration in 1552. '...we offer unto thee this bread and this cup...' is also attributed to Hippolytus. '...we give thanks to thee over...' - "new by private author in 1966." '...duty and service....' - "Introduced by Cranmer after the offering of ourselves in 1549, and kept there when self-offering was moved to post-communion in 1552. Here refers to whatever has been offered (thanks or elements) in previous sentence..." (71)

The 'sacrifice of praise' and the 'duty and service' it will be noted have various interpretations, interpretations argued over in the Prayer of Oblation from which they come, in 1549, 1552, 1662, 1928 and Series 1 - the litany of revisions. Series 2 puts them close to the words of Institution, 'sacrifice of praise' before, 'duty and service' after, but they remain just as ambiguous.

The sacrifice of praise can be the praise of the preface, or (pace Buchanan) the action of remembering, or the gifts of bread and wine. Similar options are available for 'with this bread and this cup we make the memorial' - is it through the offering, consuming, or doing in remembrance? Is the 'duty and service' the praising, the remembering, or as Buchanan says, "thanks or elements"? (72)

The only theological point which appears clear is that it is through eating and drinking the 'holy things' that grace and blessing come to the recipient; but the seeming precision of this (and the effect of non-communicating attendance is not given) can be put against the vagueness of 'these holy things'. Buchanan says that the plea for right reception is from Hippolytus, (73) but if we look at the text more

difficulties arise. The text reads, "Et petimus ut mittas Spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctae Ecclesiae: in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem Spiritus Sancti, ad confirmationem fidei in veritate." (74) There is a link between the Spirit sought for the offerings and the prayer that the participants may be filled with the Spirit; but Buchanan does not like the idea of offerings!

Buchanan also cites Hippolytus as a source for the anamnesis. The text reads, "Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis eius, offerimus tibi hunc panem et calicem, gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare." P. Jounel gives a (Roman Catholic) commentary: "Comme le mémorial porte sur les deux aspects fondamentaux de mystère paschal, la mort et la résurrection du Christ, sans nommer l'ascension, il n'était pas concevable qu'on introduisait la mention du retour glorieux du Christ. La réitération du repas du Seigneur, en mémoire de sa mort et de sa resurrection, et l'offrande à Dieu de la Victime sainte constituent un acte proprement sacerdotal, l'acte commun du sacerdoce ministériel des prêtres et du sacerdoce royal du peuple de Dieu..." (75)

- He suggests that the offering to God of the Victim is

closely allied to the memorial meal, - ideas eschewed by Buchanan, but they can be found in the sources he has given; and it can be presumed that as he was on the Liturgical Commission at the time these sources were the ones on which the Commissions based its compositions.
(76)

However, after a brief look at the sources of the eventual Series 2 we will now look at the commentaries for the Order, after which we will be able to discuss the theology of the Rite. The process can be described as a movement to a text which caused difficulty to the least number of people.

COMMENTARIES ON THE COMMUNION SERVICE

Series 2 brought forth many commentaries. These will be divided into three groups; those from the Catholic wing of the Church of England, those from the Evangelical group, and a third section composed of an article from an adherent of the Orthodox Church (1) and a series of articles which appeared in 'Theology' in 1966 and 1967 from both schools of thought and which need to be considered as a group. (2) I will begin with the Catholic commentaries, moving to the Evangelical response, and then treat of the 'mixed bag'. Conclusions will be drawn at the end of the chapter.

Catholic Commentaries

There are two substantial commentaries on Series 2 from the Catholic school, '1966 and All That' by G.G. Willis, (3) and by Michael Moreton: 'Consecrating, Remembering, Offering'. (4) There are also two minor contributions to the debate, by E.C. Whitaker (5) and J. Wilkinson. (6)

The first survey, that of Dr. Willis, criticizes the first version of Series 2 by saying that the controversial formula in 'The Thanksgiving' "excludes any possibility of regarding the eucharist as a sacrifice, and confines it to a bare memorial of the passion, resurrection and ascension. This is the view which the Continental Reformers of the sixteenth century would have accepted, but it is not the primitive view." (7) He contrasts this with Series 1 which included the petition to the Father "to accept this one sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving". (8) Surprisingly, in view of the voting figures, he says that the Protestant view is that of a minority which is more vociferous than numerous. (9) He prefers the original version of Series 2 with the words, "we offer unto thee this bread and this cup," which, he observed, is capable of more than one interpretation; the bread of eternal life and the

cup of eternal salvation, or the bread and the cup to be used to feed the faithful in the sacrament. (10) However, he does offer qualified support to the Service because there is no epiclesis; he supports the Roman Catholic view "that Consecration is effected by reciting the dominical words of institution over the bread and the wine." (11)

Moreton also supports the first draft of Series 2 in his commentary, and appeals to antiquity, the use of the formula of Hippolytus. Speaking of the change in the text and its final form he says, "...since the objective consecration of the eucharistic gifts is necessary to their being offered, this repudiation of the eucharistic sacrifice and the substitution of a confused memorialism, inevitably tended to weaken the significance of the concept of consecration." (12)

E.C. Whitaker in his commentary guides the minister through the rubrics of the ceremony. He does make two observations: after referring to 'The Thanksgiving' as 'Consecration' he says that the Series 2 conclusion is shorter than the Prayer Book's because the whole Service is a Thanksgiving, and therefore does not need a special prayer of thanks. "Thanksgiving is one of the main purposes of the service." (13) He says, using the old

terminology, that in "The Prayer of Consecration ...we set forth with thanksgiving the saving works of Christ and so remember him as he commanded us to do." (14) He stresses the memorial made of the redeeming action of Jesus -- life, death and resurrection.

In an interesting interpretation of the words in a Catholic sense he says, "When we 'make a memorial' we are not merely dwelling on the past, but His sacrifice and resurrection become effective with us at the present moment... Christ's own offering of himself is seen as a powerful fact of the moment and we who are his body can be identified with his offering as we make a memorial of it." (15)

John Wilkinson's book is not so much concerned with theology as with ceremonial, dealing with such things as incense, vestments and unleavened bread, the book being manifestly in the Catholic tradition of the Church of England. However, it gives as the 'object' of the 'Thanksgiving', "To give thanks over the bread and wine, after the command and example of Christ." (16) There is no notion of offering, or comment on its absence. The 'object', of the preparation of the bread and wine is just given as "to place the bread and wine 'in order upon the holy table.' This is essential, but there may

also be the secondary object of collecting and presenting the gifts of the people." (17) However, Wilkinson does refer to the "consecrated elements" (18) and speaks of the words of administration, 'The Body of Christ', as "a statement of what is being delivered." (19) In his later article he traces the history of the word 'offer' in early writings (Justin, Serapion, Cyprian), and says that the phrase, or one like it, "has a regular place in the liturgies of East and West alike," (20) He ends by saying that if the phrase causes difficulty, and is not essential, it should be dropped. (21)

Therefore, we can conclude from the books of the Catholic party that they were distressed by the apparent omission of the concept of self-offering in Series 2, and had to discover in the text the idea of 'offering' which was not clearly obvious by the end of the revision process.

Evangelical Commentaries

In contrast to the few published works on Series 2 from the Catholic party the Evangelicals produced several booklets on the new Communion Service. Obviously they had a need to fight a form of words which was unacceptable to them in the early drafts of the anamnesis; this seems to have become a rallying point.

Buchanan, the Evangelical on the Liturgical Commission, wrote two pamphlets in 1966 both published by the Church Book Room Press. The first was 'The New Communion Service - Reasons for Dissent' written after he had added his dissenting note to the draft published in April 1966. This puts forward the reasons for his action. The second, published in December that year was 'A Guide to the New Communion Service' which sets the background (1662 and 1928) to the service and goes through it section by section. It also has a chapter on 'Doctrinal Doubts'. Later he published in August 1968 'A Guide to Second Series Communion Service' - a re-working of the earlier guide, but obviously relating to the final approved version of the text. There are some minor omissions, additions and re-wordings as well as some new work in view of the preceding eighteen months of debate.

Because of Buchanan's position on the Liturgical Commission his works will be considered first. All of them concentrate on the anamnesis, the controversial words. (22) In the first work he succinctly states his position, one founded exclusively on the Gospel. Speaking of the anamnesis he says that from Hippolytus onward what has been remembered in the traditional liturgies has been the offering; (23) but in fact the Dominical command is to 'take and eat.' (24) "Do this in memory of me" (25) does not, he alleges, refer to the offering. All things come from God, and so a "further giving them to God by us is redundant..." (26) Any doctrine of offering, or of eucharistic sacrifice he says, "must...link an offering of ours with 'this' bread and 'this' cup." (27) - and although such offerings do have a liturgical expression, "they cannot properly be offered by, with, or under the bread and wine." (28)

Buchanan suggests that appeal to the early liturgies, Hippolytus, Justin, etc., is not possible. He compares the pre-Reformation formula on the Eucharist with the pre-Nicene Trinitarian formularies. He says that after the definition of the controversial points appeal to the heterodox writings of otherwise orthodox writers is not possible -- although they were "innocent of any offence." (29) Likewise, the "men of Hippolytus'

time are often simply wrong in their use of Scriptures." (30) The action in the Eucharist should be one of giving thanks over the bread and wine, and exclusively so, with no notion of offering. (31)

Therefore, Buchanan in his second booklet supports the option 'we give thanks to thee over this bread and this cup' suggested by Canon J.P.Hickinbotham. (32) He says that the petition "expresses exactly what our Lord himself did. It also gives a proper meaning to 'our duty and service' for our duty in this context is clearly giving thanks." (33)

However, in his 'A Guide to the Second Series Communion Service' he rejected the idea of alternatives and options, because then he would be approving something which he felt would be wrong and also aiding the division of the Church of England into two camps, each with its own liturgical formula. (34) Also, "...others have had to learn that the touchstone of Scripture gives no clear support to...eucharistic sacrifice." (35) It is this adherence to his own perception of the words of Scripture which obliged Buchanan to fight the preceding drafts of the Service until an acceptable text had been found.

Of the final text he says that it quotes Scripture, and because of the "mere quoting" is "quite unexceptionable". (36) Both the person and the work of Christ are remembered, the person being alive and not dead. (37) Buchanan sees the connection between the Supper and the death of Jesus is shown by the words of the minister before the Administration. (38) "Draw near in faith: receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for you, and his blood which was shed for you; and feed on him in your heart by faith with thanksgiving." "Here are atonement-type words used explicitly to explain the body and blood of Christ." (39) The sacrifice of Jesus, not of ourselves is the scriptural teaching, and so is important.

Buchanan also allays fears that the Service indicates that there is a change in the elements. He says that the absence of a rite for further consecration "will also draw attention away from any suggestion of an objective change in the elements." (40) He suggests in 'A Guide to the New Communion Service' that the Thanksgiving "provided a context within which all the bread and wine that is used is to be reckoned as consecrated." (41) He adds that the words of administration are used only about the elements which are given and received. There is no presence of Christ

independent of the eating and drinking. (42) This is the climax of the Service. (43)

Another noted Evangelical, Beckwith, however, was completely dissatisfied with the service and in a small booklet also published by Church Book Room Press listed six doctrinal changes in the service. (44) Regarding 'Doctrinal Change' (his sub-heading) in the Eucharist he says that there is "less stress on the centrality of Christ's death, in its saving work and on its relation to the sacrament..." and "that the reformed teaching about Christ's presence in the sacrament is only explicit in the optional sections 30 and 32...and that the rubrics seem to permit reservation of the remains." (45) Unfortunately there is no theological explanation in the manner of Buchanan, the statements are just made. Beckwith supports the Service as a means of experiment, but suggests that this advantage needs to be weighed carefully against the doctrinal changes. (46)

A more substantial critique of Series 2 comes from Rev. D.A.Scales, in 'What Mean Ye by this Service?' (47) in which he subjects the Service to a rigorous examination by Holy Scripture (48) and compares it with the Book of Common Prayer. The work is concluded by his listing twenty-nine errors divided into three

categories: Ambiguities, Unscriptural Practices, and Unscriptural Doctrines. (49) Many of the 'errors' do not pertain to the matter under discussion - for example the permission to use 'Kyrie eleison' being "vain repetition" in a "foreign tongue." (50)

Briefly, Scales objects to the importance given to the Offertory, being placed in the part 'Communion' (51). He says that the title 'Thanksgiving' shows that something is "offered and given to God; thus the bread and wine are also to be offered to God as the consecration is part of 'The Thanksgiving'. This is a clear indication that this prayer is to teach the Mass doctrine of sacrifice." (52) He suggests that because the words 'sacrifice of praise' occur in the second sentence of the prayer of consecration, and are so linked with the words of institution, they set forth the teaching of "the sacrifice of the Mass". The word 'sacrifice' in the Series 2 Rite is not joined to the 'one perfect sacrifice of Jesus' and so differs from the 1662 Book. (53) The words 'grant that these gifts may be unto us the Body and Blood' are held to imply either transubstantiation, or at least consubstantiation, recourse being made to the Book of 1549 from which the words are taken. (54) Of course the words of Administration 'Body of Christ', as used by the Church

of Rome, also imply transubstantiation. (55)

He objects to the anamnesis, first of all as putting a long interval between the words of institution and administration. (56) He also thinks that because a replacement text was found and agreed to that replacement text too carries the theological burden of offering. Therefore, the oblation is still there, a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." (57) The words 'accept this our duty and service' in the Service are also taken to refer to an offering, and so against the Reformed tradition. (58)

The anthem 'Lamb of God' also offends for it "can speak clearly of a sacrifice at the time of utterance, whereas Christ has once taken away the sins of the world." (59)

Finally Scales says that the reversion to the 1549 conclusion '...we thank thee that dost feed us in these holy mysteries with the Body and Blood of thy Son...' (which omits the words of 1552 and 1662 '...feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son...') implies that all who receive 'the holy mysteries' are fed automatically. The words which

underline the reception by faith are no longer said.
(60)

Like Beckwith Scales also thinks that the rubrics permit reservation in view of future Communion. Against this he quotes Article XXVIII "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved."

In his final section, headed by the quotation from Exodus, (61) he urges all his readers to turn away from a service which is so completely against the Articles of Religion. "Let nobody be ignorant of this." (62) Even Buchanan is not spared criticism, all the Liturgical Commission are castigated: "How frightening that persons of such belief were entrusted with the production of the new order." (63) The doctrines of the service were condemned by Cranmer, "The very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of trans-substantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead...These injuries to Christ be so intolerable that no Christian heart can willingly bear them." (64)

Several Evangelicals collaborated on a book entitled 'Towards a Modern Prayer Book - The New Services Examined'. (65) In fact the booklet does not enter into serious criticism of either Series 1 (which is treated very briefly by Beckwith) or Series 2. However, the points made on Series 2 by Beckwith are worth recording here. He speaks of the lack of an explicit mention of the second coming (66) and the lack of acknowledgement of the finality of the atonement. (67) He also commented on the words 'we offer unto thee..' and the note on further Consecration; both items omitted from the final version. (68)

A Conservative Evangelical, H.E.W. Turner, offered a theological critique of Series 2 in 'Theology' in 1969. (69) As with other evangelicals he regrets the disappearance of an obvious connection between the 'once-for-all-ness' of the Cross and the Eucharist, and also the eschatological dimension. (70) He also disapproves of the short text for the Administration, which gives the impression "that the elements are things in themselves, or supernatural quiddities" (71) and suggests that the words of Administration will become a major problem, as they are for him. (72) Regarding 'The Thanksgiving' he restricts himself to giving approval to the manual acts which were inserted in the text after

the publication of the first draft. He makes a plea for the prayer of oblation before the final thanksgiving prayer at the end of the service as a response in faith, "it is only after we have received Christ himself that we dare make our responsive offering to him..." (73)

We have here an interesting collection, ranging from Buchanan's eventual satisfaction (after initial disquiet) to the profound dissatisfaction of Scales. The objections refer primarily to the purity of the Reformed doctrine, based solely on Scripture.

Miscellaneous Articles

During the debate on Series 2 the journal 'Theology' published a number of articles with the title "We offer this Bread and this Cup" by writers from the Catholic wing of the Church of England: J.L. Houlden, A.H.Couratin, M.J. Moreton, and G.J. Cuming. Later there was an 'Evangelical Rejoinder' by R.T.Beckwith and L.O.Buchanan. (74) Although the words of the title of the article were deleted in the final version of the Service it is interesting to plot the thoughts of the writers and the schools of thought in the context of the striving for an acceptable rite for the Church of England. It highlights the difficulties under which the revision took place.

The fundamental article of the series is that of Houlden. He says of the words 'we offer this bread and this cup' "the words are a kind of shorthand...For we do not offer in our own right: Christ offers... Nor do we offer the bread and the wine: Christ offers himself..." (75) For him the phrase shows the response of man with Christ's offering, "by sheer grace participating in that offering...sacramentally, in the Eucharist." (76) It expresses the "universal tradition from the earliest period in which any tradition at all becomes visible and

that a witness of such strength should not lightly be disregarded." (77)

The other authors dwell on the traditions behind the phrase. Couratin speaks of the sacrificial language of the second century Fathers. (78) He also mentions the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus from which the words come, and refers to 1 Pet.2.5 ("...be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.") The offering of the whole Christian life "is symbolized and expressed in the celebration of the Eucharist and the offering of the bread and the cup." (79) The offering for Cyprian, he remarks, was of the passion of the Lord. (80) Couratin concludes his article by suggesting that "...a compromise can be reached if a return is made to the undeveloped language of the first two centuries." (81)

Moreton in his article quotes early rites which had the idea of offering: - the Egyptian Rite, the Jerusalem Rite, the Syrian Rite, the East-Syrian Rite, and the Byzantine Rite, as well as the Western Rite. He concludes, "the concept of the eucharistic offering... is not only found to be present, but is seen to be actually central to the eucharistic prayers, and to have prevailed universally... The sacrifice of Christ, by

which man is restored to God, is the very means by which man approaches God in worship." (82)

Finally from the Liturgical Commission Cuming says that Cranmer deleted from the Reformed Canon any mention of an offering of the bread and wine, (83) but that in the seventeenth century an understanding of sacrifice was current among some notable theologians. He quotes from Andrews, Overall, Cosin, Hamon L'Estrange, Taylor and Herbert Thorndike. (84) He concludes, "...there were not wanting those who thought that representation involved the actual offering of the consecrated elements to God..." "The idea of offering the bread and the cup as a representative memorial has been accepted in the Anglican Communion, ...at any rate for most of the time, in many places, and by very many people." (85)

In their rejoinder to these articles Beckwith and Buchanan concentrate on "their understanding of Christ's sacrifice...(which) is really crucial for evangelicals." (86) They summarize their understanding in four points, all based on the New Testament: a) Jesus' death and his obedience to that death are his sacrifice; b) this sacrifice occurred once for all on earth, the sacrifice is not eternally existing, but can be viewed as eternally efficacious; c) the Church benefits from

Christ's sacrifice, but does not participate in it; the sacrifice was untainted by sin and atones for it: the Church's sacrifice is not one with Christ's, but the Church offers itself in response to his, and through this finds acceptance; d) the offering of a sacrifice is not to be confused with the feasting on it. (87)

They also say that they consider the sacrament as primarily a manward ordinance because it is a means of grace, but not exclusively so; but the precise details of this are left vague. (88) They reject the historical arguments, saying that Catholics, like Couratin, "...exaggerate the silence of the New Testament, and then suggest that we fill the gaps by assuming that the liturgical language and practice of the first three centuries must go back to apostolic teaching. Such an assumption would hardly be a safe one." (89) The liturgy for them must be based on the Bible.

For the writers their basic tenet is that there must be a cautious and accurate expression of biblical truth, away from "patristic fundamentalism" (90) - for example the Hippolytus text must not be considered as 'inspired'. (91) It is the current meaning of the phrase 'we offer this bread and this cup' that they contest; not the implied meaning from the past, which

can mean that the items are placed at God's disposal. (92) So they support Cranmer who turned against the Fathers, and back to Scripture. (93)

This compilation of articles underlines the basic division between the two wings, the division between 'Scripture sola' and 'Scripture with Tradition'. Both groups remained apart, although Houlden used Scripture in his article, nevertheless, the 'universal tradition' of the ancient liturgies was also invoked. (94) - And of course the other writers used the Fathers, early liturgies and seventeenth century divines - hardly authorities evangelical writers would accept uncritically.

Finally in this survey of published works we come to an article by W.J.Grisbrooke in 'Studia Liturgica'. (95) He gives a literary and theological critique, and offers his own list of improvements for the Service, the addition of an invocation of the Holy Spirit, and an acclamation for use after the Institution Narrative. (96)

He examines the differences between the first and final versions of Series 2, ignoring the intervening drafts. He suggests that "in the context of change" the revised formula must exclude the idea of offering because it is unacceptable to the evangelicals, "... and it is not comprehensive, for the purpose of the change is to repudiate doctrine held by many Anglicans, and to prevent them giving it liturgical expression." (97) Likewise, the change from 'we pray thee to accept this our duty and service' to 'We pray thee to accept this our duty and service and grant that we may so eat and drink these holy things in the presence of thy divine majesty that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing' shows a similar alteration of doctrine. He suggests that the new text is subjectivist and receptionist. (98) The 'duty and service' attached to eating and drinking, and the use of the word 'may' seem to be the reason for this statement, which is not made precisely clear in the article. (99)

He concludes his article, as he began, by rejoicing that the Service was issued for experimental use, and because of this a more satisfactory liturgy can be reached. Obviously he means satisfactory from his own point of view. (100) The criticisms of the anamnesis suggest that because one group thinks the the meaning of

a formula is 'y' then it is impossible for another group to hold the same formula as meaning 'x'. Certainly Evangelicals wished to exclude the idea of offering as being explicitly stated, but all groups supported Jasper's compromise, so the words of that must be acceptable to the Catholic wing. It could be held that the act of making the memorial is done through offering and so implied. Likewise, 'these holy things' could serve to be a denial of receptionism.

However, this final critique serves to remind us of the difficulty of taking one sense from any form of words used in a Service, and so provides us with a sort of cautionary tale as we move on to the final survey of Series 2.

CONCLUSION

We have now examined the history of Series 2 and the commentaries on it by a selection of interested parties, and now the whole can now be examined. One thing which it is impossible to do is to examine the mind of the writers of the Service. The convention in English law that the mind of the legislators does not affect legal judgements on their laws seems to be enshrined in the Liturgical Commission. This is a shame when the language itself is open to many interpretations, and was so designed. (1)

The process of revision of the anamnesis can best be summarized in the phrase 'from Hippolytus to Cranmer'. We have seen how the Catholic writers had recourse to tradition, and the Reformed turned to Scripture alone, and this is the fundamental division between them. It is, perhaps, the only conclusion that can be drawn from the commentaries. Likewise when we examine the texts of the revisions themselves we can use the first version with the elements from history to provide an 'unreformed' meaning; and we can also interpret the texts of the revisions in a 'Catholic' way by looking at the background. Or we can take the words as an expression of the insights of the Reformers.

The first sentence of the Thanksgiving after the 'Holy, Holy...' is a petition that the 'sacrifice of praise' be accepted, and that 'the gifts of bread and wine may be unto us his body and blood.' The words 'sacrifice of praise' have had a chequered history as Buchanan has indicated, and he suggests that here they refer to the praise of the Preface and Sanctus. (2)

They can be taken to mean the praise offered, as he suggests, but the same sentence, (albeit after a semi-colon) refers to the gifts of bread and wine, preceded by the adjective 'these'. So it is not untenable that the gifts could be a sacrifice of praise. - At least as regards the words. The intention behind them will vary with the Minister. Obviously if the gifts were considered as a 'sacrifice of praise' this would approximate to the traditional teaching, and also the orthodox Roman Catholic teaching. The words could also refer to the complete action, occurring as they do in the first part of the whole.

The 'gifts of bread and wine' are also unclear. If we accept a division between the manward and Godward action then we can ask: are the gifts from God to us, or from us to God; who is giving to whom? The response depends on one's theology. Likewise, the conditional

'may be unto us' can also be purely receptionist; but the conditional is also used in all the Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Catholic Church, e.g. "Haec ergo dona...ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiant Domini nostri Iesu Christi" - it is unlikely that this is intended to promulgate receptionism. (3) However, the words 'body and blood' seem to exclude a 'bare memorial'. In the 1549 text there is a similar petition, that the gifts of bread and wine "maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christi"; (4) but in 1552 and 1662 the petition is that in receiving the bread and wine "[we] maye be partakers of the blessed body and bloud". (5)

The actual institution narrative seems to present no problems. However, the insertion of the rubrics was after the first draft had been published in 1965. There may have been a desire to return to the norm of 1552 in the earlier version which was later changed to conform to 1549, and perhaps to stop the adoption of some extreme ceremonial in some churches.

Now we approach the controversial points. The next paragraph of the text will be examined line by line as laid out in the comparison of the six versions. (Appendix 1)

The connection 'Wherefore, O Lord' comes from 1549, and establishes the paragraph as referring to the Institution Narrative immediately preceding it. By virtue of its proximity it would appear that it is linked to the command 'Do this...in remembrance of me' (1 Cor.11.25). The insertion in the last version of 'with this bread and this cup' (from the seventh line of the first four versions) makes it clear that they are to be used to make the memorial. There is no memorial through, for example, a self-oblation; the memorial is of the once-for-all death and resurrection of Jesus, and anticipates the final coming.

Because of the closeness of the Institution Narrative, the use of 'Wherefore' and the deletion of the offering in the final version it seems clear that the memorial is effected through eating and drinking. In the earlier version the sense seems to imply 'Wherefore, O Lord, having in remembrance...we offer...' The offering in that version is part of the remembrance. With the final version this is not the case unless the word 'memorial' is made to carry several meanings. This is possible if it is considered as implying the calling to mind of the (sacrificial) passion, death and resurrection by the bread and wine in an efficacious way which permits the recipient to share in Jesus' offering.

- A belief close to that of the Roman Catholic Church, which of course also holds that the Mass itself, by analogy, can be called a sacrifice. (6)

The deleted phrase 'we offer' has been subjected already to close scrutiny. Suffice it to say that the 'manward' movement of the Eucharist is strengthened by its omission. The early liturgical texts and their theology are clearly left behind.

This omission means that 'this our duty and service' is left rather up in the air. Does it refer to the 'memorial' of the preceding sentence, or to the eating and drinking of 'these holy things'? I have already shown that it seems more likely that the memorial is the eating and drinking. Therefore, we have the 'duty and service' changed from the self-offering of 1549 and 1552 and used to mean something different. The user of the Service may have pre-conceived ideas as to what is the 'duty and service' demanded in the Eucharist, which would obviously constrain the sense. On these several meanings it is instructive that in the General Synod debate on Series 3 Buchanan said, concerning the anamnesis paragraph of that service, "I believe that there is far less ambiguity, if any, in this paragraph than in Series 2. I honestly believe

that it makes sense from beginning to end, which I doubt whether Series 2 did." (7)

The phrase 'holy things' is capable of meaning either the Body and Blood of Christ, or the bread taken in memory. 'In the presence of thy divine majesty' is equally imprecise. However, the eating and drinking is causal - 'that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing'. This is only potentially the case, there is no guarantee that the recipient will be so filled; it may depend on his faith, or his belonging to the elect, or to his sinlessness. The phrase provides a link with the optional command after the Lord's Prayer, 'Draw near with faith...' (8) This link will, of course be broken if the singers of the anthem 'Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world...' believe that the words refer to what appears to be bread at that moment.

Two short prayers end the Service. The former is a basic thanksgiving and comes from 1549. The second is a self-offering derived from the same Book. The self-offering in this position was discussed when considering the Interim Rite.

The final version of Series 2 uses the word 'may' twenty nine times (in the 1965 first draft it occurs twenty two times). This provides plenty of scope for variation from a house or sick-room to a large Cathedral. Having examined the text and its commentaries we can say that the words are capable of a similar wide variation in their use and inferred meaning. The obvious meaning can be taken to be that of the Evangelicals, but they are also susceptible of Catholic interpretation if that is intended by the reader. This being so the Service kept to a sort of middle ground when it came into use in July 1967 as the first new Service which the Church of England had officially authorized since 1662.

The Liturgical Commission had a hard time with Series 2. But it must be remembered that this was the first Eucharistic Liturgy that it had composed, (as opposed to Series 1, an authorisation of existing variants of the Book of Common Prayer). It joined modern liturgical scholarship to the needs of a Church different from that of 1662. Often the debates reflected the tension between the scholarly and the pastoral points of view.(9) Its long birth bore lasting fruit, for it was the progenitor via its 'you' form, published in 'Modern Liturgical Texts' (10) of Series 3,

and both it and Series 3 are in the Alternative Service Book of 1980. (And the style of the blue 'rubrics' remains.)

But if we look at its formularies and ideas we are drawn yet again to Jasper's introduction to the 'Draft Order' as a clear expression of the Commission's policy, "Only by using such language as does not require any one interpretation can we produce a liturgy which all will be able to use, and which each will be able to interpret according to his own condition." (11) When we come to look at the overall development of the Eucharistic theology we must expect difficulties in interpretation because of such an authoritative statement.

SERIES 3

HISTORY

I will begin by discussing the development of Series 3, and follow this by an examination of the published commentaries and criticisms of the text. Finally, some general conclusions will be drawn.

The first version was published on 16th. September 1971. The first revision took place over two Groups of Sessions of the General Synod: 10th. November 1971 and 9th. and 11th. February 1972. The second revision was at the July Group of Sessions in 1972, (9th. & 10th.). The final version was approved on 7th. November 1972, it was published 18th. January 1973; and authorized for use from 1st. February 1973. (1) Unlike the first two Alternative Services - Holy Communion Series 1 & 2 Liturgical Conferences were not held. However, extra-Synodical activity was required.

The draft text was published with an authoritative Commentary explaining the basis of the composition and giving reasons for some of the material. (2) This will be used as the draft text is examined here.

There are eight parts of the rite which are of interest: §24 'The Taking of the Bread and Wine,' §29 'The Thanksgiving' which has four sections of note: the paragraphs beginning 'Accept our praises...', 'For in the same night...' and 'Therefore, heavenly Father...', to these can be added the Acclamation. §35, dealing with further consecration and §36 on reservation will also be looked at. The note which limits the rite to episcopally ordained ministers will also be used. (3)

The composers of Series 3 used the structure of Series 2 as their base. (4) The idea of 'corporate thanksgiving' is used, the whole action of Thanksgiving "sets apart the bread and the wine for their God-given use, in accordance with the commands of Jesus Christ." (5) The development from Series 2 to Series 3 is referred to by commentators of both the Evangelical and Catholic traditions on the Order. (6) It also made clearer the four-fold shape of the Eucharist as proposed by Dix, (7) for the taking, thanking, breaking and giving are obvious in Series 3. In Series 1 and Series 2 (as well as Series 1&2 Revised) the taking is directed during the Institution narrative as in the Book of Common Prayer. (8) In Series 3 there is a sub-heading 'The Taking of the Bread and Wine' before the Preface, and the subsequent rubrics direct the president to take

the bread and wine, (§25) and after 'The Thanksgiving' to break the consecrated bread (§26). Cuming in an article defends the Taking before the Thanksgiving by saying it both follows the Passover ceremonial and the biblical narrative. (9) The initial impact of Series 3 was because of its language; it did not address the Divinity in the 'thee-thou' second person singular, but used the 'you' form. This attracted the first comments when the Service first appeared before the General Synod. (10)

The first unspecific General Synod debate brought up points which will be examined later on - reservation, the lack of an invocation of the Holy Spirit, and also the omission of an offering. (These last two were changed subsequently, as was the form of further consecration which also attracted early attention.)

To an observation that the liturgy was ambiguous Buchanan, (a member of the Liturgical Commission, and perhaps speaking authoritatively,) replied that the 'anamnesis' paragraph had "far less calculated ambiguity, if any...than in Series 2." He "honestly believed" that it made sense from beginning to end. (11) To a comment that the Thanksgiving lacked a verbal offering of the holy gifts to God, which a speaker said

was held "by the overwhelming majority of Christians throughout history" he replied that "to import this doctrinal emphasis would divide the Synod from top to bottom." (12) In the concluding speech to the general debate Jasper confined himself to some general observations. Then the Synod moved on to discuss the whole thing section by section.

Towards the end of the day, after a time had been spent on the text of the Creed (13) it was proposed that there should be a meeting between the proposers of amendments still to be discussed and the Liturgical Commission. After further debate this was agreed. There was also a brief exchange on the subject of the acclamation just before the session ended. It was proposed that the line in the draft, 'In Christ all shall be made alive' be changed to 'Christ will come again'. (14) Jasper objected to the change, saying that the acclamation should refer back to what had happened, not anticipate the anamnesis. The proposed change was rejected. (15)

In the period between the November and February Groups of Sessions The Liturgical Steering Committee met the people who had submitted amendments which concerned the sections after the Acclamation. Then the Committee

submitted its report to the General Synod. (16) The Committee did not report on the suggestions for the anamnesis, saying that it was in "continuous discussion" with members of the Synod who had expressed disquiet and had put forward various proposals. (17)

At this point there was interest in the idea of further consecration (also termed 'supplementary consecration'.) The use of this concept seems to have been introduced to Anglican liturgy in the short-lived 1548 'Order of Communion', but reappeared in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. (18) According to Buchanan the provision for further consecration was dropped from Series 2 in its revision, the 1662 use being advised. (19)

The supplementary consecration will be examined because it indicates the idea of the composers of the rite as to the formula (and actions) which are considered essential to the Thanksgiving. In the Book of Common Prayer the priest had to repeat the Dominical words and actions. (Beginning "Our Saviour Jesus Christ in the same night that he was betrayed..." for the bread, and "Likewise after supper he took..." for the wine). This means that offering is not mentioned. In the 'Commentary' on the draft of Series 3 the formula of

the Book of Common Prayer is criticised thus: "...such a practice is contrary to our understanding of the Thanksgiving as a whole, and perpetuates the idea of a 'moment' of consecration effected by a specific formula. The Commission cannot recommend a continuation of this practice." (20)

Therefore, in the Report the Commission directed that "... the president returns to the holy table and adds more, either in silence or with these words: Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup as your Son our Lord Jesus Christ commanded, we receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood." (21) In the Committee's meeting in January 1972, after the debate of November, two points were raised. (22) These were the possibility of addition to the bread and wine in silence and a suggestion that the form of words be similar to those given in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Commission had said in its 'Commentary' that it was unable to agree on the method to be followed for further consecration. It could not find any objection to silence, or to the words suggested, which reflected the 'Thanksgiving' and did not encourage the idea of a 'moment' of consecration. (23) The Commission itself could not agree over the suggestion that the extra bread

and wine be added in silence(24) but rejected the proposed change of words, saying that it felt "that the element of thanksgiving should be more strongly expressed [than in the 1662 text] together with the idea that what is being done is an extension of the existing sacramental action and not an entirely fresh one." (25) Although the Doctrine Commission supported the text in the Report only a majority of the Liturgical Commission did, there was no unanimity. (26)

The Committee dismissed very briefly a request that the words in the Institution be changed to the traditional passive form 'is given' and 'is shed' from 'I give' and 'I shed'. (27) It said that although the Greek passive participle is used the active tense is preferable in English, indicating "that it is Our Lord who is the free and willing agent in the operation." (28)

When the Synod met on 9th. and 11th. February 1972 the Report of the Committee was discussed. The first amendment was to insert the word 'memorial' in the post-institution paragraph of §29, so that in place of 'Therefore, heavenly Father, we do this in remembrance of him: with this bread and this cup we celebrate his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross...'

it would read, 'Therefore, heavenly Father, with this bread and this cup we celebrate the memorial of his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his resurrection...' (29) Jasper accepted the change of words, but it was rejected by the Synod, apparently because of the 'Catholic' ideas, the Evangelicals being happier without the word 'memorial'. (30)

However, one change was made in the paragraph. Jasper proposed that the sentence 'Accept this our sacrifice of thanks and praise...' be changed to 'Accept through Him our great High Priest this our sacrifice of thanks and praise...' in order to stress "the eternal aspect of what our Lord is still doing." The amendment was carried without a vote. (31) Two other minor amendments were rejected, without debate. (32)

On the second day three major points were debated: further consecration, reservation, and the status of the 'president' of Series 3, as well as minor points which do not concern us here.

Concerning further consecration the first amendment proposed was the deletion of the words 'either in silence or'. The Commission in its 'Commentary' had said that silence "caused the least possible disruption

to the continuity of the service." (33) There was a short debate in which the only point in favour of silence was the fact that the Doctrine Commission had not found any objection to it. (34) The Archbishop of Canterbury suggested that something should be said in order that the people know what is taking place, for the consecration "...is one of the most stupendous things that ever happened in the physical world." (35) Jasper, speaking in a personal capacity was also against the use of silence, saying that "...it might lead to all kinds of injudicious actions...and...I find any theological arguments which can be produced in favour of it singularly unconvincing." (36)

The amendment was carried. However, a second one to change the words said at the further consecration was not carried at that time. The amendment had suggested changing the words in the Report (37) to a repetition of the Institution Narrative, introduced by the words "Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup we pray that this bread (and wine) also may be to us the Body (and Blood) of your Son Jesus Christ who (in the same night that he was betrayed...)...In the night that he was betrayed after supper he took..." (38) The words after 'Jesus Christ' repeat, with minor variations the formula of 1662; (39) this itself came

from the 1548 text (which referred to the wine alone), which was not in the intervening Books, 1549 and 1552. (40) It was, of course, taken from the normal Roman Catholic practice when the elements needed consecration because of some defect in the matter at the usual time of consecration. (41) Reservation in Roman Catholic Churches meant that there were usually enough hosts reserved.

The speakers in the debate all supported the change of words. Jasper summarized the problem neatly when he said in the Synod debate, "...what one is trying to do is somehow or other to bring into a sacramental act which has already taken place and which is now taking place a further supply of bread and wine which somehow or other must become consecrated elements in order that they may be given to the communicants." (42) However, the Synod rejected the change of words, but the problem came up again in the July Group of Sessions.

In the rubrics for supplementary consecration in all versions of Series 3 (as well as in the Alternative Service Book) the verb 'adds' is used. It is unclear if this means that supplementary consecration only 'works' if some of the original elements is left to which more can be added; and so does not 'work' if the elements

are exhausted before the supplementary consecration. It could be held that 'adds' indicates only that the celebration is continuing, but this is not made clear by the rubrics, nor by the Synodical debates.

The next point dealt with the suggestion that the words in §36 'for the purposes of communion' be deleted. However, after brief speeches in favour of the amendment it was rejected. There were no speeches against the amendment, so we must assume that the majority of the Synod were in favour of the status quo, and did not need convincing.

The last amendment I wish to consider is the insertion of a reminder of the Canons of the Church of England in the Order. The suggestion was that it should read, "No person shall consecrate and administer the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper unless he shall have been ordained priest by episcopal ordination..." (43) This was to make clear the meaning of the word 'president' in the Order. In the Orders of Series 1 and Series 2 the traditional word 'priest' had been used.

Finally, after it had been decided to refer the Order, (as amended) by the Synod back to the Liturgical Steering Committee for revision the whole was also referred to the House of Bishops "for consideration of the theology of the Service, particularly in the light of the recent Anglican/Roman Catholic statement on Eucharistic Doctrine..." (44) This was accepted by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Report from the House of Bishops was available at the next group of Sessions, and accepted by the Synod on 9th. July. (45) The suggestions were adopted by the Synod in the debate on the following day. Also available was a summary of the amendments to be debated, and the reaction of the Liturgical Steering Committee to them. (46)

On 10th. July the Synod reached §24, which in the draft read, "The bread and wine are brought to the holy table". Rev. M.Henshall proposed that the text from Series 1, 1 Chronicles 29.11, be added. Buchanan opposed this saying that it introduced the "questionable concept of offering the elements to God at this point." After several speeches in favour the amendment was carried. Buchanan later wrote that this insertion damaged the distinction between the placing of the

offerings of the people on the table and the clear taking of the bread and wine by the Minister as part of the structure of the Rite (and part of the Dominical command). (47)

The next amendment of significance was the insertion of the words 'by the power of your Spirit', so that the paragraph before the Institution Narrative read 'Accept our praises...grant that by the power of your Spirit these gifts of bread and wine...' This was proposed by Rev. D.Carter, saying that the power of the Holy Spirit was being given more importance in ecumenical studies on the Eucharist. Such an invocation had also been suggested by the House of Bishops in their report. (48) The amendment was also supported by Jasper, and was agreed without a debate.

The matter, which was discussed immediately after it was not so straightforward, being the change to 'I give' and 'I shed' from 'is given' and 'is shed' as in the previous Orders' Institution Narratives. Jasper supported the active tense saying in the Synod, "It makes clear in a way that has been missing hitherto that it is our Lord himself who is the free and willing agent in the operation." However, Professor Porter, from Exeter, in the last speech on the subject said that the

Liturgical Commission had solved "...a great crux of New Testament exegesis, because the words of Scripture leave open who does, who gives, who it is who sheds...and the words of Scripture at this point are probably framed to leave this question open." (49) Perhaps because of this the amendment was carried.

The next amendment was also carried. It proposed the change of the third line of the Acclamation from 'In Christ shall all be made alive' to 'Christ shall come again.' (This was later changed, just before the vote, to 'Christ will come again', the error having been noted in time.) Jasper objected to the change, saying that the form of words suggested could be put anywhere in the rite, but the original words had more relevance to their position, "We felt that the point of the second coming was that we should all be made alive in Christ to share eternally in that heavenly banquet of which the Eucharist is both a foretaste and a prayer." In spite of his theology the amendment was carried, after a count had been ordered. (50)

The anamnesis was also changed, following a suggestion from the House of Bishops. (51) The division between the sacrifice and the language used in the draft was resolved. The new formula read: 'Therefore,

heavenly Father, with this bread and this cup we do this in remembrance of him: we celebrate and proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven; and we look for the coming of his fullness in glory." This text, however, seems to have originated not from the Bishops but from the Committee itself. Later in the debate Jasper referred to the "original text" dated only 'May 1972' (GS 77) with the words 'the fullness of' added, it is not the Bishops' text, which omitted these words. (In GS 83, dated 31st. May, 1972). However, the Synod preferred the Liturgical Steering Committee's text, and it was approved, although one member objected to the omission of any idea of 'offering'. (52)

The final amendment we need to examine is a change proposed to the introductory note on Canon B.12; to omit the words 'and administer' in order to make it clear that lay-readers were not excluded from the distribution of the sacrament. This was passed without any debate. (53)

Series 3 was then provisionally approved (54) which meant that as amended it was submitted to the House of Bishops, and so be ready for final approval after that.

It was submitted for final approval on Nov.7th. 1972. All the amendments passed in July were kept. The House of Bishops made a final amendment changing 'pardons' to 'forgives' in the prayer after the Confession. This was passed.

In view of the long debate on Series 3 it is interesting to look at the final voting figures for the three Houses:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	27	0
Clergy	148	10
Laity	123	9

The text was published on 18th. January the following year, and was able to be used from 1st. February 1973. (55)

COMMENTARIES ON THE COMMUNION SERVICE

Having examined the history of the composition of the Holy Communion Service of Series 3 we shall now look at the particular commentaries and criticisms. These naturally fall into two groups, Catholic and Evangelical. The 'Commentary' on the Report of the Liturgical Commission of 1971 will not be examined here because it dealt with the draft text.

There was also published a collection of essays by ten authors, seven of whom were members of the Liturgical Commission; however, as Jasper says in his Introduction "These essays...are...however, in no sense an official commentary...this book is intended as a contribution to further study on the subject, and each essay only has the authority of its author." (1) This being so the work of the essayists will be considered with the appropriate school.

Catholic Commentaries

The first two commentaries appeared in the review 'Theology' in 1972 as the rite was going through its final stages.

The first to appear was by Rev. M.J. Moreton, who also wrote other booklets as we shall see. However in his first article (2) he suggests that Series 3 drew its inspiration from the 'Apostolic Tradition' (3) and regrets that it omits the clauses 'offerimus tibi panem et calicem' and 'Et petimus ut mittas Spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctae ecclesiae' (4). He puts his case that the sentiments in the clauses should be inserted, but "If it should be objected that these omitted clauses are the badge of a party it should be recognized that the party includes that part of Christendom which receives the Roman and Byzantine rites and their derivatives to this day. They are the clauses, moreover, which pre-eminently express the meaning of the rite." (5)

He also suggests that the clauses in the unrevised Series 3 '...with this bread and this cup we celebrate his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross' (6) can "do duty as an offering clause." (7) But he

doubts if this can really be the case, quoting the 'Commentary' of the Commission which says of the verb 'celebrate' "a verb which we consider singularly appropriate especially in view of its popular background." (8)

He rejects Series 3 as being shallow because it neglects offerings, making thanksgiving do duty for praise, "It has gone for compromises and novelty...and...failed to integrate the calling to mind of the Lord's sacrifice with the ritual act with which it should be proclaimed." (9)

The two other booklets published by this author continue these criticisms, as well as adding others. (10) He objects to the word 'president' being used in the rite, as implying "the silent rejection of the Catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice." (11) This alleged rejection continues throughout the works. He calls the sentence 'Accept...this our sacrifice of thanks and praise' in the anamnesis sentence ('Therefore...') which is linked, via the semi-colon to the petitions dependent on eating and drinking 'these holy gifts', "receptionist", and so clearly not Catholic. (12) He also objects to the insertion of the phrase from Hebrews 'our great High Priest', saying,

"The uncritical drafting of the theology of the Hebrews into the eucharistic prayer results in the denial of there being any reality in the liturgical sacrifice of the eucharist." (13)

In his later book he says that Series 3 "expresses no intention of offering the eucharistic sacrifice as this is understood in the liturgical texts of catholic Christendom..." (14) This is because "Although the eucharistic sacrifice may be termed commemorative of the sacrifice of Christ, the anamnesis cannot be regarded as sacrificial, it is remembering." (15) In the earlier book he suggests that the phrase 'our sacrifice of thanks and praise' is not a translation of 'sacrificium laudis' from the Roman Missal, but carries on the work of Cranmer. (16) The words are separated from the anamnesis by a full stop, and relate to the communion 'as we eat and drink...' (17)

Also in his later book he alleges that there is no intention expressed to 'consecrate' the elements, in spite of the rubric. (18) He says, of the lack of rubrics, "...the suppression of manual acts takes a reductionist view of the dominical words, and does nothing elsewhere to supply and express the traditional concept of consecration and sacrifice in the prayer as a

whole." (19) He also suggests that the formula to be used if there is insufficient bread and wine is not consecratory, but again is receptionist, '...may be to us...' (20) The explanation of consecration as a 'holy use' "falls short of the concept of objective consecration." (21)

For Moreton the Communion is completely unsatisfactory because it seems to him to be fully in the Reformed tradition of the Church of England. "It [Series 3] coheres from the standpoint of Evangelical eucharistic thology. It is incoherent from the standpoint of Catholic eucharistic theology." (22) Because of this it "perfects" the intention of Series 2 and "an essentially protestant rite has been ushered in under a Catholic guise." (23)

A book by Rev. M.Perry, Archdeacon of Durham, gives straightforward commentary on Series 3, designed for use by P.C.C. members. (24) There are one or two points in his work which bear examination. On the 'Taking of the Bread and Wine' he says "...whenever we offer back to God the things he has first given us, he does things with them. We give him bread and wine and we get back the very body and blood of Christ." (25) The consecration comes about by the whole of the

Thanksgiving, but is actually effected by the act of remembering. (26) He speaks of the 'remembering' of Jesus, and quotes the ARCIC 1972 statement (27) that the remembering is of Jesus' sacrificial death, resurrection and ascension. (28) In the paragraph devoted to the sacrifice the Archdeacon says, that "...through the offering of the Eucharist [we are able] to present once more before God that awe-ful sacrifice." And although the sacrifice was made once-for-all "we represent it and re-present and renew [it] by our remembrance and communion." (29)

Therefore, the Archdeacon assumes that there is an offering and also a sacrifice in Series 3, and this is intended by the composers of the rite. This is not what Moreton understood from the Order, and not, as we shall see, what the Evangelicals understand from it. Yet his commentary does not go against the text; and the book is dedicated to Jasper, who read the book, and discussed it with the author, who hopes he has "rightly interpreted the mind of the Church of England Liturgical Commission." (30)

The final booklet to be examined from the Catholic school is that of Trevor Richardson, (31) whose basic criticism is of the anamnesis paragraph. He says, "I believe this whole section to be disastrously inadequate and misleading in terms of the catholic doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice and a glaring example of Anglican comprehensiveness at its most dishonest." It is "an appalling melange." (32) The reason for this language is that the "anamnesis is of the Last Supper, not of the saving acts, and we remember it with the bread and the cup," and although the saving acts are celebrated and proclaimed it is not explained how; and nothing is offered, even though "we ask the Father to accept 'this our sacrifice of thanks and praise' whatever it is." (33) He concludes that the rite "sustains a view of the eucharist in which the Elements are in no way connected with the sacrifice of Christ and indeed in which the real presence of Christ in the Elements may be denied." (34)

His trenchant criticism, and that of Moreton may be compared with the explanations offered by the Liturgical Commission in the collection 'The Eucharist Today'. It is significant to note that the author, Dr. R.J.Halliburton, of the chapters devoted to 'The Peace and the Taking' (cap.7) and 'The Canon of Series 3'

(cap.8) is from the Catholic wing of the Church of England.

On the 'Taking' he says that the Offertory section "summarizes neatly the spirit of the offertory, the thankful return to God of his own good gifts..." (35) However, he also quotes approvingly Theodore Klauser on the offering of the early Church, who says that each member of the congregation symbolically "expressed concretely his intentions of taking an active part in the sacrifice, and made an offering of his very self..." (36) This links the sacrifice and the offering, and the people, through the use of a 'symbol' - the offering of the gifts (not just of bread and wine in the early Church). This idea was not taken up by the other writers.

When Halliburton reaches the epiclesis in his second essay he says that it "asks a divine response to our obedience, that we may receive the fruits of the communion of the body and blood of Christ." (37) Moving on to the Institution Narrative he reiterates the argument from the original 'Commentary', that the omitting of the manual acts and special fount or type underlines the fact that the whole prayer is consecratory. (38) On the further consecration he says

that it 'works' "by association" (39) but the actual words of Institution are "the warrant for performing this service...[and]...may be seen as an essential part of our memorial of and thanksgiving for the works of the redeeming Christ." (40) Unlike the other Catholic commentator, Moreton, he does not enter into any detail.

On the anamnesis he says of the idea of time, "when the memorial is made we encounter the redeeming Christ and avail ourselves of the redemption which he wrought once for all but perpetually offers to us", (41) and he gives us a long quotation from St. John Chrysostom, concluding, "What we do is done as a memorial of what was done then...we accomplish the memorial of it." (42) He concludes that the phrase 'to offer Christ's sacrifice' is the same as 'making the memorial of Christ's sacrifice.' (43)

Halliburton's argument is that the omission of the verb 'to offer' does not mean that it is ignored, just expressed differently. The whole work of God, (and the sacrifice is Christ's saving work) is recalled in the redeeming Christ. (44) Again it must be asked why this particular point has not been taken up by other commentators, and why it was not mentioned by the other Catholic writers whom we have looked at.

This concludes the summary of the arguments of the Catholic wing. With the exception of Halliburton they are all united in protest against Series 3 as being too protestant; neglecting the Catholic traditions of offering and sacrifice. Halliburton offers a defence of the text, or rather the ideas behind the text. I have brought out the principal arguments for each writer, letting each speak for himself, as well as adding a few comments of my own. After examination of the Evangelical writers both schools will be compared.

Evangelical Commentaries

There are two brief commentaries on Series 3 from the Evangelicals of the Church of England published by 'Grove Books', and two longer works from the pen of Beckwith. (45)

P.E.Dale's booklet, which has questions for discussion, in the manner of Archdeacon Perry, makes two points. He regrets that change in the anamnesis paragraph, saying that the death of Christ is the event remembered in the Lord's Supper. (46) On the revised text he says, "The total effect [of the change] is to make the manner of 'celebrating' less obviously the use of the elements, and the point of reference of the 'celebrating' less distinctively the cross..." (47) On the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' he says, "It is not easy, nor, some would say, desirable to interpret this sentence as implying some continual sacrifice by our Lord in heaven, to which our celebrations here on earth somehow respond." (48) So in opposition to the Catholic writers Dale stresses the death of Jesus, which is celebrated through the elements: he is wary, of course, of any idea of 'sacrifice'.

D.L.Frost, on language, has two items in his booklet under the heading 'Rich Ambiguity'. (49) He likes the "useful" ambiguity of 'once for all' in the anamnesis paragraph, which suggests that although it says on the surface "that Christ's sacrifice was made once and for all, yet because the language chosen omits the copula there is also a strong suggestion...that Christ died once, but died on behalf of and for, all men." (50)

On the word 'celebrate' he says, "This was intentionally multi-valent, intentionally unitive, and has been aimed at giving both Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals something to which they could whole-heartedly consent." (51) He interprets the word 'celebration' himself as a celebration of a living reality, not a re-enactment. (52)

Both examples he gives are far away from any sacramental calling to mind of the sacrificial death of Jesus, which seems to be the touchstone of the Catholic writers we have examined. Because of his position as a member of the Liturgical Commission his comments on the ambiguities 'designed in' to the rite are significant. His statement is parallel to that of Jasper in the introduction to the draft text of Series 2 Communion

Service: "We have...tried to produce forms of words which are capable of various interpretations." (53)

Beckwith's earlier book, written with J.E.Tiller, 'The Service of Holy Communion and Its Revision', can be divided into two parts, a critique of Series 3 and a Draft Service which the authors have composed. Here I will only look at their criticism of Series 3. (54)

Their basic premise is 'Scripture Sola': "What is not contained in Scripture is unessential" (55) "...we must go back...to the New Testament itself." (56)

Having nailed their colours to the mast their criticisms of the Alternative Services follow. (57) We can summarize these as:

- a) there should be a return to the New Testament; (58)
- b) the Passover should be referred to; (59)
- c) that the saving death of Christ be mentioned, and the Cross made central; (60)
- d) that the second coming be seen as something to which the people can look forward; (61)
- e) Holy Communion should be an invitation to eat of the body given for us, and the blood shed for us; (62)
- f) there should be no statement or act indicating that a sacrifice is being offered, except that thanks are

given; (63)

g) there should be a link with the Church and the Holy Spirit; (64)

h) that the reception be seen as an action which has a consecratory function. (65)

Three of the points are dealt with at some length in the book, and it is worth examining them in greater detail; these are the parts on the body and blood of Christ, the sacrifice and the consecration.

Towards the end of the book the authors say that the Alternative Services have "blunted Cranmer's receptionism" which had appeared in his rewording of the Institution Narrative. (66) The Reformers held that there was no presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements, (67) and it is possible to conceive of the real partaking of Christ's body and blood "with or without a real presence of his body and blood in the elements." (68) From a series of texts the authors conclude that the Dominical words could be taken to mean, 'This represents my body'. (69)

On the sacrifice the authors again return to the Scriptures, and say that it is not in the Gospels that Jesus offered a sacrifice of praise, just that he 'gave thanks' and this is the phrase to be used. (70) They reject the translation of 'anamnesis' as 'making present again' or the word 'do' (in 'do this in memory of me') as meaning 'offer'. They appeal to the usual meaning of words. (71) The offertory itself "is no more sacrificial than waiting at table." (72) All the ideas of sacrifice and offering have to be carefully expressed in New Testament language, and so the ideas from the fourth century liturgies have to be rejected. (73)

Concerning the consecration Cranmer is used as the court of appeal; "the elements are set apart in a divinely appointed way to be a means of grace to worthy partakers...They are not in every respect the same as they were before, but have been made a sacrament." (74) The authors also include the eating and drinking as consecratory "in the sense that they too put the elements to a holy use and make them means of grace to those who partake worthily." (75)

Finally on this book I quote from the four page study-guide based on it, ('Revising Communion') which summarizes their argument that revision should begin not from Hippolytus, but from the Prayer Book, which, "incorporates Reformation safeguards (not so evident in Series 3) against such erroneous practices as the mass-sacrifice, adoration of the bread and wine, reservation and prayers for the dead, stressing instead Christ's atonement on the Cross and spiritual feeding on Christ by faith." (76)

In Beckwith's smaller work, 'The Revised Series 3 Communion - A Way Forward', there is one major point of interest, when he criticizes Series 3, saying, "it needs to be made clear that 'our sacrifice of thanks and praise' in the consecration prayer (section 29, p.22) is a sacrifice in which thanks and praise are offered (as in Heb. 13.15, and 1662) not a sacrifice in which something or someone else is offered in a spirit of thanks and praise (as in Lev.7.12f. 22.29, and the Canon of the Roman Mass)." (77) He suggests that the sentence 'Accept through him...' be moved to the prayer of oblation (section 40) after the Communion, - the place where Cranmer put it. (78)

For these firm Evangelicals Series 3 is far removed from the light of the Reformation, and hovers dangerously near Rome, away from the purity of Scripture. However, the Evangelical writer in the collection 'The Eucharist Today', Buchanan, (79) says that Series 3 was based on Series 2, and that Jasper, himself, and Canon K.N.Ross had had a three cornered correspondence on the Rite (80) - so an Evangelical was involved in its composition. He does point out that traces of Hippolytus do remain in the rite. (81)

The Evangelical writers looked at the Scriptural basis of Series 3, and were somewhat disappointed at the emphasis given, and the Catholic writers felt that the historical Canons had been ignored in the hybridization. Both groups support their objections and with appeals to Scripture and history (or in the Catholic case, tradition). Both are sure that they have been let down by the Liturgical Commission. Having been informed by both schools let us now look at the Order of Holy Communion again.

CONCLUSION

Before we come to 'The Communion' two things are worth thinking about; the first is the note concerning the president at the rite; the second is the offertory sentence.

The clarification of the president's standing says, "...only those who have been episcopally ordained priest shall consecrate the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper." (1) In spite of the modernity of the word 'president' which replaced 'priest' which had been used in every rite up until then the traditional word 'consecrate' appears. (2) We have seen in the preceding section how the Evangelicals can use the word in a way which is far from the sense that the Catholics give it. (3) Beckwith quotes Cranmer on the bread and wine: "...they may be called holy and consecrated when they be separated to that holy use by Christ's own words ...[of holy communion]." (4) The word 'president' is far removed from that of 'priest' with its connotations of sacrifice, (5) and Jasper himself says, "...this word emphasises not what the minister is, but rather what he does. He is involved in a corporate action in which he has a particular distinctive role, and which he cannot do just on his own." (6)

Jasper does not qualify what the distinctive role is, but relates it to the presidency of Christ at the Last Supper. (7) This leaves open the question of a sacrificial meal, anamnesis, and the function of the president in relation to the Last Supper and the Congregation.

Moving to the 'Taking of the Bread and Wine' we can say that although the word 'offertory' does not appear its spirit lives on. The sub-heading 'The Taking...' appears before §§23 & 24 'A hymn may be sung, and the offerings of the people may be collected and presented' and 'The bread and the wine are brought to the holy table...' (8) The actual taking is indicated in §25 'The president takes the bread and wine.' The sub-heading unites the offerings of the people, and their presentation with the bringing of the bread and wine and the taking of them by the president. These three sections form one unit. On the offertory Dale, an Evangelical, says, "It is therefore appropriate that no action which suggests that man brings something to God should detract from the symbolism of God giving to man in the eating and drinking." (9) This statement should be compared with the extract from Halliburton given above, particularly the quotation from Klauser. (10) It can be asked if the 'symbolic' uniting of the gifts

(bread and wine, money?) and the giver, or even the non-contributing member of the congregation, is made clear. Dale suggests that the sentence, able to be said at the offertory, be applied to the gifts rather than to the elements. (11)

Therefore, in the 'Taking' the options are left open as to what is offered and why. (12) The actual taking of bread and wine is clear, and corresponds with the first part of Dix's four-fold formula, but the rubrics under the heading seem to confuse this with 'offering'. However, the fact that the instruction to the president to take the bread and wine is the only rubric unqualified by 'may' in §§23-25 lends force to it, but it can be easily overlooked.

The first section of the 'Thanksgiving', before the 'Holy, holy...' is a prayer of praise, and non-controversial.

The first paragraph after the 'Holy, holy...' is called by Halliburton 'the epiclesis', (13) however, this sentence was not intended to include a petition to the Holy Spirit; it was only inserted at the behest of the Bishops, with the support of the Liturgical Commission in July, 1972, at the second revision stage.

(14) The paragraph was designed to be "clear and logical" with three main stages of thought; looking back to the praise of God, invoking Jesus' example as a warrant for the service, "and the third, 'grant that these gifts', expresses our dependence upon God who makes this solemn meal of bread and wine his sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." (15) Halliburton says that the purpose of the prayer is to "ask a divine response to our obedience, that we ourselves may receive the fruits of the communion of the body and blood of Christ." (16) Obviously Halliburton sees the act of the Holy Spirit as being that divine response. The 'Commentary' explanation, obviously written before the insertion of the phrase, indicates that 'grant that these gifts...' be understood in a way that means that the meal is the sacrament, a sentiment which appears to be distinctly Cranmerian. (17) The phrase 'may be to us' can be interpreted as an acknowledgement of receptionism; (18) or conditional on the power of the Spirit (or, in the 1971 draft, on the following of the example of Jesus).(19)

This paragraph then, sets the scene for the many varying shades of meaning which will be uncovered in the paragraph after the acclamation. The Institution Narrative itself is straightforward, the debate on the

tenses has been given in sufficient detail above. (20)

The words of the first sentence of the anamnesis paragraph state that with the bread and wine three events are celebrated and proclaimed: the sacrifice, the resurrection, and the ascension of Jesus. Also the second coming is desired. The change of words effected at the revision in July 1972 did not alter the sentiments, although Dale implies that the salvific death of Christ is not stressed sufficiently, and quotes 1 Cor.11.26. (21) Halliburton says that the 'remembrance' of Christ's saving work is but an expansion of the liturgical shorthand of 'we offer Christ's sacrifice.' (22) However, Moreton states, crisply, "Never does anamnesis do duty for oblation." (23) The 'Commentary' remains silent on all of this.

Certainly it seems unlikely that the average person would take the 'remembrance' to include offering. Indeed, to use a negative argument the satisfaction of the Evangelical writers on this point seems to indicate that they are happy that it is not there.

The second sentence of the paragraph, 'Accept...' presents similar problems. Again the 'Commentary' does not help. Halliburton suggests that the words 'sacrifice of thanks and praise' are reminiscent of 'sacrificium laudis' of the old liturgies. (24) However, the pronoun 'this' of the sentence is fairly open: does it refer to the 'thanksgiving' prayer itself, the bread and the cup, the body and blood of Jesus, our offering (of ourselves, of the bread and cup?) or the eating and drinking? The picture is somewhat unclear. Likewise 'these holy gifts' is also imprecise in meaning. Are the gifts from us to God, part of our offering with that of Jesus, or from God to us? Finally in this sentence three events are asked for in the eating and drinking. (25) The plea to the Father to 'unite us in the body of your Son...' is open to two meanings: the body received at communion, or the body of the Church.

Therefore, the anamnesis paragraph leaves many questions unanswered. It seems unrealistic of Moreton to expect a fully (Roman?) Catholic doctrine in the 'Thanksgiving' of a Church which is both Catholic and Reformed; but there are ideas which are susceptible to a Catholic interpretation, as Dr. Halliburton has shown.

Finally in this conclusion two small points are worthy of note: the agreement on further consecration and the rubric on the disposal of the elements which follow.

The concluding words of the president over the additional elements are interesting, they say '...we pray that this bread/wine may be to us his body/blood, and be received in remembrance of him.' Again we can ask if the 'be to us' is conditional on the prayer of the president being accepted, or on the faith of the recipient?

The following section reads, 'Any consecrated bread and wine which is not required for purposes of communion is consumed at the end of the administration, or after the service.' (26) The 'Commentary' said "This rubric leaves entirely open the questions involved in the administration of the sacrament to the sick and in reservation." (27) Beckwith in his 'The Revised Series 3 Communion - A Way Forward' suggests that this legalises reservation, the phrase, 'which is not required for purposes of communion', having been adjudged to have a future tense. (28) He suggests, as a compromise that the elements be taken to the sick straight after the celebration, and not reserved; this would stop any

worship of the elements. (29) Beckwith prefers the Book of Common Prayer which orders the Curate, and if necessary other Communicants, to "immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same [consecrated elements]."

Therefore, at the end of our survey of Series 3 we have an example of its genius. The simple words leave open various acts depending on the readings. It is up to the user of the rite to decide if the variant readings were 'designed in' and intended by the composers of the service. As has been shown in this section the 'Commentary' remained quiet on these parts, or else, as for the reservation and further consecration, leaves the field open. It did say that it was opposed to providing "alternatives which are avowedly partisan." (30) It seems to have resolved the problem by having texts which can be used by all schools (at least in theory), having been passed by the elected representatives of its members. We have, perhaps, concentrated on its difficulties, but its openness to the various readings is its main strength.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK

HISTORY

The passing of the Worship and Doctrine Measure in 1974 (1) permitted the Church of England to authorize texts for Holy Communion which were more permanent than those permitted by the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure. In 1973 the Synod Standing Committee issued a report which mapped out the future course of liturgical revision in the light of the Measure, then completing its passage. (2) It suggested that the 1662 rite, together with "modern language (Series III type) form of service" and Series 1 and 2 form of service (where justified on pastoral grounds) be authorized. (3)

Three years later, in the February Group of Sessions the Alternative Service Book Working Party presented a report. (4) This was theologically non-controversial, although a member of the Prayer Book Society said that those who would not turn from the 1662 forms of worship were not being given preferment. (5) The Report was accepted, a move against the Alternative Service Book being rejected.

One year later there was a progress report by the Standing Committee. (6) It said that of the Series 3 services only Holy Communion was to be revised; the other services were to be 'adapted' and so not subject to long debate. In November that year a further report was published on the revision of Series 3. (7) It sought the ideas of the Synod: "Thus far the Synod has simply proposed a modern language text, will that be appropriate of the Book?... This is a matter which only the Synod can resolve." (8) The subsequent debate in the Synod was principally about the text of the Lord's Prayer. (9)

It was really in 1978 and 1979 that the Alternative Service Book took up the time of the Synod. As well as the official 'Report of Proceedings' of the Synod we have as a source of information the newsletter 'News of Liturgy' edited by Colin Buchanan, who was closely involved in the revision process. Buchanan has also edited 'The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England' (10) which traces the process which the Prayers went through to attain their final form.

On May 16th. 1978 the Liturgical Commission published GS 364, a Report on 'Alternative Services, Holy Communion, Series 3 Revised'. The Report had been preceded by the publication of the Minutes of the meeting of the House of Bishops which had looked at the recommendations of the Revision Committee and had made changes. (11) The Minutes revealed that Thanksgiving D (an ecumenical Canon from the Joint Liturgical Group), Thanksgiving E (for use with the sick), and Thanksgiving F (for use with children) had been deleted. The actual texts were not published then. (12)

The Minutes had also revealed that the Bishops wished to use the anamnesis from Series 2 ("Therefore, Lord,...with this bread and this cup..."). Buchanan in his booklet 'Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service' gives further information, saying that the basic structure of the anamnesis had been agreed by the Commission in 1977 as a two-fold unit: 'Therefore, in remembrance of... we celebrate...' which also stressed the perfect sacrifice. The text agreed by the Commission was changed by the Bishops because of mis-information at their February 1978 meeting. The Liturgical Commission met on February 27th., disagreed with the Bishops, and their four members who jointly with the four members of the House of Bishops were the

Steering Committee then produced a compromise text, more in line with the thoughts of the Liturgical Commission, and then submitted it to all the Bishops by post. This was agreed to by the Bishops and eventually appeared in GS 364. (13)

In the Report the text used for the Eucharistic Prayer is a revision of Series 3, but in an appendix are revisions of the Eucharistic Prayers of Series 1 and 2 Revised. In order to make clear the four-fold shape 'The Offertory' is separated from 'The Taking of the Bread and the Cup', and 'The Peace' is moved out of 'The Communion'. (14) The Institution Narrative is changed slightly, and the Acclamation put after the anamnesis, which is also changed. (15) Buchanan explains the change by saying, "The intention was to produce a sequence of thought which made the 'mighty acts' of God the object of a different verb from the crucial 'celebrate'...the Pauline structure of thought that we tell out the death of the Lord until he comes (1 Cor.11.26) is clearly expressed." (16)

GS 364 also changed the revision of Series 1. The phrase 'by his one oblation of himself once offered a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the world;' was changed

into 'by the offering of the one perfect sacrifice of himself, a complete satisfaction for the sins of the world;'. The self-offering of the original Series 1 is omitted as it was in the Series 1 Revised text.

GS 364 was debated in the July Group of Sessions, being introduced to the Synod by Buchanan. He directed the Synod's attention to the anamnesis paragraph, asking, "What do we do 'in remembrance of him'? 'What central verbs express what we do?" and "Is 'celebrate his one perfect sacrifice' a sufficient statement of the central meaning of the Eucharist?" He also asked if the omission of the "exclusive equation" 'Christ's death equals his sacrifice' although implied in the text, was helpful or not? (17)

Although the eucharistic sacrifice was referred to by some speeches (18) in the subsequent debate no major points were made. However, Buchanan in his concluding speech suggested "that there is a certain restraint necessary and proper in the sacred mysteries", and that a commentary on the words 'body of Christ' and 'blood of Christ' could not be done satisfactorily in liturgical language. He also said, "So I think there are real possibilities in sacramental language of having language which has not got to be wholly univocal and which can,

therefore, bring together persons whose consciences and outlooks may be somewhat different but who can, in fact, use the same language without any twist of conscience and with only a minimal giving away of other things which they would have liked to say." (19)

After this 'General Consideration' in Synod 1030 items for the revision of the text were submitted to the Committee from 96 Synod members. The Revision was published on 8th. February 1979 as GS 364A. The Report of the Revision Committee was published as GS 364X. (20)

The most significant part of GS 364A was the fact that there were three new Eucharistic Prayers. In GS 364X the Eucharistic Prayers were described:

- "a) The Series 3 Prayer...The key concept here is to 'celebrate the one perfect sacrifice'
- b) The Series 2 Prayer...The key concept here is to 'make the memorial'
- c) The Prayer based on the Hippolytan text. Here it is the Hippolytan Preface and some later themes that form the key concepts.
- d) The Series 1 Prayer,
- e) The Pattern of the Book of Common Prayer...The key concepts are those of Cranmer's text." (21)

There was also included a Prayer for use with the Sick based on the Series 3 adaptation. (22)

The Committee declined to add other Eucharistic prayers, although they left the way open for them. (23)

The revision of the Book of Common Prayer text first came to light in Beckwith and Tiller's 'The Service of Holy Communion and its Revision'. (24) Beckwith was also involved in the production of the Hippolytan variation, published in a booklet with Brian Brindley, 'The Revision of Holy Communion Series 3, A Joint Catholic-Evangelical Approach'. (25) The Bishop of Chichester is quoted by the authors as saying, "Can evangelicals and catholics agree on two canons which would have different emphasis in eucharistic doctrine, so that one would satisfy evangelicals and the other sufficiently satisfy catholics, but that both evangelicals and catholics would be able to use each on occasion without intolerable strain of conscience?" They respond, "We believe that it is possible, but only if the divergences of doctrine are left within strict limits, these limits being the ones imposed by Christian revelation itself." (26) They say that this is possible because of five principles of Anglicanism which they hold: the authority of Sacred Scripture; respect for

Patristic teaching; the unrepeatable atoning sacrifice of Jesus; that those who receive Holy Communion with faith and repentance are truly partakers of Christ's body and blood; and finally, the "claim of the Church of England to stand in continuity with the Holy Catholic Church of all ages, and at the same time the permanent significance of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, as a reassertion of the supreme authority of Scriptures and of our complete dependence of God's grace in Christ for justification..." (27)

The prayers that are given by the writers express different views on the relationship between the consecrated elements and the reception of Christ's body and blood, but they say, "There are some subjects on which Sacred Scripture allows more than one view." (28) They are agreed on the rejection of the repetition of Christ's sacrifice as well as 'bare memorialism'. They also express 'true reception' of Christ's body and blood through the right use of the sacrament, but hope to avoid transubstantiation, consubstantiation, as well as the Protestant views. (29)

In his 'News of Liturgy' which was published after the texts were released Buchanan commented, "The essence of the plan is a trade-off by which Brian Brindley promotes a full modernized 1662 Communion, which he will not use but Roger Beckwith wants very much, and in return Roger Beckwith will put his hand to a eucharistic prayer based on Hippolytus which he will not use but Brian Brindley wants very much." (30)

The proposed texts of the anamnesis those published in GS 364A are set out in Appendix III. The Book of Common Prayer revision was changed in three places by the Committee with the addition of words from the 1662 text. For Hippolytus' text the re-working by Brindley and Beckwith was itself changed, the major variations being not in the anamnesis paragraph although it was changed, but in the epiclesis paragraph. (31)

The other significant variation in GS 364A is in the 'Offertory'. In GS 364 'The Peace' was at the end of the section 'The Word and the Prayers', followed by 'The Communion'. Within 'The Communion' there were two subheadings: 'The Offertory' (with the sentence from 1 Chronicles 29.11 used in series 3) and 'The Taking of the Bread and the Cup and THE THANKSGIVING' (capitals thus), followed by the rubric "When the offertory has

been completed, the president takes the bread and the cup into his hands" (32)

GS 364A had the heading 'The Ministry of the Sacrament' with three separate sub-headings: 'The Peace', 'The Preparation of the Gifts' and 'The Eucharistic Prayer'. In the 'Preparation of the Gifts' there were three sections: The placing of the bread and the wine on the table, (this being obligatory), then, "The president may praise God for his gifts in appropriate words to which all respond 'Blessed be God for ever' ", followed by "The offerings of the people may be collected and presented. These words may be used..." [the words from Series 3 which are derived from Series 1 follow] finally, "At the preparation of the gifts a hymn may be sung." (33)

GS 364X says that these three optional sections are "a compromise, but one which...may be accepted in good conscience by all traditions in the Church." (34) The responses are those which are used in the Roman Missal of Paul VI. Buchanan expressed the position of an Evangelical when he said, "For myself, I find difficulties...as to both the idea of offering the bread and wine to God, and also in giving him thanks for them when that is to be the role of the eucharistic prayer

itself." (35) However, the Committee do say, "It is not intended that any or all of these actions or words need to be used, or that they should be used in any particular order." (36) This seems to be the first time a Response is given without any Versicle.

The Committee also changed the place of the Acclamations in the Eucharistic Prayers. Although they could "see a logic in placing them after the narrative of institution had been taken up and expounded by the ensuing anamnesis" (37) they changed them to the Series 3 position because of the ecumenical advantage and a "widespread popular welcome for them at that point." (38)

At the end of the Eucharistic Prayers the 'Additional Consecration' formula was changed slightly from "Father, we have given thanks over the bread and the cup according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ, who said..." (39) to "Father, giving thanks over the bread and the cup according to the institution of your son Jesus Christ who said..." (40) The reason for this was "to make clear that this is an extension of the Eucharistic Prayer and not a separate act." (41)

The revised texts were put before the Synod on 21st. February 1979. In his introduction the Bishop of Derby (Rt. Rev. C.W.J.Bowles) stressed the variations and options available. He said, "In...discussion our tradition of uniformity was unconsciously if not consciously at work, but the desire to avoid division at the heart of the Sacrament of Unity was the strongest consideration of all..." but added "None of them [the Eucharistic Prayers] is a 'party' prayer..." On language he said, supporting ambiguity, "Ambiguity can help us not only to get along together and worship together, but it can also assist us to maintain a certain humbleness of mind and a readiness to grow in our interpretation of truth." (42)

The detailed examination of the texts took time both in that February Group of Sessions and in the subsequent July Group.

On the 22nd. February the response 'Blessed be God' at the 'Preparation of the Gifts' was debated. (43) The texts from the Roman Catholic Church were proposed. Buchanan spoke against them saying that the Eucharistic Prayer itself is a thanksgiving, so that the prayers suggested were "mini-canons" and leave "the rest of the service rather otiose." (44) He added, "...the

Roman prayers offer the unconsecrated bread and cup to God. That is to many people in the Church of England a very difficult concept to make any sense of, and the only sense they can make of it is one they do not want to be committed to at all and they do not see it as part of the Church of England's formularies hitherto..." (45) The amendment to add the prayer lapsed, less than forty members of the Synod supporting it. (46)

The Synod also debated the fact that there was now a definite choice of Eucharistic Prayers. The debate did not produce any real argument, and the various options, as options, were approved. (47)

In July the texts of the Eucharistic Prayers were debated. In the First Eucharistic Prayer "renew us by your Spirit, inspire us with your love, and unite us in the body of your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord" was put in the place of "may we who are nourished by his body and blood grow into your likeness and, made one by your Spirit, become a living temple to your glory." (48) Later the words deleted were put into the Second Eucharistic Prayer. (49)

The Third Eucharistic Prayer had a significant change. After the Benedictus the Prayer began, in the version of GS 364A, as suggested by Beckwith and Brindley, "Lord, you are holy indeed, the source of all holiness; grant that by the power of your holy word and according to your holy will these your gifts of bread and wine may be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." (50) The Bishop of Guildford (Rt. Rev. D.A.Brown) proposed that 'Holy Spirit' be inserted in place of 'holy word'. This was accepted, (97 votes to 96) even though it was "obnoxious" to Beckwith. (51)

The debate continued on the 5th. and 6th. July, but the amendments proposed were minor, perhaps with the exception of the proposal for the Eucharistic Prayer for use with children, which was rejected. (52)

The House of Bishops subsequently considered the texts, and made several amendments. The only one of interest being a minor change in the Second Eucharistic Prayer where 'nourish us with the body and blood of your Son' was preferred to 'nourish us by his body and blood.' (53)

The texts were approved on 7th. November 1979.

(54) The voting figures were: (55)

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	33	3
Clergy	207	10
Laity	150	23

Nearly eighteen months later debates took place in Parliament on a Bill which sought to protect the Book of Common Prayer. It was introduced into the Lords (Second Reading) and leave was sought to introduce it into the Commons (First Reading) on 8th. April 1981. Its purpose was to enable twenty people whose names were on a Church Roll (or 20% of the total number if the total number of names was under 100) to require the use of the Book of Common Prayer once a month at "the principal morning service," that is the service, "but for this Act, be normally attended by the greatest number of people." (56)

In the Commons the debate was short, the Bill being introduced under the ten - minute rule. Mr. van Straubenzee opposed the Bill on behalf of the Government saying it "intervenes in one albeit important area in

which Parliament has decreed that decision shall be a matter for the Church..." (57)

The debate in the Lords later that day went on for four hours (until after midnight, unusual for them). In his introductory speech Lord Sudeley concentrated on general themes. However, he did say, "There does exist in this field some difficulty in assessing whether doctrinal irregularity has been committed or not...more sense can lie under the words than in them....There is no doubt, generally speaking, that the old emphasis on the Cross and atonement has been sidestepped." (58) In his reply the Bishop of Durham, Rt.Rev. J. Habgood, who had been Chairman of the General Synod's Standing Committee on the Alternative Service Book, said, "I particularly hope that we shall not be drawn towards the doctrinal red-herrings which he put before us." He saw the question as, "Is the legislation...adequate to protect the interests of those who want to worship according to the Book of Common Prayer?" (59)

The Lord Chancellor posed the question, "whether 20 persons, who happen to be on the electoral roll of the parish, are entitled to impose upon the rest of them once a month what is called the Book of Common Prayer?" (60) He repeated the Government's policy as stated in

the Lower House by van Straubenzee.

The following speeches did not touch doctrine, but spoke of English and tradition. For example, the Marquess of Salisbury compared the Book of Common Prayer to an old church building, "It gives one a sense of security..." (61) and Lord Mottistone said, "I should have thought that stability was one of the great strengths of the Church of England through the ages and one it should hold on to rather than try and loose." (62) Other Peers deprecated the language of the Alternative Service Book, and described it as being of a "bed-sit" (63) as "used in Oxford St." (64) by "a Treasury civil-servant" (65).

Theology was noticeable by its absence. The use of the Book of Common Prayer was sought because of tradition and language. The one point given above about the atonement was not taken up at all by any other speaker in the four hour debate. What we do have is a debate about words and forms of words, but not about the ideas behind them. The fact that changed words could indicate changed or developed doctrines does not occur in either debate. For this reason I will not discuss the points presented, but leave the debates as an indication of the impression which the Alternative

Service Book had made on the Members of the Lords and Commons. (66) The Bill passed both Houses with comfortable majorities. (67) However, because it does not have Government support it is unlikely to become law.

INTERPRETATIONS

It is too early to pass any definitive judgement on the Alternative Service Book. However, three books have been published, two of them commentaries, the third is a compilation of essays attacking the revision of the Prayer Book. There are also two small pamphlets. (1) The article in 'Anglican Worship Today' on The Order of Holy Communion is signed by Buchanan, that in the 'Commentary' is unsigned, but bears signs of his authorship. (2)

The critical volume stems from the attack on the Alternative Service Book by 'PN Review' in Nov. 1979, which commented on three petitions to the Synod against the revision just before it was due to authorize the Alternative Service Book. The petitions were not concerned with theology, but about language, and need not detain us. (3) The subsequent book also concentrated on language, only one contributor dealing with theology: Rev.G.Taylor on 'The Book of common Prayer as a repository of doctrine.' (4)

In the article he speaks of the Book of Common Prayer Consecration Prayer, which "expressed the Atonement simply and succinctly in undying words which may never be bettered, namely that Christ 'made, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world' but this is not found in the Series 3 Communion. There, in what is now called 'The Thanksgiving' we find 'Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin, giving him to be born as man, to die upon the cross,' but these token references to the Atonement are tame by comparison and more selfish in concept." (5) He devotes more space to attacking "the Socialist militants in the Church...political considerations being seen [by them] as more important than any spiritual teaching." (6) The 'perfect sacrifice made for all' of the Alternative Service Book text, although less repetitious than the Book of Common Prayer text does seem to express the same ideas, notions of 'tameness' or 'selfishness' seeming rather subjective. Taylor does not give any theological support to his claim, and does not suggest any definite theological inaccuracy.

'Anglican Worship Today' gives a general theological introduction to the Service of Holy Communion, as well as more specific details referring to the Alternative Service Book. (7) It seems to have a clear bias towards the Reformed tradition. For example, in making the point that the new Book reflects the ideas of the Reformers, Buchanan says that it teaches "not so much that an objective change has happened in the elements [at Communion], as that they have power, in the right context and to the believing recipient, to convey the presence and pardon of Christ. (8) This is then linked to the teaching of the Reformers that "the bread is only the body of Christ to the faithful recipient." (9) The chapter in the 'Commentary' is more technical and detailed than 'Anglican Worship Today'; both books will be used in the Conclusion below.

Beckwith's booklet gives a general guide to the Alternative Service Book. He prefers the Order following the Book of Common Prayer because it is less ambiguous concerning the offering, "the words of offering are confined to a post-communion prayer where they cannot be misunderstood".(10) Of the four Eucharistic Prayers he prefers the fourth, which concerning the sacramental presence repeats the Book of Common Prayer, asking that those who receive the bread

and the wine" may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." (11) Perry give a more detailed commentary designed for the average church-goer. Interestingly enough he supports offertory processions as a visual aid to the worshipper.(12) He underlines the union between the ideas of memorial and sacrifice: "we can never say the Eucharist is one without the other."(13) He develops the idea of anamnesis to conclude, "We are all able...through our offering of the Eucharist to present once more before God that awe-ful, sacrifice [of Jesus]." (14) This interpretation would not, I think, find favour with Buchanan.

Brindley, from the Catholic stream, published a brief note on the Alternative Service Book in 'The Church Observer' (15) under the title 'What is the matter with the ASB?' He replied to his own question in terms of format rather than theology. He suggests that the revision process needs to continue, helped by small booklets rather than be frozen in a book; - thus apparently ignoring the booklet of Rite A and the possibility for parishes to do their own scissors and paste job on the Book for their own use.

The Church Literature Association, which publishes Catholic material within the Church of England, is unaware of any Catholic commentary on the new Book comparable to Buchanan's work. (16) However, they publish for the Church Union a version of Rite A for use in parishes of the Catholic tradition who do not want to put together their own compilation. (17) There are a few things of interest in this booklet. Under the heading 'The Offertory' it inserts the rubric, 'Bread and wine are brought to the altar to be offered by the priest...' together with an addition from the Roman Catholic Missal: 'Pray, brethren, that our sacrifice may be acceptable to God the almighty Father. May the Lord accept the sacrifice at your hands for the praise and glory of his name, for our good and the good of all his Church.' it also puts the Peace and the Lamb of God in the position they are given in the Roman Catholic Missal. Only the customary Roman Catholic words of administration are given, 'The Body of Christ' and 'The Blood of Christ.'

These variations show how the Rite can be adapted to external conformity with a different tradition. One presumes that the followers of this variation do have a spiritual external conformity with their own tradition. Here we have an example of the genius of the basic 1980

Rite to be open to all schools of spirituality.

CONCLUSION

SURVEY

We have now examined the development towards the Alternative Service Book of the Church of England, concluding with the four Eucharistic Prayers in one Order which are designed to have a life somewhat longer than the forms which preceded them and which (of Series 1,2,3) they perfect. It is now possible with all the information laid out regarding the genesis of the texts to plot in theological terms the development towards the Church of England's Services of Holy Communion from 1662 to the modern texts. (1) The four Eucharistic Prayers were to some extent 'standardised' and their similarities and differences become apparent when they are compared. They are laid out in Appendix IV; historically they can be read from right to left; the Book of Common Prayer adaptation - for use with the sick, Series 1 Revised, Series 2 Revised, Series 3 Revised. The progressive textual changes are given in the historical section of this work.

The central part of the Eucharist can be compared to a series of brackets around a common centre with the Institution Narrative as the centre, then the epiclesis and the anamnesis next to it, surrounded by the praise and the petition for right reception, the Preface with

the Sanctus and the Doxology form the next 'brackets', and finally we have the Offertory and the Communion. (2) In this conclusion we will use the following order: Institution Narrative, epiclesis, anamnesis, praise, petition for right reception, Preface, Doxology, 'Offertory', Communion.

It is obvious that, to use Dix's word, the 'shape' has changed, the four-fold action is now visible. (3) This will be made clear as we study the layout and the rubrics of the Orders, (4) but our prime concern is the theology behind such changes, not the examination of primitive texts. Naturally the early forms will be used, but it is not our purpose to see how, or if, they have been restored, but to look at the ideas which are behind the phrases in the liturgies under discussion.

Institution Narrative

The actual text of the Institution Narrative has remained essentially the same from 1662 to 1980 despite the attempt in Series 3 to change the tense to the active. (5) However, the surrounding rubrics are indicative of a development. The Book of Common Prayer specifies the manual acts of taking the Paten, breaking the bread, the laying of the hand on the bread, taking the Cup, the laying of the hand on the Cup and every vessel during the recitation of the Dominical words. This is followed in Series 1, and simplified in Series 2 (the priest is just to take the bread and wine). (6) In Series 3 the manual acts are not specified at all during the Narrative, but Note 16 of the Alternative Service Book permits the 'traditional acts' and prints them in full in the 1662 revision. (7) As was mentioned above the Dominical words are to be used during Further Consecration, the option of silent addition being withdrawn. (8)

The omission of the manual acts diminished the visual importance of the Institution Narrative, and stressed the totality of the Thanksgiving, (9) but the restoration of the Dominical words for Further Consecration drew them back into prominence again. This

seems to indicate a tension between the traditional importance of the words and the desire to stress the unity of the whole Prayer. The use of the passive form in the Eucharistic Prayer and the active in Invitation to Communion (10) also speaks of a tension, this time between the fidelity to the Greek text of Scripture and the elaboration of it. The question of Professor Porter, "Who does, who gives, who sheds...?" (11) obviously struck a chord in Synod. Fidelity to the text was only rigorously followed at the centre of the action. Buchanan in the 'Alternative Service Book Commentary' speaking of 'Consecration' underlines the fact that it is not a Biblical word. In the Alternative Service Book it is in the taking of the elements and the saying of the Thanksgiving that effect consecration, "although some breadth of varying opinion may remain as to what consecration effects in relation to the bread and the cup."(12)

The Institution Narrative of itself, we can conclude, presented little problem for tradition is followed. The manual acts are optional in Rite A in the Alternative Service Book except for the Dominical act of taking, and in that revision the Liturgical Commission did not seek to change the tense again. But the option was consigned to the 'Notes' and left to the imprecise

formula "the president may use traditional manual acts during the Eucharistic Prayers" (13) and the active tense is used outside the Thanksgiving.

The Epiiclesis & Petition for Consecration

In this section we have, apart from the words of the Institution Narrative, the only text to come unchanged through successive revisions, from Series 2 to the texts in the Alternative Service Book (including the 1662 Revision): 'these gifts of bread and wine'. The Book of Common Prayer asked that the recipients of the 'creatures of bread and wine in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his most holy Body and Blood'. (14) From Series 2 on, the emphasis changes from the recipients to 'us' - presumably the people present, be they communicants or not (e.g. children). This is a reversion to the 1549 form, and perhaps away from the implied notion that all those attending the Communion Service will receive Communion, (and perhaps away from the teaching that Communion is in remembrance of the passion and death of Jesus?) (15)

The 1549 text uses the words, "thy gyftes and creatures of bread and wyne." (16) This is a change from the Roman text at this point which specified 'oblations', (17) with the idea of a 'Godward' movement. The text does not show if there is any difference in the gifts after the Consecration, although the Eucharistic Prayers 1 and 2 use the word 'holy' after the anamnesis.

The invocation of the Holy Spirit at this point was suggested by the House of Bishops during the revision process of Series 3. (18) Historically this invocation can be traced back to the fourth century as well as to the traditional Roman Canon, (19) and is explicit in the new Canons of the Roman Catholic Church, including a similar insertion into the second Prayer, taken from Hippolytus' text. (20) The Alternative Service Book makes the Epiclesis a place for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the worshippers, thus removing it from the area of controversy, viz. does it have a consecratory function?

The development of this section of the Thanksgiving has changed considerably the emphasis of the Book of Common Prayer from a request that the reception (made in remembrance of the passion and death of Jesus) of the bread and wine may enable the recipient to be a partaker of the Body and Blood, to a plea through the Holy Spirit, that the gifts of Bread and Wine may be to all the body and blood of Jesus. The mode of the presence is hidden in the words "may be to us" which as Jasper said, "...can be used by Anglicans of all schools of thought to express their view of the Eucharistic Presence, for it is "capable of various interpretations," (21) and is "evenly poised between the

subjective and objective interpretations" as Couratin said. (22) The major change to the text of Hippolytus at this point by Brindley and Beckwith was the addition of the words that "these holy gifts of bread and wine may be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," and this is now the norm in the first three Eucharistic Prayers of the Alternative Service Book.

The Anamnesis

In the Book of Common Prayer it seems as if the anamnesis is the Communion itself. The Dominical words 'Do this in memory...' are followed in the 1662 text by 'Amen' and the distribution. What is called to mind is the sharing - the eating and drinking - of the bread and wine. (23) In the pre-distribution position of the Prayer of Oblation the 'this' in the phrase "accept this our sacrifice of praise" can refer to the Prayer itself.(24) (We have looked at that Prayer (25) and the detailed arguments in the making of Series 2 in sufficient detail in the body of this work.) (26)

In the four modern texts the remembering is of the past, of all the acts of Jesus. Although this seems to be against St Paul, 'For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes,' (1 Cor.11.26) (27) it must be asked if the death is proclaimed as death, that is the end of a human life. Rather it seems that the death of Jesus was the beginning of the process of redemption which was finished in the resurrection and ascension. The Eucharist proclaims the beginning and then elaborates the very reason why it is proclaimed; (28) and this has been followed since Series 2.

As we have said earlier in this conclusion the remembering for Cranmer was in the eating and drinking. However, in the Hippolytan text the remembrance is in the offering of the bread and the cup, through which offering thanks are given; (to cite the crucial words, "Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis eius, offerimus tibi hanc panem et calicem, gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare.") (29) In spite of the pleas of the authors of the original Series 2 form 'we offer this bread and this cup' (30) the traditional formula was rejected. The offering, it was held, was not an instituted act of Christ, "and is an intrusion." (31)

The idea of offering is closely allied to that of 'sacrifice' in the Eucharist, for the self-offering of Jesus on the Cross was his sacrifice. The question arises, therefore: to what extent does the word 'offer' in the anamnesis refer to any analogous sacrifice made by the people present at the Service? (And does the receiving of Communion affect the people's 'sacrifice'?) On the one hand the Evangelical position is that "When our Reformers dealt with the question of the eucharistic sacrifice their constant aim and guiding principle was to establish and maintain a clear distinction between Christ's sacrifice for us and that which we offer

through Him. This, they held, is what the Bible itself seeks to do; and this is the right way to avoid the trials and tribulations of the Mass-doctrine, in which Christ's sacrifice and ours are confused so disastrously." (32) On the other hand the Catholic wing make use of the Didache and other sources, especially Malachi 1.11 "In every place a pure offering shall be made to my name." (33) Couratin (using Justin) summarises this, saying "...the narrative of the institution is recited, and the bread and the cup are offered, and God is asked to accept what is done with them as a spiritual sacrifice through the mediation of Christ." (34) This can mean that the bread and the cup are placed at God's disposal, and that "he may use them for the spiritual feeding of those who receive with faith" (35) but obviously the word 'offer' has a more usual significance in the liturgy. What both parties have to avoid in the explanation is best summarized in the words of Article XXXI, "...the sacrifice of the Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of sin or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." The tension between the two schools of thought aided the development of the new forms.

In the Prayer of Oblation the clause, "And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee" was deleted from Series 1 Revised, although it was followed by a reference to Communion, and so the sacrifice could be joined to the reception, a sacrifice of 'praise and thanksgiving'. The other mention of sacrifice in the Prayer is left intact: "although we be unworthy...to offer unto thee any sacrifice,yet...accept this our bounden duty and service..." and remains in the fourth Eucharistic Prayer of the Alternative Service Book. The 'duty and service' then seem to be a sacrifice, but it is far from the word 'remembrance' and so near to the words 'holy communion' that they seem to point in that direction. The pronouns "this...this...this" in the Prayer seem most logically to refer to the reception. (36)

The point to be noted in the Series 2 debate is that in the first draft of June 1965 the offering of the bread and wine is joined to the anamnesis. Subsequent versions added the phrase on eating and drinking, then deleted the explicit offering, so that the memorial was to be made with the bread and the cup. But the 'how' is left vague, and depends on the interpretation of the individual. (37)

In Series 3 the statement "we do this in remembrance of him" was followed after a colon by "we celebrate and proclaim his perfect sacrifice...his resurrection...and his ascension." (38) which leaves open the 'this' - what is intended to be done, and how is it done?

Buchanan in his 'Anglican Worship Today' speaks of the anamnesis as explaining "how" the Dominical command 'Do this' is carried out. (39) He also says that the anamnesis "describes what we do." (40) He gives extracts from each prayer to show this:

- 1: "we celebrate...his own perfect sacrifice."
- 2: "we make...the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord."
- 3: "we celebrate this memorial of our redemption."
- 4: "we offer you through him this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." (41)

The 'how' of the celebration (Prayers 1 and 3) or of the making of the memorial (Prayer 2) or the offering (Prayer 4) seems in each prayer to lead to the reception of the Sacrament; for in each case this is the action to which the faithful, in whose name the President is proclaiming The Thanksgiving, look forward. Therefore, the additional words after the Institution Narrative can

still be held to accomplish what Cranmer intended by his 1552 Prayer Book: that the reason for the Thanksgiving is Reception. However, the anamnesis texts also speak of "our sacrifice of thanks and praise"(Prayer 1); "This offering of our duty and service (Prayer 2); "we bring before you...this our duty and service" (Prayer 3); "we offer you through him this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (Prayer 4). These words can be taken as part of the offering of praise of the complete action, not just of the Reception. (42)

Therefore, the tension between the parties has been solved by the revision process by leaving open how the passion, death and resurrection are recalled; also unclear is what is offered and how this is done; and how in response to the acts remembered the memorial is made with the bread and the cup (which in fact are specified only in the first two Eucharistic Prayers).

Praise

The introduction of praise to the petition for consecration in the Book of Common Prayer stresses the continuation in perpetuity by the Church of the unique self-offering of Jesus as satisfaction for the world's sins. This was repeated by Series 1 and carried all the way throughout the revisions, with some minor 'tidying' being done at the 1978 revision. (43)

Series 2 asked the Father to "accept our sacrifice of praise", and this phrase was included in the Alternative Service Book. Series 3 spoke of "praises", and this too has lasted, although the Liturgical Commission's translation of Series 2 into modern English on which it is based used "offerings of praise". (44) The third Eucharistic Prayer follows the Hippolytan text and says, "Lord, you are holy indeed and the source of all holiness."

These texts do not relate to any controversy, but express the tone of praise which is traditional. They pick up the themes of the Preface and link it to subsequent sections.

Petition for Right Reception

In modern versions this is linked to the anamnesis. We have already noted how Cranmer saw the reception as the anamnesis itself. (45) In the Series 2 Prayer it is significant that the first controversial draft from the Liturgical Commission in 1965 did not mention eating and drinking, but by the time that the final version appeared the 'duty and service' was no longer clearly the offering of the bread and the cup, but could be the reception. A similar movement can be observed in Series 1. The original text with just the change of the position of the Prayer of Oblation leaves open the meaning of the sacrifice offered and duty and service; but Series 1 Revised joins closely the sacrifice and duty and service to the Communion in consecutive sentences; and the Alternative Service Book just separates them with a comma. Nevertheless the identification is not explicit, and "this our sacrifice of thanks and praise" (the Series 3 phrase carried over to the Alternative Service Book) although joined to the "eating and drinking of these holy gifts" does not automatically imply an identification of the two.

The text is even more nuanced in the third Eucharistic Prayer. Brindley and Beckwith added "We pray you to accept this our duty and service, a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" to Hippolytus' text, between the thanks for being able to bring the bread and the cup and the plea that the Holy Spirit may come on the chosen people and gather together all who share in the bread and the cup. Therefore, the link can be made either down to the line on the sharing, or up to that on the bringing of the cup. It is neither the simple text of the fourth century ('We offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks...And we ask that you would send your holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church, that gathering it into me...') (46) nor the straight clear thought of Cranmer. Both this and the other new Prayers plot a middle path at this point.

Preface & Sanctus, Doxology

Neither of these parts of the Service presents any controversial points to us, but both are part of the traditional form of praise to the Father for the work of the Son and an acknowledgement of the power of the Spirit through whom all Christian worship is made. In the Alternative Service Book the themes of the Preface are echoed in the Eucharistic Prayers. It is interesting to note that the Benedictus has been moveable. In 1549 it was after the Sanctus. It was deleted in 1552, 1662, 1928. In Series 1 and Series 1 & 2 Revised it is optional after the Sanctus. In Series 2 it is optional after the Canon, in Series 3 it is an optional anthem during Communion. In the Alternative Service Book it returns as an optional verse after the Sanctus in Rite A. Rite B retains the Series 1 and 2 rubrics. (47)

Offertory

During the revision process the Offertory went through many changes, best summarized as an identity crisis. The rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer speak of the people's Alms for the Poor (and other devotions) which are brought to the Priest in a bason (sic) and placed on the holy Table. The priest himself puts on the table "so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient." This is followed by prayers for the Church militant, an Exhortation or two, Confession and Absolution, Comfortable words and the Preface. There was no formula in Cranmer's Service to replace the Offertory in the Roman Rite. (48)

The theology of the Roman Catholic Church which was rejected by Cranmer can best be summed up in the words of the first Canon of the Council of Trent on the Mass, "If anyone shall say that in the Mass a true and real sacrifice is not offered to God, or that what is offered is nothing but that Christ is given us to eat - anathama sit." (49) The Reformers eschewed any notion akin to the repetition of the sacrifice, including the offering. The texts in the 1570 Roman Missal gave prayers for the offering of the host and the chalice by the priest; the host offered for all, including the living and the dead,

the chalice being described in its offering as 'calicem salutis', both are 'sacrificium nostrum'. The last prayer of the priest read, "Suscipe sancta Trinitas hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus ob memoriam passionis, resurrectionis et ascensionis Jesu Christi Domini nostrum..." Finally he asked the congregation, "Orate fratres, ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem Omnipotentem." The ideas in these prayers were completely rejected by the Reformers.

Before the Second World War there was a Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church on the Continent which wished to encourage the active participation of the laity in the Mass. To this end offertory processions were begun, for example the Young Christian [sc. Catholic] Farmers used to bring produce to the altar. The rationale behind this seems to have been the wish to experience in some way the sharing of Christ's offering of himself. The faithful wished to express their desire to be associated with him and so offer the fruits of their work as an expression of themselves. Obviously this was linked to the Roman Catholic theology of the sacrifice of the Mass.

Similar offertory processions seem to have begun in the Church of England also before the 1939 war but increased in popularity after the war due to the 'Parish and People' movement. (50) The four-fold theory of Dix drew attention to the Taking (apparently equivalent to the Offertory) as an integral part of the whole Service of Holy Communion. "It [the Offertory] is an integral and original part of the whole eucharistic action, not a preliminary to it...The offertory, the prayer and the communion are closely connected moments in a single continuous action, and each only finds its meaning as part of the whole." (51)

Archbishop Ramsey, as Bishop of Durham, applied a counter-balance to this notion of offertory processions when he wrote, "The new movement places much emphasis upon the offertory, as the offering to Almighty God of the bread and the wine as the token of the giving to him of the people's common life... The idea of sacrifice is taught in many parishes in connection with the offering of bread and wine in the offertory and ourselves, our souls and our bodies, in the prayer after Communion...By itself, however, this sort of teaching about sacrifice can be a shallow and romantic sort of Pelagianism...for we cannot, and dare not, offer aught of ourselves apart from one sacrifice of the Lamb of God." (52)

Of course the Church of England cannot accept the Offertory as it is understood in the Roman Catholic Church, but the two extracts given show the tension which existed when the revision process began. (53) The line between the Cranmerian position of the offertory of money, and the 'modern' approach became more blurred as the revision of the Holy Communion progressed. (54) Historically Series 1 separated the bread and the wine and the money, and allowed the extracts from 1 Chronicles 29, (vv 11 & 14) ('Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power, And the glory, and the witness, and the majesty. All that is on heaven and earth is thine. All things come of thee O Lord, and of thine own do we give you.') It seemed from the context that the Scripture applied to the bread and the wine. Series 2 began by repeating this, but early in the revision process deleted 1 Chronicles 29, joined together the bread and the wine and the gifts of the people and suggested an offertory procession. (55) Series 3 separated the offerings of the people and the bringing and taking of the bread and wine (with its own heading), the final version also offered 1 Chronicles 29. Series 1 & 2 Revised also separated the presentation of the offerings and the bringing of the bread and wine (with 1 Chronicles 29 for the bread and wine), and had the heading 'The Preparation of the Bread and Wine' but the

first rubric after the heading said "The Priest begins the offertory". Series 3 Revised used the heading 'The Offertory' for the bringing of the bread and wine and the presentation of the offerings of the people, 1 Chronicles 29, or other words, being allowed. This was followed by the 'Taking of the Bread and the Cup' by the priest after the Offertory as preparation for the Thanksgiving. The revision of this (carried into the Alternative Service Book) deleted the heading 'The Offertory' and spoke of the 'Preparation of the Gifts', the bread and the wine being placed on the holy table by the president who praises God for them "in appropriate words"; this is then followed by the collection and presentation of the offerings of the people, 1 Chronicles 29 being an option available to be used. Finally, 'The Taking of the Bread and Wine and The Giving of Thanks' are together as a heading. Although in Series 1 and Series 3 there is a separation of the bread and the wine from the offerings of the people the use of 1 Chronicles 29 may suggest that God is being given not just the bread and the wine, but "All things...and of your own do we give you." The combining in Series 2 of the presentation "at the same time" (56) of the bread and the wine and the offerings of the people, together with the imprecise use of the word 'offertory' in Series 1 & 2 Revised indicates the

closeness with which the bread, wine and offertory can be identified. In the Alternative Service Book the distinction between offertory and taking is clear, and there is a separation between the praising of God for the bread and wine, and the use of 1 Chronicles for the money.

In the Alternative Service Book the link between the offerings of the people, and the optional use of 1 Chronicles 29. seems to show a blurring of the separation between the bread and wine and the offertory for the poor which was envisaged by Cranmer. He had directed that the offering be humbly presented by the Priest, but that the bread and wine be placed on the holy Table by him. (57) The Alternative Service Book's optional ceremonies and words can be made to seem like the Offertory in the Roman Catholic Church, (although the word 'offering' does not appear in the Missal of Paul VI,) as well as being able to present a separation of the "offerings" and the bread and wine in the manner suggested by Cranmer. This seems to have been what Jasper intended when he wrote of the offertory, "...it would be most unwise to include any prayers which would tend to produce one official interpretation of these acts..." (58)

The Communion

The Communion itself did not cause any great controversy, and so has not been included in the body of the work. However, a brief look at the words of administration will be informative.

The words given in 1662 were, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving" and "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this is remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." The first half comes from the Roman Catholic Mass, "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternum." (59) The second half came from the 1552 text (they were joined in 1662) (60) which underlines the fact that the eating and drinking are 'in remembrance'. Series 1 split these words and gave the Minister the choice of either the first sentence, or of the second, or of the full version to each group of communicants, or to all of them. (61) (The first draft of Series 1 gave a multiplicity of choices, either the 1662 words, or the choice given in

the final version, or an adaptation to be said to the "whole number" of communicants.) (62) Series 2 from its earliest draft to the last version allowed the Priest to say "Draw near with faith: Receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for you, and his blood which was shed for you; and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving" To each communicant the Priest had to say "The Body of Christ" and "The Blood of Christ," to which the communicant had to reply, "Amen" (63) (The 'Draw near...' came from the 1548 version.) (64) Series 1 & 2 Revised offered either the 1662 texts, or the words "Draw near with faith..." followed either by "The Body (or Blood) of Christ" or "The Body (or Blood) of Christ preserve your body and soul unto everlasting life" or "The Body (or Blood) of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for you preserve your body and soul to everlasting life." The communicant had to reply "Amen" to whatever version was used. (65) Series 3 gave the text "Draw near with faith..." followed by "The Body (or Blood) of Christ keep you in eternal life." (66) The Alternative Service Book follows Series 3, but also allows the form "The Body (or Blood) of Christ," that allowed in the Book of Common Prayer, and also the invitation "Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to his supper." (67)

In a commentary on Series 2 Bishop Roderic Coote (from the Church of Ireland tradition) wrote in the Chelmsford Diocesan Newsletter, "Some people feel that the words 'The Body of Christ' sound too Roman - if so how important to them is that 'Amen'. To an R.C. 'The Body of Christ' would mean: 'by transsubstantiation (sic) this is the Body of Christ' whereas to an Anglican they would say; 'This can be, or may not be, to you the Body of Christ - it depends on your faith'. The word 'Amen' which the communicant says, means 'May it be so'." (68) Halliburton, from a more Catholic tradition, gives another interpretation in 'The Eucharist Today', "The actual words of administration incorporate the very early formula 'The Body of Christ', 'The Blood of Christ', to which the communicant responded 'Amen' i.e. 'Yes, I believe, this is the Body of Christ.'" (69)

The words 'Draw near with faith...' seem to echo Calvin who in 'The Institutes of Christian Religion' wrote "Sacraments may be called 'pillars of the faith'...It is therefore certain that the Lord offers us mercy and the pledge of his grace both in his Sacred Word and in his sacraments. But it is only understood by those who take the Word and the sacraments with some faith, just as Christ is offered and held forth by the Father to all unto salvation, yet not all acknowledge

and receive him." (70) We have also seen that 'receptionism' is "common Anglican teaching." (71)

The change in the words of administration underline the fact that there has been a movement from Cranmer, (eating and drinking 'in remembrance'). The destination of the movement is left to the individual communicant, depending on faith; either in the faith in what is being given, or of the sure faith of the justified. As Lancelot Andrewes wrote to Cardinal Bellarmine, "Concerning the mode of presence we define nothing rashly." (72)

A DRAWING TOGETHER

We have now looked at the development of the texts of the Church of England since 1945. As part of our examination we have also looked at the comments of those involved in framing and approving the texts. We have examined commentaries produced for these new formulae. These commentaries have been like spotlights coming from opposite sides of a theatre; both are focused on the same thing and so there is illumination which is total rather than partial. Finally there has been a synthesis of the development of each part of the central act of the rite. These have made clear the changes from the Book of Common Prayer to the Alternative Service Book.

The year 1945 was taken as our starting date. Obviously during the Second World War liturgical and theological development was slowed down, but we can look at the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York published in 1938: 'Doctrine in the Church of England.' (1) It provides an indication of the 'state of play' of theology at that time. On the Eucharist it says, "The Eucharist is a corporate act of the Church towards God, wherein is united with its Lord, victorious and triumphant, Himself both Priest and victim in the

Sacrifice of the Cross." (2) It then gives four ways in which the connection can be expressed:

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

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

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

4. through the doctrine of the Heavenly Altar, at which we join in the perpetual offering by Christ of Himself, and share the life of Christ crucified and risen."

The Commission adds that the first is the view "generally held in the Church of England, many members of which would find here alone the sacrificial element in the rite," but continues "...we consider that all of them should be regarded as legitimate in the Church of England...But if the Eucharist is thus spoken of as a sacrifice it must be understood as a sacrifice in which...we do not offer Christ but where Christ unites us with Himself in the self-offering of the life that

was 'obedient unto death, yea the death of the Cross.' "

(3) These four ways leave open vast areas for further explanation, for example it can be asked if in repeating the 'words and acts' of Christ an offering is repeated?

On the Presence in the Eucharist the Commission refuted "Transsubstantiation" (sic) (4) and supported Receptionism and Virtualism, (5) but concluded, "...perhaps the strongest and most characteristic tradition of Anglicanism is to affirm such a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as enables the faithful communicant both to receive this life as a spiritual gift and to acknowledge Him as the giver...combined with a determination to avoid as far as possible all precise, scholastic definitions as to the manner of the giving." (6)

Therefore, we can see that just before our period the Church of England declined to offer precise definitions on the subject, and did so in an authoritative document.

In December 1971 the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission published an agreed statement on the Eucharist (The Windsor Statement). A key section reads, "Christ's death on the Cross...was the one,

perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world. There can be no repetition of or addition to what was accomplished once for all by Christ. Any attempt to express a nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the eucharist must not obscure this fundamental fact of the Christian faith... The notion of memorial as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ - i.e. the making effective in the present of an event in the past - has opened the way to a clear understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event, or of its significance, but the Church's effectual proclamation of Christ's mighty acts. Christ instituted the eucharist as a memorial (anamnesis) of the totality of God's reconciling action in him. In the eucharistic prayer the Church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death and its members, united with God and with one another, give thanks for all his mercies,..." (7) On the epiclesis the Statement read, "Christ through his Holy Spirit in the eucharist builds up the life of the church, strengthens its fellowship and furthers its mission." (8)

The Agreed Statement had its detractors, principally, but not exclusively Evangelical, (9) but eight Anglican Synods found the Statement acceptable: those of Canada, England, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, South Pacific, U.S.A. and Wales. Canada said that the statement was acceptable to Anglican theology and the U.S.A. Bishops recognised their own faith and the faith of the Church in it. (10) The question was also asked in the General Synod in England if the Statement had any bearing on Liturgical revision. The Bishops submitted their views to the Liturgical Commission without publishing them. (11)

However, the Statement does not offer any degree of precision on the controversies which we have discussed, e.g. offertory and sacrifice. The eucharist is the 'memorial' of the totality of God's redeeming acts, and obviously the sacrifice of Jesus was the supreme act; but as to whether the memorial is itself a sacrifice the options are left open, it seems. The Statement offers a footnote saying, "The early Church in expressing the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection often used the language of sacrifice..." (12) The Roman Catholic Bishop Clark in his commentary on the Statement admitted that there is no unequivocal statement that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, but says the "thrust of the

reasoning is that the Eucharist makes present the once-for-all Sacrifice of Christ." (13) This of course is paralleled by Charley's note already referred to, that the efficacy of the sacrifice is present, not the sacrifice itself. (14)

Therefore we can conclude that the 1971 Agreed Statement is of the same vein as the 1939 document from the Church of England. Both leave open the way to various schools of thought and various interpretations.

It would be easy to be cynical about this openness of the Doctrinal Commission Report and the Agreed Statement. It is possible to quote from 'Alice Through the Looking Glass', (is the fact that it is the work of an Anglican priest significant?)

" 'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean - neither more nor less.'

'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be the master - that is all.' " (15)

Both Jasper and Buchanan speak of the meaning of words. Buchanan has written of "the openness of honest ambiguity", ambiguity which "...is tolerable, not because it has any innate virtues of its own - for clearly it is merely a tool - but because in certain situations it makes for the peace of the church without hallowing a flight from truth." (16) Jasper, in a lecture on Gore, said that "There must be studied ambiguity", and looks to the early Church, quoting from Gore, on the Eucharist, "There is a kind of clearness of statement which suits material objects but which simply does not apply to spiritual things... Nothing is in fact more striking than the constant anxiety of the Fathers to make men feel that human language can but simply adumbrate, and not fully or precisely define, divine mysteries." (17) Also the Bishop of Derby, C.W.Bowles, Chairman of the Revision Committee of the General Synod for the Revised Series 3 said, "Ambiguity can help us...to get along together and to worship together." (18)

Therefore, we can say that the Church of England in the time under review moved from a position which was expressed officially by the Book of Common Prayer as something fixed, and unofficially by other texts, to a position where the multiplicity of interpretations of

the liturgy was desired not just by the users, but also by the compilers and authors of the rites as well as by the authorising bodies. As has been shown, often the writers of one school or another have criticised some idea, but often both have criticised the same part from, as it were, different angles. This demonstrates, I think, that the Liturgical Commission trod the middle path. We have tried to show that the arguments from one side could be answered by the other, and above all that various meanings could be found in the text and in the emphases in the text, and that these were part of the policy of the Commission. (19) The Preface of the Alternative Service Book provides the warrant for taking this as definitive. "...the way [Christians] choose to pray expresses what they are. Hence those who seek to know the mind of the Church of England in the last quarter of the twentieth century will find it in this book as certainly as in those earlier [ones]..." (20)

The quotations above from Buchanan and Jasper make clear, I think, this policy of the Church of England as shown by its Liturgical Commission. For, although they were writing (I presume) in a private capacity in the articles cited, they reveal the basic policy which seems to have inspired the Liturgical Commission in the composition of the Alternative Services and the

Alternative Service Book. This is the policy of being open; of 'honest' (Buchanan) and 'studied' (Jasper) ambiguity. (21)

Have there been any boundaries placed to the ambiguity beyond which it can be said 'This is not intended'? The answer to this seems to come from the Scriptural tradition of the Church of England, if a position can be based on Scripture then it is accepted. There is only negative proof for this, but it can be observed that in the writers we have examined all have ultimate recourse to the Scriptures as proof of their position; and have striven to show that what they were against was either not Scriptural or based on a false interpretation of Scripture. (22)

We are drawn to the conclusion that the clear movement in the Church of England has been to a realisation that precise formulae reflecting definite ideas inhibit the understanding of the Eucharist. Texts and rubrics which leave the interpretation to Scripture alone free both the theologians and the ordinary Churchman to strive for, or hold on to, their own synthesis of faith which is above all Scriptural, but is also Catholic as well as Protestant and Reformed. The Liturgical Commission in its memorandum for the 1958

Lambeth Conference asked, on revision of the Prayer Book, "...are we committed only to their [16th. and 17th. century Anglican Reformers] general appeal to Scriptures, to the undivided Church and to reason, to the creative adventure which they initiated of holding together 'Catholic' and 'Reformed' insights in fruitful tension...?" (23) The question was not answered, but "creative adventure" seems to apply to the work of the Commission more accurately than the direction offered in the Book of Common Prayer to eschew "innovations and new-fangleness." (24)

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1) As well as the individual texts there are collections by Rev. C.O.Buchanan in the following books:

Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968, O.U.P. 1968
Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975, Grove Books, 1975.

He has also written Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, Grove Booklet on Liturgy & Worship, 14, 1975, and it was followed by booklets for the periods 1973-4, 1974-6, 1976-8. (Published in 1974, 1976, 1978, Nos. 14A, 14B, 14C in that Series.)

He has also published charts showing the development of the Eucharistic Prayers in the Alternative Service Book, The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England, Grove Liturgical Study, 20, 1979.

The time up to 1958 is dealt with by The Liturgy in English, ed. B.Wigan, O.U.P. 1962. (Henceforth 'Wigan').

2) Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, A memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission. SPCK, 1957.

3) Ibid. pp23-25.

4) Ibid. cap.V 'Guiding Principles for Prayer Book Revision', pp29-34.

5) Ibid. p38.

6) The Lambeth Conference, 1958, SPCK. 1958, pp2.78-2.85.

7) Ibid. p2.82

8) Ibid. pp2.83 & 2.84. This was not without controversy, cf. article by the Evangelicals R.T.Beckwith and C.O.Buchanan, This Bread and This Cup in 'Theology', 1967, p268.

9) The question also arose in the third group of Sessions in 1959. Cf. also the 1981 debate, pp154ff. below.

10) Speech in General Synod Debate, 20th.Feb.1972. The final voting for the measure was:

	Ayes	Noes
House of Bishops	34	0
House of Clergy	170	2
House of Laity	140	8

(General Synod Debate, 20th. Feb.1974)

The Measure received the Royal Assent on 12th. Dec.1974 (announced in Synod 4th. Feb.1975).

In November 1972 the Synod had decided that the Measure would not affect the Book of Common Prayer.

BEFORE 1966

1) The history and description of these Missals is in Anglican Missals by J.M.M.Dalby in 'Church Quarterly Review', 1966, pp204-216.

The Anglican Missal, Society of SS. Peter & Paul, 1921, after some parts had been published separately from 1910 The Altar Missal, A.R.Mowbray for the Society of St. John the Evangelist in 1936. Other Missals were available which printed the 1662 Service with either the Roman or Sarum Rites. E.g. The English Missal, 1912 and The Missal, being the Priest's Edition of The People's Missal, 1920. Dalby gives a wealth of detail which does not concern us here.

2) Dalby, op. cit., pp209-211 gives details of the The Missal. He does not mention Frere who suggested "The present prayer of Consecration should be relieved from its isolation, by the reannexation to it of the present Prayer of Oblation; and the Lord's Prayer should follow the climax of the whole action." (Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, John Murray, 1911, pp190-191.).

3) G.J.Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy, Macmillan, 1969. p105, Reference to Zwingli's Opera... 1.188b. (Henceforth 'Cuming').

4) Cuming, p141. Ref. to Cosin's Works, v.114, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. (No page given.) Cosin also preferred the 1549 position for the Prayer of Oblation, cf.Cuming, p151. Also in An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, edited and published by J.Parker, 1877, p ccxxiv.

5) Cuming, p145, Ref. to Laud's Works, III, 343, 353. Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.

6) Cuming, p183-190.

7) Ibid. p216 & 229.

8) G.K.A.Bell, Randall Davidson, O.U.P. 1935, p359; cited in Cuming, p221.

9) G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press, 1948, p666.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church defines Pelagianism as "The theological system which held that a man took the initial and fundamental steps towards salvation by his own efforts apart from the assistance of Divine grace." (Article, 'Pelagianism'.)

10) C.L.Berry, A Plea for the Prayer of Oblation, Alcuin Club Tract No.26, A.R.Mowbray, 1951, p6.

11) Ibid. p12.

12) Grove Liturgical Study 7 1976.

13) Op. cit. p18.

14) Ibid. p17, referring to Cranmer's On the Lord's

Supper, Parker Society,. Cambridge, 1844, p136.

15) Cuming, pp80-81.

16) Buchanan, What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?,
Grove Liturgical Study, 7, 1976, pp23ff.

17) Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy p655 citing Cranmer's
Defence, from his Works, ed. Jenkyns, p459.

18) Ibid. p666.

19) In The Interim Rite, in 'Theology', 1963, p65.

20) Ibid. p66.

SERIES 1

- 1) Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury, 1966, p121.
The text was published by SPCK in 1965, "For permissive use in the Church of England for a period not exceeding three years from 7th. Nov. 1966 under the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure, 1966."
- 2) The background to these options is given in another article by Dalby, Alternative Services: The Canon of Series 1 in 'The Church Quarterly', 1967, pp442-451.
- 3) Report of Proceedings of The Liturgical Conference 1966 C.I.O., for the National Assembly of the Church of England, April 1966.
The main speeches, with a commentary, had been published separately under the title Liturgical Reform, Some Basic Principles by the C.I.O. for the National Assembly. There was a Second Liturgical Conference in 1967 which dealt exclusively with Series 2, and this will be mentioned in due course.
The third Liturgical Conference, 1968, did not touch the Eucharist, being concerned with Morning and Evening Prayer, together with the Calendar.
- 4) Convocation of Canterbury, Chronicle of Convocation May 9th. 1966, pp135-136.
- 5) Comparison between Alternative Services, First Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity, SPCK, 1965, Holy Communion, pp23-37; and Alternative Services, First Series, Holy Communion, SPCK, 1966. Both versions use the complete form of words: 'An order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.'
- 6) Chronicle of Convocation.
- 7) Ibid. The Archbishop of Canterbury said, "I have myself always been an advocate of what is called the Interim Rite, regarding it as an interim rite, and I have been looking forward to having an opportunity of lawfully using it, having hitherto restrained myself from so doing..."
- 8) Ibid. In fact the text is Hebrews xiii.
- 9) Ibid.
- 10) Ibid.
- 11) Journal of the Convocation of York, 1966, pp36-40 (Canterbury's discussions take up 19 pages in their Chronicle...)
- 12) Ibid.
- 13) Speeches by the Bishop of Southwark and the Archbishop of Canterbury in Convocation, 9th. May 1966.
- 14) Verbatim report in Minutes of the Church Assembly,

1966 pp781 ff. The House of Laity discussed the Service separately from the other Houses, who had, of course debated it in the Convocations. This division had been specified in the first clause of the Prayer Book (Alternative & Other Services) Measure, 1965

15) Cf. speech by Mr. P.H.C.Walker in the Assembly. He said that Cranmer had changed the 1549 Book because it was susceptible to Roman meanings. His position can be summarized by saying that he believed that the movement in the Eucharist was from God to man, man could bring nothing.

16) Ibid.

17) Ibid.

18) Ibid.

19) Church Book Room Press, 1967. Beckwith's argument is on pp19-20. He does not give any reference to Augustine's writings.

20) From: The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward VI, ed. E.G.S.Gibson, Dent. (Everyman Series, 1st.ed.1910) p222. (Henceforth 'Dent').

21) Op. cit. p20.

22) GS 217 Holy Communion, Series 1 & 2 Revised, The Liturgical Commission of the Church of England. Copyrighted 1974, published 1975. (All General Synod documents bear the prefix 'GS'.)

The Standing Committee on Liturgical Revision had recommended in June 1973 (in GS 161, §§37 & 50) that there be a joining of Series 1 and Series 2 for pastoral reasons, "lest there be liturgical anarchy" (§37). The joining would help "towards a greater uniformity" (ibid.). The Synod accepted the recommendations in July 1973.

23) GS 217.

24) General Synod, 14th. July 1976. The debate was concerned principally with the Prayer of Humble Access. The Revision passed the vote for its approval: House of Bishops, 29-0, House of Clergy, 105-52, House of Laity, 115-35.

25) GS 217A Holy Communion, Series 1 & 2 Revised, by the Committee appointed at the July Group of Sessions 1975. (There was also GS 217B, a lithographed sheet which gave further minor rubrical variations.)

26) This is close to Jasper's text suggested in his Gore Memorial Lecture, 6th. Nov.1963, reprinted in 'Church Quarterly Review', (1965, Gore on Liturgical Revision, p32) 1 Chron.29.11 and 1 Chron.29.14 had been given separately by the American Prayer Book of 1790, where they refer to the collection taken. (Cf. also Wigan, p238, and Buchanan, Modern Anglican Liturgies, p354).

27) Inserted into GS 217A, §26.

28) Cf. above p19.

29) The 'Te igitur' of the Roman Canon reads, "...haec sancta sacrificia illibata," and the Unde et memores, "Hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam..." The Roman Missal of Pius V included in the Offertory prayers, "Veni, sanctificator, omnipotens aeterne Deus: et benedic hoc sacrificium, tuo sancto nomini praeparatum."

30) Cf. Berry, Op. cit. p6; Berry quotes Bishop Sparrow's Rationale or Practical Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer, which gives Romans 12 and Augustine's City of God (Bk.10, cap.6) as authorities for saying that what is offered is "...ourselves, souls and bodies, devoted to God's service."

The letter to the Romans does not explicitly cite the Eucharist as the means of making our bodies a 'living sacrifice' - and this is the basis of Augustine's argument. Augustine gives Romans 12.3-6a, and concludes, "This is the sacrifice of Christians who are 'many, making up one body in Christ.' This is the sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, a sacrament...where it is shown to the Church that she herself is offered in the offering which she presents to God" (Trans. by H.Bettenson, Pelican Books,1972).

One can cite here the Roman Catholic Eucharistic Prayer 3, in the Roman Missal of Paul VI, which places the phrases thus: "Look with favour on your Church's offering, and see the Victim whose death has reconciled us to yourself. Grant that we...may...be one body, one spirit in Christ." (ICEL trans.)

31) Cf. What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing? esp. pp16-17.

SERIES 2: HISTORY

1) Buchanan gives the texts in Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968.

2) In the first draft published: Alternative Services Second Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity, 1966, pl46. (This gave Holy Communion and other Services). In the second and third published drafts: An Order for Holy Communion: The Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York April 1966 (The third version adding: As amended and accepted by the Convocations on 12th. Oct. 1966 and to be presented to the House of Laity of the Church Assembly,) this appears at p viii.

3) Modern Anglican Liturgies, pl42.

These six versions are:

Version I. The first draft, 17th. Dec. 1965

Version II. The Liturgical Commission's final Report, 29th. April 1966

Version III. Steering Committee Group text, 7th. July 1966

Version IV. Text as amended by Convocation, 12th. Oct. 1966

Version V. Text proposed by Steering Committee to Liturgical Conference, 15th. April, 1967

Version VI. Final text, accepted 7th. July 1967

4) Version I, pl47.

5) The Liturgical Conference, 1966. Report of Proceedings, C.I.O. April 1966, for the National Assembly of the Church of England, pp73-75. Couratin resigned from the Commission in 1966; Buchanan observes he was "rocked by the changes in the text of the anamnesis, and undermined by Ratcliff's death." (His newsletter: News of Liturgy, Dec. 1980.)

6) Ibid. pl47.

7) Ibid. pl46. These words are deleted in Version IV, and more descriptive sentences are inserted; these will be discussed later, see p40 below.

8) Ibid. pl48.

9) Op.cit. p74. All quotations from Couratin here are from pp74-75. He said that the most important parts of the Communion Service were the Lord's actions: giving thanks over the Bread and the Cup, the Breaking of Bread and the Sharing of the Bread and Wine. If we add the Lord's taking of the Bread - implied by the Canon - we have the classic Dix 'Shape' of the Liturgy. (Cf. Dix, op. cit. pp48ff.).

10) However, in the 1549 Book they are surrounded by

- other words which clearly influence them. It speaks of God's command to us "to celebrat a perpetuall memory of that his precious death untyll his coming again: Heare us (o merciful father) we beseech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl+esse and sanc+tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely bloued sonne Jesus Christ. Who in the same nyght that he was betrayed..." (Text in Dent p222).
- 11) Version II & IV, p xi in each. He also objected to the Prayer for the Dead.
 - 12) Version IV, p viii.
 - 13) Liturgical Conference, Proceedings..., p74.
 - 14) Version I, p148.
 - 15) In Version IV, p viii, 'Them' is used.
 - 16) In Version IV, p viii the lower case is used for 'eucharistic sacrifice'.
 - 17) This sentence has been smoothed over in the written text, but remains essentially unchanged.
 - 18) In the written text "The use of the phrase is in line with the Anglican appeal to antiquity" and the original text given in Version I is removed: "Only by using such language as does not require any one interpretation can we produce a liturgy which all will be able to use, and which each will be able to interpret according to their own convictions." (Cf. p34 above.)
 - 19) The phrase 'may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing' occurs in the 1552, and 1662 Books, and various subsequent revisions. (cf. Wigan: The Indian Liturgy, 1960, p124, The Canadian Liturgy, 1959, p143, Rhodesian Liturgy, p156 (text not given), West Indian Liturgy, 1959, p179. The other phrases are special to this rite.
 - 20) Articles of Religion, Art. XXVII. "Take and eat this..." and "Drinke this..." were put in the words of administration in the 1552 Book, and retained and expanded in the 1662. (Dent, p389 for 1552 text).
 - 21) In his chapter: 'Series 3 in the setting of the Anglican Communion,' in The Eucharist Today, ed. R.C.D.Jasper, SPCK 1974, pp15-16, and 30, where in his notes he cites Ratcliff's articles in 'The Journal of Ecclesiastical History' Nos. 1 & 2, 1950, and Couratin in 'Theology', August 1950. See also Couratin in The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, vol 2, 1969, pp147-153.
 - 22) The New Communion Service, Reasons for Dissent. Church Book Room Press, 1969.
 - 23) Ibid. p4. Hippolytus's text, quoted by Buchanan (p3) is "Therefore, in remembrance of his death and resurrection we offer to thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee because thou hast found us worthy

to stand before thee and minister to thee." This is repeated in Eucharistic Prayer 2, Roman Missal of Paul VI.

24) Ibid. p4.

25) Ibid.

26) Ibid. p5.

27) Ibid.

28) The York Journal of Convocation, 10th. & 11th. May, 1966. The quotation is from p74. The debate is printed in full on pp68-74, 98-119.

29) Ibid. p119. The Convocation moved on after lunch to something completely different: it expressed alarm at the effect of Selective Employment Tax upon charities.

30) Canterbury Chronicle of Convocation, 1966, 10th. May. p166.

31) Ibid. pp169-170.

32) Ibid. p175.

33) Ibid., quoting Buchanan, The New Communion Service..., p11. Taken from the 1549 Scottish Liturgy.

34) Ibid. p176. Dr. Brown had been associated with the composition of liturgies in Africa and India.

35) Ibid. pp179-180. The Archbishop was president of Convocation.

36) Ibid. p186.

37) Ibid. p187.

38) Convocations of Canterbury and York, Joint Synod, Sessions of 11th. & 12th. October, 1966. Debates on Liturgical Revision. Reprinted from the Canterbury Chronicle of Convocation and the York Journal of Convocation. SPCK & C.I.O. 1966.

39) Op. cit. pp267-268. The Archbishop of Canterbury said that six options had been proposed:

1) to include the provision of the two variants: 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup'; 'we give thanks unto thee over this bread and this cup' either to be used at the discretion of the celebrant.

2) to omit the words which had been debated, and to have 'looking for the coming of his kingdom we pray thee to accept our duty and service'.

3) to substitute for 'we offer unto thee, etc.' the words, 'we do this which he hath commanded,' or 'we do before thee this which he hath commanded.'

4) to substitute a phrase from the 1549 Book 'we do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make.'

5) to recast the prayer thus: 'Wherefore, O Lord, with these thy gifts of bread and wine upon thy table, we remember his saving passion, etc.' 'Accept this our duty and service etc.'

- 6) to substitute for 'we offer this bread and this cup' the words, 'we celebrate this sacrament.' (p286)
- 40) Ibid. p308, Jasper; p316, Bishop of Chelmsford.
- 41) Ibid. pp324-325.
- 42) Ibid. p331.
- 43) Ibid. pp344-345.
- 44) Ibid. pp345-346.
- 45) Ibid. p356.
- 46) Ibid. p359.
- 47) Ibid. p368.
- 48) Church Assembly, Debate 17th. Feb. 1969. The question of Prayers for the Queen and for the Dead were debated.
- 49) The Liturgical Conference, 1967, Report of Proceedings, C.I.O. for the National Assembly of the Church of England. p4.
- 50) Ibid. p8.
- 51) Ibid. pp10-21.
- 52) Ibid. pp36-37 I have given the figures wherever they are given here.
- 53) Jasper's speech, pp37-38.
- 54) Speech by Dr. T.G.Jalland, Ibid. p38.
- 55) Ibid. pp41-42. He earned a rebuke from Mr. van Straubenzee, M.P., for attempting to steam-roller this point of view. (p42).
- 56) Ibid. pp53-54.
- 57) Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury, p108. The Joint Synod was also reported in the Journal of the Convocation of York.
- 58) Ibid. p109.
- 59) Ibid. p111.
- 60) Ibid. p112.
- 61) Ibid. p115. Some precise figures were given to the House of Laity, sitting separately, Report of the Proceedings of the Church Assembly, 1967, House of Laity sitting separately, p554.
- Canterbury Upper House: 22 for 0 against.
- Canterbury Lower House: 130 for 13 against.
- York Upper House: 12 for 0 against.
- York Lower House: overwhelming majority for.
- 62) Ibid. p524.
- 63) Ibid. p527, referring to Jasper's remarks that the service was a 'stop-gap' at the Liturgical Conference. (Cf. Report of the Proceedings..., p37)
- 64) Ibid. pp545-553.
- 65) Cited, Ibid. p553, no reference given.
- 66) Ibid. p551.
- 67) Version I p146.
- 68) Cf. above, pp58-59.
- 69) A Guide to the New Communion Service, Church Book Room Press 1967.

70) Ibid. pp46-47.

71) Ibid.

72) Ibid.

73) Ibid.

74) There is a treatment of the 'Apostolic Tradition' by P.Jounel in 'La Maison Dieu', 94, 2 trimestre, 1968, which compares it with Eucharistic Prayer 2 in the Roman Missal of Paul VI. The text used here is that of B.Botte, La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte, Munster, Westfalen, 1963, p17. ('La Maison Dieu' p51.)

75) Buchanan, op. cit. p46, 'La Maison Dieu', citing Botte, op. cit. p17.

76) This has been confirmed to the present author in a note from the Secretary of the Liturgical Commission at the time.

SERIES 2: COMMENTARIES

- 1) W.J.Grisbrooke, who wrote Series II: The New Communion Service of the Church of England Examined, 'Studia Liturgica', 1970, No. 1.
- 2) Articles by Moreton, Houlden, Couratin, Cuming, in 1966, (pp431-452) and in 1967, (pp265-271), a rejoinder by Beckwith and Buchanan.
- 3) Subtitled 'Revision of the Eucharist' and published by the League of Anglican Loyalists, 1969. Dr. Willis was the first secretary of the Liturgical Commission.
- 4) Subtitled 'Catholics and Series 3, 2, and 1, and 1662.' Published by the Church Literature Association, 1976.
- 5) The New Services - 1967 A Guide and Explanation, SPCK, 1967.
- 6) Eucharist for Experiment, Church Union, 1967. This deals primarily with rubrics. He also wrote an article for the collection Catholic Anglicans Today (DLT, 1968).
- 7) 1966 And All That, p8.
- 8) Ibid. p9.
- 9) Ibid.
- 10) Ibid. p8.
- 11) Ibid. p11.
- 12) Consecrating, Remembering, Offering, p12
- 13) The New Services, 1967, p17 It can be asked if the Prayer Book Service was not also a 'Thanksgiving'?
- 14) Ibid. p15.
- 15) Ibid.
- 16) Ibid. p21. Note that he does not give as the object "eating and drinking".
- 17) Ibid. p18. The importance Wilkinson puts on placing on the table could be traced back to Dix's 'four-fold' theory.
- 18) Ibid. p24.
- 19) Ibid. p23.
- 20) Op. cit. p153.
- 21) Op. cit. p154. He does not actually reveal whether he would drop it.
- 22) Buchanan also speaks of prayers for the dead, but this falls outside the area under discussion. His first work was published on the same day as the text which had his 'Note of Dissent', and was written with the consent of the Commission. Cf. his second work, p10.
- 23) He quotes Hippolytus in Reasons for Dissent, p3. "Therefore in remembrance of his death and resurrection we offer to thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks to thee because thou hast found us worthy to stand before thee and minister to thee." No source is given for this translation of the 'Apostolic Tradition'.

- 24) Ibid. p4.
 25) Lk.22.19 & 1 Cor.11.24.
 26) Op. cit. p4.
 27) Ibid.
 28) Ibid. Erratum insert.
 29) Ibid. p5. Cf. p44 above.
 30) Ibid.
 31) Ibid. p6.
 32) The name of the composer of this, a conservative evangelical, is given by Buchanan in A Guide to the New Communion Service, p37. It receives his support on p34 of that booklet.
 33) A Guide to the New.... p34.
 34) Op. cit. p27. He repeated this in an article in The Churchman, 1967, on the Anglican-Methodist Unity scheme, and suggested that the agreed text "enables us to worship in common and together while the sorting out goes on" (p172).
 35) Ibid. p28.
 36) Ibid. p29.
 37) Ibid.
 38) Ibid. In the final version of Series 2 and that of Oct. 1966 the words are at §30. In the Draft Order, also §30 they are obligatory. The words are based on 1549 and 1552, but both omit the preliminary admonition, 'Draw near with faith...'
 39) Ibid. p29.
 40) Ibid. p30.
 41) Op. cit. p23. And in A Guide to Second Series...., pp38-93, Appendix 4. L.Paine in a discussion booklet also published by the Church Book Room Press, The New Communion Service, A Scheme of Study for Parish Groups, also suggests this, pp9 & 13. He also objected to the use of 'Wafers', preferring bread to be broken, p10.
 42) A Guide to Second Series...., p30.
 43) A Guide to the New...., p22.
 44) The Second Series Communion Service, What are the Issues? No date, but published after Buchanan's three booklets, so seems to be after 1967. Beckwith also published a book, written with J.E.Tiller: The Service of Holy Communion and its Revision in 1972. This deals with both Series 2 and Series 3. Throughout he refers to 'Series 2 - 3' and nothing in the book refers to Series 2 alone. In view of this and its date of publication it seems more appropriate to treat of the book with Series 3.
 45) Op. cit. pp5-6. The other doctrinal changes refer to prayer for the dead, sins and forgiveness and the second coming.
 46) Ibid. pp7-8. (The concluding pages).
 47) Published at Cambridge and Whinburgh by the Truth

and Faith Committee in 1969.

- 48) Ibid. p7.
- 49) Ibid. pp50-51.
- 50) Ibid. pp16-18, cf. Articles of Religion, XXIV, and Mt.6.7. 'vain repetition' (AV).
- 51) Ibid. pp27-28.
- 52) Ibid. p28.
- 53) Ibid. p29.
- 54) Ibid. p31. Scales brings into the argument Bucer, who thought that the words were unsatisfactory from the Reformed point of view.
- 55) Ibid. pp42-44. Cf. Bishop Coote's comments, p191 below.
- 56) Ibid. p35.
- 57) Ibid. p36.
- 58) Ibid. p37.
- 59) Ibid. p40.
- 60) Ibid. p45.
- 61) Ex.12.26, the words of the child asking for an explanation of the Passover Service. Ibid. pp52-56.
- 62) Ibid. p55.
- 63) Ibid. p56.
- 64) Ibid. p54. Quotation from Cranmer On the Lord's Supper, Parker Society, 1844, p6.
- 65) Published by the Marcham Manor Press, 1966, before the final version appeared. The writers were R.T.Beckwith, C.O.Buchanan, J.W.Charley, H.L.M.Craig, G.E.Duffield, J.I.Packer.
- 66) Op. cit. p65.
- 67) Ibid.
- 68) Ibid. p67.
- 69) The Alternative Service for Holy Communion, pp491-499. It followed on a linguistic critique by Mrs Battiscombe which appeared in Feb. 1968.
- 70) Ibid. p493.
- 71) Ibid. p494.
- 72) Ibid. p498.
- 73) Ibid. A similar plea was also made by G.D.Kirkpatrick in Remaking the Liturgy, Collins, 1967, p90.
- 74) The 'Catholic' (although G.J.Cuming is more 'mainstream') articles were published together in 1966, the 'Evangelical' reply in 1967. Moreton had published, earlier in 1966 in 'Theology' a review of a more general nature, The Alternative Services Reconsidered of which a part dealt with the Holy Communion. (pp57-60) In the article he underlined the tradition of the formula of offering. "Anything else would be inconsistent with the Anglican appeal to antiquity." p59.
- 75) Op. cit. p435.
- 76) Ibid.

- 77) Ibid. p436.
- 78) Ibid. p439. Reference to 1 Clement 44.4. Ignatius of Antioch, Ephesians 5.2, and Phillipians 4.1, and the Didache, and also Justin's Dialogues, 41 & 116.
- 79) Ibid. p440.
- 80) Ibid. p441, ref. to Ep.63.17.
- 81) Ibid.
- 82) Ibid. pp443-447, for texts of Rites. Quotation from p447.
- 83) Ibid. p448. Cf. his History of the Anglican Liturgy pp79ff. "He, [Cranmer] hoped to satisfy the reforming zealots by supressing all mention of oblation..." (p81).
- 84) Ibid. pp449-451. One quotation will suffice here, from Taylor, "Christ has constituted the priesthood to offer to God and represent in this solemn prayer and sacrament as Christ is offered." Taken from his Holy Living. Cuming gives as source 'W.J.Grisbrooke, Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ppl9,26,195.'
- 85) Ibid. pp451 & 452.
- 86) Article, 'Theology', 1967, pp265-276. Quotation from p268.
- 87) Ibid. p267.
- 88) Ibid. p268.
- 89) Ibid. p269.
- 90) Ibid. p269. The phrase 'patristic fundamentalism' is taken from Houlden's article in the series, 1966, p436.
- 91) Ibid. p271.
- 92) Ibid. p269.
- 93) Ibid. p270.
- 94) Ibid. p436.
- 95) 1970, No.1. The author is a layman of the Orthodox Church.
- 96) Ibid. p23.
- 97) Ibid. p25.
- 98) Ibid. p26. His reason for this statement is the separation of 'accept' from 'in the presence of thy divine majesty'; and distinguishes 'this our duty and service' from 'these holy things', but the argument is not worked out.
- 99) The rest of this section on the anamnesis is a 're-write' by Grisbrooke to permit a 'Catholic' interpretation but avoiding the words 'we offer'. He also suggests '...we make before thee with this bread and this cup, the memorial which he has commanded us to make, and we pray thee to accept this our spiritual sacrifice in the presence of thy divine majesty.' (pp26-27) He suggests a self-offering in the eucharistic prayer, and an invocation of the Holy Spirit over the

worshippers, and a mention of the Communion of Saints.
(He gives the resulting prayer on p30).
100) Ibid. pp2-3 & 35. Series 2 was still in use ten
years later, although with minor rubrical variations;
and in the Alternative Service Book has a life until at
least 1990.

SERIES 2: CONCLUSION

- 1) Cf. Jasper's Introduction to the Draft Order, p146 and the 1966 version, p viii. This I feel is a most important statement of policy. See above, p34.
- 2) In A Guide to the New Communion Service, p46 he says that in the Roman Canon it refers to the Eucharistic Sacrifice; in 1549, the thanksgiving offered in the canon, and in 1552 to the post-communion thanksgiving, and presumably also in 1662.
- 3) It should not pass unremarked that the Second Eucharistic Prayer (given here) and Series 2 were both based on Hippolytus. The other Canons of the Roman Catholic Church use either 'fiat' or 'fiant' just before the Institution Narrative.
- 4) Dent, p222.
- 5) 1552 text in Dent, p389. The 1662 Book has modern spelling.
- 6) Conc. Trent. sess.22. Thursday, 17th Sept.1562. Doctrina de Sacrificio Missae.
- 7) General Synod Debate 10th. Nov. 1971.
- 8) This was in the Draft Order, 1965, removed in April 1966 and re-instated in Oct. 1966.
- 9) Similar debates took place in other Churches at this time, but these do not fall within our area.
- 10) Published August 1968 by SPCK. The author was Cuming. Cf. Buchanan: Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service. Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 68. 1979, p3.
- 11) Draft Order, p146, 1966 text, p viii.

SERIES 3: HISTORY

1) The dates are given in Further Anglican Liturgies, p45. Appendix III below sets out the details of the change in the revisions which are of interest. A typescript of an early (?) draft of Series 3 has come to hand. The variations are given here for completeness. At §24 the rubric reads, "...the offerings of the people may be taken and presented." (The published version had "collected and presented.") The Prayer before the Institution Narrative reads, "...grant that these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and blood." (This omits the "his" from before "blood".) The prayer after the Lord's Prayer reads, "Draw near and receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he gave for you, and his blood which he shed for you; and in remembrance that he died for you, feed on him in your hearts with thanksgiving." (The later version inserted "with faith" after the first two words, and used "Remembering" to begin a second sentence.)

2) A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3, Church of England Liturgical Commission, SPCK, 1971. (Henceforth 'Commentary').

3) This did not appear in the draft and did not come until the Feb. 1972 discussion. It was introduced so that others, e.g. Methodists, would be excluded. This was to re-assure the Catholic party.

4) Commentary, p5.

5) Ibid. p6. Also Canon Jasper in Synod, 10th. Nov. 1972, "a logical development of Series 2." Cf. Buchanan's article in The Eucharist Today - Studies on Series 3, SPCK, 1974 ed. R.C.D.Jasper, esp. pp17 - 18.

6) Beckwith, an Evangelical, refers to this in two works The Revised Series Three Communion - A Way Forward, Latimer Studies, No. 2, 1979, in cap. 2. and, with J.E.Tiller The Service of Holy Communion and Its Revision, cap. 2. Moreton (Anglo-Catholic) also published two works, Made Fully Perfect, A Critique of the Order For Holy Communion 3, Church Literature Association, 1974 (esp. pp22-23) (Henceforth 'Fully Perfect'). His second book is Consecrating, Remembering, Offering, (Henceforth 'Consecrating').

7) The Shape of the Liturgy, pp48ff. cf. Note 9, p210 above. The Report by the House of Bishops, 31st May 1972, on Series 3 speaks of the "'shape'" of Series 2 "which has been edifying and valuable theologically". (para 3)

8) The Alternative Service Book of 1980 follows Series 3. Before the Preface the rubrics require the president

to take the bread and the cup into his hands and then replace them on the table. (§36). Note 16 permits the "traditional manual acts during the Eucharistic Prayers".

9) Cuming's chapter in The Eucharist Today, pp40-41.

10) General Synod Debate, 10th. Nov. 1971. The comment of the Dean of Guildford is noteworthy: "He [God] is to be addressed on a par with someone we have met on a bus."

11) General Synod Debate 10th. Nov. 1971.

12) Ibid. The comment came from Rev.D.Carter of London, to whom Buchanan referred as "Father Carter" in the debate.

13) The difficulty was the choice between 'I believe' and 'We believe'.

14) Proposal by R.J.Oldham.

15) In Commentary there is no theological explanation. The brief comment is "the desire for congregational acclamations at this point has been met by three brief statements which focus attention both on our Lord's death and resurrection, and on our salvation which arises from them and is not yet fully realised. These lead to the anamnesis..." (p25)

16) Published Jan. 1972. GS 68. This meeting, and the one after the Feb. group of Sessions seem to have replaced the Liturgical Conferences held in connection with Series 1 and Series 2. GS 68, GS 77, and GS 83 have 'III' for '3' in their titles.

17) GS 68, p2.

18) Wigan, Appendix E, gives details of these. The history is continued in Buchanan's Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968, pp17-19. The text of the 1548 Rite is in Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed, ed. R.C.D.Jasper & G.J.Cuming, Collins, 1975, pp148-151.

19) Buchanan, Modern Anglican Liturgies, p18 (Cf. also his A Guide to the New Communion Service, p23, where he objects to the use of the 1662 rite because the concentration of the sacramental action into the institution narrative (which he does not like anyway in 1662) in supplementary consecration "does seem particularly mechanical".

20) Commentary, p26.

21) §35.

22) GS 68 pp4-6.

23) Commentary, pp26-27.

24) GS 68 p5. "...The decision should be left to the Synod without any recommendation."

25) Ibid. p6.

26) Ibid. p6.

27) Ibid. p14.

28) Ibid. p14. The words 'he gave' and 'he shed' were

used in the Invitation to Communion (§32) and remained unchanged.

29) General Synod Debate, 9th. Feb. 1972.

30) Ibid. Speeches of Rev. J.G.Hunter, and Messrs. Keulemans and Duffield. 'Memorial' was also associated with 'War memorial' - of dead, not 'memorial' of living Christ, (speech by Rev.R.D.Silk).

31) Ibid. The lower case was used in subsequent printing, but the upper case appears in the Report of the Debate.

32) The first amendment was to leave out 'our' in 'this our sacrifice and praise' in order to avoid Pelagianism. Jasper thought the words as given "will cause less disquiet among the greatest number of people." (General Synod Debate) The second was a change of words in the last section of the paragraph, substituting words from Series 2 and from the Roman Catholic Eucharistic Prayer III: 'Grant that we may be filled with your grace and heavenly blessing, and in your mercy and love unite all your children wherever they may be.' Canon Jasper replied that the words of Series 3 "had a terseness which says well what ought to be said." (General Synod Debate).

33) Commentary, p27. Indecision is indicated in words used by the Commentary "we were unable to agree which [method] should be adopted if only one method were to be provided." (p27.)

34) General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb. 1972. Speech of Rev. P.S.Dawes. The Doctrine Commission does not seem to have published its Report. (The decision is referred to in Commentary, p26.) The papers in the Commission's book, Thinking about the Eucharist, SCM, 1972, give the theological background to the decisions; cf. Bishop Ian Ramsay's Preface, p iv. Dawes, also suggested that the consecration is similar to the grace before meals, "and if we go for a second helping we do not need to say grace again."

35) General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb. 1972.

36) Ibid.

37) §35 in the draft Order. "Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup as your Son our Lord Jesus commanded we receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood."

38) General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb. 1972, moved by Canon C.D.Smith.

39) 'Again' for 'likewise', 'testament' for 'covenant', 'forgiveness' for 'remission'.

40) Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed, p151. Cf. Buchanan in What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing? p12, where he suggests it was needed for three reasons: the chalices were too small, the priest may not have

- consecrated enough, or people may have drunk too much.
- 41) E.g. Sarum Missal (ed. F.H.Dickenson, Burntisland, 1861 - 1863, col.652), "Cautelae Missae..." "Si autem sacerdos in actu consecrationis deficiat, verbis aliquibus jam in parte prolatis sed in toto non completis; secundum Innocentium, alius sacerdos debet incipere ab illo loco 'Qui pridie...'" Missale Romanum, 1474 (ed. R.Lippe, Henry Bradshaw Soc. vol. xxxiii, 1907, p372), "Si autem sacerdos in actu consecrationis..." as in Sarum Missal. The Missale Romanum of Pius V, 1570, had a long section in its introductory pages entitled "De defectibus in celebratione Missarum occurrentibus." Cap.III, "De Defectu Panis", §5 reads, "Si id advertit post consecrationem, etiam post illius Hostiae sumptionem, posita alia, faciat oblationem, ut supra, et a consecratione incipiat, scilicet ab illis verbis: Qui pridie..." §4 just says that the oblation is to be made, but does not give any form of words.
- All the above have similar sections on the defects in the consecration of the wine.
- There are no equivalent sections in the Roman Missal of Paul VI; although §286 of the 'Instructio Generalis' does say that the consecration narrative is to be recited over the wine if the priest had put water into the chalice instead of wine. Cf. also Halliburton's note 70, p127 in The Eucharist Today. He does not indicate physical contact in this rite, although he gives historical data on the custom of consecrated wine being added to a larger amount of unconsecrated wine, and the putting of a portion of a consecrated host into a chalice of unconsecrated wine to effect consecration.
- 42) General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb. 1972.
- 43) From Canon B.12; episcopal ordination is specified in Canon C.1. In the debate Japer side-stepped the problem of Anglican/Methodist unity. He also said that the note did not exclude lay people assisting in the administration.
- 44) General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb.1972, proposed by the Dean of Worcester, E.W.Kemp (later Bishop of Chichester).
- 45) GS 83, dated 31st. May 1972, signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as Chairman of the House (of Bishops). General Synod Report, 9th. July 1972.
- 46) GS 77, dated May 1972.
- 47) In his The End of the Offertory - An Anglican Study, Grove Liturgical Study, 14, pp36-37. Cf. p29 above, and Note 26, p208 above.
- 48) General Synod Debate, 10th. July 1972, GS 83 §8.
- 49) General Synod Debate, 10th. July 1972.
- 50) The voting in favour of the amendment was: Ayes

133, Noes 127. The amendment came from the House of Bishops, and was moved by Archbishop Coggan.

51) GS 83, §7 The Liturgical Commission added to the Bishops' text the words 'the fullnes of' in the last clause in response to a suggestion from the Bishops. (Information to present author from Buchanan). It also changes 'Cross' to 'cross' cf. GS 77, p6.

52) Rev. D.A.J.Stevens, who protested on behalf of "many hundreds of ordinary priests" of the Catholic wing.

53) The words were tidied up to read "It is provided in Canon B 12 'Of the Ministry of Holy Communion' that only those who have been episcopally ordained priest shall consecrate the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

54) There were, however, two brief interjections protesting about the rules, but they were not taken up by the Synod. The formula on further consecration rejected in February was passed with the addition of the Dominical words, cf. Appendix II, pp XI & XII.

55) Cf. p98 above.

SERIES 3: COMMENTARIES

- 1) The Eucharist Today, pl.
- 2) A Liturgical Pastiche, 'Theology', 1972, pp79-83.
- 3) Ibid. p82.
- 4) Ibid. ("ecclesiase" is in 'Theology', "ecclesiae" seems correct.)
- 5) Ibid.
- 6) §29. This was changed at the Bishops' request.
- 7) Op. cit. p82f.
- 8) Commentary, p25, which also says that through the word 'celebrating' the "doctrine of the atonement is duly strengthened." (Ibid.) Cf. also P.F.Bradshaw's article in The Eucharist Today, (pp130-141) where he gives all the possible meanings of 'celebration' which he says has to be used "to seek to communicate its hidden riches" (p140) - presumably all the meanings he has found.
- 9) Op. cit. p83.
- 10) Fully Perfect and Consecrating, cf. note 6, p221 above.
- 11) Fully Perfect, p10.
- 12) Ibid. pp25-26.
- 13) Ibid. p27. His reasoning is based on the exegesis of Hebr.4.14 & 10.10. He says, "the argument in Hebrews is that the Levitical sacrifices have been superseded...the altar at which Christians...have a...right to eat is in heaven." (pp26-27). But 'High Priest' was put in to help Catholics.
- 14) Consecrating, p10.
- 15) Ibid.
- 16) Fully Perfect, p24. He quotes the 1549 Book, "we...entierely desiryng thy fatherly goodnes, mercifully to accepte this our Sacrifice of praise and thankes geuing..." (Dent, p223. Moreton modernises the spelling.)
- 17) Fully Perfect, p25.
- 18) Consecrating, p15. cf. §30 of Series 3 'The president breaks the consecrated bread, saying...'
- 19) Ibid. p15. On p12 he refers to the way in which the Dominical words are not stressed in the printing.
- 20) Series 3, §35.
- 21) Consecrating, p16.
- 22) Fully Perfect, p32.
- 23) Consecrating, p16.
- 24) Sharing in One Bread, SPCK, 1973. Perry's aim was to help Catholics so that all may use Series 3, although he himself did not belong to the Catholic tradition. In 1980 he published a similar booklet with the same title. This performed a similar function for the Alternative

- Service Book. See pl61 below.
- 25) Op. cit. p52.
 - 26) Ibid. p57.
 - 27) Ibid. pp60ff. 'The memorial makes effective in the present a past event.' (ARCIC, §5)
 - 28) Op. cit. p63.
 - 29) Ibid.
 - 30) Ibid., in 'Acknowledgements', p ix.
 - 31) Holy Rite Though Partly Wrong, Church Literature Association, 1973. (2nd. ed. 1975)
 - 32) Ibid. p16.
 - 33) Ibid.
 - 34) Ibid. p17.
 - 35) Op. cit. p93.
 - 36) Ibid. p92, quoting Klauser, A Short History of the Western Liturgy, p109.
 - 37) Op. cit., p107. The essay is entitled The Canon of Series 3.
 - 38) Ibid. cf. Commentary, p21.
 - 39) Op. cit. p107. cf. also p108 above.
 - 40) Ibid. p109.
 - 41) Ibid. p112.
 - 42) Ibid. ppl13-114. From In Hebr. hom. 13.1, 14.1, in Early Christian Doctrines, J.N.D.Kelly, A.&C. Black, 4th edn. 1968, pp451 & 452.
 - 43) Ibid. p114. On the next page this is described as 'liturgical shorthand' in a phrase taken from Houlden's article in 'Theology', 1966, p435, cf p82 above.
 - 44) Op. cit. ppl14-115.
 - 45) The two works from Grove Books are A Guide to Series 3 by P.E.Dale, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 10, 1972 and The Language of Series 3 by D.L.Frost, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 12, 1973 cf. R.T.Beckwith & J.E.Tiller The Service of Holy Communion and Its Revision, which commented on the 'report' of 16th. Sept. 1971, and The Revised Series Three Communion - A Way Forward.
 - 46) Op. cit. p11. Reference given to 1 Cor.11.26, 'For as often as you eat this bread and this cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.' (RSV)
 - 47) Op. cit. p12.
 - 48) Ibid.
 - 49) Op. cit. p25. He is also pleased at the retention of 'remembrance' for 'memorial' as suggested in the Synod. He thinks that 'memorial' has the meaning for most people only of memorial tablets. (Cf. speech by Rev. R.D.Silk in the Synod, 9th. Feb. 1972, referred to above, p104). Mr. Frost was a member of the Liturgical Commission, and a signatory of the Report. We can, therefore, take his commentary as authentic.
 - 50) Ibid.

- 51) Ibid. pp25-26.
- 52) Ibid. The examples he gives, of a birthday party and Independence Day of a State, seem to mean this.
- 53) Church of England Liturgical Commission, Report, Alternative Services, Second Series, June 1965, pl46. Cf. p34 above.
- 54) The criticisms are made in two chapters of the book: cap. 2, Doctrinal issues in revision, (pp26-53) and cap.3 Liturgical issues in revision - which has less relevance to Series 3, (pp54-82). A four page study-guide to Series 3 was also issued by the publishers (Revising Communion) which summarized the arguments. This will be referred to later. Cf. pl29 below.
- 55) Op. cit. p39. Although the authors say that they do not hold to the principle that what is not in Scripture should be prohibited they object to prayers for the dead and eucharistic sacrifice because "neither feature can be shown to be present in the worship of the New Testament." (p38)
- 56) Ibid. p29.
- 57) The authors also consider Series 2.
- 58) Ibid. p29.
- 59) Ibid. p30.
- 60) Ibid. pp30-32 That fact that the death was an atonement is also mentioned here.
- 61) Ibid. p32.
- 62) Ibid. pp32-34.
- 63) Ibid. pp35-40.
- 64) Ibid. p40.
- 65) Ibid. pp40-48.
- 66) Ibid. p59. The words to which the authors refer must be the 1549 Book (which, they say, expresses Cranmer's mature liturgical thought, p44) '...merciful father,...vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christ.' (Dent p222) Cf. p37 above.
- 67) Ibid. pp33-34, cf. Article XXIX - That the wicked do not partake of Christ's body and blood.
- 68) Ibid. p33.
- 69) Ibid. Among the texts given are Mt.13.37-39 (explanation of the parable of the weeds of the field) and Hebr.13.9-12 (Christians should concern themselves with grace, not food). They also say that in the Old Testament ceremonies, as well as in Baptism, the presence of the Lord is never static.
- 70) Ibid. p35.
- 71) Ibid. p36.
- 72) Ibid. p37.
- 73) Ibid. pp38-39.

- 74) Ibid. p42.
- 75) Ibid. p45.
- 76) Concluding sentence of the leaflet.
- 77) Op. cit.
- 78) Ibid.
- 79) Chapter entitled: Series 3 in the Setting of the Anglican Communion.
- 80) Op. cit. pl8. Canon Ross was the compiler of the booklets of Series 1, cf. p23 above.
- 81) Op. cit. ppl7 & 32 "The last relics of the Ratcliff - Couratin theory [of Ex.24.8-11 influencing the composers of the Hippolytan rite] are to be found in the words 'as we eat and drink these holy gifts in the presence of thy divine majesty.'"(p32) Cf. p42 above.

SERIES 3: CONCLUSION

- 1) On pl. of the final version of Series 3, before the 'Notes' on posture, etc.
- 2) The word does not appear in the 1549 and 1552 texts, being used first in 1662.
- 3) For the (Roman) Catholic meaning cf. the Oath of Berengarius of 1079 (Denzinger-Schonmetzer, Enchiridion Symbolorum... 23rd. ed. 700) "post consecrationem esse verum Christi corpus..." And the Council of Florence's Decree for the Armenians (Denzinger, 1321), "Sub qualibet quoque parte hostiae consecratae et vini consecrati, separatione facta, totus es Christus", also the Council of Trent's Decree on the Eucharist, (Denzinger, 1640) "...statim post consecrationem verum Domini nostri corpus verumque eius sanguinem sub panis et vini specie una cum ipsius anima et divinitate existere..."
- 4) In The Service of Holy Communion and Its Revision, p41, quoting Cranmer's, On the Lord's Supper, Parker Soc. p117.
- 5) Moreton expresses disquiet over this point, Fully Perfect, p7. He is worried that the change implies "the silent rejection of the Catholic doctrine of the eucharist."
- 6) The Eucharist Today, p5. He cites Justin's First Apology as his source, but gives no reference.
- 7) Ibid. p6. He quotes the document of the Groupe des Dombes (In Modern Eucharistic Agreement, SPCK, 1972, p66) "Christ himself is presiding at the meal where he gives his body to be eaten." Elsewhere in the document the word used is 'ministère' (§30 of the doctrinal agreement) 'Prêtre' (and also 'Pasteur') is used only once, of Christ (§35).
- 8) After the July 1972 debate the option appears '...and this sentence may be used...'
- 9) A Guide to Series 3, p10.
- 10) Cf. p121 above.
- 11) Op. cit. p10.
- 12) For example, it could be said that the words 'Of your own do we give you' could apply to our joining with the self-offering of Jesus to the Father. There is nothing in the words themselves which indicate that this could not be the case.
- 13) The Eucharist Today, p106.
- 14) Proposed by Rev. D.Carter and seconded by Jasper. Reference to §8 of GS 83. - The Report of the House of Bishops, which requested that the work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist be made clearer.
- 15) Commentary, p25.

16) Op. cit. p107.

17) Commentary, p25 says that the phrase in question "expresses our dependence upon God who makes this solemn meal of bread and wine his sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." Cf. Buchanan's What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?, pp17 & 21, where he summarises Cranmer's thought as given in 'On The Lord's Supper'. He suggests that Cranmer understood the Dominical command 'Do this...' as meaning to eat. He bases this on pp136 & 352 of the work. Beckwith & Tiller in their book mentioned above disagree with this reading, but only extend the consecratory acts from the thanksgiving to include the eating and drinking (pp43 - 44), so the actions do seem to be consecratory whichever commentary is followed.

18) The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church on 'Receptionism' says that this is common Anglican teaching. It can perhaps be understood in the extract from Hooker in Cross & Moore's Anglicanism (p463, from The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Bk. V, cap.lxvii,§12) "...this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth unto faithful receivers instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation...". (Cf. also Bk. V, cap lxvii, §6, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receivers of the Sacrament.") Moreton in Fully Perfect, p15, contrasts this idea with the Roman Catholic Eucharistic Prayers II, III, IV, which pray that the bread and wine 'may become the body and blood of Christ' implying objectivity apart from the faith of the recipient.

19) Moreton in Fully Perfect, p15 also suggests that the word 'as' indicates that the presence is transitory as well as subjective.

20) Cf. p110 above.

21) In A Guide to Series 3, p11.

("For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.") Archbishop Ramsey saw the separation of celebrate/proclaim, death/resurrection as a rhetorical device, a hendiadys. The unchanged phrase caused him "a lot of perplexity" as an "unnecessary and wrong dichotomy." (His speech at the end of the debate, 11th. Feb. 1972.)

22) The Eucharist Today, pp115-116.

23) Consecrating, p10. However, the 'Apostolic Tradition', has 'Remembering, therefore, his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup...' (Prayers of the Eucharist Early and Reformed, p23.)

24) The Eucharist Today, p116. We have already

summarized Moreton's objections to this sentence. See p115 above.

25) Moreton asks if although there is no 'moment' of consecration, if there is a "moment of benefit in communion"? (Fully Perfect, p25.)

26) §26. This remained unchanged during the revision procedure.

27) Op. cit. p27.

28) Op. cit. p11. He says that three diocesan courts had ruled thus; but no details are given.

29) Ibid. p12.

30) Commentary, p24.

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK: HISTORY

- 1) Cf. p9 above.
- 2) The Future Course of Liturgical Revision, GS 161, June 5th. 1973; accepted by Synod July 1973.
- 3) Op. cit. para. 54 (iii), pl8. See note 22. p208.
- 4) GS 284. The Report dealt with the size and composition of the Book.
- 5) General Synod Debate, 27th. Feb. 1976. Speech by Mrs. J.L.Ensor.
- 6) GS 325. In the General Synod Debate on Feb. 16th. again Mrs Ensor spoke for the Book of Common Prayer, saying "...it is not very easy for those who wish to use the 1662 Book of Common Prayer to do so because every obstacle is put in their way."
- 7) GS 351.
- 8) Op. cit. p3.
- 9) General Synod Debate, 9th, November, 1977.
- 10) Grove Liturgical Study 20, 1979. The booklet collates twenty-six prayers, the editorial text being minimal. News of Liturgy [henceforth 'NoL'] is published monthly by Grove Books.
- 11) HB(78)(M)(M2). The meeting took place 21st. and 22nd. February. The minutes were circulated with the General Synod papers and are filed with them in Church House. They were also reprinted in NoL, April 1978.
- 12) NoL, May 1978; also Buchanan in General Synod Debate, 11th. July 1978. They were published later in NoL:
 'Responsive Canon' NoL March 1979
 Joint Liturgical Group Canon, NoL April 1979
 Canon for Children, NoL May & June 1979.
- 13) Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service Grove Booklet on Liturgy & Worship 68, 1979, pp6-9 gives details. Additional information to present author from Buchanan.
- 14) GS 364 p7 (commentary) ppl8-19 (text), cf. Series 3 §§21-24. The word 'Offertory' was put in at the request of the House of Bishops, (then deleted in GS 364A. Information to present author from Buchanan).
- 15) See comparison of texts in Appendix III.
- 16) NoL, May 1978, p3.
- 17) General Synod Debate 11th. July 1978.
- 18) By Archdeacon Timms, the Bishop of Leicester, Rev. R.J.Avent, and Rev. W.M.D.Persson.
- 19) General Synod Debate, 11th. July 1978.
- 20) Holy Communion Series 3 Revised, Report of the Revision Committee, GS 364X. The duplicated Report was circulated to Synod members. The 44 pages contained 285 numbered paragraphs. Reference will be made to those

numbers. GS 364 was entitled: Alternative Services Holy Communion Series 3 Revised A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England.

GS 364A was Alternative Services -- Series 3 The Order for Holy Communion also called the Eucharist and The Lord's Supper As revised by the Committee appointed at the July Group of Sessions 1978. This title 'The Order...' was adopted for the Alternative Service Book. The texts given in GS 364, GS 364A and the Alternative Service Book are laid out in Appendix III.

21) GS 364X para. 8.

22) Ibid. paras. 279 & 280.

23) Ibid. para. 10. They mention the Eucharistic Prayers from the Roman Catholic Church, other Anglican Churches, non-episcopal Churches, and the Joint Liturgical Group. But they did suggest that others could be added later, para. 13.

24) Cf. ppl26ff above.

25) Church Literature Association, 1978. Later also published in Beckwith's booklet The Revised Series 3 Communion - A Way Forward. Cf. ppl29f above.

26) Op. cit. p4. They do not provide in either work a reference for the quotation from the Bishop.

27) Ibid. pp5-6.

28) Ibid.

29) Ibid. They cite Hooker (Ecclesiastical Polity 5:67:1-4), saying that "the important question is whether Christ's body and blood are received, not how they are related to the elements."

30) NoL, November 1978, p7. Information from Buchanan suggests that in fact it had already been agreed to put the 1662 Revision to the Synod to be authorized.

31) GS 364X in para. 187 says, "we have amended Mr. Brindley's text in discussion," but does not give any reason for the amendments. The Holy Spirit is sought for "your people", not for what the "Church sets before you" ("oblata").

32) GS 364, §§26-27.

33) GS 364A, §§32-35, and so in the approved text.

34) GS 364X, para 136. The R.C. texts were also given in para. 132, "Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation; through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made: it will become for us the bread of life." and "Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation; through your goodness we have this wine to offer, fruit of the vine and work of human hands: it will become our spiritual drink." The texts are based on a prayer from the Passover Ritual.

35) NoL, Jan. 1979, p3.

36) GS 364X para. 136.

- 37) GS 364X, para. 168.
- 38) GS 364X, para. 170.
- 39) GS 364, §41.
- 40) GS 364A, §48.
- 41) GS 364X, para. 228 Cf. p107 above. Buchanan holds that this is more distant from the idea of extending the original Consecration. The Liturgy for Communion..., p21.
- 42) General Synod Debate, 21st. Feb. 1979.
- 43) GS 364A, §33.
- 44) General Synod Debate, 22nd. Feb. 1979.
- 45) Ibid. He repeats this argument in his The End of the Offertory, p41.
- 46) Ibid.
- 47) Ibid. Nothing else of interest was debated in the February Group of Sessions.
- 48) The new words are from Series 3, and were composed by Buchanan. They were suggested by Jasper, but opposed by the Steering Committee for reasons of style. General Synod Debate, 2nd. July 1979.
- 49) General Synod Debate, 2nd. July 1979.
- 50) GS 364A, §40, and p10 in the Beckwith-Brindley booklet.
- 51) Word used by Brindley in the General Synod Debate, 2nd. July 1979. Several speakers in the Debate did point out that an epiclesis was not necessary. The Liturgical Committee was neutral. A further amendment, moved by Buchanan after the change, to insert 'and word' after 'Spirit' was lost.
- 52) Proposed by Mr. C.P.Dixon. The text is published in the General Synod Report, 5th. July. 1979. He gave its background as an amalgamation of a Dutch prayer and a Roman Catholic one; both of which had been submitted to the Revision Committee, but had been rejected.
- 53) Text in NoL, October 1979.
- 54) The final versions of the Eucharistic Prayers are laid out in parallel in Appendix IV below.
- 55) NoL, November 1979.
- 56) The Prayer Book Protection Bill. It can be asked if the "but for this Act" implies that it was expected to diminish the number of worshippers at the service? Also the Bill does not specify if the service is Holy Communion or not.
- 57) Parliamentary Debates, 8th. April 1981, col. 962. Viscount Cranbourne sought leave to introduce the Bill. His arguments were repeated in greater detail in the Lords later that day.
- 58) Official Report, House of Lords, 8th. April 1981, col. 617. The brief exchange in the Commons avoided theology.
- 59) Ibid. col.619.

60) Ibid. col.627. He also pointed out that the Bill did not oblige any of the twenty to attend the service they had forced on others.

61) Ibid. col.652.

62) Ibid. col.656.

63) Ibid. col.648, Lord Beswick.

64) Ibid. col.635, Lord Glenamara.

65) Ibid. col.638, Earl of Onslow.

66) The Bishops in the Upper House were alone in their defence of the Alternative Service Book. The Bishop of Durham refuted all the points against the Alternative Service Book which were raised by Lord Sudeley. He spoke of the balance which Bishops had to maintain in public worship. He added that in spite of sales of half a million copies of the Alternative Service Book the Book of Common Prayer was maintaining its sales as before. (Ibid. col.623). The Bishops of Rochester and Oxford, as well as himself spoke of the popularity of the Alternative Service Book in their dioceses. (Ibid. cols.623,653 and 663). Two other Bishops voted against the Bill, but did not speak. (Bishops of Chichester and Southwark, Ibid. col. 669).

67) Commons: Ayes 152, Noes 130. (Op.cit. col.962.)

Lords: Contents 28, Non-Contents 17. (Op.cit. col.667.)

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK: INTERPRETATIONS

- 1) The two commentaries were published at the same time as the Alternative Service Book. The Alternative Service Book 1980, A Commentary by the Liturgical Commission, C.I.O., 1980 and Anglican Worship Today, Collins, 1980. The former will be referred to as 'Alternative Service Book Commentary'. The third book is Ritual Murder, ed. B. Morris, Carcanet Press, Manchester, 1980. The two booklets are: Using the ASB (Rite A) Communion Service by R.T. Beckwith, Latimer house, 1980, and Sharing One Bread by M. Perry, SPCK, 1980. Perry's book is similar to the one he published for Series 3, and even shares the same title. Cf. note 24, pp226-227 above. His work on the Alternative Service Book has a laudatory Foreward by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who also wrote a similar Foreward to the book edited by Buchanan; although the two books were written from very different points of view.
- 2) In a private communication to the present author Buchanan failed to deny that he was the author of this section.
- 3) Typical language used was, "To neglect them [Authorized Version and the Book of Common Prayer] is to loose touch with our language in its first simple and supple splendour." (From 'A General Petition,' PN Review, number 13, p57). The Review is published bi-monthly, number 13 is 'vol.6, No.5.' Its offices are at the same address as the Carcanet Press.
- 4) A brief note about the author in the book says that he is Rector of St. Giles in the Fields, London, and an ex-Naval Chaplain. He is the only contributor to the book who is qualified theologically.
- 5) Op. cit. pp41-42.
- 6) Op. cit. p43.
- 7) It also gives a general historical background to Anglican worship.
- 8) Op. cit. p118.
- 9) Ibid.
- 10) Op. cit. p11.
- 11) Ibid. He also says that the words of distribution and the post-communion thanksgiving prayer also express "the same spiritual conception of Christ's presence." (Ibid.)
- 12) Op. cit. p53. He called them an "eye-gate". He says that they are an offering of ourselves (p54). He does not mention the 'traditional manual acts' permitted by the Alternative Service Book, saying that there are no special ceremonies in the Eucharistic Prayer. (p67).
- 13) Op. cit. p72.

14) Op. cit. pp74-75. On the remembering he says, "We become present once again at those sacred and eternal moments of past history and are assured of our eternal destiny as we offer our lives - in our history of today - to God in union with his life." (p70).

15) No. 3. Oct. 1980, p3. It is the magazine of the Church Union, a Catholic society in the Church of England.

16) Private communication to the present author.

17) It is entitled: The Eucharist a Selection from Rite A, For use in... (The ending left off for overprinting with the name of the Parish.)

On the first page it adds 'Preparatory Prayers.' The first of these is significant, and is adapted from the Preparatory Prayers of the 1570 Roman Missal; it reads, "Almighty God we offer the holy sacrifice to your praise and glory, and for the glory of the holy assembly in heaven; for our own good and the good of your pilgrim Church on earth; for all who have asked us to pray for them in general and in particular....and for all who need our prayer."

CONCLUSION: SURVEY

- 1) The development from 1549-1662 has been treated by A.H.Couratin in his articles in Church Quarterly Review, 1962, 1963, later published as The Service of Holy Communion 1549 - 1662, SPCK, 1963; see also Buchanan's What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?
- 2) As was stated in the Introduction the purpose of this work is to examine the Eucharistic Theology as expressed in the Liturgy. The Creed, Confession, etc. do not fall within our purview.
- 3) Cf. p99 above.
- 4) Couratin The Service..., p24. says that the rubrics of 1662 "alter at once the shape and the intention of Cranmer's Second Communion Service [1552]." He picks out the Offertory, the heading 'Prayer of Consecration' and the rubrics on the remains of the Consecrated Elements, and the manual acts as indicative of this. We shall concentrate here on the Offertory.
- 5) Cf. p104 above. Series 2 changed the word 'Testament' to 'covenant' and it was then used throughout, even in the Book of Common Prayer Revision as was the insertion of the words 'to thee' (later 'to you') in "gave thanks to you" to stress that the Prayer is addressed to God. Interestingly enough the current English language ICEL [Roman Catholic] version uses the future tense in their paraphrases: "...this is my body which will be given up for you." and "...this is the cup of my blood....It will be shed for you and for all men." The German and Spanish texts also use the future tense in their paraphrases. The French and Italian versions do not. Although the Latin text was changed slightly in the 1969 Roman Missal both the 1570 and 1969 Missals have the same tense. "Hoc est enim Corpus Meum" and "Hic est enim Calix Sanguis Mei...qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur..."
- 6) §24.
- 7) §65.
- 8) Cf. ppl05-106 above.
- 9) 'Thanksgiving' was used in Series 2, 1 & 2 Revised, and Series 3. It does not occur in the Alternative Service Book where the phrases 'The Eucharistic Prayer' and 'The Taking of the Bread and the Cup' are used. Cf. also Halliburton in The Eucharist Today, p109.
- 10) Series 3 §35, Alternative Service Book, §45, Series 2 §30 (in passive tense). This prayer was composed by the Liturgical Commission from the 1549 Invitation to Communion and the 1552 words of administration. Cf. Buchanan, A Guide to the New Communion Service, p46.
- 11) Cf. ppl11 above, and the General Synod Debate 10th.

July 1972. (Professor Porter & others).

12) Alternative Service Book Commentary, p79.

In Anglican Worship Today he suggests that the removal of the rubrics at the Consecration is a return to Cranmer "who abolished an objective consecration altogether." (p119).

13) Alternative Service Book, Note 16.

14) The text was repeated in Series 1.

15) 1549 text in Dent p222.

16) Ibid. Later used in Series 2 on.

17) The Roman Catholic text says, "...supplices rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas et benedicas haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata." This was accompanied with three signs of the cross. Cranmer allowed two.

18) Cf. p110 above. The phrase was inserted into Series 1 & 2 Revised.

19) References given by Halliburton in The Eucharist Today, pp106-107. and pp125-126 (notes 55-58 and 61). Because "it is not one of the instituted acts it cannot rightly be held to consecrate" according to Beckwith and Tiller (p46). For them it is "the least defensible" view of what consecrates. (p45).

20) "Haec ergo dona, quaesumus, Spiritus tui rore sanctifica, ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiant Domini nostri Iesu Christi."

21) Jasper's Introduction to the first draft of Series 2, 1965, p146. Cf. p36 above. In the Commentary to Series 3 it is also held that the meal is the sacrament. Cf. p134 above.

22) Couratin at the 1966 Liturgical Conference. Report, p74. Cf. p38 above.

23) Cf. p15 above. Note reference to Cranmer 'On the Lord's Supper' in Buchanan What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing? p17.

24) Cf. p13 above.

25) Cf. p15 above.

26) Cf. pp40-61 above.

27) This point is made by D.Gregg, Anamnesis in the Eucharist, Grove Liturgical Study 5, 1976. p26.

28) Cf. GS 83, The Report by the Bishops on Series 3. Para. 7 speaks of the "strange separation between the Cross and Resurrection" and para. 9 "If the Prayer of Thanksgiving can be amended so that the unity of Christ's redeeming work is not obscured the House of Bishops believe that the rite will be congruous with sound doctrine." See also Archbishop Ramsey's reference to hendiadys, General Synod Debate, 11th. Feb. 1972. Cf. Note 21, p231 above.

29) Cf. p65 above. Buchanan in his Guide to the New Communion Service says that the anamnesis is

"Traditional at least since Hippolytus. Changed into administration in 1552" (p46).

30) Houlden, Couratin, Moreton and Cuming in 'Theology', 1966. Cf. pp82ff. above.

31) Buchanan The New Communion Service, Reasons for Dissent, p4.

32) J.I.Packer in Eucharistic Sacrifice, Church Book Room Press, 1962, p12. This is a synthesis of Cranmer's view. He gives an extract from 'On the Lord's Supper' (Parker Soc. ed. p346) which begins "it is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices..." (Ibid.).

33) Used in the Didache, 14.3, cf. Jasper & Cuming, Prayers of the Eucharist..., p16.

34) In 'Theology', 1966, pp441-442. In the article he refers to Clement, Irenaeus, Cyprian as well as Justin; the quotation here is from Justin, Dialogue, 41.

35) Couratin's 'minimalist' interpretation, 'Theology', 1966, p442.

36) "This sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving...this, the duty and service...this holy communion." However, "duty and service" are reminiscent of "our duty and our joy" in the Preface.

37) Cf. our conclusion, p91 above.

38) Cf. p111 for the changes in the text.

39) Anglican Worship Today, p120.

40) ASB Commentary, p86.

41) ASB Commentary, p86, cf. Anglican Worship Today, pp139-141.

42) Buchanan in Anglican Worship Today speaks of Cyprian's interpretation of the offering of the Mass as being the Church's offering of the sacrifice of Christ, and then of Rite A, which does not use the words "'offering the bread and the cup to you.'" but "of celebrating Christ's sacrifice and similar concepts" (pp123-124). 'Similar concepts' leaves the field of interpretation wide open. The words 'This our sacrifice' in Prayer 1 can, perhaps, be considered an "objective sacrifice" as in Roman Catholic theology.

43) GS 364A. GS 364 omits the phrase 'by his one oblation of himself once offered' which appears in brackets in the Book of Common Prayer, Series 1, but not in Series 1 Revised. GS 364A also changes 'a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the world' to 'a full atonement for the sins of the world, offering once for all his one sacrifice of himself.'

44) Cf. note 8, p220 above. It was reprinted by Buchanan in The Development... as a stage in the development of Series 3.

45) Cf. p44 above.

46) Cuming, pl1. The variant readings do not affect the argument. Unlike the primitive text the Alternative Service Book does distinguish the various concepts by paragraphing.

47) Ratcliff's suggestion that in antiquity the Sanctus was at the end of the anaphora (cf. Series 2) does not affect our study of the modern texts, and does not relate to the controversial points. (Sanctus and Pattern of Early Anaphora II 'Journal of Ecclesiastical History', 1950, pp131-134.) Cf. p42 above.

48) Offertory sentences were given in 1549 and 1552. All refer to help being given to the poor (including the clergy). Dent pp217-219, and 380-381. Perhaps they were to recall the Offertory chants of the Roman Mass. Cuming gives an interesting quotation from Luther's Formula Missae et Communionis, (1523) on the Offertory, "Next comes all that abomination known as Offertory, to which all the forgoing part of the Mass is compelled to be subservient. From this point onwards practically everything speaks and smells of oblation. So then, let us repudiate all those things that speak of oblation, together with the whole of the Canon, and keep what is pure and holy..." (Cuming, p32.)

49) Denzinger, 23rd.ed., 1751. The text of the Decree on the Mass reads, inter alia, "...For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of the priests who then offered himself on the cross, the manner of offering alone being different." (Denzinger, 1743)

50) Buchanan in The End of the Offertory - An Anglican Study, Grove Liturgical Study 14, 1978, p29, draws attention to the reference to the offertory processions at Klosterneuberg (The Austrian Canon Regular Monastery) in A.G.Hebert's Liturgy and Society, Faber, 1935. He suggests that this may have influenced the parish communion movement. It should be remembered that the 1570 Roman Missal did not encourage much overt participation by the laity (and the language was Latin); this insertion was designed to provide a more (physical?) involvement.

51) Dix, The Shape..., pl10, cf. Buchanan, op. cit. pp28ff.

52) In Durham Essays and Addresses, SPCK, 1956, cited in Buchanan, op. cit. p31. Houlden in his chapter in Thinking about the Eucharist stresses the self-offering as part of the sacrifice, "Chiefly 'sacrifice' has one property which other images lack and which needs to be inserted in any account of the believer's relationship with God: totality of self-offering." (p95)

53) Buchanan, op. cit. p35, mentions the Liturgical Commission's Report for the 1958 Lambeth Conference,

- Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England (SPCK 1957) which says that in a number of churches there is "lay participation in the presentation of the elements either through an Offertory Procession or in other ways..." (p24) The Report also mentions Archbishop Ramsey's caveat given in the preceding paragraph. (Ibid.)
- 54) Cf. pp29 & 109, above.
- 55) Suggested in the introduction to the first draft, pl47. "True to our principle of leaving a wide discretion in such matters we have drafted our rubrics to cover both an Offertory Procession by lay people from the congregation and also the simplest placing of the bread and wine upon the holy Table." This was repeated in the published version of December 1966, p ix. Nothing on the Offertory Procession appeared in the Liturgical Commission's Commentary on Series 3.
- 56) The rubric is at §26.
- 57) This blurring can be seen in Halliburton's comments on the Series 3 offertory, "offering to God of his own good gifts" (the bread, the wine, the money?) and the congregation taking an "active part in the sacrifice." (In The Eucharist Today, pp92-93) cf. pl21 above.
- 58) 'Church Quarterly Review', 1965, pp31-32. In the same article he also said that the "real 'taking' or offertory comes with the great Eucharistic prayer itself" and should not be confused with the presentation or preparation of the elements. For the opposition of the Evangelicals, cf. ppl49 & 151 above. Buchanan in ASB Commentary says that the Rite "hints that not everybody is agreed on the theology and suitability of this Roman Catholic provision." (p77).
- 59) J.A. Jungmann, Missarum Sollemnia, Benzinger Bros, Inc, 1951, traces the words 'Body of Christ' to Ambrose (De Sacr. IV.5.25) He says the words 'May the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ...' seem to go back to the eighth cent. (pp388-389).
- 60) Cf. Buchanan's A Guide to the New Communion Service, p47.
- 61) Op.cit. pp21-22.
- 62) Op.cit. p33.
- 63) §§30-31.
- 64) In Prayers of the Eucharist, pl49. It preceded the General Confession, as it did in 1549, & 1552 (Dent. pp224 & 386).
- 65) §§34-35.
- 66) §§32-33.
- 67) The alternatives were introduced in GS 364A §§45, 46, & 68, where they are in the Alternative Service Book. The alternative invitation (§85) is adapted from the text used by the Roman Catholics, "This is the Lamb

of God..." The Eastern formula "The gifts of God for the people of God" is an option too in §85. The Alternative Service Book also gives this Eastern text. "Draw near..." is optional on week-days.

68) Summer 1970. Loose leaf, no page numbers.

69) Op. cit. p119. He also gives the formula, "May the Body of Christ keep you in life eternal" as from the eight cent. and provides a brief eschatological note.

70) Bk.4. Cap.XIV, paras. 6 & 7. Westminster Press Trans. 1960.

71) Cf. Note 18, p231 above.

72) Cited in Moore and Cross, Anglicanism, p200. It is quoted approvingly by H.E.W.Turner in his chapter in Thinking about the Eucharist, pp108 & 112, "...[It]...still represents our stance in the matter." (p112)

CONCLUSION: A DRAWING TOGETHER

1) SPCK. The Commission was set up by Archbishop Davidson and apart from its first two years had William Temple (as Bishop of Manchester and Archbishop of York) as its Chairman. (Its first Chairman was Bishop Burge of Oxford who died in 1925.) The Commission was originally intended to provide a means of finding agreement between the various schools of thought in the Church of England. It was finally approved by Archbishop Davidson as an advisory body, not having any authority. (cf. G.K.A.Bell, Randall Davidson, pp1148-1149.)

2) Op. cit. pp161-162.

3) Ibid.

4) Ibid. p174.

5) Receptionism is described in the Report as the teaching that the Body and Blood are received by the faithful, but the presence is real only in their hearts, and not in the elements prior to reception, (p169); and Virtualism as affirming that the bread and the wine become the Body and Blood with spiritual power and effect. (p170) Several pages are devoted to these two theories.

6) Queen Elizabeth's rhyme was given as a footnote, p171.

'Twas God the word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what the word did make it,
That I believe and take it.'

(T.Fuller, The Holy State, 1642, p315).

7) §5 of the Windsor Statement, last paragraph.

8) §3 of the Windsor Statement.

9) Noteably Beckwith, who in Christ's Presence and Sacrifice, Church Book Room Press, 1973, pp17-18, said that the idea of anamnesis had been misunderstood; e.g. p17 "This is contrary both to the etymology and to the usage of the Greek word..." This was repeated in paper to the Oxford Conference between Evangelical Anglicans and Roman Catholics, 1975, entitled, The Doctrine of Holy Communion, cf. pp74-76 where his point is closely argued. (The Conference papers were published by 'The Churchman' and The Church Book Room Press). (He had earlier published an article An Evangelical Looks at the Agreed Statement in the journal 'Faith and Unity', No.16, 1972, pp49 & 52. This was later developed by himself, with others of a like mind into the 1973 booklet.)

The evangelical, Rev. J.W.Charley, defended the

statement, saying, "...the present statement avoids any suggestion of 're-presenting' Christ's death. What is made present is not the historical sacrifice of Christ itself, but the efficacy of it... there is no biblical warrant for any supra-temporal interpretation of the cross which circumvents the historical finality." The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship, 1. These words only appear in the second, May 1972, edition. They are not in the first edition, published December 1971, at the same time as the Statement.

10) Rev. C.Hill, one of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Counsellors on Foreign Relations compiled the comments in ARCIC Paper 162: Anglican Response to Windsor and Canterbury, prepared for the ARCIC meeting in Chichester, Summer 1977, p15. The Irish and New Zealand approval was accompanied by detailed comment.

11) The question was put in the Synod by Very Rev. E.W.Kemp, 11th. Feb. 1972. The Bishops' response is given in the Report of the Liturgical Steering Committee, May 1972, GS 77. (Cf. pp109 & 224 above.)

12) After the words 'Christian faith' in the extract cited above.

13) In his Agreement on the Eucharist, R.C. Ecumenical Commission, 1972, p8.

14) Cf. note 9 above.

15) Through the Looking Glass, cap.VI. (Published 1871). Dodgeson wrote at a time with its own peculiar liturgical, rubrical and doctrinal controversies....

16) Ambiguity in Schemes for Reunion, 'The Churchman', 1967, pp172-173.

17) 'Church Quarterly Review', 1965, pp27 & 23, quoting Gore's The Body of Christ (1901, 2nd. ed. p155) He also quotes M.Dewey (The Anglican Tradition, 1958, p6) "The task Anglicanism attempts is to express and formulate apparently conflicting truths and so to present them that they are revealed as complementary rather than contradictory." We have already noted that his Introduction to the drafts of Series 2 said that the forms of words were designed to be open to various interpretations. (1965 Report, p146, Oct. 1966 Report, p viii,) cf. p36 above. At the 1966 Liturgical Conference he quoted the final sentence of Darwell Stone's History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, (Longman's, 1909), "...the interpreter [of the Mystery of the Eucharist] will most likely be right who is patient of a wide latitude of interpretation." (Report, p7.)

18) In the General Synod Debate, 21st. February 1979. Cf. p151 above.

19) A similar point is made by M.Wiles in his conclusion

to the Doctrine Commission's Thinking about the Eucharist, p119.

20) Alternative Service Book Preface, p10. The following page adds, "But words, even agreed words, are only the beginning of worship...only the grace of God can make up what is lacking in the words of men."

Buchanan in NoL, Oct.1980, gives the author of the Preface as the Bishop of Durham, John Habgood. In a BBC broadcast the week before the publication of the Alternative Service Book Buchanan said that the intention of the Commission was to respond to the sorts of emphases the Church was asking for. This may help to explain the varying stresses (or emphases?) in the Alternative Service Book.

21) See also the introduction to the first draft of Series 2, "We have...tried to produce a form of words which are capable of various interpretations." (p146, cf. p62 above,) and Bishop Bowles' introduction to the Revised Series 3.

22) The Introduction to the Doctrine Commission's Report said, "The Anglican Churches...are the heirs of the Reformation as well as of the Catholic tradition; and they hold together in a single fellowship of worship and witness those whose chief attachment is to each of these..." (p25).

23) Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, p39.

24) Book of Common Prayer, 'Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained.'

One can also recall the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, which begins, "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Publick liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting any variation of it." The Liturgical Commission seems to have followed this by writing in the allowed variations. Is this even more 'creative' than the avoidance of 'innovation'?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. TEXTS (By date)

Collection of Various Texts: Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed, ed. R.C.D.Jasper and G.J.Cuming, Collins, 1975.

1549 & 1552 Orders in The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward VI, ed. E.G.S.Gibson, Dent. 1st. ed. 1910, reprinted frequently.

The Anglican Missal, Society of SS. Peter & Paul. 1910-1921.

The English Missal, W.Knott, 1912.

The Altar Missal, A.R.Mowbray, for Society of St. John the Evangelist. 1936.

Alternative Services, First Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity, SPCK, 1965.

Alternative Services, Second Series, A Draft Order for Holy Communion, An Interim Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission, Printed with the permission of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, June 1965, SPCK (published 1966).

Alternative Services, First Series, Holy Communion, (An Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion), SPCK, 1966.

Alternative Services, Second Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity, SPCK, 1966.

An Order for Holy Communion, [Second Series] The Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, as amended and accepted by the Convocations on 12th.Oct.1966, and to be presented to the House of Laity of the Church Assembly, SPCK, 1966.

Alternative Services, Second Series, An Order for Holy Communion, Privileged Presses, 1967.

Alternative Services Series 3 A Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Privileged Presses, 1971, [also as GS 48].

Alternative Services Series 3, Holy Communion, The text of the Draft Service incorporating amendments made by the General Synod in Nov. 1971 and Feb. 1972, GS 86, C.I.O. 1972,

Alternative Services Series 3 Holy Communion, The text of the Draft Service incorporating amendments made by the General Synod in July 1972. GS 86A, C.I.O. 1972.

An Order for Holy Communion, Series 3, Privileged Presses, 1973.

Alternative Services Series 1 & 2 Revised, Holy Communion, A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England. GS 217, C.I.O. 1974.

Holy Communion Series 1 & 2 Revised, As revised by the

Committee appointed at the July Session 1975, GS 217A, C.I.O. 1975.

Holy Communion 1 & 2 Revised, Alternative Services Series 1 & 2 Revised. Privileged Presses, 1976.

Alternative Services Holy Communion Series 3 Revised, A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England, GS 364, SPCK, 1978.

Alternative Services Series 3 The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and The Lord's Supper, As revised by the Committee appointed at the July Group of Sessions 1978, GS 364A, SPCK/C.I.O. 1979.

The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and The Lord's Supper Rite A from the Alternative Service Book 1980, Alternative Service Book Publishers, May 1980.

The Alternative Service Book 1980, Services authorized for use in the Church of England in conjunction with the Book of Common Prayer, Alternative Service Book Publishers, November 1980.

'Privileged Presses' above refers to the combination of Cambridge University Press, Eyre & Spottiswoode, Oxford University Press and the SPCK.

The Alternative Service Book is published by the Privileged Presses, together with William Clowes (Printers), Hodder & Stoughton, and A.R.Mowbray & Co.

Extracts from the Orders of Holy Communion are reproduced by permission of the Central Board of Finance of the Church of England.

2. OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS (By date)

Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury, SPCK.

Journal of the Convocation of York, C.I.O.

Report of Proceedings of the Church Assembly, Church Assembly and SPCK.

Report of Proceedings of the General Synod of the Church of England, C.I.O.

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

The Lambeth Conference 1958, SPCK, 1958.

The Liturgical Conference 1966, Report of Proceedings, C.I.O. 1966.

The Liturgical Conference 1967, Report of Proceedings, C.I.O. 1967.

Commentary on Holy Communion, Series 3, Church of England Liturgical Commission, SPCK, 1971.

Report on Holy Communion Series III, Liturgical Steering Committee, GS 68, 1972.

Report on Holy Communion Series III, Liturgical Steering Committee, GS 77, 1972.

Holy Communion Series III Report by the House of Bishops, GS 83, 1972.

The Further Course of Liturgical Revision, Report by the Standing Committee, GS 161, 1973.

Alternative Service Book: Progress Report, The

Standing Committee, GS 325, 1977.

Holy Communion Series 3 Revised, Report of the Revision Committee, GS 364X, 1979.

The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and the Lord's Supper (formerly Holy Communion - Series 3 Revised) Amendments made to GS 364A at the February Group of Sessions, 1979, GS 364C, 1979.

The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and the Lord's Supper (formerly Holy Communion - Series 3 Revised) Amendments made to GS 364C on 2 July 1979, GS 364D REVISE, 1979.

The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and the Lord's Supper (formerly Holy Communion - Series 3 Revised) Amendments made to GS 364A on 4,5,6 July 1979, GS 364E, C.I.O. 1979.

Alternative Services - Series 3 The Order for HOLY COMMUNION also called THE EUCHARIST and THE LORD'S SUPPER. As revised by the Committee appointed at the July Group of Sessions 1978 and by the General Synod at the February and July Groups of Sessions 1979, GS 364F, 1979.

The Order for Holy Communion also called The Eucharist and The Lord's Supper (formerly Holy Communion - Series 3 Revised) Amendments made by the House of Bishops on 24th. October 1979, (to GS 364F

and GS 364G) GS 364H, 1979,.

Where no publisher is given for General Synod Documents they are simple lithographed papers.

3. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

This list gives details of the works found more useful. Bibliographic details are given for all books and articles at their first mention in the work.

Various Authors, The Eucharist Today - Studies on Series 3, SPCK, 1974.

Various Authors, Thinking about the Eucharist - Papers by members of the Church of England Doctrine Commission, SCM, 1972.

Various Authors, Towards a Modern Prayer Book - The New Services Examined, Marcham Manor Press, 1966.

Various Authors, The Alternative Service Book - A Commentary by the Liturgical Commission, C.I.O. 1980.

R.T.Beckwith, Prayer Book Revision and Anglican Unity, Church Book Room Press, 1967.

R.T.Beckwith & C.O.Buchanan, This Bread and This Cup - An Evangelical Rejoinder, Theology, 1967.

R.T.Beckwith, The Second Series Communion Service, What are the Issues? Church Book Room Press, n.d.

R.T.Beckwith, The Revised Services Series Three Communion - A Way Forward, Latimer Studies 2, 1979.

R.T.Beckwith & J.E.Tiller, The Service of Holy Communion And Its Revision, Latimer Monograph III, Marcham Manor Press, 1972.

C.L.Berry, A Plea for the Prayer of Oblation, Alcuin Tract No.26, A.R.Mowbray, 1951.

C.O.Buchanan, The New Communion Service - Reasons for Dissent, Church Book Room Press, 1966.

C.O.Buchanan, A Guide to the New Communion Service, Church Book Room Press, 1966.

C.O.Buchanan, A Guide to Second Series Communion Service, Church Book Room Press, 1968.

C.O.Buchanan, Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958 - 1968, O.U.P. 1968.

C.O.Buchanan, Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968 - 1975, Grove Books, 1975.

C.O.Buchanan, Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 14, 1975.

C.O.Buchanan, Supplement for 1973-4 to Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 14A, 1974.

C.O.Buchanan, Supplement for 1974-6 to Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 14B, 1976.

C.O.Buchanan, Supplement for 1976-8 to Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 14C, 1978.

C.O.Buchanan, What Did Cranmer Think He Was Doing?, Grove Liturgical Study 7, 1976.

C.O.Buchanan, The End of The Offertory - An Anglican Study, Grove Liturgical Study 14, 1978.

C.O.Buchanan, The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England, Grove Liturgical Booklet 20, 1979.

C.O.Buchanan, Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 68, 1979.

C.O.Buchanan, editor, News of Liturgy, Grove Books, monthly, from January 1975.

Church Union, The Eucharist: A Selection from Rite A, Church Literature Association, 1980.

A.H.Couratin, The Service of Holy Communion 1549-1662, SPCK, 1963.

A.H.Couratin, The Tradition Received, Theology, 1966.

G.J.Cuming, The English Rite, Theology, 1966.

G.J.Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy, Macmillan, 1969.

J.M.M.Dalby, Anglican Missals, Church Quarterly Review, 1966.

J.M.M.Dalby, Alternative Services: The Canon of Series I, The Church Quarterly Review, 1967.

P.E.Dale, A Guide to Series 3, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 10, 1972.

G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press, 1948.

W.H.Frere, Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, John Murray, 1911.

D.L.Frost, The Language of Series 3, Grove Booklet on Ministry & Worship 12, 1973.

D.Gregg, Anamnesis in the Eucharist, Grove Liturgical Study 5, 1976.

W.J.Grisbrooke, Series II: The New Communion Service of the church of England Examined, Studia Liturgica, 1970.

J.L.Houlden, Good Liturgy or even Good Battlefield?, Theology, 1966.

G.A.L.Lloyd, The Interim Rite, Theology, 1963.

M.J.Moreton, The Alternative Services Considered, Theology, 1966.

M.J.Moreton, The Early Liturgies, Theology, 1966.

M.J.Moreton, A Liturgical Pastiche, Theology, 1972.

M.J.Moreton, Made Fully Perfect, A Critique of the Order for Holy Communion 3, Church Literature Association, 1974.

M.J.Moreton, Consecrating, Remembering, Offering, Catholics and Series 3,2, and 1 and 1662, Church Literature Association, 1976.

W.B.Morris, Ritual Murder, Carcanet Press, 1980.

L.Paine, The New Communion Service, A Scheme of Study for Parish Groups, Church Book Room Press, n.d.

M.Perry, Sharing in One Bread, SPCK, 1973 & 1980.

T.Richardson, Holy Rite Though Partly Wrong, Church Literature Association, 1973.

D.A.Scales, What Mean Ye By This Service?, Truth and Faith Committee, (at Cambridge and Whinburgh), 1969.

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

E.C.Whitaker, The New Services - 1967. A Guide and Explanation, SPCK, 1967.

B.J.Wigan, The Liturgy in English, O.U.P. 1962.

J.Wilkinson, Eucharist for Experiment, Church Union, 1967.

C.G.Willis, 1966 And All That - Revision of the Eucharist, League of Anglican Loyalists, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

COMPARISON OF TEXTS

SERIES 2

I JUNE 1965 Liturgical Commission Draft Order. II

Wherefore, O Lord,
his saving passion, having in remembrance
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and look ing for the coming of his kingdom,
offer unto thee
we this bread and this cup;

and we pray thee to accept
this our duty and service,

in the presence of thy divine majesty

through the same Christ our Lord...

Wherefore, O Lord,
his saving passion, having in remembrance
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and look ing for the coming of his kingdom,
offer unto thee
we this bread and this cup;

and we pray thee to accept
this our duty and service,
and grant that we may so
eat
and drink these holy things
in the presence of thy divine majesty

that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly
blessing;
Through the same Christ our Lord...

Wherefore, O Lord,
his saving passion, having in remembrance
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and look ing for the coming of his kingdom,
offer unto thee
we this bread and this cup;
give thanks to thee over

and we pray thee to accept
this our duty and service,

and grant that we may so
eat
and drink these holy things
in the presence of thy divine majesty,

that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly
blessing;
Through the same Christ our Lord...

VI JULY 1967

Final Text.

VII

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

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

We pray thee to accept
this our duty and service,

and grant that we may so
eat
and drink these holy things
in the presence of thy divine majesty

that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly
blessing;
Through the same Christ our Lord...

APPENDIX II

COMPARISON OF TEXTS

SERIES 3

I Draft. Published 16th. Sept. 1971

§24

The bread and wine are brought to the holy table.

§29

Accept our praises, heavenly Father, through your Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ; and as we follow his example and obey his command, grant that

these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and his blood.

Take, eat; this is my body which I give for you...

Drink this, all of you; for this is my blood of the new Covenant, which I shed for you...

In Christ shall all be made alive.

Therefore, heavenly Father, we do this in remembrance of him: with this bread and this cup we celebrate his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross; we proclaim his resurrection from the dead

and we look for the fulness of his coming in glory.

Accept

this our...

§35

...the president returns to the holy table and adds more, either in silence or with these words:

Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup as you Son our Lord Jesus Christ commanded, we receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood.

II First Revision a) 10th. Nov. 1971

X

Accept through Him our great High Priest this our...

Accept through him our great high priest this our...

§35

...the president returns to the holy table and adds more,
with these words:

Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and
the cup as your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ commanded, we
receive this bread/wine also his body/blood.

IV Second Revision 9th. & 10th. July 1972

§24

The bread and wine are brought to the holy table, and this sentence may be used: Yours, Lord, is the greatness, the power, the glory, the splendour, and the majesty; for everything in heaven and on earth is yours. All things come from you, and of your own do we give you.

§29

Accept our praises, heavenly Father, through your Son, Our Saviour Jesus Christ; and as we follow his example and obey his command, grant that by the power of your Spirit these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and his blood.

Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you...

Drink this, all of you; for this is my blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for you...

Christ will come again.

Therefore, heavenly Father, with this bread and this cup we do this in remembrance of him: we celebrate and proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven; and we look for the fullness of his coming glory.

§35

..the president returns to the holy table and adds more, with these words:

Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup according to the institution of your Son, Jesus Christ, who said, 'Take, eat; this is my body', (and/or 'Drink this; this is my blood',) we pray that this bread/wine also may be to us his body/blood, and be received in remembrance of him.

Also, the Revision on the 9th. & 11th. Feb. 1972 added before the 'Notes' the following:

..No person shall consecrate and administer the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper unless he shall have been ordained priest by episcopal ordination in accordance with the provisions of Canon C.1.

This was changed at the Revision of 9th. & 10th. July 1972 to read:

..only those who have been episcopally ordained priest shall consecrate the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

APPENDIX III

COMPARISON OF TEXTS

ANAMNESIS

GS 364 GS 364A ASB

FIRST EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364

Therefore, heavenly Father,
we do this in remembrance of him.
We proclaim his offering of himself
made once for all upon the cross
his mighty resurrection and glorious
ascension;

and as we celebrate his one perfect sacrifice
with this bread and this cup
we look for his coming in glory.

[Acclamation]

Accept through him, our great high priest
this our sacrifice of thanks and praise;
as we eat and drink these holy gifts
in the presence of your divine majesty,

renew us by your Spirit,
inspire us with your love,
and unite us in the body of your Son
Jesus Christ our Lord.

FIRST EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364A

[Acclamation]

Therefore, heavenly Father,
we remember
his offering of himself
made once for all upon the cross
and proclaim his mighty resurrection and glorious
ascension.

As we look for his coming in glory,
we celebrate with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice.

Accept through him, our great high priest,
this our sacrifice of thanks and praise;
as we eat and drink these holy gifts
in the presence of your divine majesty,
may we who are nourished by his body and blood
grow into his likeness
and, made one by your Spirit,

become a living temple to your glory.

FIRST EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

ASB

[Acclamation]

Therefore, heavenly Father,
we remember
his offering of himself
made once for all upon the cross
and proclaim his mighty resurrection and glorious
ascension.

As we look for his coming in glory,
we celebrate with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice.

Accept through him, our great high priest,
this our sacrifice of thanks and praise;
as we eat and drink these holy gifts
in the presence of your divine majesty,

renew us by your Spirit,
inspire us with your love,
and unite us in the body of your Son,
Jesus Christ our Lord.

SECOND EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

GS 364

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
with this bread and this cup
we make the memorial of his saving passion,

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

Accept we pray, this our duty and service;
and as we eat and drink these holy things
in the presence of your divine majesty,
fill us with your grace and heavenly blessing.

SECOND EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364A

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,

having in remembrance his death once for all upon the cross,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and looking for the coming of his kingdom,
we make with this bread and this cup
the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord.

Accept we pray, this offering of our duty and service;
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts
in the presence of your divine majesty,
fill us with your grace and heavenly blessing.

SECOND EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
ASB

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,

having in remembrance his death once for all upon the cross,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and looking for the coming of his kingdom,
we make with this bread and this cup
the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord.

Accept we pray, this offering of our duty and service;
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts
in the presence of your divine majesty,
fill us with your grace and heavenly blessing;
nourish us with the body and blood of your Son
that we may grow into his likeness
and, made one by your Spirit,
become a living temple to your glory.

THIRD EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
Beckwith/Brindley Proposal.

And so, Father, calling to mind his death on the cross,
one perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of all
rejoicing at his mighty resurrection and glorious men
ascension,
and looking for his coming glory,
we celebrate this memorial of our redemption.

We thank you for counting us worthy
to stand in your presence to serve you;
we bring before you these gifts, this bread and this
cup.

We pray you to accept this our duty and service,
a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

send the Holy Spirit on all that your Church sets before
you;

may we who share in the body and blood of Christ
be brought together in unity by that Spirit
so that we may praise and glorify you for ever
through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord,

THIRD EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364A & ASB

And so, Father, calling to mind his death on the cross,
his perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of all
men,
rejoicing at his mighty resurrection and glorious
ascension,
and looking for his coming glory,
we celebrate this memorial of our redemption;

We thank you for counting us worthy
to stand in your presence and serve you.
we bring before you this bread and this
cup;

We pray you to accept this our duty and service,
a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

Send the Holy Spirit

on your people
and gather into one in your kingdom
all who share in
this one bread and one cup;

so that we, in the company of all the saints,
may praise and glorify you for ever,
through him all good things come
Jesus Christ our Lord;

FOURTH EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
we commemorate the precious death and
passion,
the mighty resurrection and the glorious ascension
of your dear Son Jesus Christ.
Accept through him
this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

and grant that by his death and merits
and through faith in his blood,
we and all your Church may receive forgiveness of our sins
and all other benefits of his passion.

We are unworthy by reason of
our sin
to offer you any sacrifice,
yet be pleased to accept this,
the duty and service that we owe;
do not weigh our merits, but pardon our offences,
and fill us all who share in this holy communion
with your grace and heavenly blessing.

FOURTH EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
GS 364A

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
in remembrance of the precious death and
passion,
mighty resurrection and glorious ascension
of your dear Son Jesus Christ,
we offer you
this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

Grant that by his merits and death,
and through faith in his blood,
we and all your Church may receive forgiveness of our sins
and all other benefits of his passion.
Although we are unworthy
through our many sins
to offer you any sacrifice,
yet we pray that you will accept this,
the duty and service that we owe;
do not weigh our merits, but pardon our offences,
and fill us all who share in this holy communion
with your grace and heavenly blessing.

FOURTH EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

ASB

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
in remembrance of the precious death and
passion,
mighty resurrection and glorious ascension
of your dear Son Jesus Christ,
we offer you through him
this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Grant that by his merits and death,
and through faith in his blood,
we and all your Church may receive forgiveness of our sins
and all other benefits of his passion.
Although we are unworthy
through our many sins
to offer you any sacrifice,
yet we pray that you will accept this,
the duty and service that we owe;
do not weigh our merits, but pardon our offences,
and fill us all who share in this holy communion
with your grace and heavenly blessing.

APPENDIX IV

COMPARISON OF TEXTS

ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK

38 18 FIRST EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

President The Lord be with you or The Lord is here, and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

President All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

President All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

President It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy, at all times and in all places to give you thanks and praise, holy Father, heavenly King, almighty and eternal God, through Jesus Christ your only Son our Lord.

For he is your living Word; through him you have created all things from the beginning, and formed us in your own image.

Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin, giving him to be born as man and to die upon the cross; you raised him from the dead and exalted him to your right hand on high.

Through him you have sent upon us your holy and life-giving Spirit, and made us a people for your own possession.

PROPER PREFACE, when appropriate (section 76)

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying:

All Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.

This ANTHEM may also be used.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

39 SECOND EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

President The Lord be with you or The Lord is here, and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

President All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

President All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

President It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy, at all times and in all places to give you thanks and praise, holy Father, heavenly King, almighty and eternal God, through Jesus Christ your only Son our Lord.

The following may be omitted if a Proper Preface is used.

For he is your living Word; through him you have created all things from the beginning, and formed us in your own image.

Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin, giving him to be born as man and to die upon the cross; you raised him from the dead and exalted him to your right hand on high.

Through him you have sent upon us your holy and life-giving Spirit, and made us a people for your own possession.

PROPER PREFACE, when appropriate (section 76)

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying:

All Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.

This ANTHEM may also be used.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

40 THIRD EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

President The Lord be with you or The Lord is here, and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

President All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

President All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

President Father, we give you thanks and praise through your beloved Son Jesus Christ, your living Word through whom you have created all things;

Who was sent by you, in your great goodness to be our Saviour; by the power of the Holy Spirit he took flesh and, as your Son, born of the blessed Virgin was seen on earth and was... about among us;

He opened wide his arms for us on the cross he put an end to death by dying for us and revealed the resurrection by rising to new life; so he fulfilled your will and won for you a holy people.

PROPER PREFACE, when appropriate (section 76)

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying:

All Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.

This ANTHEM may also be used.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

41 FOURTH EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

President The Lord be with you or The Lord is here, and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

President All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

President All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

President It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy, at all times and in all places to give you thanks and praise, holy Father, heavenly King, almighty and eternal God, creator of heaven and earth, through Jesus Christ our Lord:

PROPER PREFACE, when appropriate (section 76)

The following is used when no Proper Preface is provided.

And now we give you thanks because he is the true high priest, who has loosed us from our sins and has made us to be a royal priesthood to you, our God and Father.

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying:

All Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.

This ANTHEM may also be used.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

84 A EUCHARISTIC PRAYER FOR USE WITH THE SICK

President The Lord be with you or The Lord is here, and also with you. His Spirit is with us.

President All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

President All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

President It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy, to give you thanks, holy Father, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The Order following the pattern of Book of Common Prayer (continued from section 22)

63 Priest All Lift up your hearts. We lift them to the Lord.

Priest All Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

Priest It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy, at all times and in all places to give you thanks and praise, holy Father, heavenly King, almighty and eternal God, through Jesus Christ your only Son our Lord.

Through him you have created us in your image; through him you have freed us from sin and death; through him you have made us your own people by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

PROPER PREFACE, when appropriate (section 76)

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying:

All Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.

(The Prayer of Humble Access follows)

BEFORE INSTITUTION NARRATIVE

E.P. 1
President Accept our praises, heavenly Father,
through your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ;
and as we follow his example and obey
his command.

grant that by the power of your Holy Spirit

these gifts of bread and wine

may be to us his body and his blood;

E.P. 2
President Hear us, heavenly Father,
through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
through him accept our sacrifice of praise;

and grant that by the power of your
Holy Spirit

these gifts of bread and wine

may be to us his body and his blood;

E.P. 3
President Lord, you are holy indeed, the source of
all holiness;

grant that, by the power of your Holy Spirit,
and according to your holy will,

these your gifts of bread and wine

may be to us the body and blood of our Lord
Jesus Christ;

BEFORE INSTITUTION NARRATIVE

E.P. 4
President All glory to you, our heavenly Father:
in your tender mercy
you gave your only Son Jesus Christ
to suffer death upon the cross for
our redemption;
he made there
a full atonement for the sins of the
whole world,
offering once for all his one sacrifice
of himself;
he instituted,
and in his holy gospel commanded us
to continue,
a perpetual memory of his precious death
until he comes again.
Hear us, merciful Father, we humbly pray,

and grant that by the power of your
Holy Spirit

we who receive these gifts of your creation,
this bread and this wine,

according to your Son our Saviour Jesus
Christ's holy institution,
in remembrance of the death that he suffered,
may be partakers of his most blessed body
and blood;

E.P. - Sick

Hear us, Father,
through Christ your Son our Lord,

and grant that by the power of your
Holy Spirit

these gifts of bread and wine

may be to us his body and his blood.

1662 R

65 Priest Almighty God, our heavenly Father,
in your tender mercy
you gave your only Son Jesus Christ
to suffer death upon the cross for
our redemption;
he made there
a full atonement for the sins of the
whole world,
offering once for all his one sacrifice
of himself;
he instituted,
and in his holy gospel commanded us
to continue,
a perpetual memory of his precious death
until he comes again.
Hear us, merciful Father,
we humbly pray,

and grant that we who receive these gifts of
your creation,
this bread and this wine,

according to your Son our Saviour Jesus
Christ's holy institution,
in remembrance of the death that he suffered,
may be partakers of his most blessed body
and blood;

INSTITUTION NARRATIVE

E.P. 1 - 4

Who in the same night that he was betrayed,
took bread and gave you thanks;
he broke it and gave it to his disciples,
saying,
Take, eat; this is my body which is given
for you;
do this in remembrance of me.
In the same way, after supper
he took the cup and gave you thanks;
he gave it to them, saying,
Drink this, all of you;
this is my blood of the new covenant,
which is shed for you and for many for the
forgiveness of sins.
Do this, as often as you drink it,
in remembrance of me.

All

Christ has died:
Christ is risen:
Christ will come again.

E.P. - Sick

Who in the same night that he was betrayed,
took bread and gave you thanks;
he broke it and gave it to his disciples,
saying,
Take, eat; this is my body which is given
for you;
do this in remembrance of me.
In the same way, after supper he took the cup
and gave you thanks;
he gave it to them, saying,
Drink this, all of you;
this is my blood of the new covenant
which is shed for you and for many for the
forgiveness of sins.
Do this as often as you drink it, in
remembrance of me.

1662 - R

Who in the same night that he was betrayed,
Here the priest takes the paten.
took bread and gave you thanks;
he broke it, *Here he breaks the bread.*
and gave it to his disciples, saying,
Take, eat;
Here he lays his hand on all the bread.
this is my body which is given for you;
do this in remembrance of me.
In the same way, after supper
Here he takes the cup.
he took the cup and gave you thanks;
he gave it to them, saying,
Drink this, all of you;
*Here he lays his hand on all the vessels of wine to be
consecrated.*
this is my blood of the new covenant,
which is shed for you and for many for the
forgiveness of sins.
Do this, as often as you drink it,
in remembrance of me. Amen.

ANAMNESIS

E.P. 1

President Therefore, heavenly Father, we remember his offering of himself made once for all upon the cross, and proclaim his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension. As we look for his coming in glory, we celebrate with this bread and this cup his one perfect sacrifice.

Accept through him, our great high priest, this our sacrifice of thanks and praise; and as we eat and drink these holy gifts in the presence of your divine majesty,

renew us by your Spirit, inspire us with your love, and unite us in the body of your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Through him, and with him, and in him, by the power of the Holy Spirit, with all who stand before you in earth and heaven, we worship you, Father almighty, in songs of everlasting praise:

All Blessing and honour and glory and power be yours for ever and ever. Amen.

E.P. 2

President Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father, having in remembrance his death once for all upon the cross, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, and looking for the coming of his kingdom, we make with this bread and this cup the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord.

Accept through him this offering of our duty and service; and as we eat and drink these holy gifts in the presence of your divine majesty, fill us with your grace and heavenly blessing; nourish us ~~by his precious blood~~, with the ~~body and blood of your Son~~ that we may grow into his likeness.

and, made one by your Spirit, become a living temple to your glory.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be yours, almighty Father, from all who stand before you in earth and heaven, now and for ever. Amen.

E.P. 3

President And so, Father, calling to mind his death on the cross, his perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of all men, rejoicing at his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, and looking for his coming in glory, we celebrate this memorial of our redemption;

We thank you for counting us worthy to stand in your presence and serve you; we bring before you this bread and this cup;

We pray you to accept this our duty and service, a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

Send the Holy Spirit on your people and gather into one in your kingdom all who share this one bread and one cup, so that we, in the company of all the saints, may praise and glorify you for ever, through him from whom all good things come, Jesus Christ our Lord;

By whom, and with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be yours, almighty Father, for ever and ever. Amen.

ANAMNESIS

E.P. 4

President Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father, in remembrance of the precious death and passion, the mighty resurrection and glorious ascension of your dear Son Jesus Christ, we offer you through him this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

E.P. - Sick
Therefore, Father,

proclaiming his saving death and resurrection and looking for his coming in glory, we celebrate with this bread and this cup his one perfect sacrifice.

Accept through him, our great high priest, this our sacrifice of thanks and praise, and grant that we who eat this bread and drink this cup

may be renewed by your Spirit and grow into his likeness.

Grant that by his merits and death, and through faith in his blood, we and all your Church may receive forgiveness of our sins and all other benefits of his passion. Although we are unworthy, through our many sins, to offer you any sacrifice, yet we pray that you will accept this, the duty and service that we owe; do not weigh our merits, but pardon our offences, and fill us all who share in this holy communion with your grace and heavenly blessing.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be yours, almighty Father, now and for ever. Amen.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom and in whom, all honour and glory be yours, Father, now and for ever. Amen.

1662 R

See
Prayers
After
Communion

1662 - R AFTER COMMUNION (After the Lord's Prayer)

70 One or other of the following prayers or one of those at sections 52 and 53 is used.

71 Lord and heavenly Father, we your servants entirely desire your fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and to grant that, by the merits and death of your Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all your Church may receive forgiveness of our sins and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present to you, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice, humbly beseeching you that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with your grace and heavenly benediction.

And although we are unworthy, through our many sins, to offer you any sacrifice, yet we pray that you will accept this, the duty and service that we owe, not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory are yours, Father almighty, now and for ever. Amen.

or

72 Almighty and everliving God, we heartily thank you that you graciously feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of

your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and assure us thereby of your favour and goodness towards us and that we are true members of the mystical body of your Son, the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs, through hope, of your eternal kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of your dear Son. And we humbly beseech you, heavenly Father, so to assist us with your grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as you have prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with you and the Holy Spirit, be all honour and glory, now and for ever. Amen.

52 President Father of all, we give you thanks and praise, that
53 when we were still far off you met us in your Son and brought us home. Dying and living, he declared your love, gave us grace, and opened the gate of glory. May we who share Christ's body live his risen life; we who drink his cup bring life to others; we whom the Spirit lights give light to the world. Keep us firm in the hope you have set before us, so we and all your children shall be free, and the whole earth live to praise your name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

or

55 All Almighty God,
53 we thank you for feeding us with the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ. Through him we offer you our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice. Send us out in the power of your Spirit to live and work to your praise and glory. Amen.