

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 41

May 1978

Editorial

The revised Series 3 Communion is with us; the 1980 machine rolls on; and Synod has its hands full for July. The new report from the Liturgical Commission (GS 364, published by S.P.C.K. on 18 May, 40 pages, 95p) is the central feature of the whole preparation for 1980—not only because the communion is the central service of the Book, but also because all other services are being 'adapted' to conform to it. It is the point of reference for all other liturgical material: seasonal sentences, opening notes, text of the Lord's Prayer—all these and many more provisions for the whole Book will be taken from what Synod agrees for the communion service. What then is changed from the existing Series 3 text? The Commission has provided its own introduction to the report which draws attention to several features, but it may be helpful to group the changes in a different way.

Flexibility

Part of the ethos of Series 3 is its flexibility. The new report takes the principle further, though without necessarily making the presentation of the text more complex. One new possibility, often canvassed in the past, is the provision that the penitential section may be taken at the beginning of the service (section 5—indicated by numbers only hereafter), though the actual text of it still comes after the prayers. Another new possibility is the use of other forms of the prayers—not only is the 'General Intercession' (i.e. all sorts and conditions) allowed and the Litany (or parts of it), but also 'Other suitable forms' may be used. This surely includes extemporary prayer, and allows the service to be adapted considerably for its particular context on any occasion. There is also provision of a shorter form of confession and absolution (22). Above all, there are now two alternative eucharistic prayers (A and B, Appendix 6, pp.27ff), and it will be known that the House of Bishops excised three more still (D, E and F.—see *NOL* for April). The two which survive are unambiguous—they are simply 'you' forms of the eucharistic prayers from Series 1 and Series 2—but the principle of alternatives is conceded. The particular prayers provided may help those wedded to Series 1 and/or Series 2 to find their way to using Series 3, and thus may incidentally undermine some of the reasons for proposing to include '1½' in the new Book.

Seasonal provision

The Appendixes now group together all the Proper Thanksgivings (which go with any of the eucharistic prayers) and all the introductory and post-communion sentences and the seasonal blessings. The range of these has been considerably increased.

The ICET versions

The 1975 *Prayers we have in Common* (still available at 65p) is used for most common texts. The Gloria in Excelsis is unchanged, the Nicene Creed has several changes (including the restoration of the word 'incarnate'), and the Lord's Prayer is altered (without international agreement)

in the controversial ninth line, where we now have 'Let us not be led into temptation'. One member of the Liturgical Commission was sufficiently opposed to this to register reservations in the Introduction (p.9), and it is certain that some other members of the Commission were unenthusiastic. We have already 'sold' the text 'the time of trial' to large numbers of worshippers, and it seems a pity to some now to go back on that.

The structure of the eucharistic action

Series 2 and Series 3 were laid out so that cross-headings gave expression to the 'four actions'. But not only are we now concerned lest those cross-headings should suggest four actions all of equal weight, we are also aware that even the Series 3 arrangement could leave the idea that the preliminary action of 'laying the table' is the first of the four actions—i.e. the 'taking'. So now the 'taking' is moved to be bracketed with the Thanksgiving, and the laying of the table is a separate event on its own entitled 'The Offertory'. The title is not very welcome, in view of the Commission's scrupulous avoidance of it in the past. But now that it cannot be confounded with the first of the instituted actions, it is relatively harmless. The 'taking' itself is directed at 27, and it expects the president to take up the bread and cup at this point, though one alternative allowed is to do so during the narrative of institution. This looks retrograde, but, as the Introduction explains (p.7), indented rubrics have traditionally provided for this in Thanksgivings A and B. It is to be hoped that the rubric at 27 will not encourage more 'taking' during the narrative of institution in the main Thanksgiving C. I hope to comment further on this in my Liturgical Study in June, *The End of the Offertory*.

The eucharistic prayer

Last month we noted that the House of Bishops enjoined 'The Lord is here/His Spirit is with us', thus ensuring that a fine feature of the existing rite survived. The Commission has slightly revised the Preface to bring a better logical order into the events celebrated. And we have moved the acclamations to follow the anamnesis (relying upon examples in Australia—who have now given it up!—and in North India and in the new Roman Catholic prayers for use at children's masses). This means that the narrative of institution flows smoothly on into the anamnesis (keeping the echo from '... in remembrance of me' to '... we do this in remembrance of him.'). And the acclamations themselves echo the faith and expectations set out in the anamnesis. So the logic seems much tighter.

However, those churchmen who are sensitive to doctrinal issues will have turned quickly to the anamnesis itself to see what the Commission has included. It will be recalled that the minutes of the meeting of the House of Bishops of 21-22 February said that their lordships adopted the Series 2 text at this point for the main prayer (C) as well as for the Series 2 prayer (B) in the Appendix. But the Liturgical Commission were not, of course, *ipso facto* made signatories to that decision, and in fact they met on 27 February, and decided that the Bishops' decision was based on misinformation and therefore asked for further consultation. The resultant text is underwritten by both Bishops and Commission!

Why change it at all?

The reason for the change (let alone for the temporary diversion to the Series 2 text) may not be immediately obvious. The intention was to produce a sequence of thought which made the 'mighty acts' of God the object of a *different* verb from the crucial 'celebrate', so that 'celebrate' could be used in a clause which summed up the whole action. Thus 'celebrate' and 'proclaim' were separated from each other again, and to those who naturally equate 'his one perfect sacrifice' with 'his offering of himself once for all upon the cross', then the Pauline structure of thought, that we tell out the death of the Lord until he comes (1 Cor. 11.26), is fairly vividly expressed. It is difficult to see what other understanding of the text is so natural. However, the Revision Committee will no doubt be handling dozens, if not hundreds, of suggested amendments to improve this section. Members of the Liturgical Commission, still relieved to find themselves delivered from the Series 2 possibility here, may well be doubtful whether it is possible to go much further and remain agreed with each other. And those of us who will have to handle the text in Synod are determined not to get into a majority/minority split. This issue is far too important—important before God—for it to be resolved by mere majority voting.

The timetable

The text gets 'general consideration' in Synod in July. It then goes to a Revision Committee (which I am on), and will presumably not return until February 1979 for its Revision Stage. Some of us are in for a busy Autumn, and on the present text and the Synod's handling of it depend the character of our main eucharistic rite for at least a decade ahead. Brethren, pray for us.

Colin Buchanan

NEWS ON THE OFFICIAL FRONT

Apart from the Series 3 revised communion, about which plenty is written above, the Series 3 Initiation Services will be before the July Synod for the Revision Stage and provisional approval. The report of the Revision Committee is being agreed as this *NOL* is published, but it shows that almost 350 proposals for amendment were received by the committee, and the text bears the marks of those proposals in line after line. It will be discussed more fully next month.

The July session will also handle the final approval of the Series 3 Calendar and Lectionary, and of the Series 3 Ordination Services. If the former is approved it will not immediately become lawful (so we are advised). But in that case *NOL* will this Autumn publish an 'almanack' from the new provisions for those who wish to see the material related to the actual year—without, of course, implying that the material is lawful.

It is now becoming possible to think more closely about the timing of the 1980 Alternative Service Book. If it is to be authorized from All Saints Day 1980, then it must be published by, say, mid-September. If it is to be published then, then printed copies (for review and advance distribution to the trade) must be available by, say, mid-July. And if there are to be printed copies by mid-July, it is doubtful whether the originators (the

CBF) and the publishers can wait until after the November 1979 session of Synod to get the final text. So perhaps something must give—it may be that All Saints Day 1980 will be the date of publication, not of authorization.

And a footnote: we failed to take note of the abortive move in the House of Lords in March to pass a 'Ballot of the Laity' Bill—a move to ensure that a poll of all the parishioners of a parish could be instigated, and a majority could then insist that 1662 remains in occasional use. The Bill failed, but it provided yet one more of those rare occasions when the 'three-times-a-year' churchgoers got a chance to get passionate in public about how the church's worship changes when they are not at it, and what a shock it is when they return to it. We hope to print some extracts from Hansard in coming months.

BOOKS THIS MONTH

Marriage and the Church's Task (C10, £2.50—the price went up, for which we apologise) was not available on 18 May. We thus despatched the Series 3 communion report without it, and sent it on after. We review below both the Roman books of similar titles, *The Once and the Future Lituroy* and *The Liturgy To-day and To-morrow*—both by famous authors. And yet another picture book for Series 3 communion has come—*The Lord is Here* by Collins (90p, published 5 June). This actually comes after the publication of the revised text of Series 3, and it must have been a narrow decision in the House of Bishops which preserved the words 'The Lord is here' at all! But it is a typically delightful Collins publication, and we wish 'em well with it.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is no. 59, *Pastoral and Liturgical Ministry to the Sick*, by Michael Botting. This complements last month's introduction to the ministry to the sick, and we indicate this with the same cover picture (which, by the way, is by Peter Ashton, which we failed to acknowledge in last month's booklet).

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 14, *The End of the Offertory*, by Colin Buchanan. This is a historical and practical study, including some emphasis upon the teleology (i.e. the 'end') of the offertory, and with special reference to recent Anglican developments.

. . . and a reprint

of no. 35, *Drama in Worship*, by Andy Kelso is scheduled for June, with a strong possibility of no. 20, *A Case for Infant Baptism*, by Colin Buchanan coming up in August. (Other back-numbers which are virtually sold out now—in addition to those listed in the catalogue—are nos. 18, 22, 27, 41 and 48. Nos. 7, 21, 23, are not far behind).

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

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

Reviews

J. D. Crichton *The Once and the Future Liturgy* (Veritas, Dublin, £2-50)
Joseph Gelineau *The Liturgy To-Day and To-Morrow* (DLT, £1-85).

Father Crichton is a famous author, with a hint of the 'send-up' about him. His opening description of the 'old mass' (which is clearly meant to unsettle Lefebvrist) is an example of this. He first of all points out that the actual textual changes are minimal, and he then gives a blow-by-blow account of a Sunday low mass, and shows that the major differences are those of the mood of the celebration. Finally, the tops it up:

'On the other hand, the present rite could be celebrated much as the old without infringing any existing positive law. Thus the celebrant could turn his back on the people if he wished, he could of course say the whole Mass in Latin, a server could make the responses and so on.' (p.16).

He adds that if it were done like this few would know it was not the old mass.

But this is but the overture to a probing into the future. He looks to changes in language, changes in symbols (he is ready for 'real bread', p.47), changes in fixity (such as letting presidents write their own eucharistic prayers), changes in participation. He is ready for dialogue and discussion in place of sermons, for homegrown prayers in place of the set ones, for laypeople to administer both elements, and for what Anglicans would call an 'Auxiliary Pastoral Ministry' (of married priests) to ensure the provision of the eucharist in general. He has similar proposals for the other sacraments, and is concerned in his final chapters with a fusion of liturgical and charismatic ways of praying.

Anglicans will have to smile as he holds forth on the possibilities inherent in a novelty—breaking the bread *during the narrative of institution* (p.69). Think how this violates the 'fourfold' action of the eucharist. Think how it undermines the structure of Series 3, and other modern liturgies. Think how it came into 1662, but is now expelled as contrary to the pattern of historic liturgies. And then think that Father Crichton actually wants to import it into the Roman rite! Why isn't *he* looking over his shoulder to wonder what the ecumenical effect would be . . . ?

The Gelineau book, translated from the French, is not dissimilar. He is concerned with the nature of the community, and the *style* of worship, as such as with texts. He too thinks that ordinary parish leaders could be ordained to a non-stipendiary priesthood. And he too is not looking over his shoulder, 'Moreover, the question of the ordination of women to certain ministries . . . is still fortunately an open one in the church.' (p.71). He too wants the laity to be involved in planning and conducting worship. And he too sees beyond the biblical homily:

'The exclusive use of the sermon has given the faithful the idea that this is something to be listened to . . . But it remains incomplete. My brother in the faith has something to tell me about the good news, and I have something to tell him. One may be suffering for his faith and another may want to tell of the joy he finds in it. One may have learnt from books, another from experience. One may have something to say because he has the simplicity of a child and another because he has endured . . . It is together, in sharing the Word and the bread, prayer and decisions, that we form the church.' (p.70).

David Watson *I Believe in the Church* (Hodder, £3-50).

How marvellous that David Watson should write a big book on the church. No Anglican evangelical has done so in nearly four hundred years. And up to a point what a marvellous book it is. It glows with pastoral zeal, with the sheer reality of what God has done at York, and with a love of scripture and of the scriptural imagery about the church. And yet, and yet . . . it is not what the title declares it to be. It is somehow distributive from a position taken for granted rather than contributive towards an understanding of the nature of the church. Worship and sacraments (not in relation to each other) are both handled as separate functions of the church, rather than as in any sense constitutive of it. Ministry and episcopacy are treated similarly. And history is by-passed (or more accurately skipped over). Thus the knotty question of structures, of independency and connexionalism, of visible and invisible, of continuity and immediacy, of schism and unity, of truth and authority—these questions are hardly even noticed, let alone handled as befits a book of 368 pages.

But those are *my* hang-ups, as I wanted to believe the title. If, on the other hand, you are ready simply to accept the wisdom and experience of David Watson about the life of the local church (usually one particular one), then you will greatly enjoy the book and profit from it. I find I can switch off my ecclesiological concerns and then enjoy this fine pastoral book for what it is, rather than regret it for what it is not.

Peter J. Jagger *A History of the Parish and People Movement* (Faith Press, £2-50).

Here is an interesting piece of work, limited by the limitations of its subject, rather than by any lack of enterprise and research in its author. 'Parish and People' as an organization began in 1949, to conserve and spread the fruits of the Liturgical Movement in the Church of England. It went merrily on its liturgical way in the 1950s, encouraging the Parish Communion, and lay participation in it (especially in the offertory procession), and enjoying the very benign leadership of Bishop Henry de Candole. However, in the 1960s all sorts of tensions arose. Those whose plan was liturgical reform started to lose their role as a pressure group, as the Church of England at large accepted so many of their ideals—whilst others discovered that their real goal was an overhaul of theology and structures to which liturgical reform was simply the entrance. The figure of John Robinson—once so eminently a 'Liturgical Movement man'—became suspect, and the use of his name by P & P threatened to alienate twice as many supporters as it would attract. The literature spelled out how P & P united high and low, but the talk behind the scenes (as the book shows) often concerned how evangelicals could be induced into involvement. The 1965 Conference on 'The Baptismal Life' was the last great event of the old P & P—suddenly its life faded away into 'One for Christian Renewal' (an ecumenical grouping) and 'The New Synod Group' (an Anglican quasi-political grouping). Nine people present at the AGM in 1970 wound it up and handed over its assets. The period of liturgical renewal fostered by this agency was over. The book offers no analysis, no epitaph. But the reader may well be able to construct his own.

THAT 'BLESSING' AT THE COMMUNION RAIL

Further answers flow in. First of all there is a learned treatise on its origins:

'William Laud was fenced in at his carpeted Holy Table by a surplice of Puritans he had crossed over baptism at Hampton Court. Suddenly a pack of spaniels rushed in bow-wowing at the altar, hotly pursued by the young Prince Charles. Laud railed at this breach of privilege, pushing down the spaniels but failing to distinguish between them and the future king. Since his hand lighted on that ill-fated head, all loyal ministers have followed suit in an unprecedented Act of Uniformity by touching children at the altar for the King's Evil (sc. in executing Laud). This provoked the Puritans into an immediate round of Pym's Game (how many Articles can you forget?) which ushered in Winds of Change, Cromwell and the Common Market.

'Pure Laudians used one word for this blessing "Remember!". At the Savoy Opera in 1661 the Revised Version was "Tender heads may be helped by a cap better than a rubric."

'What words? "There, there, little boy—not yet!" (*pat!*) "Wait until you're *this* big". (*Bless the air over the child!*)

This comes from the Rev. Roger Wilkinson, and must be currently dubbed an unproven hypothesis. Lest other historians wish to dig deeper, we should make it clear we do *not* pay for articles printed, nor make academic awards for such original research. On the other hand, we *are* prepared to give an airing to new hypotheses . . .

Then some more contemporary practice:

'I give them a Bible text with some hopefully appropriate words such as "May God bless his word to your heart" . . . *between* administering the bread and the wine to the adults.' (Rev. David Shacklock, Northiam). 'May the Lord Jesus be with you and in your home.' (Rev. Peter Taylor, Ironville). 'May God bless you and meet your needs.' (Rev. David Lumb, Plymouth). 'At my priesting Kenneth Woolcombe was administering, and on reaching my son, then aged 2½, laid his hand firmly on his head with the words "the Lord bless you, Julian, and keep you, and make his face shine upon you." Julian scowled up and said equally audibly, "No!". I'm not sure who won that round, really: does episcopal blessing demand response?' (Rev. Tom Wright, Merton College, Oxford). 'Remember that Christ died for you and feed on him in your heart by faith with thanksgiving.' (Rev. Reg Griffiths, Stoke on Trent). 'I say slowly and deliberately "The Lord be with you" to each child *without* laying my hand on their heads . . . [which] can give the wrong idea . . . of blessing being manually conveyed.' (Rev. Ted Pratt, Mackworth). 'Keep, O Lord, this child in eternal life.' (Rev. Frank Pickard, Northampton).

At the same time, Mr Colin Scull writes to urge that only one 'blessing' should be given (not one by each of the ministers where two different persons are bringing the bread and the cup), though even this must be viewed as folklore rather than rubrical direction! He also urges (what I fancy is now widespread) that Christian names should be used at the administration of the elements.

WHAT ARE CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES OF WORSHIP?

In the March editorial we raised the question as to what are true 'Catholic' principles of worship to-day, and in the April one we more or less indicated that it did not seem that Loughborough had said anything very useful about this. However, our readers are as equal to this challenge as they are to the question of the origins of 'that blessing at the rail', and the Rev. Peter Faulkner (who is vicar of St. Birinus', Calcot, Reading—i.e. near to the heart of Brindley country) writes as follows:

'May I venture to offer a personal view which, I hope, reflects a style of worship as "Catholic".'

'Worship is seen as a paradoxical exercise in which a collection of factors and objectives, sometimes apparently contradictory, must in some way be woven together into a coherent experience. It must be enjoyed! It should involve effort on the part of all participants, having no place for a passive audience. It unites the worshipping community with the past, relates it to the present, and involves it with eternity. Essentially solemn it must be filled with fun. It must be rich in symbol and ritual yet free and spontaneous. It is done with authority. It must be flexible. It involves as many of the senses as possible, even smell! It involves the Trinity, so embraces an infinity of insight and understanding. As it builds up the body of Christ on earth, his church, it must also be able to speak to the outsider and questioner.

'Somehow it must sweep up in a whirlwind of spiritual power the lover of 1662 and the dreamer of new Berkely and everything between. It must be reasonable, yet cannot be wholly logical, for it is experience rather than explanation, and though it involves words should take worshippers beyond language. And since it cannot do all these at once, it relies on cycle of the year to emphasize first this and then that. Even so, it will fail at some level or another, serving to remind its practitioners that they are human. And when someone does "get something" from it, the depersonalization, in some sense, of the clergy in fine vestments reminds us that it is to the church's work and God's grace (not the cleverness of Father Pete) that is due the thanks, in all things yours, Lord.

'It is illogical yet holds within itself something of the church's doctrine, hence the sadness occasioned by attempts to remove some loved ideas from its verbal forms. Sacrifice lies at the heart of it. 'It must not be confused with Bible study, teaching, training, proclamation, outreach, and suchlike; yet all of these are symbolically and actually present within it, for it sums up all life offering it to God for his transfiguring.

'So what is Catholic worship? The response to the command to "Do this" summed up in a public and ritual event, so that it may be expressed in a total and complete living, it is gazing on the divine in earthly forms, it is being constantly surprised by what God can do with our efforts, it is people and God together in ritual for living, it is out of this world.

'Is that any help?'

This exotic description is itself up for comment. Or can anyone define evangelical principles in worship? And would the two be exclusive of each other?