

A different kind of Ending

Another project we undertook during 1995 was a revised Order for the Consecration of a Burial Ground. This time it wasn't just the compilation of resources that was required, but rather some entirely new liturgy. At first sight this seemed relatively simple—after all nothing could be less appropriate than the only extant example we could find. But we soon found ourselves needing to clarify with the Registrar details about the 'Sentence of Consecration', and wondering whether the Bishop's job was to bless the burial ground or bless the community (dead and alive?) or both.

Training

Training has featured highly on our agenda. Following three successful training events last winter on the Service of the Word (see July's NOL), we have been preparing a training event on the Eucharist, and particularly the new Eucharistic Prayers. It has been a considerable drawback that the date for their approval seems to keep on being put back! We shall be using the new prayers as a way-in to get people thinking about various issues relating to how we 'do' the Eucharist in our churches.

Other Items

- We responded to a suggestion by COB to push for a policy on which version of the Lord's Prayer should be used in our Church Schools. After a long debate at a DLC meeting we wrote to the Diocesan Director of Education, who seemed surprised that we should even raise the issue, he promised that after he had consulted with everyone he would get back to us; we need to chase him up on that one!
- We discussed plans for an open-air service which was to be the highlight of a visit to the Diocese by the Archbishop of Canterbury; the visit went well, but we agreed afterwards that the DLC was not actually the right place for discussing that kind of service as there were too many other people and organisations that also had to be consulted.
- We sent one of our members to the Liturgical Commission's Residential Conference—he came back raising important questions about the relationship between DLCs and the Liturgical Commission; his report implied that the Liturgical Commission sees the relationship as almost entirely one way, allowing little space for contributions from DLCs to the liturgical process; a frequent refrain in our discussion was 'Where in all this is the voice of the Parish Priest?' A clear case of '5 out of 10, could do better'.
- We finished the year responding to a request for training for 'people who lead worship but who are not clergy or Readers'—which raises all sorts of issues about whether there is a definable ministry of 'taking services' or 'leading worship', and whether we should offer training for something that we know is going on but probably does not have proper authorization!

Tony Walker, Retford, Notts.—Secretary

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1996 **£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. 253

January 1996

Editorial

In the Dublin findings, published this month in Grove Worship Series no. 135, *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, edited by David Holeton, there are at three different places, and from three different sources, statements which bear upon the issues of lay presidency. No longer it seems can this matter be swept under the carpet, and that augurs well for the handling of the document due at some point from the House of Bishops and for the place of the question at the Lambeth Conference. It may be worth picking up these pointers from the Dublin material.

Firstly, the chairman writes in his introduction:

... the question of lay presidency, which has more recently become a matter of considerable tension within the Communion, has been put in a wider theological and pastoral context creating the possibility of resolving the issue satisfactorily ... (p.6)

Secondly, the group on 'Structure, Order and the Eucharist' write in their group statement (which does not carry the authority of the whole Consultation):

'II. Some have proposed that in the absence of a presbyter, the bishop might instead authorize a eucharistic celebration presided over a deacon or lay person. This solution, like the distribution of previously consecrated elements by deacons or lay people, can sever the connection between pastoral and liturgical leadership. If such persons are acting as leaders of a Christian community, they are exercising what are presbyteral functions, and therefore ought to be ordained as presbyters. The authorization by a bishop of a deacon or lay person to preside at the eucharist constitutes an appointment to office, rendering 'lay presidency' a contradiction in terms. Moreover, the sign of appointment to presidential office in Anglican tradition is the laying-on-of-hands with prayer.' (p.22)

Thirdly, the whole Consultation adopted, among its 'Principles and Recommendations' the following:

'6. In and through 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.' (p.7).

Now it not my part to advocate lay presidency. But I think those who are advocates of it may well be thrown by this curious juxtaposition of three separate findings—for they will find the Group Statement (the second quotation above) impossible, the Consultation's 'Principles and Recommendations' (the third quotation above) almost exactly what they seek (even if the Consultation did not realize what it was saying, which opponents of lay presidency may yet need to insist!), and the chairman's expectation (in the first quotation) of 'resolving the issue satisfactorily' interesting—indeed fascinating—but wonderfully ambiguous!

Let me spell out the impossibility of the Group Statement's treatment. In doing so, I hope I shall also indicate, as myself a member of the Consultation who was in another Group, that Group Statements have *not* been endorsed by the whole Consultation. In this case the Group concerned has indulged in some odd logic—and it looks as though it has done so in the interests of securing a certain conclusion, a conclusion known and desired before the argument was put together.

The first part of the odd logic is that the Statement fails to notice that there are around the world many congregations in many different social settings where a deacon or lay person holds at least some pastoral responsibility for the flock, and to have such a pastor also responsible for the provision of the eucharist would *unite* the pastoral and liturgical functions rather than 'sever the connection' between them—and this, despite the Statement, would appear often to be true of distributing elements previously consecrated also.

The logic goes on oddly when the paragraph first of all says that those presiding as lay people 'ought to be ordained' (for the assumption is that presiders are leaders of the community, and lay people are not to be that); but it then goes on to say that to give them authorization 'constitutes' ordination; and it then adds the anti-climactical addendum that the 'sign' of this would be the laying on hands. So we have a sequence of: (a) they ought to be ordained; (b) they *have been* ordained without the sign of ordination, by this mere authorization; (c) that is not how 'the Anglican tradition' does things! I am reminded of the split between those who said we should not ordain women and those who said we cannot—this is a kind of mirror image: under (a) we should not have lay presidency, but under (b) we *cannot!* The argument is a mirror image because the 'cannot' argument applied to women presbyters says that, do what we will, they remain obstinately deacons, unaffected and unchanged by the ritual of ordination performed over them—whereas the 'cannot' argument applied to lay presidency says just the reverse, i.e. that, do as little as we will in authorizing lay people to preside at communion, we have nevertheless ordained them presbyters for life with indelible orders, character, and the lot. We shall have to be smart in issuing letters of orders by post in the same envelope. Old-fashioned ordination with live contact with a bishop will become as rare as Lent ordinations are in England now. We are left to ponder the force of the mention of 'Anglican tradition', but that need not take us long—for 'the Anglican tradition' is only a statement of how things have been, not how they are to be. It is true, for instance, to say that 'the Anglican tradition' would have little truck with ordaining women or calling God 'you' or allowing lay people to distribute the eucharistic bread; but that which has not been cannot, simply on the grounds that it has not been, be told that it must not be. Otherwise no reformation, renewal, or creativity would ever have place in the church. So the Group's invoking of 'the Anglican tradition' is presumably a manifestation of defeatist nostalgia, not an heroic enforcement of a logically circular argument.

If the Group got it wrong by mistaken deliberation, the whole Consultation got it right by happy inadvertence. Here the advocate of lay presidency can say 'Hear! Hear!', though there is reason to think that a good proportion of the Consultation did not realize what a door it was opening. Look again at

FROM THE JOINT LITURGICAL GROUP NEWSLETTER The Sarum Conference: September 1996

JLG is hosting a conference to be held at Sarum College, Salisbury on 24 and 25 September 1996. The Conference will consider Worship in 21st Century Britain, and is aimed at those interested in worship, liturgical and otherwise. JLG hopes that Churches will identify and send people who are the future as well as the present members of their liturgical and worship panels. Here will be room for between thirty and forty conference members in addition to members of JLG. The conference fee will be £65. Further details will be available in the New Year. At present what follows indicate some of the areas we hope to cover.

- Charismatic traditions
- Black-led traditions
- Free church traditions
- Liturgical traditions
- Cultural diversity and the future of worship
- The bible and worship
- Ecumenism and worship
- Life cycle spirituality: personal prayer and rites of passage

DIOCESAN REPORT 10—SOUTHWELL

A Service of Ending

The most innovative work done by the Southwell Diocesan Liturgical Committee in 1995 was to produce 'A Service to Mark the Ending of a Group or Organization'.

The idea for this came from a hint dropped by our Bishop in his recent Episcopal Visitation that parishes might look at their programme of activities and see if there are some church activities that have fulfilled their purpose and ought to be closed down. So we set to design a service—not quite a funeral service, but not far from it! Our aims were:

- to encourage people to give thanks and make remembrance for all that has been achieved through the group or organization;
- to allow people to express their feelings in their time of 'mourning', whether these be feelings of relief, letting go, disappointment, or even of betrayal and being let down;
- to help people to look to the future with appropriate expressions of hope and to remember that God's work continues in new way as situations change.

We eventually produced an outline structure (with acknowledgements to *A Service of the Word!*) comprising Preparation, The Word (including suggestions for symbolic actions), Prayers and Conclusion. To this we added a compendium of prayers, hymns and Bible Readings gleaned from various sources, and made up one or two prayers of our own. Copies are available for £1 plus postage from Michael Allen, Dunham House, Westgate, Southwell, Notts. NG25 0JL.

Dear Colin

Thank you for Phillip Tovey's review of the *Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints St. John Chrysostom*. You will know of old my interest in the wording of the anamnesis, which we all know is of no small concern to yourself as well!

It is not without significance that in the introductory notes to the Liturgy, the Greek Orthodox Archbishop draws attention to the fact that he has deliberately reverted to the older reading of this paragraph, with the present participle '*prospherontes*', instead of the present indicative '*prospheromen*'. What is of further interest is that the Archbishop goes on to explain why this course of action has been taken, namely that this whole paragraph should lead up to a series of main verbs which are the congregation's acclamation, 'we praise you, we bless you, we give thanks to you, O Lord, and we pray to you, our God'.

Far be it for me for one moment to suggest that this might be a pattern that could be adopted in these Islands in any ecclesial body. But it is nonetheless an interesting line of thought.

All good wishes, Yours ever,
Kenneth Stevenson, Bishop of Portsmouth

Dear Colin

We believe that the current ecological crises are among the most important issues facing the World and the Church. We think that Christians are coming increasingly to see care for God's creation as an essential part of the Church's worship, prayer and action. We hope that living in harmony with the rest of creation will be seen increasingly as an integral part of a Christian lifestyle.

We are therefore grateful that the Liturgical Commission has increased the provision of readings on Creation found in the Revised Common Lectionary. Nevertheless we are dismayed that this increased provision still represents a reduction of what the ASB provides. We would urge that, if possible, a way be found to include a Creation Sunday as a major festival of the Church. If this is not possible, then we would ask the Commission seriously to consider at least making the creation readings mandatory on the Second Sunday before Lent, and not optional as at present proposed.

Yours sincerely,
Keith Innes, Chair, Environmental Issues Panel

ON TO THE MILLENNIUM

An important conference on Liturgy at
St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden

'Whither Worship in AD 2000?'

Saturday 15-Saturday 22 June 1996

An exploration of the state of public worship across the Christian traditions in the middle of the last decade of the 20th century, and asking the question 'Where is it going?' With the Revd. Dr. Martyn Atkins, the Revd. Dr. Paul Beasley-Murray, Canon Michael Perham, the Revd. Graham Woolfenden.

Contact: The Subwarden, the Rev. Dr. R. F. Buxton,
St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, Deeside, Clwyd, CH5 3DF
Tel: 01244 532530 Fax: 01244 520643

that Recommendation 6—its punch line is in the last sentence 'Separating liturgical function and pastoral oversight tends to reduce liturgical presidency to an isolated ritual function.' This exactly makes the lay presidency point—that it is absurd during, say, the presbyter's holidays or illness, to rake up a retired ordained man or woman from twenty miles away or more, ship that person in, hold his or her hand, and guide from behind the 'isolated ritual function'. How much better to locate the liturgical presidency where the actual pastoral oversight is at that moment, e.g. with wardens or a Reader.

So what does the rest of that Recommendation say? Well it says that it is appropriate for lay people to fulfil a series of liturgical roles, a series which does not include eucharistic presidency—but it also says its list is a selection from 'among other tasks', so the list is not designed to exclude other roles. It then says that the 'liturgical functions' of the ordained come from their pastoral responsibility—but of this too we must ask whether it is an excluding principle. Could it not rather be a succinct exemplar—implying that, *just as* in the model and agreed case of the ordained, the liturgical functions come from the pastoral, so, when lay people hold pastoral responsibility, with them too the liturgical functions arise similarly? The last sentence then enables the lay persons rather than restricting them.

Of course, if you know in advance the conclusions you are seeking to reach by perhaps untried argument, then you will be happy you have duly reached them. But if the untried argument (one with much theological and ecclesiological weight in it) proves in fact to lead to the opposite conclusion, what do you do then? I would say that it was very good news that this Consultation decided in advance that it would genuinely tackle a subject which Anglicans have always pretended was not a subject fit for discussion; and if this first such public discussion leads to oddly drafted results, then it appears there is need to tighten the arguing process, and perhaps purge our minds of the necessity of ensuring that the evidence must lead to a previously known conclusion.

And I do wonder what the satisfactory resolution will be . . .

Colin Buchanan

[Incidentally, in the place is the Anglican Communion most likely to authorize lay presidency—that is, the diocese of Sydney—the Synod has postponed the question till October or November this year.]

EDWARD KING—A MISPRINT IN DECEMBER

In the letter last month from Peter Mullins, the Clergy Training Adviser from the diocese of Lincoln, a line dropped out from the second paragraph, which completely distorted the sense, and we apologize to our correspondent. The paragraph should have read:

'[In the proposed Calendar, March, being in Lent, has been cleared of most saints.] This may have been the Commission's original intention, but it simply isn't what its proposal does. The ASB offers us ten days in March with Festivals and Lesser Festivals. Its proposal is for eight days with such Festivals (including two which they admit the Romans move elsewhere in the year and one entirely new addition) as well as other days when commendations may be made in intercessions.'

The omission of the words from 'with Festivals' to 'eight days' inclusive

attributed the policy of the new proposals to the ASB itself and failed to say anything to expound what the Commission's proposal actually involves.

A PRAYER BOOK FOR AUSTRALIA—THE SHORTER EDITION

E. J. Dwyer, the publishers, have sent a copy of the second printing of the 'Shorter Edition' of the APBA (the first printing sold out rather before it reached the shops—and this printing has been done in Hong Kong, presumably for the sake of speed). The book is in exactly the same hardback format as the full edition, but is 493 pages long as against 850, and weighs around 650gms as against over a kilo! It retains Sunday and Daily Services and the Psalter, but omits all Calendar and Lectionary materials (save Collects), all 'Pastoral Services' and 'The Ordinal'—then it tucks in at the end the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Athanasian Creed.

A REVISED LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF NIGERIA

The existing modern liturgy of the (Anglican) Church of Nigeria dates from 1983 and is a very close imitation of Rite A in the ASB. A revised edition has been published in 1995 by CSS Bookshops Ltd., 50/52 Broad Street, Lagos, in a 56 page A5 paperback format. Its major new feature is the inclusion of an alternative eucharistic prayer—the current First Eucharistic Prayer from Rite A now has a partner in the modern form of the eucharistic prayer of the Church of South India (with its Eastern type epiclesis). But there is other shuffling—Humble Access comes after Agnus Dei and the Lord's Prayer has been moved on to the BCP post-communion position.

HOT OFF THE PRESS—CELEBRATING THE ANGLICAN WAY

As we go to press this handbook to being Anglican comes onto the market. It has 256 pages, is published by Hodder, edited by Ian Bunting, and compiled in large part from and through the Grove Spirituality Group. It was originally inspired by *Anglican Worship Today*, and has been many years in gestating. It is not as lavish as 'AWT' but is very comprehensive—including a worldwide vision. Official price is £12.99, but Grove customers can have it for £9.99 in January. Full review next month.

Book Reviews

H. R. McAdoo and K. Stevenson, *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition* (Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1995, 216pp.)

This is a delightful book for which the two authors have each written a half, McAdoo on the Mystery of Presence and Stevenson on the Mystery of Sacrifice. As can be expected from these authors, there is much concentration on Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, but this is not exclusively so. They show an Anglican belief in presence without advocating any one theory, and a conception of sacrifice that is qualified by a variety of other concepts—covenant, memorial, heavenly offering. The short chapters make this an ideal book to read for a train or plane, and each chapter shows a breadth of scholarship. There is a thought-

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

You contemplate the third phase of modern English in liturgy (no masculine pronouns for God) and the possibility that Horatius may need to jump into the river again, though not without a promise to explain himself when and if he does so. I think it is because you have taken an all-or-nothing approach to phases) 1 ('you' for 'thou') and 2 (inclusive language for persons) that you are now considerably threatened by 3. The fact is that human beings have some power of decision over the linguistic forms they wish to use. Though the first stage in capitulation is invariably 'this one will not go away'—the stage you are at now, I guess—there is nothing inevitable except that thinking makes it so.

I recall the mediating position by the Liturgical Commission under the leading of John Sweet with regard to the ELLC guidelines (see Appendix 1 to *Making Women Visible* (1988)):

'What if the guidelines conflict? It appears that Guideline 2 ["Sensitivity should be shown to the need for inclusive language"] has been given tacit pre-eminence. We regard Guideline [5] ["The revision should be as faithful as possible to the original Greek or Latin texts"] as having priority over 2.'

That imperative has not changed. The Commission continued

'On balance we see a case for sensitivity but not for the total exclusion of "man" generic, or for laboured avoidance of "he", "him", "his" for God.'

So while phase 2 is accepted as far as new writing is concerned it cannot be said that it has been fully conceded at the level of principle. But what a practice? There are conflicting signs. In *Language and the Worship of the Church* (GS1115, 1994) the Commission simultaneously reasserted the Sweet position and declined to stand by it in any specific case, apart from a clearly interim backing to 'and was made man' *until it is clearer that there is agreement on a satisfactory alternative* (italics mine). Yet the Commission also recommends that 'the classical texts from the Book of Common Prayer should continue to be valued in the wider church which uses the Alternative Service Book . . . by encouraging the mixing of traditional and modern texts within one service', thereby raising a question even about phase 1.

'Traditional forms of description of God or address to God should *not* be consciously avoided or deliberately softened in use'. And is not this exactly what the ELLC programme amounts to? Yet the Commission studiously avoids criticism of ELLC, failing to draw attention to the way in which its own advice has been disregarded—even failing to register that the traditional English version of Sursum Corda ('It is meet and right so to do') neatly circumvents the real or imagined difficulty.

Yours ever,

Robin Brookes,

(Erstwhile manager of Church House Publishing)

[There seem to be more questions for the Liturgical Commission and for policy makers of synod than there are for me—COB]

The 'view from the parish' by Trevor Parkin voiced concerns over the wealth of new material coming forward, producing a reaction of uncertainty not unlike that of a big dipper. There were still doubts over material in the ASB that had for some evangelicals not been resolved. There must be liturgy that was understood and that was faithful to the scriptures, both concerns that were dear to Cranmer.

Colin Buchanan provided a succinct overview of the strength of the evangelical contribution to liturgical reform. The agenda has now moved beyond texts, in a Church of England which now has a more articulate and active laity. Evangelicals are less scared of the aesthetic, and there is more variety in worship and in teaching methods.

The initiatives of the Liturgical Commission, outlined by Trevor Lloyd, were more clearly seen against this backdrop. They work with a determination to produce liturgy that is acceptable throughout the Church, by maintaining an adherence to Scripture, exercising caution in anything that goes beyond Scripture, and emulating Cranmer's model of studied ambiguity. Following these principles, current work is taking account of

- seasonal material
- resource directories rather than full texts
- the debate on inclusive language
- a revised lectionary.

Armed with this wealth of background information, the afternoon was given to workshops which provided space for more contributions on specific areas of concern. All in all this was a useful and informative day for those concerned about recent developments in the liturgy of the Church.

PRAXIS are running two similar days that will reflect Catholic and Charismatic concerns.

Anne Barton

[It is easier for a consumer to report such an occasion than for a speaker. But there is perhaps one footnote I should add as a speaker who also led a group discussion on the communion after lunch that day. I report that some of the toughest evangelical opponents of Series 3 and Rite A were there, and their minds were concentrating on these rites rather than the six which are near authorization at the moment. In the course of the plenary discussion in the morning Roger Beckwith made a passing reference to the Third Eucharistic Prayer in Rite A, and Michael Vasey, who was the speaker in that session, replied 'But you wrote that' (referring to the famous Brindley-Beckwith 'deal'). To this Roger Beckwith replied in turn 'Ah, but that was horse-trading' (which it clearly was). No evangelical on the Commission—nor, I think, on Revision Committees—has ever acknowledged that form of horse-trading to be a proper procedure—and, if it were proper, no text could be attacked (as Rite A and I with it were attacked in the afternoon) for being in error, as the writers of it could always say 'Ah, but that was horse trading with error' and be exempt from blame. The afternoon group attacked 'sacrifice of thanks and praise' and a minor series of similar texts. There was also a famous plenary moment when a plot was uncovered not to call God 'Father' anywhere in the proposed EP3!]

COB

provoking introduction by Rowan Williams which talks of Anglican amnesia. This is a book to educate our minds and warm our hearts and so lead us to some of the deep veins of Anglican thinking, on the eucharist. The material that both authors contribute complements their other writings on the period. It deserves to become a standard work. I advise you to buy it and read it!

Phillip Tovey

George Guiver, *Everyday God* (SPCK, Triangle, 1994, 84pp., £4.99)

George Guiver, a charming lay brother of the Community of the Resurrection, is well known for his major work, *Company of Voices* (SPCK, 1988), a book with a large historical backbone but a very practical outcome for those who work at it. George Guiver has now written (following my review of Paul Bradshaw's *Two Ways of Praying*) to agree with my passing remark in the review that the study of offices is hard work for the average person wanting to learn to pray. He does more than agree—he backs up his point with his own shorter book, which had not previously come NOL's way.

The book is a delight, particularly for George's own gift of illustration (I am not clear who has done the cartoon line-drawings but *they* are not what I mean by 'illustration'). I shall return to that, but I also want to applaud the 'starting-point-from-where-you-are' approach. How does ordinary speech 'work'? How do you begin conversations? How do you dance deftly without thinking about your feet? And do you think praying is like talking to a ghost, a 'dumb invisible man'? No? So how do you 'see' God? Or 'hear' him? George will tell you—convincingly. Here is an author with all the equipment needed for talking naturally to young children (though actually he teaches ordinands—but that may not imply quite so great a distance as you might think), and the book does indeed pick up his point that starting by teaching about the origin of offices may not be the best way into forming praying lives.

Just sometimes he pushes his point a fraction harder than it warrants. I am not *quite* convinced that the general run of humanity functions in quite the ritualized way at the various stages of getting to know each other that he lays out. (It is a matter of 'What do you say after you have said "Hallo"?'—or perhaps 'after you have said "and also with you"?') But even then I concede that the distance from our practice is so slight that we can fully understand his point and start to apply it to our prayers.

Thus, for instance, he points to the extremely limited range of conversation many of us have with people who provide us with services, and writes: 'All of these things have something to tell us about knowing God. When it comes to knowing him, many Christians are stuck at the newsagent's or hairdresser's, where God is just a face. If that is so we are still at the stage of first impressions.' Only the bubbling unselfconscious extrovert will fail to identify with this.

One of the many gains that the ritual undergirding of his argument gives is an emphasis on rhythms of living, and a pointing up of the barrenness of a prayer life which does not match those rhythms. However, he is at the same time keen that our rituals should be 'Take-away prayer' (which is the title of chapter 8)—that our weekdays and our homes should be the setting for rhythmic prayers as well as our Sundays and our church buildings.

The book thus brings us to the brink of texts for daily offices, and ideally we would then be ready to try out 'CCP'—and perhaps make use of a DIY Prayer Stool as recommended on page 83.

COB

This month's publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 135 *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist* edited by David Holeton, which gives the material from the Dublin IALC of last August, with a brief Introduction by the editor. The material is of two sorts: the agreed 'Principles and Recommendations', and the group Statements which have only the authority of the groups concerned, and were still unpolished at the end of the Consultation and have been to varying degrees edited since. These Statements form 95% of the contents (the Booklet is 44 pages long, against the usual 24), and fall under the following headings (1) Eucharistic Theology, (2) Ministry, Order, and the Eucharist, (3) The Structure of the Eucharist, (4) Ritual, Language, and Symbolism, (5) Liturgical and Eucharistic Renewal.

. . . and this month's offer

is a renewed supply of the new 'Boston' essays, *Children at the Table* (Church Hymnal Corporation, New York) edited by Ruth Meyers, at £8.50 postfree from the editorial address.

. . . and that Almanack

for CCP 1996 is also still available from the editorial address for 50p plus SAE.

AN INSTITUTION IN ELY

Recently I went to an institution in Ely Diocese, interested to see the rite to be used. It was authorized in 1973 and amazed me in its contents. Firstly, and perhaps most staggering was the complete lack of Bible readings. Yes, there were elements of Scripture in the service, not least in the procession around the church. But there was not one reading from the Scriptures! Secondly, after the first hymn we went straight into the oaths. This was so anti-climactical; from the joy of praising God to legal formality. Thirdly the comments about baptism seemed rather over the top:

The parish priest shall constantly remind his people that baptism is the beginning of new life in Christ and fellowship in his Church. He shall urge that parents and godparents know their responsibilities. He shall see the children who are baptized are brought in due course to the Bishop to be confirmed by him, and encourage them actively to maintain their membership in Christ's family. Together with the people, he shall seek out those not baptized in infancy and help them forward to Baptism and Confirmation.

This may express various rubrics and canons of the church, but does it express the expectations of the archdeacon? There must be a lot of baptisms and confirmations in Ely, or there would be if clergy and laity were able to keep even half of that expectation, and that would be true for the rest of the Church of England. The bishop and clergy at the service are to be congratulated in their creating from this text a joyful service. Many dioceses have their own rite, but is it not time we stopped all this duplication of effort and provided a national service of institution?

Phillip Tovey

A (PAPAL) EUCHARISTIC MILLENNIAL JUBILEE?

The latest edition (Vol. 69, no. 6) of the American journal, *Worship*, has a lengthy essay by Thomas Reese on 'A Eucharistic Millennial Jubilee'. This picks up the papal statements of November 1994 about the coming of the third millennium, and Reese draws out the following papal emphases:

The millennium should be celebrated as a 'great Jubilee';

This celebration should be 'intensely eucharistic';

It should be a time of strengthening the ecclesiology of communion; It should also be ecumenical, with prayer for the unity of Christians;

Finally, it should have a special role for the Pope.

Apparently, there is already to be an International Eucharistic Congress to be held in Rome 'during the Jubilee year' (presumably the year 2000). Rees explores how the papal eucharist at this Congress can become the world focus for the celebration of the millennium. He sees three stages to this, reported here in summary:

1. Preparation: the readings announced long in advance; used for quiet days, meditation and focussed prayer for the celebration—the vestments and furnishings specially made in every different corner of the world and then so unified as to represent the world—and similarly with the wheat and grapes for the eucharistic elements—and a worldwide collection for the poor going on at the same time (target \$100 million, to be distributed at the Pope's discretion)—this would presumably be 'brought up' in the celebratory rite, and at the same time international bankers could 'bring up the debts that they have cancelled in honour of the Jubilee'!

2. The Actual Celebration: Christians of all colours and traditions could participate fully in the liturgy of the word, and could read the lessons, sing in choirs, and lead intercessions—the *Filioque* would be dropped—the *fermentum* (a token particle of the consecrated bread) would be sent to each of the 2,400 dioceses in the world by travelling pyx and by the speediest means (Concorde? Or FAX?), and in each the particle would be dropped into the chalice at the bishop's eucharist in his cathedral. Reese discusses whether the *fermentum* could also go to non-Romans, and, within the discussion, lets slip that to receive such a gift would be to acknowledge at least that the Pope has a special universal role—which, one may infer, might make it harder to receive.

3. The continuing Jubilee: At this point the main discussion by Reese is about the bishop in turn sending his *fermentum* to every parish, 'Thus the jubilee, initiated in Rome, would reach into every corner of the Church'. I would have thought some other, more imaginative, features of going on from the central celebration could have been dreamed up.

Do readers have good ideas? We would like to start the ball rolling.

COB

EVANGELICALS AND LITURGY

The PRAXIS day on 8 November was a chance to consider liturgy and worship post-ASB from an evangelical perspective. A gathering of some 35 people at All Souls, Langham Place, heard Michael Vasey outline the recent history of revived interest in liturgy among evangelicals, dispelling the myth of their alienation of liturgy. He set the tone of the day with a reminder that liturgy had been of major importance to the Reformers. It nonetheless remains a poorly resourced Cinderella subject for colleges and courses.