

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 40

April 1978

Editorial

CATHOLIC RENEWAL?

I wrote last month on prospects for the Loughborough Conference of Anglican Catholics. I duly attended the Conference from 29 March to 1 April, and have written of my general impressions in the *Church of England Newspaper* for 14 April. For present purposes I am addressing myself solely to the way that worship figured at the Conference (though I am giving a separate mention of the debate on the ordination of women).

The original Press Release about 'Catholic Renewal' in May 1977 spoke of the Church's 'life or worship and prayer'. It was clear that this was to be part of the restoration and renewal for which the initiative (and the Conference) was designed. How then did worship emerge from Loughborough?

The Conference was largely an 'up-front' one. There were massive papers given by heavyweight speakers—often very attractively and penetratingly. None of them was *directly* handling worship, though several allusions came through. Michael Marshall (the Bishop of Woolwich) pleaded in his paper on 'Creation' for a true sacramentality, which saw heaven mediated through the things of earth. He compared the work of the Spirit at the Annunciation with the work of the Spirit through the epiclesis in the eucharist—though only as separate illustrations of sacramentality in operation. He affirmed the idea of a common *structure* to the liturgy, whilst deprecating uniformity of text. And he then departed from his printed script to express unease about the 1980 Prayer Book on these grounds. His own alternative was apparently that the laity ought to have no liturgical text in front of them at all—a curious blind spot which I have heard Michael Marshall enunciate before. He also pleaded for a return to a devotion to our Lady . . . Bishop Terwilliger of Texas concluded his paper (on 'Reconciliation') with a brief mention of each of the traditional 'Seven Sacraments'. He chose to expand on his treatment of marriage (in order to drop some hints about sexuality), and his references to the other six were unamplified. But he did say ' . . . it needs to be affirmed that every eucharist is indeed an exorcism of the powers of evil because it is a manifestation of the victory of Christ . . .'

Richard Holloway (on 'Consecration') delighted the Conference with his teasing and yet demanding concept that we are caught as Christians in *both* 'the glory-strategy' and 'the dust-factor'. Much of his concern was with ethics, and his most memorable contribution on worship was his quotation from John Betjeman (which he called a 'glory trip'):

. . . under the Travers baroque, in a limewashed whiteness,
The fiddle-back vestments a-glitter with morning rays,
Our Lady's image, in multi-candled brightness,
The bells and banners—those were the waking days
When Faith was taught and fanned to a golden blaze.'

He went on 'Well, I'm not going to knock that kind of thing . . . a bit of nostalgia for the way we were . . . [is] like gin and bitter lemon, dangerous only if it becomes a habit.'

Kenneth Leech completed the Catholic platform with 'Spirituality To-Day'. He achieved a *tour de force* on methods of spirituality, but whereas Richard Holloway had been pleading that we should love Jesus, it seemed to several of Leech's hearers that he had not even mentioned Jesus! As he had made hostile noises about Arianism, I was prepared to reckon he had at that point been indirectly speaking about Jesus, but the evidence was admittedly slight. He conducted a full-scale attack on the disuse of daily offices (and the pathetic provision for them in the new services), on the cerebral 'middle-class Baalism' of the same new rites, and on the lack of a 'focus' in our new church buildings (in contrast to the tabernacles before which the unlettered faithful knelt in meditation for hours on end in the old buildings).

Those with 'walk-on' parts also achieved their moments. The Bishop of Leicester, welcoming the Conference, ruminated as to which previous inhabitants of Leicestershire would have been glad to see the Conference being held. He offered them amongst others Archbishop Laud (actually an absentee incumbent of Leicestershire), but reminded them 'he would insist on your putting the holy tables back up against the East wall.' The Abbot of Nashdom, who was the organizer of worship but amazingly confessed what a new experience it was to him to take part in Series 1, 2 and 3, had to appeal for the return of one of the matching golden stoles with which the concelebrants were garbed each day—apparently some clergyman had pinched one.

But it was the actual worship of the Conference which presumably most expressed the understanding and mood of its organizers. Michael Green, in his evangelical response, called it dull, and I found many of the Conference members to agree with him. It was all formal, which might or might not have been expected. It was not always well presented, as e.g., when the congregation sang the Rutter setting to Series 3, obviously very few knew it—but they could have been rehearsed. The texts of Series 1, 2 and 3 communion were jumbled together, with Roman ceremonial which laid all the emphasis upon the narrative of institution, contrary to the ethos of Series 3. The concelebrants (if such they were) joined in the eucharistic prayers after the Sanctus, which again had the effect of dividing the prayer into pieces, and the main item of importance seemed to be the thurifer and his incense. The music, to an electronic organ, was uninspiring, and the singing only reached any heights in the last hymn of all on the last day. Marian devotions were freely interpolated on the second and third days, which may have fulfilled the hopes of many present, but are hardly my style. The Abbot waved his hand vaguely to indicate how we should move in order to receive communion, and the result was sometimes chaotic. Even the liturgical homilies were relatively formal. The Kiss of Peace was just long enough to smile at one's neighbour and was over. The only spontaneous note was the outburst of clapping, which I think was a form of praise of God, after the end of the final eucharist. It certainly expressed

the sense of encouragement many had found at the Conference, and my own inevitable comparison of it with Nottingham may make me slightly more critical than many of those who had only been to Loughborough would have been.

I think I was most of all sorry that the informal had no official place. There was no chance to pray or share in groups or in any other way as far as the programme was concerned. In fact, some charismatic brethren approached John Gunstone, and he convened a late-night meeting for 'Prayer and Praise' in one of the halls of residence. 40 came the first night, and (after Michael Green mentioned it from the platform) 80 the second night.

Is it possible that it was at these warm and moving meetings that the renewal was most evidently going on?

Colin Buchanan

BOOKS THIS MONTH

We have been sent *The Body at Prayer: An Introduction* by H. Caffarel (SPCK, 75p), which is an illustrated pocket-guide (translated from the French) giving details of all standard postures for prayer and meditation. It looks a little like a fitness guide for busy housewives, but is more (and less) than that. We also have *Short Prayers for the Long Day* compiled by Giles and Melville Harcourt (Collins, £1.50), which is a series of prayers, quotations and meditations, not unlike *Pray Every Day* in format, and due to be published on 25 May. Similar again is *When You Pray*, compiled by John Gilling and Sister Patricia, C.S.P. (D.L.T., £1.25), published on 24 April, though this is less in office form, and more a collection of prayers for many occasions. A leather edition of it will be available in May at £2.95. The Lyttleton Press have sent us *Across the Divide* (£1.50) which is an Exposition by R. T. Beckwith, G. E. Duffield, and J. I. Packer of the 'Open Letter on relations between Evangelical Churchmen and Roman Catholics, Orthodox and Old Catholics', which was itself published and distributed in July last year. We also have (through the kindness of the Rev. Alan Nicholls of the Anglican Information Office, Sydney) the first copy, sent to us airmail, of *An Australian Prayer Book*. We hope this means the surface copies are well on their way, though we had been hoping they would arrive by now. We are once again having to hold over a review of *he Once and the Future Liturgy* by J. D. Crichton. And we gather that *The Study of Liturgy* will not now be published by S.P.C.K. till July. David Watson's *I Believe in the Church* (Hodder, £3.50) is published on 8 May.

NOTE: We give a last warning that we shall despatch the report of the Liturgical Commission containing Series 3 Revised Holy Communion to every customer who has booklets on Ministry and Worship on 16 May—it is published on 18 May. This will be a separate despatch from the monthly one. The cost will be 95p postfree (it has 48 pages), and that will be added to your standing order invoice. If other customers (including those who take *NOL* only) want the report then they must order it by sending a postcard. The CIO is publishing on the same date the report of the Marriage Commission entitled *Marriage and the Church's Task* (£2) and this can be snet in the same envelope provided an order is received by us in time. This will *not* be snet without an order.

LOUGHBOROUGH AND THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

Full marks to the Catholic Renewal Conference for their handling of the ordination of women. They held the issue back for a plenary on the afternoon of the third day, and it was obvious that the greater part of the Conference was wholly opposed to the ordination of women. There was fear of bitterness and a large-ditching stance. In fact, what might have been the worst part of the whole Conference became one of its best. The speakers were fairly relaxed, the Conference was prepared to laugh at itself, and the temptation to take a vote on a specific motion was resisted by solemn decision of the Conference. Furthermore, the temptation to overstate the case, and to cumulate bad arguments with good, was also resisted. There was more readiness to concede that the issue *could* be investigated in an open-ended way than one would have expected from such staunch opponents. There was more reliance upon the argument that the Church of England should not act unilaterally without the Roman and Orthodox Churches than there was upon the essential maleness of the priesthood, derived from the maleness of Christ. And there was happy applause for a young (slightly unkempt looking) married woman, who declared herself a 'women's-libber', who had been arrested for that cause, but who *still* was opposed to the ordination of women—which she called the 'soft option'.

This month's booklet . . .

is no. 58, *Ministry to the Sick: An Introduction*. Four London clergy, David Gregg, David Lee, David Stoter, and Bernard Hughes, join together to present short essays about the history, theology and pastoral practice of ministry to the sick. This leads on to . . .

. . . next month's . . .

which is no. 59, *Pastoral and Liturgical Ministry to the Sick*, edited by Michael Botting. Michael Botting is the author of no. 42, *Christian Healing in the Parish*, which was published in 1976 and went into a second edition last year. Whereas nos. 42 and 58 are deliberately self-restrained about the details of liturgical texts, no. 59 is intended to go on from pastoral practice to the provision of liturgical material.

. . . and a reprint

actually a second reprint of *Thinking about Baptism* (7p, and £1.25 for 20), demand for which has been swamping us.

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

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

SERIES 3 HOLY COMMUNION (REVISED)

We have attempted through the Winter to keep out of these pages any leak about the contents of the new Series 3 Communion revision. It has been enough to deny the rumour of the 'East End Five' that the Liturgical Commission was in disarray last September and October. However, we now have from a different source a public set of official statements which amount to a whole package of leaks, yet most of them of an allusive and mysterious character for those who have not seen the full text. The package is contained in the minutes of the House of Bishops of General Synod who held a special meeting on 21-22 February (the document is HB(78)(M)(M2)).

Before we look at the leaks, we should note the official interest of the House of Bishops in the draft order. There are two reasons—one official, one unofficial—why the House is involved in discussion with the Liturgical Commission to get a text agreed by both bodies. They are as follows:

- (i) Officially, it is the task of the House of Bishops to introduce a new service into Synod for 'General Consideration'. The House must therefore be prepared to back the rite they introduce.
- (ii) Unofficially, history shows that the Liturgical Commission cannot function if the House of Bishops will not support its work. This matter goes right back to 1960, when, after the then Archbishop of York had attacked the Commission's first published texts on initiation, a crisis of confidence ensued, and the Liturgical Commission said it could not continue without the support of the Bishops. Since then, the Commission has always consulted the House of Bishops (even before the technical procedure in (i) above was introduced), and has always had its goodwill before publishing texts. Of course, there are always new bishops every year, and they often forget or are unaware that their private support before publication implies their public support after publication . . .

At any rate, the meeting of the House of Bishops on 21-22 February was to agree a text for the revised communion service, and then to notify the Liturgical Commission. What then can be learned from the minutes? The following extracts may help:

- (i) The Anamnesis: 'They noted that there was no general agreement amongst members of the Liturgical Commission on the various proposed emendations . . . [this was based upon misinformation, another hazard of relationships between the two bodies] . . . they noted the general dissatisfaction expressed by the Liturgical Commission and, it was understood, in the public questionnaire on the published text in Series 3 [both of which are overstated] and therefore inclined to return to the wording of the Series 2 anamnesis . . . by vote, 30 in favour 6 against, it was agreed that the form of anamnesis [in Series 2] . . . should also be included in Thanksgiving C.' In the light (or murk) of this minute the general public may well wonder whether the Series 2 anamnesis is to be in the main Thanksgiving in Series 3 (Revised). And they may well wonder for the next few days whether this is agreeable to the Liturgical Commission or not.

- (ii) Alternative Eucharistic Prayers: the phrase 'Thanksgiving C' in the extract above indicates that there existed (in an appendix) two prior Thanksgivings—i.e. the eucharistic prayers of Series 1 ('A') and Series 2 ('B') in a 'you' form of address to God. It was this provision of a Series 2 text in Thanksgiving B which heartened the Bishops to include it in the main Series 3 prayer—i.e. Thanksgiving C. In addition the House of Bishops' minutes record that their lordships deleted unilaterally Thanksgivings D (an ecumenical text from the Joint Liturgical Group), E (a shorter 'mini-canon' for use with the sick or with house groups) and F (a responsive canon based upon one of the Roman Catholic prayers for use at children's masses). The Bishops did think the Liturgical Commission could produce something of the 'E' sort for house groups, but did not like the wording provided. For the sick they thought the text usual in church was needed. So the general public now knows that the Bishops have deleted three eucharistic prayers from the report form of the revision, but does not know what the texts of these prayers were.

- (iii) Humble Access: 'It was agreed that there should not be any provision for the Prayer of Humble Access to be used after the Lord's Prayer and before the Distribution when the penitential sections were taken at the beginning of the rite.' This is of little interest as regards Humble Access—but it gives further information about the shape of the rite, i.e. that the penitential section may come at the beginning.

- (iv) Salutation: the Bishops agreed that 'The Lord is here/His Spirit is with us' should stand in *its* eucharistic prayer, and 'The Lord be with you/and also with you' in *its* prayers. So, as can be seen between the lines, a desire to standardize these has been frustrated.

This is all that can so far be discovered publicly about the forthcoming report. There will be more to report when the actual text can be seen (see p.3 about the distribution of this).

It is perhaps also worth recording the Bishops' final minute about this service:

'[In deleting Thanksgivings D, E and F] the House distinguished between the longer term "normal" provisions which would be found in the Alternative Services Book and the freedom which should continue to exist for experimentation with freer forms of Thanksgiving which might come to be authorized for limited use in particular circumstances after the book had been issued. In excluding these prayers they were anxious not to be thought to end experiments in this field. They wished the Liturgical Commission to be assured that they would be ready to consider authorizing such experimentation separately from the Alternative Services Book.'

So . . .

OTHER NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT

The House of Bishops (at the same meeting as that reported above re Series 3 (Revised) Holy Communion) accepted the text of the Ordination services as given provisional approval in Synod in February, and they will thus come back unchanged for final approval in July.

The Calendar and Lectionary did not escape quite so unscathed. Once again, the full flavour comes through a direct quotation of the minutes:

'The Bishop of Derby, noting the narrow margin [viz. 117-120] by which the inclusion of Josephine Butler amongst the lesser festivals and commemorations had been defeated in General Synod, proposed that, in pursuance of their powers under Standing Order 85D, she should be inserted in the Calendar on the appropriate day.

'After discussion, which included discussion of the propriety of actions under Standing Order 85D, the House of Bishops approved the inclusion of Josephine Butler, Wife and Mother, Social Reformer, 1907, amongst the lesser festivals and commemorations on December 30th, by 22 votes to 21.'

Well might there be discussion of the propriety. These powers of the House of Bishops are to ensure that minor inconsistencies left as a result of the revision stage are ironed out. They should not be, and (I think) never previously have been, used to reverse a vote on a particular amendment taken at revision stage.

'BLESSING' AT THE COMMUNION RAIL

The following are some sample answers to last month's query:

' . . . my own practice is to . . . say "God loves you, N.B.". I feel it is essential to include them . . . but do not think it right to single them out for an actual personal blessing.' (Rev. Philip Hall, Hull). 'Never have understood what on earth (or in the heavenlies) I was doing as I patted the little dears on the head . . .' (Rev. Donald Gray, Liverpool).

'God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit bless preserve and keep you' . . . if a layman does it "May" is added to the words.' (illegible, Reading) (But adding a 'may' turns a subjunctive into another subjunctive—COB). 'The Lord Jesus bless you' [and Christian name]' (Rev. Brian Harding, Accrington). 'The blessing of Christ' (Rev. Arnold Moon, Formby). 'The Lord Jesus Christ bless you' (Rev. Trevor Park, Dalton-in-Furness).

None of these correspondents has any clue when or how the practice originated, but a lengthy and learned poker-faced reply has been received from the Rev. Roger Wilkinson of St. George's Hospital, London. This we hope to print next month.

BISHOPS IN SEPARATION—YET AGAIN

In *NOL* for February we noted that two grounds of objection might (at least theoretically) be brought against the Denver consecrations in the USA—one, that the consecration of the first bishop was done by two bishops only, and, two, that such consecrations are at best of doubtful validity, as once there is a schism, then validity can only be asserted of the acts of the main continuing body, and not of the separating community. There is need of further comment on both these.

- (i) The 'single-bishop-consecration' was defended as having plenty of precedent, but a careless sentence led us into saying that Augustine of Canterbury was himself consecrated this way. This was of course untrue, and Mr. Alan Campbell of the Scottish Episcopal Church has been on the phone to make the point. What was in mind was the advice of Pope Gregory to Augustine that he could begin a succession of bishops in Kent by consecrating on his own. We also learn that the Roman Catholic Church began its episcopal succession in America in the same way.

- (ii) The defence of the validity of the consecrations-in-separation was not put up in the interests of the separatists—and similarly no opponent of them, however sorely tempted, should be led into asserting the invalidity of these consecrations out of mere pique or fear or antipathy. The difficulty is that we all stand on the same rug, and if it is pulled out, we shall all collapse. For Anglicans have since the Reformation *not* been trying to assert the validity of their orders in a vacuum (for presumably those ordained in Anglican Churches are content that, *on their own principles*, their orders are valid). No, the battle has been to get the Roman Catholic Church to acknowledge that, *on its principles*, our orders are valid. And the argument, traced back to St. Augustine of Hippo, is that valid orders can be conferred even without the consent of the whole church, and, in the last analysis, in despite of the opposition of the greater part of the church. If that principle is not conceded, then bang go the Denver consecrations, but bang also go Old Catholic orders, all Anglican orders, and probably even Eastern Orthodox orders for good measure.

There is undoubtedly a theological analysis to be done to establish the ecclesial status of the 'Anglican Church of North America' and its relationship to the Anglican Communion. There may even be a controversy to be conducted. But a controversy amongst Christians is a summons to use the exactly appropriate weapons, and to do no more damage than is absolutely necessary. Just as name-calling and spite are excluded by the gospel, so the grabbing of any old theological blunderbuss (such as 'invalid orders' seems to be) is to be deprecated on the grounds of its incongruity with the size of the problem. And not only so—ironically it is also to be feared by those who seize it, as this blunderbuss is liable to go off in their hands and to harm themselves as much as those at whom they aim it.