

LITURGICAL FORMS

FORMALISM AND THE LIBERTY OF THE SPIRIT

By J. D. CRICHTON

THE TENSION between liturgical formalism and freedom of spirit is very old. It may well be a symptom of a tension that is rooted in human nature itself. In the classical roman religion of pre-christian times, formalism seems to have been the order of the day; it is usually held that this is why the mystery-religions of the empire had such an appeal. The religion of ancient Rome made no appeal to the emotions. Performed by a hieratic class, it represented an act of state rather than worship springing from the heart. But even the mystery-religions rapidly became formalized, and were in any case divorced from moral behaviour. Yet they did have some impact, and died out only because christianity, apart from being true, showed all the signs of a superior vitality. It is ironical, however, that just as the mystery-religions were dying, the liturgy of the roman church was becoming more formalized. Rituals, like the carrying of candles before bishops and of incense in processions, language influenced by roman pagan religion, the elaboration of ceremonial as worship, moved into the great basilicas: all these went to produce the peculiar genius of the roman rite as it was until yesterday.

On the other hand, if we look at the New Testament material, there are sufficient indications that early christian worship was very free. Even if St Paul was worried about charismatic worship, and wished to control it, he in no way repudiated it.¹ All he asked was that the 'gifts' should be used for the 'edification' of the body of Christ. He could not see any place for 'speaking with tongues' in the christian assembly: that was for the unbeliever.² But prophecy was a perfectly legitimate activity even in worship. If, when unbelievers came into the assembly and its members were 'all prophesying . . . a man would find himself analysed and judged by

¹ 1 Cor 14.

² 1 Cor 14, 22.

everyone speaking'.³ In the New Testament, prophets had a distinct role. The Church is built not only on apostles but on prophets.⁴ The 'prophets' and the 'teachers' (*didaskaloi*) 'ordained' Paul and Barnabas for their mission to Cyprus, with fasting and prayer. The source of Timothy's charism as president of the local community was both 'prophecy' and the laying on of the presbyters' hands.⁵ We should not be surprised, then, to find in the *Didache*, which may be contemporary with the later documents of the New Testament, that 'the prophets' are to be allowed to preside at the eucharist (though whether this was a 'liturgical' service in the strict sense or not must remain doubtful), or that bishops and deacons are equated with the prophets and teachers rather than the other way round.⁶

Though the nature of the ministry in the New Testament is extremely obscure, there is sufficient evidence to show that ministry was associated with charism and prophecy; and perhaps some indication that it was derived from prophecy, at least in the sense that it was the charismatics who were regularly chosen for the ministry. Certainly, in the early theology of the episcopate, the bishop was always closely associated with the holy Spirit. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, the bishop receives a 'perfect' grace for the right preaching of the gospel.⁷ In his ordination, all the people pray for the descent of the holy Spirit; and the ordaining bishop prays that the ordinand may receive the sovereign Spirit which was given to God's beloved Son, Jesus Christ. The very ancient rite of laying the book of the gospels on the candidate's head (not shoulders, as later) has been shown convincingly to be a symbol of the giving of the holy Spirit to the apostles at Pentecost in the form of the tongues of fire.⁸ Finally, not to prolong the list, from the earliest times, episcopal ordination was conferred on Sundays. A letter of St Leo the Great, endorsing this custom, gives as the reason that it was on a Sunday that the apostles received the holy Spirit.⁹

³ 1 Cor 14, 24. For the 'analysed' of the *Jerusalem Bible*, the *New English Bible* has, more acceptably, 'searches his conscience'.

⁴ Eph 2, 20.

⁵ 1 Tim 4, 14.

⁶ *Didache*, chs. 10 and 15. I do not think that the question of the priestly status of the prophets can be decided by the simple suggestion that if they presided at the eucharist, then they must have been priests. Cf Daniélou, J.: *A History of early Christian Doctrine* (London, 1964), p 350 and note 38.

⁷ Cf B. Botte's edition, ch 2, p 5.

⁸ Botte, B.: 'L'Ordre d'après les prières d'ordination', in *Etudes sur le sacrement de l'Ordre* (Paris, 1957), pp 13-35, 36-41.

⁹ Ep. IX, cited in *Etudes sur le sacrement de l'Ordre*, p 208, note 1.

In the tradition, then, the episcopate is a charismatic office which is at least as important as its conserving function. As we see from the letters of St Ignatius of Antioch, the bishop, because he is the head of the local church, has the duty of preserving the faith and, by doing so, of maintaining communion with the sister churches scattered throughout the world. He, with the presbyters and deacons, has the duty of holding the local community together: that is, of maintaining local unity. This he does by *agape*, a love that is most conspicuously shown in his presidency over the liturgy. What is more important is that Ignatius sees the unity of the Church in dynamic and not static terms. For him, the Church is the Spirit-filled body of Christ; and the source of its unity is the holy Spirit. The appointment of the bishop, with his presbyters and deacons, is approved by Jesus Christ and confirmed by the holy Spirit.¹⁰ The whole Church is like a choir or orchestra; the presbyters, as it were, sing in harmony with their bishop, and all give unanimous praise to Jesus Christ. This 'pneumatic' union between bishops, clergy and people is sustained by the one eucharist, the sacrament (to use modern language) of the one body of Jesus Christ and the single cup of his blood, celebrated at the single altar. For Ignatius, the Church is a community of *agape*, in which the holy Spirit is present; and the whole constitutes an organic unity, though it is an intensely *personal* union which is both the source and the consequence of that unity. Within the *una sancta*, whose keystone is the bishop, there is liberty of spirit, and the action of the holy Spirit is almost palpable. Here is a living Church, 'attuned', to use Ignatius's word, to the triune God, whom the Church, however humbly, reflects.¹¹

The constitution on the liturgy (not to mention that on the Church) gives a similar picture. The bishop is the high priest of his people; and his liturgy, when celebrated with his presbyters, deacons and people, all performing their respective roles, all joining in the same prayer, all celebrating the same eucharist at the same altar (here are echoes of Ignatius), is 'the pre-eminent manifestation of the Church'. It is, as we have learnt to say, the *sacrament* of the

¹⁰ *Letter to the Philadelphians*, Prologue. G.

¹¹ Letters to the *Ephesians*, 4 and to the *Philadelphians*, 4. We may also recall the opening address to the *Romans*, 'presiding over love'.

At the other end of the historical spectrum are the remarks of Cardinal Suenens: when dialogue is entered into in a spirit of prayer, of openness to the holy Spirit and of mutual respect, there the leading of the Spirit may be discerned; and it is the duty of the bishop to discern it. Cf the *London Tablet*, 16 May, 1970.

Church, showing its true nature and conveying to men here and now the eternal redemption of its head, Jesus Christ.¹²

Since, then, the liturgy is the sign or sacrament of the Church, if it is to remain a credible sign, it must reflect the flowing life of the Church. As we have been taught, the Church is the body of Christ; and it is in the nature of bodies to grow and develop and, within the limits of their nature, to change. Not only should we not be surprised by a changing liturgy, we should be disturbed if it showed no signs of change. As is well known, the Council wrote the principle of adaptation into liturgical reform;¹³ and we should not let the word 'adaptation' blind us to the fact that chronologically, if we look into the future, this means change, and that geographically it spells the end of uniformity. This principle has in fact been implemented by the *Consilium* (now the Congregation for Divine Worship) in the new rites that have come or are coming into use. It will be conspicuous in the new marriage rite; but it is already evident in the new order of baptism, where, for instance, the formula of the renunciation of evil may be adapted to different regions and cultures. The principle is not so clear in the new order of the mass, where the alternatives are strictly limited. However, as we have been able to observe in the last few years, the change from latin has already produced different *styles* of worship in different countries.

We are thus brought to the question whether we need fixed forms of worship or not. To attempt to answer this we have to realize that 'forms' can be 'rites', that is, basic structures. They can be certain gestures or attitudes that occur or may occur within the rite; or they can be texts which interpret the rite and in fact give it its meaning. It seems to be a finding of the most elementary human psychology that men at worship need fixed forms in the first sense. We do not go to church to *study* liturgy. Anyone who has attended rites other than the one with which he has become familiar through practice knows the sense of distraction experienced in following unfamiliar liturgies. We need to know where we are going; part must succeed part in an ordered and comprehensible sequence. It is only then that public liturgy can become the channel into which we pour our prayer, the means by which we reach out to God so as to be united with him. If a liturgy is constantly changing, if 'progressive' characters are always tinkering with it, the worshipper experiences an intolerable sense of frustration. However, fixed forms do not mean rigid forms

¹² *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 41 and 2.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 40.

that may never change in any detail.

Of the liturgy of the mass, for instance, the constitution on the liturgy has what may be called an organic view. It speaks of its 'intrinsic nature and the purpose of its several parts, and of the connexion between them which is to be more clearly manifested'.¹⁴ If we confine our attention to the development of the liturgy of the mass in the west, we see that there are certain basic elements that go to make up the rite the Church has known since the fourth century. There is the ministry of the word which has always had a pattern (obscured in the rite of 1570): reading has been followed by psalm or other chant, and the whole brought to a conclusion with the homily. These are the basic elements of the ministry of the word and it is difficult to conceive of it as being anything very different. For this pattern is based on something much deeper than ritual or custom. It is based on two truths. First, the proclamation of God's word in the liturgical gathering is part of the economy of salvation. This is how man, certainly in community, makes his encounter with God's living word. Secondly, when God's word is proclaimed man must respond to it. Again, at least in community, he will do this by echoing in God's word his response to it. These truths provide the criteria for the construction of a ministry of the word. A reading may be said or sung, the response may be the simple solo of the early Church to which all listened. It may be a more or less elaborate chant (on the part of the choir) to which the people may respond. Various patterns are possible, but only that one will be satisfactory which proclaims the word audibly and intelligibly and elicits a response from the people. The little entrance of the byzantine rite, or the more solemn gospel procession of the roman rite may or may not serve the proclamation; but neither is essential.¹⁵

When we come to the ministry of the eucharist, we discover (and the new order has helped us to discover) that the all-important element is the eucharistic prayer. This, again, is a proclamation. It is, says the order, the culmination of the whole celebration: for in it there is 'eucharist', thanksgiving, and memorial (*anamnesis*); during it the holy Spirit is invoked, and the Church makes the eucharist which in turn makes the Church. The relation of its parts

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 50.

¹⁵ The Taizé community has devised one of the best rites I have seen. The gospel book is taken, with lights, down into the midst of the people and there proclaimed. At the end of it, the book is taken, again in procession, to the entrance of the church and enthroned between lights. The message is clear: what you have heard, proclaim to the world.

is now more clearly seen,¹⁶ especially in the three new eucharistic prayers, which in turn have helped us to understand more clearly the 'movement' of the roman canon with which we have been so long familiar. But the 'offertory rite', which had been built up into a 'little canon', also appears in its true light, as no more than a gesture of the people who present their gifts. Yet the old fashioned liturgiologists spent a great deal of time enquiring into the various ways of performing the offertory; whether the chalice was mixed at the offertory or at the beginning of the mass; and whether, according to where it was mixed, the rite belonged to this or that family of liturgies. Sheer archaeology, which has a limited interest but is largely irrelevant to the understanding of the eucharist.

The nature of the eucharistic prayer (and so of the eucharist) is thus clear; and now that in the west we have four eucharistic prayers (which to my regret have had imposed on them a certain uniformity), we have had some experience of doing the eucharist in four different ways. But, because perhaps *l'appétit vient en mangeant*, we have also come to realize that we are unduly restricted. The question is raised, and has been for some time, whether we are to be satisfied with what we have got. It is a question which takes us back to the beginning. The eucharist is the supreme sacrament of the Church. The Church is changing because men are changing. They live in an entirely new kind of world which has revealed, at least to the perceptive christian eye, new glories which we feel must be referred to their ultimate source and origin. Of the four eucharistic prayers, the first goes back in its oldest parts to the fourth century, the second to the third century, the third is 'modern' and the fourth also belongs to the fourth century. Unfortunately, the third might have been written at any time from about the thirteenth to the nineteenth century. It shows no awareness of the new world, of the new climate of thought which millions of men take for granted. It provides no lever by which we may raise this modern world in offering to God.

There is another question which takes us right to the root of the matter. It may be more or less readily agreed that new eucharistic prayers, reflecting the life of our time, are necessary. But who is to compose them? The normal answer will be, 'the Church or Rome'; which in effect means a number of priests, with perhaps one or two lay people as advisers or consultants. This has been the procedure in

¹⁶ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 50.

all the recent liturgical reform and it may be thought that no other way was possible. But it does not reflect exactly other teachings of Vatican II. In the constitution on the Church we read:

The holy people of God shares also in Christ's prophetic office. It spreads abroad a living witness to Him, especially by means of a life of faith and charity and by offering to God a sacrifice of praise The body of the faithful as a whole, anointed as they are by the holy one (Jn 2,20) cannot err in matters of belief.

A consequence of this is that each christian is given special gifts:

It is not only through the sacraments and Church ministries that the same holy Spirit sanctifies and leads the people of God and enriches it with virtues. Allotting his gifts 'to everyone according as he will' (1 Cor 12,11), He distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts He makes them fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices advantageous for the renewal and upbuilding of the Church, according to the words of the apostle: 'The manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit' (1 Cor 12,7). These gifts must be welcomed, and if the 'presidents' of the Church have the delicate task of discerning their authenticity, they must not suppress them.¹⁷

We may conclude from this that the people have a duty of praise and that the Church is sanctified not only by ecclesial or clerical ministries but by the people who are given gifts (*charismata*) for that purpose. We may also recall that the constitution on the liturgy teaches that the people, by reason of their share in the priestly office of Christ received in baptism, have a right and duty to take their full part in public worship. Is their role as participants in worship completely fulfilled when the forms of worship are drawn up by the clergy? In this sense must they be purely passive, receiving humbly what is offered to them? If the people are endowed with gifts, and if they have the right and duty to worship God, is it too much to say that they also have a right to take some part in the formation of the rites?

It is true that the present procedure, which basically has been by consultation, and a fairly wide one at that, has proved to be somewhat cumbersome. Nor will anyone contemplate with equanimity the possibility of the formation of the liturgy by the counting of votes. But this does not seem to be necessary. If we go back to Ignatius's picture of the Church, if we can stop ourselves from

¹⁷ *Lumen Gentium*, 12.

rejecting his oriental poetry, we shall find a truth that could lead to practical action. Presbyters, deacons and people need to be 'attuned' to one another, as the strings of the harp are in harmony with each other. There is dialogue, there is understanding; there is, on the part of the bishop, discernment of the movement of the Spirit in his community; and there is, on the part of the people, the rich experience of the world and all its tasks, its temptations, its needs and its evils. Is it wildly impracticable to think that out of such a relationship there could come a eucharistic prayer that would reflect the world as it is, reflect indeed the *people's* experience of that world and enable them, as the author of hebrews suggested, to offer God a sacrifice of praise, 'the tribute of lips that gives honour to his name'.¹⁸ Part of the malaise of modern liturgical reforms is that the people do not feel they are their own; they have made no contribution to them. The forms have been imposed, and the people are not always clear who has imposed them.

Would such a procedure go against the hierarchical nature of the liturgy as it is set out in the constitution? I do not think so. It is here precisely that the role of the bishop as the president of the liturgy would be most important and, one imagines, most effective. He would sit down with his people and clergy, listen to them, guide the discussion, accept or reject recommendations, not merely because they offend *his* notions of propriety but because they would not be in harmony with the nature of the liturgy which is the worship of the *community*. He would have to *be* what he is, the chief liturgist of the diocese: not only in the celebration of the liturgy but in its formation. The liturgical forms that emerged would be both his and the people's, because both had contributed to their formation.

It will be objected that such a process would mean a decentralization of the Church such as has not been envisaged, at least in modern times, and a variety of liturgical forms that many would find intolerable. Given modern means of communication and the mobility of people, the process would perhaps have to be carried a little further. After the sort of discussion suggested above, the results could be co-ordinated by a liturgical commission. Certain forms could receive the sanction of the bishops of a region and, if necessary, they could be approved by Rome. Even then the contribution of the local churches, both clerical and lay, would be apparent in the resulting forms. On the other hand, a variety of forms should not be

¹⁸ Heb 13, 15.

regarded as objectionable. It is here in fact that the principle of essential patterns and the variant expressions of them comes into play. Every eucharistic prayer, as we suggested above, has and must have a certain pattern; there are elements of it which cannot be dispensed with. These would be maintained; but the form in which they were drawn up would be different.

We are now in a position to discuss the literary forms of the liturgy. If certain texts must by their nature have an underlying structure, it does not follow that their literary forms must always be the same, and it seems undesirable that they should be. Two examples immediately come to mind: the eucharistic prayer itself and the collect. Both of these derive from a certain literary tradition which in itself is somewhat mixed. Jewish as well as greco-roman rhetorical influences can be discerned, and in the west the influence of roman classical oratory has been considerable. Thus the roman canon is a majestic piece of declamation redolent of the rhetoric of the forum. True, its latin was christianized, and the jewish influence is always apparent (the calling of the divine names and the 'blessing' of God for his gifts); but it was and remains a monologue. This did and does express very well the presidential role of the priest-celebrant; and it is only through confusing the roles of priest-president and people that some wish the people to say the prayer with him. But does it follow that the eucharistic prayer must always be a monologue? Is it true that this literary form suits the psychology of modern people, who more and more are ceasing to listen to anything for any length of time? Is it not likely that interventions of the people from time to time during the prayer would meet their need?

This has been partly conceded with the addition of the proclamation after the consecration; and one notes with interest that in the alternative prayers of the blessing of the water in the new baptismal rite, the people constantly intervene with an acclamation, 'Blessed be God'.¹⁹ These prayers are in a 'eucharistic' form. They bless God for the gift of water, for the redeeming work of Jesus Christ; they ask (and here acclamation becomes invocation: 'Hear us, Lord') that those to be baptized in it may be re-born and share in Christ's resurrection. It would not be difficult to construct a prayer for the eucharist along the same lines.

Like the eucharistic prayer, the collect, with its invocation of the

¹⁹ The new *Order of Baptism*, 223, 224.

divine names and attributes, with its highly formalized pattern and language, bears the marks of its origins and age. The question is being asked more and more frequently whether this form of prayer suits modern people. Its genius, we have been told for generations, is its brevity and yet it is over almost before people have had time to take it in. Yet it too is a presidential prayer, and the president of the assembly has the right and duty of *leading* the people in prayer. There seems to be no very cogent reason why the collect should retain its literary form, even if its function in the liturgy should be kept. Again, one would hazard the guess that the form found for the prayer of the faithful (*alias* bidding prayers) has proved acceptable to people; and this form, somewhat modified, could replace that of the classical collect. Its theme, however, should remain general; particular 'intentions' should be excluded, since it is not merely the prayer of the local community. It is the prayer of the whole Church at a given moment. Freedom of composition, here as elsewhere, is controlled by the needs of the community.

It may be worth pointing out here that the prayer of the faithful should be kept fairly free both in content and form. People may make their own contribution and should be allowed to do so. The tendency that has been observed in recent years to stereotype such prayers is to be regretted. It is due to a failure to appreciate the liberty that the new liturgical forms have given us. The ways in which the people may make their contribution are various: they may send in petitions or put them in a box; there may be parish groups who, after discussion, would reveal certain needs of the community; and in some places or in small assemblies, different people could voice their petitions. This latter practice may not be appropriate in the circumstances of the large parish; but it does come near to the picture of the early Church as suggested by St Paul.²⁰

Thirdly, there is the matter of attitudes and gestures. In the past these have been rigidly dictated, at least as far as the clergy were concerned, by a body of positive law called rubrics. These are hardly paralleled by anything in the new order of the mass. What is required is that the celebrant and his assistants should understand the rite, see its broad pattern and do things because, in the particular circumstances of celebration, this is the best way of doing them. This is true also of the people; any tendency to 'clericalize'

²⁰ 1 Cor 14.

the attitudes and gestures of the people should be resisted. It is for the clergy to teach them what the liturgy is, to expound where necessary the meaning and purpose of particular movements, and then let the people find their own way about it. An obvious example of this is the new gesture of charity (formerly the *pax*) which has been introduced into the new order *for the people*. The order makes it very clear that it is a movement of the people to be done by the people and, after instruction and perhaps suggestion as to how it should be done, the people do in fact find the most credible way in which to do it.

Yet, on the other hand, a public assembly of many people needs some uniformity of movement: the 'scrum-down' type of communion 'procession' was (and if it still exists, is) a disgrace. And yet there are many people who resent any other way of doing it. What is lacking is a sense of community which, again, shows itself to be the criterion of ordered yet not regimented worship. What in fact has been lacking is a sense of christian community. The priest has 'held his corner', the choir have often looked with scorn on the un-musical mob in the pews, and the mob in the pews have acted in an entirely individualistic way, giving the impression that their neighbour, whom the gospel tells them to love, was their enemy. The whole liturgical action has been atomized inside the worshipping body and insulated from the community outside it.

In these circumstances, liturgical reform and liturgical order had to proceed *per modum auctoritatis*, although there has been a tendency on the part of some local episcopal authorities to limit even the liberty given by the new liturgical documents. One suspects (un-charitably perhaps) that there has been a sighing for the old flesh-pots of Egypt, so odiferous with their onions and garlic; and in one particular instance, the organization of house-masses, there has been evident a desire to restrict them or even discourage them. The latest document from Rome on the subject is very reserved and somewhat rigid. Yet it is just in these circumstances that liturgical experimentation can most profitably take place. It is here that rites, texts and gestures could be 'tried out'. And if the participants were required to send in a report on their activities to the bishop or his representative, the chance of dialogue leading to the establishment of certain needs of the people would be real. In such a dialogue between church leaders and people one cannot doubt that there would be the movement of the holy Spirit.

Admittedly the practical problems are enormous. How is this sort

of dialogue to be maintained in our vast dioceses and in the sometimes equally large and anonymous parishes? Undoubtedly there are dangers, of which not the least would be the imposition of certain views and attitudes by a small group or élite in a parish. One must also concede without hesitation that what is possible in a liturgical celebration with a small group is impossible in the circumstances of a large city church. It is this situation of the large church which underlines the need for fixed forms of worship; but it is also true that it is precisely here that our worship most needs *humanizing*. How this is to be achieved, how people are to be helped to realize that they are a community of persons bound to each other and all engaged upon worshipping God, is a very difficult matter. But there is some evidence to show that where there has been an imaginative policy of group or house masses, the groups, when they join in sunday worship with the parish community, are able to animate it and give it a human complexion. Again, the design of (some) modern churches helps the community spirit, though one regrets that even here there are too many instances of a 'hieratic' outlook built into the very plan of the church: altars stuck up on high platforms, suggesting that the priest-celebrant is 'boss' rather than president. One hopes, too, that at least in the planning of new parishes, the very slight tendency to be observed of providing several multi-purpose buildings to serve one area ('parish') will lead to an ease and intimacy of worship which has been impossible to achieve in older churches.

In the period that lies ahead, there will, I think, be two tendencies in liturgical practice. The first will seek to absorb, formalize and perhaps eventually to fossilize the new liturgical forms. There are already signs of this, and one cannot but have some sympathy with those who are tired of change. It is however a tendency to be resisted; for if the principle of variety within fixed patterns is accepted, there will always remain a sufficient uniformity along with the possibility of freedom. Parallel with this, and sometimes in conflict with it, will be the tendency to discover new forms, to experiment, perhaps with a concern to concentrate on what are conceived to be 'the needs of the people', but which may be no more than the fashions of the moment. In various parts of the world there have been many signs of this, too; and the experiments, sometimes based on an imperfect knowledge and appreciation of what liturgy is, do not always inspire confidence. However, the remedy is not a policy of suppression, which will be self-defeating and doomed to failure.

What then can be done and, as I think, should be done? The pastors of the Church, whether bishops or priests, are not merely *performers* of the liturgy, much less the mere guardians of the rule-book; they are *presidents* of the liturgy and the *leaders* of their communities. This implies a positive and, within the genius of a particular liturgy, a creative attitude to it. Liturgy does not exist in a book whose regulations can and must be imposed, irrespective of local conditions and circumstances. It is a living, ever-growing thing; and if *lex orandi, lex credendi* means anything at all, the liturgy should be reflecting the changing insights which the members of the Church acquire into its nature in different places and in different ages. The constitution on the Church in the modern world has taught us that you cannot isolate into separate compartments the 'Church' and the 'world', the natural and the supernatural, the human and the divine. Hence the prayer of christians must reflect their new insights into the nature of reality, indeed into the ever-flowing process of the redemption of this earthly order. It is over this changing, moving and sometimes baffling situation that the pastors of the Church are the presidents. Trusting in the Spirit that is theirs by the laying on of hands, and in the gifts of the Spirit that are present in the christian people, they should be able to teach, guide and encourage them into ways of worship consonant with a public liturgy, but which also reflect and meet the needs of these same people. Pastors need to be liturgists in the full sense of the word, presidents of their communities in which there is the rich, flowing life of the modern world. They must be able to lead their people to the point where they can lift up to God, as 'a holy sacrifice', their bodies, their lives, the whole richness of creation.