

have noticed that some congregations are not encouraged to participate fully in the liturgical drama, to interact with symbols, to use movement in ways that can focus an encounter with God. The scale of worship seems unreal and inappropriate for the physical space: half a dozen people sitting on the back rows, leaving the vicar on his own in a distant chancel. The use of symbols is timid: water poured in the font does not splash and is hardly a sufficient quantity to wet the napkin used to wipe it away from the head of the baptized; bread is a small wafer disc with little relation to bread *'such as is usual to be eaten'* (BCP).

'Worship is a reenactment of the saving acts of God in which everyone participates.' We do not ask first 'What words should be said?' but 'What will we do?' and 'How can we create a liturgy which will allow/invite participation in the ritual and connect us with the mystery?' This liturgical drama seems to have been tamed, becoming 'anaemic and predictable.' We have smoothed out all elements of conflict, challenge, doubt, fear and struggle. The signs of contradiction and the potential for surprise have been removed. We should take seriously these shadow aspects of our life. Liturgy cannot be all froth and fun.

4. The Motor Car—In for a Service

You will have read comment and seen images of the special liturgy in Coventry Cathedral to celebrate the centenary of the motor car industry. Signs of contradiction inherent in such a theme led to protest:

Worship was interrupted by a naked lady with slogans inscribed upon her flesh. She leapt up and shouted condemnation of the car. Press and television cameras were on hand to record the incident for a curious public. Vitriolic letters were received by the Bishop of Coventry and the Provost. Why? The visual symbol of an old Daimler car being driven down the aisle of the Cathedral nave seems to have raised hackles, even if it had not come in to be blessed by the Bishop.

In the sixties theologians had concluded that a sharp division between sacred and secular worlds was a false dualism. There is no separate realm of the holy: 'God saw everything that he had made, and indeed it was very good' (Genesis 1.31). God claims the whole of our lives, not just the cleaned up, Sunday-best bits. If we recognize that 'In our imperfect world the motor car has been a mixed blessing,' then that will be true of almost anything we might bring as an offering to the Lord.

John Brassington

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address: 173 Canterbury Street, Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA

Telephone (01634) 851818 or 855252 Fax (01634) 573549

Postal subscription for 1996 £6.50 (by air £9.00, US\$18.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 255

March 1996

EDITORIAL

THE SIX EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS GO DOWN

On the vote on Final Approval, to give authorization to the six eucharistic prayers until 31 December 1998, the Houses of the General Synod voted thus at around 11.20 a.m. on Wednesday 14 February:

	Yes	No
Bishops	25	10
Clergy	164	44
Laity	135	81

Thus the texts, needing two-thirds majorities in each House of those present and voting, failed to achieve the requisite figure in the House of Laity, and were defeated. The only lawful eucharistic prayers for use with Rite A remain those in Rite A. The six and all their kindred material have perished. I write whilst the impact of the event is still on me (i.e. the day after) as I suspect I shall write with greater passion if I get with it right now. I suspect I need to report the debate, attempt to discern why the texts went down (with some other side-reflections), and to ask what can now be done, or in what direction the new Liturgical Commission can go, if there is to be any progress at all.

Firstly, then, let us look at the debate. By my count 34 persons spoke—and the debate ran over from the Tuesday to the Wednesday. The chairman cannot close the debate on Final Approval, but he reduced the length of speeches to three minutes on the Wednesday. And there was no shortage of people to speak in favour, or, like the Bishop of St. Albans, to say that they thought the prayers could be much improved, but that the short-term lease of life would give us a chance to try them out. However, the opponents slowly bore their way into the situation such as to suggest by the time of the adjournment on the Tuesday that the gaining the two-thirds, at least in the House of Laity, would not be easy. The difficulty was that the grounds of objection fell into a series of quite distinct categories, some of them mutually exclusive. I have tried to demarcate these. I write in the present tense as if I were still there (and I doubt if I will ever exorcize the vividness of it...):

- (1) There are undoubtedly a few who, like Professor Arthur Pollard, would have the gravest difficulty in supporting anything which was post-1662 and threatened to widen 'Uniformity;'

- (2) There are those who object to the language, imagery, and idiom of the prayers—with more sending up of ‘silent music’ and suchlike;
- (3) There are hard-line evangelicals who, after toothcombing the texts, cannot find the atonement on the cross spelled out sufficiently strongly or in the language they desire—and, for full measure, there are also one or two who object to biblical language about ‘eating the body of Christ’ and complain about forms of words (like ‘...be to us the body and blood of Christ’), already long accepted in the ASB;
- (4) There are Catholics who are the mirror-image of these evangelicals. They see in the ‘Trinitarian’ structure of the eucharistic prayers a threat to the focal character of the narrative of institution, particularly as they recognize that exaggerated manual acts (and bodily reverences) would fit ill into texts where the work of the Spirit is yet to be invoked;
- (5) The Bishop of Birmingham adds that the prayers are ecumenically disastrous, and that nos. 1 and 3 would jeopardize our assent to ARCIC-1 on the eucharist and to the Lima text. He can cope with the rest.
- (6) There is much interest in prayer no. 5, stated to be the one designed ‘for when children are present.’ A number of members either pooh-pooh the concept or pooh-pooh the execution.
- (7) There is a cautious reaction against ‘too much variety,’ too much, it seems, for one speaker in four or five opposing them.

It is clear that any one of the above was viewed as a sufficient reason for voting against the texts in the minds of most of those who alleged them. Nor were they to be placated by the brevity of the licence requested—there was a kind of under-current around which said ‘Once they are using these texts, they will never give them up; so we must make sure they never get them.’ This, it seems to me, is simply not true: to take an example, the very recent discovery by some vigilantes that prayer no. 3 fails to address God as ‘Father’ got an airing as part of a cumulative reason for rejecting it—but that is exactly the kind of correction that could well be made at a next round of revision without depriving anyone...

It has to be said that the defeat is unprecedented, not because there have not been defeats of liturgical texts before, but because in previous cases the controversy has been known long before the final approval stage, and when the defeat has happened everyone has known why. Thus it was that the House of Laity defeated the Series 1 (1928) confirmation service in 1966; and thus it was that the House of Laity defeated first the Blessing of Oils and secondly the Reconciliation of a Penitent in 1982-83. In each case there was a single theological issue at stake; it was generally known what it was, and, when the defeat had been inflicted, all could see *why* the text had gone down. Not so this time; no-one knows what was determinative in the minds of the 81 members of the House of Laity individually, nor whether there was any single category of complaint

And yet... worship is done because that is what human beings are meant to do. ‘Rituals connect us with majesty, transcendence and awe, and with the child’s capacity to enter into the moment, to experience wonder, and to play in the universe’ (Canon Robert Warren, National Officer for Evangelism). Worship is done for its own sake, without the missionary tendency to look beyond for results.

We have explored issues raised by a concern for common prayer at two DLG events in 1994:

‘Preparing and Presenting All-Age Worship’ and ‘Introducing A *Service of the Word*.’ An attempt has been made to provide an ordered pattern of worship for family or all-age services, which might otherwise have ‘no recognizable liturgical structure.’ Such services can lose the sense of being common prayer, the action of the whole church and not just of a local group. Given structures must be strong enough to support a liturgy which demands all our energies and imagination.

The DLG is attempting to find a balance between total freedom to experiment and rigorous constraints on that freedom. Many parishes in the diocese of Coventry need to bear this message: ‘For freedom Christ has set you free: move into your freedom and express your corporate faith with the resources on offer.’

2. Too Much Explanation—Going Beyond Words

The Anglican worship tradition is embodied in a book: *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), *Alternative Service Book* (1980), *Patterns for Worship* (1989) and whatever appears in 2000. The book provides us with ‘a recognizable shape and structure to worship and also familiar texts to be used, some of which are known by heart.’ We have yet to consider how to do liturgy in a non-book and postmodern culture. Much of our Anglican worship has been swamped with too many words.

Some Christian leaders are inclined to explain everything as they go along, not just by announcing hymn numbers, but by providing a running commentary on what we are doing and why. The congregation in church is not an audience watching clergy actors—all have a part to play in this participatory drama. Too many explanations can impede worship. Might they also suggest a lack of trust in God to ‘speak’ through other media than words?

Would not our liturgy be more distilled and focused through ‘the suppression of every useless word’? Can we go beyond words by using movement and dance, music and silence, colour and symbol? It is possible to move the furniture or the people in church, to change focus, to use the symbols all around in stained-glass windows, pictures and banners, cross and candles, eagle lectern and stone font. Other symbols can be brought in from outside church: earth, flowers, water, clothing, autumn leaves, gingerbread doves and a Chinese dragon kite.

Symbols can resonate at the deepest levels of consciousness without being defined or explained. Chris Brain declared that his Nine O’Clock Service was an attempt to ‘reestablish ritual in this generation, bringing back symbol against the mechanistic, reductionist, rational world we live in: bringing back artists to express things that are inexpressible in words...’

3. Liturgical Drama—Everyone Participates

In our continuing work with parishes who are conducting a Worship Audit we

PRAXIS DAY ON LITURGY AND COMPUTERS

An encouragingly large number of people (40+) gathered at St Matthew's Westminster early in January for a day arranged with much care by Michael Perry (the Tonbridge and Jubilate one). Two staff workers from the Christian Copyright Licensing scheme told us about new software (USA now, UK soonish?) which would give you words of songs, and also record your usage of them (making reporting to CCLI much easier), and also gave notice of the long awaited licence to photocopy music (probably based on the number of copies you are likely to make of any one item). Evidently extensive research has shown that 84% of churches would like to be legal: almost 100% are currently not.

We also heard about the daily 'thought' on Teletext (p.687, Channel 4): the Rev Adrian Benjamin welcomes comments and ideas (0181 445 4464). Richard Steele (Communications officer for the Blackburn Diocese: 01772 718012) was upbeat about the Internet, and the new ChurchNet UK service provided by St. Martin's College Lancaster. He did not shirk the problems, but clearly wants Christians involved. He'd dialled up 'liturgy' on the worldwide web, and found 8,611 replies.

Tim Anderson and Ruth McCurry told us about Worshipmaster and the Catholic Liturgy Disk respectively. There are two main differences between them. Worshipmaster allows free choice of text and song/hymn material within very broad boundaries; the Liturgy Disk tells you what you can do on any one Sunday, and gives limited choices. The other difference is that Worshipmaster won't be published in Windows form because Hodders have pulled the plug. The Catholic Liturgy Committee have put vast resources into helping Mowbrays do theirs. The meeting reckoned that the C of E should get its act together regarding electronic X, and not allow publishers outside Church House to set the terms (Hodders have electronic rights to ASB etc till 1997, and are doing nothing).

The day did much to raise the awareness not only of possibilities for parish clergy with computers, but also of the questions surrounding electronic publishing facing the Church as a whole. Colin Buchanan is now armed and ready for a possible Synod debate this year. Thanks to PRAXIS once again.

Jeremy Fletcher

DIOCESAN REPORT 13—COVENTRY

Some of the issues raised in this report are more personal than others, but all have arisen out of the work of the Coventry Diocesan Liturgical Group. The departure of Michael Sadgrove 'Provost of Sheffield' and the arrival of Chris Burch to be Precentor and Diocesan Liturgical Adviser mark a new era for the group.

1. Common Prayer—Rare Experiment

'We see our task as evangelistic in its widest sense, reaching a jumble of cultures whose language and presuppositions are remote from ours.' The logo of our DLG is a filled chalice set against the mercia cross. This is linked to the logo of the decade of evangelism with the words 'Worship and Mission.' Both are seen as integral in the life of our whole Church.

sufficient to have secured the assent to the prayers of another nine of the House if that one factor could have been addressed. Instead the six prayers were peppered with very mixed grapeshot, and it is impossible to tell whose weapon, and which bits of the grapeshot with which it was loaded, inflicted the fatal wound...

So what went wrong? First of all, let me make it clear what was *not* wrong. As a member of the Revision Committee which took two prayers from Synod in January 1995 and turned them into six, I do *not* concede that we had 'too many.' The Synod had seen five in July 1994; it had asked the House of Bishops to introduce up to five; it had expressed disappointment when the House only brought two; it had broadly welcomed the six from the Revision Committee in July 1995, and had declined at Revision Stage to table any amending motion in respect of any of the six; and it is highly likely that, if any reduction had been attempted at any point in 1995, that would have provoked a greater outcry on behalf of the one under the knife than any actual outcry of there being too many. For what no-one still knows is what fans would have emerged from their corner for each one under threat, just as would happen if it were proposed to reduce the existing four eucharistic prayers in Rite A down to two. Many parishes could agree the principle, but there would be great dismay when it came to the point of excising any particular prayer. If the Synod had agreed even unanimously that it wished to reduce the number of the prayers, there would have been bitter controversy over each one as it came up for removal.

So, again I ask, what went wrong? I offer three more or less administrative reasons, two people reasons, and an underlying theological question. The Synod was unpredictably afflicted by all these coming together, and was left in tatters. I doubt if it could all have been predicted; I know I myself never foresaw it; and I do think that it was a combination of different factors nearly as unlikely as a total eclipse of the sun which brought the texts to defeat. Let me spell them out.

The first 'administrative' reason lay in Synod's Standing Orders. The liturgical standing orders had been altered after the Ministry to the Sick (and 'Blessing of Oils' etc.) went through Synod in 1982-83, but they had never really been tested. In July 1995, it was clearly a very heavy demand to ask that, for the sake of minor verbal amendments, the texts be referred back to the Revision Committee (with all the delays that would imply), and people held off. It is difficult to know whether, if they could have moved amendments in full Synod (as in Spring 1979), they would have made more attempts. Paradoxically, in the event, if there had been a second Revision Stage in November 1995, the timetable would not have taken longer, the incoming members of Synod would have had a chance to participate in revision, and final approval would still have come up on St Valentine's Day. Ah, well, hindsight was ever wise. (But perhaps in July nobody wanted to revise the text, but simply to affirm it—that is the more obvious explanation of there being no motions, but look where *that* leads...)

The second administrative nonsense was the whole business of the progress

from Revision Stage to Final Approval straddling the election of a new Synod. Perhaps we all thought that, *au fond*, it would be the same Synod, little changed. Perhaps we were lulled by that uncontroversial Revision Stage to think the texts would simply sail through as the latter stages of the ASB texts did at Final Approval. But the newcomers were more numerous, more suspicious, and more synodically muscular than in our hearts we anticipated.

The third administrative factor was the delay from November to February (fully explained in earlier issues of NOL). What that did was to remove Final Approval from a tidying up, ten-minute job, which the new Synod would have been invited to put through in totally routine way on the day after the Queen inaugurated us, and instead to turn it into a cockpit job, in which new members who had already flexed their combative muscles had a chance to let rip, and those who had not made their maiden speeches, detecting that the debate could not be closed, used the chance to throw in their particular objections and get in some sparring practice to increase their synodical confidence.

Three administrative problems; yes, and two people ones. The more serious of these was the behaviour of members of the 1990-95 Synod. Having asked for the prayers, and having got them, having submitted suggestions to the Revision Committee (or not), having declined to take any delaying or altering action at Revision Stage, they yet turned and complained at Final Approval. (And, one might add, the ten—yes, *ten*—bishops who voted against came from a House which had cleared the texts in June 1995, had muttered about later excising in July, but had not tabled any motions for that Revision Stage, had then declined to excise any prayers in October 1995 and again in January 1996, had then, as a House, brought the prayers to the General Synod for Final Approval, only to find that if no more than two bishops who voted in favour had in fact voted against, the House would have defeated its own business.) My own mind inevitably goes back to the revision of Rite A in 1978-79, when we had over 1,000 amendments coming to the Revision Committee—the members of Synod got stuck in: then we handled over 300 amendments in full Synod; and at the end of it we had near-consensus. Then the Synod got stuck into the process—this time the Synod shrugged at the process and came divided to the end of it.

The other people question was the newcomers to Synod. Somehow they were not helped to understand the process or to be sympathetic to starting at the Final Approval stage. I think this is because most of us had thought that, if the texts came unscathed through the Revision Stage and through the final ratification by the House of Bishops, then it would be a routine matter to get the Synod's rubber-stamp. Hindsight suggests that more steps should perhaps have been taken to bring the vast number of new members into an understanding of the timetable and process, perhaps by a different kind of document introducing the texts, putting them into a larger context. But I gladly confess that is mere wishful thinking, and, granted the other problems identified above, the new members who voted against might well have done so whatever blandishments

BOOK REVIEWS

Marchita B Mauck, *Places for Worship: A Guide to Building and Renovating* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, imported by Columba, 1995, pp 71, no UK price given.)

Professor Mauck, a sometime Consultant to the North American Catholic Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, has written a straight-forward and succinct guidebook for those in Catholic parishes in the United States who may be planning to design and construct a brand new building or reorder an existing structure. The book assumes a North American context and draws many examples, with photographic illustrations, from the parish church of St Pius V, Pasadena, Texas.

The booklet offers much valuable, down-to-earth advice which is obviously relevant and transferable to other settings. It demonstrates the practical outworking of principles enshrined within the United States Bishops document *Environment and Art in Catholic Worship* (1978). If this booklet is anything to go by, then the Bishops' document itself is worth consulting. The basic philosophy embraced is that, whenever possible the celebrations of the people of God should determine the design of a building. Two brief quotations will convey the flavour (flavor?) of this useful and stimulating booklet: 'the purpose of the building is to support and nurture the spiritual life of the assembly'; and 'The building process [is] an occasion for the community to reflect upon the rites it celebrates as the foundation for understanding its identity and mission.' Would that Anglican parishes further afield rebuilt or reordered more often!

Richard Hines, North Thames Ministerial Training Course/Oak Hill College
Hannah Ward and Jennifer Wild (compilers), *Human Rites: Worship Resources for an Age of Change* (Mowbray, London, 1995, pp 328, pb, £16.99)

It would be very easy to be snootily dismissive of this book of pastoral liturgies. On first viewing in the book shop I saw some of the categories listed ('A liturgy for the celebration of your menarche'; 'Coming out of the Baptist Ministry') and instantly pigeonholed it into 'off the wall.'

Reading it has changed my mind. The book does not claim much for itself, simply that it is a compilation of liturgies written by a host of people for specific occasions. There are therefore many acknowledged weaknesses, but the book does serve to inspire and give ideas, as the introduction hopes. The overall theme is that of change, and there are liturgies for the classic rites of passage, as well as other events (emigration, abortion, AIDS, healing, homelessness, etc). Some of the material is excellent, some is very weak, and much of it I would not use in its current form.

The great strength of *Human Rites* is that it encourages the pastor, carer, friend, or minister, to think of a liturgical response within a pastoral situation. I can now more clearly imagine offering a liturgy to people of have undergone huge traumatic change, or who are contemplating such a move, and these liturgies show how it has been done on specific occasions. Use it as a set of resources; gain an insight into other people's worlds (there are some moving liturgies here, as well as some very strange ones, to my eyes), and be encouraged to work with people liturgically within your pastoral care.

Jeremy Fletcher

WRINKLES IN THE LORD'S PRAYER

The *Church of England Newspaper* reported as follows on 2 February:

New Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer has been given an overhaul by Italian Catholic bishops. If the Pope approves their changes, which he is likely to do, then Catholic churches in Italy will be using the new-look prayer from next year. It is expected that other churches around the world will follow suit. The new version changes the word 'hallowed' to 'glorified' and asks God not to abandon us to temptation, rather than not lead us into temptation. The bishops claim that this is closer to the original text and no longer gives the false impression that it is God himself who tempts us.

If this has any implications for English-language versions, then we are all have trouble ahead. Anyone who wishes to see what has happened with these sensitive lines of the Lord's Prayer in modern English will find a record in COB's *The Lord's Prayer in the Church of England* (Worship Booklet No.131, January 1995).

Quite independently of the above, though aware of it, I tabled a question in General Synod as follows:

To the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission

In the light of debate in July 1994 about a modern language version of the Lord's Prayer, and of a changing ecumenical situation, and with a recognition that the draft Initiation services going shortly to a Revision Committee contain only an ancient form of the Lord's Prayer even in the context of modern language services, what steps does he propose—either by separate decision or within the context of revising any one service—for bringing the Church of England to a single consistent modern ecumenically friendly text of the Lord's Prayer running through all new services to be used after 1 January 2001?

Because the Question-Time ran out of time—and the chairman of the Liturgical Commission was coming on late in this particular session's agenda—I received only a written reply, which meant I could not ask any supplementaries.

In July 1994 the Synod endorsed a recommendation that

'both the modified traditional form and an agreed modern version of the Lord's Prayer should be used in public worship in the Church of England.'

The question of which modern version is agreed could, potentially, be decided afresh with each piece of liturgical business coming before the Synod in the next five years. It would clearly be undesirable for different modern versions to be agreed in different synodical processes. We are looking into means by which the Synod could be enabled to make a once-for-all decision about an agreed modern version and on the 'mix' of modern and traditional use.

I think the Commission (which will presumably be a new Commission) will have to move fast—and I only hope the Vatican does not move at all, or ELLC holds the Italian bright ideas at bay...

COB

were offered them.

I suggested finally that there was a theological problem. I am not sure I can even identify this, but it is something to do with continuity. Each of the earlier stages of revision (except, perhaps, the first) involved a reflection upon existing rites, a seeing how they doing, a putting out of questionnaires, and a revising with some confidence that we were pretty near to where the people wanted us to be. I think in 1978-79 they were also very keen that we should have a catholic-evangelical *rapprochement*, even if that meant caution. Few would deny that this time the Commission was asked for new texts, nor that they have produced good new ones, nor that there have been enthusiastic responses from many many quarters. Since 1989 all over the country parishes have been trying out the new texts: I have heard one on the Radio 4 Sunday morning service—I have heard of one used at an ordination! But something somewhere in the inner guts of the liturgical life of the cautious Church of England has not been open to this assault. Indeed, it has been interesting to find that prayer no. 6, which was produced from within the Revision Committee and never had the *fiat* of the Commission itself, appears to have suffered from virtually no assaults at all. Could this be because of this continuity factor? I confess I am sad if it is so—but I have a suspicion it is. The Church of England at large was not quite ready to rally to the innovatory, and so the consensus did not appear. Yet I would not place too much weight on this factor—the matters I raised earlier appear both more random and more damaging.

So the question arises: where do we proceed from here? There would appear to be a range of four logical possibilities:

- (a) we do nothing, but just leave the existing Rite A eucharistic prayers hanging around;
- (b) we do a minor revision of the above, but still on their 'Hippolytan' basis;
- (c) we do our utmost to get some or all of the frustrated six back onto the agenda;
- (d) we devise totally new prayers which are more 'way out' than the defeated ones!

The defects of all these are visible at sight:

(a) and (b) ignore all the creative work done, and leave the provision of virtually monologue prayers unchallenged, and open to all the criticisms and complaints of the decade and a half of use. If an attempt were made to make them more responsive they would probably start to look like no. 6 in the six, and would come under the (c) category.

(c) is an extremely difficult programme to undertake. As no-one knows why the six were rejected (see above), to attempt to get any wording identical or close to the text of any of the six prayers is to invite an angry opposition, saying that the vote of Synod was being ignored. The six are currently all *equally* rejected, and rejected in all their parts, within the total package, and it is

procedurally improper and thus counter-productive to attempt to resurrect them synodically.

(d) is frankly scary. If the Synod will not eat bread, would it be helpful to feed it cake? There may well be a case for more inventive, even more daring, designs for eucharistic prayers, but they could only be credibly considered once the Synod had gone for the six or something like them. At the moment there would appear to be no charter for even the most fleeting bold thought.

So, I ask, what *is* to be done? And my answer is that we are leaderless, rudderless, directionless and in swirling cross-currents *unless* we can find a way to rescue some agreed texts or parts from the six. My proposal would be that the July sessions of General Synod should include a 'liturgical conference,' this would perhaps unemotionally enable the least-liked elements in the six to be identified; and they could then be excluded, and the rest could be started again. The minutes of the House of Bishops in January show that Rite A revised is about to start its synodical processes, and the salvaged prayers could be added to them, and a unified package result. Any eucharistic prayers in the package would then go through the full revision process, and the whole text could be ready in good time for the year 2000. What would have been lost would have been the opportunity to use the texts legally for two years, prior to giving them their final shape, but the possibility of getting new texts into lawful play by 2000 would still be there. And if Rite A revised comes to Synod without any visible eucharistic prayers attached, well, see my next paragraph but one below...

Such a conference might well (with the right preparation and leadership) also tackle large questions of principle, questions hardly handled in the public process of the texts. Do we think abandoning Hippolytus is a good idea? Do we think the epiclesis should be moved down the prayer? What form should it take? How responsive should such prayers be? And what overall length? And how flexible and open to local creative insertions? And should a batch of such prayers all operate on identical principles or is structural variety in order?

What is clear is that, if the Synod agenda does not include something of this sort, then Rite A revised will arrive at Synod without new eucharistic prayers attached. Many Synod members will then try to write in their own at Revision Committee. There is plenty of precedent for this (even with the six!), but it is a long-stop procedure, not a norm nor an excuse for abolishing the wicket-keeper. So the Commission, the House of Bishops and the Standing Committee of Synod have got to function fast, decisively and proactively to rescue anything. I very much hope soon to be able to report soon that they have done exactly that.

Meanwhile, what does this imply for the proposed Grove Booklet—Worship No.136, *Six Eucharistic Prayers*? Obviously, Trevor Lloyd and I and the Company have lost our chance of a best-seller. But the Booklet will still come in April, and we now have good hopes of including the final text of the prayers. There cannot be an official Booklet containing them now, and Church House Publishing is granting us rights, which will ensure that the texts are readily

available round the world. The official Booklet was scheduled to cost around £3, so we represent good value—though clearly the texts cannot lawfully be *used*, and a legal synodical health warning will be printed in each copy!

I am glad then to be able to draw your attention to a happier matter. In January 1997 the Grove Booklets will celebrate their Silver Jubilee. The Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW) intends both to celebrate this Jubilee and at the same time to address the future by holding a residential conference at Swanwick. It will run from 10.30 a.m. on Monday 6 January to 3.30 p.m. on Wednesday 8 January 1997, thus taking maximum advantage of two nights in residence. Its title—still subject to fine-tuning—will be 'Evangelicals and the Future of Anglican Worship.' Most of the input will be 'in-house'—i.e. from Grove Booklet authors. The GROW sub-committee planning it are very keen that liturgists from 'across the board' should come and should engage with evangelicals as they grapple with issues of both principle and practice. I am also able to announce that there will be no 'Evangelical Anglican Leaders' Conference' in Westminster for two days next January—the organizers are skipping a year, and reconvening for Lambeth year, i.e. in 1998. The EALC organizing committee has known of the Swanwick plans and commends the Swanwick conference to the constituency.

The anticipated cost of residence is £69, with slight reductions for advance booking and for being an NOL subscriber. Full details will come with a brochure which we hope to circulate with the April mailing. But this advance notice is to enable you to get the date into your diaries, and to start putting pennies into your piggy bank (or to approach your diocese or whomever about your 1997 CME grant). It would be splendid if every DLC in the country could send someone.

Colin Buchanan

PS: In my (qualified) review of *Celebrating the Anglican Way* last month, I failed to mention that it is obtainable from Grove Books Limited (or any Grove Books agent, such as I am myself) for £9.99 (post free in Britain). I had thought this price was an opening offer only and I wrote in uncertainty about the closing date for it, and the nature of any ongoing offer. I apologize to the firm and to potential customers—and have to say that, even with my very specific qualifications, I reckon it is a very good buy indeed at that price.

Production note: the keen-eyed will see that NOL has now followed the new format of Grove Booklets. We hope you like it.