

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 135

March 1986

## Editorial

The Church press in England in March has had a small stir through the letter from Cardinal Willebrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, to the co-chairmen of the current Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission. The Cardinal apparently suggested that adherence by both communions to the ARCIC 1 statements on the eucharist and on ministry and ordination would mean that *Apostolicae Curae* (the famous condemnation of Anglican orders by Leo XIII in 1896) would be not so much evaded as fulfilled—only now we would find that for the future the Anglican Communion *did* meet the doctrinal requisites of Leo XIII and thus its orders might be valid. The 'fulfilment' would come through the Anglicans having shifted their doctrinal intentions.

Now, reasonably close examination shows that this letter is not making promises, but is suggesting possible areas for exploration. The co-chairmen apparently described Willebrands' letter as 'helpful', which clearly shows (in a world of ecumenical politeness) that they did not perceive anything like promises in it. On the assumption that the question is before ARCIC II in any case, it is probably to that body that we ought to look for more purposeful theological initiatives. So *NOL* cheerfully enters the fray in order to give help to them all.

Firstly, we must be clear that Anglicans are not, or should not be, seeking grounds to reassure themselves about their own orders. We do see episcopal succession as bound up with the continuity of the church, and we both profess and defend our continuity with the church of Augustine of Canterbury (or of Cuthbert and Aidan), and thus with the church of all time. Any oddities of the Reformation period were no different in kind from oddities of other periods—and there is plenty of illustration of ordinations being recognized which had been conferred whilst the body giving them had been excommunicated by another part of the church. Some of us would go further and say that, whatever value a bishop has in relation to the unity of the church, once the church is visibly divided then each part has to make provision for ordinations whether or not it possesses the 'historic episcopate'—and questions of 'validity' (which are not merely scholastic) should not be resolved simply by reference to the dynasty of orders. The Church of England functioned as a part only of the Catholic church, but that is sufficient as we see it—and we were episcopally continuous into that bargain!

Secondly, we might just be interested in helping Roman Catholics to recognize our orders on their terms, but we must be very wary lest we be heard to be adopting those terms ourselves.

Thirdly, we dare not suspend the validity of our ordinals upon the doctrine of our eucharistic rites. How would there ever have been valid ordinations

in the first two centuries after the apostles on this premise? And—curiously—the reports of the Cardinal's letter suggest that he was more interested in formal statements on the eucharist than he was in our eucharistic rites (it has been an old complaint of *NOL* that ARCIC did not seem to be interested in eucharistic rites whilst pronouncing on the eucharist). But Leo XIII's torpedo homed in precisely upon the eucharistic rites of 1552 and 1662.

Fourthly, we note that the defect of intention in the 1552 and 1662 ordinals was established by Leo XIII not only by reference to the eucharistic rites, but also by reference to the striking out of the power to offer sacrifice from what was being said to or about the ordinands in the ordinal itself. I very much doubt whether, from a Roman Catholic point of view, the ASB ordinal has corrected this—and the majority of Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion still follow a 1662-style ordinal.

Fifthly, we have to observe that the Anglican Archbishops, in their *Answer* of 1897, did veer a little too far to meeting the Pope on his own ground. It might be argued that they were functioning *ad hominem*, but they do look as though they are accepting his criteria when they say (para XI) 'we set the sacrifice of the cross before the Father'. This passage is complex, and it has to be set alongside some very robust answering by the Archbishops (including an emphasis on the opaqueness and distortion of the Roman rites from which the Pope speaks). But the Archbishops would have done better to decline to subject the Anglican eucharistic rites to this kind of accusatory investigation, rather than to try to exculpate them with the above kind of apologia.

Sixthly, we do not know how the Cardinal envisages Anglican orders passing from invalidity to validity if Leo XIII is salvaged in such a way that we failed the test then, but might (with a fair wind and some kind examiners) pass it now. What invalid bishop is to pass valid orders to some ordinand? Or do we already have enough Old Catholic juice in our body ecclesiastical for the potential for recognition as valid to be there in some way? In other words, if we are solely looking to the future, when and how shall I discover my own orders' validity in Rome's eyes.

I am not mischievous, but both curious and slightly guarded. We look forward to the next step. Perhaps there could be some biblical basis to the argument?

Colin Buchanan

## THE NEW LITURGICAL COMMISSION

The names of the new Liturgical Commission were announced during March—somewhat paradoxically after the Commission's first meeting on 11 March. They are: the Bishop of Winchester (Colin James) (Chairman), the Bishop of Chester (Michael Baughen), the Provost of Portsmouth (David Stancliffe), the Archdeacon of Leicester (David Silk), the Revs. Trevor Lloyd, Michael Perham, Geoffrey Rowell, Bryan Spinks, Kenneth Stevenson, John Sweet, Michael Vasey, Dss. Jane Sinclair, Mr. A. G. B. Scott, and Miss O. G. Wade.

COB is not on this Commission—it is appointed by the two Archbishops after some form of consultation with the Standing Committee, and a new rule limiting membership to fifteen years successive service has mown

down both Donald Gray and me. *NOL* will continue, unless it gets impossibly out of touch (and readers must tell us). And COB finds himself, to his surprise (and no doubt others') on the Doctrinal Commission.

## WOMEN BISHOPS?

There had been enough coming and going between the odd group of Anglicans opposed to there being women bishops (apparently half of the group that met were from the breakaway North American splinter groups, so *their* concerns about Anglicanism were distinctly *ab extra*), the Anglican primates' consideration, and the expectations that an assistant bishop who was a woman might soon be elected in the USA (one good friend of mine has six times declined to have her name in the list for election, not because she has doctrinal or political reservations, but because — good gospel woman that she is — she reckons she can do more for the renewal of the church where she is in New York city), that *The Times* has a first leader on the subject on 22 March 1986, advising the Church of England it will have to lump it, and adumbrating difficulties about the Lambeth Conference if there is to be a woman bishop at it, as it would cause . . .

## COB'S LITURGICAL SCRAPBOOK

**February:** (21) We walk over the ground in the cathedral to get the 'Blessing of the Oils' right—the point being to place three goodly flasks in symmetry on tall stands to see how the deacons will guard each one, and the diocesan bishop move to pray over each one—and they will then go to the vestry for filling each parish's flasks afterwards; we have worked on the vows for renewing commitment to ministerial service, and the provost will interrogate the two bishops, the diocesan the presbyters, and I the deacons, deaconesses, lay ministers etc.; we have joyful hymns, and hope everyone comes. (22) radio interview opposite a humanist about whether the church should have a monopoly of ceremonial (as opposed to bare) wedding rituals—I fail to oppose him, and get cut out of the *Sunday* broadcast as a result. (23) Confirmations morning and evening, with a diocesan competition for 'A Song for Canterbury' in between—preparing for our diocesan pilgrimage to Cantuar in June.

**March:** (2) Confirmation with anointing of both baptismal and confirmation candidates in morning—and preaching at Magdalene College, Cambridge in strict 1662 evensong surrounds (with anthem). (7) Central TV want a 'spot' on footwashing for a broadcast on Maundy Thursday, so I do a commentary first, then wash the feet of four Christians at St. Martin-in-the-Bullring (including the feet of two afro-caribbeans and also those of Dick Rodgers who is living in St. Martin's throughout Lent under prison conditions to draw attention to the plight of Irina Ratushinskaya—and this I do find humbling to me). That evening there is a parish confirmation brought forward from the Sunday, as there are two shifts (both eucharistic) on Sunday morning, and insufficient time to confirm 38 candidates and get clear for the second shift—on the Friday evening I find there are three men in their late forties among the candidates, each being there through losing a son or daughter by death in the last six months—I am to go back on Sunday morning to preside and preach (9), and I do and go to a family service at a District Church in the same parish at 11.15 (fortunately I am not having to address the six-year-olds); on

Sunday evening it is baptisms and confirmations again—including a man in his mid-twenties converted through his wife dying. (12) Eucharist at a Church Middle School and my first chance to celebrate the Transfiguration, last Sunday's theme—in the evening a confirmation with an 81-year-old in a wheelchair joyful (and near tears) to be confessing the faith. (16) Confirmation in the morning at Rubery, where liturgy is enriched during Gospel procession, as a two-year-old boy walks up the aisle towards me carrying in his hands (but upside down) John Hick's *Evil and the God of Love* — he must have purloined it from a parish library at the back of church, but it adds a weight and seriousness to proceedings . . . in the afternoon it is my first public school confirmation — no mutual greetings at the Peace, but genuine Christianity — one boy had lost a brother through death recently . . . in the evening I begin a 24-hour parish Visitation which is enlivened not so much by liturgy itself as by a six-year-old's answer in a school assembly to which I have asked the question 'what happens in church' — back it comes 'please sir, babies can be born there' (perhaps Nicodemus should have got involved in this discussion).

## This month's booklet . . .

is Liturgical Study no. 45, *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques*, by John Fenwick. John Fenwick lectures in liturgy at Trinity College, Bristol, and previously wrote Worship booklets on *The Eastern Orthodox Liturgy* (no. 56, now out of print), and *Eucharistic Celebration* (no. 82 — which had much impact from its cover cartoon, but is notably good work in its contents also!). Here the solid research of a doctoral thesis is laid heavily under contribution, with special relation to the roigins of the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. James.

## . . . and next month's

is Worship no. 95, *Worship in the Inner City*, by John Bentham (incorrectly stated to be John Fenwick in the catalogue). John Bentham is a curate in inner Leeds, who here follows up research work done in College days with the testing of parochial experience — and the 'ACUPA' report is in view throughout. Its section on worship, reprinted in *NOL* in December is set out again in an appendix. (The Ethics booklet in April, and the Pastoral booklet in May, both work with the same report also.)

## NON-LITURGICAL FOOTNOTE

Did anyone see that a Faculty was sought in the London diocese on behalf of St. Stephen's Walbrook to introduce a Henry Moore sculpture into the church building as a holy Table. Apparently it was honey-coloured marble, weighed ten tons, and was cylindrical (give or take a curse or two) in form. The Chancellor decreed it was *not* a holy Table within the meaning of the act, not least because it was not movable. Fancy a 'no' to anything in London diocese.

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)

## Correspondence

My Dear Colin

... I write because I am moved to comment on an entry for February 12: 'Ash Wednesday' — and ashing in my diocesan's chapel — is it just hardness of heart, or is this in fact the least "effective" ceremony of the new provision, as it does seem to be to me?

No, it is *not* just hardness of heart. Of all the various ceremonies of the Church's year in the historic rites, this is the one with which I have felt least comfortable ever since, I suppose about twenty-five years ago, I first began really to think about it. The problem is seen at its sharpest, it seems to me, in the revised Roman rite, where the blessing and imposing of ashes is placed directly after the Gospel (and homily). The Gospel is Matthew 6.1-6 and 16-18: 'But when you fast, put oil on your head and wash your face, so that no one will know you are fasting ...' And immediately afterwards, one proceeds to do exactly what the Gospel clearly, even if implicitly, tells one *not* to do. That, surely, is no basis for an 'effective' ceremony! And the old custom of retaining the mark of the ashing throughout the day is *directly* contrary to what the Gospel says — although I suppose that in these days it can be an act of witness in a way in which it wasn't in the middle ages.

But I don't know what the alternative is; and *some* ceremony to mark the beginning of Lent seems to be psychologically desirable.

Yours ever,

Bill Jardine Grisbrooke

## Review

George Appleton (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Prayer* (Oxford University Press, 1985).

George Appleton needs no introduction to any connoisseur of devotional books. Here, inside just under 400 pages, is contained a massive collection of prayers of various shapes and sizes, which embrace not just the many parts of the Christian tradition, but also prayers from the world's religions, including Buddhist, Chinese, and, of course, Jewish.

As the user graduates from perusal to dependence, three issues are raised: how to find your way about the book, what were the principles of selection, and how is the material presented. There is little problem with the first, because Appleton adopts a helpful scheme that is aimed at meditating on the Scriptures and the Trinity, so that (for example) Easter and Pentecost prayers come in sections under the Son and the Holy Spirit. Meditation is the key-word, for before we go into specific prayers for occasions and seasons, there is a whole section of prayers on different themes, e.g. a poem by John Donne appears under 'penitence' (p.110).

On selection, it is hard to fault Appleton, because he has taken such trouble to include a wide selection of material. Even for the theologians squeamish, the prayers from other religions can (mostly) be Christianized simply by the context of use. On the other hand, one can take issue with the particular eucharistic prayers which have been chosen for printing in

full; why Byzantine Basil (pp.227ff) and the Roman Fourth Eucharistic Prayer (pp.235), when Alexander Basil and the USA 'Common' Eucharistic Prayer (American Prayer Book, pp.372ff) might have identified better with modern scholarship and pastoral use.

It is in presentation that the reader may have some reservations. The Editor's Introduction contains the ominous words, 'new forms and prayers have not finally proved themselves' (p.ix), which may partially explain a penchant for providing prayers in traditional English, whether Anglican, Byzantine, or other. However, the repeated use of English Missal-type translations of Roman prayers, with the citation 'Western Rite', is perhaps a mannerism that should have been avoided, since one may well ask what the 'Western Rite' is in post-Vatican II Europe, and after a century of liturgical study that now knows far better questions of origins, development, and interdependence of various liturgical families. The more the ecumenical movement progresses, the more accurate it becomes to describe traditions in cultural rather than theological terms, so I would equally challenge the description 'Eastern Orthodox' (*pace* Kallistos Ware).

These few points, however, do not prevent the reviewer from enjoying the book, not least because the *melange* is judicious and sweeping. Indeed, it is nice to have George Appleton's own modern English compositions lying side by side with prayers from the Bible and from antiquity.

Kenneth Stevenson

Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission *For the Sake of the Kingdom: God's Church and the New Creation* (Church House Publishing for Anglican Consultative Council, March 1986) 650p. £2.95.

This book is perhaps of greater significance for unveiling to the world the nature (and indeed existence) of the team with this title than for anything it says about liturgy, worship or sacraments. The report paints on a broad canvas, about the church (and not just the Anglican Communion) in the world, and about the limits of comprehensiveness — and the role of 'Liberation'. Its style and approach leave a distinct impression they *could* turn to liturgy and sacraments (which are, after all, much beloved themes of Anglicans). The C/E members are Drs. Helen Oppenheimer and Rowan Williams.

Peter Moore (Ed.) *The Synod of Westminster: Do we need it?* (SPCK, 1986) 145pp., £4.95.

This is a terrible book. Peter Moore has thrown together a bunch of disparate authors who all want to have a crack at the General Synod for its self-evident defects. But what are their alternatives? I think Peter Moore wants 'the bishops' to run the Church of England. Hugh Craig wants 'the laity' to run it, with perhaps a small walk-on part left for the clergy. Enoch Powell does not doubt but that the only understandable and non-sectarian role that a national church can have is one that derives from the government running it. Alister McGrath believes the Synod has ill-gotten and ill-exercised power in relation to changing the doctrine of the Church of England, but his sole illustration of this is both highly exceptional as a synodical procedure, and actually inadequate to make this point even if it were both typical and fairly represented. It is a moot point

as to whether the book rises to the level where it deserves refutation — on balance it would be helpful if it did receive its come-uppance, as it is mischievous and rancorous.

None of this sounds liturgical either — it is simply a pleasure to get the irritation at the book out of one's system. Liturgy does appear — mostly as the opportunity for another knock. Hugh Craig (who was on the Liturgical Commission from 1976 to 1981) says that the Synod produced 'a book of services which, on account of its complexity, has been called "the most clericalized in the history of the Anglican Church"'. Alister McGrath says that, in relation to producing norms for worship, 'the General Synod is not competent *de facto*, and should not be permitted *de iure*, to deal with such complex doctrinal matters'. One wonders who should, and how authority would pass to him/her/them ...

## LENT HOLY WEEK EASTER

Without promising to publish everything we receive, we do want these columns to have some mature response to the new services. We would particularly like to hear from those who have been doing new things in Holy Week and Easter because the new services nudged them into doing so.

## ASB EUCHARISTIC LESSONS INDEX

Charles Fowler, reader in the Birmingham diocese, writes in with the following corrections to the Index. These should be incorporated in the pages you have inserted in the back of your ASBs for the best results. Future errors notified us will also be published. *NOL* emphasizes that no-one is doing other than attempt to print what John Hayden has supplied — there is no check going on, other than proof-reading (which itself often fails in *NOL*), as to whether the information is both accurate and exhaustive. Nor are corrections supplied, such as those below, being checked. Let the reader grab our Index and his ASB and check for himself. We will even print corrections to the corrections ...

Genesis	1.26-28, 31A	302 and 923 (new entry)
	12. 1-4	786 (not '876')
Numbers	3. 5-9	wrongly printed as '5.1-9'
1 Kings	19. 9-18	418 (not '408')
Proverbs	2. 1-9	958 (not '957')
	8. 1-11	871 (new entry)
Isaiah	25. 6-9	608 and 835 (separated from next entry)
	25. 8-9	331 and 937 (separated from last entry)
Jeremiah	29. 1, 4-11	wrongly printed without '1'
	31.31-34	524 (not '526')
	33. 6-9A	905 (new entry)

## ASB EUCHARISTIC LESSONS INDEX

January *NOL* (Genesis to Kings)

continued from February *NOL* (1 Chronicles to Lamentations)

Reference	Page	Reference	Page
Ezekiel		Malachi	
3. 4-11	781	2. 5-7	352 & 873
12.21-end	740	3. 1-5	434 & 757
34. 7-16	610		
34.11-16	857	Matthew	
36.25A, 26-28	268	1.18-end	762
36.24-28	674 & 919	1.18-23	440
37. 1-14	596 & 676	2. 1-12	462
		2. 1-12, 19-23	458
Daniel		2.13-18	823
3.13-26	734	3.13-end	464
6.10-23	731	4. 1-11	505
7. 9-14	627 & 630	4.12-20	816
		5. 1-12	487 & 813
Hosea		5.13-16	698
2.19, 20	965	5.13-19	854
6. 1-3	930	5.17-26	723
6. 1-6	622	5.43-end	914
11. 1-9	668	6. 1-15	886
14. 1-7	495	6.16-21	502
		6.24-34	969
Joel		6.24-end	899 & 730
2.12-17	500	7.13-27	737
		7.21, 24-37	927 & 303
Amos		8. 5-17	931
5. 6-15	500	9. 9-13	801
5.21-24	970	9.35-end	869
8. 4-7	971	10.16-22	702 & 847
		11. 2-15	435
Obadiah		11.25-30	864
		12.22-32	511
Jonah		12.38-42	482
3. 1-5	867	13.15-end	762
		13.18-30	900
Micah		13.24-30	485
4. 1-5	696 & 913	13.52-end	854
5. 2-4	445 & 797	14. 1-12	712 & 848
6. 1-8	666	16.13-20	782 & 784
7. 7-end	585	16.13-end	516
		16.24-36	848
Nahum		16.24-27	271
		17. 1-13	520
Habakkuk		18. 1-6, 10	803
2. 1-4	739	18.21-end	670
		19.16-21	876
Zephaniah		19.16-26	660
3.14-end	490 & 787	19.23-end	865
		19.27-end	756
Haggai		20. 1-16	692
		21. 1-13	532
Zechariah			
2.10-end	439 & 831		
4.1-6A, 10B-14	783		
8.20-end	815		
9. 9-12	531		

## FURTHER TO HENRY MOULE

Yes, plenty of help has come in, and clearly the author's chief point of reference was Kilvert. So there was contemporaneous witness. Other delectables from parish histories would be welcome.