

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 111

March 1984

## Editorial

### SERIES ONE ON THE BRINK . . .

We do not often allow ourselves even modest headlines, but the debate in General Synod on 29 February over the proposed revival of Series One services snatched some headlines at the time, ranks vividly in the minds of synodsmen who were present (even whilst they acknowledge the far greater importance of other issues they were handling), and has probably not gone away yet. So what happened?

The Bishop of Birmingham introduced his motion:

'That the Synod requests the House of Bishops to introduce into the Synod at the next group of Sessions (a) the text of the Series 1 Baptism service and (b) the text of the Series 1 Holy Communion Service so that they can be considered for authorization under Canon B2.'

This was the 'The bishops are asking Synod if they would like to ask the bishops to ask the Synod to authorize Series 1' motion. The Bishop of Birmingham pleaded that Series 1 rites had only been dropped from the list in 1980 because it had been intended to make provision for the uses involved in some other way, and thus the omission of it had gone through unchallenged. The Archbishop of York later appeared and agreed that when he, as Bishop of Durham, had introduced the motions to give currency till 1985 to some services in booklet form, but *not* to Series 1 communion, the last thing he would have wished to do was to exclude its use. (The *Report of Proceedings* of General Synod of February 1980 does not read in accord with these reflections: Brian Brindley then moved an amendment to include Series 1 communion in the list, the Bishop of Durham was not unkind to it but did say the Synod should exert 'gentle pressure' to move folk along in their use of rites, and the Synod defeated the amendment by 148 votes to 104).

I spoke against the motion for exactly the reasons stated in Synod in 1980 as reasons why Series 1 services should not be continued—not forgetting, what the Bishop of Birmingham in his speech never mentioned, the controversial manner of the original introduction of Series 1 communion. It originally passed in 1966 in the House of Laity by 174 votes to 79 (in a packed house), and there were then no processes such as Revision Committees to find agreement over controverted issues. When such procedures became available, then Series 1 quickly moved on to become Rite B. Lovers of the use of 1662 with some variants should plead 'changes of no substantial importance', and those who still wanted to use the 'Interim Rite' and refused Rite B should be asked what their 'Interim' use was ever going to lead to. I urged that someone should move that the question should not be put.

Canon Hugh Williams successfully moved the inclusion of Series 1 Morning and Evening Prayer in the motion, the Archbishop of Canterbury delivered himself of a 'heavy' on behalf of lovers of antique liturgy (this followed up an amazingly backward-looking article by him in the *Daily Telegraph* a few days earlier—once again we think he should sack his advisers), and Peter Dawes then moved that the question should not be put. This procedural motion was ultimately defeated by 179 votes to 149 and the debate proceeded. The questions about petitions for the departed and the nature of the eucharistic prayer in Series 1 were not discussed directly, though they underlay several speeches. Those unhappy about 1928 doctrine were joined by those who felt it simply unseasonable to rake up these old rites for the sake of what was admitted to be a dying use. The Bishop of Norwich, who valiantly voted against the service when he was an evangelical watchdog in the old Convocation of Canterbury in 1966, now reported a moving conversation he had had with Harold Macmillan in the House of Lords a few minutes earlier—and *he* wanted the old restored. The Bishop of Birmingham told the Synod that some speechmakers were more concerned for oppressed ethnic minorities than they were for oppressed liturgical minorities (the Synod had been attacking the British Nationality Act the day before), but this seemed such a stupendous overkill of an argument, and the parity between the two oppressed groups so impossible even to imagine, that the Synod was if anything influenced against the Bishop of Birmingham's motion by this advocacy.

So we came to vote by Houses, and it came out thus:

	Yes	No
Bishops	28	1
Clergy	122	66
Laity	91	80

The House of Bishops must now reflect on what they can properly and effectively do. Their choices are:

- 1 Act on the strict letter of the request, and see the communion service (at least) blocked by more than a third of one, or possibly two, Houses.
- 2 Introduce the services under the longer procedure, so that a Revision Committee can work on the communion service. This would probably bring it to look like Rite B!
- 3 Make some slight amendments themselves, and still try for the shorter procedure. They could get a reluctant increase of support that way.
- 4 Forget about the whole business.

*NOL* is ready to waste some column space showing what a short step it is from the 'interim rite' to Rite B (see pages 5 and 6 below). Meanwhile there are rumours that Viscount Sudeley's Prayer Book (Protection) Bill is to be raised again in the Lords in April, presumably to put pressure upon the bishops to get Series 1 through (or some kindred step). But suppose the bishops cannot do so . . . ?

Colin Buchanan

## GENERAL SYNOD

The Draft Deacons (Ordination of Women) Measure passed through its Revision stage painlessly on 28 February. The main interest centred on how women deacons could be involved in the process of synodical government between 1985 and 1990, rather than on whether there should be such persons. There will now be a reference to the dioceses, and the expectation is that they will be asked to respond by Easter 1985, in order that a full presentation of diocesan returns can be made to General Synod in July 1985. That session of General Synod should then give final approval. Then it goes to Parliament—but Parliament usually goes into recess in July and does not reopen till November. So Parliamentary authorization could be slowish, and might not come till the beginning of 1986. Then arrangements for actual ordinations would have to be made, and the first actual women deacons to emerge from the process might appear a little before Easter 1986. And between March 1984 and March 1986 there could still be many a slip.

The Liturgical Commission report on the comparison between the Sunday lectionaries of the Church of Rome and of the ASB was before the Synod on 29 February, and the Synod 'took note' of it, but did not reach the following motion (yes, there was a following motion, and *NOL*, in accordance with its custom, misled its readers about standing orders . . .). This was tabled by Brian Brindley, and read:

'That this Synod respectfully requests the House of Bishops to introduce into the Synod at an early opportunity proposals to permit the use in the Church of England, for a period of nine years, subject to the usual safeguards, as an optional alternative use to the presently authorized Tables of Lessons for Holy Communion, of the Three Year Sunday Eucharistic Lectionary referred to in GS 603 (with the minimum of adaptation) together with appropriate psalms and any necessary alternative Collects, as a step towards eventual introduction of a Common Lectionary available for use by all English-speaking Christians.'

The debate on the 'take note' motion included a speech by Brian Brindley angled towards his motion, and also a spirited advance shot across his bows by Donald Gray (who claimed to practice two forms of lectionaristic ecumenism at once, by using the Roman daily eucharistic lectionary, and the Joint Liturgical Group (i.e. ASB) Sunday one). The report itself is reviewed below, and the following motion will be taken in July.

Mr. Fairlie's motion, reported in our editorial in January 1984, was passed with little penetrating discussion and without dissension, on the evening of the same 'Leap Year Day'. Standing Committee has now to make of it what it can.

On 1 March we had the next crack at what the House of Bishops is doing about marriage after divorce. The Synod voted on the following motion (following some amending of the proposal we published last month):

'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 those 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 people concerned;
  - (d) set out guidelines for diocesan bishops, clergy, and panels.
- (iii) asks the Standing Committee to review and report on the effect of recent and current changes in society and in the Marriage Law and the growing number of divorces on the doctrine of Marriage according to English law and the obligation of the Church to marry all parishioners who are not divorced'.

The voting on this motion was:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	35	7
Clergy	128	68
Laity	132	55

So the affair runs on till we meet again in July.

### This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Liturgical Study no. 37, *Why Liturgical Worship Anyway?*, by Michael Sansom. This is a highly exploratory, and yet quite stimulating, exploration of aspects of liturgical worship which stand in its favour but are regularly overlooked or underweighed. It is a serious *prima facie* case established in a controversy which our more liturgically minded readers may not even acknowledge as a problem. Indeed, come to think, it is possible that those most in need of the argumentation are those who by definition are not readers of *News of Liturgy*. Ah well!

### . . . and next month's

is Worship Series no 88, *Welcoming the Bishop*, by David Coultts. The author is both a liturgical and a bishop's chaplain (he is chaplain to the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich), and has encountered in his own person the disturbing problem as to how to give the bishop a proper liturgical role when he visits St. Pelagius—where on the one hand he has no experience of their chosen local liturgical peculiarities, but on the other may well be asked or expected to take charge without any briefing and see the event through without shipwreck. David Coultts' booklet should at least ensure it never goes wrong again in one part of East Anglia, and we anticipate *enormous* demand for the booklet . . . !

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.45 by inland post for the year 1984 - £4.00 with *News of Hymnody* added)

GROVE BOOKS  
BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0002 251114)

16p

... and a St. John's College Newsletter should as usual come with this (and will tell you of COB's sabbatical).

### SERIES 1 AND RITE B—A TEXTUAL COMPARISON

What does the lover of Series 1 communion (particularly in its 'Interim Rite' form) have which he loses if he turns to Rite B? Here is a listed answer:

- 1 The opening Lord's Prayer (often said *sotto voce* by the priest alone).
- 2 The greeting before the collect.
- 3 Reference in the rubrics to long exhortations after the sermon.
- 4 Opportunity to have the Offertory (of money) with its sentences before the intercessions.
- 5 Rite B has different versicles and responses which may be interspersed between the paragraphs of the intercessions.
- 6 The omission of 'according to thy promises' in the reference to the departed in the intercessions (i.e. in Series 1 this is *not* said).
- 7 The Prayer Book confession (and shorter alternative)—Rite B is different.
- 8 Part of the relative clause at the beginning of the absolution.
- 9 The Comfortable Words are in Rite B an option *before* the confession, rather than a mandatory item following the absolution.
- 10 The Prayer of Humble Access is not now to be said by the priest on his own.
- 11 The Peace is a required versicle and response in Rite B, whilst it is an option printed elsewhere in Series 1.
- 12 The option not to say the Sunday Preface, which is an option in Series 1 and mandatory when there is no other Preface in Rite B.
- 13 Rite B has the opening 'All glory be to thee' in the post-Sanctus (from 1928).
- 14 Rite B has the insertion 'by the power of thy Holy Spirit' in the 'first epiclesis'.
- 15 Rite B has the assimilation of the longer and shorter endings of the canon into one, which is very near to the longer ending.
- 16 Rite B has a provision for supplementary consecration (omitted in Series 1).

Rite B provides many other options, but if it is legal affirmation of their use which Series 1 lovers want, then the above list indicates the amount they would have to change to be fully lawful (and, it must be remembered there has hardly been a congregation in the land using Series 1 communion from the 1967 booklet (as the Bishop of Birmingham acknowledged in the debate)). Of the list above, nos. 3, 5, 10, and 16 are almost certainly irrelevant to virtually all Series 1 lovers, nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, are self-evidently matters which are 'of no substantial importance' under Canon B.5, (and, therefore could be done Series 1 way whilst using Rite B), nos. 8, 12, 13, 14, 15 are small changes made in the priest's part which, if not done, might still be argued to be of no substantial importance, but would be much better being done, and, it can be guessed, would not be noticed in most congregations. The items the congregations would notice would be nos. 7 (congregational), 9 (new place—or omitted, but not all priests who use Series 1 have always followed the rubric here anyway), and 11 (which

must now be used, though it *can* be used in the place Series 1 has it as an option). Thus, even if the actual required changes were made, it is unlikely that more than 80 to 100 words are involved. Dr. Margaret Hewitt said in Synod that she had to change her place of worship because her incumbent scrupulously abandoned Series 1 when it was illegalized in 1980—but what then took its place which was so unendurable as to cause her to leave?

*NOL* stands by the above list until it is refuted or amended by close attention to opening notes, text, and rubrics. We undertake to lay on a demonstration antique Rite B, fully lawful, which the lover of the Interim Rite could only distinguish from the text of his heart by the use of a microscope. One wrong line in a hymn or a sermon would be a hundred times more prominent and more wounding—and those are happening week after week already . . .

C.O.B.

### THAT SOUTH AFRICAN CONSECRATION IN SYDNEY

Our information was gleaned in advance, and was incorrect in that the Archbishop of Capetown did not go himself to participate in the Sydney event, but sent Bishop Swartz of Kimberley and Kuruman instead. But it is clear that Bishop Swartz went on behalf of the House of Bishops of the Church of the Province of South Africa, and the Archbishop of Capetown stayed at home lest it be thought he was acting not fraternally but metropolitanically towards the new bishop—a notion which would have scuppered the new bishop in his own diocese.

There are two minor complications worth noting: one is that the Church of England in South Africa includes congregations in Zimbabwe (i.e. in area of the Province of Central Africa) and the authorities in that Anglican Province have not been consulted or involved; and a second is that some Australian bishops have complained that the Archbishop of Sydney (with the consent of the Primate, Archbishop John Grindrod of Brisbane) has acted without the agreement of all the Australian bishops. It is hard to know whether this latter complaint is one of wounded *amour propre* ('they never asked me') or of real opposition to the event ('they should never have done it, and I would have opposed it if I had been asked').

### Reviews

*A Common Lectionary. A Report by the Liturgical Commission.* (GS 603, C10, 30p).

This report has been produced by the Liturgical Commission following the passing of Brian Brindley's motion in November 1982 that Synod consider authorizing the three-year Roman Catholic Sunday eucharistic lectionary and asking for a comparison with the authorized lectionaries of the Church of England. In a cool, even unenthusiastic, way the Commission has responded. In Appendix 1 they set out the underlying principles of the Roman lectionary. In Appendix 2 they set out A) the readings common to both lectionaries, B) those only in ASB and C) those only in the Roman lectionary. (There is no list of those passages that do not appear at all!) While the Commission does not 'advise any particular course of action' it says that most members of the Commission think it would be wise to proceed no further while some wish to authorize the Roman lectionary for

use with the 1961 lectionary only. If it was made an alternative to that of the ASB there would be a need to change a) the ASB Calendar (the pre-Advent Sundays before Christmas would have to go, for example), b) the collects which reflect the ASB themes, and c) the Sunday officelections that also reflect these themes.

Four issues could have been drawn out more sharply, although it may be that official reports prohibit candid discussion.

- 1 *Strengths and Weaknesses of the Roman lectionary.* The lectionary is one of the great achievements of Vatican II, and I think has some significant strengths. Its three-year cycle allows more scripture to be read. It identifies Ordinary Sundays of the Year when themes are abandoned and Gospels and Epistles are read 'semi-continuously'. This avoids the tendency in the ASB of the theme to impose on scripture, witnesses to other ways of approaching the Bible, and helps hearers to get to know their way round the Bible. The ASB's approach is at its weakest in the interminable Sundays after the Epiphany, and compares unfavourably with the Roman Sundays after Easter. However the Roman lectionary is weak in making the Gospel always the controlling lesson, and particularly in the effect of this on the Old Testament reading. The theological presuppositions of the ASB arrangement is surely more satisfactory in its Trinitarian basis and in the weight it gives to the different parts of scripture. Two features of the Roman lectionary that are significant for Anglican self-understanding are not highlighted in the report. One is the status given to the Apocrypha. The other is the omission of verses 'of little pastoral worth or involving difficult questions' (Instructions 7d). In my experience of the *daily* eucharistic lectionary the omissions are frequent and irritating in portions that are often too short anyway.
- 2 *Ecumenical Dimension.* This is a major part of a drive to adopt the Roman lectionary and follows the 1978 Lambeth Conference's recommendation of a common lectionary and their drawing attention to the Roman lectionary. However the ASB lectionary springs from another ecumenical initiative and commitment. It also represents another tradition in liturgical renewal from the Roman, one that has been very fruitful and is regarded positively in Roman Catholic circles. The rapid emergence of one liturgical tradition in Western episcopal churches could stultify renewal. There is a long and good tradition of non-Roman use in the Western church.
- 3 *Purpose of a lectionary.* Talk of a common lectionary unifying the churches seems to me to be a bit suspect, and different in kind from the proper search for common liturgical patterns. It is the whole of scripture that is common to the churches and should operate as such. Some discussion assumes that the Bible will be more familiar to Christians from the liturgy than from their own private or extra-liturgical study. (Justin, Hippolytus and the Didascalia give us a very good picture of the private and public reading of scripture.) Lectionaries must be seen as complementing the church's encounter with scripture elsewhere. Does the issuing of a lectionary allow the reading of the 'unauthorized' parts of scripture? If it does not forbid it, it does not allow for it either. Why not explicit provision to allow churches to read other parts of scripture in connection, for example, with an expository sermon series?

- 4 *Alternative lectionaries.* I think that there is a case for authorizing alternative lectionaries. In the Roman case amendment would be needed to preserve some good features of the ASB calendar. (Thematic collects seem to me somewhat *overdone* anyway). The biggest danger (apart from some parishes being more Roman than Anglican!) is restless switching between alternatives. It would be wise to follow the example of the 1922 Measure that where a change in lectionary is made it must be continuously followed at least until the end of the ecclesiastical year.

Michael Vasey

I. Pahl (ed.), *Coena Domini I: Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformation-skirchen im 16./17. Jahrhundert* (Spicilegium Friburgense 29). Fribourg University Press 1983. 75 Swiss Francs.

In just over 600 packed pages, Irmgard Pahl has brought together a team of well-known liturgiologists of the Reformation era in order to provide us with a full collection of eucharistic texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many will see the book as a worthy successor to the volume published in the same series in 1968 entitled *Præx Eucharistica*, which consisted of a set of eucharistic prayers from the main Eastern and medieval Western Churches. Dr. Pahl helped Anton Hanggi complete the earlier volume, so that she learnt how difficult it is to get scholars to produce the right kind of material in a uniform manner.

*Coena Domini I* is made up of no less than 27 chapters, each of which contains a full bibliography, together with texts in the original languages. I could not help noticing the omission of Bryan Spinks' Grove Liturgical Study on Luther, which may be a casualty of printers' delay (the volume was supposed to have appeared some years ago). On the other hand, I enjoyed playing around with sixteenth century Danish, as the book gives us a comprehensive treatment of all the main families of Reformation rites, Lutheran, Calvinist, Zwinglian and other. Moreover, as a native Scots Episcopalian, I also enjoyed seeing Colin Buchanan's enforced objectivity in the Anglican chapter, in relation to the 1637 Prayer Book.

Two main faults often become apparent in collections of texts. One is selectivity; the other is a preconceived 'norm' in presenting the material. Dr. Pahl's publication manages to avoid both. The reader can find out exactly what the Worms German Mass of 1524 did by way of adapting the 'Orate fratres'. And the texts are presented in such a way that they can speak for themselves, so that we do not have to look at these important documents through the spectacles of the twentieth century eucharistic prayer.

The book deserves success as a library text-book; all specialists should buy it anyway. And we look forward to its two planned successors, which should take us through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries up to the present day.

Kenneth Stevenson

[One of the risks *NOL* takes in getting reviews from independent thinkers is passing unkind side-swipes at the editor, as above. I can fairly state here that 'Objectivity' is my middle name (yes, it begins with 'O') and thus the only way it is 'enforced' is that one has no control over one's natural good gifts. COB].