

We first asked people to reflect on what they had seen and heard; we gave some explanation about the structure of *A Service of the Word*, about what *A Service of the Word* permits churches to do, and some inspiration about how to use *A Service of the Word* creatively. Then we gave some 'hands on' experience, and asked people to begin to plan *A Service of the Word* for themselves. The first time we did this we asked too much of people; we asked them to form into groups and plan a service together with people they didn't know; and, because we didn't give them enough time, not much was achieved. On the two subsequent occasions we used the 'goldfish bowl' model, and had a pre-picked small group modelling the process, and then encouraged the audience to respond with comments, questions and suggestions.

The evenings were concluded by a question and answer panel, of which the diocesan Bishop was one of the members. There was also a book stall with copies of *A Service of the Word* and other appropriate liturgical books.

**Model B** was organized by one member of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee and consisted of a Saturday workshop for one particular deanery to which 65 people came.

The day began with four acts of worship in different parts of the site. The four acts were: Charismatic, Traditional (BCP Evensong), Taize/Contemplative and All-Age. Participants were invited to visit each of the acts of worship and then decide which one they felt most comfortable with. When people had made their choice, there followed a discussion about why people made the choice they did and the importance of personality in the style of worship that we choose. After a 20-minute discussion the groups divided and half went to another group to continue the discussion. The depth of the discussion and openness to learning about new and different styles were most impressive.

After coffee an address by a member of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee tied together the issues about personality and preferences with a new flexibility of worship allowed by *A Service of the Word*. The idea of liturgical building blocks was introduced and the way in which they can be placed together in different ways.

After lunch the real fun started. The participants were invited to divide into four groups to prepare an act of worship that would be celebrated later in the afternoon. The groups were Action (dance, drama, etc.), Music, Word, and Structure. The groups were all given the Gospel reading for the following day (the marriage feast at Cana) and told to get on with it! By 4 pm a service was sorted out which included an Israeli dance, confetti, Taizé chants, and a wedding reception (not in that order!).

Southwell Diocesan Liturgical Committee offers the structures of both these training sessions to others who may be interested. For further information please contact Tony Walker on 01777 703800 or Mark Beach on 0115 961 3214.

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1995 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

*Editorial Address:* St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. (01634) 851818 or 855252; Fax (01634) 573549)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**

**(Tel: (0115) 943 0786 Fax: (0115) 922 0134)**

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0115) 973 3292

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 247

July 1995

## Editorial

General Synod this month is tackling a hatful of liturgical matters (see the account on page 3 below), but I refer to one major piece of liturgy missing so far from the synodical agenda—and I refer to it because it is also missing from the discussion which should have contained it.

Let me mystify, let me explain that I have been reflecting on *Something to Celebrate: Valuing Families in Church and Society* (CHP, 1995, 238pp., £7.95). This was published on 6 June and created a 24-hour stir on the media. The reasons for this were, I judge, threefold. All of them arise from the issue of cohabitation (and perhaps I could start with a linguistic protest—why are cohabiting people not 'cohabitants' rather than the absurd passive 'cohabitees?'). This is not a review of the whole report (which contains much that is valuable), but simply a handling of the missing liturgy—namely, the marriage service! And here is why cohabitation got such publicity.

The first reason was the matter that hit the headlines hardest—the recommendations of the Working Party about cohabitation begin rather improbably with a calling upon the Church to abandon references to 'living in sin'. This was just what the journalists needed—but surely far from relevant to a Church in which few if any of us ever hear this old-fashioned phrase used? I asked a member of the Working Party why they had majored on this anachronism, and learned that it was because of Ted Pratt's (imitation) Grove Booklet entitled *Living in Sin?*. But even Ted himself is not, as I read him, actually *using* the phrase, so denouncing it gave a gratuitous headline for the sake of no actual gain.

The second reason for the report's entry into the news was that a matter of real substance lies behind the cosmetic 'Down with "living in sin"'. The report is ready to be positive about cohabitation—a standpoint perhaps signalled most clearly by the sentence '... some forms of cohabitation are marriages already in all but name' (page 116). So the headline-writers were onto something.

The third reason for interest was that, although the report appears to be the unanimous finding of the Working Party, it emerges that one member, Alan Storkey, resigned from the Working Party in April this year as the report was completed—and the rumours were that he had dissented, but had not been able to record his dissent, so had resigned. Certainly he is now free to take his opposition, if such is the case, into the public arena, and I would anticipate there would be questions in General Synod in July which will establish what actually happened. The Archbishop of Canterbury seems to be distancing himself from it.

I am no stranger to cohabitation, if you take my meaning. I can even see some cases where something near to marriage seems to be in operation—perhaps particularly where there is a joint mortgage (though it would be perverse if the dinkies could have their sustained coupling recognized as marriage on the grounds that they have a mortgage, whereas a couple in a rented flat could not). But I was left with a sense of gaps in the logic:

Firstly, the quest for the positive in situations of cohabitation suggests a mindset which antedated the sifting of the evidence. That being so, I have little qualm about suggesting the opposite. We would need to know at what point mere casual coupling (which might be fornicatory) became 'permanent' (and thereby passed into respectability); we would need to rule out all those many situations where one or both are already married and the cohabitation is technically adulterous; we would need to know how to distinguish the truly free and symmetrical enduring relationships from the exploitative and asymmetrical ones (I am surely not the only pastor who at intervals sees a man walk away from his partner when she gets pregnant?); we would need to know how to establish in any relationship that it truly is 'a mutual, life-long, exclusive commitment' when nothing formal or public has been registered or is likely to be; and we would need to know what sexual licence we were offering to all sorts of pairings from teenage upwards which could not be readily distinguished from at least the outward appearance of cohabitation. To put it another way round: is it possible for observers to know in advance that *any* relationship is permanent (let alone free and unexploitative), which is unregistered? Or can one only establish commitment in such cases by the sheer lapse of time? Are unmarried couples actually committed, or are they clear they are not yet committed? And can one partner have a different view from the other?

But the second gap is the liturgical one. The report is lamentably short of any discussion of the significance of the marriage service, so that the question 'What lack we yet?' is not well handled. The nearest thing to such a treatment that I can discover lies in two sentences on page 116:

'Theologically and morally, what makes a marriage is the freely given consent and commitment in public of both partners to live together for life. A wedding ceremony serves to solemnize and bless the commitment that the couple make to each other.'

It is odd that the phrase 'in public' in the first sentence is not explicit in the second; and it is odder still that two sentences later comes 'cohabitation which involves a mutual, life-long, exclusive commitment may be a legitimate form of marriage'—and the 'in public' is not only not explicit in this, but actually will not fit. So the report starts to waltz on its own theological definition as soon as it has made it; and the treatment is so brief that no nuancing or explicating is possible.

I conclude that we have ahead of us some very thin ice: we are going to be asked to recognize some coupling situations as comparable to marriage and others (presumably) as not. In the process we shall find we have written all theological substance out of the marriage service, and this report is moving us that way without really admitting it. We have to look hard and long at the values to be attached to public and attested symmetrical vows of lifelong fidelity as a context for exclusive monogamous sexual union. If there are values, then the report appears to make little of them: if there are not, then by all means let us (as the report and the world around us threaten to do) turn the ceremony into something of no more substance than the crowning of a May Queen, or the organizing of a gorgeous float of feminine pulchritude for a carnival.

But I doubt if the liturgists would actually relish that task.

Colin Buchanan

## DIOCESAN REPORT 6—WINCHESTER

There seems to be a perverse determination in COB's decision to place the Winchester Diocesan report for NOL in the month containing St. Swithun's Day. If he is still hoping for a reflection on that, who knows? Maybe Swithun's next successor as Bishop of Winchester will be persuaded to supply one . . .

One unexpected aspect of a Vacancy-in-See is the postponement of subjects that tend to claim the attention of Diocesan Liturgical Committees. Yes, the Winchester Diocesan Worship Group will need to give attention to such matters as the revision of Induction services but we find ourselves saying 't'ht will have to wait until the appointment of the new bishop'. This leaves the group with two major concerns.

Our first concern is the promotion of good liturgical education and practice through residential CME courses and through training days which clergy and laity can attend. The Group is increasingly being seen as a resource whose advice can be sought in preparing liturgy. We are currently working on training for church musicians and for leaders of 'Family Services', as well as on material for 'Makeway' (a diocesan all-age festival), and for 'Young Church Builders' (an annual event for children from across the diocese). It has therefore proved invaluable to have the Diocesan Children's Work Advisor and the Adult Lay Training Officer in the Group. They are encouraging us to be more proactive rather than merely reactive; for instance in thinking towards a commissioning service for lay workers. (We decided against a response saying 'We commission . . . to edit the Parish Magazine. Thank God.')

Our second concern is that we need to increase awareness of the work of the Worship Group, particularly at senior levels in the diocese. Recent work on a VE-Day service outline for parishes was pre-empted by an alternative production from another diocesan structure. By circulating the minutes of our meetings to all the Senior Staff we hope to improve communication and eliminate such duplication, so that the resources of the Group will become an asset to enrich the worshipping communities within the diocese.

Anne Barton, Secretary, Winchester Diocesan Worship Group

## SOUTHWELL DIOCESE—AN EXTRA REPORT Using *A Service of the Word*—Two ways of training lay people and clergy

Over the past few months Southwell Diocese has put on two different training courses to introduce *A Service of the Word* to clergy, Readers, and parish worship groups.

**Model A** was organized by the diocesan Liturgical Committee itself and consisted of three training evenings in different parts of the Diocese. In all 280 people took part, which shows a healthy interest in things liturgical.

Each evening began with a 35-minute act of worship giving people a taste of what *A Service of the Word* can do for an adult evening service (we deliberately avoided the 'Family Service' model). The service drew a number of parallels between the discovery (or was it rediscovery?) of the Book of the Law in the time of King Josiah with the discovery (or is it the rediscovery?) of the value of non-Eucharistic worship, as exemplified in *A Service of the Word*. This was followed by coffee and a mixture of group discussion and plenary session.

We promise to do everything possible to help where there is need, and to ensure that they may enjoy the years that lie ahead in comfort, dignity and contentment.

This we promise as a lasting token of our appreciation and gratitude.

*The service continues:*

We are all children of the same heavenly Father, whatever our age, whatever our nation or race. Some of us lived through the years of war, others are of a younger generation: but we all have a responsibility under God to care for one another.

I invite you all as members of the wider community, to make your own commitment to the people of the wartime generation.

Will you honour all who bore the pains and adversities of war?

**All By the help of God, we will.**

Will you offer them your help and support, and protect their dignity and welfare?

**All By the help of God, we will.**

Will you remember the causes for which they endured adversity and for which many fought and died, by promoting peace, justice and harmony among all people?

**All By the help of God, we will.**

Will you always acknowledge how precious are the gifts which God has entrusted to us, and exercise the freedoms and opportunities you have with gratitude and humility?

**All By the help of God, we will.**

May Almighty God, who has given us the will to undertake these things, give us also the strength to perform them: for his name's sake.  
**Amen.**

**HYMN**

*Love divine or For all the saints*

**THE BLESSING**

*The ringing of church bells at noon on Sunday 20 August is encouraged.*

**SOLOMON AMUSAN—NOL BURSAR AT DUBLIN IALC**

At the time of going to press £650 had been received against the £850 needed. Thanks to all our readers.

**STOP PRESS**

Another member of the Liturgical Commission, Kenneth Stevenson, is to be a bishop—Bishop of Portsmouth; *A Prayer Book of Australia* approved overwhelmingly on 6 July; *Patterns for Worship*, published in England (£15.00).

**GENERAL SYNOD JULY 1995**

General Synod meets at York from 7 to 11 July for the last group of sessions of this quinquennium. Following York, the Synod will be dissolved, and a new Synod will be elected for the next five years in October. But the shape of the five years to come is already yawning before us—the Commission (granted the goodwill of the House of Bishops) has plans ahead to keep the Synod busy on liturgy all the way through to the year 2000.

As NOL will be at the press as Synod meets, this edition inevitably reflects the position before the meeting, even if readers receive it after. We apologize for that, but will endeavour to keep a clear record going even where we are up to a month late. Here then is how it looks before we start.

Firstly, there is a pre-synodical meeting by invitation to look at issues about 'prayer and the departed'. This was a matter of close combat twenty-five to thirty years ago, and clearly the present Commission would like to get some agreed groundrules before drafting definitive texts. Equally clearly they are far beyond the starting point and must have got many ideas already running. We shall be seeing their notions fairly soon.

Secondly, within the Synod agenda there are two different stages of liturgical revision. On the Saturday, 8 July, there will be 'General Consideration' of the 'Initiation Services' (GS 1152) which were published last month. These are similar in structure to the ASB rites, though with a tendency towards placing the implications of baptism into a post-baptismal position. There is a separate section for 'Confirmation, Reaffirmation and Reception'; and in confirmation the longstanding Stancliffe text emerges 'N., God has called you by name and made you his own' (with optional anointing) followed by the laying on of the hand and 'Confirm, O Lord, . . .' There are no hints here that 'Reception' can replace confirmation for those joining the Anglican Church from other denominations, though this was originally part of the expectations raised in 1991. There is then a further whole section of 'Wholeness and Healing', which looks designed to swallow up the existing *Ministry to the Sick* provisions. This 'General Consideration' debate which will be followed under Standing Orders by committal to a Revision Committee, but, because a new Synod is to be elected in October, the closing date for synodspeople to send in suggested amendments is not mid-August, as might have been expected, but instead is 5 January 1996—after the new Synod has first met at the end of November. The Revision Committee will presumably then meet in February, March, April and May and report to the July 1996 session of General Synod.

Next (on the Sunday afternoon) comes firstly the final approval of the indefinite extension of time for the Revised Catechism; and secondly the Revision Stage of the (six) 'Additional Eucharistic Prayers'. Under the current Standing Orders, never previously seriously tested, people wishing to amend the text must move a motion asking the Revision Committee to 'reconsider' the texts, with a view to securing some stated change. The floor of the Synod has nowadays no power to make changes itself; and the upshot will be to keep the control of the process in the hands of the Revision Committee, but at the expense of a considerable time-lag whilst the Committee convenes to deal with any motions which are passed, and comes back to Synod for a further Revision Stage. Thus the pressures will be on the Synod not to pass 're-committal' motions, lest there be a long delay. The House of Bishops is undoubtedly surprised at how two eucharistic prayers have grown so swiftly to six, but their action cannot necessarily be predicted.

The last task in Synod will be 'General Considerations' for the Liturgical Commission's massive *Report on the Calendar, Lectionary and Collects, 2000* (GS 1161). In broad terms this will take the Church of England over to the three-year pattern contained in *The Revised Common Lectionary*. This too will go to a Revision Committee for which proposals must be submitted by 5 January 1996 (it occurs to the editor that this time-lag gives a uniquely good chance for DLCs to pore over the texts—initiation as well as calendar and lectionary—and make serious submissions to the Revision Committee after coprorate consideration locally).

Finally, there is 'GS Misc 452' due for circulation, though not, for the moment, for debate. This is *Extended Communion: Report by the House of Bishops*. It anticipates the later provision of texts, but for the moment simply indicates the intention of the House to regularize existing diverse practice. It ends by stating that the House will 'wish to emphasize the following points:

1. Pastoral necessity will be the principal criterion for which bishops will seek evidence in considering requests and advice from incumbents, PCCs and rural deans.
2. For every congregation there must be regular celebration of the full rite of the Holy Communion; and the nature of the rite of extended Communion must make the difference between it and the full rite clear.
3. The provision which the House of Bishops has in mind is not the provision of the elements consecrated on some previous day in the same place, but of elements consecrated on the same day in a different place, though within the same team or cure.'

It looks as if the years 1995-2000 will be as busy on liturgy as were the *anni mirabiles* of 1975-80.

#### **This month's publication ...**

... is Worship Series no. 133, *Worship audits*, by Mark Earey. The idea of an 'audit'—whether financial or missionary—has come into church life strongly in recent years. In particular the 'worship audit' has been a feature of Coventry diocese; and this booklet sets out its chief features and explores its appropriateness for parishes up and down the country.

#### **... and this month's bargain**

from COB (address on page 12) is Clifford Owen's book, *Baptise Every Baby?*, for which remaindered copies are available at £1.50 postfree. The book is in large part attractively autobiographical, and tells of the development of a missionary policy for infant baptism in the parish of Bordon when Clifford Owen was ministering there in the late 1980s.

#### **... and an award for an author**

goes to Phillip Tovey who in May received a Lambeth Diploma in Theology for his work on extended communion (as revealed, for instance, in Joint Liturgical Study 26 in December 1993). Our congratulations.

### **THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS AND INITIATION**

The minutes of the House of Bishops, which met in Liverpool on 7 and 8 June, show that the House passed overwhelmingly this motion:

'The House of Bishops affirms that confirmation remains an essential part of Christian initiation within the tradition of the Church of England, although in anticipation reception of Holy Communion before confirmation may be permitted in carefully defined circumstances, and where children thus admitted are able to discern the significance of the Sacrament.'

Readers of NOL will recognize that this is quite a shift from the previous stance of the House of Bishops. It has been a very long haul, and it still has to be turned into legislation—presumably General Synod Regulations passed in accord with Canon B.15A.

### **ACT OF REMEMBRANCE**

Let us remember before God all who have died as a result of war, oppression and tyranny.

### **THE KOHIMA EPITAPH**

When you go home, tell them of us and say:  
For your tomorrow we gave our today.

### **LAST POST and SILENCE**

#### **FOR THE FALLEN**

They shall grow not old as we that are left grow old:  
Age shall not weary them nor the years condemn.  
At the going down of the sun, and in the morning,  
We will remember them.

**We will remember them.**

### **LAMENT and REVEILLE**

#### **ADDRESS**

#### **HYMN**

*Teach me, my God and King*

#### **PRAYERS**

Let us give thanks for the example of courage and fortitude given to us by men and women who have endured war; and let us pray for all people who suffer, especially those who, having survived conflict, still bear its marks in mind or body; and for all who have been bereaved through war.

*Silence*

Lord, hear us: **Lord, graciously hear us.**

Let us give thanks for the gift of peace; and let us pray for all who live now amid conflict, and for those who live in fear of violence or oppression.

*Silence*

Lord, hear us: **Lord, graciously hear us.**

Let us give thanks for the reconciliation that has been established between nations opposed in war; and let us pray for the people of all nations and their leaders, that those divisions that remain may be healed.

*Silence*

Lord, hear us: **Lord, graciously hear us.**

### **THE LORD'S PRAYER**

#### **ACTS OF COMMITMENT**

*[If organizations belonging to the Tribute and Promise group are represented at the service, members may say:*

We, the voluntary organizations of Tribute and Promise, pledge ourselves anew to our work in support of the wartime generation.

## TRIBUTE AND PROMISE

### **A Service of Remembrance and Commitment to mark the 50th Anniversary of the end of the Second World War Commended by the Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland for use on 19-20 August 1995**

Based on the service to be held at Buckingham Palace on 19 August  
This service is being distributed for use by churches in local acts of remembrance.

It may be freely reproduced or adapted.

*Tribute and Promise* (telephone 0171 403 8783) is an alliance of charities to raise awareness of the needs of the wartime generation.

## ORDER OF SERVICE

*Other hymns or readings may be substituted, and the suggested words may be adapted to suit local needs.*

### **THE NATIONAL ANTHEM**

### **THE BIDDING**

We come to worship God, and to give thanks for the end of the Second World War fifty years ago. At this time, we have on our hearts most particularly those who were involved in the conflict in Asia and the Pacific.

But our commemoration is wider than this: for it is right for us to remember the part played by all the people of our nations and Commonwealth who lived through that period of war: for they shared the conviction that oppression and tyranny must not prevail.

So, during this act of worship, we shall affirm our commitment to ensuring the welfare and dignity of members of the wartime generation; and we shall acknowledge with gratitude the courage of men, women and children who, despite the hardships and horrors of war, kept hope alive.

Let us pray.

Almighty God, you have created us in your image and have called us to live in peace and mutual love. Forgive our sins and our failure to live according to your will; and give us grace to serve you, and our brothers and sisters for your sake. We make our prayer through him who died to reconcile the world to you, Jesus Christ our Lord.

**Amen.**

### **HYMN**

*O God, our help in ages past*

### **THE READING**

*Romans 8.31-39.*

*ANTHEM or HYMN (optional)*

## Book Reviews

Ruth Meyers (ed.) *Children at the Table: A Collection of Essays on Children and the Eucharist* (Church Hymnal Corporation, New York, 1995, 200pp.)

I must declare an interest in this book. It is a revamped and enriched version of Grove Liturgical Study no. 44 which I edited nearly ten years ago under the title *Nurturing Children in Communion*. The Study arose from the first International Anglican Liturgical Consultation held in Boston, Mass., in July 1985; and it incorporated the Statement and recommendations of the Consultation under the title 'Children and Communion', whilst also including edited versions of many of the preparatory papers provided at Boston, not the least important of which were reports of progress from various countries.

The Study has been out of print for two or three years, and the idea of an up-to-date version of it has grown in the Episcopal Church of the USA. Thus this new collection includes an updated revision of each of the main essays in the original Study, but, with much more space available, adds others in addition. There are three contributions to the Boston Consultation which I arbitrarily excluded from the original Study for reasons of space: David Holeton on 'The Communion of the Baptized and Anglican Tradition'; Kenneth Stevenson's personal account of growing up in an improbable three-way split of Danish Lutheranism, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Catholic Apostolic Church; and Leonel Mitchell's defence of baptismal anointing (all three of these have been published in the USA in the *Anglican Theological Review*). There are also essays written since Boston by Ruth Meyers, Leonel Mitchell and Louis Weil, and published elsewhere before being brought together here. And there is one essay—that on the acceptance of child communion in New Zealand—which was actually written for the post-Toronto collection, David Holeton (ed.): *Growing in Newness of Life* (ABC, Toronto, 1993). And COB has written a new Introduction.

The overall impression is of enormous weight of scholarship and round-the-world experience all pulling at the same end of the rope—as well as dealing effectively with anyone who threatens to take up the other end. The only problem is that sheer fact of Toronto. Toronto in 1991 took the whole thrust of Boston much further and has (as noted above) its own literature. But a set of essays relating to Boston is then torn between simply bolstering and expounding the original Boston Statement and getting genuinely up to date in 1994. It reads a little as though some world-class golfers decided to stop their own game somewhere round the course, to rest on a tee and to let the people from behind 'play through'—though without being able to resist giving them a little coaching as they went by. The fact that both sets of players are largely one and the same people reduces but does not entirely eliminate this impression, and we are still faintly surprised on the eighteenth green to welcome a clutch of improved Boston players when we thought the Toronto group was leading the field.

*Days of the Lord Vol. 5 (Ordinary Time Year B) and Vol. 7 (Solemnities and Feasts)* (The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1993 & 1994), 376 pp. and 395 pp, £16.50 each).

Here are two additions to the seven-volume commentary on the liturgical year, translated from the French and made available to English-speaking Roman Catholics. Volumes 1 (Christmas-Epiphany), 4 (Ordinary Time Year A) and 6 (Ordinary Time Year C) have been reviewed in previous editions of NOL.

Volume 5 takes us through Ordinary time for year B of the three-year lectionary. That means most of Mark's Gospel read consequently. As such, this book makes a good basic Preacher's (cum liturgical) commentary on Mark.

Volume 7 is divided into two parts: first a section tackling the three 'Solemnities of Ordinary Time' which are, Trinity, Sunday after Trinity (the Body and Blood of Christ), and Sacred Heart (which rejoices in the concise title, 'Friday after the Second Sunday after Pentecost!'), and then a section on the Sanctorale Cycle, which consists of the Presentation, St. Joseph, The Annunciation, Birth of John the Baptist, Apostles Peter and Paul, The Transfiguration, The Assumption, The Triumph of the Cross (Holy Cross Day), All Saints, Dedication of the Lateran Basilica (ie the Cathedral of the Diocese of Rome), and the Immaculate Conception!

'The privileged treatment they enjoy is due to the fact that they commemorate especially significant aspects of the mystery of God or Christ or else signal events of salvation history that the "sacrament of the liturgical year" unfolds in the "today" of the Church and the world.' (p.1).

In both sections the approach is the same: to have a chapter giving some historical and theological background to the liturgical celebration (e.g. for the Sunday after Trinity, a chapter on the history of the veneration of the Blessed Sacrament, and for the Feast of the Assumption an explanation of the parallel between Mary and the Ark of the Covenant). These helpful chapters have the same sort of feel as the introductory chapters we have become used to in *Lent Holy Week Easter, Promise ...* etc. Each is followed by a chapter (or, in the case of the first section, three chapters; one for each of years A, B and C) on the Biblical material set by the lectionary. Unfortunately for non-Roman readers without easy access to the three-year lectionary, the readings are not given and have to be guessed.

The book concludes with an essay on how to get the most out of the liturgical year (compared to a 'long-distance hike' p.307), including useful material on different ways of reading the Bible ('studious', *lectio divina*, 'liturgical').

Mark Earey, Chatham

Michael Perham (on behalf of PRAXIS) *At All Times And In All Places: A Syllabus for Liturgical Formation in the Church of England* (Mowbray, 1995, 28pp. £4.95).

PRAXIS, as should be known in England, is a kind of Anglican liturgical ginger-group, bringing together representatives of the Liturgical Commission, of the Alcuin Club and of the Group for the Renewal of Worship (GROW). In theory therefore it combines the official with the unofficial, the catholic with the evangelical, and the academic with the practical. Its programme is usually advertised annually in this journal, and its meetings are occasionally reported here also. It originated as much as anything through a lack of any Diocesan or Area Liturgical Committees in London diocese but now runs a programme all over the country. It is ably steered by Michael Perham as chairman and Michael Vasey as secretary.

This *Syllabus* is, to the best of my knowledge, the first actual publication to emanate from PRAXIS; and at first sight it both demands much and gives little. It has divided its 'Syllabus' requirements under twenty headings and given them a page each. Each page then contains between fifteen and twenty-five lines of subject matter, grouped under about five sub-headings. Each line is then itself a mere heading as, e.g.: 'How many books do we need' (p.6); 'The English choral tradition' (p.8); 'Finding a theology of space appropriate to a building' (p.11); 'Baptism and ritual today' (p.16); 'New thinking: staged rites [of marriage]' (p.19); etc. etc. Imagine around 400 such lines; treat them as a skeleton syllabus, and get to work on how you would train a congregation, teach an evening class, or prepare ordinands, with it. Then you will see why I say it demands much of you!

So what does it give? Firstly, a carefully thought-through set of subjects, grouped, headed and sub-headed as described above; secondly, a brief set of biblical references on each of the twenty pages; thirdly, a general bibliography at the beginning and a slightly more specialized one (six book titles or so for each page of the Syllabus) at the back. After that we are on our own—a blank building site and a few strands of straw in our hands, and a pyramid is awaited. Well, the job *can* be done, and it is much easier to make bricks with straw than without. The four Praxisioners who produced it are to be congratulated—and it is encouraging to find how much from the Grove stable is being recommended. No pyramid-builder should be without it, even if it quickly dawns upon him or her how much is being left to the reader's initiative and inventiveness. It might well serve examination candidates well also, as it will certainly expose how brief and selective the course they have followed has inevitably been. What may not emerge quite so quickly is the suspicion that even the syllabus and its reading-list have an element of selectivity to them also. But who could be wholly objective in providing a syllabus for the whole Church of England? And for my part I think I approve of the way the answers are loaded, at virtually every point where I have detected them so to be ...