

DIOCESAN REPORT 14—LIVERPOOL

Here in Liverpool Diocese we have never been the one to follow the crowd. It will therefore come as no surprise to hear we are not attempting to rewrite our induction service. However, we recently turned our creative skills to the compiling of a book of liturgies for our diocesan conference for clergy and licensed lay-workers. The liturgies we included were varied in form and provenance, utilizing the New Zealand, Canadian and South African prayer books as well as recent liturgical commission publications. With all these possibilities for a vibrant and positive experience of the new resources for worship, which service do you think was the most popular? You've guessed it, Wednesday's Book of Common Prayer evensong! (The prophet without honour in his home town, maybe?)

The project which is about to exercise us most is the development of a liturgy study module for the diocesan lay-training course. Work on this will start early in 1992.

David Stancliffe has just conducted a day for the diocese talking about the possibilities in using *The Promise of His Glory* and about the direction the Liturgical Commission intends to pursue approaching the year 2000. Perhaps one of the most important issues he raised was about alternative baptismal theologies to the Romans 6 model in the present service. His input was extremely interesting and liberating.

On that note, as Cilla Black might say, 'Ta-ra, lad!'.

Peter Winn, Seaforth—Secretary

ISSN 0263-7170

28p

Postal Subscription for 1992 **£5.50** (by air **£8** or **US\$16**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,
Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-851818 or 855252; Fax 0634-573549)

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

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 733292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 203

November 1991

Editorial

'ALTERNATIVE EPISCOPAL OVERSIGHT'

The proposed ordination of women as presbyters is so much news at the moment that it is, I fear, inevitable that NOL gives some attention to it most months. This month the issue is precipitated by a document entitled *Alternative Episcopal Oversight*, which was circulated to members of General Synod during the November session. The issues concerned are strictly ecclesiological, though, as they involve a concept of 'impaired communion', there are strong sacramental overtones.

We have heard the phrase 'Alternative Episcopal Oversight' for some time. It was even reported around May that the Archbishop of Canterbury had said he would be ready to discuss the concept with those developing it—an offer which not every bishop would have been happy to endorse. But the principle (hereafter dubbed 'AEO') was obviously intended as a formula allowing the opponents of women's ordination to make their protest, to separate sufficiently from those involved in ordaining women, to continue working from within the Church of England for a reversal of the decision, and thus not to secede either to Rome or to separated 'continuing Anglicanism' if the blow falls. The 20-page booklet now tells us the formula which is intended to provide these results.

The formula is cunning. It does not view a synodical decision by the Church of England (let alone a Parliamentary *fiat*) as determinative of any opponent's action. Whereas I had thought that the decision itself would be viewed as irrevocably flawing the ecclesial stance of the Church of England, and would thus be the point of decision for opponents, this AEO formula does not take that view at all. (I think the compensation provisions are compiled broadly on the supposition that it is the *decision* by the General Synod (or Parliament) which would compel clergy in conscience to abandon their posts—but I am open to correction on that.) The AEO view is that, however regrettable such a synodical decision might be, the legislation merely permits, but does not require, the ordination of women as presbyters. Thus any (or indeed every) bishop is free not to avail himself of the permission, and the face of the Church of England *could* in theory remain unaffected by the legislation.

So where does the point of decision come for the individual clergyman, or the individual parish? Answer: the crossing of the line comes not when the Church of England makes its corporate decision, but when the individual bishop of the particular diocese deliberately acts on it. The document usually treats the occasion of his so acting as the point of his first ordination of a woman presbyter, but I suspect that the licensing or instituting of woman presbyter from elsewhere might be an equal burning of the boats, and that seems to be acknowledged on page 4. Apart from other cunning features of this formula, it means each bishop individually would be made the agent of disruption in his own diocese, and this might

well give wobbly ones pause before they first make women deacons presbyters. (However such bishops will be equally under pressure from MOW; from women candidates, from a host of their own advisers, and from parishes looking for an ordained woman member of staff.)

At that point, the formula expects opponents of such ordinations to separate from their bishop—not totally, but to the point of going out to arm's length (or perhaps only supping with him with a long spoon). Parishes would still be parishes of the Church of England, and would in some real sense still be in his diocese; and clergy would still be clergy of that diocese, though in a kind of non-violent unco-operative standing protest against their bishop. The parishes and clergy concerned would certify their diocesan that they were now in a state of 'impairment of communion' with him, which in turn would mean that the people concerned would then be seeking AEO. And they would form a 'Diocesan Council' to co-ordinate their efforts.

One unclarity of the document lies in the question as to how far distant from their diocesan the dissentients would then feel—and act. The 'Diocesan Council' for instance would be heavily engaged with the diocese. It would have to monitor appointments in the parent diocese, and make suggestions, and press an 'Equal Opportunities' policy (but this reads as very odd—how can *anyone* in 'impaired communion' with the diocesan ever be offered a role requiring unimpaired communion, such as an archdeacon's?) Again, the dissentients would not cut all financial ties: the 'Diocesan Council' would 'negotiate' a mere reduction of quota for the 'impaired communion' parishes. Above all, we do not learn whether those in 'impaired communion' would be literally unable to share in communion with their bishop, or would only separate themselves if he were employing a woman president at a particular eucharist?

Nor do we learn much about the alternative *episcopoi*. I found no hint as to whether individuals were to pick their own (kosher) episcopal person, or whether the 'Diocesan Council' would approach one on behalf of all—or even whether the existing diocesan would connive and himself appoint one. Indeed the interesting scenario starts to present itself that a diocesan might conceivably appoint his own suffragan, ensuring that the suffragan never ordained a woman as presbyter and was heard to mutter that he wished they were not being ordained, and was thus acceptable.

However, if the 'Diocesan Council' were to recommend or appoint, then a whole rag-tag-and-episcopal-bobtail might emerge. On page 5 the document says:

'At the time of the "great heresies" the principle was established that under such circumstances it is the duty of faithful priests and laity to enter into communion with the *nearest orthodox bishop*' (Italics mine)

Would it be retired bishops who would so function? Or would a neighbouring suffragan do? Or will all 'Diocesan Councils' have to recommend an offshore bishop (*viz* the Bishop of Sodor and Man, or conceivably the Bishop of Europe or his assistant) simply on the grounds that such bishops rarely have an ordination, and thus have little chance of corrupting themselves? And if it is a clutch of retired bishops, and if they

THAT KENYAN EXCISION

We reported in September that all the copies of the Kenyan *Modern services* which had reached us had had pages 57 and 58 removed by sheer cutting with scissors. New supplies have now come, and we can report what was missing (but cannot, we fear, replace copies—though we will supply photo-copies of the removed pages to all who write in with SAE).

Para 23 (after the 'Welcome') is 'Anointing (Optional)' and para 24 is 'Admission to Holy Communion'. This begins with a rubric instructing the adults who have just been baptized to stand, but it is not absolutely clear that they are the only ones newly baptized who are being admitted to communion. Nor is there any mention of confirmation (though that is covered by a Note on page 45). But it is at least possible that these pages have been reprinted with something that went ahead of the rules now eliminated. For it is difficult to see the pages 57 and 58 which are now available as being in any sense dangerous.

GROVE BOOKLETS TWENTIETH BIRTHDAY

The twentieth birthday party for Grove Books is ON, at St. John's, Nottingham, on 18 January 1992 (the first numbered Grove Booklet was Ministry and Worship No. 1, *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist*, by Julian Charley, and it was published on 31 December 1971).

The day will have the following features to it:

- 10.00 a.m. Lecture by Colin Buchanan 'Grove Booklets—origins, development, impact on the church, and scope for the future'
- 11.00 a.m. Coffee
- 11.30 a.m. Workshops (led by the different Grove 'Groups'—Worship, Ethics, Pastoral, Spirituality, Evangelism)
- 12.45 p.m. Lunch
- 1.45 p.m. Workshops (led by the different Grove 'Groups'—Worship, Ethics, Pastoral, Spirituality, Evangelism)
- 3.00 p.m. Communion service

Please register by sending £2 (which includes coffee and lunch) with your name and address to Grove Books Ltd.

To: Grove Books Limited, Bramcote, Nottingham NG9 3DS
I am coming to the 20th birthday celebration on 18 January 1992.

I enclose a cheque for £2 made out to 'Grove Books Limited'

Name

(please print clearly)

Address

.....

.....

FROST THAWS VERY CAUTIOUSLY

In the September NOL we reported (somewhat cavalierly as it emerges) that David Frost was in some way assisting the Australian Liturgical Commission with the 'inclusivization' of the 'Liturgical Psalter' of which he (with the Cambridge Hebraists, John Emerton and Andrew McIntosh) holds the copyright. We used a somewhat sweeping analogy, suggesting that, in view of his previous resignation from the Commission (on this very issue of inclusive language), it must now be fairly painful for him to do such work himself, and it must feel like a choice between self-inflicted hemlock or externally applied garrotting. The matter, it appears, cannot be reduced to such crude analogies, and so we gladly rescind our remarks, offer our apologies, and attempt a scalpel-like accuracy of definition in our re-statement.

Firstly, it is clear that the copyright of the English text of the Psalter is so convincingly entrenched with David Frost and the two Hebraists; that no monkeying with even one syllable can be done without permission. And permission will not lightly be given . . .

Secondly, the team is not putting up a mere blank *Non possumus*. They are open to alteration, if the need is really there. Indeed David Frost uses the analogy with a doctor treating patients who smoke—if he cannot persuade them to give up their fags, at least he can try to reduce damage to their health to a minimum. It is in such a mood that David Frost has (provisionally) made himself available.

Thirdly, private correspondence now reveals that the copyright holders are not committing themselves to agree a result either against the clock, or at all. It looks as though they have till July 1993 to decide whether a principled inclusivish smoothing job can be done at all, such as to carry the consent if not the actual delight of the original team.

So, although David Frost is getting round the table with members of the Commission, he is not (to quote our own naughty word) 'coralled'. He pays tribute to the friendliness of the endeavour.

This leaves two tiny footnotes lurking in NOL's mind:

- (i) Is the English Commission also wanting this work done?
- (ii) If I were to work over the Frost English Text (the 'FET'), and visibly *change* it, would the resultant text be in breach of copyright at all? How small must changes be for it to be clearly the FET which is undergoing piracy? Suppose, alternatively, that the text was indeed ruined, but so totally that the result was not easily traceable to an FET original—*would* that be in breach of copyright?

At proof stage, we have the answer to the second footnote from the horse's mouth. The aforesaid animal reports 'it would be immediately obvious if someone lightly "doctored" it—and demonstrable in a court of law, though heaven forbid that it should ever come to that.'

get ever more elderly and decrepit, then how is *their* succession to be sustained? Are they to be encouraged to become an alternative episcopal college (or oversight pool?) and to ensure the continuity of the order?

But above all, what content has this oversight? What powers has such a bishop? Is he being viewed as a bishop at all, or simply as a static figurehead with some sacramental powers? For the scheme involves a strong pledge to continue to work within the present synodical system, and includes the aim of dismantling from the inside the offending legislation. The existing bishop is invited to join the 'Diocesan Council' at least once each year, and dissentients will, it seems, themselves be found on his Bishop's Council. It is doubtful whether they can offer much 'canonical obedience' to their alternative overseeing bishop.

I hope these proposals carry the judgment of dissentients. They would certainly help those who seek the ordination of women to feel less guilty and might just help one or two bishops to pull back from the doomsday judgments about the whole business. But I confess that, if I were a dissentient, I would have a very heavy heart. If clergy in particular are let off the hook of outright quitting, then by staying they will find themselves compromised in all sorts of ways into accepting the ordination of women as at least possible and as *de facto* being practised. The AEO proposals function by avoiding 'guilt by association' but immediately precipitate their own people back into a casuistical jungle, in which the people would be daily faced with new issues as to whether going to a diocesan committee or sharing in a deanery eucharist—or even sending a male candidate for ordination to a mixed bunch of selectors—was conceding too much, I suspect that AEO, once adopted, would then hold the opponents in and erode their principles as they went along. As to whether they could then beget a further generation of internal non-jurors, that is even more improbable.

As I rather think the outcome above might actually hold the Church of England together, and, as its ultimate outcome would be one I would welcome, I rather incline to think that AEO is a good proposal in this point in the Church of England's history. But I also suspect my slightly cynical support will hardly help its chances.

Colin Buchanan

GET-TOGETHER OF DIOCESAN LITURGICAL COMMITTEE SECRETARIES

The annual conference of representatives from the DLCs was held at Church House, Westminster, on 9 October. There was a combined fare of contributions from Liturgical Commission members, reports of the Toronto Consultation, and group discussion. One or two vignettes:

Bryan Spinks set out a whole spectrum of tasks ahead for the Commission, including offices and occasional offices; Michael Vasey was advocating the four-year lectionary from JLG, sniping at the thematic approach in the ASB—in the course of which, whilst deprecating getting little snippets of the Bible grouped thematically, he put in the memorable line 'if people to-day don't know one way round the Bible, why try to give them a second?' The diocesan secretaries reported considerable interest in the 'communion before confirmation' issue, and hoped for new things from the House of Bishops. But overall the day was largely one of the Commission and the diocesan committees staying in touch with each other, rather than an attack upon particularly arresting or threatening new agenda.

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1991

On Tuesday 12 November, Mrs. Molly Dow moved on behalf of Coventry Diocesan Synod:

That this Synod, welcoming the initiatives taken by other Churches, request the House of Bishops as soon as possible to introduce proposals for a Eucharistic Prayer suitable for use in the Church of England at Services with children present.

Molly Dow explained that there was no put-up job by the Liturgical Commission (a non-existent rat NOL acutely sniffed out last month), but rather a genuine desire by her own local deanery. There were several amendments tabled, of which only half of one succeeded (the motion was divided for voting purposes), and that enabled the plural 'Eucharistic Prayers' to replace 'a Eucharistic Prayer'. COB had put down his own amendment to delete 'with children present' and substitute 'at which children are likely to communicate', and found to his chagrin that if any previous amendment was passed (for all that they dealt with singular and plurals, or with main Sunday services or other occasions), then his amendment would be deemed to have lapsed. He challenged it, and the lawyers ruled the same again. Some from the floor showed concern also, but found the platform adamant. It even looked as though some might be wanting to support COB's amendment—but, no, it was simply concern for fair play: the record shows that the other amendments were duly defeated (except for the making the singular into a plural, and that was subject to a knife-edge decision that it did *not* imperil the COB amendment). COB then moved his amendment, but failed to move the Synod. All were sympathizing with non-communicant children, and threw out the rigorous amendment. It will make little difference to the actual task of drafting.

On the Thursday, 14 November, the Synod debated the Liturgical Commission's report *The Worship of the Church as it Approaches the Third Millennium* (GS Misc 364), introduced by a Standing Committee covering report, *Liturgy: The Next Steps* (GS 989, Church House Bookshop, 8 pp. 50p). The Bishop of Winchester moved 'that this report be received', and then Archdeacon David Silk moved two motions, accepting one amendment, and led the Synod to resolve overwhelmingly:

That this Synod ask the Standing Committee:

- (a) to bring forward proposals by July 1992 for the Revision of Canons B2-6 (consistent with the Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure 1974) so as to achieve the increased flexibility within an ordered framework called for by the House of Bishops;
- (b) in consultation with the Liturgical Commission and the Standing Orders Committee, to consider whether the authorization of liturgical texts could be expedited by the revision of the liturgical business procedure and to report within the quinquennium to July 1995.

and

That this Synod:

- (a) recognize that some revision of the liturgical material contained in the Alternative Service Book should be put in hand so as to be authorized by 31 December 2000, although not thereby precluding the possibility of the existing texts in the Alternative Service Book also continuing to be authorized beyond that date;
- (b) call on the Liturgical Commission to bring forward, within this quinquennium, recommendations as to how any revised texts and services might best be embodied in a book or series of books.

Reviews

The St. Hilda Community *Women Included. A Book of Services and Prayer* (SPCK, 1991, 94pp., £7.99)

This is the book that provoked questions in the house and it should provoke questions for all who are interested in present trends in liturgy. The first part of the book is 4 introductory essays setting the scene. Once again we see the inflexibility of the Church of England dissidents, with the whisper of 'who will rid me of these female priests?' We all know how the story developed. The unchurched of this community can only reinforce their interpretation of the church as patriarchal. So out of their experience St. Hilda's has aimed at non-sexist liturgy and community.

The second part puts the prayers in the order needed for a eucharist. There is much that is new and fresh. The use of dance and symbol is particularly to be welcomed. As might be expected, Mother is heavily used, as is wisdom and God as She. Father is avoided, and, yes, the Lord's Prayer is rewritten, but people have been doing that for years, and this one is good. I was unsure about 'God whose body is all creation'. I know it has a respectable parentage, but it still suggests pantheism to my mind. I was also very disappointed with the eucharistic prayers. These raise the crucial issue of the Trinity. If Father is avoided, what do you call the first person of the Trinity? The first eucharistic prayer seems to be addressed to the Spirit and Christ and only in the final doxology comes a reference that might be to the 'Father'. The second eucharistic prayer is addressed to Wisdom (=Christ) and seems to envisage a binity. The fifth prayer is agnostic in the preface as to who (or what) we are giving thanks. This is one of the weakest points of much feminist liturgy and has not been avoided here. Do St. Hilda's believe in the Trinity?

It is worthwhile pondering this book and at the same time contrasting it with the *New Zealand Prayer Book 1989*. They are perhaps both going in a similar direction (and New Zealand includes an alternative Lord's Prayer), but they do not arrive at the same place. Clearly inclusivity and language about God cannot be avoided, but New Zealand seems to my mind to have got it more right than this book.

Phillip Tovey

Kevin W. Irwin *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1991; imported by Columba Press, Dublin; 78 pp., sterling price £5.99)

This is a brief introduction to the discipline of reflecting upon liturgy as historical theology. There are but four brief chapters—one on 'Origins of the Notion of "Liturgical Theology"', which pivots on the meaning of *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, a second on 'Contributions of European Authors' (Dalmais, Vagaggini, Bouyer, Marsili, Lukken, and Houssiau), a third on 'Contributions of American Authors' (Schmemmann, Wainwright, Kavanagh, Fink, Kilmartin, Power and (Mary) Collins), and finally 'Directions for a Method of Liturgical Theology'.

The selection of authors is meant to be contemporary, but with a scope that straddles the changes of Vatican II. They are cited and summarized specifically insofar as they have contributed to our understanding of 'liturgical theology'. And in the last chapter Irwin draws from his thirteen chosen exponents three different understandings of the phrase 'liturgical theology', understandings which jostle with each other in their writings. Then at the end he tosses in for good measure some pregnant glimpses of a *lex agendi* to complicate Prosper of Aquitaine's original maxim. After that it is up to us to follow up his sources—he himself has stopped, just as we thought he had got started. Perhaps that is what 'A Primer' means. COB

A Personal Prayer

Jesus Christ Son of God, make yourself known through me. Jesus Christ Son of the Living God speak through me to others. Amen
Episcopal Church of the USA

Welsh Prayer

O Dhuw, rhoddaist i ni'r newyddion da yn dy Fab Iesu Grist; llanw ein calonau a diolchgarwch, fel y dywedwn wrth eraill am y llawenydd a dderbyniasom. Sanctaidd Ysbryd, rho inni ffydd Sanctaidd Ysbryd, rho inni obaith Sanctaidd Ysbryd, rho inni gariad. Bywha dy waith yn y plwyf hwn, gan ddechrau ynof fi trwy Iesu Grist ein Harglwydd. Amen.
The Church in Wales

French Prayer

Seigneur Jesus Christ
Nous te remercions que tu es venu sur terre
Pour nous enseigner ta Parole vivante
Que tu es mort sur la croix pour notre salut
Que tu es descendu au tombeau et ressuscite
Pour mettre fin a la mort eternelle qui nous attendait
Que tu es monte au ciel pour nous preparer la vie eternelle
Seigneur nous savons que tu aimes notre Province
Envois-nous ton Esprit Saint pour que Nos projets d'evangeliser nos
pays soient prosperes
Aide-nous dans la preparation de la creation
Des Provinces Francophones de nos trois pays respectifs:
Le Burundi: le Rwanda et la Zaire en 1992
Que Ton Esprit inspire nos Eveques
Pour que l'unite et l'amour soient des instruments cles
Dans cette famille de tes serviteurs
Benis cette decennie de l'Evangelisation
Benis toutes les oeuvres du Monde entier
Qui glorifient ton Nom
Nous te prions au Nom du Pere et du Fils et du Saint Esprit. Amen
L'Eglise de la Province du Burundi, Rwanda et Zaire

Correspondence

Dear Editor
Surely Bishop Harrison in his letter in the current October issue of NOL, has had a ship of the pen! He writes of a bishop recently consecrated in the Far East, as being required to wear a black *rochet*—surely he means a *chimiere*! Living as I do in Southwell, I have seen him quite often in the Minister here, and his rochet is always white(!) and his Chimere black.
John Castledine, Southwell

This month's Booklet . . .

is Spirituality no. 39, *Freedom to Choose*, by Richard Bauckham—and there is also Evangelism no. 16, *Proclaiming Good News Down-le-Street* by Steve Tulley of Chester-le-Street.

. . . and next month's

is Joint Liturgical Study no. 20, *Origins of the Roman Rite* edited by Gordon Jeanes, lecturer in liturgy in Durham University.

. . . and a New Edition

is Ethical Study no. 66, *Caring for the Earth*, by Keith Innes.

Contributions in the debate included an urging of the Roman lectionary by John Hall of Southwark, an emphasis upon a 'tradition of repetition' by the Bishop of Ely, a denunciation of using a tongue unknown to the local people by Dr. John Sentamu, and a haunting assertion by John Gladwin (Provost of Sheffield) that the BCP knew its context in society, but the ASB does not, and new texts need to. The Bishop of Winchester had so charmed the Synod at the outset that to provide any actual head-on clash was difficult, and making points for future consumption was the best tactic available.

In question-time, the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission was asked whether the Commission had plans 'to provide material for eucharistic and non-eucharistic services for the country festivals of Plough Sunday, Rogation, Lammas, and Harvest.' The Bishop of Winchester replied that they had no plans (beyond *Patterns*) but would listen carefully to the debate on the Thursday coming (i.e. the one reported here in the preceding paragraph). He was also pressed by two questioners as to whether the Commission (which included persons signing the Toronto Statement) had as a Commission any mind on that Statement, and, if so, whether it would be reporting it to the House of Bishop or to the Synod. The answer was warily Wintonian, but acknowledged that in some sense the Toronto Statement was now above ground in the Church of England and could not be ignored. Later on Canon Peter Lock, who moved the Rochester diocesan motion on the 'Knaresborough' recommendations in July, asked 'will the House of Bishops be producing a further statement on their position regarding children receiving communion before confirmation?' The reply by the Archbishop of Canterbury goes somewhat beyond the bland minutes of the House of Bishops, and is worth quoting in full:

'The House considered at its recent meeting a number of issues arising from the decisions taken in July. The House has no plans now to issue a further statement regarding the admission of children to communion before confirmation. The House is conscious however of the decisions (i) not to seek to phase out present experiments in this area and (ii) not to accept the terms of the Rochester diocesan synod motion requesting the House to provide draft regulations on the point. In these circumstances the House agreed to seek appropriate means to monitor and evaluate experiments that are presently taking place and have appointed a small group to consider and advise the House on how this might best be done.'

There was also a question related—amazingly—to an answer given *in the House of Commons* by the Second Estates Commissioner 'that changes of gender when using the Lord's Prayer were unlawful'. This was the subject of various supplementaries, in the course of which it was wickedly mooted that an heretical version of the Lord's Prayer would be not unlawful *if it were sung* . . .

HOUSE OF BISHOPS OCTOBER 1991

The minutes of the House of Bishops' meetings of 22 and 24 October reveal that a group was set up to 'co-ordinate the further work required' in the field of initiation. Very little else of liturgical significance occurred.

FROM THE JOURNALS

by Bryan Spinks

Since the last 'From the Journals' there has been quite a deluge of liturgical articles—though mainly due to a steady build up of numbers of *Worship*, and my failure to find time to read them all! *Mea culpa*.

Lutheran Quarterly 4 (1990) contained my paper entitled 'Mis-Shapen: Gregory Dix and the Four Action Shape of the Liturgy', further debunking this Anglican theory. Dix is a perennial pest who will continue to have to be debunked from time to time. *The Shape of the Liturgy* was an important landmark, and a classic, but it really is dated, and in the wrong hands, positively dangerous! *The Record* 24 (Spring 1991) has a short reflection on the reordering of French Roman Catholic churches, and a look at the changing role of the minister. It also reprints an article from *The Evangelical Magazine*, 1955, on Alexander Whyte.

Studia Liturgica 21. 1 (1991) contains four articles on the lectionary; Claude Wiener on the Catholic lectionary, Horace Allen (that great liturgical joker) on the Common Lectionary, Donald Gray on the JLG four-year lectionary, and K-H Bieritz on the German Lutheran Preaching lectionary. These were published as part of the preparation for the Societas Liturgica conference on the Bible in Worship. Peter Jeffery writes on the Sunday Office in Seventh Century Jerusalem, working from a fairly recently discovered Georgion Chant Book. Diane Karay Tripp has a most interesting paper on Daily Prayer (mainly private prayer) in the Reformed tradition. This is completed in 21.2. In this issue Peter Galadza considers the role of icons in Byzantine worship, and in conclusion argues for an iconostasis as in St. Vladimir's Seminary in Crestwood, New York, employing a low, railing-type templon. This enables the worshippers to see the ministers who are icons, as well as the icon paintings. Bill Grisbrooke has written a very perceptive article under the title 'Liturgical Reform and Liturgical Renewal', urging that something has gone wrong, and suggesting that amongst other things, we need to recapture a sense of symbolism and community. Boone Porter writes on the use and background of the prayer made popular by the CSI liturgy, 'Be present, be present, O Jesus, our good high priest', tracing its visigothic origin. This issue also contains the paper which I read at the SLS conference in 1990, on how Richard Baxter and Jeremy Taylor reflected their doctrinal views on baptism and the eucharist in the liturgical compilations. Mark Searle contributes a bibliography on Liturgy and Social ethics.

In *Worship* 65:1 John McKenna writes on 'Symbol and Reality', looking at the symbolic process, the history of the notion of symbol, the nature of symbol, and a creative approach to symbol. This is yet another article stressing the importance of symbolism, though it all seems very difficult in terms of knowing quite what changes in the liturgy are actually needed and possible. Robert C. Garafalo looks at co-dependence and sacramental marriage; by narrowing attention to the moment of marriage (vows and consummation) the Church is ignoring the wider interpersonal context in which the couple's relationship evolves, and that one's capacity for life-long marriage may be impeded by factors other than a lack of goodwill and commitment. Kenneth Untener offers a short note on the ordination of women.

In 65:2 E. E. Uzukwu writes on African symbols and the liturgy, and Joseph Healey on inculturating the Holy Week liturgy in East Africa. Paul Marshall writes an interesting paper on Style and Substance in seventeenth century England. This looks at the Puritan-Episcopalian disputes leading up to 1660. He rejects Addleshaw's view that it was all based on simple-minded reading of patristic texts, and Horton Davies' view that it was simply about styles of worship. Marshall looks at Thorndike, Taylor and L'Estrange. All were committed protestants. He argues that the debate was really about the theology of the church, the function of the worshipping assembly, and how history is to be read. Thomas Krosnicki takes up a subject recently aired by Fred McManus in *Shaping English Liturgy* regarding the need to tidy up the preparation of the gifts in the Roman rite, and he makes some concrete proposals.

In 65:3 an article looks at Marian festivals, arguing that to be useful, these must be grounded in scripture and the symbolic trajectories that emerge from scripture. Louis Roy looks at inclusive language regarding God, and Michael Whelen looks at the use and meaning of the litany of the saints. Issue 65:4 has James Dallen on liturgy and justice, Zimmerman on the General Intercessions, giving eight guidelines. Paul Turner takes up Aidan Kavanagh's hypothesis on the origin of confirmation, arguing at one point that it holds out hope for sacramental theologians who vainly strive to reclaim the modest beginnings of an overgrown rite. Michael Lawler writes on the sacrament of marriage—rather in a similar vein to Garafalo—arguing that the fullness of Christian marital love is eschatological, and it is a mistake to place so much emphasis on the marriage ceremony and consummation. Issue 65:5 has three articles on preaching, the bible and theology. A. Gittins has another look at sacrifice and the eucharist. He refers to A. H. Couratin and to Godfrey Ashby, but seems unaware of Kenneth Stevenson's study. Getachew Haile contributes a piece on a 15th century Ethiopic hymn to Mary. (to be concluded)

DECADE OF EVANGELISM

Selection of prayers from round the Anglican Communion Advent to Epiphany

Following Christ's Example

O God by your grace, during this Decade of Evangelism, you have called us to a goodly fellowship of faith. Bless our Bishop and all clergy and people. Grant that your word may be truly preached and truly heard, your sacraments faithfully administered and faithfully received. By your Spirit, fashion our lives according to the example of your Son and grant that we may show the power of your love to all among whom we live. We ask this through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen

Church in Bermuda

Renewed Strength

Fill and strengthen your servants, especially evangelists who serve in remote areas under difficult conditions, with the assurance and power of Christ's victory over death and evil that during this Decade of Evangelism they will proclaim with renewed commitment and courage the thrilling fact of a new life which all who believe in him and his resurrection can freely enter in, share and enjoy.

In so doing, may we your Church reflect your love for the world and her preparedness for Christ's return. For we pray in his name. Amen.

Church in Kenya