

Lambeth 1958 and the "Liturgy for Africa"

BY ROGER BECKWITH

AT the turn of the year a slim booklet appeared from the S.P.C.K. press in London under the title *A Liturgy for Africa*. It is a holy communion service, originally prepared at the wish of the Anglican archbishops in Africa by the Archbishop of Uganda, Dr. L. W. Brown, but drastically revised at a meeting of representatives of the five African provinces in 1963, and now, after further emendation, published. It will be put into such experimental use as the authorities in each province and diocese shall decide, and it is expected that after some years of experimentation, a decision will be taken about final revision and permanent authorization.

* * * *

The *Liturgy for Africa*, whatever its merits, is a document of great significance. It is the first Anglican communion service in which a deliberate attempt has been made (as was explicitly declared in the first draft, and is quite clear from the printed version) to follow the advice given by the committee which reported on the Book of Common Prayer at the 1958 Lambeth Conference. (The Canadian, Indian, Japanese, and experimental West Indian liturgies were at an advanced stage of preparation in 1958, and give little sign of having been affected.) Since this advice was of so remarkable a character, it seems very possible that the *Liturgy* will be discussed at the 1968 Conference, and if it is emphatically approved it may well set the direction for eucharistic revision in the Anglican Communion over a long period of time. But even if Lambeth 1968 does not discuss the *Liturgy*, the fact that the Lambeth committee's suggestions have now been put into practice is bound to influence subsequent attempts, especially as another liturgy of the same sort is known to be in preparation and is due to appear this month.

The Lambeth committee's report is remarkably wide-ranging, and gives advice on the revision of most parts of the Prayer Book. The pages that chiefly concern us here, however, are the opening ones, since it is in these that the committee deals with the Prayer Book in general and with the holy communion service, and from these, therefore, the *Liturgy for Africa* chiefly takes its lead. Among the committee's bold suggestions are the following. The 1662 Prayer Book should no longer be regarded as the norm of doctrine and worship and the uniting factor in the Anglican Communion, as it has been hitherto. Rather,

* (Among those to whom the *Liturgy for Africa* was sent for comment in the course of its preparation was the Liturgy Group associated with the Evangelical Anglican research centre at Oxford, Latimer House. The author of this assessment, who is the present chairman of the group, has drawn freely upon the work of all members of the group.)

certain specified features of the Prayer Book (listed as of primary or secondary importance), combined with membership of the catholic church, adherence to the catholic faith, and possession of the historic episcopate (which are even more important), and with the common historical roots of the Anglican churches, may be regarded as uniting factors, but the Prayer Book as a whole should not. In any part of the Anglican Communion where the Prayer Book is being revised, these listed features could with advantage be maintained, and the primary list ought to be ; yet the unity of the Anglican Communion ultimately lies in none of these features, but in the fact that " we are a federation of Provinces and Dioceses of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, each being served and governed by a Catholic and Apostolic Ministry, and each believing the Catholic faith ".

To the features of the Prayer Book which the committee has listed as of primary or secondary importance, it adds a third list (without saying where these rank in importance) containing ancient or " primitive " features of worship which would likewise help to unite the Anglican Communion, if by general agreement they could be restored. It would similarly help the cause of Anglican unity if individual services could be revised so as to conform to an agreed structure. The committee goes into some detail as to the structure it envisages for the communion service and the service of adult baptism—not the structure of 1662, but a revision of that structure, partly on primitive and partly on functional lines. It is a structure, and not perhaps a service (the language used is here obscure), in which the committee wishes the Anglican Communion to be united, but it thinks it regrettable if more than one service is used for the holy communion in a single province. Two pages are devoted to a doctrinal excursion entitled " The Eucharistic Sacrifice ", in which the view taken is that controversy on this subject can now be " laid aside ", and towards the end of its report the committee deals with " Prayers for the Departed ", recommending that these should be optional.

In our examination of the *Liturgy for Africa* it will be convenient to follow the general lines of the Lambeth committee's report, and to look at it first in the light of the proposal to abandon 1662 as a norm, secondly in the light of the proposed new structure for all Anglican communion services, and thirdly in the light of the suggestions regarding the eucharistic sacrifice and prayers for the dead.

* * * *

The committee's proposal to abandon 1662 as a norm of doctrine is, of course, a separate issue from its proposal to abandon 1662 as a norm of worship. Both aspects of the proposal are to some extent qualified by the two lists of features in the Prayer Book (either of primary or of secondary importance) which the committee desires to see retained. The list of primary features comprises the use of the Scriptures and two creeds, of the dominical sacraments, and of episcopal confirmation and ordination. The list of secondary features comprises simple, common prayer in the vernacular, a balance between word and sacrament, the use of the Psalms, the inclusion of a creed in morning prayer, evening prayer and the holy communion, the reading of the Old Testament (as well as the New) at morning and evening prayer, and

the honouring of the saints without invocation. These are only the bare bones of the lists, but there is in fact little elaboration of any item. It would be easy to criticize the lists, on the grounds of the arbitrary selection of items, the unjustifiable assumption that those in the first list are more important than those in the second, and the complete failure to distinguish what is biblical from what is traditional (each list being a mixture of both). But the chief thing to notice is how little the lists contain. Apart from the text of the Bible (read according to new courses of lections, as the committee later suggests) and the text of the two creeds retained, a Prayer Book revised on these lines would hardly need to contain a word of 1662, and though it would have many corresponding services, their structure, like their text, could be completely new. Moreover, the only *doctrines* of 1662 that would necessarily appear would be the doctrines of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds: those of the Athanasian Creed and the Catechism would not have to be included, any more than the documents which embody them, and the same is true of the doctrines which 1662 expresses, either explicitly or by implication, in the rest of its services.

In putting forward this idea that 1662 should cease to be a norm, the committee was conscious of disagreeing with one of the committees that reported at the previous Lambeth Conference, and indeed with the tradition of the Lambeth Conferences in general. There is no doubt about this disagreement, for ever since the 1897 Conference, when the Thirty-Nine Articles began to fall into disfavour, the Prayer Book has been regarded by the Lambeth Conference as the great standard of doctrine in the Anglican Communion (see the 1897, 1930 and 1948 Encyclical Letters, Resolution 36 of 1920, and Resolution 49 of 1930, besides committee reports), and it has likewise been regarded as the vital bond which unites all Anglican in a common worship (see, besides committee reports, the Encyclical Letters of 1888 and 1948, Resolution 10 of 1888, Resolution 24 of 1908, and Resolution 78 of 1948, the only deviation being Resolution 36 and the corresponding committee report of 1920).

Various facts show the great influence which this tradition has hitherto possessed. The chief of these is that even Prayer Books which seem to have departed signally from the doctrine of 1662, as in the communion service, often retain to a remarkable degree the 1662 wording and order. Another significant fact is that when the English Liturgical Commission published its report *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 1957), in which it put forward in a rather less bold way the same proposal as was put forward the following year by the Lambeth committee, the then Archbishop of Canterbury thought it necessary to add an appendix of Lambeth statements on the subject, and to outline in his foreword the very different policy that they embody. A third fact to notice is that in the resolutions of the 1958 Conference, whereas many of the committee's positive proposals were adopted, this negative proposal was ignored, and in the Encyclical Letter it was virtually rejected.

Whatever may be thought of the committee's proposal, the arguments which they themselves use in its support are not very convincing. They point out that there is considerable divergence between the

various Prayer Books and authorized services which the different parts of the Anglican Communion employ. This is true : but the divergence is not, generally speaking, as great as the committee's proposal would suggest, and for this the normative status of 1662 is chiefly responsible. What is more, even if some Anglican churches had departed completely from the norm of 1662, it still would not follow that the others ought to be encouraged to do the same : for, as the preface " Of Ceremonies " in the Prayer Book and Article 34 point out, the primary duty of the church in any place is to do not what is done abroad but what will edify its own people, and provided what it does (however different from what is done abroad) is faithful to Scripture, Christians elsewhere have no right to be offended or alienated by it. This applies as much when a church maintains its customs as when it changes them.

The committee's second argument is derived from the statement in Article 34 that " every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying ". The question at once arises, however, whether it would be edifying to abandon 1662 as a norm. If 1662 is scriptural, it would certainly not be edifying to abandon it as a norm of *doctrine* ; and the practical difficulty discovered by the committee of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon in a proposal that clergy should assent to 1662, though they use a revised book for services (see its report *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, S.P.C.K., 1958, pp. 64f.) could easily be avoided by making sure that the revised book conformed to 1662 in its doctrine, thus maintaining the normative status of 1662 and removing all grounds for such a proposal. But would it be edifying to abandon 1662 as a norm of *worship* ? This also seems very doubtful. The broad tradition of the 1662 book has taken deep root in all parts of the Anglican Communion, and Article 34 as a whole (if understood in the light of the preface " Of Ceremonies ") is actually against changes in the customs of a church which the principle of edification does not demand. It may, of course, be asked (as it often is today) whether the principle of edification is not inevitably violated by using an English pattern of worship in a country of such different traditions as Africa or India. But it has to be remembered, first, that the 1662 pattern is not, in its origins, purely English ; and secondly, that this pattern has in fact taken root (however surprising we may think it) in those countries. The C.I.P.B.C. committee has here a peculiar right to be heard ; and in the course of a very interesting discussion of this question (*op. cit.*, pp. 77-92) they state that, in the case of India at any rate, the call for national self-expression in worship does not interest the laity, such self-expression is more practicable in the accessories of worship than in its spoken texts (cf., even A. T. Hanson, *Beyond Anglicanism*, 1965, pp. 176, 190-2, 213), and the Prayer Book seems to have vindicated its capacity to provide a pattern of worship for races of a very different culture. It cannot be taken for granted that this is true of all other countries where the Anglican Communion has branches, but the evidence suggests that it may well be so. It is certainly true of Nigeria (see T. S. Garrett's article *Conservative and Unionist*, in *Theology*, September 1965), and it is well known that even

in South India the services in the *Book of Common Worship* are not very much used by ex-Anglican congregations. The fact that the vernacular translations of the Prayer Book are in the language of today, not of the seventeenth century, and the fact that the introduction of the Prayer Book on the mission fields took place in the context of the introduction of a new religion, no doubt helped to make it acceptable, quite apart from its liturgical excellence; and the natural conservatism of the human mind, which seems to be peculiarly strong in some cultures, helps to keep it such. There is certainly no reason why, where the Prayer Book has possession, it should be abandoned in favour of services like the *Liturgy for Africa*, which have no greater claim to be indigenous, and are not even naturalized.

The third argument of the Lambeth committee has already been noted: the unity of the Anglican Communion, so they contend, is due not to the Prayer Book, as earlier Lambeth Conferences have supposed, but to the fact that "we are a federation of Provinces and Dioceses of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, each being served and governed by a Catholic and Apostolic Ministry, and each believing the Catholic faith". But the unity here depicted is neither simply Christian (since it includes the historic episcopate) nor specifically Anglican (since it includes nothing that distinguishes the Anglican churches from other orthodox episcopal bodies). An account which includes as much as this ought to include the Prayer Book (if not the Articles) as well. Of course, when Lambeth Conferences have defined the unity of the Anglican Communion in terms of the Prayer Book, they have not intended to exclude from the definition the catholic church, the episcopate, and the catholic faith, since these are all contained in the Prayer Book. What they have intended to indicate is that there are other things contained in the Prayer Book also, without which an adequate account of the nature of Anglican unity is impossible.

The final argument used by the committee is that Cranmer's aim was a recovery of the worship of the primitive church: in this he achieved notable success, but was hampered by having less knowledge about early Christian worship than we have today. This definition of Cranmer's aim is less than a half truth, as the prefaces "Concerning the Service of the Church" and "Of Ceremonies" in the Prayer Book sufficiently show. Cranmer's great concern was to restore worship to conformity with the Christian Gospel, as set forth in Holy Scripture, and to construct orderly and edifying services based on the principles and instructions which Scripture contains. Anything which had never subserved this end or had ceased to do so, however ancient, he discarded. He undoubtedly retained what was old in preference to substituting something new when the new would have been no better, and *restored* what was old when it was better than what was in use and better than anything he could devise himself. But it is clear that he would not have restored what was old just because it was old, though no better than what was in use: this would have been contrary to his principle of avoiding needless changes in existing customs (see the preface "Of Ceremonies", and cf. Article 34). Had Cranmer known all that is known today about early Christian worship, he might well

have made more use of it at points where changes were then needed. But he would not have made use of this knowledge at points where changes were not then needed, and he would not have expected us to make use of it at points where, because of his work, changes are not needed today. His work may not always have been "primitive", but, in whole or in part, it has held its ground in all branches of the Anglican Communion since their inception, and therefore, on the basis of his principles, it has now the same claim to be left standing as the harmless medievalisms which he left standing himself.

In any case, if Cranmer "achieved notable success" in restoring the worship of the primitive church, as the committee says, why need his Prayer Book be wholly set aside by those who wish to carry the restoration further? It must always be remembered that a complete restoration of the worship of the primitive church would be impossible: for, as A. Couratin remarks, when criticizing the committee's report at this point, the evidence from the first three centuries is still scanty, the ecclesiastical and social situation was then completely different, and theology was in an immature state (*Lambeth and Liturgy*, 1959, pp. 5f.).

* * * *

So much for the arguments used by the committee. It may perhaps be thought surprising that they do not also appeal to the fact that we are living in an ecumenical age, when distinctive denominational traditions of worship have no certain future. It will be remembered that the Church of South India has since its formation drawn up a completely new liturgy. It will be remembered also that a Joint Liturgical Group was appointed by various English and Scottish denominations in 1963, which has on its agenda, among other things, the consideration of the structure of the communion service; and that the Nottingham Faith and Order conference of 1964 welcomed this fact, and unanimously recommended that "future work on liturgical revision carried on by member churches of the British Council of Churches should be undertaken in common or in close consultation" (*Unity Begins at Home*, 1964, pp. 63f., 76). Similar things are doubtless happening in other countries. Now, in a united church the tradition of none of the parent churches can of course be made a rule to which the others must conform; and even if the liturgy of the united church is optional, yet, other things being equal, one can expect that it will be more widely used and less disliked if it is a completely new work, like the South India *Book of Common Worship*, than if it is one of the existing denominational liturgies, like the *Book of Common Prayer*. But it has to be borne in mind, first, that the Anglican churches for whom the Lambeth committee's proposal was intended are not parts of united churches: consequently, though it may be wise for them to start experimenting with new alternatives to their present services, perhaps devised in consultation with other orthodox churches in their locality, it would be wrong at present for them to cause dissention and distress by abolishing and replacing their existing tradition of worship, as if reunion was certain and imminent. And secondly, it must not be forgotten that the purpose of the Lambeth committee's suggestion that the 1662 norm be abandoned was the substitution of a specified

pattern of worship (including a structure for the communion service) common to all the churches of the Anglican Communion. But if the various Anglican churches, in drawing up alternative services, were to follow a pre-determined pan-Anglican pattern, it would be little better than a farce for them to consult the other denominations in their respective localities about the matter. Thus ecumenical considerations do not really favour the Lambeth committee's scheme, but rather exclude it.

However, be these arguments on behalf of the committee good or bad, it has to be admitted that if the committee's proposal that the 1662 norm be abandoned were adopted in some parts of the Anglican Communion, this would not be without its advantages. It would show Anglican disunity for what it really is. The fact that the Church of the Province of South Africa, for example, receives the 1662 book as a doctrinal standard, and the fact that in its communion service it retains so much of 1662, and where it departs from 1662 tends to go no farther back than Cranmer's service of 1549, serve only to obscure the further fact that the ethos of its service is completely different from that of any of the English communion services. The liturgiologists of the Church of the Province no doubt shared the view common until lately among Anglo-Catholics that the English communion services (except perhaps 1552) were all intended to teach Anglo-Catholic doctrine, and that it comes to its purest expression in 1549, which was less affected than any of the others by the malign influence of continental Protestantism. This distorted view of history is entirely rejected by the modern school of Anglo-Catholic liturgiologists, of which the chief living representatives are Professor E. C. Ratcliff and Canon A. Couratin (both members of the English Liturgical Commission). If the Church of the Province of South Africa were now to break completely loose from the English liturgical tradition, it would put the different ethos of its communion service in a much clearer light, though its way back into the Reformed tradition might well be made more difficult.

On the other hand, in provinces where the 1662 services or services of similar ethos are still in force, the adoption of the Lambeth committee's proposal would be an unmitigated disaster. If 1662 is scriptural, to abandon it as a norm of doctrine would be indefensible. And to abandon it as a norm of worship, though less serious, would not be less of a mistake. For, as has already been seen, according to the preface "Of Ceremonies", and Article 34, the customs of a church should never be disrupted more than is necessary. Hence, the 1662 'Preface' locates "the wisdom of the Church of England" in the cautious and conservative policy that it has always followed in revising the Prayer Book. This principle of avoiding needless change is based by the Article and the preface "Of Ceremonies" on concern for unity and concord, and also for those weaker brethren with whom it is a great matter of conscience to depart from any custom in the things of God to which they have grown used. These are, of course, thoroughly biblical grounds, and on these grounds a radically altered service would only be desirable as an alternative to 1662 (or to a minimal revision of 1662), and not as a replacement for it, which (in the case

of the communion service) is what the Lambeth committee explicitly desiderated. Of course, it might happen that an alternative would so win its way that people would cease to desire 1662. This only time could tell. But it is also possible that a minimal revision of 1662 would so satisfy people that a new service would have difficulty in maintaining its place even as an alternative.

An alternative to some of the services of the Prayer Book would be no bad thing. Probably there would be more variety in the Prayer Book already, had it not been drawn up for a people only semi-literate. Certain alternative services are provided in the Methodist *Book of Offices*, in the South India *Book of Common Worship*, and (most fully) in the Scottish *Book of Common Order*, and they obviously go some way towards supplying that variety which is otherwise only possible through the use of free prayer. Moreover, in drawing up an alternative service, considerable liberty may rightly be allowed, lest the service be spoiled through the compilers having their eye too much upon an existing service of different structure or content. But, however new in form, an alternative service must not be new in doctrine. For the function of a service in relation to the church's doctrine is simply to express it—not to alter it, and not even to blur it. Moreover, if an alternative service interferes with established doctrine, difficulties at once arise over ministerial subscription, divisions occur, and even the ideal of variety is not achieved, for variety is only possible if both services are acceptable to the same people. This is why the alternative liturgies which have already been added to 1662 in various branches of the Anglican Communion commonly fail to provide any more variety than 1662 provides in itself.

The *Liturgy for Africa*, being based on the Lambeth committee's proposals, and therefore, as the first draft pointed out, "not a revision of 1662", departs somewhat further from 1662 than any earlier Anglican liturgy, with the possible exceptions of the liturgies of the U.M.C.A. dioceses and the diocese of Korea, which are all of a strongly Roman type. To be sure, it is not as totally different from 1662 as it might have been, and will only be authorized at present for experimental use. But the fact ought to be faced that if the Lambeth committee's principles take root in Africa and are fully carried out, Anglicans there may find themselves confronted with a service still further removed from 1662, and there will be no alternative. For the committee thought it "regrettable that there should be any necessity for alternative rites within a single province", though it recognized that "circumstances sometimes make this inevitable, at least for a period". It considered, however, that "a province may find it advisable to test new liturgical work for limited periods under the control of the Ordinary". The printed draft of the *Liturgy for Africa* is now entering on this period of testing, during which there will presumably be no attempt to prohibit 1662. If the Lambeth committee had its way, however, approval of the *Liturgy for Africa* at the end of its period of testing would mean that the prohibition of 1662 was only a matter of time.

It must be recognized that the Archbishop of Uganda does not personally wish the Lambeth committee's proposals to be followed

in this particular. In the first draft he wrote : " There will probably always be a need in many churches for 1662 . . . but it seems better to preserve it in its integrity and not to tinker with it ". Similar ideas have been expressed by members of the English Liturgical Commission also. But on this policy the dangers are equally serious. For if 1662 is not to be " tinkered with ", it means that the permanent choice will be between a service written in the language and reflecting the conditions of the twentieth century, and a service written in the language and reflecting the conditions of the seventeenth. Moreover, it will in Africa be a choice between an " African " service and an " English " one. These considerations make it still more imperative that any alternative service should not interfere with the doctrine of the existing service. Otherwise those who on doctrinal grounds feel bound to choose 1662 will lay themselves open to continual misunderstanding. They will be thought to be living in the past. They will be thought to be lacking in a proper national consciousness. These disabilities are already in evidence in those parts of the Anglican Communion where 1662 is a tolerated alternative to an Anglo-Catholic revision. In such churches Evangelicals are usually a diminishing minority.

* * * *

It was remarked earlier that the Lambeth committee's proposal of abolishing 1662 as a norm was anticipated by the English Liturgical Commission. Chapter six of the Liturgical Commission's report, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*, published in 1957, is devoted to this theme, and makes one realize that the principle laid down in the previous chapter, that " Prayer Book Revision should be conservative ", is understood by the Commission in the loosest possible sense. The English Liturgical Commission was evidently one of the major influences on the report of the Lambeth committee, and this is intelligible when one realizes that a copy of *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* was sent to all bishops attending the 1958 Conference, and that the Rt. Rev. Colin Dunlop, Dean and Assistant Bishop of Lincoln, under whose chairmanship the Liturgical Commission produced it, was also a leading member of the Lambeth committee.

If it be asked what led the English Liturgical Commission to the policy adopted from it by the Lambeth committee, the answer must at least partly lie in the fact that Anglo-Catholic liturgiologists seem to have realized sooner in England than elsewhere that the older Anglo-Catholic interpretation of the history and doctrine of the Prayer Book is untenable. For this growth in understanding Professor E. C. Ratcliff, the leading English liturgiologist of our day, and in that respect the most influential figure on the Liturgical Commission, is chiefly responsible. But once the fact has been grasped that the Prayer Book is not in any of its classical editions an Anglo-Catholic book, the natural course for Anglo-Catholics becomes clear—to break loose from the traditions of the Prayer Book. And this is the course that the members of the Liturgical Commission either chose or were persuaded to take.

Since Lambeth 1958 the Liturgical Commission has carried its policy into practical effect in its proposed baptism and confirmation

services, which are of course fresh services, not revisions of the old ones ; and it is already clear that the same policy will be followed in the communion service on which the Commission has been working, and of which the first draft is due to be published this month. The booklet, *Re-shaping the Liturgy*, by H. de Candole and A. Couratin, recently issued under the auspices of the Liturgical Commission by the Church Information Office, shows not only this, but also that all the changes of detail recommended by the Lambeth committee, to which we shall come in a minute, are (together with many others) under active consideration by the Liturgical Commission. But as the changes of detail recommended by the Lambeth committee are practically all adopted in the *Liturgy for Africa*, besides the principle that 1662 is no longer to be treated as a norm, the *Liturgy for Africa* should be carefully studied by members of the Church of England, as throwing light on the service which their own Liturgical Commission is producing. The Liturgical Commission's project is the second communion service mentioned above as based on the Lambeth committee's principles, and it may well prove to be an even greater departure from the form of 1662 than the *Liturgy for Africa*.

The second great influence on the Lambeth committee, after that of the English Liturgical Commission, was that of the liturgy lately produced by the Church of South India. This again was no accident. For another member of the Lambeth committee was the Bishop (now Archbishop) of Uganda, who had formerly been a member of the C.S.I., and had been Convenor of the C.S.I. Liturgy Committee at the time when it produced its eucharistic liturgy. In any case, a liturgy of such originality and distinction, so recently produced, would have been bound to attract the Lambeth committee's attention.

The C.S.I., because of its peculiar situation, was able to stand aside from the tradition of the Anglican Communion and look at it in a detached and critical way. It made some interesting and worthwhile experiments, many of which were based on early precedent, though not all ; and nearly every concrete proposal which the Lambeth committee made for altering the communion service was anticipated by the C.S.I. The influence of the English Liturgical Commission and the influence of the C.S.I. were complementary, for whereas the Liturgical Commission wished 1662 to be abandoned as a norm, the C.S.I. had actually abandoned it, and had made its own experiments without having this model before its eyes.

Among the proposals made by the Lambeth committee were these. Instead of being united by the text of 1662, the Anglican Communion should rather be united by various common elements in its worship, including a common structure for the communion service, to which all the provinces, in their various eucharistic services, could (so the committee believed) agree to conform. (The Conference took up this proposal in Resolution 76, requesting that a committee be set up to prepare such a structure.) This structure would not be the structure of 1662, but the structure in use in the primitive church, which Cranmer was only "feeling his way towards". The structure to which Dom Gregory Dix had drawn attention not long before—offertory, prayer of thanksgiving or consecration, breaking, distribu-

tion, in that order—was evidently in the committee's mind, and probably the ancient form of the consecration prayer also, but they elaborated this structure in some detail.

Thus, among other changes, the committee proposed the following. The offertory should be moved, so that it clearly belongs with the thanksgiving, etc. The *Gloria in Excelsis* should be moved, so that those who only stay for ante-communion have an opportunity of praise. The sermon should be moved, so that the creed becomes the believing response to the *whole* ministry of the word. And since the communion is becoming increasingly the chief Sunday service, even those who stay for the complete service will not have an opportunity of hearing an Old Testament reading or singing the Psalms unless these are added to the service. Then again, the prayer for the Church should be broken up into a litany. Exhortations should be short. The length and language of the confession should be modified. And the consecration prayer should include thanksgiving (for the committee accepted the popular but dubious view that the consecration of the eucharist is effected by thanksgiving), giving thanks not only for the Lord's death, but also for His resurrection, ascension, and future return.

All these proposals of the Lambeth committee had already been put into effect in the C.S.I. liturgy, and each of them has now been reproduced in the *Liturgy for Africa*. This is not at all surprising when one remembers that the *Liturgy for Africa* was drafted by the Archbishop of Uganda, a member of the Lambeth committee, and before that the Convenor of the Liturgy Committee of the C.S.I. Nor is it surprising that the *Liturgy for Africa* contains many other C.S.I. features not mentioned by the Lambeth committee. Thus, westward position is recommended; the confession, comfortable words, and absolution, in that order, are moved to the beginning of the service, where the declaration of the Law stands already; the prayer for the Church is extended to include all mankind; the giving of the peace is introduced; a congregational response is introduced into the prayer of consecration; and Ps. 103 is used in the post-communion. Archbishop Brown himself calls the C.S.I. liturgy the "parent" of the *Liturgy for Africa* (*Relevant Liturgy*, 1965, p. 50), and with good reason.

These features of the C.S.I. liturgy, and most of those mentioned by the Lambeth committee, are in themselves harmless, and in some cases are highly commendable. Some of them adapt the service to modern needs, some of them conduce to orderliness of structure, some of them help to bring out the communal character of the sacrament. Many of the features listed are ancient revivals: they therefore have at least this value, that they prepare the way for possible reunion, by taking us back from the distinctive usages of modern denominations to the practice of an earlier period, express the oneness of the Church through the ages, and (in the *Liturgy for Africa*) underline the Anglican claim that the Fathers belong to us rather than to Rome. There is no reason why such features should not appear in an alternative to the 1662 service. But why precisely these features? There are other ways in which modern needs could be provided for, orderliness of structure achieved, and the communal character of the service expressed. Even ancient revivals need not be confined entirely to

those contained in the C.S.I. service, as if there was no variety in the early Church. And since we are going back to antiquity, why not go back to the New Testament itself, and bring about the passover background of the sacrament, and the basis of the sacrament in the covenant theology of the Bible, which are not explicit either in 1662 or in the C.S.I. liturgy? Surely, if 1662 is not to be regarded as a norm, C.S.I. need not be regarded as a norm either. Yet the *Liturgy for Africa* is not much more than a new edition of C.S.I., omitting the epiclesis, omitting, adding, or moving a few sentences and prayers, often altering the language (usually for the worse), but basically very similar. The chief difference lies in the addition of two controversial features to which we shall come in a moment. Otherwise the service has the insipidity of a rather pale imitation. But if there is to be a radically new service for use in Africa, why should it not be a radical departure from C.S.I., just as C.S.I. was a radical departure from 1662 and its descendants?

It may perhaps be thought strange that Archbishop Brown, after producing (with whatever assistance) so original a liturgy as that of the C.S.I., should now produce one so unoriginal as the *Liturgy for Africa*. But when the policy of the Lambeth committee has been considered, this ceases to be puzzling. It must be borne in mind that, whatever a radically new liturgy might contain, the only *essential* constituent, which could not be omitted and for which there could be no substitute, is the form of the New Testament institution. When one sets beside this the list of features called for by the Lambeth committee, and when one notes that even these do not amount to a complete structure, such as the committee wished all provinces to adopt, one can see how constricting their proposal is. The projected advisory committee for completing this structure seems still not to have been set up (Bishop Stephen Bayne reported in June 1963 that no action had been taken, but that the circulation for comment of the draft *Liturgy for Africa* was intended to help prepare the way (see S. F. Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point*, 1964, pp. 19f.), and consequently Archbishop Brown had to complete it himself. He very naturally completed it on C.S.I. lines—the lines which, in its imperfect form, it was already following, and which were, of course, quite congenial to him.

The reason why the Lambeth committee envisaged such a detailed structure is not far to seek. Having abandoned, in their mind's eye, the 1662 norm, and needlessly abolished that measure of unity in worship throughout the Anglican Communion which it supplies, they were faced with the problem of securing the same (not necessary but certainly desirable) end by other means. They found their solution in the chimerical notion that a new norm could be laid down, either by themselves or by some other committee, which would attract the adherence of the whole Anglican Communion in some such way as 1662 (not only through liturgical excellence but also through historical priority) has to a considerable degree attracted it hitherto. But since the 1662 norm, as we have seen, ought not to be abandoned, and any radically new service should only be an alternative to 1662 (or rather to a minimal revision of it), the need for such an impracticable project as a new but uniform structure ought not to arise, and it should be possible

for alternative services (provided they preserve Anglican doctrine) to be constructed in freedom, without any restrictions as to their form, like those so largely involved in the committee's project and its African outworking.

This is not to say, of course, that the 1662 norm is at present adhered to in all parts of the Anglican Communion as closely as one could wish. We have already seen that this is not so. Indeed, one of the aims of the African archbishops in commissioning the *Liturgy for Africa* was to secure greater uniformity in eucharistic worship (see L. W. Brown, *Relevant Liturgy*, p. 53). But the fact that the U.M.C.A. dioceses and South Africa have departed as far as they have from the 1662 norm does not seem to be any good reason for urging West Africa, Uganda, and the other dioceses of East Africa to do the same. If greater unity is needed, why should not the U.M.C.A. dioceses and South Africa rather return to something more akin to 1662?

It is not quite clear whether the Lambeth committee would have been satisfied with such uniformity in Anglican communion services as a single structure would provide, or whether they were seeking this merely as a first step towards a single service. If the latter, their language shows that it would be a service with certain local variations, but none the less it would be recognizably the same service everywhere. The statement with which the committee opens its discussion of the communion service—that "there are reasons for hoping that it is now possible to work towards a liturgy which will win its way throughout the Anglican Communion"—suggests that this is in fact what the committee had in mind. And the *Liturgy for Africa* supports this interpretation of their meaning, for in it the Archbishop of Uganda, himself a member of the committee, has begun the implementation of their scheme by producing for the African provinces not just a structure but a service. It is true that the Archbishop does not himself think that we can ever expect to see a world liturgy (*Relevant Liturgy*, p. 63), but even though he has not put forward a service for the whole Anglican Communion, to produce a service for the five African provinces, with their forty-six dioceses, covering much of a continent (the extra-provincial dioceses of North Africa, Egypt, Sudan, Liberia, Madagascar, and Mauritius do not seem to be involved), is ambitious enough, and a great deal will turn upon what use these provinces and dioceses make of it. Three of the provinces are at least predominantly Evangelical (in the broad sense of the word), two of them are overwhelmingly Anglo-Catholic. If a single communion service can win acceptance in all these provinces the Lambeth committee's project is well on the way to becoming reality. There are reasons for thinking, however, that this will not happen—reasons bound up with the revolutionary character of the service and especially with the novelties of doctrine which, with the committee's encouragement, the service introduces. It is to these, therefore, that we must next give our attention.

(To be concluded.)