

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan Issue no. 109 January 1984

Editorial

General Synod meets at the end of February, and, whereas its particular liturgy-related business is reported on other pages of *NOL*, there is a Private Member's Motion to which I draw attention. It comes up on the evening of Wednesday 29 February, and it runs as follows:

- That this Synod,
- aware of the different, and deeply held, convictions existing within the Church of England (and other Christian bodies) concerning the nature of the ordained priesthood,
 - noting that this difference of conviction has lain behind various divisions of opinion on major issues in recent years,
 - sensitive to the ecumenical implications of the word "priest" and
 - believing that a thoroughgoing study of the theology and functions of the ordained priesthood is urgently needed,

Welcomes the study of various aspects of Ministry currently being undertaken in response to the ARCIC and Lima documents, and requests the Standing Committee to consider in particular how progress can best be made towards agreement on the ordained priesthood within the Church of England itself.

It might be argued that this issue, like others which have appeared in this column, is not directly liturgical. But it is very nearly so, in two obvious respects, and also in some less obvious. So *NOL* cheerfully offers the Synod, the Standing Committee, and indeed ARCIC and the WCC Faith and Order people, and Uncle Tom Cobley and all, the benefit of its advice on the subject of priesthood.

The relevance to liturgy comes at these two notable points:

- the word 'priest' is a cultic word, used in the Old Testament of those with cultic duties at the temple (though certainly with more than cultic duties), and in the New Testament of Christ himself and the amazing new cult summed up in his sacrifice and his living 'within the veil' in the holiest for us. When 'priesthood' is used of the church (1 Peter and Revelation), then it is of priestly access to God and priestly sacrificial offering (of praise etc.) which the church has to give to God that it speaks.
- the word 'priest' has, since the time of Hippolytus (and possibly Clement) been used of ordained ministers of the church, and has been frequently thought to find its significance in the cultic functions of the ministry (though the origins of its use in church history may actually lie with the question of *authority* rather than of cultic responsibilities or rights).

NOL has but limited space, and is well given to prejudice. So I here promote the study for which Mr. Fairlie, the mover of the motion, calls by setting out some of the salient points of one side of the matter.

They are as simple as this:

- in the Old Testament the word for a priest of the house of Levi is rendered '*hiereus*' in the Septuagint.
- in the New Testament the same word '*hiereus*' is only found of Old Testament priests (and once or twice of pagan ones), of Christ himself in the epistle to the Hebrews, and of the church as a whole in 1 Peter and Revelation. Whilst a dozen different words are used for teachers and leaders in the church, *this* word nowhere appears.
- in church history the use of Old Testament terms for New Covenant ministers has arisen, but for reasons which should be questioned. In English there has been a further problem, because the word 'priest' is etymologically 'presbyter' writ small, but is ecclesiastically used as the rendering of '*hiereus*', thus adding to confusion.

We thus welcome the tendency to use the term 'presbyter' in place of 'priest' for the second order of ministry, and are then in a better place to go on and debate the *functions* of the presbyterate. Which we will do.

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD

The Synod meets in February in the week of the eighth Sunday before Easter, that is in the week preceding Ash Wednesday and the beginning of Lent. This year that week runs from Monday 27 February to Friday 2 March (as Easter is about the latest it can be until we invent even-more-fictitious new moons). As a result it is unclear whether the next edition of *NOL* can carry news of Synod, whilst it is virtually certain it cannot do any advocacy about proceedings in Synod. It is likely to be going through the press in that week. So we report the likely agenda now, but may not be able to comment usefully again until the March *NOL*.

Marriage after divorce: 'Option G' appears to be running into *enormous* opposition round the country. Whilst the form of consultations the diocesan bishops have chosen has varied greatly (so that no easily comparable statistics are available), yet reports suggest heavy defeats for 'Option G' in well over half the gatherings. Thus the House of Bishops, which meets on 31 January, will have to decide whether to press ahead, put a brave face on it, and attempt to rally the General Synod for 'Option G' after all—or whether to acknowledge that the regulation (printed out in the December *NOL*) is dead or at least dying, and try to seek alternative provision. In such a case, the voting that there *are* cases where a church marriage after divorce is appropriate will presumably remain on the table, thus committing the Church of England to finding *some* method of distinguishing cases. But if no alternative is to hand, then 'Option F' (the incumbent's discretion) will inevitably take over, as the law provides for it already.

Series 1 Communion: *NOL* reported in October 1983 that the House of Bishops had decided to introduce a motion in February 1984 asking the Synod to ask the bishops to bring forward Series 1 baptism and communion services. That particular minute of the House of Bishops mentioned that the chairman of the Liturgical Commission was present at that meeting of the House of Bishops, but it is now possible to state that he was *not* present in order to advocate the line the House actually took, nor to suggest to the House that the Liturgical Commission wanted Series 1 services re-introduced. As *NOL* at the time made clear, the Liturgical Commission has expressed no such mind, and we understand that the chairman of the Commission made that clear to the House of Bishops. And, whilst it is still not wholly obvious what particular lobby has persuaded the bishops to try this hesitant tactic ('we are asking you to tell us whether you want us to tell you you may want these services'), yet there are already six eucharistic rites in use lawfully in the Church of England (BCP, Series 1 and 2 Revised, Series 2, Rite B, Series 3, and Rite A) and two of them are but a hairsbreadth from Series 1. Series 1 was allowed to lapse in 1980, and lapsed is how it should stay.

The Roman Catholic three-year Lectionary: The Liturgical Commission is bringing to Synod its report on the Roman Catholic Sunday Lectionary. We hope to have the report reviewed next month in *NOL*. For the moment we note that the Commission has set out the principles governing the Roman Catholic Lectionary (which are quite unlike those behind the ASB provisions), and has concluded that, as a Commission, it has no mind to ask the Synod to authorize this Lectionary. In Synod the platform is not bringing forward any motion for such authorization. That would be up to interested individuals.

Women as Deacons: the Measure providing for this, now revised by the Revision Committee, comes for Revision Stage in Synod. If passed, it will then be referred to the dioceses for a period of roughly a year, with a view to its enactment in 1985.

STOP PRESS—BISHOPS DROP OPTION G

We went to press a day or so late, and thus are able to slip in the news that the House of Bishops met on 31 January, and decided (as suggested opposite here) that 'Option G' is dead, and should be given decent burial. It does not yet appear what the House of Bishops will bring to General Synod at the end of February, but it seems that they will try to hold the existing position (that the Church of England hopes its clergy will not officiate at marriages where one party has been previously divorced, whilst statute law allows them to, and will protect them if they do). The first press notices after the announcement suggest that the bishops are going to want us to take our time about it, and to ensure that any future proposals come definitively before diocesan synods as well as General Synod. There were even hints that they might contain *criteria* for approving such marriages as well as *procedures*. That will be a mountainous task.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 87, *Introducing Liturgical Change*, by Trevor Lloyd. The booklet includes some theological handling of the necessity to be ready for change in the church's institutional life (including liturgical texts, and ethos, and setting). It also goes on to handle practical and psychological questions involved in the pastoral care of a congregation whilst change is under way.

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 17, *How we grew a local ecumenical project*, by Ray Simpson—an incumbent in Norfolk engaged in doing just that. The booklet comes at just the point that the Standing Committee of General Synod is addressing itself to ways of helping local projects, and the evidence here bears well upon the question.

. . . also next month

is Spirituality Series no. 8, *Finding a Personal Rule of Life* by Harold Miller. The title here is self-explanatory—and the relevance self-evident.

. . . and all the Spirituality titles need a mention

as they are omitted inadvertently from the last catalogue. They are:

- Living the Trinity* by Peter Adam
- A Beginner's Guide to Spirituality* by Michael Botting
- Puritan Pietist Pentecostalist: Three Types of Evangelical Spirituality* by John Tiller
- Spiritual Autobiography: A DIY Guide* by Roger Pooley
- Darkness* by Philip Seddon
- Knowing God Incarnate* by Richard Bauckham
- Creative Prayer* by Jane Hatfield

. . . and a reprint

now published is Ministry and Worship Booklet no. 64, *Grow Through Groups*, by Eddie Gibbs.

. . . and prices

are now uniformly 80p for booklets and £1.60 for Liturgical Studies.

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.45 by inland post for the year 1984—£4 with *News of Hymnody* added)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602 251114)

16p

THE ASB's RIBS ARE SHOWING

One of the infelicities in Rite A is the introductory line to the Peace at section 31. It reads:

'The president may say

Let us offer one another a sign of peace..

and all may exchange a sign of peace.'

The difficulty here is twofold: both that congregations who got used in Series 3 days to getting on with the kissing straight after the versicle and response preceding this are now caught in uncertainty as to whether to wait for the president to give this new optional 'trigger' to their action; and also that where the kiss of peace has been well formalized the words 'Let us offer . . .' are incredibly stilted and formal. Curiously, the original words 'Christ is our peace [etc.]' were introduced during the revision of the text, in preference to 'We are the body of Christ . . .', on the grounds that the latter had an unnecessary horatatory cast to its 'Let us then pursue . . .'. And the very persons who made this objection then followed up with the (Roman) 'Let us offer . . .'. So we still have hortation.

Footnote to last month's 'ribs': After complaining about 'full of grace' as the description of the BVM in the Collect of Advent 4 (on the grounds that it was based on the Vulgate's quite misleading 'plena gratia', and suggested wholly wrong things about the BVM), I got a salutary corrective on St. Stephen's day. (were you saying your offices that day?). There the introductory sentence is Acts 6.8—and Stephen is 'full of grace and power! And so he is in the original—*pleres charitos kai dunameos*. It is verbally closely parallel to John 1.14, where the incarnate Word is said to be *pleres charitos kai aletheias*. So perhaps *NOL* was over-reacting again 'full of grace'? Well, perhaps . . . But the case from scripture could also be represented as one where the BVM was not called 'full of grace', but St. Stephen could be. And that would not only be accurate translation, but would also never be misunderstood.

BOOKS ON LITURGY

Just a reminder—we usually have a wide range of new books on liturgy available to be sent postfree anywhere in the world, and particularly to standing order customers. Thus, to take a quick sample, we currently have:

B. D. Spinks (ed.) *The Sacrifice of Praise* (Rome, £8.50)

G. Wainwright *Doxology* (Epworth, £10.50)

J. F. White *Introduction to Christian Worship* (Abingdon/SPCK, £4.95)

D. E. W. Harrison and M. C. Sansom *Worship in the Church of England* (SPCK, £4.50)

AN HISTORIC CONSECRATION TO THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE?

The English church press has not so far noticed an event which was several weeks running headlines in Australia (and presumably, as will appear below, in South Africa). It concerns the appointment of a new bishop for the Church of England in South Africa. Readers who do not know of this body will not, we fear, get much more information here, and some prior knowledge is anticipated in the account below.

The Synod of CESA has chosen a Sydney clergyman, one Dudley Foord, to be its next bishop. The existing chief bishop, Stephen Bradley (a Sydney clergyman in origin himself), asked the Archbishop of Sydney, Donald Robinson to consecrate him. Donald Robinson said he would—provided that the Archbishop of Capetown, that is, the metropolitan of the Church of the *Province* of South Africa, would consent to his doing so. Archbishop Philip Russell not only consented—he is flying to Sydney to be a co-consecrator of the new bishop.

So here is a consecration of a bishop to a grouping which has been treated by Archbishops of Canterbury and the ACC etc. as schismatic ever since it formed itself into a single institution (by the bonding together of various separate parishes which had never joined CPSA—in the latter part of the 1930s). CESA has opposed CPSA at every turn, and the mood between the two has been often bitter—not assisted in the last twenty years or so by the pro-apartheid stance which CESA has seemed to assume (largely through a 'don't let's get involved in politics—let's get on with preaching the gospel' approach). Now the CPSA archbishop is offering the hand of friendship—indeed the hand of consecration and the kiss of peace—to the new 'schismatic' bishop. There must be inherent in this a real move towards healing the division. And *that* raises the interesting question as to whether that is what CESA actually wants. Is it possible that their distinctive witness could be killed by kindness, whilst opposition or cold-shouldering will never diminish it? Others may be able to tell us more.

Meanwhile, it is an odd thought that an event in St. Andrew's cathedral in Sydney on 12 February could be shot through with such significance. Perhaps any of our readers who know South Africa would especially like to pray for the occasion, and for Dudley Foord.

What we do not know, at the time of going to press, is whether Stephen Bradley himself will take part alongside Philip Russell in the consecration. Arguably, if he is still in office, and the new bishop is his assistant or coadjutor, then oaths of canonical obedience ought to be made to him! Or what sort of oaths are being made? We hope to inform readers.

Book Review

Diocese of Birmingham *Supplement to the Alternative Service Book: Authorised for Use in the Diocese of Birmingham 1984* (obtainable from Church House, Harborne Park Road, Harborne, Birmingham B17 0BH, n.p.)

This diocesan service book, produced by the Bishop of Birmingham with the assistance of an active and able Diocesan Liturgical Committee, is a most interesting piece of work. It is duplicated on one side of the paper (A5 size) and contains 66 pages in a plastic sliding spine binder, so that further materials can be added (and existing ones changed) at will. And the Bishop seems to have gone to considerable lengths to get the appropriate legal cover for each item in the collection. The contents include parish texts (as, e.g., the 'Public Welcome of an Assistant Curate'), diocesan texts (as, e.g., for renewal of priestly vows on Maundy Thursday—though no institution service is included), rejected General Synod texts (including the 'Reconciliation of a Penitent'—concerning which see *NOL* for March last year), the text of the Liturgical Commission's document on Concelebration, and a form of Compline, pinched from neither Archdeacon of Leicester nor Grove Books (the two chief contenders in this market hitherto). It even includes a form for 'The Admission of Children to Holy Communion before Confirmation'—though this is safeguarded by an opening rubric which states '*This order may be used only in "experimental parishes" approved by the Bishop.*' Whilst *NOL* wholly approves of giving communion to children, it is hard to say what authority the bishop claims for *this* provision—it must be a feature of the catch-all '*Jus liturgicum*' which he mentions at the outset. The actual textual provision we hope to publish next month.

CORRIGENDUM TO A REVIEW

Michael Sansom writes:

'In my review of Geoffrey Cuming's *Godly Order* I seem to have said that "unfortunately" the chapter on Cosin was the most interesting! Why should it be "unfortunate"? Do we smell a protestant plot in the pages of *NOL*? Is there a covert value-judgment (*viz.* that the whole book is dreadfully dull, but the chapter on Cosin raises it to the level of merely tedious)? Is the implication that Cosin was of no significance at all?

'Abandon speculation: the sentence should have read "*Undoubtedly* the chapter on Cosin is the most interesting".'

[True—yet another misprint—Ed.]

D. Broughton Knox *The Lord's Supper from Wycliffe to Cranmer* (Paternoster, 1983, 76pp., £2.50).

Broughton Knox has been known for many years as the doughty protestant principal of Moore College, Sydney, but his protestantism has always been based on careful scholarship, notably his work on the doctrine of faith in the reign of Henry VIII. Now some of the fruits of his recent research into Wycliffe are made available for the sixth centenary of Wycliffe's death (31 December 1384—see ASB p.21!). From the standpoint of a reformed doctrine of the eucharist, Broughton Knox' work has two particularly interesting features—(i) it opens up to us some of the teaching of Wycliffe himself (which is known more by third-hand references in the history books than directly by most Anglicans), and (ii) it exhibits a true relationship between Wycliffe and the reformers. The fifteenth century remains somewhat blank (so there is no demonstrable *continuity*), not because there were no Lollards, but because their theological contributions on the doctrine of the eucharist are not extant. Broughton Knox has a fine chapter on the early reformers, and Frith in particular shows a dependence on Wycliffe.

For my taste the book is infuriatingly brief, having the character of an introduction rather than a survey or an analysis. There must be a commercial judgment behind this somewhere, that this is what the Christian public is more likely to want (for Knox has a thoroughness which would easily have afforded us more). And there is, as a closing titbit, an intriguing Knoxian note on page 19 that Wycliffe was 'nearer to the truth' than the reformers in relating the spiritual state of the priest to the efficacy of the sacrament. Whew!

C.O.B.

CHANGE OF GROVE BOOKS' STAFF

Anita Jones, who has been sales assistant since Autumn 1981 and did all the donkey work of getting the address-list and invoicing codes onto the St. John's computer, is leaving in February to become a policewoman. She is being succeeded by Julia Pounder, and those who have got to know Anita by name are encouraged to use the same familiarity to Julia. My grateful thanks and good wishes go with Anita.

C.O.B.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

This month's is a recollection of COB from the days when Series 3 was being devised. In Series 2 the Lord's Prayer finished without the doxology—as we wished to be ecumenical, and Rome did not use the doxology. But by the time we reached the revision of the text, there was evidence of Rome including the doxology (for ecumenical reasons—because the Eastern Orthodox use it!). So we solemnly put it back in. We then had a splendidly fundamentalist fulmination from Kenneth Ross:

'If we are going to put in the doxology we cannot say at the beginning "As our Saviour Christ has commanded and taught us, we are bold to say:" as it is quite evident he did *not* so command and teach us. What we ought then to say is "As holy church has commanded and taught us . . ."