3

Revival

The tension between the reformed and High Church parties in the Church of England and other churches associated with it, which was described in the previous chapter, would increase during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic revivals occurred. In the Church of England, this tension would come to a head in the early twentieth century with the failed attempt to authorize the 1928 revision of the Book of Common Prayer. This failed authorization left the 1662 Book of Common Prayer as the only authorized text for the Church of England. The Scottish and American churches succeeded in revisions, but they had little impact on the offertory. Some Anglo-Catholics employed devotional materials called missals that they would interleave with the 1662 edition, which included significant material related to the offertory. While authorized texts did not impact the offertory extensively during this period, contextual changes would have a significant impact with the rise of the Ritualists.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The first group, or party as it would be called, to begin the revivals that characterized this era was the Evangelical party.[1] As Kenneth Hylson-Smith acutely observes, "Although the Evangelicals may trace their history back to the Puritans, the Reformers and the Lollards, in its modern phase the story

1. Balleine, *History of the Evangelical Party*, v.

begins in the eighteenth century."[2] The Cambridge Platonists, and their successors the Latitudinarians, had so successfully promulgated the use of reason in religious life that it had changed the very culture of the Church of England such that religion was seen more as a part of civil society than a regenerative force in people's lives.[3]

Several factors contributed to the rise of the Evangelical party in the Church of England including the preaching of George Whitfield, the conversion of John and Charles Wesley, and the pietism of the Moravians. The Evangelical revival gained such momentum that by the 1830s Evangelicals numbered among one-eighth to one-quarter of the clergy in the Church of England, with many of them in the upper hierarchy.[4]

Early Evangelicals and Methodists, reflecting the impact of the Nonjurors and their eucharistic theology, considered the sacraments to be of great importance. For example, William Law, who is considered a second-generation Nonjuror, inspired both Wesleys with his devotionals. Thomas Deacon and John Clayton would also impact John Wesley personally, while Thomas Wilson's *A Short and Plain Instruction for the Better Understanding of the Lord's Supper* was instrumental in Charles Simeon's conversion. These early Methodists and Evangelicals saw the Eucharist as a unique setting in which this enthusiastic discovery and reception of the Gospel could occur.[5]

By the early nineteenth century, the Evangelical revivals waned, but the Evangelical party remained a powerful force in the established church. However, Parliament passed the Catholic Emancipation Act and the Reform Act, in 1829 and 1832, respectively, giving Catholics more freedom in civic life and radically redistributed representation in Parliament.[6] Parliament's attempt to suppress two Irish archbishoprics and eight bishoprics would prove a step too far, however, for a group of men later called the Tractarians.[7] John Keble's sermon entitled "National Apostasy," preached on July 14, 1833, would mark the origin of this movement.[8]

While a relatively small movement, the Tractarians would prove to be influential in terms of the liturgy more by inspiring later generations than by any concern for liturgical change themselves. In fact, the original Tractarians were quite adamant that they were not "ritualists." Instead, the

2. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England*, vii.
3. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England*, 8.
4. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England*, 9–10 and 68.
5. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, 61–78.
6. Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England*, 124–25.
7. Gilley, "Keble, Froude, Newman, and Pusey," 105.
8. Knox, *Tractarian Movement*, 111.

concerns of the Tractarians centered on ecclesiology.[9] However, some of the successors of the Tractarian Movement, known as Ritualists, would emphasize ritual such that it would become one of the greatest controversies in the Church of England. Eventually, Tractarians and Ritualists became known collectively as Anglo-Catholics.

Cries for prayer book revision occurred as early as 1824 and continued through the nineteenth century with Tractarians and Evangelicals contending for it.[10] Two factors heightened the conflict around prayer book revision. First, some members of the Church of England decried the Tractarians' desire to restore true Prayer Book worship as evidence of popery, an attempt to revive liturgical practices that, while technically legal, had not been a part of Anglican worship for a long time. This controversy and a growing anti-Catholic sentiment was exacerbated by the increased presence of Roman Catholics in England due both to immigration after the Napoleonic wars and to conversions from the Church of England. Eventually Pope Pius IX issued a bull declaring the country to be an ecclesiastical province of the Roman Catholic Church and establishing an archbishopric in Westminster and twelve diocesan bishoprics. In response, cries of "papal aggression" rang throughout the country, and growing anti-Catholic sentiment would heighten the conflict between the Ritualists, the successors to the Tractarians, and the Evangelicals.[11]

Several high-profile prosecutions, involving liturgical practices such as the number of altar candles used, the mixing of the chalice, and the eastward position of the celebrant, eventually did more to damage the reputation of the Evangelical Party than to stem the practice of ritualism.[12] Instead, ritualist practices increased significantly during these years.[13]

The heightened conflict became the subject of litigation, which, although largely ineffective in stopping the liturgical practices, involved both ecclesial and secular courts.[14] The Church Association, a religious society founded by the Evangelicals in 1865, became the primary antagonist of the Ritualists and were successful in the prosecution of some clergy. However, most Ritualist clergy simply continued their practices by either narrowly

9. Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 1:212.

10. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 41. See also Spinks, *Rise and Fall*, 137–47.

11. Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 1:303.

12. Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 2:354.

13. Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, 2:319.

14. Carpenter, *Church and People*, 227. See also Spinks, *Incomparable Liturgy*, 149–51.

working around the law or flouting it altogether.[15] Legislative efforts were also made to outlaw the practices.[16]

Eventually these liturgical controversies led to Archbishop Davidson convincing Prime Minister Balfour on March 8, 1904, to appoint a Royal Commission of Ecclesiastical Discipline.[17] The Report of the Royal Commission of Ecclesiastical Discipline would begin the process of prayer book revision in the Church of England. The Proposed Prayer Book passed through the National Assembly and the House of Lords but failed in the House of Commons.[18] Thus, the 1662 Book of Common Prayer remained the only authorized prayer book for the Church of England.

While prayer book revision stalled in the Church of England, it went forward in other provinces of the Anglican Communion.[19] First, the Scottish Church elected to make the English 1662 Prayer Book its official prayer book in 1863. Later in 1884, John Dowden in his classic book *An Historical Account of the Scottish Communion Office*, issued a call that the Scottish rite should return as the official rite.[20] By 1912, an official prayer book was authorized containing both the Scottish Communion Office of 1764 and the English Communion Office from the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.[21] In 1929, the Scottish Episcopal Church would authorize a revision to its prayer book, which remains the authorized version to this day.[22]

During the nineteenth century, the Oxford Movement also influenced the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. For example, William Augustus Muhlenberg, an Anglo-Catholic priest serving an urban parish, sought to break up the long service of Morning Prayer, Litany, and Ante-Communion to allow for weekly communion. As a result, the Muhlenberg Memorial passed by General Convention in 1853 permitted these services to be separated.[23] Controversies surrounding ceremonial were common in this church as well. However, secular litigation would not have occurred due to the separation of church and state in that country. Instead, the General Convention of 1880 appointed a commission to begin the process of prayer

15. Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England*, 128–30.

16. Graber, *Ritual Legislation*, 42–43.

17. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 74–75.

18. For events leading up to prayer book revision, see Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 79–112; for details of the process, see 113–46.

19. The first Lambeth Conference of seventy-six bishops from across the Anglican Communion was convened in 1867.

20. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 63–64.

21. ScBCP1912.

22. ScBCP1929.

23. Moriarty, *Liturgical Revolution*, 14–15.

book revision. Twelve years later, the General Convention authorized the Prayer Book of 1892 and another revision in 1928.[24]

The controversies between the Evangelical and Tractarian/Ritualist/Anglo-Catholic wings of the church had a profound impact on Anglican liturgy during this period. While the authorized texts did not change significantly, proposed prayer books and unauthorized devotional materials illustrated the significance of the conflicts involved. Furthermore, contextual changes during this period played an almost greater role than textual changes for the offertory.

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Despite the several attempts at revision in this period, the offertory texts remained relatively stable. Therefore, instead of a thorough review of the texts in each subsection, I will focus on changes occurring in three provinces: The Church of England, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. In addition, I will analyze a selection of Anglo-Catholic missals. While not technically authorized, they did have widespread use in Anglo-Catholic parishes and would influence future prayer book revisions.

The Church of England—The Convocation Prayer Book and the Proposed Book of Common Prayer of 1927

As cries for prayer book revision increased in the middle of the nineteenth century, the reestablishment of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1852 and the Convocation of York in 1861 provided a means for addressing these concerns. These synodical assemblies, whose histories extend back to the Middle Ages, permitted the concerns of bishops and other clergy to be addressed. Over the next couple of decades, the Convocations met to discuss prayer book revision and produced four reports. Finally, in 1880 along with the fourth report, the Convocations drafted proposals for prayer book revision but did not submit them to Parliament for approval because of concern regarding the Ornaments Rubric. Ritualists had interpreted this rubric, which had been added to the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, to permit more elaborate ceremonial in the liturgy.[25]

24. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 133–40.
25. Cuming, *History of Anglican Worship*, 158.

The differences in the offertory between the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the 1879 *Convocation Prayer Book* involved two minimal changes. The proposed *Convocation Prayer Book* moved the exhortation for examination and the exhortation for negligence before the sermon, very likely to allow them to be said when communion was not occurring. Also, the proposed rubrics gave the priest greater flexibility to determine when to dismiss non-communicants.[26]

Because the *Convocation Prayer Book* failed to be presented to Parliament, active liturgical revision came to a halt. While cries for revision continued on into the twentieth century, no new prayer book was adopted. The first formal effort at revision in the twentieth century was the *Proposed Book of Common Prayer of 1927*, which was put forward to Parliament, but struck down by the House of Commons.[27] Although its adoption was not successful, there were some aspects of the proposed prayer book that should be examined.

One of the changes in the *Proposed Book of Common Prayer of* 1927 was consolidating the rubrics regarding communion found at the beginning and end of the office into a section at the beginning entitled "General Rubricks of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion." This section included some additional rubrics that likely resulted from the controversies over ritualism. For example, "The Order here provided shall not be supplemented by additional prayers, save so far as is herein permitted; nor shall the private devotions of the Priest be such as to hinder, interrupt, or alter the course of the Service" as Anglo-Catholics would add devotional prayers for the priest especially during the offertory.

The proposed Prayer Book also would have added an entirely new section entitled "An Alternative Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion." One of the significant changes in this alternative order is the use of headers throughout the service. The offertory rite contains three distinct headers. First, a header entitled "The Offertory" occurs immediately before the rubrics regarding the offertory sentences. Then, a header called "The Intercession" occurs after the rubrics following the offertory sentences and before the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church. Finally, a header named "The Preparation" occurs after the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church until the Prayer of Humble Access.[28]

26. *Convocation Prayer Book*, 16-11 and 17-8—17-10 (pagination is by section number).

27. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 122–25.

28. EngPropBCP1927, 221–25.

The offertory sentences include some important additions. One is 1 Chr 29:14b, "All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee," from Lancelot Andrewes's "Peculiar Sentences." Three other sentences have oblationary references. Psalm 50:14 refers to offering God thanksgiving and paying one's vows. Psalm 27:6 explicitly uses the word oblation: "I will offer in his dwelling an oblation with great gladness: I will sing and speak praises unto the Lord." Finally, Gen 14:18 references Melchizedek's sacerdotal offering of bread and wine. Had these offertory sentences been authorized, they would have indicated a move away from the Reformation insistence that oblationary language should be avoided.

Two more additions would indicate an intentional movement in a High Church direction. First, the addition of this rubric "it is an ancient tradition of the Church to mingle a little water with the wine" addresses the commixture controversy discussed in the last chapter.[29] Then, the inclusion of the Prayer of Humble Access immediately at the end of the section entitled "The Preparation" after the Comfortable Words is significant.[30] In his *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, Walter Frere suggests this move so that the Prayer of Humble Access no longer interrupts the flow of the Eucharistic Prayer.[31] Thomas Drury, the Evangelical Bishop of Ripon, agreed to this change.[32]

Had this revision been accepted, it would have been the first time in Anglican history that the Prayer of Humble Access would have occurred before the consecration. Thus, the church would be offering itself, along with the elements, to be consecrated rather than responding to the consecration by coming to the table to receive. It could have been perceived as contradicting an evangelical principle that the Eucharist is a response to Christ's oblation of himself once offered and supporting the Catholic principle that the Eucharist is a union of the church with Christ's oblation of himself once offered.[33] While these changes did not occur as the House of Commons failed to authorize the proposed prayer book, they do indicate an important theological development.

29. EngPropBCP1927, 222.
30. EngPropBCP1927, 225.
31. Frere, *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, 186–94.
32. Frere, *Walter Howard Frere*, 74.
33. Cockworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, 99.

The Scottish Episcopal Church—Books of Common Prayer 1912 and 1929

In 1909, the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church appointed a committee to consider revision of the 1764 Scottish Communion Office. This resulting revision was modest, completed and authorized within two years, and published in 1912. Soon after, another committee was appointed to consider a fuller revision of the prayer book. This revision took eight years to complete and was authorized June 14, 1928, the same day that the House of Commons rejected the Proposed Book of Common Prayer for the English church.[34]

A unique feature of the Scottish Books of Common Prayer 1912 and 1929 was the authorization and use of two communion offices, one from the 1662 English Book of Common Prayer with minor deviations and the other largely from the 1764 Scottish Communion Office.[35] The structure of the offertory rite was significantly different between the English and Scottish communion offices. For example, the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church and the general confession occur within the offertory rite in the communion office from the 1662 Book of Common Prayer but occur immediately before communion in the Scottish Communion Office.

In addition to these structural changes, some textual changes to the offertory were important. The offertory sentences of the 1912 Scottish Book of Common Prayer included many of Andrewes's Peculiar Sentences with their oblationary language. Also, it included a rubric regarding commixture in the Scottish communion office but absent from the English communion office, while both included a quotation of 1 Chr 29:11, 14 as the bread and wine are offered.[36] The general rubrics of the 1929 revision permitted the use of either a loaf or wafers for the communion bread and for commixture of the chalice. They also included rubrics that are very likely a response to Anglo-Catholic practices, such as: "It is hereby declared that it is the duty of the Minister to use and observe the Order for Holy Communion without diminishing therefrom or adding thereto. The Order here provided shall not be supplemented by additional prayers save so far as may be ordered or permitted by the Bishop."[37] This rubric was likely an attempt to curtail the Anglo-Catholic practice of adding prayers from the Sarum and Roman

34. Jasper, *Development of the Anglican Liturgy*, 136–38.

35. ScBCP1912, "Scottish Communion Office," n.p.; and ScBCP1929, "Scottish Communion Office," n.p.

36. ScBCP1912, "English Communion Office," n.p., and "Scottish Communion Office," n.p.

37. ScBCP1929, "Scottish Communion Office," n.p.