

“ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS THEREIN
ADDED”—SOME LITURGICAL AND
ECUMENICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE
EUCHARISTIC RITE IN THE *BOOK OF DIVINE
WORSHIP*

by the Reverend Kenneth F. Yossa

THE 1979 PRAYERBOOK: PRECURSOR OF A ROMAN CATHOLIC
LITURGY

Under the influences of the modern liturgical movement and the ongoing engagement of Anglicanism with its medieval Catholic and Patristic roots, the *1979 American Prayer Book* would undergo the most comprehensive revision and augmentation since its inception, occurring alongside similar movements throughout the Anglican Communion. A new order for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist *ad experimentum* was produced in 1966 by an eleven-member committee of the Episcopal Church’s Standing Liturgical Commission (SLC). Instituted formally at the 1967 General Convention, this initiative included the promulgation of a revised *Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* and authorized a “Plan for the Revision for the *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP),” manifesting the Episcopal Church’s desire to provide general Prayer Book reform—itsself originating in similar efforts made in the early 1950s. Eventually, further revisions were made following a canonically required three-year trial period. Noting that the updated format of the Eucharistic Liturgy had been almost unanimously accepted within Episcopal parishes, the SLC encountered great dissention concerning how or even if the Tudor-era language of the 1928 edition and its predecessors should be abolished in favor of contemporary English. This led the SLC in 1970 to produce a “compromise” Eucharist, in response to requests by a “substantial minority” of Episcopal faithful who held a deep attachment to the traditional English. A “First Service” retained the language of the 1929 version, but the taxis of the office and a number of prayers were

The Reverend Kenneth F. Yossa, a priest of the Byzantine Catholic Church, received his M.A. in Theology (Church History) from Seton Hall University and his Ph.D. from Marquette University in Religious Studies (Systematic Theology). This is his first published peer-review essay.

revised in a way consistent with similar changes within the eucharistic rites of the Roman Catholic and other Western churches.

A “Second Service” in great measure reflecting the 1967 contemporary-English version was produced, relying on texts since introduced by the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET).¹ Soon a provisional version of the Prayer Book was produced, *Services for Trial Use*,² which included the two versions of the revised Holy Eucharist.³ Use of this version was strongly encouraged, but since the 1928 Prayer Book remained the typical edition, either could be used locally at discretion.⁴

The compromise version was well received by a majority of Episcopal dioceses and parishes over time. While abandoning the structure of the 1928 BCP Communion Service, the first setting retained the Tudor-era English, which presumably would permit the *Old Prayer Book* to wane toward a quiet end in Episcopal churches. The second setting was intended to satisfy the desire of those who had a greater affinity for modern English in this worship. Both settings engendered a liturgical solidarity with the contemporary usages of other Western churches.⁵ These settings were reproduced in *Authorized Services*, an alternate-interim Prayer Book promulgated in 1973. The text of the two settings, known as “Rite One” and “Rite Two,” was augmented and incorporated into another interim Prayer Book entitled *The Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer* (the “Blue Book”) issued *ad experimentum* at the 1976 General Convention of the Episcopal Church, U.S.A. (ECUSA) in Minneapolis.⁶ The 1979 BCP, which became the typical edition at the Denver General Convention, was virtually identical to the *Draft Proposed* and remains the typical edition to the present.⁷ Nevertheless, opposition to the 1979 version continued, and for the sake of peace diocesan bishops were empowered to dispense from its use in favor of the 1928 Prayer Book.⁸ (This provision, it should be noted, was by no means exercised by the majority of the ECUSA hierarchy, and subsequent requests for permission to use the 1928 edition have been usually denied, whether in individual or general circumstances.)

Soon after the 1979 Denver General Conference, many individual Episcopal clergy and laity—in some cases, entire parishes—broke from the national church. Many of these could be distinguished by their opposition to forces originating in societal, political and cultural factors in contemporary American life which, in their view, were negatively influencing the Episcopal Church and radically altering its ethos. In some quarters, great concern was expressed by members regarding what they perceived as “a breakdown in the doctrinal and moral integrity of their church.”⁹ Clearly, many Episcopal faithful no longer felt at home in their own faith group. The proposed reforms of the Prayer Book were considered, rather uncritically, as an integral part of this “liberalization” taking place within the Episcopal Church,¹⁰ and these factors

among others gave rise to what came to be known as the Continuing Church Movement.¹¹ In some instances, many of the Continuing bodies established parallel Anglican jurisdictions and parishes in the U.S.A., identifying themselves as Anglican in teaching, tradition and practice, but enjoying no canonical fellowship with the Episcopal Church or the rest of the Anglican Communion. Particularly between 1977 and 1981, disaffected groups of Episcopal and Continuing Church clergy sought another course—establishment of communion with Rome for themselves and, in some cases, the faithful within their charge.¹²

THE PASTORAL PROVISION AND THE *BOOK OF DIVINE WORSHIP*

To provide pastoral accommodation for the former Episcopalians and “Continuing Anglicans,” in May, 1979, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB)¹³ passed a resolution allowing former Episcopal clergy (whether married or single) to retain their ministries within the Catholic Church following reordination. It would also provide for the preservation of the Anglican liturgical heritage, particularly by means of a future Anglican-use liturgy. Fifteen months later, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith under Cardinal-Prefect Franjo Seper formally recognized and approved this plan which came to be known as the “Pastoral Provision.”¹⁴

By 1981, Bishop (later Cardinal) Bernard Law of the Springfield-Cape Girardeau Diocese was appointed by the NCCB as Ecclesiastical Delegate to the Holy See for this project. Father W.T. Brown, a former Episcopal priest who participated in the dialogues with Rome and the NCCB, and Father James Gurrieri of the NCCB Committee on the Liturgy headed a commission to define the shape and scope of an acceptable Anglican liturgical usage. Two years later, an office of Holy Communion was produced almost entirely from Episcopal liturgical sources. By 1987 a new series of offices was approved by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in consultation with the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. These were incorporated into a one-volume manual resembling the BCP, the *Book of Divine Worship* (BDW).

A letter of approval by the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith noted several items,¹⁵ including principally the following: 1) The BDW represents a *usage*, not a rite,¹⁶ 2) the BDW may be used only in the so-called “common identity” or *personal parishes* of the Anglican tradition, 3) permission to apply the usage in favor of former Episcopalian faithful is to be given by the local ordinary after consultation with the Ecclesiastical Delegate, 4) a “suitable catechesis” is to be provided in the implementation of this initiative.¹⁷ The Congregation for Divine

Worship and the Sacraments simultaneously issued a letter recognizing the legitimate pastoral value of an “Anglican -usage” in the Catholic Church for former Episcopal clergy and laity, noting the confirmation of a provisional BDW by Pope John Paul II “for interim use ... until such time as other arrangements can be made.”¹⁸ The current *editio typica*, essentially identical to the 1987 version, was published in its final form in the latter part of 2003.¹⁹ The title page reads as follows:

THE BOOK OF DIVINE WORSHIP
being elements of *The Book of Common Prayer*
revised and adapted according to the Roman Rite
for use by Roman Catholics
coming from the Anglican Tradition,
approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
and confirmed by the Apostolic See

PARAMETERS OF THE ANGLICAN-USE LITURGY

A body of general directives was issued by the Congregation for Divine Worship in 1987 for the BDW to insure that Anglican-usage liturgical offices would remain the exclusive privilege of Pastoral Provision communities or, in the case of individual clergy, *pro celebrante ipse*. These directives remain currently in force and allow for: 1) the use of the standard Roman liturgical books as an alternative to the BDW, at the discretion of the pastor or his delegate, 2) recognition of the local ordinary, the Ecclesiastical Delegate, a Pastoral Provision priest (i.e., former Episcopalian/Anglican) or a priest of the Latin Church deputed for service to a Pastoral Provision community by the local ordinary as the licit celebrant for any Pastoral Provision divine service,²⁰ and 3) variations and additions in future versions of the BDW and, when necessary, the convocation of a special Commission comprising the Ecclesiastical Delegate (who is always a bishop) and the ordinaries in whose jurisdictions the Pastoral Provision is exercised.²¹

When the Pastoral Provision was in the preliminary stages of formation (i.e., before serious discussion of a modified BCP had apparently taken place), many former Episcopalians had hoped at least that some *portions* of it might be retained and incorporated into their worship—much in the same way as the vernacular prayers were included in Cranmer’s Mass of 1547. To the happy surprise of some of these faithful, the first version of the BDW retained nearly ninety percent of the 1979 Prayer Book.²² The BDWs Daily Office, the lectionaries for various liturgical offices, and most of the sacramental celebrations outside of the Holy Eucharist use the 1979 orations, invocations, invitatories and rubrics. The final version of 2003 also provides two Psalters, that

of Coverdale and the revised version contained respectively in the 1928 and 1979 editions of the BCP.²³

Given the extensive reliance upon Patristic and medieval sources on a par with that of the *Anglican-use*, it might be asked why, if the 1979 Prayer Book eventually gained acceptance even among the greater number of its Episcopal Church critics, could it not simply have been adopted for Catholic use *in toto*. One problem arises with the theology of the texts themselves. With particular regard to the Eucharistic Liturgy, Anglican bodies have tended to avoid textual phrasing or physical gestures which might exclude absolutely accommodation for certain Reformation-based traditions and teachings.²⁴ Therefore, while the current Episcopal Church liturgy and those recently undergoing revision in other Anglican churches have retrieved a great deal from traditional and contemporary Western liturgical sources, much of their substance is informed by a Reformation context. In the case of a “Prayer Book” for use under the Pastoral Provision, it was found necessary to make modifications in some Episcopalian/Anglican texts to more fully accommodate received Roman Catholic teaching and praxis. This accounts for most of the non-1979 edition variations inserted into the BDW, taken from the Roman Missal, or more specifically, sections of the 1974 and 1985 English language *Sacramentary* produced by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL).²⁵ From a strictly Catholic doctrinal perspective, the perceived theology gap could be considered successfully shored up through a number of adaptations. Others created new problems in places, affecting fundamentally the linguistic, historical and praxiological integrity of the Eucharistic rite in the BDW. By way of a cursory review, several obvious and significant differences between the 1979 BCP and the BDW versions of the office of the Holy Eucharist are evident, including the following:

In Rite One of the BDW:

- The alteration of the prayer of absolution in the Penitential Order to the subjunctive mode by adding the word “may” to “Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you all your sins, etc.” (This was an obvious change intended to counteract the Reformation concept of absolution as declaration.)
- The introduction of a Presentation/Offertory Rite, the text of which is taken directly from the 1974 ICEL *Sacramentary* (Roman Missal).
- The substitution of the 1892 version of the Eucharistic Prayer (and its alternate 1976 paraphrase) with that of the Roman Canon, using the sixteenth-century translation of Coverdale.
- The addition of the *Ecce Agnus Dei* (using ICEL’s transla-

tion) to part of the 1979 BCP invitation; the elimination of the 1559 Prayer Book's "composite" formula for the administration of Holy Communion to the faithful.²⁶

- The retention of the use in the 1976/79 versions of the Prayer Book which contain a bidding adapted from the Byzantine Divine Liturgy, "The Gifts of God for the People of God" (*ta Agia tois agiois*).²⁷
- The omission of the phrase "take them in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on Him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving."²⁸

In Rite Two of the BDW:

- The same as in Rite One, except for the replacement of Eucharistic Prayers "A" through "D" from the 1976/79 versions of the BCP with the standard four Prayers of the Roman Missal (in the ICEL text).

THE PRAYERS AT THE OFFERTORY²⁹

Most versions of the Offertory in the West, on the eve of the Reformation, were constructed along the late-medieval format, consisting essentially of the following: 1) Psalm-chant (= antiphon), 2) offering prayer with two separate oblational prayers for the bread and wine gifts, respectively, 3) incensation, 4) washing of the hands, and 5) an "ante-epiclesis." This office concluded with a bidding (*orate, fratres*), its response and the "Secret" (i.e., Prayer Over the Gifts). This structure is also found in the Sarum Offertory rite, except that a *single* prayer for the offering of the bread and wine was used—apparently reflecting the Gallican rather than the Roman liturgical tradition.³⁰

Anglican and Continental Reformers alike were unanimous in their desire to eliminate the concept of the Eucharist as an oblation in the traditional sense, not only eliminating anticipatory elements of the consecration, but also avoiding any prayer of offering at all prior to the Anaphora. The medieval Offertory was abolished in all editions of the Prayer Book used in England from 1548 onward, as Harrison and Sansom note:

Clearly, Cranmer wanted to avoid any suggestion that the Communion service contained any form of sacrifice or oblation other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and the offering of ourselves in obedience to God. He achieved his end, however, by breaking with a long tradition, dating from at least the second century, in which Christians spoke of 'offering the gifts,' which might include not only the bread and wine but also oil, cheese and olives."³¹

The traditional proper Offertory antiphons were replaced in the 1552 Prayer Book and other subsequent editions with twenty fixed “Sentences” or verses from Sacred Scripture,³² containing mostly generalized thanksgiving themes.³³ The Sentences quickly lost their character as a psalm-chant substitute and were reduced to “biddings” for the offering of alms and other charitable goods by the faithful.³⁴ Following the practice of all previous U.S. editions, the 1979 Prayer Book provides no prayer texts for the rite of Presentation³⁵ although a hymn or anthem may be taken at the occasion:

[R]epresentatives of the congregation bring the people’s offerings of bread and wine, and money or other gifts, to the deacon or celebrant. The people stand while the offerings are presented and placed on the altar.³⁶

Given that an explicit, formulaic Presentation/Offertory rite had been used for centuries in all Western pre-Reformation liturgies, it was clear that an Offertory rite proved necessary if an Anglican liturgy were to exist within a framework of other Catholic rites and usages.³⁷ Likewise, given the continuity it enjoyed in pre-Reformation usage as a derivative of the Roman Rite, it seemed appropriate that the ceremonial washing of the celebrant’s hands be restored as well. To this end the NCCB Committee on the Liturgy insisted that the Roman Presentation office as given in the ICEL *Sacramentary* (Roman Missal) be adopted without alteration, and consequently the Vatican Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments confirmed this addition in the provisional version of 1983 as well as in the 1987 and 2003 versions.

With regard to the Roman Presentation office (and the ICEL version of it), a wholesale extraction is wanting on a number of levels. First, with regard to Rite One, a serious problem presents itself in the divergence of idiom.³⁸ To hear and participate in a liturgy using sixteenth century English which suddenly switches into modern English (if the prayer is said aloud) creates an unnecessary interruption in the flow of the celebration. This is particularly so with regard to a presidential office and a core text for the eucharistic liturgy. It might perhaps be considered a merely stylistic incongruity—and would be for many an issue of little importance—but it would suggest another and arguably more pervasive issue relevant to both Rites One and Two.

From the information available, it is difficult to discern clearly why such a complete adoption from the ICEL *Sacramentary* (Roman Missal) has been insisted upon. It might suggest, on one hand, an opposition to the use of an *Anglican* liturgy for Roman Catholics (and consequently, a potential source of disunity within general American Catholic liturgical practice) or on the other, the perception that such an attempt would create a diminution of the standard Roman Rite and/or the cur-

rent version used in the United States and other English speaking nations. In either case, such a policy would encourage not only disrespect for an approved Catholic usage but also contradict the principle that *all* legitimate and recognized liturgical rites have their own genius and properties which may not be prejudiced against one other.³⁹

In either case, there are a number of viable alternatives. The traditional Sarum Offertory office could be used for the BDW Liturgy, entirely or by adaptation.⁴⁰ Another possibility could provide for an offertory adapted from other Anglican usages which, unlike those of the United States, have retained or provided a prayer (or prayers) of offering.⁴¹ Finally, a prayer of offering for the gifts, recommended by a less proleptic text (keeping with post-conciliar liturgical sensibilities) could be adapted from other eucharistic liturgies, particularly of the Medieval West.⁴² With regard to the differences between Tudor-period and modern English, traditional and contemporary versions of the prayer could be prepared, as is the case currently with collects and other prayers throughout the BDW. But certainly, the insertion of the standard Roman Presentation prayer, derived from the *seder* (“Blessed are you, Lord God, etc.”), seems to be an incongruity when compared with the surrounding texts of the Mass.

THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

With some degree of historical irony, eliminating Cranmer’s 1549 “Prayer of Consecration,” the Vatican Congregation for Divine Worship determined that all six Eucharistic Prayers contained in the 1979 BCP (two in Rite One and four in Rite Two) would be replaced by the four standard Eucharistic Prayers of the *Sacramentary* (Roman Missal).⁴³ All of the 1979 BCPs Eucharistic Prayers follow a more or less traditional pattern with an introduction, the Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, Epiclesis, Commemorations/Supplications and Doxology.⁴⁴ Rite One contains a Eucharistic Prayer I identical to the sole Anaphora of the 1892 and 1928 editions (and nearly identical to Cranmer’s 1552 version—itsself a paraphrase of the Roman Canon from the *Hanc igitur* onward). Ultimately, it would seem that the BDW commissioners were left with little or no alternative; to do otherwise would have allowed for the use of texts which, from a Catholic perspective, remained substantially unsuitable for the Eucharistic Liturgy.⁴⁵ This is particularly true of any number of passages which could be construed as a denial of the propitiatory-sacrificial nature of the Mass, reducing it to a strictly spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (i.e., a non-metaphysical memorialization of Christ’s passion and death.) Perhaps even more to the point, by the estimation of mid-twentieth century Episcopal Church sources this anaphora

[h]as the momentous effect of aligning the Eucharistic Sacrifice, not with the altar of the Cross of the historic Calvary which belongs to the far away and the long ago, but with the universal and eternal Altar of the Heavenly Intercession.⁴⁶

As such, therefore, Anglican-Reformation eucharistic theology would present a grave difficulty when attempting to express with greater precision received Catholic teaching, including that presented as recently as Vatican Council II.⁴⁷

It must certainly be said that, despite the textual difficulties (from a Catholic perspective), the 1979 Prayer Book remains an outstanding liturgical and literary work for pastoral application, liturgical retrieval and adaptation, and English language liturgical usage. Indeed, the Holy See has tacitly confirmed this assessment by implication, judging most of the 1979 BCP as conformable to Roman Catholic faith and practice, and accounts for a unique and historic initiative in the realm of Christian liturgy.

THE “KING’S ENGLISH?”

A further question concerns the language style in the BDW regarding substitutions from the ICEL *Sacramentary* (Roman Missal). With the insertion of the Roman anaphoras in the BDW, a problem immediately arose with regard to the use of ICEL’s Eucharistic Prayer I (the Roman Canon) within eucharistic Rite One. This discontinuity of idiom easily could be interpreted as a linguistic intrusion, yet after a formal intervention by one of the U.S. Pastoral Provision liturgy commissioners, the Coverdale translation of the Canon was permitted.⁴⁸ This timely intervention provided a standard Western Catholic formula, in Tudor-period English, representing more of an English pre-Reformation use.

The revival of the ancient *anamnesis*, which included the acclamation of the people, was significant enough to be included in Rite Two of the Prayer Book, although the acclamation is omitted in both eucharistic prayers of BCP Rite One, conforming to 1928 and prior usages. The same difficulty arises in Rite One as at the Offertory, namely, the insertion of two idioms from the same language. In this particular instance it happens twice, shifting mid-text in the Eucharistic Prayer from a sixteenth-century translation, to a twentieth-century translation, and back again.⁴⁹ While the need for a kind of parallelism between Rites One and Two can be easily understood, it seems to give the appearance that the cut-and-paste editing used in the Offertory occurs here as well.

If preservation of textual parallels was of sufficiently high importance, it might have been better to provide a separate “traditional” translation of the Roman Missal words of institution and memorial acclamation. Perhaps an even simpler approach might have simply allowed the Coverdale translation in BDW Rite One to be retained in its entirety (i.e., including the omission of the Memorial Acclamation, as in the 1979 BCP Rite One). Given current Western precedents supporting such a practice (e.g., the 1990 Hispano-Mozarabic liturgy and the current indult Tridentine liturgy of 1962 which omit this), such an approach would pose no genuine difficulty or grave liturgical inconsistency.⁵⁰

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS OF THE BOOK OF DIVINE WORSHIP

The promulgation of the Book of Divine Worship has, for the first time in history, provided for the adoption by the Catholic Church of a liturgical form essentially conceived and evolved within a Reformation faith community. The realization of such an unprecedented event, taking place over four centuries from its inception—and aided by less-than-desirable circumstances related to the Episcopal Church’s internal difficulties—has allowed a significant portion of the rich Anglican liturgical tradition to rightly take its place in the Catholic Church alongside the living usages of Milan, Spain, certain Western monastic communities, and Rome itself. Remarkably, the ecumenical and liturgical ramifications of the BDW *editio typica* in the summer of 2003, itself a great event, have gone largely unnoticed. This is particularly worthy of mention given the levels and depth of separation in general between Reformation-based churches and Catholicism, as well as Anglicanism’s ongoing post-nineteenth century retrieval of a Western Catholic identity. The reality of a comprehensive Anglican sacramental usage within the Catholic Church is a truly magnificent achievement liturgically and ecumenically which cannot be underestimated.

At present, the majority of Pastoral Provision faithful and clergy, who have successfully established eight active parishes/missions in the United States, have chosen to exercise the Anglican-use option.⁵¹ In nearly all respects, their music, liturgical texts, appurtenances, worship areas, and so forth, are essentially the same as those found in the average Episcopal parish. The implementation of the BDW (despite problematic items I have identified here) is a powerful testimony to the concept that “significant elements and endowments” of traditions outside the visible, institutional limits of the Catholic Church are revered and cherished.”⁵² Through the Pastoral Provision, Rome and the Catholic hierarchy in America have effectively given recognition and approval to a vast portion of the Anglican heritage as truly *Catholic*. At

the same time, it provides an opportunity for Anglican Christians (at least in the United States) to retain treasured elements of their ecclesial life, comprising an already vast array of local and particular churches, manifesting the particular genius and devotion of each.

The promulgation of the BDW, as a form of the BCP from which it originates, provides an opportunity (for some, a first time) to allow the faithful raised in the Roman liturgical tradition to gain a sense of respect and understanding for Anglican Christians, their way of life and prayer, and their unique and precious forms of worship. As long as these faithful and clergy continue to embrace this heritage, it seems most likely that the new BDW will continue to grow and define itself as a truly Catholic liturgical document, drawing from Anglicanism's profound spiritual and liturgical heritage.

¹ This ecumenical-liturgical consultative body was composed of representatives from English-speaking churches which sought to develop common liturgical texts; a great number of these remain in use among Roman Catholic, Episcopal and many mainline Protestant Churches. The group was founded by the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The texts of ICET were published in 1970 as *Prayers We Have in Common*.

² Cf. *Services for Trial Use: Authorized Alternatives to Prayer Book Services* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation), ix.

³ It also included a version of the now-familiar three-year lectionary cycle, similar in content and arrangement to that of the 1969 Roman Missal.

⁴ *Services for Trial Use* was the first interim Prayer Book to reflect the extensive changes which would later become normative in the official 1979 edition. It was enriched with new orations and offices, and included the restoration or retrieval of many pre-Reformation and patristic practices and rites. The new office of Holy Communion, now renamed "The Holy Eucharist," reflected traditional Western liturgical usages more strongly than any previous version of the American Prayer Book. Some of the major reforms included specifically: the use of the *Trisagion* ("Holy God") as an alternative to the *Kyrie* in the penitential rite; the (implied) option to observe the general confession and absolution at the beginning of the service; allowance for a discretionary omission of the Offertory Sentences; the return of the *Gloria* to its pre-1552 position before the Collect; a restoration of the Rite of Peace (and of its early Medieval location before the Preface); the addition of several new eucharistic anaphoras; an invitation to the reception of Holy Communion derived from the Byzantine Divine Liturgy and Cranmer's formula for distribution.

⁵ Roman Catholic influences in the 1976 and 1979 versions of the Prayer Book are unmistakable. For example, the various formats for the general intercessions found in the Prayer Book are directly attributable to the January, 1966 recommendation of Concilium. (Cf. *The Universal Prayer of the Faithful*, 2nd ed., Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1966.) See also n. 49, below.

⁶ Loc. cit.

⁷ The only differences between the 1976 and 1979 versions consist of the removal of the *Reproaches* of Good Friday and the textual reversal of Daily Evening Prayer and the Order for Worship for the Evening.

⁸ Joseph H. Fichter, *The Pastoral Provisions: Married Catholic Priests* (Kansas City, Missouri:

Sheed & Ward, 1989), 100.

⁹ David Bird, et. al., *Receiving the Vision: The Anglican-Roman Catholic Reality Today* (Collegetown, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1995), 130.

¹⁰ For most of the 1928 Prayer Book revision opponents, unlike their counterparts in the nineteenth century, the issue for the majority was not Romanization as it had been in that previous era, nor even the potential reduction or elimination of a nobler form of English in the liturgy. Rather, the reticence derived from a perceived threat originating in the potential co-opting of changes in liturgical texts by certain groups seeking comparatively radical change in traditional Anglican doctrines and disciplines. (See Fichter, 105.)

¹¹ “Continuing” in the sense that these bodies have “continued” what they believe to be an authentic representation of Anglican doctrine and practice.

¹² The specific and very complex issues of moment, which caused such disturbance in American Episcopal life in the 1970s, go well beyond the scope of this paper. However, mention should be made of the then-recent ordination of eleven women to the presbyterate by a retired bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) in 1974, and the subsequent confirmation of this act by the Denver General Conference. Such an action polarized an already disaffected minority of Episcopalians. The issue of female priestly ordination and the “Prayer Book issue” were often indiscriminately included together in a blanket of grievances against the Episcopal Church at that time. Interestingly enough, many of those who became Roman Catholic and would have at one time opposed both female ordination and extensive Prayer Book revision as Episcopalians, actively embraced the latter, as I will discuss.

¹³ The National Conference of Catholic Bishops was the name adopted for the canonically recognized U.S. Catholic episcopal conference, adopting this name in 1966. In 2001 the organization changed its title to The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

¹⁴ Rev. Jack D. Barker, “The Pastoral Provision for Roman Catholics in the U.S.A.” <<http://www.stmarythevirgin.org/jackbarker.htm>>.

¹⁵ This letter authorizing it bears the signature Cardinal-Prefect Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI).

¹⁶ This was to emphasize that the Anglican usage was the *variant* of a rite, being in this case the Roman. The term “usage” applies as well to the *Ambrosian* and the *Hispanic* or Old Spanish-Mozarabic liturgical offices, which are variants of the Gallican Rite.

¹⁷ Loc cit.

¹⁸ That is, indefinitely. This letter bears the signature of Cardinal-Prefect Paul Augustin Mayer, OSB and that of the dicastery’s secretary, Archbishop (later Cardinal) Virgilio Nöe. The latter was particularly devoted to this project and believed that the widest application of Anglican texts to the BDW should be made. He also personally supervised sessions of the draft committee when held in Rome.

¹⁹ According to an authoritative source, two alterations were made for the *editio typica* of 2003: 1) The BCP Prayers of the People, omitted from the 1987 version of the BDW, were now included as an optional form for use at the celebrant’s discretion. 2) A very slight transcription error occurred in Rome regarding Coverdale’s English language *Canon Missæ* for Rite One. A correction of this error was made in 1999.

²⁰ Loc. cit. This last provision is notable, insofar as it varies from a similar situation arising in the case of the Tridentine Liturgy, which may be celebrated only by indult.

²¹ Ibid.

²² It is difficult to ignore the irony here that many of the same Episcopalians who rejected the 1979 Prayer Book would later embrace it through its altered embodiment in the *Book of Divine Worship*. At the same time, it seems that rejection of the former Book could be attributed to various reasons. For instance, some rejected it strictly for linguistic reasons and/or an affinity for the 1547 order of service. Others, as I have already noted, rejected it because they believed that a reform of the Prayer Book was nothing short of a betrayal of the traditional values of the Episcopal Church, whether liberal or conservative, depending on the individual. In the end, those who joined the Catholic Church seemed quite satisfied, for the most part, with the revisions of the 1979 Prayer Book, with

the alterations borrowed from the Roman Missal.

²³ Coverdale served as Anglican Bishop of Exeter from 1551-1569. The well-known 1553 English version of the Bible, which he translated, bears his name.

²⁴ While the liturgical balance has increasingly shifted toward the Roman Catholic tradition since the Tractarian Movement of the nineteenth century, Reformation sensibilities are still present in the 1979 BCP and should not be easily overlooked. For instance, the 1967 *Prayer Book Studies 21: The Holy Eucharist*, produced as an outline to guide future revisions of the Liturgy, made the following recommendations regarding the composition of eucharistic prayers for a future rite: "Whatever language is adopted should . . . avoid any idea of a propitiatory sacrifice or a repetition of Christ's sacrifice. The 'once for all' character of His work must not be obscured." (Loc. cit., 40.) There can be little doubt that this recommendation, upon comparison with the text of the 1979 edition, was observed.

²⁵ There were also some portions taken from the 1928 BCP, e.g., various supplications from the Litany.

²⁶ Which is as follows, as given also in the 1928 U.S. Prayer Book: "The Body (Blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat (drink this) in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving."

²⁷ The Byzantine Divine Liturgies of St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom.

²⁸ This omission was perhaps among the most obvious. It was composed by Zwingli for his Liturgy of 1551 and adopted by Cranmer in the 1552 BCP formula for administration of Holy Communion. There can be little doubt that it was meant, first of all, to reinforce the Reformation concept that the Eucharist was merely a commemorative/thanksgiving meal, not a propitiatory Sacrifice and secondly, to accommodate a "receptionist" view, i.e., that the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was dependent upon the faith of the individual recipient.

²⁹ The term Offertory in the Roman usage now strictly refers only to the psalm-chant taken during the Presentation Rite, as it did in the early medieval period. However, because Offertory remains a synonym for the Presentation in the Anglican-use liturgy, I retain the term here.

³⁰ E.g., the usages of the Gallican Rite, the Dominicans, the Norbertines, etc.

³¹ D.E.W. Harrison and Michael C. Sansom, *Worship in the Church of England*. (London: SPCK 1982), 83.

³² Cranmer directed the following regarding the Offertory in the 1549 BCP: *Then folowe for the Offertory, one or more . . . entences of holy scripture, to bee song whiles the People doo offer, or els one of them to bee saied by the minister, immediatly afore the offering*. It seems that the "offering" here refers to what is known now as the Eucharistic Prayer.

³³ Many of these remain in the 1979 US edition, which also contains an 1882 provision allowing for the restoration of a chant at this time in the form of a hymn or anthem. Cf. Marion Hatchett. *Commentary on the American Prayer Book* (New York: Seabury, 1989), 348.

³⁴ Cf. The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. *Prayer Book Studies IV: The Eucharistic Liturgy*. (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1953), 194.

Since 1764, the Episcopal Church of Scotland has used an offertory prayer of sorts (adapted from I Chronicles 29:11, 14) in its Prayer Book; within the last half-century other Anglican national churches have imitated this practice, notably those of South Africa, Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and England, itself. However, these prayers are not specifically eucharistic and, in fact, are mostly *generic* prayers of thanksgiving. In England and Wales the current (provisional) alternative to the 1662 Prayer Book, *Common Worship* (2001), offers *seven* prayers of offering. However, with the exception of the adoption of the Roman prayers and one taken from the *Didache*, they follow the practice just mentioned.

³⁵ In *Prayer Book Studies XVII: The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper* (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966) the proposed (study) text provides three texts at the Presentation,

given as Scriptural sentences but intended to be an offertory prayer. In the end, none of these were incorporated into any trial version or typical edition with this stated intention. (Loc. cit., second section, 13)

³⁶ From "Holy Eucharist I," *The Book of Common Prayer*. (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1979), 333.

³⁷ An argument could be made that *any* offertory formulae are of little value in conjunction with the liturgical action and/or are generally proleptic with regard to the consecration of the gifts. Yet custom and the avoidance of a type of liturgical utilitarianism (i.e., reducing the bread and wine into objects *merely set* on the altar for transmutation into something else) also must contribute to the rationale. This would deny the gifts of bread and wine a certain symbolic valence, either as a focal-point for the faithful spiritual sacrifices or a thanksgiving for earthly gifts rendered to God and returned to man as a saving Mystery. Even the majority of the medieval pre-anaphoral offering rites had a value for their day, underscoring the connection between the gifts and the part they play in the liturgical re-presentation of the once and only Sacrifice of the Cross.

³⁸ The Scripture readings and homily would, expectedly, be exempt.

³⁹ Cf. Second Vatican Council, Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 4 and Decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, nos. 2, 6. It should be noted that the principle enunciated in the latter decree applies to all liturgical rites (in the strict sense of the word) or usages of particular churches, whether Latin or Eastern.

⁴⁰ In this case, for the sake of authenticity and historical continuity, the use of a single offering prayer reflects the practice of Sarum, York and most other medieval usages outside Rome, even those which were derivatives of the Roman Rite. This format is also reflected in the twentieth century revised Hispano-Mozarabic Liturgy.

⁴¹ For instance, the prayer found in the South African BCP of 1954 seems quite suitable: "Bless, O Lord, we beseech thee, these thy gifts and sanctify them unto this holy use, that by them we may be fed unto everlasting life of soul and body; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

⁴² A recent and very successful example of such an attempt may be found in the critically revised "Hispano-Mozarabic" usage Liturgy, approved for use in the Archdiocese of Toledo and for all of Spain in 1990. This Iberian usage of the Gallican Rite was almost entirely supplanted by the Roman Rite before the beginning of the sixteenth century. By the early twentieth century, the usage was limited to a special chapel in the Toledo Cathedral, but with the promulgation of the new Hispano-Mozarabic Missal (in Latin and Spanish), this usage has enjoyed a renaissance over the last decade.

The single prayer of offering (or *Sacrificium*) during the Preparation of the Offerings is as follows: "Almighty and eternal God, may this oblation of bread and wine which we, your unworthy servants place upon your altar, be favorably received in your sight. / Receive our act of worship as an acceptable sacrifice to you, that, renewed by your grace we may worthily render fitting praises to you." (Cf. *Ordo Missæ, Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum*. Toledo, 1990.)

A similar revision/retrieval also was accomplished for the Ambrosian usage of the Gallican rite in Milan, and was promulgated in two versions, one in 1981 (in Latin), and one in 1986 (in Italian). Unlike the Offertory used by its Mozarabic "cousin," no provision for a Gallican style offertory was made in this liturgy; it is identical to that of the 1969 Roman Missal. It is difficult to understand why a more traditional version of the Ambrosian offertory office was, in fact, abandoned. Cf. Rinaldo Falsini and Cladio Magnoli. *La Celebrazione Eucharistica nel Messale Romano e Ambrosiano: Testo e Commento* (Milano: Edizioni OR, 1996) and Cesare Alzate, *Ambrosianum Mysterium: La Chiesa di Milano e la sua Tradizione Liturgica*. Archivio Ambrosiano series 81. (Milano: Nuove Edizioni Duomo, 2000).

⁴³ Rite Two contains four eucharistic prayers. Prayer A, which bears a resemblance to Eucharistic Prayer III in the Roman Missal, is something of an adaptation of Prayer I and II from Rite One; Prayer B was very loosely based on the tradition of Hippolytus (cf. Roman Eucharistic Prayer II) and is a conflation of two versions of the Prayer in the 1970 *Services for Trial Use*. (Cf. Hatchett, 375.) Prayer C, composed by the late Episcopal litur-

gist Howard Galley, while bearing similarities to the Alexandrine Liturgy of St. Basil (“St. Mark”), is a thoroughly modern composition. It is the only one in the BCP which provides for interspersed congregational responses (similar to the newer eucharistic prayers approved by Rome in the 1980s). Prayer D is essentially an English translation from the Latin text of Eucharistic Prayer IV in the Roman Missal, with some modifications. (Indeed, in most respects it is a clearer and more accurate translation than ICEL’s 1974 version.)

⁴⁴ The epiclesis historically falls after the Words of Institution only in the Eastern liturgies.

⁴⁵ This touches upon the frequently debated issues of style and content in current Roman Catholic liturgical texts, which Pope John Paul II insisted be “free from doctrinal ambiguity and ideological influence” as well as possess quality prosody “in praise and worship which fosters respect and gratitude for God’s greatness, compassion and power.” (Cf. the *ad limina* visit by the Roman Catholic bishops of the San Francisco Metropolitan Province, December, 1993.)

⁴⁶ *Prayer Book Studies IV: The Eucharistic Liturgy*. (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1953), 262.

⁴⁷ For example, the epiclesis of Prayer B reads “may the Sacrament of the Body of Christ...unite us to your Son in his Sacrifice.” Prayer C, likewise, presents an ambiguous expression in the epicletic supplication concerning the change in the gifts: “Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be [rather than “become”?] the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.” These examples and others strongly suggest (with the possible exception of Prayer D of the BCP) that the wording of the eucharistic prayers had to be more specifically conformed to a Roman Catholic understanding. Other theological differences, such as sanctification, merit after justification, the atonement, the intercession of the Saints and varied notions of the Real Presence could prove equally problematic. Thus, as Zampino observes, “the offering language and the sacrifice language [of the BCP] have not changed—not since 1552. The Real Presence can be identified [in Rite One], but there is no language suggesting that Jesus is either offering or sacrifice.” (In David A. Zampino, Sr. *A Theological Comparison of Eucharistic Metaphors as Expressed in Anglican and Roman Catholic Liturgies*, 30. Unpublished thesis, Marquette University, 2002.) Even when the term “sacrifice of praise” (*sacrificium laudis*) is used in the Roman eucharistic prayers, “it is part of the sacrifice of Jesus, while in the Anglican rite, [i.e., the BCP] it stands alone.” (*Ibid.*, 31.)

It should be noted that the differences between the traditional Roman Canon and the Cranmerian versions of it contain very specific differences highlighting, respectively, Catholic and Anglican doctrine as illustrated by the following examples: That those who will receive the gifts “in remembrance of his [Christ’s] death and passion, may [as a consequence of the remembrance?] be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood; “By the merits and death of thy Son...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,” which might be interpreted to exclude the intercession of the saints and efficacious merit under justification.

Having made these observations, a note of explanation is due at this point. Lest these points be interpreted as a polemic against Anglican-Reformation theology, I mention them in as much detail in order to contrast the two perspectives, Reformation and Roman Catholic. They provide part of the reason, in my opinion, that at least some of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* eucharistic prayers could not be retained within a Roman Catholic liturgical usage.

⁴⁸ It is the same Canon found in the English Missal, an Anglo-Catholic-based work of the mid-twentieth century which combines texts from the respective propers and ordinary found in the 1929 BCP and the so-called Tridentine Roman Missal, translated into Tudor-style English. It was intended for use in “High Church” liturgical settings.

⁴⁹ It could be argued that the Lord’s Prayer is just such an intrusion. However, because the standard, familiar version of the “Our Father” has been said that way in English for several centuries, it seems unlikely that such a discontinuity would be noticed. In fact,

the opposite might be true if otherwise.

⁵⁰ Given that the upcoming ICEL translation of the *Roman Missal*, 3rd edition (which is a work-in-progress as of this writing) will be more attentive to a stricter, literal translation from the Latin master text, while also providing a more formalized version of “worship English,” it seems likely that a future edition of the BDW will be adjusted in places for linguistic parity with the former. (Cf. Congregation of Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, Instruction “On the Use of Vernacular Languages in the Publication of the Books of the Roman Liturgy” [*Liturgiam authenticam*], March 28, 2001.)

⁵¹ As of this writing, active Anglican-use parishes/missions are located in Texas (San Antonio, Houston, Arlington, Fort Worth, and Corpus Christi), South Carolina (Columbia) and New York (New York City).

⁵² Cf. Second Vatican Council, Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis redintegratio*), 3.