



**The Liturgy of the Ordinariates: Ordinary, Extraordinary, or *Tertium Quid*? The Reverend
Monsignor Andrew Burnham, Assistant to the Ordinary**

This paper was delivered to the 2012 meeting of the
Centre International d'Etudes Liturgiques UK (CIEL UK)
at the Brompton Oratory on Saturday 24 November 2012

On 4th November 2009, the feast of that leading reformer and Counter-Reformation divine, St Charles Borromeo, the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum cœtibus* was promulgated. It was a momentous document, not least because of the new place it gave to Anglican liturgy within the family of the Latin Rite. Thus, we read in ¶5 section 3:

Not 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 is a one and sufficient primary source and reference point for our enquiry this afternoon. There are two lines of enquiry. First, what 'liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition...have been approved by the Holy See'. Second, what liturgical books are likely to emerge with the approval of the Holy See. There are simple answers and there are ever more complex ones. The simple ones first: the only liturgical book proper to the Anglican tradition which has been approved by the Holy See is the *Book of Divine Worship* (BDW). And the question of what liturgical books are likely to emerge is equally simply dealt with: we do not yet know; there is an international working party, *Anglicanæ traditiones*, which is dealing with these matters, but its progress and proceedings are confidential. Some of the new work has already emerged. Drawing mainly on what is called the 'Series One Marriage and Burial Services', the Congregation for Divine Worship (CDW) has produced authorised Marriage and Funeral Rites for the Ordinariates. In addition to that, the Congregation has promulgated a Calendar for the Ordinariates – which, like a diocesan Calendar – is the Calendar of a Particular Church, supplementing the General and National Calendars. It has also authorised as a Lectionary for the Ordinariates – that is, not just a version that can be read but a liturgical book – the Revised Standard Version (RSV), Second Catholic Edition, as authorised for use in 2001 in the Antilles. The Calendar and Marriage and Funeral Rites are not in themselves full liturgical books, of course, and, though the Lectionary is already proving to be one of the defining characteristics of the importing of Anglican

liturgical patrimony, no one could claim that the Roman Lectionary in the RSV was at any stage an Anglican liturgical book. What it represents, however, is even more significant than that. The RSV is the finest example of the principle of translation which is common to both the Anglican tradition and to the CDW Instruction of 2001, *Liturgiam authenticam*. That principle is, roughly speaking, whatever the merits of dynamic equivalence as a translation method for foreign novels, in order to get as close as possible to the original meaning, literal translation – where a Hebrew, Greek, or Latin word is, as far as possible, represented by a vernacular word – is what is needed for translations of the Bible and the Liturgy. This has been the principle of translation employed not least by the Authorised Version of 1611, the Revised Version of 1881, and the various RSV editions. In short, the RSV Lectionary reads and sounds like an Anglican liturgical book. Here one should perhaps add that the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), over which there are stalled negotiations in the move to adopt it throughout the Catholic English-speaking world, reads better and, we are told, is more accurate than the RSV but is problematic because of its use of inclusive language, to the point where the English is inclusive but the Hebrew or Greek not. Again, putting things very roughly, translating *adelphoi* as ‘brothers and sisters’ is employing the interpretative skills of dynamic equivalence where literal translation would say ‘brothers’, or, in traditional inclusive fashion, ‘brethren’. (No one thinks that there are no women amongst the Plymouth Brethren).

Mention here should be made of the *Customary of Our Lady of Walsingham*, just published. The brilliance of this book is almost entirely to be attributed to my fellow-editor, Fr Aidan Nichols OP, who has assembled a very fine anthology of post-biblical readings from British sources, mediæval, Catholic, and Anglican, to accompany the Calendar. There is much from Blessed John Henry Newman, including sermons from his Anglican days, but there are passages by other Anglican figures too, such as Traherne, and T S Eliot. My part in the project was putting together and adapting the Prayer Book Offices and Litany, with adapted collects, hymns, and short readings, and compiling a version of the Roman Office Lectionary, including both the One-Year and the Two-Year tracks. Thus it is possible, day by day, to celebrate the Divine Office with up to four long readings, as in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer (BCP), but adhere to the Ordinariate Calendar and the rhythm and trajectory of the Roman Office Lectionary. The Customary, issued under an *Imprimatur* from the Ordinary, is not one of ‘the liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, which have been approved by the Holy See’ but a legitimate way of exploring and maintaining Anglican liturgical patrimony at this stage in the development of the Ordinariates. Though it is specifically for the Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham, there are signs that people in the other Ordinariates, American and Australian, will use and benefit from the Customary. Meanwhile the Ordinariates are adapting the BDW for interim use, and that rather brings us to the Mass.

The Order of Mass cannot be celebrated exactly as found in the BDW. For one thing, the Holy See has indicated that, to avoid muddle with the new translation of the Roman Missal into English (2010), the liturgical language of the Ordinariates should be ‘traditional’ rather than ‘contemporary’. Broadly speaking, whatever in BDW is ‘Rite Two’ or ‘Contemporary’ is no longer to be used. Secondly, since BDW draws on the Roman Missal in its 1970 version for prayers over the gifts, and the Calendar in BDW does not fit the Ordinariate Calendar, some adaptation is necessary. Furthermore, the collects in BDW are neither a complete set (there is nothing for the Immaculate Conception nor for the Common of the BVM) nor in explicit conformity with the Catholic doctrine of the intercession of the saints. (The amended set of collects in the Customary were altered in order to be more complete and sufficient). Nevertheless, for our purposes, we can take the BDW Order of Mass, *mutatis mutandis*, as the existing rite of the Ordinariates, matching the criterion of being from one of ‘the liturgical books proper to the

Anglican tradition, which have been approved by the Holy See.’ We can also look at how it may be reformed – and, to do that, I need to put on one side what I have heard and seen inside the working party as these matters are discussed, and confine myself to what is known and to what are intrinsically logical outcomes. Since nothing has yet been decided – however close we may be to that point, we are not at that point – any of these speculations may come to pass or fall away.

We might now profitably pose the question in the title of this lecture and apply it to the BDW Rite: is this the Ordinary Form of the Latin Rite, the Extraordinary Form, or is it something entirely different, what you might call a *tertium quid*? There are certainly features which suggest the Ordinary Form. The Three-Year Mass Lectionary is envisaged. There are ‘Prayers of the People’. The *Berakhot* and other prayers at the Preparation of the Altar and the Gifts are in you-form, from the Roman Missal 1970, despite the context being otherwise ‘thou’ and ‘thy’. There is one Eucharistic Prayer, the Roman Canon, in what is called an ‘Old English translation’, and is sometimes said to be by Miles Coverdale, but, apart from the matter of language, the Canon is as found in the Missal of Paul VI, with, for example, acclamations after a re-located ‘mystery of faith’. Where the BDW Rite draws on the Extraordinary Form, in so far as the Extraordinary Form differs from the Ordinary Form, it does so only very slightly. It is likely, for example, that the celebration will take place facing East, perhaps with three sacred ministers, making use of dalmatics or dalmatic and tunicle, and (who knows?) humeral veil. None of that is explicit and, in due course, there may need to be a *Ritus servandus* to amplify the present *prænotanda*. There is a greeting before the Collect (as there is in Extraordinary Form), a rubric in the Creed indicating a genuflection, and rubrics in the Canon requiring the Celebrant to genuflect before each elevation as well as afterwards. Beyond this, there is little or nothing that derives from the Extraordinary, as contrasted with the Ordinary Form.

There is unsurprisingly quite a list of things which appear in the BDW Order, Holy Eucharist: Rite One, which are inherently Anglican, and amongst them, a number of things which are distinctly American Episcopalian, as opposed to English or Australian Anglican. We shall not here however divide these too sharply into the two categories of English Prayer Book tradition and Scottish-American Prayer Book tradition. There is penitential material at the beginning – an Exhortation, the Decalogue, or a Penitential Rite, any of which may take place at an earlier time, perhaps at a special service. There is then the greeting ‘Blessed be God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit’ (with seasonal variation), the Collect for Purity, the Decalogue or Lord’s Summary of the Law, the *Kyrie* or *Trisagion*. The Ordinary of the Mass is in the Anglican translation. The prescribed forms of Intercessions – none other is permitted, though lay people may lead them – are from Anglican sources. There is a second Penitential Rite (for when the earlier version did not take place) which consists of traditional Anglican material, and may conclude with the Comfortable Words, and the exchange of the Peace. There are 27 of what Anglicans call ‘Proper Prefaces’ for use before the *Sanctus*. 22 of these are adapted from *The Book of Common Prayer* 1979 (BCP 1979) of the Episcopal Church. The Communion Rite is also as in BCP 1979, with the use of the words ‘[Alleluia.] Christ our Passover is sacrificed &c’ at the Fraction (in a position not dissimilar from that of 1549 where similar words are used without a Fraction rubric). After *Agnus Dei*, in its classical position, in both BCP 1979 and BDW, comes the Prayer of Humble Access. The receptionist words after ‘The Gifts of God &c’ are replaced by ‘Behold the Lamb of God &c’, and the longer words at the distribution in BCP 1979, the combining in BCP 1662 of the formulæ of 1549 and 1552, disappear in BDW in favour of ‘The Body (Blood) of Our Lord Jesus Christ keep you in everlasting life. [Amen].’ Though this is recognisably similar to the words of administration in the Roman Mass (EF), the BCP 1979 variant also survives: ‘The Body of Christ, the bread of heaven, [Amen]. The Blood of Christ, the cup of salvation. [Amen].’ After Holy Communion there is either the

invariable Prayer of Thanksgiving first found in 1549, and available to Anglicans ever since, or a proper Post-communion Prayer for Marriage, the Sick, or the Departed. The blessing, based on Philippians 4:7, and similarly available since 1549, concludes the rite, together with the various dismissals as found in BCP 1979.

From this long and varied list of Anglican words and texts and distinctly Anglican usages – whether English or American – we might too readily conclude that we have a simple answer to our question. The Ordinarate Use – or, rather, the distinctive Use to which the Ordinariates presently have access – is neither the Ordinary Form nor the Extraordinary Form but a *tertium quid*. And, though we have not reached the end of our consideration of the matter, it would not be entirely unreasonable to settle for *tertium quid*, a third whatever, something else, something different. But liturgy is both rite and ceremony – what is said and what is done – and both carry the heavy freight of meaning. To arrive at meaning, we might also consider change and omission: what Anglican things are changed in or removed from BCP 1979. First, there is a change of headings. The overall title, ‘The Holy Eucharist’ remains. But out goes the 1979 sub-title ‘The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion’. Out go other sub-titles too: ‘The Word of God’, ‘Confession of Sin’, ‘The Great Thanksgiving’, ‘In come ‘Liturgy of the Word’, ‘Penitential Rite’, ‘Liturgy of the Eucharist’, ‘Preparation of the Altar and the Gifts’, ‘Roman Canon’, and ‘The Communion Rite’. Some of these changes are cosmetic, others less so. What Anglicans refer to as the ‘Celebration of the Holy Communion’, is not usually what Catholics are referring to when they talk about the Sacrifice of the Mass. In adopting the double axis of ‘Liturgy of the Word’ and ‘Liturgy of the Eucharist’, BDW is consciously adopting the balanced shape of the post-conciliar mass. The removal of ‘Confession of Sin’ is another instance of modifying the Anglican tradition of general confession and general absolution. Here it is titles not texts which are changed. The insertion of ‘Preparation of the Altar and the Gifts’ is straight out of the Missal of Paul VI, as are the prayers themselves. ‘The Great Thanksgiving’ has Byzantine echoes but the BDW Order prefers ‘Roman Canon’, and, once again, we find ourselves labelling what is very nearly the Ordinary Form, albeit in quaint language. But, as we have already noted, the celebrant genuflects before the elevation of the host and of the chalice, as well as after both elevations. A whiff of the Extraordinary Form.

If we look at the deeper structures of BCP 1979 then what we have most assuredly is not the Cranmerian Communion Service but an instance of the ecumenical consensus on liturgical reform in the second half of the twentieth century, dressed in Anglican language, as interpreted by American Episcopalians. BDW is the same Order, tweaked to live up to a more fully Catholic agenda. In Anglo-catholic churches in England more or less the same thing was happening round the *Alternative Service Book* 1980 (ASB1980). The strong evangelical voice meant that ASB 1980 could not quite deliver all that was thought desirable: the *Berakhot* were vetoed as pre-empting the logic of the Eucharistic Prayer. The Three-Year Lectionary was rejected in favour of the Two-Year version produced by the Joint Ecumenical Group. The Eucharistic Prayers, though Alexandrian, or Western, in shape, like those of the Missal of Paul VI, were studied in ambiguity, more so than many other parts of the world, where the evangelical lobby was less powerful. Unsurprisingly, following much liturgical scholarship and the trajectory of the Scottish-American Prayer Book tradition, the Eucharistic Prayers in BCP 1979 were Antiochian, or Eastern, in shape, with the *epiclesis* – the invocation of the Holy Spirit – coming after the Dominical words. Even less surprisingly BDW made no use of the BCP 1979 Eucharistic Prayers.

In the main, despite these differences, BCP 1979 in the US and ASB 1980 in England marked the same staging point, that is, they complemented and responded ecumenically to the 1970 Roman Mass. In that sense, one might say that the liturgy of the Ordinariates is more a version of the Ordinary Form of the Latin Rite than a *tertium quid*. It is bedecked with the finery of Anglican prayers, whether by Cranmer or inspired by Cranmer, but there is a logic, and an underlying community theology, with the terms 'Altar' and 'Table' used alternately. This is unmistakably the post-conciliar Catholic liturgical consensus, as Anglicans interpreted it.

What to make, however, of those occasional instances of Extraordinary Form influence? The genuflection in the Creed, the double genuflections at the elevations, show an intriguing conservatism. As we have already noticed, American High Church Episcopalians and Anglican Use Catholics like ceremonial, and they often face East. The popularity of the 'Anglican Use Gradual' (available on-line), which is a setting to simple plainsong formulæ of the propers of the Mass – on the lines of Francis Burgess' 'English Gradual' – shows that there is a continuing interest in vernacular translations of the pre-conciliar Roman Missal. The two main resources are the *Anglican Missal* and the *English Missal*. The *Anglican Missal* was produced by the Society of Saint Peter and Saint Paul in 1921. The most recent altar edition of the *English Missal*, the fifth edition of 1958, was reissued in 2001 by the Canterbury Press. Both of these resources came out before the reformed Missal of Blessed John XXIII, the present Missal for Extraordinary Form celebration, and therefore reflect the Tridentine Use at an earlier point. One of the missals – the *English Missal* – was, in progressive editions, ever closer to the Roman Missal, though it was thought necessary to provide for both Sundays after Trinity and Sundays after Pentecost, where (contrary to what one might expect) it is not just the enumeration which is different. Similarly Cranmer's Communion Service is inserted (pages 225-236 in the Canterbury Press version), as is his Prayer for the Church (page 248), some of his Prefaces (pages 251-369, intermittently), the 'Prayer of Address or Humble Access' (page 320), the 'Prayer of Consecration' (pages 374-375), the Prayer of Thanksgiving after Communion (page 390). This volume was one that the priest with Romanizing tendencies could use for everything from a simple Cranmerian Communion to a full-blown *Missa solemnis* in the vernacular, an ascent in churchmanship which might take many years. Or, just as likely, he could adhere to the Western Rite (as Anglo-catholics called it) all week and sound like a good Anglican on Sundays, without changing the altar book.

It is clear that these vernacular missals are not what *Anglicanorum cœtibus* refers to as 'liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, which have been approved by the Holy See', yet, for generations, they were the lodestar or, if you will, lodestone of Anglo-catholics. Following the 1970 Missal, which gained significant support amongst Anglo-catholics in England, there was a small number who continued to look to the older missals. In North America the missals retained – and continue to retain – greater attention, not least amongst Continuing Anglicans, for many of whom the 1979 BCP marked a de-railing of Episcopalian liturgy, just as, for traditional Catholics, the Paul VI Missal marked a similar crisis point. But there is a further complication in that, by and large, American Episcopalians, contrasting Episcopalianism with the non-liturgical worship of, for example, Southern Baptists, see themselves as bound to a text and to its ceremonial instructions in a way in which many English Anglicans (Anglo-catholic and Evangelical) do not. The paradox of English Anglo-catholicism has long been its propensity for liturgical anomy amidst an obsession with getting things right – just so – according to the rules of the tribe, which are the ceremonial instructions and rites deemed to be in force, whether that means Fortescue and the old missals, or the General Instruction and the English translation of the Bugnini Missal. I have inevitably been outside the loop these last couple of years but

I can imagine some of the casuistry and whimsy that English Anglo-catholics, who have no time for the Ordinariate project, have had to employ in order to introduce the 2010 translation of the Roman Missal into their sanctuaries.

It is far from clear – indeed it has not been finally decided – how pre-conciliar resources and influences will play out in the production of a revised Order of Mass for the Ordinariate. One could assume, perhaps, from the use of genuflections in BDW, and from some of the prevailing ceremonial styles, that the pre-conciliar aesthetic will continue to inform Ordinariate liturgy. The references in BDW to phrases such as ‘psalm, hymn, or anthem’, in whatever order, and whether singular or plural, permit what in the modern Roman rubrics is referred to as ‘*alius cantus*’, but, to those in the know, indicate the propers of the Mass, as found in the *English Hymnal* and the Francis Burgess books from Wantage, or in the American *Anglican Use Gradual*. This is not necessarily what BDW (still less BCP 1979) had in mind: a rubric permitting the *Gloria Patri* after psalms (BDW page 274) rather implies a different approach to psalmody – whole psalms, to Anglican chant, perhaps, with a Glory be &c at the end. Indeed another rubric nearby makes it clear that the synaxis of the Office may replace ‘all that precedes the Peace and the Offertory’, a convention known in England as ‘Stay Behind’ but found only in Low Church parishes where Morning Prayer was the main Sunday morning service with a facility for Communion afterwards for the faithful few who chose to stay. Supposing, however, that a revised Ordinariate Use moved from the typical Anglican ‘hymn, psalm, anthem’ rubric to specify the propers of the Mass – Introit, Gradual, Alleluia, Offertory, Communion – or even to include the actual texts among the propers – or, supposing that the *Anglican Use Gradual*, or something similar, became a formal, rather than an informal, resource, the feel of the Ordinariate Liturgy would certainly seem more like the Extraordinary Form than it presently does.

So, before moving to a final section of this enquiry, we can sum up where we have got to so far. It is our understanding that the Ordinariate liturgy, though very distinctive in its Anglican characteristics, is nonetheless a version of the ecumenical consensus of the late twentieth century liturgical movement – the consensus that was very influential in the emergence of the Ordinary Form. We base this, in the end, not on words like ‘Table’ as a complement to ‘Altar’, because the Byzantines too talk about the ‘Table’. Nor do we rely on ceremonial indications: as we have noticed, these liturgies are likely to be celebrated in a conservative way. Indeed, it was for the sake of liturgical conservatives in the Anglican Communion that such Orders as ‘The Holy Eucharist: Rite One’, in BCP 1979 and BDW and Rite B in ASB 1980 were produced. In England, at any rate, those who opted for the traditional language liturgies were not mainly the Anglo-catholics and were thought, generally, to be timid and backward-looking rather than radically conservative. What we do notice is the bulking out of the Liturgy of the Word – three lessons and a psalm on Sundays and solemnities, drawn from the three-year cycle – so that, with the homily, there is equipoise between Word and Sacrament. We notice too the linear organisation of the Mass. There is little or none of the back-stitching and dramatic displacement, and little of the re-iteration, that characterise the older structures, and to which Catherine Pickstock has drawn attention. BDW has just the one Eucharistic Prayer in Rite One – the Roman Canon in its ‘Old English Translation’ – but ‘at his discretion the Celebrant may substitute any of the four Eucharistic Prayers in Rite Two’, which are, naturally enough, the four Eucharistic Prayers in contemporary language as found in *Novus Ordo*.

It has been interesting to pose the question - The Liturgy of the Ordinariates: Ordinary, Extraordinary, or *Tertium Quid?* – and it has been, at least for me, something of a pleasant *divertissement*, almost a self-indulgence. I shall finish with a further self-indulgence by examining very briefly what I hope the

celebration of Mass in and through the Ordinariate movement may contribute to the evolution of the Latin Rite. You may not agree that the Latin Rite needs to evolve much further: you may be basing your hopes on the withering away of the Ordinary Form and the triumph of the Extraordinary Form, with a certain recovery of how things were before the reforms of Pope Pius XII. I think we can agree that, when it comes to the Office, we need to move back beyond Pope Pius X and put our trust more fully in St Benedict. But, to be strictly correct, whether we are talking about recovery of what has been lost or moving forward to something new, we are nonetheless in for further evolution.

One thing that I hope the Ordinariate movement will bring – and we are certainly trying to do this in Oxford – is a love for and promotion of plainsong, that is, cultic singing, and of the treasury of masses and motets of the Latin Rite. Anglicans have long showed enthusiasm for this cultural side of liturgy, and I hope that it will remain part of the Anglican patrimony of the Ordinariates. Another thing, which we have seen plenty of evidence for, is a concern for ceremonial and liturgical performance, for preaching, and for the observance of due solemnity. Amongst the Ordinariate groups, especially in America, there is an abiding affection for such devotions as the *Introibo ad altare Dei* and the Last Gospel. Beyond that there is a concern for the celebration of the Office in public, for the traditional devotions – the *Angelus*, Benediction, the Litany of Loreto, the recitation of the Marian Antiphons at the right times of year, the Rosary, Stations of the Cross – for abstinence and fasting, and for priests bearing public witness by dressing in Roman collar and cassock. It has been quite a shock, becoming a Catholic, to discover to quite what an extent these devotions and priorities have fallen into disuse, indeed are sometimes not known about or understood. Congregations have been brought up, as we all know, on a musical diet of junk food, and with Mass as practically the only public expression of faith and devotion. All of us, if we were reduced to one such expression, would choose the Mass, of course, but there has been a mixture of carelessness and vandalism about other things. Most important of all, amongst the things the Ordinariates bring into the rich diversity of the Catholic mix, is a proper regard for the Mass as Sacrifice and for the Blessed Sacrament as the Presence of the Most High, as God pitches his tent in our midst. Most of us are victims of what I call eucharistic inflation, whereby, in order to bring the worshipper to his or her knees, it is often not sufficient simply to have a tabernacle in a prominent place; instead we need exposition. Churches where perpetual adoration has been available subtly have been replaced by chapels of perpetual adoration, where there is no such subtlety. The *reductio ad absurdum* for me is the Blessed Sacrament behind glass in a quiet corner of a bookshop. I wonder if this host is in a moment of suspense for adoration, in between consecration and communion – for that is what the Reserved Sacrament is – or whether it is a product for adoration, removed entirely from the eucharistic action. We need to examine some of our new pieties and rehabilitate some of the older ones. God is not mocked but his children sometimes lose their way.

I am very grateful to CIEL for this opportunity to address you. We former Anglicans bring far less to the table than we receive but as we continue to look with dismay on the ecclesial community from which we have come – where what might have been, at best, a symbiotic relationship between secular culture and Christianity, is proving increasingly to be the subjugation of Christianity to the demands and half-understandings of secular culture – we are so grateful to find ourselves ‘deep in the panting heart of Rome’.

Andrew Burnham

St Clement, 23rd November 2012