

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 105

September 1983

## Editorial

I wrote last month of a tag from a learned paper at Vienna—'Solemnization is alienation'. It provides me with a peg on which to hang a fear I harbour. It is fear which relates to scripture.

I am aware of the liturgical background to the scriptures—and it is commonplace amongst scholars that pericopae of the Gospels were handed down orally for decades, and were 'formed' into a shape for homiletical purposes. The narrative of institution may well be a similar kind of liturgical 'piece'. And, for lack of better candidate, we may surmise that the origin of the arrangement of the New Testament books in the canon is the liturgical practice (still with us) of reading 'Epistles' and 'Gospels'. Papias in 130 A.D. or thereabouts says that there *have to be* four gospels—and presumably someone had already broken up Luke-Acts in the interest of this sort of doctrine. I am very ready to concede that the scriptures arose in their present shape from within a 'liturgical' context, and were in part orientated towards a 'liturgical' usage.

However, we have to be very careful about this principle in the light of the 'solemnization' factor. The reformation in Europe involved a tremendous rediscovery of the *power* of the scriptures. *NOL* has so far made no nods towards the 500th anniversary of Luther's birth—but it does so now. The change in Luther's life—as in so many since his time—sprang from God speaking in *power* to him through the scriptures. Once that event had occurred, then the clock could never be turned back.

So my fear is lest our liturgical usage of scripture sterilizes it. We have a poker-faced rendering of two or three passages. We have ASB printed texts in which to follow them. We have a 'liturgical sermon' based on one of the texts. And the whole enterprise may fall into the same formally correct liturgical usage as a well-ordered procession, or a good organ voluntary—we can see it is being well done, it has a certain reassuring familiarity, but the jagged deep-cutting power of the word of God has gone.

Now I cannot be advocating that we should *not* read scripture in an ordered way in church. I am certainly not. But I do urge that we must not be content with the *solemnized* use. Congregations must be made aware that scripture was not written or arranged originally in ASB lectionary shape. Books of the Bible must be known as books. The argument of individual letters of Paul must be grasped by people reading them as single letters. The reading of the Bible in the home ought to provide the background to the highlighting of short passages in church. And there is always just a sad chance that our home-reading schemes (be they Scripture Union, Bible Reading Fellowship, or whatever) compound with the Sunday (and weekday) lectionary patterns to convey a subliminal message that the Bible is too hard to grasp except in very small portions. Whereas what we ought to be encouraging is that Christians should read whole books of the Bible as single books, reading in modern versions, and reading fast without worrying about difficulties too much. There are many households and individual lives where the idea of reading a short

passage daily is virtually unrealistic, and thus the insistence on it only makes for a guilty conscience. But a flexible wide reading of what we assume Christians will *enjoy* might be a different story. And the short passages come back into their own in groups, and, of course, in liturgy.

This then brings us to the preaching. One of the tasks of the ASB preacher is to use his passages to open windows into the whole Bible. Another is to *apply* as powerfully as he can the message in front of him. And a third is to look for the Holy Spirit to make that a word of frightening relevance and power to the believers. But if the word read and the word preached have abandoned their power to the solemnization of the wholly formal and routine, then the alienation is coming to birth.

Colin Buchanan

## THE LIMA LITURGY

Associated with the 'Lima' statement, *Baptism Eucharist Ministry* there has come to be a eucharistic rite first used at a meeting of the Faith and Order Commission at Lima in January 1982, and given prominence by its use at Vancouver in July 1983, where the Archbishop of Canterbury was the president. The October Worship booklet we publish will give greater space to this, with comment, but for the moment we publish here for information the eucharistic prayer of the rite. This will obviously have considerable ecumenical mileage (as a matter of prediction, not *necessarily* with *NOL's* approval). For an evaluation see next month's booklet.

## THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

- P. The Lord be with you  
C. **And also with you.**  
P. Lift up your hearts.  
C. **We lift them to the Lord.**  
P. Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.  
C. **It is right to give him thanks and praise.**

[Preface]

- P. Truly it is right and good to glorify you, at all times and in all places, to offer you our thanksgiving, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God. Through your living Word you created all things, and pronounced them good. You made human beings in your own image, to share your life and reflect your glory, When the time had fully come, you gave Christ to us as the Way, the Truth and the Life. He accepted baptism and consecration as your Servant to announce the good news to the poor. At the last supper Christ bequeathed to us the eucharist, that we should celebrate the memorial of the cross and resurrection, and receive his presence as good. To all the redeemed Christ gave the royal priesthood and, in loving his brothers and sisters, chooses those who share in the ministry,

that they may feed the Church with your Word and enable it to live by your Sacraments. Wherefore, Lord, with the angels and all the saints, we proclaim and sing your glory.

[Sanctus]

**Holy, Holy, Holy . . .**

[Epiclasis I]

O God, Lord of the universe, you are holy and your glory is beyond measure. Upon our eucharist send the life-giving Spirit, who spoke by Moses and the prophets, who overshadowed the Virgin Mary with grace, who descended upon Jesus in the river Jordan and upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. May the outpouring of this Spirit of Fire transfigure this thanksgiving meal that it may become for us the body and blood of Christ. May this Creator Spirit accomplish words of your beloved Son,

[Institution]

who, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks to you, broke it and gave it to his disciples, saying: Take, eat: This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me. After supper he took the cup and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them and said: Drink this, all of you: this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me. Great is the mystery of faith.

- C. **Your death, Lord Jesus, we proclaim!  
Your resurrection we celebrate!  
Your coming in glory we await!**

[Anamnesis]

Wherefore, Lord, We celebrate today the memorial of our redemption: we recall the birth and life of your Son among us, his baptism by John, his last meal with the apostles, his death and descent to the abode of the dead; we proclaim Christ's resurrection and ascension in glory, where as our Great High Priest he ever intercedes for all people; and we look for his coming at the last. United in Christ's priesthood, we present to you this memorial: Remember the sacrifice of your Son and grant to people everywhere the benefits of Christ's redemptive work.

- C. **Maranatha, the Lord comes!**

Behold, Lord, this eucharist which you yourself gave to the Church and graciously receive it, as you accept the offering of your Son whereby we are reinstated in your Covenant. when we shall be fed by Christ's body and blood, fill us with the Holy Spirit that we may be one single body and one single spirit in Christ, a living sacrifice to the praise of your glory.

[Epiclasis]

- C. **Maranatha, the Lord comes!**

[Commemorations]

Remember, Lord, your one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, redeemed by the blood of Christ. Reveal its unity, guard its faith, and preserve it in peace. Remember, Lord, all the servants of your Church; bishops, presbyters, deacons, and all to whom you have given special gifts of ministry. (Remember especially . . .) Remember also all our sisters and brothers who have died in the peace of Christ, and those whose faith is known to you alone: guide them to the joyful feast prepared for all peoples in your presence, with the blessed Virgin Mary, with the patriarchs and prophets, the apostles and martyrs . . . and all the saints for whom your friendship was life. With all these we sing your praise and await the happiness of your Kingdom where with the whole creation, finally delivered from sin and death, we shall be enabled to glorify you through Christ our Lord; we shall be enabled to glorify you through Christ our Lord;

C. **Maranatha, the Lord comes!**  
Through Christ, with Christ, in Christ, all honour and glory is yours, Almighty God and Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, now and for ever.

C. **Amen.**

## SERVICE REGISTERS

Perhaps service registers are in my mind because of the injunctions of 1547 which I have been editing, for they require registers of occasional offices to be kept. But the more general point is that I have been finding that recent patterns of service registers fail to have a column for 'TEXT' or 'SUBJECT' in which the preacher records the appropriate information. The time of day is still there. The cash-columns have suffered no diminution (at least since decimalization reduced the number of columns), the preacher still puts his own name in—but it has ceased to matter on what subject he preached. Is there something here which relates to this month's editorial?

C.O.B.

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 2M114)

### This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Liturgical Study no. 35, *Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549*, edited by Colin Buchanan. There are four documents included here, somewhat unlike each other in length. The four are: Edward VI's Injunctions of 1547; the relevant part of the Act for receiving in both kinds (1547), the Royal Proclamation to the 1548 *Order of the Communion*, and the report of the great parliamentary debate of December 1548. They are edited so as to stand nearer in presentation to the originals from which they are taken than most modern editions do. And they are intended to supplement the appendix material in Geoffrey Cuming's *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, and to stand as a trilogy with COB's other Liturgical Studies from this period: no. 7 *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* and no. 34 *Eucharistic Liturgies of Edward VI*.

### . . . and next month's

is Worship Series no. 86, *Lima and ARCIC on baptism and eucharist* also by Colin Buchanan (and the Ethics booklet in October is also by COB—a nightmare is happening at the editorial end. . .). This booklet is designed to give a popular lead in respect of two major documents on the sacraments which will be part of the life of the Church of England for some time ahead. The booklet includes comment on the Lima liturgical text which is printed in part in this issue of *NOL*.

### . . . and a catalogue

should come with this.

### . . . and another reprint

to follow Liturgical Study no. 12/13 in September is no. 61, *One Baptism Once* by Colin Buchanan.

### . . . and the future of Grove Books

begins to come clearer, as the working party draws near to the time when the company, Grove Books Ltd., can be launched and can request charitable gifts and donations to enable it to take over the existing stock and go into business. The existing one-man-band struggles on, and is keeping its head above water financially—just.

### Book Review

Lothar Steiger, *Erschienen in der Zeit. Dogmatik im Kirchenjahr. Epiphany und Vorpassion nach den Evangelien*. (Johannes Stauda Verlag, Kassel, 1982). 214 pages, DM.28.

In the wake of Geoffrey Wainwright's *Doxology* Epworth, 1980, which is a systematic theology written from a liturgical perspective, the Heidelberg professor, Lothar Steiger, has prepared a study which investigates the liturgical year from a theological perspective. Where Wainwright deals with the totality of dogmatics, as expressed in Christian worship, Steiger handles particular *loci* of dogmatic theology as they arise out of the liturgical worship of the church year. *Erschienen in der Zeit* is part of a larger study and covers the gospels of the Epiphany season and the pre-Lent Sundays according to the traditional German lectionary. It therefore deals, exegetically, with such dogmatic themes as revelation, baptism, creation, faith, etc. Although not easy to read (even, I suspect, for those whose mother tongue is German), it nevertheless is a provoking book which underlines the specific theological content of liturgical worship.

Robin A. Leaver

### THE ASB'S RIBS ARE SHOWING

The next most opposed line in the Book is 'That which God has joined', which irritates through its impersonality compared with the BCP. Here, of course, the trouble lay in scripture—Matthew 19.6 is clearly neuter. Preachers may be helped if they can see that it is a *single entity*—i.e. a team or something like one—which God has created by the joining. The background to the Greek verb is actually 'The yoke which God has joined' . . .

### . . . AND ITS SPINE IS BREAKING

My own SPCK green ASB has now been tested nearly to destruction point. What evidence is there after three years of the respective durability of the different editions?

### LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

Robin McDowick, a naval chaplain, writes:

'The RN version of the Venite is:

'The sea is his and he can have it:

The hands prefer the dry land.''

### Correspondence

Re: *THE MARY ROSE*

Dear Colin,

Apologies for not responding to your invitation sooner:

In the first place, it is important to understand the depth of feeling in these parts over the raising of the *Mary Rose* not only because of the vast costs incurred, but also because the sunken wreck was held by many, very understandably, to be the proper and final grave of those who went down with her, and as such should never have been disturbed. When, during the course of archaeological exploration, the skeletal remains had necessarily to be removed and brought ashore, an arrangement was made with the Coroner which virtually gave the *Mary Rose* Trust the right of what to do with them. The remains are of considerable scientific and medical interest, and were it not for the strength of public feeling, might, I think, have remained on the archaeologists' workbench forever.

However, local demand, to which I was more than ready to add my voice, urged proper burial. You have to remember that in and around Portsmouth there are a large number of families who have lost one or more of their members at sea, and who never had a grave or a proper funeral service for them. It was out of this that our plans for the funeral rite were born, spanning as they do the entire period from then until now. From the letters and comments I have received, many from those who have lost relatives at sea, it is clear that the representative nature of the occasion says something important to them.

So much for the background: now the particular points. One, how do we ensure we get the Rite the deceased would have recognized? In this case, I feel we can reasonably be sure, as St. Albans could when it re-interred the remains of a number of Abbots of the Abbey when excavating for their new Chapter House. And *is* that the right criterion? It certainly has a good deal to commend it pastorally: our practice here is to give a good deal of weight to the wishes of the deceased and their families at funerals, provided they don't deny the major tenets of the Faith.

Was a Requiem said at the time? The onus is on the Provost to show it was not! I hope there was: but it would be difficult to prove it. But surely the point is irrelevant? It was the practice then, and still is, for a Requiem to be said not only at the time of death, but also on the day of burial, and indeed on each anniversary of the death. In many churches now there is a book where cremations and interments that occur are recorded under the date, and the pages turned and the names remembered throughout the year. It is for this reason that the date of the sinking, July 19th, has been chosen as the date for the Requiem and interment next year.

Then there is the question of the next of kin: 'would Protestant descendants now write to the Provost and lodge any objections they have.' I suppose it is too much to hope (given the penultimate paragraph of *NOL*'s April editorial!) that the emotive words like catholic and protestant should be avoided. By 1545, we are talking about Anglicans, members of the Church of England, who then no doubt as now held a variety of positions. I believe a unity by inclusion, rather than purity by exclusion, and would be very happy to devise an appropriate Service should we need, for example, to re-inter the remains of Benjamin Burgess, a Non-Conformist minister who was Vicar of Portsmouth during the Commonwealth, and who is buried in the Chancel!

I am grateful to *NOL* for airing the whole question, and apologize for not having been able to respond any sooner. If people have further comments and suggestions to make, I would be glad to receive them before I make more detailed plans in the autumn. And while I have the opportunity, I ought to make it clear that I am prepared to spend the considerable amount of time that will clearly be involved in the whole event not because of any archaeological interest in the Sarum Rite as such, though that will be interesting, but because of the considerable amount of pastoral need amongst local people which the whole issue has brought to the surface.

Yours ever,

David Stancliffe, Provost of Portsmouth

Dear Colin,

Three cheers for the Diocese of Southwark (Issue no. 103/July). How sensible of them to equate 'Deacon' and 'Deaconess'. Can somebody tell me why the suffix '-ESS' is not considered respectable to denote the female of the species? Instead of gestating a new order ('women Deacons') would it not be far more sensible, 1) for Synod to declare that they regard the office of Deacon and the office of Deaconess as identical, 2) to resolve that in future a common ordinal shall be used for both, and 3) for the Church to accept that thereafter their functions shall be interchangeable.

What could be more simple than that?

Yours sincerely,

Frank E. Pickard

[But the great bulk of 'Catholics' in the Church of England have wholly opposed 'deeming' deaconesses to be deacons—and Southwark are not urging it either! Nor will the synod do it!—COB]

Dear Colin,

Re: Daniel Young *Welcoming Children to Communion*

It is quite a long time since I came across such a blatant example of theology by magisterial assertion as is contained in the first few paragraphs of Daniel Young's booklet. His basic assumption that the theology is agreed beyond question and that all that remains is to discuss the practice and procedure of giving communion to babes in arms is quite premature as far as I am concerned.

Questions arise on every side. Does a belief in the priority of grace really lead straight to the implication that baptized infants should be given bread and wine? How does what is said about the 'unity of the sacraments' actually relate to New Testament teaching about baptism and the Lord's supper? Does the fact that baptized children undoubtedly belong to the church family imply that everything the family does they should do as well?

These are still very much open questions as far as I am concerned, but it will take a lot more than the cavalier treatment of them that the Young booklet provides to entice me along the revolutionary path that advocates of infant communion are raring to tread.

Perhaps you need a Doctrine series!

Yours,

Tom Smail

Dear Colin,

I think I would . . . urge *NOL* to become more consciously protestant and reformed and to act as the protector of the conservative evangelical and reformed position . . .

A critique of mine would be that Grove Books in varying ways has effectively turned the older historic evangelical position *into a dissenting view* . . . May I qualify for the title of 'assiduous protestant reader'? Assiduous I am, for I have every copy; protestant I hope I am and yearn to be . . .

Mr. Faulkner [the original 'assiduous catholic reader'] asks if any reader sees a present day justification of the North End position. Yes, I see many. I see it firstly as a repudiation of any mediatorial position (Eastward position), and equally of any 'Big Brother' position (Westward position, derived from early Roman worship . . .). On the contrary the North Side . . . speaks of the 'priesthood of all believers' and the equally-yoked sharing of all ministers of the gospel, ordained and lay.

. . . For my part it passes my understanding why any reformed or evangelical minister can find it in his heart to deviate from this wonderful reformation and (as you say) Laudian heritage, or to 'teach others also' . . . If it was good enough for Laud and for Newman (in his Anglican days) it should prove most acceptable to Mr. Faulkner, and of very great comfort to his parishioners . . .

Yours sincerely,

Tony Warner