

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 100

April 1983

## Editorial

We reach our centenary this issue. I fear that troubles in the finance department have given readers too much of having to look at Grove Books in recent months, and I want to spare you that again. So to mark the occasion I reflect briefly on the role of *NOL* itself.

I could wish now that I had started it all way back in 1964 when I first joined the Liturgical Commission. This was during the last stages of the lull before the storm broke: and when it broke, there proved to be news—live, hot and sometimes controversial, news—every month thereafter. It would have been most useful to have the record and diary going right from the start.

In the event *NOL* was the product of growing confidence in the group of younger liturgists which I chair (now known as the Group for Renewal of Worship—GROW). When we were half way through the third year of publishing Grove Booklets on Ministry and Worship (i.e. in 1974) we began to realize that the series would run on and on—and thus *NOL* could be launched on its back. (We also decided then to thin out the booklets themselves slightly by slipping in a weightier 'Liturgical Study' every third month in place of a Booklet). So *NOL* got launched in January 1975, and has appeared at the end of every month since. Its readership is into four figures, including many both in England and overseas who take it on subscription on its own for its own sake. This includes national and diocesan liturgical committees and commissions.

The element of 'record' is very important to the project. To publish firm data, accurately presented, and as up-to-date as possible, is the central aim to the enterprise. We already encounter folk relying upon it as a reference work when writing theses. We observed the same use in Kenneth Stevenson's Alcuin Club book for 1982, *Nuptial Blessing*. And we are therefore very ready to print corrections, and make apologies and amends, when we get things wrong. We always welcome such corrections. We also keep all backnumbers in stock as far as possible, and will provide photo-copies of others to order, in order that the record may be available to all who want it.

However, even the most easily duped of our readers have noticed that it is not quite *all* 'news' of this 'hard data' sort. Just an element of subjective judgment peeps through our editorial stance. We favour no-one—save our own views. We spare no-one—save our own misjudgments. We run with the hare and hunt with the hounds more shamelessly than any. We even invent news if there is not enough around. But everyone knows we do it, and bargain for that when they buy it. So we expect to continue . . .

Behind, and above, and in it all, we believe in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. We reckon that liturgy is important because—and almost because—it is how the people of God know God and encounter him and are built up into Christ. The peace of the Lord be with you all.

Colin Buchanan

## ANGLO-CATHOLIC WORSHIP

No, not last month's Liturgical Study this time, but the actual worship at the Catholic Renewal Conference at Loughborough 5-8 April 1983. How did it strike a not-very-anglo-catholic participant? And the answer is a mixture of joy and irritation.

Let us deal with the irritants first. Apparently to be catholic you have to have a measure of Marian devotions. So most services seemed to include a token spot for Mary—and, in particular, the Conference Eucharists at noon each day, began with what the programme called 'The Easter Anthem' (not the one in the ASB!)—*Regina Coeli*:

Joy to thee O Queen of heaven, alleluia.  
He whom thou wast meet to bear, alleluia.  
As he promised, hath arisen, alleluia.  
Pour for us to God thy prayer, alleluia.

Tune: as for *Jesus Christ is risen today*—which I should have loved to have sung in Easter week. The Hail Mary came in the middle of the Rite A intercessions (and it is not even in a 'you' form) and was a serious irritant there. And on the Thursday we ended the eucharist with *Faith of our Fathers* by Faber:

Faith of our fathers, Mary's prayers  
shall win our country back to thee . . .  
Faith of our fathers! Holy faith!  
We will be true to thee till death.

'Night prayers' were built around devotions before the Sacrament reserved in which the reserved wafer was brought from an upstairs room to be 'exposed' on the communion table, and raised in its monstrance to 'bless' the people. As I said in last month's editorial, these sorts of devotions strike me as wholly unrenewed catholicism. And my impression of the Church of Rome is that extra-liturgical devotions are on the wane in proportion to the renewal of the church. Even Loughborough 1978 did not use a reserved wafer this way, and if this is part of the programme of Catholic Renewal it will help to make it divisive and sectarian, and *not* a broadening and all-embracing movement.

The third area of irritation caused me less problems, but the Conference more. The eucharistic text printed in the programme had the following variants from Rite A (among others) included:

1. At the 'offertory' the Roman text 'Pray, brethren, that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God'—though, interestingly, the Roman offertory prayers with their response (which is in Rite A) 'Blessed be God for ever' were not included.
2. In the Lord's Prayer the 'embolism' ('Deliver us, Lord, from every evil . . .') came after 'but deliver us from evil'—with the slightly comic effect which Rome has that the Lord's Prayer addresses God as 'thou' till it reaches the doxology, when it goes all ICET.
3. The Roman prayer for peace following the Lord's Prayer was included.
4. The Peace itself came in the Roman position.

On the three days, the Bishops of Leicester, London, and Chichester in turn were the presidents, and each reverted in some degree to Rite A—Leicester more thoroughly than the other two. Each of them had the Peace in the Rite A place. But the Bishop of Leicester was sufficiently provoked by the text as printed to say hard words about it in his address on 'Christ is our Peace in his Church'—calling it a 'pedestrian imitation of Rome'. So somebody somewhere must have had a red face.

These Conference eucharists were 'concelebrated' by up to 80 or so priests (and perhaps half a dozen bishops). The priests sat in the front rows of the stalls, and lifted their right hands as they recited their part of the eucharistic prayer—one commentator compared them to a Nazi rally giving the Hitler salute, but the faithful will not so misunderstand any photo they see. The whole prayer still centres for anglo-catholics on 'this is my body' and 'this is my blood' and the ceremonial usages which attach would never allow the liturgical purists to make any headway with their insistence that the whole prayer 'consecrates' and the narrative of institution is grammatically a subordinate relative clause . . . So a bit more renewal here too please. The 'concelebrants' joined in more than the narrative, less than the whole prayer. Why?

Whilst looking at the reform of such concelebrations perhaps a word about bishops would be in order. They seemed a little uncertain about donning and doffing their headgear and one or two looked more than a little at sea. There was also purple skull-caps beneath the mitres of some, and a second stage of donning and doffing went with these. My own prejudiced view is that mitres do not enhance anything aesthetically, but when a diocesan bishop wears one in his own cathedral and such places, it does pick him out, and you can see him coming in a procession. When more than one wear mitres, then you merely get in a procession—a sight like a forest of periscopes in a crowd outside Buckingham Palace, and in the performance of the rite untidiness and uncertainty, and slightly nervous watching of each to get the donning and doffing right. Fortunately the consecrations of bishops I have attended (with up to 100 bishops trying to join in the laying on of hands) have *not* had all the bishops mitred—only the presiding archbishop, I think.

The music was rousing, and the responsorial psalms both moving and joyful. The settings of the eucharist were different each day—and better each day (in 1978 they were still on Series 2 and Martin Shaw—none of that this time). But what about all the instruments? Where are they? The organ had a monopoly—what about some renewal here?

Amongst it all, there were fine hymns, splendidly sung. There was true silence. There was love and joy and peace among the members. There was encounter with Christ. There were even some fringe charismatics ('renewal' among anglo-catholics is formally nothing to do with 'charismatic renewal'). I went to an 'open prayer group' where there was 'singing in the Spirit' along with interceding for people and praising God for all his gifts. One or two charismatic choruses, being printed in the Mayhew-McCrimmon *Celebration Hymnal* we were using, crept into the singing during communion at the Conference eucharists.

Sadly—from *NOL*'s point of view—liturgy and worship were again not part of the Catholic Renewal Conference programme of addresses and

workshops, so there was little to learn of where *thinking* is up to among them. We had a very enjoyable Conference, but I am not sure it laid down guidelines for 'Catholic Renewal'. It was painting with broad strokes on a very large canvas—or several large canvasses in turn. And when the bishops tried to define 'catholicism' they were unable—so it looks as though discovering what 'Catholic Renewal' is is further off still. Most of the attempts talked about the Trinity and the incarnation (and perhaps creation) as foundational to Catholic truth. But to one enquirer these were common beliefs of all Christians, and the interest lies far more in those *differentia* which distinguish anglo-catholicism from the rest of Anglicanism. This was left (as in 1978) almost entirely unsaid—but it surely lies somewhere in the area of apostolic succession and ministerial priesthood? Let them tell us about 'renewal' in *this* area.

Those concerned with the health of Grove Books will be glad to know that Grove Books had a good conference! The bookshop did not stock this literature, but the organizers graciously provided separate selling space in the exhibition hall. The Liturgical Study, *Anglo-Catholic Worship*, sold well, and around £300 worth of business was done altogether. Grove Books even got a kind commendation from the Bishop of Chichester, the president of Catholic Renewal, in his keynote address—and a round of applause from the Conference! Would readers please make sure their anglo-catholic friends know that we are off the Index? Sadly, despite the *ex cathedra* commendation, the Faith House Bookshop in Tufton Street still declines to exhibit Grove Booklets (which they displayed until January this year). Would all our readers please tell them we are respectable . . . ?

## LITURGY AND SPIRITUALITY

This is the title of this year's Congress of Societas Liturgica, the international, interdenominational, society, society linking liturgy teachers and practitioners throughout the world. The Congress is in Vienna from 18 to 22 August. Those who wish to come should contact John E. Rotelle, O.S.A., P.O. Box 338, Vilanova, Pa. 19085, USA. Although advance information mentions cheap flights from London, enquiry suggests they do not go on the right days! If anyone is interested in a party rail ticket (leaving London on the morning of 17 August) would he or she please write to *NOL* quickly.

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 251114)

### This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 84, *Liturgy for the Sick: The new Church of England Services*, by Colin Buchanan and David Wheaton. The new services themselves are to be published on 26 May this year in an A5-format booklet costing £1 (ASB 70). This commentary, and practical guide to the use of the services, precedes the official rites in accordance with Grove Books' long-standing custom. Just like last month's *Liturgical Study* the booklet has run over-length, so is extra good value for money. The rites themselves are authorized from 1 June 1983 to 31 December 1990.

NOTE: Grove Books intends next month to send a copy of these official services on 'inertia sell' post-free to every subscriber to the Worship series, chargeable to the Standing Order account. Those who do not want it should notify us immediately. Others who do want it should send a 1/2" x 6 1/2" addressed envelope with 17p worth of stamps on it, and £1, to Grove Books. We will try to get all posted before the May bank holiday.

### . . . and next month's

is Pastoral Studies no. 14, *Jesus or Britannia*, by David Prior. This is an investigation into rival claims of Jesus as Lord and of nationalism. It is the result in part of David Prior's reflections on nationalism whilst he was ministering in South Africa, but it is also occasioned by the jingoisms to which most Britons were tempted by last year's Falklands Islands conflict.

### . . . and News of Hymnody (NOH)

reaches issue no. 6 this month with a spirited defence by Christopher Idle against the probing attacks on the concept and execution of *Hymns for Today's Church* in recent issues of *NOH*.

### POMPEY LOVES SARUM (continued)

Last month we asked by what authority the Provost of Portsmouth was going to offer a requiem mass for the sailors who died in the *Mary Rose* in 1545. Bob Paterson of Gabalfa, Cardiff, writes in now with the far simpler question—how does the Provost know that no requiem was offered for them in 1545? He assumes that the loss of life was known ashore, and this would have been the appropriate liturgical action to take (and was not Portsmouth in the Winchester diocese where one Stephen Gardiner of impeccable catholic persuasion was bishop?). Thus, if such was the case (and the onus is on the Provost to show it was not!), then the only thing left to do is interment—for which the Provost does not propose Manrician rites anyway.

The nagging further question *NOL* had was the question of next of kin. There may be up to half a million people or so descended by direct line from those sailors, and it is the nearest members of the bereaved family who have rights under the Worship and Doctrine Measure to object to the service proposed. Would Protestant descendants please now write to the Provost and lodge any objections they have—particularly now with respect to the interment.

These columns are open to the Provost (a regular subscriber) to make any statement he wishes.

### Book Reviews

Marion J. Hatchett, *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer 1776-1789* (Seabury Press, New York, 213 pages, U.K. price £17.50 from S.P.C.K.)

To his fine comprehensive commentary on the new American Prayer Book, Professor Hatchett has now added this study of the earliest American Prayer Book of 1789. It is the very first complete and detailed history of the composition of that book ever to be written, and it is done with the same thoroughness and clarity which marked his work on the current Prayer Book. Each step in the process is described in detail, original documents are frequently quoted, and extensive notes and a substantial bibliography round off the volume. His labours not only lay open much detail not previously known but also set the record straight at a number of points. In particular, he clarifies the part played by the proposed Prayer Book of 1786 in the making of the 1789 book. This study will obviously be of most interest to American Episcopalians wanting to know more about the origin of their Church's worship, but because of the American Prayer Book's influence elsewhere within the Anglican Communion, and outside it, it should be of value to others interested in the evolution of the Anglican liturgical tradition.

Paul F. Bradshaw

[We do not usually have reviews of our own publications, but thought the following is gain to our columns . . .]

Colin Buchanan (ed.) *Anglo-Catholic Worship: An Evangelical Appreciation after 150 years* (Grove Liturgical Study 33, 1983, £1.50).

Grove Liturgical Study No. 33 is subtitled 'An evangelical appreciation after 150 years', and the implied compliment to catholics is genuine. Evangelicals are now engaged in a study of liturgy that has the same objects and methods as catholics use, and the resulting good temper enhances the quality of everybody's work. This booklet is more than a gracious sesquicentennial gesture; it refines issues in a way that furthers theological dialogue.

To a great extent the contributors rely on literary evidence, and the lack of practical experience occasionally shows. David Gregg, for instance, seems unaware that catholic Anglicans have always emphasized 'guidance' rather than 'penance' in the confessional in a way that until Vatican II made a great gulf between their practice and that of the Roman church; and the use of that sacrament among Anglicans has been much more widespread than he allows.

Imitation of Rome is a dominant theme of the booklet. The reasons for this tendency have rarely been examined, and it may help to begin the examination here. Church of England ritualism arose at a time when continental travel was becoming easier, cheaper, and commoner. This helps explain why English Roman Catholic influence on Anglican ritual was always less important than the continental. Not only did Anglican catholics harbour a deep antipathy for the Italian mission; Englishmen are always susceptible to exotic colour.

Desire for the colourful plays a role in all ritualism, secular as well as religious, but Anglican adoption of Roman customs and ideals has more serious elements. In liturgy, as distinct from ceremonial, there is a high

sense of western cultural identity and the heritage of *Romanitas*, which marks the work of Dom Gregory Dix and others, many of whom never adopted Italian baroque ceremonial. (Italian baroque ceremonial was always rare, and largely confined to London, Brighton, and the south coast).

Before Vatican II Roman style ceremonial was usually called 'western use'. This distinguished it from 'Sarum use', the enthusiasm of Percy Dearmer and his followers, who aimed at restoring mediaeval English rituals. The western lobby derided the Sarum use's archaeological and romantic liturgy, and held that it was anti-ecumenical and isolationist. Both sides had respectable intellectual arguments, and the asperity between them was at times acute. The Study assumes too readily that the westerners were in sole charge: the Sarumites were probably more numerous and certainly more influential.

Realize that a booklet cannot say everything, and I value this one more for its stimulation than for its reportage. I notice that the view of ministry expressed never takes account of the representational character of all Christian ministry, and I see in the implied debate—explicitly mentioned by COB at the end of the booklet—the next initial stage for Catholic-Evangelical dialogue.

Two lesser details make me react.

Could we exterminate the phrase 'in the context of the eucharist'? This would help us to recover the idea of the Christian assembly naturally including the ministry of the word, the eucharist, and whatever else is proper to a particular occasion. The separation of the eucharist from other activities of the assembly is the root of many liturgical ills, and incidentally gave rise to the solecistic use of 'synaxis' for the liturgy of the word.

And why has the editor resuscitated the word 'anglo-catholic' in other than an historical sense? He must have noticed that the people so described do not call themselves 'anglo-catholics'. Are we being invited to start using the word 'anglo-evangelical'?

+ Richard Leicester

### EVANGELICALS AND THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

A passing remark in *NOL* in January, when we were discussing the Assembly of Evangelical Anglicans and its motion on lay presidency, referred to its stance on the ordination of women. Last our remarks were so cavalier, we have been requested to put in the actual statistics of the voting on the various orders and the admission of women to them. The Assembly wanted women to be deacons (80-0, with 8 abstentions) wanted women to be presbyters (48-29, with 11 abstentions) did not want women to be bishops (27-41, with 20 abstentions).

### THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION

The Liturgical Commission met with diocesan liturgical representatives in Church House, London, on Thursday 21 April. The services for use with the sick (along with the 'Reconciliation' rite which failed) were the subject of brief introductions by members of the Commission in the morning. In the afternoon the diocesan representatives worked in groups to discover what they wanted the Commission to do for them. Some suggestions were structural (e.g. investigate how the diocesan committees were actually appointed, and ensure that one General Synod member is

on each in order to ensure that the committees know what is happening in General Synod (if they fail to read *NOL*, that is)) and others included, providing help with episcopal services, doing more background documents like *Eucharistic Concelebration* (GS Misc 163), giving prominence to questions of 'presentation' of the liturgy, and so on. An unexciting but useful day.

The Commission itself went off to Stepney and into conclave. However, it can now be announced that a new participating 'Consultant' has been appointed, Mr. Robin J. Brookes, Senior Editor at SPCK, and one of those most intimately involved in the publication of Church of England rites. This is gain, not only by bringing in a category of persons somewhat lacking in the past, but by bringing in Robin Brookes himself, who is deeply respected for not only his expertise but also for his affable good relationships with all and sundry. The Commission has done well for itself.

### THE ENGLISH SOCIETY OF LITURGISTS

The Society for Liturgical Study met at Westminster College Cambridge from 11 to 13 April to consider 'Liturgical presidency'. The papers included a magisterial and pregnant contribution by Paul Bradshaw on 'Liturgical Presidency in the Early Church', which we hope will become a Liturgical Study from Grove Books later this year. Intriguing suggestions of a more modern sort came from Richard Buxton who favours not only 'communion at arm's length' but also communion in the home from TV—or even a video cassette. A touch of continuity with the tradition (not much more than a touch, we fear) made him suggest that the president of the rite (in some conventional church building, or possibly a consecrated studio) would have an 'intention' when he uttered the eucharistic prayer to 'eucharisticize' all elements which viewers might then bring into the action. Distance would be no problem—and if recordings or videos were used, neither would time lapse. Indeed we might be nearing the time when one single Christian president (the Pope?) prayed one eucharistic prayer for all time before the camera, and simply marketed the video for all eucharistic events thereafter. This would not only provide communion wherever it was needed (and give a good profit to the manufacturers)—it would also obviate any further need for an ordained ministry, or arguments about validity. If only the Catholic Apostolics had discovered this in the nineteenth century they need not have perished from the earth.

### AND A CLOSING TRIBUTE

to Miss Helen Stubbs, for many years the warden of St. Francis' Retreat House, Hemingford Grey, Huntingdon. She was a sweet Christian lady whose place in liturgical history is that she offered hospitality to the Group for the Renewal of Worship (see Editorial, page 1), and thus furthered Grove Booklets. She died on Palm Sunday and rests in Christ. We thank God for her.