

**A record of a meeting of members of the  
International Anglican Liturgical Consultation  
at Ripon College Cuddesdon**

**3-9 August 2003**

## *Liturgical Formation*

The meeting began with a celebration of the eucharist at which the Bishop of Salisbury was presider, and convened after a reception and dinner. The chair, Paul Bradshaw, welcomed participants. He thanked those who had made the meeting possible, especially members of the steering committee, members of the England home team (Jeremy Fletcher and Gilly Myers who put together the worship booklets for the week), and John Harper of the Royal School of Church Music. He welcomed Alan Detscher, a presbyter of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Bridgeport, Connecticut, as ecumenical partner. He also thanked Graham Wolfenden, lecturer in liturgy at Cuddesdon, and Simon Jones, who arranged transportation.. Graham Wolfenden welcomed the meeting on behalf of the Principal of the college. David Stancliffe welcomed the meeting on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury who sent his good wishes. Paul Bradshaw commented on the somewhat remote location of the College and the consequent limitation of amenities. The meeting discussed various housekeeping matters. Paul Bradshaw noted that 61 persons were present, representing 16 provinces of the Anglican Communion.

Paul Bradshaw reminded the meeting that this event was not a Consultation. The Consultations were originally held every two years but when it became clear that it was impossible to get wide representation so frequently it was decided that full consultations would be held only every four years and meetings of members would be held at the two-year intervals between them. Official statements could not be made by this gathering. It remained to be seen whether the subjects addressed by this meeting would become the subject of a full Consultation or if the meeting would be treated as a "one-off" after which no immediate further work on the subject (Liturgical Formation) would be necessary at this time.

The subject of this meeting was how God forms *us* in worship. Liturgy as the means of formation of people which was replaced in practice by concern with the revision of texts. How can we effectively enable people to participate people in liturgy and enable leaders to help people to grow.? This is not an end in itself because liturgical formation is also a matter of forming people for mission in the world. What is realistic for people in many parts of the Anglican Communion? We need to hear from the various provinces of the Communion.

Members of the meeting introduced themselves.

The digests of the addresses of the principal speakers which follow are intended to recover the highlights of their remarks. The reports of the leaders of small discussion groups are incomplete.

### **1 The meaning of liturgical formation today**

Juan Oliver addressed the meeting on the subject of the meaning of liturgical formation today, stressing *formation*. He said that when he was growing up he sometimes heard of the formation of seminarians, which suggested that seminarians had to be grown in a complex process in which self and spiritual life were addressed. He was surprised when he encountered the idea of *Christian* formation which countered an acceptance of an abstract and intellectual approach to the preparation of people for Christian life. By *formation* there was reference to the development of the whole person, actions as well as thoughts. Thus formation was connected with ethics, affecting behavioural patterns and not ideas alone. Abstract attention to creeds did not satisfy the serious seeker. Thus Christian formation as a process was born out of a concern with making Christians because Christians are *made* rather than *born*. A Christian is made by taking a holy bath and eating a holy meal with us.

But how do Christians grow and develop? What is the relationship of worship and Christian maturity. It is not enough if it reflects ignorance of scripture or indifference to the poor and becomes only art for art's sake. How do people become mature through worship? Worship itself is formative. It is too easy for us to forget how much formation goes on in and through liturgy *unconsciously*. Liturgical formation takes place in and through liturgical action. A century ago the Cambridge school of anthropology defined ritual as a vehicle for meaning and ideas contained in myths. This definition did a disservice to liturgy. The transfer

of ideas from brain to brain is much simpler than worship. Worship and the presence of God are much richer and deeper than the ideas of the conscious mind. Worship affects the whole person and not only the thoughts.

Worship forms us by introducing us to life in a world which is different from our everyday world. It is a kind of make-believe—life in the presence of God. This new world is called the kingdom, or the reign of God or, in the Coptic tradition, the new world. Liturgy engages us in this new world by having us engage with it again so that we may learn how to live it and not only think about it. As in theatre, we suspend disbelief and give ourselves over to new ways of being, joyful, compassionate, and righteous in the world.

What are the ritual means at the disposal of liturgy? There are seven actions of the liturgy which rehearse the kingdom or reign. In the case of the eucharist they are a) the gathering of the assembly into the people of God, the church, b) the people of God listening to God, c) the people of God responding to God in praise and supplication, d) the people of God thanking God and asking for the Spirit, e) the people of God sharing a meal, f) the people of God sent out into the world in service. These are the ritual means by which the people of God are assisted in formation. The people of God are the main symbol in the event. The assembly is sacred and if the building is sacred it is because the people of God are sacred. In pagan religions the people are sacred because their building is sacred, but in Christianity it is the other way around. It is the assembly and what it does in worship that is formative.

The work of worship is not merely logical. We are doing these things in the presence of God as if we were in the reign of God. Our actions are ordinary but their meaning is multidimensional. They are evocative rather than didactic. The liturgy allows for multiple interpretations, so sharing its meaning cannot be univocal. It is symphonic. Thus eating and drinking together is a sign of the inclusion of the outcast, but also of the new Jerusalem, heaven, etc. Actions that can only mean one thing tend to impoverish worship. We cannot succeed in grasping the meaning of worship by insisting that it be rational. Our gathering is different from other gatherings. Our place of worship is marked as a special place, even temporarily. Liturgy is a human artefact which we must craft. What does it mean for the assembly to have to craft its liturgy? Where do we acquire our actions, movement, music, prayers, etc.? The first answer is *from the past*. It is inherent in worship to present itself as *the way we have always done it*. But the assembly must also craft its worship in ways that are patently meaningful in relation to the culture in which it lives. The great temptation is to think that the worship we like serves the needs of everyone else. Falling into this temptation results in worship becoming deformative rather than formative. Some particular phase in the development of worship is exotically confused with the reign of God. Someone who experiences a great Anglican liturgy as being *in heaven* implies that they have died and have gone to King's College, Cambridge. It is only when the assembly crafts liturgy which is rooted in the tradition but finds expression in forms drawn from the present culture that the reign of God may be apprehended.

Catechesis which treats liturgical formation as the opening up of liturgical secrets is trafficking in *arcana*. The questions are *what did it mean for people then* and *what does it mean for people now?* But our liturgy is full of details whose meaning has been lost and to which we assign new meanings in order to justify their continuation. The ritual tools of worship must be ever examined in terms of the immediate context, and reformed accordingly.

Worship forms us not only in the act of worship but also in the ways in which we reflect upon worship and relate it to our personal and corporate everyday lives. This process, originally offered by the bishop or presbyter as *mystagogy*, has never stopped. We fall into the trap of thinking that the meaning of the eucharist is contained in a book in the library, while it actually lives in this person and that person and in them both when they talk about it. Meaning is always meaning to *someone*, it isn't meaning to itself. Meanings are not self-existing beings but human artefacts. Making meaning is not simply an insight in the mind but is the making of a connection between this action and my life. The import of the eucharist is revealed by the question, *what would it be like for me if there were no more eucharists in the world?* If I don't make the meaning no one can give it to me. Liturgical formation has something to do with meaning-making, by individuals and corporately.

We should plan rites and reflect on them afterwards. Do not look for meaning prior to the rite (the meaning of the honeymoon cannot be known until after the honeymoon). Leave Augustine in the library for now because meaning-making is the work of the participant. Bring Augustine into the conversation eventually but only when Augustine echoes what someone is saying and they can discover shared meaning

in the community. It is very difficult to articulate a meaning if there is no one to talk to. There is no substitute for a group of peers talking about the meaningfulness of a rite and its importance to one another. These groups are best led by laity. Make those who are preparing for rites visible to the congregation so that the congregation can see that such people are the norm. Finally, connect worship to the work of justice. The liturgy is not supposed merely to point to or talk about justice but to enact and do justice. The work of justice must be apparent in the liturgy and not present only as an intellectual concept.

None of the above is intended to be anti-intellectual. However, it is important to recognize that just because we like an idea from the Christian classics does not mean that we understand it. We still have to build our own understandings out of our culture and every aspect of our situation in life. Active reflection on liturgy is not the parroting of old ideas but the building up of new ideas. Intellectual concepts must be deconstructed and reconstructed in relation to our own time and context.

Juan Oliver offered the following questions for discussion. How do your people celebrate? How do they arrive? What do they wear? What happens? How do they tell the difference between good and bad celebrations? How do your people share the meaning of their celebratory experiences? What categories of thought do your people use to describe and evaluate a celebration? Group leaders reported on their discussions and the meeting engaged with Juan Oliver in questions and comments.

Some group responses:

- Trends noted: In First World societies, there seems to be a waning of common cultural points of celebration. Generally, formal social gatherings consist of: a sense of gathered community by way of invitation, bonds of friendship, family or collegueship, with clear demarcations of expected behaviours depending upon event/context. We noted that most celebrations can be marked by the sharing of food and drink, music, story-telling, laughter and some of the more spontaneous stuff of gathering of friends.

There was some discussion of social gatherings around bereavement, noting the distinctiveness of Irish and Melanesian cultures in relation to the other (British, North American) cultures in the group. In the former, gatherings are spontaneous, soon after death, and emotional expression 'raw' and immediate, and this part of celebrating the passing of a loved one is valued. In the other cultures present, it is more expected that the bereaved have time 'alone' or apart from wider gatherings in order to 'collect' themselves, and the social rituals of celebration of the life of the departed are more contained within the formal parts of the rites.

It was noted that for the First World societies present within the conversation, that wider cultural kinds of celebration are often tied to 'entertainment' events (notably sporting events). The older cultures of common singing have all but disappeared (i.e. pub-singing, table-singing, etc.), with the exception of some football songs sung by large crowds.

It was also noted that for these societies, though social gatherings, especially larger, more formalized ones, may express a desired levelling of social class, often they tend to replicate the socio-economic-political divisions within a society, noted either by patterns of exclusion or patterns of roles that are taken on within the gathering. (i.e. all may be invited and honoured, but the women may still be the only ones expected to serve the food, or all may be invited, but patterns of privilege go to certain classes of people). Singing, dancing and other cultural expression may be relegated to the 'entertainment' (i.e. some singing to entertain others)

The exceptions were noted with particular reference to the cultures of Melanesia and Canadian indigenous communities, where the values of equality of the 'circle' of community are specifically enacted within occasions of celebration, and can serve as cultural reminders of 'the way it's supposed to be' in other social interaction. This extends to invitation (widely issued, and inclusive, and if you bring food you're a part of the gathering), and to the patterns in the celebrations themselves (everyone dances, everyone sings, everyone eats).

And

As we discussed cultural celebrations, apart from the context of the church, we wondered what might be the appropriate cultural analogue for Christian liturgical celebrations. There are different customs for different events. For example, soccer games are large public events, in contrast the more intimate setting of a dinner party. The size of the gathering affects the quality of the celebration. However, we noticed that joy and an invitation for laughter often characterize celebrations, regardless of the size of the gathering.

We found it difficult to focus on secular celebrations and moved quickly to church celebrations. We reflected at length on rites of passage, including weddings and funerals, which often have a religious context, and graduations. We noted that these events typically have both a more formal ritual and a less formal gathering that may also have some ritualistic components. Often there are quite different expectations and norms for these different aspects of the celebration, for example, a marriage liturgy might be a very sombre affair, while the reception that follows is much more joyful. We noticed that participants in many of these events give evidence of a strong desire for a sense of roots

Another group reported,

There are few opportunities for communities or individuals to reflect together on their experiences of worship. In Western churches, the 'coffee time' after worship, which could offer one such opportunity, has itself often been ritualized, making conversation superficial and 'detached' from the worship time.

The absence of opportunity to reflect on or discuss worship experiences, can contribute to situations of pastoral breakdown.

Spiritual directors should be trained/encouraged to help individuals to reflect on their experiences of worship.

And,

A Group first asked the question "what/who are our people?" When we live in multicultural worlds, discerning a single group, or a homogenous cultural celebration is more difficult, some sub-cultures celebrate in very different ways than others and yet we belong to at least two, often many more, of these sub-cultures.

Many modern, first world cultures (such as the English) have little in the way of public celebrations. The gathering of people is important. When you have a dinner party, welcoming, introducing, making comfortable, drawing into the circle and offering food and drink are key—how does the opening of most liturgies resemble this at all? (answer from many—not much!) Think of the difference in how we treat latecomers (or early arrivals) at a liturgy as compared with a domestic gathering where they are guests. One person wondered, in light of that, why we have the coffee hour afterwards (in the normative Sunday morning pattern of liturgy). Perhaps we should always have it before the liturgy.

The group discussed *time* as a factor in difference. For many Europeans, a liturgy scheduled for 10:00 begins at 10:00; for other cultures, the stated time is a suggestion or irrelevant and the liturgy begins when it is ready, or when the elders arrive, or when the important people arrive. The "clock time" is not important. One person described this as an emphasis on *kairos* rather than *chronos*—not the right time until it is really the agreed-upon right time.

How welcome are visitors really (or how welcome do they really feel) Do we only welcome those who "fit"—who are like us? If they are different, what do they need to leave outside, what can be brought inside to the liturgical gathering? (language, dress, cultural participatory patterns, etc).

One way of welcoming the stranger is through hospitable music—music that is accessible, that can be accessible in spite of different levels of literacy and attention span.

## **2 Liturgical education and formation from an African perspective**

Solomon Amusan addressed the meeting on liturgical education and formation from an African perspective. He said that because Christian liturgy did not originate in Africa there were difficulties in examining liturgical education and formation from an African perspective. He decided to investigate liturgical formation from the point of view of African traditional religion with a view to determining the contribution which such formation may make to the concept of Christian liturgical formation.. He focused on the Yoruba tribe, to which he belongs and which has a larger number of Anglican members than any other tribes in Nigeria. Among Yoruba people awareness of their pre-Christian religion is one of the factors encouraging a lively practice of Christianity. Traditional religion is dying but it has affected liturgical practice.

Nigerians in general and the Yoruba in particular were already a religious people when westerners brought Christianity. Worship of God was not new to them and they had various intermediary deities through whom they offered their worship to the supreme deity. Among these gods are Sango, Oya, Egungun, and Ogun.

At the heart of Yoruba culture is the offering (sacrifice) of gifts, even of the smallest kind. Ogun worship in particular involves blood. Ogun is the patron of professions involving iron, like driving, blacksmithing, farming, and hunting. The liturgy of Ogun worshippers lacks written texts but was passed through family priests from generation to generation. Documentary evidence is lacking because the worship was suppressed by missionaries and colonial authorities. The structure of the liturgy is based on the ancestral spirits of individual extended families and is not readily available.

Yoruba worship puts deity at the centre of all affairs of life. The worship is private (morning worship at the shrine of the deity) and public (involving song, dance, prayer, and offerings, usually at festivals).The opening act of worship involves bringing kola-nuts to offer. The nuts are broken and eaten as a sign of fellowship. Shared with the god, they form a bond of communion. The details of worship are rigorously preserved because any deviation could jeopardize its efficacy. Worshippers gather at the house of the priest, who wears liturgical clothes. A procession, led by children, moves to the Ogun shrine with dancing, singing, and drumming which continues at the shrine as an act of invocation at the beginning of worship. When they are settled at the shrine the priest cites traditional narratives of Ogun in the forms of songs of praise. Then the kola-nuts are pierced and some are set aside for the absent. The nuts are shared

if the two halves of the split nut, cast up and forward, fall with one half facing up, the other down—indicating acceptance. If acceptance is not indicated a further oblation, as indicated by an oracle, must be made. Intercession is then made for local, regional, and national communities, coupled with prayers with vows and testimony to prayers which have been answered and to the fulfilment of vows. The form of intercession resembles the forms found in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Prayer is an important element in worship. After the prayers a dog is beheaded and its blood is sprinkled on the shrine with palm oil and palm wine. After further prayers there is a blessing by the priest and a votive hymn. Singing, drumming, and dancing continue. In spite of the spontaneity of the prayers the structure of the liturgical events is stable. The liturgy contains elements seldom practised in the Christian eucharist, including the singing of native hymns, dancing, drumming, invocation, individual offertory, extempore prayers and the sharing of elements.

Belief that full responsibility for all human affairs belongs to the Supreme Being and that the people are to act as ordered by their priests or diviners is the principal factor that guides the life of the adherents of traditional religion, which was the religion before Christianity and Islam arrived in Yorubaland. All circumstances of life are attributed to the Supreme Being, who is transcendent. The people try to live in the way that will please him. The Yoruba say of God, “God who occupies the whole extent of the world, the Saviour who saves both slave and free-born.” This explains why there is no temple to localize the Supreme God. God is universal and has absolute control of the universe.

The importance of native music in worship: missionaries who came to Nigeria, and who are still respected, introduced a Christianity which was deeply tinged with western culture. Anglican missionaries introduced the English Anglican liturgy and translated it verbatim into Nigerian languages without considering its relevance to the context. Anyone who suggested that Nigerians did not need to throw away what was good and valuable in their own culture would have been accused of rank heathenism. In spite of the independence of the Nigerian Anglican church, the cool and sober forms of worship are still the standard. In Nigerian culture, overt and warm expressions are natural and excessive restraint and coldness in ritual action is incompatible with the corporate sensibility of the people. Nigerian worshippers want to be domestic and spontaneous rather than rigid and to be emotional in celebrating God’s presence with the beautiful music of their native tongues. No one who has seen a Nigerian festival or a sacrificial ceremony, or a marriage or naming ceremony or funeral would fail to see that music is a dominant form of artistic expression in Nigerian social and religious life. It is an outlet for emotion, a vehicle for verbal expression, and a special means of communication and bonding. In the day to day activities of Nigerians, it is very hard to separate music or singing from their lives.

Worshippers in churches like the Anglican Church are denied native hymns with drums and dancing. The 1996 Book of Common Prayer tried to redress this. The 1662 liturgy makes the worship alien to the people and their culture and hampers the sense of worship itself. Many go to other denominations in their search for a truly culturally fulfilling Christian worship. Music does not depend on words. It speaks to hearts in a language that transcends racial and national barriers. It goes hand in hand with religion, appealing to young and old, rich and poor, of all races.

At the advent of Christianity, Yoruba Christians also observed festivals related to their gods. Because of the interrelation of religious and social life, these festivals are kept by Christians. Sometimes this is called syncretism. However, Christian involvement in the festivals is due to social pressure to conform or at least to participate. The veneration of Ogun is associated with economic motives, the ensuring of professional success, while the veneration of the spirits of the ancestors is seen as socially beneficial because it connects the living with the heritage of the past and serves to strengthen the family unit. Elements of traditional religion still make a profound impression on some Christians.

Religious practice includes healing which is sought by offering sacrifice and the use of native medicine prescribed by the priest along traditional lines. Native medicine is believed to derive its origin from the deity who teaches the priests how to prepare it. In most cases a charm is worn by the patient to protect from disease or to prevent evil from falling on the user. Native medicine is also used for good luck, quick sales of wares, to ensure prosperity, for retentive memory, etc. In Yoruba society, where concern for health and the quest for healing and the use of native medicine are so important, those aspects of Christian worship which are concerned with healing must be acknowledged, affirmed, and enhanced, as in the epistle of James and the healing ministry of Jesus. In addition to the specific rite of anointing, every

area of liturgy can exercise a healing role. African churches have to decide whether it is sufficient to incorporate local traditions into the existing liturgy or whether they should seek a genuinely Christian new inspiration in African terms, creating a true African liturgical norm.

In 1983 the Nigerian Anglican church adopted an alternative service book. In 1996 the church adopted a new Book of Common Prayer for a five-year period, borrowing from various sources and introducing Nigerian ideas. Any attempt to introduce drumming, dancing, singing, and clapping into the liturgical formation in Africa must respect the solemnity and dignity of the liturgy. Of course they can be done solemnly and with great dignity and it would be possible fittingly to dance to the altar at the offertory and also with singing of choruses during the reception of the elements.

The meeting engaged Solomon Amusan with comments and questions.

### **3 Liturgical Formation of the People of God**

Mark Earey said that his subject was the “people of God” understood as ordinary worshippers and not as ordained or lay ministers. Liturgical formation involves *understanding* liturgy, *training* for a leadership role, and the formation of people by the liturgy through *engagement* with liturgical worship. Education is often merely explaining the exotic, but Mark Earey said he preferred to cut things that require such explanation. The problem is that the people of God don’t have the opportunity to cut the exotic because they aren’t in control. However, one dimension of education is explanation. However, liturgical education may also empower lay people to challenge the *status quo*, at which point it is prophetic and not repressive.

For most people education ends after confirmation classes or their equivalent. Further, the approach of many to education is suspicion. Telling people something new suggests that their present knowledge is deficient. There is very low learner motivation. Most worshippers are not motivated to learn more about public worship. Changing liturgical texts motivates people to learn, even if they are opposed to change and want to marshal their arguments against it. Mark Earey said that in his experience the church lacked a national liturgical education strategy. National, diocesan, deanery, parish, and ecumenical levels of communication have to be identified as avenues for resources. The internet also provides a rich resource because it is able to bypass bottlenecks in the church’s structure.

How do you motivate liturgical learning? One way is to “piggy-back” on other educational events dealing with other issues. This involves creating partnerships with other movements in the church. Connections may be developed between parish events (like funerals) and liturgical education. The concept of the liturgy as something to which there are right and wrong answers is one of the greatest hindrances to liturgical education. References to “the liturgy” imply that there is one correct way. It is better to speak of liturgical worship. Liturgical education should empower rather than oppress people.

If worship is going to form people for living, the question is whether it is *connected with* the rest of life or for an *escape from* the rest of life. For many western people the starting point is “me and God”. Liturgy is then lots of people being “me and God” in the same building. But *life* is what we have to go back to when we can’t avoid it any longer. People often speak of liturgy as the place where they engage with God and offer their lives to God, but that really should happen in everyday life. For Christians the primary place of engagement with God, encounter with God and offering to God, is the day-to-day living of our lives for God. Liturgical worship is symbolic or representational of this “worship by living.”. Private devotion—personal worship—is a subset of the corporate liturgy.

Resistance to liturgical change is actually a result of formation. When people are asked to consider new forms of worship they are being challenged to deconstruct a negative formation. But there is also positive formation. We can help make it happen by enabling people to see the structure or shape of the worship in which they are participating. Liturgy is not a jigsaw puzzle whose bits must be made to fit together but a journey, which is a more dynamic model. Providing an outline is a form of education, although passive. How do we enable a sense of structure when there are no books or booklets, for instance when a screen is used.

An important model of liturgy is *drama* in which participants are engaged. Active participation in the liturgy is not just a matter of getting people to do jobs. *Engagement* is not about leading or doing a job but is a matter of feeling and knowing what is going on. It can happen in silence, in a sense of awe, even in sharing the notices. To be formed you have to be engaged. For many people their experience of worship is not what liturgists think it is. Those who are in charge have made participation feel as if it is a matter of

doing the right things in the right way and many ordinary worshippers have felt “de-skilled”. Sometimes it is as if liturgy had lost its humanity and therefore those vital connections which reveal it as something which is part of a life lived to the glory of God. We need to recover ways to use our symbols so that they do not need to be explained. Connections are important in formation as they are in education. There is a tension in connection between *now* and *not yet*. Tension demands connection at both ends. Worship *will* form us and shape our assumptions about God, whether for good or bad. Worship which is in spirit and truth will be authentic both to who God is and to where we are.

Mark Earey suggested questions for group work discussion. What are the opportunities for partnership and what are the pastoral connections in the life of the church that may be opportunities for liturgical education? Are there missing resources that should be commissioned/produced? Do you agree that liturgical worship needs to recover “humanity”?

Some group responses:

*Dialogue in Difference:* The group noted that sometimes the best learning/formation moments come when one is confronted by encounter with difference. Examples were given from ecumenical and inter-cultural exchanges. Reflecting on the experiences of Canadian Anglican-Lutheran exchanges in the context of working towards Full Communion, one member remarked that often in the ecumenical encounter one is confronted into learning about oneself and one’s own tradition and culture as much as, if not more than, that of the other. In these situations one sees and hears oneself through the eyes and voice of the other. Similarly, times of liturgical change, in parishes and Provinces, can provide teachable moments, as people are confronted with difference. The challenge lays in the quality of the relationship that exists with the difference.

*Media* –(referring mainly to the mass media of radio and television broadcast) the challenge to the church is to engage proactively with media as opposed to reactively – though we find ourselves more often in the latter stance. Church of England representatives pointed to the privileged place that this Church has in relation to some broadcast media and production houses. For example, the Church of England has liturgical advisors to several soap operas (television dramas) – for East Enders, Archers. When it comes to the broadcasting of actual liturgies, there are many challenges, including the temptation by producers not to necessarily focus on what is the core of the liturgical action, but to put their energies more with what makes for good entertainment.

It was noted that shut-ins very often make much use of broadcast liturgies. But given the realities of much broadcast media in terms of their being bound within multinational conglomerates, it was suggested that contacts with local media (print and broadcast) are often the best places for the church to connect.

*Other Partnerships for Education* – It was noted that liturgical education often happens (and often at its best) during parish visitations – funerals, weddings, pastoral care visits, marriage preparation work. In some locations, seminaries and faculties of theology find themselves (whether by their own initiation or as recipients of invitation) in the position of partners with the local church in educational and formational initiatives.

*Reflections from contexts other than First World-* Much of the conversation about mass media had little to do with the realities of some of our members, who face a completely different set of challenges related to gathering of and exchanges between communities. Where there are multiple languages, long travel times, little technology, and illiteracy, the “issue” related to “partnership” is all about the quality of community. Formation in liturgy happens in community, and in the cultures where community is among the highest value, the needs are vastly different from those of the culture that has dominated this consultation.

*Observations* - The waning of community (as value and as reality) in the north/west societies whose participation dominates this Consultation has been a recurring theme within our group conversations. If we are truly to recover *humanity* in liturgy, the foundational challenge to us is to recover *community* in its fullness, in all the counter-cultural dimensions that it lives (and that our cultures seek, often in flawed ways).

Another group reported,

Experience of demand for education varies across the Communion. In some places, by making use of Lent for education programmes, we have made the unfortunate association of education with penance!

People use worship time to fulfil their own needs at that time, e.g. a young parent taking “time out” while children are involved in Sunday School.

Formation can begin when people ask questions about liturgical changes, when they ask “Why?”

Liturgists and Presiders need to get to know and to take more seriously the lay experience of liturgy.

The role and importance of preaching within the liturgy needs to be re-discovered by liturgical study, not merely in homiletics. For most worshippers it forms part of a “whole” experience of worship.

Lay worshippers are formed more by what they join in saying/singing, rather than by what they hear. Yet much recent liturgical revision allots theological richness and substance to presider’s texts rather than to people’s texts.

And,

A group agreed that the “jargon” of formation” was difficult—very different ideas form from the different uses of the terminology. The word is used in many different ways, but what does it mean in practice? So much of the discussion has been on what the assembly does in the liturgy—but what about what God does in the liturgy, is it not the primary action of God that begins any liturgical formation?

The group agreed that “engagement” is a much more inclusive term than “active participation.” One can be “active” but not engaged, and often active participation means outward busyness not inclusive of contemplative participation.

It was suggested that the changes in liturgical structure are matched by the impact of changed words i.e., in our attempt to emphasize rightly the importance of liturgical structure, we should not underestimate the importance of changing words too). How are we reformed by the verbal changes, such as “we” to “I”, “Thou” to “you”, and common text recited by all. How do our concepts of God and church change because of these changes? How do too many words in the liturgy deform us? What does repetition actually do in formation (both ritual and verbal)?

Formation is not just through words, however. The group strongly stated that non-verbal language is as important or even more important (gestures, posture, movement) in forming us

The shape of the service—the *ordo*—was another way to move away from an overemphasis on text and towards an embodied liturgy, but the key work of strategy was important also: how will these changes be introduced (methodology not just content)? There were two examples: the first was the use of silence It was suggested that in order for this to be effective it needed to be introduced carefully and with clear limits, so that people will feel comfortable knowing it was both planned and will have an end. The second comment was that changes could be either alarming or liberating, but a known and repetitive structure allowed people to participate more fully than a more spontaneous series of constant changes. The group also discussed the importance of using media effectively and with some savvy. The two way conversation between the media and the church needs to be maintained. When the media portrays things incorrectly (especially changes in liturgy) the church has a responsibility to engage in the conversation, not just accept it. A strategy on media that has worked in the C of E involved instructing the media to focus on the ritual actions when broadcasting liturgies, not just on the words, and in being pro-active in popular television shows so that the church as depicted actually has something to do with reality, not simply nostalgia.

One missing resource at the parish level was post-liturgical reflection on the experience of the liturgy. What are the first words of the liturgy? Can anyone remember, and what can we learn from each other’s perspective following a parish liturgy?

Finally, the relationship between clergy and parishioners is one of trust—how is that built up in a non-permanent clergy position, which is becoming more common in many communities?

And,

A group focused in why there is resistance to change when it comes to liturgical formation. They noted that liturgical education of the people of God may not happen because traditionally there is no expectation on the part of lay people that education or change is needed after confirmation. They asked, “Is resistance to change different for the rich and the poor?” They noted that there are different attitudes to change on the part of different cultures (including local cultures), so some understanding of the culture is necessary in order to understand different responses to change. In answer to the question whether liturgical worship needs to recover “humanity,” it was noted that when there is a shift from fixed forms to a more flexible form for the intercessions, there is greater sensitivity to human experience.

#### **4 The role of music in liturgical formation**

Carol Doran said she understood formation as the ways in which the faithful learn by osmosis or accident to value and take their part in the church’s liturgy. She said she wanted to acknowledge the importance of leadership. Liturgy helps us over the difficult spot where learning new things is no fun at all. The church’s music is neither the property of nor intended to benefit musicians. Contemporary western culture has become entranced by music which is performed by others, and by polished performance which often causes people to say, “I am not a singer; I am not a musician.” Such people are unaware of the biblical tradition that those who know God will automatically sing God’s praises. We are built to express ourselves through music. This is the way God made us.

Many people think of music as an option in the church. These misconceptions have important implications for our task. The work of respected researchers has demonstrated that musical ability is not limited to some parts of the population. One of them said, “Making and appreciating music is part of every human being’s mental equipment.” Most people need serious encouragement and musical catechesis. Music is often treated as filler or background in relation to the liturgy. Music has the capacity to enable people to increase the breadth of their conceptions about God. What would be required in order to have the unique potential that music possesses to be fully experienced in the life of the faithful?

Music, because of its inherent nature, its beauty, draws both the stranger and the faithful towards the church’s liturgical prayer. It encourages increasingly deeper participation in that prayer. Music itself is a complex symbol system which is, in its own way, able to communicate meaning. Music’s ability to communicate cross-culturally has a Pentecost quality because it can be appreciated at some level by all

people. We learn about becoming when we listen respectfully, when we commit ourselves, to listening to one another and when we adjust our voices. As we in this meeting have sung together we have come to respect one another.

Not all people will choose the same kind of music, but singing together and using a variety of musical styles will often eliminate the need to debate the relative values of each style. Singing together has the capacity to reconcile. Rowan Williams spoke along these lines at his enthronement. The beauty of music itself, and not necessarily any particular style, is inherently attractive. Even congregations of the deaf use drums. One of music's most important contributions to liturgical formation is its ability to participate in revelation. Music is able to spark the imagination. Music has no more important role in liturgy than to enable our understanding of the meaning of the text. The Old Testament records the exuberant use of music, as at the dedication of Solomon's temple. The New Testament carries no record of such extravagant music, but music was employed from the church's earliest days and even persecution did not cause it to be abandoned. By the beginning of the 5<sup>th</sup> century Augustine expresses his concern that music fascinates and draws the worshipper away from the texts. His soul is deeply conflicted, not because of music's beauty but because he finds himself enjoying it. He sees reason as the proper leader of prayer and the bodily senses as its assistant.

The meeting has already noted that liturgical formation is rare and formation for music in liturgy is rarer. The faithful people deserve a welcoming into liturgical participation. There are other emerging difficulties, like the acknowledgement of differences in our culture. The surrounding culture has produced its own challenges to music in liturgy. The scope of music which is broadcast has become so narrow that some kinds of music have become uncomfortable to people, even frightening. Formation of seminarians for music leadership is one of the most important tasks today. Carol Doran said she was committed to the principle that every seminarian should discover his/her own voice so they can recognize the voice that God has given them and thus become able to lead the congregation's music program capably and become lovers of music. Imagine a parish where catechesis for children involves learning their congregation's musical settings and hymn tradition. Imagine a parish where all choir programs integrate liturgical catechesis into every rehearsal and prayers before and after rehearsal. Imagine a clergy-musician collaboration that would encourage the parish musician to lead the prayers in those choir rehearsals. Imagine the meeting of the church's board that approves funds for the musician's continuing education in liturgy. Imagine a parish where settings of texts sung by the congregation were carefully chosen to express and enhance each ritual moment, where song included ancient and contemporary hymns led musically with enthusiasm and respect for the qualities of each unique community which was their source.

## **5 Liturgical Education and Formation in Ordination Training**

Tomas Maddela said that the proper place of every baptized member in the liturgy of the church has been restored in the course of the liturgical movement. However, there is in the assembly a variety of roles. The community is not undifferentiated. There are leaders, but they act for all and in relation to all. The mode of participation of people differs according to their liturgical competence. Every liturgical assembly must have a president. The BCP continues to present numerous challenges to all participants, but especially to those who lead. The one presiding at any liturgical assembly who does not perform effectively is wasting his or her time and that of the participants. In the Anglican Communion today there is an earnest desire to provide competence for candidates for ordination so that they become "at home" in their role.

Preparing ordinands for liturgical leadership involves education, training, and formation. How should we go about preparing candidates for ordination for liturgical leadership within the seminary program? While seminarians form a seemingly homogenous group, their background is diverse. There have been changes in the profile of seminarians throughout the Communion.

*Liturgical Education.* There are two distinct aspects: first, the liturgy is in itself formative, but on the other hand there is a sense in which the liturgy is learned. If the liturgy is the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit, then its role in the education of the ordinand is of primary importance. In the early centuries of Christianity it was the only sphere in which formation took place. This does not mean that the liturgy is the sole teaching centre of the church, but it is the source. Nor does it mean that the liturgy should be a classroom. Preparing people for liturgical leadership requires a program of instruction within an academic community under the influence of scholarship. In most seminaries today liturgical

studies are, for the most part, conducted by liturgists. A single general program would be difficult to establish but certain patterns are possible, involving the adoption of a core program with additional elective options.

A problem facing seminaries today concerns the training of those who teach liturgy. Another problem area concerns the library. Many seminary libraries cannot afford the resources now available.

*Training.* It is in this area that theory and practice are closely aligned. It is in this area that liturgy professors are challenged to take cognizance of the leadership requirements of their students. Liturgical training is concerned with the conduct and planning of liturgical celebrations. These programs are related to the actual chapel services of their seminaries, which provide a laboratory environment. A common method of training liturgical leaders is videotape—seeing is believing. Every student ought to see himself or herself as the people will see them. Because the BCP provides options another method in training is role-playing in which students are given pastoral situations to work on. Training is not just a matter of learning rubrics. One of the tasks of teachers is to provide harmony between theory and practice.

*Formation.* Formation should press toward the sanctification of the student, sanctifying the whole day by using the eucharist and morning and evening prayer as the determining elements. The liturgy unites and relates all the aspects of the spiritual program into one whole. It must not be misconstrued in terms of its external aspects. The seminary seeks to provide an atmosphere in which the seminarian will be able to exercise his or her spiritual character. The tone of life in a seminary is set by the eucharist. Nothing is more important. Every aspect of its celebration merits careful attention. More than canonized formulae is necessary. The eucharist in the seminary must be adapted to the life of seminarians who are like no other group; it must be celebrated *by* them and not merely *for* them. The eucharist should not be celebrated in the early morning in order to get it out of the way. It must enter most intimately into the details of the daily life of the seminary. What is needed more than anything else is *persons*, the involvement of persons who lead in a manner that is more than merely valid. Planning worship for the seminary community can be a model of planning for those who as parish pastors will have to work at the real needs of a parish congregation.

Is the seminary the proper place for preparing liturgical leaders? As long as liturgical celebrations in seminaries remain perfunctory future priests will carry over into their ministries the standards they receive in seminary. Seminary life does not correspond to the life of a parish. The seminary enjoys a group environment which may be lacking in the parish. Another problem is that the seminary often does not allow students to experience the full sweep of the liturgical year. When a person is ordained he or she becomes a liturgist and through him or her the people are brought into contact with the incarnate and written word. Shaping good liturgy is an art, calling for crafting and design. It may require timing and practice. Those involved must learn to be self-critical. Simplicity bids us to keep out of the way. Many liturgical woes can be attributed simply to lack of common sense, but common sense requires years of experience in participating in the liturgy, combined with education, training, and formation.

Tomas Maddela suggested the following questions as a basis for group discussion. What are the challenges confronting us in our respective provinces? What other models aside from the seminary model can be proposed as a better way of providing education, training, and formation?

Some discussion points reported by group leaders.

Ordinands in western countries now tend to be older and to have already experienced liturgical formation. There is a lack of integration of life formation into their seminary experience. Another challenge is reluctance to deal with practicalities like presidential styles because of issues of churchmanship. There is a lack of challenging individuals' experience of worship. Who trains the trainers of curates? Some provinces have training parishes with training incumbents. But in some places the situation is chaotic. There is a lack of post-graduate training in liturgical studies, a particular problem for Africa. Liturgy and liturgical formation tends to be on the bottom of the pile when provincial priorities are being discussed. One of the keys to good liturgical formation of clergy will be better formation of the whole people of God and the raising of their expectations.

The church needs to break out of seeing one model of training for all and discover what it means to be a liturgical community in diffuse communities. The semi-monastic model for seminaries was predominant but not universal. We now have a model which is more related to parish settings. In commuting seminaries no service has the whole community present. Seminaries face the community question in a special way because pressure in the academic world favours people who work alone. The movement from the monastic to the academic model produces an identity crisis. We need an agency in the church that has responsibility for carrying on the theological tradition in a way that no one parish can supply.

One province reported the problems raised by the integration of a variety of cultures. Another province talked about the challenge of parity of stipendiary and non-stipendiary priests. There were questions about the problems of being trained in one liturgical culture and then sent to work in another. If you can't get your head and heart around serving another tradition, have you been well-formed? While there is liturgical education happening, is there much formation? One province reported that education is seen as the job of the theological faculties and formation is seen as the job of the church. Have people been well-formed if they don't have an appetite for lifelong learning when they leave seminary? One province suggested that the lines between the traditional parties are blurring and the question is how to adapt to new distinctions? One group noted that conversation had not included the diaconate, although a vocational diaconate is a significant part of church life in some places. Are we paying proper attention to the transitional diaconate and its training needs?

One group heard about the ways people are coping with lack of funding and with change. Residential models of training are disappearing and ecumenical models provide particular challenges. There are also "weekend" schemes for people who are not able to participate in residential programs. These models are often enriched by people who bring local talent and their own particular skills. In one province people spend weekends in a training program over a period of five years.

Relying on the first two or three years of ministry for formation is not a good idea. Clergy used to be trained as leaders of prayer but the model has shifted to social or counselling helpers. We need to return to the leaders of prayer model. What happens in class and in church are almost opposite, producing a schizophrenic situation for those being trained. It is essential to provide controlled liturgical experimentation, followed by critical evaluation. Professors of liturgy must have a role in designing chapel services. The relationship of seminaries to secular institutions often creates conflicts which affect the liturgical schedule. Many find that commuting students come out more mature, perhaps because they "have a life". Residential students tend to be more neurotic and obsessed with trivia. Models of continuing education for everyone need to be explored and shared.

There is, or will be, a lack of trained and academically-qualified teachers of liturgy, either now or in the near future. There is a demotion of the importance of liturgy. In many ways ecumenical education is the only way to have seminary training, and it provides rich resources. The downside is that there are Anglican parishes served by Anglican clergy who are not trained in Anglican liturgy. Sometimes long-distance learning is the only way, but much is lost, like the corporate worship experience. Team-teaching involving liturgy and another subject often results in the other subject taking over. Other models to be considered: think internationally and send our liturgy professors around the world; return to some of the apprenticeship approaches; make better use of the international resources of the internet; seminaries need to look outwards rather than inwards.

Another group reported,

*General Observations:* diversities of programs, of liturgical cultures, of politics within Provinces; issues of fulltime stipendiary/non-stipendiary/part-time "class" structure.

*Ireland:* One theological college associated with Trinity, Dublin, since the 16<sup>th</sup> century has been teaching Anglican ordinands. There are challenges related to the diversity inherent in the body gathered within one college. People can become over-intense and conflict and mutual policing rise up regarding liturgy above all other things. There is an inescapable political texture to all of this, with mutual suspicion rising on both sides about those from another "hue". It remains tremendously difficult to separate out theology, liturgical training and politics.

*Solomon Islands:* The Church in Melanesia has one place for training. The main challenges facing this Province have to do with inculturation, a very delicate work that involves a lot of sharing of stories across diverse cultures. The diversities are political cultural, linguistic. The new Prayer Book is a very good example of the fruit of these commitments, in its work to respect different cultures and contexts of Melanesia.

An observation from Melanesia: When new liturgical resources are introduced, and are marked with the words "For Trial Use", people tend to react, "we don't "trial use" this, we *worship!*"

*Church of England:* The parity of formation of stipendiary and non-stipendiary priests is a major issue. Are we creating a "first-class" and "second-class" set of processes and expectations? The challenge before the Church of England at present is to find other models of formation and education that can achieve some parity in the outcome. Some dioceses are exploring the place of local training groups, training particularly applied to the practice of ministry and worship in which the student becomes a part of a liturgical "cell"—a local group constituted to help in formation of ministers. The interesting thing is that these cell groups end up forming communities in which not only the student is being formed but the community is being formed as well. There are also other, mixed models of training, for example "Sandwich" course training (some seminary, some field-distance education). Seminaries tend to have theological characters – and this affects liturgical formation. How to adapt to the character and needs of local parishes, especially in combined parishes? This is a deeply pastoral challenge: if you can't get your head and heart around the otherness of another tradition that you are to serve, how well have you really been formed? The level of formation in the BCP is minimal, but many parishes have 8am BCP services and Evensongs, burials. All concentration tends to be, in theological education, on what is "hip", but the pastoral reality is something else. In England, while education is happening, there is not much formation happening within the context of education, and most formation tends to be "on the job".

*Canada:* The Anglican Church of Canada's experience mirrors much of that expressed above, (re the "two-tiered" approach, challenges of harmony of expectations at a national level and attention to local needs, the challenges inherent in distance education and the at times disjunction between the worshipping community of formation and that of service), and all within a vast geography across which is flung a relatively sparse population. How to balance the needs of local communities in their local cultures (particularly indigenous cultures) with the wider demands of training for diaconal and presbyteral ministry?

How truly to honour local indigenous cultures and their ways of discerning, forming and teaching their leaders and communities? The Anglican Church of Canada has no “seminaries” as such, but rather theological faculties in universities, and smaller, locally-developed ministry training centres and colleges. There is a wide variety of programs. One of the greatest challenges comes from the general low level of relationship between the schools and the church structures. Discernment and assessment for ministry processes occur in one place, education in another. Formation is often seen as the “church’s job,” education is seen to be that of the theological college. And in some places, bishops are making decisions to ordain students with a minimum of theological education and formation (for different reasons), sometimes early on or midway through a course of studies.

*Australia:* How do you do formation with a student body which forms a disparate community if at all? Many are opting for distance and part-time education. “Local” priesthood formation is given a “second class” treatment. The colleges each have a kind of “party” orientation, and there are challenges to be faced in placing of students outside of their comfort zones. What to do about the newly ordained who stop reading and learning? How well have they been formed, if life-long learning is not a part of their vocational core? Some theological students sign up for courses out of the desire to learn, whereas many ordinands see the work as another “hoop” to just get through.

*U.S.A.:* 11 seminaries serve various regions. In liturgical education, the old lines of high, low, broad, are now blurring. Now the challenge is how to prepare people for new divisions in the church that have to do with multiculturalism, racism, acceptance of gays and lesbians in the life of the church, etc. Seminaries tend to work out liturgical formation and education in the context of very progressive ideals, but then what happens when the newly ordained are placed in liberal, conservative or traditionalist parishes? Sometimes the training is so progressive that it is beyond even liberal parish life.

*Japan:* The Japanese church is living with the legacies of a wide variety of missionary movements that brought very different forms of Christianity and of Anglicanism to the country. Each diocese now does its own training, and there is a desire to see some unity in the training programs.

### Another group reported,

The dynamics of the seminary learning community deeply affect the challenges of liturgical formation, e.g. the average age of students, or the proportion of married people.

It is essential to acknowledge and work with the previous life experience and liturgical formation (even where this has been “de-formation”) of students and their families. Sometimes formation has assumed that students are a tabula rasa when they begin their training, and there has been little or no attempt to integrate prior experience into present formation.

Because of sensitivity to issues of church party (evangelical or catholic), or issues of ecumenism, clear teaching about liturgical styles and other issues about liturgical practice, are sometimes omitted or glossed over. Students are thereby deprived of opportunities to be challenged and affirmed, to learn new skills and reflect on them.

Perhaps for the same reasons, liturgical formation is generally placed at the bottom of the pile in seminary and provincial education budgets.

Even where traditional curacies are still regarded as training, few resources are given to the formation of supervising rectors as formation directors, whether in liturgy or any other areas.

### And,

One group’s discussion primarily took the form of sharing ideas in relation to the question, “What can we share about training, education and formation for seminarians in/from our own provinces?”

In Canada, the norm is the ecumenical consortium to the extent that the Anglican formation is thin in some places, resulting in fully ecumenical liturgical training except for an Anglican “brush-up” at the end. The primary challenge is one of a crisis of trained leaders—there is only one fulltime liturgy professor at the moment. Sixty percent of priests are trained in seminaries, with 8 major seminaries.

In Australia, where there are seven seminaries, much of the training is also ecumenical. The primary problem was described as not a lack of trained professors but a lack of interest. Liturgy is not taken seriously as a subject. There is some training in liturgy at the parish level, especially for urban areas, but in rural areas there are parishes which are barely Anglican due to a lack of trained priests and the move toward an ecumenical model.

1. In the Church of England, the norm is still popularly considered to be residential seminaries (monastic to less monastic in structure). There are between 12 and 14 of these seminaries still available. In spite of this popular view, close to 50% of the priests and deacons are trained through on-line courses, distance learning, diaconate and tutorial schemes, and some local training of ministers (which is often very limited). There are very few academically trained liturgists. The creative response to this is represented by the gathering in June of 30 liturgy tutors where there was discussion of continuity and approach. Part of the challenge is that as liturgy is increasing integrated into other seminary topics it means that liturgy actually is subsumed—it doesn’t really get taught, only mentioned.

In Sri Lanka there is one main seminary for the Uniting Churches. Liturgy is underserved because of the ecumenical character of all the teaching at this seminary. Even a basic element such as following and living by the liturgical year is not present in many parishes because of a lack of preparation and training. Ironically, in spite of this, Anglicans are seen as the ones with resources, liturgical, calendrical, ritual, etc.

In Southern Africa there is one Anglican college (and also another in Mozambique). At the college there is one course on worship in the diploma and an opportunity for distance learning which connects to this one course also. Most of the

training has to take place at the diocesan level, but there are not many teachers trained in liturgy and library resources are bleak. Continuing education for clergy is one forum for liturgical education, although the primary stumbling block is the lack of finances to go abroad. On-line training may begin to make some differences. All ordinands are moved to different parishes and learn through these apprenticeships.

There is one single theological seminary in Dublin (for Ireland). Much of the instruction is done by liturgical instructors who travel to parishes and dioceses.

In the US, there are 11 major seminaries, and while all have liturgy professors listed (one has two liturgy professors), there is a dearth of people with the actual degree (and the ability to teach) so that one major seminary has just hired an ethics professor to teach liturgy. Many have, in addition, someone teaching liturgical music as well as homiletics professors. For the moment the situation is much better than other Anglican provinces. The great fear is the near future with a number of retirements on the horizon and the small number of American Anglicans in doctoral programs in liturgy.

Some general comments, reflections:

The Anglican communion should emulate the liturgical centres run for RC laity—lay leaders trained and administering parishes.

How do seminaries help the larger church? It seems that often they are inward looking rather than outward. Two ideas—more online courses, and clergy trained to be liturgical tutors for more local learning on site.

The whole communion should make use of the liturgical professors that some provinces have in abundance—move them around!

Training should be regionalized. For example, if the C. of E. could combine resources and form a regional training course, it would emphasize the strengths and needs of the local situation and fit more of a praxis model.

There should be apprenticeship positions for liturgy—what can we learn from other fields like law, and how they do this now?

Share international resources through the web—the internet needs to be made better use of.

## **6 The continuing liturgical education and formation of the clergy**

Richard Leggett offered some suggestions for an agenda. He recalled a remark that the work of liturgical renewal was far from complete. The work of formation was just beginning. He said it had become clear to him that the reforms of the last 40 years had not yet permeated all the congregations in the Anglican Church of Canada. A fair number of clergy do not think liturgically. There can be no single agenda for the continuing liturgical education of clergy. The continuing education of clergy in the area of liturgy and worship needs to make room for the experience of mystery. A question: “what has been your most significant experience of worship and why?” It is important to lead to reflection on *why?* Generation Xers are for the most part post-modern. They need to find a church that emphasizes a sense of the holy. How do you create a holy space? How do decoration, movement, and preparation contribute to that.

Clergy need to continue to learn how the space and environment for worship shapes the actual experience of believers. The house of God is composed of many spaces. When their use remains static they cease to hold their potential to witness to the mystery being proclaimed in the liturgical assembly. How can these spaces be released to enable the experience of membership in Christ’s body?

Clergy need to understand the power of symbol. Richard Leggett said he had too often heard, “It is only symbolic.” This indicates someone who has lost a sense of wonder and openness to surprise and the ability to let actions speak. Symbol is reality at its most intense level of being expressed. Symbol is related to liturgy as metaphor to language.

It is not enough to attend to liturgical aesthetics alone. We need to help clergy understand what God is doing in the world. Language and gestures matter. Clergy need to be able to shape a community of prayer in touch with the secular events of day to day.

The dominant [western] majority culture tends to think of inculturation as something that is offered to others. How do we determine those aspects of Christian faith and practice that unite Christians in all times and places. How do we disagree? What is transcultural and unites, and what is not? How do we identify those aspects of our culture which are life-denying? Transcultural commitment is expressed in hospitality.

Who are the people who are in the pews? Who are the people who are *not* in the pews? How does our Christian practice include and exclude?

How can we experience other forms of Christian faith and practice in terms of the *other*? How we conduct pastoral offices may determine the future course of a seeker.

The continued education of clergy in liturgy and worship should make visible the drama of Christian worship. This involves being able to distinguish between what is essential in a Christian rite and what enhances it. Many clergy do not understand the dynamics of the liturgical year. Drama is more than story. Clergy must learn to be sensitive to the quality of the celebration. Liturgy as drama is more than performance by the clergy.

Clergy need to learn how to identify music that is congregational, focusing on what the congregation is gathered to do. Instrumental music can be congregational if it enables the congregation to reflect on the work of God in them and in the world. Clergy need to have a clear sense of the movements within the liturgical action and how music serves the action rather than action the music. Clergy need to learn how to identify music that is eclectic because no one style of music is definitive.

The church needs clergy who are strong, loving, and wise. Appropriate qualifications for ordained clergy are depth, native talent (especially openness to others, respect for others, and responsibility to others), desire and feeling a call, aptitude, a call and mandate from the church. Being strong means knowing the whole story, i.e., their own tradition and the broader and catholic tradition. Being loving means knowing how to lead the pilgrim people. Being wise means engaging in theological discourse rather than religious slogans. Clergy need opportunities to engage in discussion rather than debate, so they can enable others to engage in discussion

In continuing education programs topics are not always as important as finding life-giving presenters whose passion may inflame others. We need a strategy for continuing education. More than four decades of liturgical revision have passed but the strengthening of liturgical leadership remains before us.

The meeting engaged in discussion with Richard Leggett.

A group reported on its discussion,

They noted a number of "overlaps" with the subjects raised in the earlier presentation on Liturgical Education and Formation of the People of God.

What do we do as leaders of worship? Do we engage with all who are present and with the liturgical action? Do we act as though the other liturgical participants matter? Do we understand this as "our" prayer, not "my" prayer? Some of these are fundamental presuppositions to approaching the liturgy as presider or celebrant (and those are two different theological stances)

How do people form us as presiders? How are we shaped by the particular communities we serve in and by the liturgy itself? What is the role of preaching in liturgical formation and in the formation of presiders?

The group enjoyed the characteristics of "strong, loving and wise" but wondered about development/formation/continuing education to strengthen those elements.

The importance of knowing the structure was confirmed (as stated by the presenter) and the problem of presiders (and others) who too often see the liturgy as simply words. What are some techniques to move presiders towards an embodied style of presiding.

The group noted that the arrangement of space has a lot to do with the physical movement and the physical relationship between presider and congregation.

The group expressed concern that liturgical theology (the Eucharist as an action done by all) is either tipped toward "everyone does everything all the time" or "father does it all the time." How to arrive at an appropriate balance?

Those who preach, preside, and exercise any leadership must always know who is in the pews, who the constituency is as far as economics, culture, language, primary issues, etc.

## **7 The liturgical formation of children, teens, and young adults**

Ruth Meyers told the meeting that the biography of an early 20<sup>th</sup> century bishop tells the story of a young mother who wanted to receive communion but was unwilling to leave her child behind and did not know if she could take the child with her. Someone encouraged her to go to the rail, and she did and was delighted that she was welcomed. The story of her reluctance indicates that the practice was uncommon. Much has changed since then. Eventually children came forward for a blessing and then began to ask why they could not receive communion. A few parishes admitted children to "early" communion. Then in 1970 in the Episcopal Church provision was made for the communion of children and the communion of all the baptized is now accepted practice, even if it is not the norm.

The location of “Christian” education in a Sunday school suggests that children must learn to be Christians in an academic setting, modelled on secular schools, which usually takes place at the same time as the principal liturgy of the day. Adults come to church to worship; children come to church to be instructed. Sunday School continues through elementary and junior high school, when children are introduced to a young group, which usually meets at some time other than Sunday mornings. There is again an assumption of non-participation. Teenagers typically decide that the Sunday worship is not for them. Perhaps they have learned their Sunday School lesson only too well. Why is it necessary to keep children away, except perhaps for communion.

Episcopal worship values decency and good order. Action tends to be deliberate and staid. Such worship embraces the intellect rather than the emotions. It is an adult experience, designed by adults for adults. People are expected to conform, to speak or sing their lines at the proper times, to listen attentively (or appear to) during the sermon. Children, whether acolytes or in the pews with their parents, are expected to behave. Children who move about or whisper too loudly at the wrong time are likely to be admonished by their parents or receive harsh glares. In many ways it is kind to keep children away. Better to have them in Sunday School. Such an approach suggests that the problem lies with the children who are unable to worship properly. Perhaps the problem lies with our worship and its failure to engage children properly.

Ruth Meyers said she was not suggesting a children’s homily, which usually involves children gathering around the preacher at the front of the church where they become a source of amusement for the adults. Let us consider a place where we have welcomed children, she suggested, i.e., the communion table where participation is less intellectual. We might go further and ask what children have to offer adults. Jesus not only welcomed children but said that it was to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs and that those who do not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it. Ruth Meyers quoted characteristics of the kingdom to be found in children, especially trust, Children are gracious receivers.

James Fowler developed a theory of faith development. At an early stage a child develops an attitude of trust or distrust. At this stage liturgical formation consists primarily of attendance at worship in a worshipping community where a familiarity with the sights and sounds of worship may be inculcated. The involvement of children in baptism and communion reminds adults that none of us earns God’s favour. Fowler calls a second stage of formation *intuitive projected faith*. At a third stage children are able, with joy, to grasp the concept of God. At this stage children’s experience of God is not sustained but is experienced in bursts (Cavaletti: *Catechesis of the Good Shepherd*). Children at worship at this stage may have moments of awareness of God even though they cannot follow the logical sequence of the liturgy. Parents can assist them by calling attention to images and stories and symbols. Young children have religious insight. Sensory experience is important. Children may be asked to ponder rather than give the right answer.

As children reach age six they move into another developmental stage. They can follow a narrative and repeat it in great detail. They think concretely. Fowler calls this stage of development *mythic literal*. The child is not yet able to step back and form concepts, but narratives give a new sense of coherence to child’s world view. Cavaletti encourages children to grasp salvation history from creation to parousia, and to see the eucharist within this context. Learning and reflecting on the acclamation, “Christ has died . . .” helps children connect with biblical stories of Jesus’ death and resurrection. Children at this stage are able to connect physical and mental activity to participate in community. They can act as greeters, can take up the collection, do the work of the altar guild, perhaps even bake the bread for the eucharist. They can develop a sense of competence and of being members of a particular parish. If the parish is committed to the work of justice and kindness, children will also be formed in this direction.

Adolescents are concerned with identity and with peer relationships. They are able to reflect on the practice of worship and talk about what they are doing. They are able to enter roles of lay ministry, like giving communion, in spite of canons in some places which require ministers of communion to be “adult”. In what ways do adolescents participate in the community of faith? Do they have opportunities to share in planning worship? Adolescent peer groups may relate positively to worship in peer groups, even though they are less at home in ordinary Sunday liturgy.

In the U.S. dropping out of church is common among young adults. Two-thirds leave church for a period of two years or more. The identity experience of adolescence continues among young adults. Their life

stage is a distinct period of development in which they deal with identity and life-style. They are seeking a dream and a community to ground them. What would it mean if we recognized that they are also in a critical stage of faith formation? The coherence of faith and practice, i.e., authenticity, is important.

Ruth Meyers suggested questions to stimulate discussion. What experiences of formation enable children, teens, and young adults to engage more fully in liturgy in a manner suitable to their developmental capacities? What might we learn from children, teens, and young adults about full engagement with liturgy. In what ways do they challenge us to reconsider our assumptions about liturgy? How might all of us in the liturgical assembly receive the reign of God as little children?

Some responses:

Those working in very large congregations face problems in involving large numbers of children in the assembly. There are health issues for young people in receiving communion, especially where children are discouraged from sharing drinking bottles. Why do we persist in having children in an educational setting and telling children about worship and then sending them away, rather than having them experience worship and then reflect on it. We need to recover the child's capacity for innocence. Children will quickly pick up the disengagement of adults and imitate it.

Historically, Sunday Schools started as literacy schools. There is a strong tradition of "children's church" with family orientation. However, children's services are usually something that adults watch. They can therefore be exclusive although intended to be inclusive. How do we avoid creating ghettos for children. High family mobility has particular challenges, creating discontinuity in parishes. What happens to a child who has not had the earlier formation experiences, e.g., a child coming to church first the first time at 12 years. We have forgotten what it means to be human in worship and have turned it into something of a head game. We tend to use children as liturgical guinea-pigs. Children pick up on authenticity and on risk-taking. We can learn much by paying attention to our own spiritual autobiographies. Children have a keen sense of justice and need to be engaged with the world's issues. They can also be unforgiving critics.

Formation is not necessarily measurable by biological age. The head choirboy at Salisbury Cathedral preaches instead of the bishop on one day in the year. The impact of handicapped children and their spirituality was noted. How real discern adult discipleship to be? A group discussed variations in the practice of the communion of children in different parts of the world.

Children like repetition, so just having them there and having things repeated is part of formation. Children playing at liturgical roles at their own initiative is part of formation. Children tend to like music and singing in particular. Children are like the canary in the coal mine: if they are switched-off and bored, the rest of us are probably being poisoned. We need to be much more adaptable and flexible and recognize that a plan is what you do when nothing else happens.

It is remarkable that repetitive elements in the liturgy appeal to children at certain stages in development, but also appeal to some adults as well. Familiar gestures and texts have a positive role. Have we become too word-bound and length in our worship—for everyone and not just for children. Can we look at worship as a time of formation for all? Shall we move away from liturgies for part of the congregation and think about liturgies for the whole? Does the environment for worship signify an openness to children, or is the message different?

One group responded,

The group was made up of three from the English provinces, four from the US provinces including one Spanish speaker, and one member each from South Africa and Japan.

Rather than focus on the specific questions given to us by Ruth the group centred its discussion primarily on the difficulties faced by teenagers (adolescents). While Ruth has focused on the ways in which the different ages represented in our congregations could be formed in the Christian life and incorporated into the fullness of the life of the Church, we looked at the obstacles they faced and the peer pressures they experienced which together undermined the Church's attempts at formation.

We spoke of the "socialisation of the playground," recognising the power of peer pressure. The cry of one of the English children in secondary / high school was "Mum, it just isn't cool to be Christian!" Our teenagers tended to be "socialised into militant apathy" regarding the faith. On top of this there was the increasingly busy programme of teenagers in the west which militates against involvement in Church activities.

One member questioned Ruth's criticism of the children's talk pointing out that this often gives children a sense of their importance and value. Some children love being brought down to the front, though it was also recognised that others hate it. It depends on the age and the stage of the children.

One member talked about the way their church had developed the Liturgy of the Word where children do not go out to their own activities. Rather there are two different styles of presentation. One is a traditional format, including a sermon. The other, called the Gospel Alternative, is all-all-age, interactive engagement with the lections. Both are open to all ages and people go to the style that most suits them.

One member asked why we are so captivated by the idea of "learning" in the liturgy of the word. It was pointed out that if we saw the sermon as proclamation rather than teaching the possibilities were opened up. Another member spoke of the "didactic anxiety" of western culture. He explained how their particular church tried to be as non-didactic as possible in all its programmes but the laity seemed unable to grasp this. When the Rector went to a children's group and asked open-

ended questions the leaders seemed concerned that the children gave the “right” answers, often to the point of prompting them. He wondered where this didactic anxiety came from and concluded it must be part of our western culture.

We talked about specifically created (or planted) Youth Churches recognising that this could provide an environment where young people could grow freely, but we were aware of the tension that the Christian assembly is called to be all embracing. Should we therefore create single culture churches as the evangelists tend to suggest? Or should we resist the temptation?

A further question was asked about the time of our services. Teenagers/adolescents rarely get up before midday so is it any surprise that there are few of them in Church on a Sunday morning? This raises the more reaching question of the whether our worship times should be more tuned to the rhythms of the communities of which we are part.

Another group responded,

The group was intentional about listening to the experiences of members from different cultural contexts.

*Melanesia/Solomon Islands.* The Melanesian churches generally have a mid-week Church School, in which time is set aside from the main Sunday liturgical celebrations for teaching. Children generally have a more active role in the liturgy, stemming from their full integration into the life of the community. In rural areas, the role of children within worship is becoming more important. The older people tend to say: “we’ve done our work, now it’s your turn, and we’re going to sit back and enjoy your contributions.” In the main cathedral, there are several Sundays each year on which the children lead worship, incorporating drama and other gifts into the liturgy. The new Melanesian prayer book includes a children’s eucharist, not as an appendix, but within the main body of the book.

*Japan:* The Japanese church has programs of Sunday School, and values summer camp experiences as special times for young people to share in worship together.

*The United Kingdom:* Members from Great Britain reminded the group that, historically speaking, Sunday School started as a literacy school. Now, there is a strong tradition of “children’s church”, and deliberately intergenerational worship. The “family services” of the 1950s saw the largest congregations. However, a question arises, when ‘family services end up being children’s services that the adults watch. A critical set of questions was identified: What happens when, from an immediate-view perspective, in seeking to be more inclusive (here, of families and children), we end up creating something subtly insidious, and become exclusive communities. How do we acknowledge the need to work with children without creating ghettos of children and young families, and without excluding the childless, the elderly, etc.

*Ireland:* The church here lives with the painful reality that confirmation and admission to the eucharist are firmly set together, presenting very real challenges both theological and practical for what “full inclusion” of children in the life of the community means.

*Observations and Questions:*

How do we pay attention to the formation needs of someone who, for example, at adolescence or early adulthood has *not* had the formative experiences of Christian worship (let alone Anglican worship) as an infant and child?

Children tend to have the characteristics of any oppressed group – they suffer our projections on who they are.

We have allowed ourselves to miss out on a lot of what it means to be human in our worship, turning it into a “headgame”. Attentiveness to the children in our midst, and to our own experiences can help to integrate more of a fullness of humanity in our worship lives.

Oftentimes particular liturgical expressions aimed towards children, or that single children out for a particular action, can have a profound effect on the others in the gathering, as the children’s “spotlighted” participation can provide a witness of faith at intuitive and other levels of communication not always experienced in traditional liturgy.

We tend to use children as liturgical guinea-pigs.

We can learn much by paying attention to our own spiritual autobiographies, and we as liturgists need to be challenged to do this with care and attention.

We acknowledge that in some of our cultures we are entering into, or are already in a time when high boundaries make it difficult to have pastoral relationships with children and teens.

What attracts children and teens can often be more of a matter of the authenticity of the community and its leadership in its engagement with the world, in presiding, preaching and participation of the community in liturgy, and having relationships within the community and with the leadership.

Teens and young adults have particular gifts that we are sometimes uncomfortable in receiving: they can be keen to justice within communities and society, and can be harsh, unforgiving critics. But should not the church be a place where public argument can happen and where, like the best of families, we can allow, even encourage mutual critique, and hold together?

Another group responded,

As a starting point we agreed that formation is not be measured by biological age as though adults were mature and “formed” and children the reverse.

We feared we might be heavily loaded towards the “first world”, and would be wise to learn more about the rest. Bishop Alfred Reid (of Jamaica) told us of children passed down a row in church to adults better able to control them (!)--a very “extended family” concept, and calculated to show a better engagement with the liturgy by the children than often in the

West. Bishop David Stancliffe (of Salisbury) told us of his visits to the suffering Southern dioceses in Sudan, where often the men are away and the women and children offer leadership in village communities—even including a 9-year-old preacher. Another member reflected on his experience of schools in East Africa, and of tendencies in Africans in England, to conceive of learning as learning by rote—partly through lack of resources, partly through limitations of teachers, partly through Victorian English influences running on, etc.

We were also aware that family-groupings differed, and the desire of parents to be with children in church might vary for all sorts of reasons, including how the rest of the week was spent.

We looked at various vignettes from experience:

- (a) Head choirboy at Salisbury cathedral being boy bishop and preaching once a year.
- (b) Handicapped children showing depth of spirituality.
- (c) Worship in schools 'a vibrant experience' (church schools and others mentioned)
- (d) How real do children detect adult discipleship to be?

We spent a good third of our time then catching up on communion—from infant baptism time, from a point of preparation, or from confirmation—and various stories of retrogressive practice were told, as well as exciting radical ones. We thought it connected with previous discussion.

### Another group responded,

Where congregations are numerically very large, e.g. in parts of Africa, there are also very large numbers of children. This presents a different set of problems to those experienced in churches where numbers are small.

What prevents us from allowing children to experience (adult) worship and then facilitating their reflection on these experiences? Instead, we often structure the teaching as a preparation for the experience.

The innocence, imagination, and reverence for mystery, with which children approach experiences in the Church, are what adults need to recover for themselves.

Children are sensitive to the attitudes and behaviour of adults in worship. If the adults are not engaged, the children will not be engaged either.

### Another group responded,

Historically there seems to be evidence of multiple ways of engagement that included children—the example presented was medieval liturgy with its visual dimension and room for movement. These basic elements make it easier for children to participate, freeing adults and engaging those with no “churching.” One parish had a Saturday evening Mass that allowed a separate space (freer) for children and incorporated a great deal of movement in an attempt to “speak” in many different ways.

The group spent a fair amount of time talking about how to engage children *throughout* the liturgy (while also engaging adults), and not just for the liturgy of the Word, as well as the pros and cons of the choices presented.

The length of liturgy is too much for children (and probably for many adults) Several parishes had Christian education outside of liturgy time (for adults and children)—for example, between liturgies. One had scheduled “Sunday school” for Thursday evenings, for but noticed a dropping off of Sunday attendance as a counterpart.

Questions were raised about the cultural realities of separated, blended families and their implications for scheduling times of Christian education and even for separating the children from their families when they spend so little time together during the week. The multi-generational liturgy of the word was perceived as counter-cultural and faithful to the complexity of the body of Christ.

So much of what we do (and plan) starts with an adult perspective and then gets “dumbed down” for children. What would happen if we started the other direction, building up through the stages of life to mature expressions of faith?

The issue of denying communion to children, even though they seemed to be ready, and the reality of different theologies and different pastoral practices makes the issue of children in the liturgy even more difficult.

A conversation about didactic approaches led to the realization that we still are teaching and are not out from under the instructed approach to liturgy. Are there not other ways to instruct/teach, or perhaps better, to model?

Adolescents need to meet for liturgy at 10 pm—it works better!

In Sri Lanka, it is quite common that on the first Sunday of the month, the children do the Liturgy of the Word (responsible for its shaping and execution); on the second Sunday of the month, the youth do the same; on the third Sunday of the month the mothers; on the fourth Sunday of the month the fathers (including responsibility for preaching). But all of the groups are there all the time.

In Southern Africa there is great variety in approaches: some parishes have the “Sunday school” during the liturgy of the word, where it is directly structured through the lectionary; a number of parishes do not have enough space for the activities to take place simultaneously, so everyone uses the church proper at different times; in some parishes, children are very active in leading worship and, particularly where parishes have large numbers of older people, there is a great desire to have children around and in the liturgy because it is often the only interaction with children that some people have during the week.

## 8 Provincial Reports

- a Scottish Episcopal Church:** Andrew Barr reminded the meeting that the website of the province is [www.scottishepiscopal.com](http://www.scottishepiscopal.com). At the moment the province is going through a period of experimental rites. The church has been having a big debate about the nature of membership, which coincides with consideration of initiation rites in the process of dealing with the new liturgical texts. The Liturgical Committee of the province has been visiting parishes to observe the ways in which initiation is celebrated. There are some problems in the interpretation of the Toronto Statement. The marriage rite is now in a very short experimental period of three years. A Communion Book for Children has been produced which sold out in the first month.
- b Philippines:** Tomas Maddela reported that the Episcopal Church in the Philippines has a new Book of Common Prayer ratified in May 1999. This was formally presented during the celebration of the ECP's Centennial in 2001. In spite of typographical errors, the new book was widely accepted. Translation of various rites began in the six dioceses. Today there are six vernacular translations of the rites. Tagalog translations of baptism, marriage, and burial rites and the propers will be off the press before the end of the current year. In 2002 the draft of a hymnal was presented. It was approved for trial use while revisions are being made. The hymnal features classic hymns, new compositions in the vernacular, and some hymns from different parts of Asia. The ECP National Commission on Liturgy is working on a manual for priests to guide them in the use of the new BCP and the preparation of special liturgies especially for Holy Week. Seminar-workshops are being organized for people responsible for liturgical music. St. Andrew's Theological Seminary has become the main producer of special forms of liturgies for various occasions. It has produced six forms of Vigil Services for Saturdays in the major seasons of the year, vigils for major feast days, special form of morning and evening prayer adapted from Jewish liturgy and Taizé. They hope eventually to be able to share with the whole Anglican Communion some of the fruits of their labour.
- c Canada:** Eileen Scully outlined work in the province of Canada under several headings. The province has no national liturgical commission but a working group within a larger committee dealing with issues of faith, worship, and ministry. There are two significant partnerships: one involves collaboration with those working with the Anglican Council of Indigenous Peoples in the area of worship, assisting local indigenous councils and parishes in the development of their own liturgical rites and adaptations of the *Book of Alternative Services* within their cultural contexts as well as monitoring the translation of liturgical texts into vernacular languages is being monitored. Another partnership with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada is proceeding towards the connection of the worship committees of the two churches and a conference on liturgy be shared in 2004. Work is being done on a collection of collects to complement the Revised Common Lectionary. Work is being done ecumenically on liturgical material for emergency service personnel. Consultations will be held on "Liturgy after 2001," encouraging theological conversation and reflection on liturgy now and in the future. Work has begun on making liturgical texts available on CD-ROM and is now in a policy-development phase. Parallel French and English texts are being proof-read. Musical settings for supplemental eucharistic prayers have been published. The Evangelical Lutheran Church has approved the Anglican French translations for use in their churches. A rite for civil marriage is being expanded. A group is working on Calendar revision. A number of dioceses have been discussing and working on forms for the blessing of same sex unions, including New Westminster. Note is being taken of locally-developed eucharistic rites which have been authorized by the local bishop. The meeting discussed the blessing of same sex unions against the background of a theology of marriage in which the ministers of marriage have been understood to be the man and the woman, whose commitment is then blessed by the church.
- d Australia:** Ronald Dowling reported that the province has been working on Holy Week rites, which are almost ready for authorization and publication. The province now has a CD-ROM which contains not only the prayer book but also editions of hymnody and a range of resources. The provincial Commission has also moved into the field of formation.
- e Japan:** The last revision was made in 1959. The 1959 BCP (Japanese) was not a translation of the 1662 BCP (the Church of England), but a new book which the NSKK compiled for itself on the basis of the results of liturgical study in the 1950s. It was basically in accord with the orientation

proposed by the Lambeth Conference in 1958, but it was inadequate because it was written in older, not modern, Japanese, and because it could not incorporate the fruit of the remarkable progress of the liturgical study in the 60s and thereafter. The NSKK synod (General Assembly) in 1971 decided to revise the Japanese BCP, which was approved and adopted in the 1990 NSKK synod after some 20 years of study and trial-use, taking into account newer versions in the Anglican Communion including the ECUSA 1979 BCP and the Alternative Service Book 1980. In accordance with the general trend of the revision of prayer books in the Anglican Communion, the 1990 Japanese BCP can be characterized as follows:

(1) The services are in contemporary Japanese; (2) Overemphasis on penitential sentiment is eliminated, and emphasis is put on gratitude (eucharistia); (3) The sense of the church as the community (ecclesia) is clarified in the services and prayers; (4) Alternatives are given to the service formulas and prayers; (5) Stress is laid on the sense of *Missio Dei*. The book is still inadequate because it does not offer a sufficient number of alternatives, and therefore more effort should be made to study and revise the book in the future.

In 2000 the NSKK set up the committee on liturgy as a standing committee. The task of the committee, decided by the NSKK synod, is to “sit on and examine the matters related to the liturgy and liturgical books, and to submit revisions and amendments to the NSKK synod.” The committee consists of 6 members (5 priests, 1 layperson / 4 males and 2 females). The committee proposed to the 2002 NSKK synod the trial use of the psalms following the first reading and the partial amendment of the lectionary. The proposal was accepted by the synod.

Currently the following items of work are under way: (1) amendment of the lectionary; (2) study on inclusive language to be used in the prayer book; (3) study on a further revision and enlargement of the prayer book; (4) translation into Japanese and publication of the 1991 Toronto Statement :*Christian Initiation in the Anglican Communion*, the 1995 Dublin Document :*Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, and the 2001 Berkeley Statement :*Anglican Ordination Rites*,

In 2002 the NSKK synod decided to adopt a new Japanese translation of the Lord's Prayer in common with the Roman Catholic Church in Japan. The Christian churches in Japan had used their own respective translations of the Lord's Prayer, of which the main ones are the NSKK, the Roman Catholic, the United Church of Christ, and the Lutheran Church versions. The fact that the most important prayer—the prayer given by the Lord Jesus Christ—differs slightly from church to church may be an obstacle to evangelism in Japan and, importantly, can be regarded as a symptom of the broken unity of the Christian churches in Japan. The NSKK, therefore, proposed to the Roman Catholic and other churches a possible common translation of the Lord's prayer and, on the basis of this proposal, translation work was done by experts from the NSKK and the Roman Catholic Church, with the attendance of experts from the Lutheran church as observers. This led to a new Japanese version of the Lord's prayer to be commonly used by the NSKK and the Roman Catholic Church.

### **Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia**

Eric Fairbrother told the meeting that each diocese has a ministry educator, most of whom are on the faculty of the theological college. The Liturgical Commission is working on a number of issues: the template reflecting the structure of the liturgy; Te Pouhere Sunday (2<sup>nd</sup> after Pentecost) which celebrates the church's constitution; a request for pastoral liturgies relating to the different ways the different cultures use elements such as water, salt, healing etc.; an anthology of prayers and occasional services covering a wide range of occasions and concerns; an electronic version of *A New Zealand Prayer Book* is being produced which will, with the Bible, be capable of insertion in a palm pilot.. George Connor told the meeting that the Commission consists of six people, two from each of the major cultural groups. Maori and English are the languages of two of the groups, but the third group has five languages. Language presents problems: can we find a language that is acceptable to old and young? The church has agreed that there can be only one ordination rite for all priests and all deacons, whether the deacons are transitional or vocational.

**Ireland.** Ricky Rountree told the meeting that the Church of Ireland has just finished a hectic six years in which the Book of Common Prayer was revised. There are services in both contemporary and traditional language. The Church of Ireland is the first province to revise the ordinal since the

IALC at Berkeley. Canon Ricky Rountree has been appointed as the Central Liturgical Officer for a period of 18 months. His task will be to coordinate the introduction of the new BCP and to put in place a structure for liturgical education and formation.

**England.** David Stancliffe told the meeting that a liturgical officer has not yet been appointed. The Commission is on the seventh draft of a new ordinal. The next piece of work is the office book dimension of *Common Worship*. There will be a new daily office lectionary. There will also be tables to read the psalter. Another piece of work is the bringing together of material on the seasons

**Kenya.** Joyce Karuri brought the new Kenya prayer book to the attention of the meeting. There is also a new Kenya hymnal in the works, but there is not money to publish it at the present time. The province is now trying to translate its liturgical materials into the national language, Swahili, and into other languages as well. A program of visiting dioceses has begun to train people to appreciate the new liturgical texts. There has been an attempt to provide services and prayers appropriate to the real situations of the people. The only restraining factor for Africa is money. The provincial department of liturgy has accomplished a great deal.

**Southern Africa.** Ian Darby reminded the meeting that the province consists of seven countries. There is a new addition to the calendar, Sister Henrietta Stockdale, a pioneer in the nursing profession. The province has pointed the Harper-Collins Psalter. New collects in inclusive language have been produced, and a service for the closure of a marriage. The province has revised its annual lectionary. The province lacks liturgical teachers. A number of liturgies have also been produced by a church unity commission, on which Ian Darby holds the liturgical portfolio.

## 9 Member topics

**What is actually meant by Liturgical Formation?** Christopher Irvine said he had detected in recent Church of England texts a trend towards formational language. He said he was talking about *formation* and not education. Three possible approaches or viewpoints, each valid and none exclusive. First, the *liberal* viewpoint which relates to the didactic emphasis in the Prayer Book tradition but sees education as one of the key aims of corporate worship, the drawing out of the responsible Christian person. This approach seeks informed participation. The *evangelical* approach focuses on gathering the people before and under the word of God so they might be convinced and converted. Worship is opportunity for proclamation and preaching. The *sacramental* approach, which in continuity with the Caroline Divines and the 19<sup>th</sup> century catholic revival, would give centrality to the celebration of the sacraments and accord to the divine presence a degree of objectivity. The purpose is the formation of the Christian in the likeness of Christ. Formation is the strong theme in contemporary English liturgical revision.

Formational language is reflected in a number of prayers which refer to growing into the *likeness* of Christ. What are we actually saying about what is happening with God and the worshippers in this particular act? Christopher Irvine presented a number of examples of liturgical language as it correlates to various liturgical themes and events. In most cases, he noted, there is a structural relationship between what is being prayed for and invocation.

Some tentative conclusions. Why this increase in formational vocabulary in recent Church of England liturgical revision? Is it a rhetorical ploy that participants might get the point of worship? Is it a curious exercise in self-persuasion of something that is becoming more difficult to believe in? Is it an attempt to counter the increasing weakness of religious discourse and the collapse of a public rhetoric in western culture? But as George Steiner says, language can still echo with a largely forgotten meaning and resonate with our experience? We might detect a shift from the liberal to a more objective orientation which gives a greater priority to the action of God. Such an understanding sits more comfortably with a liturgical ecclesiology but also accords with a more Patristic understanding of sacramental celebration as the occasion *par excellence* when the worshippers are engaged and formed by the unfolding mystery of God. How might one adopt this understanding? We would need to work with a more developed *pneumatology*, which would give a greater priority to the presence and active working of God, placing less emphasis on our "active participation" and more on the worshippers as those who are acted upon. The question, when working with a new liturgical text, is not what we make of it but what it makes of us. Something needs to be said about the disposition and expectations of those who come to worship. A liturgical text can only hope to inculcate the appropriate mood. We must come to worship with a more attentive and possibly contemplative attitude.

One might look for help from Paul Ricoeur. He speaks of the necessity of the reader to be open to the text, “exposing ourselves to the text and receiving from it an enlarged self.”. We might speak of the necessity of the worshipper being open to the transformative possibility of the text. We might speak of the kind of participation that is required of those who worship, a participation which allows for both an “unmaking” in confession and a “re-making” in communion in order that the individual is re-configured to Christ.. Formational language can awaken us to the possibility of change and invite us to respond. In the Benedictine understanding of the conversion of life, liturgical worship is a lifelong process “till Christ is formed in me.” Further, worship is the occasion when the body of worshippers is re-configured as the body of Christ in and for the world.

**Christopher Griffiths told the meeting about education and training, in Southern Africa.** In rural areas where there are many points and few priests, clergy plan services but lay people are responsible for much of the presentation of the liturgy. The synaxis is often led entirely by lay people, the priest making the opening greeting and preaching, but leaving the rest to lay people. A training program is being developed throughout the Province to enable lay people to fulfil their role. Training programs often run 7-8 weeks because that is as long as people can commit at one time. Weekends are also used. A session on inculturation is vitally important because all liturgy is inculturated, but it depends on whose culture. Another important session is “worship as pastoral care,” and the recognition of Sunday as the opportunity for pastoral care. This applies to the Sunday liturgy and not just to the life-cycle rites. Christopher Griffiths said he was dealing with people with no biblical studies. He said clergy and ordinands who are inadequately trained are more likely to set rules. Lay people are more likely to be liturgically conservative. There has been agreement that worship is central to the future life of the church, but no one is providing money for it.

**Liturgical Formation of the People of God** Ronald Dowling told the meeting that liturgical formation is about the people of God, which means not just about the clergy. The lay people have many gifts to offer. Traditionally, however, the one place where lay people have no control is in the area of worship. However, this does not fit well with the fact that the people have gifts of many kinds. People perceive that the parish priest does all the worship-arranging. Ronald Dowling said that when he realized this he encouraged people to take responsibility for the liturgy itself.

This took the form of a program in which a small group took responsibility for preparing worship for the season of Easter. The parish council agreed to the program. Ronald Dowling chose the committee (because one of the tasks of the parish priest is to discern gifts), with a very mixed membership. A liturgical history was then taken, exposing certain constants, including constant change. This gave the committee a framework. This was followed by an educational program, oriented primarily to the coming Easter season, but including many other details. After about ten weeks the committee sat down to make plans. The only requirements the rector imposed were that the Easter liturgies had to be the eucharist, the lectionary had to be used, and the presider had to be the priest.

Unexpected changes took place, e.g., gathering in the narthex rather than sitting in silence before the service began. Everyone processed in. Another change brought people to gather around the altar for the eucharistic prayer. At the end of the Easter season the congregation was asked to comment. Older people tended not to like it while younger people tended to like it, but in the end there was general approval. The people’s comments were given to the team members who were asked to express their own feelings about what happened and about the responses. They then evaluated their own work and Ronald Dowling interviewed them. Several things have come out of this process.

First, there should be an outsider involved in a process of this kind. Ronald Dowling had to play too many roles as teacher, priest, etc. Second, the time frame was too short and many things were not done in the end, e.g., decoration of space. Third, people like ushers were not brought on board.

Ronald Dowling said that the evaluations revealed that many people were coming from their past. The education course was considered to be essential to give committee members the power to do what they had to do. They found the team experience important: Members said they would not like that responsibility themselves but would want to share it with others. All but one said they would happily go on being a worship committee in the future, whether on a seasonal basis or even permanently.

Liturgical formation is more than enabling people to participate better in liturgy. It is also involvement in leadership and planning. It is both the experience of worship and a targeted education program.

## 10 Visual Liturgy 4.0

Trevor Lloyd introduced Visual Liturgy 4.0, which had just been published by Church House Publishing, by means of a PowerPoint presentation. This version of Visual Liturgy has been made more user-friendly as a result of criticism of earlier versions. The browser gives access to an editable database of liturgical items and structure-based templates. It is possible to drag and drop material from one service to another. The program may be customized for particular parishes and congregations. A number of different views of assembled material are possible for the use and reference of different people (organist, readers, etc.). Details of the program were demonstrated.

## 11 Alternative and additional readings

Paul Gibson reported (for information) that he had reacted positively to the Church of England's adoption of a schedule of readings as optional first readings for the Sundays after Easter, based on the readings from the Hebrew scriptures used at the Easter Vigil, and that he had proposed to the Consultation on Common Texts consideration of the possibility of commending this policy to the churches. The CCT asked its Canadian members to return with a proposal. The CCT has not yet acted on the Canadian recommendation but it will be submitted in a short presentation at the forthcoming Societas Liturgica and may then go on to the English Language Liturgical Consultation.

David Stancliffe told the meeting that there emerged at the Lambeth Conference the possibility of adding to the Anglican Cycle of Prayer a single reading for each day. There has been pressure in the Church of England for some years rising from the fact that people come to the weekday offices without any awareness of the sequential reading that is going on. Individual readings, out of context, may be less than helpful. Some work had been done in this direction, producing a two-reading-a-day lectionary. A number of questions remain. What underlying pattern should inform such a lectionary?

## 12 Relations with other bodies

Paul Bradshaw noted that the IALC is part of a network of many bodies, with a variety of styles of leadership. He asked members to identify and describe some of them.

**Task Group on Theological Education.** Robert Paterson told the meeting about developments in theological education. Theological education has to be delivered to bishops, clergy, and to the general worshipping body of the church, including lay ministers. Groups are being formed to work at theological education from these points of view. Raising awareness of theological education is a major concern. The concerns of an additional group have been described as the "Anglican Way," the means by which the tradition is held in a changing framework. The process has been commended to the Primates and a meeting to develop it will be arranged.

**Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission.** Eileen Scully told the meeting that the mandate of the Commission is to address the question, "What does it mean to be in communion, particularly in reference to communion with the see of Canterbury?" The Commission has been asked to work on what makes and breaks communion. The Commission is working on inculturation, on scripture and engagement with scripture, on provincial autonomy and its relation to communion. The Commission has been asked to review the book *To Mend the Net*. The Commission is just starting to get up and running.

**Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER)** Bill Crockett told the meeting that the task of the Commission is to look at the ecumenical dialogues with which Anglicans are involved, to monitor them, and to check for consistency. There are guidelines to govern this activity. In response to a question, Bill Crockett explained that communion between churches ecumenically is a dynamic process rather than a static and universal situation. Within the Anglican Communion itself, there are two models of communion between the autonomous provinces—an historic model based on the practice of distinct provinces in communion and dialogue with one another and a model reflected by the *Virginia Report* which suggests the necessity of instruments of unity. The meeting noted IASCER's comments on IALC's discussion of eucharistic food and Bill Crockett agreed to inform IASCER that they were received.

A member asked that the question, "Who speaks for the IALC between full consultations," be put on a future agenda.

### **13 Ecumenical Partner**

Alan Detscher, ecumenical partner, reflected on the meeting. He said that for some 30 years he has followed liturgical development in the Anglican Communion. His doctoral dissertation was on Anglican ordination rites from the 8<sup>th</sup> century in England to the 1979 American BCP. It was a pleasure to be reminded again of the formative nature of liturgy. Juan Oliver and others set out things which were not particularly new but of which we need to be reminded. Liturgy forms the people of God as church. The church's liturgy is not separate from our daily life. It crystallizes the joys and sorrows of our life in Christ, our participation in his death and resurrection and sharing in his body and blood. One of the great reforms of our own time is recovery in the west of awareness of the Holy Spirit. The liturgy reminds us of who we are and who we hope to be. Through the liturgy we join creation's hymn of thanksgiving. The liturgy must enable us to look back to the saving work of Christ, to bring our present lives to God, and enable us to look forward to the reconciliation of all things in Christ.

If the liturgy is to be truly formative it must be inculturated. Translation and new texts have been done, but is this enough? How do we fully inculturate our liturgy? If there are or soon will be more non-English speaking Anglicans than anglophones, how is this to be done? What we heard about children involves inculturation. Liturgy does not have to be "dumbed-down" for children, but must at times reflect a child's culture. What are our obligations to people of "other" cultures? In the early centuries, when the gospel was brought to Rome, the liturgy was adapted to Roman culture. When it went north it was transformed, and when it returned to Rome it was transformed again. In the Latin church attempts to inculturate have been frustrated. We are going through a period of retrenchment. People who don't like the liturgical reforms are trying to reverse them, although Alan Detscher said he did not think they would succeed.

We still have clergy young and old who lack a basic understanding of that which we celebrate. We have all too often been unable to help our people understand the mysteries they celebrate. Insufficient time is given to the study of liturgy, which is coupled with a lack of funds to do this work. The office that produces a new book is often closed as soon as the book is published. This happens not only to Roman Catholics but in other churches as well. Sometimes it takes a generation for new liturgies to be fully used.

Unless we renew the liturgical spaces which were designed for another time and for other liturgies we will continue to be frustrated. The renovation of space often causes irritation. We need trained architects, designers, and consultants who are sensitive to our spiritual needs. All this requires time, personnel, and money. What do we do?

Alan Detscher thanked the meeting for hospitality and fellowship.

### **14 Where do we go from here?**

Paul Bradshaw suggested several next steps identified by the Steering Committee, reviewing the distinction between consultations and meetings in the history of IALC, and the relationship of the IALC to Societas Liturgica..

- The next Societas Liturgica will be in Dresden in Germany. It would be possible for the IALC to hold a consultation in Prague in the first week of August in 2005. The meeting noted that the 2007 congress of Societas Liturgica may be in Sydney, Australia.
- A small group (Ronald Dowling, Cynthia Botha, and Ian Paton) has been identified to work on the ACC's assignment regarding eucharistic food. Ronald Dowling will be convener. Consultants may be seconded.
- The Steering Committee has agreed that the findings of this meeting should be published.
- There was significant agreement that a return to the subject of inculturation was necessary, giving greater prominence to members of cultures other than Anglo-Saxon.
- A possible subject of a future IALC (or meeting) might be "the identity of Anglican liturgy," with emphasis on the kind of formation that is necessary to enable liturgical leaders and planners to design liturgies using the liturgical material now available in electronic form (CD and internet) which tends to provide a great variety of alternatives which must be intelligently and responsibly assembled. Members noted that this possibility stands in some tension, or even complementarity, with

inculturation. A member suggested that the Steering Committee study the Report of the Lutheran World Federation on culture.

- A member suggested that some guidance on what maintains unity and integrity in the Communion would be helpful. A tension between global and local identity was noted.
- A member suggested that the liturgies at the next IALC might be as different as possible from one another. They might also reflect liturgical experimentation as it is going on in provinces.
- A member suggested that a consultation with emphasis on inculturation should include Anglicans from India and China.
- The possibility of a consultation in Africa was noted.
- The chair encouraged members to keep in mind the need to raise money for full consultations, and for those able to undertake this responsibility to identify themselves to the Steering Committee.
- The possibility of full consultations in 2005 and 2007 was raised. The meeting noted that this arrangement would be within the guidelines adopted in Berkeley in 2001.
- The possibility of regional consultations was suggested.

## **16 Conclusion**

Paul Bradshaw thanked the speakers for the care they took in presenting and those responsible for designing the liturgies of the week. He expressed his thanks to John Harper for music leadership. He thanked Simon Jones for his help in many ways, not least in arranging transportation. He thanked Alan Detscher for his participation as ecumenical partner. He thanked the members of the meeting. Members expressed their appreciation of Paul Bradshaw's leadership.

Paul Gibson  
1 October 2003