

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 182

February 1990

## Editorial

*Patterns for Worship* was debated in General Synod on the morning of Thursday 22 February in a less than passionate debate. The Bishop of Winchester, chairman of the Liturgical Commission, introduced the report, drawing attention to both the 'UPA' role of the proposals in it, and also the giving of a shape and useful resources for 'family services' – though it was clear that this title is itself reckoned to be unclear. He added some overview of the way in which the needs of the Church of England have become apparent in recent years, and then went on to commend the new eucharistic prayers – 'liturgically they cohere round a central core of thanksgiving and supplication'. And Synod 'is asked to reflect on what we have put forward' (particularly, that is, to reflect on what procedures should now ensue).

In the debate Bill Persson, the Bishop of Doncaster, a member of the Commission, expressed his own reservations about some of the wording in the eucharistic prayers – on the grounds that they moved over a line which Rite A had not crossed towards too 'catholic' a doctrine. Mark Santer, Bishop of Birmingham, responded with the evaluation that 'show' as the main verb in an epiclesis did not sufficiently indicate any actual change (and quoted Hooker on the change). Others thought the package moved in the right direction and greeted it enthusiastically, though not all thought it went far enough (and 'potter' and 'clay' were thought to be rather sophisticated images). Something near a broadside came from Hugh Craig (reinforced by John Stokes, M.P.) who thought the whole concept of 'Common Prayer' to be imperilled, and the inadequate structure and lack of balance in the 'Service of the Word' to be reprehensible. He was not willing that any part of it should be launched into the public arena on the say-so of the bishops alone, but it must gain the agreement of the representatives of the laity. Peter Forster in turn asked questions about the liturgical duties of a 'national church'. But the Synod ultimately 'took note', and the next step lies with the House of Bishops. I shall hope to discuss the wording of the draft eucharistic prayers in particular in these columns, and correspondence on the subject is cheerfully encouraged.

Other results in General Synod, including a surprise, are recorded elsewhere in this issue.

Colin Buchanan

## GENERAL SYNOD FEBRUARY 1990

*Patterns* is reported elsewhere. But there was an unexpected shake-up on Tuesday, the first day (enough to make the back-benchers hug themselves with glee). The residual Series 1 services (Marriage and Burial) came up for final approval in their extension from the end of 1990 to 31

December 2000. They had received provisional approval without debate and without a count in November 1989, so all looked easy. However, Series 1 Burial services had had an element of the controversial when first authorized in 1966, and the memory has obviously not wholly died.

There was a request for the two services to be voted on separately, and this was put to the Synod, and lost on a show of hands. Thus a single vote had to authorize both services – and in the event it came out thus:

	Yes	No
Bishops	35	0
Clergy	140	34
Laity	104	60

Without a two-thirds majority in the House of Laity, the extension was defeated, and *both* services lose their licence on 31 December 1990. It was clear, of course, that it was the Burial services which were under attack, but the implication for marriages is that the choice is now solely between 1662 ('brute beasts' and 'obey' etc.) and the ASB.

Someone will have to do some quick thinking to get round *that* one (though I would have thought that to introduce a motion to give Series 1 Marriage a five-year lease would not be contrary to Standing Orders, or, if it is, then it might be a case for suspending them for the one occasion . . .).

Extensions to 31 December 1990 were granted to the other bits and pieces: Series 2 Baptism and Confirmation, and 'Further Alternative Rules to Order the Service together with an Alternative Lectionary'. The *Revised Catechism*, now distinctly long in the tooth was in fact simply extended for another five years, although it was supposed to have been revised again in the last quinquennium.

The first Private Member's Motion by, David Hawtin, ran as follows:

'That this Synod requests the House of Bishops, in the light of issues raised by the Knaresborough Report, to consider the case for reviving the catechumenate in order that adults, young people and infants may be associated with the Church, as a preliminary to Baptism, and to make provision for a draft order of service, whereby candidates would be admitted to such a catechumenate'.

This was passed without division on a show of hands, and it raises a whole hatful of problems . . . More on a later occasion.

## . . . AND THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

The House met on 23-24 January, and approved the passing to General Synod of the items set out above. It also received a report on initiation from the Liturgical Commission and 'Following an extended discussion the House asked that the Commission should prepare, for its next meeting, a further detailed report on a number of issues raised.' This sounds like a clash between the Bishops and the Commission over 'Renewal of Baptism' (or whatever title is currently in vogue). But we will have to wait and see . . .

Knaresborough surfaced at last! Another minute records discussion of it:

' . . . In 1987 the House of Bishops decided to defer further consideration until after the Lambeth Conference. In view of the Lambeth Conference Resolution 69 asking Provinces to consider this matter and in view of requests from the dioceses for further debate following their deliberation on *Children in the Way* the House expressed the hope and expectation that the subject would be on the agenda of General Synod during 1991.'

So hang on, kids, you might *yet* receive communion before you reach the age of confirmation.

## . . . AND PARLIAMENT

That Clergy (Ordination) Measure, which would permit in principle the ordination of those who are divorced and re-married, or have a marriage partner in that position, came again to the Commons on the first day of Synod, 20 February. There it was passed by – wait for it – 228 votes to 106. So there will be much joy in certain homes where ordination has been blocked until now.

Our own wry comment can only be that the Commons remains a wholly arbitrary and incompetent body to have final say in the Church of England's internal rules. A total vote of 334 must be unprecedented since the 1928 debacle. Somebody somewhere who failed to turn them all out last Summer has now delivered 183 new supporters of this Church legislation. Was it simply that the vote fell on a Tuesday, not a Friday – or in late evening rather than at 3.30 a.m.? Or is it that there is now a Church of England Whip's Office, which produced a three-liner? Anyway, it seems that the establishment has been salvaged for a few more weeks, and the crisis (or humiliation) which would have arisen from a second rejection by the Commons has been resoundingly avoided.

## A NEW ZEALAND PRAYER BOOK

This latest addition to the family of Anglican prayer books, in preparation since 1985, and partially revealed in separates such as the 1984 *Liturgy of the Eucharist* and a draft Synod edition in 1987, hit the headlines when it was published last November for its rather doctrinaire omission of all references to Israel. It is only this month that sufficient quantities of the book have been available in the UK for us to appreciate its other innovative features. It is a beautiful book to handle, clear print sensibly laid out, ribbon markers and probably the only Anglican prayer book with the cover designed by its archbishop. It is predictably bilingual, but not rigorously so: there are only parallel translations in one section. But the Pacific cultural setting is clearly reflected in the provision of parts of the eucharist in Fijian and in Tongan, a completely Maori eucharistic service, in the Maori-inspired Prayers in a house after death (where the English parallels, rather than translates, the Maori), and in such occasional rejoicings as the Benedicite Aotearoa:

'Dolphins and kahawai, sealion and crab,  
coral, anemone, pipi and shrimp:  
give to our God your thanks and praise.

The first major section in the book is entitled *Liturgies of the Word*, and includes

– *Morning and Evening Worship*, a 'full liturgy of the word' on the ASB pattern but slightly more permissive and including a Magnificat from which all male references to God have been removed, as well as some good short collects: 'In darkness and in light, in trouble and in joy, help us heavenly Father, to trust your love, to serve your purpose, and to praise your name, through . . .'

– *Daily Services*, for clergy and others, including small groups, laid out with a chunk of common texts and varying canticles, psalms and readings. Including the nine additional songs of parise, there is a wealth of canticle material here, almost all of it straight from scripture.

– *Daily Devotions*, a pattern for each day of the week which can have a daily reading added to it, or be used straight from the book, including gospel meditations and epistle meditations which are a mix of scripture pastiche and meditative commentary with no clear boundary between the two. So, for instance, after a paraphrase about the yeast and the pearl-buyer we have

'When we set our minds on God's reign,  
our hearts on God's justice,  
everything else will be ours as well.'

with the response

'Listen to Jesus who proclaims good news,  
which he alone fulfils.'

Some people might want to be highly critical of 'messaging around with scripture' (though the New Testament folk did it) but it is quite an attractive way of getting people to meditate on scripture: I just wonder whether these juxtapositions will stand the test of time

– *Midday Prayer, Night Prayer and Family Prayer*, all organized as a series of selections to put into the menu at the right points and including hymns and poems such as

'Lord, Holy Spirit,  
you blow like the wind in a thousand paddocks . . .'

– *Family Prayer* ('We need to be quite informal in taking this service, which only lasts three to five minutes') gives some useful instructions ('It is worth persevering') but misses the opportunity to promote a liturgical exchange between this and the more formal services for instance by encouraging seasonal and responsive materials, short prayers and canticles which could be shared.

*Psalms for Worship*, a new translation, is deliberate in omitting parts 'not suitable for use in the corporate worship of the church.

The Introduction to the next main section, *The Liturgy and the Laying on of Hands for Confirmation and Renewal* lists the contents of a baptismal liturgy and talks of a 'process of response to the baptismal action', which might include the candidates giving personal witness to their faith at the

Affirmation, but clearly does not envisage the kind of process and growth-in-faith-approach of the new Roman rites. It is not until after the baptism

that parents are asked how they intend to care for the child. The Profession of Faith comes after the actual baptism, making the latter a symbol of renunciation, cleansing and rebirth while faith is a prerequisite for the laying on of hands. And though the water is 'this water of rebirth', the most definite statement about the child after baptism is 'you are now a pilgrim with us, . . . a member of Christ's body, the Church.' No doubt some of us would want to ask fundamental questions about this approach! The Confirmation/Renewal material, however, is good, including some excellent questions on Commitment to Christian Service and some alternative prayers for either confirmation or renewal at the same service. Now, in my experience, you don't have to be a bishop to lay hands on someone for renewal, so do we have here the possibility of a very similar service to confirmation being conducted by presbyters – or is that too much like the thin end of the wedge of presbyteral confirmation?

*Liturgies of the Eucharist* begins with a chatty sermonic introduction with no references to sacrifice or presence, but to a 'sacred meal' where we 'give thanks to the Father, remember Christ, call upon the Holy Spirit, unite ourselves with all the faithful, and share God's food and hospitality.' It is a good example of a warm, informative introduction for the worshipper to read, centred on her contemporary spiritual needs rather than the historic disputes of the church – the kind of introduction which would be unlikely to get through our General Synod's Revision Committee!

Here we have a family of four or five eucharistic liturgies ranging from the full text of the *Thanksgiving of the People of God*, which is virtually the ASB Rite A structure (apart from having the sentence of the day immediately before collect and 'Proclamation' (Readings), the confession only in the early position, an optional position for the Lord's Prayer at the end of the intercessions and humble access (Frost version first) as an additional prayer or 'private devotion'), to the directory-style menu for *A Form for ordering the Eucharist* (Gather in the Lord's Name . . . Prepare the Table . . . Make Eucharist . . .). The only mandatory text in the latter is the eucharistic prayer, with Sanctus and Acclamations optional, and the preface introduced by 'The following or any other suitable words are used.' And in between, an Alternative Great Thanksgiving with plenty of insertions and two liturgies on Creation and Redemption, and Thanksgiving and Praise.

There is enormous richness and variety in this eucharistic provision, a variety which is at its fullest in the creativity of its many prefaces (though would they not be easier to use if they were printed only once as a collection of some long, some short, prefaces for use with any of the prayers, rather than repeated as separate additions to the different prayers?). This variety and permissiveness means that the preface can move away from a recitation of the great acts – and even from all mention of the cross. Variety extends even to the versions of the institution narrative and (presumably) to the theological assumptions behind the anamnesis and epiclesis formulae: 'Therefore, recalling . . . we celebrate our redemption with this bread of life . . . Send your Holy Spirit that these gifts . . . which we receive may be to us . . .'; 'Therefore . . . in this sacrament of the suffering and death of your Son, we now celebrate . . . and proclaim . . . Remember God . . . we were far off . . . As we eat this bread and drink this wine, through the power of your Holy Spirit feed us . . .'; 'Therefore . . . in the suffering and death of Jesus our redeemer, we meet you in your glory. We lift up

the cup of salvation and call upon your name. Here and now, with this bread and wine, we celebrate your great acts of liberation . . . Empower our celebration with your Holy Spirit, feed us with your life . . .'. And in the *Service of the Word with Holy Communion* (for lay administration from the reserved sacrament) we have, after a very full thanksgiving with the response 'Glory to God in the highest': 'may the love and faith which makes this bread the body of Christ, this wine his blood enfold us now . . . May Christ's Holy Spirit bring to us in the sacrament the strength we need . . .'. What is the explanation of the tense and meaning of that word 'makes' – and possibly of the trinitarian theology implied?

A similar lack of theological rigour occurs sometimes in the prayers that go with the seasons and themes of the two year lectionary. For example,

'Each year you come to us, Emmanuel,  
God with us in a manger,  
Each time you come to us  
in the broken bread and the cup we share.'

or 'You died on the cross, a criminal under a curse;  
you are God who forgives.  
You died helpless, a failur and in pain . . .  
you showed us the greatest love there is;  
for you died for us with the passover lambs.'

But, theology apart, both these examples reflect the inventiveness of ideas and images, and directness of language which are refreshing characteristics of the book.

The section of *Pastoral Services* has some useful, if occasionally wordy, hints and tips linking with pastoring, and includes another *Holy Communion* (for the sick), *Ministry of Healing* (twice the introduction tells us only a priest may use oil, though a layperson may lay on hands), the *Reconciliation of a Penitent*, the *Thanksgiving for the gift of a child* (with the family all together naming the child and the mother praying 'I thank you for the experience of giving birth'), *The Blessing of a Home*, and liturgies for *Marriage* and *Funerals*. There is an excellent selection of prayers for marriage and family life, and plenty of deliberate choice for the couple preparing the service with the minister. The second *Marriage* form is less formal: 'Pray that God will uphold and cheer your life . . .'. 'I love N and I want to marry her' . . . and a question about support to 'any children of the bride or groom'.

The book ends with the *Ordination Liturgies* and a *Catechism*.

Trevor Lloyd

ISSN 0263-7170

25p

Postal Subscription for 1990 £4.35 (by air £5 or US\$11)

Editorial Address: Shipbourne Vicarage, Tonbridge, Kent TN11 9PE  
(0732-810001 FAX 0732-810073)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS.  
NG9 3DS (0602 430786 Fax 0602 220134)

**This month's booklet . . .**

is *Evangelism series no. 9, Cross-Cultural Evangelism*, by Hitesh Dodhia, a curate in Leamington Spa who was brought up as an East African Asian, a Jain by religion, and then converted. So he writes from the inside about relationships across ethnic and religious divides – a vast need in Britain to-day.

**. . . and next month's**

is a double-sized Joint Liturgical Study, no. 13/14, *The Liturgical portions of the Apostolic Constitutions: A Text for Students, with Translation, Introduction and Annotation*, edited by W. Jardine Grisbrooke (cost £6.50). This long-awaited addition to the readily available patristic liturgical texts further enhances the Joint Studies.

**. . . and reprints**

are *Ministry and Worship no. 62, Preaching at Funerals*, by Ian Bunting (£1.40), and *Ethical Studies no. 64, AIDS – A Christian Response*, by Roy McCloughry and Carol Bebawi (£1.95).

**. . . and a new Stock List**

should also come with this issue.

### A KENYAN SERVICE OF HOLY COMMUNION

Bishop David Gitari, the chairman of the Church of the Province of Kenya's Liturgical Committee has at intervals joked to me that the draft Kenya liturgy (first hailed in these columns two years ago) has been used more in England than in Kenya. Certainly I find I have all sorts of duplicated texts of it, used in theological colleges, in Selly Oak, at Swanwick and elsewhere. But now there is a definitive Kenyan text, published by the Uzima Press in Nairobi, in a glossy booklet form, rather like the old Series 3 rite.

For those who knew the draft text, the next stage in revision will have its own logic. Most of the changes iron out infelicities. The sending of our troubles to the 'setting sun' is transmuted now into sending them 'to the cross of Christ' – with a sweep of the hand towards the cross on the communion table. But most of the 'inculturated' features are still fully discernible, including references to ancestors, and the wonderful trinitarian interrogatory opening to the eucharistic dialogue:

*Minister* Is the Father with us?

*People* He is.

*Minister* Is Christ among us?

*People* He is.

*Minister* Is the Spirit here?

*People* He is.

*Minister* This is our God

*People* Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The rite is authorized by the Provincial Synod, and is being translated into Kiswahili and local vernaculars. Bishop Gitari writes in the Preface that the rite is an 'exciting foretaste of the future new Prayer Book'. So all round the world we should encourage the Kenyans to go on seeking truly inculturated orders of service. This is indeed an exciting lead.

Copias are available from Grove Books at £1.25.

### 'WILLING AND ABLE'

When the General Synod tackles baptism, it always gets in a procedural muddle – sometimes so deep as to make the suspicious wonder whether the platform was not deliberately muddling matters to avoid action. The bones of the present story go like this:

In 1974 the General Synod passed a motion that it wished baptism to continue to be available to the children of parents who are 'willing and able' to make the requisite promises. The 'and able' arose from an amendment by Christopher Wansey, which was added wholly cynically by him, as he did not believe any parents 'able' . . . The motion was sent down to the dioceses when the whole set of 'Ely' questions was so referred, but the dioceses were not required, as they were with the issue of the admission of the unconfirmed to communion, to respond to questions in a set form.

Various dioceses voted on this actual motion, but none moved it in the General Synod when the issues returned there in July and November 1976. Instead there was a Southwell diocesan motion (moved by COB) asking for a re-consideration of the conditions upon which infants were accepted for baptism. This motion was passed by 170 votes to 151, and the Standing Committee, on the basis of it, asked Bishop Knapp-Fisher to write a one-man review of the issue. This he did (and a fairly limp document it was), but it was never brought to the Synod for debate. Thus, in my view, the issue has remained *sub judice* ever since – the General Synod has asked for a chance to review Canons, rubrics and regulations, and has not been given it. Every attempt (e.g. by questions in Synod) to bring the matter forward over the thirteen years since then has led to very gentle brush-off by the platform. And when in the late 1970s Jack Bradshaw, a lay member, brought forward a Private Member's motion to delete 'and able' from the 1974 motion, all my own efforts to persuade the Standing Committee that the 1974 motion had been superseded by the Southwell one were ignored, and his motion was debated (and defeated).

Now at last there is some action. The motion by Roger Godin (amended in all directions at once) was duly passed in the February 1989 session of Synod (for the text see *NOL* for February 1989), and we heard that a one-man paper was to be the response to this. We now hear that wider consultations are to precede the paper, and we hope to report the matter in due time – and it does not look as though there will be a report for the present Synod to debate in its own life-time which ends this July.

But – astonishing by-product – Roger Godin himself had apparently been picketing the platform behind the scenes as to why the Canons had not been amended in the light of the 1974 motion. And the Standing Committee apparently took the point, though it will be clear from the above that I believe the whole 1974 motion now to have been superseded and to have lapsed. So the Standing Committee, even whilst trying to work out how to take the least possible action on the Godin motion (on financial grounds), decided to initiate a change in Canon Law at the same time.

But even that does not exhaust the story. For when the amendment to the Canons was drafted, it was drafted to require the *godparents* to be 'willing and able'. This has now been hastily corrected at Revision Committee. It is almost unbelievable that the 1974 motion should be believed to have force and currency which it never had (for it was only a preliminary vote when motions were sent to the dioceses), which it doubly did not

have after the Synod accepted the Southwell motion in 1976, and which, when it has so wrongly been believed, is then *not copied out right* by the drafters. It is, if that is possible, even more unbelievable that, when the Godin motion is still being processed and *its* issues are still *sub judice*, the Standing Committee should initiate this reform of the Canons based so ineptly upon a defunct motion. Well, I wrote to the Secretary-General, setting out the 'superseded' approach, and he replied (perhaps even wistfully) that he had not thought of that. I in turn had to write back and point out to him that he had *had* to think about it in relation to the Bradshaw motion in the 1970s, when he had declined such an approach. But what has stuck in my mind has clearly not stuck in his!

Well, Synod did not complete revising the text of the 'Miscellaneous Provisions' Measure, and 'parents' who are 'willing and able' are not yet in the draft form of the Measure and amending Canon. I hope to write further elsewhere about all these oddities. But if the Godin motion gets anywhere, then Synod should shortly be asked to amend the Canons again. For the newly re-touched form will not do.

C.O.B.

### DIocese TO DIocese

Editors: Martin Dudley and John Corbyn

It has been two or three issues since I last looked at the ongoing work of DLCs and it is clear from a morning spent on the telephone that some of the committees in my area are engaged in very interesting work, as well as some more mundane stuff. The problem, as ever, is that liturgical material, especially when it breaks new ground, takes time to prepare, try, reconsider and put to other diocesan authorities. Sometimes, as with institutions, the parameters are set by episcopal staff meetings and DLCs have to work within them, whether they like it or not. Questions about initiation raised by requests for 'non-traditional' fonts, confirmation at the font, reception of people from other churches, the 'death' of marriages and release from vows are being considered in various places in response to local need.

In *Oxford* much of the practical work is being done by the Parish Resources Department, with a day on Young People and Worship planned for March. The DLC is considering institutions and inductions. *Guildford* has arranged a conference on church music and is now turning its attention towards the All Saints to Candlemas package, 'The Promise of His Glory'. The Diocesan Eucharist for the Blessing of Oils will be celebrated on the Tuesday of Holy Week, using a version of the Portsmouth rite. The DLC has also issued bread-and-butter leaflets on leading intercessions and reading lessons.

Liturgical activity in *Truro*, which comes under the Director of Training, is hampered by distance and shortage of funds, but the stress is placed on liturgical training for those who lead worship. This has also been a major feature of the work of the *St Edmundsbury and Ipswich* DLC. With a great increase in lay leadership in rural areas, there has been a need to provide training in basic skills. A liturgy day was run at Framlingham College in November last year, 120 people were able to attend and a further 25 were disappointed. The DLC was encouraged by the response and is planning another one for next year. Hymnody, music, making the readings come

alive, questions of all-age worship, were just some of the topics covered. The approach is homegrown, rather than bringing in 'names', with attention given to how people cope where they are rather than offering them pre-packaged liturgical forms.

*Chelmsford* would be interested to know about consecration or blessing of burial grounds and the consequences of doing the latter rather than the former. The DLC there has arranged two workshops on the new and much needed liturgical skill of using directory material. They have also been quick to issue preliminary reflections on the material in *Patterns for Worship*. With Ian Forrester's particular skills in both music and liturgy, the cathedral has turned its attention to the relation between them.

*Canterbury* and *Bristol* are both at work on revising institution services. They seem to have different approaches to their task. One stressing and developing the use of symbols and the other placing a greater emphasis on the promises of priest and people. Bristol has also worked on the licensing of Rural Deans, the consecration of churches (because of an increase in church building on the eastern side of the diocese) and a rite for bringing radically altered buildings back into use. They have also been teaching the younger clergy how to celebrate BCP services without self-conscious antiquarianism or modern mangling.

Two matters have turned up in several dioceses. The first is lawlessness. This is often thought of as the domain of catholics, who turn to the service books of the Roman Church for further suitable, and unsuitable, words. But evangelicals and charismatics, in their own ways, are pushing the liturgical laws to the limit and in some cases completely disregarding them. The key to containment might be intention: what was the intention of the lawmakers? What were they trying to safeguard? And what is the intention of the lawbreaker? That question leads to the second matter: experiment. Faced by a forthcoming clergy conference, one diocese is attempting to get away from the diet that tries to suit everyone with a mix of jumpers, surplices, vestments, BCP, ASB, post-ASB and informal worship. *Patterns for Worship* already offers interesting possibilities. Can a clergy conference succeed in uniting all shades of churchmanship in its worship whilst still allowing the bishop to preside lawfully? How far can experiment go? This is important not least because it has been argued that if the bishop does it, it must be legal, which is simply not the case.

### Other Activities

Dioceses and Commissions are not the only places where liturgical activity takes place, of course. Many parishes are liturgically pro-active. But I want to give a plug to a book produced by the Church Union Theological Committee and published by SPCK on 22 February at a very reasonable £9.95. Edited by Geoffrey Rowell and me, it is entitled *Confession and Absolution*. It covers the biblical background, the Christian tradition, and many modern facets of confession, together with a collection of liturgical texts. COB will probably arrange to review it and, though biased, I commend it.

Martin Dudley

The Rev. John Corbyn  
24 Milking Stile Lane  
Lancaster LA1 5QB  
0524-382362

The Rev. Martin Dudley  
The Vicarage, 107 Owlsmoor Road  
Owlsmoor, Camberley GU15 4SS  
0344-771286