

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 78

June 1981

Editorial

General Synod meets at York from 3 to 7 July, and from 5 p.m. onwards on Sunday 5 July it is due to give 'General Consideration' to *Services for the Sick* (GS 471) and *The Blessing of the Oils and The Reconciliation of a Penitent* (GS 472). Readers of *NOL* will already have discovered that I am a signatory and supporter of the first of these reports (despite its tacit permission of reservation against which my evangelical forebears fought), and my opposition to at least one prayer in the 'Reconciliation' part of the second report. However, the Standing Committee has appointed a single 'Steering Committee' to act in respect of both reports (whether or not there are different Revision Committees for the Steering Committee to steer), and I find myself on that Steering Committee. I had to make clear in my acceptance that I might find myself in total opposition to the 'Reconciliation' provision, for I think the Church of England has little benefit in trying to authorize material for *private* ministry, and certainly not if it proves to be controversial, and I dissented for this reason. The crucial words are in the first of the two alternative absolutions printed:

'Our Lord Jesus Christ
... forgive you your offences.
And by his authority committed to me,
I absolve you from all your sins ...'

In previous issues of *NOL* I have discussed the authority of 1662 in relation to this (January 1981), the meaning of the biblical material (February 1981), the secretary-general's answer to a synodical question (March 1981), and the exact meaning of the existing 1662 provision in relation to that answer (May 1981). My last effort now before the Synod debate concerns the *theology* of the form of words above, irrespective of their authority.

The question I ask myself is: does 'forgive' mean the same as 'absolve'? I think they do mean the same as each other in all other Anglican liturgical contexts—and traditionally Anglo-catholics have rested the authority of the priest to 'absolve' upon the wording of the 1662 text at the laying on of hands at ordination 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven.' But if they *do* mean the same, then what can the priest's 'absolution' add to God's 'forgiveness'? Surely the second part of this 'Absolution' is then theologically a resounding anti-climax, in contrast to its apparent literary form which is advertising a true climax!

On the other hand, suppose they are different from each other in meaning in this single and unique use. What then is that theological difference? Could it be that 'forgive' is substantial, but 'absolve' is merely declaratory of what God has already done? Or that 'forgive' represents what God does (on, as it were, the vertical relationship), and 'absolve' what the church does (on, as it were, the horizontal relationship)? The wholly exceptional and somewhat hairsplitting use of language which results provides a very shaky foundation for the Synod to accept this form.

I should again make it clear that I am not wanting to *ban* anything. I do not think that the church can or should make rules about what is said in private counsel. At the most it should make suggestions (and it is arguable that even then it does not need to *authorize* them). Any such suggestions should be non-controversial and openly pastoral. But of course all ministers should be free to use any material, and not just that which is suggested. That is the present position, and I think it wrong to change it.

Colin Buchanan

THE NEW LITURGICAL COMMISSION

The names of the new Liturgical Commission (appointed by the Archbishops after consultation with the Standing Committee) were released on 12 June. They are as follows:

Chairman: The Rev. Professor Douglas Jones, Durham (already announced).

Members of the old Commission: The Revs. Colin Buchanan, Donald Gray and Dr. David Hope; Dss. Diana McClatchey; and the Ven. David Silk.

Newcomers:

The Rev. Dr. Paul Bradshaw, vicar of Flamstead, St. Albans (author of *The Anglican Ordinal* and lesser works)

The Rev. Trevor Lloyd, vicar of Holy Trinity, Wealdstone (author of several Grove Booklets, and joint-editor of *Anglican Worship Today*)

The Rev. Graham Midgley, Chaplain of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford

The Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Rowell, Chaplain of Keble College, Oxford (author of *The Liturgy of Christian Burial*)

The Bishop of Leicester, Bishop Richard Rutt (contributor from Korea to *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-75*, etc.)

The Bishop of St. Albans, Bishop John B. Taylor

Mrs. Ann Warren, a journalist and lay member of General Synod

The Rev. Canon Hugh Wybrew, vicar of Pinner, Middlesex

It is apparently possible that other names will be added yet. Members of the old Commission not re-appointed (whether at their own wish or not) include Ronald Jasper, Geoffrey Cuming, Charles Whitaker, Mrs. Jean Mayland, Professor Jim Kinsley, the Bishop of Gloucester, Hugh Craig, David Frost, and Bishop Alexander Hamilton.

The new Doctrine Commission has also been appointed and includes liturgists in the persons of John Halliburton (principal of Chichester Theological College) and the secretary, Michael Perham.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

From Graham Kings: 'Heard during Evening Prayer in a Cambridge Church: the curate, instead of the versicle "Praise ye the Lord" said the response "The Lord's name be praised"—then after a short silence added "There's no answer to that, is there?"'

THE GREAT PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

I mentioned last month that I had now had a chance to read the *Hansard* of the debates on the Prayer Book Protection Bill in the Lords and Commons on 8 April. I must therefore begin by correcting an error—in the House of Lords those in favour were 28, those against 17 (and *NOL* in April reported it as 24-12). Five bishops were among the minority.

I was castigated in *Church Times* on 29 May by David Martin for calling the supporters of the Bill in Parliament 'ignorant' and 'incompetent' (see my editorial in *NOL* in April). A quick reading of *Hansard* fully confirms me in my opinion, which was originally based on compressed press reports only. In reply to David Martin (*Church Times*, 5 June) I pointed out the stupidity of the noble Lord who thought that the cut-price discounts of the ASB were designed to undercut the BCP. But now I should add one or two other gleanings:

1. Lord Sudeley said in the Lords: 'Throughout these endeavours Professor Martin has handled the press with great skill so that there is now not a single national newspaper which does not favour the traditionalists' case over the Prayer Book.' Yet David Martin himself disingenuously says in *Church Times* 'Parliamentarians have simply arrived at the same conclusion as leader-writers and contributors in all the serious newspapers: *The Times*, *The Guardian*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Daily Mail*, *The Economist*, *The Spectator*, the *New Standard*, and the *T.L.S.*' So, so, so—when parishes agree not to use 1662, then there is a wicked clerical plot afoot ('salami tactics' are David Martin's words, but in my innocence I do not recognize this literary figure of speech, and assume it to belong to Shakespeare or Bacon or somebody)—but, when the national press comes to a single mind over 1662, then they are all independent, objective, well-informed, responsible commentators. Oh, Professor Martin, you should have prevented your friend in the Lords paying you that tribute ...
2. Lord Sudeley also said: 'The old order of priorities in the objects of marriage given in the Prayer Book are the procreation of children; the avoidance or—to put it bluntly—the relief of fornication; and the mutual society, help and comfort, but it is impossible to deny that some significant shift of meaning has been achieved when this order of priorities is simply reversed. Furthermore, a lighter accent is put on fornication ... This is ignorant—any couple that wants 1662 can have it (except a certain Royal Pair—see p.8); and it is incompetent—does he really want a pastoral preparation for marriage to be based on the actual 1662 text here? (And is this what the famous few hundred polled in David Martin's Gallup poll last year wanted?)'
3. Various speakers said that 1928 would be quite acceptable as a variant on 1662. Can we believe our ears? Are the legislators who threw out 1928 in 1928, and thus legally banned it from use (see 'Laughter in Liturgy' last month) now recommending it without the benefit of law. Those who go to the law, to the law let them go. Only the marriage and burial services from 1928 are currently lawful as Series 1 services, and all others are illegal. The ignorance of the liturgical situation in the speeches was stupendous.
4. There also appeared to be ignorance about theological colleges, but I wish to return to that next month.

As this set of gleanings is all mixed up with David Martin's letter to *Church Times*, perhaps I should explain something else. He wrote 'Colin Buchanan actually conducted a burial service for the Prayer Book in his college: a singularly tasteless exhibition which eloquently tells its tale.' I of course could not conceive how he could have imagined this (Professors are supposed to write history on the basis of evidence). He has perhaps jumped (because he wanted to jump?) to wrong conclusions on the basis of a passing remark in *The Server* of Spring 1981. But the true source is *NOL* for November 1980. We refer him to it.

More next month ...

This month's booklet ...

... is Liturgical Study no. 26, *Symbolism and the Liturgy (II)*, edited by Kenneth Stevenson. This is the second symposium containing papers from the 1980 meeting of the Society for Liturgical Study in England—the contributors being Bryan Spinks, David Tripp, and Stephen Platten. Grove Books does not often offer disclaimers (our editorial stance being very broad and inclusive—especially with Liturgical Studies), but gives notice that Stephen Platten's paper on biblical imagery in liturgy is not universally agreed or agreeable ...

... and next month's

is Worship Series no. 77, *Intercessions in Worship*, by Michael Vasey. This is another booklet attempting to help in the actual use of the ASB services, and is a shrewd combination of basic principles and practical illustration.

... and a reprint

is no. 55, *Urban Church Growth*, by Eddie Gibbs—this being its fourth printing.

... and a misprint

in last month's ethics booklet *Pushing Asunder?* by John Bullimore needs correcting (and we apologize to the author). On page 23 the last words of the second paragraph should read 'In this point he was *incorrect*'!

... and 1982 diary

from Filofax (seven days to a page) is now available @ 74p.

... and some future plans for 1982

include the launching of yet another series—Grove Spirituality Series. A group convened by Ian Bunting is already at work on these booklets and the provisional plan is to publish them three times a year (in February, June, and October) in months when the current booklets only come one in a month. Standing Order customers will be asked when renewing whether or not they want these—from August renewals onwards. Another strong possibility is a matching companion/supplement to *NOL* entitled *News of Hymnody*. We should be very glad to have reactions to this suggestion.

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

**GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602 251114)**

OTHER SYNODICAL BUSINESS

Apart from the directly liturgical matters (see Editorial on page 1), General Synod in July is due to debate the 'Filioque' clause in the Nicene Creed on Monday 6 July (but not of course to take any decisions at this point), and to debate divorce and remarriage on Tuesday 7 July, when the Bishop of Winchester will move:

'That this Synod

- (a) considers that there are circumstances in which a divorced person may with the approval of the Bishop properly be remarried in Church during the lifetime of a former partner; and
- (b) asks the Standing Committee to prepare a Report setting out a range of procedures for cases where it is appropriate for a divorced person to remarry in church in a former partner's lifetime, for consideration by the Synod before any action is taken to repeal or modify the existing regulations and resolutions of the Convocations.'

If this motion fails various other motions await to be debated, some looking for other ways to loosen the regulations, one asking for a re-affirmation of them. But if it is passed, then the other motions will presumably fall.

There are also Private Members' motions on the diaconate and the Roman Catholic lectionary, and a Winchester diocesan motion asking for the admission of children to communion prior to the age of confirmation. It is doubtful whether any of these except the one on the diaconate will be reached.

The debate on the Charismatic Movement, originally forecast for this session will now come in November. The report will be published in early September (and can be ordered from Grove Books).

IN MEMORIAM—EDWARD HARDY

E. R. Hardy may have been a name little known to most readers of *NOL*, but on the English liturgical scene he was no mean figure. He died on 26 May at the age of 72. He was an American Episcopalian who had been resident (and active) in Cambridge since 1969, and had also represented the American Episcopal Church on our Liturgical Commission as observer since then. Those who knew him may have been astonished to discover from *The Times'* obituary that he enrolled as an undergrad at the age of 12 and graduated at 14—such things being associated in our minds with England centuries ago, not with America in this century. On the other hand, once told the tale, we could well credit it. He was of enormous learning.

Edward Hardy was large and fleshy in his build, slow moving physically whilst actively itinerant mentally. He was primarily an historian, secondarily a liturgist, but he was always slightly dilettantist (what better role for an observer?), and enjoyed delivering and capping anecdotes. Because he was without passionate concern (at least in respect of English liturgy) he could always wear his learning lightly and indulge his (slightly ponderous) sense of fun when he wished. He felt like an institution, and his death further breaks the thin continuity between the last Commission and the new one. We shall miss him.

Book Reviews

Michael Davies *Pope Paul's New Mass* (Augustine Publishing, 673 pp., £4.50).

This book completes Michael Davies' learned but Lefebvrist trilogy—the other two being *Cranmer's Godly Order* and *Pope John's Council*. The burden of his complaint this time is that the *Missa Normativa* is a lapse into undiluted Protestantism, and that this lapse is *not* due to the findings and mood of Vatican II (which he can just about accept), but to the meddlesome and mischievous work of the Consilium which produced the new mass. Bugnini is his pet hate among persons—whilst his liturgical antipathies are concentrated on the Westward position for the president, receiving communion in the hand, the reliance upon Hippolytus (an early Protestant?), lowbrow and charismatic choruses, children's eucharistic prayers, and *Anything* which makes Rome more like anybody else. The word 'ecumenical' is the most condemnatory term of abuse he knows. Perhaps typical extracts would whet the appetite:

'... the most evident characteristic of the new liturgy is that it is the Cult of Man rather than the Cult of God.' (p.170)

'Tragically, the accumulated wisdom of centuries was rejected by the Conciliar Church in favour of the liturgical practice of the sects.' (p.372)

We are unlikely to see another book of this weight and this vehemence in this cause ever. Connoisseurs should read it now.

C.O.B.

Books from SPCK: SPCK have sent us a devotional book by the Bishop of Blackburn, Robert Martineau, called *Travelling with Christ* (78pp., £1.25); Emilie Griffin's 'spiritual classic' *How God Became Real* (Sheldon Press, 189pp., £4.95); two volumes in the series 'The Classics of Western Spirituality', *Hadewijch—the Complete Works* (412pp., £8.50), and (slightly unexpected!) *Ibn Al' Arabi—the Bezels of Wisdom* (302pp., £7.50); and finally a reprint of the famous Lowther Clarke *Liturgy and Worship* (868pp., £15)—a good work of 1932 and impossible to sell nowadays on the second-hand market, but the best of luck to SPCK in their adventurous reprinting. It is not actually published till 3 September, but as it is identical in every respect to the 1932 edition (except for the cover blurb) mentioning it now will not break any embargoes, but will rather have the hungry customers who reject the secondhand copies queuing pantingly for their new ones.

CORRECTIONS FOR HYMNS WITH THE NEW LECTIONARY

We have been notified of two further corrections to make:

Page 32: Note 1, Stanza 1, line 6 should read 'Of the peace . . .'

Page 153: The version of *O happy home* which is found in **WoV** (see footnote 3) is '495' in **WoV**, not '459'.

We are grateful to those who sent these in, and (with one or two corrections to the corrections!) we hope soon to have a stick-in slip available to go with *Hymns with the New Lectionary*.

LITURGY IN AUSTRALIA

Last month's *NOL* carried some remarks about liturgy in the Anglican Province of New Zealand. Now for some attention to Australia.

An Australian Prayer Book (the 'AAPB') has been in use now for over three years, and is viewed everywhere as a unitive force. It looks as though it has simply 'arrived' without vast pressures for it or against it. It is theologically cautious, and when difficulties occurred on the Commission there was a convention to return to 1662 until a way through was found. Sometimes the 1662 emphases then remained.

The eucharistic material has been of enormous benefit. In many many areas (including the vast numbers of parishes 100 or more miles in length) the eucharist is the only service in regular public use, and the text fulfils the need well. There is criticism of the collects as not as good as the ASB ones (!), and a sighing for one or two features of our English eucharistic prayers, but in general a rallying round the texts as provided. They have just begun the three-year lectionary cycles for the second time.

One half-joke got into the book. The Benedictus Qui Venit was not allowed into the text of the eucharist, but is printed in the 'Notes' following the service as 'suitable' as an anthem. However, in each of the eucharistic prayers there is *white space* following the Sanctus (said to be due to the opportunistic editing of Gilbert Sinden!)—so that parishes which wish to use the Benedictus Qui Venit there only have to put the text onto a rubber stamp—and behold it fits in. There is something not unlike our treatment of the Roman 'Offertory Prayers' about this.

The daily offices in AAPB are a delight. The Book presents a complete office for morning and evening for six days of the week, and the variety and continuity this gives seem just right.

The question of children at communion is well in arrears of the New Zealand situation. There is apparently a constitutional question in Australia as in New Zealand, and I was made aware that some raking over the exact significance of the 'Confirmation Rubric' in 1662 still lay ahead. On the other hand there was *some* openness to the notion at the National Evangelical Congress which I attended in Melbourne, though it is usually the non-sacramentalist evangelicals (and they are especially non-sacramentalist in their stronghold, Sydney) who are slowest to get the message about admitting children to communion.

The General Synod meets only once every four years, and it is due again in August. Then it will have before it further proposals from the Liturgical Commission called *Additional Services for Use with An Australian Prayer Book*. These include some provision for special occasions (the dedication of a church building for instance), but also the provision for the reception into communicant membership of the Anglican Church of baptized communicant members of other denominations (whether Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, or non-episcopalian) without calling it 'confirmation'. There are also forms for the laying on of hands and the anointing of the sick.

. . . AND AN APOLOGY TO THE MAORIS

NOL is well aware that the Maori name for New Zealand is Aotearoa, and apologizes for poor proof-reading last month.

THE ROYAL WEDDING

As the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's have shown themselves still (fairly) loyal to the Crown, in that by a 'majority' in early June they duly 'elected' the new Bishop of London, the Royal Wedding at St. Paul's is still on. Speculation is beginning to warm up about the nature of the service, but *NOL* remains serenely convinced that the Archbishop got the Royal Pair to St. Paul's especially so that he could practise his hand on the ASB. Naturally the press speculation tends to concentrate on whether the bride will say 'obey' or not—but it is possible to omit it with a Series 1 service, and to include it with an ASB one—so that a knowledge of which rite was being used would not solve that one. We are left to reflect on the possibility that the organist at St. Paul's is busy practising *Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven and Crimond*. And will there be a sermon? We will tell all, after the event.

CANADIAN LITURGICAL REVISION

Liturgical matters occupied more time at the Canadian General Synod last June than they have for some time. Synod directed the Doctrine and Worship Committee to prepare a book of alternative services for presentation at the next General Synod which will meet at Fredericton during the summer of 1983.

While there have not been any new rites published by the Doctrine and Worship Committee since the Marriage rite of 1978, that is quickly changing.

The most significant publication is that of a new eucharistic rite. After some six years of work the rite made its official appearance in February 1981. Those familiar with the general 'shape' of the Anglican eucharist today will not find too many surprises. There are five eucharistic prayers written in a variety of styles making the rite flexible and meeting the needs of a very diverse church. Something that is not new to Anglicanism but not yet general is the provision of a variety of fraction sentences. If there is novelty it is in the provision of variable prayers at the Preparation of the Gifts and after communion. Of the two editions of the rite available only the altar edition contains the variable prayers.

The rite assumes the use of a three-reading, three-year lectionary. The Lectionary, published in March, is an interim version of the CCT project working towards a common revision of the Roman *Ordo Lectionum Missae* and its derivatives.

The Calendar has appeared in two parts. As both the eucharist and lectionary assume a revised *temporale*, this material has been published with the Lectionary. Another publication, *The Commemoration of Persons*, has appeared as a separate document for study and comment.

Over the coming months a new Ordinal will appear as well as a rite for the Dedication of a Church as well as another for the Thanksgiving for a Parish (feast of dedication). Well under way are liturgies for Ash Wednesday and Holy Week which should appear in the autumn. Beyond that there are revisions under way of most of the remaining Prayer Book material. There is likely to be little quiet time for the Committee over the coming years.

David Holeton