

would be for a more regular update on what is happening centrally, what stage revisions are at etc. Some of the members of General Synod from this diocese actually like to be briefed beforehand about the liturgical matters due to appear at Synod. How helpful it would be if the Secretary of the DLC here was also briefed beforehand by the Commission!

Stuart Morris  
Secretary, St Edmundsbury and Ipswich Diocesan Liturgical Committee

### DIOCESAN REPORT 8—WAKEFIELD

The main focus for our work during the past twelve months has been one of liturgical formation and education. The Group has gone to a number of Deanery Synods with a Liturgical Roadshow looking at areas such as: What is worship?, the need for liturgical formation, issues of community and the use of liturgical space, what is likely to be included in Liturgy 2000, and managing the framework for change. The roadshows have been well received and underline the need for deeper reflection on liturgy by laity, as well as clergy who often find it difficult to keep abreast of liturgical developments.

A residential POT conference in January gave the Group the opportunity to begin work with a new generation of clergy. We were responsible for the conference worship which included liturgies ancient and modern and everything in between! Workshops were on the theme of *Creating the Liturgy*, including a session on issues of presidency.

With the authorization of Calendar, Lectionary and Collects along with the impending release of the Rites of Initiation our priority for the new year is to run small sessions for parishes and clusters on how to use the new material to best advantage. We also intend holding workshops for the parishes authorized to use the experimental rites. A study day on Presidency is planned for early 1998.

Michael Rawson  
Secretary

---

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ  
Telephone: 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949  
Email: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1998 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**  
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU  
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

---

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 276

December 1997

## EDITORIAL

### STANDING ORDERS COME HOME TO ROOST

This is the dreariest headline I have ever produced, in a journal which only provides headlines when something extraordinary has happened. But, whilst others report bits of liturgical business (see below) from General Synod, and I report that we never reached the first debate for General Approval on the Lord's Prayer nor the adjourned debate for General Approval on Extended Communion,<sup>1</sup> I and all other members of Synod have had cause to reflect on the liturgical Standing Orders under which we are currently considering an ever-increasing flow of texts. Again, I intend to bore you with history. Procedures in liturgical revision have gone through four stages so far:

1. From 1966 to 1970 the Convocations met jointly, amended texts in plenary, agreed them by two-thirds majorities in accordance with the Alternative Services Measure, and then sent them on to the House of Laity who debated them separately but had to say 'yea' or 'nay' with no real opportunity to amend them. The Laity got round this by sending them back to the Convocation with requests and sometimes protests attached...
2. From 1970 to 1973 the General Synod functioned under its own initial standing orders, which provided for two rounds of revision in full Synod, with a Liturgical Steering Committee (which I was on) responsible for all rites, but needing to propose all amendments as textual revisions in full Synod prior to Provisional Approval and then Final Approval.
3. From 1973 to 1983, the Synod functioned under different standing orders by which a separate Revision Committee, with a Steering Committee within it, was provided for each service in turn, and there was only one Revision Stage in full Synod. The Revision Committee could now actually revise the text and would then bring a revised text to Synod, and function from the same revised text thereafter. This worked well initially, but between 1974 and 1978 the number of amendments went on increasing by geometrical progression, till the initiation rites in 1977 attracted 300 amendments, and Rite A in 1978

<sup>1</sup> Once upon a time in the dim and distant past, a set of draft services to be 'Series 1' was published (actually in December 1965) with a paste-in slip under 'Communion of the Sick' saying that a text and rubrics were under consideration and would be published shortly—and the first actual materials seen then came in December 1980; so I wonder if 'Extended Communion' is now filling the same role. Certainly its Rite A contents are already dating fast as new eucharistic material passes through the experimental and synodical pipelines.

attracted 1200. Rite A then had nineteen hours in full Synod for its Revision Stage (around 300 amendments were handled in full Synod!), and, although the upshot was almost unanimous agreement, the procedure was deemed too wasteful of Synodical time and energies.

4. The standing orders were then revised again after *Ministry to the Sick* went through in 1983 (and *Blessing of Oils* and *Reconciliation of a Penitent* were defeated), but were barely tested until the famous six Eucharistic Prayers came along in the 1994 (they had an uncontroversial outing earlier with *A Service of the Word*), and even then the Revision Stage went past in Synod without motions for recommittal. The Calendar and Lectionary did attract motions for recommittal, but saw them all off in July 1996, and the full test came with the Initiation services in November 1996, when the first recommitments happened.

So far so good—so it would sound. But I became aware in respect of the Calendar and Lectionary that people were moving to refer sections back for reasons which I would not have adduced. This was in places where I had sent in motions for recommittal, but others had got in first; so they then moved *their* motions on the sections in which I was interested; their motions, slain from the platform by Michael Perham, then failed to raise 40 people's support, and I then had no chance to adduce my reasonings. I was left unhappy.

Well, it all came home to roost on 26, 27 and 28 November. We had the odd sight of Michael Perham (yes, it was he again) asking 40 people to signify by standing that they wished debate to continue when he was nevertheless resisting the stated reason for recommitting a section—and was merely asking for debate to continue in order to play fair by a speaker with a totally different point. The muddle continued, as it became clear that if two different points were made, and the recommittal was then voted, no-one on the Revision Committee would have the faintest idea which of the two changes was really wanted by the Synod and which not. So Brian McHenry in the chair thoughtfully resorted to suspending standing orders, taking straw polls on separate points being made, restoring standing orders, and then having the vote on recommittal.

Clearly this cannot go on. Standing orders which can only be made to work by suspending them are self-evidently condemned. We have the clumsiest of instruments to achieve the most sensitive of results. If we reach the stage where it is safer to refer the whole thing back and then amend line by line in full Synod, we might as well be back at one of the earlier solutions...

It all raises the interesting question as to what fellowship the kingdom of God has with standing orders.

---

Sackcloth and ashes—we've made an useful culpable accidental 'scoop.' The eucharistic prayers we published last month had not been seen before in the public arena, and a proper, if mild, protest has reached us from the secretary of

Our Committee meets three times a year, and is now almost composed of the membership recommended by the Liturgical Commission. We do have a close link with our bishop, who is chairman of the committee, but does not normally attend the meetings. The Precentor of the Cathedral is a member, as is the Chairman of the Diocesan Music Committee. All we are lacking is the Diocesan CME officer, mainly because the diocese is without one at the time of writing! The bishop, usually at the recommendation of the Secretary, appoints the other members. We are a council of the bishop, and not of the diocesan synod, which gives a certain freedom, but also very little cash with which to work from the synod's budget.

This Secretary took on the job about 18 months ago, when the previous holder of the post was translated to become Dean of Exeter Cathedral. The Secretary soon discovered that with the job went being a member of the Diocesan Advisory Committee as their Liturgical Adviser. What a sensible DAC to include such a person! So as well as DLC and DAC meetings there have been a number of visits to churches and PCCs to advise upon possible liturgical reordering, usually at quite an early stage, which is always useful.

Our work recently has included 'Patterns for Worship Roadshows' to all the deaneries in the diocese, partly to promote the material in the book, and partly to get across the use of a 'directory' of liturgical material, and how to be creative in its use. This had quite a good response, but it was not true to say that all 19 deaneries were equally enthusiastic about having a visit from us!

We are in the middle of preparing a local Diocesan Calendar, along the lines of *Exciting Holiness*, which we hope will be ready for publication by the year 2000! We never knew there had been so many holy people in Suffolk.

Again, just for this diocese, we have written a form of service for Extended Communion at the request of our bishop.

Together with our neighbours of Chelmsford, Ely, Peterborough and Norwich, some very successful liturgical 'days' have been held in our Cathedral at Bury St Edmunds. One was on the possible new initiation rites and led by David Stancliffe. One on the principles behind any new eucharist that may appear in Liturgy 2000. And our most successful to date was held this last September when over 270 Clergy and Readers attended a day on the Revised Common Lectionary and Calendar led by Michael Perham, with some useful musical input from the Royal School of Church Music.

These five dioceses form 'East Anglian PRAXIS' and another part of the work through that collaboration has been to promote Liturgical Formation as a part of CME in each diocese, which has been enthusiastically received by the regional bishops.

The Secretary has also attended the Day Conferences held annually for DLCs at Church House by the Liturgical Commission. While these are valuable, a cry

## DIOCESAN REPORT 6 (1997–98 CYCLE)—ROCHESTER

'Forward in Mission' was the title given to the Rochester Diocesan Conference at Butlins Bognor!

About 500 people went to this event—clergy and laity from the Tuesday until the Friday in early November.

People from every parish were able to be present. One of the key elements of the conference was worship and this proved to be an interesting challenge.

The Manhattan Plaza was not built for rite 'A' Communion and the Cockney Pride Bar was hardly in keeping with the early morning worship based on the Iona Community. And yet the worship worked.

As well as the big set pieces, there were the specialized slots and a one-off torchlit procession led by the Bishop Suffragan along the sea front which had folk throwing stones into the sea.

It seemed to me that we had learned the basic art of taking ourselves out of the everyday and material world into the things which pass our understanding.

Sometimes it was through the powerful words used in a drama mime or the sheer enthusiasm of the drummer.

Sometimes we used our imagination to move beyond the familiar and the darkness of the night was offset by the torches burning brightly.

Those of us involved in the liturgy will need to appreciate how it actually works for people and how different people will make it work in different ways.

The new revised lectionary was one of a number of workshops arranged during the conference. With Mark Earey moving away from Rochester, I found myself as the new Chair of our DLC agreeing to take his place. No easy task.

Still it gave me a chance to look carefully and creatively at what was on offer. Many churches across the land will be using the new lectionary.

How it will work, for them I do not know, but it is my prayer that the reading of the Scriptures and the rhythm of the Church's year will nourish afresh the life of the church.

No one thing ever changes the whole picture and a table of readings set out on the page will not bring the church alive in the spirit.

Nevertheless, such tools should always provide a way for the Church as a whole to move forward in mission—taking people beyond the here and now and reminding them of the things which are eternal. Well that's the theory anyway!

Paul Wright  
Chair Rochester DLC

PS can I recommend Mark's package on the RCI. Only £6—a bargain! Thanks Mark.

the Liturgical Commission. The story went like this: when the prayers were cleared by the House of Bishops in October, I enquired as to when they would appear, learned (I think!) that it would be around 10 November, and duly published them as it was clear *NOL* could not be out till around 20 November. But I did not check back, did not pick up that there had been a delay in distribution, and thus innocently (yet guiltily) published the texts. If you want to buy the news before it happens, then *NOL* is for you.

December 1997 brings *NOI* to the end of twenty-three years of monthly publication. Founded to chart the way through the great flurry of new liturgical texts and complex synodical procedures in the 1970s, we find ourselves back in a virtually identical enterprise in the late 1990s. But we will delay extended navel-gazing till December 1999 (when everybody will be navel-gazing, we guess). For the moment, to all our readers, a very happy Christmas.

Colin Buchanan

### GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1997

The Council for Christian Unity brought forward a motion arising from the informal 'talks about talks' with the Methodist Church (a report roundly denounced in the *NOL* editorial in January 1997). In the event, the agenda had moved on, the proposal for integrating ministries through slow takeover by Anglican episcopacy was back on the shelf, the policy was to have formal conversations with the Methodists and to encourage those in the conversations to take agreement as far as it was possible to get. The Synod then voted after a very full debate as follows:

	<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Bishops	30	nil
Clergy	185	9
Laity	176	34

### INITIATION SERVICES—FINAL APPROVAL

It was not all wholly calm sailing for the Final Approval stage for the initiation rites, not least because some evangelicals in Synod are unhappy about categorical sacramental language (which was defended by Tony Thiselton and Tony Higton), and about prayers for 'sanctifying' the water at baptism (though it was discovered in debate that 1662 does just that). There were no complaints about the form of the vows or about proxy declarations, and there was appreciation of the opportunity for testimony (O that parishes would actually use it). COB slipped in a speech putting down a 'marker,' partly about the oddity of confirming those baptized as adults, partly about the undeclared nature of any theological purpose for oiling candidates. Anyway, we went through the doors

and, needing two-thirds majorities in each House, emerged with:

	<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Bishops	34	nil
Clergy	179	16
Laity	165	39

The rites are authorized from Saturday, 11 April 1998 (i.e. Easter Eve), until the Synod rescinds its authorization. It is likely that officially published texts will be available before that. Grove Books will (of course) be publishing a commentary and guide to use in February...

### REVISION STAGE—COMMUNION RITES 1 AND 2

*(Uncensored report from the steersman's rostrum)*

At General Synod in November the new Eucharistic Rites began their Revision Stage. As a member of the Steering Committee I had a personal interest in the proceedings, which spread over parts of three days during the week.

I went into it all believing that the Committee had done reasonably well in handling the 152 written and 23 personal submissions from Synod members. As ever it was a balancing act, but to my mind there was an acceptable amount of liturgical fudge, and a lot more clear thinking. Having been sent away with two rites, (A and B) we returned with four: Rite 1 in contemporary and traditional language, (the old A and B); and Rite 2 in traditional and contemporary language (the Prayer Book 'as used' and a Contemporary language Prayer Book order, as requested by many). Rites are now grouped by shape, not language. We offered them to Synod with, I think, a fair degree of hop.

Now that amendments are not taken during the debate, Synod expresses its disapproval by moving that parts of the rite should be subject to a 'reference back' to the Revision Committee. This month's editorial (by a mover of such a reference back) draws attention to the flaws found in this procedure; from the Steering Committee's point of view the 'take note' debate was wasted because members could not comment on specifics of the text without being told (quite rightly) that their point would be covered later.

The 'references back' were also frustrating because we often wanted to resist the formal motion, whilst wanting to hear debate on another aspect of the same text which we knew someone else wanted to raise. We ended up dealing with ten such motions, of which eight were referred back to the Committee. It took a long time. There are seven more to come.

Was this a good way to do liturgy? I do not begrudge the time spent; the Eucharist is the 'leading case,' and what we do here will determine aspects of other services. Some of the references back were positive, especially those concerning material which Synod had previously not debated. Some concerned

the congregation to voice joy at the completion of the marriage. In this service they seem to congratulate the couple on getting the vows right and the congregation intrudes into the personal covenant being established between bride and groom, made by the vows and confirmed with the self giving and sharing symbolized by the rings. These two elements cannot be separated without introducing confusion over what the rings are really for and what marriage is all about. The *Acclamations* feel much more appropriate after the *proclamation* and *blessing* of the couple which they seem to continue and extend.

In the service the *Registration* is not mentioned at the end of the service [although this is allowed in the notes]. Surely this should be presented as the preferred norm in preference to the intrusive central position. The first opportunity for a hymn is presented halfway through the service, this is rather late, I think.

I suspect that many of the new services will, like this one, use the Grace as a welcome but it is a poor alternative to 'The Lord be with you.' The Grace has for many been a traditional way of ending a service, or period of prayer [BCP], it is confusing to use it as a starter. It is longwinded and sounds very 'pious' as a welcome to what is often a congregation of strangers. It gives the minister a long statement and the congregation a short reply. 'The Lord be with you' with its balanced reply is a much friendlier welcome. It has been quite widely used and some congregations have even learnt it!

The long introduction reprinted from *ASB* including the exhortation not to undertake marriage 'carelessly, lightly or selfishly, but reverently, responsibly, and after serious thought' is unfortunately very negative [six words to deter marriage] when today many clergy are trying to persuade reluctant couples to wed. In a time when many guests at weddings are cohabiting this seems to encourage that, rather than risking matrimony.

A better wording for use in the third millennium might be:

'It is a way of life that all should honour; and it must not be undertaken carelessly, lightly, or selfishly, nor neglected rashly, irreverently or without serious thought.'

The introduction to the vows is problematic. It assumes the reading is about 'Christian marriage' but some are OT readings, some are actually about Church life [eg 1 Cor 13], it could be argued that there is no such thing as specifically Christian marriage, just marriage, especially in biblical times. Perhaps we should speak of 'biblical marriage.'

The vows are no longer 'solemn' though couples now treat them with more fear and hesitancy than ever before. The element that most often causes difficulty is saying 'till death us do part' but no improvement is suggested. 'Till parted by death' would be easier to say!

Stephen Leeke  
Warboys

*(Editorial note: Part of this letter is held over to next month.)*

This training pack is exactly what it suggests. It is aimed at those at diocesan, deanery or parish level who are wanting to help people to begin to understand something of the new *Calendar, Lectionary and Collects* and the reason for the present process of liturgical revision in which we are engaged. There is a tremendous amount of material—much more than one would need in a presentation to a Deanery Synod or Chapter, material that would be excellent in Reader training and that would provide a useful short course of sessions in the parish.

The pack consists of three elements. Firstly, there are twenty sides of A4 giving clear and concise notes for use when talking to groups of people, including ideas for small group work. Secondly, there is a handout already prepared to reinforce the session(s) and thirdly 17 OHP master sheets to enhance the training experience. The handout and OHP originals can be freely photocopied for training purposes.

If you are looking for resources that will help you to offer training on this topic, then I guarantee that this clear, relevant and adaptable material will prove not only useful but excellent value for money.

Andrew Nunn  
Southwark

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

In *News of Liturgy* you asked for comments from parishes 'road-testing' the new Draft Services. Here are some comments on the Marriage Service which we have used.

I feel it has been forced into a Eucharistic shape which it does not fit.

Putting Marriage into the context of Holy Communion will only accelerate the isolation of the Church from those who are at present uncommitted. It is a sectarian move. It is very rare to be asked for Holy Communion at a Marriage Service. Nevertheless this is more easily achieved with the *ASB* service than this new one! The liturgical fashion for communion with everything, devalues both the Eucharist and the other sacrament, ordinance or observance. It also gives rise to more ecumenical difficulties.

The *ASB* shape with *Reading & Sermon* either before or after *The Marriage* would allow a simple rubric saying that at a nuptial Eucharist *The Marriage* section should take place before or after *the Ministry of the Word* and appropriate propers and intercessions used.

The separation of *the declaration of intent* and *the Marriage* feels very artificial and *the Ministry of the Word* intrudes in a most inappropriate way. The effect is that the marriage dominates *the Word*. The couples are in effect half-way through their vows.

The new position for *the acclamations* is confusing. In the *ASB* they allowed

changes we had made in response to the original debate or strong pushes from submissions, and it seemed strange to hear strong views the other way from Synod.

Some were simply people who had failed to sway the Revision Committee the first time, and were hoping to get Synod to do it instead. Though his was somewhat different from this, the Bishop of Woolwich felt that we had only gone halfway to meeting his point and restoring the 'Taking.' Synod seemed to agree. As the Steering Committee member delegated to speak to this, I was seized by the frustration of having to respond to a streetfighter who had Synod (and two Archbishops) in nodding agreement, and not having put in the necessary half hour to encapsulate the entire morning the Revision Committee had spent on that section.

In all references back it was very easy for heavyweights to drop a few liturgical credentials and take the Synod with them. Standing there I felt somewhat like a rabbit frozen in the headlights of the Synodical juggernaut with the Bishop of Woolwich at its wheel, and knew I was on a loser.

The real frustration was that the task of liturgical revision was being lost in detail after detail. I'm more convinced than ever that Revision Committees do an important task, and while keeping their eyes on the ball must also keep their eyes on the goal. I hope that Synod when it resumes its adjourned debate in February will do the same.

Jeremy Fletcher

## 'STUNNINGLY ELEGANT'—PUBLISHING THE NEW LITURGY

Getting the texts through General Synod more or less unscathed is one matter, but what will they look like when they appear in the bookshops? The Liturgical Publishing Group, chaired by the Bishop of Guildford, is dealing with this issue. The first fruits of their labours was the publication of the new calendar, lectionary and collects material. The Group aims that the new material will be 'stunningly elegant'—people will want to buy official Church House Press versions and not pirate copies. At the November Synod, there was a general debate on publishing issues as well as a lunchtime meeting to discuss matters more informally.

The Synod agreed to take note of the Group's report (available as GS1268). In the debate on this several comments were made to set publishing in a wider context. Jeremy Fletcher pleaded that there should be more resources available for training of worship leaders in using the material—basically (he said) we need two more Mark Eareys and all three need to be funded centrally rather than out of the proceeds of car boot sales, as is the case at the moment. There were pleas from other members that music should not be ignored in the presentation of new liturgies and that the typeface should be as clear as possible. The cost to parishes of introducing new material was raised in the debate and

in the lunchtime meeting—the Publishing Group is well aware of this problem and is doing what it can to keep the price of booklets down. Some Synod members think that the current round of liturgical revision will not be completed by 2000 and we should authorize the *ASB* to last a little bit longer. The Group's view is that we should not extend the authorization of the *ASB* as a whole, but we might do it for appropriate sections.

In voting on the specific recommendations from the Publishing Group, Synod accepted that the final product should be called *Common Worship* and subtitled *Prayers and Services for the Church of England*. The Synod authorized the Publishing Group to be responsible for minor changes in the published versions of the new services including such matters as punctuation, spelling and capitalization. The Group wanted to omit paragraph and section numbers from the final version of the text but COB successfully proposed an amendment so that Synod did not agree in the end that such numbering should be omitted.

Other advice and information given at the lunchtime meeting was that parishes should be strongly urged not to buy any more *ASBs* now (!) and that Bishops might have the power to grant dispensations to give parishes time to change over to the new material.

The publishing debate also included some discussion of the new Psalter. There had been quite a lot of disquiet about the proposals put forward by the Liturgical Commission (GS Misc 504) and in the end Jane Sinclair successfully moved an amendment in which the Synod asked the Commission to continue to work on the Psalter along the lines of what is in GS Misc 504 and to make a complete draft available for wide discussion and comment before the Synod makes a final decision. It is worth obtaining GS1268 (and GS Misc 504—the current progress report) to see what the thinking of the Publishing Group is—I find these questions come up frequently in parishes and deaneries. Of course, as well as the Group producing conventional books, they are producing material on disk and the first such production, *Visual Liturgy* (CHP), is selling beyond the publisher's wildest dreams.

Charles Read

### IN MEMORIAM—GEORGE TIMMS

George Timms died on 15 November at the age of 87. He had thirteen years as vicar of St Mary's, Primrose Hill, ten years as archdeacon of Hackney, many also as chairman of the Alcuin Club, and a walk-on role in liturgical revision at one or two crucial points in history. He engaged in an argument with Gregory Dix about the reformed Church of England teaching (and especially that of Archbishop Cranmer) on the sacrament. Dix, it will be recalled, blew the whistle on the 1833-and-subsequent 'Catholic' view that somehow the English reformers were holding onto the substance of the pre-Reformation doctrine of the sacrament, and only engaged in cosmetic surgery in the Edwardine Prayer Books.

Dix is ruthless—even 1549 is Zwinglian! George Timms represented that traditional 'Catholic' view, and he attempted to maintain it over against Dix, with a carefully documented pair of essays entitled 'Dixit Cranmer' (CQR nos.286/7, 1947). Dix stuck to his guns, restated his position and laid Latin under further contribution with 'Dixit Cranmer et non timuit.' I think Dix had the better of the argument (though Cranmer might be rescued as marginally above Dix' low water mark), but Timms had courage to take on the mighty (and heavily armed) guru, and, though his presentation may have been affected by his own traditionalist anglo-catholicism, yet he got his foot into the door of church history.

Those who came across him in his colourful archdeaconry will remember him for those same 'Catholic' prejudices. Indeed the 'East End Five' who protested on behalf of the Protestantism of the Church of England in the late 1970s were dubbed by him the 'North End Five'—a typical sample of his dry wit...

George put his signature onto Rite A in the Revision Committee. It was he who insisted on

nourish us with the body and blood of your Son,  
that we may grow into his likeness  
and, made one by your Spirit,  
become a living temple to your glory.

The Revision Committee put it into the first eucharistic prayer and the Synod moved it into the second (and it is now recurring in the (conflated) first). I can never use the second prayer without breathing a passing thanksgiving for George Timms as I turn the page. So he too 'being dead, yet speaks.' Perhaps readers may know other places where the finger of George has writ our liturgy; if so, we would love to publish them.

COB

### BOOK REVIEWS

Bro Tristram SSF has again produced his own almanack to accompany and guide *Celebrating Common Prayer*. It is entitled *Celebrating Common Prayer 1998* (or *The CCP Ordo*), and is available from the editorial address on page 12 below for 50p in stamps (o.n.o.) and an SAE.

*Lectionary Training Pack*—PRAXIS £5 (£6 by post)

I am all in favour of material that makes life easier. This pack produced by PRAXIS in advance of the introduction of the new *Calendar, Lectionary and Collects* is just such material. Having been involved in the diocese of Southwark in two 'sell-out' roadshows on the new lectionary (I never imagined that talking about lectionary could suddenly become so popular a pastime!), I only wish that I had had this material to hand.