

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 64

April 1980

## Editorial

In a recent NOL I ventured to include as my own 'pet hate' *pews*. These are such a universal feature of church buildings, so clearly functional and without doctrinal significance, so eminently useful and innocuous, that it seems a bit hard to list them with, say, enormities like kneeling after the Sanctus. As a single-word addition to 'pet hates' can hardly be a mere space-filler (there are no such items in *NOL*—every word springs from the deepest conviction), I conclude I must have meant it—and I did. Why then?

The pew is the concomitant of the 'auditory' church, and came in force in much the same period. It is designed and arranged to seat a maximum number of people in one building in such a way that they can hear the unamplified utterances of the man 'up-front'. It was the three-dimensional model of the response to the triple-decker pulpit—the word came from the latter, and was received in the former. This pattern dominated free church interiors in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, as well as Anglican ones until the coming of the Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival. Its quintessence is a galleried church, in which one-third or so of the congregation can sit upstairs, and the triple-decker or something comparable lifts the preacher to make his address from half-way up between the stalls and the (square) dress circle. When Addleshaw and Etchells wrote their *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship* they could subtly draw out the splendours of the classical auditory church, and contrast it cheerfully with two-room, orientated, Gothic Revival production. But at the crucial point of the pew, the old order remained. The squire might have lost the high-backed chamber in which he and his family sat as in a stage coach, with a brazier to warm their feet, and sherry or whatever to warm their hearts. But the fixedness of the nineteenth century pew was no different from that of the eighteenth.

It has bequeathed to us a deep sense of passivity in worship. Because the congregation all look forwards, they never see each other's faces, and never relate to each other as people. The nearest thing to a break-through has been the kiss of peace, but the pew cramps and dampens this terribly. The Liturgical Movement has led to a re-creation of East Ends of church buildings, with communion tables pulled out to sit on chancel steps or on platforms built into the nave, and this has enabled a better relationship to arise in the liturgy between officiants and congregation. But so far little has been done to help congregations relate to each other—and the reason for that seems to be the super-sacro-sanctity of the pew . . .

It is easy for me to write this way. In our College chapel we worship with the table in the centre and the worshippers using chairs and seated all the way round it—erstwhile in a square, latterly in a diamond, and most recently of all in a rugby-ball shape. Then the building and context help to preach 'we are the body of Christ'—in so many many parish churches they are subliminally teaching just the opposite, and teaching it more effectively than liturgy or preacher can ever assert the truth!

What are you doing about buildings and furnishings for the new book?  
Colin Buchanan

## QUESTIONS IN THE FEBRUARY SYNOD

- Q. Under what authority will it be possible to continue the widespread practice of using the Book of Common Prayer services of Morning and Evening Prayer without the penitential introduction and with the substitution of a personal choice of prayers after the third collect for the State prayers?
- A. Authority to allow the options in connection with the Prayer Book Service of Morning and Evening Prayer to which Canon Williams refers was originally contained in Series 1 Morning and Evening Prayer. These services lapsed in 1973. The Series 2 Revised form of the service allows similar options. While that form of the service does not follow the Prayer Book form in every respect, I am advised that the Minister could use it so as to achieve the result desired by Canon Williams, relying in so doing on the authority conferred on him by Canon B5, relating to the use of variations which are not of substantial importance.
- Q. Will their Lordships consider preparing an explanation and justification of the policy of the Synod restricting the administration of Baptism, normally, to the hours of public worship, to be published as a pamphlet suitable for handing to enquirers, making it clear that it is drawn up by the House of Bishops, and preferably over the signatures of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York?
- A. This matter will be brought to the attention of the House of Bishops at the next meeting.
- Q. In view of the fact that the translation of the Psalter known as The Grail Psalter is quite widely used (because of its suitability to the music of Pere Gelineau and others) will the House of Bishops consider introducing proposals under the Prayer Book (Versions of the Bible) Measure to make its use lawful?
- A. This matter will be brought to the attention of the House of Bishops at the next meeting.
- Q. In the light of the recent debates on Holy Communion Series 3 (Revised), will the House of Bishops be inviting the Liturgical Commission to bring forward proposals for alternative Eucharistic Prayers for use with such special groups as Children and the Deaf?
- If the House of Bishops does not propose to take this initiative at the present time are they willing to clarify the position as regards the use of other suitable authorized prayers—e.g. the recently produced Eucharistic Prayer for use with the Deaf which is in the process of authorization by the Sacred Congregation for Rites in Rome.
- Q. When will the Liturgical Commission start work on the Eucharistic Prayer for use with children and special Eucharistic Prayers for other occasions as was mentioned in the Revision Stage of Holy Communion Series 3 Revised in July 1979?
- At what date is it anticipated these prayers will be brought before the Synod?

- A. I have been asked to reply, and with your permission Mr. Chairman, I will answer Mr Dixon's and Mr. Cheeseman's questions together. As members will be aware the terms of office of the present Commission, as in the case of all the other Boards and Councils of this Synod, expire at the beginning of next year. The Commission is already fully engaged on the Services for the Sick. In the light of these factors, the question of alternative eucharistic prayers would be better dealt with by the new Commission when it is appointed. The House of Bishops will, therefore, keep the matter in mind, and will refer it for consideration by the new Commission as one of its first tasks. So far as the second part of Mr. Dixon's question is concerned, only material contained in the Book of Common Prayer or authorized by Canon may be used in the Church of England. If the 'suitably authorized prayers' to which Mr. Dixon refers come within either category then their use in the Church of England would be lawful.
1. What steps are being taken to publicize and expound the Alternative Service Book, once it comes into use, through the media, and especially through religious broadcasting?
- A. The Alternative Service Book Committee is actively considering this matter in consultation with the Church Information Committee and the publishers. But it would be premature for me to go into the details.
- Q. Can the Secretary General confirm that parishes who wish to produce their own versions of particular services in the Alternative Service Book for use in their own parish will be allowed free use of the basic material?
- A. I confirm that parishes will be allowed to produce their own versions of particular services in the Alternative Service Book on the same terms as have hitherto applied in the case of the Alternative Services—i.e. they must seek copyright permission, for which there is a small fee (£5 at present). Applications for copyright permission should be addressed to the Legal Adviser to the General Synod here in Church House.
- Q. Is it the intention of the Liturgical Commission to produce a Guide to the Introduction and Use of the Alternative Service Book, to enable the parochial clergy and Parochial Church Councils to come to a properly informed and sensitive decision on whether or not to introduce it in their parishes?
1. A Guide to the Alternative Service Book is in the course of preparation and will, it is hoped, be published on the same day as the Book itself. In order to keep the price as cheap as possible, it will be published as a paper-back.
- Q. Has permission at any time been needed, or sought, or granted, for binding up the 1662 Prayer Book with other material, such as for example *Hymns Ancient and Modern*?
- A. No control is exercised by this Synod nor by the Central Board of Finance over the binding of the 1662 Prayer Book with other material. That Prayer Book is printed under Royal Patent and Privilege, and it is within the discretion of the printers concerned to decide to whom they will supply sheets of the Book for binding. I suggest that Mr. Manchester pursue his enquiries with the printers, Eyre and Spottiswoode, Oxford University Press or Cambridge University Press.

## RITE A—AND THE LORD'S PRAYER

Those who take Worship booklets on standing order should find a copy of Rite A in with this despatch, unless they have cancelled it. Others will be finding their way to the text in the coming days. Please note that, quite apart from an *embarras de prières eucharistiques*, the ninth line of the Lord's Prayer now reads 'Lead us not into temptation'. Let 'the time of trial' now cease . . .

### This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship series no. 72, *A Late Night Service—Compline in Modern English*, compiled by Mark Davies. The text of the service conforms as nearly as possible to that of the ASB—including the use of the Collins' psalter, and the ASB text of the confession, apostles' creed, Lord's Prayer, etc. Introductory chapters give a background to the service, a commentary on its text, and some suggestions for its use. The occasion has been taken to include the very haunting setting of the evening collect which was composed by Chris Humphries for St. John's College two years ago. This faces the last page of the text of the service.

The service itself, will also be offprinted as an 8-page booklet for 20p—but for quantities of 20 copies or more the price is 12½p per copy.

### . . . and next month's

is Pastoral series no. 2, *The Local Church's Political Responsibility*, by Graham Dow. Whilst many Christians still need to be convinced that political questions belong to the commitment of Christian discipleship, this booklet argues the case simply, and discusses models used by Christians to understand their role.

Along with the booklet there is also a leaflet *From Awareness to Action* (numbered 'Pastoral 2A') which is available separately. This raises searching questions for group use in local churches, with a view to assisting relevant action in the locality. The leaflet will usually cost 15p (10p for purchases of 10 or more), but will be sent free to all those who obtain the booklet on direct standing order.

### For those who take Ethics booklets, please note:

- (a) there is this month an ethics booklet not mentioned in the catalogue—no. 34, *Last Orders, Please: A Study in the Use and Abuse of Alcohol* by Philip Crowe.
- (b) This newcomer alters the numbering of booklets which have been announced. These are now numbered:  
35 *Christian Ethics in the Old Testament* by Greg Forster (May)  
36 *The Values of Science* by David Atkinson (July)

## LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Just a snippet from the Society for Liturgical Study (reported elsewhere): in discussion a questioner asked 'Does putting on a chasuble at the offertory imply a liturgical change of gear?'

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

GROVE BOOKS  
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

## NEW DRAFTS IN IRELAND

The Church of Ireland is preparing new drafts of its modernized services' apparently with a view to incorporating them into a modern English Prayer Book. The drafts arise from earlier ones presented to the General Synod of the Church of Ireland in 1979, now revised in the light of comments received—with a special mention given to the submission of the Evangelical Fellowship of Irish Churchmen. The main upshot is that the communion service has moved to a very close likeness to the English Rite A—resembling it in general structure (though without provision for penitence at the beginning), in actual language ('hidden' in the collect for purity; 'incarnate of' in the creed; 'through negligence, through weakness, etc.' in the confession, 'Christ is our peace, etc.' in the peace, and 'Lead us not into temptation' in the Lord's Prayer), and in various other nuances. On the other hand, the previous Irish emphases are kept in having texts to inspire almsgiving at 'The Offertory', an emphasis upon the all-sufficient work of Christ on the cross in the post-Sanctus, and the alternatives of ancient or modern in the Lord's Prayer (which still follows the fraction as in the English 'Green Booklet').

Finally, there are points where the draft is very conservative: the Gloria in Excesis, epistle, and blessing, are mandatory at all services; the last two lines of Humble Access have been restored; the decalogue has reverted to the text in which it was found on the two tablets on Mount Sinai; and the response to it shows a liking for the old Prayer Book form.

The texts for Morning and Evening Prayer have not yet decided whether they are ancient or modern . . .

The report of the Liturgical Advisory Committee which proposes these texts is published for submission to Synod, but not apparently as a public document which can be sold in the market-place. It is due to be debated—and perhaps amended—in the Irish Synod in May 1980.

## IN MEMORIAM—TOM GARRETT

Tom Garrett died on 10 April at the age of 67. In a very full life, largely overseas, he made some significant contributions to both the study and the practice of liturgy. He was in South India from 1940 to 1963, and in that time played a key part in the writing of the Liturgy of the C.S.I. in 1949-50, and also wrote two good books, *Worship in the Church of South India* (Lutterworth, 1958) and *Christian Worship: An Introductory Outline* (Oxford, 1961 and 1963). From 1963 to 1969 he was in Nigeria (and his South Indian hand may be seen in the 'United Liturgy' which was drafted there for the union scheme which failed to happen in December 1965 (he wrote this up in *Studia Liturgica* in 1966)). When he returned to South India in 1969 (and became a bishop in 1971) he was involved in producing the modern English version of the CSI liturgy which was then under way, and he wrote this up in my *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975* (Grove Books, 1975). He returned to England as assistant bishop of Leicester in 1975, I only got to know him in the 1970s myself, and others could write more about his role in the liturgical world than I could. But, along with being a fine Christian gentleman, he has clearly left a creative mark upon the post-war liturgical tradition. It was sad to read a *Church Times* obituary which never mentioned liturgy (and *The Times* then copied it).

C.O.B.

## THE ARCHBISHOP AND THE FILIOQUE

In with all the ecumenical walk-on parts, the presence of representatives of other faiths, the Archbishop's querying whether he himself ought to be clad in gorgeous cope and hat (he did query it, didn't he?), the bringing of the ancient Gospel book from Cambridge, the parade of Anglican metropolitans from round the world, and the TV commentators with inevitable references to Thomas Beckett and shots of Michael Ramsey—there was an item of liturgical significance. The Nicene Creed was used, and, at the Archbishop's personal insistence, it was said without the Filioque!

Why should this be a matter of concern? Not for the moment because it might please the Orthodox. Nor because it might perplex the Roman Catholics. Nor because the Church of England might be viewed as taking up a stance in relation to the authority, or the truth, of the Filioque clause. These matters were inevitably raised by the decision, but they are not the matter in point—that is, the one of authority within the Church of England.

Readers of *NOL* will recall (for some of this has been in these columns) that Bishop Runcie, then of St. Albans, asked the Revision Committee in the Autumn of 1978 to put brackets round the clause in the new rite (and thus in the ASB). The Revision Committee declined to do so—reckoning that it would still be *said* as though without brackets, so that there would be no gain in relation to the Orthodox. When the revised text (GS 364A) came to Synod in February 1979 the Steering Committee pointed out to the House of Bishops that, if the Filioque were to be handled meaningfully in the House of Bishops prior to November 1979 (when final authorization was due), it might be helpful to find the mind of Synod during the Revision stage. The Steering Committee even tabled an amendment with that in view. However, the Bishop of Truro made a firm speech on behalf of the House of Bishops in which he made it clear that the Bishops did *not* want to have a Synod vote on the matter, and the Steering Committee withdrew their contingency amendment.

Equally, when the text went to the House of Bishops in Autumn 1979, prior to final approval in Synod, they let it go by without touching the Filioque. The final text was then authorized till 31 December 1990, with the Filioque still in place in the Creed.

So, what is the Archbishop up to? He has, of course, power to authorize services of this 'enthronement' sort off his own bat, as Synod has no provided such services for national use. It *might* then be that he can order the Creed to be said in any form he likes. But it is very doubtful whether any Archbishop is well-advised to take advantage of this arguable licence. What have the Orthodox learned? They might be led to think that the Church of England has abandoned the Filioque? Or is about to do so? Or that the individual in charge of a service in the Church of England decides for himself what he shall use? Any of these would be a false conclusion to reach. On the other hand, they might conclude that the Church of England thinks it a matter of complete indifference—and this *may* be true, but would hardly rank as an ecumenical gesture towards those who think it very important.

So come on, Dr. Runcie, we all love you very much—on what, if any, other Church of England occasions would you think it appropriate to drop the Filioque off your own bat?

## MODERN CHURCHMEN AND LITURGY

The Modern Churchmen's Union has sent an 'Open Letter' to the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 25 March 1980—the date of his enthronement. It has achieved no public mention whatsoever, but, as *NOL* tries to record what ripples there are, its references to liturgy ought to be noted.

The Letter refers to a method of 'reasoning from experience of this world to affirmations about a transcendent God'. After kind words about Maurice Wiles, the Letter describes the benefits of this theological approach (as contrasted with '[God's] self-revelation in Jesus Christ and in his word'). It then continues:

'It is, we suggest, in liturgy that this [i.e. change in theological method] is most urgent both since it is a vital link between Church and people and also because it is here that traditional forms of belief are so firmly established that there is a reluctance to expose them to any new insights . . . (It may be that the clergy have developed an instant translation device so that for them the words are re-interpreted. Unfortunately the laity have no such device).

'It has been noted time and again that there is a wide gap between lecture room and pulpit. We see a similar gap between the theologians and the Liturgical Commission . . . The stark prose of the many doctrinal statements in [Series 3] make it difficult to go beyond the face value of the words. "This is the Word of God" seems to imply the acceptance of the literal verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and we do not believe that "Christ shall come again" is the best way to speak of the fulfilment of the Kingdom of God.'

'We also see in Series 3 an example of how a narrowly based theology, limiting the mode of God's activity, can be linked to a limiting view of membership of the Church. "We are the people of God" and "We have been made a people for God's possession" all too readily take on an exclusive meaning . . .

' . . . careful assessment is needed of the emphasis in recent years on the Eucharist as the main act of worship. We recognize the value this has had in the life of the Church, but we hold that there are many who do not respond to such a sacramental approach, and their needs should be remembered . . . We hope then that such experiments as using music and dancing in worship will not be confined to eucharistic worship . . .

What can we say? When we have noted that all the quotations from Series 3 have got the text wrong, and have been gladdened by the percipience of modern churchmen who have noted that there already exist in the Church of England (at least in the eucharist) experiments like 'using music . . . in worship', we are left to say, as year in and year out we have said: come then, produce your alternative liturgical programme, and do not confine yourself to knocking Series 3.

## THE SOCIETY FOR LITURGICAL STUDY

The Second Meeting of the Society for Liturgical Study—St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden—14-17 April 1980.

Two dozen liturgists descended on St. Deiniol's Library for their second meeting last month. Made up of parish clergy, university and college staff, the group explored the theme of Symbolism in Worship. A welcome increase in the Roman Catholic membership of the Society found expression in the papers which were delivered.

The Rev. Tony Boylan, RC National Advisor for Liturgical Formation, opened the conference with a discussion of the problems of symbolism in liturgical training. Then, in a magisterial paper, the Rev. Chris Walsh, of Ushaw College, Durham, delivered a lecture on symbolism and anthropology which provided us with a long-awaited map through topical and complex territory.

The Rev. Stephen Platten, Chaplain of Lincoln Theological College, read a paper on Symbolism, The Bible, and the Liturgy, and in radical and Farrer-esque fashion asked some crucial questions on our use of biblical images in worship. After that, the Rev. David Tripp, Methodist Circuit Minister in Manchester, gave us a witty synthesis on ambivalence in receiving symbolism, which ranged from Tatian to the Salvation Army.

'Symbolism in the Sacraments' was the title of the Rev. Bryan Spinks' contribution, in which primary and secondary symbols were clearly distinguished; and the conference ended on a patriarchal note, with Monsignor (sic! and to be congratulated) James Crichton giving a brilliant exposition of the problems and possibilities of liturgical adaptation.

Half the fun of the meeting was the chance to talk and compare notes, whether on prayers of offering in Egypt, or on how to do liturgical dance. The commixture was good, and much is owed to the Rev. Donald Gray for his able and open chairmanship of the gathering.

Kenneth Stevenson,  
Secretary

STOP PRESS: That illustrated guide to the ASB: as we go to press we are able to announce that it has been picked up by a reputable publisher and, provided that the team of authors (and illustrators) can fulfil their tasks and deliver the completed job in May, then all will duly come to pass. Grove Books—and the Group for Renewal of Worship which produces the *Grove Worship Series*—will be acting as the author/editor/compiler end of the deal, but we also hope to be distributing the book. More details next month.

## AND TAILPIECE—AIDS TO RITE A

When looking for aids to help PCCs and others understand 'Rite A', do not forget that we published a commentary on it last August—Booklet no. 68 *Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service* by Colin Buchanan (now 50p). For more serious study there is GS 364A (we have some shopworn copies at £1), and *Liturgical Study 20 The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England*, also by Colin Buchanan.