

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 103

July 1983

Editorial

This issue seems to be all about women—mostly deaconesses and women deacons. Simultaneously *News of Hymnody (NOH)* for this month has over half its space devoted to an attack upon 'sexism' in hymnody. It may be an appropriate moment to re-open the question in these columns also. I attempt to do so on this occasion somewhat historically rather than prescriptively.

There are three stages of removing sexist language from the liturgy. They are as follows:

- 1 Rubrics which may be followed by persons of either sex ought not unnecessarily to include *he*. The Revision Committee which touched up Rite A determined to avoid this trap, and thus the intercessions (for instance) may involve both men and women indiscriminately without the rubric apparently loading the position.
- 2 The use of the generic 'man' and 'men' in the text may be revised. This occurs frequently, not least in the Creed ('for us men and for our . . .'), and the Americans have changed it there. It does start to stand out in the text of prayers now, but in 1979 the Synod was asked (by COB) to consider whether it accepted the argument that all generic uses of 'man' were at an end, and, if so, whether it would then act ruthlessly on the excision of such terms. Synod preferred to view such terms as still viable (as in 'in man for man the foe'). But the *NOH* article urges that they have ceased to be.
- 3 The use of the masculine for God may be altered ('Our parent in heaven'). America is certainly well on with this sort of programme. The Wren article does raise the consciousness of women in a serious way—how do men's terms affect their prayers? It is true that the pronoun in strict gender for the Holy Spirit in the New Testament would be 'it' rather than 'he', though we must argue for his (sorry, its) personhood within the Trinity. But how far can we disembowel the imagery of the New Testament and have a language of prayer which is not only in visible continuity with the tradition of the church, but also can live in the heart of a person devoted to the New Testament?

The ASB has not yet reached stage 2. So where do we go next?

Colin Buchanan

COLLECTS WITH THE ROMAN LECTIONARY

One of the side issues raised by the Roman Catholic three-year lectionary (along with 'ordinary Sundays' or 'Sundays of the year') is the provision of English-language collects. The Australian Liturgical Commission is having another go at providing its own Anglican set to go with the lectionary, and our friend and contributor, David Frost, is announced as the author-to-be of them. Those who know him well also know that he will strive not to have his writings amended in committee or in Synod—so, reading between the lines, it looks as though he has bargained for a free hand to write collects—and has got it.

GENERAL SYNOD—(i) MAKING WOMEN DEACONS

The decisions in general of the last eighteen months took a further step forward at York on 13 and 15 July. Essentially the Synod was debating (at 'General Consideration') the 'Draft Ordination of Women as Deacons Measure', and the overwhelming acceptance of that now means that a Revision Committee has to take aboard the actual submissions made by members of Synod and bring back a revised text of the Measure for 'Provisional Approval' (after revision in full Synod). After that the Measure will be referred to the dioceses and will require the assent of more than 50% of the diocesan synods (assent can be refused by any one of the three Houses). Then it would come to General Synod again for 'Final Approval' and go on for Parliamentary Approval (overseas readers are invited to avert their glance from this dreadful step and read on). With approving votes at each stage, and a fair wind in general, it could all bring about the actual ordination of women as deacons in the first part of 1985 (thus securing their status as 'clergy' before the elections to General Synod in September 1985).

However, the Draft Measure includes provision for making existing deaconesses deacons, and this led to a synodical tiz-waz. Clauses 1(3) to 1(6) make provision in principle for this to happen. Draft clause 1(7) reads as follows:

'For the purposes of subsections (3) to (6) of the section the Archbishops of Canterbury and York may jointly authorize forms of service for deaconesses to be [conditionally] ordained to the office of deacon: and such forms of service may be used in any cathedral or church or elsewhere within their respective provinces as they may determine.'

However, the mention of '[conditional]' ordination (which was what the Synod voted for last November) led us to a report by the Standing Committee which 'on balance' preferred a suggestion of Archdeacon David Silk that we should employ 'supplemental' ordination. The Report had actual liturgical proposals attached to express this doctrine, and the implication was that if the Synod now adopted the 'supplemental' doctrine then this set of liturgical proposals would be smuggled into Lambeth Palace to become the rites authorized by the Archbishops as provided by the draft Measure. In the event the concept of 'supplemental' ordination took a beating from which it never recovered (and, so *NOL* hopes, never will recover). But it was properly observed that the liturgical rites might have merit in their own right without the novel doctrine standing over them, and the Synod (with David Silk's own consent) overwhelmingly amended the Standing Committee's motion about 'supplemental' ordination, and instead passed the following:

'That this Synod welcomes the model liturgical forms in Schedules I and II of the Report, and, subject to the Draft Measure being given General Approval, instructs the Revision Committee, in revising the Measure, to enable liturgical forms based on these models to be used.'

No-one has official responsibility for producing the forms—they can but emerge! But *NOL* would hope that they would be referred to the residential

meeting of the Liturgical Commission in September—there would be something awry if the Archbishops were getting their liturgical expertise from other sources. For the moment we air the second model—the ASB-style one. The other is based on the Prayer Book forms, and is less satisfactory (we may air it in the next *NOL*). Our own hope would be that the Archbishops would only authorize one form, and that should be of ASB type. In which diocese in the land is there still (or will there be in 1985) a demand for BCP-style ordination rites?

SCHEDULE II

An outline of a Form of Service in the style of the ASB 1980 as an adaptation of the Service for the Ordination of Deacons, suggested to be authorized by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in accordance with clause 1(7) of the draft Measure for ordaining existing deaconesses as deacons.

Sections 1-10: according to the ASB.

Section 11: substitute 'deaconess' for 'persons'.

Section 12: *Bishop:* We give thanks and praise to Almighty God who has called these persons to the office of deaconess in his Church, and who has richly blessed their ministry and made it fruitful. We believe them now to be called to serve God in the office of deacon in his Church. Is it therefore your will that they should be ordained?

People: It is.

Bishop: Will you uphold them in their ministry?

People: We will.

Section 13: according to ASB.

Section 14: *Bishop:* In order that we may know your mind and purpose and that you may be strengthened in your resolve to fulfil your ministry will you, before God and this congregation, reaffirm the commitment you made when you accepted the Office of Deaconess out of love for the Lord Jesus and his Church? Do you believe . . .

Sections 15-17: according to the ASB.

Section 17A: *The Deaconesses return to the Bishop the New Testament which was handed to each of them when made Deaconess.*

Section 18: according to the ASB.

Section 19: first paragraph from ASB but omit second paragraph and substitute: And now we give you thanks that you have called these your servants to share this ministry entrusted to your Church; renew and enrich in them the gifts of your grace that they may be completely equipped for your service.

Here the Bishop lays his hands on the head of each candidate and says Send down the Holy Spirit upon your servant N for the office and work of a deacon in your Church.

Remaining prayer according to ASB.

Section 20: *The newly-ordained deacons stand and the bishop returns to each one of them the New Testament newly inscribed saying:*

[The Communion and onwards, as in ASB.]

This text did evoke *some* doubts among members of Synod (particularly about the handing in of the New Testament for re-inscription!), but it clearly is *not* launching a doctrine of 'supplemental ordination' if adopted, and so the motion commending the rite was accepted because it avoided mention of a novel theology. (And, it should be added, some of the hesitation about the theology was because of its readiness to hand as a bogus way of solving ecumenical problems in relation to ordained ministries . . .)

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 85, *Welcoming Children to Communion*, by Dan Young. This does handle the question of principle (should children receive?), but it moves on to handle the practical questions which arise when the question of principle has been solved. As it is likely that many are in fact held up on the principle, because they cannot see their way through the practical problems which ensue, the two parts of the booklet coinhere most usefully.

. . . and last month's

was Liturgical Study no. 34—and it is coming with this! We have been late before (some think we always are), but never like this. A double trouble tripped us up—the correcting of the proofs of sixteenth century spelling in *Eucharistic Liturgies of Edward VI* proved to need more time than the editor or printers had allowed and ran the job, still unfinished, into time earmarked for another customer who could not be delayed—and then the printers got hit by both holidays and illness. So, at the time of writing, for inland despatches we are reckoning to send Liturgical Study 34 with the July booklets and this issue of *NOL* (and *NOH/7* also).

GENERAL SYNOD—(ii) 'MARRYING DIVORCED PERSONS IN CHURCH

In last month's editorial we set the scene briefly for the York debates on providing church weddings for those who have previously been divorced. The actual debates on 12 and 14 July unearthed many fears about adopting a procedure (the inter-diocesan panels) without any criteria (still to come in the mysterious 'Green Book'). However, a great plethora of amendments failed one by one to gather the Synod, and the original platform motion then remained on the table. This motion was then passed by 284 to 143, and it reads as follows:

'That this Synod—

- (a) adopts option (G) as set out in paras 77-79 and 106 of this Report and Appendix IV thereto as the procedure for consideration as to whether a divorced person may be permitted to marry in church according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England in the lifetime of a former marriage partner of that person;
- (b) requests the Standing Committee to bring forward as quickly as possible such proposals as are necessary to rescind the existing Regulations and Resolutions of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in this regard and to substitute therefor new Regulations of the General Synod to give effect to the Synod's decision under (a) above and for their adoption as an Act of Synod, and to take all other steps as are necessary, including the preparation of appropriate documentation and a Handbook to the new Regulations ("The Green Book") and the organization, recruitment and training of the necessary panels, to effect the implementation of the new procedure, if at all possible by Easter 1984.'

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 281114)

15p

GENERAL SYNOD—(iii) ARCIC AND BEM

'ARCIC' we know—'BEM' is the growing title for the WCC 'Lima' document *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. The Archbishop of Canterbury commented in the debate 'ARCIC and BEM—they sound like flower-pot men'. Nor was he alone in his good humour—Professor Henry Chadwick, who introduced the debate, reflected on the value of the verbalization of agreement. He did not want to go overboard for verbalization, whilst he acknowledged at the same time that ecumenical progress could not be expressed solely in 'loving grunts'! And, to cap it all, a kind of auction emerged between various distinguished leaders of the Church of England as to who had had the most memorable experience in meeting the Patriarch of Antioch.

This is not to box up the whole debate as one long laugh (though the above will spare *NOL* the necessity of laying on a 'Laughter in Liturgy' this month). Very serious questions about the eucharist in particular were raised (not least by that doughty Protestant, John Pearce, who urged that the ARCIC statement by its very terms ruled out any 'receptionist' interpretation). But the matter will be handled in a leisurely way by the Church of England—another General Synod debate in 1984, a reference to the dioceses, and an attempt after that to respond by General Synod. Some of us at York were wondering how Roman Catholic opinion can be discovered about the ARCIC statements—the answer apparently is that it has been referred by the Vatican to the national episcopal conferences throughout the world.

A couple of footnotes here may be appropriate—firstly, that the new ARCIC membership has been announced, and the Anglican chairman is Mark Santer, the Bishop of Kensington, previously principal of Westcott House. Secondly, the two Grove publications to respond to ARCIC may become of more and more usefulness: Julian Charley's *Rome, Canterbury and the Future* (£1.25) and the CEEC statement, drafted by John Stott *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report* (40p). We also hope to be publishing an evaluation of *BEM* in our Worship series soon.

ORDINATIONS AT SOUTHWARK—3 JULY 1983

Ordinations each summer lead to exchanges of information—and sometimes of horror stories—between members of theological colleges' staffs, who are so often the only people who actually participate in such services in several different dioceses. In previous summers we have simply recorded oddities without naming places, but this year I decided to report one of the ordinations I was attending—those at Southwark on 3 July 1983. Some of the features reported below are distinctive to Southwark, some are common to some other dioceses. My only embarrassment at reporting is a personal one—I am known now as a reporter and it means I am occasionally viewed askance when I visit liturgical events. At the same time, I gladly report that when all the liturgical niceties have been chewed over, yet ordinations are inevitably very happy and joyful occasions—the joy including those from parishes receiving new deacons or deaconesses, parishes seeing their deacons priested, families of candidates, cathedral staffs (who usually enter into ordinations as a high point in their year), and college staffs and students who come to support those who

have completed courses and are now beginning parish ministry. Against that background, I pick out points of note about Southwark:

- 1 Women! As I drove down the motorway in the early morning the radio informed me there would be a protest and an exit and (outside) a 'wilderness liturgy' by women wishing to be priested. Well, they were there—kneeling at the back till after they had received communion, then departing quietly to be televised in their protest outside. It was all done in a very gentlemanly way—the Bishop of Southwark was known to be sympathetic. It seems the deaconesses had wished to be presented as though candidates to be priested: but he asked them *not* to press the point and they agreed. All are to be commended on the pattern followed.

Southwark is interesting as being at first sight apparently unclear whether or not it is already making women deacons rather than deaconesses. Mervyn the last bishop commended Elizabeth Canham to an American bishop as already being a deacon and thus qualified to receive priest's orders (see her book *Pilgrimage to Priesthood*, recently published by SPCK). In many respects the service seemed to be saying that the women *are* made deacons—they were presented with the men, there was but a single exhortation ('A deacon is called . . .') to both men and women, and the laying on of hands came within a single ordination prayer (entitled 'The Ordination of Deacons') in an indiscriminate pecking order. The women took stoles across one shoulder just as the men did. So certainly the Holy Spirit must have been hard put to sort them out. On the other hand the word 'deaconess' was used at the laying on of hands, and in the 'letters of orders' issued. And Southwark is represented in the General Synod House of Laity by at least one deaconess! So it looks as though the matter has been pushed to within an inch of giving true holy orders to women candidates—but the inch gap does remain and the narrowness of it rather emphasized the existence of it.

- 2 Programme. Southwark are still using printed sheets from the 1978-80 Series 3 (rather than Rite A) era—and defective ones at that (for the homily to the candidates for presbyters' orders is drastically cut). But this is apparently to be corrected shortly. If a visitor may make a suggestion to all who arrange such services (and one of the unknown mysteries is *who* does arrange them), surely the word-processor could now be used, with the basic liturgical material stored on it, and with the adaptations for the particular service at any time then inserted into it so that a 'clean' text which gave details of the candidates and an order easy to follow, including the hymns, could be printed or duplicated. This sort of provision would also ensure that the women received carefully planned and exhibited treatment instead of the kind of *ad hoc* (or *hanc?*) rustling up often to be found.
- 3 The Presentation. Southwark has always presented the candidates by name (once upon a time they used to have a sort of roll call with a 'present, sir' sort of response). Nowadays the candidates for

non-stipendiary ministry (NSM) have their secular avocations named as well as their parishes ('to serve in the parish of St. James the Less Ocean Green and as a bus conductor with London Transport'). Full marks for that.

- 4 Conordination. Three bishops laid hands on all candidates, reciting the ordination words together (and indeed the whole of the ordination prayers together). This seems a highly dubious proceeding, and is clearly only cosmetic—the requisite laying on of the bishop's hands is achieved by the diocesan bishop anyway, and the letters of orders etc. are issued in his name alone. If it *is* cosmetic, then it must be judged on cosmetic (i.e. aesthetic) grounds. And, for my money, not only is the common recitation of a long prayer by three voices unrubrical (which it clearly is), it is also unhelpful. The attempt to correlate three movements and actions also sets some problems with headgear (see my remarks in April *NOL* about multiple mitres at the Loughborough conference).
- 5 The Giving of the Bible. Unauthentic liturgy seems to have taken over here in Southwark (and, so I gather, in some other Southern dioceses). There is no 'giving' at all! Instead three varied volumes were 'proffered' (I believe that is the right term) to the candidates by the three bishops, and the candidates touched the Bible nearest to them, and then let go afterwards. The same Bibles were used for deacons (who are supposed to have New Testaments) as for priests. But there was a dishing out of genuine new Bibles or New Testaments to the candidates after the service. 'Proffering' is a nonsense and contrary to every reference in the text of the service—not least to the words 'Receive this book . . .!' A little bird told me it dates from Mervyn's time as a Southwark time-saving feature—but if the numbers in Southwark are really too great for the candidates to be given Testaments and Bibles individually, then the numbers are *too* great, and those spare bishops ought to be doing the deacons separately in areas or something of that sort.
- 6 'Concelebration' (wrongly so called). Southwark are here like so many dioceses—the new priests stand in a semi-circle round the bishop and join in the second half of the eucharistic prayer (i.e. the half that is less 'eucharistic') with a hand outstretched. This again is unrubrical and distorting of the eucharistic prayer. One also idly wonders whether those present thought they had or had not now presided for the first time at the eucharist—or thought they were going to at some future point! Certainly, once the eucharistic prayer was over they were communicated by the bishop and took no further part in the distribution—which would be odd for those presiding at their first celebration. So this too seems to be more cosmetic than actual. (Have the Liturgical Commission report and Grove Booklet, both on 'concelebration', reached the South Bank?)
- 7 Distribution. Southwark cathedral, with perhaps above 1000 persons present, witnessed a very small amount of bread and wine being

'eucharisticized' at the ordination. Instead the many distributants were taken to a side-chapel and equipped with vast amounts of 'pre-consecrated' elements. All very convenient—but *is* it authentic, and ought it to be encouraged? Inspired leaks suggest this is being reviewed in Southwark.

Many things come absolutely right in Southwark—and particularly those central points we have emphasized in previous years, such as truly ordaining within the ordination prayer, with the giving of the Bible left till after. And Southwark has a true practice of the bishop(s) standing to lay on hands, and going round among the kneeling candidates to do it. The rite this Petertide was further enriched by the presence of Rowan Williams as the preacher (and his text was John 20.22-23—but he preached about 'retaining' sins rather than about 'loosing' them!). And I was personally made very welcome by being asked to assist in the administration. So the above liturgical notes are put out hesitantly, for I enjoyed the service enormously, recognized the presence of Almighty God, and love the folk concerned very much.

C.O.B.

THE ASB'S WOUNDS ARE BOUND UP

John Pratt of Harlow wrote when the Desk edition of the ASB first came out to point out that the famous block error in the ASB on pages 954-957 had been corrected. This error is the printing of three readings from the provision for the 'Blessing of an Abbott' under the provision 'For an Enthronement or an Installation or an Induction'. As far as we know, all the pew editions still have it. But for the Desk edition the correct readings (1 Pet. 5.1-11, Luke 10.1-9, and John 10.11-16) are printed. Then, very coyly, the publishers (or editors, or who?) have added a note on page 978, at the very end of the Propers:

NOTE

The readings on pp. 954-7 are in accordance with Table 3(d) p.1070 Earlier editions of the Alternative Service Book printed Colossians 3.12-17, Luke 12.35-44, and Luke 22.24-27, which are not inappropriate.

Not a sign of penitence here—just a hint more of having made a mistake, and a hint less about it being for our good, would have been 'not inappropriate'.

THE REGURGITALL COMMISSION OF AUSTRALIA

The second set of propers for special festivals will come next month. The women will find some corrective to the Misogynist's celebrations of last month.