

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 212

August 1992

authority in the Church of England and then nothing happens for three years or more? Meanwhile parishes gaily use the material, Holy Communion Rite C flourishes and members of the Commission hold training days on the use of the contents. Of course, if you attend the splendid PRAXIS days you are told that you must not use the Eucharistic prayers and for the rest Canon B5 is wheeled out or the rubric 'other suitable words' resorted to. Nevertheless, it appears that the Liturgical Commission can only kick-start the General Synod into action by conniving at 'unofficial' usage. Rather than pursue those die-hards that want to use the Roman Missal, cannot the Church trust its own Commission to produce suitable liturgies for those who wish to use them? Uniformity is gone, all is now tailor-made.

St. Albans is sufficiently close to London for church people here to attend and appreciate the PRAXIS days; however they are a bit pricey and prone to late cancellation. Our own Workshop Day on *Promise of his Glory* in September 1991 at Letchworth attracted 45 clergy and lay people to hear Geoffrey Rowell and experience some of the services. A Service of Light for St. Matthew was a new liturgical treat. We are planning an All-Age Worship day for next Spring.

NOL provided the model for a *LITURGY NEWS* leaflet sent out with the Diocesan Bundle. The aim was to inform hard-pressed clergy what was on offer in the way of texts and commentaries. The only editing required was over *Making Women Visible*, which we discovered was NOT approved by the House of Bishops. This sensitive issue is making cowards of many people. Will the Liturgical Commission be pilloried when the potato gets too hot to handle? It looks as though Initiation is becoming the next touchy subject; hence the dropping of the Baptism service from the *Promise of His Glory* Report (p.193-202) before *POHG* was finally printed. By the way, Kenneth Stevenson thought it a hoot that everyone in Hemel Hempstead Team parish calls the book 'POHG'—sounds like a sneezing porker.

The Liturgical implications of *Faith in the City* and *Faith in the Countryside* are slowly beginning to exercise us. No doubt we will tailor some services there too.

Does any other Cathedral have the Blessing of oils service on the Tuesday in Holy Week? St. Albans Abbey does. 'Why not on Maundy Thursday?' you might ask. Because the Bishop of St. Albans is the Lord High Almoner to the Queen and is elsewhere that day. Taylor made?

Ian Cooper

Discalced Secretary of St. Albans DLC

**Editorial Note:** *Making Woman Visible* is certainly not 'approved' by the House of Bishops. It could not be, as the machery does not work that way. But it is 'commended', as offering useful small changes to make under Canon B5. COB

ISSN 0263-7170

30p

Postal Subscription for 1993 **£6.00** (by air **£8.50** or **US\$17**)

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

## Editorial

As I write, the BBC programme *Heart of the Matter* has been investigating Morris Cerullo's claims about miracles of healing. As I understand it, the saga has gone like this.

In June Morris Cerullo was at Earl's Court. Placards and posters around London stated that those who came would see miracles. This of itself aroused dissension before the crusade ever opened—dissension within the Christian camp, it should be stated, because there are many believers who fear that such claims not only may bring the gospel into disrepute, but may do so by cruelly deceiving people who have enough pain or trouble to bear anyway. One of the most notable of these critics was Peter May, an evangelical Christian who is a medical doctor, and is frankly sceptical about whether there are *any* medically documented modern healing miracles comparable to those in the Gospels (and it is, of course, comparability which has to be asserted if any continuity with our Lord's healing ministry is being claimed). At any rate, Peter May asked for the best documented three healings the Cerullo team could produce to be brought into the public arena for testing. The Cerullo team assented and said they would do it.

As an aside, I should add that I recently saw a video-clip (I *think* from the same crusade, but I am open to correction) in which Cerullo, quoting the coin found in the fish's mouth by the apostles, offered miracles of *debt cancellation*. The programme *Heart of the Matter* did not include any persons in this category, but there must be many Christian home-owners out there, in trouble with their mortgage-payments in recession-hit Britain, who would benefit. And perhaps there are some Third World governments which might seek this miracle too.

At any rate, eight weeks after the crusade finished, the Cerullo team claimed that they had had 476 cards returned by people claiming physical healing. And under examination it boiled down to very little indeed: there was one child who had had a weak left eye, but now showed a better result with that eye than ever before, though it was still weaker than the right (here the somewhat sceptical therapist was protesting that perhaps the first test she had conducted had not been done in the best conditions, so that even a major improvement was difficult to certify); and there was also a woman with a serious problem in the vertebrae, who on X-raying proved still to have the condition, but since receiving prayer ministry at the crusade had had no pain. There was also the sad instance of the epileptic who had ceased taking medication and had had a fit and died in the bath a fortnight after the crusade. There were also people who declined to be interviewed. The BBC programme was scrupulously fair, but it ended with pathetically little evidence of even *claims* to be physically healed, let alone of objectively tested miraculous recoveries.

How are we to reflect? I am one who has always wanted to promote a ministry of healing, and to do so particularly within a context of worship. I have also seen at intervals (and still do) unexpected healings of a remarkable sort (including at least one, quite unsought on my part, when I was laying a hand on a woman *in confirmation*). But I am also unconvinced about drawing too short and straight an exegetical line from New Testament healing miracles to our own time, as though we could simply read off that Jesus gave sight to the man born blind, and we by faithful prayer can and should do the same. Instead of such possible simplicities I offer the following agonizing complexities:

1. If we are to see 'signs and wonders', they will by definition be visible, tangible, measurable. Peter May is surely right to seek documented evidence of a 'before' and 'after' sort? A 'wonder' is a real wonder (a *thauma* in Greek)—it gobsacks you, takes your breath away at very sight of it.
2. If we are to draw a doctrine from the New Testament of God's continuing provision of healing miracles to those who call on him in faith, then we must have a theological explanation of the Black Death in the fourteenth century and of the Bubonic Plague in the seventeenth and of AIDS sweeping across Africa in the latter part of the twentieth. By 'theological explanation' I do *not* mean anything to do with God's judgment (a terrible suggestion), but an explanation of why the faithful have died alongside the unbelievers. Was there no faith for miraculous healing till certain Western ministries arose? or, alternatively, is there no historical perspective of modern claims?
3. I ask therefore whether it is at least possible that it is Western fascination with health for its own sake that has underlain the insistence that signs and wonders are not only being done amongst us, but are available to all who believe.
4. I pose some difficult (but test) cases:
  - (a) are Christians protected from *sudden* death (in car accidents or by drowning or however)? For certainly it would appear too late to bring them physical healing once their bodies are mashed up or burnt?
  - (b) when sailors on shipboard in the old days got scurvy, was prayer for recovery the right answer—or was it lemon juice? When millions face starvation in Somalia, is it miraculous recovery from emaciation that they require—or is it food? When a little old lady is afflicted by pneumonia from living in a damp room, is it she who needs hands laying on her, or her walls which need damp-proofing?
  - (c) does God have purposes in and through pain for his people? I once wrote a foreword to Jane Grayshon's *Pathway through Pain*, and she had been visited by every kind of healer . . .
  - (d) is it at least possible that the widespread currency given to contemporary healing stories gives an unbalanced picture of what is actually *happening* 'out there'? No author, no publisher, no

## HOUSE OF BISHOPS

### Deacons: Solemnization of Marriage

Guidelines issued by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York

1. The minister officiating at a marriage service in the Church of England should normally be a bishop or a priest<sup>1</sup>
2. A deacon may officiate at a marriage only if the consent of the incumbent and/or minister is first given.<sup>2</sup>
3. The authorized services should be used without variation whether the officiating minister is bishop, priest or deacon.
4. When a priest is present he may delegate to a deacon parts of the service including:
  - i. the blessing of the ring(s);
  - ii. the pronouncement of the blessings(s) on the couple.
 \* The priest should pronounce the blessing of the congregation at the end of the service.

+George Cantuar

+John Ebor

July 1992

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Where the incumbent or minister has colleagues who are in holy orders (priests as well as deacons) the decision as to who should solemnize the marriage of a particular couple belongs to the incumbent or minister. Consideration should be given to the wishes of the couple and there should be discussion at the parish staff meeting or other consultation between colleagues. In considering who should be the officiating minister, pastoral considerations are important. A significant factor may be that a person who is to solemnize the marriage should also have prepared the couple for the wedding; in the case of a newly ordained deacon (man or woman) it needs to be noted that training to undertake marriage preparation is at present primarily a post-ordination task and colleges and courses do not require students to develop skills in the area before ordination. In the first year following ordination as deacon therefore, a deacon should rarely, if ever, solemnize a marriage and should only do so for exceptional reasons.

<sup>2</sup> Reference to the incumbent and minister means the incumbent of the parish to which the deacon is licensed and minister means minister or priest-in-charge of the church in which the service is to take place.

## DIOCESAN REPORT 21: ST. ALBANS

St. Albans Diocesan Liturgical Committee is proud to propose the solution to all the problems that Diocesan Liturgical Committees throughout the land seem to have with the production of suitable services for Institutions/Inductions/Beginning a New Ministry etc. The answer is COMPUTERIZE. The 'Rochester Jotter' (NOL 199/July 1991) pleads for cross-fertilization; the Liturgical Commission suggests future production of 'core' material and 'resource' material. Whilst awaiting input and encouragement from 'on high', St. Albans DLC suggests a 'pick-and-mix' Institutions Service Directory containing a collection of texts from which parishes of the new minister choose the material for their needs. Some of the provision might be labelled 'core' material that must always be used, but the rest would be a flexible friend. It is hoped that this approach will tailor the service more neatly in LEPs, Team Parishes, etc. And to make it truly flexible the whole production is placed on Floppy Disc and the parish's Word Processor swings into action, cutting and pasting a tailor-made service (complete with cover and date to comply with the copyright provisions).

Are we allowed to say two-and-a-half cheers for the Liturgical Commission? The production of *Patterns for Worship*, *Promise of His Glory* and *Making Women Visible* has given us all much to reflect on before it gets down to revising the ASB for the year 2000. However, is there a strange case of encouraging us to bend Ecclesiastical Laws emerging? Why are reports like *Patterns* produced with bold type disclaimers on the title page that this report has no

## ABBEY CONSECRATION TEXTS

Paul Ferguson, the Precentor of Westminster Abbey, assures NOL (which was not present at the time) that at the most recent consecration of bishops at Westminster Abbey on 3 July, the Creed and other errant bits (like *‘facing the high altar’* for the Creed) had been brought thoroughly up to date.

## ‘NUPTIAL BLESSINGS’

Those with long memories may remember that in November 1990 the General Synod debated an Exeter diocesan motion, and passed it as follows:

‘That this Synod request the House of Bishops to re-examine the question of what constitutes the Nuptial Blessing and who may impart it.’

Exeter synod had clearly been aroused by the admitted fact that deacons (women and men) were officiating at weddings and were pronouncing blessings, in line with the rite but in what some have thought to be an undiaconal way. (I should add in passing that I am still somewhat surprised that the Exeter synod had passed this.) In the General Synod debate I pointed out the various ways in which deacons and lay people could and should—quite lawfully—‘impart a blessing’. However, I was not resisting the motion, and thought it might help to have the House of Bishops pronounce on the matter.

Now they have. It is in GS Misc 397, entitled *The ‘Nuptial Blessing’: Deacons and the Solemnization of Marriage*.

Of course Exeter diocese were after the issue of ‘who may impart it’, but the House of Bishops had little difficulty in solving this one, and came up with a more consistent and more rubrical answer than in 1987, when the House last ruled on the matter. A deacon (to take the sensitive case) who officiates at a wedding should use the authorized service ‘without variation’ (see on facing page).

But the House found the prior question ‘what constitutes the Nuptial Blessing’ much harder. Various will o’ the wisp’s were pursued, but none proved to have substance. In the event, the relevant paragraph of GS Misc 397 reads as follows:

‘The House of Bishops has considered this request. The various rites provide blessings of various kinds in various places. In the ASB there is a blessing of the couple in paragraph 19 and a blessing of the couple and congregation together at paragraph 30. There exists no single common or consistent liturgical usage running through all Anglican rites which can confidently be dubbed “the nuptial blessing”.’

This seems to be a very good answer to the original question from Exeter diocese. Then—when we know that we do not know what the nuptial blessing is—the House of Bishops’ new guidelines come into play to tell us who can say it! The full guidelines read as follows:

bookseller, and no reader ever had proportionate time for stories of prayer followed by *no* visible results—so the lack of ‘results’ is not publicized in proportion to how much it actually happens.

5. The cautions should make us (a) very careful about how we follow instinctive ‘sensing’ that people are going to be physically healed, (b) very fearful of shortcircuiting the medical profession, and (c) very chary of promising or appearing to promise recovery to those with terminal, chronic, or permanently afflicting injuries or illnesses.

It is actually infuriating to be driven into defensive cautions. My own every desire is to promote a positive and health-ful healing ministry. I believe it is a part of every ongoing pastoral relationship. But it means pastor and pastored together have to live with God’s upshots whatever those upshots may be.  
Colin Buchanan

## AMENDING CANON no. 15

This unexciting-sounding Canon came into force on 11 July (when it was promulgated in Synod in accordance with the terms of the (equally unexciting) Church of England Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 1992). The part of the Canons affecting liturgy which was thus amended was B38, concerning funerals. The amendment gives total power to the bishop of a diocese to control the actions of Anglican clergy in cemeteries and crematoria. Draft model directions have been sent to bishops, registrars and diocesan secretaries, and these, when turned into actual directions, will go to incumbents and funeral directors. In the main they protect the position of the incumbent of each parish, and fasten also upon him the pastoral care of the bereaved. They are clearly intended to end the abuse of pirate clergy officiating at funerals (usually, though not invariably, for the financial rewards involved). On occasion these have included disgraced clergy. It is not entirely clear how, unless the funeral directors themselves get the message, the suggested model directions—or any directions of any sort—would actually stamp this out. But there must be good hopes that funeral directors *will* get the message. Any clergy in doubt about their own diocese’s directions should contact the bishop’s office.

## RENEWING BAPTISMAL VOWS IN WATER

There is a steady trickle of enquiries to NOL or its editor about the theology, liturgy, and practice of submersing adults in renewal of their baptismal vows. It is hoped there will shortly be a Grove Booklet wholly devoted to this (at the moment, it emerges in passing notes in COB’s Worship Series no. 91 *Adult Baptisms* and Liturgical Study no. 48, *Anglican Confirmation*, and in the ‘Toronto Statement’ in Worship Series no. 118, *Christian Initiation in the Anglican Communion*). Would parishes with an existing (or even a lapsed) practice please write to NOL about it? Details of preparation, explanation, liturgy, and even certification, would be much welcomed—as also a note of the degree to which the bishop has been informed and/or involved. Contributions from other countries and other denominations would be gratefully received.

## ANNUAL MEETING OF DIOCESAN LITURGICAL COMMITTEE SECRETARIES

This annual meeting, convened by the Liturgical Commission, takes place this year in London on 30 September. It looks as though there will be little to be unveiled from the Commission itself, and the emphasis will be upon diocesan contributions. Perhaps there will be a chance to look at those draft ‘Liturgical Canons’.

## Book Review

David Pawson *Explaining Water Baptism* (Sovereign World, Tonbridge Kent, 1992, 64pp. n.p.)

This is one in whole series of 'Sovereign World International Booklets', each of them, as far as I can see, having as a title *Explaining . . .* (there are cross-references in the text to such titles— . . . *Repentance, . . . Faith, . . . the Holy Spirit*—and 44 prospective subjects are listed on the back cover).

Obviously, I have a special interest in David Pawson's writings on infant baptism, as he and I have read papers over against each other at Tyndale House, Cambridge, once each decade since the 1960s (and currently await our next invitation to do it again in the 1990s); and in addition he provided a response to my *A Case for Infant Baptism* (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship no. 20, originally published in 1973) and I published that response, with my own further reply, in *Infant Baptism under Cross-Examination* (no. 24 in the series, first published in 1974). These booklets are still in print, and still provide the major points around which the arguments should cluster. It should also be pointed out that David Pawson has strong charismatic convictions, and his large book *The Normal Christian Birth* (reviewed here three years ago) has a handling of the relationship of baptism to other features of Christian initiation which is unique to him.

So what does this short variant on a Grove Booklet offer? Well, it has much on baptismal symbolism (including washing, death-and-resurrection, and putting on new clothes). It has a brief chapter on the baptismal formula—and it never occurs to David Pawson that 'in the name of Jesus' and 'into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' are anything other than baptismal formulae; so he has to reconcile the two texts. There is a chapter on penitence and faith, and the necessity for not just professing them but *proving* them (which seems to go a little beyond the New Testament, and possibly beyond human capabilities too). There is then a chapter on Spirit-baptism, clearly distinguished from water-baptism, and more or less visible and/or audible (though he reads a little indistinctly here). There is a chapter on 'The Church Door', in which the important point is taken that the essence of baptism can hardly be the 'going public' about faith. Indeed an objectivity of a quite 'catholic' sort is asserted: 'When we are baptized into Christ, we become members of the universal church automatically, without any choice in the matter . . .' (page 45). This strongly suggests that the universal church is co-terminous with the baptized—a fascinating point for David Pawson to be making.

There is a kind of break after this chapter on the church, and the last two chapters and the appendix are by way of explanatory or expandatory foot-notes. One is on the efficacy of baptism (again David Pawson is nearly Roman Catholic); one is on the necessity of baptism for salvation (with the same emphasis); and the appendix is on 'Baby or Believer?'. 'Baptism cannot be applied to babies without radically changing its meaning' (page 63). But I think I would not only cavil at this conclusion, but would also note that he deals largely with cartoon images of infant baptism. He does not grapple with any closely-reasoned case. And his own parting shot in relation to the children of believers is 'Since it is a once-in-a-lifetime event, it would seem much better to be slow than too quick . . .' And my complaint would be that it is not only impossible to test what is the right speed when a six-year-old asks for baptism, but the principle our author reaches on his last pages is in exact contradistinction to the whole of New Testament baptismal practice. As I wrote about infant baptism at the end of Booklet 20, 'The case rests'. COB

## DECADE OF EVANGELISM

### Selection of prayers from round the Anglican Communion Season of Pentecost

Loving Father, whose grace abounds towards those lost:  
in their poverty and wealth;  
in their sin and self-righteousness;  
in their hatred and their pride;  
grant that your own people may demonstrate  
your grace in their lives,  
in their joy in spite of pain;  
in giving with delight;  
in their victory over sin;  
in their love for all;  
in their humility before others,  
and thus commend the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,  
who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit,  
one God, now and for ever. **Amen.**

#### *Church in the Southern Cone*

Almighty God, you have sent your Son, into this world to show your love for us, and you are still working and wishing that all people of the world may enjoy perfect reconciliation and communion with you. Grant that we may be enlightened to discern your work here on earth and make us able to give ourselves in the Decade of Evangelism, to become witnesses to your work, and to share with all people the fulfilment of your eternal Kingdom, through the only High Priest, your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

#### *Church of Japan*

Almighty God give us your Holy Spirit so that we may have power to speak about you and not be afraid to spread your Word throughout the world. May we ourselves show the world your Word through our actions and know that you are always with us. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

#### *Church of Melanesia*

God our Father, you have given us new life in your Son Jesus Christ, and poured out your Spirit upon us. Renew us by the same Spirit, and transform us into the image of Christ, that by the power of his love within us, others may come to know him as Saviour, and follow him as Lord. **Amen.**

#### *Diocese of Wakefield, Church of England*

Lord of Light—shine on us,  
Lord of Peace—dwell in us,  
Lord of Might—succour us,  
Lord of Love—enfold us,  
Lord of Wisdom—enlighten us.

Then, Lord, let us go out as your witness, in obedience to your command; to share the Good News of your love for us in the gift of your Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. **Amen.**

#### *St. Asaph: Mothers' Union (Wales)*

(All provided by the Evangelism Officer of the ACC)

### MORE ON 'BLESSINGS' AT COMMUNION

Our contemporary, *Liturgy*—which is the rather-more-official version of NOL which obtains in the Roman Catholic Church—carries a letter in its August-September edition as follows:

'Dear Editor

I write with reference to the blessing of non-communicants during the distribution of Communion.

I should be interested to know of others' experience and usage where a lay Eucharistic Minister is asked for a blessing. Recent "local custom" has encouraged priests to give a blessing without there being any clear instruction about the form to be used. This has resulted in a wide divergence of practice. Equally, however, no instructions are available to lay ministers who have fewer options open to them.

Yours

Tim Garthwaite'

This letter suggests that the whole business of 'coming forward for a blessing' is spreading in the Roman Catholic Church, after its ever wider employment in the Anglican Churches. Readers of NOL will recall a Vatican disapproval of this, at least as an ecumenical gesture (and in this role it perhaps began in the 'inter-church process' in 1986-87). But there may be other, more domestic, Roman Catholic liturgical contexts where people ask for 'a blessing' rather than receive communion.

Clearly then, the lay ministrants of communion are facing the same issue in the Church of Rome as was aired in the General Synod question we published last month—*dare* they pronounce what is grammatically (for it all comes down to grammar in the end) a 'blessing'? Can a layperson (or deacon) presume to say 'God bless you' or 'God's love surround you'? What doctrinal foundations might shake or split or disappear in the night if lay lips uttered these sacred priestly phrases? The correspondent in *Liturgy*, who reckons that 'lay ministers . . . have fewer options open to them', must presumably have ruled out these *real* blessings as not available options at all. So how is a blessing to be constructed which does not err into forbidden grammatical territory on the one hand but is detectably a blessing of *some* sort (and therefore offers *something* from God) on the other?

Let Anglicans beware of grammatical no-go areas masquerading as theology . . .

### WOMEN TO BE ORDAINED IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The General Synod of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa voted in early August in favour of the ordination of women as presbyters. A fuller report will, we hope, be available next month.

We confirm that decision date on this issue for the Church of England's General Synod is Wednesday 11 November.

### OF INSTITUTIONS AND READINGS

Since I am at the stage when many of my friends who were ordained with me are being instituted to livings, I seem to go to an awful lot of institutions. Many of them are in my own Diocese, and the liturgical interest in the institution service begins to wane after three or four services.

However, sometimes I go to ones in other dioceses and so it was that I went to Pete Hobson's institution in Hackney Marsh on 19 July. The first unusual thing to report is that this was on Sunday afternoon. Very few people from the Stretford Deanery (where Pete had previously served) could attend, though there was a large contingent from his old parish of St. Bride's, Old Trafford, who had travelled down on the Sunday morning. This raises the old question again of whether an institution is for the church receiving the new incumbent alone or whether the 'sending' church has any part to play. Certainly in this case the 'sending' church played a significant part in the service in that they provided some musicians.

This was the first outing for Richard Chartres as the new Bishop of Stepney, and I think it is fair to report that he tried very hard to make it a personal and informal affair. He seemed to know enough about the parish and its new incumbent to preach an appropriate sermon, based on the Gospel reading which was the parable of the Prodigal Son.

And this is the other unusual feature of this particular service: the parable was presented as a piece of drama by some young people from the Hackney Marsh Team Ministry. There had been a New Testament reading prior to this and after the drama the story of the Prodigal Son was read. The drama was very good indeed and I was left wondering whether the actual reading of the parable had been necessary.

On the same day as that institution I heard about another church where they never preach on a Sunday morning, but present the reading in dramatic form. Here too the reading is actually read as well as performed. There seems to be only one reading and it is a very short one at that (three or four verses). Would it have been O.K. to dispense with *reading* the Gospel story at the institution (since this is a one-off service), whilst certainly not O.K. to dispense with a sermon and to have very short readings as the staple diet on a Sunday?

Back in Manchester, one of my colleagues on the Liturgical Committee often complains that sermons turn into Bible studies (by which he means Bible expositions) when they should be acts of proclamation. In theory, I agree with him, and in the ideal world all church members would attend mid-week groups for learning about the Bible. Sunday sermons, especially at the eucharist, could be more proclamations of the gospel in character. However, we do not live in such an ideal world and most people will receive all their Christian teaching in the context of Sunday worship.

At heart, I think I still feel that sermons will have to contain some element of teaching, if only because the readings on which they are based may need a certain amount of explanation. And can you draw such a neat line between proclamation and teaching? Surely the Good News we proclaim needs to be *taught* to our congregations as well.

Charles Read

### **This month's Booklet . . .**

is Spirituality Series no. 42, *Praying with Children in the Home*, by Jane Keiller—a very special practical piece of work, which, springing from her experience as a mum as well as a deacon, coaches readers in imaginative ideas for bringing up their children in the faith.

**. . . and Evangelism Series no. 19 also has a worship theme** for it is *Reaching the Unchurched: Exploring the Lessons of Willow Creek* by Paul Simmonds (of CPAS staff). The basic Willow Creek thesis is that the truly churched should be nourished mid-week, and Sunday 'church' should be extremely user-friendly for the previously unchurched. It looks as though it works—wonderfully—in Illinois.

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

is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no. 22-23, *Foundations of Music in the Early Church*, by Edward Foley. This is a double-size Study, costing £7.50 in England, and opens up (with amazing detail) a field that might have been thought to be a non-event. On the contrary—it is event-ful.

### **. . . and a reprint**

is Pastoral Series no. 44, *Forward in Healing*, for which there has been a constant demand.

**. . . and a reminder about our latest non-liturgical publication** which is *From Scepticism to Hope: One Black-led Church's Response to Social Responsibility* by Selwyn Arnold, National Overseer of the New Testament Church of God—120 pages, £6.95. This is not sent automatically to standing order customers, but, if ordered, can be added to invoices. Already enthusiastic reviews about this breaking of new ground are arriving at the editorial office.

### **. . . and a notice about PRAXIS**

ought to be circulated (to subscribers in Britain) with this issue of NOL.

### **. . . and renewing for 1993 will soon be in view**

at a cost of 35p per copy (when sent on Standing Order with Grove Booklets direct to the customer), or postal subscription (payable in advance) as follows:

	<i>Inland</i>	<i>Airmail Overseas</i>
<i>News of Liturgy</i> (monthly)	£6.00	£8.50 (US\$17.00)
<i>News of Hymnody</i> (quarterly)	£2.20	£3.00 (US\$6.00)
<i>NOL</i> with <i>NOH</i>	£7.50	£10.00 (US\$20.00)

Air costs have risen as this journal has gone up from eight pages to ten, and now to twelve, thus crossing weight boundaries. Payment for renewing subscriptions (or opening new ones) can be made at any time from now on, though reminders will probably come with the October issue.

## **FROM THE JOURNALS**

by Bryan Spinks

*Anglican Theological Review* has bouts of liturgical interest, and one such bout has just passed. The Spring issue of vol. 73 (1991) had an article by D. Stevick on Hooker's Criteria for liturgy. The Fall number was devoted to liturgy and language. David Jasper offered a viewpoint from his own discipline of theology and literature. The aim of worship, he suggests, is not to be pretty. It is busy with intensely practical business, leading people to the possibility of worship of a lost God. R. M. Frye writes on praying Our Father, and challenges the radical feminist language of God. J. N. Wall writes on 'History, Culture, and the Changing Language of Worship' and is

convinced that only contemporary language rites create the relationship between people and liturgy which Cranmer strove for. Ralph N. McMichael wants to clean up classical prayers with regard to male language. Rock Schuler looks at the ECUSA Supplemental Liturgical Texts and in my view quite rightly protests against attempts to alter prayer in favour of special themes such as groups' agendas! OCP 57:2 contains Bob Taft's views on the Sanctus—he still wants to find an Egyptian origin, even though he had read Spinks in manuscript! Arranz continues his study of the penitential prayers in the Byzantine tradition. *Worship* 65:6 includes an article by Herve Legrand on the non-ordination of women—tradition or simply historical fact? and Joanne Pierce on some early medieval liturgy and its lessons for us today. 66:1 (1992) includes Carl Peter on 'A role model in an ecumenical winter', Doris Donnelly on impediments to praise in the worshipping community, and Theresa Koerke on 'Toward an Ethics of Liturgical Behaviour'. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 105:4-5 has an article by J. Hamesse on the University Sermon; Mark Zier on Peter Comestor; and Juris Liduka on 'Sacred and Secular Eloquence and the Middle English Poetical Works in Bodleian Ms. Digby 86'. 106:1 has major articles in Italian, but also has a note by David Holeyton on 'Two Hussite Latin Antiphonaries'. *Ecclesia Orans* 1991/3 has Paul Bradshaw's article on 'Zebah Todah and the Origins of the Eucharist', giving in more detail his views expressed in his recent book, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. Here is a 'splitter' (see his book) at work, looking carefully at the Jewish zebah todah, and the views of Cazelles, Talley, Giraudo, Gese, Perrot and Leon-Dufour, only to demolish them on the grounds that there is nothing in the NT narratives to suggest Jesus intended the meal as a todah meal; the meal was not associated with the temple; and we simply do not know if the Birkat ha-Mazon was such a standard meal prayer as everyone has so readily assumed. Splitters 1—Lumpers 0. It also contains an article by Adrian Nocent on the order of confirmation, and Brian Jenson on Tropes. *Liturgy* 16:3 continues the themes of Parish Worship and Children, as well as an article by Brian Nichols on the defects of the present opening rite of the Roman mass (there seems to be a whole host of papers being published on the need for reform at this point). 16:4 is entitled 'Rites and Easter Resources', and includes an article by Don Withey, and also an interesting article by James Leachman (studying at St. Anselmo, Rome) on Anglican liturgy in the Catholic Church—those American Anglican congregations which have become Catholic and have a bridge liturgy. It also reprints Bill Grisbrooke's article from *Studia Liturgica* on liturgical reform and renewal. 16:5 continues this article with a response by Jimmy Crichton, and an article on the epiklesis by Pauline Clarke. 16:6 is devoted to Architecture. *Studia Liturgica* 22:1 contains some of the Societas Liturgica 1991 Toronto Congress papers on the Bible and Liturgy. Those on the lectionary by Horace Allen and Marjorie Procter-Smith will be of interest to members of the Church of England who are ready for a new lectionary. *The Record* No. 25 winter 1991 will also be of similar interest, for it announces that in the forthcoming Book of Common Order the Church of Scotland will be giving up the JLG lectionary, and the book will instead give and promote the Common Lectionary. This information is given in an article introducing the new book by Charles Robertson. [I have now taken up my office of Vice-President of the Church Service Society (the first Anglican to be so elected so I am told) and am busy preparing a paper on Calvin on baptism to be given at Edinburgh and Aberdeen in October.]