

DIOCESAN REPORT 4—LEICESTER

The nub of this one-day workshop in the diocese of Leicester was to face two questions. What is the building for? How to adapt a medieval church to twentieth century needs. Quite a lot of us taking part ducked the first question, but all sorts of good things were heard and some of them have been laid to heart.

On the second Saturday in Lent about a hundred people gathered in St. Mary's Hinckley and spent the day together. The Provost of Portsmouth spoke about options, about finding ways of fitting liturgies and buildings together, about paths and circles, about transcendence and immanence, about balancing these two and about the way paths and pilgrimage belong to change more than circles do. Circles are strong, but tend to exclude whatever is not already part of the circle. He helped us to think, laugh and find courage, showing ways of asking the right questions in the right order. Our Diocesan Chancellor spoke and let us see that a chancellor can be a strong friend, helping us keep a parish church, especially in a town, must serve the citizens and the civic bodies as well as making the faithful feel at home.

Participating came after lunch. In groups of five or so, we all had a chance to consider St. Mary's (who were about to ask for a faculty and to seek for change in the arrangements), and to put our own proposals on a piece of acetate to be shown on a screen for all to see. The morning speakers then gave verdicts.

Out of a dozen or so groups canvassed about half were practical, sensible and dull on their proposals—because the liturgical needs of the particular community had not really been sifted. Other groups made livelier suggestions. but coffee, creches and circular worship did feature more prominently than the font.

The workshop ended in worship—the Blessing of the Light, prayers of penitence and hymns that sing of peace and energy.

Simon Carter

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 221

May 1993

Editorial

I took a few hours in mid-May to attend the annual Church Planting conference at 'HTB'. I have long had my own hesitations about the churches putting back their ears and going for plants willy-nilly—and I have some hankerings (which are confirmed by my present place of ministry) for some discreet church unplanning. However, when the enthusiasts get together, it is the multiplying of congregations which seizes the agenda.

Another item in the atmosphere there was intermittent reference to 'the Dawn 2000 Strategy', and it is those allusions which helped give me a picture of where the church-planters may want to take us. Once church-planting is a 'good thing', then developing a national strategy makes good sense—and I gather the phrase 'Dawn 2000' is in fact imported from the Philippines and Guatemala, and came onto a national scene almost before it came on a local one.

We are starting to get the upshot—national denominational strategies. I understand those are already receiving official underwriting in both the Baptist Union and the Methodist Connexion and elsewhere. I also hear that there is a kind of unwritten (or perhaps small-print written) expectation that denominations will only 'plant' in co-operation with their neighbours.

My whole impression is that this *caveat* is on the scrap-heap. A more prevailing philosophy has two quite other major planks, and, once any weight is put on them, then the 'co-operation' factor is more or less doomed.

The first of these two 'planks' is a spiritual superiority. 'Planting' comes typically from a flourishing and (probably) charismatic congregation of whatever denomination, one which already gathers people from a wide area and has little concern for the churches already in its immediate neighbourhood. If this lively congregation decides to plant by dividing, then it may apportion broad geographical areas to two new congregations which arise, but the likelihood that this will have included the best total coverage by the Churches as a whole or that town, and the best chance of evangelizing any neglected areas in that town—well, that sort of likelihood is minimal.

The second 'plank' fits well with this. This is the notion that the more churches there are the merrier. I have sometimes heard it expressed as one church to 1000 people across the land. I am unclear as to whether this is integral to the 'Dawn 2000 Strategy', or an incidental piece of house church conventional wisdom. It could even make sense if there were a plan for 'planting', with the co-operation of all local churches, in any unchurched area of 1000 people or so—and directing the mission of that plant single-mindedly towards those 1000. There are plenty of urban

ISSN 0263-7170

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

35p

places, which, by that kind of definition, are quite unevangelized. But experience suggests that much planting (when inspired from outside the Church of England parish system) is ready to ignore all existing congregations on the ground, and simply open a new church, and go into liturgical competition (if we may so dub it) with the neighbours. (The church of England parish system exercises its own constraints upon Anglicans (except in South Hertfordshire), but even Anglicans may ignore their ecumenical neighbours when planning plants). I use the term 'liturgical competition' because that in large measure is the name of the game—churches offer a variety of worship-style tastes (some of which make special claims to the presence and power of the Holy Spirit), and customers go for what they like. The upshot is that the eye says it has no need of the hand, but instead would prefer to dwell in a clone of fifteen or fifty eyes.

Do I exaggerate chaos for the sake of my argument, or through my own desire to keep matters tidy? It may well be. But a caution is still in order. I do not want to knock the whole 'church planting' industry, which has won a thousand victories already. But a senseless and uneclesiological adoption of a priority for planting can lead to trouble.

Colin Buchanan

BLUNDERING JOURNALISM

We owe readers apologies for errors last month. The one which most blemished these pages was the statement that St. Etheldreda's church in the City of London had been destroyed by that IRA bomb. In fact it was St. Ethelburga's. Not a soul wrote in . . .

However, the account of Ann Widdecombe becoming a Roman Catholic was also full of blemishes. The Chaplain to the House of Commons, Donald Gray, wrote to us with a detailed set of corrections. We carefully put it aside for publication—and lost it! He for his part could not reproduce it against the clock when asked. We therefore give a health warning that nothing (save the name of the MP from Maidstone and the ecclesiastical affiliation she was changing) should be treated as reliable in respect of detail in that account. We will correct as soon as the official corrigenda from the Mother of Parliaments are to hand.

As a final footnote there has been a further flurry about the aforesaid MP in the press during May. Apparently someone has frightened her with a forecast that the Church of Rome might yet ordain women. So within a matter almost of days of her reception into Rome, she was to be found stating in public that the Orthodox Church might yet offer the best hope of refuge if that dismal day of Rome's defection came. This, on inspection, is a highly impolitic and possibly disloyal stance to take—to prepare one's exit for the time when Rome defects from the true faith is not to take Rome seriously in its own claims. One wonders idly what kind of preparation for her migration to Rome she actually received. Or is it possible she wasn't listening properly? For her words read as though the revealed central core of the gospel of Christ is 'women shall not be ordained'; and a true disciple of that core revelation will then move on through any church or

Jewish way. His followers were divided into twelve tribes. The male followers were circumcised (Wroe was publicly circumcised in 1824, and frequently rebaptized in rivers). Strict dietary laws were imposed and only Kosher meat eaten. Followers were expected to abstain from spirits and tobacco. The men had to remain unshaven, and were nicknamed 'Bear-dies' (or 'Joannas'). They wore dark-coloured broad-brimmed felt hats, claret-coloured waistcoats, and similarly coloured Quaker-style coats with large buttons. The rules were enforced by corporal punishment inflicted by the women. Each member had to learn Hebrew. Those who were shopkeepers did not open on the hours of the Jewish Sabbath.

The Ashton Sanctuary was impressive. It was opened in 1825 and the 3,000-seater building cost £10,000. It had no windows but was illuminated by two large roof lights. The floor was of oak and the pews of mahogany. The fittings were of silver and bronze. In the Sanctuary were two large pulpits. The worship was solemn and impressive. Two sentries stood at the doors with drawn swords and only admitted those wearing white surplices or ephods (apart from the prophet who wore his claret-coloured clothes). He did not conduct worship, but sat apart in a gallery. He would stand, with an iron rod in his hand and declare—'This morning the angel of the Lord appeared to me and said . . .'. The priestly officers included a High Priest and other priests who were identified by a coloured belt and wore hats rather like French judges. A band of 30-40 musicians led the singing of chants and hymns. Public baptisms took place in nearby rivers.

The worship of the Southcottians was equally impressive, and singing became a feature of their worship. Her Anglican supporters in orders conducted communion services based on the BCP. Particularly noteworthy was the annual 'Uplifting of the hands' service held on 12 January. It began at 6.00 p.m. and ended at 7.30 p.m. It consisted of readings from Joanna Southcott, the bible, prayers, the Lord's Prayer and hymns. At the close of the service the believers stood and raised their hands and said quite slowly, three times—'The will of the Lord be done. Come Lord Jesus. O come quickly'.

Joanna Southcott died in 1814, and John Wroe in Australia in 1863: not the first and certainly not the last to believe in strange and bizarre teachings on the last things.

Best wishes
Alan Munden

This month's Booklet is . . .

Evangelism Series no. 22, *Inner-City Evangelism*, by Tony Adamson—and alongside it is Spirituality Series no. 45, *What is Celtic Christianity?*, by Elizabeth Culling.

. . . and the Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies

are now in place for the whole of 1993. They are as follows:
24 Paul James, *Liturgical Presidency* (the June publication)
25 Ric Lennard-Barrett, *Sarapion: A Text for Students* (September)
26 Phillip Tovey, *Extended Communion* (December).

The titles are not exact, but the subject-matter is fairly clear from them.

LAY PRESIDENCY OF THE EUCHARIST

It may seem a great distraction from the major agenda of the present moment in the Church of England, but we detect an ever-growing restiveness, at least among evangelicals, with the regulations which restrict eucharistic presidency to bishops and presbyters. There has been a request round the diocesan evangelical fellowships that they will all study and debate the issue by this Autumn.

It is difficult to imagine that this discussion will everywhere erupt into motions carried through diocesan synods. The dynamics of the issue have always seemed to be that around a half, or sometimes more than a half, of a synod will not want to debate the issue at all, and if it does arise there will be a motion to move to next business. Yet at intervals a sane (even a middle-of-the-road) voice will ask whether the resistance has any substance in it—we recall Anthony Harvey in the 1970s and John Austin Baker in the 1980s, both perfectly coolly and without any hint of the radical, suggesting that lay presidency involved no collapse of treasured Anglican principles.

What the issue does require is a copperbottomed theological rationale of *why* the presidency should be confined to bishops and presbyters. Thus the call becomes a summons to set out and defend one's doctrine of orders. And that is not so easy to do . . . Rochester diocesan synod has tabled for debate a motion from a deanery, which will probably come on the agenda in 1994, 'that this Synod requests the House of Bishops to show the theological reasons why the presidency of the eucharist is restricted to bishops and presbyters.' Close inspection suggests that even those who are opposed to lay presidency not only can vote for this motion, but might even benefit theologically by so doing (providing, that is, that the House of Bishops, has an answer . . .).

COB

And there is a Grove Booklet! *But Who Will Preside?* was written by Alan Hargrave in 1990, and of his experience in South America. It is *Worship Series* no. 113.

Correspondence

Dear Colin

The TV series 'Mr. Wroe's Virgins' has given some insight into the millenarianism of the 1830s and showed some aspects of its worship.

John Wroe the Prophet of Ashton-under-Lyne (the site of the New Jerusalem) and his Christian Israelites broke away from the Southcotians, and had 50 societies in England, 13 in Ireland and overseas, particularly in USA and Australia. Wroe's Australian followers provided him with a house just outside Wakefield.

Unlike the TV prophet, the original was an ugly hunch-back, a tyrant who put down all opposition. Wroe's apocalyptic faith was expressed in a

denomination and its particular contingent contemporary form, uncaring about all those other secondary matters or belief which it professes, but simply looking for a place to lay her head where she can be sure that, when she wakes up in each morning, the core truths will not have been flung away in the night. Actually, she is safe in Rome for a few years yet, but her loyalty is strictly conditional . . .

STOP PRESS—The Bishop of London will make no Declaration.

On 28 May the plans for the Diocese of London were revealed, agreed by the Diocesan Bishop with his area and Suffragan Bishops, and with his own staff.

The Bishop of London will *not* make a Declaration under Clause 2 of the Measure. He is clearly influenced in this by the fact that he would not be able to pass on to his successor the provisions of such a Declaration, the force of which would be to make the diocese a 'no-go' area, with no ordination or licensing of women presbyters. As it is, the diocese will be the same as all the others.

The Bishop of Fulham, who is the only non-geographical Suffragan in the diocese, will now take on scattered jurisdiction to look after those parishes which do not wish to stay in close association with their own area Bishop.

In addition, an interesting feature of the proposals is that, where an area Bishop does not personally reckon to ordain or licence a woman presbyter, the Bishop of London will ask the Archbishop of Canterbury to provide a Commissary who will carry out these functions for him. It is clear that the Bishop of London thus avoids taking direct responsibility himself, and remains on the knife-edge which the Measure creates for Bishops who are themselves opposed to the ordination of women (or at least doubtful about it), and yet do not make the Declaration.

There will be many parts of the country which will be following events in London very closely indeed. It is clear that this plan is a very fine attempt by the Bishop and his staff to carry out a Measure which is generally unwelcome to them, and which they think to be almost unworkable. It will be a great triumph if they carry it through.

Meanwhile, the Measure itself is still before the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, which has just finished interviewing Synod members (for the first time), and now goes on to non-Synod members.

THE NEW CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION

We slipped in a Stop Press note in March about the appointment of David Stancliffe as chairman of the Liturgical Commission, and said we would expand it a bit in April. We then failed to mention him in April—and it is just as well. For just as he was involved in negotiations about his access, as a chairman who was Provost of Portsmouth, to the House of Bishops, lo and behold, he changed sides and started to pull at the other end of the rope. He has been nominated by Her Majesty as Bishop of Salisbury, and enters the H/B of right. Possibly he even nullifies the received (and easily perceived) dictum that no-one was ever made bishop for his liturgical expertise, though there were certainly other factors which may have been uppermost in the minds of the Crown Appointments Commission (no-one has access to the motivating ecclesiastical principles which guide the PM in making the final choice). We think he is the first dean or provost to be made a bishop in the Church of England since Eric Kemp left the deanery of Worcester to become Bishop of Chichester about nineteen years ago.

And apparently honours arrive in threes—as if the chair and the see were not enough, he also receives a Lambeth D.D. We doff our caps and bow low.

THE COMMISSION AND THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

(We resume the printing of the text we began earlier in the year).

THE PBS SUBMISSION

- Hence we are bound to have reservations about the issue of 'inclusive language'. If familiar phrases are altered, if 'for us and for all men' becomes 'for us and for all people' or 'for all mankind' becomes 'for all humankind' (not to mention more extreme alterations) the worshipper is bound to be aware that he is being required to assent to a theory—a quite modern and contested theory—about the use of language. The substitute expressions are not there because they are more accurate or more euphonious but because the expressions they replace are thought by the compilers of the liturgy to exclude women.

We recognize that the Commission are under considerable pressure to make these changes, but we think they cannot avoid thinking the matter through *ab initio*. Do the traditional locutions exclude women in the way they are said to do? The substantial question cannot be evaded simply by a policy of avoiding offence. It is true that a woman who believes that 'mankind' excludes women will be offended if the word is used and women are, as she believes, excluded. But equally, if a preacher asserts that 'God loves all mankind' and is then accused of neglecting half the human race, he will resent the accusation bitterly if, as he believes, his words have no such implication.

of the use of intinction in Massachusetts long before the AIDS scare may have impelled further use. In these free churches which did take up the offer, it is sometimes the practice for everyone to hold the full cup until all have been served, and then for all to receive simultaneously. This is something like our secular use when drinking a toast. It can certainly be represented as having a strong corporate aspect to it.

How would the Church of England stand in respect of this. I recall that, two years ago, I put a TV company on to Paul Kirby, the vicar of Bidston on Merseyside (whom I know through a shared task in MORIB), as leading an inner urban congregation in renewal whilst standing apart from the establishment of the Church of England. When the shots of his congregation at worship were shown, lo and behold, they use individualized separate cups. I took the trouble to enquire into the practice a little, and report as follows:

Firstly, a single flagon holds the wine during the eucharistic prayer.

Secondly, it is poured into individual cups at the breaking of the bread.

Thirdly, the cups are then distributed and drained.

How are we to evaluate this? I offer the following pointers:

Firstly, the action followed exactly matches that used in relation to the bread by those who bring a single loaf or bap or roll as the bread for communion.

Secondly, we can hardly insist that lips must touch the rim of a common cup for it to *be* common, as we are ready for the use of spoons (as the Eastern Orthodox and the Eastern rites of the Roman Catholic Church use—and I have experience of so receiving at Mar Thoma celebrations)—and intinction itself is designed to ensure that lips do *not* touch the cup. So we should be open to all sorts of methods by which the single stock of wine is conveyed from a single container to the individual recipients (straws would be a debatable possibility, for instance).

Thirdly, any church which uses individual wafers is in no position to criticize the separate cups—for the common cup should surely be matched by the common loaf? Alternatively, if no reason is advanced for the bread we share to come from a visibly common (and somehow mutually *attached*) source, then there is no basis for insisting on a common cup.

Fourthly, it occurs to me that a modest amount in each cup would ensure no-one took to much . . .

So NOL invites others outside Bidston to inform us if you are entering this relatively unexplored area. What trailblazing activities can you report? (And is our impression correct that the use of 'real' bread is growing around the parishes?).

John Fenwick, *Liturgy for Identity and Spirituality*, (TMAMOC, Manganam, 1992) 47pp., Rs10.

John Fenwick gave a series of lectures to the Mar Thoma on their liturgy and spirituality which have been published. This is fair but hard hitting discussion of the Mar Thomite liturgy from one of the few outsiders to be given permission to celebrate their rite. It shows the interaction of Anglicanism and Mar Thomism and is full of incisive points and suggestions. I wondered at times why he was not lynched, but the Mar Thomites seem to have received the criticisms well.

Both books are obtainable from The Director, TMAMOC, Manganam, Kottayam 686 018, Kerala, INDIA.

Phillip Tovey

The Consultation on Common Texts, *The Revised Common Lectionary* (Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1992, 128pp., £4.95).

'CCT' is the parent ecumenical body of ICET and ELLC, CCT itself being a North American inter-church body, and ICET/ELLC being truly international. *The Common Lectionary* (1983) has had enormous influence throughout the world, and it was based sufficiently on the Roman Catholic three-year lectionary (from which it differs in detail only) to appeal both to Roman Catholics, and to those who look towards Rome for liturgical models. This revision of it is itself very minor, increasing the element of 'semi-continuous' reading of the Old Testament (as an alternative), and keeping an eye on the usefulness of the provision for churches which have non-eucharistic Sunday services 'In such cases the use of the lectionary will be more directly homiletical but this is not inconsistent with its purpose' (page 15). And, along with a very clear presentation of the Sunday and major holy days on the three-year cycle, there are bonus additions to make this not an almanack but a book—a full introduction, an appendix on 'The Story of the Common Lectionary' (another change now, we learn, is an increased proportion of texts which feature women), a bibliography, and indexes which enable the place in the three years of any given reading to be found.

Church of England readers who buy this will, of course, be wondering if they are getting a glimpse into their own future. The provenance in Britain of the book is the Canterbury Press (erstwhile 'A. & M.'), and, whilst that is a private press, it looks as though the challenge to our two-year thematic and anthological Sunday lectionary is getting closer and closer.

COB

SEPARATE CUPS?

We received an enquiry the other day about the use of separate cups—the glass-thimble type found in free churches and originally propagated (so we believe) by an American concern with hygiene—it is rumoured that the thimbles were first marketed in the States under the (anti-sacramental) slogan 'There's Death in the Cup'! I doubt if Episcopalians picked up the opportunity to buy the individualized little glasses, but I do recall quite a bit

What is being advocated, in the name of inclusive language, is a more or less extensive censorship, practised upon those who use the English language in the way they were brought up to do and in a context, that of worship, in which the language is particularly dear to them.

The problem is that, once the principle is conceded by comparatively minor changes that the familiar locutions are 'sexist', the claims of justice can be said to require ever more drastic alterations to the language which will not in the end stop short of the historic statements of Faith themselves.

THE COMMISSION'S RESPONSE

3. The Commission is aware that many people are unimpressed by the arguments for 'inclusive' language, and indeed that some see grave dangers in it. Inevitably the Commission contains a variety of views, some tending towards the opinion that the inclusive language issue is a passing 'fad', others towards the opinion that we are living through a significant change in the use of inclusive language. But we are united in our view that

(i) We have to address the issue, both because there are those in our own Church for whom it is important, and also because it is very much on the agenda of those international bodies with which we have dealings;

(ii) We have no wish to see any tampering with historic texts in the interests of inclusive language. We should not want to encourage a minister using a Prayer Book Service to make adjustments to exclude 'man', 'mankind', etc. We take a more relaxed line with the texts of the last twenty-five years, and see no harm, and sometimes positive good, in some rephrasing of them;

(iii) We welcome the opportunity, in creating new texts, to celebrate and affirm the feminine in a way that historic texts since the Reformation period have seldom done, and thus to recover a strand of liturgical writing in medieval times, found not least in Saint Anselm and Lady Julian of Norwich. In encouraging this creativity, we are careful not to depart from our scriptural roots or to sanction doctrinal change. Some of us are drawn to the prayers written by such people as Janet Morley and Jim Cotter, but recognize that most of their material would be unsuitable in authorized services.

(iv) However little or great our enthusiasm for this issue, people are altering liturgical texts to make them more 'inclusive', and they have canonical freedom to do so providing that there is no doctrinal significance in the change. In providing *Making Women Visible*, the Commission tried to ensure that, where people were making changes, they should find the best alternative, in terms of rhyme, meaning and sound doctrine.

For the record, the changes quoted in the submission ('for us and for all people' and 'for all humankind') are not among those commended in *Making Women Visible*.

FROM THE JOURNALS

by Bryan Spinks

This particular 'From the Journals' must be regarded as an interim 'catch-up'. *Worship* always seems delayed arriving in the UL, and the last look at the Journals made reference to only the first number of the 1992 issue. Here is the rest, though somewhat abbreviated!

Worship 66.2 has a paper by Gordon Lathrop on Christian Leadership and Liturgical Community, which is an abbreviated version from a forthcoming book. In 'Liturgy and the Christian Imagination' Margaret Mary Kelleher illustrates that liturgy contributes to the on-going construction of Christian identity. Keith Graber-Miller examines the Mennonite ceremony of footwashing—the sacrament that almost made it—looking at its origins in this denomination, and its shift in meaning. In 66.3 Bob Taft examines the soteriology of liturgical celebrations, and J. Michael Joncas writes on 25 years of development of music in the Roman rite. Teresa Berger contributes an article under the title 'The classical Liturgical Movement in Germany and Austria: Moved by Women? which is a feminist reading (or re-write) of the Liturgical Movement. Teresa claims that it 'was a movement carried on by women and a movement concerned with women's issues'. This look at the women behind the men of the Liturgical Movement provides an interesting footnote to the Movement. 66.4 has Mary Collins on the ICEL Liturgical psalter, and Jane Mary Trau writes on the Male image in religious language, providing yet another call to purge language. (Soon we will be forced into Quaker silence for fear of offence!). William Seth Adams reflects on Baptismal Ministry in the Episcopal Church, arguing that what we claim about the importance of initiation is not supported by the physical, observable evidence. 66.5 has Catherine Dooley on liturgical catechesis, showing that it is only part of the larger catechetical ministry. There is an article on rites of passage, and Martin Dudley's paper at SLS 1990 on Corpus Christi—though with no reference to the work by Miri Rubin. In 66.6 Gail Ramshaw looks at the 'myth of the Crown'—God as the crown or King. It may be that I am old, senile, and just plain insensitive, but this paper seems to me to be an OTT reaction to a metaphor. Sara Butler looks at the concept of the priest as sacrament of Christ the Bridegroom.

Martin Stringer, the new Secretary of SLS, and now a lecturer at Birmingham University, contributed a paper to the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 73.3 (1991) on 'Situating Meaning in the Liturgical Text'. This is a useful examination by a sociologist/anthropologist who has studied liturgy, and who has respect for liturgical compilation and also the importance of symbolism, *Studia Liturgica* 22.2 (1992) contains the remaining papers from the 1991 Societas Congress on the Bible in Liturgy. It also contains an interesting piece by Maxwell Johnson on Sarapion, Graham Woolfenden on Morning and Evening Prayer in the Mozarabic rite, and an article on Kierkegaard and the eucharist. *Studia Liturgica* 22.1 (1993) contains some papers sponsored by the Notre Dame Center for Pastoral Liturgy, and is a series of contributions from the fields of biogenetics, anthropology, psychology as well as theology about the place of ritual. I hope that some will not find Lawrence Hoffman's article on Jewish Circumcision too exclusive and male-dominated! *Liturgy* 17.1 has some articles on initiation, and James

Leachman writes on the Pontifical Institute of Liturgy in Rome; 17.2 is on the theme of Reconciliation; 17.3 is devoted to Penance and Reconciliation; 17.4 has a series of contributions grouped under the title 'the Psalter Mystery and Sunday Celebrations'.

Book Reviews

Paul Turner, *Sources of Confirmation: From the Fathers through the Reformers* (Liturgical Press, USA, 94pp., \$6.95 (imported by Columba Press, Dublin)).

This book is almost entirely texts, with hardly a word of introduction or commentary. There are 198 extracts in all, beginning with Tertullian (yes, there is no earlier evidence). It is good to have the medievals and reformers included, and a final chapter gathers texts which deal with 'reconciliation' rites, particularly of those returning to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church.

The English writers include Bede and Alcuin. but go thin in the Reformation period—the only representative being Henry VIII! So that is how European history of the sixteenth century appears to a Roman Catholic author in the USA.

But perhaps the English have a subliminal effect: I had to read the sub-title twice to be sure it was not ' . . . the Fathers thru the Reformers'.

COB

TMAMOC, *A Study on the Malankara Mar Thoma Church Liturgy*, Liturgical Study Series No. 1, (Mar Thoma Printing School, Manganam), 61pp., Rs10.

This book is a collection of essays on the Mar Thoma liturgy and as such is a wonderful insight into the thinking of an eastern reformed church. The first essay by George Mathew looks at the development of liturgy, and particularly St. James (the liturgy of the Mar Thoma church), and the causes for change. It would appear that liturgical revision is in the air. The second chapter looks at various factors that have shaped the Mar Thoma liturgy with particular reference to history. Then comes a discussion of the theology of St. James' Anaphora. Here there was a big stress on eschatology and the Spirit, the flowering of eastern roots. There is a fascinating discussion on the diaconate, by K.V. Mathew, who seems to be advocating a permanent, non-stipendiary, non-clerical, sub-diaconate. There are almost no deacons in the Mar Thoma church and all the functions of the deacon are done by laymen. The final chapter on inculturation by George Mathew is the best of all, and sets the discussion in an Indian reformed eastern context. This book is one of a few written by Mar Thomites about their liturgy, and as such is an invaluable witness to their approach. The suggestion that this is the first of a series is most encouraging, we can look forward to the later volumes.

Phillip Tovey