

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 65

May 1980

Editorial

Now Rite A is out and in use I am beginning to encounter all over again the complaints that were voiced—and more or less silenced!—in General Synod last year. They centre on the one great point—how can any simple layman 'find his way around in it'? And in essence this is a complaint about a multiplicity of choices.

My first reaction is to say that we have heard it all before—strange, is it not, that in the late 1960s the Church press used to amuse itself with doing computerized sums to find out how many different ways there were of handling the options in Series 2 communion? Strange, because *that* rite had only one position for penitence, and one eucharistic prayer (indeed it was lucky to get that many!). But it was confusing and complex, etc. etc.

This leads to further historical musings. In the days of '1662-only' did not every parish have a different rite from its neighbours? It certainly did in my experience—an itinerant clergyman soon discovered that what the locals thought was straight Prayer Book was nothing of the sort—the only difference in those days was that the 'options' were unseen and uncharted—they simply happened without book or rubric to guide them.

In Rite A the stuff is set out as options. Is it then so difficult to follow? My own guess (based upon some short experience) is that congregations can cope with going from the Collect for Purity to the Kyries or Gloria in Excelsis without being warned to omit the intervening penitential material, though a warning may help. They can see that if they have had penitence at the beginning, it is not surprising that they omit it later, and the lead in to Humble Access, or the example (or urging) that they should stand for the Peace after the prayers, is not too horrifying in such cases.

But the main trouble has been thought to lie in the four eucharistic prayers. How can the unsuspecting be saved from error here? Ideally, in my opinion, by knowing *before the service starts* which of the four will be in use—and they can be told this either by its being mentioned within the greetings, or by being exhibited (as, e.g., 'EP3') on the hymnboard (like 'Mag' and 'Nunc' used to be at Evening Prayer), or both. If the greeting method is being used, then one natural way of handling the whole material is to say:

'To-day is the third Sunday after Easter: the theme of the second year's readings is "The Resurrection and the Life"; we welcome as our guest preacher Canon and we shall be using the third eucharistic prayer, to be found on page 136, with the last of the Easter Proper Prefaces, no. 16 to be found on page 156.'

But even if the congregation fails to find the right prayer (and they really should not fail), yet the responses are identical for all four, and many may

well prefer to listen prayerfully and respond appropriately rather than keep a finger in the place. And many congregations may prefer always to use the same prayer, and will then have no difficulties either. For my own part, I loathe being told 'third eucharistic prayer' when I am expecting 'The Lord is here' or (less satisfactorily) 'The Lord be with you.'

The business about announcing at the beginning brings a reminder that the rubrics of the Introduction and the thrust of opening Note 2 combine to make the president not only a fellow who articulates the eucharistic prayer, but the person who presides over the whole action—from the greeting to the dismissal. If he gives away functions *within* the action, yet he ought to begin and end it. I resisted this on the Revision Committee, found myself outvoted, defended it on behalf of the Committee in full Synod, found myself more successful at defending it than I had expected, and now settle for the principle with equanimity.

Ceterum censeo sedes rigidas iam esse delendas.

Colin Buchanan

HOW TO WRITE RITE A RIGHT

Rite A more or less made it into the shops and churches in time for Labour Day, and has apparently passed into use here and there quite quickly. But to many, it represents a first glimpse behind the veil of secrecy surrounding the look of the ASB. Its text was fixed in Synod on 6 November 1979, so the production has had nearly six months to get the booklet right (and, indeed, the text has been virtually final since July 1979—but more of that anon). Readers of *NOL* will recall the hiccups in getting the Initiation Services into action last year (along with *NOL*'s libellous suggestions for which we apologized). So how, we have been asking ourselves, have the production team been using their six months this time?

Well, the typography and format we had already learned from the initiation booklet. It looks as though folk are reasonably pleased with these. The rubrics become less and less important with continued use, and they are probably sufficiently low-key in their blue to die from sight naturally. But those with keen memories of early days with the 'green booklet' (i.e. that obsolescent Series 3 fossil) will have looked first at turnovers. And the upshot? Well, here is a rundown:

Section 10: a turnover in the middle of the Gloria in Excelsis. Not desirable, but tolerable.

Section 19: ditto with the Creed.

Section 38: a turnover in the narrative of institution avoids the unwanted turnover straight to the acclamations, but it looks contrived.

Section 39: a turnover straight to the congregational Sanctus is not as bad as the old one to the acclamations—the Sanctus response is better known, and better advertised in the 'cue' words preceding it.

Section 40: a turnover within the president's part is acceptable.

Section 41: a turnover to the Benedictus Qui Venit is probably going to make it harder to know what to do next where congregations are unsure whether they are using it or not. Or it may make it harder to know to kneel . . .

Virtually all the other turnovers are good, and some very good indeed: One is just left to reflect: if the eucharistic prayers had not been 'lined out', would they have gone onto two facing pages without any turnovers? I asked the Liturgical Commission office to do some experiments on this when the Steering Committee was deciding about 'lining out' in Autumn 1978, and concluded that there was no certainty that they would all come on two facing pages only even if we did not line them out. But the different format of GS 463A managed to get all but no. 4 on two pages, and may have deceived expectations about the Rite A presentation.

It looks as though there will be no president's copies—at least for a while—of Rite A on its own, so I tend to use two copies placed overlapping each other, so that the eucharistic prayer is read from the small text from three parallel columns without any turnover.

However, there are two big areas of actual error, which ought to be placed on record:

1. The actual text. In *NOL* for October 1979 we listed the alterations to the service agreed by the House of Bishops. There were eight of these (apart from six alterations to GS 364B, the sentences, which *NOL* did not list). Of the eight, five recur in Rite A, and of the three which have been corrected, two seem to have been corrected wrongly! The errors, as compared with the Bishops' alterations, are:

1. In Note 1 (p.115): delete 'begins'
2. In section 21 (p.125): in line 7 of p.125 delete 'all' and insert 'those'.
3. In section 39 (p.135): In line 14 of p.135 delete 'by his body and blood' and insert 'with the body and blood of your Son'.
4. In section 41 (p.139): After the rubric across the middle of the page delete the whole line 'And now we give you thanks' and in the next line delete 'because' and insert 'for'.
5. In section 76 (p.155): In Preface 9 delete the comma in line 2.

The two other errors which have crept in in the correcting of two others are:

1. In section 59 (p.146): In rubric 59 the bracket at the end should read '(see section 80)'
2. In section 63 (p.148): In line 7 of p.148 delete 'your only son'.

2. Blues and blacks. The use of numbers in blue and black is purely a presentational matter settled by the backroom boys after the text leaves Synod. Sure enough, the opening 'General Notes' come up (facing p.115) with an explanation:

'Where a number of options are included in a mandatory part of a service, the rubric governing the options is numbered in black, but the texts themselves are numbered in blue'

Advertisement

ST. DEINIOL'S LIBRARY

The Gladstone Memorial Library, Hawarden, nr. Chester

A Working Library – 120,000 volumes: Theology, History,

Classics, Literature, 19th Century Studies

Residential – Single and twin rooms, full board

For individuals, groups, reading parties seminars conferences

Modest Charges

Bursaries for Clergy and Students

Within easy reach of beautiful North Wales

Apply to: The Warden, St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Deeside, Clwyd, CH5 3DF Telephone: 0244-532350

How then does the text as presented measure up to this rule?

Sections 20, 21: '21' ought to be in blue, but is in black.

Sections 37-41: '38' ought to be in blue; '39' is correct; '40' ought to be in blue; and '41' is not present at all. (Quite a clean up is needed here . . .)

Sections 51-53: '52' and '53' ought to be in blue.

Sections 70-72: '71' and '72' ought to be in blue.

In addition to the above we note that "Alleluia! Alleluia!" has quotation marks in section 55, but 'Amen' does not in section 46; that the alignment of blues and blacks seems poor on p.149 (and less obviously elsewhere) and (to reach to the final pernicketiness) that the lines at the end of the four eucharistic prayers differ from each other in width!

Apparently these latter troubles spring from the computer! Latter-day technological progress means that no line can be corrected on its own, but a whole programme (e.g. for a page) has to be rewritten. So errors avoided at the fourth proof stage nevertheless sneaked in at the final printing. We are left to hope that some secure guarantees will protect the ASB itself from similar imps in the machinery.

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

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

FURTHER TO THE FILIOQUE

I was no doubt very foolish to get mixed up in this one, and I now begin to see the difficulties both in getting out of it and in staying in it! For the moment I temporize by telling the tale as it has developed.

I was encouraged by an eminent Anglican to send a copy of last month's remarks to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He sent a reply—not for publication—in which he courteously but firmly indicated that he would certainly want to omit the Filioque again in the future on occasions when Eastern Orthodox guests were present (and it is his warm concern for the Orthodox—especially those behind the Iron Curtain—which comes through from him). I replied, sticking to my own point that the House of Bishops last February had declined even to ask the Synod its opinion, and well warned that the ASB would soon be printing for a ten-year period of life, had failed to take any action or propose any policy in the months between February and November in 1979. I also recalled, and acknowledged that the then Bishop of St. Albans had been on sabbatical in February 1979. And I learned from him that the Uniat Churches of the Roman obedience omit the offending words—and in the Latin rite those who use Greek as their vernacular rendering of the Latin have (since vernacular came into the Latin rites) used the original form, and have balked at putting Filioque into Greek!

Later in May (on 16 May, to be precise) the *Church Times* aired last month's stuff from *NOL* on the back page, which at least meant that I get nobbled about the issue whenever I go anywhere!

I have a strong letter from one Roger Wilkinson, chaplain at the West Middlesex hospital, from which I offer extracts:

'We all love you, too. So *you come on* . . . You know as well as I that others [i.e. the Eastern Orthodox] have been struggling at least since the Bucharest meeting of 1935 to discover what the competent authority of the C. of E. is. Your own description of the relations between the Steering Committee and House of Bishops suggests we ourselves haven't a clue where that lies . . .

'Surely you wouldn't have us equate "the Catholic Creeds" with any odd Roman accretion? . . .

[and, in a tailpiece—]

'By insisting that "God from God" be said, the Patriarch of Canterbury was subscribing to Toledo 589, if my memory serves me . . . So I believe Canterbury 1980 to be a basically Western formula—the twinkling of an eye in both directions. Get to know your cats, mate.'

My own final thought—in order to escape from the problems with which I began this report—is that there is no need to use the Nicene Creed at all at occasions like enthronements, or other *ad hoc* ceremonies, and that the only place where it must occur in Church of England liturgy is at the eucharist on Sundays and Principal Holy Days. On those occasions its text (for better or worse, and I make no comment on that issue) is controlled by Synod's decisions last year. And on other occasions why use it at all?

C.O.B.

AND ANOTHER ARCHBISHOP ABOUT A THIRD ARCHBISHOP

It was said on the radio that when Cardinal Hume was preaching at a requiem mass for Archbishop Romero, he ventured the opinion that the assassinated archbishop was probably a saint, and 'therefore we should probably not pray for him'. This, if correct, is a direct echo of pre-reformation teaching, and would seem to imply that purgatory is still there, and most of us go by that route and need the prayers of the living to speed up (and soften up?) the convalescent process. So far, all is very clear—even if we thought the Church of Rome had modified the picture recently.

But it should be noted that the presentation is directly contrary to those latter-day rationales for offering petitions for the departed which Anglicans tend to adopt. 'No', they say, 'we are not praying for the departed on the grounds that they have specified need of deliverance from some less-than-paradisiacal existence. No, we pray for them as a natural continuation of praying for them when they were still alive, to express our oneness in Christ with them.' Again, the matter is tolerably clear. But the Anglican who accepts this rationale rather than the medieval one could never accept that a 'saint' was not a proper subject for petitionary prayer—surely, he is exactly the man above all men with whom we wish to 'express our oneness in Christ'?

NOTE: we hear that the new Catechism of the Church in Wales asks 'Why do we pray for the dead?' and answers 'We pray for them because we still hold them in our love, and because we trust that in God's presence those who have chosen to serve him will grow in his love, until they see him as he is.'

BOOKS

Stand by for the publication of the report by the Churches' Commission on Covenanting, probably due out on 26 June (we can take orders for post-free despatch, but price not certain at the moment). The liturgical centre-piece of the inauguration of the 'Covenant' must include the coming together of the various Churches, the consecration of new Bishops, and the 'recognition' of existing ministries. But it is bound to include much more than that—and indeed it does. There are interesting side-questions (which the small group of liturgical advisers, on which I served, had at least to discuss), like:

- 1 How many are coming (?5000, ?10000, ?20000)?
- 2 Where can they be accommodated? (?In the open-air—or dare we not risk the weather?)
- 3 Ought there to be an interval (? for ice-creams) in a service which might last four hours?
- 4 Dare we clash with the Cup Final?
- 5 What part should Her Majesty play in these proceedings?

For the moment, I can only point out that I have reason to expect some good solutions to old problems in the report—and one unexpected problem which liturgy-watchers will have to wait and see if they can spot.

Another forthcoming publication should now be the Liturgical Commission's report on services for use with the sick. The task has been finished by the Commission, and the report should soon be published.

Other books we have been sent: *A Responsorial Psalm Book* (Collins, £5; J. D. Crichton *Praying and Singing* (Collins, £1.80)—a nice piece of work; Peter Spink *Spiritual Man in a New Age* (D.L.T., £1.65); and (by my good friend David Silk) *The Office of Compline—an Alternative Order* (Mowbray, 50p)—a somewhat plusher job than the offprint from Grove Booklet 72, but then four times as expensive! It includes more psalms and seasonal provision.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . 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.

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 22, *E. C. Ratcliff and Liturgical Revision*, edited by David Tripp. This was advertised in a provisional way in the last catalogue as *Rare Pieces by Ratcliff*, but the actual pieces—largely from obscure journals—are sufficiently homogeneous to deserve the changed title. David Tripp the editor shared with Arthur Couratin in the major earlier production *E. C. Ratcliff: Liturgical Studies* (S.P.C.K., 1976) and has access to all Ratcliff's literary remains. The new collection fills some of the ground between 1928 and 1965.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Further to the quotation about liturgical change of gear from the April meeting of the Society for Liturgical Study, there was also the remark from John Gunstone (that well-known high-profile charismatic) that he often liked 'not to be wearing a chasuble during the first half of a eucharist, as this enables me to keep my arms free for [wait for it] *the sermon*.' (Italics ours). Was it really the *sermon* for which he wants his arms free?

PET HATES

. . . or actually a pet love: from Charles Isbister, of Cookridge, Leeds, 'I do like priests who kiss babies after baptizing them—and, structured or restructured, I shall go on kissing in Series 3, 33, and 333!'

From Geoffrey Crees, of Greenham, Berks.:

- 1 President and/or servers looking round the congregation to estimate how many wafers to use.
- 2 Priest's wafers
- 3 Wafers.'

RUN-UP TO THE ASB IN NOVEMBER

The first advertising is now starting to appear. Hodders claim that theirs is the only hard-back under £4 (in fact, £3.60)—but theirs is a slightly smaller typeface and page-size than the standard (as, e.g., in Rite A). The SPCK/Clowes/CUP consortium have a 'soft cover' edition at £3.50 (without psalter) or £4 (with psalter). Their hard-backs are £4 and £4.50 respectively. They are also advertising 'Presentation' editions in leather at £12.50 and £15, and in calfskin at £17.50. The cheapest 'Altar Book' size will be £14.50.

What are dioceses doing? In the coming months we would like to list in these columns notice of open meetings arranged by dioceses to publicize and explain the ASB. Would diocesan liturgical secretaries please notify us well in advance?

And what is Grove Books doing? There are two important answers to this.

1. The illustrated guide to the ASB—edited by COB, Trevor Lloyd, and Harold Miller. This will be a 256-page multi-coloured hardback—a family resource-book, with cartoons by Taffy, introductory articles, and simple clear commentary on each service in the Book. It is to be published by Collins Liturgical Publications on the same day as the ASB, and *NOL* will soon carry details of price—and be circularizing blurbs about it. It will be a teaching/resource aid without parallel in Anglican liturgical history.

2. We reckon to publish as an extra from Grove Books a compilation provisionally entitled *Hymns with the New Lectionary*. Robin Leaver writes about it as follows:

Robin Leaver and Geoffrey Whitehead are compiling for Grove Books an index of hymns for the Sunday themes of the ASB. The index will list suitable hymns for each theme from 24 or so well-used (or new) hymn books. The compilers invite those who have been selecting hymns, for use with the Series 3 Lectionary themes, from the following hymn books, to send in lists of their own particular usage: *English Hymnal, A & M Standard, Methodist Hymn Book, A & M Revised, Congregational Praise, Hymns for Church and School, Hymns of Faith, Anglican Hymn Book, Church Hymnary (Third Edition), With One Voice, Hymns & Songs, 100 Hymns for Today, Praise for Today, English Praise, New Church Praise, Youth Praise 1 & 2, Psalm Praise, Sounds of Living Waters, Fresh Sounds, Partners in Praise, New Catholic Hymnal, Praise the Lord* (Revised), *Song in Season*.

Please send lists to Rev. R. A. Leaver, The Priory, Cogges, Witney, Oxon., OX8 6LA.

STOP-PRESS—Church of Ireland Synod throws out new proposals Telephoned information tells us that the Synod of the Church of Ireland face 120 amendments to the proposed communion service (they are getting all too like England!), but the 'mix' of what was passed and what was rejected did not assuage doubts of the laity, and the tire failed to get its two-thirds majority in the House of Laity. The proposals for Morning and Evening Prayer and Litany were accepted.