

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 115

July 1984

Editorial

July 1984 has been the month of York Minster. All ecclesiastical trails have led to York and they first took a large crowd to the consecration as the new Bishop of Durham of Professor David Jenkins on Friday 6 July. This was a controversial consecration, as the bishop-designate had, since his designation, declared (among other things) that the resurrection of Jesus (in which he says he believes) was not a spatial event affecting the dead body of Jesus. Resurrection does not imply or hang upon an empty tomb. This had caused much petitioning of the Archbishop of York not to proceed with the consecration, but he had held a press conference on 4 July to insist on a breadth to the interpretation of the formularies, and thus to reject the petitioners. The consecration went ahead. One Northern bishop let it be known he chose not to be there. Denis Nineham, no less, preached the sermon. Objectors stood outside with placards. And John Mowl, vicar of Buglawton, Congleton (with whom I was once a colleague as a curate . . .) rose during the service to make a protest. It looks as though practically everyone else in the Minster was a well-wisher, and a rousing shout of 'It is' greeted the Archbishop's question 'Is it therefore your will that he should be ordained?'

How are we to reflect upon this occurrence? As I was out of the country, I had not been involved in the petitioning. But I offer the following observations (all subject to the new Bishop's views truly being as stated above):

- 1 For myself, I am an old-fashioned believer, and I see in, for instance, Peter's sermon in Acts 2, a dependence upon the empty tomb as part of the initial apologia for the resurrection.
- 2 Whilst I would not necessarily want to deny the title of 'Christian' to someone who holds these views, I do not conceive that there is any power in such a position to reproduce itself in other people. In general our leading liberal theologians have begun their overt Christian lives amongst conservatives, and their liberalism is a sophisticated but emasculated development from that. It is only the continuance of a strong New Testament gospel in the church that wins unbelievers for Christ.
- 3 It is not only that David Jenkins' views seem to be idiosyncratic (we ought not to take too seriously the instant finding of the TV programme that various other bishops hold similar views), it is also that they are rather passé. The beliefs of this Professor of 59 years of age seem to contrast unfavourably with the much clearer position of so many recent additions to the episcopate—most of such bishops being ten years younger than him. So perhaps we have here one consecrated out of due time—his due time being really ten years ago or more. There is hope for the Church of England in that thought.
- 4 One is tempted to ask how David Jenkins' beliefs differ from those of an occultist (though no doubt the distinction can be made). And I am frankly puzzled as to how this Christianity we share ever began if it did not begin with a clear victory *over the grave*.

- 5 Some of the trouble in this case arose because the bishop-designate apparently revealed his position *after* he had been recommended by the Crown Appointments Commission, and nominated to the bishopric of Durham by the Crown. We must assume that the Crown Appointments Commission (which is not short of old-fashioned believers) will check the beliefs of its favoured *episcopabiles* in future.
- 6 The Church of England gives the oddest possible messages to unbelievers or to members of other faiths, or to Christians of other denominations. We are sticky about women's ordination, inflexible about episcopal ordination, ready to lay down absurd rules about dress and ceremonial (see Laughter in Liturgy below), and yet have so much liberty of interpretation about the resurrection of Jesus that, in effect, it does not matter whether he rose bodily or not. The combined effect is of a body which tithes mint and anise and yet swallows camels with hardly a hiccup.
- 7 If, of course, we have got the new Bishop of Durham's position wrong, then it is simply his Public Relations Officer needing an overhaul.

After the peak event of Friday 6 July, York Minster had a subdued role on the Saturday and the Sunday. On the Saturday, David Holloway attempted to get the General Synod (meeting at the University of York) to adjourn for two minutes to reflect (sorrowfully) upon the consecration. He spoke with dignity and conviction; he failed to secure the majority of votes, but a real unrest was registered. Then on the Sunday the Synod went to the Minster for the Synod eucharist, and the Archbishop of York preached on the role of controversy in the church.

Then came the holocaust. Sometime after midnight that night, and thus in the early hours of Monday 9 July, fire fell on the South transept of the Minster, and burnt it out, roof included, so that only a shell remained. There was heroism of every kind: the Archbishop of York was there at 5 a.m. on his way to Geneva; the Dean and Chapter were moving valuables out of the choir from about 2.30 a.m. onwards; fire-engines came from all round Yorkshire; and the damage was confined to the South transept—'by a miracle' as the Archbishop of Canterbury said.

And that introduced the next round of controversy. If there *was* a miracle, was it one of preservation or of condemnation? Was the Minster being protected from attacks of lightning, or subjected to the wrath of God (presumably because of the previous Friday's activities)? The linkage was so easy to make, yet the conclusion so difficult to make stick. Curiously the final impression seems to have been that the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office (yes, they were with the Ecclesiastical) thinks it *was* an Act of God, but the theologians are less sure. And a letter in *The Times* points out that perhaps lightning conductors do *not* protect . . . On Monday evening there was (by previous arrangement) a farewell dinner held during Synod for Ronald Jasper, whose time as Dean of York was to be completed the following Sunday, 15 July. He, in his mild and unfussed way, started to see a silver lining to the thunderbolt—'why' he said, 'we have a whole team of very skilled craftsmen at the Minster, and they will now have the chance to show they are no whit behind the medieval craftsmen.' Oh yes, but they will need money . . .

Life—and perhaps providence—is full of surprises in York. C.O.B.

POSTSCRIPTS TO THE YORK DOINGS REPORTED OPPOSITE

At proof we can report: (a) all correspondence from abroad seems to be commenting on David Jenkins and the Minster fire; (b) the House of Commons on 17 July rejected the Appointment of Bishops Measure (by 32 votes to 171)—some members, with total disregard for logic or even basic commonsense, citing the Durham appointment as reason for keeping the present system unchanged; (c) St. John's College on 24 July was threatened by a field fire—it came within yards of the staff houses, and then the wind changed. What has St. John's got that York lacks?

LITURGICAL EVENTS IN THE JULY SYNOD

The question of the consecration of bishops is raised in the Editorial. The debate on the Roman Catholic three-year lectionary was shelved till November, as the time was needed for the debate on marriage after divorce. Series One services were not on the agenda (see article below) and nor was the report of the Derby working party on Local Ecumenical Progress (see article below). Thus the bishops' proposals on marriage after divorce were the major event with liturgical implications during the course of the four days in York.

As outlined last month, there was some division in the House of Bishops, and the Bishop of Salisbury emerged as the spokesman for the minority paper, which would have retained church weddings for solely those marrying for the first time. However, the main proposals of the House of Bishops, steered ably by the Bishop of Guildford, prevailed. This was a lengthy regulation (with attached 'Guidelines', covering the categories of persons to whom a second marriage service could be safely accorded). The Regulation included the rescission of the old 1957 Convocation resolutions, and at that point a crucial vote was called (just as it had been in November 1983 with 'Option G'). The voting was:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	27	9
Clergy	107	73
Laity	119	63

The Synod then referred the draft Regulation to the dioceses for response by 10 January 1985. If the Regulation is *then* to proceed in General Synod, it seems that a change in Canon Law may also be necessary.

There was also the question of Women Ordained Abroad. This Measure has been contested as much by the indirect procedure of trying to ensure it is 'Article 8' business (i.e. that which touches the doctrine of the Church of England, and must therefore be referred to the dioceses and gain a two-thirds majority in each House at final approval), as by the direct method of debating it on its merits. The actual provisions of the Measure are so incredibly limiting that the dioceses may yet ask *why* they are being asked. But Article 8 business it is, and that by a decision of a slightly fudged sort, as the explanation given Synod acknowledged that on a strictly legal interpretation the Article 8 categorization was not required. As everyone knows that in November the Synod will be returning to debate the ordaining of women to the presbyterate within the Church of England, the issue of 'Women Ordained Abroad' may soon pale into some insignificance. Right now, it sounded to be stupendously important.

WHAT OF THOSE SERIES ONE REVIVALS?

That curious motion which the Synod narrowly accepted in February, asking the House of Bishops to introduce Series One services which had

lapsed, was not on the July General Synod agenda. However, it was the subject of some informal consultation. The opponents of the motion persisted with the point that Series One communion can be obtained under the aegis of Rite B by any man of good will and some imagination. The Morning and Evening Prayer additions had come through a backbench amendment in General Synod in February, and are not necessarily welcome to the House of Bishops (they have in fact been illegalized not just since 1980, but since 1973). So the question now rests on Series One infant baptism, which the Bishop of Birmingham thinks is in widespread demand, but the Liturgical Commission members have never encountered this demand. As the Commission has its questionnaires out round the dioceses (see the text in April *NOL*), it should be possible to get some evidence on the demand. Readers of *NOL* who know clergy or parishes which are sighing with frustration at being denied Series One baptismal rite, please write in urgently.

JOINT ORDINATION

Bristol Cathedral saw on Friday 6 July a lesser event than York Minster staged, and yet—who knows?—perhaps a more forward-looking one. For the first time, as far as is known, an Anglican ordination was united with a Free Church one, in this case a URC one. The questions which are used in common were addressed by the bishop to all the candidates in common, the prayers were (obviously) made for all the candidates at once, and the ordination was done in the order of first the Anglican deacons and deaconesses, and then the URC ministers, Anglican presbyters were not being ordained at this service. Strictly speaking (the service sheet was careful here) the ordinations were not 'joint'—but in 'parallel'.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 89, *Preaching on Special Occasions*, by Charles Hutchins. The '*Preaching at . . .*' series within the overall series already includes '*. . . Funerals*' (62), '*. . . Baptisms*' (70—currently virtually out of print), '*. . . Weddings*' (74), and '*. . . Communion (i)*' and '*(ii)*' (78 and 79). So here is the natural successor to them.

. . . and the Ethics Booklets are back

with no. 54, *Videos, Permissiveness, and the Law*, by Francis Bridger.

. . . and next month's booklet

is Pastoral Series no. 19, *The Pastoral Care of the Unemployed*, by Julian Charley (previously known to readers of Grove Booklets for his writing on the Anglican-Roman Catholic documents—of which *Rome, Canterbury, and the Future* (£1.25) is the only one still in print—but also heavily involved in inner Liverpool in exactly the theme of this booklet).

. . . and a Reprint

is *Thinking about Baptism* at 12p, or £5.50 for 50.

. . . and Filofax diary sheets for 1985

are now available at £1.30 for seven days to a page, and £2.60 for seven days to two pages. If you think you have a standing order, but the right pages have not come with this, please contact us urgently.

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 (0602 251114)

16p

THE REPORT ON LOCAL ECUMENICAL DEVELOPMENT

This report, to which the editorial here referred in June, was duly published on 6 July, and only space forbids explanation of it here this time. It will figure in our August edition. COBs Private Member's Motion began well.

PRAYER AND DEDICATION AFTER CIVIL MARRIAGE

The new drafts are reviewed below by Christopher Byworth. They were not *exactly* in view in the marriage debate in General Synod on 10 July, but the 'Salisbury' opposition to the new procedure proposed would of course have such services as a centre piece of the policy. Nevertheless, all, except the most rigid indissolubilists (and even they have an elastic nullity programme up their sleeves), see some use and need for such services as these. It was argued that they should be private, but this was felt to be casuistry—if a service happens in a church building it is public almost by definition.

We cannot print the whole text here, but do urge readers with an interest in the matter to acquire a copy from Church House, London, and to send in comments as shown in the review below.

Review

DRAFT SERVICES OF PRAYER AND DEDICATION AFTER CIVIL MARRIAGE (GS Misc. 193)

The Liturgical Commission has prepared three draft services and put them before the House of Bishops at its June meeting. The services are with or without communion, and, when they include communion, Rite A or the BCP can be used. It is hoped that the two archbishops will approve these drafts as commented on by the House of Bishops after the bishops have also framed guidelines as to their use. Since the services are not alternative to provision in the BCP, they can be authorized in this way without the full General Synod process. However, comment is invited and should be sent to the Secretary of the Liturgical Commission at Church House before 31 August.

Professor Douglas Jones in his introductory report raises the questions of need, appropriateness, and form. As reviewer, I should declare a personal involvement. Not only have I as Rector taken such services in two dioceses, but as a divorced and subsequently married clergyman I have been through one myself. There is a clear pastoral need for such services and to make them semi-private would fail to meet that need, as felt both by church-going and non-churchgoing couples. Many couples deeply want public and church recognition and joy for their second marriage and the opportunity to make a commitment to God as well as one another, and pray they may receive his grace. Thus the non-use of the term 'Blessing' in the title which is, of course, deliberate, seems unwise and unnecessary.

How like a wedding service should these services be? The Commission has wisely written new services; but as long as a rubric or compulsory spoken introduction makes it clear that the service is not a wedding, it seems hard-hearted not to allow traditional wedding music or to permit the woman to come down the aisle on her father's arm. The ring must be on the finger from the start of the service, though it may be blessed. Does

this requirement arise from a misunderstanding that it has to be put on in the Register Office, or from a desire to ensure the service is not seen as a wedding? Either way it looks hard-hearted. It is a pity too that the excellent ASB introduction to the marriage service has been wholly omitted rather than adapted. Past tenses rather than declarations of intent ('will you . . . ?) are rightly used, and the congregation is called on to support the couple. The wording, which is based largely on a Salisbury rite, is on the whole very felicitous, though no opportunity is given to those who wish to add 'worship . . . obey' to their declarations. The penitential section which commences each service (except, sadly, the Prayer Book Communion one), may not be adapted, a wise rubric. It would also be wise and appropriate to suggest to the divorced partner a time of discussion leading to individual penitence, absolution, and the declaring of the death of the former marriage.

In my view these services are much needed and if constructed with sufficient sensitivity they would largely sidestep the widely-felt desire for full marriage in church! Diocesan guidelines will be needed to encourage all clergy to offer such services and to prevent it becoming the speciality of a few who are known to be sympathetic to the divorced.

Christopher Byworth

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

We have never really included ordinations under this heading before, but along with the usual crop of reports of events which overdo 'vesting', or only allow candidates to touch a Bible briefly, rather than actually receive one each, or took an hour and a half over the distribution of communion, we have this summer received a report which can only qualify for inclusion here.

THE DIVESTING OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION

In one South Coast diocese, East of Portsmouth and West of Canterbury, the candidates are required to *shed their trousers* in order to be ordained. This is *not* done in order to make it easier for women to qualify, but apparently on the alleged grounds that trousers are 'lay' clothing, and cassocks are ministerial clothing. And ne'er the twain shall mix, it seems. Apparently the fleeting glimpse of an unclad male ankle passing in procession does the same thing for the congregation's religious affections as the equivalent glimpse of an unclad female one did for Victorian men's amorous affections.

Rumour (which has been carefully investigated and substantiated) has it that not all candidates shed their trousers with a light heart and a sense of abandon. Some even wished to keep them. To such stalwarts the ultimate compromise was offered in a spirit of Christian conciliation—they could *tuck their trousers into their socks*. Whilst this would not reveal that alluring glimpse of male ankle, it would conceal those awful reminders of one's past lay life, the trouser ends. If any eye-witness could report what proportions of candidates went for the nude ankle, and what for the discreetly socked ankle, we would be glad to report it.

But, sadly, the congregation may have been unaware of the issue, and have been looking at the candidates' faces or other irrelevant parts. They will know better in future.

THE ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL AND LITURGY

The sixth meeting of the ACC took place this month in Lagos, Nigeria, very soon after a diplomatic crisis had arisen between Nigeria and Britain (leading to cartoons of the Archbishop of Canterbury being loaded into a crate for despatch to Lagos . . .). Amongst the documents prepared for the Council was a survey of liturgical developments in the Anglican Communion, drafted by Colin Buchanan at the ACC's request.

ASB NEW PRINTING

The 'New Printing' of the ASB was published on 12 July. All three sets of publishers have produced a text, each using a hard-back two-colour, 'with-Psalter', standard (i.e. 168 x 114 mm.) size, format. The changes include a larger style of page numbers, and an index to the themes of the readings (*not*, as the blurb and the titles in the editions seem to suggest, an 'Index to the readings'—*that* would surely list the scriptural references in their biblical order and give page numbers for passages to be found?). The copyright holders never admit the text has included errors, so they can hardly claim now to have eliminated any! But they have—see article below.

The Cambridge/Clowes/SPCK edition (ASB 178) comes in blue, green, or red at £6.25: the Hodder and Stoughton one (ASB 200) in blue or red at £6.25: and the Oxford/Mowbray one (ASB 302) in blue or red, with four marker ribbons, at £6.75. At first sight the last-named is the best buy—it needs to be, for Oxford/Mowbray got it all wrong last time . . .

TRUE ERRORS IN THE NEW EDITION OF THE ASB

Recap: we recently offered £1 each to readers who could spot 'true errors' in the new edition, unspotted or unrecorded before. A 'true error' is a mistake made subsequent to authorization by General Synod, or in contradiction to the ASB's own style of presentation. Between October 1980 and February 1981 we printed each month prizewinning contributions in respect of the original ASB—and paid 50p for each one (bar those discovered by COB, or admitted anonymously by folk in the pay of the publishers). The total came to 75 or so, and 64 have been corrected now. The continuing errors are listed below. The count is complicated by an uncertainty whether something which recurs is to be reckoned as one error or more than one. And the whole matter is confused by the repeated failure of the holders of the copyright and of the various publishers to admit any errors, or even to define what is to count as an error. *NOL* cherishes a fond notion that really the authorities should have launched their own slush-fund to bring perfection to the publication. They might have been able to pay more too . . .

Here then are the continuing errors, as *NOL* distinguishes them:

pp.130, 133, 136, 139: the numbers of the Eucharistic Prayers ought to be in blue not black (cf. use of black and blue in sections 51, 52, and 53).

p.180: In section 5 'Jesus' ought to be 'Jesu'.

pp.190, 193: the sections numbers should be in blue (see re Rite A above).

pp.315, 320, 323: in sections 12, 27, and 30, there should be a colon (or semi-colon at 30?) not a comma after 'keeping' (section 12 has now been changed to the erroneous form).

p.657: in the last line but one the numbers '(13) (14) (15) (16)' should follow 'Resurrection'.

p.780: under 'St. Peter should come 'INTRODUCTORY SENTENCES' (in the plural). (This error *has* been corrected on page 503).

pp.954-957: the publishers have done their best with the dog's breakfast they created in 1980. The knock-on effect comes on page 959 where a reading supposed to be *in extenso* (Ephesians 4.1-7) is handled by a cross-reference. And that pompous note on page 978 (with a reference to it on page 954) more or less tidies up the matter.

pp.988, 1018: the note about Christmas Day should also come on pages 450-454 and 1050.

p.1291: the text of the Nicene Creed used in Rite A is *not* identical with the ICET text, and thus ought to be listed, like that of the Lord's Prayer, as 'adapted'.

Here are two further true errors from the original ASB, continued now, but not previously recorded:

p.93: in verse 18 'Glory' should not have a capital.

p.1147: in Psalm 42 verse 11 the second line should start against the left-hand margin.

We have not yet checked the points which we originally called 'inconsistencies' rather than 'errors' (see *NOL* December 1980 and April 1981), but we can comment slightly further on two points which seem to be not 'true errors' but 'erroneous truths':

p.464: the New Testament passage of Epiphany 1 year 1 *was* authorized in this form (Acts 10.34-38a) in Synod, and thus it was the entry on page 1051 (which said 'Acts 10.34-48a') which had to be corrected. But it is very likely that it was a misprint Synod authorized!

p.1071: the rules in the notes contain an ambiguity for years in which there are 33 'weeks of the year'. A note in *NOL* in December 1980 drew attention to the problem as to which of the 34 'weeks of the year' ought not to occur in such years. The Roman Catholic rule here is complex, and the note (contributed by the deviser of the ASB rule, Archdeacon David Silk) concluded: 'Thus it will be necessary to clarify the matter in future editions of the ASB . . .). Well, the future edition has come—where is the clarification?

Finally, there are the first claims to 'new true errors'—those collector's items of all items, the places where they got it right in 1980 and wrong now. So far there have been two payments of £1 made:

p.48: at section 4 there is a complete blank in the text (Charles Whitaker). (ECW showed up at General Synod in York for the Jasper dinner (see page 2), went straight to the bookstall, where advance copies were on display turned up page 48 (I think he was actually looking for page 61, where a famous error occurred in the comparable section last time), and triumphantly exhibited the error, almost as though he had known it was there by ESP . . .).

p.130: the rubric 'or' has disappeared between the two alternative greetings at the beginning of the eucharistic prayer (and thus the wooden-headed president might well say both) (Judith Buchanan). (My daughter was asking as I compiled this list what had survived as errors, and I showed her page 130 (see list above) and asked her if she could spot the error—and she came up innocently but correctly with this 'new true error').

In addition, the publishers are ready to admit one (no £1 paid):

p.1223: numbered as '1233'.

Do send in yours. We have not yet checked out the Index to the Readings (pages 1292-1296). So that could be a goldmine. Meanwhile, we will try to find out what the folk with the master tape have been up to.