

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 38

February 1978

Editorial

The Church Press this month has given a little publicity to a motion which, seconded by Canon Peter Boulton, I persuaded the Southwell Diocesan Synod to accept when voting on the Ten Propositions. It read as follows:

This Synod accepts Proposition 6 subject to the following provisions:

- (i) That recognition of ministers in other covenanting churches pre-supposes that those churches should have received the historic episcopate at the inauguration of the covenant;
- (ii) that such recognition should be effected by the action of the whole episcopate of the covenanting churches, incorporating (but not ordaining) the existing ministers into the historic threefold ministry by invocation of the Spirit, by a distinctive sign, and by concelebration of Holy Communion;
- (iii) that such recognition is currently restricted by the will of this Synod and its members to reserve their position on the admissibility of women to the ordained ministry of the Church of England.

The main point of this composite motion was to give expression to a plan formulated at a meeting of catholic and evangelic members of Synod (along with some bishops and some non-members of Synod) convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury last Autumn.

What our motion implies for the liturgical act by which the covenant and the new relationship between the covenanting churches would be inaugurated can be easily spelled out. It should look like this:

- 1 The Churches recognize each other as Churches.
- 2 Prayer is made for those who are to be bishops in each of the Churches.
- 3 New bishops are consecrated for the Churches which are not episcopal at the moment (this would not have to be done entirely by Anglican bishops—Bishop Leslie Newbigin, erstwhile of the Church of South India, is a minister of the United Reformed Church!).
- 4 Prayer is made for those who are to be presbyters in each of the Churches.
- 5 The whole episcopate of the covenanting Churches incorporates the existing presbyterate into the presbyterate within the threefold historic order of ministry. This is done by prayer, and by a distinctive sign.
- 6 The distinctive sign is still not determined, but because it is to be 'distinctive' it cannot be the laying on of episcopal hands—for that would *not* distinguish it from ordination. The ideas canvassed are: the stretching out of the hands of the bishops towards the presbyters (see *Growing into Union*, and the citation of it by John Huxtable in *A New Hope for Christian Unity*); a special form of the kiss of peace; and some variant on 'the right hand of fellowship'. New cogent ideas for this would be welcomed.
- 7 Concelebration. Despite everything said in the editorial of NOL last month, there is a case, in this unique situation of new 'recognition' of ministers, to involve them in an act which proclaims visibly, loudly, and once-for-all, that such recognition is true and *ex-animo*. (But let us keep 'concelebration' for that occasion).

Well, General Synod must look at the Southwell motion in July—along with other diocesan motions. And if General Synod likes it, then the Churches' Unity Commission will have to see if it will cohere with the replies from the other Churches. But at least the contrived ambiguity of the old Anglican-Methodist at the point of intergrating ministries is dead and gone.
Colin Buchanan

NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT

Synod duly tackled liturgy on four successive days from 31 January to 3 February, and the following action was taken:

(a) **Ordination Services—Revision Stage.** The largest number of amendments was moved by the Rev. Brian Brindley (no stranger to these pages), and he succeeded in pepping up the opening Notes in his own (colourful Anglo-catholic) direction. Thus he got added to the Note 4 (which says the Bishop has discretion over the ordering of the details of the service) the words '*It is appropriate that those newly ordained should be invited by the Bishop to exercise their new ministry in the course of the service.*' This apparently implies that new deacons should lay the Table, that new priests should concelebrate (but can they?—see last month's editorial), and that new bishops should . . . should what? (In Hippolytus the new bishop presides at the eucharist, but no-one apparently wants to dispossess the Archbishop from this function). In Note 8, which refers to symbols of office, he got inserted the words '*(the chalice and paten)*' in relation to the priest's office, and '*(pastoral staff)*' in relation to the bishop's. He wanted the ring and mitre also, but these were removed by an amendment to his amendment. The Rev. Gordon Dodson narrowly succeeded with an amendment to ensure all Bible readings were from recognized versions (whereas the Revisoin Committee's report included eclectic renderings). Little else of note was changed.

(b) **The Alternative Calendar, Rules to Order the Service, and Lectionary—Revision Stage.** Here there were few changes, though keeping it the way it was took long enough in all conscience to fight off the amendments. The chief surprise was that the feast of the BVM was altered from 15 August to 8 September (I had sworn to resist this, for reasons set out in *NOL* two years ago, but had a defective order paper in my hand and was out of the chamber when it happened!). Mrs. Adcock tried to strike a blow for equal representation for women in the list of minor saints, and just succeeded with Catherine of Siena, and Margaret of Scotland, and lost Josephine Butler by 120 votes to 117. St. Martin of Tours and St. Edmund came in also. And the Sundays after Trinity are now renumbered and become Sundays after Pentecost. All Souls Day was opposed, but survived without the advocacy which Kenneth Ross in the old days used to offer on the Liturgical Commission—'We must keep it, or what will John Stott do for a Feast of Dedication?'

(c) **Use of Roman Texts.** The 'cloak-and-dagger' air about this relates to the speech Brian Brindley made when first moving his private member's motion in November, 1977. He then gave an account of what was purported to have occurred at a meeting of the House of Bishops in November 1976—a meeting which rejected the daily eucharistic lectionary produced by the Liturgical Commission, and instead voted for the Roman daily lectionary. Now, after this account by Brian Brindley, the House of Bishops has released a fuller authoritative account of its own. This makes it clear that at the meeting in November 1976 (at which it was supposed to be agreeing the

Liturgical Commission's document) when it voted for the Roman daily lectionary, it had no machinery by which to handle its own decision (and was arguably badly advised in making that decision). Thus, for a year, the bishops were wondering where their favoured lectionary was going to surface on the Synod's agenda, when in fact their vote had been simply a registering of their opinion *into thin air*. Seen from that standpoint Brian Brindley's Private Member's motion was doing the bishops a favour . . .

His original text read:

'That this Synod respectfully requests the House of Bishops

- (a) to invite the Liturgical Commission to examine the Roman Lectionary (Geoffrey Chapman, 1970) and the ICET translation of the Roman Missal (Collins/Goodliffe Neale, 1974);
- (b) as a contribution to ecumenical understanding, to recommend to the General Synod the authorization for optional alternative experimental use of such Readings from Scripture, Collects, and other prayers, as are found to be not inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of England.'

It will be observed that this may well have involved far more borrowing from Rome than a daily eucharistic lectionary. At any rate the Synod had plenty of alternatives to handle. Canon Paul Welsby wanted an amendment which would ask the Commission to produce a daily eucharistic lectionary, taking the Roman provision into account. The Bishop of Oxford joined the fray with an amendment which would have asked the House of Bishops to take as an exceptional action the unusual step of adding the entire Roman daily provision to the alternative calendar and lectionary (by means of a note) between now and July, i.e. whilst the calendar and lectionary stand referred to the bishops prior to final approval. This would of course put it beyond amendment or recall, as no alterations can be accepted at final approval, and many in Synod, led by Mr. Oswald Clark, viewed this a bad constitutional precedent although it was admitted on all sides to be legal. The Rev. David Silk, a member of the Commission, then weighed in, succeeded in getting Paul Welsby's amendment amended further, and then in getting it passed. The Bishop of Oxford's effort then fell to the ground, and Synod, on the third day of debating this, over two separate sessions of Synod, finally passed this amended motion:

'That this Synod respectfully requests the House of Bishops to invite the Liturgical Commission to prepare a Daily Eucharistic Lectionary for inclusion in the Alternative Services Book providing for the optional use at the Holy Communion on those weekdays for which no separate provision is already made in GS 292B of the readings contained in the Roman Lectionary.'

This ensures that the Roman Lectionary is adapted for the Church of England Calendar (which was the Liturgical Commission's point); it ensures that no backdoor route into the ASB is taken (which was

the constitutionalists' point); and it confines its scope to the daily eucharistic lectionary (which was the evangelicals' point). We shall report again on progress, but it ought to create no problems.

(d) **Liturgical Psalter and Good News Bible.** The Archbishop of York made a brilliant speech about principles of translation, and the criteria by which to assess these new versions, in introducing them both. The Liturgical Psalter alone was then debated, and was attacked hip and thigh by the Bishop of London. He objected to the archaisms in the Psalter and regaled the Synod with a swift stream of the most delectable of these, saving his greatest scorn for the 'coals of juniper' in Ps. 120. London in turn was attacked by Winchester and Durham, and the Archbishop of York wagged his head and with sad irony remarked 'But it says "coals of juniper" in the translation because that's what it says in the original'. The Psalter was overwhelmingly approved.

The Good News Bible was not then debated and Synod adjourned till July. An amendment to the motion to approve the GNB calls for the discontinuance of any provision for authorizing versions of the Bible at all, and that will take time in July presumably.

(e) **Charismatic Movement.** My private member's motion was not reached, but also should come up in July. The Standing Committee tabled an amendment, to be moved by Dr. Margaret Hewitt, which read as follows:

'Leave out all words after "many" in line 3 [see text in *NOL* for January 1978] down to "and" in line 6 [line 7 as printed in *NOL*] and insert:

"churches, warmly commends, the contribution already made by Professor Hollenweger, the Fountain Trust and the British Council of Churches amongst others to the evaluation of its distinctive features, and would welcome further studies which would".

More of this in July . . .

(f) **Discussions with the Orthodox and the Visit by Cardinal Hume.** Both of these contained warnings that to ordain women was to make relations with the respective Churches harder.

(g) **Questions.** I had a question about the Alternative Service Book to the Bishop of Durham which I intend to report next month. The Rev. A. R. Heawood asked a question about the costs of Revision Committees and learned that the Ordination services Committee cost £1697, and the Calendar and Lectionary one over £2485.

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

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

CORRIGENDA

A review of this Liturgical Study in *The Reader* for February 1978 points out two errors on p.14:

- (i) In footnote 1, women were admitted as readers in 1969, not 1970.
- (ii) In the footnote continued from p.13 the report *Readers and Sub-deacons* was in fact a report of 1904, and this ought to have been spotted by the writer of the essay (viz. COB) who quotes from it naively as though the date of the reprint (1962) were in fact the date of the original report. (The editor, Trevor Lloyd, had had his doubts in the first place, hence his added square-bracketed footnote).

In general the review (by Canon King, the secretary of the Readers' Board) treats the Liturgical Study as very cautious in its advocacy of lay presidency. But it may to that extent be more realistic than he sounds.

THE REVISION OF SERIES 3 HOLY COMMUNION

Months have gone by since the report from the Liturgical Commission with proposals for the revision of Series 3 Holy Communion was first expected. However, it is possible now, with great caution, to anticipate that the report will be published at the end of April, giving the requisite eight weeks interval prior to its being debated in General Synod for the first time in July. We think that this report will be of great interest to readers of *NOL*—indeed, in one sense it is *the* most central and determinative production of the Liturgical Commission since the original text of Series 3 Communion was published in 1971. We therefore propose to follow our, rarely implemented, policy of 'inertia selling'. To all subscribers on private standing order who take *NOL* with Ministry and Worship booklets we will send a copy of the report to reach you on publication day. These subscribers will have the right to return it and have their postage credited also.

It would of course help us if they notified us in advance. Those who take *NOL* on its own, or with one of the other two series of booklets, will have to order in advance. Please send a postcard if you want it (and specify whether by air or by surface if overseas). The cost is currently unknown, but is expected to be around 80p to £1, and postage will be free as usual. Up-to-date details will come in next month's *NOL*.

In April, May and June, *NOL* will give considerable space to this report and readers' letters are invited both before and after publication.

THE 1980 PRAYER BOOK

Our appeals for enthusiasm have led to a deafening silence. On the other hand our suggestion of a groundswell of discontent has been met by considerable agreement. Thus we learn that on 4 March the Sheffield diocesan Synod is to debate the motion, moved by the Rev. Don Brewin: 'In the light of the economic pressures, and the need for flexibility in the living Church, this Diocesan Synod doubts the value of producing an Alternative Services Book, and requests General Synod to reconsider the project.'

Mrs. Jean Mayland is to oppose this—a fairly heavyweight response by the Sheffield Bishop's Council. If it is passed, then presumably the General Synod Standing Committee will have to find time for it in the July session of General Synod.

This month's booklet . . .

is no. 57, *Parish Leadership and Shared Responsibility*, by Tom Walker. His *Open to God* (no. 38) is now in its third printing, and he here goes further into the question of the ministerial structures and pastoral oversight of a congregation in renewal.

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 13, *Worship in the New Testament (ii)*, by C. F. D. Moule. This is the second half of the book originally published by Lutterworth, of which the first half formed Liturgical Study no. 12.

. . . and a reprint

. . . yes, as fast as that. It is no. 55, *Urban Church Growth*, by Eddie Gibbs, first published in November 1977, and now sold out and reprinting.

. . . and prices

of backnumbers go up to 35p on 1 April

. . . and the airmail NOL

is up for review. As overseas readers will be aware, we have kept prices down by producing a thin lightweight 'airmail' edition of *NOL*. We are conscious that the print comes through on this, and it is not easy to read. If readers think it worth writing to register complaints, then we will gladly look again at the cost of sending the usual weight *NOL* for the rest of this year without increasing the subscription.

. . . oh yes, and how much does NOL cost?

We gave warning in Autumn 1976 that in 1977 we would charge 16p for *NOL* in months when it was sent without other booklets to those who took a series of booklets, but not one every month (it is always 8p only when sent with booklets). We have discovered that not all subscribers read this warning in advance, and some have queried it, and the doughty few have deducted the extra from their payments. We have accepted such losses stolidly and not carried on a debit to the next invoice. But on the other hand, we can hardly afford to send an 8p leaflet postfree when postage is 7p! So in 1978 we are making a nominal charge for postage in such cases, and invoices to standing order customers will show 10p. If you still feel you are being robbed, then make your own deduction, and we will lick our wounds. But please do not ask us to send it the following month—the difficulty in our despatch system would cost more than anyone would save. And we hope your charity will reach to paying 10p for the odd month.

WANTED

Can any reader put us in touch with copies of *Parish and People* from the 1940s and 1950s? This would be greatly appreciated. Drop a line to *NOL*.

And we also have a request for alternative versicles and responses for Morning and Evening Prayer—has any reader got any useful sets of these (whether homegrown or pirated) up his sleeve?

Reviews

Nicholas Cabasilas *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (translated by O. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty) (S.P.C.K., 1978, £.95).

Any westerner trying to 'get the feel' of Orthodox worship would read this book, for in it the richness of the Liturgy is explained in language which is clear, direct and familiar—a remarkable achievement for a fourteenth century Byzantine (probably a layman) and his translators!

Cabasilas' work is prefaced by a short sketch of his life and times, and by a rather longer introduction to the Liturgy (by R. M. French) which gives much of the text and explains such features as the iconostasis.

The Commentary itself is for the ordinary communicant and is refreshingly free of later hesychast concepts (such as the vision of Uncreated Light) and of devotion to Mary and the Saints. Indeed, much of the appeal of the work lies in its simple Christ-centredness.

There is little critical assessment of the origins of the various parts of the rite, but the whole is interpreted as a drama, unfolding the life, ministry and death of Jesus, and many helpful devotional comments are made. In addition, there are some delightful tilts at the errors of the 'Latins' and intriguing asides on such questions as whether the dead can receive communion.

There are of course doctrinal points that one might want to question (the word 'sacrifice' for instance is used rather freely), but the aim of the book is to help the reader encounter his Lord more deeply in the Orthodox Liturgy—and for me it achieves this aim.

John Fenwick

[Readers may care to measure John Fenwick's own booklet no. 56 by his own criteria set out here—Ed.]

J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O.P. *Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Catholic Church* (Austine Publishing Co., 25p).

I doubt that many readers of *News of Liturgy* will be tempted to buy this pamphlet, and if they do I hope they will take it for what it is: a concise and reasonable statement of the Roman Catholic teaching on sacrifice and priesthood as it stood between Trent and Vatican 2, with no real assessment of the change in the climate of theology over the last fifteen or twenty years. Both Protestants and Catholics who work in the ecumenical field have to face the fact that there are conservatives who neither admire nor understand what is happening in the Church today, and who interpret the changed climate of opinion as a self-out to the spirit of compromise. The purpose of this booklet is avowedly polemical: it will help none but those who wish to understand the spirit of reaction in Roman Catholic circles. To that extent it forms a companion-piece to Grove Booklet 13, again the work of a Dominican, but of one who sees things in a very different light.

Nicholas Sagovsky

BOOKS

Apart from *Sacrifice and Priesthood* (reviewed elsewhere) the indefatigable Augustine Publishing Co. has also sent us *The Roman Rite Destroyed* in similar format (it is by Michael Davies and costs 35p). Its title is self-explanatory. On the other hand we have *The Once and the Future Liturgy* by J. D. Crichton (Veritas, £2.50), which, however critical of existing Roman liturgy, takes no comfort from going back to the past. We hope to review this book next month.

SCM announce that in March they are republishing two books by Oscar Cullman *Baptism in the New Testament* (£1.95) and *Early Christian Worship* (£2.25). It will be recalled that the first of these was meant to answer Barth's antipedobaptism (but does so with a sort of theological overkill), whereas the second has become famous for its perception of 'liturgy' everywhere in the sources.

BISHOPS IN SCHISM?

The recent announcement of the consecration of bishops for the Episcopalians in America who have separated from the Episcopal Church over the issue of the ordination of women has caused one or two ripples in the Church press in England. One of the problems has been that apparently not all the separated Episcopalians wished the vent to occur (though some consecration of bishops at some point in time is part of the logic of separation). But traditional catholic theology has also two other questions to handle:

- (a) *Can a consecration in separation from the main body be a true and valid consecration?* The answer to this is, yes. The first expression of this principle came with Augustine's treatment of the Donatists in the early fifth century, and this 'theory of orders' (that they must be traceable in a continuity backward in time to the 'undivided church', but need not be traceable in a universal continuity of ecclesiastical communion with the other bishops which are contemporary with them) is usually called 'Augustinian'—though in fact Augustine's main concern was over the validity of baptisms, rather than of orders, given in separation. Before Anglicans treat such separatist consecrations as no consecrations, they must recognize that their own claim that Rome, *on her own presuppositions*, ought to recognize Anglican orders as valid, rest partly upon a similar case—the consecrations in the first two years of Elizabeth I's reign were of a similar 'separatist' character from a Roman point of view.

- (b) It is clear that the Americans went to some trouble to get three bishops to be joint consecrators of the new bishops—and then failed, through the illness of one, actually to get three. Is a consecration by two bishops valid? The answer to this is, yes. On all sides there is full recognition given to the consecration of Augustine of Canterbury by one bishop only, and the Old Catholic line of bishops was sustained for twenty years (from around 1721 to 1741) by a series of single-bishop consecrations by the exiled (and accidentally resident in Holland) 'Bishop of Babylon'.

[More on this next month]