

Lucas: an Evangelical History Review 2.6 (December 2013)

Donald Robinson and the Imperfect Unity of *An Australian Prayer Book*

Andrew Judd¹

An Australian Prayer Book (AAPB) 'is Donald Robinson's book *par excellence*. And he shares that proprietorship with Gilbert Sinden of Adelaide.'² This, the opinion of fellow commissioner Edwin Judge, is only barely an overstatement. Robinson was one of only three men to see the commission through from 1962 to 1978, and its minutes reveal he was extremely active in its meetings.³ Together with Evan Burge and Gilbert Sinden, much of the drafting of the final prayer book is indeed Robinson's work.

Yet it was not through quantity of work that Robinson left his imprint on AAPB. Rather, it was through two of Robinson's defining personal characteristics. First, Robinson's idiosyncratic scholarship, his logical approach to words, and his grasp of liturgical history propelled the commission down an inevitably evangelical course. Second, his intellectual generosity and principled churchmanship nurtured a spirit of trust and cooperation. This often enabled true agreement, and not just compromise, to be reached with those who did not share his evangelical convictions. AAPB is, because of

¹ Andrew Judd is Associate Minister with responsibility for Campus Ministries at St Barnabas' Church, Broadway, in Sydney.

² Edwin Judge, 'Personal Interview', May 11, 2012.

³ See e.g. 'Minutes of the Standing Liturgical Commission' (Trinity College, Melbourne, June 2, 1969), Box 3, Folder 1, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

Robinson, an imperfect unity, but one truly attempted. It is the closest Australian Anglicans would ever come to finding 'a common ground behind divergences of tradition'.⁴

1960-1962: The Liturgical Movement

The 1960s saw a flurry of Prayer Book revisions, from South Africa to America.⁵ Robinson was dismayed at how many such revisions could, like the Canadian prayer book (1959), be glossed by anglo-catholics to re-introduce pre-reformation elements, and he was determined not to allow such compromises here.⁶ Whether Australian dioceses could ever agree on a new prayer book was an open question. The 'Red Book Case' brought against Bishop Arnold Wylde of Bathurst in 1948 had poisoned relations between anglo-catholics and Sydney evangelicals, stifling liturgical cooperation for the next two decades.⁷ Even in 1968, T.P. Grundy feared that 'there is in the Anglican Church of Australia no widespread interest in or concern for liturgical revision at the present time'.⁸

⁴John Grindrod, 'Preface,' in *An Australian Prayer Book for Use Together with the Book of Common Prayer, 1662* (Sydney: Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, 1978) 13.

⁵Colin Buchanan, *An Evangelical Among the Anglican Liturgists* (London: SPCK, 2009); Colin O. Buchanan (ed.), 'Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1968-75,' in *Further Australian Liturgies* (Nottingham: Grove, 1975) 315-352; Colin O. Buchanan, *Anglican Worship Today* (London: Collins, 1980).

⁶D.W.B. Robinson, 'The Holy Communion: Is the 1662 Order Adequate?' *Australian Church Record* (July 19, 1963) 6.

⁷Ian Breward, *A History of the Australian Churches* (St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1993) 137; Charles Sherlock, 'The Anglican Church of Australia,' in *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (ed. Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 325.

⁸T.P. Grundy, 'Letter to unidentified recipient(s),' December 2, 1968, Box 3 Folder 1, Donald Robinson's Personal Files, Moore College Archives.

But Grundy had misread the climate. *The Book of Common Prayer* (BCP) no longer satisfied either evangelicals or anglo-catholics. Every diocese except Sydney was using local deviations, ostensibly authorised by the Bishop.⁹ There was a ‘widespread laxity’ in use of BCP.¹⁰ Its language was widely recognised as obsolete.¹¹ Broughton Knox longed for a modern ‘terse’ English without any overtones of religiosity.¹² Even Marcus Loane, who loved its early modern English, nevertheless conceded there was growing unfamiliarity with it.¹³ Modern English translations of the Bible had begun to appear, and (with the possible exception of Queensland) Australian interest in liturgical reform was also growing.

Robinson still savours 1662 today.¹⁴ Yet he had three concerns. First, he agreed that its language was now obtuse. His love of superannuated language was eclipsed by his

⁹R. Gordon Arthur, ‘Letter to Broughton Knox,’ December 5, 1962, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

¹⁰D.W.B. Robinson, ‘The Church of England in Australia,’ in *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968* (ed. Colin O. Buchanan; London: Oxford University Press, 1968) 298.

¹¹Evan Burge, *Proclaim and Celebrate* (Sydney and Melbourne: Anglican Information Offices, 1973) 3; Anglican News Service, ‘Revised Prayer Book Services,’ *The Anglican* (January 13, 1966).

¹²Broughton Knox, ‘Letter to Donald Robinson, including questionnaire,’ undated, File 11, Box 6, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

¹³Marcus Loane, ‘Letter to the Bishop of Grafton,’ circa 1965, Folder 7, Prayer Book Commission Gilbulla 1965, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

¹⁴See D.W.B. Robinson, *What is Liturgy? An Address Given to Members of the New South Wales Branch of The Prayer Book Society* (Sydney: Prayer Book Society in Australia [NSW Branch], 2001).

evangelical concern for ‘a style which will sustain the worship and devotion of the faithful throughout their lives’.¹⁵

Second, the theology of the 1552 service had been ‘clouded’ by some minor additions in 1662 which he wanted removed. Robinson also wanted to reiterate what he saw as the existing law on vestments.

Third, the changing pattern of Sunday worship made BCP’s five offices an anachronism: the same congregation was not present for the whole day. This meant most people would receive *either* Holy Communion *or* Morning Prayer, and only some of the appointed lectionary readings for the day.¹⁶ Robinson wanted these elements combined into ‘one basic’ Sunday service. This was a direct application of his ecclesiology, which made the ‘fellowship’ of the gathering central to all ministry. The service ‘is not a liturgy to be performed, but something for the gathering to do’.¹⁷ Thus ‘the implications of this divided congregation for the meaning of church membership are serious,’ approaching the ‘schismata’ anticipated by Paul in 1 Corinthians.¹⁸ For the same reason, baptisms should be restored to their place in the gathering.¹⁹

¹⁵D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision’ (Paper presented to General Synod Prayer Book Commission, March 1963), Box 6, File 11, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives, 2.

¹⁶Robinson, ‘Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,’ 3.

¹⁷D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Liturgical Patterns of Worship’ (1971), in *Selected Works* (ed. Mark D. Thompson and Peter G. Bolt; vol. 1; Sydney: Australian Church Record, 2008) 323.

¹⁸D.W.B. Robinson, ‘What Needs Changing in the Book of Common Prayer: Paper Read at First Meeting’ (Prayer Book Commission, April 26, 1963), Box 6, File 3, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

¹⁹*Ibid.*; Robinson, ‘The Church of England in Australia’, 303.

Robinson also wanted a more priestly role for the congregation, and insisted that parishioners have input into hymns and alternative orders of service.²⁰ Such congregational participation, however, would not extend to *ex tempore* prayer.²¹

The Prayer Book Commission (1962-1966)

Australian liturgical reform began in earnest with the creation of a Prayer Book Commission by the First General Synod (1962). Its 32 members were appointed by the diocesan bishops, with 10 appointed by the NSW metropolitan. From NSW it included Chairman Robert Gordon Arthur (the Bishop of Grafton), Donald W.B. Robinson (Vice Principal of Moore College), Marcus L. Loane (Archbishop of Sydney), D. Broughton Knox (Principal of Moore College), and T. Philip Grundy (Bathurst). Other members included Secretary A.W. Harris, Felix R. Arnott (Archbishop of Brisbane), John R. Bleby (Archdeacon from Adelaide), John N. Falkingham (Dean of Newcastle Cathedral), Alfred C. Holland (Perth) and R.L. Sharwood (Melbourne).²² The commission's first meeting was at Gilbulla, NSW, in April 1963.

On 1 January 1962 the Constitution of the Church of England in Australia had come into force.²³ It was no secret that both Knox and Robinson had opposed the Constitution. Breward interprets this as 'a sign that Evangelicals still deeply

²⁰Robinson, 'Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,' 2.

²¹D.W.B. Robinson, 'Liturgical Patterns of Worship', 323.

²²'History of Christ Church Cathedral, Newcastle,' May 10, 2012, Online: <http://www.newcastlecathedral.org.au/history.html>; *Diocese of Sydney: Year Book 1966* (Sydney: William Andrews Printing, 1966).

²³Stephen Judd and Kenneth John Cable, *Sydney Anglicans* (Sydney: AIO, 1987).

distrusted Anglo-Catholics'.²⁴ Yet the new Constitution provided the legal mechanism for work to begin towards a new Australian liturgy. Crucially, it established an important and immovable principle: nothing the commission produced could contradict the principles of doctrine and worship embodied in 1662 and the 39 Articles (together the 'authorized standard of worship and doctrine in this Church').²⁵ In effect, Australia was stuck with 1662's theology in a way that England was not.²⁶ Uniformity, and not comprehensiveness, was enshrined in the Constitution, and 1662 was ('at least on paper') the instrument of 'fellowship and mutual recognition'.²⁷ Where agreement could not be reached, the drafters could refer back to the theology of 1662; where the interpretation of 1662 was itself controversial (for example, the words of distribution) they would be required to fall back on 1662's exact words.²⁸

This strongly favoured the evangelicals. 1662 had removed the elevation of the host, and its memorial prayer anticipated a reality already present in the context of fellowship.²⁹ Unlike the ambiguous 1549 form, the 1552 eucharist (preserved in 1662) placed the *anamnesis* in its position right before the actual communion. Robinson regarded

²⁴Breward, *History of the Australian Churches*, 137.

²⁵Robinson, 'Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,' 1.

²⁶*Constitution of the Church of England in Australia, 1962*, ch. 2 section 4; Sherlock, 'The Anglican Church of Australia,' 326.

²⁷Robinson, 'Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,' 1.

²⁸D.W.B. Robinson, 'Letter to John Bunyan' (Sydney, December 15, 1966), Box 3, Folder 1, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

²⁹D.W.B. Robinson, 'The Holy Communion: Is the 1662 Order Adequate?' *Australian Church Record* (July 19, 1963) 2.

the 1662/1552 order as less liable to being re-read by Anglo-Catholics as a sacrificial rite.³⁰

He had not supported the Constitution, but Robinson embraced this constitutional principle sedulously. This was not merely because it favoured his position: Robinson exhibited this same legal positivism regarding the 1977 Canon to Authorise AAPB.³¹ Furthermore, the principle of uniformity – ‘common prayer’ – pervades his writing as much as his actual committee work.³² Any revision ‘must commend itself to the synod of every diocese’.³³ This meant working together with all his Anglican brethren, however difficult their disagreements. Robinson supported only limited alternatives for ministers to choose within the service: he did not want AAPB to turn into a ‘parson’s handbook’.³⁴ In 1963 he could dream of an entirely revised liturgy faithful to the Anglican confession – ‘my private fancy is that I could make the Book more scriptural’ – but he suspected that only a conservative revision of 1662 would please his ‘dissenting brethren’.³⁵ Occasionally, this meant sidelining a controversial issue: for example, they removed the rubric requiring priests to stand on the east of the altar, and left the ‘*Agnus Dei*’ and the ‘*Benedictus qui venit*’ to be decided under the general

³⁰*Ibid.*, 6.

³¹ See, e.g. Marcus Loane, ‘Letter to Donald Robinson’, July 26, 1977, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977 [1993/054/018], Sydney Diocesan Archives.

³²Robinson, ‘Liturgical Patterns of Worship,’ 330; Robinson, *What is Liturgy?*, 17.

³³Robinson, ‘Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,’ 1. Emphasis his.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 2. C.f. Evan Burge, *Proclaim and Celebrate* (Sydney and Melbourne: Anglican Information Offices, 1973) 4.

³⁵Robinson, ‘Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,’ 1.

discretion for appropriate hymns (moves anticipated by Robinson as early as 1963).³⁶

This churchmanship did not sit apart from his ecclesiology. On the contrary, it:

proceeds from our commitment to one another within the fellowship of our denomination, and not, as it were, descending from above; and if difficulties arise in the use of the Prayer Book, we must resolve them in the light of our commitment to each other. To extend the principle of 1 Corinthians 11, we should 'wait for one another' in Prayer Book revision, if we wish to maintain mutual confidence in our association.³⁷

Robinson's concern for unity within his denomination was, in his mind at least, a direct application of the NT 'fellowship' principle.

The first commission's primary task was to prompt the trialling of new liturgies and gather feedback from across Australia. Its report to the 1966 General Synod included two draft liturgies for experimentation, and others were produced and disseminated by the commission. Three years later, Arthur and Falkingham would report back to General Synod the country's assessment of these rites: 'A Liturgy for Africa' was widely rejected, while 'A Modern Liturgy' (AML) was well liked but received many contradictory criticisms of its theology and wordiness. A liturgy developed within an ACT parish and the Communion service of English Series II both received consideration and influenced the final draft. This feedback led

³⁶*Ibid.*, 2.

³⁷Robinson, 'Liturgical Patterns of Worship,' 323.

to ‘Service of Holy Communion for Australia (1969)’ which was also delivered to General Synod.

In a period where liturgical reform could make secular news,³⁸ such experimentation was sensational. In the spirit of experimentation, Robinson had floated a new version of the Lord’s Prayer which tried to reflect modern New Testament scholarship into a more accurate, if idiosyncratic, translation. Memorable lines included ‘Our bread of the morrow give us today’. The result was a public outcry. *The Sun*, *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Australian* and *The Sydney Morning Herald* all seized upon Robinson personally – ‘The Canon who rewrote the Lord’s prayer’ – with front page headlines, cartoons and interviews with the woman on the street: ‘It is not right that religious words should be changed,’ said Mrs Pico of Darlinghurst Road.³⁹

This first commission had a limited brief, but found even that task ‘hard, exacting, at times frustrating’. It was a liturgical, and not a doctrinal, commission, and as yet there was no way of dealing with doctrinal roadblocks underlying the rubrics for baptism and communion discipline.⁴⁰ Furthermore, due to its size, the commission met only twice, with its final

³⁸B. Ward Powers, ‘The Prayer Book Goes Modern,’ *Sun Herald* (March 12, 1967).

³⁹‘Leave the Lord’s Prayer Alone: Man in the Street Doesn’t Want Change,’ *The Sun* (September 14, 1966) 1; ‘Sticks Out Like Granny’s Teeth: Why I Rewrote Lord’s Prayer,’ *The Sun* (September 15, 1966) 1; ‘Anglican Lord’s Prayer: Protests on New Version,’ *Daily Telegraph* (September 15, 1966); ‘Lord’s Prayer,’ *Daily Telegraph* (September 16, 1966); ‘Lively Prayer Debate Expected,’ *The Sydney Morning Herald* (September 15, 1966); ‘Cartoon,’ *The Australian* (September 16, 1966) 8; ‘Why the Canon Rewrote Prayer,’ *The Australian* (September 15, 1966).

⁴⁰Robinson, ‘Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,’ 2.

meeting in October 1965.⁴¹ This meant the work was carried out largely by a small drafting committee consisting of Gordon Arthur, Felix Arnott, Donald Robinson and A.W. Harris, all of whom were from NSW except Arnott.⁴² Much of the drafting was done by Donald Robinson.⁴³

Executive decisions were inevitably made and, fed by the latent distrust towards evangelicals following the Red Book Case, suspicion grew. In May-June 1966 Archdeacon John Bleby (a commission member who made a modest contribution to the prayers and Old Testament readings)⁴⁴ wrote a series of angry letters, complaining that the marriage impediments rubric had been changed without consultation:⁴⁵

There is a real danger that the whole work of the Commission may be ruined by what the Drafting Committee has done. In many ways the Drafting Committee seems to have exceeded its authority and to have had but scant regard for opinions expressed by the

⁴¹See Liturgical Commission Files, in Donald Robinson's Papers, Box 3 Folder 1, Moore College Archives.

⁴²'Minutes of Meetings of the Drafting Committee of the Standing Liturgical Commission,' 1965 1963, File 1, Box 6, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁴³E.M. Webber, 'Letter,' circa 1966, Folder 8, Drafting Commission '66, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁴⁴Liturgical Commission Files, in Donald Robinson's Papers, Box 3 Folder 1, Moore College Archives.

⁴⁵John R. Bleby, 'Letter to Ven. A Harris,' June 28, 1966, Folder 8, Drafting Commission '66, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives; John R. Bleby, 'Letter to Donald Robinson,' June 14, 1966, Folder 8, Drafting Commission '66, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

Commission as a whole.⁴⁶

Robinson attempted to explain that he had done this work in good faith and, in fairness, had indeed sent the drafts to Adelaide but received no response.⁴⁷ This succeeded in improving the tone of Bleby's complaint.⁴⁸ But it did not remove the suspicion attached to Robinson as a Sydney Anglican, and colleague of the Red Book Case's star witness, Broughton Knox. Once the experimental liturgies were released, Bleby joined Queensland in an attack on AML, which was almost certainly written by Robinson and had been included in the 1966 report for discussion.⁴⁹ Queensland had little patience for liturgical reform anyway, and reacted strongly against this 'Moore College Rite'. They were 'filled with horror at Sydney Diocese's root and branch revision' – despite being provided with a copy during the drafting process and having raised neither 'criticism nor comment'.⁵⁰

In April 1967 Bleby echoed these criticisms, but this time in public. He wrote to *The Anglican* criticising AML for breaking with the principle of 1662 in that it was slanted

⁴⁶John R. Bleby, 'Letter,' May 30, 1966.

⁴⁷D.W.B. Robinson, 'Letter to Ven. J.R. Bleby,' June 2, 1966, Folder 8, Drafting Commission '66, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁴⁸John R. Bleby, 'Letter to Donald Robinson,' June 14, 1966, Folder 8, Drafting Commission '66, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁴⁹"'A Modern Liturgy' Found Defective,' *The Anglican*, June 22, 1967. See also H.W. Griffiths, 'Letter to the Editor: Prayer Book Revision,' *The Anglican*, September 22, 1966.

⁵⁰The Registrar, 'Letter to the Rt Rev Bishop of Grafton,' July 28, 1966, Box 6, File 12 "Correspondence," Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives. 'The Registrar' is probably Falkingham, but the carbon copy omits his name.

towards a particular view of the eucharist.⁵¹ Such an argument had been made in March by Rev. E. Randall (also from Adelaide), and Robinson had already written a defensive letter in reply, arguing that AML reflected the doctrine of the Anglican Church and not a particularly Zwinglian position.⁵² Robinson expressed his ‘disappointment’ to Bishop Arthur at the attitude taken publicly by Bleby and the Bishop of Adelaide, particularly the impression given that AML ‘was entirely the work of a small group of like minded people’.⁵³ The commission was too large to get anything done, but attempts to delegate the work to subcommittees had raised suspicion of conspiracy by a ‘Sydney Melbourne Axis’.⁵⁴ This atmosphere of distrust caused some to doubt the viability of the whole project:

I think it is becoming very clear that there is little possibility of agreement about a revised Liturgy for the Church in Australia at this stage. What I am afraid of is that there may be a division of the Church along party lines before the possibility of such agreement can be further explored.⁵⁵

⁵¹John R. Bleby, ‘Letter to the Editor: A Modern Liturgy,’ *The Anglican*, April 20, 1967.

⁵²D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Letter to the Editor of The Anglican,’ March 27, 1967. See also Robert Gordon Arthur, ‘Canada Not Ignored: Prayer Book Revision - Letter to the Editor in reply to Archdeacon Twigg,’ *The Anglican*, October 20, 1966.

⁵³D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Letter to the Bishop of Grafton,’ May 22, 1967.

⁵⁴Secretary of the Liturgical Commission, ‘Letter to the Rt Rev Bishop of Adelaide,’ June 6, 1966, Box 6, File 12 “Correspondence,” Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁵⁵The Registrar, ‘Letter to the Rt Rev Bishop of Grafton,’ July 28, 1966, Box 6, File 12 “Correspondence,” Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

Nevertheless, in that same month Bishop Arthur, the recipient of this letter, addressed General Synod with a message of cautious hope. As Chairman of the commission, he named the frustrations and recognised that ‘[d]ivergences in things liturgical in the Australian Church run deep and are sometimes a serious hindrance to the fellowship and work of the Church’. Yet he also reported that:

we have experienced a remarkable openness to one another. We have seen our various traditional positions in new perspectives. We have become more clearly aware of our unity in Christ and in his mission to the world of our time. We are confident that the task of revising the Prayer Book can be carried forward, provided that we proceed “with patience, forbearing one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace”.⁵⁶

His hope would be rewarded.

The Standing Liturgical Commission (1966–1978)

At the General Synod of 1966 a new commission was established, with fewer members and more money to combat the first commission’s ‘great frustration’.⁵⁷ A change in constituency almost certainly helped too. Even in 1965 doubts

⁵⁶R.G. Arthur, ‘Report,’ in *Prayer Book Revision in Australia: Report of the Prayer Book Commission to General Synod 1966* (Sydney: Standing Committee of the General Synod, 1966) xviii.

⁵⁷Falkingham, moving resolution 19/69; Report of the Standing Liturgical Commission to General Synod 1969. Both in *Proceedings of the Third General Synod 1969* (Church of England in Australia, 1969).

had been raised over what Bleby could contribute,⁵⁸ and by 1973 he was gone, along with T. Philip Grundy, Felix Arnott, R.L. Sharwood, I.W. Shevill and T.B. McCall (who died). They were replaced by the moderate Anglo-Catholic Evan L. Burge (Classics lecturer at ANU, later Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne),⁵⁹ Edwin A. Judge (from 1969 professor at Macquarie University), I. George (Dean of Brisbane), L.E.W. Renfrey, D.B. Warner and Brother Gilbert Sinden. By 1977, J.B.R. Grindrod (Bishop of Rockhampton and Chairman), Canon L.F. Bartlett (Rector of St Michael's, Vacluse), A.C. Holland (Assistant Bishop of Perth), and D.A. Garnsey had also joined. David Frost, not a member, assisted with the Psalms.⁶⁰ The committee met four times before the next General Synod, often for days at a time.⁶¹

Like the first commission, this group was a 'microcosm' of the different traditions within Australian Anglicanism.⁶² Yet Robinson would soon report that, unlike the first commission, 'Easier communications have, with other causes, brought about a remarkable degree of mutual understanding and friendliness'.⁶³ This emboldened the commission to contemplate a new challenge: creating a whole new prayer book for Australia. Bishop Arthur hinted at this as a possibility

⁵⁸Letter to Bishop of Grafton RE: proposed liturgical commission,' November 1, 1965, Box 6, File 12 "Correspondence," Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

⁵⁹See Evan L. Burge, *Eucharist and Sacrifice: The Austin James Lecture 1975* (Melbourne: Ecumenical Liturgical Centre, 1975).

⁶⁰Breward, *History of the Australian Churches*, 176.

⁶¹November 1966, February 1967, November 1967 and June 1969.

⁶²John Grindrod, 'An Introduction to An Australian Prayer Book,' in *When We Meet for Worship* (ed. Gilbert Sinden; Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1978) 22.

⁶³Robinson, 'The Church of England in Australia,' 300.

in his 1966 report.⁶⁴ But the commission's brief was only ever to consult, advise and continue drafting new experimental liturgies.⁶⁵ Judge recalls how the idea of making a whole new book came about:

Donald suddenly actually said to us, the ten of us sitting around the table, he said something like 'we should write a whole new book'. It was his idea. It was like a bombshell. We were getting nowhere, we were sick to death of variations and revisions and floundering and so on, and inertia was settling in on the commission and really frustration as to what it was all about. And he simply said ... like a voice from Mt Sinai: "We must write a book" ... Nobody had thought of that. So on the one hand, it was a truly creative moment, and nobody had told us to write a book, so we were naughty in a way, we took it upon ourselves ... we were going to spring a surprise on our church!⁶⁶

That surprise proved not unwelcome, and the General Synod of May 1971 gave the commission permission to refocus its attention on producing a new book.⁶⁷ Bishop Grindrod later observed that producing a *book*, and not merely a continuing stream of revised services, ensured a period of stability, and

⁶⁴*Prayer Book Revision in Australia: Report of the Prayer Book Commission to General Synod 1966* (Sydney: Standing Committee of the General Synod, 1966) xvii.

⁶⁵See Resolution 2/66, General Synod of the Church of England in Australia (1966).

⁶⁶Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

⁶⁷Resolution 10/73, *Proceedings of the Fifth General Synod (1977)* (Sydney: Standing Committee of the General Synod, 1978) 231.

forced all parties to reach agreement on one book of *common* prayer for Australia.⁶⁸

Judge describes the second commission as characterised by a 'sacrificial commitment' to 'our principle of agreement – we had to agree' (rather than merely compromise):

I had never in academic life experienced anything so intense in an intellectual sense as the life of that commission, constrained by very high ideals of integrity of course, to the sources and that kind of thing, and to each other's view, and this beautiful commitment actually to reach true agreement on every detail.⁶⁹

Consequently, votes were never taken, and the evangelicals did not 'sit there backing each other up as if it were a debating society'.⁷⁰

This is not to say that agreement came easily. Much of the commission's energy was spent on the communion service. The strategy was to develop two services. The first was a conservative revision of 1662, so that those dissatisfied with the new style would not be forced back to an unchanged BCP.⁷¹ The second order was a radical revision in the line of AML. Neither rite would be included simply to satisfy the evangelicals or the anglo-catholics:⁷² the 'closer equipoise of evangelical and catholic sections' in Australia meant 'Only

⁶⁸Grindrod, 'An Introduction to An Australian Prayer Book,' 19.

⁶⁹Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

⁷⁰Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

⁷¹Robinson, 'The Church of England in Australia,' 300.

⁷²Cf. Barry Spurr, 'An Australian Prayer Book,' in *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy* (ed. David Martin and Peter Mullen; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981) 165.

variations which had the goodwill of both sections were included'.⁷³

Particularly difficult was the issue of oblations. Robinson wrote to John Bunyan in 1966, explaining the absence of any oblation of the consecrated elements to God in AML. While he recognised 'how sincerely this concept is held by many,' he considered it 'unrealistic to think that here in Australia such a feature will be accepted by the church as a whole', as 'No evangelical will touch this concept'. He was right: during the extensive consultation process of 1977 Broughton Knox objected to the line 'may we who have reached out our hands to receive your gifts' as it could be seen as referring to the bread and wine mentioned moments before.⁷⁴

The solution reached by the commission – that of retaining the offertory under the heading 'Thanksgiving' but making it refer only to the congregation's alms and oblations to the poor and not to the elements – is unique within the Anglican world.⁷⁵ It came about by a combination of the strict 1662 principle, and Robinson's idiosyncratic logical style: 'When we found that agreement was not possible, our procedure was to fall back on 1662 or its equivalent.'⁷⁶ But what was to stop the battle ground relocating to a debate over the proper interpretation of 1662? Surely this could become

⁷³Robinson, 'The Church of England in Australia,' 300-301.

⁷⁴D.W.B. Robinson, 'Handwritten notes from the Provincial consultation on An Australia Prayer Book at St John's Parramatta,' July 28, 1977, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977, Sydney Diocesan Archives.

⁷⁵Buchanan, *An Evangelical Among The Anglican Liturgists*, 143.

⁷⁶D.W.B. Robinson, 'Letter to John Bunyan' (Sydney, December 15, 1966), Box 3, Folder 1, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives.

simply another matter of interpretation over which evangelicals and anglo-catholics would divide along familiar lines? Remarkably, it seems that anglo-catholics were convinced by Robinson's reading of 1662:

My Anglo-Catholic friends have told me that, while "a modern liturgy" does not express all that they would like to express in the service of the sacrament, *they find it acceptable, and in general accordance with the doctrine of 1662.*⁷⁷

It is testament to the integrity of the anglo-catholics on the commission that they conceded this point, even though it meant losing elements of the eucharistic service very dear to them.⁷⁸

It was also a factor of Robinson's formidable intellectual presence on the commission. The anglo-catholic Evan Burge (draftsman of AAPB's second order communion) had been convinced by Robinson's 'cogently argued case' that 'offertory' in the Prayer Book's Elizabethan English referred to the *offertorium* (a scriptural anthem, not an action), though he continued to hold that there was more going on in the mass than Robinson, and the Constitution, would allow.⁷⁹

⁷⁷D.W.B. Robinson, 'Letter to John Bunyan' (Sydney, December 15, 1966), Box 3, Folder 1, Donald Robinson's Papers, Moore College Archives. Emphasis mine.

⁷⁸Cf. *A Prayer Book for Australia*, which, in theory bound by the same principle, nevertheless allows the 'offertory' to take place regardless of the presence of alms or other offerings, leaving the bread and wine as the only possible oblations: *A Prayer Book for Australia* (Alexandria: Broughton Books, 1995), 106.

⁷⁹Burge, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, 4; Citing D.W.B. Robinson, 'Eucharist And Offertory: The Anglican Tradition' in *The Churchman* 75 (1961) 31-40.

Edwin Judge tells how in one meeting Robinson pointed to the offertory in BCP:

We humbly beseech thee most mercifully [**to accept our alms and oblations, and*] to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty.⁸⁰

On the side of the page is some fine print: *“*If there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words be left out unsaid.”* With his characteristic logical positivism, Robinson drew the unavoidable conclusion: if oblations refers to the bread and the wine (as anglo-catholic practice assumed), then how can BCP possibly make provision for their absence – *from a Communion service?* Judge reports that the committee was ‘incredulous’, but it was there in ‘black and white’ so ‘there was no way it could be wriggled out of, just that people hadn’t noticed it before’.⁸¹

Robinson could thus rule out the ‘comprehensive’ view of the Prayer Book: ‘I am not prepared to admit, as a simple proposition, that “one principle of the Church of England was that its liturgy was capable, within certain limits, of diverse interpretation.”’⁸² BCP did have *a* theology – an *evangelical* theology – and the 1662 principle combined with Robinson’s

⁸⁰*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches and the form or manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons* (Standard Edition, 2004.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1662) 244.

⁸¹Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

⁸²D.W.B. Robinson, ‘A Comment on Archbishop Rayner’s Privately Circulated Paper on Prayer Book Revision and the Ruling Principles of the Constitution’, May 1967, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977, Sydney Diocesan Archives.

detailed historical, liturgical and linguistic knowledge left little room for alternative doctrines. He was a formidable exegete, whether of Greek or Elizabethan English. Judge reflects: 'I think a lot of [people] ended up frightened by him ... I suspect a lot of people felt intimidated, really, by the clarity.'⁸³

Alongside the BCP principle was another principle: that of going back to scripture. This enabled the commission to move beyond BCP even on controversial issues. In 1970, Robinson wrote to the *Church Record* about prayers for the dead, arguing the evangelical case against 'my friend and colleague Dr Sharwood', a fellow member of the commission.⁸⁴ While the more anglo-catholic 1549 prayer book included extensive prayers for the departed, 1662 had all but eliminated them:

1549: We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace; and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.⁸⁵

⁸³Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

⁸⁴D.W.B. Robinson, 'Canon Robinson on Australia '69,' *Australian Church Record* (April 16, 1970).

⁸⁵BCP 1549, in Edward Cardwell, *The Two Books of Common Prayer Set Forth By Authority of Parliament in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth* (Oxford: University Press, 1852) 296. See also the ancient English Liturgy

1662: [We bless] thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.

The bare 1662 formula left many, including some on the commission, dissatisfied. But equally Robinson recognised that ‘there was no chance of their inclusion in any future Prayer Book in Australia’.⁸⁶ Sydney had removed such prayers from the trial version of ‘A Liturgy for Africa’.⁸⁷ The wording of a previous Australian draft liturgy – ‘and in faith and trust we leave in your keeping N.’ – had satisfied anglo-catholics but evangelicals had objected.⁸⁸ Something more than the 1662 principle was required:

Donald came up with the answer. This is one of his personal contributions. It was his solution that we go back to scripture, the scriptural doctrine of resurrection, and write in something that is yet to happen to the departed: that is, at the last day they will be raised.⁸⁹

The result was a development beyond 1662, but in a different direction to 1549:

according to the use of sarum in John Henry Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer Being a Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England* (London: Rivingtons, 1876) 200-201.

⁸⁶D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Letter to John Bunyan’ (Sydney, December 15, 1966), Box 3, Folder 1, Donald Robinson’s Papers, Moore College Archives.

Emphasis mine.

⁸⁷*Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968* (ed. Colin O. Buchanan; London: Oxford University Press, 1968) 303 – note apparatus.

⁸⁸Robinson, ‘Church of England in Australia,’ 320-336.

⁸⁹Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITHFUL DEPARTED.

We give thanks for the life and work of ...

We praise you, Lord God, for your faithful servants in every age, and we pray that we, with all who have died in the faith of Christ, may be brought to a joyful resurrection and the fulfilment of your eternal kingdom.⁹⁰

Judge may be overstating it to say that ‘This was a total solution to an age old little battle ground’.⁹¹ It was certainly not a unique solution (the Scottish prayer book has a similar formula). Yet it does demonstrate a willingness to embrace scripture as a unifying force, taking conflicts in a new direction.

This creative approach to old disagreements seems to have been aided by the fact that, unlike the first commission, they had enough time face-to-face to develop pastoral relationships with one another. This is not to say that negotiations were always easy. In 1973, the commission had still not reached a decision on including the ten commandments in the communion service.⁹² Judge was pushing for their inclusion, but Arnott was horrified at the appearance of legalism. Tempers flared. Arnott packed his bags and left the room, telling the group he had had enough. ‘The saintly Bishop Arthur rose up from his chair and went out into his corridor where Felix had his bags. And we all sat transfixed at the horror.’ But moments later, having convinced Arnott to stay, Bishop Arthur re-emerged:

⁹⁰AAPB, 141.

⁹¹Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

⁹²Burge, *Proclaim and Celebrate*, 15.

With a look of infinite sadness on his face, and the faintest suggestion of a grin, [Arthur] said, “well, at least we can say we’re the only part of the Anglican communion to keep the ten commandments.”⁹³

Time together in the same room allowed brotherly affection, and even friendship to grow between these men from very different traditions. Indeed through the liturgical commission Robinson developed a lasting friendship with his co-author, Brother Gilbert Sinden of Adelaide, a member of the Anglican Society of the Sacred Mission and part of the ‘catholic tradition of churchmanship’.⁹⁴ A complete contrast to the careful exegete from Newtown, Sinden thought ‘Words by themselves are no longer regarded as an adequate medium of communication’.⁹⁵ For Sinden, Christ is in the elements ‘as the climax of his active presence in the gathered faithful’, which is in an undefined way ‘more than a *sign*’.⁹⁶ While he had much respect for Robinson’s linguistic arguments, it is clear from his commentary on AAPB that he did not share all his conclusions on the communion service: he was, for instance, perfectly happy to reserve the sacrament.⁹⁷ AAPB’s adoption of the three year Catholic lectionary is probably Sinden’s touch.⁹⁸

The degree of trust, cooperation and friendship between Sinden and Robinson was remarkable, given they were from such ‘different geographical, spiritual, and theological

⁹³Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

⁹⁴Gilbert Sinden, *When We Meet for Worship* (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1978) 7.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, 7.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, 78.

⁹⁷See *ibid.*, 79-93.

⁹⁸Sherlock, ‘The Anglican Church of Australia,’ 325.

places'.⁹⁹ Sinden would later recall how strange their relationship appeared to others, retelling more than once the story of an exchange during a meeting at Moore College. After a particularly heated debate between Robinson and Sinden, the committee took a break. Robinson and Sinden got up and left the room – sharing a joke between themselves. Sinden looked back to see Lionel Renfrey, mouth open, staring at disbelief that two men who disagreed over so much could moments later be laughing together over morning tea.¹⁰⁰

Robinson's generosity of spirit never contradicted his fierce intellectual force. But it enabled him to get along well with those with whom he had fundamental disagreements. Judge recalls an incident when Robinson (presiding at the communion for the opening of General Synod) sang the thanksgiving in St Andrew's Cathedral, as a gesture of spiritual generosity towards the anglo-catholic bishops present. For Judge this is 'one of the hallmarks of the quality of Donald Robinson'.¹⁰¹ This quality diffused the toxic distrust lingering after the Red Book Case, and became a catalyst for the true agreement across the theological spectrum experienced by the second commission.

1977 – 1995: An Australian Prayer Book

Marcus Loane anticipated a 'major debate' at General Synod over AAPB.¹⁰² Legal questions raised on the eve of the new

⁹⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰Peter Robinson, 'Email to the author,' May 23, 2012.

¹⁰¹Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

¹⁰²Marcus Loane, 'Letter to Donald Robinson 26 July 1977', July 26, 1977, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977, Sydney Diocesan Archives [1993/53/21].

book by Bleby led to a flurry of judicial opinions,¹⁰³ and fed Loane's suspicion that Bleby was 'lending himself to a group of General Synod members who will oppose the Prayer Book on any ground they can command'.¹⁰⁴ Each page had to be approved by the General Synod in committee. Some expected a difficult debate. But Robinson broke the tension:

We had the books open ... [Bishop] Donald Cameron must have said starting on page five, the contents page, ... 'is there any motion here?' Donald Robinson at once jumped up, also a bishop, and said 'yes, but not on that page, something earlier.'

'Oh,' said Donald Cameron, turning to the copyright page, 'is it something wrong with that?'

'No, no, no, *no, earlier* than that,' said Donald Robinson.

'The *title page*? You want to change the *title page*?'

'No' he said 'earlier than that!'

'What? the picture? You don't like the *picture*?!'

'No,' he said, 'I like the picture, I want to get rid of the *Spike*!'¹⁰⁵

Many present had not noticed the caption to the first line drawing, identifying the plant as 'Acacia Oxycedrus Spike Wattle'.¹⁰⁶ 'Spike' was, at the time, a derogatory term for an

¹⁰³See D.W.B. Robinson, 'Personal Papers - 1977 Canon to authorize An Australian Prayer Book AAPB', [1993/53/21], Sydney Diocesan Archives.

¹⁰⁴Marcus Loane, 'Letter to Donald Robinson', July 26, 1977, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977 [1993/53/21], Sydney Diocesan Archives.

¹⁰⁵Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

¹⁰⁶The caption was added to the draft on the 29th of August 1977: Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977 [1993/53/21], Sydney Diocesan Archives.

anglo-catholic. The whole synod ‘burst into a tremendous uproar of laughter’ at Robinson’s deliberate mocking of ‘the mere name calling which so often poisons these things ... it just broke the tension’.¹⁰⁷

In the end, AAPB was approved by General Synod with only one vote against, apparently by a member of the commission.¹⁰⁸ Who cast this vote is not recorded, but it is possible that it was Lionel Renfrey who represented Adelaide that year at General Synod, and resigned from the commission in January 1977. Perhaps the intellectual assent demanded by Robinson’s commanding presence on the commission left some of those with deep anglo-catholic conviction quietly unhappy: unable to challenge Robinson in that didactic environment, but bound by conscience to lodge a silent protest.

Furthermore, for all the high ideals of agreement and truly *common* prayer, the 1978 Book carries within its pages a prolepsis of the disunity which would shape the 1995 revision: ‘a little stab in the back occurred.’¹⁰⁹ Towards the end of the Roman eucharistic prayer is the *sanctus*. A translation appears in full in the 1549 BCP:

Holy, holy, holy, Lorde God of Hostes:
 heaven and earth are full of thy glory:
 Hosanna, in the highest.
Blessed is he that commeth in the name of the Lorde:
*Glory to thee, O lorde in the highest.*¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

¹⁰⁸Colin O. Buchanan, *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984* (Alcuin Club Collections; London: SPCK, 1985) 208.

¹⁰⁹Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

¹¹⁰BCP 1549.

The last two lines (the *Benedictus qui venit*, shown here in italics) were dropped from the 1552 and 1662 editions, presumably as it shifts unhelpful attention to the consecrated elements as evidence of the Lord's parousia. For anglo-catholics these lines became essential to a true understanding of the eucharist; for evangelicals, their absence a non-negotiable mark of orthodoxy.

Robinson thought the 'Hosanna in the highest' line a 'retrograde' inclusion, but apparently agreed to its retention.¹¹¹ On page 146 of AAPB, the thanksgiving appears in traditional 1662 form, without the two lines. Yet the prayers do not continue until the next page, leaving a gap of about two lines; ostensibly it is a pagination issue, so that the next prayer is not split awkwardly over two pages. Yet curiously, this two line gap after the *Sanctus* also appears on pages 160, 163, 165 and 169, where pagination is not relevant. Someone, at the typesetting stage, appears to have deliberately introduced a two line gap after 'Hosanna in the highest'. Anglo-catholic parishes in Sydney have been known to use a stamp or a sticker in this place to restore the 1549 words, and theology, to the service.¹¹²

Judge, citing the ninth commandment, refused to speculate on who introduced this typographical betrayal of the principle of agreement. Yet the candidates are few. General Synod established a separate committee 'to work with the printer in setting up the type, layout, etc.', and there were only two members: Executive Editor Gilbert Sinden and Editor

¹¹¹D.W.B. Robinson, 'Submission to Liturgical Commission Executive on Common Forms', February 20, 1976, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977, Sydney Diocesan Archives.

¹¹²Edwin Judge, 'On Being Comprehensive but Unambiguous' (unpublished address to General Synod, September 1994).

David Garnsey.¹¹³ We can only assume that, in the end, the principle of agreement and mutual sacrifice was eclipsed by theological conviction.

Nevertheless, the first copies of AAPB became available on 5 April 1978, and Buchanan reports that the book, on the whole, passed ‘uncontroversially’ into use. AAPB became the first prayer book in the Anglican communion to use ‘you’ instead of ‘thou’.¹¹⁴ Criticisms have been levelled at the book on several grounds: that it lacks the liturgical and poetic merit of Cranmer’s masterpiece; that it lacks a distinctively post-British identity; that the commission’s focus was too much on doctrinally sensitive parts (communion, confirmation and marriage) to the neglect of other parts.¹¹⁵ It has also been argued that AAPB helped to ensure the demise of anglo-catholicism within Australia, bringing back uniformity to worship (and with that uniformity, the evangelical doctrine of 1662).¹¹⁶ This may be an overstatement, but certainly its strong evangelical flavour was unique within worldwide liturgical reform.

Conclusion: Robinson’s Theology and Churchmanship

The apparent contradiction between Donald Robinson the New Testament scholar and Donald Robinson the Bishop is well

¹¹³‘Project ’77’, Bishop of Parramatta Correspondence - Liturgical Commission 1974-1977, Sydney Anglican Diocesan Archives.

¹¹⁴Sherlock, ‘The Anglican Church of Australia,’ 324.

¹¹⁵‘A preface sensitized,’ *AJL* 6 (1997) 25, cited in Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia*, 373.

¹¹⁶David Hilliard, ‘The Anglo-Catholic Tradition in Australian Anglicanism,’ in *Re-visioning Australian Colonial Christianity* (ed. Mark Hutchinson and Edmund Campion; New Essays in the Australian Christian Experience; Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity, 1994) 210.

rehearsed. His work on the liturgical commission, beginning as it did while he was at Moore College and ending while he was Bishop of Parramatta, is an illuminating window into the reality of this apparent contradiction. In his analysis of AAPB, Sherlock speculates on the liturgical impact of Knox's distinctive view of the church and divine revelation, and Robinson's teaching that the NT church 'properly exists only in "the heavenlies" ... and is visible only when believers "assemble" (that is, are "churched") for "meeting"':

The outcome is an 'exclusive' congregationalism, in which any level of 'church' beyond the congregation is seen as merely administrative, as is the bishop's office. Services are understood to be 'meetings' for 'fellowship' (teaching and encouragement), leading to a wide spread abandonment of Prayer Books, lectionary, and robes.¹¹⁷

He concedes that all these were 'trends resisted strongly by Archbishop Donald Robinson', yet the implication is that Robinson could not turn back the logical tide that his theology had brought in. His conservative churchmanship and radical theology remained at odds.

Yet a closer look at Robinson's liturgical work has told a different story. Robinson was bound by a sincere concern for principles: constitutionalism, common prayer and, above all, love for those brothers with whom he fundamentally disagreed. These principles made AAPB possible, and gave it its ultimate shape. Crucially, these principles were a direct application of his NT observations. Sherlock's reading is confused by his conflation of Robinson with a very different churchman into

¹¹⁷Sherlock, 'The Anglican Church of Australia,' 327.

the 'Knox-Robinson View of the Church'. Judge recalls: 'he [Donald] would get so angry actually with the phrase the Knox-Robinson view of the church. "There wasn't any such thing," he said.'¹¹⁸ Whereas, in Judge's estimation at least, Knox 'was so firmly against denominations, and he was debunking everything that is conventionally meant by church', Robinson 'was not a debunker ... you don't sing the liturgy in the cathedral [if you are a debunker]'.¹¹⁹

In his presidential speech, Marcus Loane predicted that the Fifth General Synod 'may prove to be the most critical and significant ever to have been held in Australia'; while Loane was a self-confessed traditionalist and always hoped that BCP would remain in use, his grand hopes for the new AAPB was that the church may 'go forward with good hope and patience until COMMON PRAYER is restored to our congregations'.¹²⁰ This echoed T.P. Grundy's hopes, nine years earlier:

We cannot, of course, hope that liturgical revision will settle the arguments but we can hope that it will help to unite Anglicans rather than divide them. Liturgical revision aims to find new ways of expressing our common faith in terms with which at least most of us can agree.¹²¹

AAPB is both a memorial to these high ideals, and to the gritty reality of church politics. Robinson's strengths, and his corresponding frailties, are inscribed in its very pages. His

¹¹⁸Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

¹¹⁹Judge, 'Personal Interview'.

¹²⁰*Proceedings of the Fifth General Synod (1977)* (Sydney: Standing Committee of the General Synod, 1978).

¹²¹T.P. Grundy, *We Do As He Commanded: An Introduction to "Australia 1969"* (Melbourne: General Board of Religious Education, 1969) 20.

ability to love and trust those on the other side of the liturgical table allowed AAPB to be a truly creative document, which could be embraced by people from multifarious theological perspectives. This scholarly power and grasp of the subject matter was recognised when the Australian College of Theology awarded him an honorary Doctorate of Theology in 1978.¹²² The evangelical liturgist Colin Buchanan identifies AAPB as one of only two liturgies worldwide which show ‘more than merely defensive involvement of evangelicals’, embracing modern language while preserving 1662’s theology of the atonement and eucharist against patterns emerging in catholic revisions.¹²³ The constitution that Robinson never wanted tied AAPB to the ‘principles of doctrine and worship’ laid down in BCP and the *39 Articles*, but Robinson himself was responsible for convincing his anglo-catholic friends that those principles were *evangelical* principles.

Yet both these strengths also carried weaknesses with them, leaving their impression in the final book. Robinson’s intellect could command the commission’s assent and even respect, but it could not erase heartfelt anglo-catholic ideas. Some were almost certainly intimidated by him.¹²⁴ There was dissent, but it was the quiet dissent of those who knew they could not win the argument, seen in Burge’s letter to the editor, and the silent vote against ‘Donald Robinson’s book’ at General Synod. And with Robinson’s idealism – his principled churchmanship and intellectual generosity – came the tendency

¹²²‘Master List of Graduates’ (Australian College of Theology, Accessed 2012).

¹²³‘General Trends,’ in Buchanan (ed.), *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*, ch. 5; Buchanan, ‘Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1968-75,’ in *Further Australian Liturgies*, 15.

¹²⁴Judge, ‘Personal Interview’.

perhaps to entrust himself too quickly to men, assuming that they too shared his principles. Even as he caricatured the distrustful evangelical, rooting out 'spikes' from the illustrations, someone was sneaking a 'spikey bit' right under his nose in the guise of innocent pagination.

AAPB is not quite the 'testament to disunity' which Spurr claims.¹²⁵ But its imperfections hint at the future for liturgical reform in this country: an apathy towards *common* prayer, a loosening of constitutional principle, and the spawning of comprehensive liturgies to suit every liturgical fancy. Robinson had anticipated, perhaps naively, that the 'trial use' of AAPB over 10-15 years would culminate in a single definitive revision of BCP, one which would be uniformly observed throughout Australia.¹²⁶ In fact, AAPB would prove to be Australia's final glimpse of uniform worship. AAPB was indeed to be an 'instrument of fellowship', as Robinson hoped.¹²⁷ But it was, and could only be, an imperfect and temporary one.

¹²⁵Spurr, 'An Australian Prayer Book,' 163.

¹²⁶Robinson, *What is Liturgy?*, 18.

¹²⁷Robinson, 'Principles Which Should Govern Prayer Book Revision,' 1.