**Creating an Italian Reformed Liturgy: Anglican Aspirations and Conflicts**

On 13 September 1881, Count Enrico di Campello (1831-1903), Roman Catholic priest and Canon of St. Peter’s Basilica, stepped into the American Episcopal Methodist church in Rome, and abjured his allegiance to the Pope:

After having spent the best part of my life in the Pope’s Church; after having for twenty years and more sustained a combat with the absurdities of Catholicism, after having dragged and gnawed the chains which tied me to that ancient enemy of the truth, I was at last touched by the grace that is not to be resisted. (Campello 1881, 142; Milaneschi 2014, 148)

Although this act of self-redefinition took place in a Methodist church it was destined to play out in an Anglican context, and it set in motion a chain of events that catalysed ten years later a sharp and protracted dispute between two members of the Anglican hierarchy. In 1891 and 1892 the Archbishop of Dublin, William Conyngham Plunket (1828-1897), and John Wordsworth (1843-1911), Bishop of Salisbury, locked horns over the creation of a Eucharistic liturgy for Campello and his followers.

This article uses previously unpublished manuscript material to examine that contest. The papers of John Wordsworth held at Lambeth Palace Library, London (henceforth, ‘LPL’) form the primary source; manuscript file 2911 contains material relating to the Campello case. The papers of Edmund White Benson (1829-1896), Archbishop of Canterbury (LPL MS Benson 41) provide further detail. Use has also been made of the final annotated drafts of the liturgy, held in the Christopher Wordsworth Collection housed at Liverpool Hope University. The official organs of the parties furnish further source material:, the *Quarterly Report of the Italian Church Reform Society,* the published Annual Reports and Accounts of the Anglo-Continental Society and the journal of Campello’s Church, *Il* *Labaro* which was edited from 1890 by the pastor of Campello’s San Remo congregation, Ugo Janni (1865-1938). Early biographies or autobiographies of the protagonists have also been consulted, together with journal articles of the period - especially those written by parties to the events. The chief recent secondary source consulted is Milaneschi (2014), which offers a useful historical frame, particularly regarding the Italian protagonists, but neither discusses the liturgy in detail nor treats the Anglican involvement in critical depth. Unless otherwise stated, translations from the Italian (all Campello’s letters, Wordsworth’s to him and *Il Labaro*) are my own. To facilitate comparison, the official English version of the Italian liturgy (*Liturgy*, 1892) has been presented alongside a mid-twentieth-century pew edition of the Tridentine Roman Missal that follows a similar translation style (*Daily Missal*, 1956).

This article first tracks the complicated relationship between Campello and Anglicanism, mapping it against his identification with the ‘Old Catholics’ of northern and central Europe, wo had followed an analogous path to Campello’s in seceding from Rome – in the case of most of them as a reaction against the Declaration of Papal Infallibility by the First Vatican Council (1870). It then briefly outlines the first liturgical steps taken by Campello and his congregation before considering in detail the events of 1891 that culminated in the initial acceptance of a revised liturgy by the synod of his Church (27-30 September 1891). It then turns to the Anglican response to that Synod and to the eventual drafting of the definitive liturgy in 1892, and concludes by assessing the liturgico-historical significance of the rite.

**Count Enrico di Campello: Caught Between Anglicans and Old Catholics**

Campello’s appearance at the Methodist church was pragmatic. After years of clandestine agitation for a radical reform of the Roman Church along nationalist patriotic lines (Milaneschi 2014, 146) he became progressively disillusioned that Pope Leo XIII (Vincenzo Gioacchino Raffaele Luigi Pecci, 1810-1903; elected 1878) would deliver reform from within (Campello 1891, 121-7; Milaneschi 2014, 147-8). The natural setting for his abjuration would have been the American Episcopal Church of St. Paul’s, whose founder and Rector, Robert J. Nevin (1839-1906), was a longstanding friend (Nevin 1881; Milaneschi 2014, 148). At the crucial moment, however, Nevin was absent, and Campello turned to the hospitality of the Superintendent of the Italian Mission of the Episcopal Methodist Church, Leroy M. Vernon (1838-1896). Vernon understood the prize convert to have turned Methodist (Vernon 1881; Ireland 1911, 129), but any Wesleyan allegiance was short-lived, and Campello became a regular communicant at Nevin’s church (Nevin 1881).

Underpinning Campello’s adherence to St. Paul’s was the theme of e*piscope*, a recurring motif across this article. Despite his rejection of the Bishop of Rome, Campello remained wedded to the concept of episcopacy (see, for example, Campello to Meyrick, 5 Oct 1891, LPL 2911, f. 32). His brief experience of Methodism clarified his perception that the Anglican – rather than the Episcopal Methodist - model offered the oversight he sought (Connybeare 1884, 4-5). He appealed to the Anglican episcopate in 1882, therefore, ‘to be placed under its protection until such a time as it shall please God to constitute a fully national Catholic Church in his country’ (Nevin 1883). Responsibility for Campello was assigned to Abram Newkirk Littlejon (1824-1901), Bishop of Long Island, who had charge of the American congregations in Italy (Connybeare 1884, 5, 36-37; Nevin 1885; Milaneschi 2014, 148).

Shortly after his abjuration, Campello established in Rome the *Congregazione di San Paolo –* the first manifestation of a body variously known as *La Chiesa Cattolica Italiana, La Chiesa Cattolica Nazionale Italiana* or *La Chiesa Italiana Riformata.* Over timethis Church came to number ten-or-so congregations in central and north-western Italy. In 1885, Campello transferred his activities to his family lands in Arrone in Umbria, leaving the Roman congregation in the care of Giambattista Savarese (1829-?), a Neapolitan priest and theologian who had served as a canon lawyer in the Roman Curia before joining Campello in December 1883 (Conybeare 1884, 14-19). Savarese played a pivotal role in the development of Campello’s liturgy as it was he who carried out the Italian translation of the Roman Missal (*Liturgia,* 1884) that later formed the base text for the disputed 1891-2 revision. By that time, however, Savarese was no longer party to events: in 1886, he returned to the papal fold, having lost a struggle over the appropriate distance the new Church should take from Roman clerical discipline and liturgical practice (Campello to Benson, 24 May 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff. 210-212; Nevin to Benson, 5 June 1896. LPL Benson 41, ff. 220-221).

Campello recognised that if episcopal oversight of a bickering infant community located in a hostile environment was to be effective, then the bishop needed to be geographically closer than the United States; he suggested that either an Old Catholic or different Anglican Bishop should be appointed (above-cited letter to Benson). In response, Benson transferred episcopal oversight to Wordsworth (Nevin to Benson, 15 July 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff. 246-7; Benson to Theodore Benedict Lyman, Bishop of North Carolina, 17 August 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff. 274-275v; Wordsworth to Benson 16 September 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff. 286-287v). The line of authority, however, was compromised by Campello’s appeal to Plunket for financial assistance. In response, Plunket founded the ‘Ladies Italian Association in aid of Church Reform in Rome and other parts of Italy’ (LPL Benson 41, ff. 251- 252v), soon renamed the ‘Italian Church Reform Association’ (How 1900, 93 and 296-7; Falkiner 2005).

Common to the Anglican parties (Nevin included) was membership of the Anglo-Continental Society. Founded in 1853, the Society had three broad aims. These were to foster an understanding abroad of the Church of England, to support the reform of national churches through the spread of information rather than by direct proselytization, and to offer the example of a ‘purified Christianity’ to those who were disillusioned with their previous experience of religion (Meyrick 1879, 3-4; Meyrick 1905, 176-181; Chapman 2014, 220-223). The Society’s membership was drawn Anglicans of diverse opinions, but its founder, Frederick Meyrick (1827-1906), who dominated its activity across its first fifty years was strongly opposed not only to Rome, but also to the introduction of more elaborate ritual practices within his own Church (Gregory, 2004). Wordsworth’s biographer and academic collaborator, Edward William Watson (1859-1936), offered a critical perspective on the Society and of its founder: ‘it has had little influence, and …Meyrick’s usefulness was impaired by the excess of zeal that he threw into the cause’ (Watson 1915: 94). Perhaps Watson was understating matters. John James Lias (1834-1923), Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral wrote Wordsworth that Meyrick had ‘resolutely made up his mind that his doctrinal standpoint is the only permissible one, and that he himself is the only person who has a right to a voice on the relations of our Church with the Continental Catholics’ (11 October 1891, LPL 2911 ff. 211-214, at 211v). Meyrick was a natural co-worker for the evangelical Plunket in revising the Italian liturgy, but he also had strong connections to Wordsworth: Meyrick had been examining chaplain to Wordsworth’s father, Christopher (1807-1885), Bishop of Lincoln. The elder Wordsworth shared Meyrick’s opposition to Roman Catholicism (Watson 2015, 315) and energetically supported the Society. John Wordsworth, who ‘inherited much of his father's antipathy towards Rome’ (Watson 2012), became the Society’s president in 1899. However, in the question of the Italian rite he counterposed to Meyrick’s narrow perspective a humane openness and a breadth of liturgical knowledge.

1886 thus closed with Campello dependent upon the British Churches. In truth, his situation was more complex still: he considered himself an Old Catholic, and for the training and ordination of his clergy he looked to Eduard Herzog (1841-1924), first bishop of the Swiss Christian Catholic Church. Here, the paths of the various parties intersect. During the 1870s the Anglican Church had taken a keen interest in these new Churches, and the elder Wordsworth, Plunket, Meyrick and Nevin had all participated in Old Catholic Congresses and in meetings between Anglicans and Old Catholics across the 1870s. (Meyrick 1905, 256-262; Watson 1915, 93, 321; Chapman 2014, 224-262). John Wordsworth took an active interest in the Old Catholics across the 1880s and 90s, and collaboration between Wordsworth and Herzog counterbalanced that of Plunket and Meyrick in the creation of the Italian liturgy. However, coincidence of interests cannot mask ecclesiological confusion – Campello was subject to an Anglican bishop, depended on Anglican funding, but strongly identified with the Old Catholics. Not surprisingly, Campello complained to Wordsworth on 27 August 1891 that he found himself ‘between Scylla and Charybdis’:

I have to keep happy the gentlemen of the London Committee [i.e. the Italian Church Reform Association] who belong, in the main, to the evangelical wing of the Anglican Church … and I also must make an inhuman effort to appear to be what I am not so that I can keep my brothers in the faith happy (and rightly so), the Old Catholics of Germany etc. Thus, I pass above the first and below the second. (LPL 2911, ff. 26-27, at f. 26)

**The Liturgy of the Italian Catholic Church: First Steps**

To understand Campello’s dilemma, we need briefly to step back along the path that led to the impasse. After receiving license from Littlejon license, Campello used an Italian translation of the American Book of Common Prayer (Nevin 1885). This was replaced in 1884 by Savarese’s adapted Roman Missal (Connybeare 1884, 14-18). Nevin, delicately noting that Savarese’s edition did not bear Littlejon’s episcopal approval and stressing its provisional nature, described it as:

a translation of the Latin Missal, revised only so far as was necessary to bring it into harmony with Catholic [ie. As opposed to Roman] teaching and primitive practice. The slight but dangerous additions by which the comparatively modern doctrine of the Invocation of Angels and Saints were introduced into the Mass have been unsparingly cut out. (Nevin 1885; see also Nevin 1884b)

Savarese’s work did not escape Roman censure. On 24 September 1884, the Cardinal Vicar General of Rome served notification of excommunication upon the *Congregazione San Paolo.* He condemned the liturgies there as a ‘parody of the divine mysteries’, and particularly criticized the use of the vernacular, a perceived diminution of emphasis on the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the absence of any invocation of the Virgin Mary and the Saints. The Congregation’s liturgical books ‘breathed the icy breath of Protestantism’ (*Notificatio* 1884, 165-6, 169-70). In truth, all parties overstated their case: Saverese’s liturgy was replete with angels and saints, and breathed a balmy Tridentine air.

That Savarese’s rite was not entirely to Campello’s taste is evident from a letter to Benson, written in 1886 when Campello’s relationship with Savarese had broken down:

I … desire a liturgy derived from the Roman, but connected, and in some part imitating the Anglican Liturgy, so that we may be distinguished from the Papal Church. We desire also the institution of the chalice to the Laity which is arbitrarily refused to them by Signore Savarese. (24 May 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff. 210-212; English translation by Wordsworth, 28 May 1886. LPL Benson 41, ff.214-215v, at 215)

He was to be given precisely such a liturgy by Plunket and Wordsworth – albeit with a looser connection to the Roman Rite than he had intended.

**July -August 1891: Opening Skirmishes**

Savarese’s exit furnished Campello with a rationale for revising the liturgy, as the former departed with the unused copies of the eucharistic liturgy (Benson to Wordsworth, 22 September 1891. LPL Benson 41, ff. 207-208v, at 207). By 1890 new books were needed, and so in July that year Campello and Meyrick met at the latter’s Norfolk parsonage to agree upon principles for a revised version (Campello to Meyrick, 5 October 1891, LPL 2911, ff. 30-31v, at. 30v). At this juncture the strands of Campello’s relationship to the Church of England catastrophically knotted. In summer 1891 he sent copies of the draft of a new rite to Meyrick and Plunket (Campello to Wordsworth, 27 August 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 26-27, at 27v). Unbeknown to that pair, however, Campello also sent his liturgy to Wordsworth for comment (Campello to Wordsworth, 24 July 1891. LPL, ff.21-23) – and subsequently forwarded Meyrick and Plunket’s revisions, too. Although Campello’s draft rite circulated among all Anglican parties, their archives unfortunately do not contain it. Meyrick’s annotated copy passed to Campello and thence to Wordsworth, and is last heard of in a letter from Meyrick to Wordsworth, requesting its return (December 10 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 233-234v., at 234v.). The Meyrick papers held at Pusey House, Oxford, however, contain no material whatsoever relating to the Campello case. So, we fall back upon the chain of correspondence found in Wordsworth’s papers.

Meyrick and Plunket met to consider the Italian liturgy in Dublin and, on 22 August, Meyrick posted their individual replies and a corrected proof to Campello (see Campello to Meyrick, 26 August 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 24-25v, at f. 24). Campello’s distress on receiving this material is evident:

My embarrassment increases every day thanks to the pressure under which Canon Meyrick has placed me. The above-mentioned Canon, with his cuts, suppressions, additions, makes a monster of my liturgy. If it were published it would reduce my standing, too, and would heap upon me the scorn and the ridicule of the whole of Italy. I cannot understand how Meyrick, such an educated and erudite person, could do this to me. … Stripped back like this, my liturgy might perhaps satisfy the intolerant folk of the Low Anglican Church, but it would have every intelligent English person laughing, and would provoke the disdain of the Old Catholic Church of Germany and Switzerland. (Campello to Wordsworth, 2 September 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 26-27, at f. 26)

The nature of Plunket and Meyrick’s objections to the rite can be discerned from the ensuing correspondence. Campello responded to Meyrick in a lengthy letter dated 26 August, copied to Wordsworth (LPL 2911, ff. 24-25v). Wordsworth and Herzog provided an even more-detailed overview in a joint letter to Campello (9 September 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 86-90). Wordsworth consulted with Archbishop Benson throughout, so we also have a thorough commentary on Meryck’s revisions in Archbishop Benson’s hand (LPL 2911, ff. 76-79). This document evidently preceded the Arrone Synod of late September 1890 (f. 76), and in October, Wordsworth updated Benson via a synoptic comparison of the Synod’s liturgical decisions and the Plunket-Meyrick proposals (LPL 2911, ff. 217-218v). We can clearly identify the contested issues, therefore, through the protagonists’ correspondence.

Campello’s revision does not appear to have moved radically beyond Savarese’s translation – indeed, in the eyes of Plunket and Meyrick, the text they received from Campello was the Savarese liturgy (Minutes of the General Committee Meeting of the Italian Church Reform Association, 10 December 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 237-241, at f. 237v). Their response was to drive the whole in a more reformed direction. Primary targets for revision or excision were texts that could be associated with the doctrines of the Eucharist as sacrifice, Transubstantiation, and Purgatory. An alertness to the language and imagery of sacrifice is suggested, for example, by the deletion of Psalm 43: 4 – ‘and I shall come to the Altar of God’ – from the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar that opened the rite. The English Reformation had torn down the sacrificial altars, and instituted the Communion Table; the language of the Italian rite must reflect that same reality.

In order to excise references – even slight – to Transubstantiation, Meyrick and Plunket deleted many traditional prayers, such as at the comingling of the species after the Lord’s Prayer (*Haec commixtio –* ‘May this mingling and consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to us who receive it effectual unto eternal life’ *Daily Missal* 1957, p. 975)*,* the *Domine non sum Dignus* before reception of Communion (‘Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof …’, p. 965) and the prayers at the ablution of the vessels (*Quod ore sumpsimus* and *Corpus tuum, Domine –* ‘May thy Body, Lord, which I have received, and thy blood which I have drunk, cleave to mine innermost being …’, p. 965). However, the cut that was to prove most contentious was the section of the Canon immediately before the Consecration (*Quam oblationem*); it was the final clause of this prayer that was particularly disputed because, as we shall note, Wordsworth challenged Meyrick and Plunket’s interpretation of it:

‘Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all respects to bless, + approve, + ratify, + make worthy and acceptable, that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord’ (p. 943)

Thirdly, Plunket and Meyrick were at their most fastidious in eradicating prayer for the dead. The Roman Canon contains two balancing commemorations – of the living before the Consecration, of the dead after it. Not only did Plunket and Meyrick remove the second, but they reinforced that erasure by deleting the heading (though not the text) of the first: to draw prayerful attention to the category of living members of the Church perhaps risked a suggestion of other categories?

However, the proposed revision extended beyond attention to the three above-mentioned neuralgic points. To Campello’s distress, an essential quality of continuity was dissolved as phrases that were seared into the memory of his congregation disappeared and ancient prayers permitted to other Old Catholics were denied to him. Ritual elements were swept aside, such as the *Lavabo* (the priest’s ritual handwashing) as were prayers, such as that said at the mixing of water and wine (*Deus qui humanae substantiae* – O God, who, in creating human nature …’, p. 925) and at the close of the Roman sequence of offertory prayers (*Suscipe Sancta Trinitas* – Receive, O holy Trinity this oblation that we make to Thee…’, p. 931). Meanwhile, to Campello’s ears the imposition of expressions from the Book of Common Prayer, such as its Preface conclusion, ‘with all the company of heaven,’ made poor sense in translation (Campello to Meyrick, 26 August 1891).

Wordsworth’s response was two-fold. Fortuitously present in Switzerland, he contacted Herzog, forwarding Campello’s correspondence, and suggested that they met in Berne on 8 September 1891 (annotation in Wordsworth’s hand on the back of Campello’s letter to Wordsworth, 27 August 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 26-27). The outcome was a joint letter to Campello (9 September 1891, LPL 2911, ff. 86-90). Second, he contacted the other parties; a draft of the letter to Plunket survives (6 September 1891. LPL 2911, ff. 198-292). I consider the joint letter to Campello before turning to Wordsworth’s engagement with Plunket.

Herzog and Wordsworth robustly challenged the Plunket-Meyrick revisions. They rejected the removal of the *Commixtio* with its prayer; they retained the *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas*. They also rejected the proposed insertion of the Prayer Book Preface conclusion, and vigorously defended the use of the words ‘for us’, which they judged to be ‘orthodox and important to show us that the true doctrine of the Missal is not Transubstantiation, nor the use of the Sacrament outside communion’ (f. 88). Here we recognize the hand and mind of Wordsworth. During the same year, he published a volume on the Eucharist (Wordsworth 1891), and on several points his position on the Campello liturgy can be discerned across the pages of that book. ‘Become for us,’ he argued there, was not a statement of belief in Transubstantiation, but the opposite: its meaning was identical to the Prayer Book’s, ‘that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine … may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood’ (Wordsworth 1891, 144). Benson, too, disagreed with Meyrick and Plunket on this point, citing Cranmer’s use of ‘become for us’ against Gardiner as evidence of its essential conformity to Protestant thought (LPL 2911, f. 79). Wordsworth and Herzog retained both the offending phrase and the Commemoration of the Faithful Departed.

Wordsworth and Herzog also proposed their own revisions, which were to feature in the final version of the liturgy. Wordsworth suggested the reordering of the Prayers at the foot of the altar (see the minutes of the Arrone Synod, LPL 2911, ff. 91-103, at ff. 99-99v); an emphasis on intercessory prayer, too, was Wordsworth’s (1891, 63ff). The influence of Herzog’s Swiss rite can also be seen: the recasting of the *Lavabo* as a private preparatory rite of the priest celebrated in the sacristy; the transposition of the reference to the Old Testament sacrifices of Abel, Abraham and Melchizedech to before the Consecration (Cobb 1978, 25), and the recommended reduction in the number of Signs of the Cross in the Canon.

Wordsworthhad written to Plunket two days before he met with Herzog, politely but directly (LPL 2911, ff. 198-202):

Many of the corrections appear to me to be unnecessary and some to be impolitic. Some of them are unnecessary as based on a merely Anglican way of looking at words and phrases and others are impolitic as a break with tradition, or as implying that the words changed in the Roman Missal are unorthodox or represent some superstitious belief (f. 198v)

A liturgy more closely aligned with the Anglican Prayer Book risked alienating two groups of people, Wordsworth argued. The first was the Italians, who were religiously conservative and who could never accept ‘an imitation of the Anglican liturgy,’ which the Archbishop and Canon had introduced ‘in detail – chiefly in the way of omission’ (f. 199v). Thus, ‘the excision of the word “Altar” would lead all men to cry out “This is mere Protestantism”’ (f. 200). Wordsworth made clear that he was under no illusion about Campello’s Church – it was, at best a preparation for a future Italian reformation. But Plunket and Meyrick’s liturgical proposals risked undermining even that possibility (f. 199). The second group was the Old Catholics, and especially the Swiss, who would be alienated by the liturgy as proposed, and whom Wordsworth considered an essential support to the Italians. However, Wordsworth harboured a third concern: that Plunket and Meyrick were confident that they would prevail because they held Campello’s purse-strings. ‘I cannot think that it is wise,’ Wordsworth wrote, ‘to press these changes upon [Campello] against his will and to urge him to accept them under fear of losing pecuniary support’ (f. 198). Plunket, by his own later admission, did not reply to this letter (Plunket to Wordsworth, 21 February 1892. LPL ff. 250-253, at f.250). Instead, Meyrick prepared a letter to Campello.

Meanwhile, armed with Wordsworth and Herzog’s proposals, and with the reassuring presence of Herzog in the chair, Campello presented his liturgy to the Arrone Synod. He opened by reading his letter to Meyrick, as above (LPL 2911, f. 99), but did not open the floor to discussion of Meyrick and Plunket’s concerns. Herzog passed directly, instead, to a consideration of Wordsworth’s proposals for the reorganization of the formulae at the beginning of the liturgy (ff. 99-99v.) The position of the Creed, and some slight re-wording and editing within the Canon were voted upon – but the contentious ‘may be for us’ was not discussed. The Synod approved Campello’s rite with the Wordsworth-Herzog amendments, and ignored the revisions demanded by Plunket and Meyrick. Readers of the summary accounts given of the Synod in the *Quarterly Report of the Italian Church Reform Association* (1, 1, 10; 2, 1, 29-30; 1, 3, 52) may have been forgiven for understanding that Plunket, Meyrick and their supporters were satisfied with its outcome; the approval of the liturgy was simply reported without comment. Behind the scenes, however, things were progressing rather differently.

**October 1891 – May 1892: Crisis**

Meyrick and Plunket made their counter-move while the Synod was in session. On 29 September, Meyrick issued what Campello described as ‘a real ultimatum’. (Campello to Wordsworth 7 October 1881. LPL 2911, f. 32) Meyrick’s letter, fully-cited in Campello’s response (LPL 2911, ff. 30-31v), had a dual intent. The first was to complain that instead of printing the liturgy as revised in Dublin, Campello had sent it to Wordsworth; Campello read this as an attempt to undermine Wordsworth’s authority. The second was a threat: ‘Let it be well understood that without the substantial corrections that we recommended, neither the Archbishop nor I would be able to raise the subsidy that even now we only find with the greatest difficulty’ (f. 30). Wordsworth’s concern had proved prescient. Plunket explained his position to the Italian Reform Association’s General Committee meeting on 10 December 1891, as recorded in the minutes:

If services such as those which enjoined prayer for the Dead … and if phrases such as those which prayed that the elements as Holy Communion might become to the recipients the Body and Blood of Christ were to form part of the formularies of the Italian Church, he, Lord Plunket, … did not see how he could with an honest conscience as Chairman of this Committee, assure the members of the Church of England or of Ireland that the principles of this reformed Community were in accordance with those of our own Communion – and he did not see the slightest hope, once the facts of the case were known, of obtaining further help from that class of contributors who, confiding in the assurances already received, had hitherto so generously aided this cause (LPL 2911, 237-241v, at 239v-240).

The Committee resolved that ‘no further steps should be taken towards the final adoption, or use, of [the liturgy approved at Arrone] until an opportunity be given at another Synod of ascertaining the mature judgement of the Italian Church with respect to them’ (f. 240v).

Fundamentally, Plunket doubted the legality of the Synod’s liturgical decision; debate had been limited to peripheral matters, and several members of Campello’s clergy – notably Ugo Janni – undoubtedly supported a more radical reform. Janni devoted little column-space to the Arrone Synod in the pages of *Il Labaro*, and reference to its liturgical decisions was lukewarm: ‘the idea prevailed that we should carry out only those reforms that experience has shown to be necessary. We do not believe, therefore, that we have done a perfect job’ (Janni 1891b). The *Quarterly Report of the Italian Church Reform Association,* meanwhile*,* published an extract from a private letter in which Janni had expressed his own opinions; Plunket and Meyrick were mustering their forces:

As to the liturgy, my own wishes have always been for a wide reform, which should frame ours in perfect harmony with the Anglican liturgy. The service in my Church at San Remo is in no way ritualistic. The Holy Table I detached from the wall, and I stand with my face towards the people. I neither make genuflections nor the sign of the cross. A simple cross, not a crucifix, is fixed to the wall. My wish is that the service should be simple and spiritual. (Janni 1891a)

During the following weeks, Wordsworth received letters from prominent members of the Association, expressing their anxieties, and eventually in February 1892 he wrote again to Plunket, who this time responded (LPL ff. 250-253). Plunket explained that he faced a moral dilemma:

Now I put it to you as a man of honour, can I, if this liturgy be adopted conceal the fact of its adoption and by thus misleading our friends obtain their money under false pretenses? And if this cannot be, and if the necessary consequences of a disclosure must be the immediate drying up of the financial sources of our present insufficient income, and the disaster which would thereby ensue, would I be acting the part of a true friend of Campello were I to shrink from warning him of the impending danger, and urging him for the sake of the cause which we all have at heart to make such timely concessions – not involving abandonment of principle – as may avert the stroke. I put it to you also as a man of candour and discrimination, whether such a warning can be called a ‘threat’? (f. 252)

Matters were deadlocked; only a second Synod would satisfy Plunket. He was, however, finding difficulty in mustering evidence for his version of events (How 1900, 284). After a delay of several weeks, he replied on May 3 to Wordsworth’s invitation to meet (LPL ff. 254-255v). A date of May 31 was agreed, when the two met at Lambeth Palace with Meyrick. The three reconvened on 1 July to complete their work.

**May – July 1892: Resolution**

The meetings produced a liturgy of compromise. The base text remained Savarese’s, and at a casual glance many of the disputed prayers could be recognized from their *incipit*; below the opening words, however, their content had been altered, sometimes radically. Furthermore, Swiss and Anglican elements had been introduced that nudged the liturgy structurally away from the Roman Rite.

The writing process can be tracked across a sequence of printed drafts. Wordsworth produced the text for discussion, of which LPL contains two copies. One is lightly annotated in Wordsworth’s hand, the other more heavily corrected by Meyrick (*Liturgia 1892a* and *b* respectively). A third printed version, usefully inscribed, ‘Chr. Wordsworth 24 July, 1892’ (*Liturgia* 1892c), is a proof for the text as agreed, corrected by Wordsworth’s brother Christopher (1848-1938). A fourth, definitive, edition (*Liturgia* 1892d) bears the date ‘Aug. 1892’ in John Wordsworth’s hand. The final Italian text was published in four installments by Janni in *Il Labaro* (*Liturgia* 1893-4), and corresponds to an English translation (*Liturgy* 1892) which has been used below. In analyzing the key features of the liturgy, I work from the final text, drawing upon the earlier drafts when appropriate.

The opening pages of the liturgy – which are the least annotated by Meyrick – bear the stamp of John Wordsworth. The Liturgy opens with the Roman Prayers at the foot of the altar – restructured per Wordsworth’s suggestion, and with a securely Protestant adaptation of the *Confiteor*. This prayer demonstrates progressive textual revision between 1884 and 1892:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Roman Missal | Savarese (*Liturgia* 1884) | *Liturgy* (1892) |
| I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Petr and Paul, to all the saints and to you, Father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. Therefore, I beseech the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and you, Father, to pray to the Lord our God for me. (*Daily Missal* 1956*,* p. 905) | I confess to Almighty God, in the presence of the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, of blessed Michael the Archangel, of blessed John the Baptist, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, of all the saints, and of you, my brothers, that I have sinned exceedingly with thoughts, with words and with deeds through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault. (p. 1) | I confess to Almighty God, to the whole Catholic Church, and to thee, my father, that I have sinned gravely in thought, word and deed by my fault, my fault, my grievous fault. (p. 2) |

Savarese had already abbreviated the invocation of the Virgin and the saints, rendering them witnesses to – rather than recipients of – the confession (*Liturgia* 1884, 1). In *Liturgia* 1892a, they take their leave entirely, their witness replaced by that of ‘the whole Catholic Church.’ The antiphon to Psalm 43 at the start of the rite is an example of compromise in action. Wordsworth had proposed that the problematic verse 4 should be replaced by a different antiphon, but Meyrick’s copy deleted this and inserted, ‘I will go to the altar’ (*Liturgia* 1892b, 4). The use of the word ‘Altar’ in the accompanying rubric, however, was deleted (p. 5); a scriptural reference to a spiritual altar might be accommodated, whereas a physical altar could not. So, the *liturgy* (1892) had the priest proceed to the ‘side of the Epistle’ of an unnamed physical feature that only later in the rite was identified as the ‘Holy Table’.

From that ‘Epistle side,’ the priest was to lead two liturgical elements that responded to Wordsworth’s appeal for the inclusion of intercessory prayer. These were the amplification of the Kyrie into a litany of intercession and the additional collects introduced after the Collect of the Day. The inclusion of Collects for the nation, for the Church’s mission and for the conversion of Israel closely echoed Wordsworth’s thought. Anglican readers, moreover, would have been comforted by familiarity – the Collects for Peace, for the Clergy and People, and the final Prayer of St. John Chrysostom were taken directly from Matins and Evensong of the Book of Common Prayer.

The Offertory, too, opened with a reassuring Anglican echo, with the catena of Gospel Sentences found at this same point in the Prayer Book. What followed, by contrast, appeared to present a Roman face – a full set of Offertory Prayers that in the Missal are characterized by the language of sacrifice and of the real presence. In *Liturgia* 1892a, however, they had been considerably abbreviated, and the exuberant language of the Roman Rite subdued. For example, the *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas* was retained, but at half its original length and shorn, like the Confiteor, of references to the Virgin and Saints. The treatment of *Deus qui humanae substantiae,* was subtler: the prayer reverted to its ancient form (Mohlberg 1981, no. 27) – a suggestion of Benson (LPL 2911, f. 79). Thus, any mediating role of the eucharistic elements *per se* in the communicants’ participation in Christ was denied. However, the theologically risky theme of divinization which was the thrust of the ancient prayer was avoided in translation by replacing participation in Christ’s divinity, with the less-specific request to share in his ‘glory.’

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Roman Missal and *Liturgia* (1884) | *Liturgy* (1892) |
| O God, who in creating human nature, didst wonderfully dignify it, and hast still more wonderfully restored it, grant that, by the Mystery of this water and wine, we may become partakers of His divine nature, who deigned to become partaker of our human nature, even Jesus Christ our Lord … (*Daily Missal* 1956, p. 925; *Liturgia* 1884, p. 4) | O God, who hast framed the dignity of human nature in a wonderful manner, and still more marvelously hast reformed it, grant that we may share in the glory of Him Who did not disdain to make Himself participator in our humanity; that is, of Jesus Christ, thy Son … (p. 7) |

Meanwhile, the Lavabo traced a peripatetic trail across the drafts. *Liturgia* 1891a, b and c followed the Swiss model in treating this as the priest’s private act of preparation, placing it at the head of the rite. *Liturgia* 1892b has a marginal note at the end of the Offertory, ‘Washing? No’ (p. 10). *Liturgia* 1892d lacks the *Lavabo* entirely, but both the English published version and the Italian edition published in *Il Labaro* by Janni (1883, 4, 10 p. 8) have it, complete with traditional psalm, at the usual Roman point at the end of the Offertory.

*Liturgia* 1892a and b reproduced unaltered Savarese’s Prefaces, and not surprisingly it was here that Meyrick’s annotations increased in frequency. The three Prefaces that most offended Protestant sensibilities were those of Lent, of the Virgin Mary and of the Apostles. The original Lenten Preface risked presenting the Lenten regime as a ‘work’, and therefore struck at a Reformation understanding of grace: ‘who by this bodily fast dost curb our vices, lift our minds, strengths and rewards bestow’ (*Daily Missal* 1956, p. 880). A subtle shift in focus from the human act of fasting to God’s role as teacher, and the insertion of an explicit reference to grace, resolved the issue: ‘Who teachest us by bodily fasting to restrain vices, to lift up the soul, and subject the flesh to the spirit by the grace of Christ our Lord’ (*Liturgy* 1892, 9). From the Preface of the Virgin Mary the expression, ‘the glory of Virginity’ was deleted – the door thus being firmly closed against any hint of Mary’s perpetual virginity. Revision of the Preface of the Apostles clearly aimed to avoid any sense of their exercising a continuing role in the Church.

The cumulative effect of these revisions was to move the liturgy away from a Tridentine world-view. That process intensified in the revision of the Canon, where even the slightest of abbreviations could be significant. For example, the removal of the adjective ‘spotless’ to describe the eucharistic species avoided too-close an association between the communion bread and the perfect sacrifice made once for all on the cross (*Liturgia* 1884:5*; Liturgia* 1892: 15). There were many such changes, but rather than treating the Canon in full detail, I focus on the two substantial issues that were raised by Plunket and Meyrick in 1891.

Wordsworth made two important revisions to the Commemoration of the Faithful Departed. The first related to the subject of the main verb of its opening section, which is ‘to remember.’ In both the Latin original and Savarese’s translation that subject is God: the prayer asks that he should remember the dead and perform an action of which they are the beneficiaries. Wordsworth, however, shifted the remembering agent from the divine to the human.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Roman Missal and *Liturgia* (1884) | *Liturgy* (1892) |
| Remember also, O Lord, Thy servants and handmaids *N.*  and *N.,* who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and rest in the sleep of peace. To these, O Lord, and to all that rest in Christ, grant we beseech Thee, a place of refreshing coolness, light and peace (*Daily Missal,* p. 949; *Liturgia* 1884, p. 7). | We also commemorate, O Lord, Thy Servants and Thy Handmaidens who have gone before us with the seal of faith and sleep the sleep of peace … To Them, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, we pray that Thou wouldst grant reunion in peace with us that remain, and perfect bliss of soul and body in Thine eternal Kingdom (p. 12) |

In translating the second part of this prayer he was even more creative. The divine action sought in the Latin was that God should grant to the deceased ‘a place of refreshing coolness, light and peace.’ This raised the possibility that those same dead might transit some interim stage before the general resurrection, the effect of the prayer being to assist them along that way. Wordsworth avoided this theologically problematic possibility by focusing attention on the *eschaton*.

The resolution of the problem of the *Quam oblationem* was simpler but more drastic: Wordsworth removed it altogether, and replaced it with the epiclesis Herzog had written for the Swiss liturgy:

We pray Thee also humbly, O Lord God, to send to us thy Holy Spirit, the giver of all life and holiness, that these earthly gifts may be sanctified as heavenly, glorious and spiritual oblations, so that the bread we break may be the communion of the body of the Lord, and the cup which we bless may be the communion of the blood of Jesus Christ. (*Liturgy* 1892, 12; see Cobb 1978, 25)

**Conclusion**

The *Quarterly Report of the Italian Church Reform Association* published Wordsworth’s appraisal of the Italian Liturgy:

I think there is in this sister Liturgy of the National Church an example of a reformed Liturgy paralleled to our own while it borrows very little or nothing directly from it, which may show us the possibility of reforms on the lines of the Church of England which shall nonetheless have a colour of their own suitable to the nation in which they are made. That is why I value this Liturgy so much. It is distinctly Latin in its origin, has borrowed very little from the Church of England, and yet there is nothing in it which members of the Church of England might not use, and use with great pleasure and profit’ (Wordsworth 1893).

Thanks to Wordsworth and Herzog the liturgy did indeed contain creative innovations, such as the structuring of intercessory prayer and the epiclesis, that prefigure twentieth-century liturgical developments, and not only in Anglicanism; several features of the post-Vatican II Roman Catholic reform of the liturgy appear to be anticipated here. The use of the vernacular, the reduction in the number of Signs of the Cross, the abbreviation – or elimination – of Tridentine prayers, especially in the Introductory and Offertory Rites, all strike echoes. That Wordworth and Herzog should have attempted in 1891-2 to apply the fruits of liturgical study to ritual practice gives them claim to a place in the broad currents that flowed into the classic Liturgical Movement. However, the outlines of the Italian liturgy were framed not only by liturgical scholarship, but also by theological concerns that were very different to those of, say, the authors of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Not only for Meyrick and Plunket, but also for Wordsworth, the liturgy had to express a clear theological discontinuity with the earlier Roman Rite - or, at least, with the prevalent Roman interpretation of it.

So, ultimately, the significance of this Liturgy lies within the Anglican tradition. We tend to think of Anglican liturgical reform as a twentieth-century phenomenon, but the 1892 Italian rite pushes back pushes Anglican engagement in concrete liturgical reform back at least to the last decade of the 19th century. True, it is not a reform of the Prayer Book, but Wordsworth’s statement that there was ‘nothing in it that Anglicans might not use’ anticipates the possibility of broader patterns of worship that could borrow from other Christian traditions without sacrificing theological integrity. This is extraordinary, given the immediate context of anxiety and conflict in England over the introduction of more elaborate gestures, fitting and vestments into Anglican ritual – not least when these were perceived to imitate ‘Papist’ practice. Wordsworth himself had only recently served as an Assessor at the 1888-90 trial of Bishop Edward King of Lincoln for ritual practices, and ahead lay the 1904-6 Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline that would critically scrutinize the ritualistic practices of a small number of the clergy of Wordsworth’s Salisbury Diocese. His statement also indicates an alertness to the possibility of – indeed the need for – authentic liturgical inculturation.

However, the Italian liturgy did not provide the potent paradigm for liturgical development that Wordsworth hoped. The dream of a National Italian Church after the model of the Church of England faded, as did public awareness of its liturgy. The tensions within Campello’s Church were too strong for it to be sustained in the form he had attempted. His ‘Scylla and Charybdis’ analogy proved catastrophically prophetic: to Old Catholics he was too Protestant to be *episcopabile*, while many within his Church sought more radical reform. Janni and Campello drifted apart, and early in 1901 Janni and his congregation joined the Waldensians, quickly to be followed by two other of Campello’s clergy (Milaneschi 2014,164-5). On 3 March 1902, the London *Times* reported that Campello had submitted to Wordsworth his resignation as leader of the Church (p.10); *the Annual Report and Accounts* of the Anglo-Continental Society for 1901 carried the same story (p. 15), adding that the likely successor would be Filippo Cichitti Suriani (1861-1944). On 8 December 1902 Campello was received back into the Roman Church (Milaneschi 2014, 154).

The final item contained in LPL 2911 is Wordsworth’s copiously-corrected draft response to this event:

In the eyes of those who know him, there is only one interpretation to be placed upon his conduct viz that advantage has been taken of his old age and decrepitude to extort from physical inability that allegiance which C.C. bravely and honourably refused for many years prior to the collapse of his health. … [H]is recent regrettable action is clearly due to the series of paralytic strokes which have wrecked his constitution and cannot have failed to weaken his once clear and vigorous mind (ff. 358-360).

Wordsworth could not publicly admit that Campello’s reversion was rational. Yet, in truth, Campello’s character was complex. His return to Rome, therefore, may not entirely have arrived out of the blue as Wordsworth suggested; the initiative certainly appears to have been Campello’s own (Milaneschi 2014, p. 154). Wordsworth’s note bears no indication of its intended audience. The London Times report of the Annual General Meeting of the Anglo-Continental Society held on 8 June 1903 perfectly summarizes Wordsworth’s position (p. 11.). However, when the account of that meeting was published in the 1904 Annual Report of the Society (p. 5) no mention was made of Campello. Perhaps there was no longer any need; only a few weeks after the meeting took place the would-be reformer, whose return to Rome ultimately symbolised a failed expenditure of time, energy and (especially) money on the part of the Society, died.

**Peter McGrail**

**Liverpool Hope University**
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