

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 35

November 1977

Editorial

It was only at the very end of October that the Anglican-Orthodox statement agreed at Moscow last year became public (*Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement*, S.P.C.K., 99pp. £1.95). The subjects covered include 'The Knowledge of God,' 'The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture', 'Scripture and Tradition', 'The Authority of the Councils', 'The Filioque Clause', 'The Church as the Eucharistic Community', and 'The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist'. It is immediately obvious that the agenda of theological discussion look different when the Orthodox help draw it up. But it is also obvious that liturgy is a crucial feature of those agenda.

From the point of view of a Western Christian, and an inheritor of the Reformation, the questions look distinctly heterogeneous and of great disparity. Few in the West can get worked up about the *Filioque*, and few would have thought the 'Invocation' as important a subject as the questions of authority. In part, it would seem, the apparent disparity arises from the Eastern concern to see the Christian faith as a whole—where to err in one part, however small, is to damage the whole. This is of course a traditional stance of both Romans and Calvinists in the West, but both seem prepared to allow that more questions are now open than they used to do. The East, however, has not really changed at all, and one can sense the difficulty the Orthodox theologians had in coping with Anglican distinctions between essentials and inessentials (p.58).

In part, on the other hand, the shape of the agenda reflects the actual disputes which have separated East and West over the centuries, and matters which affect worship are as follows:

- (i) In 'Scripture and Tradition' we find this sentence: 'The liturgical and canonical expressions of Tradition can differ, in that they are concerned with varying situations of the people of God . . .' (p.84). This suggests a slight giving of ground by the Orthodox, though it is not clear that the B.C.P. (for example) would be thought a tolerable variant!
- (ii) In 'The Authority of Councils', the status of the Seventh Council and the veneration of icons is specifically mentioned—but then so are the Western images and religious paintings (p.86).
- (iii) 'The Filioque Clause' is debated both as to the authority of the *Filioque*, and as to its truth. Without necessarily yielding the second point, the Anglicans agreed it should be omitted from the Nicene Creed (p.88). (Paradoxically, only the Episcopal Church in the USA had ever done this, and a month after the Moscow Agreement was made the General Convention of ECUSA reversed the process and restored the *Filioque*. It will be a question for our General Synod in respect of the revision of Series 3 communion).

(iv) The section 'The Church as the Eucharistic Community' involves a back-reference to the Bucharest Conference of 1935. That Conference had had on the Anglican side a heavy loading of Anglo-Catholics, and the six points agreed (which are set out in this report on p.93) were not wholly acceptable to the 1976 Anglicans. The Statement simply 'notes' the six points. The approach in the Moscow Statement is to handle the ecclesial context and a refreshing approach it is. I am puzzled by the phrase 'The eucharistic action of the Church is the Passover from the old to the new'—and wonder if I am naive in seeing an inappropriate form of pun. I can see how Roger Beckwith, undoubtedly the most Protestant member of the Anglican team, is able to sign the agreement (though I just wonder whether the Orthodox members or all the other Anglicans could see this). And the whole section, whilst subtle at times, has a strong pastoral 'feel' to it.

(v) The section on the 'Invocation' (or *Epiclesis*) is not so satisfactory. There is a rejection of 'consecration by formula' (p.90). But there is also the statement 'For the Orthodox the culminating and decisive moment in the consecration is the *Epiclesis*' (p.90). This does appear both to give one 'moment' too much weight, and to raise great questions over the propriety of most Western rites of the last 1500 years. The statement goes on to say 'The Spirit comes not only upon the elements, but upon the community'. (pp.90-1). But this seems to go too far towards allowing the *Epiclesis* to take the Eastern form of calling down the Spirit upon the elements (even if upon the community as well). It may be arguable that he is only to descend upon the elements *as used* in the administration, but we would need to see this argued.

There were other tangles to work at. Many on both sides placed great emphasis upon the Spirit—but for wholly disparate reasons. The Orthodox pointed out that the ordination of women would add a wholly new barrier to improved relationships (see pp.75-6). The question of priesthood was to be taken up by sub-commissions. But above all, one can sense in the report the struggle of two different moods of thought to get to terms with each other. Everyone will wish the dialogue well in this respect, and there is real ground to be gained as they succeed.

Colin Buchanan

NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT

In General Synod, in the second week in November, the following decisions were taken:

- (i) On Tuesday 8 November, Peter Dawes finally got his private member's motion debated. This read:
'That the Standing Committee be invited to introduce a draft Canon for amendment of Canon B 21 to provide that instead of the words "(every minister) shall from time to time administer the sacrament of Holy Baptism upon Sundays or other Holy Days at or immediately after public worship" there be substituted

words to the effect that "(every minister) shall normally administer the sacrament of Holy Baptism upon Sundays at public worship".'

This motion was originally drafted to be attached to the response of General Synod to the Initiation debate, but was then relegated to Private Members' motions. Peter Dawes resisted an attempt by Brian Brindley to substitute 'regularly' for 'normally' (pointing out that once every ten years would be 'regular'!), and his motion was duly passed on a show of hands. We shall report what now happens.

(ii) The Initiation Services Series 3 (GS 443) received 'General Consideration' on the Wednesday afternoon, 9 November. It was noticeable that several in the debate wanted another look at the confirmation of those baptized as adults, and indeed the confirmation of those received from other Churches. The indefatigable Peter Dawes did not want to use threefold affusion on eighteen-month-year-olds (but refused my private offer of instruction in how to do it). Others picked on points where the introduction and the text seemed at variance, and there was mention of restoring the sentence about the Red Sea (which was in the draft report in 1972—GS 225), and also a desire for chrism. The services were duly remitted to a Revision Committee. This will no doubt be memorable among Revision Committee experiences, being chaired by the Bishop of Southwark . . .

(iii) The Bishop of Durham the same afternoon presented proposals for 'Adaptation' of services in order that they should appear in a standardized form in the 1980 Prayer Book. This does not involve any change in Standing Orders, but merely that the existing short procedure should be used, a method available at the Standing Committee's discretion and currently used for the extension of period of services already in use. It means that the only amendments which can be taken come from the members in charge. However, the Synod did not wish to debate this, but was obviously raring to have a go at

- (iv) The Lord's Prayer. The Bishop of Durham's motion read as follows 'That this Synod considers,
 - (i) that only one version of the Lord's Prayer should be included in the Series 3 Services incorporated in the Alternative Service Book; and
 - (ii) that the version so used should be the modern language version which the Synod in due course approves for Holy Communion Series 3 Revised.'

There was much concern to have a traditional version printed in parallel columns (or conceivably elsewhere in the Book) with the modern version. Brian Brindley waved the new American Book at the Bishop, and offered to help him in the typesetting of the 1980 columns. The Bishop of Southwell reported on a motion which went (narrowly) through the Southwell Diocesan Synod asking for the same thing. But the Bishop of Durham stood fast, and on a vote kept his policy in being by 171 votes to 148! The Bishop also resisted an attempt to get traditional texts of canticles included.

The Synod also passed a Private Member's motion paying tribute to the RSCM, and all choirs and organists—and began to debate another (by the aforesaid Brian Brindley) asking the House of Bishops to consider Roman Catholic texts. This was adjourned till February.

Meantime various moves happen backstage. The *Church of England Newspaper* carried a story in October that the Liturgical Commission had failed to agree on a text of Series 3 Revised Communion at its September meeting after a 'stormy' session. This was most authoritatively denied by the chairman, Ronald Jasper, the Dean of York, in a letter a fortnight later, and it is odd to speculate how such an idea could have arisen. The Revision Committee on the Ordination services has completed its report, and this (along with the Calendar and Lectionary Committee's report) should be published in the near future. The Marriage Commission will apparently not report for a short while—and it seems that the Presidents and Standing Committee have been appointing a new Doctrinal Commission. So there is plenty of action.

JOURNALS

We have been notified of a forthcoming Anglican 'new weekly newspaper'—apparently of a 'Catholic' flavour. *Christian World* will be published from 187 Woodstock Road, Oxford, and enquiries should be directed there.

We have also received notice of a newsletter-cum-bulletin called *Music in Worship* to encourage and inform those with responsibility for music in worship. Correspondence about this should go to Robert Page, 78 Trevallance Way, Garston, Herts.

BOOKS THIS MONTH

We have mentioned *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue* (£1.95) in the editorial. We also have a few copies of the unsatisfactory Knapp-Fisher report mentioned in the Summer (12p). There is a new book on the Ten Propositions, *A New Hope for Christian Unity* by John Huxtable, the secretary of the Churches' Unity Commission (Fount, Collins, 95p). This is well-documented, perhaps slightly euphoric, quite clear that the 'recognition' of ministers in Proposition 6 is *not* to be turned into something like ordination. (This point is perhaps reinforced by his reprinting as an appendix (amongst 'Key Documents on Unity') the proposal for 'reception' into the presbyterate of ministers of non-episcopal churches which was set out by the *Growing into Union* team in 1970—complete with their 'sign' of reception, the stretching out of the bishop's hands towards them.)

We are also informed that on 4 January there will be published by the C.I.O. the preparatory articles for Lambeth 1978 *To-Day's Church and To-Day's World* (£3.50). Order this now to receive it on publication day.

Michael Harper's latest and weightiest book *Let My People Grow* (Hodder, £2.95) is back in print and in stock. It is on leadership rather than worship, but is worth a mention. (All books are post-free, of course).

8p per copy (£1.90 by post for the year 1978, (£2.25 by air))

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

BITS AND PIECES

'Mangled Matins and Ante-Communion'—reports of findings of this rarity from the past come from two archeological digs. One at St. Lawrence Whitchurch was only on weekdays ('massins'!). But the real thing still obtains (though in the evening) on the first Sunday of each month at St. Mary's Summerstown, Wimbledon, where Frank Gough is now vicar; and it sounds from his letter as though the Wombles may want to tidy up even this small leftover . . .

We read in the newsletter of 'Conservative Evangelicals in Methodism' Roger Beckwith's assessment of the worship at NEAC: 'The devotional side of the conference was . . . unbalanced, being almost entirely dominated by the evangelical pop anti-culture.' What? Even the All Souls' orchestra? Any comments?

40 ordinands at St. John's College (out of a total of around 68 in residence) caused a minor ripple at General Synod and in the columns of the *Church Times* when they advocated the end of the requirement that ministers should wear robes when leading services. They had been given a lead by the chairman of Council, Mr. Peter Harden, who had earlier written to the same effect.

The Southwell report on infant baptism policies, having been referred to the deaneries (which on the whole are unhappy about alternative policies), was finally defeated in the Southwell synod on 22 October. The matter now rests with the Bishop's Council. A few copies remain in stock.

A recent radio report said that the General Synod of the Anglican Church of the Province of New Zealand had resolved that Christmas should be celebrated in New Zealand on 21 June! One can sympathize with the predicament of Christians in the Southern hemisphere (who have no focus for a Winter holiday) without being sure that we were not having our legs pulled. Do New Zealanders keep All Fools Day in November perhaps? Reports would be welcomed.

Silly Season stuff: we have a request from Durham for Series 3 in Geordie. Any offers?

There is available free from Collins Liturgical Publications *Notes on the Text* of the new Psalter, compiled by Andrew Macintosh. This is 60 pages in length, and is written to explain knotty points to non-hebraists. Write to Collins Liturgical Publications, 187 Piccadilly, W.1. for your copy.

A CAPITAL LOAN

We asked last month if anyone would be in a position to help with a capital loan (say, £500-£1000). This is to help repay an earlier loan for which the lender has urgent need. Part was met last month, some is still required. What we failed to say is that we pay commercial rates of interest—we are not a charity!

In order to have as many materials to hand as possible for a booklet on liturgical services for the sick, Michael Botting (of St. Georges Vestry, Leeds 2) asks if readers could send copies of their services to him.

This month's booklet . . .

is no. 55, *Urban Church Growth: Lessons from South America and Britain*, by Eddie Gibbs. The booklet lays great weight on the quality of church life (including worship and fellowship) as the key to growth. It also has an illustrated cover . . .

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 12, *Worship in the New Testament (i)*, by C. F. D. Moule. Professor Moule's classic, originally published by Lutterworth in the early 1960s, has been out of print for a decade. It is now re-published in two parts (the second part will follow in March) in an exact reprint of the original. Each part has 40 pages.

. . . and a catalogue supplement

should also be enclosed, giving details of reordering *NOL* for 1978, and of forthcoming titles.

. . . and the Jordan Memoirs

under the title *Born Under a Lucky Star* should accompany this mailin, if you ordered it. If you think you ordered it, but have not had it, please write and complain quickly. (Details in catalogue sheet).

THE AMERICAN SPLIT

Dr. Trueman Dicken, who was an observer at the St. Louis Congress of the Fellowship of Concerned Churchmen, writes to correct any mis-impression conveyed by the report in September of 'the actual formation of a separating Anglican Church in America'. The point of concern is of course to emphasise the claim that the 'Concerned Churchmen' are *the* 'continuing Anglicans', whereas it is the General Convention of PECUSA (and, which we did not mention last month, the General Synod of the Anglican Church in Canada) which have separated. There were not meant to be any historical or moral value-judgments included in our brief report. It is agreed on all sides that the two bodies are 'separate' from each other, and both claim to be 'in communion with Canterbury'. In the 'St. Louis Affirmation', which expresses the stance of the 'continuing Anglican Church', Section IV bears upon liturgy:

'PRINCIPLES OF WORSHIP

'PRAYER BOOK THE STANDARD OF WORSHIP 'In the continuing Anglican Church, the Book of Common Prayer is (and remains) one work in two editions: The Canadian Book of 1962 and the American Book of 1928. Each is fully and equally authoritative. No other standard for worship exists.'

'CERTAIN VARIANCES PERMITTED 'For liturgical use, only the Book of Common Prayer and service books conforming to and incorporating it shall be used.'

Historians concerned with minutiae may care to note that in Section II the Athanasian Creed is listed as to be 'thoroughly received and believed', when it has had no previous place in the American Church's formularies since 1790! To that extent the St. Louis Affirmation attempts to get behind the liberalism of the very first American revisers. Could it be that a return to 1662 itself will yet be in view?

It is obvious that liturgical questions are not in fact central to the Affirmation, though it is also true that the extreme radicalism of many of those engaged in liturgical 'renewal' in the USA (and perhaps in places in Canada too) has led to the inclusion in that reaction against radicalism, which the Affirmation represents, of a rejection of all modern liturgical forms being authorized or at least purveyed in the two countries.

Englishmen may view with apprehension the forthcoming grappling with the question of the ordination of women. It is very doubtful whether they would lump the question together with liturgical revision as has happened across the Atlantic.

REMARRIAGE IN CHURCH AFTER DIVORCE

NOL is not directly concerned with the disciplinary issue, which is bound to come to the fore again in England when the current Marriage Commission reports in the course of 1978. But there has been some mention in England of the liturgical text authorized by the Bishops of the Church of the Province of South Africa this year, and it is therefore timely to publish it without prejudice to the disciplinary question.

A FORM OF SERVICE FOR THE SOLEMNIZATION OF MATRIMONY OR THE BLESSING OF A CIVIL MARRIAGE TO BE USED WHEN ONE (OR BOTH) OF THE PARTNERS TO THE MARRIAGE IS DIVORCED AND HAS THE SPOUSE OF A FORMER MARRIAGE STILL LIVING

This service must always be used when the Priest has received the Bishop's licence to solemnize a marriage or to bless a civil marriage in accordance with Canon 33.

THE INTRODUCTION

With the persons to be married standing before him, the man on the right and the woman on the left, the Priest addressing all present says:

My brothers and sisters (*at the discretion of the Priest another form of address may be used*), Holy Scripture teaches us that from the creation of the world Holy Matrimony was instituted by God himself to be an exclusive and lifelong union of body, heart and mind between one man and one woman, whereby they find mutual joy and are a help and comfort, one to the other, in prosperity and adversity. We should see in every marriage a sign and mirror of God's unchanging love towards His people.

This purpose of God was defined by Christ when he said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and be made one with his wife; and the two shall become one flesh': and again, when he said, 'What God has joined together, man must not separate'. What God commands, He also gives grace to fulfil.

A marriage which is broken and damaged beyond human hope of repair is not only a cause of human suffering; it is also evidence of sin, for God's will is set aside, vows are broken and the stability of marriage in our

society is further weakened. A broken marriage exhibits the disorder of the fallen world rather than the glory of God and his purpose for mankind revealed in Jesus Christ.

The Church of Christ must be faithful in its witness to the declared purpose of God. It shares also in his compassion. Therefore, in our ignorance and in the weakness of our sinful nature, we dare to turn to God whose justice and mercy are boundless, for He alone has perfect understanding. For His willingness to forgive, and for the freedom which He gives through Jesus Christ our Saviour we praise him and are bold to ask his blessing on the union of N. and N. who now approach Him in penitence and hope.

The Bishop has satisfied himself that there is in this instance no prospect of re-establishing a true marriage relationship between the partners of the former marriage(s). He has examined these persons and is assured that they understand the Church's teaching concerning marriage and truly intend to enter into a permanent and stable union.

Before we ask God's blessings on their marriage let us with them humbly ask forgiveness for our sins, and especially for our share in those sins which divide us from God and from one another, and which destroy the unity that God in his love planned for his children.

Silence may be kept. Then is said by all,

Almighty God, our heavenly Father in penitence we confess that we have sinned against you through our own fault in thought, word and deed and in what we have left undone. For the sake of your Son, Christ our Lord forgive us all that is past and grant that we may serve you in newness of life to the glory of your Name.

The Priest says,

Almighty God have mercy on us; pardon our sins and set us free from them; confirm and strengthen us in all goodness, and keep us in eternal life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The Priest says to the Congregation,

I am required to ask anyone present who knows a reason why these persons may not lawfully marry, to declare it now.

The Priest says to the couple,

And if either of you knows a reason why you may not lawfully marry, you must declare it now.

Then follows the Marriage (p. 442) or the Blessing of a Marriage (p. 450) and either of the Benedictions as set out in the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony in the Prayer Book.