

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan Issue no. 178 October 1989

Editorial

Baptism is in the news this month, and it is news because of pulls in two different directions.

One pull has been within the Movement for the Reform of Infant Baptism (MORIB), of which I am president. At the end of September, it became known that Alan Wright, the founder and chairman of the Movement, and vicar of All Saints, Taunton, had been 'baptized' by submersion during the Summer.

This kind of event had seemed in prospect for some time. It was the early public statements by leaders of the Movement which originally made me nervous of it; and a year ago, when the Committee asked me to take the role of 'president' I again pointed out how serious it would be if any of the committee members were to speak out as though wishing to *abolish* infant baptism, and I had to dissociate myself from them. In other words, I found (and find) the declared 'Aims' of MORIB wholly satisfactory, but the stance of some individuals far from it. The Committee looked at my response, thought it through with prayer, and renewed the invitation to me. Having issued my warning, I was then happy to accept.

The action by the chairman this Summer exactly fulfilled my fears! I received no advance information and simply had to respond after it had happened. And in the event, through the graciousness of Alan Wright, it was resolved in such a way as to clarify the position of MORIB. Alan Wright placed his resignation as chairman in the Committee's hands, and the Committee reluctantly, but with a clear and unanimous mind, accepted it. Paul Kirby, the vicar of Bidston in the Wirral, was appointed to succeed him. And the Committee viewed its action (and issued a press release to this effect) as sustaining its commitment to the stated Aims of *reforming* the administration of infant baptism, and as avoiding being distracted into a flirtation with abolitionism. And the Autumn programme of public meetings in different regions of the country goes ahead. Indeed the Movement should now be seen much more clearly to be what its Aims imply – a voluntary pressure group within the Church of England working for a more gospel-related administration of infant baptism for the sake of the church's mission within the country – as well as for the sake of Christian unity.

Alan Wright has a separate kind of question to ask himself, as others are asking him: namely, what does your submersion this Summer imply concerning the baptism you received as an infant, on the basis of which you were both confirmed and ordained? Alan has made both private and public statements in answer to this, in which he uses the term 'supplemental baptism'. There *may* be the possibility of a broadly acceptable formula lurking behind this, and I honestly hope that there is (readers will know of my own willingness to go near to the brink or even over it with renewal of baptismal vows in water). But the explanation seems to be coming after the event, which still does not tell us the rationale upon which he planned the event – nor do I myself know at the moment how the liturgy of the event would or would not have been open to some such

interpretation. So we suspend analysis. But the MORIB Committee honours Alan for his founding role, and wishes to stand close to him personally and to offer support.

If Alan has pulled against infant baptism, then the other 'pull' is towards an indiscriminate baptism. Mark Dalby, who thirty years ago wrote a good book, *Open Communion in the Church of England*, and is now a member of the Liturgical Commission and the author of an odd chapter on baptism in the Alcuin Club symposium, *Liturgy 2000*, has produced a book in favour of (nearly) indiscriminate infant baptism, – *Open Baptism* (SPCK, 105pp., £4.95). This book has already been the subject of a ding-dong between its author and me in the *Church of England Newspaper*, and I do not wish to reprint that material here. In any case Mark Dalby does me the honour of a chapter in his book all more or less to myself – viz chapter 8, 'Where Grove Goes Wrong' (*sic*)! For these purposes it seems that Gordon Kuhrt and his *Believing in Baptism* are also 'Grove', for his book falls under the same condemnation. But I think we may want to reply, and offer 'How Grove Gets it Right' to him for a second edition.

Mark Dalby says that my writings suffer from two weaknesses: firstly, in playing down the role of godparents; and secondly, in drawing an 'over-confident distinction . . . between believer and unbeliever' (p.88). To these points I briefly reply again that godparents have no basis in the New Testament at all, and parents are the true (and only credible) guarantors for a Christian upbringing (and there is no mileage in 'the faith of the church' as a basis either). I also reply that the distinction between believer and non-believer *needs* to be clear in theory (and needs to be for all kinds of business which is not baptismal). But Mark Dalby would be reading an erroneous message into 'Grove' if he were to think that such a distinction implies a hard-and-fast actual judgmental separation of parochial sheep and goats, as though an incumbent could tell them apart at sight. That *would* be 'over-confident' – but it is nowhere recommended in the *Grove corpus*.

But the real Achilles' heel of the 'open' position is that it cannot engage with the Baptist. This book simply has to shrug off the anti-pedobaptist and acknowledge there is nothing here to help him or her. Quite the reverse indeed – as the Lima Statement pointed out seven years ago, an apparently indiscriminate policy causes a flight from infant baptism among good Christians and both creates Baptists and sustains them in their conviction. Adult Anglicans who wish they had not been baptized as infants may be brought to value infant baptism if it is clear that the Church of England is genuinely trying to reform its practice. But the scandal of *indiscriminate baptism, especially as backed by the odd arguments of Mark Dalby*, will not only do little good for those who receive the sacrament – it will also alienate those who struggle to make sense of their own baptism or their church's practice.

What the Church of England most needs in this area '(and what Grove' modestly supplies) is a rationale which can be addressed *simultaneously* to both Alan Wright and Mark Dalby. Otherwise the two will inevitably be polarizing from each other, and that is happening before our eyes. I would not dream of offering a *via media* simply on the grounds that it provides a compromise – compromise in itself has no merit at all. But a disciplined, yes a scriptural, advocacy of infant baptism appears to me to offer not only truth, but also the point of meeting.

Much work remains to be done, and there is much personal agony still to come in many places. Our prayers should be sympathetically engaged.
Colin Buchanan

Footnote: Because MORIB *has* now clarified its stance, I venture gently to suggest to readers that they might well join the Movement.

Applications to the Rev. Clifford Owen, Clifton-on-Teme Rectory, Worcester-shire.

THE YORK INTERNATIONAL ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

We print this month the second document of the four sets of 'findings' of the York Consultation, in sequence to the major Statement on Inculturation last month. There are two other findings to accompany these first two: one on copyright for liturgical texts, and one on a fixed Easter. Grove Books has been asked to put the four documents together and publish them as *Findings of the Third International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, York, 1989*. We intend to do this as an 'extra', and it will cost £1. However, to readers of *NOL* it will be sent with the November issue with only 50p (US\$) added to your costs. If you have *NOL* with Booklets and pay in arrears this will happen automatically (unless you notify us that you do not wish to have it). If you pay a year's subscription in advance you will be receiving with this issue an invoice for 1990 issues, and this will give you the option of sending the extra 50p now and receiving the *Findings* with next month's despatch.

ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATIONS

GUIDELINES:

Adopted at York, August 1989

PREAMBLE

1. We welcome the recognition given to the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations (ALCs), particularly in Resolution 4 of the Standing Committee of ACC 1988 and in the presence of Bishop Colin James of Winchester as the Consultation's link with the Primates Meeting and the ACC.
2. In view of the limited financial resources available for consultation on liturgical matters within the Anglican Communion and of the importance of establishing more effective means of communion within our Communion, we are grateful for the generosity of the Primate of the Church of Canada in making his Church's Liturgical Officer available to ACC, on a part-time basis, as a co-ordinator of communications about the liturgical concerns of the Provinces and regions of the Anglican Communion. ACC may wish to involve the ALC Steering Committee in the development of his job description.
3. We welcome the increasing awareness of the importance of consultation on liturgical matters within the Anglican Communion. We note with appreciation ACC-7's recognition at Singapore of the second Anglican Liturgical Consultation and believe that regular Anglican Liturgical Consultations should be recognized as the significant place where liturgical issues affecting the whole Communion are addressed. Between these Consultations oversight of such issues will rest with the ALC Steering Committee.

PRINCIPLES

1. The primary task of the Consultations is to foster mutuality, scholarship and understanding, to respond when particular issues arise and to assist clear communication, but not to impose any programme on the Anglican Communion.
2. Lambeth 1988 resolved that, 'each Province should be free, subject to essential universal Anglican norms of worship, and to a valuing of traditional liturgical materials, to seek that expression of worship which is appropriate to its Christian people in their cultural context.' (Resolution 47).

It is part of the calling of Anglicanism to search for local expression in the worship of the historic Christian Church and to be committed to local ecumenism.

The Provinces and regional Churches of the Anglican Communion are self-governing. While Anglican Liturgical Consultations have no automatic authority within individual Provinces or their liturgical processes it is hoped that due weight will be given to their recommendations.

3. Links between ACC, the Primates' Meeting and the Anglican Liturgical Consultations are important and should be valued by all. This should promote healthy interaction between Provincial and regional leaders, those who have responsibility for liturgical processes within individual Churches, and liturgical expertise within the Communion.
 4. The world of liturgical scholarship is increasingly ecumenical. It finds an international expression in the biennial meetings of Societas Liturgica. Holding ALCs in association with meetings of Societas Liturgica has advantages in terms of wide contacts and of financial savings. There should be no assumption that people must attend both events unless the theme of the Societas Liturgica meeting is of direct relevance to the ALC.
 5. Consultations should be planned to promote:
 - (i) access to developments in liturgical scholarship and practice;
 - (ii) adequate representation of Provinces and regional Churches;
 - (iii) the contribution of those with expertise in particular areas;
 - (iv) mutual exchange, cross-fertilization and encouragement.
- There is a need to balance continuity with open access and to avoid the formation of a closed group.
6. Funding for Consultations may remain limited for some time. A major claim on funds available from central sources should be enabling the attendance of those nominated by Provinces and regions unable to afford to fund participants for themselves. In addition, as recommended by the ACC Standing Committee, we hope that funds may be found from Churches attending previous Consultations to assist attendance from other Provinces and regional Churches.

We also welcome the suggestion of ACC-7 that support and funding should be offered to Provinces and regions with few liturgically-trained specialists to help in pastoral and theological aspects of liturgy and in the training of liturgists.

PRACTICE

1. Biennial meetings in association with the meetings of Societas Liturgica should be the normal occasions for ALCs. This does not exclude the possibility of other meetings should occasions arise.
 2. Attendance should consist of:
 - (i) those whom Provinces and regional Churches choose to nominate and send;
 - (ii) Anglican members of Societas Liturgica;
 - (iii) others whom the Steering Committee may invite.
 3. The business of ALCs should be directed by the Steering Committee and should include (but not be limited to):
 - (i) items or themes determined by the Steering Committee;
 - (i) matters referred by ACC or the Primates' Meeting;
 - (ii) matters referred by particular Provinces and regional Churches.
- This Committee will elect from its own number a chairman and secretary within a period of three months of the conclusion of the Consultation.
5. Much of the business of the Steering Committee will necessarily have to be done without the expense of face to face meetings. The ACC appointed co-ordinator may be invited to participate in ways that are deemed useful by the Steering Committee.
 6. The procedure for electing the three members of the Steering Committee shall be:
 - (i) A nominating group of three people shall be elected at an ALC. Agreement to serve on this shall disqualify a person from being nominated to the Standing Committee.
 - (ii) The nominating group shall invite nominations for the Steering Committee and then present three names to the ALC for election. It shall take into account the diversity of regions and traditions of the Anglican Communion as well as practical considerations.
 - (iii) The ALC will have the right to make further nominations and will conduct a direct election.
 - (iv) At each election the person obtaining most votes shall be elected for four years and the others for two years.
 - (v) If a vacancy occurs the Steering Committee shall appoint a person to fill the office until the next ALC.
 7. The procedure of ALCs shall include the following:
 - (i) The Steering Committee shall write after each Consultation to notify each Province or regional Church of the date of the next Consultation.

- (ii) In preparation for Consultations the Steering Committee shall arrange for papers to be circulated in advance. It may also be helpful to arrange for the preparation of concise position papers on particular topics.
- (iii) Consultations shall normally proceed by consensus.

This month's booklet . . .

is *Worship Series* no. 110, *Worship in the Restorationist Churches*, by James Steven. In last month's trailer we included 'Praise Marches' also, but that section of the booklet appeared at draft stage to be slightly different in content, and threatening to the overall length, when added at the end of the main booklet. So we detached it and present it separately next month in *NOL*. The main booklet gives a thorough treatment of worship in this British post-charismatic development, and he has now not only many living examples but also a great crop of writings and of song and hymnody on which to draw. The result is a very satisfying treatment.

. . . and last month's

is a rare one to advertise – but that is how it is. Technical difficulties about the production of John Fenwick's Joint Liturgical study held it up. We are in the process of cracking the problem, and the Study *may* (but may not) be ready to go out with this mailing. We apologize – such delays are rare, and this one has an element of modern technology in the woodpile.

. . . and next month's

notable is the Evangelism Series no. 8, *Church Planting 2*, by Bob Hopkins.

. . . and renewing for 1990

comes up for those who take *NOL* on its own or with *NOH* by advance subscription. Prices for 1990 are:

NOL on its own **£4.35** (by air **£5.00, US\$11**)
NOL with *NOH* **£5.35** (by air **£6.50, US\$13.50**)

(Add **50p** for *Findings* of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation – see page 2 above).

You should receive an invoice with this, and you are encouraged to renew immediately.

. . . and prices of booklets in 1990

are in for a rise. The standard booklets go up on 1 January to £1.40 each. So buy your backnumbers now whilst prices are still low.

ISSN 0263-7170 **22p**
(Prices as set out a few lines above for 1990)
Editorial Address: Shipbourne Vicarage, Tonbridge, Kent TN11 9PE
(0732-810001 FAX 0732-810073)
GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS.
NG9 3DS (0602 430786)

Book Review

R. C. D. Jasper *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980* (SPCK, 384pp., 1989, £19.95).

Those of us who know Ronald Jasper knew that when he retired as Dean of York in 1984 he was planning some major writing on the liturgical revision and the ASB. The first outcome, jointly with Paul Bradshaw, *A Companion to the ASB* (SPCK, 1987). Now we have the *magnum opus* – for surely there is not a greater one to come – though I learn there *is* a third, which is on music?

The rumours were that Ronald Jasper was writing a history of the Liturgical Commission, of which he is one of the very few surviving original members. My own appetite was whetted when he wrote to me early in 1985 to ask for some of my recollections about the part of individual people in the compilation of the new rites. So I have been keeping an eye open since. And it is well worth the wait – it is a lovely book to have, and is bound soon to be at the elbow of all students of the rites.

Ronald's Introduction tells us that, like Topsy, it 'just grewed'. It actually grewed backward – that is, the quest for a beginning point prior to the forming of the Commission in 1955 proved to be difficult, and ended up (or perhaps 'began up') in 1662! The temptation to go back to Cranmer must have been pretty strong . . . as it is, the book has two halves – a history from 1662 to 1955, and a Jasper (select liturgical) autobiography from 1955 to 1980.

The history is by no means a standard duplication of the Cuming *A History of Anglican Liturgy*. Whilst Geoffrey had an amazing attention to detail but had a 'mainstream' story to tell, Ronald has his own professional interest in by-paths (originating in his own doctoral studies in nineteenth century revision attempts). So we find here a spotlight on the 1689 quest for 'comprehension', on Samuel Clarke, on the Nonjurors [does the participle 'juring' exist (p.33)? From what verb is it formed – it might be useful in Scrabble . . .], on the Scottish and American links, and on many others.

In the twentieth century the reader senses the pace quickening and, at least in respect of England, the story integrating. To this reader, for instance, it was a joy to find a discussion of the 1930s and '40s which included coverage of the Liturgical Movement, of 'opposing totalitarian philosophies of right and left', of *The Shape of the Liturgy*, of the Adleshaw and Etchells book on architecture, of Ernie Southcott, of the Royal School of Church Music, and even of *Towards the Conversion of England* (see pages 180-185). I also learned how little I knew about the production of *A Shorter Prayer Book* and the furore surrounding this 'well-meaning but insensitive act' (page 154). And in a chapter on 'The Wider View' there is an introduction to the rites of other denominations and of Anglicans overseas. The Church of South India gets pride of place in this.

Then comes the autobiography. For sixteen of the twenty-five years covered I was on the Commission, and I started at exactly the point where Ronald Jasper inherited the chairmanship from Donald Coggan, so I have my own autobiographical account which intertwines with much that is here. I began my time by dissenting (over a proposed eucharistic oblation), but although this caused some heartache on the Commission, it was on

the whole endured fairly cheerfully. Why? well, I slowly learned that no amount of being difficult that I could achieve could compare with the unmentionable enormities of Eric Milner-White who had dissented in 1958 from the first baptismal proposals, and had nobbled the Archbishops privately, and had then attacked the proposals (with considerable success) in the Convocation of York. Well, that dissenter's activities are now set out on record in chapter 9. Mine come in chapter 11, which is about Series 1 – and I found one or two tiny errors in this chapter, whereas a microscope would hardly bring one to light elsewhere. There is also an omission – my memory is that the Archbishops asked the Liturgical Commission to edit and 'own' the Series 1 services, and the Commission refused point-blank to do so, saying they thought it was their task to produce new rites, and regurgitating old ones might actually prejudice the debates on new ones. Ronald records how he and the Archbishop's chaplain then did the work (at great speed) on behalf of the House of Bishops, who were perforce the editors for public purposes.

Two chapters then pick a most careful (and beautifully exact) course through vast thick jungles of interlocking influences and competing materials – one on the lectionary and one on modern language. Then comes Series 3, the main preoccupation of the 1970s. There is a good sweeping view, though it is clear that Ronald Jasper lost interest in the Revision Committee process in General Synod and, because he is writing autobiographically, they get little attention – and what they do is relatively dismissive (as, e.g., on pages 318 and 352-4).

The production of the ASB brings a triumphant conclusion – for all there is a sniping by the critics going on. Overseas developments have been little in view in the second half of the book and 'Anglican' here must mean 'Church of England'. The astonishing fact now, at least to this reviewer, is how far off it all seems. It is in fact ten years this coming month from the final authorization of the rites – and from the presentation of the 'Petition'. But it now has both the fascination – and the sense of distancing – of events being viewed through the wrong end of a telescope. Ronald in his retirement must find that too. To-day we salute him.

C.O.B.

DIocese TO DIocese

Editors: Martin Dudley and John Corbyn

Doing Justice to the Liturgy

I am a member of the Oxford Diocesan Liturgical Committee, though it hasn't actually met whilst I've been a member, and I gather that most of the work is done by the secretary. However, there is evidence of substantial liturgical activity in the Diocese. There are ten half-day Workshops on Worship arranged by the Department of Parish Resources and the Diocesan Institute for those who are interested in developing informal all-age worship, both eucharistic and non-eucharistic. This follows on from some of the findings in the Bishop of Oxford's highly successful Visitation of the whole Diocese during this year. There was also, on Friday, 13 October, a Trainer's Workshop with the intriguing title *Doing Justice to the Liturgy*,

run by the Rev. Keith Lamdin (Head of the Parish Resources Department) and Oxford Archdeaconry Parish Development Adviser, Barbara Doubtfire, at Toc H's Cuddesdon House, former residence of the Bishops of Oxford.

The day promised to explore the relationship between our daily experience of life and our worship, asking why they sometimes seem unconnected and why at other times our worship takes hold of us and brings us face to face with God in an encounter which is affirming and transforming. It would involve, we were told in the introductory leaflet, acknowledging the reality of our experience, engaging with the eucharistic liturgy from ASB and the day's scriptures as set, and exploring whether it is possible to do justice both to the given-ness of our experience and the given-ness of the text.

There were 18 participants, with slightly more men (all priests, I think) than women, but all involved in parish or diocesan ministries. After coffee we had a session with our diaries looking over the last week, seeing not only what we had done but also what we had felt, an experience briefly shared in small groups. Then we were asked to draw round our feet and to colour the pictures or write on them or whatever so that they expressed the week's experience. When we had done this, we were asked to stand on them and consider what it felt like. (I should say that this is the point – standing on my feet – that my baby son's gastro-enteritis caught up with me and I had to rush to the gents!). After this we went, with our feet, to the chapel, there to consider the 'symbolism of the sacred space'. This was singularly unremarkable and contrived. On the Altar, two very large candles burned, a green chasuble was draped over the front, a chalice topped by a paten with a roll on it stood there, together with a bookstand and Rite A. We also had the readings, though we were given those for Friday of Week 29 rather than the correct Week 27. We were asked to share our feelings about it before returning to our meeting room, there to consider the difference between sacred and secular space!

After lunch the chalice, topped by paten and roll, were placed in the middle of our circle of chairs. And we were asked 'Is there anything you would like to say to the bread? A statement or a question. Or do you want to give the bread a voice, do you want to let it speak?' These were some of the observations that followed:

- 'Bread, you look like a stone. I would like to see you broken open'.
- 'I look to you with confidence that you will feed me'.
- 'The bread protests. I am not only the humdrum and the ordinary, but the special. *What have you to do with me?*'
- 'The bread says, I am so strong and powerful that I can be broken for you'.
- 'Does it hurt when you are broken?'
- 'How can I break you without making a mess of it?'

And then Barbara Doubtfire threw in a ten pound note and asked about the money paid for the bread and the symbolism of bread in a cash-economy and read one of Quoist's prayers of life. There was time again to share in small groups and by now I was tired of this childish, manipulative game and angry about what was being done not only to me but also to the liturgy.

The final scene for me came as we were asked to put our drawn feet in a position that expressed where we stood with regard to 'the sacred symbols'. They were put around the chalice, under the chalice and under the roll, by the door, and mine stayed in my folder. Mr. Lamdin wanted to know more of what these actions expressed as he was to preside over the Eucharist in a moment, and I finally spoke, though only to say that these were not 'sacred symbols'. Chalice and paten, even the bread and wine for the Eucharist, are not symbols but the vessels and material of the celebration. Such meaning as they have comes only from their reference to Christ and his saving action, and Christ had not yet been mentioned during the day. When Ms. Doubtfire, poised, literally, between the pain of gender issues and her desire to be close to the symbols, said that we must hold on to what was said 'by the voice over there' (because she hadn't bothered to find out what my name was), another question came to me: can we always celebrate the Eucharist? Are there not certain pre-conditions before we can have a eucharistic community able to celebrate? And unable to celebrate under Mr. Lamdin's presidency on that occasion or to share the Peace, and lacking the love and charity needful to receive Communion, I made a free and adult decision to withdraw.

The original idea was fine, innovative and to be welcomed. I am sorry to say that it was pursued with a lack of real understanding about the relation of experience and ritual expression, with no knowledge of the meaning of sign and symbol, with a very slight grasp of liturgy, and no willingness – it seemed to me – to encounter the true given-ness of eucharistic action and text. Readers of my contribution, 'The Ambience of Liturgy,' in Alcuin's *Towards Liturgy 2000* will know that these are things that I care passionately about. Liturgists should not put on group dynamics courses and dabblers in psychology and group dynamics should not be allowed to tamper with training in liturgy. Bring together specialists in various fields with recognizable ability and you might get some promising results, but it shouldn't be left to amateurs. Liturgists cannot be content with studying ancient texts and writing new ones whilst allowing others to deal with the psychological, anthropological and sociological aspects of liturgical celebration.

News Needed

John and I are always glad to hear from DLC's and others about diocesan liturgical activities. There is one area that we have been asked to look into and your experiences would be particularly welcome. It is the big diocese-wide Eucharist, the sort celebrated in a football stadium. Please let us know if you have been involved in one, who organised it and whether the DLC was involved.

Martin Dudley

The Rev. John Corbyn
 24 Milking Stile Lane
 Lancaster LA1 5QB
 0524-382362

The Rev. Martin Dudley
 The Vicarage, 107 Owlsmoor Road
 Owlsmoor, Camberley GU15 4SS
 0344-771286