

Every now and again our Synod asks committees of the Diocese to present their work to it. A visitor from the London Diocesan Synod who spoke during a debate on the Porvoo Statement was also there to see the Ecumenical Committee make its presentation of which he said, 'What other august body could I visit to debate such important matters and also see its members in pleats of laughter after a sketch about bird-watching?' In this tradition the DLC was asked to present its work to the Synod late last year. The Chair and Secretary have ever since been known as the Two Ronnies; but to be serious the responsorial style of the Two Ronnies helped provoke a good debate about some of the key issues liturgical reform needs to face in our church: from the uniformity/diversity debate to electronic publishing; from the requirement to be relevant to a changing society and the need to keep hold of our memorable treasures. The presentation was received very well and published by the diocese as a booklet which had to go into reprint!

The Committee has spent much of its time in sustained consideration of ASB 2000, taking a keen interest in detail as well as the in broad issues. It is working hard at listening and talking to General Synod members and tries to keep an eye on the wider diocese's opinions as they experience more new material.

Last year it seemed to the Committee that suggestions as to the nature of revision to Rite A presented at Selwyn College might cut harshly across practice for many churches, especially with regard to the placing of prayers of Penitence and the Prayer of Humble Access. There was also some concern over revisions to the Eucharistic Prayers and what may happen to the ones we have now learnt to use best, especially Prayer 4. A straw poll around the deanery Chapters as to current practice found that around a third of parishes regularly used provision which we feared might go. We hope this will inform the Liturgical Commission.

In fulfilling our liturgical formation role we have been cooperating with the Decade of Evangelism Support Group to arrange three conferences on Evangelism and Worship. The first of these in February had John Bell speaking on releasing resources especially in small urban congregations, though workshops covered other issues to do with releasing people's gifts to lead and participate in worship. 200 people turned out for a Saturday and received the day very well. In the summer Graham Cray is the keynote speaker at a conference again offering a diverse number of workshops on taking culture seriously. One of the workshops is to be led by the Bishop of Warrington on taking traditional churches' cultures seriously. In the autumn Stephen Cotterell leads a day on the Eucharist in the same series.

Tim Stratford

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address: 173 Canterbury Street, Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA

Telephone (01634) 851818 or 855252 Fax (01634) 573549

Postal subscription for 1996 £6.50 (by air £9.00, US\$18.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 257

May 1996

EDITORIAL

1996 sees an interesting centenary—the condemnation of Anglican orders by Pope Leo XIII, in the encyclical *Apostolicae Curae*. There has always been reason to think this was a judgment of policy rather than strict theology—Roman Catholics in England were upset at every sign of friendly relations developing between continental Roman Catholics and C/E Catholics, such as were evidenced between Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal. The implications of such friendships appeared to suggest that the Church of England was being recognized as *the* Catholic Church in this country, a recognition highly damaging in principle to English Roman Catholicism. Condemning Anglican orders would probably settle our hash, put an end to any suspicion of recognition, and allow Roman Catholicism an open field and uncompromised exclusive claims.

It was a genuine question. Rome in principle will recognize as valid and true orders given in separation from the unity of the Roman Communion—a theological position dating back to Augustine's recognition of Donatist orders and baptism as true. Thus Rome recognizes Eastern and Old Catholic orders as true orders conferred by true bishops, even though conferred outside the fabric of the Catholic Church. Should not now Anglicans, who took great care about sustaining their episcopal succession both at the Reformation and ever since, qualify on the same basis? Certainly it had been the claim of Newman, Pusey and Keble—for at least as long as all three were Anglicans—that their orders were Catholic and ought to be recognized by all, as stemming from bishops in the true unbroken English succession. Could not Rome see it?

Well, we do not know. We know Rome *refused* to see it, and delivered a strong judgment against the validity of Anglican orders. Did they start with the conclusion and then go looking for the evidence? Anglicans must be pardoned if they take that view. At any rate, the encyclical was put under intense scrutiny at the time, and it was met then with a robust reply from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (to which I shall return below), and it has had plenty more scrutiny since. Its centenary is now marked by a special edition of the *Anglican Theological Review* (Winter 1996 issue), entitled 'Anglican Orders: A Centenary of *Apostolicae Curae*'—a collection of addresses given at General Theological Seminary, New York, in Spring 1995; and the essays are being reprinted in England this month as R Williams Franklin (ed), *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896-1996* (Mowbray, 1996, £12.99).

The original arguments of Leo XIII included reference to the lack of specification as to *which* order was being conferred in the 1550/1552 Ordinals—a point which, if it were fatal to the true succession, could hardly be repaired by the insertion of the titles of the orders in 1662. But the Pope's main point was concerned with 'defect of intention.'

The argument goes (syllogistically) like this:

- (a) the distinctive task of the priesthood is to offer the sacrifice of the mass;
- (b) but the Anglican Prayer Books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries eliminated in their eucharistic rites all reference to the sacrifice of the mass;
- (c) there cannot therefore be the right intention in the Anglican ordination rites to ordain true priests.

So the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster got what he wanted and more than he might have expected.

What are we to say to this? The first response came in the reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York the following year (and it is good to have the full text of the encyclical and 'edited excerpts' of the reply, *Saepius Officio*, here in English—I could have wished for the full text of the latter which is, I understand as rare as a blue moon, and I found recently when I needed to refer to it that I had myself only the Latin text (yes, yes, I *can* manage that, but I am slowish)). The Archbishops delivered themselves of a robust and even (to a controversialist) enjoyable reply. They called in question sweeping statements about reordinations in Mary Tudor's reign. They pointed out that earlier history cannot support either the notion that the particular order must be named at the crucial point or the idea that ordination was directed solely and distinctively to the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice. They also mentioned in passing how the vast weight of Roman ceremonies is medieval in origin, not primitive. And they restrainedly, even condescendingly, ventured the opinion that Eastern rites (fully recognized in fact by Rome) might well perish under the same condemnation as Anglican ones. They also emphasized the corruptions and excesses against which the purified Edwardine ordinals were in protest. However, when it came to eucharistic rites, they half-conceded the Pope's major premise ((a) above), that the purpose of ordination is to provide priests to offer the eucharistic sacrifice. They wrote (in a passage *not* excerpted here):

'Primo enim sacrificium laudis et gratiarum offerimus; tum vero *sacrificium Crucis Patri proponimus and praesentamus*, et per illud remissionem peccatorum...impetramus.' (para XI—emphasis mine).

The question is 'What does "*Patri proponimus and praesentamus*" mean?' It appears that they are telling the Pope—at the very least to allow him to recognize our ordinations on his terms—that we do have a eucharistic sacrifice. But, one has to say, not only should they have rebutted and disallowed his terms at

WORKSHOPS and 'FOUNDATIONAL ISSUES'

The Workshops will allow Conference members to follow one theme through three sessions of 90 minutes, and will include the following subjects:

- Eucharistic Issues (theology, role and frequency, presidency, texts, extended communion, freedom)
- Initiation Issues (texts, discipline, etc re baptism)
- Confirmation and 'catechumenate' Issues (Alpha, baptism and catechumenate!)
- Music (and theological issues of music)
- The Bible in the Church (lectionary, preaching, communication, Bible in texts, obeying the word)
- Liturgical Formation (inc worship and understanding, mature spirituality, participation, ethics)
- Symbolism (an exploration of what the evangelical tradition—and theology—will charter)
- Youth Culture and 'Alternative Worship'
- Healing (especially healing ministry within worship)
- All-age and 'Family' Worship

The 'Foundational Issues' come twice in the Conference in the same form each time, to enable all members to attend two separate ones during the three days. They include the following subjects:

- Scripture and tradition in worship
- What is it to be Anglican in worship?
- Anglo-catholic worship: friend or foe?
- Worship, church and society
- Emotions and worship
- The efficacy of sacraments
- Willow Creek and 'church for the unchurched'
- Poetry and image, gender and the post-modern: issues in language

Booking Form—to be sent with cheques (payable to 'GROW Conference') to Conference Secretary, Mrs Judith Read, St James' Rectory, Great Cheetham Street East, High Broughton, Salford M7 0UH (0161-792-1208)

Please book me in for the January 1997 GROW Conference

Name

Address

Phone FAX Email

I enclose a cheque for £25 non-returnable booking fee and claim discounts as below:

Booking prior to 30 September £5
 1996 NOL subscriber £2

I expect to receive with my receipt a voucher for £2 towards NOL in 1997
 I acknowledge that I owe £..... which I will pay at the Conference

**The Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW) Conference on Worship
EVANGELICAL ANGLICANS and WORSHIP BEYOND 2000**

A residential conference at The Hayes, Swanwick, 6-8 January 1997

A Conference celebrating the silver jubilee of Grove Booklets and preparing evangelical Anglicans (and others) for worship in the coming millennium, organized by GROW (the group who produce Grove Booklets in the Worship Series and provided *Anglican Worship Today* to accompany the ASB in 1980).

AIM: To address (primarily) the evangelical constituency, in order to appreciate ground travelled over forty years in respect of Anglican worship, so as to understand the present, and thus to fuel thinking and harness resources to enrich a mission-orientated future.

The Conference will convene at 11am on the Monday and run till the afternoon of the Wednesday. The cost will be £69 (with certain reductions listed below). It is open to all, whether they view themselves as evangelicals or not. The agenda includes a bringing together of those concerned for the doctrinal health of our worship and of those concerned for the experience of the Spirit in worship with participation by evangelicals from the Liturgical Commission and the General Synod. The task will be to find both priorities and strategies for the future, and to do so by engaging robustly with each other.

The conference will function in three main strands:

- (a) Main addresses by Colin Buchanan, Michael Vasey, John Leach and Trevor Lloyd.
- (b) Sub-plenaries concerning 'Foundational Issues'—Scripture and tradition, doctrine and worship in a comprehensive church, the efficacy of sacraments, etc.
- (c) Workshops, which will meet on all three days to consider particular issues.

The agenda will also include an opening Bible reading on worship led by David Peterson (the new principal of Oak Hill), morning and evening worship, late-night sideshows, a 'market of good ideas,' and a concluding agape.

REGISTRATION

Full fee	£69
Reductions:	
Applications received by 30 September	
with £25 non-returnable booking fee	£5
Being an NOL subscriber in 1996	£2
Voucher sent with receipt for NOL in 1997	£2
Total reductions available	£9
Cheapest net booking	£60

this point, but also they should not have attempted to twist the 1662 eucharistic rite into meeting those terms. There is not a hint in the 1662 rite of 'sacrificium Crucis Patri proponimus and praesentamus,' and it is sad, in the midst of such an excellent controversial apologia, to find such a gloss put on the reformed rite.

There are several contemporary issues running on from the pugilisms of a hundred years ago, and the symposium finds interest, for instance, in the conditional ordination of Graham Leonard and others in the recent secessions of Anglicans to Rome. There are also fascinating papers by Stephen Sykes and Paul Bradshaw on Anglican ordinals to which I will return (*DV*) next month. But there are two issues about eucharistic issues which need urgent mention.

The first is ARCIC and *Clarifications*. There are references in contributions by both Edward Arnold and Christopher Hill to this perverse document, with a strong suggestion that, as the Vatican has apparently said it likes *Clarifications*, the basis for recognition of Anglicans as offering the true sacrifice of the mass is made much easier—thus presumably leading to a change of mind on sixteenth and seventeenth century ordinals and ordinations. I stick out my chin and say that *Clarifications* distorts the 1662 eucharistic rite shamefully; that the existing ARCIC 1 documents on the eucharist are not to be glossed by its sophistications; and that the Churches of the Anglican Communion have not, it seems, ever really been asked to endorse it—it is a kind of partisan private letter to the Pope which we have been allowed to see (and there is a private member's motion awaiting debate in our Synod which would reject the document out of hand). I think we can do without hints that *Clarifications* would enable the Pope to recognize our orders *on Leo's XIII's terms*.

The other contemporary issue is simply odd. It is true, as far as I can see, that ARCIC 1 produced a doctrinal agreement on the eucharist which did not have regard to actual eucharistic rites. That suggests, at the least, some forgetfulness about the status of rites. It is true that *Clarifications* errs in misrepresenting the historic Anglican rite. But those two errors do not bear upon short-term use of new eucharistic prayers in the Church of England. The Bishop of Birmingham, in the famous February debate on eucharistic prayers, said that prayers 1 and 3 (see the April Grove Booklet) would damage relationships with Rome on ARCIC; and the initial evidence from our enquiry is that all sorts of persons took his remarks seriously, and may even have switched from 'yea' to 'nay' as a result. We have to leave aside the fact that in *up to six meetings* of the House of Bishops these prayers had been on the agenda, and such allegations about them had been no part of the debates, and that no motions to delete either of these prayers had been part of the business in the two decisive meetings in October 1995 and January 1996. But we are surely in position to note:

- (a) the Bishop did not state what it was which was so particular to these two prayers (but not the others) as to affect ARCIC business;

- (b) ARCIC is *international*; and consideration of Anglican eucharistic rites cannot be confined to contemporary Church of England issues;
- (c) the issues about eucharistic rites must surely come back to 1662, not only because Leo XIII tells us that the validity of our orders over three centuries depends upon that rite, but also because it is today an entrenched foundation document, a 'norm' still of the Church of England and of many other Provinces. To that extent *Clarifications* was right to refer to it—it was the manner of reference, not the fact of it, which was lamentable. And eucharistic prayers authorized for alternative use till the end of 1998 cannot possibly be held to be of the same authority.
- (d) In short, it would be wonderful indeed if the passing or rejection of any short-term eucharistic prayer in any single Province of the Anglican Communion today could possibly affect deliberations of ARCIC about the superseding of the 'absolutely null and utterly void' verdict on our orders promulgated in *Apostolicae Curae*.

It is a curious and thought-provoking centenary indeed. I must look to my orders.
COB

P.S. I promised a brochure about the GROW conference in January 1997 in last month's NOL but there was none. Instead it is in the text this month. Please photocopy freely.

JLG SAYS GOODBYE TO DONALD GRAY

On Wednesday 27 March 1996 the Joint Liturgical Group gave a farewell dinner at the Atheneum for Donald and Joyce Gray to mark Donald's retirement after 27 years that had included service both as Secretary and Chairman. Previous years had seen Donald himself hosting similar dinners in the Jerusalem Chamber to other longstanding members of the JLG such as Neville Clark, Raymond George and Gordon Wakefield. During the years since its founding in 1963 the JLG played an important role in enabling some of the insights of the Liturgical Movement to become established as common property across the Churches in Britain. Donald has recently finished a biography of Ronald Jasper, a central figure in much of this development. Under Donald's chairmanship the JLG began to discover a new role in serving the renewal of the churches, exploring new and wider questions as well as seeking to serve ecumenical initiatives such as Local Ecumenical Partnerships. Tributes on the night also mentioned Donald's contribution to the Society for Liturgical Study, to the work of ELLC and his advocacy of the Revised Common Lectionary. The evening made clear the great affection in which Donald is held and particularly his gift for unpretentious and genuine friendship which has drawn together people from different traditions.

Michael Vasey

NOTICE BOARD

The debate we advertised last month for Thursday 4 June at the SPCK in Marylebone cannot now take place then. Why not? Why, because there is no such date this year. We hope that *Tuesday* 4 June will sound more credible. COB and Michael Perham are confronted by two Prayer Book Society persons around a motion provisionally worded as '1662—"Our incomparable Liturgy"—but is it?' That is at 6 for 6.30pm.

We learn that Canon Laurie Bartlett, the Chairman of the Australian Liturgical Commission, has been awarded a Th.D. of the Australian College of Theology, *honoris causa*. Not only had he piloted *A Prayer Book for Australia* to a very successful conclusion last July, but he proves to be the only surviving member of the Commission that produced 'AAPB' in 1977. There will be many in other parts of the world to honour his work also.

Here in the Church of England we await not only the results of the Revision Committee work, but also the appointment of a new Liturgical Commission itself—for a new Synod leads to a new Commission, and the new Appointments sub-committee should have by now had a consultation with the two Archbishops which leads to the Archbishops appointing the Commission. Little change in membership is anticipated.

It may be small beer compared with the millennium—or even with the centenary of the unwelcome *Apostolicae Curae*—but May 1996 provides a significant anniversary for 'alternative' services. The Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure went through Parliament in March 1965, and came into force on 1 May 1996 (the Measure having provided for the Archbishops to name the date). So the first possibility of 'alternative' services dates from that month. It is also a thirtieth anniversary in my personal history, as I dissented from two features of the proposed Series 2 (then known as 'Second Series') communion, wrote a booklet in that April, and got it circulated to all members of the Convocations by the time they debated the draft texts in early May (this was, of course, long before synodical days).

Next month's publication is...

...Joint Liturgical Study No 34, *Welcoming the Baptized*, by Tim Turner. The author is a Rector of the Episcopal Church in the USA and has done a special study—particularly with reference to ECUSA—of rites for receiving baptized adults from other Christian denominations. His case is argued theologically as over against a general drift of the current rules and conventions in ECUSA, and is full of good sense as well as surprising information.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY—TORONTO IN WESTMINSTER

It is a long time since the last such heading appeared, but we now cannot resist the report that on Maundy Thursday in St Matthew's Westminster the following instruction appeared: 'Please keel as the sacrament is carried to the place of Repose.'

BOOK REVIEW

Youth A Part: Young People and the Church (Report of the General Synod Working Party, National Society/CHP, April 1996, pp 196, £7.95).

This report was published after Easter with much trumpeting about the loss of young people from the church (the statistics on page 13 show a 34% drop between 1987 and 1994). I went at it a different way and looked up some words in the index. 'Worship' has references to about 12 different pages: 'Music' is found on page 49 only (surely not only there?); 'Greenbelt' gets honourable mentions; 'Bible' has no entries at all (and 'Sex' is not an entry as such, but 'Sexuality' gets an entry, and it refers to four lines of text, no more). The major section on worship is the first ten pages of chapter 4 (entitled 'Young People's Space'). In it there is a pride in the number of young bell ringers, servers and choir-members; there are criteria for more experimental liturgical ideas; and there is discussion of 'Alternative Worship', including 'Rave in the Nave' etc. A point is made of how infrequently young people are involved in the planning and preparation of worship. The 'sacraments of baptism, confirmation and marriage' (*sic*) are discussed on pages 94-97; and there are also recommendations on page 164:

- 6.1 We recommend that a bank of resource material and ideas relating to new ways of worship be kept at diocesan and national level and that opportunities are made to share these. We also encourage the formation of worship study centres to act as a focus of worship ideas and to provide training.
- 6.2 We recommend that the lessons learnt from early work with Local Ecu-
menical Projects' approach to Canon Law are used when considering local liturgical experimentation (see paragraph 4.11).
- 6.3 We recommend that diocesan advisory groups be set up to work with "al-
ternative" or new worship initiatives to offer them a framework of support and accountability (see paragraphs 4.13-17).
- 6.4 We recommend that liturgical revision groups should consult with young people and use their input and perspectives.'

But the worship side of the report does seem all too brief.

COB

CHART OF PROCEDURES IN LITURGICAL REVISION

We have been asked to help Joe Christian understand the procedures in the Church of England's revision of official liturgical texts. We respond by updating the chart we published in both booklets and these columns twenty years ago (NOL was founded as the scale of textual revision started to escalate towards the authorization of the ASB, and giving readers ability to follow these arcane processes was always to the forefront of our priorities). The chart over-leaf represents the stages in following through the standing orders of General Synod, and should perhaps be kept beside you (or on your bedroom wall) until all goes quiet on 1 January 2001.

Each liminal point in the process is numbered, and the stages have to come in this order, so that, whatever the timescale of any stage, it is always possible to trace where the texts have reached and what is the next stage to be expected. The crucial feature of the chart is the vertical dividing-line which separates stages out of the public view (those to the left of the line) from those in the public view (to the right of the line).

The earliest stages (1-4) may be the most complex, and may even involve some public appearances. Thus the six eucharistic prayers (in the shape of four in Rite C) reached stage 4 in the late 1980s. Before they went on to stages 5 and 6, they spent around *five years* in passing through stage 4. These side-trips (I call them that not because time was not passing, but because the processes were not directed towards the authorization process, and were even appearing to frustrate the possibility of that process) were as follows:

	PRIVATE	PUBLIC
Early 1989	Commission completes (Stage 3)	
November 1989		Published for public reaction (in <i>Patterns</i>)
February 1990		Preliminary debate in Synod
June 1990	H/B asks Commission to edit texts for authorization process	
November 1991		Synod asks for prayers to be used when children are present
January 1992	Commission brings edited texts to H/B and are asked to do better (and include children)	
January 1994	Commission brings five eucharistic prayers to H/B—and H/B decides on preliminary debate in Synod	

July 1994

Synod, with neutral report from H/B before it, amends motion, and asks for 'up to five' prayers to be brought for authorization

October 1994 H/B decides to send two eucharistic prayers to Synod for authorization process (Stage 4!)
Report is printed (5)

November 1994 Report is published (6)
General Approval in Synod (7)

After that the processes follow the chart. The revision Committee on the eucharistic prayers sat from January to May 1995 (8), and reported to General Synod (10); the report, including the revised texts, was published (six prayers now!) in June 1995 (11) and the report was debated in Synod in July 1995 (12). No motions for re-committal to the Revision Committee were moved (let alone passed), so the process moved straight to (16) as the debate on the report was concluded in that July. The 're-committal' procedure has never happened yet since the standing orders first provided for it.

The House of Bishops met for stage 17 in October 1995. A sophisticated wrinkle in the procedure then occurred as a faint possibility arose of a 'separate reference' to the four Houses of the Convocations (Upper and Lower of both Canterbury and York) and to the House of Laity (a process which would come between stages 19 and 20 but could not alter the text—it is a tactic which did happen in 1983 with the services for 'The Reconciliation of a Penitent'). This possibility did not come to pass, but the texts were not made public, and the delay enabled the H/B to reopen stage 17 in January 1996. Very minor amending occurred, and the texts were then printed (18) and published (19) in time for the debate in General Synod for Final Approval in February 1996 (20). The defeat of the prayers at stage 20 meant that there are no more stages...

The other texts currently undergoing the process are Initiation Services and Calendar, Lectionary and Collects. Both these had stage 4 in early 1995, stage 7 in July 1995, and stages 8 and 9 in January to May 1996. Stage 12 is awaited for Calendar, Lectionary and Collects at York in July 1996. Initiation Services are completing the Revision Committee stage more slowly and may not reach (9) till July. So stage 12 is likely in November. In the light of recent history, no-one can reliably prognosticate beyond July 1996. But if you do keep this chart by you, we will attempt to guide you through the convoluted processes. We shall continue to use these stage numberings, unless someone changes standing orders.

CHART OF PROCEDURES IN LITURGICAL REVISION

