

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 122

February, 1985

Editorial

In the debate in General Synod, reported on pages 2 and 3 below, I expressed myself as pleased with the Anglican/Roman Catholic Statements in inverse order of their appearance—in other words, that I thought the eucharistic agreement the best, and the authority statements the worst. Nothing I heard in the two days of debate or read in the FOAG report altered my opinion on this. However, it was clear that the centre-point on this graph of rising hesitation lies in a particular encapsulated phrase in the Ministry and Ordination statement. It comes in paragraph 13, and reads as follows:

'Nevertheless [the ordained] ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit.'

At first sight, this phrase delivers the ordained ministry from being a special 'priesthood', whilst still retaining for the ministers a distinctive role and calling within the church. This has always been a concern of evangelical Anglicans—'priesthood' to them, to have biblical force, must refer to the high priesthood of Christ (which is inalienable) or, derivatively, to the common priesthood of the whole church (as in 1 Peter 2.5 and 9). There have been cunning attempts at compromise, whereby 'ministerial priesthood' was seen as a kind of delegation of powers from the church to specific persons who thus exercised the church's priesthood for it (by some kind of mythological ecclesiastical social contract?). However, evangelicals have always seen through *that* one—it has a doctrinal sleight of hand to it, and even if it delivers the rabbit out of a different hat from the Council of Trent, yet it looks like the same rabbit (and it leaves the hat empty of priesthood for the whole people of God, perhaps?).

So what a relief from this sort of stretching of language the words above seem to offer. The church has a 'common Christian priesthood' and it is not fudged but affirmed. And the ordained ministry is a special gift to the church from God, neither delegated by the church alone, nor established as a personal gift to individuals in a vacuum by God. All seems well.

But, it emerges that the statement has an element here of the shot silk tie. So far from previous statements being softened by this form of words, what is really being asserted (from one angle of looking at the tie) is a bidding *up* of the priesthood of the ministry. From this point of view, the words 'another realm of the gifts of the Spirit' is a trumping of all the priesthood aces that exist. So we are going to have to be careful how we

communicate with each other about this new and fascinating phrase. *Ecce sacerdos* indeed (as they seem to sing at these enthronements of bishops). But who is the *sacerdos*, and where the *locus* of his *sacerdotium*? Some hard talk ought to come in the dioceses.

Colin Buchanan

1552 AT KING'S LONDON

In January I mentioned the three 'historical' celebrations of Anglican rites in King's, and the second of these fell not only on St. Valentine's day (not mentioned in the second Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI), but also during General Synod, so I went along. The result was impressive—two lines of worshippers faced inwards (college style) with the communion table running East and West parallel with them, and between them, and the pulpit moved to stand centrally looking down the church from where a nave altar might often be placed. The priest and assistants wore surplices (but no dog-collar), and the bread was certainly such as is usual to be eaten—several rolls. A sermon was preached much in the style of the First Book of Homilies, and this helped the 'flavour' of the rite greatly. Those used to 1662 felt the greatest difficulty at points marginally different from it—e.g. remaining seated for the Gospel, and not saying 'amen' after the narrative of institution. We also had the splendidly archaic experience of saying the Lord's Prayer 'after' the priest (lined out). And one or two tiny questions remained: should the opening Lord's Prayer be *sotto voce*? Should the monarch on such occasions be Edward VI or Elizabeth II? (It was E.II, but with a slight hesitation once!) And should the wine be poured from bottles to cups after the narrative of institution or earlier? (The rite gives no guidance). This correspondent took opportunity to join in the spirit of the event, and, having missed his lunch to come, begged one of the rolls left over and, in the words of the rubric, had it 'to his own use'.

If anyone can report the 1549 or 1662 celebrations we would be glad to print accounts. Congratulations to Professor Stuart Hall and his colleagues in providing this very fine fare.

SYNOD IN FEBRUARY 1985

We had quite a series of liturgical and quasi-liturgical material:

(i) 'BEM' and 'ARCIC' on Tuesday 12 and Thursday 14 February. The two sets of statements led to some ecumenical euphoria as well as more cautious warnings, and it was (understandably) the ARCIC statement on authority (hardly our business here) which incurred most opposition. John Pearce attacked the ARCIC eucharistic terminology about the bread and wine 'becoming' the body and blood of Christ, and also drew attention to the different ways in which the crucial statement about priesthood and ministry could be and are being understood. COB suggested that under fine words the 'BEM' material on baptism was blandly inclusive so that it was hard to oppose or falsify, whilst agreement on it did not actually take you very far. The Faith and Order Advisory Group (FOAG) had

a weighty report on the statements before the Synod, and on the eucharist this highlighted 'anamnesis' again as a key concept. The Synod bought the package and sent it down to the dioceses.

(ii) *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* (GS 643) came up on Wednesday 13 February, and debate touched on small matters about its wording. There is no certainty yet what of the introductory material will be 'commended' or even 'authorized' with the rest of the services. John Pearce suggested that the legal advice that the material is not 'alternative' to that in the BCP was wrong, but gained little ground. He also had a crack at the word 'altar' (on which the chairman gave him assurances of change) and processions on Maundy Thursday Evening (combined with a watch). But Synod duly 'took note' without more than a handful of hands against, and suggested amendments are to be sent in writing to the secretary of the Liturgical Commission immediately. Comment from persons not in General Synod is also welcome. The process intended is that the Commission should revise the text in the light of comments, pass it to the Bishops, and then, if they like it, let it be 'commended' for use by the Archbishops acting outside the provisions of canonical 'authorization'. This means that the rites will have no official status in the Church of England though perhaps some moral or atmospheric backing!

(iii) The Revised Catechism was (provisionally) commended for use for a further five years, but with the intention that its method and contents should be revised or at least reviewed in the meantime.

(iv) Marriage after divorce came on the Wednesday evening. The bishops had despaired of the viability of their proposed regulation, and are simply leaving the law of the land and the existing Convocation Resolutions to get on with each other as best they may. The only change they proposed was that the Canterbury provision that services of prayer and dedication should not be held after civil marriage should be repealed (York has no such provision). The Synod argued its way to giving provisional approval to the rescission of the relevant paragraph.

(v) Intermediate booklets. The range of these authorized until 31 December 1985 has been reduced when the next five years have been in view. In November Series 2 (Revised) Morning and Evening Prayer and Series 2 Communion did not get provisional approval. This time, on the Thursday evening, Series 3 Communion did not get final approval (voting: bishops 14-7; clergy 49-75; laity 55-92). The hardy survivors, duly authorized till 31 December 1990, are:

Series 1 Marriage and Funerals (taken together): bishops 16-0; clergy 79-23; laity 76-26.

Series 2 Baptism and Confirmation: bishops 15-1; clergy 82-20; laity 69-26.

(vi) Further Alternative Rules to Order the Service together with an Additional Alternative Lectionary. This (largely touching 1662 uses) was extended to 31 December 1990 on Final Approval (bishops 20-0; clergy 98-2; laity 119-6).

(vii) Godparents (GS Misc. 202) were debated on the morning of Friday 15 February. The Bishop of Leicester led off, pointing out that he was giving information, not really recommending action. (He also referred to an article in *The Guardian* on 2 February 1985, to which space is given here on page 6, and said he saw no reason to produce his own periodical in order that all and sundry should know his views—this being of course an oblique reference (one which the Synod recognized) to *NOL*, but then *he* has a diocesan newsletter and can say what he likes *officially* each month...). The debate included little theology or rigorous thinking, and was determinedly anecdotal ('Mother: Peter, why are you staring at your godfather so hard at this meal? Peter: I'm watching to see what he looks like when he drinks like a fish.'). At the end of it Michael Hodge duly moved his following motion:

'That the Standing Committee be invited to introduce a draft Canon for amendment of Canon B23 by the addition, at the end of paragraph 4, of the words "provided that not less than one of the parents or godparents shall be an actual communicant member of the Church of England".'

This was lost by 113 votes to 90.

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Pastoral Series no. 21, *The Pastoral Care of Young People*, by Lance Pierson. An experienced author writes for leaders of youth groups, with particular reference to the relationships between leaders and young people.

. . . and the Spirituality Booklet

is Spirituality Series no. 12, *Prayer in Pain*, by Ian Williams.

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study no. 41, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgies 1975-1985*, by Colin Buchanan. The big reference work, *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984*, edited by COB (SPCK £25) will be published soon after, and this Study provides the Introduction, with a survey of general trends, which ideally would have come in the big book, but was squeezed out by the limits of price and space. The Study has its own value, however, independently of the big book.

. . . and a catalogue

should come with this issue of *NOL*.

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.55 by inland post for the year 1985 - £4.20 with *News of Hymnody* added)

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602 251114)

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

The minutes of the meeting of the House of Bishops on 22 January became available at the February session of General Synod. Some of the decisions affected the February session, and are reported there, but in addition the following are noteworthy:

(i) **Frequency of the use of the 1662 Confirmation service and the 1662 Ordination service.**

In the light of a question [from COB] . . . the House agreed that Bishops should keep records of the frequency with which these services were used for the three years with effect from 1 January 1985 with a view to a report then being made.

(ii) **The theology and current practice of The Reconciliation of a Penitent.**

[Following the Private Member's Motion in November] . . . The Standing Committee [of the House] took the view that this matter could not be a high priority for the Doctrine Commission itself but that it might be possible to commission an individual to prepare a report. The Archbishop of Canterbury reported to the House that the Rev. Canon J. Macquarrie had accepted his invitation to prepare a report accordingly.

(iii) **Texts of Services of Prayer and Dedication.**

The House reaffirmed its view that such forms of service should be available and invited the Liturgical Commission to give further consideration to a number of points concerning the revised texts the Commission had prepared with a view to a further report to the House at its meeting in June.

The House . . . agreed it should not itself issue general guidelines but that each Bishop should make such arrangements as he believed appropriate to be consulted about or informed of the use of such services by his clergy.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY—A ONE-LINER

The cathedral evensong at Southwell on 27 January 1985, at which Bishop Denis Wakeling was preaching his last sermon and the diocese was saying good-bye to him and his wife, had the versicle of the vicar-choral printed thus:

'O Lord, whew thy mercy upon us;'

Perhaps the reply should have been:

'And we shall be truly zapped.'

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY—EXTENDED ACCOUNT

Giles Godber writes from Tiverton about Herriott-like experiences when taking communion in the homes of the sick and shut-ins:

'On I went [from explaining to a previous recipient that she could not have a woman as next bishop of Exeter ('Oh I know we can't be vicars, but I thought anyone could be a bishop')] to a lonely old dear, who is deaf and has a speech impediment. Hardly had I got bread and wine and linen out, than the TV repairman came. He was inclined to be very technical in his conversation and to speak softly, so I had to translate both ways to make progress. Eventually we were able to return to the (1662) service. Just as I said "Therefore with angels and archangels . . ." loud "Yoohoos" came from the kitchen. I

rightly guessed this was the "bread-lady", whom I have encountered before. I increased volume to window-rattling levels, the hint was taken, and the yoohooing subsided. As soon as we'd said "Amen", I bellowed "Someone at the door". " . . . to this thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness . . ." continued my congregation enthusiastically, now well into the mood. "Yoohoo" called the bread-lady, anxious not to be forgotten.

'After we had bought four loaves, paid for them and discussed the weather, it emerged that the bread-lady needed to use the loo. My table, bread, and wine, blocked her way. So I picked it up and moved it, mentally apologizing to the last paragraph of Article 28. In the end we managed to complete the service and I moved to house no. 3, to face five yapping dachshunds . . .'

AN OLD CANARD

One Peter Mullen, a well-known clergy journalist, wrote recently in *The Guardian* about COB that he 'was the sprite who conducted a funeral service for the Book of Common Prayer'. This has been said—and denied—before. The source which is being misrepresented is *NOL* for November 1980, and a half-retractation by *The Guardian* occurred when a letter from COB was published on 16 February. (The original linked the Bishop of Durham, Don Cupitt, COB, and—astonishingly—the Bishop of Leicester, as the most dangerous trendies in the Church of England!)

SPECIAL EVENTS

Enthronement at Portsmouth

Reports and texts reaching us about this event on 16 February suggest that it was a resounding and memorable occasion. The three parts went as follows:

Morning: Enthronement (with oaths, staff, etc.) and sermon by Bishop Timothy (one correspondent asks why all had to stand and sing at the entry of the various processions—especially if the congregation wanted to spot MPs, dignitaries from elsewhere, etc.—but the provost tells us it was to 'get them on their feet and keep them warm' so that they could have true silence and expectancy when the bishop himself came . . .)

Lunch-time: Civic greetings in the Guildhall Square (yes, in the open air), and then all adjourned for soup and a roll in the Guildhall (the provost writes 'The civic authorities graciously said "yes" to giving everybody soup and a roll, rather than giving a select party wine and smoked salmon'). The bishop thanked the hosts, reminded all present of the needs of the hungry, and gave thanks to God for the food.

Afternoon: Eucharist at St. Mary's, with all chairs removed from the nave. Twenty groups of four assistants stood round a communion table in the midst, holding vessels which they raised during the eucharistic prayer, and then used for distribution (so, although these folk were probably not 'concelebrants', they were bearers of the elements which were being consecrated at some distance from the bishop . . .).

Then a fast adjournment to the Isle of Wight ferry—despite rumours, the Solent was not frozen over and the islanders could not walk home.

And at Peterborough

We have had some indication that our correspondent of last month was thought unfair by some of those who took part in the Peterborough enthronement. We would be very pleased to have more enthusiastic accounts, but none have reached us so far (perhaps we have few readers in the Peterborough diocese?).

And the Croydon service in Southwark cathedral

A correspondent writes:

The 'staff' was vegetable and mineral rather than human but a little prior knowledge of Southwark Cathedral treasures (exhibited some five years ago) enabled me to see the hollowness of the symbolism. The Bishop of Southwark entered carrying a gilt metal crozier which he used until the Gospel. The 'Handover' took place as he and the Archbishop stood side by side behind the Holy Table with Croydon 'personnel' to the Archbishop's right and Southwark 'personnel' to the Bishop of Southwark's left.

At the relevant moment a Canon spirited into the Archbishop's hand an ivory crozier which was handed over and used by the Bishop of Southwark for the remainder of the service (a verger was spotted taking the first crozier back to the vestry). This is a Southwark heirloom—formerly property of Archbishop Garbett—whereas the gilt metal one used earlier is also a Southwark possession—formerly belonging to Bishop Simpson. The symbol might had have some point if the crozier had been linked with Canterbury or the Croydeon area.

This was, however, for me not the feature of this service of most liturgical significance; there were two that were:

- 1 Although vesture may not be important in itself, it is significant, given the present stage of legislation for women deacons, to note that all deaconesses present were, very markedly vested as deacons—in albs and stoles worn deaconwise.
- 2 The consecration of the elements was efficiently accomplished, but at variance with all extant Church of England rubrics in that only the vessels needed to communicate the sanctuary party were placed on the Holy Table. All other vessels—and there were many—were held by those who were to be in charge of their administration, standing at the sanctuary step in front of the Bishop. As he spoke the words of institution they were somewhat raised and held forward. I am aware that this has become common Roman Catholic (especially Papal) practice, but it is novel and unregulated in the Church of England.

This last looks *very* like the Portsmouth practice.

And the VE Day Service

Our information is now that it is happening, that Westminster Abbey has been the subject of a late booking by the government for 8 May, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury will cut short his Australian trip to be present and preach. So Church and State still balance on a knife-edge . . .

Book Review

Bryan D. Spinks *Freedom or Order?: The Eucharistic Liturgy in English Congregationalism 1645-1980* (Pittsburgh Theological Monographs; Pickwick Publications, Allison Park, Pa. USA 1984) 290 pp. paperback, price in English shops about £22.

Bryan Spinks, Chaplain to Churchill College, Cambridge, has written a first-class book on a subject liturgists have largely ignored until now—the development of the eucharist in English Congregationalism. Development there has been, though 'regression' might be a better word if one holds a 'real presence' doctrine. The author carefully shows the change to memorialism that developed after the more orthodox theology of the early Independents and the Savoy Conference. He demonstrates the reaction against Zwinglianism that took place by the neo-orthodox service book compilers after World War II, led by a Congregationalist high-church faction mainly emanating from Mansfield College, Oxford. Always in a minority, they managed nevertheless to dominate the national committees that published worship material. Though Congregationalists never had service books that were required in church, the new services had an influence in many places and might well have a long-term effect, through osmosis, in training colleges and larger churches.

The book has a good balance of theological and liturgical interrelationships with much interesting history. Some great characters are explored, such as Richard Baxter, John Hunter, and William Orchard, the latter being a very high church performer in the fashionable Grosvenor Square Church in the 1920's who taught the Romans a thing or two.

This is a very important work for all concerned with worship in England, which always had a large influence in the colonies where Congregationalism has flourished. In this ecumenical age, it is encouraging to find that a Free Church tradition has been willing to change toward the main-line understandings of the eucharist. It would be interesting to find out if any of the liturgical revisions in Roman and Anglican circles have been influenced a little by the 'Genevan' Congregationalists.

Rev. Charles Brock

Mansfield College, Oxford, Ash Wednesday, 1985

T. F. Torrance *The Eldership in the Reformed Church* (Handsel Press, Edinburgh) 16 pages, 50p.

We have before mentioned Handsel Booklets, a slightly more official form of Grove Booklets published for the Church of Scotland. Here they show their official status by exhibiting their Archbishop of Canterbury. And, although the subject is not in the strictest sense liturgical, it is a pleasure to commend it. In simplest terms, Torrance exposes the lack of New Testament backing for an office called 'lay elder', such as has been the touchstone of Presbyterianism. However, having peremptorily bundled the elders out of the front door, when they seemed in secure occupation of the hearth, he immediately brings them back in through the kitchen door, but with a different name. The equation is perfectly simple: modern lay elder equals New Testament *deacon*! All is then clear as light, and the same persons duly re-occupy the hearth. An admirable piece of work.

(Handsel have also sent a larger (£1) booklet by Alan Lewis, *Theatre of the Gospel*, and solid Bible commentaries in the series they share with Eerdmans, but these have less claim to an airing in *NOL*.)