

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 125

May 1985

Editorial

One of our most diligent correspondents, and a learned liturgist is Kenneth Stevenson—prolific author, and Anglican chaplain at Manchester University. He never misses a chance to shiver a lance, and now writes: '... your Grove Liturgical Study 41 takes issue in a lengthy footnote (p.22, n.1) about the Scottish anamnesis-oblation. I'm not trying to convert you to my views (expressed in Liturgical Study 40, p.32, n.2), but I cannot agree that the Scottish formula goes beyond modern Roman Catholic parlance here. The trouble with modern structural analysis of eucharistic prayers is that it tends to undermine what some of us keep saying about the *unity* of the prayer. In the Scottish prayer, the eucharistic sacrifice is set firmly within the context of offering praise (preface) and thanks (institution narrative); the word "offer" is used in both places. Then, at the anamnesis, an attempt is made to set the eucharist in the context of the self-offering of Christ . . .'

Just in order that we should get the issue straight, I now set out the text from *Scottish Liturgy 1982*:

'We now obey your Son's command.
We recall his blessed passion and death,
his glorious resurrection and ascension;
and we look for the coming of his Kingdom.
Made one with him, we offer you these gifts
and with them ourselves,
a single, holy, living sacrifice.'

There is then an epiclesis, asking for the descent of the Spirit upon both worshippers and elements.

The Stevenson defence is an attempt to prevent any careful analysis of carefully put together words! Liturgical committees construct with extreme care. They debate the meaning, implications, nuances, and even misunderstandings to which their texts are exposed. Anglicans have always known that this paragraph is the most delicate of all to construct. The Scots started certain linguistic fashions here in the eighteenth century, and knew they were deliberately setting a new path. They have had ample opportunity to indulge in comparisons with other texts since, and they have had two new liturgies themselves since 1977. So, although the Eastern texts which underlie the hard-headed Scottish constructions may have been drafted in an unselfconscious and holistic way (if 'drafted' is the correct word to use at all), no-one can believe that of modern texts, often placed on word processors and doctored line by line as the committee drafts. Words are placed in a certain order for various purposes, and there is inevitably a sense of developing meaning (or lack of it) in any given eucharistic prayer. It is true that there might be things which we wish we

could say all-of-a-cluster in moment of time, but they have in fact to be spaced out in a sequence which is not absolutely expressive of the unity of the whole. Yet although that way of thinking is entirely appropriate in principle, I am still unsure how it becomes a defence of the problem in the Scottish text.

The particular issue I raised in Liturgical Study no. 41 was this business of a 'living sacrifice' (though in parenthesis I should add that I have never thought it good to call for the descent of the Spirit upon the elements, and we do not do that in the Church of England. The Scottish text seems to say in so many words that there is a union of Jesus Christ, the elements, and the worshippers, and they constitute 'a single, holy, living sacrifice'. This kind of expression seems deliberately chosen, and does not seem to have its meaning or thrust better exposed by an invoking of Kenneth Stevenson's 'principles of liturgical language' explanation. It raises three questions:

- (i) What sort of 'union' do we envisage? Our union with Christ in his death and resurrection is a Pauline concept by which we become justified (seen by God as having died with Christ) and committed to newness of life. The concept does not make us the *offerers* of Christ's sacrifice, surely?
- (ii) In what way is an offering to God of the gifts a way of offering to him of ourselves? This connection is neither biblical nor patristic as far as I can see, and the self-offering of Romans 12.1 which lies behind the Scottish text has no sacramental background which is discernible. It has cultic overtones, but it is simply as those responding to the mercies of God that we are summoned by the apostle to 'present our bodies'. So how is that now the gifts and we with them are a 'single' sacrifice?
- (iii) How further is it that the gifts are a 'living sacrifice'? This is a straight borrowing (though through other sources?) from the language of Roman 12, and a straight change in its meaning.

It is not that the Scots are here saying that they are doing actions with the body and blood of Christ (though even that would be allowable as an interpretation on the *husteron proteron* principle enunciated by our correspondent), but that they follow a tradition which is adrift from scriptural thought-patterns. Nor is it that the Scots are particularly under attack in my Liturgical Study—it is rather that a particular doughty apologist for the Scots has invoked a principle which is worth debating in its own right, but does not seem (to my subjective reasoning) to remove the Scottish text or others from careful investigation of a linear and grammatical sort.

We are of course here in the midst of a debate about authority and tradition. Kenneth Stevenson (as he shows in that learned and trenchant paper in Study no. 40) sets considerable store by the primitive traditions, though he wishes to see them expounded as congruent with scripture. I have long since concluded that there is no harm—indeed considerable release—in venturing the thought that the early church hath at intervals actually erred and its formulations are open to criticism. And there are other instances where unguarded language about the eucharist passes as innocent before a matter comes into controversy (as with ante-Nicene language

about the Trinity), but loses its innocence when controversy brings a microscope to bear upon each syllable, each word, and each sequence of words. Liturgy-writers are used to this microscope, and should be assumed in the anamnesis paragraph to have used it with particular care.

Stevenson delightfully concludes: 'When I drive North, I usually prefer to enter Scotland by the *Western* route, but that's for *geographical* (not *theologica*) reasons!' Sez he.

Colin Buchanan

A PERSONAL STATEMENT BY COB

Readers will perhaps know by now that I am to be the next Bishop of Aston. The invitation came out of the blue at the very point when the Appeal to launch the charitable Company was being printed. I was urged by my chairman of Council to accept (see his note below), and the delay involved in getting the matter rubber-stamped in high places enabled the company publicity to go ahead at the end of April undisturbed by this particular cross-current. Yet the cross-current was bound to come, and it now has. I am very grateful to Bishop Roy Williamson for the supportive note he has put below which sets out the genuinely charitable cause for which the Company is launched.

What of COB? Consecration is at St. Paul's cathedral at 11 a.m. on 25 July, and my offside on that day will be archdeacon Wilfred Wood, who is to be Bishop of Croydon, and has gained some fame already as about to be the first black bishop of the Church in England. One of my students was kind enough to point out that I might be the first member of the Liturgical Commission to benefit from an ordination service he had himself helped write. (Even Cranmer never had that privilege . . .). So that has been a happy thought, and many other supportive and generous letters have come in since the announcement, and I do thank so many folk who have taken time to write and/or to pray for me and my family. It is a very happy bonus for me to have a flexible platform like this one which I can turn to good use in saying thank you.

What of my Grove Books role? The Company starts trading on 1 July. About £6000 has come in so far, and each day brings a bit more. Do please join the Association—and we have plenty more Appeal forms. From 1 July COB will cease trading, sell his stock to the Company as it is needed, and begin to eliminate his own debts. In particular I shall be editorial manager for the Company, and general manager also. I will continue to edit *NOL* from Birmingham. And I shall attempt not to merge too easily into the ecclesiastical establishment, but to strike a contrast with prevailing attitudes when it so strikes me. I have never thought that bishops should be cardboard cut-outs, and I think it least of all of myself.

I will keep you posted re my editorial address (I move house in August), but distribution will still be done from St. John's College premises.

There is more about this event on page 5 below.

C.O.B.

A NOTE FROM THE BISHOP OF BRADFORD

Colin Buchanan has asked me if I would say a word on his behalf in relation to the formation of Grove Books Ltd., and to his own appointment to be

Bishop of Aston. I have been chairman of St. John's College Council almost since he became principal, and, when he ran into acute financial difficulties, I chaired both the consultation on the future of Grove Books in March 1983, and the working party which derived from that and has now led to the formation of the company. Colin is also a personal friend.

I became satisfied at an early stage in the investigation that, although delivering Colin from a financial responsibility that was beyond his resources to bear would be a genuine and desirable outcome of the process, yet the chief task was to conserve for the Christian Church, and perhaps particularly for the Church of England, the theological and practical publications which were then dependent upon him and his finances. Although the process has been slow, it is a matter of great joy to me that the timing has so worked out that the company starts trading just three weeks before Colin is consecrated, and that his diocesan Bishop, Hugh Montefiore of Birmingham, is willing for him to continue for a while with some of the managerial tasks which he has fulfilled for thirteen years so far.

I think it is necessary to make clear that the Appeal was never launched in order to help Colin on to his next appointment, and he has been extremely embarrassed lest anyone think that the charity involved was simply COB! Quite the reverse—the taking over of the business by the company was done so as to capitalize it and enable it to expand, and only incidentally to relieve Colin—and that only with a view to his continuing as principal of St. John's. The new appointment has come as a surprise, and Colin was scrupulous lest it look as though the Appeal was being launched to help him. He was also concerned lest he should go to Birmingham to be classified as a debtor with liabilities which he could neither escape nor meet. I took some responsibility myself for assuring him that the Appeal would get the company off the ground in good style and urging him to accept the offer with a good conscience. He did so accept, but asked me if I would in this way back the Appeal, which I gladly do. I have great confidence in the initial directors of the company, I read the publications with pleasure and profit myself, I want to go on receiving *News of Liturgy* myself each month, and, as chairman of St. John's, I welcome the interlocking of this enterprising Christian publishing with an exciting Theological College which is in so many other ways also a multi-purpose resource centre for the Church catholic.

Please then support the Appeal, and enable the company to start trading with a healthy capital backing from the Christian public.

Roy Williamson

Bishop of Bradford

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)

SOME FURTHER QUASI-LITURGICAL MATTERS RE COB'S FUTURE

At St. John's the College student journal appeared on the corridors with a special issue within twenty-four hours of the announcement. This was called *News of Episcopacy* (no. 666). In with various unflattering non-liturgical matters there were also some unflattering quasi-liturgical matters. These are reprinted by permission:

- (i) There is an illustrated advert as follows:

Wopples Copes 'A new line'

'The Buchanan'

Split in the middle for use when cycling. Concealed extra pockets can carry up to 500 Grove Booklets at once.

- (ii) NEWS FROM GROVE BOOKS

The following titles have been deleted:

Worship Series 85	<i>Welcoming Children to Communion</i>
Liturgical Study 9	<i>Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?</i>
Pastoral Series 2	<i>The Local Church's Political Responsibility</i>
Ethics Booklet 5A	<i>A Christian Critique of Capitalism</i>
Ethics Booklet 49	<i>Banning the Bomb</i>

The following revised titles are now on offer:

Pastoral Series 10	<i>Freemasonry—Not so bad after all</i>
Pastoral Series 12	<i>Government Economic Policy—Why it works</i>
Pastoral Series 14	<i>Britannia rules the waves—The Christian's patriotic duty</i>
Worship Series 90	<i>Evangelical Anglicans and Liturgy—Or else . . .</i>

The following titles appear in a new enlarged edition:

Worship Series 50	<i>Evangelicals and Obedience</i>
Worship Series 88	<i>Welcoming the Bishop and his wife</i>

This month's new titles:

Pastoral Series 22	<i>'Ex Cathedra'—an Anglican Option!</i>
Spirituality Series 13	<i>Praying 'on yer bike'—a guide to episcopal spirituality</i>
Worship Series 92	<i>Sacramental Initiation Complete in Confirmation</i>

There were also one or two ceremonies at lunch in College, involving the *porrectio* of book covers of *The Bumper Book of Confirmation Sermons*, *One Consecration Once*, *Anglican Bishops Today*, and a few more.

One or two correspondents have muttered about the use of *Ecce Magnus Sacerdos* when my time comes, and my general response has been to say that I am inevitably corruptible, but not instantly or overnight. Incidentally if any friends would like to come you simply roll up on the day without a ticket (clergy do not robe), and you can come to the buffet lunch by sending £2 per head to the Principal's secretary at St. John's College by 19 July. More next month.

CEREMONIAL ROBES

Without prejudice to the question of finding a common usage (Frank Pickard urges evangelicals to settle for the cassock'-alb' or 'chalb'—I always thought it ought to be an 'albock'), the Bishop of Thetford submits an extract from the biography of Bishop F. J. Chavasse, about worshippers at St. Paul's, Preston in the early 1870s:

"The people were shrewd and observant, with views of their own. "We peeps over the gallery", said an old woman to him soon after his arrival, "and when he [the new curate] comes out of the vestry we looks to see what he wears, and if he wears a white 'un we sez 'a good un', but if he wears a red 'un, we sez 'a Pusey'." (p.29).

Today's good bishop, who has supplied this, says that, as a Cambridge man, he thinks this does constitute a good reason for wearing hoods—at least, presumably, at institutions or launchings of curates.

GENERAL SYNOD IN JULY

General Synod meets from 2 to 5 July this year in London, the last session of the present Synod, which is then dissolved. It is possible that the June *NOL* will not reach readers before the session, so we give some slight advance information now. There is in fact little which touches on liturgy—the nearest being certain legislative business: final approval of the ordination of women as deacons (which then goes to Parliament) and the Revision Stage of the Measure and Canons which give new liberties in respect of worship in designated Local Ecumenical Projects. There will also be a debate on the Anglican/Lutheran, Anglican/Reformed, and Anglican/Orthodox dialogues. The first Private Member's Motion is likely to be one asking for the restoration of the catechumenate. There is also the Final Approval of permission to use a service of public prayer after civil marriage.

This month's booklet . . .

is Pastoral Series no. 22, *Christ's Exclusive Claims and Inter-Faith Dialogue*, by Chris Sugden. The recent BMU report, debated in the Church of England General Synod in July 1984, was a careful reaction to the multi-faith situation now prevalent in English towns. Chris Sugden argues, by detailed examination of the report, that the working party has somewhat undermined the 'exclusive' claims of Jesus Christ, and taken the edge of conviction about his uniqueness from our evangelism and our relationships with other faiths.

. . . and next month's

is Liturgical Study 42, but not the one advertised. Instead the 'extra' we listed for April now becomes this Liturgical Study—*A Liturgical Glossary*, compiled by Michael Sansom. The title advertised—*Liturgies of the Spanish and Portuguese Episcopal Churches*—will now be no. 43 in the series and be published in September.

. . . and a further advance change

comes in July, when Worship Series no. 92 will be *Evangelical Anglicans and the Lima Text* by Tony Price. The booklet by Trevor Lloyd, on the new Lent, Holy Week and Easter provision, has had to wait till October as the official text will not be published till well after that.

THE MASSED RALLY MASS

We have found ourselves reporting the new style (if new it is) for consecrating the elements at monster-sized celebrations—the occasions reported were the transfer of Croydon archdeaconry from Canterbury to Southwark in Southwark cathedral in January, and the first eucharist of the new Bishop of Portsmouth on the day of his Installation in his cathedral in February. The Provost of Portsmouth, David Stancliffe, has described at length this pattern, whereby the elements are held by the distributants (whether ten or forty in number) facing inwards round the holy table, whilst the president leads the eucharistic prayer, and this brings the bread and wine within the sphere or intention of the eucharistic prayer, and they are thus consecrated as fully and satisfyingly as if they had been spread all over the table and had been in the president's view without being deliberately manipulated. It would seem that the Rite A rubrics are thus interpreted as allowing that at section 36 many persons lift the bread and wine from the table and do not replace them, and that this goes nearer to the spirit of the rubric than the lifting by the president of simply one paten and one cup when in fact there is enough silver for a school prize-giving spread in front of him. I wrote to David Stancliffe with some supplementary questions and he responded:

"... this kind of geographical boundary [i.e. the traditional notion that elements on the corporal got consecrated and others did not] seems to make little sense of the president's intention in consecrating, and it is far more dignified as well as convenient if the vessels are held in the hands in the ring of clergy who surround the president . . . Some of what lies before him will be supported by the holy table, and the rest by the hands of his ministers. The supporting ministers are more like cake-stands than co-consecrands, and that is why it matters little whether they are priests or not: we use both . . . when he breaks the bread is a powerful sign . . . As far as the ministers' communion is concerned, we invariably do that at the end, after the people have received . . ."

This sounds coherent, clean, authentic, functional, and yet also powerful. Let all rally-type eucharists take note.

THE VISITING PREACHER REMARKS

Why do right-handed clergy, greeting right-handed laity, stand on the left-hand side of the exit door from church to shake their hands?

FOOTNOTE: One correspondent reckoned he had spotted last month's archidiaconal contribution—he was sure no archdeacon in the land other than the archdeacon of West Ham, Peter Dawes, would have expressed himself the way last month's 'Visiting Preacher' did. Wrong! And our 'Visiting Preacher' will remain anonymous—he began as an archdeacon to make sure that he would not too lightly be identified with *NOL*'s editor. And some of his contributions may not be based in fact . . .

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY

The same archdeacon of West Ham, mentioned above, submits the following:

"One of our Area Bishops tells me that, having sent out his usual standard blurb on Confirmation to an Evangelical parish, he got back a reply saying that "as there is an interregnum at present, and we have no Vicar or Curate, there will be no communion"."

Book Reviews

Bishops' Conference of England and Wales *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC 1* (Catholic Media Office, April 1985, 40p).

The Roman Catholic bishops have now responded to ARCIC 1, and to that extent we are beginning to find out whether the Church of Rome regards the agreements registered in the Statements as a welshing on the truth by their theologians, or a substantial step towards full accord. Certainly the bishops of England and Wales are more comprehending of the spirit of the Statements than was the Holy Office in its famous condemnation *Observations* of 1982. The bishops seem to be saying 'yes, but' in most cases, and in some their 'yes' is much louder than their 'but'. It is complex, of course—I am not sure I could accept the ground on which they accept the eucharistic Statement, for instance, and would prefer them to be understanding it the way I do. They do want it said 'more forcibly' that the eucharist 'is offered to the Father by the whole Christ, head and members, in the power of the Spirit', and they do see that the present text emphasizes particularly that the eucharist is God's gift to the church, when somehow they want it also to be the opposite. They also seize on the acknowledgment in the *Elucidation* of the Statement on the eucharist that some Anglicans 'still find any adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable', and say that even to acknowledge that there are such people stretches them a bit far. (As a matter of fact, those who thus decline to adore, do so decline because they cannot wrap their minds round any notion of 'Christ in the reserved sacrament'—not because they know he is 'in' it but do not wish to worship him.)

One of the most unexpected features of the response is the call in the latter sections (44 and 45) for a more trenchant encounter with evangelical Anglicans. It is an interesting thought that they have been panting to meet evangelicals, only to find that official Anglican bodies kept on shuffling a tired pack with no evangelicals in it and served them up again and again. The truth is not exactly like that, but we do hope that the desire to meet evangelicals will be honoured by some dialogue with *learned* evangelicals. Other Anglicans should not fear lest evangelicals will simply being negations to such encounter—the richness of evangelical sacramentalism ought to be re-discovered by such dialogue.

Graham Kendrick *Worship* (Kingsway, 1984, 214pp., £1.95).

I just knew the name 'Graham Kendrick' as the writer of modern charismatic choruses, and then I was lent this book. I still do not know what if any denomination draws him, and this book does not help us to find out. That is unusual in itself—a denomination's most distinctive ways are usually its worshipping ways, yet Graham Kendrick can write a book this fat without really touching on a worship programme. He is concerned for worship of the heart—as the biblical authors are. But he is perhaps underestimating the role of a good *programme* to stir the heart.

The best chapters to my mind are ones on 'celebrating a new social order' (about love and fellowship—he thinks our average worshippers are in fact sealed into glass cages fitting closely round each), and on the leadership of worship. But there are demanding parts on creativity, personal discipline, and a host of other matters. Good reading, so long as you know before you start that you will find nothing here about the shape of the liturgy, nor indeed about the eucharist at all.