

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 82

October, 1981

## Editorial

Interest in relationships between Anglicans and Roman Catholics seems to be quickening in England. Partly, there is a consciousness of Rome in the offing when the Covenant between the non-Roman Churches is under discussion (though it is not necessarily that Rome wants it defeated—the more regular impression I get being that the English Roman Catholics hope we will go ahead, as a useful step towards the sort of business we must one day do with them). Partly, we hear that the recent ACC meeting wanted further discussion about disputed doctrinal points (including justification) to figure on the agenda of the next Anglican-Roman Commission. Partly, we hear that the last Commission has now finished its work, and agreed a final statement which we may see in the New Year. And did not Cardinal Hume say something about 'Uniat Status' for Anglicans in any future agreement with Rome? And, towering over all the particular questions, is not His Holiness due to visit England in 1982? And will this not precipitate all sorts of speculations about ecumenical relationships—from the over-rosy to the paranoically hostile?

Well, *NOL* has no objection to the Pope's visit. We give it a cautious welcome. There may be problems if the Pope insists on wrapping together birth control and abortion as both sins, and both sins of the same ilk—whereas we would want to take the opposite view on contraception, whilst standing very near to him on abortion. But that is hardly liturgical business, and it is to that that we address ourselves here. What liturgical points do we wish to make to His Holiness and his adherents? At a rough count, we find five areas of sacramental-cum-liturgical disputes which are worthy of mention here. We put them into the front line, asking that they should be handled as of high priority.

1. The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist: it is possible to quibble about this and that in the statement, but broadly it seems to me to be couched in terms which Cranmer could at a pinch have affirmed, and his prosecutors must have inevitably denied. Of course the discussion is cast in a different conceptual framework—a more churchly one—than the sixteenth century generally used. But I believe the above to be the case. Well, then, can we please hear what Rome *officially* thinks of it? For I have a nasty suspicion that whilst Anglican Province after Anglican Province has at least commended the statement for study, the Church of Rome has so far given no official approval (even of the 'commend for study' sort) whatsoever. So we ask—where does Rome stand on the agreement? Or is it simply that twelve individual Roman Catholics have found a way of stating their beliefs which I find I can agree, but only twelve . . . ?
2. The Roman Eucharistic Prayers: it is marvellous to be able to say (what was not at all clear in England twenty years ago) that the Roman Mass *is* the Christian Eucharist in one form. Previously the form almost completely obscured the authentic character of the celebration—now it can do no more than cause a hiccup. Then I had the greatest difficulty

in attending a mass, as its character was so difficult to recognize or respect. Now there is little question as to its character, and I would wish to receive communion, if, as, and when, that door opens. But we have still not eliminated all the hiccups from the text, and I would *not* be happy at being asked to preside at the eucharist with a Roman text. The extent of offering sacrifices to God in the eucharistic prayer has been reduced to a very narrow compass—but there it is. Look at the respective lines:

Prayer 1: still the old Roman canon

Prayer 2: 'we offer you Father, this life-giving bread, this saving cup.'

Prayer 3: 'See the victim whose death has reconciled us to yourself'

Prayer 4: 'We offer you his body and blood'.

These would take some more justification than the Anglican-Roman statement gives us. And there are other causes for hiccups . . .

3. Intercommunion: it is easy to understand why Rome has not allowed this. It is easy to understand how it has to come as a creeping growth, starting at the fringes of the Churches and working towards the centre. It is easy to understand—but less easy to accept. An editorial here may be but a tiny tin whistle—nevertheless, we blow it. Come on, your Holiness, do some recognizing that we are Christian.
4. The cultus: again, we cannot stay on it—but is the extra-liturgical cultus of the sacramental elements necessary? If it is not, would it not be sensible to note the offence it causes? If it is, why is it?
5. Anglican orders: the official Commission, having agreed on both eucharist and ordination, declined to touch this point. But the Roman denial of the validity of Anglican orders derives from supposed disagreement on the eucharist—Rome could not recognize that Anglicans 'intended' the right occurrence when they celebrated communion (and especially not when they did it in the post-Reformation years). Now Roman Catholics agree a statement which would completely undermine the 'defect of intention' argument. Yet nobody on Rome's side proceeds to undo Leo XIII's work. We think that it should be done—not because we necessarily subscribe to the theological basis in Augustinianism on which Rome rests, but because we think that *from Rome's standpoint* some sort of consistency is desirable, and we need to know whether Rome sees the agreements as having any 'cash value'. So come on, your Holiness, what about our orders?

If we get any answers, we will print them.

Colin Buchanan

## THE NOVEMBER SYNOD

No, no 'Liturgical Business' is on the agenda. The nearest to an interest the liturgical scene has is in the debate on the Charismatic Movement, in the debate on whether women can be deacons (*not* deaconesses—more on this next month), and in the Winchester diocesan motion on children at communion. This latter is unlikely to be reached. There are also some Private Member's Motions (well down the list) on the Roman Catholic Lectionary, the possibility of catechumenate, the authorization of the Grail Psalter, and the wearing of robes at Morning and Evening Prayer.

## FURTHER TO THE COVENANT

The dissentients ran a vast four-page inset in the *Church Times* in early September, in the course of which they dropped big hints that the way to unity with Rome was by rejecting the Covenant for unity. However, on almost the same day the Roman Catholic Auxiliary Bishop in Southwark, Bishop Charles Henderson, wrote in the October issue of *The Southwark Liturgical Bulletin*

' . . . it was heartening to read in the report on the Methodist Conference at Norwich that an almost unanimous vote was recorded in favour of the covenant for unity. We pray that the other Churches will reach the same decision.'

And so it comes to our diocesan synods for separate voting, before returning to General Synod for July 1982 and the definitive vote. Voters might be advised to note the report of the working party on episcopacy in Methodism which reported to the same Methodist Conference. This working party has tried to treat the Church of England as being honest and open when it has (in effect) said: 'We do want you to become episcopal, but the form and manner of your episcopacy (which we can see will not be exactly "diocesan") will be up to you—you must find its best form to fit your structures and history'. Well they have believed us, and so have proposed that *every Circuit Superintendent should be a bishop*. The circuits are to be somewhat larger, but in essence they are proposing a form of 'primitive episcopacy'—a true local chief pastor with a team of presbyters associated with him. And the Church of England not will be able to find doctrinal fault with that.

Ah, but wait—how will Anglican diocesan monepiscopacy relate to this phenomenon, where Methodist bishops may be eight or ten times as numerous on the ground as Anglican ones? Will not the pressures be upon Methodism to adapt their structures to existing Anglican ones? But, if they reject those pressures and stick to their principles, will they not be a prophetic sign sitting on our doorsteps?

## NEWS FROM SOUTH AFRICA

A correspondent from the Provincial Liturgical Committee of the Church of the Province of South Africa, the Rev. Brian Hill, writes of their work:

- (i) initiation services will be published soon—largely drawn from the ASB. However, the Provincial synod a year ago passed a resolution to allow the children of communicant parents to receive communion with their parents, and that puts some features of initiation into a slightly different light.
- (ii) the main recent production (which is fully authorized) is the provision of services from Ash Wednesday to Easter Day.
- (iii) there are also services for the laying of a foundation stone, the blessing of a home, the dedication of a new church building, and (still in the pipeline) new marriage and funeral services.

## HOLY WEEK RETREAT AT ST. JOHN'S

St. John's College is running a residentia Holy Week Retreat in 1982—£40 for residents, £20 for non-residents—from Tuesday in Holy Week till Easter Sunday. Write for details.

## This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 78, *Preaching at Communion (i)*, by Ian Bunting. As the Parish Communion has built up over the years, so the necessity for preaching within the eucharistic framework has also increased. And as Rite A increasingly takes over from earlier rites as that framework, so the preacher must relate to that framework. Ian Bunting in this booklet handles questions of principle about the relationship between word and sacrament, and in booklet 79 in January 1982 he will go on to the more practical features of such preaching. These booklets continue the provision of supplementary material to assist in the use of the ASB.

## . . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 8, *Learning through Experience*, by Michael Williams. This is a hauntingly interesting treatment of the value of reflection and reconsideration in the light of experience within pastoral practice of every kind, including ministerial self-assessment. As the Pastoral Group says in the latest catalogue, the method is here 'developed for everyone from Sunday School teachers to theological students'.

## . . . and last month's mistake

was the price given on the cover of *Theological Renewal*—it read '£1' when it should have been '65p'. So standing order customers who pay in arrears can breathe again. Of course in the New Year . . .

## . . . and next year's prices

will go up—and they were set out in the catalogue. The overall system continues that anyone receiving any series of booklets on standing order pays in arrears once every six months. However journals taken on their own require a subscription paid in advance by the calendar year. Because when two (or now three) journals are sent together we save postage, we offer joint subscription rates. See the catalogue for these—and next month's *NOL*. Remember that payments can always be made by Giro transfer without cost in postage or bank charges—our number is 48 821 4009—but do give full instructions on the transfer slip.

## . . . and some earlier changes

come into force on 1 December 1981. These are increases in two items which are not in series, *And So To Bed?* and *A New Canterbury Tale*. Write now for copies at the old prices.

## . . . and a paperback *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968–1975*

was advertised in the catalogue for £8.50 and will be available in the first half of November.

## . . . and remember to include *News of Hymnody* in your renewal.

## WANTED—A CHURCH BELL

New church building in Edgemead, Cape Town, is looking for a second hand church bell. Please contact Rev. Brian Hill, The Rectory, Edgemead 7405, if you have a bell to sell.

**12p** per copy (£2.70 by post for the year 1981, £3 for 1982)

**GROVE BOOKS**  
**BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)**

## WHITHER THE CHARISMATICS ?

The stop-press last month left two or three untidy ends concerning the future of the Charismatic Movement in the Church of England, and they are worth a bit of notice:

1. Before the Swanwick Conference of 21-24 September there had already been formed an agency entitled 'Anglican Renewal Ministries', which is a committee of seven leading Anglican charismatics (including Michael Harper, John Gunstone, John Finney, and Peter Peterken). This enterprise (hereafter known as 'ARM') is taking on Lawrence Hoyle as the executive secretary, and he has resigned his parish of Drifffield, and becomes a full-time occupant of the small conference centre he was already involved in running—Lamplugh House, Drifffield, Yorks. He is a man with a very large shadow and a very large sense of fun, and commanded considerable confidence at the Swanwick Conference. ARM is already handling from Lamplugh House various tapes, booklets, sheet music (strictly for songs with 'alleluia' in them), etc.
2. That 3½-hour eucharist at Swanwick (see last month)—how did it become, even for a short time, an open debate? The answer goes something like this.

It was agreed on the last evening that the morning eucharist should include both a wholesale renewal of baptismal vows, and, later, a renewal of ordination vows for the ordained (with the laity present laying hands on them and praying for them). The morning was divided into two—the first half, including both the ministry of the word and the renewal of baptismal vows, being in the conference hall at Swanwick, the second half being in the chapel. When it came to the renewal of baptismal vows the Bishop of Pontefract, who was presiding, gave an impromptu homily about renouncing evil—'Every charm, every fetish, every mascot, must go' he said 'no messing with astrology or fortune-telling either'. He enlivened this typically with instances of such objects which had occasionally been surrendered to him at confirmations. However, someone at the back of the hall got up and said 'What about Freemasonry?'. Richard of Pontefract was disinclined to pursue the subject. But others got up to put in a denunciation. And then four clergy in succession rose to say they had been masons, but since being renewed in various ways they had given up their masonry—and so should we all. Good-humouredly the president asked if anyone else had anthemas to utter, we had not, and we proceeded to renew our baptismal vows.

If a further tourist guide is needed, the time also included 'tongues' and 'prophecy', 'singing in tongues' (twice), laying on of hands and anointing for particular needs, and a large amount of sharing and fellowship—along with a magnificent Bible-reading from George Carey and a hatful of alleluias. If we missed the spectacle or experience of bishops dancing in a ring round the communion table, this was mere oversight!

3. Whither then the charismatics? The conference gave no plenary scope to debating this—worship having taken over, which is

characteristic of charismatics, and actually welcome. But whither the charismatics? Perhaps the General Synod debate in November will touch the issue? But I think the constituents ought to be articulating their expectations (or policies) to the ARM folk. Otherwise there is a danger the show will run on acquired momentum—simply being like the past, but marginally less spectacularly so each year.

### Book Reviews

Norman Todd and Michael Kindred *Four Celebrations: A Teaching Course on the Eucharist within the Eucharist* (C.I.O., £1.30)

'In the Eucharist the entire mystery of God's activity towards us is represented and made available. We cannot add anything, only discover more of what is happening and allow ourselves to be drawn in more completely'—that is what this teaching course is all about. It provides outlines for a four-week programme (which can be done in consecutive weeks, or alternative weeks, or as you wish), highlighting four important aspects of the Holy Communion service. These are: 'the Word'; 'Forgiveness'; 'Breaking and Remaking' and 'Send us out'; and the idea is that learning should take place about one of these themes each week, in the context of the Sunday Eucharist. The booklet gives outlines for the services which, while leaving the basic flow of the liturgy untouched, focus the celebration on one particular aspect, and hold the service together in a thematic way. So, for example, the 'Breaking and Remaking' idea is brought out by stopping the offertory procession half-way and making the (slightly dubious) point that here we are, offering everything we have and are, to be broken, remade in Christ, and received back at the communion.

This is a simple, practically-orientated booklet, almost foolproof (it gives check-lists for each week so that nothing is forgotten), clearly laid out, and with lots of good ideas. The dialogues, which form an integral part of the services, can feel a little contrived, but no doubt could be adapted to the particular situation, as the authors suggest. Some recommendations for appropriate hymns might also have been useful.

Well worth trying out.

Harold Miller

Paul Bradshaw *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* (Alcuin Club/SPCK £6.95).

For some years now students of the Daily Office have been referred to Dugmore's *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* as the book to read. However, in recent times this has been out of print and much of Dugmore's thought has been challenged. This latest Alcuin Book is offered by the author, Paul Bradshaw, as a replacement for Dugmore. It covers largely the same territory, namely the Jewish pattern of prayer, the daily prayer of the early church, and the relationship between them.

It should be said that the author succeeds in this immediate aim and he carefully lays to rest a number of Dugmore's conclusions. The material is generally carefully weighed and the book will be valuable for reference with its detailed consideration of the early Christian writing on the subject. What however may cause greater interest are the conclusions set out at the end of the book. Here the whole pattern and content of the Anglican system of the Daily Office is challenged on the basis of the earlier material. The questions need to be asked and carefully considered if liturgical revision is to carry on.

However there are some problems. It is all very well to present Dugmore and others as distorting the evidence. It is much harder to avoid doing so yourself. There are therefore a number of points in this book that could be challenged. For example, is the exegesis of Matthew 6.5 on page 25 fair? Is the case against public daily prayer for both Jews and Christians as strong as the author implies? These are two of the questions I have and there will be others. The debate will go on. I, for one, am very grateful to Paul Bradshaw for making such a significant contribution to the subject.

David Cutts

Michael Green *I believe in Satan's Downfall* (Hodder and Stoughton, £4.50).

Personally, I believe in the devil. Indeed on odd occasions I have had to put in a word on his behalf in liturgy so as to prevent his being wholly queezed out. And I enjoyed the brief spell we had in 1968, when at the instigation of Austin Farrer the Liturgical Commission tried to bring him in where he had not been before—in the Lord's Prayer (see Michael Green page 48).

That in passing—I already detect that previous belief in the devil makes all the difference in reading the book, and, as another reviewer said, those who do not accept the reality of the devil will hardly respond to the massive, passionate, and cosmic character of Michael Green's argument. I suppose that was the case with our reviewer in the October *Theological Renewal*. And even the convinced can occasionally find the argument over-sweeping. I have my own reservations about whether, for instance, the existence of the devil is the exact logical entail of the existence of God, in a sort of symmetrical pattern. But then I already believed in him.

That said, I found the scope and breadth of the book very challenging. But I think in the last analysis that it is not to be classified with works of apologetics for the demonic sphere—it is arguably a devotional book. It is a book to celebrate the victory of Christ, and to bring believers to confidence in that triumph. And, as we all well know, devotional books have an element of appeal to taste as well as to argument. I enjoy and profit from reading Michael Green (whilst aware of his occasional over-seductiveness) and the book is more to my taste than I thought from the title it would be.

The argument about the nature of the demonic world, about its lesser inhabitants, its exact scope and *modus operandi*, about its relationship with the sovereignty of God, and a host of others—well, they are fairly neatly arranged and powerfully presented. It is possible that the powers of darkness—being in the strict sense chaos—are not so amenable to tidy labelling as this would suggest. But the book is also a challenge not just to leave the subject vague because it is chaos—our minds must certainly be engaged.

And the liturgical part? Well, there is a section (pages 133-147) on diagnosis of possession, and on exorcism. It is written with cautions expressed on every page—but with some most unusual instances added for illustration. I wonder whether Michael Green has read John Richards, Grove Booklet 44 *Exorcism, Deliverance and Healing*, about the pastoral and liturgical needs in this area?

C.O.B.

## LITURGY AT MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY

In October 1980, a course in the history and significance of liturgy was set up at Manchester University. This course is taught in the Department of Historical and Contemporary Theology in the Faculty of Theology and is thus firmly in a doctrinal context, though there are obviously close links with the departments of Pastoral Theology, Biblical Studies and Ecclesiastical History.

The course tutors are Rev. Kenneth Stevenson, Anglican Chaplain to the University and author/editor of several Grove Booklets, and Rev. Dr. Richard Buston, author of Alcuin Club collection no. 58 and a member of the University careers and appointments service. Guest lecturers have also been used, including David Tripp, John Gunstone and Alan Shelston (of the English Department and interested in hymns).

The course may be taken in either the second or third year of the B.A. course and also forms part of the (post-graduate) B.D. programme. Student numbers for 1980/81 have been: two B.D. students, five third-year B.A. students and about seven second-year B.A. students. B.D. and second-year B.A.'s take a general course on most aspects of liturgical history and philosophy but with special attention given to initiation, eucharist, hymnology and introductory courses. This is examined by a three-hour paper. Third-year B.A.'s take this second-year course *plus* an extra course on initiation and eucharist (based on Whitaker's and Jasper/Cuming's collections of texts with modern texts in addition). (This is also examined by a three-hour paper). As well as this, liturgy features on the third year Special Esvsay paper.

During 1980/81, one third year also wrote a dissertation on the Early Eucharistic Prayers as part of her final honours exam. Both she and another student (the author!) are intending to engage in part-time research for an M.A. in Liturgy. Several students have expressed an interest in taking the course in 1981/82, including two who wish to write liturgical dissertations.

This course has really taken off, and all who took it are satisfied customers. In a time when few establishments offer liturgy as an option, this Manchester experiment should be an encouragement to all of us who are concerned about liturgy and its study, whether that concern has only recently been generated (as in the case of the author!) or has been in existence for a number of years (as in the case of the editor!).

Charles Read, Graduate in Theology  
(and especially Liturgy) of the University of Manchester

## LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Paul Welsby tops up the lesson reading laughs with this:

'The president on one of the Michaelmas Ember Days used the Gospel reading on page 883 in the ASB. The conclusion ran as follows:

"I sent you to reap a harvest you had not worked for. Others worked for it; and you have come into the rewards of their trouble. Any of these readings may be used in Ember weeks. This is the Gospel of Christ."

P.S. Do *not* laugh until you have looked it up—any of us might have done the same . . .