

PRAYER BOOK AND COMMON LITURGY TASK FORCE
Report for the ACNA College of Bishops
June 23-24, 2011

The chair of the Task Force, the Rt. Rev. William A. Thompson, is the author of this interim report.

The Prayer Book and Common Liturgy Task Force has met twice since the last Provincial Council and College of Bishops meetings in Amesbury, MA in June of 2010.

The first of those two meetings was held in Charleston, South Carolina in the last week of September 2010. The Task Force was very grateful for all the help we received from Andy Piercy of the AMiA and his assistant in showing such hospitality. Based on feedback received from the Provincial Council and the College of Bishops at their June 2010 meeting, the Task Force spent a good deal of time in September perfecting our draft of the Ordinal. Not quite having the time to complete that task, we appointed a committee to finish that effort and report to the Task Force at our meeting in February of 2011.

In September, we were blessed to have with us Dr. Phil Harrold, a member of the Catechetical Task Force of the ACNA. His presence proved very helpful. Members of both Task Forces believe that our work impacts one another, and we look to continue collaboration wherever possible.

Our second meeting took place in late February of this year. We met in Dallas at the Church of the Holy Communion Reformed Episcopal Church, enjoying the wonderful hospitality of Bishop Ray Sutton and his staff and family. All members of the Task Force were present except Dr. Packer, who was recovering from hip surgery.

Following is an overview regarding the focus and work of these two meetings.

1. The Ordinal

- a. Each of you will by now have received a copy of the Ordinal ver. 1.2.
- b. We believe the Ordinal is near ready for publication and liturgical use, with the exception of a few issues the Task Force is referring to the College of Bishops for your collective wisdom, enumerated below.
 - i. On the bottom of page 7 of the Ordinal, there is a footnote regarding the use of the *Veni, Creator Spiritus* in the diaconal service of ordination. Historically, this is an innovation. What is the College's desire, either to include or remove the *Veni*? A more comprehensive discussion of the issue, written by Bishop David Hicks, is provided at the end of this report.
 1. A related request: to consider giving the bishop authority to approve an alternative hymn invoking the Holy Spirit, at the diaconal and/or priestly services only (the *Veni* would be required for the consecration of a bishop).

- ii. The Archbishop communicated that he thought it would be good to have each ordinand for the diaconate and the priesthood swear an oath of canonical obedience. Below are two versions. The first is based on an oath in the Church of England and the second is based upon a similar form from the Church of Uganda.
 - 1. I, *A B*, do swear by Almighty God that I will pay true and canonical obedience to the Bishop of _____ and his successors in things lawful and honest: So help me God.
 - 2. I, *A B*, do swear by Almighty God that I will pay true and canonical obedience in all things lawful and honest to the Bishop of _____: So help me God.
 - 3. Shall this be included, and if so, which version?
- iii. In the last paragraph of page 8 of the Ordinal, this prayer says, “In your great mercy **accept** these your servants into the Office of Deacons....” The question was raised whether the word “accept” might be inappropriate because it seems to imply that God is receiving their transfer, when it is He who is making them deacons. Should this prayer be changed?
- iv. The Anglican Mission has produced an ordinal. Might it also be utilized within the ACNA?
- v. At the vesting of a bishop, should an option be added allowing a vesting with rochet, chimere and stole?
- c. At the end of our discussion of the Ordinal, I wish to ask the College of Bishops to approve **Ordinal ver. 1.2** to be authorized for liturgical use for the Anglican Church in North America. This is not to imply that the **Ordinal** is totally perfected. The PB&CL Task Force hopes that those who use this ordinal will submit their suggestions and improvements to the Task Force.
- d. We ask that the **Ordinal** and all other rites produced by the Task Force be copyrighted by the ACNA until final approval of a new Prayer Book. In doing this we want to discourage any individual congregations or dioceses from making their own amendments without the permission of the College of Bishops.
- e. We hope to post the text of the **Ordinal** on the ACNA website so that it can be easily downloaded in editable form for the use of the church.

2. On-going projects

- a. Eucharist Rite
 - i. We received feedback from the Archbishop giving some direction to the Task Force, for which we were very grateful.
 - ii. We received a first draft of a Eucharistic rite that we believe will be a good starting point for developing a modern English rite that is consistent with the historic prayer book tradition. I hope that we will have a draft for your comments in the first quarter of next year. I think we are on the right track here.

- iii. From feedback by the Archbishop and others, we are also planning to work on one or two shorter Eucharistic rites that could be used mid-week and for other more informal and missional occasions.
 - iv. Working on this draft will be:
 - 1. Fr. Arnie Klukas and Fr. Chip Edgar, co-chairs;
 - 2. Fr. Christopher Klukas;
 - 3. We hope to have Michael Petty's help as well.
- b. Baptism
- i. In February we had lengthy conversations that about the Baptismal rite, to be continued at our next meeting in October; we think that we are on the right track for a very good liturgy.
 - ii. We received a draft from Christopher Klukas.
 - iii. We are planning to have a liturgy for your comment at the next Provincial Council meeting.
 - iv. In our Fall 2011 meeting of the Task Force, Dr. Arnie Klukas will be presenting various historical materials related to Baptismal rites to aid us in our work.
- c. Confirmation
- i. We will also be moving further forward for a rite of Confirmation.
 - ii. Because of the complexity in the theology of Confirmation, this rite may take somewhat longer to develop than the others.
- d. The Task Force suggests that as Eucharistic, Baptismal, and Confirmation rites are developed, each diocesan bishop designate *trial parishes* of various sizes and traditions (larger, smaller, missional, new, traditional, etc.), as well as seminaries, to provide a cross-section of feedback regarding the rites.
3. Lectionary and Psalter
- a. Dr. J. I. Packer
 - b. Bishop Keith Ackerman
 - c. Andy Piercy
4. Offices: The Archbishop suggests that the present **Offices** from the 1979 BCP are most likely sufficient. However it was felt that it would be helpful to have more Biblically literate and conservative use of language for the Canticles and Psalms. This is future work.

Your feedback will be greatly appreciated.

For your information the members of the Task Force are as follows.

The Rt. Rev. William A. Thompson, chair
Bishop, Diocese of Western Anglicans

The Rev. Dr. J. I. Packer
Regent College, Vancouver, BC

The Rev. Martha Giltinan
Trinity School of Ministry

The Rt. Rev. David Hicks
Bishop, Diocese of the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic

The Rev. Dr. Arnold Klukas
Nashotah House

The Rt. Rev. Keith Ackerman
President , Forward in Faith in North America

The Rev. Aaron Zimmerman
St. Stephens, Sewickley, PA

The Rev. Chip Edgar
Holy Apostles, Columbia, SC
AMiA

The Rev. Eric Dudley
St. Peter's, Tallahassee, FL

Mr. Andy Percy
AMiA

Week of Advent I
November 29, 2010

Dear Bishops,

The paper below was presented to the Prayer Book Task Force (PBTF) at its last meeting in September. The paper raises certain issues, which need to be addressed before the final form of the Ordinal is presented to you. The PBTF does not believe it can proceed further with this aspect of its work, until some guidance is provided by the bishops of the church. We ask that you read the paper, below, and provide some direction related to the following questions:

1. Should the imposition of hands be simultaneous with the ordination prayer or with an imperative statement? The former option is a departure from the *Book of Common Prayer* 1549-1928 (BCP) tradition but reflects the ancient pattern for ordinations.
2. Should the diaconate be distinguished in any way from the priesthood and episcopate in relation to the bestowal of the Holy Spirit at the time of ordination? If the answer to this question is yes, should we reconsider including the *Veni Creator Spiritus* (Veni) in the ordination of deacons? The majority of the PBTF believes it is appropriate to include the Veni in the ordination of deacons, seeing that the history of the hymn is not tied exclusively to ordinations and believing that the hymn serves as a prayer for the church and not for the ordinand alone. A minority of the PBTF prefers to adhere to the traditional BCP pattern.
3. Is it appropriate to permit those being ordained to the diaconate to lie prostrate during the Litany? Should we seek advice on this point from our ecumenical partners in the Roman and Orthodox churches?

A Prayer and a Hymn in the Ordinal: Some Points of Consideration concerning the Veni Creator Spiritus and the Ordination Prayers in the Ordinal of the Anglican Church in North America.

The Prayer Book Task Force for the Anglican Church in America is in the process of developing a *Book of Common Prayer* for the new province, and one of the first projects to that end is a revision of the ordinal. This paper briefly touches upon two issues related to the task of revision – whether the *Venite Creator Spiritus* is to be included in the ordination rite for a deacon, and whether the “imposition of hands” should be accompanied by a precatory or imperative statement.

I. *Veni Creator Spiritus*.

The exact origin of the ancient hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, is not certain. It is attributed to Rabanus Maurus (c. 776-856), who was an archbishop and abbot of Mainz. In time, the hymn was commonly used in the monasteries of the West as the office hymn at Terce on Pentecost, and in the Sarum missal it formed part of the priest’s preparation for mass. It was not until the later medieval period that it found a regular place at the ordination of priests and bishops. Because of its relative novelty, compared to the most ancient rites, as well as its varied uses in history, the

Task Force need not feel that the place of the hymn is limited or proscribed by the earliest liturgical forms.¹

Thomas Cranmer *did not* include the *Veni Creator Spiritus* in the rite for the ordination of a deacon in the first English ordinal produced in 1550. It seems that the reasons for the omission relate to the prevailing custom of its use only for the ordination of a bishop or priest and the related understanding in the sixteenth century of the nature of the diaconate. Both Cranmer and Martin Bucer, the German reformer who greatly influenced his liturgical work, seem to have operated under the principle generally accepted at the time that the diaconate was an “inferior” office, which served as a “stepping stone” to the higher orders of ministry.² In his treatise, *De Ordinatione Legitima*, Bucer had produced essentially a single rite for the ordination of the three orders of ministry, which included a similar hymn known as *Veni Sancte Spiritus*; but he believed that the rite should be adjusted to fit the order to which a particular person was being ordained. Greater length and solemnity should be involved for the ordination of bishops and presbyters/priests and less for the ordination of a deacon.³ While Cranmer did not slavishly follow Bucer’s pattern, he nevertheless was greatly guided by the reformer’s work. Cranmer’s omission of the *Veni Creator Spiritus* in the 1550 ordinal fits Bucer’s guiding principle of the greatest simplicity being associated with ordination to the diaconate.

It should not be supposed, however, that simplicity stemming from inferiority is the only possible motivation for omitting the hymn. Cranmer’s understanding of the relation between the giving of the Holy Spirit and ordination is also of vital importance. It is noteworthy that when Cranmer adjusts Bucer’s rite for the diaconate, he not only leaves out the *Veni Creator/Sancte Spiritus*, but also omits from the ordination prayer the petition that the Holy Spirit be poured out upon the candidates, thereby making it a prayer of the congregation rather than the officiant.⁴ Further, there is no reference in the ordination of a deacon to the bestowing of the Holy Spirit at all. Bradshaw comments on this.

The Holy Spirit is mentioned only once in the whole rite, and that is in an additional question at the beginning of examination which does not appear in the other two rites or in Bucer’s rite:

Do you trust that you are inwardely moved by the holy Ghoste, to take upon you thys office and ministracion, to serve God, for the promotinge of hys glorye, and the edyfyinge of hys people?

¹ Marion J. Hatchett. *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*. (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 522-3; Massey H. Shepherd. *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*. (New York: Oxford, 1950), 531.

² The concluding prayer in the 1550 rite for the ordination of deacons states, “that they... may so well behave themselves in this inferior Office, that they may be found worthy to be called unto the higher Ministries in thy Church.” For a general overview of Bucer’s influence on the Book of Common Prayer, see Samuel Leuenberger. *Archbishop Cranmer’s Immortal Bequest. The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy*. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1990), especially 28-46.

³ “The idea of varying the one rite to create three this way, by enriching it for the episcopate and simplifying it for the diaconate, had been suggested by Bucer himself at the end of his rite.” Paul F. Bradshaw. *The Anglican Ordinal: Its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day*. (London: SPCK, 1971), 25.

⁴ See Bradshaw. *The Anglican Ordinal*, (1971), 26.

This requirement, that the candidates should be moved by the Holy Spirit, is almost certainly derived from the account of the appointment of the Seven in Acts 6, where the Apostles direct the people to choose men "full of the Holy Ghost". These differences between the rites suggest that Cranmer saw a distinction between the rite for the diaconate, in which candidates are expected to have the gift of the Holy Spirit before hands are laid on them, and the rite for the priesthood where the Spirit is conferred at the imposition of hands. Thus it would seem that Cranmer distinguished between two different sources of power in ordination. The power or authority given to deacons at the imposition of hands was the permission of the Church to exercise certain functions for which they were fitted. This power originated in the Church, which by divine providence working through the Apostles had created the office of deacons. On the other hand, the power bestowed on priests came from the Holy Spirit, which had been given by Christ to the Apostles and their successors. It is perhaps significant that in the discussion in his Common place Book on the question "Quod ordo sit sacramentum" Cranmer mentioned only the powers of the priesthood. The question of grace being conferred on deacons did not seem to occur to him in this context. Nor in any other of his writings is there any mention of the Holy Spirit being given by the Apostles to deacons, but only to bishops and priests.⁵

If, as Bradshaw suggests, Cranmer is thinking of biblical justification for the orders of ministry, then the connection of the priesthood and episcopate with the words of Christ in St. John 20:21-23 and Paul's exhortation to Timothy (1 Timothy 4:14; 2 Timothy 1:6-7) makes sense. Additionally, if Acts 6 is understood as the origin of the diaconate, then one should note that there is no mention of grace being bestowed, as is the case in the aforementioned biblical references.

Cranmer's hesitancy to connect the ordination of a deacon with the bestowal of the Holy Spirit may go back to the earliest discussions of these matters. The *Apostolic Tradition* (4th century), believed to have been written by Hippolytus at Rome, is our earliest non-biblical source of information about ordination rites. While scholars may debate the extent to which the *Apostolic Tradition* should be a guide for present day liturgical revision, its antiquity and influence in both the East and West must be taken into consideration. As Bradshaw notes, "Because this document was originally written in Greek it had greater influence in the East than in the West, and most of the early Eastern ordination rites are directly or indirectly descended from it. The later Western rites follow the same basic structure, but the prayers are entirely new compositions."⁶ With this in mind, we may turn to the *Apostolic Tradition* for comment on the ordination of deacons.

Let the deacon, moreover, when he is ordained, be chosen according to those things which are said before, the bishop alone laying on his hands in the same way as we also prescribe. When a deacon is ordained, let the bishop alone lay on his hands, for the reason that he is not ordained for the priesthood, but for serving the bishop, to do those things which are commanded by him. For he is not a member of the council of clergy, but

⁵Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal*, (1971), 34-35. See also, *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (New York: Oxford, 2006), 534.

⁶Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal*, (1971), 1.

attends to responsibilities and makes known what is necessary to the bishop; not receiving that common spirit of the presbyter, of which the presbyters are sharers, but [he receives] that which is entrusted [to him] under the power of the bishop. Wherefore let the bishop alone make him a deacon; on a presbyter, however, the presbyters as well should also lay on the hands because of the common and like spirit of the clergy. For the presbyter has only this power to receive; he does not on the other hand have power to give. Because of this he does not ordain clergy; he rather is to put his seal on the ordination of a presbyter while the bishop ordains.

Over a deacon, moreover let him [i.e. the bishop] say thus:

O God who hast created all things and set them in order by thy Word, O Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom thou sentest to minister thy will and to make known to us thy desire, give the Holy Spirit of grace and care and diligence to this thy servant, whom thou has chosen to minister to thy Church and to bring forward [in thy holy of holies the gifts which are offered to thee by thine appointed high priest, so that serving blamelessly and with a pure heart, he may be counted worthy of this high office and glorify thee through thy Servant Jesus Christ; through whom...]⁷

There are some interesting observations to be made here. First of all, we should note that the diaconate is described as a “high office.” The Task Force has historical justification for emphasizing the importance of the diaconate as an order of ministry in its own right and not simply a preliminary step toward the priesthood. As H. B. Porter notes, the diaconate in Rome traditionally held great prestige and was not believed to be a step in transition toward the presbyterate.

The diaconate had greater prestige in Rome than the presbyterate, and was not normally viewed as a preliminary to the latter. The final clause in the deacon's prayer, therefore, can hardly refer to advancement to the priesthood (as is often supposed nowadays), but either to the weighty responsibilities of the "cardinal deacons" themselves, or to the possibility of advancement to the episcopate. It was from the college of Roman deacons that the bishop of that city was normally chosen, and consecrated to the episcopate without passage through the presbyterate."⁸

Additionally, we should note that the *Apostolic Tradition* makes a distinction between the diaconate and the rest of the clergy. On the one hand, the ordination prayer asks for a bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the ordinand (“give the Holy Spirit of grace and care and diligence to this thy servant”), yet a clear distinction is made between the diaconate and those receive “the common spirit of the clergy.” This distinction is in accord with the analysis of holy orders described above, which may have guided Cranmer in his work. This should give the Task Force pause as it considers whether or not it is appropriate to include the *Veni Creator Spiritus* in the rite for the ordination of a deacon.⁹

⁷H. B. Porter. *The Ordination Prayers of the Ancient Western Churches*. (London: SPCK, 1967), 10-11.

⁸Porter, *Ordination Prayers*, (1967), 13.

⁹It should be noted that the ordinals of the Church of South India and the Episcopal Church (1979) include the *Veni Creator Spiritus* in the rites for all three orders.

It appears, then, that the decision for including or not including the hymn is connected with larger issues related to the Task Force's (and ultimately the ACNA's) understanding of the theology of holy order and what are the essential characteristics of the diaconate, presbyterate and episcopate. While such a discussion is beyond the scope of this short paper, the following points for consideration are offered in light of what has been presented above.

1. The diaconate is an order of ministry that has its own dignity and integrity and should not be viewed as a stepping stone to higher orders of ministry. It appears that the Task Force is of one mind in this regard already; however, a word of caution is offered. This particular concern should not be so elevated that other important concerns related to the underlying theology of holy orders are ignored or minimized.

2. Traditional interpretation of Scripture makes a distinction between the diaconate and the other orders of ministry in terms of its relation to the work of the Holy Spirit. Scripture and tradition would suggest that a particular bestowal of the Holy Spirit in the ordination service is closely connected in the ordination of priests and bishops but takes a different direction with the diaconate. The tradition that comes to us through Cranmer's work indicates that the gifting that comes through the Holy Spirit is already present in the case of a deacon, and the church, through the bishop, grants authority and makes provision for the exercising of the gift. The Task Force should consider whether the ordination rites should reflect this understanding in some way.

3. Because the *Venite Creator Spiritus* is a later addition to the ordination rites, the appropriateness of its exclusion or inclusion for the ordination of a deacon must be weighed on the basis of what the church desires to communicate through the ordinal. On the one hand, the *Apostolic Tradition* sanctions an epiclesis of some sort in the ordination prayer for a deacon, yet tradition and Scripture would suggest that a distinction should be made between the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the ordination of a deacon and that of the other two orders. It is possible that the inclusion of the *Veni Creator Spiritus* would be at cross purposes with this concern.

II. Precatory vs. Imperative.

The next issue concerns the actual ordination formula that accompanies the laying on of hands upon the candidate. The aforementioned *Apostolic Tradition*, as well as the New Testament (Acts 1:21-26; 6:2-6; 1 Tim 3:1-13; 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6-7), attest to the necessity of prayer and the laying on of hands to transmit orders.¹⁰ Cranmer's preface to the 1550 ordinal recognizes that the necessity of "public prayer and the imposition of hands;" but contrary to the ancient tradition, Cranmer separated the prayer from the imposition of hands. Additionally, there is no specific prayer for a deacon given in the rite for ordaining deacons, other than a concluding collect, so scholars have assumed that Cranmer intended the litany to meet the requirement of "public prayer." As Bradshaw note, Cranmer's use of litany as "public prayer" both restored and lost elements of the ancient practice.

His choice of this as the essential prayer was perhaps partly influenced by the presence of a litany in the Pontifical rites, but it is more probable that his main reason for choosing this particular type of prayer was that it was the corporate prayer of the Church, and both his bidding and the *Paraphrase* of Erasmus describe the act of prayer as by the whole group and not by a single consecrator. It was impossible for him to have known that this was a very primitive feature in the ordination rites. He was simply reverting to what he

¹⁰See Bradshaw, 1; Porter, xii.

believed to have been the New Testament practice, but in so doing he was accidentally restoring part of the structure of the ancient Roman rites with a bidding, litany, and collect, while at the same time he was departing from the universal practice of the Church, which had always included a prayer said while hands were laid on or held over the candidate.¹¹

The separation of the ordination prayer from the imposition of hands did not arise from Cranmer alone, but the origin of the practice is found in the complex developments of the ordination rites that took place in the Middle Ages.¹² At some point during this time, the laying on of hands became detached from the ordination prayers, and the hands of the officiating clergy were laid or extended in silence. While silence may be golden according to the proverb, it seems to make people uncomfortable in certain contexts, so words and actions were invented to fill the gap. The imperative formulae which accompany the imposition of hands in the 1550 ordinal (“Take thou authority...”; or “Receive the Holy Ghost...”) are derived from this later development.

In the course of time it was felt desirable to enrich this silent imposition of hands with some formula similar to those accompanying other action in the rites, and by the end of the medieval period many Pontificals included such formulas. Most adopted *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* in the rite for the diaconate and the episcopate, although in England only the Exeter Pontifical had the latter: the other English Pontificals either had silence or the singing of the hymn *Veni Creator* at this point. In the rite for the priesthood the imposition of hands usually remained in silence and an additional imposition of hands after the Eucharist, accompanied by the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum peccata*, etc. (Christ's commission to the Apostles in John 20:22-3), appeared in many Pontificals, although a few, including the English Magdalen College Pontifical, inserted this formula at the first imposition of hands instead.¹³

Cranmer's principle of simplification led him to reduce the rite to only one instance for the imposition of hands; however, he chose the wrong one. Rather than keeping the more primitive, precatory pattern in which the ordination prayer was simultaneous with the laying on of hands, he chose to retain the imperative form. If we ask why Cranmer's judgment led him in this direction, it may be that he was following the conventional wisdom of the day by which many believed the essential “matter” of ordination to be the imperative formula.¹⁴

Current liturgical scholarship is nearly universally agreed that the ancient and desirable pattern of a precatory formula with the simultaneous imposition of hands is the way to go. In

¹¹Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal*, 28. See also, Marion J. Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 524.

¹²Massey Shepherd observes that in the Middle Ages ordination rites became so complex and conflated than any two bishops' pontificals were seldom alike. *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary*, (New York: Oxford, 1950), 531.

¹³Bradshaw, 4-6.

¹⁴During the Middle Ages, a great debate raged over what constituted the “form” and “matter” of the sacrament of holy orders. Shepherd states that by the time of the Reformation many followed the opinion of Pope Eugenius IV (1431-47) that the form is constituted by the delivery of instruments (chalice, paten, etc.) and the matter by the imperative formula. *Oxford Prayer Book Commentary*, (1950), 531-2.

addition to being in accord with the tradition of the church, it makes for good theology. The imperative formula tends to convey the erroneous notion that the power to ordain is a magical ability that resides in the bishop himself and that he may wield that power at his own whim, whenever and wherever he wishes. Many of the difficulties associated with the so-called “continuing church” movement may be traced to this faulty understanding of how ordination “works.” In contrast, the precatory formula conveys the notion that the bishop is an instrument of the church, as she is directed and animated by the power of the Holy Spirit. Bradley aptly summarizes the point.

In spite of the importance attached by many Anglicans to the imperative formulas at the imposition of hands in the Anglican rites, particularly that in the rite for the priesthood, their continued use can really no longer be defended. They have no place in the primitive pattern of ordination, and they serve only to detract from the ordination prayers and induce erroneous ideas about ordination; they suggest, for example, that the grace of Order is something that can be bestowed by command rather than sought in prayer. Their presence has also caused some Anglicans and other to perpetuate the medieval theory that the form of ordination need not be prayer. This theory rests upon the hypothesis that the Church has power to alter forms from precative to imperative, a hypothesis which has no evidence to support it and which is contrary to the claim made in the Preface to the ordinal that the essentials of ordination are prayer and the imposition of hands.¹⁵

The current draft of the ordinal produced by the Task Force has made a good attempt to retain both the precative and imperative formulae. This is a commendable effort, in that it rightly attempts to follow the ancient pattern, but also to retain continuity with the stream of Anglican tradition stemming from the 1550 ordinal. While the Task Force may wish to retain the imperative formula alongside the precatory formula, especially for the deacon’s ordination (if we follow Cranmer’s understanding of the diaconate), the rites would be greatly improved by connecting the imposition of hands with the ordination prayer, rather than where it currently stands with the imperative formula. This would bring the ordinal of the Anglican Church in North America in line with the original, ancient practice, as well as the current consensus among the historic liturgical churches.

David L. Hicks
Oreland, Pennsylvania
September 24, 2010.

¹⁵Bradshaw, 209.