

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 256

April 1996

EDITORIAL

CLEARING UP AFTER THE SIX EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS GO DOWN

The defeat of those six eucharistic prayers is hardly news this month, but the task of clearing up is only just beginning. The *Church Times* published all six on 29 March along with a shortened version of the long editorial I wrote last month and they are all well into the arena. Grove Books weighs in this month with a Worship Booklet No 136, *Six Eucharistic Prayers as Proposed in 1996* Trevor Lloyd and I are the editors, and it is not the Booklet we originally planned; and that is not only because we are writing in sorrow rather than optimism.

No, the very opportunity to publish the prayers has changed our use of space. We have added to the six prayers (so set out as hardly to incur a page turnover!) the material on 'Eucharists when Children are Present,' originally written by the Commission for the report to Synod in July 1994, GS1120. It is here very slightly abbreviated to fit the available space, but the changes are of the order of putting 'BCP' for 'Book of Common Prayer.' Trevor Lloyd and I have written three short introductory chapters and a closing two pages of commentary on the six prayers in turn, and that, with the official material in the middle of the Booklet, completes 32 pages in all. Page 2 carries the classic legal health warning:

The publication of these prayers does not directly or indirectly imply that they can be regarded as authorized for use in churches.

I am often asked in what circumstances the prayers can be used. The legal answer is 'Nowhere—unless you are in a Local Ecumenical Partnership, in which case Canon B.44 might be employed to rescue a eucharistic prayer or two.' But we have heard of the first queries for texts from overseas, and presumably ships at sea and shuttles in space are beyond the limits of the Worship and Doctrine Measure.

I raised last month the need for us to find what in the corpus of six prayers might be viewed as uncontroversial, and might thus provide a core for a new start. I am now informed that the Standing Committee of General Synod are unlikely to find time for an informal conference such as I had advocated—though I retain my view that they have been facing a crisis, and owe it to themselves and to the rest of us to devise a procedure for recovery of some initiative in

tee of the Australian General Synod to seek a ruling. His statement includes a careful account of where the issue has reached in Sydney, with mention of one other (unnamed) diocese being concerned also, and he has referred the following questions to the Tribunal:

1. Is it consistent with the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia to permit or authorize or otherwise make provision for
 - (a) deacons to preside at, administer or celebrate the Holy Communion;
 - or
 - (b) lay persons to preside at, administer or celebrate the Holy Communion?
2. If the whole or any part of the answer to Question 1 is YES, is it consistent with the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia for a diocesan synod, otherwise than in accordance with a Canon of General Synod, to permit, authorize or make provision as mentioned in Question 1?

However, there has been a response from Sydney diocese. 25 members of their Synod, including two regional bishops and the Dean, have petitioned the Primate to lay a different and wider set of questions before the Tribunal (and apparently he has no option but to do this). They have included in their questions not only lay presidency, but also petitions for the dead, reservation of consecrated elements, and manual acts in the eucharist which go beyond the provision in the BCP. No comment is needed here at the moment, but it will be clear that goose and gander may yet be vying for the sauce.

- (b) Meanwhile the spotlight of practice has turned onto Armidale diocese. There Bishop Peter Chiswell, persuaded of the illegality of 'extended communion', has been authorizing, permitting (or otherwise making provision for!) deacons to preside at communion—and there are women deacons as part of this. One extra little twist is that Bishop Peter Chiswell is himself one of the three bishops on the Appellate Tribunal.

There is clearly more to come. Watch this space.

COB

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address: St Mark's Vicarage, 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

relation to liturgical revision.

However, I am now assuming they will not do it, so I have attempted another initiative in the name of NOL! We have been in touch with all the Diocesan Liturgical Committees and have asked them to ask their own diocesan representatives in the General Synod House of Laity which way they voted—and why. In one case—London diocese which has no Liturgical Committee—I have written direct to the representatives myself.

The first reports are coming in, and I shall hope to give an interim summary next month and a comprehensive survey of the voting of the whole house of Laity the following month. None of this is hacking into secret votes—all the members who voted walked ‘through the doors’ and could be plainly seen. And if any new start is to be made, then the Synod needs to know exactly why 81 members of the House of Laity voted ‘no.’ The first returns suggest an element of those opposed to the whole process—i.e. those itching for some form of near-uniformity, possibly in a near-1662 format. There are also letters and responses coming in from round the country of those who are infuriated by the blocking vote—not least from those concerned with the two very specific requests to which the Commission was deliberately responding; one for prayers for use ‘in the city’ and the other for prayers for use ‘when children are present.’

Meanwhile I find myself in the midst of the Revision Committee on ‘Initiation services,’ a Committee which is being chaired by John Hind, the Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe, and the Steering Committee is being led by David Stancliffe, Bishop of Salisbury and Chairman of the Liturgical Commission. Whilst a ball-by-ball commentary can hardly be delivered, it is in order to report that thus far a large amount of effort has been addressed to the ways in which parents of infant candidates are to be interrogated, with no small passing concern about the structure of the rite (some of the moral requirements of baptism have passed into the ‘commissioning’ after baptism in these proposed rites). The Committee is due to work hard in the last week of April and first week of May and then be near (it is hoped) to completing its work.

Another personal note: I have just been persuaded into debating (alongside Michael Perham, I believe) against two representatives of the Prayer Book Society on the SPCK London premises at 6pm on Thursday 4 June. Do come and join the fun.

Colin Buchanan

P.S. A non-liturgical footnote—it is a great relief to see a certain namesake (but no relative) of mine dropping behind in a certain presidential race.

effrontery and its consequences the break with Rome in the sixteenth century and the snapping of the fingers at the resultant excommunications issued against us by ‘Majority Christendom’—and that those who are heirs to such colossally independent decision-taking can never now develop a conscience which says ‘although we took that sixteenth century decision—and although we are not now repenting of it and bowing the knee to Rome—yet we do not think we can take other decisions about our patterns of government and life without the goodwill of Rome, and we are going to treat certain areas of potential decision taking as not only off-limits, but actually *ultra vires*, on those grounds.’ The correspondence about our rights and powers as the C of E continues as yet unfinished, for all my conviction that I have the better argument...

However, it is perhaps time we caught up with the lay presidency issue. A round-the-world view provides spasmodic and occasional surfacing of the issue, and I do not know of any recent developments in, for example, the Southern Cone of South America. Readers of NOL will be able to turn back to my discussion in January of the treatment of the issue in the Dublin inter-Anglican Statement on the Eucharist. I think that what that revealed was two different kinds of development at one time—firstly, that the issue can at least be discussed and debated, and we are not going to suffer any longer from the (degrading) ‘Mr. chairman, I propose that we waste no time on what is not an issue at all, but instead pass to next business’. I report this with some feeling, as my own hope has always been (as with so many other issues) to get the weight of arguments for and against properly heard; and it has been a very long, slow and uphill task. The second kind of development the Dublin Statement revealed was the (concomitant) relatively immature state of the discussion. Suppressing an argument leaves much of the reasoning in frozen infantility, and the chaos of thought on the issue which Dublin displayed was strong evidence of that.

In England, it will be recalled that the issue is before the House of Bishops, and the House is due—perhaps even this year—to provide a statement which reflects on the relative role of presbyters and laity in their celebrating together the eucharist. The House of Bishops has been taking some care to be properly briefed, and I would expect the arguments to be more fully weighed in their prospective statement than the *obiter dicta* of the groups at Dublin allowed.

But for most practical purposes, it is all eyes on Australia. As far as we can discern from their Church Press, the state of play there at the beginning of April is as follows:

- (a) Sydney Diocesan Synod drew back from the brink of decision at its October 1995 meeting and did not, as had been expected, send the issue to the Appellate Tribunal, the highest Church court, the place where a decision as to its compatibility with the constitution would be tested. However, the Primate, the Archbishop of Melbourne, himself then took action. He was aware of the issue arising elsewhere in Australia (see (b) below), and was asked by the Standing Commit-

son could be made with the Jewish practice of reading Adonai for the divine nature or with St Matthew's Gospel's reverential periphrasis in replacing 'God' with 'heaven'—an idiom that may reflect Jesus' own use.

48. Christians always need to be aware of the dangers of anthropomorphism; God is to be imaged neither as male nor female cf. Deut 4.16. Some popular objections to these movements in liturgical language reflect naivety about the nature of religious language... A certain obliqueness in some central liturgical texts may help the church to understand again the allusive character of religious language.

In the event the Liturgical Commission has recommended one change to the language about God in the ELLC texts; this is a return to '*his* only Son' in the Apostles' Creed, where the reference is to the Father's relation to the Son. The Liturgical Commission remains firmly committed to using male pronouns for God in its own drafting. Surely few will doubt the judgment that 'there must be a very strong presumption' in favour of using common texts in the liturgy—or that the ELLC texts are better at many points than their ICFT predecessors.

Yours

Michael Vasey, Durham

Dear Colin

Lay Presidency of the Eucharist

No-one disputes that every Eucharistic Community has a right to a President. No-one disputes that this Presidency ought to be coupled with pastoral responsibility in normal parochial circumstances. But the tradition of the church is that the president should be a presbyter, and in episcopal churches—and the C of E still remains one at the present, just about—the presbyter owes his ordination to the bishop, is licensed to his cure by the bishop and shares his cure with the bishop, as the typical rite of institution makes plain. Historically, he is President of the Eucharist in the stead of the bishop, a presidency he lays aside when the bishop appears.

Even what I have said so far will probably be agreed. The question is whether a bishop can properly devolve his archetypal presidency on a layman. As this flies in the face of all mainstream Christian practice, what we are *really* arguing again about is the right, indeed ability, of the Church of England to make a departure with no reference to Majority Christendom as represented by the ancient churches of the East no less than the church of the West.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Pickard, Northampton

LAY PRESIDENCY

The last letter above prodded me into replying to my old sparring partner Frank Pickard about what he says we are *really* arguing about, i.e. the right and ability of the Church of England to take major independent decisions 'with no reference to Majority Christendom...' In my reply I retorted (as I always have to opponents of women's ordination) that no modern decision we can take can ever rival in its

NOTICE-BOARD

Durham Diocesan Liturgical Committee write in asking for 'a subsection called *Network Information*,' suggesting that short notices asking for help might come in brief compass under such a heading. So here is the 'Notice-Board'—and underneath is the notice they want displayed.

Amazingly Durham DLC ask for help re Institution services—and ask in these terms: 'Have other dioceses revised this service? If so, this diocese would be pleased to hear about it...' It makes NOL think that perhaps we need a database listing of Institution services.

Sarum College are staging a residential 'Workshop on Pastoral Liturgy, Personality Type and Human Development' under the overall title of 'Liturgy and Communication' from Tuesday 7 May to Friday 10 May. The overall cost is £90 (non-residential £65), and bookings should be made (soon!) with Linda Cooper, Sarum College, 19 The Close, Salisbury, Wilts SP1 2FE (Tel: 01722-332235, Fax: 01722-338508).

And it is not too late to go to either of these following day conferences:

Rochester Diocesan Liturgical Committee (with support from Canterbury DLC) annual day conference 'Worshipping in Tune with Heaven: Planning, Leading and Sharing in Music in Worship.' Main speaker: Geoff Weaver, Director of Studies RSCM, on 'Expanding your musical horizons—from Taizé and Iona to Africa and Asia'—workshops cover a wide range of musical styles, philosophies and activities (Wrotham School, near Sevenoaks 10-4) on Saturday 20 April 1996 (send for brochure to NOL's editorial address (or phone or fax); the cost when booking in advance is £2 per person, paying on the day £3).

Movement for Reform of Infant Baptism (MORIB) annual National Conference on 'Baptism and the Great Commission' with main speakers the Bishop of Stockport and Canon Richard Giles, Parish Development Officer of Wakefield diocese (Holy Trinity Church Centre (by the Cathedral) Coventry) 10-4 Saturday 27 April 1996 (details from MORIB Conference 1996, 24 Geldart Street, Cambridge CB1 2LX).

Send in *your* notice-board items.

EVANGELICALS AND THE FUTURE OF ANGLICAN WORSHIP

The brochure about this should be enclosed with this NOL (at least to subscribers in Britain). The cost will be £69 (with up to £9 off), and the dates are 6-8 January 1997—the place, Swanwick. We will be saying more in future months (and you don't have to be a paid-up evangelical to come—if you have an interest in liturgy, come on that basis). Bookings and other queries to Mrs Judith read, St James' Rectory, Great Cheetham Street East, Higher Broughton, Salford, M7 0UH.

WORSHIP 2000: CHARISMATIC AGENDA

PRAXIS Day Conference on 14 March 1996

About 70 gathered at St Matthew's Westminster, London for the second in the series of three one-day 'Worship 2000' events organized by PRAXIS this year. On this occasion we were given the opportunity to attend to issues raised by worship in the charismatic wing of the Church of England. The day began with two vicars reflecting on the significance of Charismatic Renewal for worship. Susan Hope, a vicar in a UPA parish in Sheffield, identified some general trends in the work of the Spirit within worship: an enhanced intimacy, immediacy and intuition, along with the use of the body and testimony. She likened the charismatic frustration with liturgy to the experience of being asked to read a love letter to the beloved when the beloved is present. Drawing upon Suurmond's book *Word and Spirit at Play* she emphasized the importance of 'play' in charismatic celebration, along with the theme of the involvement of our full humanity within worship. She was followed by John Leach who gave eight reasons why charismatic worship needs liturgy, arguing, for example, that liturgy need not be seen as a cage, restricting worship, but rather as a framework for worship in the Spirit.

Michael Vasey and Bishop David Stancliffe, representatives of the Liturgical Commission, then responded to these presentations. As well as inditing the ways in which the Liturgical Commission was developing liturgical provision, they raised issues related to the expression of popular piety within worship. Michael made the point that music and hymnody have developed historically in the 'gaps' between the regulated liturgical text (BCP), often, as in the case of evangelical hymnody, as popular devotion in argument with the liturgy (in many ways the enormous proliferation of charismatic hymnody follows this historical trend). Bishop David raised the question of how we ensure that our worship avoids self-concern and instead becomes genuinely sacrificial, thereby offering the world a vision of wholeness. Both welcomed the charismatic emphasis of worship as essential to our life in Christ, and lamented the lack of commitment by the Church of England at large to invest time and resources in the teaching of worship and liturgy.

The afternoon session was more of an open forum, permitting an exchange

The chapters are embellished with quotations from the scriptures and classic authors, and, I suspect, the book was intended to be read more slowly than is likely in this reviewer's life. NOL would be glad to publish a more profound review from anyone who can claim to have read it truly slowly and at least twice.

COB

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin,

I had intended to respond before now to your November 1995 editorial on a 'third phase' of modern English liturgical language in which male pronouns for God are avoided. In the event Robin Brooks takes up the matter in his letter in the January 1996 edition. Can I make three points in response.

Firstly, I think Robin is correct that one needs to avoid rhetoric of an all-or-nothing approach to questions of language. At a PRAXIS consultation on this subject Raymond Chapman spoke helpfully of language as a self-regulating system which liturgists have to negotiate before usage has settled. The argument of *Making Women Visible* did its best to resist the straitjacket of a single ideological approach to language.

Secondly, Robin is equally correct that the Liturgical Commission has gone to considerable lengths to avoid contested terms for human beings in its new writing. (Although some of the most difficult cases noted in *Making Women Visible* have yet to occur in new rites.) Bearing in mind the fate of the Alternative Eucharistic Prayers, your readers will understand that a Commission in creative mood (may it have the courage to continue!) has little incentive to cause needless offence.

Thirdly, Robin criticizes the Liturgical Commission for accepting the ELLC texts while itself defending the use of male pronouns for God. This seems a bit hard. It is in the nature of the search for common texts that one must ask at some stage not, Is this exactly what we would want? but, Can we live with this? *Language and the Worship of the Church* (GS1151, 1994) is surely right to give high priority to agreement between churches and across continents. Who would thank us if after thirty years we now begin to use different texts from Roman Catholics, Methodists or other Anglicans? Beyond this the Liturgical Commission gives positive reasons for being able to live with the caution the ELLC shows towards using male pronouns for God:

47. In deciding whether to adopt these changes it may be helpful to note that acceptance of a particular change does not necessarily involve acceptance of the ideology that may have motivated some of the proponents. Some will view the avoidance of pronouns for God as stylistically odd and affected, as setting up an unnecessary confrontation with Scripture and as unsustainable in liturgical prayer and personal discourse. It is important to be clear that there is no suggestion here of departure from the classic terms of Christian orthodoxy. It may be that the adoption of a more oblique and reverential way of referring to God in classical liturgical texts could contribute to a recovery of the mystery of the divine nature. A compari-

of marriage, with a three-fold designation of marriage as a *natural* sacrament (instituted by God), a *covenant* sacrament (a symbol of the community of grace established between God and Israel) and a *Christian* sacrament (as revealed by Jesus). What makes a natural sacrament a specifically Christian one is 'the Jesus-relationship of the baptismal consecration which incorporates a Christian into the Body of Christ,' or, in this sense, 'marriage in the Lord.' Regrettably, it does not sufficiently engage with the historical Protestant stress on marriage as a creation ordinance, nor on marriage in the civil or non-Christian spheres. However, its exposition of 'sacrament' is sufficiently broad-based for it to be helpful in exploring the Christian dimensions of marriage in the non-Roman context. It made me aware of the rich theological and practical resources we have to draw on in helping couples to make sense of their experience of love, and so of the potential of marriage preparation as initiation into Christian commitment. But the book leaves me with an unresolved tension: I warm enormously to the stress on 'marriage in the Lord' and the rich theological insight which opens up for committed believers. But what of those who, at this stage, do not have such a commitment? So, I am driven back to creation and the traditional Anglican stress on the causes for which marriage was given (in whatever ranking), to which the Church witnesses as God's will for society. This is 'natural' *and* Christian rather than natural as distinct from Christian.

David Kennedy

Charles Miller, *Praying the Eucharist: Reflections on the Eucharistic Experience of God* (SPCK, London, 1995, pp 116, £7.99).

This is what would traditionally be called a 'devotional' book written by an Anglican vicar with English and American experience, and a leaning towards the BCP which must, I judge, have been instrumental in 'forming' him. The chapters deal broadly with main sections of the eucharist—including an introductory one around the Collect for Purity, another on the Collect ('Collective Prayer'), two on the word, one on song ('Exultation'—with the Nicene Creed within it), one on intercession, one on penitence, one on thanksgiving (with some concessions allowed here to modern rites), and one on 'homecoming' (i.e. the reception of communion). The Lord's Prayer (attributed to the wrong chapter of Matthew on page 12) is the centrepiece of the 'homecoming' chapter, which enables it to be opened up as related to the act of communion, whether it actually comes before communion (as is allowed 'was more anciently done,' page 88) or after, as Cranmer and our author prefer.

I can appreciate much of the riches and depth of what Charles Miller explores whilst still having an odd feeling of praying the eucharist forty years ago. I can find odd references to modern eucharistic provision, but it looks as though it has been tacked into an already existing fabric and framework. I looked in vain for the Peace (or is that not a praying occasion?) and for any form of 'Send us out in the power of your Spirit'—'homecoming' here is such realized eschatology as to have little or nothing beyond it.

of questions and discussion on related areas of concern. It was at this stage that the fifth member of the panel, Sandy Millar, spoke in defence of the Holy Trinity Brompton approach to worship, which focused our discussion on a number of related themes: is liturgy to be seen as 'law' or as a means of grace? Can liturgy be 'anointed,' or is it just another ecclesiastical straitjacket? There was a fascinating brief dialogue between Sandy and some anglo-catholics present, which revealed that they were poles apart in their use of liturgy, despite sharing the charismatic experience. For the anglo-catholics, charismatic life is expressed naturally through the liturgy, whereas, for Holy Trinity, liturgy is to be used sparingly and in small doses. The fascination of this small confrontation was that it revealed the diversity of charismatics present on the day, ranging from the 'please keep your dirty liturgy away from our Holy Spirit' position (a quote from the Chairman) to those who welcome the life and gifts of the Spirit as an indispensable enrichment of the liturgy.

This was a most stimulating beginning to a conversation that needs to continue (is this the first time that charismatics and members of the Liturgical Commission have met to discuss the implications of Pentecostalism/Charismatic Renewal for worship in the Church of England?). There was not time, for example, to develop the practical application of much that we touched upon. How about a Praxis Day on some examples of 'good practice' in worship from a variety of charismatic parishes?

Thank you Praxis for including charismatics on the liturgical agenda.

James Steven

BOOK REVIEWS

Karen B Westerfield Tucker (ed), *The Sunday Service of the Methodists: Twentieth Century Worship in Worldwide Methodism* (Studies in Honor of James F White), (Kingswood Books, Nashville, an imprint of Abingdon Press, ISBN 0 687 01134 5, pp 392, pb, US\$17.95. Abingdon Press publications are distributed in the UK by SPCK.)

Karen Westerfield Tucker's *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* leaves the reader with a clear impression of the nature of worship amongst a representative selection of Methodist churches throughout the world. A number of well-established Methodist historians, theologians and liturgists offer vignettes of the liturgical development of the church as it is expressed on all continents,

In editing this work in honour of James White, Dr Tucker has provided a worthy tribute to one of world Methodism's leading liturgical scholars. She has provided a valuable resource for all who would wish to know about the ways of the people called the Methodists. More than that though, here is a publication which is of significant interest to liturgical people of all traditions. Here is found primary material for those who would wish to investigate such issues as the relationship of liturgy and ecclesiology, liturgical theology, or the effects of culture on liturgy. The

Methodist movement did not begin with a liturgical clean slate but inherited the tradition of the Church of England. That tradition was represented especially in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), or John Wesley's abridgement of it. A common theme which runs through all of the essays in Karen Tucker's book is the manner in which that tradition has been received, adapted or rejected within the life of the churches. This is an issue of great importance and this is a book of great merit. It is, to quote COB's back cover statement, a book which would be a 'splendid addition to the shelves of liturgist, Methodist and ecumenical alike.'

Adrian Burdon,

Sia'atoutai Theological College, PO Box 44, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga

Steve Motyer, *Remember Jesus: A User's Guide to Understanding and Enjoying Holy Communion* (Christian Focus Publications, Farns, 1995, pp 175, £4.99)

I am of a generation to be an enthusiastic fan of Steve Motyer's Dad! But I quickly found in this book that I should also be open to learn from the son of the distinguished father—and to learn in a field which I had always thought of as much more mine than his. And there is a delightful twist in the appendix which means that I am back still learning from Steve's Dad also.

Of course this is a fairly Protestant exposition, and the first main chapter begins with the scene of the martyrdom of Latimer and Ridley, dying for their beliefs about the Lord's Supper: but it is not a polemical book, and it goes a long way in being understanding of the various positions which the author does not hold. What he does manage to do is to hold together rubrically fixated Anglicans (that is not all the Anglicans, of course, but the others are easier) with the freest of free church worshippers. And if, for dramatic effect, he illustrates how powerfully views on the eucharist have motivated both persecutors and victims in church history, he quickly reverts to the scriptures. It is here that John Stott in his Foreword describes his treatment as 'fresh and even innovative.'

I myself would pick up as 'innovative' many facets of his scriptural discussion. He has a brilliantly crafted thesis that harmonizes the chronology of the Synoptics and John (and accounts for the apparent lack of a lamb at the Passover meal the disciples kept); he has a closely coherent weaving of the discussion of idol-meats in 1 Corinthians with the references to the Lord's Supper; he is determined not to understate 'when you come together it is not the Lord's Supper which you eat;' and he has a good go at unravelling ways in which the Supper is a 'prophetic sign.'

He begins with questions ('how frequently?' and 'do we need a priest?'), passes through the Bible, and ends with advice ('Surrender to his power') so the book is strung throughout between the doctrinal and the devotional. But it is clearly the worshipper who is chiefly in view—he or she may have odd difficult questions to ask, but basically is there to partake; and Steve Motyer quotes with approval on page 10 the famous Dix passage 'Was ever another command so obeyed?'

I suppose I am given to nitpicking, but I had some difficulty doing it here. I offer

some picked nits of last resort: it is light on liturgy, perhaps a bit light on John 6, hints at an odd early church controversy (of which I think I know nothing) on page 42, is a little unguarded on offering the elements to God (p 111), understands 'proclaim' non-verbally (p 90) and locates Cyprian in the fourth century on page 33. And that is the absolute limit of nits in a truly wonderful book.

Perhaps even then the best is kept till last. Chapter 16 is a collection of eucharistic hymnody, and—*mirabile dictu*—it reveals Alec Motyer as a writer of eucharistic hymns hitherto unpublished. Three are here, the first a six-verse meditation woven round the BCP phrase 'a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction' (with one such word italicized in each of the six verses). I hope that publishing the first verse of each of the three hymns here will not be viewed as piracy or breach of copyright. Alec was never ungenerous with spiritual wisdom! And it should give you a taste for the other verses...

Come, stand and gaze upon the cross,
and marvel that on him were laid
our sins, and trespasses and guilt,
and *full* atonement there was made.

...

Stand now as once upon the shore
you stood for that returning few;
take knowledge of our weariness,
our often failure and distress;
call us, your children, back to you.

...

Emblems of suffering,
means of his grace;
Jesus my Saviour
died in my place.
Bread of affliction,
wine of his pain,
Jesus is living,
risen again.

COB

German Martinez, *Worship: Wedding to Marriage* (The Pastoral Press, Washington, DC, 1993, pp 177, £11.99).

This is an American Roman Catholic study of marriage, including a review of the 1990 revised Roman marriage ritual. It is a fine piece of work, incorporating biblical, theological, liturgical and anthropological insights. In league with such contemporary writing on marriage it stresses marriage as covenant rather than contract and commends a 'staged' approach to the marriage rite on the Van Gennep-Stevenson model. As a Roman Catholic study, it centres on the sacramental nature