

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 249

September 1995

And as for the citation of the BCP rubrics about 'due reverence', as well I plead to making a few suggestions at this point. Rome (rightly, in my view, given some appalling sloppiness floating around in some circles) needs to be assured that normative Anglican tradition excludes flippancy or irreverence in relation to the elements—and the 1662 rubrics at least do that. (By the way: do they exclude *all* reservation? A reading of them in context suggests that reservation for use with the sick on the same day, or before noon on the next day—by which time the bread will be getting rather hard—is permissible). I am well aware that the word 'reverence' is used in two related but distinct senses in the discussion of reservation: but what is wrong with what is actually written here?

Enough. *Clarifications* is not perfect. You make ARCIC sound like an afternoon game, however. It is not: this document was ground out with a little agony, yet even the good Cranmerian in me believes that it offers a ray of hope.

Yours ever,

Charles Sherlock, Member of ARCIC-2, Australia

DIOCESAN REPORT—OXFORD DORCHESTER AREA

Oxford retains a Diocesan Liturgical Advisory Committee which rarely meets. Meanwhile episcopal areas are developing their own different ways of working. Dorchester area consists of about 200 parishes, all rural save for those in the towns of Banbury, Bicester and Witney. The post of Area Worship Adviser has been set up to help in this key realm. With the help of our Parish Development Adviser a series of training events have been happening. Many of the parishes are small and rural, and there is at present a huge amount of reorganization going on! Training events are either in the evening or on Saturday morning, and we charge £3 for each one. This is the only way we can pay expenses, as budgets are at present very tight. In fact this seems to be no barrier to people coming. We think that 12-20 attending indicates something successful.

Some of the events are to provide training in what might be seen as obvious areas for lay involvement, leading intercessions, non-eucharistic all-age worship (=family services), reading the Bible in church. But we are soon to repeat training to encourage and enable laity to lead morning or evening prayer. Some events are designed to pick up on new currents in the church, Celtic and Taizé worship (both very popular). Others are designed to introduce new material to the church, e.g. *Patterns for Worship*. It is envisaged that, as more material comes out in the revision of the ASB, there will be more such events.

The pages of NOL reveal that many DLC's are into this sort of training. At some point it would be good for such people to get together and compare notes.

Phillip Tovey, Dorchester Area Worship Adviser

[Is the 'key realm' the Dorchester Area?—COB]

ISSN 0263-7170

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

40p

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: (01223) 464748 Fax: (01223) 464849)

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

Editorial

Most of the 'news' of liturgy in August revolves round two conferences one of which, in various ways, you will find reported below. I am here using that conference as a framework to enable me to pay tribute to a notable leader of the Anglican Communion in respect of its worship and the renewal of its worship. The man is not a bishop, not much in the headlines, and not at all self-assertive. He is also not English.

Who then is this? I ask you to raise your glasses to David Holeton, Professor of Liturgics at Trinity College, Toronto, the 'high' College of the Anglican pair which face each other across Hoskin Avenue in Toronto. How happy are they who are taught liturgy there.

The occasion for this encomium and glass-lifting and (I would venture) thanking God is David Holeton's departure from office after six years as the chair and convenor of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations. I am on the new steering committee, and, as the new committee met with the old in Dublin for the handover, there came a moment near the end when David Holeton, for perfectly good reasons, left the room. I commented then 'I think we have just seen a special moment in church history'—for the departure of David from office ends the second chapter in the life of these Liturgical Consultations, and he has been to the forefront of both chapters. If the forthcoming chapters of that book look as though they may contain anything of both viability and usefulness (and they do); then they owe a tremendous debt to the man who slipped unsung from that committee room last month. He is the continuity person, the anchor man, in the twelve years of pioneering the Consultations (IALCs as they have come to be known). I list the twelve years as the first *two* chapters, because the years do fall naturally into two separate halves. And their division enables me to link a story of a person to that of an institution.

The first decision to meet as an international set of Anglican liturgists was taken at a brief meeting in Vienna in 1983 at the end of the Congress there of Societas Liturgica. Donald Gray was to chair our meeting, but David Holeton was the secretary who took on the donkey work. So 15 liturgists met at Boston in 1985, produced the Boston Statement, and agreed to meet again at Brixen in Northern Italy when Societas next met. At Brixen, with David Holeton still secretary, a larger number took steps to get a constitution and connect with the Anglican Consultative Council, and these initiatives were duly rewarded. At York in 1989—with a number now over 30—the constitution came into force, and David Holeton was appointed chair of the steering group which was to arrange further Consultations. These in turn came to pass at Toronto (and David's own college) in 1991; at an 'interim' consultation at Untermarchtal in Southern Germany in 1993; and now at Dublin in 1995. I write as the only other person in the world who has been present at each of those seven occasions since 1983 (my own role being much more backbenching—and bookselling), and also as the consistent publisher of IALC output. It is from that working

relationship that I pay tribute to a modest man who has launched a worldwide institution, and seen it become established. And he has been tireless in theology, editorial tasks, planning arrangements and carrying them through, raising money (bursaries have brought several from the 'third world' to Toronto and to Dublin), chairing meetings, sweetening relationships—and at worshipping. And, under the good hand of God, those many parts he has played are *why* the institution has flourished and grown.

So, ladies and gentlemen, please be upstanding and raise your glasses . . .

Colin Buchanan

MICHAEL SAWARD ON THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES

[The following notes represent the thrust of part of Michael Saward's speech in the Synod debate in July]

We have *one or two real gains* but consider the losses. What has gone from the ASB's infant rite?

1. The *opening interrogation*—**gone**
(A loose interrogation of everyone replaces it, in which there is no commitment).
2. *Commitment* at the outset—**gone**
3. In the ASB's first prayer ('Heavenly Father')
 - 'protect them from evil'—**gone**
 - 'that they may *walk with us*'—**gone**
 - 'that they may *grow in knowledge* of your love'—**gone**
4. In the '*Deceision*'
 - 'allegiance to Christ'—**gone**
 - 'bring up children to *fight evil*'—**gone**
 - '*answer for yourselves and for these children*'—**gone**
 - '*In the name of this child* renounce . . .' (BCP)—**gone**
 - (In the *signing* with the cross) '*fight valiantly*'—**gone**
 - '*lead you in light and obedience of Christ*'—**gone**
5. Baptismal profession's sponsored declarations—**gone**
 - '*who made the world*'—**gone**
 - '*who redeemed mankind*'—**gone**
 - '*who gives life to the people of God*'—**gone**
6. *Congregational Welcome*—**gone**

Most seriously of all. Mark chapter 1, Jesus' first word ' . . . Kingdom of God has arrived—repent and believe Gospel.' *Repentance* has **gone**.

Renunciation is not repentance. Renunciation is cerebral. Repentance (*metanoia*) is a total turning round. Renounce in BCP is 'so that you will not . . .'

In my youth we sang a chorus 'gone, gone, gone, gone, yes my sins are gone'. In this liturgy, while 'sin' may not have gone, 16 other items of significance have gone from the ASB rite and, by and large, they are the hard-edged ideas and phrases.

I hope then that in giving general approval to this service we shall ask the Liturgical Commission, the Revision Committee, and the House of Bishops to reconsider whether what has been lost, cannot be considered and revised.

Clarifications does not say that the unique historic sacrifice of Christ is made present.

The only comment made on this matter is on page 5, where (after quoting from ARCIC-1), the text says by way of clarification that

'In the mind of the Commission the making present, effective and accessible of the unique historic sacrifice of Christ does not entail a repetition of it.'

What is the problem with this? We go on to explain this further with a longish quote from the *Elucidation*. As you say, ARCIC-1 stopped short of 'actualization'—and so does this document.

- 2 On propitiation, you rehearse the well-known 1552-1662 repudiation of a directly propitiatory application of the eucharist to other than faithful recipients. But you accuse ARCIC-2 of all sorts of things we do not say! *Clarifications is particularly careful not to use 'propitiation' to refer to anything but a particular aspect of Christ's atoning work, viz enabling a change in relation between ourselves and God.* We all know that it had a larger, rather blanket meaning in the sixteenth century (as did 'reconciliation' cf Article 2), and that it became mixed up with unhelpful ideas of appeasement. But the key point made here is that it is *Christ's death*, and that only, that Anglican rites clearly depict as atoning/propitiatory, and that the sacrament of that death is thus a means by which that work is made effective in the present (as is also the case, I would argue, with gospel preaching, and baptism).

It was at this point that a key word-change was made. The draft had 'propitiatory *value*' in the first line of the text on page 6: this was changed to 'dimension', thus carefully avoiding a sense of the eucharist as having power in itself apart from the unique work of Christ whose salvation it celebrates. But as an effectual sign, seal and proclamation of that Christ and his work—ah what grace, power and love!

I simply do not see the problems you charge us with. (And I would have hoped that COB would note ARCIC's appreciation of the nexus between 1 John 2.1-2 and *Sursum Corda* . . .).

- 3 On presence, I breathed a sigh of relief at your lack of excoriation. Yet I admit that I do not like the impression given that somehow we are agreeing with Trent *simpliciter* (even though the reference is from the Final Report). Also note that the word 'living' was added before 'Christ', and that the appearance of *both* 'truly and really' here is no accident (pun).
- 4 On reservation, you really go over the top rhetorically. Language such as 'papalist and protestant' reflects an underlying dualistic pugilism in your attitude to what ARCIC is trying to do. I quite readily admit that reservation is described here as if it has always been the case in the Anglican Communion—but assure you that Rome can and does read BCP rubrics! What was needed was an indication of a willingness on our part to live with a tradition in which reservation has become a regular aspect of devotion. It is not my cup of tea, but I find it very difficult to object to the practices I observe *among Roman Catholics* on this point. It is, tragically, more often Anglican practices that raise my iconoclastic gorge.

this particular 'picker and stealer' claims responsibility for drafting the bulk of the *ASB* collects and those in the Australian *Alternative Collects 1985*. Of the material which Dudley identifies as 'new' but for which he is unable to give an author, I must (with no guarantee that I didn't cast an eye over my neighbour's goods) own up to: 461 (after Augustine), 538, 577, 580 (Jasper/Bradshaw's speculations as to sources are mistaken), 581, 582 (after Augustine), 584, 627, 628, 633, 635, 636 (I deny the 'possible sources'), 637, 639 (which is the source of 591 and 605), and 640. Though 389, 524, 592, 593, 594 and 596 are substantially my work, they demonstrate also the extent to which we are all of us indebted to the rich tradition of collect writing in English. We depend on cross-fertilization for some of our best efforts, even if the same process can lead to bastardization of the stock. Perhaps only time will determine which of the six hundred and forty-two flowers here presented deserve to flourish.

David Frost, Newcastle, Australia

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

Re: Your comments on *Clarifications* in March

As is carefully explained in the Co-Chair's Statement, the response to ARCIC-1 has been different on the part of the two Communions ('asymmetrical' is how I would put it). We Anglicans gave ARCIC-1 on the Eucharist 2.9 cheers—a 'clear yes' apart from a few rumblings in certain parts of my home country. All ARCIC-2 can do with this is encourage the last 0.1 to be given—which is scarcely a basis for issuing a 'comparable letter addressed to evangelicals': I'd have thought the Final Report was basically that! Rome, though, prompted by a new Cantuar, got around (after a decade) to making an official response, which on Eucharist and Ministry was about 1.1 cheer. What was to be done? Someone had to respond—and who better (or even other) than ARCIC was in a position to do so? We are not only 'keen' to respond—it is our basic responsibility to study all matters that divide our Communions.

This was not a matter of the respective Communions needing to share together in a common response, but dealing with *wholly asymmetrical responses*. In my opinion the idea of asking an ARCIC-1 group to do an initial draft, and then have it reviewed by ARCIC-2, was responsible, sensible—and the only obvious way forward. For the life of me I cannot see what is so 'extraordinary' about this procedure: it is precisely what ARCIC is set up to do. And please note: ARCIC does *not* commit the Communions: it offers carefully fashioned work *for the Communions to receive*, which is all that is happening here. To insist that 'all discussion of ARCIC-1 documents proceeds without reference to *Clarifications*' is simply ridiculous: it would forbid anyone but ARCIC-1 from saying anything—and how would the process of reception, of which *Clarifications* is but one part, then go forward? You charge us with eliminating candidates from the list after the votes have come in. I would suggest that your own procedure is like having an election in which the result is determined even before a single vote is cast!

Now to your comments on the content, number by number.

- 1 On eucharistic sacrifice, believe it or not, I totally agree with all you say. Certainly we do not make Christ's death present in the eucharist, but 'make effective in the present' his unique, once-for-all, wholly sufficient atoning work—and so say the present members of ARCIC!

SOCIETAS LITURGICA IN DUBLIN

There is neither space nor time to give a full report on this Congress this month, save to state that, with over 250 participants, it was the largest number ever. I add a couple of irreverent journalistic notes here, and promise a better report next month.

I confess however to two shocks at Dublin. One was the Bishop of Sarum, chairman of our Liturgical Commission, clad in an unprelatical teeshirt, with a text emblazoned across the episcopal chest thus: 'Liturgists do it rite'. He acknowledged that the joke was not original, but surely in its *sitz im lieben* it is?—I do not recall Ronald Jasper, for instance, thus clad.

The other shock was 15 August. Perhaps we might have expected this particular feast of the Roman rite to be fairly forcefully observed, and it was. The full force I reserve till next month.

COB

FIFTH INTERNATIONAL ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

The fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC) met in the Church of Ireland College of Education, Dublin, 6-12 August. It followed previous IALCs in Boston (children and communion, 1985), Brixen (liturgical formation, 1987), York (inculturation, 1989), and Toronto (Christian initiation, 1991). The theme this time was 'Revising the Eucharist', following on from a preliminary conference held in Germany in 1993. The Dublin Consultation was the largest yet. Indeed, the consultations have grown from the 15 people who attended the first to the 80 present this time, representing 21 churches and provinces. The IALCs are recognized by the ACC and include a representative from the Primates' meeting. The Consultation did the bulk of its work in five groups: Ministry, Order and the Eucharist; Ritual, Language and Symbolism; Structure of the Eucharist; Eucharistic Theology; and Liturgical and Eucharistic Renewal. Each group worked on a statement and received responses from the rest of the Consultaion in plenary. The statement will be published in the near future. As in Toronto, the degree of consensus considering our diversity is impressive. The Consultation also agreed a statement of principles printed here on page 4 overleaf, which are commended to the Provinces:

The Consultation enjoyed a varied programme of eucharistic worship, including rites from England, Cuba, the liturgy of St. Gregory of Nyssa church, San Francisco, and Ireland. The St. Gregory's rite was an experience, including two 'conga-like' dances at the preparation of the gifts and the post-communion. The rite employs creative use of music, text and ceremonial; there were 'bells and smells' but both were employed in the ministry of the word, the incense burning before the lectern and bells designating periods of silent reflection after the readings and a participatory style of homily.

The next IALC will be in 1999. A fund-raising committee has been established to enable yet wider participation. This will be important, not only so that the African, Asian, and South American voice can be fully heard, but also because the task of working together on agreed principles will become an increasingly important ingredient in the glue that binds the Anglican Communion together.

David Kennedy

IALC5's PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In the celebration of the eucharist, all the baptized are called to participate in the great sign of our common identity as the people of God, the body of Christ, and the community of the Holy Spirit. No baptized person should be excluded from participating in the eucharistic assembly on such grounds as age, race, gender, economic circumstances or mental capacity.
2. In the future, Anglican unity will find its liturgical expression not so much in uniform texts as in a common approach to eucharistic celebration and a structure which will ensure a balance of word, prayer, and sacrament, and which bears witness to the catholic calling of the Anglican Communion.
3. The eucharistic action models the way in which God as redeemer comes into the world in the word made flesh, to which the people of God respond by offering themselves—broken individuals—to be made one body in Christ's risen life. This continual process of transformation is enacted in each celebration.
4. The sacrificial character of all Christian life and worship must be articulated in a way that does not blur the unique atoning work of Christ. Vivid language, symbol, and metaphor engage human memory and assist the eucharistic action in forming the life of the community.
5. In the eucharist, we encounter the mystery of the triune God in the proclamation of the word and the celebration of the sacrament. The fundamental character of the eucharistic prayer is thanksgiving and the whole eucharistic prayer should be seen as consecratory. The elements of memorial and invocation are caught up within the movement of thanksgiving.
6. In, through, and with Christ, the assembly is the celebrant of the eucharist. Among other tasks it is appropriate for lay persons to play their part in proclaiming the word, leading the prayers of the people, and distributing communion. The liturgical functions of the ordained arise out of pastoral responsibility. Separating liturgical function and pastoral oversight tends to reduce liturgical presidency to an isolated ritual function.
7. The embodied character of Christian worship must be honoured in proclamation, music, symbol and ritual. If inculturation is to be taken seriously local culture and custom which are not in conflict with the Gospel must be reflected in the liturgy, interacting with the accumulated inculturation of the tradition.
8. The church needs leaders who are themselves open to renewal and are able to facilitate and enable it in community. This should affect the liturgical formation of laity and clergy, especially bishops as leaders of the local community. Such continuing formation is a priority and adequate resources for it should be provided in every Province.
9. Celebrating the eucharist involves both reaffirming the baptismal commitment to die to self and be raised to newness of life, and embodying that vision of the kingdom in searching for justice, reconciliation and peace in the community. The Spirit who calls us into one body in Christ equips and sends us out to live this divine life.

15 August 1995

the Incarnation. The source of collect 591 is not Canada but *Collects for Series 3*. Since *The Collect in Anglican Liturgy* will be a standard work of reference, a second edition should gather up such corrections.

Dudley's substantial historical and critical introduction makes my little notes—at least so far they touch on the recent history of the collects—redundant. As one who from 1969 to 1985 saw much of the process of collect development from the inside, I have been unable to fault Martin Dudley's account. In particular, he does justice to the quite disproportionate influence of the Province of Southern Africa's *Modern Collects* (1972) on the English Commission's sub-committee as it struggled to develop collects in modern English which were later to prove influential in the Anglican Communion. Much is owed to a collection that our sub-committee only saw in photocopies, and which had less influence on the subsequent Southern Africa book than it might have done. Dudley's accuracy over recent events inspires confidence in the historical survey of the collect-form in English offered by his Introduction.

Dudley has no doubt about not just the convenience of the collect as indicating a focus of the day's service but also its abiding importance. He observes that 'For generations, Anglicans have learned the essential truths of the faith . . . from the collects in their annual repetition' (p.43). But an earlier remark points to a danger: on p.41 the author wonders 'if there is, for example, a clearly recognizable Anglican theology of glory (which seems assumed by the [modern] collects)'. He is right to question the responsibility that collects-drafters take on. I recall the unease I felt throughout the process of drafting *Collects for Series 3*—an unease exacerbated some years later, when I was sent a copy of Kristen Davidse's thesis from the Catholic University of Louvain, *The Collects of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Alternative Service Book 1980: A Comparison* (1982). Davidse concluded that, together with a shift in language, there had been also a major theological shift between the two books. The shift I don't regret—but it should not have slipped by without formal theological scrutiny.

A second reflection springs from Dudley's instructive analyses as to what constitutes a good collect, and his remarks about 'changes to texts [that are] frequently arbitrary and consistent' (p.41). The variations recorded by *The Collect in Anglican Liturgy* are too often a sad illustration of 'Frost's Law of Collects': that 'the quality of any collect is matched by the capacity of a Liturgical Commission to muck it up'. The collect is a precise art-form, dependent on sensitive theology, crisp expression, good rhythm, moving utterance. When a committee gets to work, some of them with other concerns, and some with tin ears, the power gets lost, the Spirit drains away. How to prevent that, I have never known: to copyright something one wants used and which is often as much the product of the tradition as one's own seems a heavy-handed way of guarding against insensitive alterations. Perhaps commissions should swear a self-denying ordinance, that they will comment upon, but not attempt themselves to amend, the work of a writer they trust, whose judgment shall be final.

Dudley has endeavoured, for the sake of history, to include notes on authorship where possible—though handicapped by the saintly anonymity with which Commissions traditionally shroud themselves. For the record,

Martin R. Dudley, *The Collect in Anglican Liturgy: Texts and Sources 1549-1989* (The Liturgical Press, Minnesota (Alcuin Club Collection 72, 1994), 368pp., US\$24.95). ISBN 0-8146-2308-5.

A naughty pleasure of mine, ever since I joined the English Liturgical Commission in 1969, has been to leave sealed envelopes in likely places where an enterprising research student in fifty years' time might come across them—nothing as scandalous as that history of the 1928 Book which legend has it fell later into unsympathetic hands and was destroyed, but little notes as to who wrote what, when and why. Nowhere has one's scepticism about so-called 'history' been so sharpened as over the collects of *The Alternative Service Book 1980*: the sources cited in the Commission's own *Commentary* are distinctly misleading, and the errors were compounded in Ronald Jasper's and Paul Bradshaw's *A Companion to the Alternative Service Book*—largely, I fear, because the principal drafter on the three-man sub-committee that comprised Ronald, Geoffrey Cuming and myself had disappeared to Australia taking his working notes with him.

As I discovered when I attempted to put together source-notes for the Australian *Alternative Collects 1985*, we collectors are inveterate 'pickers and stealers'—though mighty quick to convince ourselves that what we lifted was our own. We are also an incestuous bunch, each eyeing our neighbours' property, and our covetousness shows up in marked family resemblances between our progeny.

Now, the whole process of the evolution of collects in the various Anglican churches is open for inspection. Every liturgist will be immensely grateful to Martin Dudley for his meticulous documentation of the adaptations, blends, marriages, mismatches, creative and uncreative warpings which have made up our collect-offerings, from Latin texts of the Sarum Missal right through to the almost contemporary collects of 1989. The material is presented in four sections that cover the principal periods of activity: the Latin Collects of the Sarum Missal, Anglican Collects 1549-1929, Collects in Transition 1930-1972, and Contemporary Collects 1973-1989. Each collect is printed with its source and authorship (if known), and with its use in the various churches and books documented. The author attempts to list all the variations in text that arise as a collect is re-worked, and cross-referencing by numbers makes it easy for the reader to trace origins and study development. Indexes of first lines and keywords are a further asset—though I would have found a *thematic* index even more helpful (as, I guess, would clergy and future Liturgical Commissions). I also regret that, though the BCP collects for Saints are included, later collects for the Sanctorale have been omitted. Perhaps a second volume might remedy this.

Inevitably, in so comprehensive a compilation, there are lapses. Entry 564 doesn't record the 'correction' made by the late Geoffrey Cuming to BCP's translation from Latin of Sarum, which reads 'nourish us with all goodness', and persisted thus into *ASB*. In the Advent collect 309, the word 'visit' was first omitted by Series 3 and *ASB*.—on my half-serious objection that the word suggested Christ had only popped in for a fleeting call at

SOLOMON AMUSAN—NOL BURSAR

Yes, Solomon Amusan did get to Dublin, and was elected to the Steering Committee to arrange further IALCs. In the weekend between the two conferences, he wrote a letter of thanks, and put it in my hands. So I am delighted to add here those words of thanks from Solomon himself:

Vining College of Theology
PO Box 3
Akure
Ondo State
Nigeria

12 August 1995

Dear Friends

I run short of words to express my profound gratitude and deep appreciation for the funds for my participation in the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation and the Congress of *Societas Liturgica* at Dublin.

I am by this letter expressing my sincerest appreciation to all the donors who responded positively to COB's request. May the good Lord continue to shower his blessings on you all.

It is always gratifying to experience the life of the Consultation. No one comes to the Consultation and remains the same. There are new ideas and insights at the Consultation. From the previous ones I always went home refreshed and inspired, and I have no doubt in me that all that I have experienced these few days will have equipped me tremendously for my ministry of teaching in Nigeria; and I should not have had this opportunity had it not been for the gifts from such generous donors. This benefit will always remain with me, and I say again 'Thank you—I love you all'.

The peace of the Lord be with you.

Yours very sincerely,
Solomon Amusan
(Canon)

[The only snag that arose in the bringing Solomon Amusan to Dublin—where he was able to contribute strongly from an African standpoint—was that, although the Irish Embassy in Lagos readily gave him a visa, the British High Commission declined to grant him the five days in England he wanted to have on his way home. The High Commission's reasoning and suspicion (indeed accusations of lying) were so unnecessary, so without foundation, that, after FAXing them from Dublin without getting a reply, I am now taking the matter up with my MP. I find it offensive that our country can be so dismissive of a genuine request for a visitor's visa for academic and similar purposes *for five days*, and not even check the details on the application before declaring them a lie . . .]

This month's Publication ...

... is Joint Liturgical Study no. 32, *Worship and Evangelism in Pre-Christendom*, by Alan Kreider, the Mennonite scholar who teaches at Regent's Park College, Oxford. The pre-Nicene Church did not expect unbelievers to come to its services (except on intermittent police raids), so was there any connection between its worship and its evangelism? The issue is explored consistently from many angles.

Book reviews

Liturgical Commission, *Report on the Calendar, Lectionary and Collects, 2000 [GS 1161]* (General Synod, 1995, 259pp., £5.00, or £6.00 by post from Church House Bookshop)

The Report begins by setting out the Commission's way of approaching the task: 'the shape of the calendar of the Christian year should precede any detailed consideration of lectionary ... The Commission therefore gave consideration first to calendar principles, but then turned to the question of lectionary, and discovered that the lectionary most likely to command widespread support, the Revised Common Lectionary (RCL), was in general accord with the calendar principles' (p.5). Surprise, surprise!

So the lectionary we are being offered is the three year RCL, slightly amended: in Kingdom and Epiphany seasons to beef up the seasonal emphasis; with alternative shorter psalmody; the restoration of most 'omitted' verses; extra Creation material; more from the book of Revelation; and provision for Bible Sunday on the Last Sunday after Trinity, rather than on Advent 2.

Each year majors on one of the Synoptic Gospels, and other books of the Bible are also read semi-continuously at appropriate times. Gone are the themes of ASB. Instead we have three readings for each Sunday (plus Psalm) which are not necessarily linked thematically, though they are seasonal. In addition, there is lectionary provision for a Second Service (assumed to be, though not limited to, some form of Evening Prayer usually), and even a Third Service (assumed to be a Morning 'clergy' office, with shorter readings). The idea is that the RCL provision is used for the 'principal' service, whether or not it happens to be a communion service. The Second Service provision gives two readings (plus Psalm), but where the New Testament reading is not from a Gospel, one is provided in addition for use at Communion services. This provision for Second and Third services is designed to complement the RCL 3 year cycle.

As if that were not enough, outside the 'closed seasons' of Advent 3 to Epiphany 1 and Palm Sunday to Trinity (plus Presentation of Christ and All Saints), 'after consultation [with whom is not stated] the minister may, from time to time, depart from the lectionary provision for pastoral reasons or preaching and teaching purposes' (p.47). The minister is then free to use either packages commended by the House of Bishops (such as

those in *Promise*, and others which are in the pipeline), or to construct packages locally. It's grudging, but at least it's there!

Gone too, are the thematic Collects linked to the readings. Instead we have two Collects for each Sunday (or Festival), the second of which is a Post-Communion prayer. This allows use of a much greater amount of material, including ASB (inclusivized) and BCP (updated) as well as new material.

In the period of Ordinary time after Pentecost, the collects are attached to the Sunday titles (which, controversially, revert to 'after Trinity' rather than Pentecost), but the sets of proper readings (titled 'Proper 1, 2, 4 etc') are related to particular calendar dates (e.g. 'Proper 13 Sunday between 31 July and 6 August inclusive').

As for the calendar itself, the Christian year begins with Advent (abandoning ASB's 'Sundays before Christmas'), and, though the 'Kingdom Season' that appeared in *Promise* is still there, it is now seen as an appropriate way to end the year (with its themes being developed in a slightly different way in Advent), rather than an extension of Advent itself. Also as in *Promise*, The Presentation of Christ in the Temple has a pivotal and significant place (and is elevated to a 'Principal Feast', though it loses the title 'Candlemas' which it acquired in *Promise!*). There is a deliberate attempt to give clearer expression to the shape of the Christian Year, with Sundays 'of' a season, rather than Sundays 'after' a Feast (though Sundays after Trinity remain, as they are seen as non-seasonal time).

The Visitation of Mary to Elizabeth and Holy Cross day also get promotion—to 'Festival' status. Lesser Festivals (the next level down!) are provided with propers, but commemorations (as low as you can go and yet still feature) are not.

Group Commemorations have, on the whole disappeared, and the lectionary provision gives generally appropriate readings for, say, Teachers, followed by a list of Teachers, with additional reading/s which are especially appropriate for that particular Teacher. In the Sanctorale, some of the dates for saints etc. have changed (mainly to move them out of Lent, except for Martyrs, who are deemed appropriate for commemoration in Lent!). Helpful short biographies are provided for new Commemorations.

No doubt the whole business of who is 'in' and who is not will give the Revision Committee and Synod speech-makers plenty to chunter about for some time to come. There is already talk of the need to re-discover the art of preaching from a text rather than a theme, but it is not only in preaching that our work will be cut out. There will also be much help needed for the congregation to appreciate and prepare for what they are coming to and to be able to put the readings of the week into some wider context, both biblically, and in terms of what the church read last week, and what we will read next week.

Mark Earey