

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 73

January 1981

Editorial

Just before Christmas the C.I.O. at last published the two reports which are the final offerings of the expiring Liturgical Commission, one *Services for the Sick*, the other *The Blessing of Oils and The Reconciliation of a Penitent* (GS 471 and GS 472 respectively—80p and 20p, available from Church House Bookshop London). These services are due to be started on their synodical course in the July 1981 group of sessions—they are not on the agenda for the February group. Then they will have to go from 'General Consideration' in July to a Revision Committee. The Committee will presumably report to the February 1982 group of sessions, and the Revision Stage then will lead to 'Provisional Approval'. The third appearance will be for 'Final Approval' in July 1982, and authorization will date from the Autumn of 1982.

The provisions have been divided into two documents (and really into three separate reports), partly because the 'reconciliation' material, though based in part on the 1662 provision for the Visitation of the Sick, is clearly intended for the use of the physically healthy as well as for the sick. Similarly the 'Blessing of Oils', whilst it includes oil for anointing the sick, has wider reference also, as it includes oil for baptism and confirmation. But there is a further reason for splitting the 'reconciliation' material from the services for the sick—and it is very personal to me. I have found myself able to sign the report for the services for the sick (which I have often wondered whether I would be able to do), but have been forced to dissent from one form of the absolution in the 'reconciliation' service. I should add that Hugh Craig, a lay member of the last Commission, has dissented from the services for the sick as well as from this absolution. The wording of our dissent from the 'reconciliation' rite is as follows:

'However, two members of the Commission, the Revd. C. O. Buchanan and Mr. H. R. M. Craig, wish to dissociate themselves from this provision [i.e. of two absolutions] for doctrinal reasons. They would wish that all the alternatives provided for absolution should be acceptable to all the main sections of the Church of England; and they do not believe that the indicative formula—"I absolve you from all your sins"—falls into this category.'

And the full text of the absolution from which we have dissented reads as follows:

'Our Lord Jesus Christ,
who has left power to his Church
to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him,
in his great mercy forgive you your offences.
And by his authority committed to me,
I absolve you from all your sins,
in the name of the Father,
and of the Son,
and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.'

It is fifteen years since I recorded dissent on the Liturgical Commission, and it is sad to have to do it again in connection with the last production of all of the departing Commission. It is also unexpected—all the points at which I have anticipated there would be difficulties have yielded to patient treatment on the Commission. But this one I did not expect. For this is a pastoral office, not really a service at all. There is no provision made for it in the Book of Common Prayer, so that, if Synod makes no imposed provision, the minister may lawfully do so off his own bat without seeking higher authority. And it has been known that the 'indicative absolution' is controversial within the Church of England. So there is no pastoral reason why this should be taken to Synod for the solemn three readings and approval by two-thirds majorities. It is quite clear that this kind of personal ministry of God's forgiveness is already in use in a flexible variety of forms, and it is in use wholly legally. It should be left that way.

However, there will be voices to say (as already they are saying), 'But this is in 1662, how can you object to it?'. There are two different levels of answer to this, to which I expect to return:

- (a) but it is *not* in 1662, except for the use of the visitation of the sick, which is a rare and restricted occurrence, not a wholesale *carte blanche*, and
- (b) we are, though it may be forgotten, revising 1662, and if the plea be that we must retain the emphases and formulae of 1662 then a large number of other matters, desired by those very people who would now criticize our dissent, must also perish.

So my counter-plea is that issues must be settled on their merits, not an attempt to wrong-foot each other by appeal to 1662. And the merits and demerits of this case (yes, with an occasional sidelong glance at 1662) I intend to pursue in the six issues of *NOL* which precede the July debate in Synod. I have here a platform, and readers will not be surprised that I intend to use it.

Colin Buchanan

MESSRS. SILK AND BUCHANAN

are doing an open conference on the ASB at Leicester Cathedral on Saturday 21 February. Ring 0533-25294 (9 a.m. to 1 p.m.).

THEOLOGICAL RENEWAL

If you are a subscriber to both *NOL* and *Theological Renewal* you should find both in this one envelope. If you do not know *Theological Renewal* you are invited to subscribe. Enough for the moment to say that it has found its natural home at Grove Books . . . It comes three times a year, and costs 65p postfree each issue to subscribers to *NOL* and/or booklets. The February 1981 issue is no. 17—backnumbers are available at 50p each.

NEW YEAR'S HONOURS

As we note the last passing of the Late Commission, so one final recognition is granted—a C.B.E. for the Dean of York, Ronald Jasper. Warm congratulations, Ronald, from the liturgical press and all our readers.

ERRORS IN THE ASB

Since Epiphany 2 every post has brought missives from those discovering as if they were the only ones, that the New Testament passage of Year 1 is recorded as Acts 10.34-48a in the lectionary on page 1051, but only 34-38a is printed out on page 464. We were notified of this error last November, but have only now discovered what we think happened. It *looks* as though the Commission and the Synod were all the time handling the shorter reading, and the reference on page 1051 is the 'true error' (though, we gladly concede, the full-orbed reading). The shorter reading is coincident with the Roman Catholic provision. But—the provision in the 1969 and 1971 reports was the longer reading, and the passage on which Synod voted, though now truly authorized thereby, was surely a misprint? The misprint must have 'corrected' in the references, whilst the reading *in extenso* followed the amputated misprint—as authorized!

And now to this month's new-true-error-spotting:

- Page 128: In line 10 of Humble Access 'son' should have a capital (Peter Taylor).
Page 146: In section 59 the word 'see' should be inserted before 'section 80' in the bracket at the end of the rubric (Peter Owen).
Page 148: In line 7 delete 'your only Son' (Peter Owen).
Page 178: In Note 12 there is a redundant full stop after 'wine' (Edward Hardy).
Page 180: In line 8 of the Gloria in Excelsis 'Jesus' should be 'Jesu' (Michael Staines).
Page 245: In the second line of section 48 'children' should be in italics (Neil Weston).
Page 246: In section 52, line 10, 'live' should read 'life' (Kevan Royle).
Page 269: In Romans 8, paragraph 2, and line 3, there should be no comma after 'Spirit' (Neil Weston).
Page 275: The Notes should be in black (Peter Owen).
Page 278: In the Hodder one-colour editions sections numbers '103' and '104' are missing (Roger Wilkinson).
Page 462: In the Gospel, second paragraph, line 8 'were' should be 'where' (Graham Palmer).
Page 680: In the last line there should be a closing of quotation marks (Peter Taylor).
Page 821: In the Gospel, the first line of the third paragraph ought to read 'many', not 'may' (David Cutts).
Page 955: In this whole section the second New Testament reading and both the Gospels are those for the Blessing of an Abbot, and complete resetting is needed (Peter Taylor—odd that no bishop has yet complained).
Page 987: St. Stephen has two 'M's, as though he always fell on a Monday (Peter Taylor).

NOTE: The above list excludes a toothcombing *tour de force* by Peter Taylor which would add about 72 items. It also excludes a whole category we have called 'doubtful' (and will probably not pay for). Both these lists will appear in February. The whole offer of 50p closes on 19 February.

ANGLICAN WORSHIP TODAY AT ST. PAUL'S

Despite what we say on page 5 about Series 3 communion still being in use for the consecration of bishops at St. Paul's Cathedral, yet just before Christmas there was an official launching of the *ASB* for the cathedral. *NOL's* observer at this occasion spotted that the leading choir-boy was carrying a copy, not of Biggles or Bunter, but, wonderfully, of *Anglican Worship Today*. We thus republicize the book as the natural companion to the *ASB* for cathedral choir-boys, and as better guaranteed for keeping them out of mischief during the sermon than Tarzan or SF. Make sure *your* choir is not being short-changed with cheap fiction . . .

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 75, *Ceremonial in Worship*, by Trevor Lloyd. Those who have found themselves within a tradition of nineteenth century mildly catholic ceremonial, or within latter-day charismatic styles, or without any light on the subject at all, will welcome Trevor Lloyd's booklet with both hands. Here are principles, here are coaching hints, and here is a gentle mockery of some of the more obtrusive oddities to be met in Anglican worship. The booklet is a breath of fresh air in a slightly stale context.

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 5, *The Wisdom to Listen*, by Michael Mitton. The 'listening' is attractively recommended, and is seen as the key to counselling and other pastoral and spiritual ministry.

. . . and the Ethics series

will come out not quite as set out in the catalogue. We now learn that the forthcoming order will be:

- 39 (January) *Happy Families!* by John Gladwin (he who has just got engaged)
- 40 (March) *Honest to Goodness* by Vernon White
- 41 (May) *Pushing Asunder* by John Bullimore
- 42 (July) (possibly) *The Human Use of Animals* by Richard Griffiths

. . . and Hymns with the New Lectionary by Robin Leaver

finally appeared on Christmas Eve. It grew and grew during the Autumn and came out at £3.50—but we supplied all advance orders at £2.50. It is rapidly building up great interest, and, we think, should be in the possession of every incumbent and organist in parishes using the new lectionary.

Hymns with the New Lectionary (Irish Church Hymnal Supplement) Harold Miller has compiled a Supplement to HNL for the Irish Church Hymnal which is available for 50p (sterling), by writing to him at St. John's College, Chilwell Lane, Bramcote.

AN INDEX TO THE ASB PROPER?

We have been sent one or two privately produced indexes to the *propers* in the *ASB*. We hope to print one next month, using a page size which will enable you to photo it (or cut it out) and paste it into a pew edition of the *ASB*.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Once upon a time on the Liturgical Commission a draft baptismal rite was sent from the Church of Ireland. They wanted the giving of a candle to be included. But the rubric read:

'Here shall the priest give the godparents a light.'

12p per copy (£2.70 by post for the year 1981)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

ASB CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS

Because of rumours of the Archbishop getting bad advice about how to consecrate bishops, and also because the bishops-to-be were friends of mine, I got on my liturgical bicycle and went to St. Paul's cathedral on 7 January. I suppose the date itself indicates the first departure from the BCP—there it was ordered that the consecration of bishops 'is always to be performed upon some Sunday or Holy-day.' However, the Canons permit the Archbishop 'for some weighty or urgent cause' to appoint another day, so we got Epiphany-plus-one . . .

I found myself revelling in the service. The new bishops were Timothy Dudley-Smith (Bishop of Thetford, suffragan of Norwich) and Mark Santer (Bishop of Kensington, Suffragan and 'Area Bishop' of London). There was an apostolic ring about the naming of 'Timothy' and 'Mark' whenever the candidates were mentioned. There was a well-ordered service, a fine sermon by Bishop Keith Sutton, and a bright January sun outside to greet us as we left. And the Archbishop *stood* with the other bishops (70 or so) to consecrate, so he must have sacked his previous advisers. It was a time of great joy. And I ran into Dr. Michael Sansom of Ridley Hall—he who wrote on the new ordinal in both Grove Booklet 60 and in *Anglican Worship Today*, 'Ordination' Sansom—and, despite the comments below, we gave the enterprise a good nine out of ten for liturgical presentation.

How could St. Paul's or the Archbishop have earned their tenth mark? One obvious way would be by graduating to Rite A! There is something oddly anachronistic in still using unrevised Series 3 communion (including 'time of trial' and all that) when Rite A has pride of place in the ASB. Perhaps the new advisers could tell the Archbishop about this new service? We also missed an Old Testament reading, and had the *Veni, Creator Spiritus* in an unrubrical, but not unsuitable, place. There was a sort of 'con-celebration' in which the Bishop of London (whose cathedral we were occupying) and the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church (who was the epistoller) stood behind the table on each side of the Archbishop and stretched out a hand in silence towards the elements during the narrative of institution, but, as far as I could see, said nothing. This might be viewed as either a friendly gesture by the Archbishop to two senior bishops of the Anglican Church, or as a liturgical woolliness. The two new bishops themselves, for all the brave opening Note 4 which Brian Brindley conned the Synod into accepting, did not 'exercise their new ministry' in the course of the service—indeed (and this is one reason why the Note was a nonsense) how could they? Were they to ordain or to confirm? Surely not? Were they to preside at communion in their own cathedrals (which some would like, and Hippolytus provides)? But they have no cathedrals and were out of their areas. Were they to 'con-celebrate'? Seemingly not, though it would hardly fulfil the 'new ministry' if they did. They did not even distribute the bread and wine.

I had hoped the service would be enriched by a Dudley-Smith hymn or two—perhaps, I even hoped, his unpublished material included one appropriate for this occasion. But it was not to be. When I asked him about it later, it proved that he could have had one, and Mark Santer had urged him to. But he himself thought it not appropriate, and we have to bow to

his genuine self-effacement. One is still left wondering when another modern hymn-writer is likely to be made a bishop, and whether therefore a good chance was missed.

But enough of the minutiae. It was good to be there.

C.O.B.

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

I much appreciate your invitation to state in full my objection to the Third Eucharistic Prayer. The images and concepts it borrows from Hippolytus are unexceptionable but often badly managed. Thus 'he . . . was manifested as your Son' (Jasper/Cuming translation), reflecting a Johannine Christology, comes out as 'as your Son . . . was seen on earth and went about among us', which implies a degree of recognition which the predominant New Testament witness would suggest was achieved only by hindsight. The Roman *Prex Eucharistica II*, also derived from Hippolytus, wisely omits this notion. The image of the resurrection is similarly badly managed.

The passive 'raised' is theologically tighter than the active 'rising', which revisions of the earlier Anglican eucharistic prayers have recognized, but this prayer persists in presenting the resurrection as an initiative by Jesus.

Similarly the 'gathering into one' in Hippolytus is also mismanaged. The unity of all who share the one eucharist becomes in this prayer the unity of the particular folk at the particular eucharist 'so that we, in the company of the saints, may praise and glorify you for ever'.

The most serious flaw of all does not derive at all from the Hippolytan canon. In saying that it is Jesus 'from whom all good things come', this prayer breaks new theological ground in an altogether unacceptable way. Why bother praying to the Father if it is the Son who is the source of all?

What I suspect is that the Catholics who participated in the compilation of the Prayer were less interested in Hippolytus than in Roman prayer 2 (albeit in English translation). So Jesus *put an end to death* (untrue) instead of *destroying* death (which is how Jasper/Cuming translate Hippolytus and what the Latin 'mortem solveret' in the Roman prayer really means). Again, 'Lord, you are holy indeed' (which is Rome not Hippolytus) is a linking of Sanctus and epiclesis which works well in the Roman Prayer ('Sanctus . . . vere sanctus . . . omnis sanctitatis . . . sanctifica') but which does not work at all in this prayer where there is no petition for the gifts to be made *holy*, and where, as a result, the connection is not made ('Holy will' scarcely preserves the continuity of idea and 'Holy Spirit' functions only as a proper name).

In short, the third Eucharistic prayer mismanages Hippolytus, stumbles when it makes its own way and relies too heavily on the Roman prayer without either correcting the infelicities of its English translation or preserving the momentum of its ideas. With very little revision it could be an excellent prayer but, alas, it has been incorporated prematurely into the relative permanence of the *ASB*.

Andrew Burnham

A PASTE-IN LORD'S PRAYER

is advertised by the S.P.C.K. (9 labels for 30p) from March. Please do not order from us . . .

Book Reviews

Colin Hodgetts *Exploring Worship: a group study guide* (Mowbray, £1.75).

Colin Hodgetts writes out of his experiences with the Othona Community in Essex of 'what happens when we cease to approach worship as an activity of the mind and begin to allow the heart and the body to have their say'.

Here is an experimental programme for a small group meeting once or twice a week for two hours. Leadership need not be expert. (Does he underestimate this?) His experience-centred practical work, backed up by discussion and helpfully provocative quotations, includes relaxation and breathing exercises, Yogas and mantras, (the first time I've heard 'Father, we adore you' described as a mantra!), practice in public Bible reading, foot massage, comparison of different translations of the Bible, evaluation of hymns, thinking critically about building and space, drama and dance. Those used to encourage groups would feel at home, others might feel very uncomfortable.

There is certainly a need for more experiential learning in churches, but some of the writer's omissions and inclusions are puzzling, even alarming. Why no mention of the sermon and biblical exposition (though he looks at story-telling)? Is it because he sees no place for it? And why Yoga and mantras when there is a soundly Christian tradition of contemplative prayer? He is reductionist about creeds—'the real problem of creeds . . . is the psychological one—why we need to say them'.

Some of his ideas are good, but I think a church house group adopting his whole programme would discover it had been offered a deficient diet.

Anne Long

Roger Beckwith *Using the ASB (Rite A) Communion Service: A Study Guide* (Latimer House, 50p)

This is a fourteen page study guide from Latimer House, written by Roger Beckwith, who has always been a keen advocate of a modernized form of 1662 Holy Communion. The booklet reminds us in no uncertain terms that the 1662 Prayer Book is still our standard of worship and doctrine, and that it is permanent in its authorization, whereas the *ASB* is temporary. It even floats the idea that the 1662 Prayer Book may still be around in 2262! This Study Guide outlines the history of the *ASB* from 1928, through series 1, 2 and 3, and asks the question 'What becomes of the booklets?' (pointing out these are still available, and that four parishes in Carlisle diocese have produced their own booklets containing only the Order following the Book of Common Prayer).

The overall impression which comes across to me is that Beckwith is rather sad to see any *ASB* at all, and that his sympathies lie with David Martin and his *PN Review* friends; and that any admission of improvements in the new Rite A is rather grudging. At the end of the day, I felt that the booklet could be a useful discussion-starter, and had within it some important correctives, but that it told me little of what I would have expected to hear under the title 'Using the *ASB* (Rite A) Communion Service'.

Harold Miller

A LAST LOOK BACK TO LAUNCHING-DAY

In my diary for 10 November (see *NOL* for November 1980) I failed to mention that the previous day I was at St. Aldate's, Oxford. There, at an open meeting at lunch-time, I was regaled by a psalm-singing quintet: *Ode to the Alternative Service Book 1980*

1. The Alternative Service Book [19]80 is the first fully 'authorized' service book issued by the Church of England in [more] than 3[00] years
2. It is not a replacement [for the] Prayer Book. [But a] modern [counter]part.
3. It is the consoli|dated re|sult Of some fifteen years liturgical re|vision in the [Church of] England
4. The services are authorized for use until [19]90 And any major change is un|likely this|centu|ry
5. Unless [Colin Buch|anan|has|anything to] [do with|it] [In which case you can frame it in a glass case; leave it t|your|children's|children;|or con|sign it to the|Bodleia.|Library
6. As you|probably|know: the Alternative Service Book [19]80 Is due for public|ation to|tomorrow, [Novem|ber|10]th.
7. Have|you con|sidered|placing an|order with the|Grove|Booklets For quantity orders of 50 or more copies of the limp or case-bound e|ditions, we offer a full|25|[%] discount.

(smile)

Glory be to the|General|Synod As it was in the beginning| to the Liturgical Commission| is now and NEVER|shall be|again. and|to the|PC|Cs change without|end.|A|men.

THE FEBRUARY SYNOD

Liturgy is not really a synodical item nowadays (though the services for use with the sick in July will raise echoes of the past), but the February Synod has some quasi-liturgical implications:

- (i) The divorce and re-marriage question: as far as we can understand the central issue (which underlies all other issues about 'services of blessing of civil marriage' and all that) is not being put to the Synod—so how we are to handle the secondary matters is anybody's guess.
- (ii) The 'covenanting for unity' question: this involves three knotty points as follows:
 - (a) should some of the URC moderators continue to exercise 'episcopal' functions without being made bishops after the inauguration?
 - (b) Should the manner of 'recognition' be accepted by the Church of England as sufficient for acknowledging the presbyters of other Churches to be truly presbyters?
 - (c) Can the Church of England 'recognize' the women presbyters of other Churches along with the men (and, if necessary, share in making them bishops?)

We are going to have separate votes on these issues, before approving or disapproving the whole package. And we also have a preliminary round on the question of the special majority needed for final approval in 1982. And only when we know how we stand on all these points shall we decide whether to send it down to the diocese or not.