

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 36

December 1977

## Editorial

At Synod last month a slightly clearer picture of the 1980 Alternative Service Book started to emerge. Brian Brindley had tabled a question about its size and cost. The answer compared it to other books around (such as Roman missals and *The Methodist Service Book*), pointed out that these currently cost in the region of £2.50, and estimated that a book costing £2.50 to-day would cost £3 in 1980. But the answer did *not* say that the book would cost £2.50 if it were published to-day, nor that it would cost £3 when published in 1980. We are left to make our own inferences.

At an earlier session of Synod we learned that the 'origination' of the book will be vested in the Central Board of Finance, which will keep the copyright, and even, if I remember aright, make a profit on it (though the 'profit' will in fact derive from heavy payments by local churches for the book). The Bishop of Durham said at the February Synod 'Underlying these plans is the conviction that the publication of this book will be an important event for the Church and that its sales will be very large.' The question which keeps recurring is 'Will they be large in fact?'

I cannot but have doubts about this. The original questionnaire asked 600-odd parishes whether they would buy it, and 400-odd said they would. But note that they firstly had no accurate costings, and secondly had no actual spending. It was a hypothetical exercise. It is easy to raise your hand for hypothetical expenditure without commitment. Will there be so many hands raised to spend actual money when the time comes?

My current impression is an ever-increasing nervousness on this score. Indeed I am not sure that I ever meet anybody (except the working party members who produced the plan) who is enthusiastic for the book. This does not mean that people will not in fact buy the book when it is there. Indeed, once it starts to sell, then it could produce a virtuous spiral, where sales in one place hearten others in other places to buy it. But still a suspicion remains.

The question of cost is still very difficult to handle. I *think* (but I could be wrong) that it will cost more than £2.50 on to-day's prices. And I *think* (but I could be wrong) that £2.50 to-day will have risen to more than £3 by Autumn 1980. So it is an immensely expensive project for the Church of England, and immensely expensive for local Churches to have in the pews.

There exist some precedents. In the USA the new Prayer Book costs around £2 per copy, and it is massive, and well-produced. But then, every ECUSA congregation has *got* to get it—the old Prayer Book is likely to lapse completely in 1979. In Australia the new Prayer Book (available here by the end of March, we hope) will cost \$6 Australian—around £3.75 on today's rate of exchange!

For myself, I am loyally going along with the work to be done to get the book ready. I made a fairly frontal attack on the concept in Synod in February 1976, and apparently only dented myself, not the project. But I still do not hear even the members of Synod saying they are looking forward to actually *buying* the book—I wonder whether they simply want other people to buy it. I ask therefore—would those who are looking forward to *buying* it themselves, for themselves or for local Churches, please write in? The worried or disenchanted need not (let *them* table motions of disquiet in their diocesan synods and find the state of opinion that way). But it would be helpful to hear from the silent enthusiasts.

Perhaps I might then add a personal word of Christmas greetings to all our subscribers and readers. I do hope this reaches you before Christmas and that it finds you—in the words of a recent title of ours—celebrating Christmas. For our part, *NOL* is about to start its fourth year of publication, and has now settled down as an 8-page entity. For the first time there is no price increase with the New Year. Similarly, the booklets on Ministry and Worship enter their seventh year (the first with pictures on the cover!), the booklets on Ethics their fifth as a regular series, and the Liturgical Studies their fourth. The only question this raises is how to stop it all, unscramble, and get out from underneath. Thus far, as with the snake eating its breakfast, once started we do not know how to stop! And, marvellously, about 98% of our readers seem to be in the same case!

So, with Christmas greetings, we look forward to 1978. God bless us, every one.

Colin Buchanan

## NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT

A programme for the revision of Series 3 communion is beginning to become clear—and a tight schedule it is. The Liturgical Commission's consultations with the House of Bishops will not be completed till well into February, and it will be just possible then for the report to be published by the first week in May, in time to give the requisite two months' notice to General Synod before it is debated there in July. If it is duly committed to a Revision Committee, it is just possible that it will be ready for the Revision stage in Synod in February 1979, and after provisional approval then, it would come forward for final approval in July 1979. This would neatly fit into the timetable for inclusion in the 1980 Alternative Service Book (for which texts must be ready by Autumn 1979). But two great problems would remain:

- (i) The other services in the ASB are to be conformed to Series 3 (revised) communion service. Thus the text of the Lord's Prayer, the wording of opening 'Notes', the style of rubrics, the versions of the salutation etc.—all these are to be drawn from this communion service and the other services are to be 'adapted' to conform to it. If it is finally approved in July 1979, then presumably the 'adaptations' will have to follow in November 1979, which is cutting it very close.

- (ii) In any case, it is very doubtful whether the Revision Committee could get its work done for the February 1979 session. It is more likely to report to the July 1979 session, which would mean that final approval in turn would be delayed till November 1979. And the 'adaptations' procedure would only then be *beginning*.

So the timetable towards getting everything into production by Autumn 1979 is already looking very much tighter than in the forecast of business reported in the August 1977 *NOL*. In January we will print a full table of progress, and we shall watch that progress very closely thereafter.

## A cross wind . . .

Meanwhile, to complicate matters, the 'East End Five' have circulated their questionnaire (reported briefly here in August) to 985 clerical members of diocesan evangelical unions. They have received 758 replies, which they claim show that the existing Series 3 rite is 'dividing the Church England'. The crucial reply in their returns is that which says of the respondents that 293 use Series 3 'amended', 341 use it 'unaltered', and 124 do not use it at all. Other questions relating to changes evangelicals would like to see are not necessarily so crucial, especially as the questionnaire carefully suggested the areas where changes might be needed (perhaps there the wonder is that only half the respondents said they wanted changes in those areas). No, the question is 'Where and how are the 293 amending the rite?'. It might be, for instance, that they omit the phrase 'We commemorate [the departed]' and go straight to the paragraph 'We commend all men . . .' (which then refers to the living not the departed). But this is *not* contrary to the provisions of Series 3, and does not amount to 'amending' the text. One respondent might call this amending, whilst another did not. Objections to reservation of the sacrament (which many evangelicals consider is 'legalized' by the service) can only be objections to a *rubric*, so it is difficult to know how *that* objection can be met by 'amending' the text *in use*.

If the 293 are making no greater amendments than are suggested above, then the questionnaire itself would suggest that 634 of the 758 are *relatively* happy with Series 3—certainly they use it. And even the other 124 might include clergy who want to use it, but their congregations do not. So the questionnaire could be showing that 83%, or even more, of evangelical clergy are finding Series 3 a possible rite for the future. It is true that an even split (363 for and 340 against) is registered for the proposition that 'the present service adequately expresses the biblical doctrine of the Lord's 'Supper'—but even then there must be no fewer than 270 of the antis, or 35% of the total, who still use it! So *how* are they amending it?

*NOL* cheerfully recognizes that the above is putting an optimistic face on the returns, and this optimism is undoubtedly speculative and inferential. But it is perhaps the more justified by the pessimism with which the 'Five' themselves appear to view their returns. It is of course true that the East End has long been the home of some very unreformed anglo-catholicism, and this may colour the approach of the 'Five'. It is also true that these columns, devoted though they are to charting, describing, and within reason promoting the Series 3 services, *have* registered the complaints which the questionnaire undoubtedly reveals. C.O.B.

## This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Liturgical Study no. 12, *Worship in the New Testament (i)*, by C. F. D. Moule. Professor Moule's classic, originally published by Lutterworth in the early sixties, has been out of print for a decade. It is now re-published in two parts (the second part will be Study no. 13 in March) in an exact reprint of the original. Each part has 40 pages.

## . . . and next month's

is no. 56, *The Eastern Orthodox Liturgy*, by John Fenwick. The author spent six months two years ago in a Greek seminary at Thessaloniki and has drawn upon his experience of worshipping with the liturgy of St. Chrysostom to do a new commendation of the rite (from within as it were) to Anglicans. There has been nothing comparable for decades.

## and titles out of print

are now as follows: nos. 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 17, 19, 31, 35, 37, *Series 3 for Children* and Ethics nos. 6 and 7. Stocks are becoming low of nos. 7, 18, 20, 21, 27. It is unlikely that any will be reprinted in the near future.

## A Service of Thanksgiving and Blessing . . .

. . . has been constantly in demand, although we sold out the third printing during the Summer. Because an official 'Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child' is going through Synod (in the *Initiation Services*—GS 343), we have refrained from reprinting the 'pirate' (though for the moment still lawful) text. However, we have taken the point that certificates are still needed, and these will be available again by mid-January. Please note that we have not recorded any orders (as we did not expect to reprint), so that you will need to order again from scratch. Cost: 5p or 25 for £1 (inclusive of VAT).

## and a catalogue?

well, we said last month we would be distributing a sheet, and we did not, and we apologise. We do not now anticipate doing a new catalogue until February or March, when the new prices come into operation for back-numbers.

## and renewing *NOL* for 1978,

should be done quickly—we sent a form about this last month to those who take *NOL* without booklets. Please return the slip with £1.90, or £2.25 or whatever your own tariff decrees. Or send details with the money but without the slip.

**8p** per copy (£1.90 by post for the year 1978, (£2.25 by air))

**GROVE BOOKS**  
**BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)**

## BOOKS THIS MONTH

There is little new to suggest, so we list some of the larger standard titles we keep in stock (and supply anywhere in the world postfree):  
*The Eucharist To-day: Studies on Series 3* edited R. C. D. Jasper (paper) £2.75.

*Prayers of the Eucharist* ed. R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming (paper) £2.50.  
*Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* edited J. G. Davies £6.00.  
*The Shape of the Liturgy* Dom Gregory Dix £7.50.  
*A History of Anglican Liturgy* G. J. Cuming £5.95.  
*The Early Liturgy* J. Jungmann (paper) £3.00.  
*E. C. Ratcliff: Liturgical Studies* edited A. H. Couratin and D. Tripp £8.50.  
*The Liturgy in English* edited B. J. Wigan £2.10.

*Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975* edited Colin Buchanan £10.75.  
*Praise Him in the Dance* by Anne Long £3.75

*The Paradox of Worship* by Michael Perry £2.50  
*The Liturgy of Christian Burial* by G. Rowell £3.75

*Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* by E. C. Whitaker (paper) £3.50.  
*First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI* £1.10

*Pastoral Liturgy* edited by Harold Winstone £3.00

*The Psalms: A New Translation for Worship* £2.50, £1.90, £1.35 and £1.25.

We also, of course, have a full range of the reports from the Liturgical Commission, *Prayers we have in Common* (of ICET), and the final glossy booklets of the Series 3 range. The American, South American and Australian Prayer Books we shall attempt to keep in stock in the New Year, though with imported books a sudden demand can leave us without stocks for weeks.

FOOTNOTE: Re 'Filofax' materials. We have traditionally only stocked these for customers in St. John's College, but have found an increasing demand for supplies from us. We have difficulty in supplying these postfree, as our margin is cut to the bone. And we have also recently had great difficulty in getting supplies at all, as the suppliers seem to have become erratic. We therefore give warning that we do not consider ourselves worldwide suppliers for these stationery materials. We will do our best, but you order from us *at your own risk*, and we cannot enter into correspondence about why 18p worth of filofax sheets did not reach you. We are sorry—but we are feeling very frustrated about these supplies ourselves.

## THE 'STARTREK' LITURGY

You may just have heard that the American Prayer Book contains a eucharistic prayer affectionately named the 'Startrek' liturgy. The eponymous bits are as follows:

'... thanks to the Lord our God

**It is right to give him thanks and praise.**

God of all power, Ruler of the Universe, you are worthy of glory and praise.

**Glory to you for ever and ever.**

At your command all things came to be: the vast expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the planets in their courses, and this fragile earth, our island home.

**By your will they were created and have their being.**

From the primal elements you brought forth the human race, and blessed us with memory, reason and skill. You made us the rulers of creation. But we turned against you ...'

## THE NEW MARRIAGE SERVICE

I thought I wouldn't like it. The maverick use I had heard of certain sections of it only served to confirm my prejudices—but I was wrong. What I had considered to be a starkness of language in comparison with 1662 now appears to be a refreshing openness and frankness in dealing with matters which previously had been dressed up in such a fashion as to make them totally obscure to those who came to the vicarage door to 'put their banns up'. Here's a sample of what I mean in connection with the physical side of marriage: '[Marriage] ... is given, that with delight and tenderness they may know each other in love, and, through the joy of their bodily union, may strengthen the union of their hearts and lives.'

I particularly liked the rubric which requires the bride and bridegroom to face each other when they are taking their vows and the form of words used at the giving and receiving of rings. Pure gain also are the acclamations immediately after the marriage has been blessed, and the required reading of a Scripture Passage prior to the sermon (which is optional). The selection of Psalms and additional prayers is also very helpful, as are the instructions to be followed and the special Readings and Propers to be used when the Marriage Service is combined with the Holy Communion Service.

Of course, there are what some will consider faults to be found. I doubt if many but the fully committed will want to take up the option of having a Greeting, Collect, Lesson(s), Hymn and Sermon before the Marriage actually begins and the Exhortation is read. Though many fathers are in a state of nerves when they bring their daughters to church for marriage I doubt if many will relish the suggestion that they might be redundant by the inclusion of the 'giving away' in an optional section.

My pastoral sense tells me—though it might be sadly awry—that though couples will be a little hesitant to begin with, this service will quickly become popular in many parishes. Certainly it will be much easier to use the service as a teaching vehicle in preparation for marriage and an enormous help to be able to place this attractive little booklet in the hands of the congregation.

Roy Williamson

## Dear Archbishop ...

We have been sent the *York Diocesan Leaflet* for August 1977. The anonymous correspondent points out that the Bishop of Selby's editorial reflects upon the Swanwick Conference which the Archbishop and I clergy had just been having, and ends with this stirring call:

'Where now? If there is a word to the whole diocese from this conference it is surely this: "Expect to be led forward". Going back—to old ways, familiar signposts, entrenched positions—is a false security: staying in the wilderness, making our tent pegs more secure for fear of going forward, never solved anything. The Kingdom is best served if we go forward ...'

The same leaflet carries on page 3 the news:

'For the first time since its inception, the Diocesan Synod used the 1662 form of Holy Communion at the start of its June session. In future it will be used in rotation with Series 2 and 3.'

Our correspondent adds 'One trembles to think where the next great leap forward will land them.'

## THAT ROYAL BAPTISM

The first I heard of it (and I have only slowly discovered I was not told most of the details) was when the BBC in London asked if they could interview me, via their Nottingham studios, for *Sunday*, their early morning programme for Sunday 18 December. They wanted to ask me whether the Queen was in breach of Canon Law in having *that* baptism privately done at Buckingham Palace. Ian Gall of BBC Radio Nottingham came round to interview me on tape, and the conversation went roughly as follows:

IG: What do the Canons of the Church of England teach about where and when baptisms should be held?

COB: They require the clergy 'from time to time' to hold baptisms in the context of public worship. The clergy differ as to whether this means that they are to hold baptisms 'from time to time', and when they hold them, they should be in the context of public worship [which the Prayer Book rubrics require], or whether it means that they can hold baptisms whenever and wherever they like, so long as 'from time to time' they still hold them in public. In addition, General Synod has now passed a motion asking that in the Canons 'normally' should replace 'from time to time'.

IG: Then should not the royal baptism be held publicly?

COB: I have no information that it is not being held publicly. I believe the Queen attends the parish Church on Sundays when she is in Sandringham, but I have never heard of her doing this in London. So I have always assumed that one of her chaplains provided a ministry in a chapel or the equivalent in Buckingham Palace, and I suppose that *is* public worship for these purposes.

IG: But is not the Queen setting a bad example?

COB: Well, in the first instance, if I were discussing a baptism with anyone, it would in the first instance be with the parents—it is not so directly the grandmother's business ...

IG: Nevertheless, will not this have a bad effect on the rest of the country?

COB: Well, if Mrs. Jones round the corner wanted to allege that as Princess Anne had had her baby baptized privately (whether that were true or not), I think I would want to ask what sort of pack-out of curious persons who had just come to stare there would be in the local parish church if Mrs. Jones took *her* baby there—such as to justify having the baptism at home. And unless there were a parallel of this sort, I would doubt if the argument from one to the other could be sustained.

IG: Nevertheless, would you say that the Queen is in breach of Canon Law?

COB: Canon Law is in the first instance binding on the clergy. But one also has to remember that the Queen is the very fount of Canon Law—the Synod has to petition her permission before promulgating Canons at her pleasure. So she cannot offend against the Canons, not only because she is lay, but also because she is Queen! And all that is on the pre-supposition, which I do not concede, that the baptism is being done privately.

IG: Well, on that pre-supposition, is the Archbishop perhaps in breach of the Canons?

COB: I very much doubt it. It is as if Henry VIII had commanded ...

The discerning will note COB's desire to avoid being sent to the Tower for *lese majeste*. But no sooner was the interview safely taped than the *Church Times* for 16 December carried the information that the baptism was to occur on a weekday, and apparently to be incontrovertibly 'private'. Had I known this, I might have commented differently. Only part of the interview was in fact broadcast. However, even on this basis, the following points should be noted:

(a) Clergy should not complain, unless they themselves are scrupulous about having all baptisms in public.

(b) There *is* a publicity problem, which is of a very different kind for the Royal Family from what it is for other families.

(c) There is a dispute about the meaning of the present Canon.

(d) There is provision for exceptions, by implication, in the 'normally' of the future Canon.

(e) The Archbishop of Canterbury would have to weigh these issues very carefully before ever dreaming of advising the Royal Family that the place they desired was inappropriate. Indeed it is extraordinary (from one point of view) that those who cannot ever envisage a refusal to baptize in any ordinary parish situation should somehow expect the Archbishop to get himself into the situation of operating sanctions against the Royal Family!

So my own belief remains that, however much a different pattern *might* have been desired for this baptism, it is *not* the right point at which to start a public campaign for better parochial practice. For one thing, that public campaign would be premature until Synod has handled the draft Canon which must now come before it. For another, the Royal Family's problems in handling a baptism must by definition be exceptional, and do not provide a secure test case of anything.

Even so, a different pattern *might* have been desired ...

## St. John's Newsletter

We are reckoning to distribute the *St. John's Newsletter* free with this mailing of *NOL*, and trust our readers find it (and its enclosures for those in England) of interest.

## STOP PRESS—CHRISTMAS IN NEW ZEALAND

Brian Carrell, our man in Christchurch, forwards a diocesan journal reporting the diocesan (*not* General) synod of that diocese, where, it seems, the great Christmas debate took place. And the diocesan synod passed overwhelmingly the motion that Christmas Day should come on 25 June, and the whole of the rest of the Church year should be moved by exactly six months to relate to it! The diocesan motion now comes before the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand in April 1978. Be sure *NOL* will keep a close watch on this latter-day revival of quasi-quartodecimanism.