

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 131

November 1985

Editorial

After all the delays the Knaresborough report, *Communion before Confirmation?*, was published on 15 November, and then debated in General Synod on 20 November—the day after the Queen opened the fourth quinquennium of the Synod. As an aside we should note that the preacher at the opening eucharist (who shall be nameless here) won a place in the record books for finding he had entered the pulpit at the Abbey and embarked on his sermon, when in fact a page or more of his script was missing, and he turned over mid-sentence only to encounter *non sequiturs* and confusion of thought and of face. Because the Knaresborough report was not released until such a late stage, this issue of *NOL* carries both a review by David Holeton (penned way back in August), and also this report on the debate.

Knaresborough was the main liturgical item on the agenda (we have a report on the debate on *The Worship of the Church* separately below). I was kindly asked by the Bishop of Knaresborough if I would attend, and sit amongst the members in charge for the Wednesday morning. I had to endure some good-natured challenges ('What are *you* doing here?'), but was glad to have a small supportive role. Bishop John Denis got it off to a fine start, reminding the Synod that changed practice was already sprouting at various places around—a natural consequence of the widespread move to a Parish Communion basis for parish life. He emphasized the theological point that the working party had stuck to water-baptism as complete sacramental initiation, though he thought that a lowering of the age of admitting children to communion was not absolutely dependent upon this theology of initiation.

Eighteen members spoke (and around fifty more had wished to). One or two muttered that confirmation was in different ways under threat, but no-one attempted to shake the scriptural foundations of the recommendations. There was a tendency for speakers to say 'My daughter was confirmed and thus made her first communion—and she has done fine', and somehow to try to handle the matter at that level. Donald Gray expounded the Boston statement, but no lobbying by COB had done any good—neither the Board of Education's covering report, nor the Standing Committee's report on the agenda contained even a passing mention of the existence of the Boston statement. (It had earlier been decided that it would cost too much to send it to members of Synod—though only a fraction of what it cost to send me, for one, across the Atlantic to help produce it . . .). The Boston Statement and its availability was mentioned from the chair before the debate began.

The debate was solely on the motion to 'take note', and this form of motion is designed to allow all to affirm the motion, even whilst differing

over the substance of the report. However, in the event, the Synod proved to want to describe its position by substantial voting at this point—and thus the motion to 'take note' was carried on a division by 263 votes to 106. It is perhaps fair to note that the opposition was not of a single frame of mind—but it is also true that opponents could well have voted *for* the 'take note' motion.

The House of Bishops has to decide what to do next, and bring forward proposals in February. They could decide to do nothing, or to bring forward a draft regulation for immediate adoption, or to refer the question to the dioceses. The Bishop of Knaresborough was fairly clear it would be a different document the Synod looked at next time.

Colin Buchanan

A WORSHIPFUL SYNOD

In its first bite at the liturgical cherry, the new Synod overwhelmingly endorsed the Standing Committee report, *The Worship of the Church* (GS 698), and gave provisional approval both to the suggestions for future strategy, and to extending the authorization of the ASB to 31 December 2000. An amendment to limit this extension to 1995 was heavily defeated—perhaps as much by the negative pressures of inbuilt memories about how much synodical time it takes to revise liturgy, as for the positive views neatly expressed by Peter Geldard, who claimed that, much to many people's surprise, the ASB had 'given unity and strength to the church'. Indeed there was only one speaker—and he one of Synod's four duly-elected Conservative MPs—who rose to express the fear that the Synod might do itself irreparable harm through the loss of the ASB. But, as the Archbishop of York said, in answering the debate: 'people will vote with their feet', which view the Synod endorsed with its hands.

But an equal surprise to many was the number, quality and content of the speeches, so that, despite the absence of at least one noted liturgical pundit, I doubt that such wide-ranging debate could have taken place at any time in the Synod's past. The focus was not so much on texts as on their use and purpose, and the points made, and all generally accepted by the Archbishop, were many and varied. So Synod found itself considering the urgent need to review the language of worship to make it more 'inclusive'—and Sr. Carol (CHN) produced much laughter as she invoked the thought of herself and her sisters solemnly pleading to 'live in love and charity with all men'. The need to take much more seriously the inter-relation of buildings and liturgy was underlined by the Provost of Portsmouth, commenting that the spirit of worship is often 'flatly contradicted' by the buildings, and urging liaison between the Liturgical Commission and the Council for the Care of Churches. Pleas were heard to push back the frontiers of permitted flexibility, especially for inner-city areas and non-book cultures—the proposed 'Directory' of alternatives and different usages was welcomed here. The Charismatic Movement and even 'House Churches' got sympathetic mention as sources of inspiration and encouragement. And both family services and a eucharistic prayer for use with children were put firmly on the agenda.

For a Synod which was only just finding its feet, it all augurs well. Let us hope the new Liturgical Commission will reflect the new breadth of sympathies apparently registered by the General Synod.

Peter Hobson

(Peter Hobson, the youngest clerical member of the new General Synod, is clearly unimpressed by past events . . .).

THE CHICHESTER TROUSERS SAGA . . .

NOL is reliably informed that long socks represent the Anglican compromise in ordination dress in Chichester diocese. This year's Petertide ordinands were advised that flapping trouser ends were inappropriate for a formal occasion and that those who intended to wear trousers should also wear long socks to tuck in the offending appendages. Our mole in Chichester reports that the bishop's chaplain did not actually inspect candidates (nor, presumably were bicycle clips or elastic bands or garters part of the vesting). But there were some candidates who had not intended wearing trousers anyway, on retreat or at ordination, and several knobbly knees were observed. It is also rumoured that a deaconess candidate was advised that she should always wear blue around the parish. How far does the Prime Minister's influence in matters ecclesiastical now extend . . .?

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 93, *Celebrating Lent, Holy Week, and Easter*, by Trevor Lloyd. Readers of *NOL* will recall from last month why this booklet is a month late. It is an exposition—theological, historical, and liturgical—of the new Church of England services, *Lent, Holy Week and Easter*. These services are themselves due to be published by CIO on 9 January (and orders can be taken for them). They will cost £12.95 for the large-print hardback edition, and £2.95 for the paperback 'pew' edition. The contents and pagination are the same in both editions. Trevor Lloyd's commentary is typical of Trevor; rich and diverse and highly stimulating. Orders for the texts themselves can be sent to us.

. . . and the Pastoral booklet

is Pastoral Series no. 24, *Beginning Pastoral Counselling*, by Ruth Fowke (who earlier contributed to no. 6, on celibacy). It is not advertised with this title in the catalogue, but on examination this is what the title there means. Ruth Fowke sets out simple, but not always self-evident, guidelines for Christians beginning, however informally, on pastoral counselling.

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 44, *Nurturing Children in Communion*, edited by Colin Buchanan. This Liturgical Study is an edited and updated version of the papers produced for the Boston Consultation at the end of July 1985. They give a picture round the world of the state of the question about children in communion, and also some theological penetration of associated questions concerning initiation. This Study will be 48 pages in length, which is unprecedented, except in the case of no. 33.

. . . and subscriptions

for 1986 are due, and you should have received a renewal notice with the October issue of *NOL*. Please send in your remittance quickly. Please also consider giving a subscription to a friend (yes, even your vicar) for Christmas.

. . . and the Appeal of the Company

should also be in this mailing. We printed vast quantities of the Appeal literature in the Spring, and reckoned all along to have a second circulation of it (and gave notice of this last month). In the event, the Company's initial finances have come out halfway up the initial bracket—the Appeal pitches the aim between £15,000 and £30,000; and the cash to hand at the moment is around £22,500, of which less than 20% is in loans and the rest is straight gifts and covenants. Furthermore, the figure is strictly that of 'cash in hand', and takes no account of standing orders and of tax reclaims, which over the next three years may provide substantial further sums. We have to come clean—the Board of Directors is thrilled and grateful for the provision of money so quickly and without fuss. It *could* be argued that to send the Appeal literature around again is unnecessary, but the Board would like to have wider support amongst the regular customers of Grove Books, and renews the Appeal for that reason. So far a handful more than 100 subscribers have 'associated', and it would be marvellous to double that. The first elections of Directors from the Associates will come around Easter. If you have responded before, or if you never intended to, then despatch the Appeal to the wpb. But if you meant to all along, but never did, now is your chance.

. . . and reprints

include Pastoral 9, *Good News Down the Street* (for the fifth time), and two eight-page jobs, *Thinking About Baptism* (12p or £5.50 for 50) and *Children and Communion* (30p). *Hymns with the New Lectionary* is scheduled next, but see below.

. . . and titles running out of print

include Ministry and Worship nos. 44, *Exorcism, Healing, and Deliverance*, 54 *Celebrating Christmas*, 69 *The Attractive Church*, Worship no. 77 *Intercessions in Worship*, and Spirituality no. 7 *Creative Prayer*. These and other titles longer out of print are under consideration for reprinting.

. . . and an elusive treasure is to hand

in John Wilkinson's *Egeria's Travels*, quoted by Trevor Lloyd in the Worship booklet mentioned above. This has been nearly unobtainable, but Avis and Phillips Ltd. (of Teddington House, Warminster, Wilts. BA12 8PQ) have copies of a cloth Israeli edition at £15. Apparently they have been in great demand as the sixteenth centenary of Egeria herself has been observed in Spain and Jerusalem!

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.55 by inland post for the year 1986 – £4.20 with *News of Hymnody* added)
Editorial address: 60 Handsworth Wood Road, Birmingham B20 2DT (021-554-5129)

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

WOMEN AND HEADSHIP (i)

At the time when the new General Synod has been elected, and speculation touches on the fate of the issue of the ordination of women to the presbyterate (on which this Synod will soon have to start voting), it is not straying too far from liturgical matters to report a couple of germane matters in England (and also Australia).

At the end of August there was formed an alliance for the Defence of the Apostolic Ministry—a combination of anglo-catholics and (a few) evangelicals. The publicity with which this was launched included the affirmation that John Stott was associated with its formation.

Later, in September, John Stott (who had been out of the country before) returned to tell the world, via an article in *Church Times*, that he had not lent his name to this grouping and its purposes—and he spelled out his own position. This is the one which evangelicals have adumbrated at intervals over the years—and Jim Packer included in his contribution to the early Grove Booklet, Ministry and Worship no. 17, *Evangelicals and the Ordination of Women*. The theological issue at stake is 'headship'. Thus ordination of itself is not, on this analysis, an impossibility for women. What is impossible is that they should hold ultimate responsibility—a governing headship. Thus women can be ordained assistant pastors, but not incumbents. The scripture texts which undergird this view are not difficult to come by—and Ephesians 5 is prominent among them.

The scriptural exegesis required must, I take it, demonstrate that the 'headship', of the New Testament passages which touch on the relationship between men and women, does

- imply ultimate 'governorship' of the man
- apply to the ministerial relationships in the church
- touch particularly on the existing Anglican parish structure so as to provide that the incumbent must be male, but ordained assistants may be of either sex.

I am personally unpersuaded that the passages do so bear on the issue. However, my contribution this minute is not to probe the exegetical questions, but rather to demonstrate, or perhaps seek to demonstrate, the impossibility of application of the principle once it is asserted. This is where I shall take this up next month!

C.O.B.

THE VISITING PREACHER REMARKS

'I wish I had realized, when I accepted to minister the cup, that the communicants would be kneeling a foot below the level of my feet, would keep their heads down on the rail, and would decline to take the cup itself from me . . .'

Reviews

Knaresborough Working-Party *Communion Before Confirmation?* (C.I.O., £3.50).

The Anglican Communion has come a long way since the Lambeth Conference of 1968 challenged the member Churches to examine their practice of baptism, confirmation and admission to the eucharist. In the light of what was generally accepted as normative Anglican practice—admission to communion only after confirmation—recent changes are little less than revolutionary. Admission to communion of the unconfirmed, at an early age, has become common practice in many parts of the Anglican world, including parts of the C. of E. Confirmation, once extracted from the 'initiation sequence', is taking on new significance as a pastoral rite, administered at a time in candidates' lives that might be better equated with Christian maturity than has been the case in the recent past. The Knaresborough Report is an important contribution to the evolution of the question and comes as a well defined challenge to the C. of E.

The Working Party has done its homework well, examining the question from almost every aspect imaginable (biblical, historical, canonical, anthropological, sociological, educational, psychological . . .), repeatedly making a convincing case for the admission of the baptized but unconfirmed to the eucharist. In so doing, however, the reader is continually reminded of the theological and pastoral difficulties posed by the present practice of confirmation. That baptism admits to the eucharistic fellowship is clear: what is to be done with confirmation is much less clear. Recent attempts by some churches to give confirmation a new theological meaning—'ordination of laity', 'commissioning for ministry' etc.—have been invariably at the cost of devaluing baptism itself. The experience of those provinces which have admitted young children to communion for a number of years seems to indicate that the confirmation question begins to resolve itself when basic principles (the relationship between baptism and eucharist) are set right first. Let us hope that General Synod will address itself to these basic principles rather than trying to resolve the confirmation question. For while I believe the Report is right in seeing confirmation in the future as being administered to older candidates, it would be unwise to make it a rite linked to achieving adult status or inscription on the Electoral Roll (Report 9.5.1.d.).

The Report takes the principle *lex orandi — lex credendi* with a seriousness uncommon in synodical reports. It is here we see how much the *lex orandi* has shifted with the new generation of liturgical books which have appeared throughout the Anglican world. As long as the *ASB* is used the question of admitting all the baptized to the eucharist will not disappear. The question is posed every time children are baptized in the context of a celebration of the eucharist in which they are welcomed by the congregation (**We welcome you into the Lord's family. We are members together of the body of Christ . . .** *ASB* §58 p.248), who a few minutes later proclaim the oneness of the body in the eucharist sharing (**Though we are many, we are one body, because we all share in one bread.** (*ASB* §43 p.142)) only to exclude the newly baptized (and other children present) from that same eucharistic sharing. This sort of liturgical schizophrenia can only undermine the catechetical value of the liturgical texts themselves and must be set right.

The conclusions and recommendations of the report ring true to the theological principles outlined in the document. At the same time they demonstrate a pastoral sensitivity which allows for a variety of ways in which parishes and dioceses might change. Communicant children would be guaranteed their communicant status should they move to parishes which would not normally communicate children. (This would avoid from the outset some of the pastoral disasters which arose in North America and which were resolved only after action by the American and Canadian houses of bishops.) Parishes themselves would have the freedom to determine their own course of change, their hands being neither forced nor tied by diocesan synods. To an outsider the inevitable pluralism might seem like a rather untidy settlement but it does have a very Anglican ring about it and is probably the only way the Church of England and overseas provinces can move ahead on the question. The provision for possible age limits is another part of the pluralism of a church in transition. Should dioceses or parishes choose to impose an age limit on communicants I trust they will do so very tentatively. They sit still with the question of *lex orandi* discussed above, a point that will quickly be learned when the younger sibling of a communicant asks his or her parents or priest why he or she cannot have communion too. The inability to produce a satisfactory explanation will quickly reduce any minimum age limit to at least the time when a child asks questions.

The Knaresborough Report is one with which its authors can be justifiably pleased. One can only encourage General Synod to take it with the seriousness it deserves and to act positively on its recommendations.

David R. Holton

Colin Buchanan (ed.) *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984* (S.P.C.K./Alcuin/Grove, £25).

First **MAL** 1 (1968), then **FAL** (1975), now **LAL** (1985). There is a certain appropriateness in the appearance of the third volume of the trilogy now: though the process of revision, once begun, is never completed even in one country, let alone all round the globe, yet several of the churches concerned have reached a sort of breathing space, often signalled by the issue of the new services in hard covers. Thus we have the *ASB* (1980), *Wales* (1984), *Ireland* (1984), *Canada* (1985), *America* (1979), *West Indies* (1980), *Australia* (1977); and others are promised for 1986. This is not the place to go into the differences between the various eucharists, though this would make an excellent subject for a MTh thesis, with all the material already collected in one book.

The presentation exactly matches that of **MAL** and **FAL**, though considerations of space have curtailed the editorial introductions which for many readers were even more interesting (and readable) than the liturgies themselves. However, *Grove Liturgical Study* 41 goes a long way to remedy this. I wish it had been possible to include one of the elegant illustrations of Australian flora which adorn the *Australian book*; sadly, no-one has followed this excellent precedent.

As I have said elsewhere (**HAL***, Epilogue), Anglican Liturgies tend nowadays to have as much in common with Roman Catholic, Methodist, or Lutheran liturgies as with each other. To get Anglican liturgies into proper perspective, we need someone to produce **NAL** (*Non-Anglican Liturgies*).

Taken together, the three volumes constitute an invaluable tool for future researchers. The nearest parallel I can think of is the five volumes of Andrieu's *Ordines Romani* (will this series too become a Pentateuch?), for range of coverage; Brightman's *The English Rite* for consummate skill in handling a mass of highly complicated material. The time and labour involved in collecting all the texts, recruiting and co-ordinating correspondents, reducing the services to a consistent form, identifying and recording minute variations, constructing comparative tables, and seeing the whole thing through the press would seem to demand the undivided attention of some secluded scholar with no other occupation. In fact, as we all know the editor has fitted it all into the spare moments of his work at St. John's (and a theological college is one of the worst *milieux* for scholarly activity), while also editing *Grove Books* (writing several of them himself) and *NOL*, carrying a very heavy workload for the Liturgical Commission, and goodness knows what else. The only word for his achievement is 'fantastic'.

Geoffrey Cuming

[I'm blushing—COB]

***HAL**? Geoffrey Cuming's own *A History of Anglican Liturgy*.

LATEST ANGLICAN LITURGIES 1976-1984: ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA

- In LIE:**
Page 179: (182 in second edition): paragraph 26 should read: 'And here . . . [as in 1662] . . . lively sacrifice. And although we be unworthy . . . [as in 1662] . . . our offences.'
- In MAL:**
Page 352: In line 1 add '(1662)' at end.
In FAL [additional to original Addendum sheet]:
Page xii: In line 12 for 'Luum' read 'Luwum'.
Page 267: In line 23 omit 'from'.
Page 268: In line 20 omit hyphen at end of line.
In line 23 for 'the witness' read 'their witness'.
Page 271: After line 9 add *apparatus* re **Eng 3**: 'God's' his'.
Page 285: Last two lines of text should be in bold type.
Page 288: In line 6, add a comma after 'thank you'.
Page 354: Two lines from the foot of the page there should be a '6' in the margin.
Page 396: After line 3, and after the *apparatus* already found to be in the Addendum sheet, add a third line of *apparatus*:
and for ever] and will be for ever
- In LAL:**
Page viii: In line 22 for '**Wind**' read '**Wind**'.
In line 23 for '**Wind**' read '**Wind**'.
Page ix: In footnote 2, line 6, for 'June' read 'September' and after 'Central Africa' add 'The Indian Ocean'.
Page x: In 'Acknowledgements' for 'Odukayo' read 'Odukoya'.
Page 205: In the last line it should be noted that there is a eucharistic liturgy from the Province of the Indian Ocean, but it was not to hand when the book went to press.
Page 238: In footnote 1, line 1, after 'no' delete the full point.