

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 49

January 1979

## Editorial

### SERIES 3 HOLY COMMUNION REVISED REVISED

No, the heading is no mistake. On 8 February 1979 there is being published GS 364A, the revision by General Synod's Revision Committee of GS 364, which was itself a revision of the 'green booklet'. This particular *NOL* is being delayed for despatch until it can go out with the revised text, which we gave warning last month we would be circularizing. For details of cost see footnote to this editorial.

What then of this new text? There is a report by the Revision Committee which is circulated in duplicated form to members of Synod, and this gives the Revision Committee's own rationale for its drafting. But there is perhaps some need of other explanation also, though it must be remembered that problems are solved on a Revision Committee by sheer voting, and thus the reasons for voting for or against a proposed amendment are not necessarily recorded except in the most general terms. What is true is that, after some initial split votes on secondary issues, the two wings of the Church of England (which were strongly represented on the Committee) got together and tried hard to find unanimous ways through difficulties. It is the tangled issues on this particular front which I most wish to discuss.

1. Although there are four main eucharistic prayers in the text, let alone the 'modernized-1662' pattern, there is no intention of putting these forward on a 'one for you, one for me' quasi-party basis. It is basic to the method, at least as far as I am concerned, that I should be able to use everything to which I agree, and I think this was generally felt on the Committee. Thus the plurality of provision is simply to give breadth and variety, and is not intended to canonize any polarization. I should therefore like to attempt a single defence of all the provision from my own personal standpoint, in order to illustrate this.

(a) *First Eucharistic Prayer*. This is in linear descent from the 'green booklet' (via GS 364), and is the characteristic 'Series 3' type prayer. I prefer it to the current Series 3 prayer in that the anamnesis paragraph (which is always the doctrinal storm-centre) has two different verbs governing the death of Christ on the one hand and his resurrection and ascension on the other. This is not only easier to say aloud than the present string of objects to the verbs, but it also makes Christ's offering up of himself on Calvary the natural antecedent to 'his one perfect sacrifice'. I do not think any other slight alterations of wording affect the theology of the prayer at other points.

(b) *Second Eucharistic Prayer*. This is a slightly touched-up version of the modernized 'Series 2' type prayer in the appendix to GS 364. Whilst I have always thought this prayer to be somewhat

lightweight in the doctrine of the atonement, it is still a prayer which helped greatly in the late sixties in bringing evangelicals and Catholics together, and I see no reason to go into opposition to it now.

(c) *Third Eucharistic Prayer*. This prayer is the Revision Committee's redraft of 'Brindley-out-of-Hippolytus' which was printed in *NOL* for November 1978. Those who are concerned for a strong doctrine of the atonement will find it here—'. . . his death on the cross, his perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of all men, . . . Those who are fearful lest too high a doctrine of consecration is implied will find that the verb 'renew' has been altered in the first part of the prayer, and that the epiclesis on the elements has been altered in the second part. There is a refreshing touch of that eschatological perspective which seems to have been characteristic of very early eucharistic practice.

(d) *Fourth Eucharistic Prayer*. This is the 'Series 1' type prayer in a retouched form. But whilst this means that a large measure of Cranmer's theology is inevitably present in the first half of the prayer, it does *not* imply that the self-oblation, which came in the eucharistic prayer at this point in 1549 and in the 'Interim Rite', is now to be found here. The place of formal liturgical self-oblation in this rite (as in Series 2 and Series 3) is in the post-communion, and this prayer has had to allow for that.

(e) *The 1662 Pattern*. Whilst the Prayer Book material (even when modernized) may be open to all sorts of objections, it will be clear that it too, ought to be acceptable to all—though no doubt some Anglicans will use it more avidly and more frequently than others.

2. Well then, are the provisions culpably ambiguous? It has been a feature of Roger Beckwith's commendation of the 'Beckwith-Brindley' deal that this particular form of co-operation does away with ambiguity, and enables everyone to be honest and transparent. For my part, whilst I am as ready as the next man to feel defensive in the teeth of this pejorative use of the word 'ambiguity', I am persuaded that the attack is oversweeping and oversimplistic. It is very rare that a phrase is so exactly balanced that it represents an even-handed ambiguity—a sort of liturgical Delphic Oracle. Phrases which admit of a breadth of interpretation are inevitable in sacramental liturgy, and are built into the original scriptural material from which the texts are drawn. But it will still tend to have a *natural* meaning, which may not totally exclude all other possible interpretations, but still does not include them even-handedly. In a church which has some *de facto* comprehensiveness, indeed in a church in which some room is needed for minds to continue moving and forming, it is highly desirable that texts which naturally have a scriptural meaning should not have their limits of meaning tied down too tightly.

3. I should perhaps add that the provision of a full 'modernized 1662' was in view on the Revision Committee from the point at which the amendments started to come in last August, and was not included simply because of the 'Beckwith-Brindley' deal. It was this which I had in mind when I asked whether the right evangelical trading counter had been found. In fact, the Revision Committee was so determined not to include the Brindley half as a 'Catholic' text, that it could never have included 1662 as an 'evangelical' one. All the material has been worked over in the interests of doctrinal consistency, though it will be observed that the actual 'Beckwith' form of the 1662 provision has been laid under contribution at certain key places.

4. It should also be noted that the Brindley half escaped unamended in its anamnesis. Its central verb and phrase—'we bring before you this bread and this cup'—have been accepted in their entirety. It is possible that this particular verbal device—and it *is* a device, just as much as 'calculated ambiguity' is—represents a hopeful way forward. Certainly the evangelicals on the Revision Committee muttered in their beards about it at first sight, but on reflection decided it was acceptable.

So much then about the eucharistic prayers. There are other points at which some reticence has governed the drafting—especially in relation to the departed in the prayers. An odd further instance of this comes after the placing of the bread and wine on the table. The next rubric permits the president to praise God in words of his own choice, but then prints the response which belongs with the Roman Catholic 'offertory prayers'. The reason for not printing out these prayers (which several would-be amend-ers submitted for inclusion) can be seen by inspecting them:

'Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation;  
through your goodness we have this bread to offer,  
which earth has given and human hands have made:  
it will become for us the bread of life.'

'Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation;  
through your goodness we have this wine to offer,  
fruit of the vine and work of human hands:  
it will become our spiritual drink.'

Evangelicals seem to be largely unaware of these prayers waiting in the wings. For myself, I find difficulties (which I expressed in my Liturgical Study 14 *The End of the Offertory*) in both the idea of offering the bread and wine to God, and also in giving him thanks for them *when that is to be the role of the eucharistic prayer itself*. At any rate the substance of these prayers does not appear, but the response does! I compare this to the smile on the Cheshire Cat. Those who do not know the Cat to which the smile belongs may be puzzled as to what will fit it—but one suspects that those who know their Cat already will have no difficulty in getting it to fit the smile. What Synod will think of this liturgical smile is anybody's guess. At the same time, the absurd use of 1 Chron. 29 ('. . . of your own do we give

you') in relation to the elements is now ended. This text is attached solely to the rubric about the money, and it makes much better sense there. It is, of course, wholly possible in accordance with the Opening Notes to move the presentation of the money offerings to a different place in the service, which would finally end any confusion about what we give to God.

Overall, there are many other small changes—in the confession, the comfortable words, the prayers, the introductory words to the peace, the Lord's Prayer (yes, look it up), and the first post-communion prayer—to name the most obvious. But it is my guess that, once the slightly unfamiliar bits and pieces have been assimilated, the rite will serve well for the ten years or more for which it is intended. Not that one can yet count on its being authorized with its current wording. General Synod has still the Revision Stage to come (on 21, 22 and 23 February) and it may yet amend the text all over again, line upon line and jot upon tittle. Not for nothing did Donald Gray wish me well last July (when I was due to introduce GS 364 to Synod for 'General Consideration') with the words 'Every blessing as you take part in the largest Liturgical Commission in the world—the General Synod of the Church of England.' It is difficult to think what there will be to write about in *NOL* when all this fuss is over . . .

Colin Buchanan

N.B. THE DISTRIBUTION OF GS 364A (NOTE: The cost is £1.50)

The Standing Committee have very kindly allowed this text to go into general circulation through the ordinary channels, and it is that which enables us to distribute it with this *NOL*. Please note in this connection:

- (i) If you take *NOL* on its own (or with Ethics booklets or Liturgical Studies only) then you will not have received GS 364A with this unless you ordered it specially.
- (ii) If you take Ministry and Worship booklets then you will receive GS 364A with this, unless you have specifically asked us not to send it. Its cost will be added to your Standing Order invoice.
- (iii) We find the 'inertia sell', with proper safeguards, suits our customers overall very well, but obviously we do apologize to any who feel 'output' by it. Please note that if cancelling or returning something you do not want puts you to extra expense, then we would be happy for you to deduct that postage from your next payment to us.
- (iv) If we have failed to send it, then please let us know by phone or return post, and we will make it good to you. Similarly, we can easily provide extra copies if ordered.
- (v) We apologize for the delay in despatch, which is due to the embargo placed on the text by the Standing Committee.
- (vi) We will be presenting in the February *NOL* a classified list of all the amendments passed in Synod, so that you can bring your copy up to date.

9p per copy (£2 by post for the year 1979 (£2.40 by air))

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

## THE FEBRUARY AGENDA FOR GENERAL SYNOD

Apart from the twelve or more hours which the Standing Committee is giving to the Revision Stage of 'Series 3 Revised Revised' (see Editorial), there are sundry smaller items of business which arise. There is 'Final Approval' for the Initiation Services, and for a bunch of adaptations. The Initiation Services are then due to be printed in a booklet form, but in the ASB page layout and typefaces. It is intended that these services should be authorized from Pentecost (4 June), and it is likely that a printed copy will be circularized with our April booklet, which is to be a commentary on it.

On the Friday afternoon the Synod should start on the Daily Eucharistic Lectionary (GS 365)—at last.

And then July and November alone remain for bringing together the contents of the Alternative Service Book—it has to go to the printers after the November session.

## BOOKS THIS MONTH

Our backlog of books sent for review grows and grows. We note the two 'Latimer Studies' mentioned in the leaflet sent with *NOL* (except overseas). There is the impressive *For all God's People: Ecumenical Prayer Cycle* from the W.C.C. (English edition jointly by S.P.C.K. and Catholic Truth Society, £3.50). Collins Liturgical Publications have a three-volume *Holy Communion and Worship of the Eucharist outside Mass* (£5). Michael Harper's latest is *This is the Day* (Hodder, £2.95). This is subtitled *A Fresh Look at Christian Unity*, and is really a personal history, expressing a personal longing. Its title repeats that of a book reviewed here in 1978 about the Lord's Day! We also have R. J. Daly *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (D.L.T.), which is by a Jesuit, and left me with more questions than it answered (£2.50). On 8 February S.P.C.K. are publishing an American book from Seabury Press *Learning through Liturgy* by Gwen Kennedy Neville and John H. Westerhoff, III (£4.95). This explores the subliminal learning effected through participation in community events, which are called 'folk liturgies', and then in the second half turns to the relationship between liturgy and catechesis. One of our own authors, Robin Leaver, has had published by Concordia in U.S.A. *Catherine Winkworth: The Influence of her Translations on English Hymnody* (£7 approx.).

## THAT ALMANACK

On balance we reckoned that the 'noes' had it—and it is a relief not to have to get the Almanack material into this edition of *NOL*. Instead we are duplicating it (the next section is from Ash Wednesday to Easter Eve) and we will send it to anyone sending us 20p in stamps. We will be printing the full calendar (without the lectionary) some time soon.

## This month's booklet . . .

. . . is no. 63, *Learning to Live: The Use of Small Groups in the Life of the Church*, by Amiel Osmaston. This includes a considerable distillation of the secular study of the dynamics of groups, along with guidelines for their harnessing to the work of the gospel. This brings us to note that

## next month's

is no. 64, *Groups in Evangelism*, by Eddie Gibbs. His first booklet, *Urban Church Growth*, has been a bestseller, and we are glad to add his second. The connection with the theme of no. 63 is purely coincidental, as there has been no collaboration.

## . . . and a catalogue

should also be enclosed, to bring advance news of the three series of booklets down to August. The catalogue also mentions a point at which we are becoming distributors to the trade. The well known (and by no means remaindered) *Workbook on Rural Evangelism* produced by the Archbishops' Council on Evangelism lacks any custodian for stocks with the demise of ACE. So we are taking it on. The price is £1.00, and it comes postfree like everything else.

## . . . and a reprint

due in February is no. 35, *Drama in Worship*, by Andy Kelso. This has been unavailable for nearly two years, and we are glad to bring it onto the market again.

## A WAY OF KEEPING HOLY WEEK

(by Colin Davey, Vicar of St. Paul's, South Harrow)

Holy Week can be a time of spiritual indigestion rather than inspiration, especially for devout and conscientious clergy. There is a wealth of ways of observing Holy Week as recent literature on the subject shows (e.g. *A Manual for Holy Week* ed. C. P. M. Jones (S.P.C.K. 1967), *Holy Week Services* by the Joint Liturgical Group, ed. Ronald C. D. Jasper (S.P.C.K. and Epworth Press, 1971), *Keeping Holy Week* by Peter R. Akehurst (Grove Booklet No. 41, 1976). Most of these are liable to involve more reading of the Passion Narratives and other portions of Scripture than time to meditate on them. I have long felt that there must be some way through this problem of having too much material set before us. The solution came a staff meeting in 1975 when we were discussing the aims of observing Holy Week and how these might best be achieved. 'Couldn't we just follow one Gospel through the week?' someone suggested. The idea was both simple and attractive. From Palm Sunday to Easter Day inclusive the main services could have as their focal point the reading of the Passion according to one of the Evangelists, with preaching or a time of meditation based on it. There would need to be a selection of appropriate readings from the chapters between Palm Sunday's entry into Jerusalem and the events of Maundy Thursday, but from then on through to Easter Day the readings would be continuous (except when St. John's Gospel was used) and would virtually select themselves each day. We began in 1975 with the Passion according to St. Matthew, and have taken since in turn St. John, St. Luke, and St. Mark.

The weekday evening Devotional Services have sometimes been shared with our Baptist and Methodist neighbours, and some years the Tuesday evening service has been our usual Tuesday Holy Communion, but the sequence of readings has been preserved throughout. The Gospel at the 9.45 a.m. Maundy Thursday Holy Communion has sometimes been part of the sequence, sometimes not. But each year we have followed the Maundy Thursday evening Communion with a 45 minute period of 'Watching and Praying' in the Lady Chapel, consisting of the reading of, and silent pondering on, the events in the Garden of Gethsemane and at the High Priest's house. The main service on Good Friday has been a 1½ Hours' Devotion, with the preaching and prayer led in turn by each of the three members of staff. Holy Saturday was part of the sequence the first year, but was subsequently left free, symbolizing the silence of the tomb.

The results of taking one Gospel at a time have been: first, relief—a release from the burden of too much material; second, a sense of unity through the week; and third, a welcome focussing on the particular features of each evangelist's account of the Passion. This has all helped to further the aim of our keeping of Holy Week which I set out as follows in 1975:

'The aim of Holy Week is, by reading, meditating, and preaching on the Passion according to Matthew, to present the challenge and the compassion of Christ; his confronting of the evil in men's hearts; his calling them to be delivered from all that holds them captive; his continuing concern for them, even while he suffers at their hands; his ultimate triumph, even at the cost of his life; and the converting power of his death. Easter is a celebration of his continuing victory, and of the life he gives to those who turn to him, and who, in his power, minister and bring his life to others, as instruments of his peace, healing, and reconciliation.'

The complete sequence of Lections from each Gospel is as follows:

	ST. MATTHEW	ST. MARK	ST. LUKE	ST. JOHN
<b>Palm Sunday</b>				
Parish Communion Gospel:	21.1-17	11.1-10, 15-18	19.28-48	12.12-19
<b>Monday 8 p.m.</b>				
Devotional Service:	21.33-46	12.1-12	20.1-18	12.20-26
<b>Tuesday 8 p.m.</b>				
Devotional Service/H.C.:	23.1-13, 33-37	13.33-14.2	20.19-26, 45-7	12.27-36
<b>Wednesday 8 p.m.</b>				
Devotional Service:	26.1-16	14.3-11	22.1-6	12.37-50
<b>Maundy Thursday</b>				
9.45 a.m. H.C. Gospel:	—	14.12-16	22.7-13	13.1-20
8 p.m. H.C. Gospel:	26.17-35	14.17-31	22.14-20	13.21-38
8.45-9.30 p.m.				
'Watching and Praying':	26.36-56 26.57-68 26.69-75	14.32-42 14.43-52 14.53-65 14.66-72	22.31-46 22.47-53 22.54-65	18.1-11 18.12-18 18.19-27
<b>Good Friday</b>				
Mattins N.T. Lesson:	27.1-19	—	22.66-23.25	18.28-40
Good Friday Service				
1.30-3 p.m.:	27.20-31 27.32-44 27.45-54 27.55-61	15.1-15 15.16-28 15.29-41 15.42-47	23.26-34 23.35-43 23.44-49 23.50-56	19.1-16 19.17-24 19.25-30 19.31-42
Evensong N.T. Lesson:	27.62-66	—	—	—
<b>Easter Even</b>				
Mattins N.T. Lesson:	27.62-66	—	—	—
<b>Easter Day</b>				
Parish Communion Gospel		16.1-8		20.1-9
or Evensong N.T. Lesson:	28.1-10, 16-20		24.1-12	

## A MODERN HYMN-BOOK—PROJECTED

Almost ten years ago a group of clergy started work on a project which came to fruition with the publication in 1973 of *Psalms Praise*. Hardly was the printers' ink dry when, somewhat augmented, they set themselves the far bigger task of producing a major hymn-book for the 1980s.

The plan, radical enough now but revolutionary then, was to combine up to perhaps a hundred modern (say, post-1960) hymns with the cream of traditional hymnody, with this one difference—the old hymns were to be firmly but sensitively re-written to replace the 'thees and thous' with 'you' and, additionally, to remove the worst archaisms without destroying the poetic feel of the material.

A tall order? Yes, and after five years' work no-one knows that better than the team of writers who have formed the Words' Group, under my chairmanship. To date about 230 hymns have been accepted, of which about 160 are revisions.

Something like 300 new hymns have been submitted, all of which have been scrutinized by the Words' Group who use a system of grading on the texts, which reach them in anonymous form. Only 60 have so far been acceptable, while at least a third of those offered have been of very poor standard.

The book, which as yet still has no name, seems likely to be published in the early 1980s. Hopefully it will take its place alongside the Alternative Service Book and the Good News Bible as the hymn-book for churches wanting fully integrated modern worship. Michael Seward

## Liturgical Study No. 16 *Liturgy and Symbolism* by Nicholas Sagovsky Corrigenda

Front Cover: Delete 'Edited by' (he is the author)

Page 3, line 19: For 'symbolisms' read 'symbols'

Page 7, line 18: Delete 'art'

line 38: For 'antural' read 'natural'

Page 9, line 32: For 'connotations . . . acts like' read 'found that I could not convey all that I meant or make myself under-'

Page 12, line 37: For '2' read '3'

Page 16, note 4: For 'Frieda' read 'Frieda'

Page 18, note 2, line 5: For 'or' read 'of'

Page 19, line 4: For 'psychet' read 'psyche',

line 6: For 'elemen,' read 'element'

Page 22, line 17: Before 'for' open quotation mark

line 20: After 'being' delete quotation mark

Page 23, note 2: For 'Terms!' read 'Terms?'

Page 25, line 7: For 'Zahrat' read 'Zahrnt'

line 9: For '2' read '2'

Page 28, line 7: After 'to' insert 'the'

line 42: For 'holly' read 'holy'; for 'pont' read 'point'

Page 32, line 10: For 'Langar' read 'Langer'

line 34: For 'words, because' read 'words. Because'

line 36: Before 'right' open quotation mark

line 37: After 'order' close quotation mark; for 'conver' read

'convey'

Inside Back Cover, line 8: For 'sacramentality' read 'sacramentality'

In all references to 'S.T.', Vol. 'I' should appear as 'I' not as '1'