

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 52

April 1979

Editorial

There has been a question circulating in the offing of liturgical revision for many years about reservation of the sacramental elements. It seems that this will surface again shortly, and I thought it might help if I tried this month to set the question in its context, and perhaps next month treat further of the matters of principle involved.

It will be recalled that reservation was abolished in two stages at the English reformation. In 1549 there was provision for 'extended' communion to the sick, but only on the same day as the celebration in church. If there were no celebration in church, then the minister had to have a separate celebration at the bedside for the sick. In 1552 the latter provision was the only one—indeed, the whole ending of the idea of 'consecrated elements' would have made reservation impossible *by definition*. Any bread or wine left at the end of the service was available for the minister to take home for his domestic use! It was not consecrated, because there was no objective consecration anyway (on which see my *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* (Liturgy Study no. 7)). And when a consecration was reintroduced over the next hundred years, then there was also the provision made that any consecrated remains there might be should be consumed by the priest and other such communicants as he might summons.

All this stood in clear contrast to the Roman Catholic system, which reserved the wafer permanently in a tabernacle, hanging pyx, or aumbry. The reason for reservation was not only, nor even primarily, for the benefit of sick communicants. It was rather that, as the presence of Christ was 'there', then the place of reservation, and the wafer itself when visible, became a 'holy place' and a focus for adoration and worship. Whilst it was true that the doctrine of transubstantiation was a more subtle doctrine than staunch protestant controversialists have sometimes grasped—and in particular the assertion of the change in 'substance' had really no necessary spatial or localized implications—yet popular devotion, and the actual official extra-liturgical developments, appeared to testify to something very like a localized, and indeed exclusive, presence of Christ 'in' or 'under' the appearance of bread. The reformers were contending with adoration of the consecrated elements, and with 'exposition' and processions for the purpose of this. Since the Reformation the Roman Church has also developed the service of 'Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament'. Because (until the 1950s) it was impossible to celebrate mass after noon, this service of Benediction was a regular evening liturgy. At the heart of it, the wafer is brought from the tabernacle (or wherever), placed in a 'monstrance', and used to bless the worshippers.

It is hardly surprising that the other wholesale borrowings from Rome by anglo-catholics in the nineteenth century led on by the last decade of

that century to permanent reservation. It was clearly contrary to the 1662 rubric, but that sort of quasi-legal force was never able to stop anglo-catholicism in full spate. Indeed, when the 1927-1928 rubrics proposed to allow reservation under licence from the bishop, it was not only that evangelicals opposed any authorizing of the practice—it was also that anglo-catholics said they could not and would not be subject to any such restrictive licence! Thus the two united to help reject the 'Deposited Book'. It was of course soon after Barnes had become Bishop of Birmingham, where he had displayed his interest in modern science—and his trust in scientific disciplines—by offering to X-ray a consecrated wafer to prove that there was nothing in it! It was clear that he would not have been issuing licences to reserve the consecrated elements . . .

Evangelicals in the 1920s were suspicious twice over. They were very suspicious of the practice of reserving (for reasons which may be discerned from the paragraphs above). But they were also very suspicious that, if anglo-catholics were brought to say they were reserving for the sake of giving communion to the sick, they would not actually mean it, but would in fact reserve for the sake of adoration and other Roman practices. There was enough substance to this suspicion for it to have left a nasty taste—though it is also true that the opposition of anglo-catholics to the 1927-1928 book did bring that matter out into the open. For those opponents of the Book were absolutely open about what they were doing and would continue to do.

When the alternative services were first being compiled in 1965, a small group worked on this question of reservation and communion of the sick. The first report of *First Services* in December 1965 said that an order for communion of the sick was under consideration and would shortly be published. And that has still not happened. So where do we go from here?

Colin Buchanan

Oh yes, and yet more nonsenses last month . . .

. . . just after the 'Personal and Apologetic' stuff had been written last month! The printers had a mechanical hold-up at a crucial moment, and the result was that galleyproofs of *NOL* only came through as I was rushing for the plane to Ireland (see p.3). The results so far noted were:

- (i) The Scottish 'Epicopal' (*sic*) Liturgy was introduced on page 6, but the extract from the text came on page 8.
- (ii) The responsive mini-canon on page 7 included several misprints, and one serious dislocation—the Sanctus had the first line in the right place, and the next three lines after 'Do this in remembrance of me'!
- (iii) The 'Apologies to Australians' (dictated over my shoulder to my secretary as I ran for the plane, and never checked at all) were slightly opaque. I *meant* to say that *NOL* is obviously *insensitive* to Australian thinskinness, but it came out as 'sensitive'. Our reviewer has meanwhile written to add his apologies to ours. We shall tiptoe round all things Australian with Agag-like delicacy from now on, lest we encounter the fate of the aforesaid worthy.

BITS AND PIECES FROM IRELAND

I had six days in Ulster at the beginning of April, very little of it for directly liturgical reasons. The main purpose was to attend the Assembly of the British Council of Churches, which met in Belfast for the first time for 28 years. In the process I picked up the following scraps of information:

- (a) The Church of Ireland Liturgical Commission is beginning to gather up responses to the 1972 eucharistic rite, with a view to its revision in 1980 or so. I was present at celebrations of this on three successive days, and would comment that an Englishman notices the odd phrase in the exhortation to confession, which runs:

'God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, Jesus Christ, to save us from our sins, to plead for us in heaven, and to bring us to eternal life.'

There is an obvious difference here from Series 3, and perhaps not one which is in favour of the Irish. On the other hand, the Irish have a clear cross-heading 'The Taking of the Bread and Wine' which has *only* 'taking' under it, and is thus clearer than the existing green booklet. In the eucharistic prayer there are no acclamations after the narrative of institution, and the anamnesis has as a central verb 'we recall [his death]'—where 'recall' is not only ambiguous, but is ambiguous as between the extremely objective, and the extremely subjective! The position of the Lord's Prayer is after the breaking of the bread, as in the green booklet. And the text of it has as the famous ninth line 'Do not bring us to temptation'.

- (b) The Church of Ireland has just published the report of a working party on the Church's 'Priorities', called *First of All*. I found its report disappointing in the one respect germane to *NOL*—i.e. that in diverting attention from finance and fabric to 'spiritual revival' the report nevertheless never mentions worship in all its 70-odd pages. I am still puzzling over this.

- (c) There was a bit of fun on the Sunday I was there. On the previous Wednesday the Government had been defeated in Westminster. On Thursday the pound rose in value (presumably on expectations that we-all-know-who would win the election on 3 May). It so happens that the Irish pound in Dublin (known as the 'punt' in Irish) had been detached from sterling shortly before when the European Monetary System came in, and Ireland joined it, but Britain did not. Initially, the punt had stood marginally *above* the pound sterling, and thus Irish notes circulated as freely in Northern Ireland as they had done before. But suddenly, when the pound rose because of the election, the punt was worth only 99.7% or so of the pound. Immediately, the shops and transport and banks ceased accepting punts. So what happened to the Irish notes? You've guessed it—they rolled up in the collecting plates in church on the Sunday following.

- (d) The B.C.C. itself was welcomed to communion at Fisherwick Presbyterian Church of Ireland Church. The eucharistic prayer was not printed out for us, and I have not seen it—but, lo and behold, it included virtually the entire text of those Roman offertory prayers on

which I commented in the January *NOL*. Now, it included them in a form which did not involve offering the elements to God, and it included them within the eucharistic prayer, which is exactly the right place for that sort of material, but from what source did they come? Do the Irish Presbyterians borrow more from Rome than they are usually thought to do? Or did this material come from somewhere else?

- (e) At the B.C.C. Assembly we handled a series of resolutions from its Division of Ecumenical affairs on Christian initiation, which will have to be accorded more time at a later date. Meanwhile we passed the following motion:

'The Assembly receives the Report *Christian Initiation* and

- (i) asks the Churches to consider how far the two classic patterns of Christian initiation described in paragraph 8 can be seen as acceptable alternatives [these were infant baptism—nurture—confirmation—communion and thanksgiving for childbirth—nurture—baptism—communion].
- (ii) welcomes the practice of dual and multiple church membership within inter-church families and local ecumenical projects and invite the churches to consider the implications of this and whether it can be applied elsewhere.
- (iii) recommends to those Churches who have entered or are considering entering into a Covenant for Unity the preparation of a Certificate of Common Membership for use from the inauguration of the Covenant.
- (iv) asks the DEA Board to review examples from this country and from elsewhere for the renewal of baptismal vows and to report to the Autumn Assembly.
- (v) invites the Churches to consider the questions raised in paragraph 18 and to inform the DEA of ways in which they are responding to these questions in practice.' [These questions concerned ongoing nurture within the Churches.]

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is no. 65, *Liturgy for Initiation: The Series 3 Services*, by Colin Buchanan. This is exactly what it says—an explanation of the new services. See below about the distribution of the services themselves.

. . . and next month's

is no. 66 *Encountering West Indian Pentecostalism: Its Life and Worship*, by John Root. At the time of writing, we can only say that the title is self-explanatory and that the booklet brings a series of questions and challenges to the traditional Churches in England.

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

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

ANOTHER EUCHARISTIC PRAYER THAT DIDN'T MAKE IT

We said last month that we would this month publish the 'JLG Canon' which was proposed by the Liturgical Commission to the House of Bishops a year ago for inclusion in Series 3 Revised, and was then proposed again to the Revision Committee for inclusion in Series 3 twice Revised. It failed both times. The text is fully public as it is published in *The Daily Office Revised* which the Joint Liturgical Group produced last year (S.P.C.K., £2.50). It was rejected by the House of Bishops partly because it was unclear whether in fact any other Churches would take it up (but someone has to be first, it might be urged), and partly because of its novel features. There was a little merriment in the Steering Group of bishops and Commission members as it was thought the Acclamation 'Christ is Victor' would go down well in the diocese of Chester. In fact, this highlighted the other problem which ecumenical texts set the Church of England—it is impossible to amend the text and still authorize the material as ecumenical, and yet it is almost impossible to ask a Synod which has full powers to amend the text to keep its hands off obvious infelicities. We have not yet heard anything of the fate of this canon in other Churches. Obviously it could, if authorized in different denominations, provide a text for united worship. But that it is not immediately in sight.

Oh yes, and it should be added that 'didn't quite make it' may be premature as a heading. Amendments to GS 364A, so long as they affect that part of the text which was not reached in February, can still be submitted and be in order so long as they reach the Secretary-General by 1 June. So there could yet be a further plethora of alternative eucharistic prayers. Next month we intend to print the one which has already been tabled as an amendment—the canon for use at a 'children's eucharist'.

. . . to give him thanks and praise

Almighty God, Eternal Father,
it is our duty and delight
at all times and in all places
to give you thanks and praise.

You are the creator of all things
and the source of all life,
in whom we live and move and have our being.

You have given us your only Son, Jesus Christ,
to free us from the slavery of sin
He was born as one of us,
was obedient to your will,
and accepted death upon the cross:
you raised him from the dead
and have made him Lord of all.

You send us your Spirit
to guide us into the truth,
to bring us reconciliation and peace,
and to renew us as the Body of your Son.

(And now we give you thanks . . .)

We praise you, for you are God.

We acclaim you, for you are the Lord.

**We worship you, eternal Father:
and with the whole company of heaven
we sing in endless praise:**

**Holy, holy, holy Lord,
God of power and might.
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.**

**Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.**

Heavenly Father,
we offer you this praise
through Jesus Christ, your only Son, our Lord,
who hallowed your name,
accomplished your will,
established your kingdom,
and gave himself to be our spiritual food.
And now we pray that by the power of your Holy Spirit
these gifts of bread and wine
may be to us his body and his blood.
For on the night when he was betrayed
he took bread, and when he had given thanks,
he broke it, and said,

'Take, eat: this is my body which is for you.
Do this in remembrance of me.'

In the same way after supper, he took the cup, saying,
'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.

Do this, as often as you drink it,
in remembrance of me.'

Therefore, heavenly Father,
obeying the command of your dear Son,
and looking for his coming again in glory,
we celebrate the perfect sacrifice of his death upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and his glorious ascension.

Christ is Victor.

Christ is King.

Christ is Lord of all.

Father, accept through Christ our sacrifice of thanks and praise,
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts,
kindle in us the fire of your Spirit
that with the whole Church on earth and in heaven
we may be made one in him.

Count us worthy
to stand before you as your people
and to offer without ceasing our adoration and service,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Through him, with him, and in him,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all honour and glory are yours, Father Almighty,
now and for ever.

Amen.

BOOKS THIS MONTH

The main book to advertise this month is the actual forthcoming Series 3 Initiation services (AS 330, 72 pages, 55p). These are in slightly larger format than the existing glossy booklets of the Series 3 type, as its pages conform to the typography and layout of the Alternative Services Book. The booklet includes: services of Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child, Thanksgiving for Adoption, the 'full' service of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion, separate services for Baptism of Children and for Confirmation of those already baptized, provision for The Renewal of Baptismal Vows, and for Conditional Baptism and Emergency Baptism. There is some expectation that the services for the Baptism of Children and for Confirmation of those already baptized will be available soon in separate format (booklets or cards) but we have no news of that yet. The services are only authorized until 31 October 1980, and will then take their place, after 'adaptation, in the Alternative Service Book.'

When we planned that the April booklet would be a commentary on these services we reckoned that they might be available for distribution with the commentary. Unfortunately, publication is not 3 May (as we had hoped) but 17 May. Still, we can always turn a necessity into a virtue, and so we now point out that there is no 'inertia sell' of these new services. We suspect that the April booklet is more or less useless without the text on which it is a commentary, but the initiative to buy the text is left with the customer. Please send us a sticky label with your name and address and 9½p in stamps and we will post it on 16 May, and add it to your Standing Order invoice. If you are not a Standing Order customer for booklets, then please send the 55p as well. Two or more copies of the services will be sent postfree, but we are unable to do this for single copies (or other orders under £1). Overseas customers will be charged 65p for the services, as they cannot send stamps.

OTHER GLIMMERS RE SERIES 3 REVISED REVISED

Letters coming in quite strongly suggest that the 1549 'By your Holy Spirit and word' might have some mileage in it, and, that 'Word' with a capital 'H' is no help. Any other comment?

One letter asks why we have not changed 'you' to 'us' in the absolution. There may be some slight interest attaching to this question. When an amendment to put 'us' was brought to the Revision Committee, it was rejected by a narrow majority, and *not* on 'party' lines (there were catholics and evangelicals on both sides of the voting). When it was proposed again in Synod, the Steering Committee members, having themselves little heart to resist the amendment in their own persons, sent for Archdeacon John B. Taylor (an evangelical who had opposed 'us' stoutly in the Revision Committee). He produced a full-blooded defence of 'you' in the absolution, and only five or so members rose in seats to ask that the debate should continue. We now suggest that those who think 'us' appropriate should send their letters to the Archdeacon rather than to *NOL*. He will not only explain, he will apparently also *convince*—which *NOL* would find difficult. (Indeed, one of the ideas in the offing for an editorial, ever since *NOL* began, has been an examination of the grammar of blessings and absolutions . . .). Those who wish to save postage might care to note that the 'you' is actually printed in italics (*viz.* 'you') which just drops a hint that a substitution of 'us' might not be wholly disloyal.

There is one part of the Revision Committee's work to which we have so far drawn no attention. On the last page of GS 364A you will find reference to Introductory and Post-communion Sentences. These are a further offshoot of the work of the Revision Committee—the provision of proper sentences for every Sunday and for Holy SAYS. The idea was to relate the sentences to the 'theme' of the eucharistic lessons, but, if possible, to draw the sentences from other parts of Scripture than the set lessons. This would give a further set of possible texts for homiletical purposes. There will still be the sentences for seasons, which can be used when more obviously sacramental texts are wanted, or for midweek occasions when the Sunday lessons are not being used, or whatever. Indeed *any* sentence can now be used according to Note 3 at the beginning of GS 364A.

Anyway, it might interest readers to see how the sentences come out. Here then is the selection from the first Sunday in May to Pentecost on 3 June:

6 May (Easter 3) <i>The Lakeside</i>	Intro: John 11.25 Post-com: John 21.12
13 May (Easter 4) <i>The Charge to Peter</i>	Intro: John 14.6 Post-com: Rev. 3.20
20 May (Easter 5) <i>Going to the Father</i>	Intro: Is. 48.20 Post-com: John 16.28
24 May (Ascension Day) <i>Ascension</i>	Intro: Heb. 4.14 <i>or</i> Luke 24.50 Post-com: Acts 1.11 <i>or</i> Matt. 28.20
27 May (Ascension 1) <i>Ascension</i>	Intro: Acts 1.11 <i>or</i> Heb. 4.14 Post-com: Luke 24.53
3 June (Pentecost) <i>Pentecost</i>	Intro: Rom. 5.5 Post-com: Acts 2.4, 11

N.B. This list omits saints' days, and by giving references only does not show the exact text proposed (which is often altered slightly, as, e.g., by including 'Jesus said'). It too is open to amendment in Synod in July. Some of the sentences proposed for Easter 3 and 4 relate more nearly to the theme of the other year in the readings—in some parts of the calendar two separate sentences are proposed for the two years. Space permitting, we will continue to print the proposals in future months.

The 'Filioque'. I mentioned in my 'diary' in February that I had tabled an amendment to remove the Filioque. This was in fact a contingency plan, in case the House of Bishops wished to sound out Synod's opinion at the February session (and it could have been done on a 'straw vote' principle, as the House of Bishops has the power to reverse Synod's findings, and that would have been an explicit expectation if the deletion of the Filioque had been debated). The matter rested with the Bishop of Truro, and his speech on the Wednesday morning made it clear he did not want the deletion moved at the February session, and I refrained from moving it.

The House of Bishops is now in a tight squeeze. If there is to be a theological report to Synod on the issues, and Synod is to have the chance to alter the Nicene Creed before the Alternative Service Book goes to print after the November session, then the pressures are on us all. On the other hand, a debate that had no chance of affecting the text in the Book would be an empty debate.