

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 39

March 1978

Editorial

This month sees the 'Catholic Renewal Conference' taking place at Loughborough University from 29 March to 1 April. It is quite obviously inspired in part by the National Evangelical Anglican Congress held at Nottingham University last year at the same time, though it is also due in part to an awareness on the part of anglo-catholics that they had to focus their role and their principles more clearly than has been happening in the last decade.

It is perhaps a good moment for an evangelical (who is critically sympathetic to the catholic movement in the Church of England) to stand back and review the achievements of catholics in the field of worship.

Undoubtedly, the original Oxford Movement had the liturgical round of the Church's year near to its central purposes. The *Tracts for the Times* from 1833 to 1841 gave as much attention as they could spare from apostolic succession to the revival of sacramental worship (including all the sacraments of Rome), the faithful adherence to the ecclesiastical calendar (including vigils and fasts and eves, of which few Anglicans had taken note since the seventeenth century), and the close observance of neglected rubrics. From these years there rose the insistence on regular—and fasting—communion, and the following decades led to a surge of gorgeousness in worship which would not have disgraced an Italian festival with all the stops out. The last years of the nineteenth century ushered in permanent reservation of the sacrament, extra-liturgical (and counter-reformation) devotions to the reserved sacrament, wholesale borrowing of latin uses and texts, and a wholesale employment of latin ceremonial to deck out the texts. The Gothic Revival added its architectural setting for this liturgical mood, and a different Church of England entered the twentieth century from that which entered the nineteenth.

It has been truly said that the great victories of the Movement were not to be found in the bizarre extremes favoured by the real zealots of anglo-catholicism. The greatest victory of all was the effect on the average parish church. By an early date in the twentieth century it was everywhere taken for granted that Anglican parish churches had altar frontals, the clergy had stoles, the communion bread was unleavened wafers, two candles adorned the altar, the priest stood with his back to the people at the altar, communion was received fasting, it was normal to bow to the altar when crossing a line at right angles to it, bishops wore mitres, and ablutions were taken with a maximum of fuss. So fast did this tide come in that innovations were quickly accepted as traditions. In fact the last Archbishop of Canterbury to take 'North Side' position at communion died in the present century (Freddie Temple); the first Archbishop of Canterbury

to wear a mitre (since the reformation) only ascended the throne of St. Augustine less than fifty years ago (Cosmo Lang); and mass vestments and stone altars were only legalized in the 1960s. It is an open question even now whether reservation of the sacrament (which is certainly a fraction more specialist anglo-catholic use, apart from the needs of the sick) is legal in the Church of England.

Right back at the turn of the century it became clear that there were two (or even three) competing notions of what made a usage 'catholic'. The Society of SS. Peter and Paul (the seedbed from which Ronnie Knox sprang) simply imitated Rome; the romantic English catholicizers (such as Percy Dearmer) wanted to show continuity with medieval England; and quite a sprinkling of persons looked East, to an area where tradition ran strong, but a sturdy independence of the pope ran equally strong.

The pope himself has made things more difficult since then. For nearly 100 years the *Church Times* denounced evening communion as a flagrant breach of catholic principles (see the extracts from the past in the recent 6000th issue)—but then in the 1950s Pius XII allowed evening masses for Roman Catholics! Similarly, the strong attachment to latin which betokened extremists until the day before yesterday is now impossible because of Rome's own action. At the same time, the Parish Communion Movement, itself a product of anglo-catholic concerns, has led away from the eastward position at the altar (and thus from most of the traditional ornamentation of the altar) and bids fair to undermine wafers also.

It is likely that worship as such will not be central on the catholic agenda at Loughborough. But there will be time for worship in the programme, and on the eve of the publication of revised Series 3 communion there is bound to be interest in new Anglican texts amongst the participants. One well appreciates that the doctrinal and devotional heart of the movement is not well summarized by a description of externals. Nevertheless, the question presses, and we press it on our anglo-catholic friends as constructively as we can. What are true catholic principles to-day in the field of worship?

Happily, Loughborough is almost as near to St. John's College as Nottingham University was for 'NEAC' last year. So I am reckoning to be there and report on it afterwards. I was asked by the Australian church journal *Church Scene* to comment on the prospects for the Loughborough Conference, and this led to my being asked to write similarly for *Church Times* on 17 March. In the course of this article I ventured to ask how far the charismatic revival, which was strongly in evidence at NEAC, was going to be found as a vital feature of the 'Catholic Renewal' which was the concern of the Loughborough Conference. That is one of the several questions I shall be wanting to ask at the Conference.

Colin Buchanan

ST. JOHN'S NEWSLETTER

We are doing another general distribution of *St. John's Newsletter* with this *NOL*. Readers will observe the 'Stop Press' feature of the front page of it. We give notice that subscribers to *NOL* will be viewed as sufficiently associated with the College (though admittedly tenuously) as to be recipients of the appeal itself later this Spring. But we only want a response to the appeal from those whose hearts respond, and others must feel under no pressure at all.

NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT—TOWARDS 1980

I mentioned last month that I had asked a complex question in General Synod of the Bishop of Durham in relation to the 1980 *Alternative Service Book*. Here are the details:

Question: 'Is it still the intention of the Standing Committee, as indicated by the Bishop of Durham in the debate on the *Alternative Service Book* in February 1977 (*Proceedings* Vol. 8 No. 1 p.220) that a "final decision about which services are to be included and which excluded" should be taken by Synod in November 1979, and, if so, does this mean that over and above adapting current services and authorizing new periods of currency for them, a further decision will in each case have to be made by Synod to include them in the 1980 Book?'

Answer (by the Bishop of Durham on behalf of the Standing Committee): 'I can best answer Mr. Buchanan's Question by summarizing the further stages in the preparation of the *Alternative Service Book*, so far as the Synod timetable is concerned.

First, we have to complete the range of Series 3 services, to make up our minds about the Psalter and to give full consideration to Holy Communion Series 3 Revised.

Secondly, we will have to consider certain relatively minor items of new material, e.g. the Sentences and some additional Collects.

Thirdly, as Mr. Buchanan says, we will have to adapt the Series 3 services so that they will fit into the Book in a way which avoids repetition and duplication.

Fourthly, all the existing Series 1, 2 and 3 services expire on 31 December 1979; and it would be necessary during 1979 to decide which of them are to continue to be authorized thereafter. It is this process which I had in mind when I referred to 1979 in my speech last February. My expectation—but I must emphasize that this is a matter which the Standing Committee has not yet discussed—is that we will have before us in the second half of 1979 three composite motions—one, covering the position between the end of 1979 and the publication of the *Alternative Service Book*; a second providing the period of authorization for all the *Alternative Services* which are to be included in the new Book; and a third providing the period of authorization for any *Alternative Services* which are to continue but which are not to be included in the Book. Each of these motions will come before us at two separate Groups of Sessions, for Provisional Approval and for Final Approval. At the Provisional Approval stage, each motion will be open to amendment—but only in that sense will there be a "further decision in each case". At the Final Approval stage, each motion will require a two-thirds majority in each house.'

I then asked a supplementary to ensure that 'open to amendment' in the answer meant 'can have its category changed from being in the Book to being authorized but not in the Book', and the Bishop confirmed that this was indeed what he meant.

BOOKS THIS MONTH

SPCK have sent us *The Three Agreed Statements* (published jointly with CTS) now available at 50p. Collins Liturgical Publications have sent Edward Matthews *The Forgiveness of Sins* (£1.25) and A. J. McCallen *More Like Christ* (£2.00), both to be published on 27 April 1978. The former is a simple explanation of the history of penance, and its role to-day, whilst the latter is a course of instruction about confirmation (including full details of the rite itself).

Further ahead SPCK are due to publish in May their massive new reference work *The Study of Liturgy* (edited by Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold). This is intended to replace the pre-war *Liturgy and Worship*. It has 528 pages, plus photos, and costs £13.50, or £8.50 in paperback.

Picture books on Series 3 communion. Following the Mowbray's venture last Summer, and the Mirfield one (*Bread of Life*) in the Autumn, we now have Collins Liturgical Publications' *We Pray Together* (to be published on 5 June 1978). Extraordinarily all three publications cost 50p—were the publishers eyeing each other? The new one is a very attractive bit of work, larger than the Mirfield effort, smaller than the Mowbrays one.

At Grove Books we are led to ponder by these productions. Do their publishers reckon on high demand between now and the authorization of the new Series 3? We had already given up reprinting *Series 3 for Children* before the other picture-books came along, on the grounds that demand would fall, and it was wrong to try to encourage it in the light of the prospective changes in the text. Collins have solved this problem (but created many others) by using a shortened version of the creed, which would ensure that no child with this book could possibly join in saying it with the congregation and that the book at several points would actually mislead those who could read a bit.

On the other hand we ourselves are girding ourselves to publish a musical setting for Series 3 communion, and will carry news of progress in future months.

We indicated last month that in May the new Series 3 (revised) communion service report ought to be available from the Liturgical Commission. We now understand that it has to be circularized to Synod members on 15 May if it is to be debated in General Synod at York in July. We retain our intention of circularizing to all subscribers to booklets on Ministry and Worship (unless they let us know otherwise) and to all others (such as those who take *NOL* only) who write in to us. If the circularization has to come mid-month between two despatches of booklets, then we shall not delay, but will do a separate distribution. We hope to get it on your breakfast table for the day of publication—postfree as usual. There is no need to write in unless you do not want it or want it sent airmail. Otherwise it will just come.

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

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

This month's booklet . . .

is Liturgical Study no. 13, *Worship in the New Testament (ii)*, by C. F. D. Moule. This is the second half of the book originally published by Lutterworth in 1961. The first half was published as no. 12 in December 1977, and this half then completes the reprint of a book which has been unobtainable (though much needed) for ten years. We detect considerable interest in this reprint, and it may be that readers have other suggestions of titles which should also be made available again this way.

. . . and next month's

is *Ministry to the Sick: An Introduction* edited by David Gregg. Four separate authors, involved in different ways in theology, history and pastoral practice, contribute short essays to open up the subject. The following month no. 59, entitled *Pastoral and Liturgical Ministry to the Sick*, will follow on from this introduction. No. 59 is edited by Michael Botting, and gives practical and liturgical advice and help. The two booklets relate to each other rather as nos. 27 and 28 (on death, published in 1974) relate to each other.

. . . and prices

of all backnumbers go up to 35p on 1 April. Write quickly for gap-fillers.

. . . and that airmail NOL

has been outdated by our discovering that an intermediate weight edition would still qualify for the particular weight-bracket in airmail postage, and would at the same time help inland postage weights. So now the whole edition is on one standard paper. It may wrinkle a little in folding, but we think readers would accept that to have the price kept down. (We are not making profits yet).

NO 1980 PRAYER BOOK?

We hear that the motion in the Sheffield diocesan synod hostile to the 1980 Prayer Book was amended in the debate on 4 March. It thus asks for the use of small booklets to continue, but does not ask that the big book should be reconsidered. Whilst this may help the cost factor, it does not touch the 'flexibility/inflexibility' question. As far as that question is concerned, the existence of the big book will undoubtedly keep all texts totally unchangeable for at least a decade and probably longer.

MEANWHILE behind the scenes . . .

The House of Bishops is reputed to have done some fiddling with the Calendar and Lectionary before bringing it forward for final approval . . . the Liturgical Commission has done its work on adapting the Roman Catholic daily eucharistic lectionary to the proposed Calendar . . . the Revision Committee on the Initiation Services has had its last meeting and is agreeing its report by post . . . and, apart from the notice on page 4 there is *nothing* we can say about Series 3 Communion (Revised) . . . yet.

Review

Roger T. Beckwith and Wilfrid Stott *This is the Day: The Biblical Doctrine of the Christian Sunday* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1978, £5.95).

I well recall in the early sixties how Wilfrid Stott, a pre-war missionary in China, rolled up at Oxford to do his doctorate on the place of Sunday in the teaching of the Fathers, and many of us have known for almost as long that Roger Beckwith was at work on the rabbinical teaching about the sabbath and on other materials which are the background to Jesus' encounters with the scribes and pharisees. Now at last the result of their labours is here—with the two authors each taking special responsibility for his own half of the book, but in a more general way both putting their names to the whole book.

They have a well-defined target at which to aim their shafts. In 1968 there was published in England a translation of the massive work by Willi Rordorf entitled *Sunday* (SCM Press). Rordorf's thesis is that Sunday in no real sense replaced the Jewish sabbath, as it was no part of the Christian understanding that it was to be a day of rest. It was simply that it settled down as the day when the church met for the eucharist—period.

The two authors marshal their evidence compellingly. In particular the sifting of the Fathers is very productive. There is evidence of how the one day is related to the seven; how private prayer should be used on the one day; how rest should be observed on it; and so on. Similarly, Roger Beckwith traces thirteen points of continuity between sabbath and Lord's day, and yet saves himself from any legalism of the sort Christian history has often witnessed. There is no comfort here for Seventh Day Adventists, just as there is none for the laxly permissive.

Above all, the book has a practical ring. It calls for hard thought about to-day's practise. The difficulty throughout the church to-day is not that the church has ceased to equate the Lord's day with the sabbath—it is rather that it has ceased to do so simply because this produced a burdensome practice. Consequently, there has been a swing away from legalism which has led us not to the firm ground of alternative principles, but rather to an unprincipled antinomianism; and it has led us not by clearer thinking, but by a gut-reaction which has been generally unaccompanied by any thought at all. Rordorf caught the Church in this country at a vulnerable moment, and it is good to have our thinking now arrested in this rigorous and demanding way.

C.O.B.

CHRISTMAS IN ENGLAND . . .

David Shacklock writes to ask what support there would be for having Christmas on a fixed Sunday—say, the fourth in December—in England.

FURTHER TO BISHOPS IN SCHISM

Last month we drew attention to two latent principles of traditional catholic theology which bore upon the consecration of new bishops for the separated episcopalians in the U.S.A. These were (i) the validity of consecrations in schism, and (ii) the validity of single-bishop consecrations (though three bishops are the minimum from a canonist's point of view). The Anglican Communion has seen several such separations in its history—as, e.g., the Non-jurors in the eighteenth century, the 'Cumminsite' schism in America in the 1870s (which led to the 'Free Church of England' which a few readers may have come across), and the Church of England in South Africa, which first appointed a retired Anglican bishop to be its bishop in 1954, and then appointed further men as bishops and he consecrated them. The line continues.

One of the more opaque questions which arise is the question of 'membership' of the Anglican Communion. It has to be remembered that until the formation in the 1970s of the 'Anglican Consultative Council' there has never been any constitutional framework which delineated the 'Anglican Communion'. Indeed those who traced their orders to the consecration of Matthew Parker in December 1559 have not necessarily even recognized or accepted each other's orders. It was, for instance, impossible in English law for a minister ordained in America to hold ecclesiastical office in the Church of England until 1874 (after the first Lambeth Conference)—and then they were only grudgingly admitted under the Colonial Clergy Act (*sic!*). Thus, what is to us a readily identifiable 'Anglican Communion' did not start that way. It has traditionally only been demarcated by the invitation issued by successive Archbishops of Canterbury to bishops of other churches to attend the Lambeth Conferences. Thus, until the coming of the ACC, the Anglican Communion was in effect created and sustained by the individual invitation list of individual Archbishops of Canterbury. In 1867 Bishop Colenso was not invited to attend—and that was significant. In 1955 Bishop Fred Morris claimed to be a member of the Anglican Communion, and bishop of a member Church—but Archbishop Fisher said he was out of the Anglican Communion, and by so saying the Archbishop arguably made it so—his own say-so being the only constitutive force to form the Anglican Communion in any visible sense.

It is not clear whether the separating Episcopalians in America even wish to be counted as members of a Communion which is in general tarred with connivance at the ordination of women, and may well be more so after Lambeth, 1978. They have been heard to say they continue in communion with Canterbury. But for 'membership' they would, it seems, have both to receive an invitation for their bishops to attend the Lambeth Conference, and also, as the constitution now has it, be formally admitted to the ACC.

In general these small separating bodies should be distinguished from the *episcopi vagantes* of whom some hundreds are apparently still loose in England. The separators are Christian people, clergy and lay alike, who for reasons of conscience stand separate from the historic body from which they sprang and then ensure an episcopal succession. (In one case, that of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the whole body separated from the Church of England, and made common cause with the Non-jurors, and lived to re-establish its credentials as a live continuing Anglican Church in communion with Canterbury). But the *episcopi vagantes* are usually

people who for some personal reason (often *folie de grandeur*) wish to be bishops, even if there are no congregations for them to serve. At this stage they tend to move into a fantasy world, and they need detain us no longer. All the Punch-like details are in Peter Anson's book *Bishops at Large*.

Letter

Dear Sir

I am disappointed to read in your issue no. 38 of the presidency of a newly consecrated bishop at the eucharist of his consecration 'no one apparently wants to dispossess the Archbishop from this function'. Is not this precisely what ought to be done? We shall never get away from the state-appointed grandee image of the imposed-upon-us bishop until (i) the diocesan say is paramount, and (ii) consecration and enthronement are one ceremony (the latter stripped of trumpets and other idiotic triumphalist survivals!) taking place in the diocese's own mother-church. This reformed, for the new bishop to preside would be wholly congruous. Is not this worth some effort to achieve?

Yours faithfully

F. E. Pickard

THAT 'BLESSING' AT THE COMMUNION RAIL

Many many readers will have come across the 'blessing' of non-communicant children at the communion rail. This is an unrecorded unscripted liturgical event, and it seems appropriate that some recording and scripting should be attempted. We therefore ask readers if they could send in postcards with brief answers to the following questions (even *guessed* answers will be of interest—well attested ones will be marvellous):

- (i) Where was this first done?
- (ii) What rationale was then attached to it?
- (iii) What words are in use as the form of the blessing?
- (iv) Is it thought it needs a priest to give this blessing? Or if a lay person is distributing the bread, may he give it?

AND, YES, IT IS EASTER

But when it falls in the last few days of the month, we do not know how to greet it in our columns. We have up our sleeves a Good Friday service we wanted to publish last month (but lacked space), and might well have published this month (but lacked time). Nevertheless, we fill our last space with the eternal truth:

Christ is Risen!
He is Risen indeed!
Hallelujah