An Apology for the Traditional Anglican Liturgy

M.F.M. CLAVIER

Since Vatican II established the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL), Western Christianity has undergone a startling liturgical transformation. Though much work had already been done prior to ICEL, no drastic measures had yet been taken in the various liturgical Churches. The movement stemmed from a common belief shared among liturgical scholars that society had changed so much that older liturgical forms were no longer comprehensible to the general public. Ever accelerating decline in Church membership and polls seemed to back up these suppositions. It was time for a liturgical 'renewal'.

In the Anglican Church the nearly complete abandonment of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* has caused serious divisions.[1] This should have been expected in a Church whose identity was, until recently, so firmly grounded on her Prayer Book. One could argue that the liturgical renewal movement is testing the ability of the Anglican tradition to exist apart from that Prayer Book. Nevertheless, common sentiment has reflected Archbishop Carey's rhetorical question: 'Why should the Church be expected to use a language 300 or 400 years old, just for sentiment's sake?'[2]

That this question reflects common opinion is worrisome because it demonstrates a lamentable grasp of the essence of liturgy. It reveals a concept of liturgy chiefly as a combination of advertisement and ministry to the general population. In other words, it is seen as a tool. As the thinking goes, the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* is out of touch with modern society. While 'advertisement' and 'ministry' are effects of a natural liturgy, they are not its primary purpose. Liturgy is, in fact, a Christ-centred, living action which takes the historical community out of history. The paradox of this statement leads directly to the four paradoxes which I believe define a Christian community and its liturgy: (1) an historically tied versus an eschatologically freed community combined with a liturgy which (2) at once defines and un-defines the members of a community, (3) takes Man to God and God to Man, and (4) makes the un-natural seem natural. The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* performs all these functions in as manner which periodic 'renewals' cannot.

The issue at hand here is not liturgical reform but liturgical renewal. As any cursory comparison of the American 1928 *Book of Common Prayer* with the new liturgies (*Alternative Service Book* or the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer*) will show, there is an enormous difference between reform and renewal. The first is still firmly grounded in the tradition of the community, the second implies a drastic revision and a fresh start. Though the first may lead to the latter, reform and revolution are by no means identical. In the words of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*:

> . . . the Church, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient: *yet so as that the main Body and the Essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against it . . .*[3]

How well do modern Anglican liturgies hold up to these criteria?

I

Christianity is peculiar among religions in that it is based upon a roughly datable historical occurrence: the Incarnation, Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. While this might seem to be an obvious fact, it is important to stress the historicity of these facts for if the Word did not actually become flesh and dwell among us, if he did not actually taste death and overcome it, then there can be no argument for or against liturgical renewal. None of it would matter in the slightest since Christianity would be nothing more than a charming, but false, myth.[4] Liturgy must be centred upon the historical Christ.

So from her very beginning the Church has been grounded in history. The historical nature of the Christian faith is vital, for by its very nature it creates a tradition and continuity. Just as Americans are defined by their history and tradition and draw at least part of their identity from their founding events and fathers, so too do Christians look back on Christ and his ministry.

Yet there is an essential difference. While Americans must be retrospective in seeking their identity and can only approximate their founders, Christians look 'presently' and are joined with the ever present Christ. As A.M. Ramsey explains 'Christ is . . . defined not as the isolated figure of Galilee and Judaea but as one whose people, dead and risen with him, are his own humanity'.[5] With the early Ephesian church there is Christ. So too, with the medieval cathedral parish there is Christ, just as he is with the future urban parish: for the Church is his Body.

Since the Church, as the Body of Christ, is living, so too is her tradition. Christians cannot consider their history as one does secular history, for to believe that the Church is the humanity of Christ is to believe that the Holy Spirit dwells within her. Tradition, thus, becomes not a series of

events but a continuous stream springing from Christ's resurrection. One might say that tradition is the tether which keeps us tied to the historicity of Christ. The Church is not bound to society but to God.

If one broadens the concept of history to include all temporality, it becomes clear that the present Church is only part way along the length of this cord. As the Early Church was obliged to hand down the faith to her future brethren, so too must the current earthly manifestation of the Church remember her descendants. To paraphrase Paul (2 Thess. 3:6), the Church must not 'walk disorderly' but follow the tradition which she has received.

Hence, the earthly Church is temporal insofar as she is tied back through time to the historical occurrence of Christ's Passion. The Church at any given time must remain aware that she is simply a link in a long chain and must therefore consider more than the present situation; she must learn to think both horizontally and vertically. One might say that St Paul should be as much involved in today's ecclesiastical decisions as should the last Christian to live before the end of the world; the former is achieved by reading Scripture and the Church Fathers while the latter is achieved through prayer. The Church is an historical community in the most profound meaning of that word.

And yet the Church is called out of time and out of this world. When one prays or worships one steps out of time and joins with all Christians who have been or ever will be. In the words of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, which uses a phrase drawn from the Early Church liturgies, one worships 'with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven'. This is of enormous significance for it means that our obligation is not to a past and future community but to one which is ever present.

This is best signified by the Eucharist. To quote St Augustine:

> . . . the whole redeemed community, that is to say, the congregation and fellowship of the saints, is offered to God as a universal sacrifice, through the great Priest who offered himself in his suffering for us—so that we might be the body of so great a head—under 'the form of a servant'.[6]

The entire Church past and present comes together in a self-sacrifice to the Father through Christ so that when someone today receives communion, he is mystically joined with everyone else who has ever and will ever receive the same.

This makes for a puzzling paradox. How can something be both historical and eternal at once? Eternity by its very definition goes beyond temporality. As C.S. Lewis explained, eternity is too large to be contained in the temporal world.[7] The answer to this conundrum is the Incarnation. To quote Ramsey again:

> The death and resurrection of the Lord happened once and can never be repeated. The deed was done in history, and yet it is the entry into history of something beyond history which cannot be known in terms of history alone . . . But this event, born in eternity and uttering the voice of God from another

> world, pierces deeply into our order of time, so that the death and resurrection of Christ were known not only as something 'without' but also as something 'within' the disciples who believed.[8]

In exactly the same way the Church is an eternal fellowship which 'pierces deeply into our order of time'. While this might appear to be an impossibility, when one recalls that the Church is the Body of Christ it should become clear that not only is this possible but necessary.

II

The liturgy is an essential element of the incarnational character of the Church. It must therefore share the same historical-eternal paradox which defines the Christian community. However, a careful middle road must be followed. If one overly emphasizes the historical nature of liturgy, then one will end up with a stagnant, 'archaeological' structure. Grace and lively fellowship is replaced by a cumbersome legalism. If one swings to the other pole, stressing the eternal, eschatological nature of the liturgy, then one ends up with an anchorless rite which threatens to fall into liturgical docetism. Tradition and eternity must mutually co-exist in all worship.

This paradox should be apparent in every aspect of the liturgy. Tradition should define an individual's identity through his fellowship while eternity should draw attention away from the Self and to the Godhead. Through tradition one can see the visible discourse of God with humanity, while eternity allows us to respond to that discourse by drawing ourselves into the eschaton and by allowing us to offer 'ourselves, our souls and bodies' to the Father. Finally, by living a corporate life at once within and without perceived nature, the distinction between the 'natural' and the 'super-natural' world should become less discernible. Awe and reverence should come to us as naturally as does love or anger.

It is now left to see if Anglicanism did indeed anchor itself upon a liturgy which met these criteria. If it has not, then without a doubt liturgical renewal is necessary. Care must, however, be taken, for if Anglicanism has indeed centred herself on a greatly impaired liturgy, then her entire tradition must be brought into question. If liturgy fails to point the worshipper to the Father through Christ, then it is no more than an idol.

Let us begin by studying just how the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* has defined Anglicanism. In his book *The Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality* H.R. McAdoo[9] argues persuasively that Anglican piety was from the beginning 'steeped in *The Book of Common Prayer*'.[10] This Prayer Book spirituality defines Anglicanism in much the same way that the *Rule of St Benedict* defines monasticism. It provides daily common recitation of scripture, psalms and canticles (*Opus Dei*) while supporting private prayers (*orationes peculiares*) all of which point towards the Eucharist.[11] In fact, the entire 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* centres the worshipper upon the Eucharist.

By this *Regula*, the Prayer Book 'is informative for Anglicans not only for definition of doctrine and polity but as well for the content and style of spirituality. That book is the matrix'.[12] In other words, the worship and spirituality derived from the Prayer Book defines Anglicanism in much the same way that the Magisterium, canons and Papacy define Roman Catholicism or biblical literalism and extemporaneous prayer define Fundamentalism.

Defines

Of course, one can argue that the *Alternative Service Book* or the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* also provides a *Regula*, one which can be understood by modern society. The major problem with this line of thinking is twofold. First, it demonstrates a horizontal conception of liturgy; it must appeal to the here-and-now congregation. Secondly, it attaches no importance to the effect the old Prayer Book has had on the community. Continuity, so essential to Christian tradition, is thus forgotten.

Literature, because it is a window into the mind of a culture, is an excellent measure of something's impact. This is a widely accepted belief among scholars. For instance, historians examine Christian elements in Old English literature when attempting to measure the influence the Church had on Anglo-Saxon society. Biblical scholars likewise examine the literature of the Near East and Graeco-Roman world to discern outside influences upon Israel.

Consider the impact that such religious poets as John Donne, George Herbert and Henry Vaughan have had on English literature. In each of their works, a strong sense of Anglican spirituality is apparent and, with the latter two, echoes of the *Book of Common Prayer* can be heard throughout.[13] Of course, all three poets were Anglican priests and such allusions might be expected. Priests or not, their, and thus indirectly the Prayer Book's, influence upon seventeenth and eighteenth century poetry cannot be denied.

If, however, one turns to secular English literature, a similar Prayer Book spirit can be discerned in some of the poetry of William Wordsworth, Samuel Coleridge, T.S. Eliot and W.H. Auden.[14] In fact, one could argue that some knowledge of Anglicanism is necessary for anyone doing a critical study of post-Reformation literature. According to C.S.Lewis, the Authorised Version, Shakespeare and the Book of Common Prayer shaped post-medieval English language and literature. This sentiment is echoed by the compilers of *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*:

> If proportionately more space has been given here to passages from the Bible of 1611 and the Prayer Book of 1662 . . . that is because English speaking and English writing are both shot through with phrases that derive from those books, still used, often unwittingly, even though the amount of church-going or Bible-reading has certainly diminished.[15]

A careful consideration of the influence of the *Book of Common Prayer* upon English literature is long overdue.[16] It will no doubt prove to have been enormous.

This leads directly to the crux of the matter of definition: continuity. An identity does not arise immediately. It is achieved over a period of time. Periodic renewal destroys any chance for such an identity ever to develop. It, in fact, anchors the community to the contemporary world instead of the historic Church.

A modern Anglican should be able to recognize an aspect of himself, if not his entirety, in the devotions of any period of Anglicanism.[17] Lancelot Andrewes or John Keble should never be foreigners. *Lex orandi, lex credendi* is the old dictum. If the liturgy is changed, how can the creed possibly remain the same? If the liturgy is renewed, so too will be the creed, especially when the basis for the new liturgies are pre-Chalcedonian liturgies. How can a Church, whose creed is in a constant flux, hope to endure?

'Un-Defines'

Having now discussed at length the ways in which the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* has defined its members, one can move on to show how it also 'un-defines'. Again, A.M. Ramsay provides a useful quote:

> The Church's life is gathered around the Liturgy since it is not only the most important of a series of rites, but the divine act into which all prayers and praises are drawn. The divine office and all other Christian services are links between one Eucharist and the next, and the private prayers of all Christians are (however unconsciously) a part of the Body's one offering of which the Eucharist is the centre.[18]

'The private prayers of all Christians are . . . a part of the Body's one offering' explains, in a nutshell, what is meant by 'un-defining'. Liturgy should draw attention away from the Self and to the Body while not abolishing the fact that each worshipper is a member of that Body. A fine line must be walked between modern individualism and the medieval totalitarian notion of the corpus. The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* fulfils this role in several ways that periodic renewal cannot.

First, since the old Prayer Book was the basis for world-wide Anglican liturgies—variations in American, Canadian and other forms of liturgical wording are negligible—it drew the individual into a perceivable fellowship.[19] No matter what parish one visited, be it 'High', 'Low' or 'Broad', one would recognize and be able to join in the liturgy. Even ardent supporters of the ASB will admit that this will no longer be the case unless every member church of the Anglican Communion adopts a liturgy similar to the ASB.[20]

Second, the very wording of the 1662 liturgy draws attention away from the Self. For example,in the Prayer for All Conditions of Men, the priest

prays 'We pray for the good estate of the Catholick Church; that it may be so guided and governed by thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christian may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life'. The attention of the congregation is focused upon the whole Church. One could quote passage after passage to support the corporate nature of the 1662 Prayer Book (and many have). It is more useful, however, to demonstrate how the form of the liturgy draws the individual into a fellowship.

Priests are required and the people encouraged to say Morning and Evening Prayer daily. The Divine Office, as this is called, has long been recognized as a form of personal devotion. Even so, the old Prayer Book prefers 'we' and 'our' to 'me' and 'my'. Even when praying alone, the worshipper is reminded that he is, in fact, not alone. He is a member of a worshipping community.

As Ramsey points out 'the divine office and all other Christian services are links between one Eucharist and the next'. Consider this with the earlier assertion of H.R. McAdoo that the Prayer Book provides daily common recitation of scripture, psalms and canticles while supporting private prayers all of which point towards the Eucharist. Remember, the Eucharist is the primary demonstration of the Church's transcendent and eternal unity. This being the case, the very nature of the 1662 Prayer Book draws the individual into the Body.

Finally, on a more psychological/sociological level, the continued use of an archaic, sacred language, because it is not encountered in everyday life, creates fellowship. As G. Wainwright states 'Christianity has a history and memory and the psychological power of traditional associations is great'.[21] This works equally well for archaic language. While this may seem to be a superficial argument, the psychological effect of an outward form is a common argument in support of such dominical sacraments as Penance and Extreme Unction, and in support of ritualized worship. Human nature seems to desire signs for reassurance when dealing with the abstract. For example, a kiss or a simple handshake are reassuring signs for love and friendship.

The 1662 Prayer Book therefore performs the paradoxical role of grounding the Christian in a continuous tradition from which he gains an identity while drawing that identity into the eternal Body. 'Renewed' liturgies, while still centring the congregation on the Eucharist, fail to link the members into the historic continuity of the Body's history. In effect, the people become too aware of eternity at the cost of historicity. A similar disposition with regard to the nature of Christ once gave rise to Docetism.[22]

God to Man

A Christian should be ever mindful of the presence of God. Too many people today leave God as they leave the church building, as if the community only existed within the building. While this has always been a

problem, this religious 'schizophrenia' has worsened only recently. This phenomenon is known, euphemistically, as the rise of secularism. Really it borders on apostasy.

Once brought into the Church through baptism, a Christian's entire life should be centred upon worship and devotion. His outlook and morals should be so coloured by Scripture, liturgy and tradition that he will be known to be a Christian by his actions. That this is far from the case today speaks ill of the state of the Church.

The way which liturgies are supposed to lead people into a godly life is threefold. First, through the divine offices, the worshipper's life becomes centred around devotion. In the Anglican tradition, Morning and Evening Prayer perform this function. Daily repetition of these services gives order and discipline to life by providing a *Regula*.

Second, the daily reading of Scripture and memorials of the saints serves to remind the Christian of God's dealing with his people. The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, like other liturgies, calls for Old and New Testament readings and a monthly cycle of the psalms. Unlike many other liturgies, however, the Prayer Book's very wording is pregnant with scriptural reminders. For example 'We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table'.[23] How can anyone versed in the New Testament help but recall the Syro-Phoenician woman's reply to Jesus when he hears this?[24] Almost every prayer, canticle, versicle and response, and collect contains at least one echo from the Bible. The worshippers thus become a people of the Book.

Through its *Regula*, its rhythms, and its biblical allusion, the 1662 Prayer Book in time comes to colour the community's perception of life. God is, in effect, brought into the individual's world. Prayer Book spirituality, therefore, not only provides an identity, but affects the person's manner and outlook.

Man to God

By its very definition, an eschatological liturgy places the worshipping community before God. This is the significance of 'Therefore with Angels, and Archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, ever more praising thee and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory'. Every Catholic liturgy since the earliest known written forms contain a similar reference to the fourth chapter of the Revelation of John. It reminds the congregation that it is now before the throne of God. In other words, a liturgy takes the people 'up' to God, focusing their attention on God.

The eschatological side of liturgy has been widely misunderstood of late. One of the major goals of the liturgical renewal movement is to 'do away with the Church as a distinctive enclosure and eliminate the special character of religious diction and action. The threshold is to be removed;

the Communion is to be an ordinary meal, with loaf passed from hand to hand'.[25] People are to be brought into a goodly fellowship.

While this is by no means an ignoble goal, it nevertheless places the stress on the wrong area. Fellowship is not the goal of a community; God is. People do not join together to worship God, but are brought together through service to him. Godly service is primary; all else stems from that single action. Liturgy, after all, means 'service'.

Something else which has been neglected is the idea behind the word 'holy'. People today banter that word back and forth with little or no conception of its true meaning. To be 'holy' is to be 'separate'. Hence, by describing the Church as 'holy', we proclaim its separate-ness. One has only to turn one's attention to the Hebrew Holy of Holies to understand the true nature of the Church.

The liturgy must therefore draw people out of society to God through service. This must be done doctrinally, psychologically and practically. In other words, when a person is at worship, he should be aware that he has passed, as if through a veil, from the everyday world into the eschatological world. In the words of G. Wainwright 'Where the Eucharist is celebrated, there at one point . . . the future age is thrown forward into the present, eternity is seizing time, the creator is raising nature to its highest destiny, ultimate reality is breaking through from the depths to the surface; for there and then at least, God is all in all'.[26] Man is brought into the Godhead.

As Dorothy Mills Parker explained, Cranmer's Prayer Book was written:

> not in street language but in heightened vernacular, the noblest language of its day, which accounts for its timelessness. The objective was not to reduce worship to a level *immediately* understood by all, but to raise people to a higher level—to inspire, chasten and sanctify them . . .[27]

Notice also that when the Prayer Book was revised in 1662, over a hundred years after the 1549 edition, the revisers kept the 'stylish' Cranmerian language. When the language is 'over our heads'[28] it draws attention to him who is 'above us: the infinite, eternal, radiant God'.[29]

A currently running commercial ends with a subtitle which reads 'Love thy car'. While at first it may seem strange that the archaic possessive pronoun should be used for a automobile commercial, further reflection illustrates the psychological effect of archaism. Since 'thee' and 'thou' were commonly used in worship or found in the Authorised Version, they have gained a tone of authority. 'Love thy car', though a silly gimmick, recalls sanctity while 'Love your car' reminds one of a bumper sticker. Like it or not, over four hundred years of liturgically and biblically used archaisms have created a sacred language. For anyone brought up in the non-Roman Catholic, English tradition, to worship without archaisms takes some adaptation.[30] Strangely, in a world where 'thee' and 'thou' are no longer used, people still need to learn contemporary liturgical language. How many people can recall the modern language Lord's Prayer?

This brings us to the final paradox: treating the unnatural, or supernatural, as the natural. If the Church is both holy and eschatological, then it follows that it is part of the 'supernatural' order. *Supernatural* is a clumsy term; it conjures up images of witches and elves. Considering that at the Fall all creation was subject to sin, then what we perceive to be the supernatural is really only true nature, creation as it was in Eden. Visible nature is thus the sub-natural.

The Church through its liturgy should become accustomed to the 'natural' world. This is not to say that Christians are to be comfortable in the presence of God. Rather, they should not be unaccustomed to awe, reverence and holy fear. 'At the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow', speaks directly to this.[31] In an age when the idea of majesty has been all but lost, it is vital that people should remember that to be at Eucharist is to be in the majesty of God's presence.

Not only that, but the community must also be reminded that the Community of Saints—both Christians who have gone and those who have yet to come—is also gathered reverently at the Eucharist. Out of such an awareness arises humility, a necessary quality in order to be also reverent and filled with awe.[32]

In fact, when one has grown accustomed to the incarnational community, it is far more difficult to be comfortable in the sight of God; for if a person is ever aware of him and the eternal fellowship of the Church, he will also be ever mindful that his sins are laid bare. He can hide nothing.

The new liturgies, so intent on building a visibly vibrant community, have lost sight of the reverential character of worship. Consider, for instance, the difference in feeling which is created by declaring 'God, you take away the sins of the world' or 'You are God and we praise you' instead of 'God, who takest away the sins of the world' or 'We praise thee, O God'.[33] There is as much difference between these two addresses as there is between 'Howdy' and 'Your Grace'.

Supporters of the modern liturgy will, of course, argue that the newer version brings God and the people closer together in a more personal relationship. While this may be true, when godly reverence is absent, such a fellowship becomes too comfortable and God too equal. If people lose their fear of the Almighty, how long will they also fear the consequences of their sins? If fellowship becomes more important than service, how long before the community comes to replace God? No matter how noble the goal, if God is no longer the centre, that goal will become an idol.

Through such language as 'we are not worthy', 'there is no health in us', 'thou sparest when we deserve punishment' and 'acknowledging our wretchedness' the depravity of the human predicament is made manifest. Cranmer's service strips the congregation of human dignity, making it clear that only by God's mercy can it hope to achieve salvation. Through human humility comes Godly reverence.

III

The only remaining argument against the older liturgies is that of ecumenicism. If the Anglican tradition clings so tightly to its identity, how then can a unified Church ever emerge? Today is a day for compromise not for tradition.

If what is meant by a 'unified' Church is one in which all people follow identical liturgies and belong in the same monolithic Church structure, then one should hope that Anglicanism clings to its heritage. From its very beginning, the Church has never been unified under a single tradition. Antioch, Rome, Alexandria and Carthage were all very different churches.

A major problem with the ecumenical liturgical movement is that by grounding itself upon Early Church liturgies, especially Hippolytus, it ignores sixteen hundred years of living, liturgical tradition. The new liturgy, in effect, attempts to achieve its historical role by clinging onto the supposed liturgy now long in the past. This is a very shallow and artificial mechanism. Tradition simply does not work in such an 'archaeological' fashion.

This is not the place to say how a unified Church should be brought about except to say that such a unity must also accept diversity in its traditions. To do otherwise is to deny that the Holy Spirit was ever present in those traditions. If that is the case, then there are many false Churches in this world. Which is the true one?

In reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury's question—'Why should the Church use a language 300 or 400 years old, just for sentiment's sake?'—one can say that the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and all the older accepted revisions fulfil both the historical and the eschatological role of a liturgy. The old Prayer Book is indeed 'a public act by which the worshippers identify themselves with a continuing community and enter into the "myth" of that community—a "myth" which is rooted in the history of Jesus Christ to which the Scripture bears witness'.[34] It has achieved this through defining its community, just as a 'myth' defines its community; by anchoring that community in the living tradition of the Church; and by leading it with reverence 'up' to God and into eternity. Periodic 'renewal' can never hope to fulfil all these roles precisely because it is constantly being renewed. Society has never proved a steady anchor, neither will the language of that society. Only Christ is that firm.

M. CLAVIER is an ordinand of the Anglican Church in America reading for M.T.S. at Duke Divinity School, North Carolina.

NOTES

1 The 1662 BCP will be used for all older Books of Common Prayer (e.g. 1928 American BCP).

2 Quoted by Robert Stackpole, *Not 'Just for Sentiment's Sake': A Defence of Traditional Language Worship*, *Churchman* 1991, p. 263.

3 P.E. More and F.L. Cross edd. *Anglicanism*, (London: SPCK, 1935), p. 167. (Italics are

mine.)

4 The stress here should be on the fallacy rather than the myth. J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis have sufficiently argued that though Christianity is a true faith, it is nevertheless also a myth.
5 A.M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: SPCK, 1990), pp. 33–34.
6 *De Civitate Dei*, X. 6.
7 C.S. Lewis, *The Great Divorce* (New York: Collier Books, 1946), pp. 123–124.
8 Ramsey, p. 28.
9 Formerly Archbishop of Dublin.
10 H.R. McAdoo, *Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1991), p. 54.
11 *Ibid.*, p. 57.
12 Martin Thornton, *English Spirituality* (London, 1963), p. xiii, quoted by McAdoo, p. 54.
13 John E. Booty, *George Herbert: The Temple and The Book of Common Prayer* (*Mosaic* 12, 1979), pp. 76–77.
14 Writers W.H. Auden, C.H. Sisson and P.D. James have been among the most vocal opponents of the liturgical renewal movement. P.D. James is now president of the Prayer Book Society.
15 *The Oxford Book of Quotations* (Oxford: O.U.P., 1980), pp. vi–viii.
16 A.L. Rowse has studied the many echoes of the Prayer Book in Shakespeare's plays 'Shakespeare and the Prayer Book' in *Ritual Murder: Essays on Liturgical Reform*, ed. by B. Morris (Manchester: Caranet Press, 1980), pp. 47–56.
17 The obvious ecumenical questions to which this statement gives rise (e.g. What about identity with the Early Church?) will be dealt with later.
18 Ramsey, pp. 118–119.
19 In the words of the 1948 Lambeth Conference, 'the Book of Common Prayer has been and is so strong a bond of unity . . .' quoted in Dorothy Mills Parker's 'The Issue of the American Prayer Book' in *No Alternative: the Prayer Book Controversy*, edd. D. Martin and P. Mullen (Oxford: Blackwell Publisher, Ltd., 1981), p. 151.
20 W.H. Auden and C.H. Sisson point out that since the English language on to which the ASB has been latched is currently in a flux and English 'vernacular' varies greatly, there can never be a world-wide common, contemporary liturgy.
21 G. Wainwright, 'Language of Liturgy' in *Study of Liturgy*, ed. by C. Jones, G. Wainwright and E. Yarnold (New York: O.U.P., 1978), p. 471.
22 The God-language controversy can be seen as a frightening outgrowth of an anchorless Church.
23 The Prayer of Humble Access.
24 Mk 7:28. 'Yes Lord, but even the little dogs under the table eat from the children's crumbs'.
25 Martin and Mullen, p. 18.
26 G. Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (New York: O.U.P., 1981), p. 120.
27 Parker, p. 151.
28 Quote from the Prince of Wales' speech before the Cranmer Schools Prize, Stackpole *op. cit.*, p. 265.
29 *Ibid.*, p. 265.
30 For instance, most people still recite the Authorised Version when recalling verses from memory. H.R. McAdoo, a staunch supporter of the ASB, admits that when he recalls passages from the Prayer Book it is from the 1662 version (pp. 55–56).
31 Phil 2:9.
32 Reverence and holiness are still very much alive in Eastern Orthodoxy which achieves such devotion through icons and ritual.
33 The *Agnus Dei* and *Te Deum* respectively.
34 G. Wainwright, *The Study of Liturgy*, p. 508.