

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 119

November 1984

## Editorial

When we gave brief mention of the new services from the Liturgical Commission on page 4 of this issue, we were not then clear whether a copy of the report would be to hand when we went to press and therefore could not plan to review it adequately this month (though we have been running sufficiently late in ourselves to be fairly sure readers would not get *NOL* for November till around 9 December, so the task was in principle on). In the event a copy has come through in time for me to write on it myself, but not in time for me to get other comment. I hope to redress this lack next month.

The report, *Lent, Holy Week, Easter*, (lettered GS 643) is published by the CIO (110 pages, £3.50). Its main provisions are: a section on Lent (including Ash Wednesday particularly); Palm Sunday and Holy Week; Maundy Thursday and Good Friday; and finally Easter. The chairman, Professor Douglas Jones contributes an Introduction ('we have distanced ourselves from every attempt to dig up the past as though we were archaeologists'), and there is a separate Introduction to each section in the report. One of the publishing possibilities inherent in this situation is that the final material might be published *with* its Introductions, as no part of the provision is going to 'authorized' and all of it will be merely 'commended' by the two Archbishops. It is likely that actual *use* of the liturgical material will be issuing from other duplicated or similar provision anyway.

Where at this preliminary stage should a signatory of the report make special comment? Well, I draw attention to a few clear points:

- 1 The quote from the chairman a few lines above encourages a theological reflection on what we are doing when keeping Lent and Holy Week. Do we walk the way of the Cross *simpliciter*? No, says the chairman—'It is in the light of the resurrection that we worship the Crucified Lord and are united with him'. It is *not* the same as getting back into the first disciples shoes—but, equally, it is not the same as just singing Palm Sunday or Good Friday hymns in the present. There is an entry into the past events—more than mental attention, less than transmigration, both cerebral and experiential.
- 2 The most imatinatively new feature of these services is the provision of an agape. *NOL* commends this to readers, and will be glad to hear of creative use of it.
- 3 The general character of the report reflects the specialist interests and concerns of the more 'catholic' elements in the Church of England. In general this was inevitable, and I have found myself glad to sign and commend the liturgical provision, *within its own*

*terms*. I shall be hoping to experience it in parochial use. But this provision does not exclusively fill the stage, and I am left to wonder what a truly creative evangelical programme might look like . . .

More next month.

Colin Buchanan

## GENERAL SYNOD 13-16 NOVEMBER 1984

Quite a bit of liturgical business was done:

### Local Ecumenical Development

The Derby working party presented its report on the Tuesday afternoon, and asked the Synod to endorse its 'positive provisions' method—i.e. the introduction of a Canon which would specifically cover what could or could not be done in a Local Ecumenical Project. Both ministries and rites of different Churches would be thereby given a new standing in relation to the Church of England in such areas—indeed it would be the first time that the Church of England had ever officially acknowledged that they exist! The main motions on the principles went through on the Tuesday by (bishops) 34-0, (clergy) 142-43, (laity) 136-37. My own amendment, to extend such recognition and use of ministers not episcopally ordained to other areas (in which the present proposal will treat them as roughly the equivalent of Anglican deaconesses), was defeated—not overwhelmingly, and after a good round of applause, but partly by those who thought that supporting it might bring the main motions to defeat (an error of arithmetic and tactics, if ever there was one). On the Friday the Measure and Canons started their progress through Synod, and go now to a Revision Committee.

### The Roman Catholic Three-year Sunday Lectionary

The debate on the Commission's report had been adjourned since February. It was quickly completed, and we moved on to the Brindley motion, to give it a nine year period of experimental use. The mover and two members of the Commission—the Bishop and the Archdeacon of Leicester—spoke in favour. COB put in an undogmatic word against. Then Christian Howard stormed in with the 'lay' angle. 'We do not have a choice—these options for the clergy are simply imposed on the laity' she stated, and the whole mood swung. The Archbishop of York put in a final nail, opining that a self-selecting tiny and unrepresentative minority were not his idea of a good basis for an 'experiment'. And the motion went down (1-16; 57-87; 47-91).

### The Ordination of Women

Here the motion 'That this Synod asks the Standing Committee to bring forward legislation to permit the ordination of Women to the Priesthood in the Provinces of Canterbury and York' was accepted in all three Houses (41-6; 131-98; 135-79—with a total of five abstentions). I have commented at length on this result in the *St. John's Newsletter* which is being sent out with this *NOL*, and will say no more here.

### The Reconciliation of a Penitent

A Private Member's Motion, by the Rev. T. Knight of Portsmouth, handled the 'Reconciliation' theme on Thursday evening. I put in an amendment to remove a slightly tendentious subordinate clause, but, with that proviso, otherwise accepted the motion. It was carried in the following form:

'That this Synod requests the Doctrine Commission to prepare and publish a report examining the theology and current practice of *The Reconciliation of a Penitent* in order to assist the Synod in any future consideration of this matter.'

It remains to be seen how this floating iceberg melts away in the warm waters of theological investigation.

### The Church of South India

Whilst this does not sound like a liturgical subject, it is worth noting that on the Friday morning Archdeacon Peter Dawes succeeded in amending the misleading platform motion, so that we finally passed the following: 'That this Synod now desires the Church of England to enter into Full Communion with the Church of South India in accordance with the traditional meaning of that term (as expressed in the 1958 Lambeth Conference Report).'

This raises very relevant questions about the status of ministers from non-episcopal Churches.

### Renewing the Licences of the Old Booklets

Almost the last agenda item on the Friday was the provisional approval for an extension from 31 December 1985 to 31 December 1990 of the existing authorized Series 1, 2, and 3 services. John Williams of Chelmsford had put down amendments to eliminate from the list each service in turn except Series 3 communion, whilst David Silk (unofficially reflecting the recommendation the Liturgical Commission had sent the House of Bishops) wished to remove Series 2 and Series 3 communion. However, the start of the debate had its own interest as the agenda said that the Bishop of Winchester would move provisional approval on behalf of the House of Bishops, but in fact it was the ubiquitous Bishop of Derby who came to the rostrum. After he had moved the motion, Winchester then rose to his feet to say he had not moved it on the grounds *he was actually opposed to the extension!* This looked like a triumph of episcopal disorganization, and the Synod was left to wonder whether names were drawn out of the hat for bishops to move things in Synod . . .

John Williams succeeded with two of his amendments, and Series 2 (Revised) Morning and Evening Prayer, and Series 2 Communion both disappeared (by 114-89 and 135-92 respectively). David Silk failed (101-128) to dislodge the green booklet. The provisional approval thus went through for:

Series 1: Matrimony and Burial—Series 2: Baptism and Confirmation—Series 3: Communion.

Perhaps not all these will get two-thirds majorities in each House on final approval.

### This month's Booklet

. . . is Pastoral Series no. 20, *The Parish Computer*, by Michael Parsons, and very practical and helpful it is (I may add that, as a one-finger typist, and a back-of-an-envelope statistician, I have been overborne by events, both at our printers and at St. John's College, and am now totally convinced of the need for the forward-looking parish to be thoroughly computerized. There is even—as the Booklet tells—a 'Church Computer Users' Group' . . .)

### . . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 40, *Essays on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Early Church*, edited by Colin Buchanan. Grove Liturgical Studies has been doing a leisurely dialogue on this issue (see nos. 19 and 31) and the new set of essays includes contributions (particularly relating to Rowan Williams Study no. 31) from Geoffrey Stevenson, Chris Hancock, Michael Vasey, Nick Sagovsky, and David Gregg. It represents the completion of ten years of Liturgical Studies once a quarter.

### . . . and renewing *NOL*

is more or less due, and you should have had a note about it with last month's issue. (Incidentally the computer address label on your envelope ought to tell you your position—'n' means *NOL*, 'h' means *NOH*, 's' means subscription, 'a' means airmail, and a date means the date we registered receipt of your sub (so that 'DEC 83' or 'JAN 84' is a reminder that you owe!). If you think you have paid and it is not shown, then wait for the December number and check the label then—the labels may have been run off before your payment was recorded. Prices:

	Inland or surface	Airmail overseas
<i>NOL</i> monthly by post in 1985	£3.55 (US\$5.25)	£4.75 (US\$7.25)
<i>NOL</i> monthly with <i>NOH</i> quarterly	£4.20 (US\$6.25)	£5.25 (US\$8.25)

Cheques (and checks) should be made out to 'Grove Books'. You can pay through our giro account (no. 48 821 4009) if you give full details on the transfer form. If you do not have an 's' on the label you pay in a different way—and know it. Reduced rates for quantities. And backnumbers are also available.

### . . . and one or two other books

which we can sell you (Christmas presents for liturgy-lovers?). CIO publish *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* on 9 December, and if you ordered one we should have enclosed it with this. Further copies should be available to those who send money, or order through Standing Order accounts. We have also got in copies of Cuming and Jasper *The Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* in paperback from America, and we are selling these at £6.25 (the cost is up because of the fall in the pound).

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

Then in the New Year (probably *not* January, but we go on hoping) there should be available COB's third volume of modern Anglican liturgies *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1975-1984* (S.P.C.K., £25). This is coming out first as an Alcuin limp-back book, and Alcuin members will get it in their subscription. The previous volume, *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975*, to which the one new relates closely, is in print in both hardback (£14.50) and paperback (£8.50). All are, as usual, postfree.

#### ... and corrections

to Liturgical Study 39, *Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England 1978-1984*, would be most gratefully received. We are aware of a few, and hope soon to publish our own 'corrigenda' sheet in *NOL* and offprint it to go with further copies sold. (Do not forget that Ministry and Worship Booklet no. 14, *Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England down to 1975*, is now reprinted at £1.60—and the whole 'set' of five booklets/studies has a reduced price of £4.80—£5 in the New Year when other prices go up).

#### ... and you could help with a forthcoming booklet

*viz.*, no. 91, *Adult Baptisms in the Church of England*. What we are after is evidence of the use of adult catechism material, or details of actual parish practice. Please write in quickly.

#### THAT QUESTIONNAIRE TO ORDINANDS

David Martin and Roger Homan in a printed letter dated June 1984 have sent to each ordinand of the Church of England a copy of *Faith and Worship*, the journal of the Prayer Book Society, for the Summer 1984 edition of which they were the guest editors. However, the covering letter adds that there is one other thing the editors want the ordinands to do—*viz.* fill in the questionnaire which comes with the journal. The questionnaire itself runs as follows:

- |   |                          |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|--|
| <p>1 Name of theological college</p> <p>2 Year of course</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">First year</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Second year</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Subsequent year(s)</p> <p>3 How fully acquainted with each of the following services do you think you were before coming to theological college?</p> <p>Prayer Book</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">Mattins</td> <td>very/slightly/not at all</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evensong</td> <td>very/slightly/not at all</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holy Communion</td> <td>very/slightly/not at all</td> </tr> </table> <p>4 At theological college how frequently have you attended each of the following?</p> <p>Answer: very often/often/seldom/never</p> <p>Prayer Book Mattins</p> <p>ASB Mattins</p> <p>Prayer Book Evensong</p> <p>ASB Evensong</p> <p>Prayer Book Holy Communion</p> <p>Holy Communion Rite A</p> <p>Holy Communion Rite B</p> <p>5 Would you consider yourself competent to lead worship according to each of the following rites?</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">Prayer Book Mattins</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ASB Mattins</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prayer Book Evensong</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ASB Evensong</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prayer Book Holy Communion</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holy Communion Rite A</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holy Communion Rite B</td> <td>yes/no</td> </tr> </table> | Mattins                  | very/slightly/not at all | Evensong | very/slightly/not at all | Holy Communion | very/slightly/not at all | Prayer Book Mattins | yes/no | ASB Mattins | yes/no | Prayer Book Evensong | yes/no | ASB Evensong | yes/no | Prayer Book Holy Communion | yes/no | Holy Communion Rite A | yes/no | Holy Communion Rite B | yes/no | <p>6 As a prospective incumbent which of the following parties do you expect to prevail in determining the forms of service to be adopted in your parish? Please feel free to tick more than one if appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the bishop(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the parish clergy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the parochial church council</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> the congregation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> others (please specify).....</p> <p>7 Please indicate in rank order of preference (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) each of the following <i>Communion</i> rites, marking with an X any forms with which you have little or no acquaintance.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Book of Common Prayer</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interim rite</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Series 1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Series 2</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Series 3</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Series 1 and 2 Revised</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ASB Rite A</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ASB Rite A following the pattern of BCP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ASB Rite B</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Missa normativa</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify).....</p> <p>8 Has your preference expressed in answer to question 7 changed since age 21? If so, please explain how?</p> |
| Mattins   | very/slightly/not at all |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Evensong  | very/slightly/not at all |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Holy Communion  | very/slightly/not at all |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Prayer Book Mattins   | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| ASB Mattins   | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Prayer Book Evensong  | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| ASB Evensong  | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Prayer Book Holy Communion  | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Holy Communion Rite A   | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |
| Holy Communion Rite B   | yes/no                   |                          |          |                          |                |                          |                     |        |             |        |                      |        |              |        |                            |        |                       |        |                       |        |  |

At St. John's the president of the JCR has written (unbidden by the staff) to the two organizers to ensure that no misunderstanding occurs, and in the course of a careful letter he points out that students 'attend' parish churches on Sundays as well as College services mid-week (qu. 4); that the value of the 'competence' question is 'dubious' (qu. 5); that qu. 6 only tests the students on knowledge of Canon Law; and finally

'our acquaintance with (both ASB and BCP) is . . . high *by the time we have left College* and not necessarily high at the time of your survey when many of the ordinands would only just have started this course . . .'

#### THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM

We recently said, in reviewing the Bishop of Birmingham's *A Confirmation Notebook*, that we thought he would like to be numbered with the 'liberal' element in the Church of England. This was a wrong thought on our part. He writes to tell us he wishes to be known as an Anglican pure and simple, without qualification or limitation. We gladly withdraw from our misdescription, and apologize for any embarrassment caused to the bishop.

#### LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

This one is borrowed from the hymnody field (but Robin Leaver is out of the country . . .): Roy Taylor of Taunton writes:

In a recent licensing service at Bilston, two hymn lines ran as follows: 'daily on the manna feeding which he gives them when they pay'.

#### BLESSING AT THE RAIL

A few Winters ago we spent some months tracking down the variant words used by clergy and others when 'blessing' children at the communion rail. Now a different but linked question has arisen. Apparently in one Southern diocese someone somewhere has complained that lay distributants should not be giving 'priestly' blessings to children, nor laying hands on them. The diocese in turn has restrained these excesses. But those thus deprived have asked what authority lies behind such restraint. Without prejudice to the rights and wrongs of the issue (on which we will pronounce definitively in due course) we simply ask at this point whether there are known to be other dioceses which have rulings or guidelines on the subject. When we *do* pronounce, we want all other cases to be taken into consideration.

#### FURTHER TO THE IRISH ALTERNATIVE PRAYER BOOK

Canon Turner of Belfast has forwarded a list of errors detected in the *APB* (with attribution to the spotter of each), numbering 25 in all. It does not look too serious, but will be corrected in further printings. So all prizes are indeed off.

#### SEABURY BI-CENTENARY

On Wednesday, 14 November, the two hundredth anniversary of the consecration of Samuel Seabury as the first bishop of Connecticut was celebrated at the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew in Aberdeen. The occasion was marked by the Eucharist in the morning and a Festal Evensong in the afternoon. Aside from being located in Aberdeen, a service in the morning and evening, and the warm hospitality of the Scots, one must ponder more the dissimilarities of the two dates than the similarities.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, whose predecessor was noted for his absence in 1784, was most prominent in 1984, even preaching at the evening service. He even took a day off from synod to celebrate the event largely brought about by one of that predecessor's inaction. The Geneva gowns worn by all in 1784 and featured on the cover of the service leaflet were no where to be seen. The small congregations of two hundred years ago were replaced with a large crowd in the morning and a full house in the evening. In 1784 the English 1662 BCP would have been used, there being no communion. In 1984 the 1982 Scottish Eucharist was used. It seems much closer to the American Rite II Eucharist of 1979 or even the 1789 American Holy Communion than either the 1764 Scottish service or Rattray's office.

As an American observer, two points were of particular interest at the celebration. First, both the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the USA and the Archbishop of Canterbury in their overwhelming praise of Seabury ignored a certain historical fact. Despite Seabury's presence in America with two Bishops of the English line, no episcopal consecration took place in America until three bishops in the English line of succession were present. One might think that Seabury's consecration was regarded with more suspicion in America than the romanticising of the tale makes known. His character was also much in question. Secondly, the expanded vision of ministry witnessed in the service did not seem to agree with Seabury's views at all. He was notorious in his desire to keep the laity at a distance, as witnessed in his own election. What would he have said to not only laity, but a little girl and a woman reading in the service?

Perhaps the most awkward moment of the celebration was the presentation of a fund for the 'training of women for the ministry in Scotland and until such time as that comes about for the training of deaconesses.' The lack of tact on the Americans' part could not be made up in the generosity of the gift. Women's ordination is no more for sale in the Episcopal Church of Scotland than it is anywhere else and the derogatory implication on women's ministry being practiced at this time was totally inexcusable. Perhaps in examining Seabury's life this was the most fitting remembrance to him on the day. His sometimes unprincipled search for consecration was finally and graciously ended by the Scots. If one were to reduce the hundreds of pages of correspondence he undertook in that search to a single sentence, one might quote a Scot in saying, 'If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly!' I wonder though,

whether a Tory, high-churchman would have agreed, even after two hundred years of mellowing, to others' search for the laying on of hands? Perhaps the Scots shall now graciously end others' search?

D. Donald Dunn III

#### Review

We have asked the mover of the original motion to do this review: *Godparents* (C.I.O., 1984, 75p)

This is a report by Richard Rutt, Bishop of Leicester, in response to a motion carried by the General Synod in February 1981. 'This Synod would welcome an opportunity to debate the role of godparents and sponsors in Christian Initiation, including their qualifications and selectipn, and to this end asks the Standing Committee to prepare and present a report which will be both theological and practical.'

In addition to a Preface and a Summary, there are six main sections. 'Present practicalities' faces the realities of the situation: the spiritually responsible and the merely perfunctory; the fulfilled and the frustrated. This is followed by a historical survey from Tertullian to the ASB. Nine liturgical functions of a godparent are listed: some currently out of favour; some suggestions for the future. In a brief look at the practices of other churches, we are reminded that in some places, godparents are either not employed or are optional. Bishop Rutt discusses the terms 'godparent' and 'sponsor', having a preference for the former while not denying the need for baptismal sponsorship. The final section discusses the theology of promises by proxy.

The Synod asked for a report and a debate. No time is fixed for the latter. As the Report contains no proposals, the invitation to *NOL* subscribers must be to read, to reflect and to recommend. What about those nine liturgical functions? Should the qualifications refer to confirmation or to actual communicant membership? Why not use the Renewal of Baptismal Vows as a means of giving public recognition to an additional godparent when this is desirable?

Michael Hodge

#### THAT FAMOUS SYNODICAL DECIMAL POINT

I wrote in Liturgical Study no. 39 (on page 15) of 'a decimal point of a clergyman' which decided in July 1976 that 'Series 1 and 2 Revised' should be finally approved—it was passed in the House of Clergy by 105 votes to 52! We all have our own stories about how it happened (more are always welcome, as mine have been told before)—but we now have an attempt from Michael Saward to outbid all competitors and win the auction. He claims (if 'claims' is the right word) to *have gone through the wrong door* (because he was too busy talking to somebody!). This correspondent even makes his mistakes on a bigger scale than others, and so far does lead the auction. All we need now is to hear from a teller who admits he made a mistake on his fingers or toes, and the auction will be over.

(I wonder if the Council of Niceae reached its decision by similar human errors . . .)