

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 76

April 1981

Editorial

PARLIAMENT ATTEMPTS TO 'PROTECT' THE BCP FROM THE CLERGY'S REJECTION!

I write the day after the Prayer Book Protection Bill was given a welcome by both Lords and Commons on Wednesday 8 April. Lord Sudeley's bill in the Lord's was passed by a vote of 24 to 12, and Viscount Cranborne's similar bill in the Commons by 152 to 130. *The Times* had backed the concept (though not necessarily the method) in a leading article that day, and although the government for very respectable reasons had had to oppose the bill, yet a substantial turnout in the Commons reflected genuine concern, and an unwillingness to be diverted from their purpose. Writing the next day, in some slight sense of shock, it is difficult to get it all into focus.

What did the bill seek to impose on the Church? Briefly, that any 20 members of the electoral roll (I have printed the text late in this *NOL*) could by petitioning require the incumbent of a parish to have as the main service once a month a service from the Book of Common Prayer. The presuppositions on which the proposals are based are staggering, and the questions they raise far-reaching. We shall try to address these.

The presuppositions seem to have been the following (and some were explicit in the debates):

- (i) the clergy have plotted together to remove the BCP from the Church of England's worship
- (ii) the theological colleges have ceased to teach or use the BCP
- (iii) good Christian men and women are being prevented from worshipping because there is only a mess of pottage available to them
- (iv) the PCCs, being cash-conscious, would always prefer a book with a 20% discount.
- (v) the BBC has failed to give equal air space to the BCP in broadcast services (David Martin asserts that this is because there are actual instructions from the Church authorities, but I do not think this was said in debate).
- (vi) if such a main morning service were instituted for the 20 persons once a month, then there would also be present the choir, the organist, the preacher, and the usual Sunday morning number of worshippers (but what if most of these declined to attend—would that still look like and be a 'main service'?).
- (vii) perhaps the biggest presupposition of all is that *we all know what a BCP service is*. But it is at least possible that each person has a different notion. In the days of 'Uniformity' no two parishes were the same in their worship (and in 1874—yes, 1874—Parliament, amid much hostility from the church passed The Public Worship Regulation Act in order to restore uniformity in the use of 1662—and

totally failed . . .). In the days of 'Uniformity' worshippers changed parishes and gave up worshipping because they did not like the way the BCP was done in their new parish. Nowadays, no doubt, they can think that they have given up because the BCP has been denied them, but suppose in future it is given to them, but not in just the way they want it?

I believe every one of these 'presuppositions' to be false, and the vote in favour of the Bill to be an indication of the total ignorance and incompetence to judge of the majority of those present in each House on 8 April.

So what questions does it raise?

- (i) What happens if a clergyman does not do what the law requires? That is what happened after 1874, and a tiny few went to prison for contempt of court when they failed to act on injunctions against them (and others exchanged livings and went back to square one . . .!). Suppose a clergyman refuses outright? Or suppose he holds such service once, but does not find all 20 petitioners present, and this discontinues? Or suppose the PCC declines to spend money providing the actual BCPs (many parishes nowadays do not possess them, as a sheer matter of fact)? Or suppose that, although the 20 come, so many others stay away that parish life is seriously disrupted—and income reduced?
- (ii) The crucial question is, where do we go from here? Even *The Times*, whilst favouring the thrust of the Bill, said 'If parliament were to be seriously tempted to take the measure up it would undoubtedly precipitate a disestablishment crisis. [The fuss over the London mitre] . . . is only a pinprick compared to resumption by Parliament of an ambition to regulate the worship of the Church of England.' (Second leader 8 April 1981). That is only too right. The Church of England has been gently gaining independence of state control over recent years, always by agreed steps. Theologically such an independence is non-negotiable. It is not only that Parliament represents a different area on the ground from that covered by the Church of England (and it does). It is not only that Parliament does not have the energy, competence, or knowledge to govern the Church of England (though it does not). It is above all the fact that the State is not recognizably Christian, and it is wholly improper for the Church to allow to Caesar that which is properly God's. We can live with a situation where the disentangling of the Church from the apparatus of being a department of State takes some time, and at any one time is incomplete. At least the direction is set. We ought to be able to live with the possibility of being so dis-established as to lose some of the Church Commissioners' millions (and to be ready for that cost if it were required of us). At a pinch we can cope with the procedures for appointing a diocesan bishop so long as we can hope for better soon (and the stink over the procedures in relations to the 'London mitre' may, I dare hope, have hastened that day—for the great trumpeted advantage of the present system, its secrecy, has been so violated as to become a great liability). But what Parliament has attempted in the Prayer Book Protection Bill is a unilateral amendment of the existing 'deal' in the Worship and Doctrine Measure. It would be possible to imagine Parliament asking for a joint enquiry of Synod and Parliament into the workings of

the Measure after five years of use. It would be possible to imagine such a joint enquiry leading to an amending Measure to go through Synod and on to Parliament. But it is wholly unimaginable that Parliament should decree, simply because it possesses the powers, that it will revert to the pre-1920 position, act as though it were re-nationalizing the Church of England, and welsh on all the agreed procedures governing the delicate Church-State relationship.

So the problem is not what the Bill if passed would do in the parishes—most parishes are already sensitive to the known needs and desires of any 20 members of the electoral roll who can express themselves jointly. The problem is not whether the presuppositions set out are accurate or not. The problem is not whether the Bill will ever become law or not (it probably will not, I gather, for lack of time). The problem is whether the Church of England retains any duties to a Parliament which has so signally and provocatively reneged on the existing relationship. If Caesar comes so threateningly close, then the issue of what is his and what is God's is sharpened in a way we have not seen for generations.

Colin Buchanan

PERSONAL

Just a reminder to readers of *NOL* that I am in Australia for the first three weeks of May including attendance at the National Evangelical Anglican Congress (NEAC) in Melbourne 11-15 May. I detect that the question of children at communion is beginning to become irresistible in Australia—the issue will not go away until the rules are changed. I hope to play my part in that. Meanwhile, it is little use writing me letters to which you want an answer . . .

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 76, *Leading Worship*, by Colin Buchanan. This booklet is especially designed to follow no. 75, Trevor Lloyd's *Ceremonial in Worship*, and enables a new look at the leading of worship to accompany the introduction of the ASB into parish life. There is an attempt to lay out 'some gentle ideology', and to move from there to practical advice, without duplicating what is to be found elsewhere. (Incidentally, as the Worship Series reaches no. 76, it this month carries the same number as *NOL* does. Next month *NOL* will go ahead. One or two ambitious authors are already trying to get their names down for Tract no. 90—on present trends it will come in October 1984, and we will keep you posted.)

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 6, *A Place in the Family*, by David Gillett, Anne Long, and Ruth Fowke. The purpose of this booklet is to discuss (from experience) the role of the single person in the Church, and the ways in which the Church adapts itself to the singles and uses them as a resource (or treats them as an embarrassment).

A BILL INTITULED

An Act to provide for parishioners of any parish to require certain forms of services to be used in the parish church. A.D. 1981.

BE IT ENACTED by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lord's Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—
1.—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 1 of the Measure of 1974, where not less than the requisite number of persons whose names are on the church electoral roll in a parish make representations to the incumbent of that parish in accordance with the requirements of section 2 below, the provisions of subsection (2) below shall have effect.

(2) In the circumstances mentioned in subsection (1) above, it shall be the duty of the incumbent to ensure that on not less than one Sunday in every month the form of service contained in the Book of Common Prayer (with such variations as are permitted by the Measure of 1974) is used at the morning service or, if there is more than one morning service, at the principal morning service at the parish church.

(3) Without prejudice to the making of further representations under subsection (1) above, the duty under subsection (2) above shall subsist for three years from its commencement.

2. Representations under section 1 above shall—

- (a) be made in writing;
- (b) be submitted to the incumbent;
- (c) request the incumbent to ensure that on not less than one Sunday in every month the form of service contained in the Book of Common Prayer (with such variations as are permitted by the Measure of 1974) is used at the principal morning service;
- (d) be signed by the persons making the representations;
- (e) sufficiently identify the signatories to enable it to be ascertained that their names are on the church electoral roll in the parish.

3.—(1) In this Act—
'the Measure of 1974' means the Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure 1974;

'principal morning service', where more than one Sunday morning service is usually held in a church, means that Sunday morning service which the incumbent considers would, but for this Act, be normally attended by the greatest number of people;

'the requisite number' means 20 or, where the total number of names on the church electoral roll in the parish is less than 100, 20 per cent of that number;

and the expressions 'Book of Common Prayer' and 'form of service' have the meanings assigned to them by section 5(2) of the Measure of 1974.

(2) This Act may be cited as the Prayer Book Protection Act 1981.

(3) This Act shall apply throughout the provinces of Canterbury and York.

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

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)

THE TEXT OF THE ASB—FINAL ROUND

We have ceased to offer 50p for 'true errors' in the text of the ASB. Those who were due for prizes should have been given credit on their accounts, or actual cash payments. If you have any reason to think you were not, please let us know. We now near the end of the venture, airing not 'errors' but inconsistencies. Some of these were undoubtedly due to Synod authorizing contradictory materials at different times, some no doubt due to imperfect editorial processes—whilst some can be explained away if the knowledgeable will write in and tell us.

INCONSISTENCIES

- Page 28: The Rules appear to govern the use of the services in the whole book. But Rule 10 prescribes that the 'Proper Thanksgivings' of Saints' Days replace those of the season in the cases specified. This would include, e.g., St. Stephen's Day, falling in the Christmas period. But on page 819 the Christmas Prefaces are prescribed . . . (John Randles).
- Page 33: The explanations about the Psalter in Note 10 do not include why some verses (e.g. Ps. 42.6-7) are printed in italics. There is also a general oddity in not printing at the beginning of the Psalter (page 1095) a cross-reference to page 33 (John Sargent).
- Pages 76 and 79: There should be an obelus printed beside Te Deum verses 7 and 14 and Saviour of the World verse 7 (compare the presentation in the longer order, pages 55, 56, and 57) (Brian Brindley).
- Page 154: Why has 'And now we give you thanks' been detached from the text of the Proper Prefaces in the 'Altar Edition'? It still has to be sung as a continuity so why create extra page-turning? (John Pratt).
- Page 159: Why is the Blessing of Epiphany in Rite A the Blessing for Christmas in Rite B? (Peter Chadwick).
- Pages 215, 220: The Lord's Prayer should have a space before the doxology (Charles Whitaker).
- Page 225: In Note 6 the first bracket ought to include the words '14 or 21', not '14 and 21' (Peter Broadbent).
- Page 232: In section 20 the word 'him' in the rubrics ought to be italics (twice). An oddity here is that there were no such italics in AS 330, but they were added in the ASB at section 55, but not at section 20 (David Lee).
- Page 258: Was the prayer at section 87 intended to be identical with that at section 100 (page 277), for it has a different address to God? (Patrick Blair)
- Page 333: The last line is wholly otiose as the two Prefaces concerned have just been printed out (Mark Tweedy).
- Pages 341, 353, 368, 385: On three of these pages (but not on page 368) the instruction 'Stand' precedes the (optional!) Canticle or Hymn at section 7, but on page 368 (a 'true error' recorded in December *NOL*) there is no instruction at all (whereas on page 122 the instruction precedes the Gospel . . .) (Peter Taylor).
- Pages 344, 356, 370-1: Are the 'job-descriptions' the end of the Presentation or the beginning of the Declaration? (David Lee).
- Page 435: In line 3 the word 'fullers' ought to be 'fullers', and it is likely that the NEB is itself in error here (see Hebrew and other versions) (Greg Forster).
- Page 449: Should there not be a note about the unsuitability of Preface (3) with the Third Eucharistic Prayer in Note 13 on page 116, or with the Prefaces on page 154 (and see also pages 819, 821, and 823)? (Peter Taylor).
- Page 458: The heading to the Gospel ought to include '19-end', not because the reference is wrong, but because this the usual ASB presentation (and see also pages 864, 939, 942, 966, 969, 1055, 1066, 1069) (Peter Taylor).

- Page 477: The Old Testament reading, which is announced as verses 22-30, in fact finishes at verse 29, and the same happens again on page 825—and it is a good verse missing (John Sargent—this seems to be a late 'true error').
- Page 602: In the first Sentence (but not in the second) quotation marks are used for Jesus' direct speech. This is unusual, but other instances also exist (COB).
- Pages 789, 855, 860, 866, 877: Why not refer to 'Saints' Days' in directions about Proper Prefaces in Rite A (see page 157)? (Peter Taylor)
- Page 818: In the New Testament passage of St. Stephen's Day, why is 'him' not replaced by 'Stephen' in line 2? (T. R. Barker and David Cutts)—who refer us to the Commission's *Commentary* page 271).
- Page 988: The note in the middle of the page uses 'read' as the last word, but on page 1018 it is 'used' (Peter Taylor).
- Page 1071: Grammatically the last line but one should read '. . . to either the day . . .' (Peter Taylor)

It is, I think appropriate that the indefatigable Peter Taylor should get in the last word for the moment. We are giving this issue a rest for the moment (though we still have tiny queries held over). However, we hear from John Andrews (and no doubt others are writing also) to point out that the new blue SPCK/CUP/Clowes with Psalter edition has corrected some of the errors listed (though still missing, e.g., 'covenant' for 'covenant' on page 689 and others elsewhere). So somebody must have had a go at putting some corrections onto the master-tape.

This is where we ought to ask SPCK to issue a statement. Come on, Patrick Gilbert, Robin Brookes, et al. Do not be shy. We think you have done a pretty good job overall, and the ASB is a fine piece of craft, so you do not need to be defensive—but what errors do you officially admit out of our list? And which deny, and why? And which have you now corrected? And which not, and why? The very short character of the list will surely bolster your self-confidence, but do, do tell us.

OMISSIONS

We have not included this month corrections to *Hymns with the New Lectionary* (we reckon to put them in in a month which has no corrections to the ASB) nor further discussion of confession and absolution (promised earlier and avidly awaited by all our readers). But see *NOL* for May . . .

Book Reviews

E. C. Whitaker *The Baptismal Liturgy* (2nd edition, SPCK, 1981) 106pp., £2.95

Charles Whitaker's small book, *The Baptismal Liturgy*, was originally published by Faith Press in 1965, and it has been an enormously useful introduction to the history of baptismal liturgy for many many students in that period. Sadly, it has been out of print for some time (Grove Books have even had desperate persons urging us to republish it as we did with the Charlie Moule *Worship in the New Testament*). Now Charles Whitaker has marked his retirement from the liturgical scene (a very thoroughgoing retirement, for he is not only standing down from all liturgical Commissions, not only retiring from his rural parish near Penrith, but he has also sold all his liturgical books (to whom? you ask), and does not intend to do more than dabble in baptismal waters in his retirement) by preparing a second edition.

The usefulness of the original is greatly enhanced. His first edition was avowedly concerned only with the Western Church, but he now incorporates a proper concern with the Eastern rites in his early chapters. Equally, his *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, which itself expanded agreeably between first and second editions, is now cited in its second edition. And, as a real bonus, Charles Whitaker has added chapters on the new Roman rites and the ASB rites (which latter he himself did much to bring to fruition). He discusses very fully in this last chapter the issue of the relation of water-baptism to the laying on of hands, and the drafting problems which faced both Commission and Synod in writing liturgy without clear guidelines. And, it will be no secret to those who know ECW's foreword to the second edition of his *Documents*, or his *Sacramental Initiation Complete in Baptism* (Grove Liturgical Study no. 1—a few copies still in stock!), he has the wisdom to come down in his own person on the 'one-staging' side. That does not prevent him writing good history.

This book is obviously going to be a standby for all teachers of baptismal liturgy in England for years ahead. Let the SPCK take a bow for getting it back on the market, and so aptly up to date. A little bird tells me that ECW himself will be dragged from his Lake District retirement soon to be awarded a Lambeth B.D. *honoris causa*. He has richly deserved it. He may be almost the last to embody in his own person that fine tradition of the learned Anglican country clergyman. We all stand more than ever now in his debt. I do hope you enjoy your retirement, Charles.

C.O.B.

B. D. Spinks (edited) *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies on the Themes of Thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies—In Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin* (C.L.V., Rome, 1981) 272pp., around £10 sterling.

Another name famous in Anglican liturgy comes up in this book—the name of Arthur Couratin. And the title of the symposium is apt, for it picks up Arthur Couratin's sermon under the same title, preached on 24 April 1955, and published in *Theology* in August 1955. In one sense the date also

indicates Couratin's zenith—he waxed ever more influential (along with Edward Ratcliff, who was his invariable resource person) in the Church of England from the death of Gregory Dix in 1952, until the death of Ratcliff and his own resignation from the Liturgical Commission in 1967. 'The Sacrifice of Praise' and his paper in *The Parish Communion Today* under the title 'The Thanksgiving of the People of God' (1962, and strangely missing from the bibliography here on page 14) were most expressive of his theology of the eucharistic prayer, and his intriguing further essay here—really a fragment—adds to the picture. Personally I can only conclude that Couratin inherited the mischievous mantle of Dix along with his learning and, although I honour his integrity (and revere the memory of him in the years I overlapped with him on the Liturgical Commission), I have difficulty in agreeing that the primitive evidence actually leads to his conclusions. He is avowedly drawing again upon his mentor Ratcliff, but, as with the earlier joint theory of the place of the Sanctus in the second century canon, the tendency to build a 60% 'probability' upon another 60% probability and found that two-storey building on a third 60% probability (which is exactly what Dix does) leads not to a likely conclusion but only to a 21.6% probability.

The other essays are far-ranging. Of the eucharistic ones the one by J. M. Barkley on "'Pleading his eternal sacrifice" in the Reformed Liturgy' calls most for refutation, while Boone Porter's survey of American contemporary anaphoras delivers us even more suddenly out of the catacombs into the present. And for a last quick trip back, I recommend Sebastian Brock's essay on 'The Transition to a Post-Baptismal Anointing in the Antiochene Rite'.

There does remain a certain sense of *déjà vu* sameness, but perhaps any attempt to shuffle the pack of well-known authors is bound to produce that result. A greater grief to me personally was the very thin character of Melrose's 'Biographical Note'. Would that some rounding out of the man as a whole, and his ministry and influence as a whole, could have replaced the obituary to the oblation of the bread and cup on which the Note fastens for all too great a proportion of its two-page length.

C.O.B.

Norman Todd and Micheal Kindred *Four Celebrations: A Teaching Course on the Eucharist within the Eucharist* (C.I.O., 1981) 28pp., £1.30. This has just been published. We hope to have a full review next month.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

It is appropriate to follow the review above with a recollection of one of Arthur Couratin's maxims, presumably used in his days as principal of 'Staggers' (1936-62). The embarrassing feature of it is that we have lost the postcard on which it was sent, and failed to record the name of the sender (an old student of Staggers?). We apologize sincerely and ask him to get in touch with us. The quotation reveals AHC responding to liturgical renewal . . .

'If you must go round behind the altar, old boy, don't go and kneel down, or you'll look like the head of John the Baptist on a platter.'