**Introduction**

**Two Movements of the Past That Inform the Future**

**The Rt. Rev. Dr. William Franklin[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Bishop Doyle has given us much to think about. This is not the first time the Church has confronted the challenge of liturgical revival and the act and meaning of the Eucharist.

As Bishop Doyle’s paper explains, the Covid-19 pandemic has raised anew the possibility of celebrating the Eucharist virtually at a time when it is unsafe for us to worship in person. A virtual Eucharist endangers the dignity of the human person by its reliance on isolated individuals rather than on our experiences in relationship to creation and one another. Bishop Doyle’s paper shows that the Eucharist is not a formulaic repetition of words and gestures but a lived experience that requires common place and presence. We should approach with caution the use of the digital realm for the celebration of the Eucharist, an act that is an outward and visible sign of our spiritual union with God and one another.

My contribution to this conversation is a review of two key 19th-century movements in liturgical revival: the Puseyites, who were part of the Oxford Movement; and the Liturgical Movement that was part of the Benedictine revival in the Roman Catholic Church. These are parallel movements that responded to the great social issues of their own age: industrialization and mechanization and the corresponding threats to health and safety, the depersonalization of work, isolation of individuals, emphasis on materialism and financial gain, lives lived under brutal conditions without the nourishment of ritual, beauty, and meaning. We may find parallels in our culture today.

At the end I offer reflection questions to spark conversation and some concluding thoughts.

I invite you to study Bishop Doyle’s paper with care. His thoughtful work helps us to understand both what is new and what is old as we examine the celebration of the Eucharist.

**Pusey and Worship in Industrialized Society**

We begin with a look at the Oxford Movement (1833-1845), the start of a Catholic revival within the Church of England.

It arose at a time when the Church was battered by challenges from Evangelicals, whose desire for a robust spiritual life was not satisfied by the historic English Church; by science, which some used to discredit religion; by anticlerical movements that saw the burning of a bishop’s palace and the abolition of 10 dioceses of the Anglican Church of Ireland by the British government; and by the Church’s own neglect of the sacraments.

All this was set against a background of the ugliness, pollution, and poverty of the industrial age; the brutal social conditions of the mill towns; and the isolation, exhaustion, and misery of workers — adults and children — who crowded the cities. The literature of the times brims over with “willpower,” “the gospel of work,” “self-help,” and “self-reliance.” It was a time of individualism and materialism, of unrestrained capitalism.

So how was the Church to respond? John Keble, Oxford don and venerated parish priest, proclaimed that religion unnourished by a visible Church with its sacramental system could not long maintain vital spiritual life in an age of secularism and revolution, and such a Church derived its authority from Christ, his apostles, and their successors, not from the Crown, Parliament, or the 16th-century reformers. The Tractarian John Henry Newman upheld the Church of England as a “divine” or “ecclesial” institution with a social mission. And Edward Bouverie Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, sought to recover the communal dimension of Anglicanism through a revival of eucharistic worship linked to a campaign to build parish churches in the new industrial cities of England — indeed, he took the unprecedented step of advocating the construction of a church every day of the year in the gritty, soul-crushing mill towns.

For Pusey and his followers — “Puseyites” — the sacramental life was the noble heritage of the community of Christ. The Eucharist gave new significance to earth as well as eternity, to matter as well as to spirit, and this belief manifested itself in social-service efforts: workers’ compensation, burial funds, distribution centers for food, clothing, and other necessities, creating the safety net where none existed and where individuals were expected to fend for themselves.

Pusey turned the movement away from the better-funded parishes controlled by some the most reactionary elements in British society, a move that we would characterize today as “afflicting the comfortable while comforting the afflicted.” He remarked that we “know full often the very clothes we wear are, while they are made, moistened by the tears of the poor” — a comment we might remember when we buy “fast fashion” cheap clothes manufactured in sweatshops in Asia in our own time.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Filled with Holy Potential**

The old Anglican establishment — the episcopal palace, the country parsonage, the Thirty-Nine Articles, the bare worship — would never make a breach in factory walls, could never lay hold of an industrial population. The times required communities of faith showing how to keep the fast as well as the festival. Pusey was reminded by the Berlin church historian Augustus Neander of the forgotten world of the patristic Church: solidarity, fellowship, sharing, corporate worship, opposition to the dominant pagan power. Neander’s teaching on the humanization of the divine and the deification of the human led Pusey to build churches in factory districts and slums as a way to remind the laboring masses that they were surrounded and embraced by God in creation, filled with holy potential.

Pusey’s message to Victorian society was that the good news about Jesus is that faith in him establishes a living, organic relationship with others. The Eucharist can become this bond of fellowship, but only if the English recover a Catholic belief in the real presence. This, of course, reversed the work of the 16th-century reformer-liturgist Thomas Cranmer, who eliminated any explicit mention of the real presence from the Book of Common Prayer. Pusey found that in order to make worship the act of all present who are members of Christ’s body, the people’s work, the Eucharist had to be celebrated so as to express Christ as a living presence in the midst of his church on earth.

That was dangerous teaching, and Pusey was found guilty of heresy in 1843 because he had overturned Cranmer, and was forbidden to preach for two years within the precincts of the university “for uttering such scandal.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

In the 1840s Pusey and his followers sensed that dignity and solemnity in worship could safeguard for a secular age the reverence due the Lord in his presence. They brought back eucharistic vestments, lighted altar candles, incense, processions, the sign of the cross, bowing and genuflection, elevation of host and chalice, and the ringing of bells at the canon “to set it [the real presence] before our eyes.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

The response to this rich liturgy on the one hand was thronged pews and great increases in baptisms. On the other hand, there was mockery, astonishment, and even riots at St. Barnabas, London, in 1851 as mobs drove the poor from their pews and the choir was pelted with rotten eggs.

At St. Peter, London Docks, in the poverty-stricken East End, high worship in 1859 at first met ridicule and skepticism (and attacks on the choir with pea shooters), but over time the priest Charles Lowder taught the people to make God’s house their home through active participation in worship. The warm, familial life made worshippers feel members of one another in a quiet retreat they came to love.

There were defeats and victories. The Public Worship Act of 1874 allowed parishioners aggrieved by the introduction of ritual to bring their offending clergy to trial. One priest had to lead worship in parishioners’ kitchens when his bishop objected to the chasuble and incense. But the communal dimension and social mission of the Church prevailed in eliminating in some parishes that classic symbol of status, party, and class: pew rents (and even glass partitions so the well-to-do would not have to smell the poor).

**Architecture and the Altar**

Pusey advocated a Catholic liturgy that involved the people: through education and through active participation (singing, responses and processions, bodily gestures, frequent communion). That was the primary way a parish and its people witnessed for Jesus Christ in the city. He urged celebration of the mass facing the people.

The real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the active participation of the people, the inspiration of beauty in place and ritual, and the acknowledgment of each person as a fellow member of the Body of Christ were the hallmarks of the movement. Nowhere were they joined in such magnificent unity as at All Saints, Margaret Street, London.

All Saints Church, built from 1850 to 1859, was the first church ever designed that strove, albeit in primitive fashion, to express architecturally for the industrial age both the revived understanding of the whole Church as the body of Christ and the centrality of corporate eucharistic celebrations. (View the church at https://www.allsaintsmargaretstreet.org.uk/)

With no pews or galleries or rood screen, architect William Butterfield created a space for the congregation to form into one body that could be organically related to the altar. The effect was to create a vision of glowing light and harmony amid the drab commercial cityscape. The provision of space for a liturgical community — where the laity could actively join in the rite — was revolutionary. All Saints has been acclaimed as a turning point, not a copy, “a bold and magnificent endeavor to shake off the trammels of antiquarian precedent” that fettered the Gothic Revival, “in many ways the most moving building of the century.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

All Saints’ single altar, visible everywhere, executed with rich liturgical dignity, foreshadowed the continental liturgical architectural of the monks at Beuron, Germany, about which we’ll have more to say later in this paper.

After the 19th century it was revived Anglican religious orders that kept alive the old balance of ritual and social protest. The Society of St. John the Evangelist (1863) and the Society of the Sacred Mission (1894) transformed the experiences of the Puseyite parishes into a new monastic tradition that was to have influence throughout the Anglican Communion into the 20th century.

**The Decline of the Movement**

When the prosecutions of offending clergy stopped in the 1890s, ritual became an end in itself, no longer subordinated to the larger mission. Though in one sense the future lay with the Puseyites — throughout the world the Eucharist now began to supplant Morning Prayer and Evensong as the chief form of Anglican worship — in another sense it did not. The Tractarians had dreamed of a popular Catholic revival, but by the end of the 19th century in most areas of English life the Church of England had been reduced to a tangential formality. In worship, public sin was rarely confronted by the cosmic scheme of salvation. The number of Anglo-Catholics raising questions about the industrial system dwindled and their influence was spurned by clergy and laity alike,

Many Anglo-Catholic parishes became isolated worlds within society — false, artificial, and alien to modern life. Communal experience was no longer primary, and in divine worship the laity were unaware that they were one body with the clergy. The celebrant alone would receive communion at the “high mass,” even when 5,000 of the faithful had gathered. Some courageous Puseyite outposts on the East Coast of the United States declined into ritual societies for the rich and their eclectic following of young aesthetes. One famous Boston parish shunted servants off to a separate mission church and smiled while an eccentric patroness publicly washed the front steps of the mother church in Lent, certain that this indeed was Catholic revival.

The industrial system of the 19th century was the historic force that gave rise to the search for liturgical community. It was Pusey who had the courage to challenge modern Christians to “grapple with our manufacturing system as the apostles did with the slave system of the ancient world … if by God’s grace we would wrest from the principalities and powers of evil those portions of his kingdom, of which, while unregarded by the Church, they have been taking full possession.”[[6]](#footnote-6) How might we grapple with the digital systems and capitalism that define our society today?

The 19th century is still our crisis. We, too, pervert the marvelous gifts machines can be. We are surrounded by machines of violence that can bring global death, machines of commerce that spew a chemical fallout, and machines of diversion that numb the mind and foster flight from responsibility. At the fall of Rome, in the Dark Ages, at the Reformation, in the French Revolution, Christian worship has presented an articulation of human values at odds with accepted public standards. This also happened in our Machine Age. And yet much of the church is ignorant of an obscure line of Christian thinkers who related worship to human beings as they existed in the industrial order. Pusey, standing in this line, holds up a heritage that we have yet to realize.

**The 19th-century Liturgical Movement**

 The 19th-century Liturgical Movement (1833-1933) was the work of the Benedictines, chiefly in France, Germany, and Belgium. It was the abbot of Solesmes, France — Dom Prosper Guéranger — who first used the phrase “Liturgical Movement,” and for him it was monastic, pastoral, and cultural efforts that led the way for the restoration of worship, which had fallen into almost universal neglect.

The leadership of the monasteries in liturgical revival is surprising because of the striking decline of the monasteries in Western Europe. In 1790 there were more than 1,000 Benedictine monasteries for men and 500 for women. Fourteen years later fewer than 2 percent of these houses remained, and by 1845 only 5 percent had been restored. They were greatly reduced in size and had been relieved of their libraries and other possessions. The religious who remained found their vocations in public forums such as preaching, parish teaching, and even journalism, but the emphasis was on public works of zeal rather than prayer. There was no emphasis on liturgy.

Guéranger discerned that his vocation was in the field of liturgy, and at the age of 25 he resolved to refound a Benedictine house as a center of prayer and research. This he did in 1833, reopening the doors of the former Maurist priory in Solesmes in western France. Guéranger maintained that the divine office, chanted in choir in its entirety with the solemn celebration of the Eucharist at its center, must be at the heart of Benedictine monasticism.

In 1840 Guéranger initiated the pastoral phase of the Solesmes liturgical renewal directed against episcopal indifference, the slovenly practice of the parishes, and the ignorance of the laity. Throughout France the laity had no idea what transpired at a high mass, did not sing at mass, and avoided the divine office.

Opposition came in 1845 from Bishop Jean-Jacques Fayet of Orleans, who asserted that religion is moral virtue, private, and individualistic — not communal; and liturgy at best is the preserve of the clergy. Guéranger responded not by making parishes the battleground for opposing practices, but by making the monasteries the models of rites and intellectual formation, offering examples to the laity of liturgical celebration, and fostering theological reflection and historical research.

The Guéranger liturgies were romantic and lyrical, illustrating three key themes: (1) Liturgy is central not just to monasteries but to cathedrals and parish churches as well, and for 1,000 years had been the chief way of transmitting the tradition of the Church (an insight modified by later research); (2) Worship, which symbolically recreates the annual cycle of events in the life of Christ, makes present in the Church the mysteries of these events; (3) The clergy must be deeply involved as teachers —a revolutionary notion for the time — with the goal of full, active participation of the people.

The liturgies opened the door to a new role for the laity. The prayer of a liturgical parish was expected to be the prayer of a lay community — a democratic notion that found its full expression in the reforms of Vatican II. Secular priest-oblates were encouraged to restore the divine office of praise, and if their priests were reluctant, they were to lead the chanting of psalms and singing of hymns. As the Solesmes oblate-book puts it, and also the Second Vatican Council: “Christ Jesus joins the entire community of mankind to himself. … He continues his priestly work through the Church, which is ceaselessly engaged in praising the Lord.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

**The Arts as Tributaries of Liturgy**

Gregorian chant soon was identified everywhere in France with the liturgical movement. In rural France it was introduced as a way of overcoming the detestable state of village liturgy, and in Paris, great centers flourished where chant was attempted with solemn perfection.

Guéranger believed that “all of the arts — architecture, painting, sculpture, music — are tributaries of the liturgy,” but he soon discovered that enthusiasm unchecked led to excess.[[8]](#footnote-8)  He faced longstanding chaotic and eclectic practices that butchered the purity of plainchant with elaborate instrumentation that drowned out the voices. Lax practices had encouraged replacing the organ with the Chinese gong at some points in the service and the singing of elaborate motets at the elevation of the host. It took nearly half a century to return to the pure sources of chant, and, as we will see, the debate over the purity of chant led to one of the key liturgical wars of the progressive movement.

In architecture, a chaotic mania for paganism in ecclesiastical building had prevailed in France after the 16th century. In Paris, Sainte-Geneviève was modeled after the Pantheon of Agrippa; La Madeleine resembles the Temple of Minerva; and Saint Philippe-du-Roule was built like an antique temple adorned with representations of God as Jupiter, the Virgin as Venus, and the saints as amorous nymphs. To our abbot this revived pagan sensuality was an “outrageous insult to the Christian cult.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

The challenge was to replace the anachronistic pastiches of the arts of the Middle Ages — the Gothic excess of romances and fairy tales — with a purer Gothic as a model of sound popular religious art. The leader of this aspect of the movement was A.W.N. Pugin, who believed that the decline of liturgical art coincided with the decline of the Gothic and of monasticism.

This lack of agreed-upon principles in music and architecture was a symptom of a greater divide. After the 16th century, worship itself suffered from the absence of a common set of principles for the guidance of compilers of liturgical books. There were 21 breviaries and missals in common usage throughout France by Guéranger’s day, the product of Gallicanism, i.e., civil authority based in Paris over the church, comparable to that of Rome. From the viewpoint of the monasteries, there could be no liturgical reform in France until the principle of unity for the office and the mass was restored. That divide — between Paris and Rome — was the basis of the other great liturgical battle that the revival movement was to wage.

**The Battle Over Liturgy**

In his multi-volume *Institutions liturgiques,* Guéranger described “the Roman liturgy as one of the means of procuring European unity.”[[10]](#footnote-10) He meant not exclusively the Roman-Tridentine books, based on the work of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), but rather a re-establishment of sound traditions, “allowing for a certain variety in form.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Roman unity and Gregorian chant — the two great conflicts — came to overshadow progressive elements of the liturgical movement, and a half-century of controversy over the two issues followed in which the Vatican became engaged.

Eager to assert papal authority in the face of an anticlerical liberation movement in Italy, Pius IX from 1847 tightened the strings that bound northern Catholics to the Holy See. He resurrected inactive sees in Holland and created a Roman Catholic hierarchy in England for the first time since the Reformation. In France he forced the adoption of the liturgical books of Trent — the Roman liturgy — in Gallican dioceses that had never used them. Guéranger was harshly (and unfairly) blamed as the instrument of a contrived uniformity destructive of the liturgical heritage of France. He got the unity he sought, but at a price.

One of the strengths of Guéranger’s understanding of liturgy was his vision of worship as a means to solve one of the great problems of the 19th century: the reintegration of matter and spirit. The background from the mid-1800s onward was a predominantly materialistic civilization that divided society into a secular sphere and an increasingly unimportant otherworldly, spiritual sphere. It was a time of industrialization, mass production, movement from rural areas to cities, exploitation of workers, and a huge wealth divide. For the Church, the challenge was to address this society with liturgies that lifted up everyday objects — candles, flowers, fruit — as well as processions that carried religion into places of work in a century that underestimated the value of labor. The liturgical year symbolically hallows time when employment schedules and technology created nightless days and seasonless years, a descriptor we might well apply to our own day.

In his later years Guéranger changed his focus from a balance of material and spiritual in liturgical theory and embraced instead contemplation over public activity, individual illumination over communal sanctification. It is not clear why he did so. But the rise of heterodox mystical theology, the hostility of the French government, and the indifference of his successors at Solesmes after his death in 1875 impeded the connection of liturgy to monasticism. And a wave of anticlericalism led to the closing of the abbey in 1901.

**The Battle Over Chant**

During these years the contribution of the community to the liturgical movement was limited to the discussions over Gregorian chant, but this was an occasion of historic importance and the cause of the second great liturgical war.

Guéranger had championed the ancient version of the Solesmes *Liber Gradualis.* A rival, Pustet of Ratisbon, circulated a Gradual based on a 17th-century Medicean edition of the sort Guéranger had deplored. Pustet persuaded Pius IX to make his version the official chant of the church for the next 30 years.

The central figure of this liturgical war was Dom Andre Mocquereau, a supporter of the Benedictine view, who saw that the issue was not one of mere papal preference (or backroom politicking) but of the liturgical worth of two opposing editions, the neo-Medicean and the Benedictine.

After lengthy correspondence and with skilled maneuvering, Mocquereau prevailed, and in an edict issued in 1903 Pius X wrote: “It being our most eager wish that the true Christian spirit may flower again in every way and be upheld by all the faithful, before anything else it is necessary to see the holiness and dignity of the temple, where the faithful gather to gain that spirit from its first and indispensable source: the active participation in the shared mysteries and the public and solemn prayer of the Church.”[[12]](#footnote-12) Those words, of course, are the charter of the 20th-century liturgical movement.

**The Revival Thrives in Germany**

We now set our sights on the Benedictine community at Beuron, on the edge of the Black Forest in Germany. There, in 1862, the priests and brothers Placidus and Maurus Wolter founded a new congregation, modeled on Solesmes, that soon oversaw outposts across Europe and in Palestine, including the influential communities of Maredsous, in Belgium, and Maria Laach, in Germany. Guéranger gave Maurus Wolter his final commission: “Inspire the love for the holy liturgy which is the center of all Christianity.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

Deeply committed to liturgy as their first and highest exercise, the Beuron communities produced missals, liturgical pamphlets, and mass translations that sold in the millions of copies to priests, intellectuals, and laity across Europe, and Beuron itself became a place of popular pilgrimage and instruction right up to World War II. Protestant students attended the courses, and as early as 1921 the prior at Maria Laach celebrated the mass facing the congregation. Retreats and classes attracted thousands, and the Liturgical Movement transformed parishes throughout Germany.

The revival extended into cultural reform as well, though in Germany it was more a matter of experiment with architecture than with Gregorian chant, as it had beenin France. Rejecting the dominant aesthetic principles of the time —“ostentation, luxury, and … the idolatrous plagiarism of dead styles” — the young artist and later monk Desiderius Lenz from 1868 to 1870 built the tiny Mauruskapelle at Beuron, the most important church of the 19th century.[[14]](#footnote-14) (View this lovely structure at https://tinyurl.com/yyk4f28u.) It was the first attempt to abandon revived styles and to construct an edifice based upon liturgical principles. It prophesied the simple, undecorated Catholic style of the post-Vatican II era. “It is liturgy transformed into line and color,” said Abbot Herwegen of Maria Laach. “I have in the whole of religious art found no more living symbol of prayer.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

Lenz took his inspiration from the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, the Ruskin Guild, Morris & Co. in England, the Nabis in France, and the Nazarenes in Germany, revolting against the Renaissance and embracing the spirit of the art of the Middle Ages and the communities that produced it.

By the 1920s the contribution of the monastery to the movement was felt more in research in the cultural as well in the pastoral sphere. From the house at Mont-César, Dom Lambert Beauduin took his influential manifesto to the industrial workers of Belgium, inviting them to make the parish mass the great weekly meeting of the Christian people gathered in unity. The popular appeal of liturgy was stressed in Beauduin’s *La Piété de l’Église* (1914), the second charter of the 20th-century Liturgical Movement: “By living the liturgy wholeheartedly Christians become more and more conscious of their supernatural fraternity. … This is the most powerful antidote against individualism.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

Another book, Romano Guardini’s *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (1918), became the Bible of the movement as it moved out from the Benedictines. Around Guardini from 1924 gathered figures who would make the parish the creative center, among

them Rudolf Schwarz, who used concrete, steel, and glass to build the first modern Catholic church, St. Fronleichnam in Aachen, in 1930, “the quintessential work of Modernism in ecclesiastical architecture” (it can be viewed at <https://tinyurl.com/y28t6esp>).[[17]](#footnote-17)

**Our Debt to the Benedictines**

With the separation of the Liturgical Movement from the monastic context in the 1920s, the memory of a Benedictine contribution faded and a negative interpretation of Guéranger gained ascendancy. Critics took him to task for his insistence on the restoration of the Roman liturgy at the expense of the development of new forms of worship.

The Liturgical Movement would not have survived the 19th century had it not been for the enterprise of monasticism. The international character of monasticism allowed monks to become the medium for the transmission of its ideas out of countries in which the Liturgical Movement had become threatened and distorted. The nature of the monastery as an institution that is a center both of learning and of daily life shaped the Liturgical Movement along a creative middle way that was at once conservative, in that it looked to the past for models, and progressive, in that it sought to create a revived community life appropriate for modern conditions.

We owe the Benedictines a debt for their work in drastically changing Western worship in the last 175 years. We are the beneficiaries of their legacy of lay participation and education, the importance of ritual and beauty in worship, the focus on agreed-upon principles with room for local variation, well-educated clergy, and the liturgy as the vehicle that brings us into communion with Christ and each other. How might that legacy inform our thinking as we examine liturgy in our digital age?

**The Link from Past to Present**

How do we get from these 19th-century movements on Eucharist and liturgy to the concerns of the Church amidst our 21st-century pandemic? Today throughout The Episcopal Church the cry has gone up that people desire once more to receive the Eucharist. There is a sacramental famine in the land.

But until 40 years ago The Episcopal Church was not a eucharistically-centered Church at all. Morning Prayer was the norm for Sunday morning worship. The Roman Catholic Church has always been eucharistically-centered. But Roman Catholic popular piety focused on the Virgin Mary and the saints. That all changed with the Second Vatican Council, and many Roman Catholics who have come into The Episcopal Church have brought a strong desire for regular Sunday reception of the Eucharist.

This eucharistic focus in The Episcopal Church has been shaped above all by the 1979 Book of Common Prayer. And the link between the 19th-century movements introduced here and the 1979 revision of our prayer book was William Palmer Ladd, Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School in New Haven from 1918-1941.

Though he could be highly critical of Pusey and the Anglo-Catholic ritualists, Dean Ladd combined his commitment to the eucharistic focus of the Puseyites with the liturgical scholarship and theology of the Benedictine Liturgical Movement, above all of the German abbeys.

Through the widespread influence of his *Prayer Book Interleaves*, essays published originally in *The Witness* magazine, and then as a separate volume in 1942, Ladd nurtured the Parish Communion Movement and helped lay the foundations of the Associated Parishes and the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music of the General Convention of The Episcopal Church, and he shaped the writing and teaching of such figures as Massey H. Shepherd, H. Boone Porter, and Frank Griswold, among many others who produced the 1979 Prayer Book.

Ladd never separated his striving for a Church centered on the Eucharist from the major dehumanizing forces of the 1930s and ’40s: The Great Depression, the rise of fascism, and the coming of world war.

In his 1957 introduction to a new edition of *Prayer Book Interleaves,* Massey H. Shepherdsaid this about the inheritance Dean Ladd has passed on to us:

When Dean Ladd wrote these papers the fascist powers were rushing the world into the bloodiest war in history. The dean was one of the few churchmen who foresaw from the beginning the tragedy that would engulf mankind. Yet he was serene and confident that a book on worship was not out of place at the time. He knew that the world would undergo revolutionary social changes that would make the aims of the Liturgical Movement all the more needful for its healing and reconciliation… But if he had lived to our present hour, he would doubtless have been astonished to behold how rapidly his prophecies would begin to be fulfilled.[[18]](#footnote-18)

**In conclusion**

*The church of Christ, in every age*

*beset by change but Spirit-led,*

*must claim and test its heritage*

*and keep on rising from the dead.*

*— Wonder, Love, and Praise, Hymn 779*

In this unsettling season of Coronatide we find ourselves beset by change, some welcome, some unwelcome. Throughout history, many moments of change — significant inventions/discoveries/upheavals, including the printing press, the internal-combustion engine, the computer — have prompted us to say: “This is miraculous” as well as “This is the work of the devil,” and to wonder, “What great things can we do with this?” as well as “What terrible harm will this inflict?” Today we find ourselves equipped to offer virtual communion. Our question is whether to do so, and why.

Bishop Doyle argues that “to limit the participants by limiting the frame of reference to a small screen is to limit our participation in the Eucharist with others. To see virtual Eucharist as a kind of hub with virtual spokes is to miss the fact that the references built into community, communion, and eucharistic celebration are also about how the multiple individuals participate in the communion or Eucharist-making of the other people.”

Our review of the Oxford Movement and the 19th-Century Liturgical Movement underscores that the Church treasures an understanding of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; the community gathered that we might see the face of Christ in one another; and the restorative power of ritual, dignity, and beauty. Those are no less important values today as we find ourselves isolated in a world marked by fear, uncertainty about the future, suspicion, anger, and the polar opposites of need and greed — a world obsessed with data and numbers that often turns its back on what the Gospel offers.

As Bishop Doyle puts it, ours is a modern society framed by the economy, public sphere, and politics, “characterized by an individualism that may be at odds with the moral imagination of the Christian liturgy.”

Any one moment cannot dictate liturgical content. We would do well to avoid changing our understanding of sacramental theology as we experience short-term upheavals because of the pandemic.

In 1981 the author Tracy Kidder wrote the Pulitzer Prize-winning book *The Soul of a New Machine,* abouta team of computer engineers working to design a super minicomputer at a breakneck pace under tremendous competitive pressure. That soul, one commentator says, may have been embedded in silicon and microcode, but it was their souls, through their attention, toil, and creativity, that brought the device to life. May our souls do the same for our liturgy today.[[19]](#footnote-19)
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