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The Anglicanorum Coetibus Society is Coming into its Own

_A Letter from the Society’s President, David Murphy_

I am pleased and very proud to be able to welcome you to the second issue of our journal _Shared Treasure_, which contains some ground-breaking and thought-provoking articles.

The first is by Father Allan Hawkins, the former Vice-President of the Anglican Use Society and pastor emeritus of the first complete parish to be received into the Catholic Church under the Pastoral Provision, St. Mary the Virgin in Arlington, Texas (now a parish of the Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of Saint Peter). He explains how the married state of many Ordinariate priests, far from being an impediment to the priestly vocation, is indeed a gift to the Church and to the members of the priest’s family themselves.

Univ.-Professor Dr. Hans-Jürgen Feulner KSG, a member of the _Anglicanae Traditiones_ Commission of the Vatican, which drew up the Ordinariates’ _Divine Worship_ liturgy, and a Director of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society, explains how the concept of liturgical diversity within a unity of faith is an important part of the “realised ecumenism” so powerfully elucidated by Monsignor Mark Langham in the last issue.

Benedictine monk Dom Benedict Andersen OSB of Silverstream Priory in Ireland, in an essentially historical article on the Prayer of Humble Access, looks into the problem of how liturgical texts from the pen of a manifest heretic, specifically designed to convey heterodox notions under the cover of traditional Catholic language, can come to be accepted by the Catholic Church and integrated into Catholic liturgy.

The journal closes with the homily delivered at the requiem for the sorely missed Jerry McGreevy, former Treasurer of the Anglican Use
Society, by his pastor, Father Eric Bergman, who is also the Chaplain Director of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society.

With this second issue I personally feel that the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society has left its moorings and taken sail. We are indeed already well under way.

The work by C. David Burt and an international team of advisors on the revision of the Gradual in line with the introduction of Divine Worship: The Missal has entered its last phase, which is the careful proof-reading and amendment of the final draft in preparation for publication. We look forward to receiving an Imprimatur from the Ordinaries, so that the Gradual can be published as part of the Divine Worship liturgy.

Another significant initiative of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society is the drafting of a Book of Devotions for the use of Ordinariate members, and hopefully other interested Christians. We are in the process of finalising a cooperation agreement between the Society and the Ordinariates worldwide and feel very confident that we can achieve important inter-Ordinariate synergies, so that the completed devotional aid will be of high quality and have universal appeal.

Planning for the first Anglicanorum Coetibus Society conference, to be held in Houston, Texas, from 21st to 23rd September of this year, has now begun in earnest. The speakers have been decided on and they have agreed to participate, a first planning meeting by conference call has taken place between the team on the ground in Houston and the Conference Committee of the ACS, which is convened by Fr. Eric Bergman. A preliminary budget is being drawn up, and advertising and marketing for the conference will begin soon.

One of the places where you can follow the Conference News is the new, completely updated website of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society, which is now online and can be accessed at www.acsociety.org. The website, which is administered by Joseph DeCaria, includes information about the Society and the possibility to become a member and pay subscriptions or make donations online. There is a full archive of back issues of Anglican Embers and Shared Treasure. The current issue will be protected by an access code, which will be made available
to members of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society and those non-members who purchase a subscription. There is also a link to the news blog which is an amalgamation of the Ordinariate Europe “Ordinariate News” and the “Anglican Use of the Roman Rite” blog. David Murphy and Deborah Gyapong are the administrators of this blog and additional authors are being sought to enlarge its scope.

You are encouraged to become ACS members and support us both financially and with your hard work. Please don’t forget that you can obtain the print version of *Shared Treasure* by taking out a subscription (see the last page).

I hope you enjoy this issue of the journal.

Wishing you all a fulfilling Lent and a happy and holy Easter

*David Murphy*

President of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society

president@acsociety.org
Father

Allan Hawkins

There were thirty-five children, aged seven and eight, ready to make their first Confessions: well-prepared, devout, serious and articulate. This recent First Penance service had been arranged in their large local parish; but the parish priest was away, and so three priests – of whom I was one – were invited to assist by administering the sacrament. The penance service itself was conducted by one of the parish’s three deacons – a retired army officer, a fine and theologically-grounded preacher and teacher of the Faith. I have heard several of his excellent Mass homilies, at Masses that he could not himself celebrate. He is not “Father”. Yet he is himself a father, and a grandfather; and, in his homily, he spoke to the children with all the ease and gentle calm reassurance for which he had been prepared by years of paternal ministry in his own family. But he was not a priest; he could not give absolution, and others, from outside that parish community, had to be in brought in to do so.

After the service, the deacon and I were talking; and he, knowing that I am a (former Anglican, Anglo-Catholic, now Roman Catholic) married priest, asked me what I felt about the report that Pope Francis reportedly called the Catholic Church’s requirement that its clergy remain celibate a “problem” for which “there are solutions,” during a controversial interview with an Italian newspaper. The Pope recalled that celibacy was adopted 900 years after the death of Jesus and pointed out that the Eastern Church allows its priests to marry. “There definitely is a problem, but it is not a major one,” he was reported as saying. “This needs time, but there are solutions and I will find them.”

I responded to the deacon’s question as I have always done over the years: I, as a married priest, have generally avoided this debate and, hitherto, I have had no desire to take part in any campaign with regard to it – while expressing gratitude, certainly, for what has been granted to me.
Nevertheless, this does not mean that I have no opinions on the matter. Nor can it possibly mean that those of us who have lived the experience of a married priesthood can have no insights to contribute to the discussion. And it is increasingly difficult to remain on the sidelines – partly because of the questionable nature of some of the arguments which are regularly advanced against married priests, and partly because there are some positive things about such a ministry – however these may ultimately be evaluated – which ought to be set out on record.

What follows is not in any sense a comprehensive argument, but merely a brief assessment of some specific points that are regularly advanced in this context, and certain reflections which arise in doing so.

First, let me set out my credentials for claiming to have an opinion which merits consideration. Apart from the years spent in military service, at university and in seminary, my entire life has been spent in clerical households – first that of my father, then in my own. My father was ordained to the Anglican priesthood in the Church of England in 1927. He died in 1981, thus giving 54 years of his life to that ministry. I was ordained to the Anglican priesthood, also in the Church of England, in 1960. Thus, between us, my father and I (each of us was married several years after ordination) can claim an aggregate of almost one hundred years of experience of living the married priesthood in a variety of ministerial settings and assignments.

Some may want to question whether this was a “real” priesthood. Let me respond simply by saying that, in our estimation, intention and experience, it was so. Certainly it was a life focused in the daily liturgy of the Church – the Divine Office, the daily Mass, the administration of the sacraments, the hearing of confessions and the giving of spiritual direction, the pastoral care of people, teaching, visiting the sick and dying, and so on – with all the spiritual, intellectual, emotional and physical demands which that entails, not to mention an extremely modest material standard of living. My father always made it clear to us, as I have done in my own family, that the needs of the parish and the service of the Kingdom of Christ have absolute first priority in our lives. In practice, this has never actually meant the making of acute
and agonizing choices – but, to the contrary, it has brought immense, varied, and often the most unexpected blessings to us. Throughout my childhood I overheard my father’s recitation of the Divine Office, I served him as an altar boy, I watched from my bedroom window as he buried the dead in the churchyard. I sang when my mother played the organ at Vespers (attended only, perhaps, by my family and a handful of others) for the Vigils of the feasts. We went as a family to joyful parish family weddings. We mourned deeply when members of our parish family died. I would answer the rectory doorbell when someone came for comfort or help. It was a blessed state, a graceful – and grace-giving – way of life. Perhaps clergy wives and children do not have an easy time, in some respects. Easy? No. But blessed, graced, fulfilled, happy? Yes, absolutely.

Jaroslav Pelikan, in his commentary on Acts, in the Brazos Theological Commentary series, wrote:

“… for centuries compulsory celibacy was not a rule for the clergy, or even for bishops: Saint Peter was married (Luke 4:38-39; 1 Cor. 9:5); Saint Gregory of Nyssa was married; and Gregory of Nazianzus the Elder, father of Saint Gregory the Theologian, was a bishop. Nevertheless, the imperative of ἐγκράτεια also in this respect acquired institutional form with the rise of Christian monasticism. Yet ascetic practice and vows could also have a darker side in Acts (23:11-13): “Behold fasting, the mother of murder!” Chrysostom exclaims (Homilies on Acts 49). This darker side becomes evident from the principal etymological derivative of the word ἐγκράτεια, which is “Encratite”, as a party label to mark the heresy of contempt for divine creations such as food and sexuality. The Encratites were described by Saint Irenaeus: “Those who are called Encratites … preached against marriage, thus setting aside the original creation of God, and indirectly blaming Him who made the male and female for the propagation of the human race (Against Heresies 1.28.1).”

If Pope Francis’ recent remarks were accurately reported, he indicated that priestly celibacy is a matter of discipline rather than doctrine; and that the Latin Church does actually have a number of married priests. Their assignments have not been universally “low key”. There are four married priests currently serving in this diocese, apart from the parishes and missions of the Ordinariate. I am one of them, now
Pastor Emeritus of an Anglican Use parish established under the terms of the Pastoral Provision of Pope St. John Paul II. More significantly, two of the married diocesan priests are pastors of normal diocesan parishes – one of them being by far the largest parish in the Diocese, having formerly served as Chancellor of the Diocese and Moderator of the Curia. It is difficult to imagine a less “low key” role; and of course, Rome was consulted before that appointment was made.

The Ordinariates established under the Apostolic Constitution Anglicanorum Coetibus are part of the New Evangelization described in Ad Gentes (Vatican II) and represent the Catholic Church’s desire, learned from half a century of direct dialogue and ecumenism, to learn and receive for itself what the providential Anglican tradition and its patrimony – “a treasure to be shared” (Ap. Cons. III) – has to offer.

What, then, are the main characteristics of the Anglican patrimony? The Liturgy in its classical Prayer Book style and language is doubtless the most visible element in this. But there is much more: a great heritage of music, hymnody, poetry – and a distinctive spirituality (English, perhaps, rather than narrowly Anglican) and pastoral style. Martin Thornton, in his Essays in Pastoral Reconstruction (1960) says this:

First, and predominantly, a superbly balanced synthesis between the Affective and Speculative strains of Catholic spirituality; this is our real pastoral level-headedness, our living via media, whereby emotion is never allowed to run away from reason. Thus Julian of Norwich can combine a vividly disturbing meditation on the Passion with the coldly logical doctrine of the Atonement traceable to St Anselm. … From this particular balance derives that plain acceptance of fact, with special regard to Christology, the Passion, and thence Redemption, which gives English spirituality its unique brand of simple optimism: the “homely loving” of Julian, the warm domesticity of St Gilbert. And this is where the pastoral and priestly traditions really come in, because this is the kind of spiritual environment in which they function. Of course our own land and Church share with all others their periods of laxity, abuse, heresy and, indeed, anti-clericalism; but throughout all these vicissitudes, this unique pastoral sense, or colour, or flavour, is never quite eradicated. There is always a certain honest worldliness. The English priest has never taken too kindly to celibacy; he has always inclined to do his duty and enjoy his beer, both without a lot of fuss. He has been trained not in the seminary but in the schools and universities
of the land, side by side with his secular brothers—and even sisters. Compared with other traditions the English clergy might look a little weak, a little amateur, a little colourless. It is vital to see that this is not true, that it is rather part and parcel with a deep, strong spiritual tradition with roots in New Testament theology. Perhaps Professor [G.M.] Trevelyan (English Social History) gives us an analogy when he writes: “If the French noblesse had been capable of playing cricket with their peasants, perhaps their châteaux would never have been burnt.”

It is said that married priests would want to live “outside the rectory”. Having lived in rectories/presbyteries all my life, I cannot imagine why this would be supposed. But, as it happens, this could certainly be said of almost all the celibate Catholic priests, both diocesan and religious, of the city in which I ministered for almost 33 years. With one exception, the clergy of the other six Catholic parishes in that city all live anonymously (in the sense that their homes are not in any obvious outward sense “rectories”) at some distance from their churches – and, since they very rarely wear clericals (unlike me!) they readily disappear into the local background.

In the English Anglican pastoral tradition, priests do not have “offices” but “studies”. Parishioners who come to them for spiritual direction, or for any other need, are thus welcomed into a home rather than into a place of business. His personal home is not regarded as being off-limits to parishioners in the way that, say, a doctor’s home would be to his patients. His telephone number – because it is the home number of a family – is not unlisted; and his people can, and do, call him at all times of day and night. Obviously, we hope that that would not be abused; and, generally, it is not. On the other hand, it is impossible to find anything other than a highly-protective answering service if one calls any of the other parishes in this area outside office hours.

Anyway, and for what it is worth, I can provide a stack of anecdotal evidence which testifies to the 24/7 availability of the married priests as opposed to the extraordinary difficulty of finding other priests to deal with pastoral emergencies at night and on public holidays. Let me provide two (out of countless) true examples of what this has meant in practice.
First, on one Christmas Day some years ago I had finally finished a long series of Masses (of the Vigil, at Midnight, at Dawn, of the Day) at about noon. I was no longer young, and I was contentedly but truly exhausted. Knowing this, my son had assisted me as server/Eucharistic minister at this final Mass of the day, and had smoothed my way as far as possible. As we got home afterwards – looking forward, of course, to family lunch, the opening of gifts and so on – the telephone rang. It appeared that a young man had committed suicide that morning, and that a priest was sought. They had called every other parish in the area and could find no one. Eventually they called me because my family telephone number is listed, and I could therefore be found. Because of my exhaustion, my son drove me to the house where the tragedy had occurred. This was not a family from my parish – but, as it turned out, the young man had been at high school with my son, who knew him and his family fairly well. Here, therefore, there was an immediate human, personal, pastoral opportunity which came about because of the “family” context in which my priestly ministry is exercised.

The second story is more recent, concerning something which happened on the eve of a recent Thanksgiving Day. There was a young parish family who live almost directly across the street from my home (itself, of course, adjacent to the church). This family had a toddler, and they were fairly early on in a pregnancy with twins. Suddenly on that Thanksgiving morning, and without any warning, the woman gave birth at home to one of the two babies. Sadly, the little one lived only for a few minutes (but, happily, was baptized in that short time). The mother, with her husband caring for her, was rushed to the hospital where the second child was born. My wife took the toddler and cared for him for twenty-four hours until relatives arrived. When, late in the evening, the husband returned home from the hospital, my family shared our late dinner with him. Then, when he could not bring himself to clear up the after-birth and blood-spattered bedroom, my son went over and did so. Forgive me: I find it hard to imagine a celibate priest being able – even if willing – to offer the kind of care that this priest’s family and household provided on this occasion.

Much of the argument against married priests seems to be based on a fallacy: that the ability to love, emotionally, pastorally, involves a quantitatively finite commodity. Thus it is often alleged that the total
availability and self-emptying that both marriage and priesthood demands preclude the undertaking of both simultaneously. But let's think about it: does a mother of ten children have only a tenth as much love to give to each of them as a mother of only one? Some would argue that the ability to love increases and expands with the birth of each of them. Am I able to provide seventeen times as much pastoral care and love to my parishioners as compared with my priest-friend who has seventeen times as many people to care for as I do?

“There would be the possibility of divorce”, it is said. Sadly, because even priests share in the fallenness of mankind, that is true. However, the effects of the Fall on priests have been rather more widely noted in other and much more lurid situations in recent times. And I am optimistic enough to think that clergy divorce is not, within the structures of a vigilant pastoral care and authority, inevitable. It was virtually unknown in the Church of England, certainly, through my growing up and the years of my own ministry there (though things have, sadly, changed since then).

Someone has referred to the Catholic priesthood as “an eschatological sign”, and of course I wholeheartedly concur. But what sort of sign is most needed in our day? We live in a world that has absolutized sex. It is an age which rejoices in barrenness (homosexuality, abortion, contraception, “DINKS” – the “Double Income No Kids” lifestyle). Might one not suppose that consecrated fruitfulness and the example of happy and united family life lived in the service of the Kingdom of Christ is by far the most important sign that now needs to be provided?

It is pointed out that “Christ himself was celibate” – as though that were somehow to clinch the argument. Of course it does no such thing. If I may so put it, there was no option in the matter. Had Jesus married, but had no children, it would have been a perplexing and dubious sign as to the meaning and purpose of marriage. If he had indeed had children, then he would have established a dynasty – and the religion of his (and its) followers would have been something quite other than Christianity.

The subject of compensation for married priests is one that needs some competent research; and my comment on it is inevitably anecdotal rather than anything more factual. I can only say that my
own compensation was modest but adequate – and, more importantly, very caringly provided. Furthermore, my total package was not vastly greater than that which is provided for the diocesan celibate clergy – although it has to provide for two adults and, in the past, for the needs of our children. In one important respect it is actually less: the amount which my parish set aside for some kind of pension provision for me and for my wife was significantly less than the monthly payment which is made for each celibate priest into the Diocesan Priests’ Pension fund. It should also be noted that my total compensation package was provided by a parish community which was less than one quarter the size of the next biggest parish in the area. In other words, if my parish could do it, almost all other parishes can do so.

Interestingly, in the English terminology, a priest is given what is called “a living”; that is to say, he is provided with an income (which is not in any sense a recompense, or compensation, for specific work done or the number of hours put in) on which to live, precisely so that he does not have to undertake “professional” work in order to exist. The understanding of priesthood is that it concerns “being” before it involves any particular “doing”. It is indeed a state of life: comparable to, and I would maintain compatible with, Holy Matrimony.

It has been suggested that there would be a tendency for married priests to migrate to family-friendly places, and to avoid ministry among the poor and in areas of high crime. In response to that, let me next say something of where the combined hundred years of married priesthood of my father and me have been exercised. My father, coming from a moderately privileged background and an idyllic youth spent in Prince Edward Island, went, after the horrors of the front line in World War One, to university and seminary and then deliberately chose to serve in a grim industrial diocese in the north of England. (He was never able, on the impoverished stipend of an Anglican priest, to afford to return home, even on the deaths of his parents.) Thus, when I and my sister were born in the 1930s he was pastor of an inner city slum parish in the worst of the inter-war years of depression and widespread unemployment.

Then, with the coming of the Second World War, my father cared for his people through the blitz. Night after consecutive night, as the
warning sirens wailed and the bombs fell, he would leave his family – and many of the children of the parish who would otherwise have been without reinforced shelters — in the cellar of the rectory while he roamed the streets of the parish all night, caring for those without shelter, helping the injured and those made homeless by the bombing, giving the sacraments to the dying. Finally, on Christmas Eve 1940, the church, the rectory (in which my mother, my sister and I, were sheltering in the cellar) and the adjacent hospital were all severely damaged by bombs. Thereafter, leaving the parish in the care of an assistant priest, he joined the Royal Air Force as a chaplain – in which, incidentally, he gave distinguished and honored service. After the war he returned to that inner city parish – an area which by then was in rapid social decline, with all the pastoral problems attendant thereon. In addition to caring for that large parish, he also served as chaplain to a huge adjacent hospital; and there was rarely a night in which he was not called there. Nevertheless, he was in church and at the altar at 6:30 AM every day of the week.

And there was always the ready assumption that if the civic community needed leadership in some secular matter, then the parish priest (the Clerk in Holy Orders – i.e. the educated one in the community) was the one who would of course provide it. Thus my father was not only president of the local cricket club (a game with which, as a Canadian, he was not particularly familiar) but also the one who chaired the process that led to the creation of a war memorial park, the building of a public library in the community, and the provision of covered waiting areas at the local bus stop. I, for my part, had many similar experiences, not least of which was the leading of a local referendum campaign in connection with the entry of Britain into the European Community (an activity which I have now come to regret, as things have developed)! I served for eleven years in a parish set in one of the London “new Towns” ministering to a very young and transplanted community, with all the pastoral demands associated with that. I also served on the government’s Social Security Appeals Tribunal, which provided adjudication in disputed cases. We carried out this varied and extraordinarily demanding ministry while we had families and small children – indeed, it was probably that very fact that enabled us to undertake so much, so often and so long, sharing as they did much of
the burden and providing a place of respite and healing for the bruising which was sometimes involved.

My own ministry in the Church of England was all spent in inner urban parishes, with overwhelming social problems, moral decay and high crime. This is precisely the setting into which my children were born; and, in the absence of a church school, their experience of elementary education included attendance at a public school which eventually had to be closed because of repeated outbreaks of typhoid there. The fact is that I did not have to work in that parish; but that was the parish to which God called me and the bishop appointed me. And these very challenges of clerical family life – in the Church of England, at any rate – seem to have provided an upbringing to countless people who have given distinguished service to the community in the professions and in public life. It has been historically noted in the United Kingdom that a disproportionate number of those who have given distinguished service to the nation in the professions, in art and letters, in academic pursuits, in the military, in politics and public service, have been the children of the clergy.

Clifford J. Levy, in an article in *The New York Times* (March 23, 2010) wrote that:

“…. in (Rudno) western Ukraine, many Catholic priests are married, fruitful and multiplying – with the Vatican’s blessing. The many feet scampering around the Volovetskiy home are testament to that. The family’s six children range from Pavlina, 21, to Taras, 9. In the middle is Roman, 16, who wants to be a Catholic priest when he grows up. Just like his father. Dad is the Rev. Yuriy Volovetskiy, who leads a small parish here and whose wife, Vera, teaches religious school. The Volovetskiys serve in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, which believes that celibate priests are not necessarily better priests. …. Father Volovetskiy said having children changed how he approached his calling. ‘It helps me to view the world through the eyes of others,’ he said. ‘And it helps people trust me more. They see that there is a priest who has a family, and they see how we live. We are part of society.’”

An old friend of mine, a priest and a fine teacher of the Faith who is now long dead, used to say that nothing makes a man of you – not even service in the Marine Corps – more than marriage. And, I would add, nothing better prepares a man for “Father-hood” than the experience
of being a father. I certainly would not claim that either marriage or fatherhood are essential for the priesthood, for I value far too highly the distinctive vocation of celibacy, and I have been greatly blessed by the teaching and care of celibate priests both religious and secular. Nevertheless, in an age where many have become “feminized”, not to say effeminate, I believe that the essential masculinity of the husband and father can make a very significant contribution to the renewal of the priesthood.

Certainly, we live in an age in which the world has lost its collective mind about sex. But I have two comments to make about it. The first is that if we lived in a society which had lost its collective mind about nutrition (as, I suppose, we do, given the ubiquity of obesity), the witness which the few sane people should give is not to starve themselves to death but to eat moderately and sensibly to the restoration of health and vitality, thus giving clear witness to what the purpose of the appetite for food actually is. And surely what the world (out of its mind, as agreed) needs most is the witness of true and holy marriages. My second point is to cry out in despair, once again, about the incredible notion that marriage is about sex *tout court*. Marriage is about procreation, about nurturing, about living selflessly, about companionship and community, about bearing and forbearing, about modeling in family life the Kingdom of God in miniature. Genital sex is a good, beautiful and God-given thing, which plays an important and significant – but, in terms of time, at least, a tiny – part in marriage. It is critics of clerical marriage who have sex constantly on their minds, not married priests. We eat to live; and, in a properly regulated household, mealtimes do not overwhelm the real purposes of life – though, perhaps just very occasionally they do adorn an occasion for celebration. It is like saying that Mozart was deplorable in that he consumed *viennoiserie* and drank chocolate rather than living only for his music. Mozart did live for his music; and his consumption of croissants, and probably other things as well, was entirely incidental to that.

The alleged connection between celibacy and the shortage of priests is debatable. However, I would want to add a couple of points. First, the Church in which the celebration of the Eucharist is rare and infrequent, and in which the lives of the faithful are not centered on the sacrifice of the altar, will be vastly different from the Catholic Church
as we – at least – have known her. Second, I am convinced that to focus the problem of the priest shortage in the issue of the provision of the Eucharist, as is generally the case, is to obscure another vastly important aspect of the matter. With the shortage of priests, we are looking to the care of a Catholic community which (because of unnaturally huge parishes, with individual priests celebrating four or even five Masses each weekend) can participate regularly in the Eucharist, but has little realistic opportunity to go to confession frequently, is unable to get spiritual direction and will be deprived of the Last Rites. That is what the priest shortage threatens.

It is hard to contemplate such a situation with equanimity; and it is even harder for me to understand how such equanimity could be justified when a possible part of the solution might lie in the (relatively) minor matter of the acceptance of the fact that celibacy and priesthood are separate – though certainly neither incompatible nor indissoluble – vocations.

And, in the end, I think that the most telling argument for me is that a priesthood which contains both celibate and married men is that which is truly the most incarnational – so that the priest shares entirely with the families in his care in the matter of putting a roof over the heads of children and food in their mouths, and – as a family man inevitably and especially is – concerned with the quality of local schools and libraries, crime prevention, local press and television, and all the rest of the issues which are proper to community life. Such concerns would certainly also include concern about the cost of food, fuel and the basic commodities, housing and insurance (among other things) from which the celibate priest is largely, if not entirely, insulated.

A friend – a Catholic priest of Seton Hall – wrote to me some years ago:

“It seems to me that married clergy bring the ‘familial’ into Church life in a way that is really needed. It needs to be said that this country is not ‘Latin territory’. ….. We should be out converting these people to the True Faith that is incarnated to them in an idiom (meaning a whole panoply of things) that will integrate their lives into a rhythm that is Theophanic. The way that casual barbarism is accepted is daunting. Nomads go where they can pasture their herds or find game, the modern
nomads go where their jobs take them – away from family, church, school and roots. This whole pattern of life seems to be as accepted as death and taxes. An optional married clergy should draw people back to familial values.”

The whole question is set, pre-eminently, within the context of the priest’s mission and ministry. We live today in what Max Weber, the great German sociologist, called a “disenchanted world.” What this colorful phrase means is that we live today with no socialized expectation of the evidence of God’s presence in the world. It is not a part of our collective representation. The Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins assured us that the world is “charged with the grandeur of God”. But society does not tell us that the whole creation is alive with proof of transcendent glory.

C.S. Lewis, in his last book *The Discarded Image* (1964) wrote that the medieval person who found himself “looking up at a world lighted, warmed, and resonant with music” has become modern man who perceives only emptiness and silence. It seems to me that we must come to grips with this situation and to recover the vocation of the priest as being one who enables persons to perceive the revealing presence of God in their ordinary lives – that is to say, the priest is to be an enchanter.

Urban T. Holmes once wrote:

“I have never met an enchanter who did not possess a certain wholesome earthiness. The Judaeo-Christian tradition has been its own worst enemy to the degree that it has incorporated into its own life that peculiar brand of Middle Eastern asceticism, characterized by an obsessive fear of the material world, which has been reinforced by centuries of recurring Puritanism. Its Christ is docetic, its sacraments are banal, and its sense of the holy is sanitized. The effective priest is not a dilettante or a ‘shrinking violet.’ The idea that ‘cleanliness is next to godliness’ originated with the rabbis of the Talmud, reflecting their anxiety over pollution. It strikes me as quite inconsistent with the Incarnation.”

Finally, if the Catholic Church is serious in its commitment to ecumenism – that is, to obedience to the will of the Lord that His Church should be one, so that the world may believe – it cannot avoid some eventual resolution to the celibacy issue. The married priesthood
of the Churches of the Orthodox East, and of the Catholic Eastern Rites, not to mention the centuries of witness in the ecclesial communities of the Reformation, will not just dissolve away. The matter will have to be addressed in a way that gives due weight to both the celibate and married traditions within the priesthood – and, in fact, the Anglo-Catholic experience and witness in this regard may well be \textit{sine qua non}.

Footnote: An extensive and thorough study of this matter has recently (2014) been published (by DDB Paris) in France. \textit{Célibat des prêtres: la discipline de l’Eglise, doit-elle changer ?} is by Jean Mercier, an editorial writer for the Catholic weekly \textit{La Vie}. As yet no English translation has been published.

This article first appeared on Fr. Hawkins’ blog: https://salveteatquevalete.wordpress.com
Prosper of Aquitaine’s well-known ancient Christian principle “lex orandi, lex credendi” (“the law of praying [is] the law of believing” – and vice versa) refers to the indispensable relationship between worship and belief. It has long governed the liturgical celebrations of the Church. Nevertheless, it does not require a rigid uniformity of liturgical expression for keeping the unity of faith. This essay will explore the recent incorporation of groups of former Anglicans into the Roman Catholic Church together with the preservation of their Anglican liturgical patrimony to demonstrate the legitimate diversity of liturgical expression in the Church, also in the West, as background for the movement toward unity in a diverse community of believers.

Diversity of Liturgical Expression – Western Non-Roman Rites and Liturgical Usages

In the preface to his first Book of Common Prayer (1549), Edward VI wrote:

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

Until the time of the English Reformation, at least five liturgical uses or diocesan usages in the English church mirrored a widespread diversity of liturgical expression in Europe that still exists today. Diversity continued in the Catholic Church even after the Council of Trent (1545–1563) with its move toward a standardization of the liturgy of the Latin Church, the largest and most significant ritual church within the Catholic Church.² It is perhaps surprising that a variety of liturgical rites exist in the Roman Catholic Church – and not only the Roman Catholic Rite that we may expect to find everywhere in the West. The Church has always had a great variety of rites and liturgical usages – in both the Christian East and the Catholic Church. Special local liturgical forms remained permissible if they had existed for at least 200 years before the Council of Trent.³ Thus, in the West there were and are plenty of non-Roman rites and diocesan or


² The designation Latin refers here to the rite or group of rites and liturgical forms and ordinances of which the Roman Rite is the most dominant; and to the traditional liturgical language that has been used within this particular church, today mostly replaced by the vernacular.

³ See the papal bulls “Quod a nobis” (July 9, 1568) and “Quo pri- mum” (July 14, 1570) of Pope Pius V included in the Breviarium Romanum 1568 and in the Missale Romanum 1570.
monastic liturgical forms and usages: the lost Old Gallican and Celtic Rites; the current Milanese or Ambrosian Rite; the Old Spanish (or Hispano-Mozarabic) Rite; the so-called Glagolitic Use (still partially used in Croatia); the former liturgical uses of religious orders like the Premonstratensians, Cistercians, Carmelites, Dominicans, and Carthusians (the last maintained to this day); the former diocesan uses in many dioceses of Italy, Germany, and Spain (and in England until the Reformation), of which only one remains in use today – that of the archdiocese of Braga in northern Portugal.  

The Apostolic Constitution “Anglicanorum Coetibus” (2009) and the Personal Ordinariates for Former Anglicans/Episcopalians

The internationally renowned German liturgist Balthasar Fischer was rather farsighted and somewhat euphoric, when, already in 1981, in connection with Article 4 of the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on Sacred Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium (SC), he mentioned the ecumenical dimension of the liturgy:

Nowhere does re-unification any longer mean – and also not in the West – the adoption of the Roman liturgy and of specifically Catholic piety. Today one can very well imagine how the magnificent liturgy celebrated by our Anglican brothers, with some minute changes, could become a “ritus legitime agnitus” [“lawfully acknowledged rite”]; an English liturgical family among the liturgical families of the Catholic

4  See Archdale A. King, Liturgies of the Religious Orders, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, 1956); Liturgies of the Prima-
Church. With all the spiritual riches that have been amassed here in 400 years, she would join her wagon to the train of Catholic liturgies.\(^5\)

On January 15, 2011, a decree of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) created the Personal Ordinariate of “Our Lady of Walsingham” for England and Wales – the first of three Personal Ordinariates.\(^6\) Personal Ordinariates are ecclesiastical administration units for former Anglican communities seeking to become Catholic while retaining many aspects of their Anglican liturgy and traditions. This diocese-like institution of the Roman Catholic Church, being a canonically independent local and particular church similar to an exempt Military Ordinariate, was accomplished with the agreement of the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales in accordance with the guidelines of the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum Coetibus* (AC) – together with its “Complementary Norms” and their “Amendment” – promulgated by Pope Benedict XVI in 2009.\(^7\) The same is also relevant

---

5 Balthasar Fischer, “Liturgie oder Liturgien?” *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 90 (1981): 273–274 [my translation from German; emphasis added and my explanation of the Latin expression]. Here the term “liturgical families” probably means “rites”. For SC 4, see *The Basic Sixteen Documents Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, NY: Costello, 1996), 118: “Finally, in faithful obedience to tradition, the sacred council declares that the church holds all lawfully recognized rites to be of equal legal force and dignity; that it wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way.”


to the later established Personal Ordinariates of “The Chair of Saint Peter”, created in 2012 for the United States and Canada, and of “Our Lady of the Southern Cross” for Australia – the last of them to date. All three Personal Ordinariates serve former Anglicans from the Church of England, the Church in Wales, the Episcopal Church in the United States of America (TEC), the Anglican Church in America (ACA), the Anglican Church of Canada (ACC), the Anglican Catholic Church of Canada (ACCC), the Anglican Church of Australia, and the Anglican Catholic Church of Australia, all of whom desire to return.
to full communion with the Catholic Church without having to give up most of their own Anglican patrimony, including their liturgical tradition.

The Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum Coetibus*, providing a special structure for groups of Anglicans entering full communion with the Catholic Church, states in its article III:

Without excluding liturgical celebrations according to the Roman Rite, the Ordinariate has the faculty to celebrate the Holy Eucharist and the other Sacraments, the Liturgy of the Hours and other liturgical celebrations *according to [the] liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, which have been approved by the Holy See*, so as to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, *as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared.*

This liturgically outstanding article – for the first time rather openminded toward a Protestant liturgical expression – describes patrimony (“liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions”) as “a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared.” According to Steven Lopes, this “description bespeaks both an internal aspect within the Anglican communities seeking full communion with the Catholic Church (nourishing the faith) as well as an external aspect contributing to Catholic liturgical celebration (a treasure to be shared)”, although the Apostolic Constitution is still rather less specific concerning what actually constitutes this patrimony.

---


Unity of Faith – The Personal Ordinariates and their Anglican Tradition Liturgy ("Divine Worship")

Rome stipulated not to compose a new liturgical text or to devise new liturgical forms, but rather to identify the patrimony from “liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition” (AC III) and to bring it – only as absolutely necessary – very carefully, with as little encroachment as possible and with pastoral sensitivity, into conformity with the indispensable Catholic faith – the “unity of faith”.\(^\text{11}\) October 2011 saw the convocation of the international commission *Anglicanae Traditiones: Interdicasterial Working Group*, at first organized only by the CDF, which has been responsible for preparing a liturgical order for all the Personal Ordinariates according to the requirements of AC III and in due consideration of the *Book of Divine Worship*, of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, and of what is meant by “Anglican Patrimony”.\(^\text{12}\) This liturgical form is to be finally approved and confirmed by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (CDWDS), in agreement with the CDF.

To date, the Holy See has successively approved the Liturgical Calendars, Eucharistic Lectionary, Order for Funerals, Order for the Celebration of Holy Matrimony, Order for the Celebration of Holy

---


Baptism [for infants], Order of Holy Baptism and Confirmation for Adults and Older Children / Order of Holy Baptism for Infants [= slightly corrected version] / Order of Reception into Full Communion with the Celebration of Confirmation / Conditional Baptism / Emergency Baptism / Baptism of One in Imminent Danger of Death / Public Receiving of One who has been Privately Baptized, and Order of Holy Mass.\textsuperscript{13}

In April 2014, the liturgical vision of \textit{Anglicanorum Coetibus} was finally realized in the publication of the official liturgical book \textit{Divine Worship: Occasional Services}, which contains the approved rites for baptism, marriage, and funeral for the three Personal Ordinariates.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} The liturgical calendar for the Personal Ordinariate in England and Wales has already been approved and confirmed by the CDWDS (Feb 15, 2012; Prot.N. 76/12/L), for the United States (February 15, 2012; Prot.N. 75/12/L), and Australia (April 30, 2013; Prot.N. 280/13/L). Roman permission has also been granted for the Mass Lectionary for the Personal Ordinariates. The Revised Standard Version Three-Year Lectionary, 2nd Catholic ed., 2 vols. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006) was originally approved for use by the Episcopal Conference of the Antilles, for the United States in 2012 by the CDWDS (Prot.N. 77/12/L), for England and Wales in 2012 (Prot.N. 78/12/L), and finally for Australia in 2013 (Prot.N. 280/13/L). For a Catholic perspective on the history of the American translations of the Bible to 1971, see Claude J. Pfeifer, “The New American Bible”, \textit{Worship} 45 (1971): 102–113. The CDWDS decreed in 2012 the \textit{Order for Funerals} for England and Wales (Prot.N. 168/12/L), for the United States (Prot.N. 169/12/L), and for Australia (Prot.N. 357/12/L); the \textit{Order for the Celebration of Holy Matrimony} for England and Wales (Prot.N. 359/12/L), for the United States (Prot.N. 360/12/L), and for Australia (Prot.N. 358/12/L). The CDWDS decreed the \textit{Order for the Celebration of Holy Baptism} for the United States, England and Wales, and Australia, May 8, 2013 (Prot.N. 277/13/L, 278/13/L, 279/13/L). The CDWDS temporarily approved the \textit{Ordo Missae} (on a preliminary basis, until the whole missal was completed) by the CDWDS’s May 7, 2013, decree for the United States, England and Wales, and Australia (Prot.N. 274/13/L, 275/13/L, 276/13/L). See also the accompanying letter of the CDF to the three Personal Ordinariates with explanatory remarks to the \textit{Ordo Missae}, May 15, 2013 (e.g. Prot. N. 526/2012–42871).

The Celebration of Holy Mass (Divine Worship: The Missal) was approved in May 2015 and introduced in the Ordinariates on the First Sunday of Advent, November 29, 2015. The richness of these liturgical texts and their conformity with Catholic faith and practice has been made available for the spiritual nourishment not only of Anglican Christians coming into full communion with the Catholic Church, but all members of the Catholic Church as everybody is allowed to join the “Divine Worship” liturgy.

When the CDF declared the work of the Anglicanae Traditiones Commission finished (after completion of these two liturgical books), an approved Daily Office (Liturgy of the Hours) for use in all three Personal Ordinariates was not in sight. In the fall of 2015 the Congregation therefore sent to each of the Ordinariates binding Guidelines for Morning and Evening Prayer in the Personal Ordinariates to ensure a certain uniformity, although the Guidelines can be implemented relatively flexibly.

The CDF clearly chose to take this rather unusual step because the introduction of one single form of the Daily Office was neither pastorally helpful nor desired. The three Ordinaries and their liturgical commissions thus have the responsibility of developing their own forms.

---


16 Cf. Letter from the Cardinal Prefect, Gerhard L. Müller, of October 6, 2015 to Ordinary Harry Entwistle (Prot.N. 536/12 – 52408).
of the Daily Office on the basis of the Guidelines. In the United States work is almost complete on a Daily Office in one volume (which will probably also be used by the Australian Ordinariate), whereas in the United Kingdom there will most likely be a revision of the Customary of Our Lady of Walsingham.

It is to be hoped that liturgical texts for the Anointing of the Sick, the Blessings, and others will follow. Adaptations to regional peculiarities, especially regarding the liturgical calendar and music, are possible.

The development of the “Divine Worship” liturgy, however, raises a number of liturgical and also ecumenical questions: Do these Personal Ordinariates create new instances of uniate churches? Are we thus dealing with a form of proselytism, which could severely derogate ecumenical dialogue not only with Anglicans? Furthermore, does the liturgy of the Ordinariates signal the recognition or perhaps even the creation of a new rite within the Roman Catholic Church and thus a dissolution of the unity of the liturgy? Or is liturgical provision for the Ordinariates merely a case of variations and adaptations of the Roman Rite with regard to the special spiritual-liturgical and cultural patrimony of a relatively large and formerly Protestant community in various countries, while maintaining the unity of the liturgy and the Roman Rite?

Ecumenical Considerations

In response to many changes in the Anglican Communion in the late twentieth century (in part over the ordination of women, liturgical revisions, etc.), the Roman Catholic Church in 2009 finally offered groups of Anglicans the option to enter into full communion with the Catholic Church – a movement and complex process that had already started in the 1980s. The Anglican Communion’s displeasure with the supposed “hostile acquisition” of its faithful by the Catholic Church

17 Ibid.: “The Congregation will not be developing further resources for the Divine Office beyond this Guideline, but rather entrusts the development of such resources to the Ordinaries.”

was apparent to observers. A BBC News headline on October 21, 2009, read, “Rome Goes Fishing in Anglican Pond”.¹⁹ Many Anglicans have accused Rome of engaging in an ecumenism of return. Of course, it has to be said that Anglicanorum Coetibus must not be the expression of such an ecumenism of return, but rather a canonical possibility of non-Catholic groups joining the Catholic Church of their own free desire while retaining some of their own legitimate traditions formed over the centuries. Any kind of proselytism or active enticement of members of other Christian denominations is clearly to be rejected. Primarily there should be ethical, doctrinal, and liturgical attraction or affection toward the Catholic Church, and not only negative differentiations and disagreements with one’s own church or ecclesial community. The Catholic Church must not go fishing for members of other communities, but should be allowed to answer a knock at her door with pastoral sensitivity – which may unfortunately cause ecumenical discords. Kurt Cardinal Koch, president of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, said in an interview on October 24, 2012:

Angicanorum Coetibus was actually not an initiative of Rome but came from the Anglican church. The Holy Father then looked for a solution and in my opinion he found a very wide solution, in which the ecclesiastical and liturgical traditions of the Anglicans have largely been taken into account.²⁰

One has to emphatically challenge the opinion that the Personal Ordinariates revive methods of uniatism in the spirit of Pius XI’s 1928 encyclical, “On Religious Unity”, that said unity would be achieved only with Christians becoming Roman Catholic, rather than the differentiated understanding of the Second Vatican Council in 1964 with the distinction between full and incomplete communion with the Catholic Church.²¹ It is, rather, for the first time the expression of the Vatican II perspective of recognizing the “liturgical, spiritual

---

and pastoral traditions” of churches of Protestant heritage “within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the faith…and as a treasure to be shared” (see AC III).²²

Theological consensus must be sought to consider what is really meant by oikumene with regard to its content, because a great diversity of interpretation exists about the “Common understanding and vision of the W[orld] C[ouncil of] C[hurches]”.²³ Divergent perceptions of oikumene exist within Christianity. The Catholic Church has given eloquent expression to a fundamental principle for the ecumenical movement: the unity of faith that is at the heart of the communion of the church does not require a rigid uniformity of expression.

Summarizing Remarks and Future Prospects

The Second Vatican Council, in its Constitution on Sacred Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium, affirms, in faithful obedience to tradition, that the Church holds all lawfully acknowledged rites to be of equal right and dignity and wishes to preserve them in the future and foster them in every way (SC 4).²⁴ Article 39 of Sacrosanctum Concilium describes the usual process for the preparation of liturgical books. However, in SC 37 the council declared that the Church does not wish to make rigid uniformity obligatory, even in worship, as long as issues of faith and of the general good are not affected. It is inappropriate to identify Catholic liturgy nowadays only and exclusively with the liturgy of the Roman Rite. The reasonable efforts of the Council of Trent to halt liturgical abuses led to a standardization of Catholic liturgy, while still allowing for several exceptions that have unfortunately all but disappeared. Article 4 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy basically recognizes the lawfulness of legitimate variety in the different liturgical families and liturgical rites – especially in the East, but also in the West.

²² Time will tell how the Personal Ordinariates will address the Lutheran-Catholic issue of full communion.
²⁴ For SC 4, see The Basic Sixteen Documents Vatican Council II, 118 (see n. 5).
Unity does not require rigid uniformity, and the catholicity of the church admits diverse forms of expression, drawing from different cultures and traditions (see *Decree on Ecumenism* of Vatican Council II, no. 4 and no. 13). Thus, a broader understanding of inculturation in the sense of *aptatio ad diversos coetus* (adaptation to different groups) according to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* justifies an Anglican Tradition liturgy that is informed by specific cultural traditions, yet remains an integral part of the Roman Rite.

It remains to be seen within the next years, as the various Personal Ordinariates develop in England and Wales, the United States, and Australia, with Canada to follow, how the “Divine Worship” Form of the Roman Rite can or should establish itself as an additional Anglican liturgical form or use within the framework of the Roman Rite. In this way, the adaptation of the liturgical books to the needs of the Anglican groups (see SC 37) may be achieved, retaining the Anglican Patrimony as intended by *Anglicanorum Coetibus* (article III), while the Roman Rite is essentially maintained (see SC 38). This certainly has been a particular challenge for the international commission, *Anglicanae Traditiones*, established by the CDF in collaboration with the CDWDS in 2011, for the purpose of preparing a liturgical ordo for the Personal Ordinariates of the former Anglicans. Careful attention, thus, had to be paid when developing an Anglican Tradition liturgy so that “any new [liturgical] forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing” (SC 23). In due course, this liturgical ordo has successively been approved and confirmed by the Holy See.

When asked in an interview in Austria in 2012 how the Catholic Church was being affected by the conversion of many Anglicans, Kurt Cardinal Koch answered:

If during a dialog it is only one side that changes, then there has been no dialog. By getting to know others, we discover our own Church anew. In that sense the *oikumene* is enriching. And that is what is so special about Pope Benedict’s offer to the Anglicans that they maintain their

---


26 *The Basic Sixteen Documents: Vatican Council II*, 127.
own liturgical traditions. This is a positive sign for the future that the Pope values diversity, not standardization.\textsuperscript{27}

From these words of the cardinal responsible for ecumenical relations, one can surmise that ecumenical talks have a capacity for enrichment in two ways. Alongside shared understanding, there can also be the enriching exchange of liturgical traditions. Thus, unity of liturgy does not mean rigid uniformity, but allows also for a diversity of liturgical forms of expression within the Roman Rite. This includes Western non-Roman rites and liturgical usages, for example, “Divine Worship” and the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite, as well as all lawfully recognized rites, and diocesan and monastic usages, of which unfortunately only a few remain. This does not, however, mean a division into new liturgical rites or families, but could certainly be seen as enrichment, even if now and then there arise significant problems that appear to be irresolvable. In the words of Pope Paul VI: “The Savior wanted one single Church, but she must at the same time be Catholic: this means requiring quality and legitimacy, and open to uncountable possible [liturgical] forms of expression”.\textsuperscript{28}

A rigid uniformity would be contrary to the Apostolic Constitution’s affirmation of the “precious gift” of the Anglican liturgical tradition reclaimed for Catholic worship in the context of unity in diversity.\textsuperscript{29}

The Anglican tradition – with its roots in the distinctive sacral dialect of the \textit{Books of Common Prayer}, with a wide diffusion throughout the


\textsuperscript{28} Pope Paul VI, talk, August 18, 1963, to the Italo-Byzantine Abbey of Grottaferrata. Original Italian text in \textit{Insegnamenti di Paolo VI}, vol. 1 (Rome, 1963), 554; quoted according to the German translation by Fischer, n. 46, 275 (see n. 5).

\textsuperscript{29} See also Pope Francis, October 31, 2014, in Rome: “Unity does not imply uniformity; it does not necessarily mean doing everything together or thinking in the same way. Nor does it signify a loss of identity. Unity in diversity is actually the opposite: it involves the joyful recognition and acceptance of the various gifts which the Holy Spirit gives to each one and the placing of these gifts at the service of all members of the Church.” See http://www.news.va/en/news/pope-seek-the-unity-which-isthe-work-of-the-holy.
English-speaking world, and with a rich heritage of music, art, and architecture, not to mention a particular ethos of parish life – surely constitutes an enriching cultural patrimony worthy of inculturation. It is uniquely susceptible to repatriation to the Catholic Church under the terms of *Anglicanorum Coetibus*. “The incorporation of Anglican liturgical patrimony in the Catholic Church, an act historic in itself, invests our liturgical expression with the sure authority of that faith, and redounds to the glory of God, the source of communion and focus of our sacramental worship.”

Hans-Jürgen Feulner is a professor of Liturgical Studies and Sacramental Theology at the Catholic Faculty of the University of Vienna, Austria, a member of the North American Academy of Liturgy and of the Board of Directors of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society. He was awarded the Pontifical Knighthood of Saint Gregory the Great by Pope Francis for his work on the Anglicanae Traditiones Commission.

This article is derived, in part, from an article published in *Liturgy* on July 17, 2015, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0458063X.2015.1051886, used with permission of the author.

30 Lopes, “Liturgical Book” (see n. 10).
The Prayer of Humble Access in “Full Communion”

Benedict Andersen OSB

It may surprise (or even shock) many to know that this Benedictine priest-monk, in the context of the celebration of the traditional pre-conciliar Missale Romanum, says as a private devotion, a text from the pen of a Protestant Reformer, and a radical one at that. Having prayed the preparatory prayers before communion in the customary sotto voce, I switch in the same voice to my mother tongue, saying from memory a prayer which I have cherished all my adult life¹, beginning with those powerful words: “We do not presume”.

There is no other text in the English language dearer to me – save the Lord’s Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, and the Coverdale Psalter – than this prayer, commonly called in the Anglican tradition, “The Prayer of Humble Access”². It has, for me, an unction, a particular grace, which few other prayers have. I quote it in full, not only for Catholics who may not know it, but also to allow those of the Anglican tradition (Catholic and non-Catholic) to read it anew:

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made

¹ I have never been an Anglican, but I’ve spent enough time in traditional Anglican circles to develop such attachments (I still have significant portions of the Psalter memorised due to regular recitation years ago of the Prayer Book’s traditional thirty day schema).
² This title is not original to the English Prayer Book tradition but first appears in the 1637 Scottish revision of the Prayer Book (“Laud’s Liturgy”), whose departure from Cranmer in terms of placement of Humble Access would be crucial in the growth of Catholic-minded Anglicanism.
clean by his Body, and our souls washed through his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen.³

The language here does not seem to be of a fundamentally different spiritual world than that of the traditional Roman Rite, or the other historic Liturgies of both East and West. It breathes the same scriptural and patristic air as these ancient traditions, and instils in the communicant the same spiritual sentiments: deep humility, bitter sorrow for sin, and a sense of unworthiness, but, at the same time, a boldness to present ourselves, and even our sinfulness, before “the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (Heb. 4:16⁴).

The Prayer of Humble Access is, to my mind (and my heart), not only one of the great Christian prayers, but one of the great Catholic prayers. This is an audacious statement, to be sure, and one which might seem incomprehensible to many fellow Roman Catholics, especially those attached, as I am, to the Usus Antiquior of the Roman Rite. I fully acknowledge the difficulty. How can a Protestant prayer, arising from a milieu of revolt against the Church, be regarded as a Catholic prayer? Is this not a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of the subtle theological “game” being played by the unfortunate Archbishop Cranmer, that of concealing novel doctrines under the outward form of Catholic phraseology?

At this point, the great G.K. Chesterton – that “prince of paradox” and “apostle of common sense” – steps in to help us understand the spirit in which the Catholic Church has come to make Humble Access, and other elements of the Prayer Book, an expression of her own faith and of the piety with which she would have us approach Holy Communion. The Book of Common Prayer, wrote Chesterton, is the one positive possession and attraction, the one magnet and talisman for people even outside the Anglican Church, as are the great Gothic cathedrals for people outside the Catholic Church. I can speak, I think, for many other converts, when I say that the only thing that can produce any sort of nostalgia or romantic regret, any shadow of

---

³ The official text from Divine Worship: The Missal.
⁴ All scriptural quotations are taken from the Authorised Version.
homesickness in one who has in truth come home, is the rhythm of Cranmer’s prose. All the other supposed superiorities of any sort of Protestantism are quite fictitious. [...] But why has the old Protestant Prayer-Book a power like that of great poetry upon the spirit and the heart? The reason is much deeper than the mere avoidance of journalese. It might be put in a sentence; it has style; it has tradition; it has religion; it was written by apostate Catholics. It is strong, not in so far as it is the first Protestant book, but in so far as it was the last Catholic book.⁵

But, again, how can this be? How can a prayer specifically framed to deny Catholic dogma – that is, the Real and Substantial Presence of the Lord under the accidental forms of bread and wine – be, or become, a Catholic prayer? The answer, I think, lies in the fact that Cranmer’s subtle “game” – feeding the reluctant Catholics of England with the bitter pill of Protestant revolt hidden under the guise of language drawn from medieval liturgy and piety – might have been a bit too subtle. As Bouyer explains:

If we pay close attention to the interpretations given by Cranmer himself to the formulas he uses, all of these prayers [...] seem to be deprived of their original content. But, since they retain practically all of the ancient expressions, with the minimum of retouching that was necessary in order to bend them to the devitalised sense in which he understood them, a person who is without the key to his perpetually metaphorical language can be easily taken in.⁶

Cranmer was, as it were, “hoisted with his own petard” because the “Cranmer Code” (as one might call it) was not easily decipherable, nor would many in the Church of England recognise that there was a code. Or perhaps if they did, they had no interest in it, settling instead for a more straightforward reading (and one more in concert with the belief of the Undivided Church). Perhaps, after all, when in the Liturgy we beg the Father to “grant us to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood”, we are asking for exactly that, without any

---


circumlocutions or the theological gymnastics as to how when we ask for the Body and the Blood we’re not actually getting the Body and the Blood!

That this is the case is demonstrated by the fact that Cranmer’s “Godly Order” of 1549 was almost immediately interpreted against its framer’s own heretical intent by Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester who upheld the King’s takeover of the Church but upheld all other aspects of Catholic faith and order. Gardiner’s “Henrician Catholic” enthusiasm about the Liturgy of 1549 prompted the far more radical “slash-and-burn” revision of 1552, in which all of the parts lauded by Gardiner were excised or rearranged to make Catholic interpretation well nigh impossible. In particular, Cranmer transferred Humble Access from its original post-consecration position to an extremely awkward position immediately after the Sanctus and before the Eucharistic prayer proper.

Now, it seemed, no one could possibly interpret the vivid language of eating the Body and drinking the Blood as in any way connected to a post-consecratory objective Real Presence connected with the elements themselves. And so the prayer remains, officially, to this day in the 1662 English Prayer Book. Cranmer had the last word officially speaking but it didn’t take long for later Anglican bishops and theologians, inspired by patristic learning and investigation of ancient (particularly Oriental) liturgies, to begin little by little to undo the damage, first in ways unofficial, and then, outside of England, in official Prayer Book revision.

The words I wrote years ago in my master’s thesis concerning the Orthodox adaptation of the Anglo-Catholic Missal tradition can be applied also to the Ordinariate Liturgy:

[It is] the product of over four centuries of liturgical development within Anglicanism. The first Anglican Liturgies were born out of the upheavals of the English Reformation, and thus bear the marks of doctrinal negation and compromise. But generations of High Churchmen – Elizabethan, Caroline, Non-Juring, Scottish, American, Tractarian, and Anglo-Catholic – reshaped this Reformation Liturgy, as much as possible, into a form closely approximating the ancient and medieval Liturgies of the Church (both Eastern and Latin). They were
able to do so because these High Church parties held a high regard for the precedents of Christian antiquity, for the patristic tradition (especially the Greek Fathers), and for the ancient liturgical usages of the Church.7

And now, at the end of “the long path away from Cranmer”8, trod by generations of Catholic-minded Anglicans, the Holy See has officially recognised in many of the most cherished liturgical forms “proper to the Anglican tradition” – including the Prayer of Humble Access – “a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared” with the whole Church Catholic.9

“Whatever anyone has said well,” said Justin Martyr, “belongs to us Christians.”10 He was speaking about those mysterious “seeds of the Word” (spermatakoi Logoi), sown by the pre-incarnate Son deep within the soil of pagan thought. If Justin can affirm this, how much more can the Church of our day find in eloquent prayers like this one, Christian but composed outside of Catholic unity, not merely tiny “seeds” of truth but, tout court, an expression – situated within proper dogmatic context – of that faith and piety which, as a good Mother, she always desires to instil within her children.

Echoing Justin, the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council, in the dogmatic constitution on the Church Lumen Gentium (1:8) affirms that “many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside of [the Church’s] visible structure”, elements which, “as gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity.”11

8 As I called it in my thesis, p. 33.
9 Pope Benedict XVI, Apostolic Constitution Anglicanorum cætibus, 4 Nov. 2009, III.
The Prayer of Humble Access, among many other elements of Anglican liturgical and devotional patrimony, ia a gift which belongs to the Catholic Church and thus has been “brought home”, as it were, into “full communion”.

Allow me to indulge in a creative re-appropriation of the words of the Patriarch Joseph: “Ye thought evil against [the Church]; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive.” (Gen. 50:20). The Prayer of Humble Access can now be regarded by Catholics as a true and faithful expression of the Church’s own belief and piety concerning the august Mystery of the Lord’s Body and Blood. Duly restored to its original function as a communal pre-communion prayer, re-contextualised within orthodox liturgical tradition, and all erroneous connotation being purged by contact with the “live coal” of the one true faith, the Prayer of Humble Access has been revealed to be a gift which has always belonged to the Church, waiting to be reclaimed by her – not merely as an expediency, a concession or a sop to Anglicans on their way into full communion, but as a genuine expression of the Church’s lex orandi and thus also, of necessity, her lex credendi.

Dom Benedict Maria Andersen is sub-prior of Silverstream Priory, home of the Benedictine Monks of Perpetual Adoration of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, County Meath, Ireland. A native of Denver, Colorado, he holds degrees in philosophy from the Pontifical Lateran University, Rome, and Eastern Orthodox theology from St Vladimir’s Seminary, Crestwood, New York.
Jerry McGreevy, RIP

Ten years ago I was the rector of an Episcopal church just across town, and Jerry McGreevy was our treasurer. In the parish office, before an annual meeting, I confided in him that I would resign my cure before noon that day. He asked me, “What are we going to do?” I said, “We’re going to become Catholic,” and from that moment Jerry was all in. For the last ten years of his life Jerry offered countless prayers and innumerable hours of his time to help and encourage others to do the same. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that St. Thomas More Catholic Church would not be here in this place today were it not for the work of Jerry McGreevy.

Jerry, however, would be embarrassed if I were to talk about him when I am supposed to be talking about Jesus, so rather than recount everything he did, I’m going to tell you a bit about the mission of this parish, because next to being a father to Kimmy and Brian, this ministry was the most important thing to him. It was his life’s work.

Our parish, this parish, is part of a movement of Anglicans and Episcopalians into the Catholic Church. We began our mission over ten years ago under what is the Pastoral Provision of St. John Paul II. It allowed for Episcopal parishes to come into the Catholic Church and retain elements of their heritage and patrimony that are consistent with Catholic faith and practice, including the liturgy we are celebrating right now. It also allowed for Episcopal clergymen, like me, to be ordained Catholic priests, even if they are married. Exceptions to the Latin discipline of clerical celibacy were made for the sake of Christian unity, in order that Episcopal pastors could continue to pastor their flock after they had come into the Catholic Church.

This provision was not well known ten years ago, so we set about raising awareness of it before we had even been received into the Church, while we were still in catechism classes. We hosted our first conference in 2005 and then a second here in Scranton with Avery Cardinal Dulles in 2006. We continued to help organize such conferences in the ensuing years in places like Washington, D.C., San Antonio, Newark, Houston,
and Kansas City. Through these conferences we won many vocations for the Church and even helped some communities like ours to be formed.

But there were problems with the Pastoral Provision of St. John Paul II. For one, it didn’t have the support of every bishop in the United States, support that had been given to us by Bishop Joseph Martino, then Bishop of Scranton. But second, even worse, there was no mechanism to replace the pastor of a community like ours if he were to retire, die, or become incapacitated. The result in these circumstances was usually that the community with a mission to welcome people into the Church would cease to exist. Bishops simply don’t have priests to assign to communities as small as ours.

So a pilgrimage to Rome was organized in 2007. We went to tell Pope Benedict XVI and his confreres what was wrong with the Pastoral Provision. We met face to face with officials from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and told them in explicit terms our concerns and what we believed the solution would be. Unbeknownst to us at the time, Anglicans from England, Australia, the United States and Canada were all begging Rome the very same year for a means to come in corporately, as groups that could retain their heritage and welcome other Anglicans into Holy Mother Church.

By this time I had been ordained a Catholic priest, and I began saying daily Mass. Like Judas in our Old Testament lesson from II Maccabees, we prayed for the dead and implored their prayers on behalf of this ministry. I said Mass almost every day, and Jerry was there every day. On weekdays, he served me at the altar, and on Sundays, he sang in the choir. Often the Mass being offered was for a deceased member of his family, but he didn’t forget the living either, as it was his fervent hope that they would come into the Church as he had.

Jerry understood in a profound way the words we heard from II Corinthians: “For it is all for your sake, so that as grace extends to more and more people it may increase thanksgiving, to the glory of God.” He knew that as more people became Catholic, they would have access to the grace available to them through the Sacraments, and in receiving this grace they would give glory to God. His prayers, his works, were for
your sake, that the praise of God would increase; but he also benefitted from the Sacraments. When he lay dying 3½ years ago, the only thing he remembered from that ordeal was receiving the Sacrament of the Sick. And he attributed his survival to the graces that flowed from that sacrament. Indeed, his doctors had never seen anything like it: two open heart surgeries in five days, and he lived. Jerry knew it was the grace of the Church’s sacraments.

And so our prayers were answered. Jerry lived to see the fruit of his labor, his pilgrimages, and his prayers. In January, 2012, Pope Benedict XVI erected a new jurisdiction for parishes like ours. Based in Houston, the Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter is essentially a nationwide diocese. The problems of the Pastoral Provision were fixed. Everything we asked for in 2007 in Rome we received, and the fruit has been more than sixty ordinations to the priesthood and the establishment of thirty-five new communities like ours on this continent alone. That doesn’t even include what’s happening in Australia and Great Britain.

We have passed from forms and shadows into what is real, and we have, by God’s grace, enabled many others to do the same. At last the words of the Gospel that we heard today make sense: we need not question the meaning or reinterpret what they plainly say: “As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me.” Our faith in the life to come is tied inextricably to our reception on a weekly and even daily basis of the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. And it is precisely this sacrament that enables us to make the sacrifices necessary to share this wealth with others. After all, when we come forward to receive, we are offering our very lives to God, just as Jesus offered His life to the Father. And in uniting ourselves to that sacrifice, we know that those who die in a state of grace will live as surely as Jesus lives and intercedes for us before the Throne of Grace.

If you desire that reality, and the strength you need to share it with others, the strength to do more than you have ever asked or imagined, come into the Catholic Church. What you see around you – this church
and Jerry’s second family – these are monuments to grace extending to more and more people, an increase of thanksgiving to the glory of God, the fruit of the daily celebration of Holy Mass. This is my appeal to you, but it was also Jerry’s. Thus, as we spend this time praying for the repose of his soul, know that he can pray also for you. And I’m sure at least part of the content of his prayers hasn’t changed. He wants still what God wants for you: the Church.

Homily preached at the Requiem Mass for G. Gerald Joseph McGreevy, December 6, 2014 in Scranton, PA by Father Eric Bergman. Jerry McGreevy was the Treasurer of the Anglican Use Society, and Fr. Bergman is the Chaplain both of the former Anglican Use Society and of the Anglicanorum Coetibus Society.
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