

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Canadian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_canadian-journal.php

Orthodox, Anglican, and Free Church Contributions to the Liturgical Movement¹

HORTON DAVIES

AS WE HAVE SEEN, the Roman Catholic contribution to the Liturgical Movement was important. Also important was the less easily defined, because interrelated, contribution to liturgical understanding and practice made by the Lutheran, Reformed, Orthodox, and other Communion associated in the Faith and Order Commission² of the Ecumenical Movement in what became officially established as the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948.³ The Faith and Order Conferences at which official representatives of these different Churches met to discuss their common convictions and to explore their differences regarding the understanding of the nature and function of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments, and forms of worship gave an immense stimulus to the Liturgical Movement. This may be recognized readily by consulting the symposia which were issued by the Commission or its subdivisions. Two of the most notable symposia, which before the Lund Conference stressed the differences (for after the Lund Conference in 1955 the emphasis was to be on the biblical and patristic unity underlying differences in the hope of overcoming them) were: *The Ministry and the Sacraments* (1937), edited by R. Dunkerley and A. C. Headlam, and *Ways of Worship* (1951).⁴ Such conferences and their conclusions indicate the growth of a common concentration on the worship of the Church of considerable moment and value. Since, however, these publications are joint reports of committees they are inevitably compromises. They must, therefore, be supplemented by the significant investigations of individual writers of the various non-Roman Communion. Individual contributions to the philosophy, psychology, history, and theology of worship

1. This article along with the companion article which we printed in our last issue on the continental Roman Catholic liturgical movement will form a chapter of *The Ecumenical Century, 1900 to the Present*, which will be the last volume of Dr. Davies' five-volume series *Worship and Theology in England*, published by the Princeton and Oxford University Presses (Ed.).

2. See the following official reports: H. N. Bate (ed.), *Faith and Order* (1927)—the Lausanne Conference proceedings; L. Hodgson (ed.), *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order* (1937)—the Edinburgh Conference proceedings; O. S. Tomkins (ed.), *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order* (1955)—the Lund Conference proceedings.

3. See W. A. Visser t'Hooft (ed.), *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (1949)—report of the Assembly held in Amsterdam in 1948. Accounts of later Assemblies of the World Council of Churches are: W. A. Visser t'Hooft (ed.), *The Evanston Report* (1954) and S. M. Cavert (ed.), *The New Delhi Report* (1962).

4. *One Lord, One Baptism* (Minneapolis, 1961) contains a Faith and Order Report on "The Meaning of Baptism."

have been considerable and have helped to stress the primacy of worship in the ongoing life of the Christian Community.

The names of Rudolf Otto, Friedrich Heiler, Nathan Söderblom, and Yngve Brilioth are themselves an index of the magnitude of the Lutheran contribution. The first three were phenomenologists who explored the distinctive dimensions of religious experience among many religions in different historical contexts, and particularly in the Christian religion. The fourth was a distinguished Church historian. Time will permit only a very sketchy account of their work; *Das Heilige* (translated as *The Idea of the Holy*) has been selected as typical Otto, *Das Gebet* (translated as *Prayer*) as typical Heiler, and *The Living God* as typical Söderblom. It should be noted that Otto and Heiler even produced rather academic liturgical forms as practical fruits of their researches. The concern of all three phenomenologists was to treat the religious experience as *sui generis*, in the tradition of Schleiermacher. All three were erudite philosophers and historians of religions. While Otto and Heiler were attracted by mysticism, Söderblom was equally concerned with the institutional aspects of religion (as was the case with von Hügel). Their importance for our purpose is that they refused to subsume religion under either philosophy or morals, though recognizing that the experiences of awe and adoration necessarily issue in intellectual statements and moral practice.

The core of religion, however, according to Otto, was itself *felt* and in the first encounter with the Divine (God or gods), it was experienced as a polarity of attraction and repulsion: a *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*. The fact that it was a mystery indicated that it could not be comprehended rationally because the Divine transcendence exceeds human grasp. It attracts because it is love, but it repulses because it is Holy Love. Such an analysis, combined with Heiler's study of different religious types of prayer and of mysticism, inevitably encouraged an investigation of worship as the corporate expression of the affectional response to God. Moreover, all rites of Christian worship explore the alternate rhythms of attraction and repulsion, of adoration and thanksgiving, on the one hand, and of confession, on the other. The work of anthropologists was making it abundantly clear that all peoples have practised religious community rites and used ceremonial signs, again emphasizing the importance of ritual and ceremonial.

Yngve Brilioth's work as a church historian contributed even more directly to the impetus to ecumenical and liturgical renewal. In 1930 there first appeared in the English translation by A. G. Hebert (himself the pioneer Anglican promoter of the Liturgical Movement) Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic* (1930). In a wide geographical and historical survey, Brilioth showed that any adequate rite for Holy Communion must contain four basic elements (with the ecumenical complication that every Christian Communion must examine itself to see if any of these complementary elements are missing in its celebration of Mass, Holy Communion, or the Lord's Supper). The first element was *Communion*, which

makes the Eucharist the sharing of a community meal. The second was *Sacrifice*, the concept that the Church is pleading the eternally efficacious Atonement and Reconciliation accomplished by the death of Christ, now the Ever-living Eternal High-Priest, with which is linked the Church's own offering of its members with the Head. The third essential element was the *Eucharist*, the joyous thanksgiving of the Church, which finds its chief expression in the Lord's Prayer offered by him who presides at the worship. The fourth and final element was the *Memorial*, chiefly of the Cross as the culmination of the overflowing of the Divine Love, but, in addition, a recalling of God's mighty acts before and after this pivotal event in sacred history. This was a capital work of ecumenical analysis and synthesis and has been influential in Protestant and even Roman Catholic circles.⁵

Among many Reformed scholars who have contributed significantly to the understanding of worship in our time, one of pre-eminent importance would be Gerhardus Van der Leeuw, a phenomenologist and distinguished historian of religions. His *magnum opus* was translated as *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (1938) and gave significant place to the importance of rites in religion. A more recently issued posthumous volume, now in an English translation, *Sacred and Profane Beauty* (New York, 1963), has important implications for worship. Perhaps his lasting memorial is the foundation of *Studia Liturgica*, "an international and ecumenical quarterly for liturgical research and renewal" which first appeared in 1962. It is significant that Wiebe Vos, its editor and founder, is introduced by the Bishop of Bristol, "as a pupil and disciple of the late Professor G. Van der Leeuw [who] has inherited a deep concern for an ecumenical approach to liturgical matters, in the spirit of that great and gifted pioneer."⁶ Numerous other Reformed scholars have been concerned with the biblical basis of worship, its structure, and its historical development; and the relationship of worship to architecture. They have particularly stressed the co-ordinate importance of Word and Sacrament.⁷

The contribution of the Orthodox churches to the understanding of worship has been far from negligible. Some indication of this has already been given in the way that this understanding fertilized the Maria Laach mystery-theology. The refugee scholars from the Russian Revolution, such as

5. The importance of this analysis can be seen by the fact that it was accepted by Fr. Louis Bouyer, the Oratorian, in *Life and Liturgy*. Subsequent scholarship would, however, add an additional element, the *eschatological*, by which the Church at the Communion Service lives, in anticipation, in the completed Kingdom of God, at the end of the ages. This is a dimension of the life of pre-Constantinian Christianity much emphasized in the early Fathers and the importance of which Dom Gregory Dix has shown in *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1948).

6. *Studia Liturgica* (Rotterdam), Vol. 1, No. 1, 1 (March, 1962).

7. Among these would be: J. D. Benoît, author of *Initiation à la Liturgie*; Jean Cadier, author of *La Cène*; Max Thurian, a prolific writer, theologian, and liturgist of Taizé, the French Reformed Church Community; W. D. Maxwell, William M'Millan, A. L. Drummond, T. H. Keir, Howard Hageman, P. Carnegie Simpson, André Biéler, and the distinguished German church historian, Hans Lietzmann, especially his *Messe und Herrenmahl* (English translation *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of Liturgy* by Dorothy Reeve, with introduction and supplementary essay by R. D. Richardson, appearing in nine fascicules).

Berdyaev, Zernov, and Florovsky, during their peregrinations in France, England, and the United States have given the West a far deeper understanding of Eastern liturgies and spirituality than was possible before. A symptom of this desire for rapprochement in England was the foundation of the Society of St. Sergius and St. Alban, with a membership from the Orthodox Anglican Communions. A desire for closer relationship between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Communions in England led to the foundation of the Society of St. John Chrysostan in 1926 and to the editing of the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* by Dom Bede Winslow, o.s.B. The purpose of both was to encourage the understanding of the doctrines and liturgy of the Eastern Christians.

Three strong emphases of Orthodox theology and spirituality have had important implications for the theology of worship. To offset atomistic individualism, the concept of *Sobornost*—the Christian life as incorporation in Christ and his Community—has been stressed. The mystical Coinherence in Christ is supremely manifested by the worshipping community according to this view. Furthermore, the therapeutic view that idiosyncrasies and alienations are overcome in the salvificatory community under its Head is another important correlate of this conception. A second important emphasis has been Solovyev's recovery of the patristic concept of God-Manhood, so that the purpose of the Incarnate Christ is to take up our humanity to God, in a word, to deify humanity, and this proceeds through the sanctification effected in the Liturgy. Finally, the recovery of the eschatological emphasis owes much to the inspiring writings of Nicholas Berdyaev in which he emphasizes that eternal life is a quality of existence that begins here and now and is not postponed to the hereafter. There again, the Liturgy is where Christians become what they are intended to be and share in the powers of the age to come. Apart from these important theological convictions, the Western world has come to recognize the biblical basis of worship, the intricate symbolism in the mysteries of the Orthodox Eucharist, and to appreciate as never before the stylistic qualities of their icons as pointers to Eternal qualities. Who can estimate the impact of the visual and musical glory of the worship of the Orthodox Churches, particularly those of the Russian and Greek Churches, and their impressive festivals, on Protestant visitors?

THE INFLUENCE OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND

Our immediate concern is merely to provide the briefest sketch of those who were the leaders of liturgical renewal in the Anglican and Free Churches.⁸ Members of the English Roman Catholic Church have not made a contribution to liturgical renewal comparable with that of Roman Catholic scholars in France, Germany, Belgium, or Italy.⁹ Yet Anglican interest in

8. A. H. Couratin in "Liturgiologie 1939-1960" (*Theology*, Vol. LXIII, No. 485, 451-8 [Nov. 1960]) begins with the monitory statement: "In no other branch of theology has interest increased in the last twenty-one years as it has in Liturgy."

9. This is probably because in a predominantly Protestant country any Roman

the development of the Liturgical Movement was, as might be expected, close and continuing. In the first place, the Church of England is unique among Protestant Communion in having retained substantially unchanged its vernacular revision of the late mediaeval Western Rite from the mid sixteenth century to the present day. Furthermore, the Oxford Movement of the 19th century reaffirmed the primacy of the Liturgy. It has, therefore, never ceased to be a *liturgical* Church and, moreover, it finds its nexus of unity, its spiritual regimen, its tradition and way of life in the *Book of Common Prayer*. In addition, as the first Book of Common Prayer was an attempt to revise worship on the basis of Scripture and the Early Church (for these are its twin foundations as the Elizabethan apologists, Jewel and Hooker, ever maintained), Anglicanism has ever had a succession of scholars doing research in the area of the early development of liturgies in East and West. The succession has been maintained in the present century as the names of F. E. Brightman, J. H. Srawley, Gregory Dix, and E. C. Ratcliff will indicate. Furthermore, the services of Anglican liturgical scholars were required in advising the other Provinces of the Anglican Communion when they began their revisions of the Book of Common Prayer in India, South Africa, Canada, and in the Caribbean.¹⁰ The very set-back suffered because of Parliament's refusal to approve the "deposited" Prayer Book in 1927 and 1928 released the services of liturgists for recommendations overseas where the other Provinces were free from the limitations (and advantages) of Erastianism, and even for the exciting ecumenical revisions being prepared for the United Church of South India. Finally, the consecration of several Anglican religious communities to the primacy of worship and spirituality has benefitted the entire Anglican Communion. It is significant that both Father Gabriel Hebert and Dom Gregory Dix belonged, respectively, to the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham and to the Anglican Benedictine Community at Nashdom. The earliest Anglican interpreter of the Continental Liturgical Movement was Father Gabriel Hebert. Learned in the Swedish tongue, he considered it part of his mission to introduce important Swedish theological works into English by his translations. He translated Anders Nygren's *Agape and Eros* and Gustaf Aulen's *Christus Victor*, and also Brilioth's important *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Catholic and Protestant*. Having done this ecumenical work of translation, Hebert showed his own mettle as an interpreter of the Continental Liturgical Movement in *Liturgy and Society: The Function of the Church in the Modern World* (1935). As

Catholic stress on a vernacular liturgy, on the table aspect of the altar, and on the active co-operation of the laity would seem like imitating Protestantism. However, among those who have helped English Roman Catholics to become more aware of the relevance of the Mass to life are the following: Edmund Bishop, Adrian Fortescue, Donald Attwater, Peter Anson, C. C. Martindale, Bernard McElligot, Frederich von Hügel, Clifford Howell, Michael de la Bedoyère, Gregory Murray, Illyd Trethowan, Benedict Stewart, Lawrence Benevot, J. B. O'Donnell, E. Allison Peers, Ronald Knox, Anscar Vonier, Eric Gill, R. H. Connolly, and Ninian Comper. The pioneers of the liturgical movement in English Roman Catholicism were Monsignor O'Connor of Bradford and Eric Gill.

10. For these rites see Bernard Wigan, *The Liturgy in English* (1962). A fine study of the South African Rite is P. B. Hinchcliff's *The South African Liturgy*.

stimulating as it was profound, the book went through five impressions in nine years, and was the subject of keen theological debate far beyond the confines of his own Communion.

The preface indicated the strength and breadth of Hebert's outlook. It averred that this "is an essay on the Church and her message, particularly as embodied in the actual order of the Church and her liturgy, in relation to the problem of belief and a true social life in the confused order of today."¹¹ Here was no merely antiquarian or aesthetic approach, but a plea to consider that the Church in her worship was living her theology, and **renewing her spiritual life**. Here was the claim that the Church was expressing the will of God in a redeemed society which already transcended in principle and partly in reality the divisions of race, nationality, and class that tear the outside world asunder, and was also commissioned to demonstrate this integrating life in the world.

In this pioneering volume, Hebert wrote urgently from a threefold conviction. First, he intended to show that the Church, far from being a collection of individuals or a quasi-legal entity, had its own organic life as the mystical Body of Christ, of which he is the Head and all Christians are members.¹² Secondly, he was concerned to demonstrate that a diluted liberal and accommodating theology had made too easy terms with the times. He opposed the *Zeitgeist* with the Holy Spirit in Bible and Liturgy. Positively he wished to claim that only a reassertion of the Gospel, as recorded in the Bible and witnessed to in the historic Creeds, was both critical and consoling enough to meet the desperate need of man in difficult days, together with the adequacies of Divine and supernatural Grace as communicated through Christ and his Church. Thirdly, he was attempting to show that "the Church in England is as much a missionary Church as the Church in India or Japan."¹³

Hebert believed that the liturgical revival offered a way of presenting Christianity as more than a system of belief (which a purely theological approach would imply) and as more than an individual way of holiness (as piety had often previously regarded spirituality). Christianity could now be presented "as a way of life for the worshipping community"¹⁴ which was a corporate renewal of faith (through the theology proclaimed in Sermon and Sacrament), of commitment and consecration (through the offertory), and an incentive to serve and transform the fragmented society outside as the very mission of the Church. Thus the evangelical, liturgical, and sociological are seen to be three correlated aspects of Christian life focused in the corporate Christian cultus.

This theoretical programme was to find its practical expression in the Parish Communion and more popularly in the *Parish and People* movement and magazine. It is a tribute to Hebert's persuasiveness that his advocacy

11. *Liturgy and Society*, p. 7.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

wrought a fundamental change in many Anglican parishes so that eight o'clock morning Communion and Matins at 10:30 or 11:00 a.m. were less well attended than the Parish Communion at 9:00 or 9:30 a.m., followed by a Parish breakfast.¹⁵

The master-work in the interpretation of the history and the significance of Liturgy from an Anglican viewpoint was *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1948), the work of Dom Gregory Dix, the witty, erudite, and original monk of the Anglican Benedictine house at Nashdom. The work of fourteen years of study and fourteen months of writing, it follows the development of the pattern of the Liturgy from its twofold origin as a combination of the synaxis (or Liturgy of the Spirit) deriving from the Synagogue and the Eucharist deriving from the upper Room through its patristic, mediaeval, Reformation and counter-Reformation, as well as modern developments, as it takes on the characteristic colouring of different peoples and centuries. Essentially he claims it has a "Four Action" shape: the "taking" of bread and wine (the offertory); the "giving of thanks" or "blessing" (the eucharistic prayer with its preliminary dialogue of invitation with its parallel in the Preface of the Prayer of Consecration); the "breaking" or fraction; and the sharing or "communion." The most important chapters are the ninth ("The Meaning of the Eucharist" with its stress on the Eucharist as Action, as manifestation, and on Eschatology and the Eucharist)¹⁶ and the eleventh ("The Sanctification of Time"), where Dom Gregory shows that in the fourth century worship, since Christianity under Constantine became a *religio licita*, was public and not private, less eschatological and more conscious of time. The worldly contempt for Christianity in several countries may indeed cause the twentieth century to rediscover the pre-Constantine characteristic of its worship as a mystery which is focused on eternity; but while the social implications of the Liturgy are recognized, there need be no withdrawal except for return and gathering only for scattering.

The contemporary implications of the Eucharist are finely described in the prefatory account of the concepts of man and society implicit in the Eucharist which speak of modern man's relation to society and his need to obtain a sufficiency of material things. "There is," says Dom Gregory, "a Christian pattern of a solution which is expressed for us and by us at the Eucharist."¹⁷ The individual's need of material things even for the good life is emphasized and met, yet the needs are met from the resources of the whole society, which are offered by each of its members for all. This analysis culminates in a *tour de force* which must be cited in full:

Over against the dissatisfied 'Acquisitive Man' and his no less avid successor the dehumanised 'Mass-Man' of our economically focussed societies insecurely organised for time, Christianity sets the type of 'Eucharistic Man'—man giving

15. This is described as worked out in different city, suburban, and rural parishes in the volume Hebert edited, *The Parish Communion* (published in 1937 and reissued 1939, 1944, and 1954).

16. "The Eucharist is nothing else but the eternal gesture of the Son of Man towards His Father as He passes into the Kingdom of God" (p. 266).

17. *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. xviii.

thanks with the product of his labours upon the gifts of God, and daily rejoicing with his fellows in the worshipping society which is grounded in eternity. This is man to whom it was promised on the night before Calvary that he should henceforth eat and drink at the table of God and be a king. This is not only a more joyful and more humane ideal. It is the divine and only authentic conception of the meaning of all human life and its realization is in the eucharist.¹⁸

Though particular parts of Dix's reconstruction and interpretation may be criticized,¹⁹ the extraordinary sweep of the perspective and the verve of the writing, and the perceptiveness and contemporary relevance of this invigorating study, are undeniable. In consequence, the volume was widely studied in many Christian Communion, more especially as it is a summary of liturgical research for the previous half-century.

A scholar of at least equal erudition and greater caution is Professor E. C. Ratcliff. At Oxford, where he was University Lecturer in Liturgiology and Fellow of Queen's College, at London, where he was Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and at Cambridge, where he was Ely Professor and subsequently Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Ratcliff's influence has been considerable. His lectures on early Christian liturgies and on the Book of Common Prayer, which are masterpieces of compressed and lucid erudition, his careful tutorials on the liturgical texts, his supervision of research students, now holding scholastic posts in many countries,²⁰ his advice to revisers or makers of liturgies in other lands, and his membership of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England are indications of a quiet but deeply pervasive and continuous influence. His written works are a mere fraction of his hidden resources. They include an admirable chapter on "Christian Worship and Liturgy" in K. E. Kirk's *The Study of Theology* (1939), another in Nuttall and Chadwick's *From Unity to Uniformity, 1662-1962* on the Savoy Conference preceding the 1661 revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and yet another assessing Cranmer as liturgist in *Three Commemorative Lectures Delivered in Lambeth Palace* (1956). His books include the magisterial *The Booke of Common Prayer of the Church of England: Its Making and Revisions, M.D.xlix-M.D. clxi* (1949) and a superb rationale of the English Coronation Rite.²¹

18. *Ibid.*, pp. xviii-xix.

19. Exception has been taken to the following features in the work: an overemphasis on the Hellenistic contrast between the eternal and the temporal with insufficient recognition of the biblical conception of time as fulfilment and *dénouement*; a supposed caricature of Reformed doctrines of the Church and of the Lord's Supper as, respectively, atomistic and memorialist (forgetting Calvin's understanding of the Church as the Communion of the elect and the sacraments as *Sigilla Verbi*); and the presumption that contrary to Jeremiah, the context of the Last Supper was a *chaburah*, not a Passover meal.

20. Four may be mentioned: A. H. Couratin, now Archdeacon of Durham, formerly Principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford, and Ratcliff's successor as University Lecturer in Liturgiology at Oxford; C. W. Dugmore, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of London at King's College; Professor James F. White, of the School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, author of *The Cambridge Movement* (1962); and the present author.

21. Reference should also be made to two important articles by E. C. Ratcliff, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora" in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. I, 29-36, 125-34 (1950), which claims that the primitive consecration prayer was a prayer of thanksgiving culminating in the Sanctus and excluding invocation and oblation.

In our own time, largely because the Church is no longer an established or privileged institution in the secular state, liturgics has come to be a study of the Church's self-understanding, intelligible to the church member and the interested enquirer. To this necessary task of popularization the Anglican Evelyn Underhill, student of mysticism, devoted disciple of Baron Friedrich von Hügel (a Roman Catholic with strong Anglican sympathies), contributed admirably by her interconfessional study *Worship* which appeared in 1936 and which has, in paperback, a continuing widespread influence. Other Anglican exemplars of *vulgarization haute* are: Colin Dunlop in *Anglican Public Worship* (1953); J. A. T. Robinson in *Liturgy Coming to Life* (1961) and in a controversial chapter in his iconoclastic volume *Honest to God* (1963); Basil Minchin in his series *Worship in the Body of Christ* (which began in 1958); and the work of the Birmingham trio of J. Gordon Davies, Gilbert Cope, and D. A. Tytler, as well as many others.

Father Lionel Thornton's massive and detailed Biblical and theological studies of the nature of the Church have also had a considerable indirect influence on the understanding of the liturgy.²²

Nor should the careful scholarly researches into liturgy, spirituality, and hymnody by many other Anglican scholars be forgotten. Two outstanding volumes were Bishop Kenneth Kirk's *The Vision of God* (1934) and G. W. O. Addleshaw and F. Etchells' *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship* (1950). Important studies of Anglican liturgical revisions were made by R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, A. C. Don and G. Donaldson. The chief researchers into the history of psalmody and hymnody in the English language were John Julian and M. Frost. A. M. Allchin and G. J. Stranks studied the history of English spirituality. Moreover, E. Milner-White and A. H. Couratin were admirable composers of litanies and collects.

A significant feature of this century has been the increasing interest of the "Low Church" or Evangelical wing in the history and theology of worship. Its representatives have made notable contributions in this field, among them C. F. D. Moule and C. W. Bowles, and A. J. MacDonald, G. F. Bromiley, D. E. Harrison, and F. W. Dillistone.

In its cumulative impact the concentration of so many Anglican scholars in the field of worship has been most impressive.

In the Free Churches the signs of an appreciation of the Liturgical Movement are more difficult to discern because they are more easily discovered in the ferment of discussions on worship in the denominational quarterlies and newspapers or in the denominational revisions of manuals of worship than in books that drew widespread attention.²³ One book, however, was a

22. The following of L. S. Thornton's books are pertinent: *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* (1942), *The Dominion of Christ* (1952), *Christ and the Church* (1956), as well as his organic and Whiteheadian conception of the nature of Christ's union with the Father, the Universe, and the Church in *The Incarnate Lord* (1928).

23. *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer*, anonymously edited by J. M. Lloyd Thomas, had already appeared in 1929. It is perhaps one of the few significant contributions of the moribund but fascinating "Free Catholic Movement" of which Lloyd Thomas and W. E. Orchard were the leaders.

notable contribution to the Free Church reappraisal of worship in the light of the long Christian tradition. It might be regarded as a Free Church counterpart to the Anglican compilation *Liturgy and Worship*, edited by W. K. Lowther Clarke. Planned by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, the newly appointed Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, it was entitled *Christian Worship, Studies in Its History and Meaning* (1936). The foreword claimed that the book, written by members of Mansfield College, was "A Systematic Study of Public Worship" and hoped that "our historical studies may be accepted as a serious contribution to this great subject and that our later chapters in particular, may serve as an interpretation, and in this sense as a vindication, of the common tradition of our Reformed Churches." The first part dealt with Biblical Studies in which H. Wheeler Robinson, T. W. Manson, W. H. Cadman, and C. H. Dodd contributed chapters. The second consisted of historical studies with chapters by J. V. Bartlet on "Christian Worship as reflected in Ancient Liturgies," by R. S. Franks on mediaeval worship, and by James Moffatt, C. J. Cadoux, J. S. Whale, and A. G. Mathews respectively, on Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and the Puritans. The third part concluded with contemporary studies on "Psychological Considerations" by E. R. Micklem, "Preaching" by Edward Shillito, "Prayer and Praise" by Kenneth Parry, and "The Sacraments" by the Editor. It was the first time that as notable a group of Free Church Scholars (Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and a Baptist) had surveyed the history of the great Christian tradition of worship and indicated its primary importance for their Communion which hitherto had been thought by others (and perhaps even by neglect among themselves) to emphasize preaching to the derogation of prayers and sacraments. Apart from its intrinsic importance, the volume was a portent.

It was not long before several authors in the tradition of the English Free Churches were stressing the importance of worship in their books. Apart from further works by the members of the Mansfield College symposium, contributions made by other Congregationalists were: Bernard Lord Manning (notably in *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts* and *Essays on Orthodox Dissent*); John Marsh (in both his historical introduction to *A Book of Public Worship Compiled for the Use of Congregationalists*²⁴ and his important essay in *Ways of Worship* edited by Edwall, Hayman, and Maxwell in 1951); James Todd in *Prayers and Services for Christian Festivals* (1951), a companion volume to *A Book of Public Worship*. Erik Routley wrote several important books in the area of church music and the theology of hymnody. The Congregationalists may, indeed, be regarded as pioneers in England of the Free Church renewal of worship in the present day.

Among English Presbyterians the name of Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson with his concern for a Catholic Evangelicalism was pre-eminent. But, of course, the splendid influence of the larger Sister Communion, the Church of Scot-

24. Published in London in 1948 and edited by John Huxtable, John Marsh, Romilly Micklem, and James Todd.

land, must not be forgotten. There was no Communion during this period to which the English Free Churches turned with greater admiration and respect in the area of theology and worship than the Church of Scotland. The 1940 edition of the *Book of Common Order*, with its splendidly comprehensive First Order for Holy Communion was taken as the pattern of Reformed worship. The writings of its liturgiologists, such as Millar Patrick, William M'Millan, W. D. Maxwell, Allan McArthur, and D. H. Hislop, were as widely read in England and especially among Free Church ministers as were the works of its distinguished theologians.

The Methodists contributed to the revival of interest in worship with several interesting historical studies. Many of them seemed to imply that they wished the umbilical knot linking them to the Church of England in the eighteenth century had never been severed. As there were "High Church" Genevans among Presbyterians and Congregationalists, so there were several "High Church" Methodists. R. Newton Flew, Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, produced a most erudite study of *Christian Perfection* through nineteen centuries in East and West. J. E. Rattenbury wrote *Vital Elements in Public Worship* (1936), *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley* (1948), and *Thoughts on Holy Communion* (1948) and stressed that John Wesley never ceased to be a high churchman in his evaluation of Holy Communion. In two careful works John C. Bowmer wrote of *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism* (1951) and brought the story more succinctly up to the present in *The Lord's Supper in Methodism, 1791-1960* (1961). John Bishop wrote of *Methodist Worship in Relation to Free Church Worship* (1950). Perhaps the most popular of all exemplars of the Catholicity of this branch of Protestantism was the winsome A. E. Whitham. Three volumes of his which were correlated collections of articles with a wide sale were *The Pastures of His Presence*, *The Culture and Discipline of the Spiritual Life*, and *The Catholic Christ*. They stressed that Catholic and Protestant saints were united in the *imitatio Christi* and, moreover, of the Incarnate Christ. More recently A. Raymond George has combined a biblical and a liturgical interest in *Communion with God in the New Testament* (1958) and is co-editor with J. Gordon Davies of a series of volumes entitled "Ecumenical Studies in Worship." T. S. Garrett, a Methodist missionary in South India, has been a notable exponent of worship in general and of the Liturgy of the Church of South India in particular.²⁵ Gordon S. Wakefield's *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (1957) reflected a choice of topic unusual for Methodist writers and important in seeing the clear parallels between Puritan and Methodist forms of piety. Geoffrey Parrinder makes a welcome contribution to comparative religion in *Worship in the World's Religions* (1961).

Although the Baptists share the same type of polity as the Congrega-

25. See his *Christian Worship* (1961) and *Worship in the Church of South India* (1958).

tionalists and have shared with them the social indignity and the spiritual rigour of espousing orthodox dissent, yet their differences on the issue of believers' baptism as contrasted with paedobaptism have tended to keep them apart and to the left of the Congregationalists in their frequent iconoclasm in worship. "High Church" Baptists have had a difficult path to tread. All the more creditable for their courage, therefore, have been the contributions of H. Wheeler Robinson, D. Tait Patterson, Neville Clarke, Stephen Winward, and Ernest A. Payne. No more liturgically advanced directory of worship in any of the Free Churches has been prepared than *Orders and Prayers for Church Worship*, by Ernest A. Payne and Stephen F. Winward (1962). While they do not jettison the flexibility of the Free Church tradition, they undergird it with a traditional theological and liturgical structure. Thus they keep the essential elements of the traditional liturgy of the Word and of the Upper Room, while refusing to become liturgical literalists insisting on sacrosanct and inalterable words and phrases. This achievement is all the more striking as this denomination in England has traditionally, since the time of the first Cambridge don to become a "Se-Baptist" John Smyth, insisted on the priority of the untrammelled Holy Spirit in worship and denigrated the priestly in order to exalt the prophetic. That prophet and priest join hands in this manual is the most striking proof of the triple and interrelated impact of the Biblical, Ecumenical and Liturgical Movements in crossing denominational boundaries and overcoming even hard and fast and almost unexaminable denominational traditions which were no longer guides but chains.

AN APPRAISAL

It is abundantly manifest that the England of the twentieth century has manifested a remarkable interconfessional renewal of worship. However, when full appreciation is given to the Liturgical Movement as one of the major signs and, indeed, a major medium of the "Twentieth Century Reformation," like all mixed Divine-human institutions it is in danger of claiming too much for itself. Two chief dangers must be guarded against: the first is aestheticism and the second is antiquarianism. It might be thought that Guéranger rather than his successors was in greater danger of falling a victim to these tendencies, particularly as his pioneering work was out of touch with parish life, whereas the Liturgical Institutes, Liturgical Weeks, and Liturgical Years of the present time have in mind the needs of secular priests and their flocks as well as of members of the religious communities. Certainly the dangers are minimized by the emphatic concern in the present phase of the Liturgical Movement for the restoration to the laity of their privileges as participants in the Liturgy; but the dangers are not entirely eliminated.

The danger of antiquarianism is great, although the exponents of the Movement have objected to the fossilization and petrification of the Tridentine Liturgy and even to the roseate view of the mediaeval rites, because the

restitution of the patristic ideal without a consideration of the changed circumstances of the present century could be a more dangerous, because a more remote, form of antiquarianism. Furthermore, while the Eastern Church in the early centuries of the Christian era undertook much eleemosynary work for "the household of faith," it was not distinguished for any prophetic attempt to remould the conditions of society into a more just and Christian order. In fact, it was ethically almost static so that in the Byzantine Church-State the chosen people became almost the frozen people. A contemporary expression of the Liturgy, while being faithful to the Christian tradition, must apply itself creatively to stimulating the twentieth century's paramount concern for establishing social justice and winning the artisan in a way that was beneath the contempt of the Byzantine theocratic rulers.

The danger of aestheticism is the greater in the Catholic and Orthodox areas of Christendom because they have ever inspired the visual and plastic arts with the sacramental principle deriving from the Incarnation, whereas Protestantism (with some great exceptions such as Durer and Rembrandt) has been afraid of absolutizing the finite in art and of confusing the Creator with the created (idolatry). The tendency of the Catholic and Orthodox branches of the Church to equate the Church with the Kingdom of God (not to see the Church as the main but not exclusive agent of the Kingdom), and their assumption that the Church is the extension of the Incarnation, lead them into the danger of sanctifying the social *status quo*. Protestantism's danger, on the contrary, is that of a too ready response to the new currents of thought in the world and therefore of contemporary relevance at the cost of dilution of the historic faith. Both Catholicism and Orthodoxy, on the one hand, and Protestantism, on the other, need the criticism of the Gospel, with its prophetic role of exposing the easy conformities and blind idolatries of institutionalism and its aesthetic trappings. The faithful proclamation of the Gospel in its fulness will not permit the making of the finite absolute or the equation of the symbol with the reality it represents and also veils. The Gospel proclaimed in its freedom and fulness is the countervailing correction of the supposedly inherent efficacy of the most perfect and lovely liturgy, the necessary distinguisher between the Creator and the works of men who are only derivatively creators. While the Liturgy should and often does proclaim the Gospel, it can also mute it, particularly in so-called "Liturgical preaching" where the unbound Word of God is thought sometimes to be a subjective element in an objective rite, and collects and sequences, not the written record of God's revelation, are made the basis of liturgical homilies.

It should not be forgotten, moreover, that even when the term "priesthood" is interpreted to include the laity in the Liturgy, the entire *Sacrificium laudis* is only a human response inspired by the Sacrifice of Him who, besides being our Great High Priest, is also a Prophet and King. His prophetic authority and his kingly rule are made known in the preaching of the Word, witnessed to by the interior action of the Holy Spirit. The ultimate restraint, then, on any aestheticism and antiquarianism in the Liturgical Movement

is the giving of a co-ordinate place to the Word and the Sacrament, so that the Liturgy of the Word balances and reinforces the Liturgy of the Upper Room, and the concern that from worship shall spring mission and the more just reordering of the life of the world in its political, economic, and social aspects. Today as never before Liturgy is correlated with Life.²⁶

26. Perhaps the most promising feature of the latest phase of the Liturgical Movement is that in the Roman Catholic Church, accelerated by the Second Vatican Council, "a new period in the history of the Roman Liturgy is coming under our eyes, and that *The Epoch of Changelessness or Rubricism* is over." In this judgment of Archdeacon Couratin ("Liturgiology, 1939-1960," p. 452), he referred to the Roman decrees of 1947 and 1955 which introduced not only changes in the simplification of the rubrics of the Breviary and the Missal, but also the new Paschal Vigil for Holy Week.