

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 106

October 1983

## Editorial

Whilst the question of the marriage in church of divorced persons looks as though it only touches very tangentially upon 'liturgy', my own recent claims for the all-inclusive concerns of liturgy compel me to look at this issue again. It is all a-boil in the country. As I write the Salisbury diocese has shown its lack of confidence in what General Synod is doing, and the York diocese has done similarly (though formally rescued by the House of Bishops (which consisted of two suffragan, as there was technically no Archbishop at all at that point)). And as General Synod convenes again on 8 November, and starts to work on the Regulation to implement the procedure accepted at the July Synod, it looks as though the disquiet will arise. I sense it in my bones, confirm it wherever I go in the country, and share it in my own thinking.

We do now have to hand the draft form an application from an incumbent will take, and this is highly complex and certainly thorough. It may prove to be so demanding as to drive clergy into the other camp of preferring to use their existing 'discretion' under the law to officiate at such services without asking anybody. The form also keeps a door open for a theological judgment of nullity, in imitation of Rome, though it is doubtful if most Anglicans like the widened nullity possibilities now existing in Rome, which seem all too often like the worst form of casuistry, specifically and even cynically devised to continue paying lipservice to indissolubility, whilst in fact dismantling marriages nearly on demand. (I hasten to add that this impression is not much more than an impression, and a more sympathetic account will be gladly published here if it is received.)

But the trouble is that when the Synod voted for the principle of accepting that there are categories of cases where a marriage in church after a divorce would be appropriate, everyone presumably hoped against hope that it would be simple (and it is not), and that the demarcation of categories would be available before the regulations were voted on (and they are not—because demarcation is almost impossible). Thus there is a groundswell around the country now which believes that the General Synod is set on a slippery slope procedure where second third and fourth marriages on demand (sometimes in quick succession in the same church and before the same congregation) will become irresistible.

Under this groundswell another fainter and further-off, but possibly increasing, tremor can also be heard. This takes the form of a question—would not the Church of England be better served by providing no marriages than by providing such a mixed bag of them? Suppose all solemnizations were civil, and believers then went to church for a Christian topping-up? This would of course save some fairly embarrassing uses

of the church for first marriages—though it would also detach the church and the clergy a fraction more from the ordinary life of the civic community. We shall, I opine, hear more of that in future years.

Meanwhile the November Synod looms. As one backbench voter in the House of Clergy who does not immediately have to face the parish clergy's problems, I am not yet clear what I shall do. I see a growing chance that the Synod, having resolved that something must be done, will then in fact be unable to accept any specific proposal about what should be done. And that will be the end of any common stance and consistent approach by the parishes and dioceses. It is clear that the Synod needs more than prayer (it needs God's answers to its prayers), but it certainly does not need less.

Colin Buchanan

## REVIVE SERIES 1?

The minutes of a meeting of the House of Bishops on 18 October 1983 include the following:

**'The authorization of Series 1 Holy Communion and Baptism Services.** The House agreed that a motion should be moved at the February 1984 Group of Sessions inviting the House of Bishops to bring forward either or both services for fresh authorization in the form in which they were from 1966 to 1980.'

This procedure enables Synod to have a debate on the issue prior to the undertaking of the formal process of authorization. However, it contains within itself a kind of threat. The motion in its present form takes it for granted that such services would be authorized without amendment. This in turn implies that they would be presented to Synod to be authorized by the 'short procedure', which precludes the revision stages new services get. That might not matter, were it not for odd doctrinal problems in the communion rite which made it controversial in the first place. The revision of it, into Series 1 and 2 Revised, and thus into Rite B, smoothed out these difficulties. Now there is a proposal to go back behind the amendments, which were agreed and put through Synod without controversy.

Members of Synod will also need printed copies of Series 1 communion. It is very doubtful whether they can or should be presumed already to own them.

Above all, we do not know from the minutes why the House of Bishops thinks this is a good idea. The origin of the move could be old-fashioned 'prayer book Catholics', who having adopted the 'Interim Rite' in 1924 or thereabouts, simply want to remain 'interim' forever. Or it could be BCP-lovers who want a good conscience in respect of substituting the Lord's Summary of the Law for the Ten Commandments. Whatever the origin is, it is not the Liturgical Commission, which, although it has discussed the question, has never shown any desire to have the House of Bishops take this step.

## WOMEN PRIESTS FROM ABROAD

General Synod is due on Thursday afternoon, 10 November, to consider the draft Measure to allow women presbyters from abroad to minister (and to preside at communion) within the Church of England under certain circumstances. It is likely that more attention will attach to the voting figures than to the arguments! The votes on this first round will tell us whether the House of Clergy is or is not likely to provide a two-thirds majority on the final round in a year's time. Although the revision committee may fiddle with the conditions under which such admission can be granted, yet such fiddling is unlikely to affect the voting much. We will keep readers informed.

## AND WOMEN DEACONS AT HOME

The revision committee on making women deacons is at work as we go to press, and it will report to the February session of General Synod. From the outside it looks as though there are now few hiccups left over the principle of making ordinary women deacons, and the interest is concentrating on how to make deaconesses deacons. The thrust of the liturgical material which the General Synod cautiously liked in July (printed in NOL in July and August) was to recognize that deaconesses are unlike laywomen in general, and to try to give special acknowledgment of their already existing ministry. One feature of this was to play down the word 'ordination'—and another the provision in the Measure that the Archbishops would have power to authorize off their own bat the form of service to be used. Enquiry suggests that it is anticipated that deaconesses will not ever be made deacons at the same service as that at which ordinary ordinands are being made deacon, but only at special 'once-off' events (probably in July 1985, if the timetable works). Thus it is possible to soft-pedal 'ordination' at the event, though it will have to be mentioned! Part of the reasoning behind this is said to be the stance of the deaconesses themselves—they are said to want to protect the ministry they have already been exercising. But another deaconess point of view might well be that 'ordination' (properly) was what this service was all about, and, far from having it soft-pedalled, they could well have it especially highlighted in the rite. What do our deaconess readers think?

## LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

A nameless clergyman visiting St. John's the other day was heard to say: 'Well, the number of baptisms has dropped dramatically, and we do not entirely understand why—though we did hear our twelve-year-old son telling an enquirer on the telephone that "we don't do that sort of thing any longer".'

## PRICES IN 1984

	Printed price	Annual Postal subscription	Airmail subscription
News of Liturgy (NOL)	16p	£3.45 (US\$6.25)	£4.50 (US\$8.25)
News of Hymnody (NOH)	16p	£1.20 (US\$2.25)	£1.70 (US\$3.25)
NOL with NOH		£4.00 (US\$7.25)	£5.25 (US\$9.50)

## This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship no. 86, *ARCIC and Lima on Baptism and Eucharist* by Colin Buchanan. The title is self-explanatory . . . but the booklet includes the text of the 'Lima liturgy', the eucharistic prayer from which we published in NOL last month, and also a brief commentary on that liturgical text. Whilst both original statements also included pronouncements on 'ministry' and *ARCIC* also on 'authority', the necessities of a short booklet (and the advertised title of the series: 'Worship') have led to a restricted commentary on simply the two major sacraments. *ARCIC* and *Lima* will both be on Anglican agendas for a while ahead yet. . . . [Oh, yes, and COB has also written this month's Ethics Booklet, no. 53, *The Christian Conscience and Justice in Representation*.]

## . . . and next month's

is Pastoral no. 16, *Whose hand on the Tiller?* by Graham Dow, Peter Ashton, David Gillett, and David Prior—a first review of the 'Tiller' report *A Strategy of the Church's Ministry* the major report published in September, and being debated by the General Synod in November.

## WHAT'S HAPPENING IN WALES?

The liturgical doings in Wales remain a mystery to mere English church-people. *Church Times* reports that the governing body of the Church in Wales ordered in September the printing of a revised Book of Common Prayer, a book which (by all accounts) will include the 1966 eucharistic rite (a sort of Rite B), and some slight adaptations of original Prayer Book services, but will be wholly in the 'thou' style of language. A modern experimental eucharistic rite is also promised, in booklet form, but a vocal minority opposition to the new standard Book has developed, and this reached both the correspondence columns of *Church Times* and also the national and Welsh press. The Archbishop of Wales was reported as advising clergy unwilling to use the revised Book to 'join another church'.

The opposition is not primarily concerned with doctrine (and it unites both 'high' and 'low'). The question is whether anything normative and mainstream in modern language will ever characterize the Church in Wales. In general such persons have been seeking permission to use the ASB—but the fierce independence of Christians beyond Offa's Dike has led to solemn refusals to contemplate such a step. Wales, it seems, cannot risk creeping liturgical colonialism from Big Sister. And, anyway, the ASB is not bilingual, and so might cause counter-revolutions in nationalistic areas . . . More in due course . . .

## . . . AND IN NIGERIA

A modern language rite, entitled *The Liturgy of the Church of Nigeria (Anglican Communion) The Order for the Holy Communion or the Eucharist* has reached us (it is published by Ibadan University Press). It is the first alternative to the BCP to be produced by Anglicans in Nigeria, and it draws heavily upon Rite A (though with only the first eucharistic prayer).

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)

15p

## ORDINATIONS—A (NEARLY) NON-LITURGICAL PROBLEM

In with all the strictly liturgical problems about ordination which are being thrown up in current English cathedral practices, our postbag and ear to the ground tell us that sometimes the complaints about procedure are allied with sheer physical discomfort or alienation in a crowded service. One notable instance of this seems to have been the London diocesan (as opposed to area) ordinations in St. Paul's at Pentecost this year. At this service, by all accounts there were around 3000 communicants (for which the organizers were not prepared) and some hundreds of these stood in the doors or outside the cathedral, and the whole service ran on for hours with a wholly inadequate distribution of communion. Every now and again a similar report comes in from elsewhere. Accounts can of course be misleading, and we would be glad to be corrected, but Michael Perham, the Bishop of Winchester's chaplain (and no mean liturgist), tells us of a Winchester pattern which, *mutatis mutandis* may have a message for other dioceses. It is as simple as this: only the deacons (and deaconesses) are ordained centrally at the cathedral—and that service is correspondingly simpler. Numbers are reasonable, because the element of personal support from parishes in which ministers serve, which is expressed very strongly at the priesting, does not really exist in the same degree when a candidate is first ordained. And the Winchester practice is to ordain priests in their own parish Churches. Each bishop is ready to go three successive Sundays around Pentecost and Michaelmas to the parishes where candidates are to be priested—and thus with three bishops ordaining on each of six Sundays eighteen priestings can be done. Thus congregations all support their own curate, share with him in communion, and enter into the event generally. The incumbent joins in the laying on of hands, and the priesting of the one man is central to the occasion.

One little genuinely liturgical footnote is the rumour that reaches us that the Bishop of Southampton uses the 1662 rite for ordinations. Where else is this now to be found in the Church of England? (*NOL* thinks it knows, but may not have enough spies out . . .).

## FUNERALS FOR STILLBORN CHILDREN

The Methodist Conference this Summer approved a proposal for a Funeral service to be used for a stillbirth. In general in England the medical staffs remove the corpses in such cases, and no live birth is registered, no funeral fees are incurred (no mean consideration), and no moment for grief other than that of birth is provided officially (though of course hospital chaplains, clergy, and sensitive midwives often say prayers with the mother or with both parents). Sometimes there is a request for baptism, which is apparently given some clergy, though it was (surely rightly?) deprecated by the Methodist Conference. In mid-October the church press ran what looked like a press release on this Methodist service, but on enquiry it proved that the text was not yet published (and indeed the Methodist bookshop at Westminster Central Hall had not even heard of such a possibility). We have however been supplied with the text which was approved by Conference, and publish it on the next page.

## ORDER OF SERVICE

*Prayer: (collect for first after Easter M.S.B. page C34 may help).*

*Brief introduction, including a reference to the name N having been given to the child.*

*Prayer: suggested pattern:—thanksgiving from Baptism with preceding and concluding additions e.g.:*

Father in heaven, we come to you as your children:

We come in sorrow that N has been taken from us so soon; but also we come in peace, for your Son has promised that all your little ones shall look upon your loving face for ever.

We come to you in prayer for her/his parents (mother), who have (has) so little time to care for her/him; We thank you for their (her) love, which surrounded him/her as she/he grew, and for your love for us all, that gives strength us.

Father, we thank you that you have created all things and made us in your own image;

That after we had fallen into sin you did not leave us in darkness, but sent your only Son Jesus Christ to be our Saviour;

That by his death and resurrection he broke the power of evil; And that by sending the Holy Spirit you have made us a new creation.

We thank you that N is, with us, an heir of all your promises, sharer with us in the humanity that you redeemed in Christ, and in the eternal life which you have revealed to us through him. We welcome our sister/brother N into the flock of Christ in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

*Psalm 23*

*Reading: perhaps from Matthew 18.1-5 10; Matthew 11.27-30; 2 Corinthians 1.3-7.*

*Prayers: Thanksgiving for Funeral rite (M.S.B. page F13)*

*For parents;*

*For brothers and sisters;*

*For attendant medical team whether attending funeral or not.*

*Commendation (M.S.B. page F14) and Our Father, and Blessing of choice.*

*'Nunc dimittis', while leading the coffin and procession or after committal in case of cremation.*

*Committal (as children's funeral M.S.B. page F20):*

Forasmuch as this child is in the care of Almighty God, we therefore commit her/his body to the ground/elements, earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in sure and certain hope of eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

*Prayers: most of our ministers will probably prefer to pray extempore here.*

[These suggestions are framed with the intention that they can be combined with the standard funeral order without the officiant having to change quickly from page to page.]

## Book Reviews

Geoffrey Cuming is in the scholarly news yet again, as this Autumn's Alcuin Club collection is by him—*The Godly Order: Texts and Studies relating to the Book of Common Prayer* (SPCK, £8.50). This will be reviewed next month. But we also received a review in *Theology* of a Grove Liturgical Study of his, one which has received all too little attention—a problem which we therefore ourselves attempt to redress. The extract below follows paragraphs about *Liturgy Reshaped*, the *Festschrift* to Geoffrey Cuming:

It is a happy coincidence that Dr. Cuming's *He Gave Thanks: An Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer* is to hand at approximately the same time. Here we have *multum in parvo* and a good illustration of the author's gifts: brevity with clarity, judiciousness with comprehensiveness. This is exactly what a student beginning the exciting exploration into worship needs to have in his hands—a short history with particular attention paid to theological aspects such as consecration, remembrance, offering, epiclesis, fraction and participation. One does not have to concur with every detail to recognize that this is a little masterpiece which in itself justifies the tribute intended by the larger volume.

J. G. Davis

*University of Birmingham*

## Other books

The Mothers' Union Young Families Department has produced *Let's have a Pram Service* (16pp. duplicated, n.p.); this is part introduction, part agenda for such services—and, to the relatively unpractised eye, looks like thoroughly good sense. We also think we overlooked the Children Society's production of nearly two years ago, *Preparing the Mentally Handicapped for Confirmation* (£1). We now have CIO from the 1984 *Anglican Cycle of Prayer* (Church House Bookshop, London, £1.60). And Collins Liturgical Publications have sent two small coloured picture books for very young children by Lesley Francis and Nicola Slæe, *The Picnic* (or *Teddy Horsley goes to Communion*) and *The Windy Day* (or *Teddy Horsley celebrates Pentecost on Whit Sunday*) There are no prices mentioned—just claims that Teddy Horsley is the first Christian Teddy Bear.

## ANOTHER TWIST ON 'CONCELEBRATION'

An article we have sat on for months from *MUD* (Mission and Unity Digest of the Board of Mission and Unity at Church House) is by John Livingstone, the Anglican Archdeacon of Northern France in the slightly unbelievable Church of England diocese of Europe. He writes about 'concelebrating' as a Roman Catholic practice of the casual visitor:

'A priest on holiday will tap on the sacristy door just before a mass begins to ask if he may join in. If there are not enough albs and stoles, he stays dressed in ordinary clothes; he may not even leave his place to come to the altar if the church is crowded: he will think himself to have celebrated if he makes a slight gesture as he joins in the Eucharistic Prayer . . . one has only to raise a hand and repeat words one knows by heart.' (*MUD* issue 21, pp.13-14).

John Livingstone goes on to say that if an Anglican priest wishes to receive communion when on holiday, then the Roman Catholic priest will see no difficulty in giving it to him. But he must be careful how he asks, because to request 'hospitality' will be heard as requesting a role in concelebrating which 'involves as yet unsolved problems of authority'. But the priest may be very vague as to who Anglicans are and, just because of this request, assume they are more in communion with the Catholic Church than is actually the case! So let our readers beware.

## A JOURNAL GOES—A JOURNAL IS BORN—AND A COMPANY SOON

I fear this portion is more or less non-liturgical, but *NOL* is the best platform I have, and the items that follow will, I hope, be of interest to all Grove Books subscribers.

Firstly, *Theological Renewal* reaches its final edition (no. 25) this month, and that should be distributed with this to all those who take it. There is thus no renewing of it to be done. *NOL* rates for 1984, with or without *NOH* are quoted at the foot of page 3 here, and in the catalogue which should have come last month. *Theological Renewal* itself contains farewells from Tom Smail and from me, a rich and typical set of contents, and a final index for those who wish to draw maximum benefit from past issues. (Incidentally, we can still supply past issues, and would be glad to make up sets).

Secondly, there should be with this issue of *NOL* a brochure announcing the launching of *Anvil* from February 1984. I dropped broad hints of this in the June 1983 issue of *NOL*, when I reprinted the press release of the old editorial board of *Churchman*. They, it will be recalled, had been sacked by the proprietors of *Churchman*, the Council of Church Society. They were in turn asking for the support of various sectors of the evangelical Anglican constituency in order to explore whether a journal such as the one they had previously edited should continue. They found strong support from the Eclectics and the staffs of the evangelical theological colleges, and had a narrow majority in favour at CEFC. Thus a very strong team of supporters is listed on the brochure, the trustees are chaired by Bishop Bill Persson, the first issue is in preparation for the press now, and the subscription is less than last year's subscription to *Churchman*. Perhaps you do not launch an *Anvil*—perhaps you strike it. Whatever the method, the journal exists, and will be found to lie close to the Grove booklets (and not that far from *Theological Renewal*) in its concerns. Grove Books wishes it well, and looks forward particularly to getting its own wares reviewed in *Anvil*.

Thirdly, there will be those who want to know what is happening to Grove Books itself. It is now almost a year since the alarm bells rang, and Grove Books has neither sunk nor soared. Instead, steadily since the consultation on 25 March a working party has been at work, and now has a draft memorandum and articles of association ready to be incorporated as a company, and the registration of the Charity Commissioners is being sought, in order that it may be a charity. When that is achieved, there will be a prospectus sent to all our customers asking them to subscribe to the charity, in order to finance Grove Books' activities thereafter. *Anvil*, as a journal, will have its cash in advance, and should flourish on that. Grove Books, which has always attempted to function commercially, will not be asking for gifts, covenants, and subscriptions.