

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 136

April 1986

## Editorial

Every now and again we permit ourselves to note an anniversary. This time it is the twentieth anniversary of the coming into force of the Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure 1965—currency of which ran from a date to be named by the two Archbishops, and they proclaimed 1 May 1966. This was the first major alteration of the 1662 Act of Uniformity, and the first opportunity for the House of Laity of the old Church Assembly to flex its muscles in relation to liturgy. It was also the end of any thought that a diocesan bishop had a *ius liturgicum* in his own person in relation to authorized services. 'Lawful authority' was now defined in an exhaustive way, and the powers belonged with the Church Assembly on the one hand, and the PCC on the other.

When I think back, I get a series of vignettes, and I nostalgically impose them on readers now.

- (i) There was great difficulty as to what to do about '1928' services, if their only support—the supposed *ius liturgicum*—was about to cease. At first there was produced a schedule of variations from the Prayer Book, but the lawyers advised that this was not a 'service' within the meaning of the Measure, and the idea was dropped. Then the Bishops asked the Liturgical Commission to edit the 1928 rites for authorization, and the Commission declined to do so—saying these were not their creation, and they had little or no heart for them. So the House of Bishops finally had to edit and present them themselves—and ran into considerable trouble.
- (ii) There was a liturgical conference in London in February 1966 to commend the services unofficially to the Assembly before the official treatment began—and to enable Arthur Couratin and other non-Assembly persons to speak. One unexpected attendee was Edward Ratcliff—not previously known for leaving Cambridge. This Conference lauded the draft Series 2 communion, and it was clear it would have to be finished in a hurry.
- (iii) On the last day of March 1966 I dissented over the oblation of the bread and cup to God in the eucharistic prayer of the Series 2 rite finally proposed by the Commission (and also over explicit petitions for the departed). I then wrote a booklet, *The New Communion Service—Reasons for Dissent*, which we got through the press within the month of April, and into the hands of Assembly members by the day the official report itself came to them (that was when I first learned about publishing against the clock).
- (iv) When the Bishops' proposals—now called 'Series 1'—came to the Convocations in May 1966 there was hardly a voice to oppose them. There were, of course, very few evangelicals then in the Convocations. But when they went to the House of Laity in June, suddenly there was uproar. The House rejected the 1928 (or 'Series 1') confirmation service by a vote of 129-72 in favour (i.e. short of a

two-thirds majority in favour), and thereby did a service to the next two decades—not least to the bishops. And events went on to have high drama over the 1928 burial services and the 'Interim Rite' communion one—both just scraping two-thirds majorities in the House of Laity. There was also much drama over getting that 'Series 2' communion service into acceptable shape, and then into authorized use. But I am not going to stay on that here—I have written elsewhere at length about it.

So what has happened in twenty years? The law has moved on to the Worship and Doctrine Measure. The language has moved to address God naturally as 'you'. The booklets have moved on to become the ASB. And the style of worship has become more congregational, less Tridentinely rubrical, and more celebratory. The Church of England has slowly learned that 'worship, and 'liturgical texts' are not identical—and renewal of worship is only in part bound up with renewal of texts.

However, it is clear that the 1662 texts are almost departed from the scene. I have an article elsewhere in this issue about the Prayer Book Society's protests. But I would now add to my Nottingham experience (which I might have been accused of rigging) my reflections on 24 Sundays at work in the Birmingham diocese—usually twice on a Sunday, and sometimes even more frequently, and not infrequently at a midweek event (see my 'Scrapbook'). I use the rites the incumbents request. In this time I have celebrated 1662 communion twice (once at a Christmas Eve midnight, once in the home of a dying elderly woman), and Rite B (and its confirmation equivalent) twice. There is virtually no live discernible use of 1662 which I have come across beyond three parishes, and even Rite B looks like a dwindling use.

So serious Anglicans have to come to terms with a move which has come not through brainwashing by the wicked Colleges (oh, what a false hare was that), nor through subversive literature, nor through prelatial decisions by arbitrary clergy, but simply through a groundswell in which all have had a part. Many may have some nostalgia for loved bits of 1662—but it would be pushing water uphill with bare hands to turn that into a policy.

Colin Buchanan

## SUNDAY TRADING

It has not been part of *NOL's* general activities to join the 'Keep Sunday Special' campaign, strictly because this is not quite within our purview (but also because we suspect Christians of wanting to have their Sunday cake and eat it). However, we duly note for the record that at near midnight on Monday 14 April the House of Commons refused a Second Reading to the 'deregulation' Bill by 296 votes to 282—a result not anticipated even by the opponents of the Bill. Clearly the Tory party could not hold ranks, and others were strongly motivated either on principle, or because of the pressures of the unions (which seem to have been strong—but *might* have had an eye on double pay etc. rather than on rest and worship!), or because they detected the government was in trouble and decided to join the fun. It is unlikely that the present anomalous laws will be cleared up for many years now.

## LITURGICAL COMMISSION

We gather that one more member has been added to the Commission—the Rev. Dr. Mark Dalby who once wrote a book on *Open Communion in the Church of England* (when this was unfashionable). Apparently the Commission is to meet for a one-day meeting in mid-May, and a delegation will go to meet the House of Bishops in June (as happened in 1981). After that, the Commission is hoping to get a clear brief and starts its serious work at a residential meeting in September. The annual meeting with diocesan representatives is scheduled for 15 October, and it is anticipated there will be some evaluation of the *Lent Holy Week Easter* material at that.

## THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES AND THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: A SURVEY

This 20-page compilation is the result of a questionnaire sent to Anglican Theological Colleges for the students to complete in October 1984. There is reference to this in *NOL* for October and November 1984—the latter issue giving the complete text of the questionnaire.

Now the results have been digested and served back to us. The organizers sensibly set aside replies from first year students (who were hardly in residence when polled), and then found themselves with 175 replies. The poll was somewhat hampered by whole Colleges passing resolutions not to complete the forms (so they allege, but the letter from John Fenwick at Bristol in the *CEN* on 18 April denies this totally, and says it must have been a coincidentally unanimous decision by the students—interestingly he sent spare money from stamps sent by the Society on purchasing 1662 Prayer Books—they must have been going for a song), and the Society is obviously defensive about a return of 292 forms from 878 possible respondents—and then had to set aside 117 of them. The 175 included five who were 'very often' in 1662 Communion services (with 17 'never') and 111 who were 'very often', and 53 who were 'often', in Rite A services. So the organizers reckon they have rumbled the Colleges—the House of Bishops have assured the lovers-of-Cranmer that 1662 is alive and well in the Colleges, and enquiry shows it be nearly extinct . . .

There are large untested assumptions behind the enquiry. How many Colleges hold Morning and Evening Prayer daily throughout the week in plenary chapel? How many Colleges have Sunday eucharists, and how many not? And does experience on parish placements 'count' whilst at College? (and, of course, are there students who 'Seldom' attend any chapel service, and are thus bound to respond 'Seldom' to each rite about which there is a question . . . ?) In answer to other questions, we find that there is some ignorance about where decision-making about forms of service is located—but then this is a sophisticated feature of a teaching course on worship and a high proportion of those beginning their second year will not have given their minds to it. We also learn that Missa Normativa ranks low in the preferences of Cranmer Hall students, and is off the list of St. John's Nottingham ones. And, very interestingly, whilst the compilers came to accept that question 5 (as to which rites the students felt competent to lead) should be washed out of the findings, they are wholly silent on question 3 'How fully acquainted with the following services do you think you were before coming to theological college: Prayer Book Matins, Prayer Book Evensong, Prayer Book Communion?'

Did they perhaps learn that the ordinands of the Church of England come from parishes with modern liturgical uses, and had no knowledge of the BCP before coming? If so, what do they learn from that? If not, why do they not tell us?

David Martin shall have the last word, from page 16 of the Survey:

' . . . it is well-nigh impossible to be ordained according to the Prayer Book use, and very difficult to be confirmed according to it. I myself have not been able to participate verbally in the services used during my time at theological college, at my own ordination or at the confirmation of my son. Once, and only once, did I encounter a fair use of alternative services, during the three days retreat before ordination; and on those occasions I saw no reason to protest. Otherwise, the situation is a blazing scandal in which the public integrity of the Church of England is clearly compromised, and the worst of the scandal is that so few churchmen openly acknowledge what has gone on.'

But did he not even *reply* when questioned at his ordination? 'Strordinary! This month's booklet . . .

is Worship Series no. 95, *Worship in the City*, by John Bentham. This booklet responds to the report of the Archbishop's Commission on Urban Priority Areas (ACUPA), and looks closely at the needs of the church in UPAs in respect of worship—including a survey of cultural and liturgical factors bearing upon this. The two pages from the ACUPA report, which were published in December in *NOL*, are included as an Appendix.

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 26, *On from Faith in the City*, a symposium by the Pastoral Group, also responding to the ACUPA report.

. . . and next month's Spirituality booklet

is Spirituality Series no. 17, *The Overcoming of Satan*, by Charles Sherlock, from the staff of Ridley College, Melbourne.

. . . and reprints are

Ethics no. 1, *The Christian and the Unborn Child*, reaches its sixth impression this month, and Pastoral Series no. 21, *The Pastoral Care of Young People*, by Lance Pierson has its second edition, after a year of good selling.

. . . and some trouble with despatch

as Julia Pounder, who has worked as Grove Books sales assistant for two years—and has given unstinted and very efficient service—has had to leave suddenly through the onset of a serious physical disorder. We are very sorry to lose her, and the result of her six weeks' off work prior to resigning was some delay in the March despatch, and delay also in handling orders. We are very sorry about this too. We think we are back to 85% efficiency, and hope to let you know how the staffing works out.

. . . and a new Director

is the Rev. Richard More, author of two earlier Ministry and Worship booklets, erstwhile chaplain of Lee Abbey, and now vicar of St. James, Porchester. He succeeds Mr. Peter Harden, who helped launch the Company, but is unable to travel to Nottingham, and has resigned.

ISSN 0263-7170

(£3.55 by inland post for the year 1986 – £4.20 with *News of Hymnody* added)  
Editorial address: 60 Handsworth Wood Road, Birmingham B20 2DT (021-554-5129)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS (0602 251114)

18p

## COB'S LITURGICAL SCRAPBOOK

**March:** (19) I have to get in the post to the parish of Shard End proposals for ending a *missa sicca* on Easter Eve in the evening. Two parishes are joining for baptisms and confirmations, which I shall administer, but they want first communions to come in their own separate Easter morning eucharists. So what to do after the Peace? I suggest four possibilities—(a) end at the Peace, obviously unfinished, (b) move the sermon (and two hymns) to come after the Peace, (c) move the congregational renewal of baptismal vows to be solemn re-dedication as climax after Peace, (d) incorporate new ending of greeting the risen Christ by specially written versicles and responses, leading into self-dedication—we shall see which they choose; (20) evening confirmation at Tyseley—a charismatic parish—and we have both testimony by interview from one candidate, and open prayer by the whole congregation before the confirmation prayer—a very joyful evening; (22) back to Aston parish, where I commission an evangelistic mission team from Ridley Hall, and we have laying on of hands and prayer for each worker (whether parish or Ridley) on the mission—the whole between kick-off and the final whistle at Villa Park over the road, else I could never have actually got there on a Saturday afternoon; (23) Palm Sunday baptism/confirmation at King's Norton—palm crosses, but no donkeys: in the evening return to Cheadle where I was curate nearly twenty-five years ago, to preach for the twenty-fifth anniversary of institution of my rector in those days—still going strong, and still with 1662 Evening Prayer and sermon and packed church; (24) Monday in Holy Week, and we try out the first of the penitential rites in the new book—imaginative use of different voices for the devotion on the Beatitudes; (26) Wednesday in Holy Week—and an afternoon end-of-term confirmation at girls' public school—once again I am torn in half at this event, but satisfy myself that the candidates are reasonably well rooted in parish churches; (27) Maundy Thursday, and we have our diocesan service of 'blessing oils' and renewal of ministerial commitment mentioned last month—our diocesan, Bishop Hugh, presides and preaches and the hymns raise the roof (see last month for discussion of how to create it—there might be copies available for anyone sending SAE to me)—general reaction from a full congregation is highly favourable—one letter asks why the stoppers on the three flasks were each in turn removed as Bishop Hugh came to pray over them, 'I do hope . . . *NOL* will give a full explanation of why the Almighty needs such assistance to get to work on the oil . . .' (it won't); in the evening I am back in Smethwick in the group of four congregations whom I first joined on Monday (only there are six joining together for this occasion) for the Maundy Thursday Liturgy, including the washing of feet (which I am learning) and the beginning of the Watch—we set both bread and wine aside for Good Friday, and sit in near darkness for silent meditation, which I leave before the most dogged watchgoers; (28) Good Friday, and I am at Northfield, celebrating their nine hundredth anniversary this year (mentioned in *Doomsday Book*). The local congregations of several denominations join to process down the High Street (i.e. the A381) behind a large wooden cross, and have 'stations' for hymn-singing amongst the shoppers (the rain holds off). It is doubtful how much impact we could make amidst the thousands who obviously have forgotten this is technically a Bank Holiday and certainly a principal

Holy Day—then lunch at 11.30 and off to church for two hours' meditations (led by COB) and a third hour of the new Liturgy—in each of the five divisions of the two hours I use one of the 'Prayers on the Passion' as a point for reflection during the silence, and in the Liturgy itself we have a thoroughgoing one-by-one kneeling before the wooden cross set up against the chancel screen, with some worshippers kissing it—I am irresistibly reminded, in the shy-cum-resolute way they come forward, of worshippers coming forward for a laying on of hands in more charismatic parishes—there are no Reproaches, but we proceed to the distribution of communion, kept from overnight but in bread only—I feel the need for some 'link' text, such as in the communion at arm's length of the sick, indicating the provenance and purpose of *this* bread (and wine if there had been); (29) Easter Eve, and in the evening comes the rite with which these notes opened: the two parishes have chosen to hold back the renewal of baptismal vows to after the Peace, and thus make this the climax of the service—we have part of the Vigil, with the responsorial Psalms enlivened by the rich solos of one incumbent, a fine music buff—but with some uncertainty by the congregation as to whether they have actually reached Easter, and can really shout 'He is risen indeed, Alleluia'—perhaps the waiting for the morrow for communion has increased this uncertainty—the climax as chosen goes not at all badly, but the bishop's attempts to go up and down the centre aisle and throw baptismal water at all corners leads noticeably to an unliturgical but corporate giggle—I suggest afterwards that the way to get away with it would be more advance notice, and then quick application by six water-throwers from different stations simultaneously—perhaps next year? (I also learn that the new book's suggestion that at the Peace (see page 236) worshippers should greet each other with 'Christ is risen' and 'He is risen indeed' actually depends upon some prior ESP communication as to who is versicler and who responder . . .); (30) Easter morning, and I am preaching and presiding without baptisms or confirmations in Castle Bromwich—a rite enlivened by a distribution of chocolate Easter eggs after communion to the kiddies: and in the evening there is a large confirmation in another parish, but still no great certainty about 'He is risen indeed, Alleluia' so I give them some practice.

**April:** (12) Confirmations morning and evening, the latter my first three-ways-on joint ecumenical service at Cotteridge, where three denominations are in an LEP (the rite even includes the Circuit Commissioning of a Methodist Local Preacher, with a Charge given to him first); the interrogation (with three ministers asking the questions in unison) follows the URC form (the 1979 *A Book of Services* page 58), but on reflection I think these questions are wordy, overlook repentance, and lead to that form of response which Ratcliff always hated 'I do' (the C/E never has it)—still I was asked to comment in advance and failed to be critical enough—there is also a low profile 'Welcome' to all the candidates by the three denominations, followed by the *real* welcome—i.e. that into 'Cotteridge Church' which is clearly a far more important denomination than the earlier three . . . (14) the evening is spent in a group of 20 or so Christians from round the diocese preparing for the 'Renewal Eucharist' in the cathedral next Wednesday, at which I am presiding and preaching—more next time.

## THE NEW ZEALAND SYNOD

The Church of the Province of New Zealand General Synod meets every other year. In 1984 it authorized the new eucharistic liturgies (of which we still have a few copies at £1.50). This year, meeting in April, it accepted revised guidelines on initiation (this will be reported in due course, when it has been to the dioceses). It also had a go at deleting the *Filioque* from the Creed (and this was accepted by Bishops and Clergy, but resisted by the Laity—are the Laity more acute theologians, or do they just like the Creed the way it is . . . ?). But, more interestingly, the Synod resolved to have a new Prayer Book. A special session of Synod will be held in 1987 (out of the two-year cycle) specifically to deal with the contents of the Book—presumably with a view to a last look in 1988. Certainly publication is hoped for 1989. And it is clear that this Book will *replace* the 1662 Book. That may raise constitutional questions, and we will try to keep readers posted.

## LISTING SECESSIONISTS?

The Church press carried this month an advertisement whereby the Bishop of London asked for persons in the Church of England (not just clergy) to send their names to an officer he has appointed for this purpose (the Rev. Robert Gould, 56 Buckland Crescent, Windsor, Berks. SL4 5JS) if they 'consider that the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood and Episcopate would imperil the doctrinal basis of the Church of England . . .'. The replies will be treated as confidential.

We do not oppose attempts by opponents to measure the strength of their supporters—we would cheerfully do the same in any comparable case. But it must be noted that there are three points of fuzziness in the procedure:

1. The persons concerned are *not* being asked to declare they would secede. Therefore little leverage is available from it.
2. They are having their names kept confidential. Therefore even less leverage is available—there was the famous occasion thirty years ago when it was said 2000 priests would leave the Church of England over cautious mixed bathing with the Church of South India—and in the event four or so left. Thus mere numbers cited will always be treated sceptically—let those who are saying they will undoubtedly leave in certain circumstances say it publicly and act on it if those circumstances come to pass. (Did not the Bishop of London say a couple of years ago that the unhappy would in fact stay *in* the Church of England, so whence the fears about secession now?).
3. The advertisement does not resort to the ultimate phraseology (of 'the appearance of ordination' or 'so-called ordination'), which would deny that such an act is effective. If anything, the advert concedes that such ordinations *are* ordinations!

So, let not the proponents of the ordination of women get too uptight. The future clearly lies with them and they can be urbane about the comings and goings of others. But, oh, for someone to tell us more clearly what ordination *is* . . .

## ASB EUCHARISTIC LESSONS INDEX

continued from January *NOL* (Genesis to 2 Kings), February *NOL* (1 Chronicles to Lamentations), March *NOL* (Ezekiel to Matthew 21)

Reference	Page	Reference	Page
<b>Matthew</b>		<b>Luke</b>	
21.12-16	826	1.67-79	442
22.15-22	710	2. 1-14	447
23.34-end	818	2. 1-19	798
24.37-44	419	2.15-21	753
24.42-46	859	2.22-35	758
25. 1-13	749	2.22-40	453
25.14-30	727	3. 7-14	978
25.31-end	425, 972 & 876	4. 1-13	507
		4.14-21	431
26. 1-30	535	4.16-21	557 & 881
26.31-end	540	6.20-23	814
27. 1-56	546	6.27-38	677
27.57-end	572	7. 1-10	721
28. 1-10	577	7.36-end	687
28.16-20	271	8. 4b-15	489
28.16-end	919, 908	8.41-end	651
		9.18-27	514
		9.28-36	519 & 793
<b>Mark</b>		9.51-end	735
1. 1-11	271	10. 1-9	806 & 870
1.14-20	468 & 272	10.25-37	714
2. 1-12	491, 932 & 973	10.38-42	966
		10.38-end	877
2.13-17	497	11. 1-13	707
7.14-23	405	11. 5-13	888
7.24-end	494	12. 1-7	917
9.14-29	682	12.16-31	893
10. 1-12	662	12.32-37	865
10. 2-16	705	12.35-43	880
10. 6-9	927	12.35-44	956 & 959
10.13-16	944, 948, 319 & 220	14. 1-3	935
		14.15-24	647
10.32-45	525	14.27-33	963
10.35-45	791 & 342	15. 1-10	657
10.38-end	877	15.11-end	665
10.42-45	977	16. 1-9	774
10.46-end	667	16.19-end	716
11.22-24	890	17.11-19	719
11.22-26	918	18. 1-8	740
12.28-34	672	18. 9-14	503
13. 5-13	416 & 767	19. 1-10	733
13.14-23	421	19.41-end	510
14.32-15: 41	528	20. 9-17	412
16. 1-8	579	21.25-33	423
16.14-end	830	21.41-end	456
		22. 1-38	537
<b>Luke</b>		22.24-30	796
1.26-38a	438 & 764	22.24-27	956 & 960
1.39-49	798 & 831	22.39-end	543
1.57-66, 80	779		

## LENT HOLY WEEK EASTER

We have not had much comment in, but start the ball rolling with misprints. There are no prizes for these this time. Mark Tweedy has picked up at the foot of page 160 that the BVM is said to have seen the tomb, whereas at the foot of page 130 it is a different, but correct, Mary!