

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 110

February 1984

Editorial

At the end of this issue there is an extract from the 'Supplement' to the ASB' authorized by the Bishop of Birmingham for use in his own diocese. We mentioned this book of services last month—in general very positively, for it shows considerably more initiative by the bishop and his liturgical committee than can be found in most dioceses. However, the Bishop of Birmingham's own foreword to the collection does raise one or two interesting points.

He writes:

'I authorize these services for use in the diocese of Birmingham only, acting under Canon B4, or Canon B5 (or in one or two cases, by use of my *jus liturgicum* as Ordinary). I hope the contents are so framed as to be acceptable to people of differing churchmanship.'

It is in this intriguing phrase 'by use of my *jus liturgicum*' that the interest lies. It is a phrase which has only gained any currency in the Church of England in the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century generally the bishops of the Church of England knew what was lawful and what was not, and had a full understanding of the legal position (even when they disagreed with it). The Public Worship Regulation Act 1874 allowed a bishop discretion to veto a proposed prosecution, and to that extent he had a very limited right in relation to marginal ceremonial activities. But I am unaware that it was called a *jus*, and it was happily, or unhappily, evaded by the action of the Church Association in 1890 in bringing the Bishop of Lincoln himself into question for his own uses. Here, if anywhere, his *jus* ought to have permitted his use—but it was not so. He had to face trial before the Archbishop of Canterbury and a court of provincial bishops . . .

A parallel situation occurred with the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act 1872 (often called the 'Shortened Services Act'). This Act actually provided by Parliamentary authority not just permission to shorten Prayer Book services in certain circumstances, but also permission to invent and construct a 'third service' from Prayer Book materials. Here again, it seems that even to go outside the range of Prayer Book services parliamentary authority was needed. And a wholly similar view is to be found in the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline of 1906.

The difficulty seems to be that from 1906 onwards the bishops were functioning on two levels simultaneously—on the one hand seeking agreement as to what they would try to get authorized (by Parliament), and on the other seeking agreement as to what line they would try to 'hold' in relation to illegal practices, like reservation of the sacramental elements, or use of the Roman rites. What they would jointly 'wink' at acquired a certain status which had no roots in law, but some specious appearance of being law. And after 1927-28 this latter became much

stronger. When the bishops were refused parliamentary authority twice running for their 'deposited book', they smoothly stated that they had not really needed that authority anyway, and the second level of 'authorization' (*viz.* 'winking at') was perfectly within their competence 'in the present emergency'. And as they systemized their claim to be 'lawful authority' (in accordance with the exceptive clause in the old Declaration of Assent), so the clergy came to believe it. To ring up the bishop about an illegal practice and get his goodwill was to have it legalized.

There is no suggestion of *blame* in this—the bishops were always in a very difficult position, and if a journalist does not always enter too sympathetically into those difficulties, well, he must be pardoned. But it is clear that the years from 1928 to 1966 especially beefed up the notion that each bishop had a *jus liturgicum*, and it remains a strong folk memory to this day.

But in fact the Alternative Services Measure gave an exhaustive definition of 'lawful authority'—and the bishop possessed none of it at all! Within the Canons which now arise from the Worship and Doctrine Measure B.4 does give power to the bishop to authorize forms not alternative to those in the BCP; and B.5 does give discretion to the bishop to sort out disputes in parishes. These powers would seem to be the sole '*jus liturgicum*' a bishop can claim *qua* bishop, and it would be interesting to know the nature of the power the Bishop of Birmingham has in view when he claims it, and to know which of his diocesan services he reckons he has authorized by it. Paradoxically, it may be the provision for admitting children to communion before confirmation (the very provision we print out below). But this must be acknowledged to be simply illegal! There are no powers to authorize it. Not a hint of *jus*. All the bishop can currently do is wink at what is theologically eminently sensible.

Colin Buchanan

THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION IN A TIME-WARP— AND IN THE DARK

The Liturgical Commission met at Addington at the Royal School of Church Music in mid-February, and sightings were reported by local inhabitants. These became an overt invasion when the parish church was taken over by the Commission to keep Good Friday at 5 p.m. one day, and Easter Eve at 8 p.m. the same evening. The invaders allowed the locals in, which is how the story got out. The locals for their part reckoned their own Easter Vigil was more exciting than the one the Commission delivered packaged on the Tuesday of Epiphany 6, but the Commission will be able to catch up if it only has the courage to write the one word 'bonfire' into its rubrics for the coming of the light. One member of the Commission was heard to remark that he thought it had a natural feel for the Commission to be sitting in the dark. But then the Commission returned behind closed doors, and the world outside does not know what will happen to Holy Week in the upshot. But the news should emerge during 1984.

A more immediate rumour is that the Liturgical Commission is proposing to continue its sorties into the public arena with an agape in the late Spring. *NOL* will print the menu if this proves to be true.

CORONATION OIL

We now print the answer of the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission to the question in November:

Question: Following the failure of 'The Blessing of the Oils' to secure a sufficient majority on 9th November, 1982, what form is available for consecrating the oil of chrism for use at the coronation of the Sovereign?

Answer: So far as I have been able to discover, from the time of the coronation of William and Mary in 1689, the form was included in the Coronation Service itself. The prayer runs: 'to bless and sanctify thy chosen servant who is to be anointed with this oil and consecrated king'. As these words were said, the Archbishop laid hands on the ampulla containing the oil. This prayer is part of the present coronation rite, revised by Prof. E. C. Ratcliff. It is based on a prayer in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

However, in 1902 for the coronation of Edward VII, the oil was consecrated by an episcopal member of the chapter early on the morning of the coronation. This was on the advice of Canon Christopher Wordsworth who wrote a long and learned letter to Dr. Armitage Robinson. The present Queen was asked whether the oil should be consecrated during the service or before it and chose the method of 1902. The form used for this pre-consecration of the oil is not known.

As to the oil itself, simple oil was used from the Reformation until 1837. For the coronation of Queen Victoria a secret formula was used by one Peter Squire. This formula has been used ever since. A new supply was made for George VI's coronation, but was not in fact used, since there was enough of the old. It was kept in the Dean's study but was destroyed by bombing. For our present Queen's coronation, a new supply was prepared under the authority of the surgeon apothecary by Savory and Moore of New Bond Street. Dr. Don was willing to reveal that the secret formula contained oil of orange flowers, of roses, cinnamon, jasmine and sesame with benzoin, musk, civet and ambergris.

Supplementary Question: In the light of that fascinating answer which went far beyond what I had expected, can the secrets be uncovered and published, as presumably the provenance of this form of blessing makes it impossible to suppose that it does not enjoy lawful authority, and it might be of use to bishops in preparing chrism for use at confirmations?

Answer: I have, of course, no idea.

[This will have to do for 'Laughter in Liturgy' this month].

THE ASB'S RIBS ARE SHOWING

Ted Pratt writes:

'I feel the middle of the Introduction to Infant Baptism is rather awkward (after a splendid start). I refer to the expression "and so God gives us the way to a second birth . . ."

How about "and so through our faith in Jesus, God gives us a second birth, a new creation, and life in union with him."?

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Pastoral Series no. 17, *How we Grew a Local Ecumenical Project*, by Ray Simpson, minister of the LEP at Bowthorpe, Norwich. The title is self-explanatory, and the booklet tells of the planting and growing from scratch of an ecumenical congregation—with all the attendant joys and frustrations (constitutional, personal, etc.).

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 37 *Why Liturgical Worship at all?*, by Michael Sansom. This study takes us back to first principles, and these are presented with both freshness and depth.

. . . and the Spirituality booklet

is no. 8 in the Series, *Finding a Personal Rule of Life*, by Harold Miller. The aim of this series has been to establish a serious renewal and re-examination of evangelical ways in spirituality, and this booklet has a self-explanatory title—challenging the lax, the unreflective, and the frankly antinomian, to re-examine themselves.

. . . and a reprint

is Liturgical Study no. 8, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*, edited by Geoffrey Cuming—astonishingly into its *third* printing. The bulk of these go to America . . .

LIVERPOOL JOINT WORK CONSULTATION

A 'Joint Work Consultation' is a Liverpool (but not only Liverpool) phenomenon to enable a clergyman to check out his work with one of his peers or almost-peers at intervals. The 'JWC' has now been written up by various Liverpool hands and published as *Explorations into Parish Ministry*, edited by John Mills and John Nelson and published by the diocese of Liverpool, but made available to the trade etc. by SPCK—it has 64 pages and costs £1.50. Its interest to readers of *NOL* will come from the third section of the actual 'explorations'—this being labelled 'Worship' and being scripted by Donald Gray, a member of the Liturgical Commission, and known to readers of *NOL*. There are twelve pages of guidelines for reviewing the strategy and the leadership of worship. Strategic considerations include the evangelistic, educational, social, ecumenical, and pastoral, roles of worship. Then follows the 'Audit'—e.g. 'Do I give sufficient desk time to preparing for Worship? (e.g., lists, written directions, circulated information); have I recently allowed a critical assessment of my voice movements, affectations and habits, during public services?' The complacent will find these guidelines are not the book for them. Needless to say, the guidelines are enriched by reference to *NOL* and to various Grove Booklets as sources and aids . . .

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.45 by inland post for the year 1983—£4.00 with *News of Hymnody* added)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602 251114)

LITURGICAL COELACANTHS AGAIN

Christopher Sterry writes with a query about the nineteenth century practice of extinguishing candles after the third collect at Evensong. What were the origins of this (if indeed it was nineteenth century)? Did it originate because someone wanted to show that he knew what was *real* office, and what was merely 1662 'State Prayers'? Or, as our correspondent himself thought when a child, was it done in order to ensure that, after the third collect and its message, we enjoyed some darkness as a background to asking the Lord to lighten it?

ANVIL

Twice last year we gave passing mention to *Anvil*, and we distributed brochures about it in the Autumn. We are glad now to announce that *Anvil* is duly launched, as the first issue appeared in mid-February. As subscriptions are being received at St. John's College, Nottingham, payment can be made along with that for Grove Books (and it is encouraging to see how many Grove Books customers are among the *Anvil* subscribers). A year's subscription is £7.95. The first issue costs £2.75 (and can be had, as a single copy, on your Grove Books account). And the first issue includes an article by COB entitled 'Anglican Evangelicalism—the State of the "Party"', which can be had as an offprint on its own for 70p.

CORRIGENDUM TO GROVE LITURGICAL STUDY no. 36

In Paul Bradshaw's Liturgical Study, *Liturgical Presidency in the Early Church*, a line has fallen out on page 23. There the fifth line up from the bottom ought to read:

... made it a rule to do nothing without consulting his clergy, he seems later to have laid less stress on this and more on independent ...

A SHORTENED LIMA

Kenneth Stevenson writes of his concern that the Lima eucharistic prayer may lose custom through its length, and has therefore produced his own shortened version. The text is drawn severely from the original, with a strong attempt to keep the emphasis and contents of the original.

The text of this is printed opposite. *NOL* would emphasize that it is without any authority (as is its parent Lima text), and may still include doctrinal problems ...

Truly it is right to glorify you;
at all times and in all places to offer you our thanksgiving,
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.
Therefore, Lord, with all the angels and saints,
we proclaim and sing your glory:
Holy

Lord God of the universe,
you are holy and your glory is beyond measure.
In the fulness of time you gave Christ to us,
as the Way, the Truth, and the Life.
He accepted baptism and consecration as your Son
to announce the good news to the poor.
At the last supper, he bequeathed to us the eucharist;
for on the night in which he was betrayed,
he took bread, and when he had given thanks to you,
he 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.
Do this for the remembrance of me.
Christ has died

Therefore, Lord, we celebrate today the memorial of our redemption;
we recall the birth and life of your Son among us,
his death and descent to the dead;
we proclaim Christ's resurrection and ascension to your 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 all people
everywhere the benefits of Christ's redemptive work.

Lord, look upon this eucharist;
may the outpouring of your life-giving Spirit
transfigure our thanksgiving-meal,
that this bread and wine may become for us
the body and blood of Christ;
as we partake together, fill us with the Holy Spirit,
that we may become one single body and one single spirit in Christ,
a living sacrifice to the praise of your glory.

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.
Amen.

GENERAL SYNOD

General Synod meets from 27 February to 1 March, and, as predicted in *NOL* in January, it is virtually impossible for *NOL* to report it hot. Instead we have to write in advance of the group of sessions, with the likelihood that this issue of *NOL* will only arrive on our readers' breakfast tables after the debating is over. Well, such is our fate, but we will not therefore pretend it is not happening, but instead look forward from the previous week.

The January *NOL* anticipated the debates on Series 1 and on the Roman Catholic lectionary. We are sorry not to give a full review of the latter in this issue. In the event the debate, timed for 29 February at 12 noon, is only on the motion to 'take note' of the report. This precludes following motions (e.g. about experimental authorization) being tabled, so that sort of question will have to come on another occasion.

What we do have now is the motion the House of Bishops is substituting for the final approval of 'Option G', which has now disappeared forever. The Bishop of Winchester is to move the following:

'That this Synod, in furtherance of the decision of July 1981 to the effect that marriage should always be undertaken as a lifelong commitment but that, nevertheless, there are circumstances in which a divorced person may be married in church in the lifetime of a former partner:

- (i) notes the criticism of Option G expressed in the recent informal consultations in the dioceses and the decision of the House of Bishops in the light of these criticisms not to return the Option G Regulation to the Synod;
- (ii) invites the House of Bishops (taking due account of comments and suggestions made in this Synod, and elsewhere, between now and the June meeting of the House) to introduce in July a draft Regulation which will—
 - (a) place the responsibility for decision upon the diocesan bishop in consultation with the parish priest;
 - (b) permit the possibility in appropriate cases of reference by the bishop to a diocesan panel of advisers with access to it, if so requested, by parish priest and/or the couple concerned;
 - (c) be more evidently pastoral in its application to the couple concerned; and
 - (d) set out clearly agreed criteria to guide diocesan bishops, clergy, and panels.'

COMMUNION FOR CHILDREN BEFORE CONFIRMATION

The General Synod working party, much strengthened since it was originally appointed by the Board of Education, has now met under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Knaresborough, for the first time in its new role and membership. We shall carry reports of this as we are able.

Meanwhile the Birmingham text mentioned last month is reprinted here for readers' interest.

THE ADMISSION OF CHILDREN TO HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE CONFIRMATION

This order may be used only in 'experimental parishes' approved by the bishop.

After the Creed at the Eucharist those to be admitted to Holy Communion shall stand before the priest:

- P:* Do you wish to receive the Holy Communion?
C: **I do.**
P: Will you come to Church and say your prayers regularly?
C: **I will.**
P: Will you go on learning about the Christian faith so that later you can be confirmed by the Bishop?
C: **I will.**
P: Almighty God, whose Holy Spirit gives us the strength and power to do all good things, guide and help these children to be loving and faithful in serving you; through Jesus Christ our Lord.
All: **Amen.**

The priest takes each child in turn by the hand, saying

*N., I admit you to Holy Communion in this church and we look forward to your confirmation, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.
and each child shall answer:
Amen.*

(If there is a fellowship or guild of young communicants the leader of it shall come up.

The priest shall give each child a membership card saying:

*N., I give you your card of membership of the Fellowship/Guild of . . .
and the leader of the fellowship or guild shall say:
N., as leader of the Fellowship/Guild of . . . I welcome you. May we help one another to follow the example of our Lord Jesus Christ.)*

The children (and leader) return to their places.

During the intercessions, prayer shall be offered for the children who have been admitted (and for the fellowship/guild of young communicants.)

**Extract from Diocesan Pastoral Regulations (1983) p.12.*

The Bishop is willing under circumstances of strict control to designate 'experimental parishes' when application is made by an Incumbent with the support of the Parochial Church Council. Before such permission can be given, the following conditions must be satisfied:

1. *Those admitted must express their willingness to be confirmed later.*
2. *They must be instructed in the meaning of the Holy Communion, and told how to make preparation for receiving.*
3. *They must be admitted by a formal ceremony conducted by the parish priest.*
4. *A satisfactory programme of continuing training in the Christian life must be shown to the Bishop.*
5. *Their names must be entered in a book kept for the purpose, and their progress monitored.*