

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 204

December 1991

We also have a series of diocesan Worship Papers, which go out in the name of the author concerned, but with the goodwill and authority of the committee. Topics that have been included in these are: How to start a parish worship committee, How to read intercessions, How to read lessons, The use of silence in worship, and the use of overhead projectors in worship.

The committee advises the Bishop on all diocesan acts of worship, whether at the Diocesan Synod, or clergy conferences, or such occasions as the Blessing of Oils in Holy Week.

We have also been given particular remits to look at drawing up special orders of service, e.g. a service of remembrance commemorating the departed, a new look to the Diocesan induction service (this is something I always escape from each diocese I have worked in!); and Christopher Cocksworth has produced a very interesting booklet suggesting certain new approaches to evening worship in the diocese. This draws on material such as *Patterns for Worship, Promise of His Glory*, and other such resource material. The Working Group on the Decade of Evangelism have been responsible for the circulation of this production.

In my own way, I try to keep the Worship Committee abreast of what is going on in the Liturgical Commission itself.

What is the future for this sort of committee? part of it is obviously to introduce new material attractively and engagingly, without too much of the old style presbyteral professionalism. Worship is about the whole people of God—and that includes everyone in the pews. But at another level, I guess, our work is going to be increasingly concerned with making any kind of liturgical worship accessible to people who come to church without any (or little) experience of Christian worship of any distinct style. As usual, the church will divide into those who will question whether there should be any accessibility at all, and those who have made up their minds how much people can take and understand—and will fillet the service books and turn the president into a compère accordingly.

Another issue that is coming up is a growing hunger on the part of many of those involved in preparing and leading worship for basic knowledge about the tradition in which we are supposed to stand. What is a collect? What makes a eucharistic prayer special? What is reverence? Why is there an instinct towards movement and gesture in religious worship? And what are the appropriate form of all these for today?

We do have an interesting time!

Kenneth Stevenson

ISSN 0263-7170

570481

28p

Postal Subscription for 1992 **£5.50** (by air **£8** or **US\$16**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel: 0634-851818 or 855252; Fax 0634-573549)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS**

**(Tel: 0602 430786 Fax: 0602 220134)**

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 733292

## Editorial:

### 'THE OPEN LETTER'

At the beginning of December, the church papers included a four-page tabloid insert, entitled 'An Open Letter'. The full text of the Letter was:

### **OPEN LETTER TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

*(Published with 2000 clergy signatures on 6 December 1991)*

Believing that Jesus Christ the incarnate Son of God, is both God and man, the unique revelation of God, the only Saviour and hope of mankind—we, the undersigned members of the Church of England, are concerned that his Gospel shall be clearly presented in this Decade of Evangelism.

We desire to love and respect people of other faiths. We acknowledge and respect their rights and freedoms. We wholeheartedly support co-operation in appropriate community, social, moral and political issues between Christians and those of other faiths wherever this is possible. Nevertheless, we believe it to be our Lord's command that his Gospel be clearly proclaimed, openly and sensitively, to all people (including those of other faiths) with the intention that they should come to faith in him for salvation.

In this we affirm no more and no less than the Apostolic and Anglican tradition. Article XVIII says: 'Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.'

In consequence we are deeply concerned about gatherings for interfaith worship and prayer involving Christian people. These include the Interfaith Commonwealth Day Observance in Westminster Abbey and other such events in some of the cathedrals and churches of England, whether they refer to Jesus Christ or whether such references are minimal or excluded.

We believe these events, however motivated, conflict with the Christian duty to proclaim the Gospel. They imply that salvation is offered by God not only through Jesus Christ but by other means, and thus deny his uniqueness and finality as the only Saviour.

These events are frequently deeply hurtful to those in this country who have come from other religions into the Christian faith, and also to Christian minorities in other lands, both of whom have frequently experienced persecution from the other faiths, and especially where such faiths are unwilling to tolerate conversions or the existence of minority Christian communities.

We, therefore, appeal to the leadership of the Church of England to oppose and, where possible, prevent such gatherings of interfaith worship and prayer in the Church of England and to seek to discourage them elsewhere. We also call upon Christian people to pray that this will be done.

Our objections to interfaith worship are theological, spiritual and, indeed, constitutional. Recognizing that the Christian faith belongs to all races and nations, we deplore objections to such worship arising from racism or nationalism.

To avoid all misunderstanding, we wish to make it clear that we seek the good of all of whatever faith, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ obliges us to proclaim him as uniquely Lord and Saviour for all.

In tiny print, surrounding the panel in which the text was printed, were the names of around 2,000 clergy signatories. It is not certain that the text had gone to all clergy, but clearly there was a high response. Whether individuals like the exact wording or not, the Open Letter ran morally near to their concerns. There were, of course, individuals who wrote to the church and national press expressing broad sympathy, but indicating that they had not signed for a variety of particular reasons. One sub-theme which emerged was the slightly alarmist nature of the supporting literature which had been circulated as evidence of the need of the Letter. Some viewed this as of no consequence, as it would be only the Letter they were signing, and not any other supportive material—whilst others viewed it as somewhat sinister, casting doubts upon the integrity of the exercise.

As an incumbent I received the text for signing myself, but I also realized that it was going to be *to* the bishops, and was not going to be signed by them. So I sent it back, expressing broad agreement, but saying I assumed I would not appear. That is what happened, and I can revert to the role of interpreter, rather than advocate, of the position taken by the 2,000.

Firstly, I think those do have a point who say that 'worship' needs defining in the Open Letter. Without clarity about that word, we can never know what kinds of co-operation are being excluded, and what allowed. 'Worship' connotes a much greater nuanced range of activities than a mere recitation of BCP services would suggest.

Secondly, I think the motivation was not any one scandal, nor even a prospect of further 'inter-faith' events, but a sense that the whole Christian cliff-face was being allowed slowly to crumble into an indifferentist sea without anyone finding a sticking-point, a place for shoring it up and resisting the crumble-factor. So there was a desire to say loudly 'thus far and no farther'. There might be included in this all sorts of fears, even ignorant fears, of other religions, but the central motivation was the defence of biblical Christianity.

Thirdly, there was a genuine echo of the position taken towards other faiths by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his enthronement sermon—where he had quoted the old motto of the London College of Divinity, now St. John's College, Nottingham (and the motto of an apostle long before that) 'Necessity is laid upon me—woe is unto me if I do not preach the gospel.' The Archbishop indicated, once the venture was launched, that he thought the Letter unhelpful in the sensitive dealings with other faith communities that church leaders have to employ.

Fourthly, it is worth emphasizing that the Letter is highly respectful towards other religions, even whilst not believing they offer Jesus Christ as Saviour, and whilst not wanting that central feature of Christianity obscured. The Letter is determined not to muddle issues of religion and race, and the distinctions made would be just as operable in Uganda, where African Muslims and African Christians have to find how to relate to each other, or in England at points where white Christians and white Muslims or Buddhists face the same issue. What the 2,000 are saying is that they dare not depart from the 'necessity' of ministering Christ to Hindus and Sikhs, thus dare not take steps which give a message of interchangeability of the world religions, or a suggestion that ethnic Europeans should be Christian, Pakistanis Muslim, and Indians Hindu. The catholicity of Christianity is wrapped into the concerns of the Letter.

They were then told to take the present Services, a pair of scissors, some glue, a pencil, a highlighter and decide:

What to throw out.

What to keep.

What to alter.

What to add.

The final group were asked to devise a non-eucharistic service for a Patronal Festival celebration at a church dedicated to St. Peter.

They were asked to consider:

The purpose of the service.

The structure of the liturgy.

The climax of the service.

The use of movement and symbols.

How is St. Peter to be brought into it?

Would the service work equally well for *any* Patronal Festival e.g. Holy Innocents, or St. Werburga's?

### **A Market Place**

By the end of the morning, to avoid a dreary and interminable plenary, each group had prepared a visual presentation of their work. One person was left in charge to explain it while the others toured the 'market place' to discover and question what the other groups had been doing. A very lively quarter of an hour.

People really seemed to enjoy the morning. There was probably too much activity with not enough time for reflection and discussion built in. Perhaps a future deanery meeting will pick this up.

The quality of work was very impressive—gagging the clergy was most successful!

Elizabeth Jane Clay, member Wakefield Diocesan Worship Group

### **DIOCESAN REPORT 16—GUILDFORD**

The Diocesan Worship Committee of the Guildford Diocese was reformed about five years ago and is an advisory group, which is responsible directly to the Bishop of Guildford. The Bishop of Dorking chairs it, and we are about a dozen in number. Our primary functions are to promote liturgical awareness among clergy and laity through conferences, workshops and other means; to advise the Bishop on liturgies for Diocesan occasions; and to keep in touch with the work of the national Liturgical Commission.

Each year there is at least one conference, held on a Saturday, the most recent of which was centred on *The Promise of His Glory*, and was led by Michael Vasey. These are always well supported, and a notable part of the clientele are trainee Readers. The next conference will be held next June, entitled 'Creative Worship' and will be led by David Stancliffe. It is becoming obvious that an important part of our work is to look again at the basics of Christian worship, e.g. how to preside, how to prepare service-sheets, what makes a balanced act of worship, how to strike the right balance between a fixed structure and spontaneity.

They were then given a list of the component parts of a Rite A Eucharist and asked to design a minimalist Eucharist for the other group. People genuinely tried to put themselves in the worship skins of others to try to meet the needs of that group.

At this point each of the clergy members of the group was given three Polo mints. They had to relinquish a mint each time they made a contribution. When their mints were used up they could only speak if awarded extra mints by the group.

### Being a Liturgical Group

The rest of the morning was 'Let's Pretend We're a Liturgical Group.'

One group worked on **Evening Prayer** and were asked to devise the structure of a service for the following situations:

St. A's is rural with an elderly congregation.

St. B's is suburban with a young congregation.

St. C's is inner city with a congregation of elderly people who have been there a long time, and an equal number of young, new converts with no church background at all.

They were asked to consider the following:

What is at the heart of a non-eucharistic service?

Can one service do for all three churches?

Should there be options?

What should all the services have in common?

Another group worked on a **Family Service**.

They were told that they were the subcommittee of the Liturgical Commission responsible for devising the Family Service (non-eucharistic). They were to bear in mind the opinions of the *Faith in the City* report which criticized the present church services as being too long, too full of abstract ideas, and too wordy and were asked to bear in mind some of the criticisms of Family Services:

They are childish, denying the adults.

They focus too much on the 'Nuclear Family'.

They aren't Anglican.

The worship is banal, dominated by a 'compere', and not God-centred.

They were given the outlines of Family Services from *Patterns of Worship*. Their task was to devise the **structure** of the Family Service for Pentecost Sunday.

Other groups worked on the **Funeral and Baptism Services**.

They were given copies of the present services and asked to consider the following:

Who is the service for?

Who is the centre?

Many of the congregation will be unused to church.

The bereaved won't hear too many words/the families will be distracted by the babies.

The deceased may have had no or little faith.

Where do the regular congregation fit in?

Finally, I do not think the 'Leadership' of the Church of England should disregard the Letter or view its signatories as a splinter group which can be dismissed. When those in sympathy who did not sign, and those who never received the Letter but would have signed, and those who put such communications in the wpb irrespective of their views, are all added together, then the figure concerned is *enormous*. It is not simply that a small coterie of misguided or misleading people have pulled the wool over loads of eyes: it is rather that a chord has been plucked deep in the Christian consciousness of a great swathe of the Church of England clergy—and we have heard from them. It may be slightly embarrassing to the 'Leadership', but no-one ought to be wishing they had not written.

As an anti-climax may I add that Grove Books published a sensitively written Worship Series no. 117 July last July, *Inter-faith Worship and Christian Truth*, by David Bookless: and the General Synod Board of Mission is publishing in March 1992 what sounds like a well-researched guide *Inter-Faith Worship? We will be reviewing or evaluating it.*

As we reach the end of 1991, so Grove Booklets completes twenty years of publishing numbered series. The first ever was Ministry and Worship no. 1, *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist*, with the text of the Statement and introduction and commentary by Julian Charley. This was published on 31 December 1971, to coincide with the publication of the Windsor Statement itself, and was for a long time the only commentary on the text available. Twenty years on, we record in these pages the sad-looking Vatican response to that Statement. But we ourselves keep a joyful twentieth birthday with a party-cum-celebration day in Nottingham—for which see page 5 below. Do come.

NOL itself completes 17 years of being published monthly. During this time it has slowly doubled its size, abandoning its famed concertina format just one year ago, and now being semi-official and carrying diocesan news. By the next millennium there may be pictures, but we have not reached that point yet. Meanwhile Christmas has taken another slide into secularity with the widespread defiance in England of the apparent laws on Sunday trading. *There* is need for much resolution, in every sense of that word.

But the joy of Christmas itself, of the incarnation of our Lord, does not depend upon the surroundings, but upon the central truths themselves. We especially wish Terry Waite a happy Christmas.

Colin Buchanan

### PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY AND MEMORY LANE

There must have been a great air of nostalgia (or was it desperation?) at the Prayer Book Society's 'Thomas Cranmer awards' this month. Princess Margaret was the latest member of the Royal Family brought in the denounce all modern substitutes, and to laud Cranmer to the skies. She presented the awards and dutifully lambasted 'those who have wished to deprive us of the Book of Common Prayer'—indeed these iconoclasts were dismissed with 'Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark'. The presuppositions of such a diatribe would not survive much close examination.

## DIOCESAN STATISTICS ON THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN TO THE PRESBYTERATE

The returns from the diocesan voting were published in comprehensive form on 3 December, and the church papers (and the nationals) have wrestled since with how to assess them. The matter looks evenly poised. Technically six synods out of 44 defeated the motion to approve the Measure, and 38 passed it. Of the six who defeated it, two defeated it in all three Houses, and four in two Houses—and there was a handful of others where the House of Bishops had a majority opposed, but both Clergy and Laity were in favour, and thus the motion was 'technically' carried. In all six which defeated the motion the House of Bishops was opposed, and presumably some episcopal advocacy in such cases affected the voting of other two Houses (or, of course, the other Houses were affecting the stance of the Bishops ...).

The overall diocesan look is a rough 2-1 vote in favour. So what are General Synod members to make of it? Let us take the composition of the Synod apart a little:

- (a) There are those who are in their own persons convinced women should not be ordained; and these persons will presumably oppose the legislation, irrespective of the diocesan voting (though some have made it clear that they will nevertheless 'go along with it' if it then happens).
- (b) There are those who will vote for the legislation irrespective of the diocesan voting.
- (c) There are those who are in favour (or at least not opposed in their own consciences) but who are daunted by the fear of a split in the Church of England. These will be asking whether the diocesan voting is high enough to be treated as overwhelming, or whether they ought (however unhappily) to vote against the Measure to retain the integrity of the Church of England.

It is obvious that only category (c) is open to argument, that the only effect argument could have would be to turn supporters into reluctant opponents, and that the argument to which the category is open is one which relates to the prospective *outcome* of voting in favour, and not to the merits and demerits of the case. It is therefore to the 'outcome' (or 'second order') question we must give our minds.

In October, I wrote in an editorial in NOL that people must not be led *at diocesan level* by the argument from possible results. I urged that the General Synod needs to know the split (if any) between those in favour and those opposed, and will be seriously misled if those are distorted by people voting out of fear of a possible outcome. Yet it is very clear that it is exactly that fear which has led to some of the diocesan statistics—not least the anti vote of the Bishop of Sheffield, who gave his 'outcome' reasons to the press at the time.

General Synod must therefore look very discerningly at the statistics before them. The issue is not only whether a 66-33 split in favour will do; it also a question of whether a truer vote might not have been 75-25, and whether the minority would indeed leave if the Measure came into force.

On this last point, we need to note:

- (a) Even the 'Alternative Episcopal Oversight' which I scrutinized in the Editorial last month is a plan for staying *in*;
- (b) Very few have actually nailed colours to the mast and said they would definitely go if the Measure comes into force;

Liturgy is ...

a means of stopping the use of the gifts of the Spirit  
a block to clergy pushing their own theology  
better when in the language of the Sun  
to be the same for every parish church in the land  
a barrier to evangelism  
needed to hold the C. of E. together  
a bore  
dated in always referring to God as 'He'  
the Book of Common Prayer  
the way to worship God beautifully

were some examples.

On the floor in the centre of the room was a large circle with the words 'LITURGY IS' printed on it. Each person placed their piece of paper near to or far from the circle depending on the amount of agreement or disagreement they held about their statement. Some took their paper out of the room at this point! No one was allowed to disagree vocally, but at the end each was given an opportunity to move one of the statements. Very strong feelings were expressed—without a threatening word being spoken!

### A human scattergraph

The next activity was to give people a chance to align themselves according to their preferences.

We made a human scattergraph about a processional cross, people being asked to move away from the cross in a north, south, east or west direction according to their strength feeling about the statement.

Move North if for you the most important part of worshipping together is receiving the bread and wine.

Move South if for you the most important part of worshipping together is receiving the Word of God through Scripture and teaching.

If the ASB/BCP help your worship, move West.

If the ASB/BCP hinder your worship, move East.

If the thought of lay presidency excites you, move East.

If the thought of lay presidency horrifies you, move West.

If you prefer worship to emphasize the holiness and majesty of God, move North.

If you prefer worship to reflect your personal friendship with God, move South.

They found themselves standing near people who thought and felt like they did and were formed into four groups. Each group was then given a description of their 'opposite number' e.g.

### NORTH WEST PEOPLE

Enjoy liturgical worship which emphasizes God's majesty

Feel receiving the sacrament is important

Insist on a priest presiding at the Eucharist.

### SOUTH EAST PEOPLE

Feel that receiving the Word of God through Scripture and preaching is important.

Enjoy the freedom of non-liturgical worship.

Like their worship to reflect their personal relationship with Jesus.

Accept the idea of lay celebration.

the apostles, and through their successors down to our own time, the apostolic tradition is manifested and preserved throughout the world. This question, then, lies at the very heart of the ecumenical discussion and touches vitally all the themes dealt with by ARCIC I: the reality of the Eucharist, the sacramentality of the ministerial priesthood, the nature of the Roman primacy.

The publication of this judgment has led to widespread dismay, as the whole process appears to have been misjudged by the Congregation for the Defence of the Faith. The issue, as far as the terms of reference and charter of the Commission were concerned, is how to find expression of a common faith between the two Communions in respect of certain controverted areas—whereas the CDF seems to be measuring off the *Final Report* against the exact text of the Council of Trent, and complaining when the two are not identical.

There may be scope for further comment in future months.

#### **This month's publication . . .**

. . . is Joint Liturgical Study no. 20, *The Origins of the Roman Rite*, edited by Gordon Jeanes, Lecturer in Liturgy at Durham University. This is largely texts on baptism and eucharist, and some other documents which throw light on the character of worship in the fourth and fifth centuries.

#### **. . . and next month's**

is Worship Series no. 120, *Methodist and URC Worship*, by David Kennedy and David Mann—a straight introduction (particularly to help Anglicans in LEPs) to the mainstream forms and styles of sacramental worship in these two major Free Churches to-day.

#### **. . . and prices**

go up on 1 January 1992—ordinary booklets to £1.75, Ethical Studies to £2.25, and Joint Liturgical Studies to £3.75.

### **DIOCESAN REPORT 15—WAKEFIELD**

#### **A Deanery Meeting about Liturgy—for a WHOLE morning!**

One of the most difficult challenges we have met as a committee was to be asked to lead a deanery morning about liturgy in the future. Make it practical they said! The standing committee came up with the title 'Liturgy or Lethargy'.

We decided that 'practical' meant 'do it yourself and move around a lot?'

#### **Liturgical Lotto**

The morning began with 'Liturgical Lotto', an effort to make people mix and discover something about trappings of worship they all used. They had to find people, for example, whose churches

- used incense
- used overhead projectors
- who had ever danced in worship
- whose clergy were vestments

(The challenge was also to avoid using words like vestments which we were incomprehensible to some.)

We offered *Major Prizes* for the winners, an Advent candle (for someone whom we suspected would find candles a novelty) and a Jesus Badge for the winner who seemed somewhat spikier! By then the atmosphere was relaxed and everyone seemed open to playing the next game. 'Liturgy is . . .

#### **Strong feelings, but no words**

Everyone was given a piece of paper with a statement about liturgy on it, ranging from the obvious to the controversial to the ridiculous.

- (c) Others have simply said (many in my hearing) 'We would have a very awkward question to answer, and the options would be to go swiftly, or stay in unreservedly';
- (d) Thus, even within a 25% minority, it is not known how many would still want to 'work' the system in years ahead, even if opposed to it in their voting.

From this, I would thus far conclude that those who are in favour in their own consciences ought not to be turned into 'no' voters by the apparent one-third minority voting against. COB

### **AND THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN IN AUSTRALIA**

We recorded in 1990 that one or two bold Australian bishops were girding themselves to 'go it alone' and ordain women as presbyters without a General Synod canon permitting it. Now the Appellate Tribunal, the final court of appeal, has ruled that they have no authority to do so, and individual diocesan synods cannot give that permission. Whilst there can have been few women deacons building much hope of being made presbyter by this route, there will also be a sense of disappointment as the last turning over of this stone reveals—nothing. All we can do is await the next moves.

### **GROVE BOOKLETS TWENTIETH BIRTHDAY**

Once again, we invite readers (along with any friends) to the twentieth birthday party for Grove Books at St. John's, Nottingham, on 18 January 1992. We can now add another tempting item to the day's fare in that Professor Oliver O'Donovan, who started the Ethics Group in 1973, and then convened it for four years, is providing a lecture on 'Liturgy and Ethics', which we propose to have after lunch. The Bishop of Southwell (he of the black rochet) will be joining us for the morning.

The day's programme now looks like this:

- 10.00 a.m. Lecture by Colin Buchanan 'Grove Booklets—origins, development, impact on the church, and scope for the future'
- 11.00 a.m. Coffee
- 11.30 a.m. Workshops (led by the different Grove 'Groups'—Worship, Ethics, Pastoral, Spirituality, Evangelism)
- 12.45 p.m. Lunch
- 1.45 p.m. An album of memories of the twenty years
- 2.00 p.m. Lecture by Professor Oliver O'Donovan 'Liturgy and Ethics'
- 3.15 p.m. Communion service

Please register by sending £2 (which includes coffee and lunch) with your name and address to Grove Books Ltd.

#### **Book Reviews**

Guildford Diocesan Worship Group *Sunday, Evening Worship: An Opportunity for Evangelism* (available from Mavis Wilson, Christ Church Vicarage, 20 Christ Church Road, Epsom, 52pp. £2.50).

This is the booklet to which reference is made in the Guildford diocesan report below. There is a brief but stimulating essay by Christopher Cocksworth to begin it—and this includes much factual information and reference to resources—and there are then several simple outline structures and suggestions. The booklet has adopted as its keynote what *Patterns for Worship* calls 'Conversation Structure', and the outlines reflect that. Each example is of a 'once-off' type, related to a theme, a season, or a special occasion. I would reckon that any parish wanting both to have a credible Sunday evening service and to re-think the usefulness of what is already there would be wise to look hard at this. COB

## THE VATICAN'S JUDGMENT ON ARCIC I

(NB: within the judgment 'E' upon the Statement on the Eucharist: 'EE' means the Elucidation on the Eucharist)

On 5 December, the Congregation for the Defence of the Faith in Rome issued its definitive judgment on the Statements of the initial Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission. The following is from the latter part of the 4.500 word judgment, reflecting on the sacraments and the sacramental life of the Churches.

It is clear, as already affirmed, that on the questions of **Eucharist** and the **Ordained Ministry**, greater progress has been made. There are, however, certain statements and formulations in respect of these doctrines that would need greater clarification from the Catholic point of view.

With regard to the **Eucharist**, the faith of the Catholic Church would be even more clearly reflected in the Final Report if the following points were to be explicitly affirmed:

—that in the Eucharist, the Church, doing what Christ commanded his Apostles to do at the Last Supper, makes present the sacrifice of Calvary. This would complete, without contradicting it, the statement made in the Final Report, affirming that the Eucharist does not repeat the sacrifice of Christ, nor add to it (E 5; EE 5);

—that the sacrifice of Christ is made present with all its effects, thus affirming the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased. For Catholics 'the whole Church' must include the dead. The prayer for the dead is to be found in all the Canons of the Mass, and the propitiatory character of the Mass as the sacrifice of Christ that may be offered for the living and the dead, including a particular dead person, is part of the Catholic faith.

The affirmations that the Eucharist is 'the Lord's real gift of himself to his Church' (E 8) and that the bread and wine 'become' the body and blood of Christ (EE 6) can certainly be interpreted in conformity with Catholic faith. They are insufficient, however, to remove all ambiguity regarding the mode of the real presence which is due to a substantial change in the elements. The Catholic Church holds that Christ in the Eucharist makes himself present sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of his Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity.

On the question of the reservation of the Eucharist, the statement that there are those who 'find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable' (EE 9), creates concern from the Roman Catholic point of view. This section of **Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidations**, seeks to allay any such doubts, but one remains with the conviction that this is an area in which real consensus between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is lacking.

Similarly, in respect of the **Ordained Ministry**, the Final Report would be helped if the following were made clearer:

—that only a validly ordained priest can be the minister who, in the person of Christ, brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist. He not only recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper, pronouncing the words of consecration and imploring the Father to send the Holy Spirit to effect through them the transformation of the gifts, but in so doing offers sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ;

—that it was Christ himself who instituted the sacrament of Orders as the rite which confers the priesthood of the new Covenant. This would complete the significant statement made in **Ministry and Ordination 13**, that in the Eucharist the ordained minister 'is seen to stand in sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice'. This clarification would seem all the more important in view of the fact that the ARCIC document does not refer to the character of priestly ordination which implies a configuration to the priesthood of Christ. The character of priestly ordination is central to the Catholic understanding of the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the common priesthood of the baptized. It is moreover, important for the recognition of Holy Orders as a sacrament instituted by Christ, and not therefore a simple ecclesiastical institution.

The Commission itself has, in **Ministry and Ordination; Elucidation 5**, referred to the developments within the Anglican Communion after the setting up of ARCIC I, in connection with the Ordination of Women. The Final Report states that the members of the Commission believe 'that the principles upon which its doctrinal agreement rests are not affected by such ordinations; for it was concerned with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question who can or who cannot be ordained'. The view of the Catholic Church in this matter has been expressed in an exchange of correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which it is made clear that the question of the subject of ordination is linked with the nature of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Differences in this connection must therefore affect the agreement reached in Ministry and Ordination.

The question of Apostolic Succession is not dealt with directly in the Final Report of ARCIC I, but it is referred to in **Ministry and Ordination 16**, and in **Ministry and Ordination; Elucidation 4**. The essential features of 'what is meant in our two traditions by ordination in the apostolic succession' are set down in MO 16 and the statement is made that 'because they (the ordaining bishops) are entrusted with the oversight of other churches, this participation in his ordination signifies that this new bishop and his church are within the communion of churches. Moreover, because they are representatives of their churches in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles and are members of the episcopal college, their participation also ensures the historical continuity of this church with the apostolic church and its bishop with the original apostolic ministry.'

These statements stand in need of further clarification from the Catholic perspective. The Catholic Church recognizes in the apostolic succession both an unbroken line of episcopal ordination from Christ through the apostles down through the centuries to the bishops of today and an uninterrupted continuity in Christian doctrine from Christ to those today who teach in union with the College of Bishops and its head, the Successor of Peter. As *Lumen gentium* 20 affirms, the unbroken lines of episcopal succession and apostolic teaching stand in casual relationship to each other: 'Among those various ministries which, as tradition witnesses, were exercised in the Church from the earliest times, the chief place belongs to the office of those who, appointed to the episcopate in a sequence running back to the beginning, are the ones who pass on the apostolic seed. Thus, as Saint Irenaeus testifies, through those who were appointed bishops by