

## KINGSTON CRY—FACING THE IMAGE

'A responsive poem for leader and congregation' by Graham Kings  
(who has in the past given us Raps—this poem being composed during a  
Consultation in Kingston, Jamaica)

*'The glory of God is a human being fully alive'*—Irenaeus

Formed in the image and likeness of God,

**We rejoice;**

Fired by violence and facing away,

**We recoil;**

Defaced, despairing, curved in on ourselves,

**We cry;**

Remaking, repairing, curved into the world.

**You come, the Image of God.**

With compassion, forgiveness, restoring the image,

**You heal;**

With powerfully piercing incisive insight,

**You teach;**

With passion and proverb and practical story,

**You preach.**

Facing Jerusalem, challenging Temple,

**You suffer;**

Surfacing from the depths of Death,

**You're raised;**

Infusing, renewing, the image refacing,

**You pour out the fiery Spirit of God.**

Being transfigured into your Likeness,

**From glory to glory;**

With unveiled face, we face God's Image,

**Reflecting the light of the knowledge of God**

Seen in your face,

**Jesus our Lord.**

---

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ  
Telephone: 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949 Email: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1997 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

---

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 270

June 1997

## EDITORIAL

This month sees the publication of the first authorized definitive post-2000 liturgical material—*The Christian Year*, published by Church House Publishing in a three-volume collection; *The Christian Year: Calendar, Lectionary and Collects* (£15.00, hardback), *The Christian Year: Collects and Post-Communion Prayers for Sundays and Festivals* (£15.00), and *The Christian Year: Advent 1997 to Advent 1998* (£4.95). These titles themselves show that there is overlap between the three; and the third draws the appropriate parts of the overall plan together to provide in full for the dated church year from Advent Sunday this year to the Feast of Christ the King (that is, 'The Sunday next before Advent') in 1998. This happens, in the ecumenical *Revised Common Lectionary*, to be Year C, so the Church of England is joining the bus on the third circuit of the three-year cycle. It is worth quoting a section from the Introduction:

'Three sets of psalms and readings are provided for each Sunday. The Principal Service lectionary is intended for use at the principal service of the day (whether this service is Holy Communion or some other authorized form). In most church communities, this is likely to be the mid-morning service, but the minister is free to decide which service time normally constitutes the principal service of the day.

'The Second Service lectionary is intended for a second main service. In many churches, this lectionary will be the appropriate provision for a Sunday afternoon or evening service. A Gospel reading is always provided so that this lectionary can, if necessary, be used at the Holy Communion.

'The Third Service lectionary, with shorter readings, is intended where a third set of psalms and readings is needed and is most appropriate for use at an office.'

Each Sunday or Principal Holy Day has its own page with the Collect, Post-Communion and lectionary (given by Scripture references) set out on the page, with the festivals fitted into the chronological order as they occur. It looks good, but is, of course, only usable once, and, when Advent 2000 brings us back to Year C, a completely different set of datings (let alone of transferences etc) will be needed.

If we return to the source books, the true *fons* is *Calendar, Lectionary and Collects*. It does, however, show the three sections into which its title divides it in

strict separation from each other, and the unity displayed is that of any one Sunday across the three years of the cycle, rather than in any congruity or even juxtaposition of lectionary and collects, or any continuity of readings from one Sunday to the next. The second volume, *Collects and Post Communion Prayers...*, is more obviously set out for direct liturgical use, with the two prayers of each occasion making one page in the book. The post communion prayers have a great interest built into them, and it will be worth noting whether congregations used to saying together by heart 'We offer you our souls and bodies/to be a living sacrifice/through Jesus Christ our Lord/etc' will be able to adapt to a different prayer set for each week—or will the unchanging corporate one remain alongside the changing presidential one? We shall see.

I finish with my own purist pernickety complaint, which lies against a general principle of the English of this material, frequently and consistently in evidence. In the days when I taught liturgy, we had collects 'of' the day and 'for' the desired result. It was penal at St John's, Nottingham, in those days (however much else one varied) to announce 'The Collect for the Conversion of St Paul' or (even worse) 'The Collect for the Beheading of John the Baptist.' My scruples appear in the paragraph above this where I write of 'prayers of each occasion.' But this definitive set of volumes has apparently canonized the solecism of an improper 'for,' and it is there in the very title of the second volume. Has liturgical language shifted? Or are we being subjected to the incompetence of an unlettered editor? Or (horror of horrors) was it in the original report and did I let this style go unchallenged through Synod and its Revision Committee when I was so busy getting Cranmer recognized as an Archbishop of Canterbury and a Reformation Martyr who did not die on 16 October? My Protestantism will have to guard me against lapsing (with my quaint old understanding of the English language) into praying 'The Collect for John Bunyan.'

If it is my fault, I shall gnash my teeth for many years ahead.

Colin Buchanan

PS: I gather my E-mail address was printed last month as 'bishopcolin @...', when it should have been 'bishop.colin @...'. We are coming on stream, but the long in the tooth at this end have yet much to learn.

### GENERAL SYNOD IN JULY

It looks at the moment as though General Synod in July will be debating the following liturgical items:

- (a) The Second Revision Stage of the Initiation Services which were remitted back to the Revision Committee in November. The Committee has redrafted several sections (more than were officially named for reconsideration), and the text will be circularized to members of Synod on 17 June—so the actual

develop into one which is also sexual.

Should that happen, then some ceremony identical with or very similar to marriage will probably be required. Marriage needs publicly stating and public recognition to decide when it has happened and to support those who have entered into it. A homosexual marriage will need exactly the same publicity. But obviously homosexual marriage will only be used by those who wish to take advantage of it just as (heterosexual) marriage is at present only used by those who choose it.

At present homosexually orientated Christians are told that no homosexual relationship can have public recognition from the church and the state takes the same view for Christians and non-Christians alike. Without public support it is harder to announce, to develop and to maintain stable, permanent and faithful homosexual relationships. It is no wonder that homosexual relationships are not always stable, permanent and faithful.

I don't see the Church agreeing to two people of the same sex having a sexual relationship in circumstances when it would not approve of two people of opposite sexes having a sexual relationship; and I have no wish to ask it to do so. But the Church may have to accept before too long that it has lost the battle on heterosexual relationships needing to find their fulfilment in marriage and if that should be so it will not be able to argue for homosexual relationships to find their fulfilment in marriage.

Marriage as an institution has lost some of its credibility in the non-Christian sections of our society and the report *Something to Celebrate* is right when it calls Christian to show the strengths and the qualities of good marriage. Strangely some people who co-habit without the support of marriage set a better example to many of us in how to live in stable, permanent and faithful relationships; and the same may be true of certain homosexual partnerships.

It may well be that the Church needs to ask some profound questions about what is the right contract to ask two people, whatever their sexuality, to make on entering marriage; and in what circumstances they can honourably have their marriage declared to be at an end.

At present marriage is available for those who wish to choose it as an option, it is not compulsory for heterosexual couples who are not Christian. And unless we do some clear thinking very quickly it will become only one option among others for Christians as well.

Homosexual Christians have not yet been challenged or encouraged by the Church to enter stable, permanent and faithful relationships or given any help to maintain such relationships. In many cases they have been forced to keep their relationships secret and circumstances have not helped their relationships to be of high quality and to last.

The Church needs to find ways to help people towards marriage and when married, and I believe that to be so whether they are heterosexual or homosexual.

With all good wishes

Charles Knowle, Coventry

## FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

[Several letters on this particular issue have been received]

Dear COB

Most gay Christians I know want a church rite in which they can express their lifelong commitment to one another. You say in last month's editorial that this leaves open the question of those who do not wish it. Would this be gay Christians having their cake and eating it?

However, Christian Research has recently shown that heterosexual Christians do this already and that there is a big gap between what Christians believe and how they actually behave. A survey of 1,765 people in Canada found that 80% of single Christians are sexually active and in America, another survey found that 30% of fundamentalist Christian marriages had broken up compared with only 23% for non-Christians.

In this kind of situation surely any church rite which encourages life-long commitment rather than permissiveness ought to be applauded. Perhaps *News of Liturgy* could make a start by encouraging liturgical work on a church rite for gay Christians.

Yours faithfully

Douglas Bartles-Smith, Dulwich

Dear Colin,

As I understand it no one can defend the House of Bishops' report *Issues in Human Sexuality* as anything other than a statement of where the bishops happened on average to be at the time the report was agreed at some early point in what will need to be a lengthy discussion.

The debate in the Church on human sexuality needs to move on or move back using Biblical material, and medical, social and psychological knowledge and reason.

Those who signed the report as well as the rest of us need to move on from that report as soon as we possibly can.

In the light of new evidence and new requests the Church needs to decide, for its members, both clergy and laity, whether homosexual relationships are in any circumstances justified and what the boundaries of those relationships should be. We are, at present, in no position to legislate for non-Christians in this matter, or even to make any recommendations.

It may be that the Church, on mature reflection will wish to say that there are no circumstances when the relationship between two people of the same sex can become sexual, in which case many deeply committed Christians are going to be disappointed and frustrated and may well feel themselves driven from the church or see their friends and relatives leave the church.

Or it may be that the Church will define, along the lines of heterosexual marriage, situations where two people of the same sex may allow their relationship to

texts await next month's issue.

- (b) The General Approval Stage of the 'Extended Communion' report which was delayed through lack of time last November.
- (c) An informal, pre-authorization stage of one or more new eucharistic prayers, about which the House of Bishops will be taking decisions in June.

It is beginning to look very much as though the necessary timetable for authorization by the July 2000 sessions of Synod cannot be sustained, and, if that proves to be the case, we may be faced with the following synodical perils:

- (a) Existing ASB services will have to have their licence extended;
- (b) A new Synod will be elected in Autumn 2000, and may behave exactly as the persons newly elected in 1995 did;
- (c) The hope (surely not just mine?) of an agreed modern Lord's Prayer for the new millennium (which needs to be in place well *before* 2000) would also be vanishing.

More immediately, the Liturgical Commission have asked for parishes to be nominated in each diocese to give advance experimental use of draft texts in process of authorization under Canon B5A. This Canon permits the two Archbishops to designate specific texts to be used in specific places for specific periods. (It was originally devised at the outset of experimentation, but has so far been but rarely used—my own encountering of it being when eucharistic prayers were being tried in 1987 and 1988 in a handful of parishes, and, I suspect, when the General Synod was treated to 'Rite A Revised' in its unprocessed state in York Minster last Summer. I say 'I suspect,' as nothing in the programme told us we were in the midst of this daring and almost unprecedented venture into the unknown—it is simply that the microscopically observant noticed that Humble Access came just before the distribution of communion instead of wherever it was in obsolescent Rite A.)

## THE PRINCE AND THE PRAYER BOOK

The Prince of Wales spoke again this year for the Prayer Book Society, at an event to mark the 25th anniversary of the Society, held in St James' Palace. *Church Times* gave his address in full on 10 May. One may be pardoned, however, if the thrust of his remarks was not entirely clear at one major point. He is reported as having said:

'I was struck...[in reading the *BCP*]...by the poignant way in which Cranmer and the church fathers so succinctly understood the problem of preserving the integrity of literature and liturgy in a turbulent and changing world.'

It is not entirely clear who these 'church fathers' were; for the 'early church fathers' had little to do with forming the *BCP*, whilst none of Cranmer's companions or associates has ever been so described before ('Reformation fathers' perhaps? Yes, just conceivably). But let us stick to Cranmer. For it is impossible to relate his actual liturgical activities to the rose-tinted description the Prince is now giving. Had one offered this royal terminology to, say, the 1549 Devon rebels, they would have bounced the wording back to the Archbishop in this inverted sense:

'We are struck by the way the Archbishop and his associates have introduced a turbulent and changing world in which the problem of preserving the integrity of literature and liturgy has become poignant, or impossible.'

That is not to say that the Devon rebels had right on their side—it is merely to state that Cranmer introduced a turbulent liturgical revolution, totally at odds with the 'preservationist' character of this eulogy on his behalf.

The Prince went on to exalt tradition (which Cranmer, of course, was overturning), and to insist that the *BCP* language and liturgy 'have shown themselves not of an age, but for all time.' This is a stupendous and mind-blowing claim indeed, far above any that Cranmer himself made, far beyond how the bishops of the Anglican Communion see the ancient *BCP* to-day, and (wonderfully) totally contrary to the Cranmerian Preface (entitled since 1662 'Concerning the Service of the Church') that 'There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted'—a text the Prince himself quoted elsewhere approvingly. The Prince said he would speak from the heart, not from the pen of a scholarly individual, but one fears he spoke from the text of an incompetent speech-writer.

This does, however, give the opportunity to clear up one or two misconceptions which are still around.

Firstly, the Prince, at his wedding in 1981, had the prayers not from the *BCP* but from the *ASB*—it was a half-and-half rite.

Secondly, big events he attends—such as the great ecumenical rite in Canterbury cathedral on 26 May to celebrate both the coming of Augustine, and the modern pilgrims following in his steps—make few concessions to pro-*BCP* sentiments. But it would be interesting to know if he classifies them as 'banal, impoverished, sloppy, limited.'

Thirdly, the rumour about the confirmation of Prince William earlier in the year should be scotched. It was said that the Bishop of London had been called in over the Archbishop of Canterbury's head to do the confirmation. The truth was simple—the Archbishop was on sabbatical, and, although there *may* have been a use of the 1662 (but surely not 1928?) rite, that was simply a bonus for the Prince of Wales through getting the (hast/wast/wert) Bishop of London in, and was not the *reason* for getting him in...

## LITURGY AND SEXUAL NOT-QUITE-ETHICS

The editorial last month raised quite a few replies, not all of them equally supportive of the editor. One from Ian Cooper in St Albans told him in no uncertain terms to stick to liturgy and not venture into ethics. Another letter, from a local notable in the Woolwich Area who is not a subscriber, began as follows:

'I have just been sent a copy of your editorial in this month's *News of Liturgy*. The sender was outraged, seeing it as a smear on all gay people. I think he hoped I would write you an outraged reply. In fact, though perhaps you come dangerously near to a bit of generalized smearing in parts, on the whole I found your article very helpful.'

This was from Jeffrey John, and, though *he* comes 'dangerously near' to over-using that dreaded word 'outrage,' I found his reply both helpful and, in the best sense, levelling with me. He went on:

'...it seems to me that the basic argument runs along exactly the right lines, and leads inevitably where I would want it to go. I agree with you that Bishop Baker's proposal for a gay blessing ceremony "if desired" and the ambiguities of Bishop Gladwin's sermon at the service in Southwark only muddy the waters.'

'...any form of blessing ceremony for same sex couples would have to rest on exactly the same covenant principles as marriage... That may not be what the majority of homosexuals in the secular gay "scene" want to hear, but that is not the point. I am sure it is what most Christian homosexuals (though not necessarily the noisiest) very badly want to hear; and I hope you will be able to support them...by publishing an official liturgy of blessing along exactly those lines.'

This leaves *NOL* (which, we must re-emphasize, is a journal of liturgy, though not of course timid one) with three loose ends:

- (a) Is there available or likely to be such an 'official liturgy of blessing'?
- (b) Does not one of the biggest problems in ethics arise when we find ourselves having to advise and encourage others on *how* to do that which we think they should not do at all (as, for instance, in the provision of rubrics for 'Benediction')—and would the provision of such an 'official'—or even 'unofficial'—liturgy bring *NOL* into that area?
- (c) Has a journal of liturgy any right or duty or propriety in getting into a moral field anyway?

And behind it the central moral question still lurks.

Tim Anderson demonstrated *Visual Liturgy*, the successor to *WorshipMaster* (both written by him), available from CHP in September, and certain to sell in droves, especially if the price can be kept as reasonable as is hoped. Meanwhile CHP will soon publish a floppy-disk version of *Patterns for Worship*.

There is already a lot of Anglican and other liturgical material available on the Internet. Much is American, especially as the ECUSA 1979 BCP is copyright-free, but English texts can be found if you know where to look. Since the copyright is controlled this is to some extent a tolerated black market.

Discussion centred on two topics: the size of the market for Internet and other electronic publications; and the impossibility of retaining control of the texts once they are freely available, which is of concern to some.

It's impossible to estimate accurately the size of the market for Internet products in, say, five years' time. Already it is possible to watch video across the Internet via your phone line, conjuring up interesting ideas for Christian 'tv' channels, or daily Matins and Evensong viewable (and prayable?) on demand. Many clergy and other worship leaders are already using the Internet and theological colleges are training ordinands to use it. Soon we will reach the point that we did with telephones and colour TVs, as Internet use moves from rarity to ubiquity. There is still a market for printed books but this is likely to be much smaller than it was in 1980 as more parishes produce their own service books.

It is clear that, if the texts aren't officially published electronically, then 'bootleg' copies will circulate, and that it is rather silly to permit people to type texts in from paper, but not to swap floppy disks. Since American material is copyright-free it is freely available on the Internet and could supplant English material just because it is easier to get hold of. A simple way to ensure official texts are used is to make them at least as easily available as unofficial material, together with appropriate guidelines for use.

This would separate copyright control from liturgical control. A possible model might be HMSO which publishes Acts of Parliament, White Papers, etc, in print and on the Internet, explicitly allowing others to copy and redistribute them electronically or on paper as long as they 'add value'. By levying a percentage royalty, if the material is given away no royalty is paid, but every copy a redistributor sells means income for HMSO. Others suggested that a copyright licensing scheme could operate, similar to CCL.

It is unclear to what extent publishers might want to add value, such as service-making guidance or other texts. At the moment several people are trying to do so, and *Visual Liturgy* is a commercial example. Hymnbook publishers might bundle copyright hymns with liturgical software. Users of the software—clergy and other worship leaders producing services—are the ones who will gain from that. It's a brave new world indeed.

Simon Kershaw  
Secretary, Christians on the Internet (COIN)

### This Month's Publication...

...is Joint Liturgical Study No 37, 'After the Primitive Christians': *The Eighteenth-century Anglican Eucharist in its Architectural Setting*, by Peter Doll. A careful look at the Anglican authors on the eucharist from this liturgically unfashionable century is followed by a relating of the theology of the eucharist to the new buildings of the period. There are four pages of illustrations.

### ...and next Month's

is Worship Series No 141 on the new Calendar, Lectionary and Collects.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Steve Pearce and Diana Murrie, *Children and Holy Communion* (National Society/Church House Publishing, distributed by Canterbury Press, 64 pp, A4 wire stitched, £5.95)

We published a 'trailer' for this book last month, and are now glad to announce that it is duly published, that its price is £1 less than adumbrated in advance (!), that it looks to be very child-friendly indeed (perhaps a little too much Teddy Horsley for my palate, but then I am not a targeted user), and appears first-rate value. Its handling of objections and anxieties on pages 13-15 is typical of its excellence (unless you are wanting to find a 'high' doctrine of confirmation). The book is indeed as described in its own trailer, and may be safely ordered on that basis.

I spotted some tiny errors—and indulge again the nit-picking instinct which has become my signature tune:

- (a) On page 4 Trent cannot have abolished the communicating of unconfirmed adults and children in the Church of Rome—and that very communicating is actually attested later on the same page.
- (b) On page 9 the parish planning is probably to include arranging 'the (annual) service at which children will receive Holy Communion for the first time'—and that is bringing some presuppositions to the House of Bishops' Guidelines which are really not consistent with them. The Guidelines do expect individual children to have a (very low-key) first communion; but on a fair reading they also expect this to happen on a one-by-one basis as individual children are deemed ready for it; and the concept of a parish planning annual or twice-yearly special services for clumps of children to be 'admitted' is forcing a programme which distorts the spirit of the Guidelines.
- (c) On page 39 the Knaresborough report, *Communion before Confirmation?*, is inexplicably renamed *Children and Communion*, which was actually the title of the 'Boston Statement' of the same year, 1985.

COB

Christopher Irvine (ed), *The Pilgrims' Manual* (Wild Goose, 1997, 96pp, A5 pb, £5.99)

I found myself leading an open-air service for the Rome-to-Derry pilgrims as they came from Canterbury and passed through Greenwich. At the right moment in the planning this little book came to hand, and I was able to give a brief from the book as to the prayers to use. The book was specifically compiled for this pilgrimage, and begins with a commendation by the Dean of Norwich who master-minded the whole complex set of movements. It will be a delight to have on the shelves—and it includes a (Celtic-style?) 'Pilgrim's Eucharist.' As far as I can tell the text is an original drafting by Christopher Irvine, and the preface in the eucharistic prayer (p64) includes the following:

Father of all living, we praise you for your vast and varied creation,  
for the light of sun, and moon and stars;  
for the high mountains and low valleys;  
for the sea, the surging waves and mighty winds;  
for water in dry places, and for the green earth.  
We thank you that we can marvel and delight in the world around us.  
You make us, male and female, in your image,  
and give us breath, thought and speech.  
Therefore we raise our voices and join the company of heaven  
as we sing your praise.  
**Holy, holy, holy Lord...**

(Travelling themes arise later in the prayer.) I think I shall be drawing on it.

COB

## ELECTRONIC PUBLISHING OF LITURGY

There follow here three items: firstly, the balance of the document prepared for the meeting last month on electronic publishing; secondly, part of a letter from Dan Connolly; and thirdly, a report by Simon Kershaw of the actual conference.

### 1. Church House Publishing—Current Plans for Electronic Publishing (continued)

19. In 1993 the electronic rights in all CBF liturgy were licensed to Hodder and Stoughton. They have now acknowledged that they have no plans to publish any further electronic products under this licence and these rights have now reverted to the CBF. This allows the CBF to make short-term plans for publishing more liturgy in electronic form.

20. The CBF Publishing Committee has endorsed the following proposals which tie in with the three areas outlined in section 3 above.
  - (a) To issue *Patterns for Worship* on disc in a basic word-processing format without any of the sophisticated indexing and search facilities offered by an expensive software package;
  - (b) to develop a Windows liturgy disc containing the text of the ASB to facilitate the preparation of service sheets. This will be an upgrade of the DOS ASB *WorshipMaster* module from Hodder with new software developed by Tim Anderson; and
  - (c) to publish selected texts on a Web page, probably free of charge. We will be able to monitor the number of 'visitors' to this page.
21. These three products are to be published and marketed by Church House Publishing during 1997. There are two key aims behind this interim plan:
  - to make texts available on disc to those who are asking for them already;  
*and*
  - to produce electronic texts in a variety of forms during the current period of experimentation.
22. The Liturgical Publishing Group recognises that electronic publishing is an area which is developing rapidly, and that any attempt at this stage to formulate a policy with regard to the electronic publishing situation in 2001 would be bound to be overtaken by events. The experience gathered from this limited publishing programme, alongside other comments received, should equip the Liturgical Publishing Group to make informed decisions relating to electronic editions of the new liturgical material for the year 2000.

### 2. Dear Colin

I was much encouraged to see *NOL* picking up the issue of 'Electronically Published Liturgy.' [Before I was ordained] I was a computer consultant. The computer bug has never left me, although I try desperately to use it creatively (I only wish that stipends would keep up!).

I do use *WorshipMaster* with the *ASB* Module—it is OK, but the hymns and songs are somewhat outdated in many respects (a slightly harsh judgment—but inevitable without regular updates). It's fine for *ASB* in that it's all there, but the user interface is quite dreadful. It should have been on Windows (and was promised there too), but that never happened, and, as far as I am aware they don't intend to address that now. That said, it does run quite stably in Windows 95 as a DOS application.

But what I really want is *Patterns* made available. [I have my own ways]

### 3. Electronic Liturgical Publishing

The Liturgical Publishing Group convened a meeting in May to discuss electronic publication of current and forthcoming liturgical material. Those present included liturgical, publishing and computer and Internet expertise.