

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 67

July 1980

Editorial

The Archbishop of Canterbury referred at length to liturgy in his presidential address to General Synod on 8 July. Here is the text of the relevant part of his address:

So much for my commitment to, and views about, synodical government, but I hope that before I sit down you will allow me a word on that subject which has occupied the greater part of our time in recent years but on which I must be one of the few bishops who have not made any contribution during the past decade. I would not want you to be ignorant of where I stand.

I do not regret *all* the recent public reactions to the work of this Synod on liturgical reform. They are a reminder that the worship of God not only expresses the life of the Church but can nourish the soul of a people. The power of sacred association penetrates into deep affections of the heart and stirrings of the conscience, and those who cling to what they know do so from no unworthy motives. Nor can someone who has travelled, as I have done, in countries hostile to the Christian religion, be unaware of the power of an ancient liturgy to carry faith and hope from age to age. But their situation is not ours, and I do regret some of the unfair imputations that pass to and fro, and not least the failure to recognize the new life that has come to so many of our congregations through a greater understanding of and sharing in the action of our liturgy.

I hope over the coming decade that it will be possible for the different rites, both old and new, to be compared with each other. I hope it will be easier once again to have a Prayer Book in the home and bring it to church. I hope that a varied and balanced teaching ministry may be built upon our Books, both of which reflect a world-wide Anglican face.

Above all, I hope there will be a readiness of people and priest so to think and plan together about the ordering of worship that it can lead to freshness of Christian life in many other areas beside liturgy.

But this is an end-of-term speech, and I have a particular tribute to pay.

The publication of the Alternative Service Book in November will be the product of 25 years' work. The Liturgical Commission was established in 1955, and we were fortunate to have so much talent available for their task—E. C. Ratcliff, Eric Milner-White, Henry de Candole—as well as the Bishop of Derby who has steered us through the intricacies of many a service, and the Bishop of Southwark reconciling himself to synodical government in order to get the Initiation Services right—and there is our friend, Colin Buchanan, second in length of service in today's Commission, starting at 30 and continuing his work with the Commission with a good deal of lively free enterprise which has enriched many a congregation through the Grove Books.

But over the 25 years, the continuing towering figure has been that of Ronald Jasper. And in expressing our thanks to all who have served on the Commission—and the present members in particular—I want to pay special tribute to the Dean of York who has held together so lively a team and put his considerable liturgical scholarship totally at the service of the Commission, of this Synod, and of the Church. Others have helped in the shaping of drafts, in the compilation of lectionaries and in much else. But he has been the director of the enterprise, overseeing the work, encouraging his colleagues, and taking the main burden of dealing with bishops, with the Synod, and with the wider public. The amount of time which he has given in the endless chores of checking and proof correcting has been massive, and perhaps only his wife and those in Church House know just what that has meant.

Together with some of his colleagues he has decided now to call it a day. He will not be with us in the next Synod and will not seek re-appointment to any new Commission. It is right, then, that we should seize this opportunity to thank him and them.

The House of Bishops, exercising episcopal leadership, has already paid its own tribute in the following words: 'That this House wishes to record its appreciation of the work of the Liturgical Commission over the past 25 years, and of the Dean of York as its Chairman since 1964, and asks that its thanks, congratulations and good wishes should be conveyed to the Chairman and members of the present Commission at their final meeting to be held in Oxford in September.'

I hope that these are sentiments which the General Synod will feel able to endorse.

Finally, and I really mean it, we stand at a point where the heroic age of constitutional and liturgical change is over, and at least for a while there will be a pause in the tide of measures, canons and liturgies. The style of the Synod during the past era has been necessarily complex. It has involved detailed legislation, extended patterns of consultation, and administrative elaboration. Perhaps it is the staff of Church House who have been the real heroes of the past decade coping with all that has been imposed upon them. But dare one hope that this style will not become a continuing way of life? That we will not absorb so much of the energy of the most gifted of our clergy and laity in this way? Can we now seek the grace of Christian simplicity and give priority to a renewal of the Gospel message, a deepening of the spiritual life, and a new concern for, and dialogue with, those in our fellow citizens who do not yet feel the love and the attraction of Christ?

To see the next Synod much more obviously serving the believing, the praying and the evangelizing Church, and to see it doing that in deeper partnership with our fellow Christians in this country and throughout the world, that is my dream, and I hope it is yours too.

Let the Archbishop's words replace any editorial of mine (save only 'Ceterum censeo...').

Colin Buchanan

THE JULY SYNOD

Questions from Synodical 'Question time' will be reviewed last month (though the editor managed to tempt the Archbishop into deprecating archaic forms of address to bishops and archbishops, like 'My Lord' and 'Your Grace'). The Archbishop's presidential address is quoted in lieu of an editorial above.

The extension of authorization of existing services occurred according to plan. The package was:

- Series 1: Matrimony, Burial
- Series 2: Baptism and Confirmation, Communion
- Series 2 Revised: Morning and Evening Prayer
- Series 3: Communion

These were extended to 31 December 1985 by 'Provisional Approval' on Tuesday 8 July, followed by approval by the House of Bishops and then 'Final Approval' in Synod on Friday 11 July. The voting at Final Approval was as follows:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	20	0
Clergy	106	3
Laity	123	5

The other tidying up of lectionaries and tables (mentioned in *NOL* for June) also occurred, and the Revised Catechism was extended for use in teaching (but who will use it?) until 31 December 1985 also. This gained Final Approval on Monday 7 July. The voting was as follows:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	21	1
Clergy	98	15
Laity	95	16

A Private Member's Motion which has been tabled for four years finally attained a debate. It read as follows:

'That the General Synod adheres to the view that Infant Baptism should continue to be available to the children of all parents who are willing to make the requisite promises; and rejects the words "and able" which were inserted after the word "willing" by its predecessor's resolution of February 1974.'

It is my own view (not shared by the Standing Committee) that this should never have been debated, as the whole 1974 situation was superseded by the Southwell Diocesan Resolution which General Synod carried in November 1976:

'That this Synod, endorsing the forms of interrogation in Series 2 and draft Series 3 Infant Baptism Services, desires that there should be a re-examination of the conditions upon which infants are accepted for baptism.'

This latter motion led to a 'miscellaneous paper' by Bishop Knapp-Fisher, but it has not so far led to a debate in Synod. So the motion stands as the Synod's last view on baptismal policy. At any rate, the Private Member's Motion above, moved by Mr. J. R. Bradshaw of Salisbury diocese, was heavily rejected, which has saved some confusion.

The debate on Thursday 10 July on the 'Covenanting' report (see editorial in June *NOL*) produced heavy opposition from the anglo-catholic ranks. Finally the Synod divided on the (wholly innocuous) motion to 'Take note of the report'. The voting was:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	35	2
Clergy	113	70
Laity	138	48

The report is due to return for more decision-taking (probably only the sending down to the dioceses) in February 1981. Meanwhile all the elected synodsmen (and synodswomen) have gone home to seek reelection in September. It looks as though the 'Covenanting' report, and the allied question of the ordination of women, will figure fairly largely in the election issues.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 73, *Family Festivals: An Approach to Worship in the Home*, edited and compiled by Michael Vasey, Tom and Lyn Jamieson, and Dan and Sue Young. This is an enchanting series of very short 'table liturgies' for the seasons of the year, in which families may share, often at Sunday lunch or a similar time. The suggestions have been tried out in the hard school of life, and have, so we gather, passed this test.

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 3, *Sharing Pastoral Care in the Parish*, by David Prior. David Prior was Rector of St. John's Wynberg in South Africa, and is now *Vicar* (note that—not Rector) of St. Aldate's Oxford. He draws on this considerable experience to write about recognizing, training, and mobilizing those with pastoral gifts to provide pastoral care for everyone in the congregation. To make this effective, he explains why home or house church life should be incorporated into the congregational pattern.

. . . and a new catalogue

has been printed and should accompany this.

. . . and some returned stock from overseas

means that we can fill the odd gap for the devoted collector—we have a few copies of nos. 6, 18, 21, and 41 which have come to hand this way. Write if in need.

. . . and a reprint

will be Ethics 8, *One Flesh*, by Paul Ramsey, and it will be out by the end of July.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

On the Liturgical Commission we were once sent a draft infant baptism rite from the Church of Ireland. When it came to the innovation of giving the candidate (or rather sponsors) a lighted candle, the draft rubric read:

'Here shall the priest give the godparents a light.'

Presumably the Irish knew what they meant . . .

10p per copy (£2.25 for the year 1980)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

Book Reviews

My friend, Jesus and Our Father (Collins Liturgical, 15 pages, 60p)

These are two delightful Prayer Books for children with the covers in a tough plastic, written and boldly illustrated by Farelith Eccles Williams. Unlike the others in the same series, they can easily be used by those who are not Roman Catholics. *My friend Jesus* consists of simple stories from the bible. Activity suggestions (e.g. 'I will look out for ways to help with the work at home, I will make a plan with my friend for something special we can do together'), a prayer to pray and a picture on each double page spread. *Our Father* takes the child through the Lord's Prayer with points to think about and some prayers to pray, some of which come from the liturgy, e.g. 'A Prayer to Pray: Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be, amen, (we say this prayer in church).' Highly recommended, with the right approach to God and on the child's level. Trevor Lloyd

A Responsorial Psalm Book For Sundays and Feastdays, edited by Geoffrey Boulton Smith (Collins Liturgical Publications, 1980) 192pp. £5.00.

When the vernacular was adopted and the three-year Eucharistic lectionary was introduced in the Roman Catholic Church, one immediately recognized need was for an adequate collection of musical settings of the appointed psalms in which the congregation could take part. Geoffrey Boulton Smith's collection is a complete and comprehensive parish psalm book designed to meet this need. Responsorial psalm settings require a cantor or choir to sing the psalm verses to which the whole congregation responds by singing a repeated refrain or antiphon. Many of the settings in the collection are simple enough to be used by the smallest and least musically equipped congregation, but there are more complex examples for those churches who have the resources to exploit them. The styles are very different too, from Gelineau to Bevenot, modal to modern, and practically every notable contemporary RC composer has contributed something. Unfortunately, the book as it stands would be difficult to use in an Anglican setting. To begin with, we do not have in the pews the service books containing all the psalm texts and refrains and there are few churches which could equip their congregations with copies of this book at £5.00 each. Second, the psalm texts are taken from the Grail psalter, which is not in common use in Anglican churches and will not be, now that the Frost psalter has been officially adopted for use with the ASB. Third, the two-year cycle of the Anglican lectionary rarely coincides with the three-year Roman counterpart and thus the choice of psalms in each is quite different. This means that the refrains or antiphons as given here are often inappropriate to the psalms in their Anglican context. This is a pity for there is much useful material here. Nevertheless it should prove to be a valuable resource for those churches who wish to experiment with another way of singing the psalms which does not pose so many problems to congregations as does Anglican chant. Robin A. Leaver

ADVERTISEMENT FOR A BOOKSHOP MANAGER(ESS)

St. John's College Bookshop—trading under the name of Christian Unity Bookshop, Nottingham—needs a new manager or manageress from October. Enquirers should write to the Rev. Harold Miller, Director of Extension Studies, St. John's College, Bramcote, Nottingham NG9 3DS.

Diaries and Lectionaries

The 1981 filofax diary (@ 60p) is included with this mailing, if we have reason to think you want it from us. Otherwise please write, and we will send it next month. Lectionaries are this year 50p for small editions (BCP or ASB), and 95p for the large one (ASB only). Availability date still unknown. Please order.

and watch out for . . .

Christian Baptism by Philip Crowe (Mowbrays, £1.25, 7 August), and The Liturgical Commission's report on Services for use with the Sick (date and price still uncertain).

GROVE BOOKS: BY APPOINTMENT SUPPLIERS TO . . . ?

By a freak of fortune I was not in the Synod when the Archbishop made his presidential address (in fact I was at Collins Liturgical Publications, getting *Anglican Worship Today* a step further on its way). And of course I had no reason to expect a presidential address to make kind reference to Grove Booklets (very humble and unarchiepiscopal productions). So I was somewhat amazed later in the morning when I got to Church House to find my friends and others all making remarks to me about it (see the text of the Archbishop's address in the editorial). However, the most memorable encounter to me was with Maurice Wood, him of Norwich. He came up to me with his eyes twinkling and said 'How did you do it? Did you have to pay him to mention Grove Booklets? He's never said anything like that about Islington Booklets!' I modestly tried to hint that it might be something to do with the relative quality or provenance of the two sets of publications, and went my way . . . C.O.B.

ORDINATIONS SUMMER 1980

A little further vetting of diocesan practice in the use of Series 3 Ordination services has been going on. Derby apparently shares with Peterborough the distinction of being the only remaining 1662 users—but the future will certainly distinguish between them. The vesting (see last month's *NOL*) is uniformly done after the laying on of hands, despite the provisions in the opening Notes. (Or is it uniform? Information please.) There is a widespread tendency to give the Bible to each candidate immediately after laying hands on him, instead of after all candidates have been ordained (and thus the idea of the laying on of hands coming *within* the ordination prayer is seriously affected). And various half-baked notions of 'concelebration' by newly ordained priests are in operation. One of these is well worth a mention: the newly ordained join with the bishop in saying the eucharistic prayer from the Sanctus to the Acclamations! Nothing could suggest more clearly the notion that there is a 'special bit' to the eucharistic prayer—but, surely, if the eucharistic prayer can or should be said by more than one president (and this we take strong leave to doubt) all should say it all? Anything else is a dismembering of the eucharistic prayer quite as grave as slumping to the knees after the Sanctus, or manipulating the elements (and ringing bells) during the Narrative of Institution.

STILL FURTHER TO THE FILIOQUE

Dear Colin,

I have been extremely interested in your articles 'The Archbishop and the Filioque' (*NOL* April 1980) and 'Further to the Filioque' (*NOL* May 1980) since, as you will recall from our earlier correspondence on the matter in May 1979, I act as Anglican Secretary to the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, which, as you know, recommended in Moscow in

1976 (see *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement* pp.62-8 and 87-8) and in Athens in 1978 that 'the Filioque clause should not be included in' the Nicene Creed. The Lambeth Conference 1978 requested that 'all member Churches of the Anglican Communion should consider omitting the Filioque from the Nicene Creed' (Lambeth Conference 1978 p.51) and the Anglican Consultative Council endorsed this in 1979 (ACC-4 pp.4-5).

My own records and correspondence show that in May 1973, after their debates on Anglican-Orthodox relations, both Convocations asked the Presidents to take steps to have 'a fresh examination of the Clause in the Creed concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit'. A small Archbishops' Commission duly reported in 1976, and while recognizing 'both traditions of Trinitarian theology, Western and Eastern, as valuable in themselves' recommended 'that in future liturgical revision, the text of the Creed should be restored to the original form of 381 A.D.' since 'the Filioque clause was introduced into the Creed without the authority of an Ecumenical Council and without due regard for catholic consent'. The General Synod was reminded of this in the Board for Mission and Unity Report GS 357 which was prepared for its discussion of the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission's 1976 Moscow Agreed Statement. The Bishop of Guildford as Chairman of B.M.U. declared (p.5) that 'in presenting the Statement to the Synod, the Board for Mission and Unity gives notice that it will be asking the House of Bishops to examine this matter (the Filioque) with a view to its consideration by the Synod as Article 7 business'. And in presenting this Report the Bishop of St. Albans added: 'What is needed at the moment is not more theological debate on the Filioque but a decision by those who exercise pastoral authority as to whether this is the moment to embark on the inevitable synodical process which must precede a liturgical revision'. What became of this request?

It came as a surprise therefore that the Revision Committee for Series 3 rejected the Bishop of St. Albans' modest proposal that the words 'and the Son' should be placed in brackets so that 'Anglicans should have the opportunity to recover the original form of the Creed' (Lambeth Conference 1978 p.109). The reason given for this was that this was considered to be a matter of doctrinal and theological rather than liturgical revision. This distinction, of course, is open to question. But the Revision Committee's decision was apparently accepted, and the Bishop of Truro agreed with Jerek Pattinson that the right step to take next was *not* for someone to propose an amendment in the liturgical debate, but for the Bishop of Truro to say that the Filioque should be taken out of the context of revising the service and placed 'in the doctrinal and ecumenical context of the House of Bishops' who would be free, if they were willing, and if they gave the Synod due warning, to make variations after the Revision stage was completed. (This links up with your report on p.8 of *NOL* April 1979).

At this stage (May 1979) I offered material from the Anglo-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission to the Bishop of Truro for use by the House of Bishops if desired. But it seems that when he raised the matter with your 'eminent Anglican' (*NOL* May 1980) he—and I quote—'seemed totally uninterested in the matter, so nothing happened at all'.

A further move was then made to take up an interim suggestion made by ACC-4 (*op. cit.* p.4) that in the meantime Churches in their liturgical

revisions might well consider ways of indicating that 'This clause is a Western addition to the Creed as originally authorized'. A request was made in October 1979 that this item might be put on the agenda for the House of Bishops with a view to such a note being added either as a footnote to the Creed or as one of the Notes at the beginning of the service in the ASB.

At the end of October the Bishop of St. Albans reported that no progress was made with the House of Bishops over the Filioque, since they were 'seriously worried at any attempt to put something fresh into the ASB at this stage'. For, 'if the Bishops altered it at all and the Synod did not like it', the only course open would be for the Synod to reject the whole book. 'I fear we have been defeated for 1980', he concluded.

It is frustrating, to say the least, that seven years of considering, studying, debating, and recommending has had no synodical result at all. If the Filioque is proposed as a liturgical matter, it is ruled out of order and re-classified as a doctrinal matter which should be dealt with in a different way. If it is asked to be considered as doctrine, the body responsible seems unwilling to do so, because of the possible liturgical consequences! Yet the main purpose of both the Archbishops' Filioque Commission and the AOJDC's Moscow recommendation was to seek the omission of the Filioque from the Creed on *canonical, historical, and ecumenical grounds*, but without making any judgment on the doctrine of the Filioque as such (See *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Agreed Statement* pp.62-8 and especially, for instance, the statements of Professor Fairweather on p.65 and of Professor Romanides and Archbishop Stylianos on p.66).

In February 1978 Miss Christian Howard urged the General Synod that 'the bishops should not be asked to *rush this matter through* in time for the ASB in 1980' (italics mine). Of course we are used to a time-scale of centuries where the Filioque is concerned, and I frequently consult the debates at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438-9 (See Joseph Gill *The Council of Florence* (CUP, 1961) Chapter V especially). But it is disappointing to discover that the matter has not really been grappled with at all at a time of liturgical revision in the Church of England.

By contrast, it was extremely encouraging to be present at the enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury on 25 March 1980 when the Creed was 'said in its original form, as agreed between the Churches of East and West in the fourth century, *so that all Christians present may say it together*'.

It may be difficult for 20th century Anglicans to understand the tiresome and tedious but persistent desire of the Orthodox to have an ancient stumbling-block removed. But the search for unity includes reconciliation and the righting of ancient wrongs. Is it too much to ask that the General Synod and its Liturgical Commission should take this seriously, and take into account the *ecumenical* implications of Liturgy?

It is just a little ironical that I am just now continuing work on 'explanatory material' on the Filioque requested by ACC-4 'for use by Synods on both the historical and theological issues involved . . .

Yours sincerely,

Colin Davey