

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 63

March 1980

Editorial

My desire to build up pressure towards the publication of the ASB has been somewhat sidetracked this month by the arrival of a beautiful new book on my desk—*Doxology* by Geoffrey Wainwright (Epworth, 609pp., £15). It is sub-titled *A Systematic Theology* (sic!), and separately sub-titled *The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life*. I have hardly had a chance to open it as I write, but the whole concept is both exciting and rewarding. This is not a book about doctrine, nor a book about worship, nor a book about historical theology—indeed it is not a book where it is obvious what should be called its title, and what its (two separate!) subtitles. But nor is it an unstructured chaos.

Rather, Geoffrey Wainwright, well known in England for his profound scholarship and judicious evaluation, has worked out that to which lesser teachers of worship pay generous lip-service but rarely true homage—the development of doctrine, church-life, and spirituality, as the fruits of worship. Those teachers of worship who have struggled in the Church of England to get worship on a par with other academic subjects (for it has traditionally been a Cinderella subject) have now been overtaken by Geoffrey Wainwright, whose bold thesis makes all other studies secondary. I have always strived to point out of my (relatively sceptical) students that worship (both studied and practised) is the firm backbone which unites into a single structure those otherwise separated subjects of, e.g., biblical studies, church history, doctrine, homiletics, spirituality, pastoral studies, music, art, architecture, psychology, group dynamics, etc. etc. But I never dreamed to see it so magisterially worked out as in this book. I hope to comment further on it in future months.

It is premature to disclose anything, but the costly project which I made the subject of last month's editorial may prove (at the eleventh hour) to have been adopted by a wealthier firm than we are. If so, it will be a tremendous encouragement to a very talented, but desperately busy, team—and in November should produce a teaching aid unparalleled in the Church of England. Watch this space.

And the ASB itself? The latest information I can pick up is that its publication has been delayed from 1 November to 10 November this year. This is not because the publishers have fallen behind schedule, but rather because the Queen is to open the next session of General Synod on 10 November. So the Archbishops can give her Majesty a copy of the ASB bound in pink ribbon. She can cut the ribbon, break a bottle of champagne over the Book, and then formally declare it open. Oh yes, and the price is up beyond £4 . . .

Colin Buchanan

THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION

The Liturgical Commission has its 99th meeting in May (when it seems the BBC's cameramen may be present), and is due to complete a report on liturgical services for the sick. These should be published this Summer, and then undergo the standard synodical process with a view to becoming auxiliary material to accompany the ASB without being included in it. The Commission itself is due to have its 100th meeting in September, and so far plans merely to agree the minutes of the May meeting, sit down (with an Archbishop or two) to a centenary dinner, and then disband. The new General Synod will be elected the same month, and the new Standing Committee of Synod will have to decide whether it even wants a Liturgical Commission in the 1980s. It may perhaps set up a very small group with a watching brief on events. But it may also be pushed by members of Synod into establishing another hard-working (dare one say 'creative'?) Commission, as the desires for auxiliary material surface over the coming years. Some of these desires are already known from the questions asked in February—for which we do not have space in this issue, but we will print them in April.

HYMN BOOK NEWS

In booklet 71 I overlooked Leonard Blake's review of *The Cambridge Hymnal* [6 in my survey] which appears in *English Church Music 1968*, RSCM 1968, pp.42-49. In the latest issue of the *Hymn Society Bulletin* (Vol. 9, No. 7, Jan 1980; pp.126-30) there is a review of *Partners in Praise* [31 in my survey] by Eric Sharpe. In January *NOL* (p.3f.) I called attention to a new full-scale hymn book which is designed to complement the ASB by ensuring that all the biblical themes of the 2-year lectionary are adequately catered for. After a recent editorial committee meeting the following information was released: (1) the title of the new hymn book will be *Hymns for Worship*; (2) the basic selection of hymns should be complete by April this year; and (3) the detailed publishing plans are at present being negotiated. Robin A. Leaver

THAT ENTHRONEMENT AT CANTERBURY

I was talking to Angela Tilby of the BBC the other day (see the reference to the BBC under 'The Liturgical Commission' elsewhere in this *NOL*) and asked her what part she would have in covering the enthronement of you-know-who at you-know-where. The answer was 'None—that belongs to outside broadcasts, not religion. It will be filmed by the sports team.' Writing prior to the particular sporting occasion, I cannot say whether they got it right or not. But I may report next month, for the benefit of sporting enthusiasts who were unable to watch their TV sets for a major midweek event.

THE PUBLICATION OF RITE A

LAST WARNING—'Rite A' is published at 35p on 1 May 1980, and a copy will be sent with all standing orders to arrive on that date unless we are notified otherwise. Others should send 35p with their order, and 'Rite A' will be sent with the April *NOL*.

AN INVITATION TO COME AND WORSHIP AT ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE

St. John's Newsletter accompanies this issue of *NOL*, but, at the last minute, we have realized that it omits the invitation to all and sundry to join with us in a celebration of communion at **7.30 p.m. on Thursday 8 May 1980**. The plan is that this somewhat informal service should be

in the open-air. The preacher is the Ven. Michael Whinney, archdeacon of Southwark. Come early and bring a picnic tea if you like—there will be a brief lecture about the College at 5.30 p.m. followed by a conducted tour. If you are bringing a large number of people please drop a line in advance to the Rev. Harold Miller, St. John's College, Bramcote, Nottingham. And do tell others.

THE ST. JOHN'S SETTING OF (SERIES 3) RITE A

Our catalogue in January failed to mention the *St. John's Setting* of what will now be 'Rite A'. In fact the setting is alive and well, and getting ready for the new rite. Organ edition copies cost 60p, congregational edition copies 15p. But there is of course one change of wording to be incorporated (there would be more than one if the Nicene Creed were included—for that has several lines changed—but there is no music for it in this setting). The crucial change is from 'Do not bring us to the time of trial' to 'Lead us not into temptation' (and worshippers who recognize that this is about to happen will say 'time of trial' with a sense of nostalgia all through April this year, knowing that the time of trial, far from being eschatological, is already almost lost in the past—but then there is plenty of temptation to look forward to . . .). David Butterfield originally produced this setting with provision for the alternative 'Let us not be led into temptation', which the Liturgical Commission was then recommending (in GS 364) over the opposition of Jean Mayland. Thus it is now easy for him to produce the requisite half-line to bring Commission's abortive proposal into line—and at the same time leave 'Do not bring us to the time of trial' for continuing 'green booklet' users. Here are the half-lines required:

Organ edition

Congregational edition

Lead us not
Do not bring us

We are offprinting these half-lines onto sticky paper, and will supply the alteration free to future purchasers. Those who are already using the text can write in for free supplies of the sticky slip—please send SAE and indicate quantities and which edition. At the same time David Butterfield has produced an (amateur) cassette of the setting. Copies of this will be sent for £1.50 postfree (VAT inclusive).

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Liturgical Study no. 21, *The Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God*, a reprint of the full text from a first edition (with original spelling, capitalization, and punctuation) with a brief introductory essay by Ian Breward, Professor of Church History at Knox College, Dunedin. The text is important to the history of worship in the Church of England—let alone in the Kirk and among the Wee Frees—and there will be many who would not dream of following its directions for worship who will be glad to have it available again.

. . . and next month's

is Worship Series no. 72, *A Late Night Service—Compline in Modern English*, compiled by Mark Davies. This text will be as near to conformity to the material in the Alternative Service Book as is possible, and will thus be easily used by those who adopt the ASB. In accordance with long-standing tradition Grove Books offers the auxiliary material before the substantive texts are in use. An introductory essay precedes the service text in the booklet, but there will also be available an offprint of the service text on a simple card, and the price of this (including a reduction for quantities) will be announced next month.

. . . and an Ethics booklet not previously announced

is no. 34, *Last Orders Please: A Study in the Use and Abuse of Alcohol*, by Philip Crowe. The title is self-explanatory. But this booklet will be published in April, which is unusual for Ethics booklets. Then in May will follow the booklet advertised in the catalogue as no. 34, but this will now be numbered '35'. This correction will be made in the next catalogue.

. . . and a reprint

of Ethics no. 1, *The Christian and the Unborn Child* by Oliver O'Donovan, should be available in April—having been delayed through the various agonies of the Corrie Bill in Parliament, which it seems has now (regrettably) perished. This is the fourth printing of the title.

. . . and a blurb

should accompany this issue of *NOL*, advertising our 'portrait' of Bishop Russell Barry, published through the good offices of the Memorial Fund to 'FRB'.

. . . and other enclosures

are the *St. John's Newsletter* for March 1980, and advertising material for *Music in Worship*.

10p per copy (£2.25 for the year 1980)

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

THOSE ROMAN OFFERTORY PRAYERS

A bad slip last month—we asked 'Does not the rubric say the celebrant is "offering" the elements?' And the answer comes back from Bill Jardine Grisbrooke (no Roman he): 'No, the rubric very carefully and deliberately does *not* say the celebrant is offering the elements.' He then points out that semi-official texts may say this (and they do—the source of COB's mistake), but the official text does not:

*'Sacerdos, stans ad altare, accipit patenam cum panis, eamque aliquantulum elevatum super altare tenet, secreto dicens:
Benedictus es . . . [etc.]*

Si vero cantus ad offertorium non peragitur, sacerdoti licet haec verba elata voce proferre . . .

[And then similarly with the chalice]

Our correspondent also points out that the term 'Offertorium' is also evaded, except in its 'classical' sense of the chant used at this point (for which see Sarum and 1549)—Cranmer in 1549 still meant the chant, though the chant was now texts of scripture about giving money!).

At any rate the ground is slightly narrowed—the question remaining being whether the *main* eucharistic action includes offering elements to God. But one is also left to wonder how much private material can be put into little missals and private productions and still get a 'Concordat cum originali' in the front pages!

PET HATES

- (1) From John Pearce: 'Those who will not announce the hymn numbers twice to aid the *deaf* . . . (P.S. This directly contradicts your [i.e. COB's] pet hate!!)'
- (2) From Peter Hutchinson: 'Causing the rafter to ring with "Go in peace, and serve the Lord", receiving a prompt and vigorous "In the name of Christ. Amen", and then seeing some GET DOWN ON THEIR KNEES AGAIN!' (Response by COB—oh, dear, we do that—in a casual way—at St. John's; but perhaps it is better than saying 'Send us out in the power of your Spirit, etc.' at a celebration in jail . . .).
- (3) From Peter Faulkner: 'Those who, using extempore prayer' use the word "do" excessively . . . Thus: "Lord, we *do* ask that you will . . . And we *do* pray that . . ." etc.'
- (4) From Phil West: 'Lessons introduced by "Beginning to read at . . ." (What else do they imagine might be begun?)' Phil West also has another: 'Presidents who keep old ladies standing through the long Series 3 Thanksgiving, because theological nicety prevents them from asking them to sit or kneel half-way through . . .' (This also runs clean contrary to one of COB's pet hates, and is only comparable to the appalling cruelty of making old ladies stand for long hymns.)
- (5) From Bob Paterson: 'Leaders of worship who view what they are leading as though it were simply a collection of separate items totally unconnected with each other; a sort of worship for kangaroos!'

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

We have a few contributions coming in for 'Laughter in Liturgy'. I think in general they ought not to be slip-ups (or slips-up?) in the notices—that's too easy. But the first ones in are printed here regardless:

- (1) From Martin Walker: (At an institution service conducted by the Bishop of Dudley): 'I am the archdeacon as well as the bishop. So I shall be the bishop; the rural dean will be the archdeacon; the team rector will be the rural dean and the patron.'
- (2) From Brett Cane: (Quoting a Montreal incumbent, who subscribes to *NOL* and can thus recognize himself): 'The flowers on the altar to-day are given in loving memory of God and to the glory of . . . er, let's run through that one again, shall we?'
- (3) Peter Skoulding: 'After a year in a very rural parish . . . my seven-year-old son was heard to render the final response as "Manure a right spirit within us"—not a bad rendering in view of the hymn line "May barrenness rejoice to own thy fertilizing power."'
- (4) From Jimmy Hamilton-Brown: (From the NEB) 'By faith the prostitute Rahab escaped the doom of unbelievers, because she gave the spies a friendly welcome. Need I say more? '(Heb. 11.31-32).
- (5) From Trevor Lloyd: (Quoting from that very good book mentioned here recently *Instructions on the Revised Roman Rites*, p.248): 'Extensive selections from the books of the New Testament are read . . . However, passages having little pastoral relevance today have been omitted, such as those concerning the gift of tongues . . .' (Where have these instructors been living for the last fifteen years?)

THAT PETITION (or, to be accurate, THOSE PETITIONS)

We print below the official text of the Synodical answer to Mr. Clark's question about the Petitions. During February charges of hostility against the lovers of modern liturgy were rebutted in the *Church Times* by Michael Saward, who combed out from *PN Review 13* some extremely virulent expressions used by the lover of the ancient—showing that it was less than fair for them to present themselves as smoothly looking for two uses to flourish alongside each other. They treat the new as banal and unworthy, and only deserving to be banished from the land! This earned a further riposte from Mr. Oswald Clark, who pointed out that it was only the Petitions themselves (which are relatively mild in their tone) which he had presented to Synod. *PN Review 13* at large was not his business. We are left thinking that Mr. Clark was formally correct, but that the head of steam which propelled the Petitions into print in *PN Review 13* included some pretty lethal gas.

One other little crumb of interest (at least to COB) is the following extract from a book review by David Martin in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* for 22 February 1980:

'Revisers wreck the powerful lingo in order to extract a core separate from form. For them the living incarnation of language is simply an external aesthetic adornment obstructing the functional efficiency of the religious communiqué. They defend themselves with comparisons drawn from scientific change, as when the Reverend Colin Buchanan claimed that you need a transparent liturgy like you need a clean windscreen. Worse still, they give the dead residue of social science

a final ghastly resurrection in theological colleges. This is how young ordinands find themselves striking life-stances in relevant "worship-situations" and spending 18 hours (almost) at a stretch "locating the source of authority in the group". No wonder the revisers voted on whether or not to expunge "the lamb of God" on the grounds that people have little direct experience of living lambs in "our modern plural, industrialized, urban society."

The temptation to respond to this is too much:

- (i) Is the passing imagery of the stained-glass window the only point in my article David Martin wishes to oppose? Or does he consider that this response demolishes my whole article?
- (ii) Does he realize that, even within the imagery, there is no need for it to have a modern dress? It could easily read: 'A medieval monk could look at a stained-glass window, and take joy from its colouring. But a medieval knight with a castle to defend would need something more transparent if he were to view the countryside round about his bastion. Stained-glass would have boxed him in, unrelated to the world around, whereas clear glass opened up his vision.' It may not have been a great literary endeavour. It may not have been exact imagery. It may not have even conveyed its message (I cannot boast of my style). But any such shortcomings can hardly have been due to its being a 'comparison drawn from scientific change'. This attack really reads like a desperate attempt to throw in the kitchen sink in the vain hope of hitting a target.
- (iii) Is not the desperation even clearer in the attempt to link the supposed bad habits of theological colleges (not this one) with the quest for truly modern liturgy? Even if the two were linked—though it is absurd to think it—then all we would have would be an instance of unworthy fruits of the use of modern liturgy. And everyone knows that bad examples of the use of ancient liturgy can also be supplied, but would simply be dismissed as bad examples to cite if they were supplied. And when there is no link at all—and the '18 hours (almost) at a stretch' is an event unknown to me in the current world of the colleges—and surely rare at the very least, if it is not non-existent?—then exactly what form of advocacy is David Martin practising?
- (iv) Who are the 'revisers' who are supposed to have 'voted on whether or not to expunge "the lamb of God"'? Certainly not the Liturgical Commission or the General Synod. The phrase 'lamb of God' is inviolate in the Gloria in Excelsis; and of the Agnus Dei, which is a latter-day reintroduction of a liturgical anthem *not to be found in the 1662 communion service*, two versions are included in new services, both retaining the phrase 'lamb of God'. I should like to know when the cliff-hanging vote was supposed to have been taken.

No-one wants literary confrontation amongst Christians to get unchristian. But, come on, David Martin, I could myself write a better attack on lovers of modern liturgy than you have done here. I cannot believe that all your scholarly instincts have deserted you in favour of blind rage?

SYNODICAL QUESTION at the February Synod

- Q. What action is proposed in regard to the subject matter of the three Petitions presented at the last Group of Sessions as to the continued use of the Book of Common Prayer and the Authorized Version of the Bible?
- A. The Standing Committee considered at their last meeting both the substance of the three Petitions and the appropriate way for responding to them. On the latter point, the position is that the Standing Orders, though providing for the presentation of petitions, are silent on the action to be taken thereafter; and the Standing Committee considered that this is a matter which could usefully be examined by the Standing Orders Committee. The fact that there was no response to the Petitions at the last group of sessions does not however mean (as some people have suggested) that the Petitions have been rejected. On the contrary, the Standing Committee's January meeting (and a meeting of the Policy Sub-Committee in December) provided the first opportunity when the matter could be considered by the appropriate synodical bodies, and that opportunity was taken.

The Committee, in examining the Petitions, appreciated their concern for the future of the Book of Common Prayer and the Authorized Version, and recognized that this is widely shared. But contrary to suggestions made by some organizers and supporters of the Petitions, it is no part of the Synod's purpose that the Prayer Book and the Authorized Version should be replaced by modern language services and modern translations of the Bible. Rather, as the Synod and the Standing Committee have made clear on many occasions and, most recently, in a leaflet which the Standing Committee sent to every parish in July 1979, they see them as complementary to each other. The Committee noted that, at the November Group of Sessions the Synod had, in addition to receiving the Petitions, taken the final steps towards authorizing the Services which are to be published in the Alternative Service Book. In this setting, the Committee felt that there would be advantage if the President would make a statement at this group of sessions (i) reviewing the course of liturgical revision within the Church of England, (ii) recalling the principles which underlie it and which are embodied in the *Worship and Doctrine Measure 1974* namely that the Book of Common Prayer remains available for use, and that the choice between the various authorized services and versions is exercised at parochial level, and (iii) reminding the Church in the parishes of the need for careful and considered decision taking in these matters. The Archbishop was asked that the Statement should include specific reference to the Petitions, while putting the issues raised in the wider perspective.

The Committee regret, as will members generally, that as matters have worked out the Archbishop of York is unable to be with us, and that there can therefore be no Presidential Address. But I hope that it will be clear from this Answer that the Petitions have been the subject of courteous and careful consideration on the Synod's behalf.