

23 Sunday next before Advent Christ the King God the Father,
help us to hear the call of Christ the
King
and follow in his service,
whose kingdom has no end;
for he reigns with you and the Holy
Spirit,
one God, one glory.

30 Advent Sunday

Almighty God,
purify our hearts and minds,
that when your Son Jesus Christ
comes again as judge and Saviour
we may be ready to receive him,
who is our Lord and God.

CORRECTION

Brian Mayne writes from Ireland to warn readers not to use the text of the Irish ordination rite as printed in our June issue on pages 8 and 9. The reason is not only that it is only for Ireland, and there not until 2004, but, more seriously, because, as printed here, it is misleading. The stuff to near the bottom of page 8 is one alternative, but it has been cut short before the laying on of hands. The rest is a full ordination prayer, alternative two, but needs the opening dialogue from alternative one to be seen in full. We hope that helps—and printed copies will be ready around March 2004 (see *Praxis News of Worship* near the time). But perfectionists and those in a hurry are invited to send an SAE to Brian Mayne at 114 Ballydugan Road, Downpatrick, N. Ireland BT30 8HF.

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ
Phone 0208-699-7771 Fax: 0208-699-7949
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 2003 **£8.50** (by air **£12.00, US\$24.00**)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 346

October 2003

EDITORIAL

I had been contemplating writing a little about 'souls' this month, not least because a Michaelmas ordination has again reminded me that the ASB Ordinal (in which I had a part) characterizes Jesus Christ as the 'shepherd of our souls'. It is defensible, not least because it is biblical (see 1 Peter 2.25), but it is also highly arguable that the translation deceives, and that Jesus is better seen as the 'shepherd and overseer [*episcopos*] of our lives'. I think I have had occasion here before to point out that, if 'SOS' stands for 'save our souls' (which is, I gather, itself uncertain), yet those who despatch the message think they are calling for a lifeboat or a helicopter, rather than for an evangelist, to be sent to them.

Well, so I contemplated. And then there came to hand for review the new book by Tom Wright, recently launched as Bishop of Durham, *For All The Saints? Remembering the Christian Departed* (SPCK, 2003, xv/76pp pb, £8.99). This is the new Bishop of Durham, fired up by his own studies of the resurrection of Christ, outdoing a certain predecessor of his if not in vigour, yet in clarity, and biblical accuracy. But this particular book—a short one for him—turns upon what happens to us on death, rather than upon what happened to Jesus, which it takes as a given. And perhaps October is the right month to mention it, for he is invading the church year, and particularly the church November, and doing so with an axe for the root of the tree.

What has triggered him into being a campaigner is the implicit, and often explicit, difference between 'All Saints' and 'All Souls'. The origins are clear—in the Middle Ages there were two sorts of believers bound for heaven (leaving aside those bound for another place—though he is ready to discuss the other place). One set—the saints—went direct: the other set—ordinary Christians—went with less overt joy via purgatory. One set was commemorated joyfully on 1 November: the other set was the subject of petition and offering of masses on 2 November, and joy might be hard to stoke up. Indeed one set qualified for liturgical white: the other was shrouded in purple or black. One set simply evoked our praises to God, though we might go on and ask for their help: the other set needed *our* help, as we prayed that their time might be shortened and their sufferings in convalescence made easier. I think we might add that, as a matter of history, praying for the departed came first, and the practice then slowly moulded the doctrine of purgatory (ie, we wouldn't be praying for them if they did not have some need, would we?).

What is clear is that the Church of England very nearly abolished the concept of specific haloed saints at the Reformation. In 1549 the intercession in the eucharistic

prayer still gave God thanks for the saints, and offered petitions for the rest. But by 1552 all that had gone—and 2 November with it. The residual notions of a small number of saints with haloes were retained by keeping New Testament ‘saints’ in the calendar and lectionary, and by not abolishing the dedications of parish churches. In Elizabeth’s reign all sorts of ‘black-letter’ saints crept back into the calendar, though not into the lectionary. And so the idea of special ‘saints’ stayed sufficiently alive for the imitators of Rome in the nineteenth century to restore 2 November, and with it masses for the dead, intercession of the saints, and virtually the whole medieval caboodle.

Tom Wright’s main thesis is that all this comes from human wisdom, from semi-universalism, from an insufficient grasp on the scriptures, from a false humility, and not from God. The scriptures are clear that Jesus Christ has suffered once for all for our sins, and there is nothing left (once death has come) to be cleared up in us. If purgatory has any meaning, it is the process of suffering and maturing on this earth—and we all come to the end of it in different ways and at unexpected times, but we then depart ‘to be with Christ’ which is far better. If we rest in Christ, who dare attribute further purgatorial processes to such a relationship—and was not the dying thief, who was promised that he would be ‘this day with me in paradise’, about the most obvious candidate for strict purgation, of which in fact there is no hint at all? And this is a great levelling *up*, so that there are no eclectic ‘saints’ who deserve a separate commemoration, a different attitude of prayer, from the rest of us. Levelling up is exactly what God’s grace achieves.

Tom Wright’s thesis here links full justification with the abolition of a privileged (because deserving) group of ‘saints’ who alone qualify for direct entry to heaven. Whether he is then content that we should retain church dedications in the name of ‘St Ambrose’ or ‘St Cuthbert’ is not entirely clear. I discussed this a little earlier in the year when the Pope ‘created several more saints’ (as the papers put it). I had also to read a short paper at *Societas Liturgica* on whether Anglicanism has, or needs to have, a ‘process’ which would lead to recognitions of sainthood, and have thus given a little thought to the matter. Tom Wright virtually clinches his case (which is actually copperbottomed, once justification through faith has been invoked) by quoting Walsham How’s hymn:

For all the saints who from their labours rest
 who thee by faith before the world confest,
 thy name, O Jesu, be forever blest.
 Alleluia! Alleluia!

 But, lo, there breaks a yet more glorious day;
 the saints triumphant rise in bright array;
 the king of glory passes on his way.
 Alleluia! Alleluia!

Until the end Holy Communion.

**Our hearts are fed, by Christ by faith,
 we proclaim his death, until he comes.**

Maranatha, Alleluia. Alleluia, Amen.

Maranatha, Alleluia. Alleluia, Amen.

THOSE ALTERNATIVE COLLECTS

I fear that we have failed to print these each month, and can only plead (a) that you are not allowed to use them yet, and (b) I cannot offer a whole year anyway (though they be lawful after the February General Synod). Here at any rate are those for November—and ‘ware Tom Wright’s strictures on the season (see editorial):

November Sunday

Collect

1 (Saturday) All Saints’ Day

God of holiness,
 your glory is proclaimed in every age:
 as we rejoice in the faith of your saints,
 inspire us to follow their example
 with boldness and joy;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

2 Fourth Sunday befoRe Advent

God of glory,
 touch our lips with the fire of your Spirit;
 that we with all creation
 may rejoice to sing your praise;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

9 Third Sunday before Advent

God our refuge and strength,
 bring near the day when wars shall cease
 and poverty and pain shall end,
 that earth may know the peace of heaven
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

16 Second Sunday before Advent

Heavenly Lord,
 you long for the world’s salvation:
 revive us from inaction,
 restrain us from excess
 and stir in us new hope
 that all creation will one day be healed
 in Jesus Christ our Lord.

The difficulty lay in discovering where worship would figure in the programme. It was virtually no part of the content of the presentations, and, if it was handled in little bits in various seminars and fora, it was hard to track down and monitor. Would any reader of NOL who learned something new and interesting about worship in such a context please be in touch quickly.

'LIMURU LITANY'

**In the beginning, mission in communion
The Father sent the Son and the Spirit.**

God spoke his word through
Melchizedek and Hagar,
Rahab and Ruth,
Balaam and Naaman,
Jethro and Job.

**Together they are sent:
Together we are sent.**

God spoke his word through
Woman of Samaria,
Roman centurion,
Woman of Phoenicia,
Cornelius centurion.

**Together they are sent:
Together we are sent.**

God spoke his word through
Monica of Africa,
Ajavi Crowther,
Abdul Masih,
Pandita Ramabal,
Watchman Nee.

**Together they are sent:
Together we are sent.**

From the beginning, mission in communion
'The Father sent me, I send you.
Receive the Spirit, the Spirit of release.

From earth's wide bounds, from ocean's farthest coast,
through gates of pearl streams in the countless host,
singing to Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
Alleluia! Alleluia!

It looks from this as though we are back with New Testament concepts of saints—and sing it with not only gusto, but also relief.

However, Tom Wright has a couple of unexpected twists to come. One of these is calendrical. He is opposed to the 'kingdom season' which the Common Worship calendar has introduced. His thrust (very forcefully expressed) is that:

'It unscrambles the eschatological teaching of the old church year, in which the coming Kingdom, on earth as in heaven, was foreshadowed in the coming of the incarnate Son. In its place it has put a very different eschatology: "the saints" have gone before us into a "kingdom" called "heaven", where we hope eventually to join them. This is precisely what the New Testament does *not* teach.' (p 62)

His view is that we now have a church year which, if I have understood him right, instead of moving to a catastrophic or at least critical intervention with the second coming of Jesus, now simply arrives by a slow and wrong process at a Jesus who is king, literally, of a far-removed heaven. The wrong season is then capped with the wrong feast—Christ the King. Here his ire increases—we already have a feast of Christ the King, and it is Ascension day. And the Roman feast, which originated as the last Sunday in October, was then, in 1925, invented to remind the people of God of their social responsibility on earth, in other words, of the present kingdom, which we pray should be realized *on earth*. When Rome moved it in 1970 to the end of this new 'kingdom season' it became a lame and unnecessary bit of eschatology, which is highly disruptive of a scheme which the following week starts a preparation for Christ's second coming. Picking up the old 'stir up' Sunday theme, he comments that the present pattern is 'like trying to eat the Christmas pudding first and stir it afterwards.' While I think he allows that the present kingdom in the midst of us can just be discerned and with an effort elicited from the new pattern, he obviously does not expect us to latch onto it that way. How interesting it would have been if he had been on the House of Bishops in the 1990s!

His other twist relates to praying for the departed. This he thinks is wholly natural and acceptable—'there are many other reasons for praying, in addition to anxiety about someone's particular state.' Clearly, he does not want to imply particular known needs (or vague unknown needs) of the departed in their present place (or state) by such prayers. He is sure they can be decontaminated from any suggestion of purgatory. But I wonder whether officially entrenched petitions for 'growth' (the American 1928 Book) or 'rest' or 'peace' do not suggest exactly those needs. But then I would be suspicious, wouldn't I? I think his thesis (and his quotation from Norman Anderson) is about continuing a conversation with God about those close to us, and the form of such prayers is personal, sometimes wordless, and not easily turned into those official prayers. However, his last word is to correct that often-

heard vestry prayer 'may the souls of the faithful departed rest in peace [and—sometimes nowadays—rise in glory]'. There is a double problem here—the 'resting' and 'sleeping' is surely bodily, and the rising *must* be bodily? He proposes to evict the 'souls', and simply pray that the faithful may so rest and so rise—and it makes more sense. For my own part I would add that a final vestry prayer simply enables us to leave the service at the point where we had reached, and it is odd to introduce a new, dramatically cosmic, theme—or, alternatively, if it *is* appropriate, then the whole congregation needs it (in the dismissal?), and not just the choir and outriders. But that is COB riding a different kind of liturgical hobby horse.

O yes, and happy kingdomtide.

Colin Buchanan

FOOTNOTE: The end is even nigher and NOL will cease in December, and only two issues are still to come. There is guidance about booking its successor on a later page. I asked last month whether readers have any topic on which they would like me to expand, while there is space (you will realize that a quarterly journal, full and rounded though it will certainly be, will not have space to spare for excursions). In fact I was then requested to open up the question of oaths, and I have done so briefly here. Blessings (which I promised in the Spring) will come in November. I may do some autobiographical excursus in December. But a little time and a little space still remains; so do let me know what you would like.

THE MEETING OF DIOCESAN REPRESENTATIVES

The Liturgical Commission's annual meeting with diocesan representatives was held at Notre Dame University (by the National Gallery) on 24 September. It looked as though the Commission had fixed the wrong date for themselves, as hardly any of them came. The notables were Paul Bradshaw (who works at ND), Peter Craig-Wild, and Jeremy Fletcher (admittedly with their back-up team of Colin Podmore and Sue Moore). This is a brief account of what they told us:

(a) **The Ordinal** (Paul Bradshaw): a text will go from the Commission to the House of Bishops for their meeting in October. They will comment and return it to the Commission. It will then come back to the House in January, in its finally recommended form from the Commission, replete with a commentary, so that it can be introduced by the House into the Synod in February. I have been asking where the Berkeley Statement would appear, so as to instruct the bishops on good principles, but it looks doubtful as to whether that will be in October, when the text can still be altered. One of the features of the text which Paul Bradshaw let slip is that the presentation of the candidates could be (perhaps should be) in the introduction to the rite. He painted a cartoon of the ASB provision whereby a bishop embarks on a communion service, and, after he or someone else has preached the sermon, he suddenly becomes aware that there are candidates for ordination waiting in the front row, and would he please divert his liturgical attentions to deal with them before he returns to the communion? I don't think it ever quite happens to me like that, but an earlier presentation will do no harm, I guess. More to the point are the rumours that the giving of the Bible has been moved to just

[Some of the ideas of dynamic equivalence lay at the back of the 1969 instruction on translation of liturgical texts] The abandonment of the principles enshrined in that document in favour of the regressive and obscurantist notions of the Vatican instrument that replaced it, *Liturgiam Authenticam*, is something that Fr Harbert will have to live with but I, for one, feel no need to.

I look forward to liturgical texts prepared according to the method outlined in this latter instruction, and comparing them with the revised ICEL texts which are present rotting on some shelf in the Vatican.

I am not arrogant enough to imagine that our own texts are perfect; I simply think that they could stand comparison with anything that the supervisory commission *Vox Clara* could come up with—if it ever comes up with anything. You see, in my cynicism, I believe the whole exercise is a Roman device to put a stop to the development of vernacular liturgical texts . . .

Is this locked horns? Or will authority give an undisputable answer?

COB

PS: Speaking of authority in Rome, we must congratulate the Pope (even in his extreme physical decline) on reaching the silver jubilee of his pontificate. I believe that, until 1871, it was thought not only that St Peter had done 25 years in charge at Rome, but that, in divine providence, no-one else would ever exceed it. 1871, of course, was the year that Pius IX did exceed it (he ran till 1878, a 32-year pontificate). So John Paul II does have precedent, but 25 years is still an extraordinary run. The anniversary is on 16 October—the date of the burning of Latimer and Ridley in Oxford in 1555. (For further comment on Pius IX, see my Grove Booklet, *Is Papal Authority a Gift to Us?*)

BLACKPOOL—NEAC4—SEPTEMBER 2003

There is little germane to NOL to report from Blackpool. Nevertheless it should not be allowed to pass unrecorded, not least because of prior comment here, including last month's back page.

The editor of NOL led the 'office' type liturgical morning worship, with great back-up from Tim Lomax (we were the GROW team, in line with previous NEACs) and the musicians. The Monday morning was enlivened by Graham Kings and his 'Limuru Rap' (see below), but in essence the structure was printed in the Congress programme, and everyone knew where they were going.

The main evening sessions, which, quite apart from major doctrinal or kindred input were topped and tailed by Bible exposition by Paul Gardner and an epilogue by Richard Bewes, were bonded and inspired by fairly joyful worship, led by Steve James (Rector of Bebington) and David Peacock (of LBC) with instrumentalists of great talent. We did get the golden oldies (Wesley and Toplady) along with the chorus-culture. High marks to all concerned.

The Sunday morning communion was presided over by George Cassidy, Bishop of Southwell, and Wallace Benn, Bishop of Lewes, was the preacher. Both wore Convocation robes (in order, one said, to be 'at the cutting edge of mission'). The order was loaded by half an hour of singing at the beginning; but the eucharistic prayer (in Order One (contemporary) was Prayer C—the Cranmeresque one). Good marks again there.

PUFFS OF LITURGICAL CONFLICT FROM ROME

The Tablet on 6 September published a review of the recent book by Keith Pecklers, *Dynamic Equivalence: the living language of Christian Worship* (Pueblo, imported by Columba Mercier, £21.50). I shall hope to review it here next month. But my own interest has been whetted by the review, and this was by Bruce Harbert, who is the new executive secretary of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). In broad terms his review manages to convey the notion that vernacular language in worship came all too suddenly after Vatican II, came in an unprincipled way, and claimed to do what is very difficult to do, translate the Roman rite. Note this paragraph:

... the liturgical history of the last forty years also reveals the movement's weaknesses. Led by speakers of majority languages, it did not encourage reflection on the problems which the use of the vernacular would cause for others. There are hundreds of languages whose speakers lack the resources for translating the Roman Rite and must consequently continue to worship in a strange tongue. The pastoral problem of providing for cities where as many as 50 languages are spoken was hardly foreseen. Areas where linguistic divisions exacerbate political ones, such as Belgium, Catalonia, and the Basque country, could perhaps have benefitted from some retention of a common language for liturgy ...

The fate of the Roman canon is instructive in this regard. In the early 1960s it was widely anticipated that the canon would remain in Latin, with the rest of the Mass in the vernacular. But Fr. Pecklers quotes Mgr Bugnini himself, the chief architect of the post-conciliar revisions, as criticizing this policy: "It would have been like opening all the doors of the house to a guest and then excluding him from his heart...It is in the canon that the mystery resides." Yet when the canon came to be translated into English, it was so stripped of its rhetoric as to be barely recognizable.

The truth is that the world of the Roman Rite is not easy of access. If its treasures are to be opened to the faithful—which was the whole point of vernacularization—then not only is careful translation required, but also a considerable effort of catechesis. Materials for this will take time to prepare ...'

The *tendenz* of the above is not difficult to detect. But it drew out a stinging reply a fortnight later from John Fitzsimmons, once chair of the Advisory Committee to ICEL:

... The pejorative reference by Fr Harbert to the translation of the Roman Canon (Eucharistic Prayer I) seems to me to be quite tendentious ...

... I note also Fr Harbert's repeated use of the word "rhetoric"; Latin rhetoric is one thing, but intelligible and worthy English is quite another ...

'It is simply not true that materials for a considerable effort of catechesis "will take time to prepare". Without leaving his own Washington office, Fr Harbert should be able to put his hand on more material of this kind than was ever allowed to see the light of day by the luminaries who inhabit the Congregation for Divine Worship in Rome.

before the dismissal—while stoling and even oiling (or, presumably, with the chairman of the Commission ordaining deacons, footwashing) may remain in the company of the ordination prayer. This sounds fairly topsy-turvy, and, if it hits the public in that shape, I for one will gird myself to oppose it.

(b) **Times and Seasons** (Peter Craig-Wild): all sorts and conditions of liturgical text are comprehended under this title, including the 'four great agricultural feasts' and the blessing of oils on Maundy Thursday. Most, if not all, of this material (expected next year) is for 'commendation', not 'authorization'. This, of course, has the paradoxical entail that the text can hardly be amended or defeated. Nevertheless, Peter C-W challenged us with fighting words—and his tongue in his cheek:

'Please only use what is legal to use, for, as you know, the kingdom of God will not come if you use unauthorized material.'

(c) **Daily Prayer** (Paul Bradshaw): A very large and conscientious flow of response has been coming from office customers all round the land, and a revised text can be expected in due course (probably 2005).

We also had discussion of weekday lectionaries (there is a new one coming), websites, and terminal services (farewells to people as much as to buildings). All these, and more, our Commission will faithfully supply.

OATHS

I find myself administering oaths at fairly frequent intervals, if not always actually within services, at least in the context of ordination, licensing or institution services. Before we approach points of principle, we need to note the actual text of these oaths. These are the forms regularly in use as required by Canons C.13 and C.14.

Loyal Allegiance

I..... do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.

Canonical Obedience

I.....do swear by Almighty God that I will pay true and canonical obedience to the Lord Bishop of..... and his duly appointed successors in all things lawful and honest. So help me God.

As a preliminary, one needs to note that the oath of Loyal Allegiance is not required of foreign nationals. That is significant for them (a citizen of the USA, to take but one example, will forfeit that citizenship upon taking an oath of allegiance to a head of state elsewhere), but it is surely significant for the rest of us also? If there is this category of clergy who are exempt from taking this oath, then it is absolutely clear that the question is whether British citizens will be loyal to their head of state, *not* whether ordained clergy of the Church of England are acknowledging the Supreme Governorship of Her

Majesty over the Church of England. It may be odd to ask for allegiance to HMQ at the outset of an appointment (schoolteachers and others have no such requirement), but it is only asking the citizens of GB whether they are loyal citizens. So, although I see problems for a disestablishmentarian elsewhere, I find no difficulty here at all.

But the question that came in was really to do with the whole principle of swearing and oath-taking. Canons C.13 and C.14, in accordance with the Oaths Act 1978 allow a 'solemn affirmation' in the form 'I . . . do solemnly, sincerely and truly declare and affirm that I will be faithful . . .' But has the Church of England any business treating oath-taking as the norm and affirming as a special variant from the norm?

The place of first resort is the 39th Article. It reads as follows:

'as we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his apostle, so we judge that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment and truth.'

So we are at least allowed, if not encouraged, by the Article to be ready to 'swear'. One commentator suggests (with some reason) that Jesus' prohibition 'seems to glance at needless, thoughtless, expletives'—and all are agreed, of course, that false swearing is clearly wrong. But is there a narrow path left for those who are ready with St Paul to say 'As God is my witness, I can vouch for this or that'—and mean it? I think the swearing we are asked to do is acceptable within these restrictions. But what do you think?

This month's publication . . .

. . . is the next one in the 'How to' occasional series—i.e., Worship Series no 177, *How to Read the Bible in Worship*, by Anna de Lange and Liz Simpson. This is a companion to the same pair of authors best-selling W169 on leading intercessions, and is in the same easy-to-browse format. Suitable for use by individuals or as a training manual for a team of readers, it starts with 'why read the Bible at all?' and finishes with a range of good ideas for making the reading catch the attention of listeners and some tips on practicalities of preparation and delivery.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

Five questions on Common Worship Order Two

1. I hope you join with me in regretting the disappearance of the second collect for the Queen. The first and now only collect conveys an atmosphere of stifling compliance (incidentally and topically ruling out of order the godly protest with regard to Dr John) and needs to be corrected more than occasionally by the more robust outlook of the second collect, which CW relegates to a section for unspecified occasions.

2. The claim is made in the literature and is implicit in the 'Structure' (p.228) that the BCP does not contain a Eucharistic Prayer. Why so? To make so much of the Eucharistic Prayer and deny its presence in our normative service is offensive and unnecessary. Does not the service from the Sursum Corda to the Prayer of Oblation (possibly to the Lord's Prayer if the Prayer of Thanksgiving is used) constitute a Eucharistic Prayer with interpolation of the Prayer of Humble Access and the reception of communion?
3. 'Ye that do truly' is labelled 'Invitation to Confession', when it is clearly the Invitation to Communion, to which confession is subsidiary.
4. More as a matter of interest than compliance, how is it envisaged that the First or Second Exhortations from BCP are to be used? They are to be read 'when the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion' and seem to assume a situation when Communion is not celebrated weekly and the service is truncated.
5. Now that post communions are so liberally provided it seems a pity not to advertise the possibility of using them as a final collect after the Gloria in Excelsis—following a historic practice based on the true (?) interpretation of the rubric preceding the six collects placed at the end of the Communion service, read in conjunction with the conclusion of the Ordination services.

Yours etc

Robin Brookes

(erstwhile of SPCK, then of CHP)

[COB replies: the *minutiae* of how to label and use a slightly bastard form of the 1662 communion service are hardly in the newsroom of liturgy, but, as usual, we indulge anyone making the effort to right in. Here are the editor's answers to the above:

1. I can hardly object, as I must have let it through. Someone must have reckoned only the first collect was actually in use—or usable. You can imagine I have my doubts about even that.
2. This notion that 1552/1662 has a traditional long eucharistic prayer, but has merely slipped the distribution of communion into the middle of it will really not do—and I thought had perished as a notion a long time ago. See COB on Cranmer . . . 1662 has a 'Prayer of Consecration', whereas 1552 has a prayer for reception.
3. This is a moot point, as I think it is clear that both confession and communion are there in the invitation.
4. If a parish is on a regime of 1662 communion, then it is quite possible that it is in a rural area and communion will only come every four weeks.
5. I agree.]