

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 227

November 1993

Editorial

I record below the proceedings of our General Synod from 9 to 12 November, so far as they concerned liturgy. But I find myself driven—quite unexpectedly—into raising again the issue of lay presidency. NOL published last month (without comment) a fairly surprising report from a diocesan Commission from the Cape Town diocese of the Church of the Province of Southern Africa. There was reason to think this would be of worldwide interest, and so it has proved to be. Nevertheless I do not reckon to give editorials to the subject very frequently, but the issue has been propelled into the public arena again through the House of Bishops' report on 'extended communion'. It is not, I venture to report, that the House of Bishops wanted to raise the issue, but in the debate on the report there was less interest in its declared theme, extended communion, than there was in lay presidency—an outcome contrary, I am sure, to all expectations. Speech following speech doubted the wisdom of what the report recommended, and saw lay presidency as a clean, truly pastoral, provision, actually enabling communion to be available in rural parishes, and in vacant livings, during clergy holidays and so on. The more we heard of the 'less-than-a-eucharistic-celebration' character of distribution of communion by extension, the more the Synod appeared to be moving towards new ways of providing a full celebration.

It is true that most Diocesan Evangelical Fellowships in the land have been considering this issue this Autumn. It is also worth noting the following paragraph (unknown of course to the DEF discussions) from the report from the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order held in Santiago de Compostela in Spain this last Summer:

'Full eucharistic fellowship concerns presidency at the service of Word and Sacrament. It is important that the president at the eucharist be as widely recognized as possible, not only within the celebrating community but also by other eucharistic communities with whom *koinonia* is sought. All churches in fact have procedures for authorizing persons to preside at the eucharist: most churches reserve this function to an ordained minister; others agree with this principle in general but allow that, in circumstances of pastoral need, a non-ordained person may act as presiding minister; still others are happy to extend the role of presidency to those who are not ordained ministers. No full Faith and Order study has yet been devoted to this question . . .' (Santiago Statement, Report of Section III, 'Eucharist' para 18)

This goes far beyond Lima, which merely said: 'in most churches this presidency [i.e. Christ's] is signified by an ordained minister' (*Eucharist* para. 29). The idea that a study of the subject should be made is fascinating, and one wonders whence the pressure for such a study came. It is the exact reverse of my experience at the Lambeth Conference where great pressure was exerted from the 'Mission and Ministry' section upon the group, of which I was secretary, which was considering liturgy not even to mention lay presidency—not even as a non-starter! Suggestions of *studying* the subject would have caused heart-failures, I guess.

An interesting example of our work is that on Extended Communion. We have several parishes, in rural areas, which use this ministry. A set liturgy was written and approved for use with general success. Issues we faced included; appropriate vessels for transporting the Blessed Sacrament, the provision of non-presbyteral blessing and the importance of linking the service of consecration to the act of extended communion. A particularly difficult matter was how to incorporate the words of institution in a thanksgiving prayer, without it appearing like a eucharistic prayer said by a deacon or a day reader. Whether this can ever be achieved is difficult to qualify, especially when congregations value their own minister, but we think we have found a useful way forward. Other committees are welcome to request examples of our material.

In order to help us keep up with the ever-changing liturgical scene, we now dedicate some of our meetings to study. Members take it in turn to lead a seminar on a particular liturgical issue. This proves a most valuable way of teaching 'old dog-collars new tricks'. We are looking forward to new regional meetings with other diocesan liturgical committees. These are planned to begin after Easter. Other plans include courses on liturgical presidency and liturgical consultancy.

The Salisbury Summer School was held in Winchester in September. We provided for this a ninety-page worship booklet. The Eucharist took material from *Enriching the Christian Year*, and the offices were from *Celebrating Common Prayer*. It proved a most successful combination, but we would be grateful of any advice as to how to make 300 clergy realize they are not all taking the service! We have also completed a Worship Audit.

Perhaps our newest work is that on a Diocesan Calendar of Saints. This started some time ago as a revision of the old list which was defunct. It has since grown into a major effort to provide a complete book of office materials and eucharistic propers for the days which hold saints and holy men and women of the diocese. Each day is given an individual collect, sentences, readings, a proper preface, and a biography of the saint. Diocesan worthies include Reformation Martyrs, Richard Hooker, Edmund Rich, Henry Moule, George Herbert, Edward King of the West Saxons, Cuthberga, Br. Douglas SSF, Birinus, Osmund, Aldhelm, Anthony Ashley Cooper, King Alfred, and several more. There is also a second list of notables who simply receive a biography and suggestions for intercession. The diocese now wants this produced to a high standard with information useful to all. We look forward to publication and advise any diocese to tackle this idea which is most interesting and rewarding.

We welcome any contact with other committees who would like to see examples of our work. Now we look forward to our new bishop, who, we have heard, has a passing interest in matters liturgical.

Rev. Stephen Lake, Secretary, Salisbury DLAC

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1994 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

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)

35p

But let us go back to the General Synod debate. This almost changed the agenda from extended communion altogether. The groundswell in the debate took clear shape in the Private Member's Motion reported on page 5 below. Of this it must be said:

- (a) It is a clear call for *study*;
- (b) There is no reason in conscience why an *opponent* of lay presidency should not support the motion;
- (c) The upshot of a House of Bishops' study would in the first instance be not a change in the Church of England's rules, but a theological debate. This would be great gain. I write as one who has reeled over the years at the sheer lack of theological engagement on the issue. Whenever it has come up in a Synod, someone has moved 'Next Business', a majority has breathed a sigh of relief at their deliverance, the move to 'Next Business' has been adopted, and the debate has never happened.
- (d) If by any chance it led to a report, the report, if it were to defend the existing pattern, would have to say something far more satisfying about the nature of ordination than anything we have seen in official documents brought to Synod thus far'.

So is it possible that the new Motion has mileage? It will surely have to be given a timed space on the York agenda (it is even possibly ahead of my own 'Direct State Control (Unwanted)' Motion). And if it ever reaches the House of Bishops, it will give us an interesting bit of theological work—work partly about orders—to do. I think the House will be puzzled to answer the question as asked.

On 4 December there falls an interesting anniversary—it will be thirty years since the promulgation as the first finished document of Vatican II of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (it came at the end of the second session of the Council). As a reasonably robust critic of the distinctive doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, I gladly pay tribute to both the content and the implementation of the Constitution. No-one brought up, as I was, before Vatican II can do other than marvel and applaud at the vast changes (not least in the liturgy) which have come over the face of Roman Catholicism since then. No one formed since Vatican II can ever now recapture how alien a religion Roman Catholicism seemed prior to the Council to be. And, of course, it does not yet appear what they will be—the Roman Catholic Church, unchanging though she herself believes herself to be, appears to us to be wonderfully *in via*. To which we therefore respond in richly religious terms: 'Roll on'.

I had hoped of course to deal this month with Michael Vasey's marvellously opaque expansion of my metaphor of postman and dog. However, I do not how anyone will over unravel this without the following materials: the review in July NOL of *The Renewal of Common Prayer*; the letter of Michael Perham in August NOL; my editorial in September NOL (employing in passing the then clean-lined and transparent metaphor of postman and dog); and Michael Vasey's October effort upping it all from

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Spirituality Series no. 47, *The Holy Spirit in Contemporary Spirituality*, by James Houston.

. . . and next month's

is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no. 26, *Communion Outside the Eucharist*, by Phillip Tovey. This is an historical and textual survey, with all the requisite background material for seeing the situation in the Anglican Communion to-day.

. . . and the Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies

will in 1994 have the equivalent of *four* issues, which is reversion to the pre-1992 position. Part of the reason is the urgency of publishing two contemporary Anglican Studies—the first one in March arising from the Untermarchtal Consultation last August (and preparing for the full-blown international Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Dublin in '95). This will provide a framework for revising the eucharist. The second contemporary Study catches the Consultation at Kanamai on 'African Culture and Anglican Liturgy', and provides the Statement (circulated with the July NOL) with a fuller introduction and introductory essays.

. . . and a reprint

is Worship Series no. 115, *Readers and Worship in the Church of England*, by Carolyn Headley, a title first published for the Readers' 125th anniversary in 1991, and then sold out in under two years. We are also reprinting Evangelism Series no. 19, *Reaching the Unchurched: Some Lessons from Willow Creek*, by Paul Simmonds—a booklet which, although it is in the Evangelism Series, wrestles with the role of worship in evangelism, and with evangelistic (or-soft touch) elements in worship.

. . . and renewing for 1994

should be done during December at the latest.

DIOCESAN REPORT 9: SALISBURY

Salisbury Liturgical Advisory Committee is pleased to report on recent activity. The past twelve months have seen several changes in our personnel, including the loss of Michael Perham to Norwich, which have allowed us time to discover a new role. We are at last moving from writing special diocesan services to the more valuable work of liturgical training and formation. We are looking forward to the arrival of our new bishop to support us in this task.

One obvious example of this is the production of our periodical called 'Spotlight on Worship.' This is a short leaflet (on one folded horizontal sheet of A4) that goes to all clergy in the diocesan mailing. It is also available to worship committees, musicians and PCCs. Our first was written by Dr. Lionel Dakers (a member of our committee) on *In Tune with Heaven*. This met with widespread approval and helped many smaller parishes absorb the salient points of the report. The second edition described possible uses for *Enriching the Christian Year*. This is a simple, cheap way of passing on a large amount of information, and, if set out well, often encourages requests for further input.

Whilst on new publications, we were frustrated by the postponed printing of *Patterns for Worship* as a large training day had been organized for November. This will take place in the summer now, as there is a great deal of interest in this book.

passing metaphor to all-consuming allegory. For now the dog is in the custody of some slightly batty elderly dowagers; the postman actually likes the dog—or wants to; and somewhere behind it all the Post Office has a grand policy into which the postman (and possibly the dog, the letters, the dowagers, and the home they inhabit) must all fit. I confess, MRV, that my mind oscillates between thinking ‘you have become so addicted to the allegory that you have forgotten what it allegorates’—and thinking that you are a very smart cookie who have a fairly devastating message for us from the Commission, but in code. On the latter understanding the message is *not* official policy, nor can it be cleanly stated, but, if put into heavy code, it *can* be said, as, if the message proves unwelcome, you can still cheerfully deny all responsibility for how people decode you. There is a serious risk that in December I SHALL decode you.

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1993

General Synod met from Tuesday 9 November to Friday 12 November, and covered various bits of liturgical or quasi-liturgical business. The strictly liturgical was the Final Approval for alternative use from 12 November 1993 to 31 December 2000 of *A Service of the Word and Affirmations of Faith*. They needed two-thirds majorities in each House and were duly authorized by the following majorities:

	<i>Bishops</i>	<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Laity</i>
<i>A Service of the Word</i>	21—0	139—0	166—2
<i>Affirmations of Faith</i>	23—0	121—6	122—2

There was also ‘Amending Canon no. 17’ which was also at Final Approval, and it changes the Canons on Liturgy. It also obtained the requisite two-thirds as follows:

<i>Bishops</i>	<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Laity</i>
38—0	176—3	173—2

This of course has yet to be processed, and will not be promulgated till February. NOL will be printing the relevant Canons in their new shape. So make sure you are worshipping canonically.

The ‘Episcopal Act at Synod’ is only marginally liturgical, for its purpose is to provide for episcopal care for clergy not enamoured of the ordination of women. We record it went through a Revision stage on the Tuesday, was preserved almost inviolate through it by the Archbishop of York, and came back for Final Approval on the Thursday. It was then endorsed and enacted as follows:

<i>Bishops</i>	<i>Clergy</i>	<i>Laity</i>
39—0	175—12	194—14

After this there fell upon me from the gallery thirty pieces of ersatz silver projected from a group of women in the gallery. They were noisy and were removed . . .

There was a number of questions with a liturgical thrust tabled. We learned that the House of Bishops will bring a report on the *Filioque* phrase in the Creed to the July 1994 session. We also learned that Bradford, Liverpool and Worcester had passed motions on communion for the unconfirmed in recent months—and the Standing Committee informed us that this issue too would come before the House of Bishops in June

1994: Before that, the House will have before it a report on the eucharist (including a eucharistic prayer for use when children are present) in January 1994.

We also had a run-in to the debate on extended communion, with a definition of terms: 'The Eucharist' is a 'complete celebration', whilst 'Sacramental Communion with the Risen Lord' (whew!) is 'reception by communicants of elements consecrated . . . in another place and at another time' (I think the 'and' should have been 'and/or').

But the big one proved to be actual debate on 'extended communion'. This came on the Wednesday afternoon, and was intended to be a debate on principles, rather than on the appended text. The House of Bishops had envisaged four 'contexts' in which extended communion might be used:

- a. the communion of people in their homes who are too sick . . .;
- b. the provision of a sacramental element in the worship of house-groups or house-churches;
- c. the bringing of communion to 'churches in multiple benefices or multi-church cures which cannot have the ministry of a priest each week';
- d. 'the provision of consecrated elements for reception by a congregation in the absence of a priest . . .'

The House of Bishops made it clear that there was no wish to get any use under category (d) authorized, and the issues concerned category (c). The textual appendix has a very curious structure, which the Liturgical Commission might reconsider with profit:

- a. The first suggestion is that the consecrated elements be placed on the Holy Table before the service begins. But this is almost diametrically opposed to the provision for a full celebration—for there the elements are usually kept away from the Holy Table until the 'laying up' after the Peace.
- b. The 'minister' then has to introduce the whole service with the 'link' words (drawn from a much later point in the vote from *Ministry to the Sick*), stating that this is a satellite eucharistic occasion. But this is again different from the 'main celebration', where the sacrament is not mentioned until the 'Ministry of the Sacrament' section comes.
- c. The 'Ministry of the Sacrament' itself looks odd. After the Peace there is a *mandatory* 'Humble Access'. Then there is a kind of acclamation, drawn from *Patterns*, also mandatory, but with most of the options seasonal or thematic. They are not eucharistic prayers, but look like a Preface component of them. This is said 'At the Lectern or Minister's stall'—a detail of instruction which Rite A would never give (and nor would Rite C, as far as I can see). The intention of course is to ensure that the 'minister' is not near the elements on the Holy Table! Silence is ordered, and then *'The Minister moves to the Holy Table'*.

Well, in the event the provisions made in the text were hardly addressed, as the great majority of speakers seemed to have little heart for 'extension' anyway. Indeed a great gaggle of them, of differing hues of churchmanship and with varying degrees of coyness or apology, began to mention lay presidency—on which see both my Editorial and the next paragraph below this. Others were urging a return to non-eucharistic worship (one, from a distinctly 'high' standpoint, fearing lest wine be spilt in transit), rather than the anomalies and oddities of 'extension'; whilst relatively few were heard to say much in favour of the principle—though those who did were urging the need of category (d) in the House of Bishops' list.

As I went home, I looked at the signatories to the Private Members' Motions. My own Motion, on removing direct state control of the Church of England, had attracted another 14 or so names during the week, and was now approaching 150 in all (it had not been called because the Synod took so long deciding not to seat the 'Provincial Episcopal Visitors' *ex officio* in the House of Bishops). Then I glanced at a newly tabled Motion, and, to my amazement, it was running neck-and-neck with me and might even have overtaken me in terms of who gets the priority at York in July. Its form is as follows:

'PRESIDENCY OF THE EUCHARIST

Mr. T. L. F. Royle (Gloucester) to move:

"That this Synod, recognizing the desire of the Church for an effective shared ministry, request the House of Bishops to report on what, if any, theological grounds exist for reserving the Presidency of the Eucharist to Bishops and Presbyters."

I have rarely seen a Motion take off so quickly. See my editorial above for further comment.

THE PRAXIS CONSULTATION ON WRITING LITURGICAL LANGUAGE

PRAXIS convened on 4 November a specially invited small group of parties interested in the formation of new liturgical texts, and in the problems of the English language. There were Commission members (Michael Perham in the chair, Baroness James, Michael Vasey, Trevor Lloyd), publishers (from Mowbray, SPCK—and Grove Books), and (presumably somewhat representative) persons from the MU, the theological colleges, parish life(!), Wales, and the Prayer Book Society (though there was a suspicion that Raymond Chapman, who was the PBS, was in fact a 'wet').

In addition to the above we had two unofficial and delightful craftspeople of the liturgical word, Janet 'All Desires Known' Morley (who earns her keep with Christian Aid) and Jim Cotter. These two directed our pre-lunch thinking—Janet Morely saying she was the last of the generation that learned a BCP collect every Sunday, and setting out criteria for liturgical writing:

- (a) the upshot must be possible for the faith community to own;
- (b) texts to be read aloud must take account of rhythms and breathing;
- (c) the content must 'resonate' with its community;

- (d) it must be recognizable as continuing 'the tradition of the church';
- (e) its style must express passion.

Amongst her further reflections were some gems: 'liturgy is to express us to God—and to protect us from him'; 'we are writing within a tradition' (see (d) above); 'there is *no* neutral place without context, we are always in the political sphere'. She also opened issues about the root purpose of the Lord's Prayer.

Jim Cotter also claimed to have been 'formed' linguistically by Shakespeare, the AV and the BCP. He offered haunting thoughts—'We weave a texture of past and present'; 'I want to weave sermons and scriptures together'; 'In Compline God is called "Lord" 36 times and "Father" twelve times, and very little else'; 'Why is there no mention of the holocaust in our liturgies of Remembrance?'

Warm discussion concluded the morning. After lunch, on came Michael Vasey on the language of liturgy, speaking in place of Jane Sinclair who had to send apologies. He emphasized that we all write from a context ('My own is being half-Jewish, and having unemployed people living with me')—and the Liturgical Commission's is

- (a) making bricks without (financial) straw;
- (b) being servants of the church;
- (c) providing materials suitable for public worship;
- (d) carrying the doctrinal weight of the C/E;
- (e) changing the C/E responsibly.

He paid tribute to the recent chairman, Bishop Colin James ('he slept but produced unity whilst he slept'). And he reflected on *Making Women Visible* ('interim and pragmatic'), and chipped in Jane's language questions:

- (a) How inclusive are we being? Do we include gender, race and age?
- (b) Should there be boundaries? Is the Commission's role to follow usage or to set directions?
- (c) What sort of language should we use about God? ('Father' comes far more frequently in English than in Latin.)
- (d) What role do we envisage for the American Psalter (already used in *Celebrating Common Prayer*)?
- (e) How do we expect or desire to identify and conserve classic texts?

In with many pearls of wisdom that were scattered during the day, there was one odd note—it emerged that at least some of the lovers of Tudor liturgical writing did so *on the grounds that you were not so clearly committed to every detail of the articles of the Creed if you used ancient language*. This struck at least one participant as a great turn-around from

the Prayer Book Society's conventional claim to be reverting to 1662 in order to hold onto sound and wholesome doctrine. It does of course provide a greater road-block, because by definition modern liturgical writing will want to tell the Christian story 'the way it is', and people who want to be reticent about the content of the faith will then sigh for the stained-glass window linguistic effect, which apparently meant you did not have to see anything *too* clearly.

COB

THE LORD'S PRAYER

The Bishop of Norwich, addressing his own Synod early this month, urged his whole diocese to use the 'traditional' form of the Lord's Prayer. This was widely reported in the Church press, and it stimulated a letter of enquiry to NOL immediately following that Synod, in which the Norwich synodsmen asked whether the House of Bishops had some such policy. The simple answer—one that should be shouted far and wide—is that the House of Bishops has no such policy, and no attempt to get it to debate such a policy is around. The Bishop of Norwich himself acknowledged that every parish (or possibly everyone leading worship) has the right to choose, and he had no greater weight for his advocacy than his own view. It may of course reflect an East Anglian conservatism, and thus may be already fairly standard in Norfolk countryside, but it has no authority from outside the diocese, and there are many considerations to be ranged against the Bishop's urging. Lest the balance tip towards reaction, the following are worth weighing:

1. The general principle that in worship we are expecting to address God as 'you' should include the Lord's Prayer. All modern services, and all texts in modern services do employ 'you', and those who use modern services, whilst they may not always expect the use of 'you' to be wholly consistent, have no complaint save that of being used to the traditional text if they are asked to say 'you' in the Lord's Prayer. They have made the transition in all other respects—why should this one be so unthinkable?
2. In all other respects the rhythm and other concerns of the traditionalists have been scrupulously protected. The elderly may recall the mayhem when the first ICET text, with 'Holy be your name' and 'Do not bring us to the test', was debated in General Synod. As it was, the Liturgical Commission rescued the day with 'Hallowed' and 'Do not bring us to the time of trial', and Series 3 settled down that way during the 1970s. But questionnaires then revealed that there was still great unhappiness about the ninth line. A curious synodical process then ensued, in which I had a 'steering' part, and at the end of it the Synod emerged with not an international text, but with 'Lead us not into temptation'! As I reflected on this, and as Synod accepted it and swept away the printing of alternatives, it became clear to me that this modern version is *not* approved because it is the best translation (it is not), nor because it is internationally ecumenically agreed (it is not), but simply because it is the modern version of the Lord's Prayer which can most painlessly wean the lovers of the ancient into using the modern. It is therefore a highly *unitive* text.
3. The Synod was therefore unwise to be seduced in 1987 by the then Bishop of Bath and Wells into treating the modern Lord's Prayer as a

partisan text, which had to be balanced with an ancient one in parallel columns with it. The procedure for deciding this in Synod was probably irregular; the printing and format of the ASB were not designed for the presentation of anything in parallel columns; and in any case the great bulk of ASBs in use had already been printed the previous way. So a 'thou' cuckoo arrived in the nest—of itself an intruder, and surely not to be met now by advocacy that it should be treated as the sole lawful occupant?

4. Part of the problem is the lack of courage of those who like the modern form and naturally use it. They are always tempted to lapse into the ancient, out of some sort of charity towards others. We may owe that charity to a dying 93-year-old, but we do not owe it to a wedding couple in their twenties who have never said the Lord's Prayer before anyway—and in civic services and the like, as long as the modern form is printed out, it is easy enough to persuade mayor and MP to use it.
5. Above all, we owe it to our own children, and children in our Sunday Schools and Church Schools, that they should begin and continue on a modern version. Their Bible versions will have 'Your kingdom come'; the rest of their prayers will address God as 'you'; and to have to help them learn 'thou/thy/thine' is otiose and stupid. Yes, in due course they will come across eighteenth century hymns which have not been Jubilaticized, but they will recognize these as not only clearly dated in their language, but also as one *genre* of hymns and songs, for which other *genres* can be substituted. To insist on an ancient Lord's Prayer as the only way to pray the Lord's Prayer is to give a much more exclusive message.
6. The fact that English Roman Catholics and Free Church people have largely stuck to an ancient form should not remove our courage from us either. We owe it to them to keep a modern version under their noses—and internationally English-speaking Christians are with us. To be a little Englander is bad enough; to be one for a wrong cause on an impossible basis in a shrinking world is simply folly.

Appello Perham, Doctorem Ecclesiae Rationabilem et Peritum, Norvicis Canonem Sedentem Commissionisque Liturgicae Participem.

AND ERROR OF THE MONTH

in October came with the Commons voting on the Measure for the Ordination of Women as Presbyters. We wangled this in at the last minute, and got it incorrect as a result—the true vote was 215 in favour 21 against. (The Lords voted overwhelmingly in favour of 2 November, but no count was recorded or, as far as we know, released.)

Book Reviews

Robert F. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1992), pp.84, £4.99 (imported by Columba Book Service, Dublin)

This is an excellent introduction to the history of the Byzantine rite. In seven brief chapters information is given on how the rite developed and changed. The book concentrates on the whole rite rather than the eucharist or architecture. There are excellent bibliographies in the foot-

notes that give direction for further reading. Anyone who has experienced some Byzantine worship will benefit from reading this book which sets out the historical development of the worship of this branch of Eastern Orthodoxy.

Phillip Tovey

Mar Thoma Church of Malabar, Selected Hymns and Order of Worship, Mar Thoma Saba Publication (Tiruvalla, 1993)

In response to the growing numbers of Mar Thoma congregations that use English, the church is translating its liturgy. This book contains 80 hymns, An Order of Worship for Sunday Morning, and the Qurbana. As the latter has been in English for some time, I will confine my comments to the first two elements. The collection of hymns is exclusively of western hymns. It could be a collection for a Keswick convention. Perhaps that reflects the spirituality of the church. When it comes to communion, I was surprised not to find 'Let all mortal flesh' or 'Strengthened for service' which at least are metrical versions from the Malabar rites. There are not even any Indian hymns of recent composition. Are there Mar Thoma hymnographers who write in English? It would seem not! The Order of Worship is for use on Sunday in the absence of the Qurbana. It follows the rough outline of a Syrian office, or perhaps it would be better to say that it uses it roughly! This office is a mixture of things Syrian and things western. There is a good use of responsive reading of Psalms and litany prayers. It is disappointing that the psalm responses have been omitted, as these are rich fare for prayer and praise. It is tragic that the proemion and sedro are also left out, such a distinguishing feature of the Syrian rite. It would also help considerably if the churches in Kerala could get together and agree common texts for English translations of traditional material like the kauma. I hope that the music department will set both the Sunday Order and the Qurbana to music, for this is a tradition that sings its services. There is no reason why they cannot be sung in English and the Mar Thoma church has the talent to do this. But does it have the will? Although I have sympathy with the need for a revised Syrian office, I feel that the baby has been thrown out with the bath water. I hope that a future revision of the office can be made that will better reflect the Syrian heritage of the church.

Phillip Tovey

WorshipMaster (Hodder and Stoughton, OUP, £95)

WorshipMaster is an exciting idea that has yet to fulfil its potential. It is a database of 1,000 hymns, the most popular from the CLC scheme. It is fairly easy to get around, the material is cross-referenced so that you can do word searches, Biblical searches and topical searches, and it gives suggestions for the liturgical year. It was helpful to find songs for a holiday club this summer.

There are however some limitations. There are no liturgical texts, not even the Lord's Prayer; so it does not save you having to type material into your computer, although the ASB is supposed to come out soon. It does not include the daily lectionary, nor the sanctorale. It told you that St. James was on Sunday 25 July, but had no suggestions for hymns. Perhaps this illustrates the problem; personally I don't want to produce a service sheet

with hymns every week, rather I would use this for particular services or to introduce new hymns. It was disappointing to find Iona listed but only one hymn from their book. Finally there is a big problem in it not being Windows-based.

A *Service of the Word* going through Synod needs to be put on disc. Indeed perhaps a programme could be devised that will indicate that we are implementing its rubrics correctly. It is when we have these more occasional services on a database, with a much wider range of hymns (perhaps by having an add-on of one or two standard hymn books), that this will be really useful. Of course for the LEP in which I work it would help to have the liturgies of the RCs, URCs and Methodists as well, but perhaps we are then talking about a CD ROM, and I am needing to buy some more hardware!

Phillip Tovey

NOL has sponsored further comment as follows:

Worshipmaster

As Phil Tovey's review shows, using *Worshipmaster* hasn't been the smooth ride some of us expected. *The Independent* was quite rude about it, and the consensus is that it is somewhat clumsy, has a limited range of hymns, is difficult to customize, and has no liturgy. There are rumblings from the Commission too.

Rather than add to all this, I decided to call Tim Anderson, who developed *Worshipmaster* during time working at our church. What about all the detailed criticisms? Would *Worshipmaster Two* soon be upon us?

Tim's main point was that *Worshipmaster* is a first attempt to do something rather special, and that many criticisms would be solved by adding extra modules at little cost. There is an ASB module close to completion, and *Patterns*, *LHWE*, *Promise*, and a module of Frank Colquhoun prayers will follow. The liturgical modules will feature warnings about missing out obligatory material. You can imagine it flashing up a message saying: 'Hey, it's Lent. Do you *really* want to use the Gloria?'

The good news is that there will be a Windows version, available next year as an upgrade at modest cost. He's been pleased that there have been few major problems with the software, although performance has been disappointing on sub 286 PCs. he's wondered about a 'cut down' version for these machines, but has found little enthusiasm at Hodders for this.

As regards the selection of music, there are 500 OUP hymns, and 500 choruses, 300 of which are the top ones in CCLI. Again, there can be more modules (Iona being a possibility), but Taize material is too short, and really needs music with it. You *can* add material yourself (a feature which Tim fought to include), and he thought that *The Independent's* criticism of this feature being 'clumsy' was a little unfair. 'You have to input the text in that fashion to ensure it behaves itself'.

Worshipmaster is a first attempt. Something like 300 churches have it. Tim would be delighted to hear from people with suggestions, comments, or queries. Contact him at: 11 Monks Court, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 0SR. (0737 224441).

Jeremy Fletcher