

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 99

March 1983

Editorial

Our salutations to anglo-catholicism in its birthday year—150 years from that famous Assize sermon, which started it all. The true anniversary comes on 14 July, during General Synod week at York. But the second national Catholic Renewal Conference comes at Loughborough University during Easter Week, and I shall be there, I imagine festivities of various sorts will run on from then till July.

One commemorative volume was published some weeks ago—*Tracts for our Times*, published by St. Mary's Bourne Street London, and edited by Tom Sutcliffe. It is a symposium honouring Eric Mascall, who lives at the Clergy House and celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of his own priesting at Trinity this year. I would like to add my own birthday tribute to Eric Mascall. I got to know him during the hectic three months when the present Bishop of London, Jim Packer, Eric Mascall and I worked together on *Growing into Union* (S.P.C.K., 1970). This was, of course, a tract on ecumenism—but it involved a lot of sharing of our spiritualities, and of reaching large measures of agreement on sacramental theology. In the process I became tremendously glad that Eric Mascall was one of us. It is not that I have always accepted his theological thinking—though I have always stood in awe of his massive learning and his limpidity of thought. It is rather that, in his last years in employment as a professor prior to retirement, he was wide open to new light, new thinking, new formulation. 'People tell me I have changed my mind' he said 'and somehow reckon this is shameful—but even an amoeba changes, and I count myself a higher form of life than an amoeba.' Thus a meeting of minds with Eric was a *real* meeting, and was perhaps a model of what a meeting of evangelical and catholic minds should be. I hope you see this, Eric—you have given great things to the Church of England.

The *Tracts* themselves contain much of interest. Liturgy has always been a consuming interest of high churchmen (both the Commonwealth period and the evidence of the Non-jutors show that high churchmen without enough pastoral work to occupy them turn to fiddling with liturgy as a hobby . . .). It comes through in this collection. The editor has a chapter entitled 'Saving God's music and words—a brief introduction to his own desired eucharistic prayer, drawing on the 1549 rite and on the 1938 Ceylon liturgy, and adding a dash of his own (including the Benedictus Qui Venit as an Acclamation after the words of Institution). Margaret Hewitt has a chapter entitled 'Whatever happened to Series 1?'—*NOL* will be answering this question soon. And there is a contribution from Viscount Halifax from 1932 'A 1549 Catholic—much of the chapter in fact drawing upon *The King's Book* of 1543, which is not the same as 1549 at all. How Gregory Dix would have scathed juxtaposition of '1549' and 'Catholic'! Alongside these rather backward-looking liturgical contributions there are others about Anglican/Roman Catholic relations, ethics, being Bishop of London, and (delightfully from ELM himself) Christians and other religions.

But I want to write about another anniversary volume—from Grove Books and published this month. It is our Liturgical Study no. 33, and we could not let either the year or number '33' go by without marking the occasion. So I have edited a symposium from the Group for Renewal of Worship (G-R-O-W) entitled *Anglo-Catholic Worship: An Evangelical Appreciation after 150 Years* (£1.50). Readers of *NOL* will not be surprised if the Study is less than euphoric, but should perhaps realize that twenty years ago it could only have been denunciatory—not just because of the actual Church of England situation, but more because of evangelical antipathy to it at the time. Evangelicals have moved some way since then (and so has Rome, of course). So our chapters—on eucharist, initiation, offices, penance, orders, ceremonial, architecture, and music—do attempt to express positive appreciation at every point where that is possible, whilst making it clear that there are further reforms we would seek. We know why we are not anglo-catholics, and we have no hesitation in measuring the distance that divides us.

Meanwhile, the Loughborough Conference beckons (though at an enormous financial outlay!). I write as one observer who has never yet discovered what Catholic Renewal *is*. We had a conference in Southwell diocese recently, and it included an hour's lecture by David Hope on adoration of the reserved sacramental elements. On those terms 'Catholic Renewal' means renewed emphasis on antique Catholic practices. Is there genuinely *new* ground for the Catholic Movement to occupy (and would it *be* Catholic if it did?)? Or is there so little room for the Movement to manoeuvre that it can only mark time more vigorously on the same spot in the hope of convincing friend and critic that it is actually moving? And does 'Renewal' here mean anything like what it means when Romans have *aggiornamento*, or others have liturgical 'renewal' or even radical 'renewal'—let alone charismatic 'renewal'? And what does it mean in terms of knowing *God*?

Colin Buchanan

POMPEY LOVES SARUM

The Provost of Portsmouth has been solving a liturgical-cum-canonical question to his own satisfaction and with considerable publicity. The question is this: what rite should be used for the burial of the sailors from the *Mary Rose*, Henry VIII's flagship which sunk just outside the harbour in 1545 and has now been brought up? Provost David Stancliffe's answer is to have a sung *Sarum requiem mass* in Portsmouth Cathedral, with a modern interment following. The intriguing canonical question is this: if a man dies when one rite is legal (*viz.* Sarum, with Henrician glosses), but is buried when another rite has superseded it, under which lawful authority does he fall? And when the Provost has made the Declaration of Assent, under what authority does *he* fall? And if it is the requiem rather than the interment which gets the Sarum treatment, why may we not hold Latin requiems for anyone who died before 1547, on the grounds that *that* is the rite he or she knew and accepted (and would feel at home at?)? The Provost may think he is the last man on earth by some hundreds of years to use Sarum lawfully, but his principle would seem to open the door to everyone to do so. Ought he not to have to prove that he was ordained by a valid Latin rite and swear loyalty to Henry VIII before he goes ahead with this?

[More next month]

BOOKS ON CHILDREN AT COMMUNION

We did not have space last month to set out details of the literature available (though we gave advance notice of our own *Worship Series* no. 85 due in July, and advertised in the catalogue under the provisional title of *Having Children at Communion*—it is being written by Dan Young). Now we draw attention to two symposia on the subject from outside England. Both amount to strong pleas for the giving of communion to young children:

1. There is first a Church of Scotland symposium—edited by David G. Hamilton and Finlay A. J. Macdonald, it is called *Children at the Table* (C/S Dept. of Education, Church of Scotland, 121 George Street, Edinburgh, 1982, 40pp., £1.90). The contributors to this are weightily theological, and write very clearly out of the Presbyterian tradition. They have not, course, encountered the pressures from the parish communion—instead they have reflected on the relationship between the child and the adult in Christ, and come to a remarkable consensus. Very thoroughly recommended.
2. There is also a world Council symposium—edited by Geiko Muller-Fahrenholz, it is called . . . *and do not hinder them* (WCC Faith and Order Paper 109, Geneva, 1982, 81pp., £1.95). It includes a report of the 'Bad Segeberg Consultation' held in April 1980. This is interesting as taking serious account of the objection usually raised by pedobaptist denominations—that although children can be baptized, yet they cannot receive communion, as they cannot 'discern the Lord's body' (Cor.11.27f.). The argument is then stood on its head, as a true 'discerning the body' involves discerning children's place within the body (as also recognizing that self-examination required is commensurate with one's maturity in sin . . .). There is also a batch of children's testimonies as evidence, and theological essays from different confessional standpoints. An Anglican contributor is David Holeyton, the Canadian author of our *Infant Communion Then and Now* (Grove Liturgical Study no. 27).

The main Church of England document there has been up to now has been the Ely report of 1971. The Knaresborough working party will certainly have to produce a fairly thorough report also. And the literature all tends to one direction. Is there any argumentation of a serious sort going on *against* children's communion?

HOLY WEEK—EASTER EVE

Along with the new services from JLG (see pages 7 and 8 below), there is also a possibility that the Liturgical Commission will be interesting itself in official Church of England provision. One of the biggest questions relating to this is the role of the *bishop* in the Easter baptisms. Does he run a Saturday night baptism-plus-confirmation *without communion* for adults in his cathedral, sending them off for Easter communion in their parish churches? (And, if so, how does the cathedral service finish?) *NOL* would be glad to have correspondence about particular practices. Please write in.

This month's booklet . . . is Liturgical Study no. 33, *Anglo-Catholic Worship: An Evangelical Appreciation after 150 years*, edited by Colin Buchanan. For details see the Editorial.

. . . and next month's is *Worship Series* no. 84, *Liturgy for the Sick*, edited by Colin Buchanan and David Wheaton. This is a commentary on the new services of the Church of England, which consist of provision for communion of the sick, for liturgical ministry of healing, and for prayers and readings for use by the sick and with the sick. The official services are being published by SPCK, Cambridge, Clowes, Oxford, and Mowbray on 26 May 1983 for £1. They are authorized from 1 June 1983. The official booklet is entitled *Ministry to the Sick* (ASB 70, 64pp.). It will be A5 in size with a larger typesize than in the ASB 'Separates'. Grove Books is planning to send one copy to all who take the *Worship* booklets, with our end-of-May despatch on inertia sell. We will mention this again with our despatch at the end of April, when those who take the *Worship* booklets will once again get the commentary before the official text is out. This has been our invariable practice since Autumn 1972 when we published the first commentary on the final *Series 3* eucharistic text two months before its publication.

. . . and a catalogue should also come with this.

. . . and a *St. John's College Newsletter* should also come. If you do not want it, please do not write and ask us not to send it—it is simpler to put it automatically in each envelope, and you are welcome to throw it away. Please let us know if we duplicate.

ANOTHER THOUGHT ABOUT GEOFFREY WILLIS

Arthur Nelson, a Methodist minister who takes *NOL*, writes to suggest that our obituary to Geoffrey Willis in December 1982 gave a picture of him as more obstructive to liturgical reform than was the case. He cites Geoffrey's involvement in the 1959 initiation rites—and his opposition to the 'York' rite. I think I would defend the view I set out on the grounds that he preferred the primitive character of the 1959 texts to the mangled medievalisms (as he saw it) of the York rite. But in neither was he being asked to approve anything contemporary or forward-looking! What do others who knew him think?

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

John Curtis writes: 'A Mothers' Union Enrolling Member, at an admission service between Christmas Carols, reading the objects of the M.U. said . . . to promote conditions in society favourable to stable AND family life and the protection of children.' John Curtis adds 'A way in a manger?'

ISSN 0263-7170
£3.25 by inland post for the year 1983—£3.75 with *News of Hymnody* added)
GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602 201114)

LATER ECHOES OF THE RECONCILIATION RITE

The Bishop of Birmingham, who advocated the Rite stongly in Synod, now writes in his diocesan Journal that it was defeated for reasons which he finds obscure, but that he 'approves' it under Canon B.4(3) for use in his diocese. The Canon reads:

The Ordinary may approve forms of service for use . . . in the diocese on occasions for which no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer or by the General Synod under Canon B.2 or by the Convocation or archbishops under this Canon [i.e. under B.4(1) and B.4(2)], being forms of service which in the opinion of the Ordinary in both words and order are reverent and seemly and are neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter

He has also indicated that forms of the rite may be obtained from the diocesan office.

We comment on this as follows:

1. We are very sorry the good bishop finds the reasons obscure. But our readers at large will not want us to set this out yet again here.
2. We are delighted that the bishop takes the commonsense view—contrary to the reply in Synod in 1981 of the secretary-general of Synod, and contrary to the 'Legal Opinion' delivered in writing to the February session of Synod,—that the Book of Common Prayer does not prescribe for what happens re private confession and absolution (except in the case of the sick). We would like to hope that he has refuted the Legal Opinion to his own satisfaction before pleading B.4(3). If not, we will be glad to help him (see below).
3. We dare to wonder whether the bishop has not now done an overkill in relation to his own diocese. Canon B.5(2) provides that

'the minister may on occasions for which no provision is made [in the BCP or by the Convocation or archbishops] or Ordinary under Canon B.4 use forms of service considered suitable by him . . .

In other words, now that the bishop has approved a diocesan use, no other forms can be used. Indeed the BCP form cannot be used except for the sick! Had the bishop drawn the attention of his clergy to B.5(2) and told them he was making a form available, all would have been free and open. But as it is, all private ministry of confession and absolution in the Birmingham diocese must conform to the rite approved by the bishop. Has the bishop talked sufficiently to his legal adviser?

The Legal Opinion bounced around another way when Roger Beckwith wrote an article in the *Church of England Newspaper*, claiming that members of Synod had been caused offence by the production of the Legal Opinion not in advance but by a memorandum on their seats when they arrived. This led to a dignified rejoinder in the columns of the *CEA* by Archdeacon Peter Dawes, the chairman of the business sub-committee of the General Synod. Amongst other points he made, he reminded readers that COB had tabled synodical questions as far back as February 1981 to clarify the point at issue, and when he had been dissatisfied with

the answer he had asked the secretary-general of Synod to write in *News of Liturgy* about it, and had then asked a question again on the basis of his own reply to the secretary-general's explanation. So the official 'Opinion' had been well known. COB, though highly dissatisfied with the content of the Legal Opinion, has no complaint at all to register about the Standing Committee's procedure. Indeed, having been informed in advance that the Archbishop of York would read out the Legal Opinion, COB was relieved to find it in writing, and granted that we had it on the Monday, there was plenty of chance to probe its many weaknesses before the debate on the Tuesday. So much was this done that by the end of Tuesday sympathy was gathering for Brian Hanson, the Registrar of Synod and author of the Opinion, as his Opinion was being shredded and he had no right of reply! Certainly, the Bishop of Birmingham must rank as a trophy of persuasion by those who attacked the Opinion.

NOL is itching to do its own dismembering of the already mutilated corpse of the Opinion. But the Opinion is long, the post mortem is intricate, the public interest is nil, and the fact of death is already well certified. So we restrain ourselves from displaying our dissecting skills. Some time if we are short of copy it will come . . .

And a correction to the text we printed last month: in section 7 ('The Dismissal') it should be you have 'endured' not 'endowed'. (i).

BITS AND PIECES

Trevor Lloyd is proposing a booklet on 'Introducing Liturgical Change', and would be glad to hear from those with both good and bad experience of attempting it. Write to the Rev. B. T. LLOYD, 39 Rusland Park Road, Wealdstone, Harrow, Middlesex.

Collects to accompany Rite B have now ceased from our columns. As we guessed, the demand for a compilation of these proved to be minimal.

We pick up the odd complaint about the new 'Desk' edition of the ASB. The print shows through the paper, it seems. And there is no ribbon marker, despite the price.

Donald Gray, of Liverpool, General Synod, and the Liturgical Commission, picks up a recent month's 'Laughter' re *Crimond*. He asks whether it was known in England before the Coronation in 1953. This occasion publicized a borrowing from the Scottish Psalter, and it has become a great favourite at weddings and funerals in England. Or does it antedate the Royal occasion?

THE NORTH END COELACANTH

This survival has not produced much correspondence over the last month. We are prompted however to ask if any readers know when the rationale of 'The Lord presiding at his table' first came in. There is a suspicion that it was Handley Moule. Any other offers? Or any other coelacanths?

Book Review

Joint Liturgical Group (edited Donald Gray) *Holy Week Services: Revised and Expanded Edition* (SPCK published 1 March 1983 in two editions—'full edition' 160pp., £4.50 and 'shorter edition' 92pp., 95p).

I am always slightly nervous of the work of the Joint Liturgical Group. Nervous because—as one who was formerly a Methodist—it can give the impression that nonconformists are much more liturgically-orientated than is actually the case. And, dare I say it, I imagine the work of the Group, which has been very influential in many ways in Anglicanism, has been mostly lost on the Free Churches. But I stand to be corrected.

Having said that, one of the things which I always reckoned the Methodists to have, was a 'feel' for Holy Week. My first introduction to Palm Sunday, 'spy' Wednesday, Maundy Thursday and Good Friday was in that context—and the events of the week were often followed through, both in worship and in preaching, very effectively. My other big 'once-off' experience of Holy Week, with its multifarious ceremonies, (done with great drama and potency), was at Mirfield. That too was a meaningful and memorable—if slightly excessive—experience. Those two expressions of Holy Week have focused in my mind over the past two years the great desire that, just for that one week in the year, I could cease to be an evangelical Anglican. Somehow, we do not seem to have been able to learn how to use this sacred week of our redemption with the love and devotion appropriate to it. I do hope this revised and attractively presented series of 'Holy Week Services' may be the beginning of a corrective to us.

The first thing which is striking about these services is that they are traditional. Granted, alongside the more common chronological approach to Holy Week ('The Day of Cleansing', 'The Day of Teaching', 'The Day of Waiting'), the revisers have added a more thematic series as alternatives. But the overall aim would appear to be making available to an ecumenical audience of the well-tryed and tested approach to Holy Week in a modern and balanced way. Given that overall aim, they are very successful.

These services come in two editions—the shorter congregational version contains the essential parts of the services and the structure is clearly seen. Lengthy readings—often printed in full in the longer edition—are given only as references. But all parts (including the dramatic readings) in which the congregation has a part are printed in full. The longer edition contains both something of a traditional rationale for Holy Week, in a slightly amended edition of the essay by Gordon Wakefield in the 1971 book, and provides all that will be needed by service leaders. Many of the readings (although oddly only in the 'Alternative' services for Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday) are given in full, so that the leader will have all that is necessary in front of him in this volume.

The presentation of both editions of 'Holy Week' services is most attractive. They are easy to follow, bound in an attractive, striking and lasting cover, and the 'Leader's Edition' provides references to the page numbers in the 'Congregational Edition' at the beginning of each service.

One of the keynotes of these services is flexibility. That is even more obvious when they are compared with their predecessors of 1971. The variety of material has been increased, especially in terms of prayers, and they can easily be adapted to a very simple setting or a very ritualistic one. The setting suggested for all of them is eucharistic, but again, alternative

service endings are given for those who would not wish to place all of them in the context of Holy communion. One of the innovations of the 1983 edition is the inclusion of dramatic readings, which have parts for a narrator, for Jesus, for a third reader, and for a chorus. This can be an extremely effective way of covering (and 'hearing') the material in the long Gospels set for Holy Week, and having them easily available in this way will be a boon for many congregations.

If anything, the services become more traditionalist and slightly less varied towards the end of the Week. But this is generally appropriate. However, it does mean that churches from less 'catholic' traditions would be encouraged to get used to/discover the riches of the 'washing of the disciples' feet, the 'veneration' (in a mild form) of the Cross, the Reproaches, the Easter Vigil with its lighting of the Paschal Candle, renewal of baptismal vows, etc. For me, that seems a benefit, because I feel we evangelicals are missing so many good things here, but it may mean that the services (as was my fear at the beginning) will have a much narrower use than is intended. Harold Mille

STOP PRESS: PRESS RELEASE FROM CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF GROVE BOOKS

held at St. John's College, Bramcote, Nottingham, on Friday 25 March 1983, under the chairmanship of the Ven. R. K. Williamson, the Archdeacon of Nottingham.

In *News of Liturgy* in recent months Colin Buchanan has mentioned the cash-flow problems affecting Grove Books, of which he is sole proprietor. Acting on the advice of St. John's College Council, he convened this 'Consultation' to look at the prospects for Grove Books, and to advise him on the best course to take. Around 50 persons from all round the country came at their own expense to participate. They included other Christian publishers, printers, booksellers, businessmen, authors, Colleges staff, customers, those who had loaned money to support the enterprise, and a cross-section of St. John's College Council, staff, and students.

The day together included a survey of the work of the various groups of authors who provide the series of Grove Booklets, and a review of the production, pricing, marketing, and distribution of the booklets. The Southwell diocesan registrar, Mr. Peter Mellors, was in attendance for part of the day, and provided legal expertise. The Consultation agreed that a small party should look at possible ways in which a charitable trust could be established to raise capital to undergird the business and ensure its continuance. This working party will meet in April, and it is hoped that some further report can be made then.

Colin Buchanan reckons that the problems can be contained, and the business continue in its present pattern over the coming months. He does not request charitable gifts in this interim period, but would like to know of those who would be ready to give (or covenant) to any future charity, so that they can be circulated if and when the time comes. Meanwhile those who wish to give practical help are invited to recommend titles to those (perhaps particularly thinking lay people) who do not currently receive them. Increasing sales would solve the problems. C.O.B. 25 March 1983