

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 72

December 1980

Editorial

As I write it is 13 December. The date has stuck in my mind (possibly incorrectly) as that which Ronald Jasper told the Liturgical Commission (at its farewell dinner at Oxford in September) had been the date of the first meeting of the Commission in 1955. So I write to commemorate the true twenty-fifth anniversary of the Commission—writing at a time when the Commission is formally still in existence, but under sentence of dissolution. The only difference between us and President Carter is that we do not yet know who will replace us—or whether some of the team will stay on as a voice from the past in the 1980s. But the anniversary provides a good opportunity to look back, and looking forward will have to come some other time.

In my own mind I have always had the life of the Commission divided into four stages, of which I was present myself for the latter two stages, but was quite ignorant at the time of the first two stages, and for these events I have had to reconstruct at second hand.

Stage 1: 1955-1960. In the early days the Commission was chaired by Bishop Colin Dunlop, the then dean of Lincoln, and its 'feel' (insofar as this is recoverable by an outsider) was that of a dons' dining club. There existed little immediate possibility of services proposed by the Commission being authorized (the Alternative Services Measure was still in deadlocked gestation in the Church Assembly). But they wrote a report for the 1958 Lambeth Conference, and started work on initiation proposals.

These initiation texts, whilst they pioneered certain principles dear to the Commission, were also the cause of much dissension. Eric Milner-White, the ageing Dean of York, maintained a last-ditch stand for the 'York Rite' of infant baptism and was reckoned by the Commission to be trying to stir up the 1958 Lambeth fathers for his cause. When the Commission's report was published in 1959, he and Ernest Evans dissented from the infant baptism material, and campaigned in public for the 'York Rite'. The Commission put up E. C. Ratcliff to savage the 'York Rite' in *Theology*, and, at much the same time, expressed its grave concern at the way it was faring on the public scene—the Archbishops had brought the 1959 proposals before their respective Convocations, where they had been attacked heavily. And in the York Convocation—where legend has it that Milner-White walked in waving his 'York Rite' and attempting to rouse a rabble—Archbishop Michael Ramsey joined the attack. The Commission protested.

Stage 2: 1960-1964. A shake-up followed. Colin Dunlop resigned, and Donald Coggan, then Bishop of Bradford succeeded him. It was decided not to publish finished work until the constitutional machinery existed to implement it. Thus a new Morning and Evening Prayer was

completed in 1962, and a new 'Churching' and Burial in 1964—but they never saw the light of day when finished, and this time the Commission was attacked for doing nothing . . . Meanwhile a new constitution for the Commission was put into force, giving the members only a three-year tenure of membership at any one time (so as to ensure the removal of dead wood, one surmises). And at the first new set of appointments in 1962 two women and a layman were added to the Commission—a drastic departure from the invariable black suits and dogcollars of the previous years.

Stage 3: 1964-1970. These were the first years of Ronald Jasper's chairmanship. I was appointed to the Commission in 1964 and Donald Coggan resigned as chairman within minutes of my attending my first meeting (not a case of *post hoc* . . .), so I date the Jasper era easily from my own memory. Geoffrey Willis was relieved of the post of secretary (and resigned from the Commission, which he did not have to do), and a full-time paid secretary succeeded him. The Alternative Services Measure gained the Royal Assent in March 1965, and the Commission published its 'Second Series' proposals in December of that year.

Then followed the period of producing and amending Series 2 texts. In the course of it Ratcliff died a week before the House of Laity authorized Series 2 Communion, and Arthur Couratin, rocked by the changes in the text of the anamnesis, and undermined by Ratcliff's death, resigned from the Commission. Kenneth Ross became the leading anglo-catholic on the Commission (and had an important part in the discussions leading to Series 3 Communion), and the English-language side of the work was strengthened by the appointment to membership in 1968 of Dr. David Frost, a young English don from Cambridge. The years 1968-1970 saw the steady drafting go ahead towards Series 3, and in 1970, when it was nearing completion, Kenneth Ross died.

Stage 4: 1970-1980. This is the era of General Synod, of Series 3 services, of the run-up to the ASB, and of new names on the Commission. Donald Gray inherited Kenneth Ross's role (and underwrote Series 3 Communion). He left General Synod in 1972, and thus the Commission lost an important anglo-catholic spokesman there. The baton was then taken up by David Silk. In 1975 Ronald Jasper became Dean of York, and in the next shake-up of the Commission (Spring 1976) Elizabeth Montefiore was displaced along with some others. Immediately after, David Frost left for Australia (writing the last line of the translation of the psalter at London Airport as he went, so rumour has it), where he made history by becoming a full member of the Australian Commission whilst still a member of the English one.

Everything going through Synod towards 1980 for inclusion in the ASB had to leave the Commission's hands much earlier. Thus the tensest time on the Commission in the last five years was the Winter of 1977-1978, when we were trying to revise the Series 3 Communion service, and at the same time persuade the House of Bishops of our wisdom. There came a moment in late February 1978 when the

Bishops decided to put the Series 2 anamnesis into the Series 3 eucharistic prayer, and the Commission withstood them head-on—and won. That was the high point of actual drama for the Commission. Since then it has been all downhill, coasting towards 1980, and working in the latter stages on the *Commentary* on the ASB.

Such it was in outline. The record above makes no mention of certain uncomplaining and highly contributory workhorses—notably Geoffrey Cuming, vice-chairman of the Commission and immense in both learning and statesmanship, and Charles Whitaker, a devotee of baptismal liturgy, and an untiring human computer on calendar, lectionary, and (particularly!) rules to order the service. His monument stands in the ASB as Whitaker's Almanack. Ronald Jasper himself was the subject of a tribute in September.

No-one knows who, if any of these, will return with the new Commission which we are told there will be. But now, on the twenty-fifth anniversary, is the time to draw a line across the old, and pay a tribute. From me it is a graded one—I have worked in and on (and even occasionally against) this Commission and grown to honour them all and love them as colleagues. Si monumentum requiris, tolle lege librum.

The end of December is not only the point where it is a pleasure to wish a very happy Christmas to all readers of *NOL*—and we do, may Christ be born in all of us this Christmas—but also a point where we ourselves celebrate an anniversary. It is now nine years since the first Grove Booklet appeared, six since *NOL* was born, and one since the 'Ministry and Worship' series forked into 'Worship' and 'Pastoral'. We look forward to our tenth year of operation, particularly welcoming *Theological Renewal* into the cluster of series for the renewal of the church.

And finally, as promised a year ago, we calendrical purists hail a new decade. Presumably we shall be the only journal to do so.

Colin Buchanan

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

Can we not get rid now of this altar/table controversy? Both terms are applicable, and both are established Anglican use.

As I understand it, an altar is a piece of furniture or masonry on which gifts are offered to God for him to use according to his will. This is precisely what we do at the eucharist, present the gifts on the table, that he may use them to make of them to us the sacramental body and blood of Christ. This is effected by a blessing of God over the gifts. As such, the table is an altar.

This is surely implied by St. Paul's argument that a Christian ought not to eat of meats offered to idols and also of the gifts from the Lord's Table. Unless there is correspondence between the two, the argument falls to the ground.

Indeed, in a sense this particular article of Christian furniture is more of an altar than a table. The gifts are presented upon it and blessed upon it, whereas normally only the priest/president eats directly from it, the people being communicated elsewhere.

Yours ever, George Timms

Last month's booklet . . .

. . . was Pastoral Series no. 4, *Have Schools lost their way?*, by Charles Martin—and mention of it was crowded out then. It takes the new Pastoral Series to the conclusion of its first year, and at that point the enterprise seems to have flourished.

. . . and this month's

is Liturgical Study no. 24, *Addai and Mari—The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*, edited by Bryan Spinks. This becomes a valuable addition to the existing text of Hippolytus (no. 8 in the series), and is possibly a forerunner of others to come.

. . . and next month's

is Worship Series no. 75, *Ceremonial in Worship* by Trevor Lloyd. We think this is the first serious treatment of this subject by an evangelical, and we hope it may provide a passing corrective to that unconsciously funny *Episcopal Services* which we noted last month. This booklet leads into a year when all four Worship booklets will be aimed to improve the use of the ASB in general and Rite A in particular.

. . . and a catalogue

should be enclosed with this, and a *St. John's Newsletter* also. The catalogue sets out prices and titles for 1981. If you have no use for it, please pass it on to a friend.

. . . and renewing *NOL*

should be explained, to those who take it on its own, in a loose sheet enclosed also. Why not give a subscription to your vicar as a New Year (nay, new decade!) present?

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Perhaps, now that the Green Booklet is obsolescent, I may help close off its time by letting slip the joke the Liturgical Commission let into the text of it. The matter relates to the seasonal sentences, in the selection of which at the beginning of the booklet there is one for 'Dedication':

'Truly the Lord is in this place; this is no other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven.'

To my own evangelical mind this seemed to overstate the role of the church building—'house of God' being slightly awkward to accept. So I drafted for a sentence after communion:

'The heaven of heavens cannot contain our God; how much less this house that we have built!'

The Commission looked at both, recognized that they were meant to negate each other, and accepted both at once without wavering. Synod never noticed it.

C.O.B.

10p per copy (12p in 1981, and £2.70 by post) for the year 1981)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

ERRORS IN THE ASB TEXT

We published first lists in October and November. We now add a further collection (and are crediting 50p to every supplier of a new true error):

- Page 18: Re 24 January—St. Francis de Sales died in '1622' *not* '1662' (Philip Barrett—who asks whether there is something significant about the later date!).
- Page 110: In index under 'Confirmation' there are no prayers on page 503 (A. C. Bryer)
- Page 155: In Preface 9 delete the comma in line 2 (error earlier noted in Rite A booklet—see *NOL* for May—and here repeated!).
- Page 191: The rubric in the penultimate line should be one line higher (John Randles).
- Page 197: In section 38 'hearts' ought to be in the singular (John Randles).
- Page 232: In the Hodder one-colour edition sections nos. '19' and '20' are missing from the margin (anon.).
- Page 254: In section 72 the words 'When it is announced' should be in blue (Peter Taylor).
- Page 292: In section 13 'this ring' should be in italics (Ian Cooper).
- Page 359: In section 15 'Kneel' should be in black (Peter Owen).
- Page 365: In section 4 'Sit' should be in black (Peter Owen).
- Page 368: 'Stand' should appear before the Gospel (Peter Owen).
- Page 369: There should be no gap between lines 5 and 6 (Peter Taylor).
- Page 421: In ninth line from the bottom 'imposters' should read 'impostors' (R. J. Dedman).
- Page 449: In line 21 'enlightens' should replace 'englightens' (Peter Taylor).
- Page 490: In line 1 of the Old Testament 'Sion' should be spelled 'Zion' (Peter Taylor).
- Page 503: Four lines from bottom the heading should be '... SENTENCES' (Peter Taylor) (the same is also true on page 780).
- Page 657: In last line but one after 'Resurrection' read '(13), (14), (15), (16)' (Peter Owen).
- Page 689: In line 28 read 'covenant' not 'convenant' (Peter Taylor).
- Page 1060: In Pentecost 21 year 2 the Epistle ought to be starred with an asterisk (Neil Weston).
- Page 1188: In verse 16 'days' should read 'day' (John Williams).
- Page 1260: In verse 123 'fall' should read 'fail' (John Randles).
And a correction to one error last month. For page '323' and 'section 30' read '320' and 'section 27'. We hope not to have to have to amend the correction to the error.

Amongst inconsistencies there has been strong attention drawn to the use of 'Proper Thanksgivings' in the Rules, 'Proper Prefaces for the First Thanksgiving' (etc.) in Rite B, and 'First Eucharistic Prayer' in Rite A. Also and arguably more seriously, there is a strong tendency to use round brackets for passages which may be omitted (as, e.g., on pages 188, 190, 229, etc.), where all previous booklets used square brackets. Square brackets can still be found (as, e.g., on page 316), and round brackets used for a parenthesis can also be found (as in rubrics and notes). Marvelously both uses of round brackets occur within each other on page 579 in an Easter Day Gospel reading!

Finally, we record a collector's item—David Butterfield received a copy without Psalter, but pages 1095 and 1096 were the heading of the Psalter and Psalms 1 and 2.1-5—i.e. they were pages 1095 and 1096 from pages printed for editions *with* Psalter! No 50p for that, David—sell it at Sotheby's instead.

... AND AN AMBIGUITY

In 1978 the Synod passed a resolution which clearly intended that the *ASB* provision of a daily eucharistic lectionary should be identical with that of the Roman Catholic Church.

The discrepancy between various published almanacks arises from an ambiguity in notes 2 and 4 on page 1071 of the *ASB*, and arises from the fact that the Lectionary provides for 34 weeks of the year, whereas in most years there are only 33. Thus in any year in which there are only 33 weeks, the readings for one week must be omitted. The notes in the *ASB* fail to make clear which week this should be.

The Roman Catholic Church always omits the redundant week between Lent and Pentecost, or, in other words, begins after Epiphany 1 and works forward until Lent, and then begins before Advent and works backward to Pentecost. If we are to conform to the mind of Synod we must do the same.

Thus it will be necessary to clarify the matter in future editions of the *ASB*, and, meanwhile, this answer will be circulated to all those who publish a manacks and others who are involved.

ERRORS IN OTHER BOOKS ...

We are very grateful to those who have written in with errors in *Anglican Worship Today*—not too many, considering the speed of production. Some of the more obvious ones are the attribution of the Magnificat to Elizabeth (I), the caption of a certain building as 'St. Albans Cathedre' (sic), and the captioning of a certain confirmation as 'medieval'—despite the clearly late eighteenth century (or thereabouts) style of the event. On the other hand, we do not admit that one of the two matters to which Geoffrey Cuming drew attention last month was an error. He questioned the statement that Thanksgiving after Childbirth is not the equivalent of the BCP Churching. The distinction in law between the two is set out in an appendix to Grove Booklet no. 5 (from way back in 1972), and although in pastoral practice the 'Thanksgiving' may well become a *substitute* for 'Churching' (as indeed it *might* become a substitute for baptism) such substitution would in both cases imply nothing as to its *equivalence*. Incidentally, *Anglican Worship Today* is being reprinted already.

There are also errors in the *Commentary*, mostly missed at proof-stage. No prizes in either case, but things spotted would be gratefully received.

Book Reviews

David Silk *Prayers for use at the Alternative Services* (Mowbrays, 1980) 166pp., £4.95.

This book has been part of the 'kit' which *NOL* suggested in advance of publication should be a standard supplementary aid to accompany the *ASB*. It is in overt continuity with Frank Colquhoun's books of prayers, and this is marked by Frank Colquhoun himself, who has contributed a kind foreword.

The prayers are divided into chapters in the book corresponding to sections of the *ASB*—'Morning and Evening Prayer', 'The Eucharist', 'Occasional Offices', and 'Pastoral Offices and Prayers'. Whatever the original source of the prayers (and all ages of the church have been laid under contribution) the language has been brought into conformity with the *ASB*. The provision for Morning and Evening Prayer includes material relating to the theme of each Sunday. The eucharistic section includes additions to each part of the service—including, for instance, greetings, alternative intercessions, the famous Roman Catholic offertory prayers, and both seasonal and general provision of extra prayers after communion. The 'Pastoral Office' section includes a 'service after a civil marriage' which begins with confession of sin! And there is a good index of both sources and subjects.

The book will slip into a jacket (or cassock) pocket. I guess there will be many copies doing the rounds this way in the months ahead.

C.O.B.

Herbert M. Carson *Hallelujah* (Evangelical Press, 1980) 158pp., £1.95.

Herbert Carson is an erstwhile Anglican clergyman who seceded in 1964 and became a Baptist. The ostensible reason for this was his conscientious inability to baptize infants, which had developed over the previous two years or so. The actual occasioning of his departure was the unexpected expectation of another child in his own family, though this is not mentioned in his *Farewell to Anglicanism*. What that book does show is that he was temperamentally at odds with Anglicanism as he conceived it—that liturgy and canons and episcopal government all smelled to him of legalism and bondage, and as a minister he longed to be free.

Free then he is, and as a true free churchman (a Baptist minister in Northern Ireland) he has written here his understanding of the biblical dimensions of worship. It reads marvellously like his oratorical sermons at St. Paul's Cambridge. There is the same painting in glowing colours on a large canvas—and there is the same lack of actual practical guidance of a detailed sort. Here then are chapters on the Old and New Testament backgrounds, 'the trinitarian structure', 'total response', the sermon, the collection, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the guests (and their state of heart), and 'amen' and 'hallelujah'. But I dreadfully missed anything about Sunday, about the church year, about liturgical prayer, about the structure or order of services, about the use of gifts, about the role of the minister in leading worship, about the frequency and role of communion, about agapes, etc. etc. The general thrill set up by Herbert Carson's contents, whether in sermon or book, is not matched by instruction on *how* to implement his principles.

C.O.B.

Leslie Francis *The Child and the Eucharist* (C.L.A., 24 pages, 70p)

This little booklet is overtly a product of Catholic Renewal. It is designed to help children understand the eucharist, and to do useful tasks before, during, and after, the service (in 'workshops') to increase that understanding. It includes lots of fun ...

STOP PRESS: As we go to press these have arrived at last, The Liturgical Commissions reports (to be debated in General Synod in February): *The Blessing of oils and the Reconciliation of a Penitent* (C.I.O., 20p) and *Services for the Sick* (C.I.O., 80p). I shall hope to comment on these next month.

Other points from letters:

From Bishop Leslie Brown:

'I'm horrified that bishops *sit* to ordain or confirm. I never have since I slipped a disc, was entirely encased in a carapace, and the next Sunday had to ordain 36 priests. Several remarked on the erect dignity of my deportment. But I knew the position was right and sitting a barbarism.'

From Peter Faulkner:

'... I shall certainly go on blessing like mad in all directions even if hard put to it to define how God works through them, but I can't help feeling he will smile and offer his grace, as usual.'

From Ian Aveyard:

'May I raise the fundamental question [about blessings—i.e. that the problem is about God blessing *people*, and not, as we had fondly thought, about his blessing objects] ... We believe in a God who loves and whose actions towards his creation are the best they can be. If the result is less than perfect that is because we are unable or unwilling to accept his graciousness. To believe that God will or can do more for us than normal implies that God does not always do his best. So in my understanding to speak of God's blessing can mean nothing extra. Its value must be to enable us to be more receptive to all that he wishes us to have and persuade us to open ourselves to what is offered ... So often the implication is that we are waiting for an unwilling Father to get on with his giving ... [But this would apply to all petitionary prayer, would it not?—COB]

From Andrew Burnham:

'The poverty of the third eucharistic prayer is gradually becoming all too evident ... It is hard to believe it is the work of either liturgists or theologians, so conspicuously inferior is it to the other Canons in Rite A ... [He then cites every point where Hippolytus is being quoted as evidence of the poor quality writing] ... It is almost true to say that any line *not* mentioned above is quoted or derived from other Canons. In any of its distinctive features this Eucharistic Prayer reveals muddled thinking and inept liturgical formulation. I shouldn't think even *ex tempore* eucharistizing would fall down so badly ... Enshrined though it is in "the book", should not the new General Synod instruct that it should not be used?'