

we tried. Are all Secretaries overworked, or are they just as inefficient as I am? No replies. We finally tracked down one local diocese with good ideas, and many topics which correspond to ours. Don't let's get too centralised, but when it comes to revising services, who is there in the centre who can collect, annotate, compare, inspire? Why do so many good ideas get wasted?

What is any Diocesan Liturgical Committee best at?

If we could discover that, we could test our own agendas to find out what is being duplicated over the country, and only spend our time on the things which have been received with the most enthusiasm, or where no one else has blazed a trail.

Workshops—we have done quite well here musically. Lots of people have attended, and discovered different kinds of music, or just enjoyed themselves. As a result, our Taizé team organize a service three times a year, so that we can worship with that special music in its own context—plus silence, plus lots of candles—with a minimum of words and a maximum of listening.

Worship—we could have done a lot better if *training* were taken seriously, and our liturgy workshop hadn't been undersubscribed. We cancelled it. Training is the buzzword in business, and most of it is probably wasted. But in worship there is a lot of good practice around, which could be shared (I speak as a lay person who worships regularly in three different buildings)—but the laity are dependent upon the clergy for masterminding the pattern of services. I see that in the Winchester diocese, *all stipendiary clergy under the age of 60 are required to attend at least one In-Service Training Course per annum*. Good. When will it become compulsory for other dioceses?

Music—I suspect that the music in liturgy is always the poor relation. But in terms of Liturgical Committees, there is scope for helping. We have plenty of ideas, but have majored on helping organists. This is not because we believe that the organ is the only instrument of worship, but our resources are limited, and one has to start somewhere. The Wakefield diocese have also run an organists' scheme, and a good idea is worth continuing.

Many parishes do not have a trained organist, and many organists are too humble to insist that the parish should help in their training. We offer to put the organist in touch with a good teacher, and we help to pay for the first ten lessons. The PCC needs to approve the scheme, because they share in the costs. The responsibility for the organ does not rest with the volunteers who found themselves playing the organ, but should be seen as part of the important part of MUSIC AS LITURGY.

Katherine Venning, Secretary

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

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

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

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

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 251

November 1995

Editorial

In the recent (and very valuable) book by Brian Davis, the Primate of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, *The Way Ahead* (Caxton Press, Christchurch, NZ)—the following is recorded:

[At our General Synod in 1987] One of the amendments resulted in the only example of non-gender inclusive language in the book. Synod bowed to those who wanted to retain the male pronoun in one of the scriptural sentences prior to the Confession in the first eucharistic liturgy. "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life" was accepted, after strong debate, in place of the Commission's offering. "Out of love for the world God gave the only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life". (p.101)

This incident will ring with echoes to all those who have followed trends in liturgical English in recent years. The language passed from 'thou' to 'you' in the address to God between 1966 and 1968; it passed from 'man' 'mankind' to 'person' and 'humanity' between 1973 and 1983; and it started to nibble away at masculine pronouns for 'God' soon after inclusive language for people had been established. These changes, creating three successive phases of modern English in liturgy, have happened fast. Indeed, it is only with the coming of *A Prayer Book for Australia* in July this year that the Australians passed officially into the *second* phase of the three uses shown—and the English are still (in the ASB) in the first. How close, how threatening, then, is the third?

It has to be conceded that the second phase has well arrived in virtually all English-speaking places (or to be accurate, English-writing places), and it is one of the levers hastening the ASB to the end of its days. No one will again draft 'love and serve all men' or 'For us men and our salvation'. The transition has not always been easy (David Frost had a story of a Mayor of New York who, being PC, ordered the holes in the sidewalk to be entitled 'personholes'—and I found myself the other day havoring on the edge of ordering a 'ploughperson's lunch'): but it has happened, and it has happened without vast inroads being made into traditional forms of belief.

The third phase is being held at bay by our Liturgical Commission. Thus far they have retained 'he', 'him' and 'his' in their drafting, and there is thus some reason to expect that our texts from 2001 will still be holding the third phase out. However, ring-fencing England (or even the United Kingdom) against linguistic fashion may not prove easy—and I am myself, as one who resisted the *second* phase when steering Rite A through Synod in 1979, a fair warning that resistances can weaken over a period of time. Horatius may sometimes jump in the river or even defect to the enemy whilst the bridge stays undefended in place—and the invaders then get into the city.

So look what is piling up. The international (i.e. 'ELLC') text of the Gloria in Excelsis we were using at the Cambridge conference ran '... and peace to God's people on earth'. It is OK—until you realize that its new wording ('God's') is chosen to get us away from the exclusive (and no doubt theo-chauvinist) 'his'. We are told that a whole Bible translation has been built on this principle in the United States. Certainly an international Statement such as we composed in Dublin has to be pretty careful on this score—though there is an interesting exercise going on (and the six new eucharistic prayers in the Church of England are part of it) in which we ask whether feminine similes—or sometimes metaphors—can be used about God, without our having to treat God as 'substantially' female or unisex. I doubt if we can get out of it by following Tom Wright in the Bible exposition he gave to Synod in 1991 in which he called the Godhead, the Father and the Son, 'he'—but the Holy Spirit 'she'. I only wish we could get out of it that way, as the language would always then be at our disposal to say whatever we wanted to say and to translate the New Testament with relative ease. If there *is* a grass-roots move towards it, please write in and let us promote it. But I fear it is a vain hope.

For the problem is, strictly speaking, located in the English language. We may find fairly easy substitutes when the human race is under discussion (even David Frost has been persuaded to write 'Blessed are they who have not ...' in Psalm 1 in place of 'Blessed is the man who has not ...'). We can also go lax and inconsistent on singulars and plurals and get away with 'If anyone thirsts, let them ...' and suchlike. It feels sloppy—but it does still communicate.

But we cannot lapse into unthinking plurals with God—and therein is our problem.

The New Zealand debate with which I began this editorial was actually, I take it, a debate between a full translation of John 3.16 and an inadequate one. The text their Synod was being offered could not say '*his* only Son'. The '*his*' is there in the original. It binds Father and Son together. It undergirds what is being implied in the verb 'gave'. So it is vital to a full appreciation of the teaching. But apparently the sense '*his*' cannot be conveyed in a gender-neutral way—so under-translation ('the only Son') alone is left. I have not seen the new version of the Bible mentioned above of which rumours reach us from America, a Bible that is in PC English throughout—but I am not sure I want to. For I fear it must be under-translation, circumlocution, or simple evasion of the sense in every line. I am tempted to ask the devotees of this style whether, if I prefer to read the New Testament in its original Greek, even then the text must avoid any suggestion that God is masculine—and, if so, is the text to be tampered with till it says not what Luke and Paul wanted it to, but instead what some modern Christians want it to say?

I venture to say that I do not view myself as a theo-chauvinist. When I speak of 'God' *simpliciter*, I do not insist on using the masculine ('Father' and 'Son' are slightly different!), but I do need to use a *singular*. I am very ready to use a gender-neutral singular personal (third person) pronoun and its cognates. I do not think it crucial to be gender-specific at every mention of God; but I do want to be able to be specifically singular, referring to the holy one, the only one who is one alone—and thus far the

DIOCESAN REPORT 8—ROCHESTER

The major event of the year for us was our day conference on 'Baptism and Confirmation—Growing in Discipleship'. With Michael Vasey of the Commission as our 'keynote speaker' we were able to engage with some of the proposals about the future of the baptism rite itself, as well as the wider issues about initiation, adult catechumenate, preparation, infant communion and parish baptism policies—many of these issues being taken up in workshops. We were also able to get a taster of the CPAS *Hands On* video course.

With a hundred or so participants numbers were down on our last day conference (which attracted 200 to a day dedicated to All-Age Worship), but with a subject like 'initiation' less likely to pull in the crowds, we were well pleased. It was particularly encouraging to see so many lay people there, who were involved with baptism preparation or with determining policy, and who had come to play their part in debating the wider issues and being better informed.

On the same theme, we (through the offices of our Chair, COB) have been working with the Bishops in the Diocese to produce a set of guidelines about the practicalities of Confirmation services to help local clergy, and to bring some diocesan consistency. A 'standard' diocesan 'Order for Confirmation' is a further possibility, with the same aims, namely to help rather than to straitjacket.

On the committee itself we have seen some vigorous debate about the Diocesan Music committee (there is some shared membership) and whether it can or should attempt to embrace the whole breadth of church music (and still command the confidence of all practitioners), or whether it would be better to allow 'contemporary' music to be catered for elsewhere.

The autumn will bring round our annual morning or lunchtime mini-conferences, which this year will be an opportunity for sharing of information about official and unofficial resources that are available or in the pipeline.

And finally ... we are exploring the possibilities of closer working links with our neighbours in Canterbury Diocese.

Mark Earey—Secretary

DIOCESAN REPORT 9—DURHAM

The advantage of doing a quick flip-through of old copies of *News of Liturgy* before writing this report is that one can find out how many other committees are doing the same as we are. I compare this with a *cri de coeur* from Michael Vasey at our recent meeting (reference the Bishop's request that we should revise the Diocesan Service of Induction):

'Liturgical Committees in each diocese waste too much time revising services. We should have services which are centrally authorized and produced, including some which are radically different. We could start by asking other dioceses if they want to unite in producing something.'

Where are you all, out there? All these Eager Beavers, doing a splendid job, but duplicating each other's work. Not long ago, Michael Vasey came back from PRAXIS talking about **Networking**. He produced a splendid map showing which dioceses should combine in sharing information. So

set out in both the traditional form, and other modern English ASB version. At the oblation in the eucharistic prayer, this translation has 'we offer you your own from your own'. There are some subtle points made on this in the British translation (p.xv) which reads 'offering you your own of your own'. I have found this a fresh translation which brings the Liturgy to life. Indeed the move to good modern English shows the Orthodox liturgy to be something living, rather than looking like a fossil. This translation is another great help in our appreciation of the Divine Liturgy.

Phillip Tovey

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF THE SHAPE OF THE LITURGY

Dom Gregory Dix's book *The Shape of the Liturgy* has been continuously in print now for 50 years. The community of Elmore Abbey decided to mark the fiftieth anniversary of publication by organizing the Gregory Dix Memorial Awards, an essay competition which it was hoped would stimulate interest in liturgy amongst non-specialists. Several hundred enquiries resulted in over sixty people submitting completed essays on a variety of liturgical themes. On 5 August 1995 a day of celebration was organized at St. Margaret's church, Westminster Abbey, in commemoration of Dom Gregory's achievement, at which the winning essayists in the competition were presented with their prizes.

In the morning there was a solemn sung Eucharist in thanksgiving for the institution of the Holy Eucharist and in memory of Dom Gregory Dix, at which Canon Donald Gray, the rector of St. Margaret's, presided. In place of the homily the Abbot of Elmore read, from *The Shape of the Liturgy*, the passage beginning 'Was ever another command so obeyed?' (p.744).

A picnic lunch was provided in the beautiful surroundings of the college gardens for some two hundred participants by 'The Coffee Club', who are responsible for catering in the Westminster Abbey precincts.

After lunch the Bishop of London presented the prizes to the award winners, and spoke of the deep influence of *The Shape* upon his own thinking and studies. Judged anonymously, the awards committee had trawled up a varied catch of winners in their net. The twelve recipients of awards included representatives of both sexes, the ordained, religious and lay states, and the Anglican, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist and Roman Catholic denominations.

Following the presentation of the awards the memorial lecture was given by the distinguished French liturgist Pierre-Marie Gy, OP. Entitled 'Re-visiting Dom Gregory Dix after fifty years', it contained a record of Père Gy's own memories of his meeting with Dom Gregory, and an overview of continental reaction to the publication of *The Shape*. It also examined the principal themes of the book, mentioning some scholars who have sought to elaborate or criticize its ideas in the subsequent fifty years. Père Gy's own evaluation of Dom Gregory was that while he was not always historically accurate he was a scholar 'with an exceptional wealth of insights' and also 'a mystagogue, that is someone who introduces new and older members of the people of God into the mysteries.' This combination, Père Gy believes, is something 'greatly and permanently needed in the Church.' It is intended that Père Gy's lecture will be published in the American journal *Worship* early in 1996.

The day of celebration, which many people have said was a particularly joyful occasion, ended with a solemn celebration of First Vespers of the Transfiguration, sung in Latin by a joint choir of Benedictine monks and nuns from Elmore, Douai, Prinknash, Belmont and Edgware abbeys.

Simon Jarrett, O.S.B.

English-language offers me in the singular only gender-specific pronouns. So I am stuck. If masculines (and, come to that, feminines) are forbidden me, then I am without the pronoun I need for God; my use of language is impoverished, and I cannot say what I want to say. And it is worse than that—the language I use in speaking about God needs to be rich and versatile beyond all other speech, and instead my range is reduced to zero, and the ease of presenting the good news that I covet is departing out of reach. That which cannot be said in formal prayer is presumably also out of court in all informal and unpremeditated speech and in semi-formal preaching? That is going to require quite an army of inner censors to keep us orthodox.

But, of course, in the past I turned tail and ran when the others did, and have long since ceased to oppose what I have called above the second phase of modern English. You may well be justified in awaiting my equal pusillanimity in relation to the third. I half-promise not to keep silence if I get reconstructed thus—and attempts at reconstructing me (or; better, the English language) will be welcome in these columns.

Colin Buchanan

Footnote: I was elected to the House of Bishops, and thus the General Synod, by the Southern suffragans, for another five-year stint. I thus hope to continue in the Church of England's synodical life (and editing NOL) to the turn of the millennium (and we all know when *that* is). Members of the existing Liturgical Commission elected to General Synod included: Trevor Lloyd, Michael Vasey, Jane Sinclair, Michael Perham and Molly Dow. Kenneth Stevenson has, of course, joined David Stancliffe and Pat Harris amongst the diocesan bishops who sit there *ex officio*.

PRAXIS

The 1995-96 Programme of PRAXIS was set out last month. One clarification which should be made is about the day in London on 'Liturgy and Computers', which, whilst it is staged by COB, is not being addressed by him. The input will come from Tim Anderson and Michael Perry (the Tonbridge one). This is on 11 January at St. Matthew's Westminster. This corrects the impression in the PRAXIS brochure and the offprinted flyers. For more information and booking procedure contact PRAXIS, St. Matthew's House, 20 Great Peter Street, Westminster, London SW1P 2BU (tel 0171-222-3704). This correction is issued in the interest of higher attendance. It should be a very illuminating day.

PROGRESS WITH THE SIX EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

The House of Bishops met on 16 and 17 October, and among its tasks was that of determining the text for final approval in Synod of the six Eucharistic Prayers which were provisionally approved in July. It will be recalled that in July there was a warning given in Synod by the Bishop of Bristol that the House might yet choose to exercise fairly ruthlessly its final powers of settling the text to be brought before General Synod at its first session on 28 to 30 November—in other words to go far beyond verbal smoothing and excise one or more of the prayers which came from the Revision Committee and went undented through Synod in July. NOL is glad to report that, in the event, the House resisted the temptation to put a

blue pencil through whole prayers and contented itself with the following:

- (a) accepting the tiny drafting requests of the Steering Committee;
- (b) deleting the optional section before the eucharistic prayer:

We celebrate together the gifts and grace of God.

We take this bread.

We take this wine

**to follow Christ's example
and obey his comand.**

- (c) adding one or two tiny smoothing changes of its own.

Thus the six prayers were to go to the General Synod for final approval around 29 November. When they do, they will require a formal two-thirds majority in each House, a procedure which involves walking through the doors to be counted. If authorized they will come into use with Rite A very quickly. They will then be in use until 31 December 2000, and in the five years of authorization will be reviewed and revised to take part in the revised Rite A order which will succeed the present ASB use.

However, the best laid plans . . . And these have gone at least marginally agly. It appears that the chair and the vice-chair of the House of Laity decided that it was just arguable that the House of Bishops had done something serious to the doctrine of the prayers, and were also conscious hat a new House of Laity would be electing a new chair and vice-chair in a few weeks time, and they wanted to be fair to their putative *successors*. So they asked for the texts to be delayed till the February session of Synod, which would give their successors the chance to ask for a separate reference to the Convocations and the House of Laity.

NOL cannot but express mingled amazement and dismay—amazement, because (as readers will recall) *no* efforts to alter the texts were made at revision stage in Synod in July; so they can hardly have been viewed as controversial then. And the limit of the House of Bishops' amendments in October is shown above, and they can hardly be viewed as doctrinally significant. So it looks as though a quite unnecessary and unexpected doctrinal scruple has arisen for no very good reason. And we profess dismay, because until now it has been the House of Bishops which has registered doubts about having six prayers, and the rest of Synod seems to have been saying 'Get on with it'. If the leaders of another House are prepared to hold texts up over what appears to be a mistaken scruple, then the Bishops will almost certainly feel less incentive to 'get on with it' on another occasion.

Grove Books was about to announce that, subject to the General Synod's authorization, the January Worship Booklet, no 136, would be *Six New Eucharistic Prayers*, by Trevor Lloyd and Colin Buchanan, giving a general introduction to the whole package, including a statement of the principles upon which the Commission drafted the prayers it originally wrote, and a succinct commentary on each prayer. This cannot now happen and the Worship Booklet which was going to be an 'extra' this Autumn is delayed until January, as no. 135, *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, edited by David Holeton, giving the material from the Dublin IALC. This will take its place in the series. *Six New Eucharistic Prayers* will now follow, probably as the 'extra', as soon as the texts are authorized (probably Februry at best). Watch this space.

(washing hands (!), orientation, posture, other ceremonies, and amidst 'endings' the kiss . . .).

The final chapter becomes exceedingly practical, including discussing how to combine 'cathedral' and 'monastic' patterns and spirituality. It is topped out by an appendix with actual proposed formed forms. These are for morning and evening; they have abandoned continuous reading of scripture, and are restrained with psalmody, and derive from the recent provision of The United Methodist Church in the USA.

The book is a very good buy for thinking praying laity, and I for one will regularly commend it.

COB

The Divine Liturgy of our father among the saints John Chrysostom, (OUP, 1995, ISBN 0 19 110012 9, pp.95).

This is the official translation of this venerable liturgy for use in the Greek Orthodox Church in Great Britain. It also includes hymns for Sundays and great feasts, and some other services. It is a most welcome volume with the Greek and English texts facing one another on opposite pages, which helps when you want to examine both texts. The service is translated into modern English, with God being addressed as 'you' throughout. Questions of inclusive language have been addressed, e.g. 'for our sake' in the Creed, but humankind has been rejected for *philanthropia* which is translated as mankind (p.6, c.f. p.10, p.15, p.18, p.19). The preparatory service is not included in the translation, as it was not intended to be a service book for clergy. It is a text for laity, and as such is very helpful. The fresh translation of the Creed and Lord's Prayer results in yet another version of the Lord's Prayer in modern English, a very undesirable situation for the whole (if fragmented) church. Hopefully one day only one version will be used by all churches. Also I had not realized before that the Creed is from a liturgical source, not the text of the council, and thus is 'I believe' rather than 'we believe' (as now in the ASB). Nevertheless this volume is much to be welcomed, and will be very useful for those of us who go occasionally to Orthodox worship, both in England and while on holiday in Greece.

Phillip Tovey

NOTE: Archimandrite Ephrem, the translator of the England English version reviewed above, has produced three pamphlets as background material to his translation. These are: *Liturgical English* (12 pages); *Surcum Corda: The meaning of a Dialogue* (12 pages); *The Lord's Prayer: Notes on a Translation* (8 pages). These each cost 50p and are obtainable from the author. The one on the Lord's Prayer declines to use the Western Latin tradition as a basis, but picks up the biblical Greek text, which is normal liturgical use for the Greek Orthodox, and thus gives us 'debts' and 'debtors'.

The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, (The Australian Antiochian Orthodox Diocese, 1995, ISBN 0 646 25440 5, pp.66).

It is rare to have the possibility to review two translations of the same text, but the Australian Antiochian Orthodox have also been translating their Liturgy. This has been independent of the British translation, and in this version we only have the English text. Everything is in modern English, and as David Frost has been the translator, it is to the high level we might expect. There are both similarities and contrasts between these two versions. This translation also uses 'mankind' for *philanthropia*. The Creed uses 'of one Being with the Father' and 'for us men'. The Lord's Prayer is

Liturgy: The Story of the Revision of its Rite and Consecration Prayer (OUP, Cape Town), a very careful review and analysis of the pressures and politics which led to the 1924 liturgy in South Africa—a liturgy which became definitive in 1929 and then was incorporated into the 1954 South African Prayer Book. The book ideally should be read alongside Ronald Jasper's edition of Frere's correspondence—and it is an echo of another era to find at its front acknowledgements of Maxwell, his original supervisor, and of Ratcliff, presumably writing in his copper-plate hand from Cambridge.

In the 1960s Peter was engaged in bringing 'Parish Communion' wisdom into a very reactionary Provincial anglo catholic churchmanship and he had a formative part in the moderating rites produced from the Province in 1969 (the year he came to England). Of course I always viewed him as a man of great discernment, for he wrote one of the best books on disestablishment of the twentieth century . . . At Oxford he gave himself to his students, focussed on biographical studies, and gave the Bampton Lectures in 1983. Liturgy was not now strongly in view. He was always restricted by a diabetic condition. But he was a man of insight and foresight and of true Christian humility.

COB

Book Reviews

Paul Bradshaw, *Two Ways of Praying: Introducing Liturgical Spirituality* (SPCK, 1995, 140pp. £8.99 also published by the Abingdon Press, Nashville)

A study of daily offices, if it is more than superficial, tends to be hard work for the average reader, and certainly less interesting than comparable work on the eucharist. All the more reason therefore why we should be grateful to a notable scholar, who writes with his own scholarly undergirding yet sets out to popularize an area where few except scholars are tempted to explore. Because it is meant to be popular, its conclusions and practical applications have considerable street credibility, but paradoxically that means that the interest in the book will tend to lie further back, and in particular to analyze the handling of the 'two ways' of the title.

The two ways are the ways often described nowadays as 'cathedral' and 'monastic' ways of using daily offices. The titles and the distinctions they imply are, I suspect, relatively recent (there is no hint of it in Ratcliff's chapter on 'choir offices' in *Liturgy and Worship in 1932*); but Paul Bradshaw has here disentangled the two ways with great clarity and with a fuller listing of the *differentia* that I think I have seen elsewhere, and his book would be very welcome for that first chapter alone. It would be interesting to see if anyone can demonstrate that any of his distinctions is in fact illusory, but, failing that, I shall reckon the case is made . . . (It is not the part of a reviewer actually to repeat here what the chapter says.)

The further chapters are a concise exploration of the origins of both the contents and also the standard devotional attitudes related to offices down the centuries, with back-reference to the cathedral/monastic distinction. There is much help on psalms, a discussion of Bible lections (perhaps not enough on *lectio continua*), and a quick tour of 'actions'

LITURGICAL REVISION 1995-2000

As we go to press, the first round of Synod documents has arrived. One of these (GS Misc 459) has this above title of the quinquennium. We reprint below the second half of the document.

The Present Position

12. To sum up, at the present time (November 1995):
 - (a) A number of policy guidelines have been agreed by the General Synod (July 1994—appended to this paper as Annex 1);
 - (b) Six draft Eucharistic Prayers are in the later stages of the Liturgical Business procedure and may be expected to come to Synod (in a form agreed by the House of Bishops) for final approval;
 - (c) Two other items of Liturgical Business ('Initiation' and 'Calendar, Lectionary, Collects') have been generally considered and stand remitted to Revision Committees (which will begin work in January 1996). Copies of the reports on these two items have been sent to new members of Synod.

The Future Programme

13. A committee has been set up (chaired by the Bishop of Guildford) to oversee publishing arrangements for Liturgy in 2000. That committee will begin work early in 1996 and may be expected to bring reports to the Synod for guidance and decision as its work progresses.
14. There are underlying policy decisions relating to Christian Initiation pressing on the Synod (a number of diocesan synod motions on children and communion are pending). The House of Bishops is expected to bring a report to the Synod in July 1996. The report *On the Way* is essential background reading to such a debate. Further liturgical proposals to underpin a catechumenate process may then follow.
15. The Liturgical Commission is well advanced with proposals for rites of reconciliation. When these are introduced to the Synod is a matter for the House of Bishops and it is possible that there may be a 'take note' policy debate before the process of liturgical authorization begins.
16. The House of Bishops has signalled its intention to issue guidelines regulating the practice of 'Extended Communion' (GS 1082 and GS Misc 452). This will involve the authorization of a rite by the Liturgical Business procedure: such a rite may be introduced to Synod by the House of Bishops of some stage in the course of the quinquennium.
17. The Liturgical Commission is working on revision of other parts of the ASB. The Liturgical Business procedure requires these to be introduced to the Synod by the House of Bishops and the timing is a matter to be decided by the House. It may be expected however that there will be a steady stream of Liturgical Business extending throughout the quinquennium. This will include proposals for the future status of the remaining Series 1 and Series 2 services (Series 1 Burial, Series 1 Marriage and Series 2 Baptism and Confirmation).
18. There will also be the need for a decision as to whether the existing form of the ASB (and other authorized services) should enjoy any period of authorization after December 2000. In 1980 the Series 3

and Series 2 communion services were given an additional five years of life in parallel to the ASB, but the Synod declined to extend that period beyond 1985. A similar decision about the existing form of the ASB 1980 will be called for from the Synod towards the end of the quinquennium.

Conclusion

19. The new Synod comes into being midway through a process of liturgical revision. New members are encouraged to obtain and read the papers referred to in this note (a list of which is given in Annex 2) and to acquaint themselves with the Liturgical Business Standing Orders and the text of the Canons on liturgy. As further general background reading the pamphlet *Public Worship in the Church of England* (6th Edition, October 1994) may be useful. Earlier reports from the quinquennium 1985-1990 are referred to in *The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium* (GS Misc 364). To obtain these or for any further information on the background to the current process of liturgical revision, enquiries should be addressed to the Secretary of the Liturgical Commission (Mr. David Hebblethwaite) or the Secretary General.

HORRIFIC MISPRINTS

Our time-pressured treatment of the six new eucharistic prayers has led to two really appalling misprints—one in June, which went unremarked till November; one in October which has stimulated some passing verbal sally from everybody who has written to us about anything at all. Despite any rumours to the contrary, we have a passion for accuracy, and dutifully document our disgraces.

The one in June came in the Acclamations in the fourth prayer. The printed text was as follows:

Dying you destroyed our death;
Rising you destroyed our life;
Lord Jesus . . .

One idly wonders if it got copied out and used anywhere. We duly repent . . . We actually know better.

The one in October referred to the fifth eucharistic prayer. In the course of discussion on page 7 we managed to say:

. . . we may not rely too glibly upon the word "filth".

'No indeed' chuckled our merciless correspondents 'we may not rely upon it at all'.

That must be the end of that correspondence—any apparent misprints hereafter are deliberate to keep you on your toes.

Next month's publication . . .

. . . is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no. 33, *Worship in Early Christian Egypt*, by Maxwell Johnson. This study is modelled on no. 9 in the series, John Baldovin's *Worship in Ancient Jerusalem*, and the author, whose own special interest is Sarapion, wrestles the scattered materials into an impressive unity.

. . . and that Almanack

for CCP 1996 is available for 50p plus SAE.

A RAP—'JO'BURG JIG'

THE CHURCH AND THE NATIONS by Graham Kings)

God the Father forms his people
from out of the nations to bless the nations;
Jesus the Christ saves his people
from out of the nations to bless the nations;
The Holy Spirit draws his people
from out of the nations to bless the nations;

Abraham called
from out of the nations, the nations are blessed;

Moses leads
from out of a nation, a people oppressed;

David fights
against the nations, the people assured;

Isaiah speaks
to lighten the nations, the people restored.

Jesus dies
betrayed by the people, for the people;

Jesus dies
pierced by the nations, for the nations.

Jesus raised
the people remade, the nations reproached;

Paul proclaims
the people reshaped, the nations rejoice;

John sees
the people redeemed, regathered from every
tribe, tongue, people and nation.

Source of the Church,
Desire of the nations;

Head of the Church,
Judge of the nations;

Breath of the Church,
Light of the nations;

Father, Son and Holy Spirit,
renew your Church to bless your nations.

Note: This was written during the consultation of the Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion held at Johannesburg 2-7 September 1995.

IN MEMORIAM—PETER HINCHLIFF

Peter Hinchliffe died at the end of October, perhaps not well known in this country, or not as well known as his person and scholarship deserved. Peter had two lives of scholarly eminence, being Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Grahamstown in his native South Africa at the age of 32, then leaving it all and coming to England when he was 40 in 1969 and starting again. He then had three years as the secretary of the old MECCA (Missionary and Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly), a Council which became the BMU of General Synod (they had to be more careful about the order in which they arranged *those* capitals) whilst he was with them. Life as a Church bureaucrat did not suit him well and he became Chaplain and Tutor in Theology at Balliol College, Oxford, where he achieved mild fame as that echo of a bygone era, a theology don who tutored his own students in every discipline within theology that they might be pursuing. He became Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in 1992 and recently reached retirement age.

Peter's contribution to liturgical scholarship began with his original doctoral studies, published in an edited version in 1959 as *The South African*