

The Anglican Use Within the Western Liturgical Tradition: Importance and Ecumenical Relevance from the Perspective of Comparative Liturgy

by Prof. Dr. Hans-Jürgen FEULNER

Faculty of Catholic Theology at the University of Vienna

Lecture version for the “Anglican Use Conference” in Houston/TX, June 13, 2009

FOR PRIVATE USE ONLY!

*

**

In the preface of the first *Book of Common Prayer* (1549) of EDWARD VI one reads:

“And where heretofore, there hath been great diversitie in saying and synging in churches within this realme: some folowyng Salsbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Banger, some of York, and some of Lincolne: Now from henceforth, all the whole realme shall have but one use.”¹

It is thus evident that at the time of the English Reformation there were at least five liturgical “uses” or “diocesan usages” in the English church. It is perhaps surprising that we have a variety of liturgical “uses” (or “rites”) in the English church of the sixteenth century, and not only *the* “Roman Catholic” rite that we may expect to find everywhere in the West. In fact, we have always had a great variety of rites and liturgical usages – not only in the Christian East, but also in the Catholic Church. This may come as a surprise for many today.

In order to understand the place and significance of the so-called “Anglican Use” among this variety of liturgical rites, diocesan usages and mutual influences, a special method of Liturgical Studies will be employed. This method is not only instructive for our purposes; it is also ecumenical *per se*.

1. Comparative Liturgy/Liturgiology – *Vergleichende Liturgiewissenschaft*

Let us begin by touching upon the method of “Comparative Liturgiology” (= *Vergleichende Liturgiewissenschaft*)² that is attributed to the German scholar Anton BAUMSTARK (1872–1948).

¹ E.Ch.S. GIBSON (ed.), *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* (Everyman’s Library 448), London – New York 1964, p. 4.

² Cf. F.S. WEST, *Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy in its Intellectual Context* (Ann Arbor University Microfilms International), Ann Arbor 1988; ID., *The Comparative Liturgy of Anton Baumstark* (Joint Liturgical Studies 31), Bramcote 1995; *Acts of the International Congress “Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years After Anton Baumstark (1872-1948)”*. Rome, 25-29 September 1998 (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 265), ed. by R.F. TAFT – G. WINKLER, Rome 2001.

a) *The German Scholar Anton Baumstark*

Anton BAUMSTARK was born into a well-educated Roman Catholic family in 1872. He began his academic career specializing in oriental studies, with a focus on Aramaic/Syriac materials. After university he lived for five years in Rome, where he re-directed his scholarly endeavours. He turned his energies toward the liturgy and literature of the Church in the eastern Mediterranean, especially the non-Byzantine east. An important moment in BAUMSTARK's life was his relationship with the German Abbey of Maria Laach. The Benedictine Abbot Ildefons HERWEGEN (1874–1946) encouraged the young scholar to also turn his attention to the liturgies of the West. In 1921 he finally obtained a university position, as *professor honorarius* for early Christian civilization at the University of Bonn. In addition to his work in Bonn, he taught Semitic languages at Nijmegen and Utrecht in the Netherlands, and later in Münster in Germany as well. He died in 1948 at the age of 75.

BAUMSTARK had a fecund mind and a productive pen. His bibliography contains no less than 570 publications, both popular and scholarly, on a very wide variety of topics, including Judaism and influences on the Quran.³

b) *The Method of “Comparative Liturgiology”*

The nineteenth-century Anglican liturgical scholar John Mason NEALE (1818–1866) seems to have coined both the English word “liturgiology” for the scientific study of liturgy, and the expression “Comparative Liturgy.”⁴ But BAUMSTARK is the one who popularized and gave theoretical formulation to the method of *Vergleichende Liturgiewissenschaft* (= “Comparative Liturgiology”), which has proven not only useful, but indispensable for the history of liturgy.⁵ It has been demonstrated many times that the solution to some problems of liturgical history and interpretation is simply impossible without the methods of “Comparative Liturgiology.”

In the early twentieth century the comparative methodology was proven effective in studies of the Eastern liturgies, as a scientific approach to liturgical texts and structures. As mentioned above, Anton BAUMSTARK did not limit his historico-liturgical research to the Eastern rites, but studied the Western Latin liturgical traditions of the first millennium as well. He developed the

³ BAUMSTARK's bibliography has been published in complete form: H.-J. FEULNER, *Bibliography of Anton Baumstark*, in: *Acts of the International Congress “Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years After Anton Baumstark (1872-1948)”*, pp. 31-60.

⁴ J.M. NEALE, *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History*, London 1863, pp. 123-124.

⁵ A. BAUMSTARK, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie* (Ecclesia Orans 10), Freiburg 1923; ID., *Comparative Liturgy*, revised by B. BOTTE, English edition translated by Frank L. CROSS, Westminster/MD 1958.

beginnings of a “Comparative Liturgiology,” which he finally expounded in more detail in his *Liturgie Comparée (Comparative Liturgy)*,⁶ a work that first appeared in French. BAUMSTARK was interested in the history of the liturgy, which presents itself to the liturgist as a product of growth; as something both given and enduring. The development of the liturgy lends itself well to “Comparative Liturgiology,” which investigates and identifies the major developmental trajectories of the liturgy and their principles. This is accomplished by a comparison and collation of the various Eastern and Western liturgical families. A “Comparative Liturgiology” seeks to take into account the wider historico-religious context, the Jewish liturgy, and the entire breadth of the liturgies of various Christian churches. Today, this wider perspective can be of particular ecumenical import.

Anton BAUMSTARK and his immediate disciples, Fritz HAMM (1872–1948) and Hieronymus ENGBERDING (1899–1969), worked on important developmental trends through a comparison and collation of the various liturgical families. They also formulated several basic “laws/principles” (= “Gesetzmäßigkeiten” in German) that serve to explain the development of the liturgy. These “laws,” which are to be observed from the earliest forms of the liturgy until Late Antiquity, are also important for a proper understanding of later liturgical traditions.

A modified method of “Comparative Liturgiology,” however, that also includes the different Protestant liturgies, must necessarily consider in its comparisons the substantial doctrinal and liturgical “rupture” from the sixteenth century onward, beyond those “Gesetzmäßigkeiten” (see below). Nevertheless, the impact of “laws” of liturgical development, which are reflected still in the nuclei of the Protestant liturgies (including the Anglican liturgical tradition), can be observed in the second millennium (up to our time) as well.

c) “Laws” or “Principles” of Liturgical Development

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- ♦ *The evolution of liturgical rites moves from diversity to uniformity (not vice-versa)*
- ♦ *Liturgical development proceeds from simplicity to increasing enrichment*
- ♦ *The development of liturgy is but a series of individual developments*
- ♦ *The development from free and improvised prayers to formulaic prayers*
- ♦ *Liturgical relationships*

⁶ A. BAUMSTARK, *Liturgie Comparée. Principes et methods pour l'étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes*, revue par B. BOTTE, Chevetogne 1939 (31953).

2. SPECIFIC LAWS

- ♦ *The older a text is, the less it is influenced by the Bible*
- ♦ *The more recent a text is, the more symmetrical it is*
- ♦ *The later it is, the more liturgical prose becomes charged with doctrinal elements*
- ♦ *The preservation of older usage in the more solemn liturgical seasons*
- ♦ *The later symbolization of originally utilitarian liturgical actions*

*

This classical method of “Comparative Liturgiology” has already shown in a fascinating manner the abundance of liturgical traditions not only in the Christian East, but also in the West. There is a great variety of liturgical rites and uses, sometimes brought together in regional “liturgical families.” Because of the radical break of the Reformation in both theology and liturgical practice, Protestant liturgies do not lend themselves well to the classical method of “Comparative Liturgiology.” A modified methodology, however, may demonstrate mutual influences and relationships in regard to the Protestant liturgies as well.⁷

2. The Catholic “Anglican Use” Within the Western Liturgical Tradition

As we said above, it is evident that at the time of the English Reformation there were at least five “uses” or “diocesan usages” in the English church. These English Uses had as their basis the Old-Gallican–Roman rite and may be considered as local adaptations and modifications of it. The differences consisted of proper ceremonial and additional texts according to the particular “use.” These five “uses” in England were associated with the major bishops’ sees of England, especially those of Salisbury (= Sarum) and York, geographically representing the North and South of England.

2.1 Liturgical Rites and Uses in Medieval Europe⁸

a) *The Celtic Rite*

According to our present day knowledge, it seems that the more ancient liturgy used in England before the time of Saint Augustine of Canterbury was the so-called Celtic liturgy.

⁷ For an application of a modified methodology in regard to the Anglican liturgical tradition, see: H.-J. FEULNER, *Das “Anglikanische Ordinale”. Eine liturgiegeschichtliche und liturgiethnologische Studie I: Von den altenglischen Pontificalien zum Ordinale von 1550/52*, Neuried 1997, *passim*.

⁸ Cf. esp. FEULNER, *Das “Anglikanische Ordinale”*, pp. 9-15.

According to the studies of “Comparative Liturgiology,” the Celtic liturgy seems to have been influenced by the liturgies of Milan, Rome, Gaul, and also from the West-Syrian liturgical family.

b) The Old-Gallican–Roman Rite

The arrival of Saint Augustine of Canterbury around the year 597 led to a change in the liturgy of the Church in England.

The Old-Gallican style liturgy of England was combined with the Roman liturgy to yield a hybrid rite, namely the Old-Gallican–Roman Rite. This process of adaptation and mixture of the rites to yield a new form possessing characteristics of both also took place on the Continent.

c) The Diocesan Usages in England

The manner in which various liturgical practices were adopted and/or adapted varied from diocese to diocese and resulted in the various uses of the English church. It is important to note that the responsibility for the ordering of the liturgy was in the hands of the local bishop, and so it is not surprising that it was in individual dioceses that the uses of England developed.

♦ *The Sarum Use*

The most famous and probably most important of the five English Uses was that of Sarum (or Salisbury as it is now called). The Sarum Use was practiced throughout southern England (even in the See of Canterbury) and in other parts of Great Britain, e.g. Ireland. Its influence was extended over a period of several hundred years although it was not accepted over local customs without some resistance.

♦ *The Other Uses in England*

In regard to the four other uses there is little that can be said. Their practice was more or less confined to the dioceses for which they are named, or at least to those dioceses nearby. The Uses of Lincoln and Bangor were not as popular as those of York and Hereford. Unfortunately, we do not possess many liturgical books of these former uses.

Thus, at the time of the Reformation in England there was no absolute uniformity of liturgical practice. The liturgical forms in use were basically Roman or rather Old-Gallican–Roman, but there were many local variations of them according to the particular use of the area. The Sarum Use was by far the most common. It was the one that the architect of the English liturgical reform, Archbishop Thomas CRANMER (1489–1556), was probably most familiar with, since it was the use of his Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury.

d) Uses/Usages of Dioceses and Religious/Monastic Orders Outside England

Incidentally, history witnesses to the same phenomenon on the European mainland: Many dioceses, especially in Germany, had their own “diocesan usages” until well into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For example, Cologne adopted the Roman Rite in 1791, and Münster – only in 1865. Also, Lyon in France, Ravenna and other cities in Italy had their own “diocesan usages.” Still today the Diocese of Braga in North Portugal has its own “diocesan usage.” Conversely, the Ambrosian Rite of the Church of Milan is to be seen as a separate, independent “rite,” and not only as a local particularity within the framework of the Roman Rite. The same is to be said about the Old-Spanish (“Mozarabic”) Rite in Toledo, Spain. Moreover, many religious communities or orders had their own liturgical traditions within the framework of the Roman Rite, for example, the Dominicans, the Carmelites, the Cistercians, and the Premonstratensians. Today, only the Carthusians still practice a rich liturgical life of their own. The Council of Trent had in fact allowed all “special rites” (of dioceses and religious orders) that were then older than 200 years to be retained. The Sarum Use would have also fallen under this category.

2.2 The English Reformation and Its Liturgical Books

a) The First Book of Common Prayer, 1549

After the break between the Church of England under King HENRY VIII (1509–1547) and the Roman Church in the sixteenth century there was a gradual change in both theology and liturgical practice. The first liturgical book to provide a complete and distinct range of services in English was the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, and its authorization put an end to the use of the Latin services. In 1550 the new Ordination rites were published in the so-called *Ordinal*.⁹

The main figure behind the liturgical reform was the abovementioned Archbishop Thomas CRANMER. It was to him that the bulk of the task of revision fell, and it was his theological concepts that are given expression in the revised rites. Although CRANMER collected and used liturgical material from many sources including Protestant ones, the *First Prayer Book* was still quite conservative. The *Communion Service* of the 1549 *Prayer Book* maintained the format of distinct rites of Consecration and Communion, which had been introduced in the 1548 *Order of Communion*; but with the Latin rite of the Mass (chiefly following the structure of Sarum Use), translated into English. The *Ordinal*, however, followed mainly the pattern of the Latin draft text of the German Protestant Martin BUCER [BUTZER] (1491–1551) from Strasbourg with only secondary additions from the *Sarum Pontifical*. The true main emphases of CRANMER’s text are

⁹ *The Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons* (1550).

the public prayer of the Church and the imposition of hands. This could be clearly shown by way of a modified “Comparative Liturgiology” with additional theological implications.¹⁰

Martin BUCER, who had come to Cambridge in 1549, was asked by Thomas CRANMER to give his views on the rites and ceremonies of the *First Prayer Book*. In his *Censura* [= *Critical Examination*] of 1551 BUCER gave his assessment, commended what ought to be retained, proposed amendments, and pointed out what ought to be abolished. As regards the Eucharistic Prayer, he preferred that the epiclesis over the gifts be changed to an invocation over the persons who receive communion. Here again the method of “Comparative Liturgiology” can help to clearly determine the influences from BUCER’s *Censura* and other sources on the *Second Prayer Book*.

b) *The Second Book of Common Prayer, 1552*

The *First Book of Common Prayer* and the *Ordinal* were both destined to have a very short life. They were to be revised within a few years of their publication as the more Protestant (Calvinistic) element of the English Reformation gained more control in the Church and State.

After the “Second Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments,” the revised *Second Book of Common Prayer* was published in 1552 including the Ordination rites.¹¹ CRANMER recognized that the 1549 rite of Communion had been susceptible to conservative misinterpretation. Consequently, in 1552 he thoroughly integrated Consecration and Communion into a single rite. In the Baptism service the exorcism, the anointing and other elements were omitted. CRANMER’s work of simplification and revision was also applied to the Daily Offices, which were to become Morning and Evening Prayer, and which he hoped would also serve as a daily form of prayer to be used by the laity. This simplification was anticipated, which a comparative methodology could prove, by the work of Cardinal Francis QUIÑONES (1482–1540), a Spanish Franciscan, in his abortive revision of the Roman Breviary published in 1537.¹² The radical liturgical and theological breaks of the 1552 *Prayer Book* with the past are evident.

c) *The 1559 and 1662 Prayer Books*

In July 1553, Queen MARY (1553–1558) restored the “old” religion by replacing the 1552 *Second Book of Common Prayer* with the former Latin service books. Under Queen ELIZABETH I

¹⁰ Cf. FEULNER, *Das „Anglikanische Ordinale“* I, pp. 157-221.

¹¹ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England* (1552).

¹² *Breviarium Romanum a Francisco Cardinali Quiquonio editum*, ed. by J.W. LEGG, Cambridge 1888; *The Second Recension of the Quiquon Breviary* (Henry Bradshaw Society 35 & 42), ed. by J.W. LEGG, 1908/1912.

(1559–1603), however, the 1552 *Prayer Book* was reintroduced in June 1559, scarcely altered in order to represent a swing in a more Catholic direction.

In 1557, the Scots Protestant Lords had adopted the English *Prayer Book* of 1552, for reformed worship in Scotland. However, when John KNOX (1510–1572) returned to Scotland in 1559, he continued to use *The Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments*¹³ he had created for the English exiles in Geneva, and in 1564, this supplanted the *Book of Common Prayer* under the title of the *Book of Common Order*. The first *Prayer Book* introduced in Scotland was that of 1637; but it was never even put into use. However, after the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688 which overthrew JAMES II and brought WILLIAM and MARY to the throne, the Church of Scotland was delivered firmly into the hands of the Presbyterians, leaving those who preferred Anglican forms with no home. These formed the Scottish Episcopal Church, and began to take as their Prayer Book the old 1637 *Scottish Book of Common Prayer*. It was reprinted several times in the 1700’s, and by the mid to late eighteenth century forms based on this book were in common use in the Scottish Episcopal Church. So when Samuel SEABURY came in 1784 to the Scottish Church to be ordained the first American bishop, he was urged to take these Scottish forms as the basis for the American Episcopal [Anglican] liturgy. He did, and as a result this book can be seen as a direct ancestor of the 1790 *American Book of Common Prayer* – particularly with regards to the Communion Service.

The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England was printed only two years after the restoration of the monarchy.¹⁴ In reply to the “Presbyterian Exceptions,” some 600 changes were made to the book of 1559, mostly minor, giving the Puritans little of what they wanted (except the so-called “Black Rubric” from 1552 which had been omitted in 1559 and was restored in 1662), but implementing rather more conservative changes (an attempt to restore the Offertory; after Communion the unused but consecrated bread and wine were to be reverently consumed in church). It was this edition that was to be the “official” *Book of Common Prayer* during the growth of the British Empire, and as a result, has been a great influence on the national Prayer Books of Anglican churches worldwide.

¹³ J. KNOX, *The Form of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc.* [...] (1556), ed. W.D. MAXWELL, *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book*, London ²1965.

¹⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches: And the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons* (1662).

d) Further Revisions (and the 1928 Prayer Books)

By the nineteenth century pressures on the 1662 *Prayer Book* had increased, connected with the “Oxford Movement” in England. The use of elements of the Roman Rite (including the use of candles, liturgical vestments and incense) had become widespread (= “Ritualism”). Following a Royal Commission report in 1906, work began on a new edition of the English 1662 *Prayer Book*. In 1927, this proposed more conservative Prayer Book was finished, but finally rejected by the Parliament for the second time, after some alterations, in 1928.

The Episcopal Church in the United States separated itself from the Church of England in 1789. Its Prayer Book, published in 1790, had as its sources the English 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and the 1637 *Scottish Book of Common Prayer* that Bishop SEABURY of Connecticut had brought over following his consecration in Aberdeen in 1784. Further revisions of the *American Prayer Book* of 1790 occurred in 1892 and 1928,¹⁵ in which minor changes were made, removing, for instance, some of CRANMER’s exhortations and introducing prayers for the dead. In 1979 a more substantial revision was made.¹⁶

3. Some Perspectives for the Future:

What is to be done and how can the Method of “Comparative Liturgiology” be useful?

3.1 “Comparative Liturgiology” and Ecumenism

As shown above, a modified “Comparative Liturgiology” that deals not only with liturgical “laws/principles” but also with the comparison of liturgical units and sub-units within their historico-liturgical and theological context can also uncover valuable insights regarding the mutual influences of Western liturgical traditions including the Protestant liturgies. Indeed, the historico-critical method of a “Comparative Liturgiology” concerns not only the past, but ultimately the proper understanding of the present. Moreover, historico-critical Liturgical Studies can more easily recognize both convergent and divergent developments in various liturgies, as well as their causes. An understanding of other liturgies and of the motivation behind their changes results in a better understanding of one’s own liturgy. At the same time, such a “Comparative Liturgiology” is also truly *ecumenical*, shedding light on the genuine wealth of local traditions in the West (and East). It can also elucidate how these various Western traditions

¹⁵ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David*, New York 1929.

¹⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together with The Psalter or Psalms of David according to the use of the Episcopal Church*, New York 1979.

can have their legitimate place within the Catholic Church, including of course the “Anglican Use,” as it was temporarily and officially approved by Rome in 2003 in the *Book of Divine Worship* for the use of different personal parishes in the USA.¹⁷

3.2 New Ecumenical and Pastoral Challenges in the USA

Now, however, we are faced with more far-reaching developments and challenges of the Anglican community, especially (albeit not only) in the USA. In this regard we can generally distinguish three major groupings in the USA:

- (a) The personal Catholic “Anglican Use” parishes according to the Pastoral Provision;
- (b) Constant appeals from individual bishops, priests, faithful, and even from entire parishes of the Episcopal Church in the US;
- (c) The Anglican Church in America (= ACA) as part of the Traditional Anglican Communion (= TAC).

ad (a)

The Pastoral Provision created in June 1980 by the Holy See allows for some exceptions to the regular practice of the Latin Rite of the Roman Catholic Church in the US: First, it allows diocesan bishops to establish personal “Anglican Use” parishes which use a liturgy adapted from the Anglican liturgy. Second, it allows married former Episcopal ministers to enter the Catholic Church and then to become priests. This is an exception to the general rule requiring Latin Rite Catholic priests to be celibate.

Along with the re-ordination of married Episcopal ministers, the Pastoral Provision of 1980 permitted the establishment of “Anglican Use” parishes in the US and created a special missal using liturgical elements from the Anglican tradition. This special liturgy was subsequently approved in 1987 by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments and the Committee for the Liturgy of the national US Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). As a result the *Book of Divine Worship* of 2003¹⁸ mainly contains elements of the 1928 and 1979 versions of the American *Book of Common Prayer* as well as the 1973 Roman Missal. Before a working version of the *Book of Divine Worship* was adopted for trial/interim use in 1984, the first

¹⁷ The original text of the *Book of Divine Worship* was first approved in 1987; it was printed with ecclesiastical approbation in 2003.

¹⁸ *The Book of Divine Worship Being Elements of the Book of Common Prayer Revised and Adapted According to the Roman Rite For Use by Roman Catholics Coming From the Anglican Tradition*, Mt. Pocono/PA 2003.

“Anglican Use” parishes in the US continued using the so-called *Anglican Missal*, which is basically the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer* with the addition of minor propers etc.

“Anglican Use” parishes are rare and are found only in certain dioceses of the USA. Any Anglican parish seeking to join the Roman Catholic Church and become an “Anglican Use” parish must have the permission of the local Catholic bishop. Some Anglican parishes in Canada and the UK have applied to become “Anglican Use,” but unfortunately have been refused permission. Hence, since 1987 (or rather 2003) the few personal “Anglican Use” parishes (according to the Pastoral Provision) in the USA officially have been using the *Book of Divine Worship*, which – next to the Eucharist – also includes the Daily Office and several other sacramental liturgical services, for example, Baptism, Matrimony, and Burial of the Dead. In view of the possibility that the Holy See may see fit to modify the canonical organization or configuration of these parishes, perhaps with a juridical structure similar to an Apostolic Administration or Personal Prelature, it may be worth considering the development of further liturgical services, including Anointing of the Sick, Confession, the pontifical rites for Confirmation and Ordination, as well rites for the Consecration of Churches and Altars. It has furthermore become clear after many years of liturgical experience that the heretofore developed liturgical services of the *Book of Divine Worship* need to be revised and supplemented as appropriate. This is necessary in order to more strongly give expression – in the spirit of “Comparative Liturgiology” – to the specific Anglican heritage and liturgical legacy found in the 1549/[1662]/1928 *Books of Common Prayer* and other sources, of course with the necessary adaptations to bring worship according to the Anglican Use into fuller conformity with the Catholic liturgical tradition (*lex credendi – lex orandi*: loosely translatable as “the law of believing is the law of praying”).

ad (b)

Individual converts or entire parishes of the Episcopal Church in the US must either – in the best case – take the rather difficult path via the Pastoral Provision, and request the opening of their own “Anglican Use” parishes, or join an available one. In the worst case the vast majority of such converts liturgically and canonically enters regular Roman Catholic parishes, a path most often taken outside the USA (and even in the USA). This is due to the fact that the *Book of Divine Worship* is for the moment valid only in the USA, since it was composed on order of the USCCB and in cooperation with the Congregation for Divine Worship in Rome.

In the meantime there are also parishes and even entire dioceses that are leaving the Episcopal Church in the US to join the jurisdiction of other Anglican provinces in South America or Africa or recently created their own church (e.g. “The Anglican Church in North America” [ACNA]). But we need not include this movement in our considerations.

ad (c)

The Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC) is an international communion of churches in the “continuing” Anglican movement independent of the Anglican Communion and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The TAC was formed in 1991 after a congress of Anglican bishops, priests, and lay people. Today the federation or union of the TAC consists of fifteen church bodies, among them the Anglican Church in America. The current primate (since 2002) is Archbishop John HEPWORTH of the Anglican Catholic Church in Australia. For the most part the TAC upholds a Catholic interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Articles (of 1563) and most parishioners of the member churches can be described as traditional Anglo-Catholics in their theology and liturgical practice. The liturgical services are not celebrated according to the more recent national *Books of Common Prayer*, but mainly according to the *Anglican Missal* of 1921 (usually in more recent editions, and in some cases according to the conservative 1928 *American Book of Common Prayer*), which partially reflects in a broader sense the liturgical usage in England before the Reformation (Sarum Use).

In October 2007, in a Plenary Session in Portsmouth (England) the bishops of the TAC recognized the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC) and asked the Holy See for full, corporate and sacramental (comm)union. Negotiations are still being conducted. Of course, there are considerable problems regarding celibacy, since most of the priests and bishops of the TAC are married. But these problems may somehow find a canonical solution.

The Anglican Church in America (= ACA) is a “continuing” Anglican church body and the US branch of the TAC. The Anglican Church in America was created in 1991 following extensive negotiations between the Anglican Catholic Church (= ACC) and the American Episcopal Church (= AEC; a “continuing” church body not to confused with the Episcopal Church in the US). The Anglican Church in America has accepted most of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church that have been traditionally rejected by Anglicans. The Anglican Church in America claims roughly a hundred parishes with a membership of around 5,200.

3.3 Some Concluding Remarks and Proposals

With the aid of a modified (not the classical) “Comparative Liturgiology,” which is not only limited to “laws/principles” of organic development, but also comprises the comparison and the mutual influences of different rites and liturgical Uses (and their component liturgical units), we could notice a huge variety of different liturgical rites and uses in East *and West*. The Catholic Church also includes many Eastern rites, such as the Melkite Rite, the Maronite Rite, the Syrian-Catholic Rite, the Coptic-Catholic Rite, the Chaldean Rite, the Armenian-Catholic Rite, and some more. And even the Latin Rite is a liturgical family that includes the widely practiced and most common Roman Rite in addition to – yet today – the Ambrosian Rite of Milan, the Old-Spanish (“Mozarabic”) Rite in parts of Spain, the Zaire Use in some parts of Africa, the diocesan usage of Braga in North Portugal, the Use of the Carthusian monastic order, as well as other liturgical uses and forms.

From the point of view of a modified “Comparative Liturgiology” we can also define the “Anglican Use” as a particular liturgical form of worship within the Western liturgical tradition of the Catholic Church. In a broader sense the “Anglican Use” partially derived from the pre-reformation Sarum Use in England with later liturgical changes, additions and omissions over the following centuries. An expanded and modified “Anglican Use” within the Catholic Church would be a true and fruitful liturgical enrichment.

If in the future, Rome would grant a canonical and hence also a liturgical solution for these current and prospective Anglican and Episcopalian converts (including from the TAC and other jurisdictions), then the Church will be automatically faced with the urgent necessity of providing *one single* common liturgical *ordo* for all three of the abovementioned groupings, as well as obligatory liturgical books. This *ordo*, in the sense of an “Anglican Use” (less probably an “Anglican-Catholic Rite”), would have to be worked out on the basis of the *Book of Divine Worship* (as the “official” liturgical book already approved by the Church), but with consideration of other liturgical books, especially the *American Missal* and the *English Missal*, together with the other sacramental rites of that tradition, including the 1549 and 1928 *Books of Common Prayer*. It may be worth examining also the liturgical books of the so-called “Western Orthodox Rite” (of the Antiochian Orthodox Patriarchate) that includes an adaptation of the Anglican liturgy. The method of “Comparative Liturgiology” could be especially helpful here, identifying the specific Anglican elements and integrating them into organic and reasonable unity within the Western tradition.

♦ **And so, what needs to be done?**

(1) One should organize a committee of competent liturgists from the abovementioned **three** main groupings (“Anglican Use” parishes, TAC, and other former Anglicans from the Episcopal Church in the US), so as to collect and sort collectively all the liturgical services of the various groups, already now, in order to present ideas and liturgical suggestions for **one** revised and modified *Book of Divine Worship*; so as to engage in discussion and arrive at a common liturgical proposal that would not contradict the received Catholic faith (cf. *lex credendi – lex orandi*).

Rome cannot allow **three or more** different Anglican Uses for each Anglican group or community that seeks union with the Holy See for understandable liturgical and ecclesiological reasons. And surely the Holy See shall not give special permission for other Anglican Uses according to the *American Missal* or *Anglican Missal* or *English Missal*, nor for an Anglican Use according to the countless different national Prayer Books such as the *American Prayer Books* of 1928 or 1979, all in addition to the already existing “Anglican Use” according to the 2003 *Book of Divine Worship*. A committee of competent liturgists of the different directions/groups of former Anglicans should think about **one** combined “Anglican Use/Rite,” maybe with only one or two alternative formulae for Eucharist at the most. The template for revision could be the already officially approved *Book of Divine Worship*, but with more liturgical elements from the *Anglican/American Missals*, the 1549/1928 *Prayer Books*, the *Anglican Service Book*, the “Western Orthodox Rite,” and other sources including the missing rituals (e.g. Anointing of the Sick, Confession, Matrimony, Confirmation, etc.). Relevant liturgical studies need to be conducted as soon as possible.

A distinction must thereby be made between “sacramental” and “non-sacramental” liturgical services. The “non-sacramental” services can be adapted in respect to the local customs or needs of a parish or religious community/order (especially the Daily Office). The “sacramental” services (Eucharist, Baptism, Anointing of the Sick, Confession), however, need to be more or less uniform (only with a few alternative formulae). One should also keep in mind the possibility of “inculturation” mentioned at Vatican II in its *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (SC 38–39), that is, the adaptation of liturgical rituals to local and supra-local customs, in this case to the Anglican heritage.

All these complex considerations should finally be extended to the other Anglican

groups (outside the USA and also beyond the TAC) interested in full (comm)union with the Holy See. It is clear that only Rome can make a final decision about a further modified “Anglican Use” and its liturgical books.

- (2) Additional work is needed on all the rites that have heretofore not been included in the *Book of Divine Worship* (Confession, Confirmation, Ordination, Consecration of Churches and Altars etc.).
- (3) As church songs are also part of liturgy in general, there is a need to think about a new or at least renewed “Hymnal.”
- (4) Liturgical education should also be provided for priests sometime in the future. Perhaps a “Liturgical Institute” could be founded for the study of pastoral-liturgical questions and for continuing formation and training of priests and lay people.

*

“Comparative Liturgiology” has clearly demonstrated not only the existence, but also the importance and ecumenical relevance of different liturgical families, rites and uses in East and West. These are a genuine and necessary enrichment of the Church. A modified and renewed Catholic “Anglican Use” within the Western liturgical tradition would be a valuable benefit for the Catholic Church. They would also have a signal effect not only for different Anglican groups worldwide seeking union with Rome because of different issues, but possibly even for other Protestant groups. For this reason it is worth every effort to find them a liturgical home, preserving their liturgical heritage as much as possible and enabling full communion with the Holy See.

A worldwide “Anglican Use” within the Latin Rite would also be a pastoral-liturgical benefit for the Roman Catholic parishes in the sense of a fruitful influence for a new *ars celebrandi* (= art of celebrating liturgy) concerning liturgical vestments, liturgical music, liturgical symbols, etc.

By way of conclusion it should be stressed that the above considerations are not inspired by proselytism. That is to say, they are not influenced by any “Conversion-Ecumenism” that intends to missionize Anglicans and other Protestants. It was rather the intention of this inquiry to provide these fellow-Christians with a liturgy within the Catholic Church, when the other prerequisites for unity are met. There is doubtlessly yet a long and difficult path ahead, but we shall believe – and certainly pray – that a beneficial solution will ultimately be found.