

to the perils of human expression,  
to embody in human terms truths which ought to be hidden  
in the silent veneration of the heart.

(From *De Trinitate*—Bishop Hilary of Poitiers, 315-367 AD)

Even when we have been careful to use a 'dignity and economy of words,' there comes that moment when the words run out, when we need instead silence and music, darkness and light, movement and stillness, sacred space marked out with signs and symbols.

*Dance into Worship* is a network concerned to explore and develop the use of movement and dance as embodied worship:

We dance as joint celebrators of life in its totality in the presence of him who has given that life to his Church. We are encouraged to develop such discipline, skill and imagination as will enrich both faith and worship. The dynamic of movement and physicality will enable our worship to become an offering of all that is human in a response to God's gracious gift.

(From the Foundation Document of *Dance into Worship*)

If you would like to know more about the work of *Dance into Worship*, or if you would like help in creating movement and dance for your own liturgy, then contact Judi Tarrant at: 103 Old Road, Oxford OX3 8SX, or by telephone: 01865 767329.

*Dance into Worship* is mounting a Whitsun workshop called 'Touch our Speechlessness.' It will take place 22-24 May 1998 at Neal House Conference Centre, East Grinstead. Full residential cost is £70. Enquiries and booking forms are available from Judi Tarrant at the above address. The group would welcome your participation.

John Brassington

---

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 278

February 1998

## EDITORIAL

The Lord's Prayer has been in the news this month, as the Synod held a 'General Approval' debate on the proposal brought before it (in the form set out in *NOL* last November). I found myself on radio and TV in opposition to the Bishop of Norwich, a noted see of reaction. And a report on the debate is to be found on pages 6-7 below.

I stood throughout the fifty minutes we had for debate, but was not called. I therefore offer readers the benefit, in broad terms, of the speech I was not able to make.

Firstly, we should look at the modern text. The major point of complaint seems to be the ninth line and the proposal to switch us from 'Lead us not into temptation' to 'Save us from the time of trial.' There has been an outcry, concentrating on the accuracy of one translation or another, but, *me iudice*, there will be an actual misleading of us by those calling for such accuracy, unless they simultaneously indict 'daily bread,' 'sins' and 'evil' (and propose 'to-morrow's bread,' 'debts' and 'the evil one'). We should not be led by the nose by those who insist on accuracy for one line but ignore all the others.

'Save us from the time of trial' is the internationally recommended, and almost equally internationally adopted text; and really that ought to settle the case. It may be forgotten now that the official Series 3 from 1973 to 1980 had 'Do not bring us to the time of trial,' and, with that background, 'Save us from the time of trial' was in fact the text I proposed to the Synod on behalf of the Revision Committee in 1979, as we hoped to go international even then. The Synod members put down various amendments, but—amazingly—failed to propose 'Lead us not into temptation.' I myself tabled this, as a fall-back—and, when other texts were rejected, we duly came to it. I regretted it, but have often since reflected that it was the unitive text—in other words, it is *the* modern language text which has had the best chance of weaning the lovers of the ancient to the use of the modern. It is a matter of history that in 1987, led astray by the then Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Synod voted once to print parallel columns in *ASB* services, and the lawyers allowed such printing to go ahead without Revision Committee or Revision Stages on the basis of that single snap vote. This means that all pressure to be 'weaned' was taken off and the modern text was treated as a kind of enemy by the lovers of the traditional, instead of as a welcoming friend. Now nineteen years have passed since the adoption into the modern text of 'Lead us not into temptation,' and the transition ought now to have been complete and the *ELLC* text adoptable. In fact it has not been so easy.

One further point worth noting about the form of the modern text is that in Australia, where modern language use seems to be near universal, when *A Prayer Book for Australia (APBA)* was authorized in July 1995, it brought this change from 'Lead us not into temptation' to 'Save us from the time of trial.' The change in the Lord's Prayer was not subject to separate debating; equally, it was not a point of synodical controversy within the acceptance of the whole Book (all were admittedly busy debating what David Silk, Bishop of Ballarat, wanted to do with one of the eucharistic prayers); and, most important of all, it has not been the subject of any grassroots reaction as the use of the new Book has spread across the land over the last two years. Christian minds should be ready and adaptable in a matter like this.

So what of the ancient? All the argument seems to be that 'people out there know it,' though Gavin Reid acknowledged in Synod that this was not so obviously true of the under-25s. Very well, we should respond, let us then make reference by rubric to the ancient and print sole in the text the modern. When those occasions come when people are saying the Lord's Prayer from memory (and therefore *do not need to look at the book*), then we can lead them into and with the ancient; but when they are ready to read from the printed text, then let there be one solitary modern text for them to read.

Of course there are arguments (largely mutually self-cancelling) about 'temptation' and 'time of trial.' I cheerfully concede the relative inappropriateness of 'Save us from the time of trial' when praying with prisoners on remand—but I also think that 'temptation' is fraught with many perils. It can hardly be settled simply on the vibes one text gives to one person and another gives to another. And if the users of the modern are not ready to agree on the ELLC text, they will find themselves overtaken by the retrogressives and the 'thee' and 'thou' programme.

Oh yes, and if you seriously want to know the history and think through the issue, do have a look at my Grove Booklet from three years ago, *The Lord's Prayer in the Church of England* (Grove Worship Series No 131, January 1995). And if you want to picket the Revision Committee, then submissions must be in by 5.30pm on Monday 16 March.

Colin Buchanan

### GENERAL SYNOD FEBRUARY 1998

General Synod duly met on 10 and 11 February, and undertook three bits of directly liturgical business and one of legislation which bears upon the liturgy. The legislative issue is discussed on page 5 below, while the texts emerged as follows:

(1) 'Extended Communion:' this material continued on its weary way, having been started and adjourned at York last July, having been ditched from the agenda under time pressures in November, and as having arrived this February in a

It is important to remember that members of the Church of England are and will be quite free to use whichever version of the psalter they wish for their worship. No single psalter is authorized for liturgical use. All that is being done at present is to prepare for the important decision on which version of the psalter should be printed alongside authorized liturgical texts in the Church of England.

Jane Sinclair

### The month before last's publication...

...was Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study No 39, *Anglican Orders and Ordinations* edited by David Holeton, delivering the essays and statement from the IALC Interim Conference at Jarvenpaa in August 1997 and it is now near to being published! One contributor was horribly late and the whole Study was delayed. We do not normally reckon to get into such a situation, and apologize to subscribers.

### ...and this month's

is Worship Series No 145, *The New Initiation Services* by Colin Buchanan and Michael Vasey. The new texts were finally authorized in November, to be current from Easter Eve (11 April). The official publication of them will come on 26 March, but the commentary (by two persons on the inside of the process) will be out first, in February. Any reader who doubts whether the official texts will be easily available in a particular locality can send £10 and an addressed label to the editorial address on page 12 and the editor's office will be glad to send you one. There will also be an infant baptism 'concertina' card, edited for ease in congregational responding; a pack of 10 costs £5 and pack of 50 is £20.

### DIOCESAN REPORT 9-COVENTRY

#### To Speak Where We Cannot Utter

Readers of *NOL* have a primary concern with the preparation of liturgical texts and the processes used to test whether these can adequately express, insofar as any texts can express, our faith. Most of you will know intuitively, if not by reason and experience, that worship goes beyond the reach of words—whether words of Scripture, words of poetry, words from the heart of our Christian tradition. Bishop Hilary of Poitiers wrote:

We are compelled to attempt what is unattainable,  
to climb where we cannot reach,  
to speak where we cannot utter,  
to trespass on forbidden ground.  
Instead of the bare adoration of faith  
we are compelled to entrust the deep things of religion

Misc 504). I wish to address Professor Frost's comments in the context of the Commission's wider liturgical work at present.

The Commission fully recognizes the importance of the psalter for the daily worship of members of the Church of England. As I indicated (Letters, 9 January), the Commission has embarked on a three-stage work of writing and consultation about the style and use of the psalter in the Church today. The revised and inclusive version of *The Liturgical Psalter*, to which Professor Frost refers, was among several psalters field-tested via members of the Commission during 1995-1996.

It was eventually decided that the Commission would work from the ECUSA text of the psalter to see how far it might be possible to produce a contemporary-language psalter in a style which accurately represents the Hebrew and is sympathetic to the very varied liturgical uses made of the psalter in the Church of England at present.

The arguments which lay behind the Commission's decision to work from the ECUSA text are set out in the introductory essay to GS Misc 504. The Commission has been concerned from the outset to get the style and 'feel' of the English of the psalms right. We need psalmody which not only accurately reflects its Hebrew Origins, but is expressed in vigorous English consonant with the other liturgical texts currently being published in the Church of England.

During the first stage of its work on the psalter, the Commission has sought the advice of its biblical consultant, Canon Dr John Sweet, formerly Dean of Selwyn College, Cambridge. Dr Sweet's advice has been supplemented by that of Dr Cally Hammond, Simon Jones and, initially, the Rev'd Martin Greenland, all of whom have a particular interest in the Hebrew of the psalms, and have studied or are studying at Westcott House, Cambridge. It is regrettable that the reference to 'Cambridge biblical scholars' paragraph 5.2 of GS Misc 504 has been a cause of misunderstanding and offence, when neither was intended.

On the advice of the Theological Group of the House of Bishops, the Commission is also working in consultation with John Eaton, formerly of Birmingham University. In addition, I would be glad to receive any further comments on the 50 psalms published in GS Misc 504 from any with technical expertise to offer.

The second stage of the Commission's work will be the preparation, with the advice of professional Hebraists, among others, of a complete psalter to be published in the autumn of 1998 for further consultation and experimental use, as requested by the General Synod in November 1997.

The third stage will be the evaluation of this exercise by the Commission during the spring and summer of 1999, to help the General Synod make its mind known on the relative merits of versions of the psalms, in a second liturgical-publishing debate, to be held probably in the autumn of 1999. The final decision on which psalter is to be printed with the new liturgical texts lies with the Liturgical Publishing Group of the Synod.

somewhat Rip Van Winklish way—as though it had gone to sleep in a bygone era and had now woken uncomfortably in ours. The debate was reactivated fairly urbanely by Kenneth Stevenson, but it was clear at an early stage that the whole principle of 'extending' from one congregation to another was in trouble. Trevor Lloyd made a powerful attack, citing three fatal features of the proposal: (a) that it is untimely ('the Commission does not want it; it has been hard even to find three members of the Commission to serve on the Steering Committee'); (b) 'Consecration in one place for use in another is neither Cranmer or BCP'—it is 'divisive not diverse' in relation to the sacrament; and (c) it is unhelpful to Christian communities (not used in North Devon, where the speaker has his archdeaconry fiefdom). After that the rite was always struggling to get taken seriously, and attention was generally focused on the principle of extended communion, not on the specifics of the text (though Christina Baxter took the notes and rubrics apart). A very timely point was made by Rosalind Campbell that in the Bishops' guidelines about communion before confirmation there is insistence that children should not be brought in just to receive, without having been present for the eucharistic prayer—yet that is exactly what is proposed for adults receiving 'by extension.' The main voices in favour pleaded 'pastoral necessity,' and this was eloquently put by Paul Brett, who, ministering in the countryside, has found himself with all his neighbouring clergy to east and west and north and south missing through illness, vacancy and misfortune, and has thus been providing for his neighbouring parishes under very considerable 'pastoral necessity.' The Bishop of Ely, replying to the debate, described him (in accordance with his own self-description) as a 'walking disaster area.' But the Synod was not easily going to swallow the need for this form of extension at all, and at the end the vote for 'General Approval,' taken by Houses, was only: Bishops 24-9; Clergy 128-57; Laity 106-89. A Revision Committee must now do what it can with the hardy surviving liturgical material—though, presumably, it cannot do anything until the Synod has adopted a pattern of words for Rites 1 and 2, the central eucharistic material from which any provision for communion must surely be derivative? And even then, what can be achieved when the Synod is clearly dragging its feet against the whole concept?

**(2) The Revision of the Eucharist ('Rites 1 and 2')**: Not all the motions for recommitment were taken in November, and the Synod drove on into the remaining set. The prayers escaped recommitment, and I had my own go at getting the 'supplementary consecration' sent back, partly on the grounds that it is fatuous to design supplementary provision before deciding what the initial eucharistic prayers should be like, but more because the whole theological basis for the form of words in the existing text is doubtful, and the case for looking again at taking more bread or wine in silence is very strong. The platform predictably rejected the proposal, and a close count resulted in the defeat of my motion by 119 votes to 103. Other motions were also rejected, but the end of the agenda

was not reached (largely through failure to limit the time on extended communion earlier), and completion presumably must now wait till July.

(3) **The Lord's Prayer:** see the later report in this issue and the editorial above.

### IN MEMORIAM—LESSLIE NEWBIGIN

Lesslie Newbigin died on 30 January 1998, 88 years of age and enormously active and theologically fertile till within a few days of his death. I owe him much for his own friendship and support in my own life, and I rejoiced that our lives overlapped again briefly through my coming to South-East London where he and Helen lived in Herne Hill (but he could not come to my installation fifteen months ago, as he was lecturing in Brazil...).

But was he a liturgist? He was known and honoured throughout the Christian world as evangelist, missionary statesman, ecumenist, apologist, and (Presbyterian) bishop; but none of those would qualify him for these columns without further explanation. It is perhaps worth offering that 'further explanation' on one front, for in his *Reunion of the Church* he dealt the theological death-blow to the 'laying-on-hands-all-round' rites for unifying episcopal and non-episcopal ministries (rites which nevertheless are at intervals recklessly resurrected). But he appears here for the one major footprint he left on more strictly liturgical history, and for this I quote from his autobiography, *Unfinished Agenda*:

[When the liturgy committee of the Church of South India was formed, and Leslie Brown was convenor] I was also a member and shared in the excitement of those early days...I remember Leslie's excitement when he found the beautiful prayer "Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good High Priest, as thou wast in the midst of thy disciples," and rushed into my bedroom (where I was having a mild illness) to ask how we should end it, and my proposing "and be made known to us in the breaking of the bread."

There has been a tendency for this whole prayer to be attributed to Mozarabic sources, and it takes a visit to the sources to discover that the South India text has only a slender link with the ancient rite; and this recollection by Lesslie Newbigin helps any tracing of origins. The text has travelled a bit—it is found in varied forms in North India, Pakistan and elsewhere. The fit Lesslie provided is a good fit, with a strong assonance and a vigorous sacramentalism. But we should not kid ourselves it was in any way ancient Spanish liturgy...

Lesslie, I should add, was a delightful personal friend and support. I never expected, when I first read his books as a student, that my life would overlap with his, and I still count myself highly privileged. He died openly knowing he was departing, and openly trusting his Lord—a parting benediction to encourage those who come after, from a theologian who lived in the light of his own theology.

COB

getting in the way of direct access to the Scripture. Protestants, he suggests, treat lectionaries as basically lists of preaching texts.

West is full of insights about the way these two paradigms affect both the way we relate to Scripture and the way we expect lectionaries to work. The three-year lectionary, just by *being* a lectionary, comes out of the Catholic paradigm and, historically, developed out of the Roman Catholic *Lectionary for Mass*. However, in containing elements of semi-continuous reading it also follows the Protestant paradigm. In addition, in adapting and using the *Lectionary for Mass* as the *Common Lectionary* or *Revised Common Lectionary*, Protestants have asserted that the Old Testament should be allowed to speak in its own right and not be chosen for and related to the Gospel. Hence the RCL (and *Calendar, Lectionary and Collects*) has two 'tracks' for the Old Testament in ordinary time: one which follows the gospel, and one which reads the Old Testament semi-continuously. The result is a lectionary with an 'ecumenical hermeneutic'—a way of using Scripture which is neither purely Catholic nor purely Protestant, but a combination of both approaches. Individual congregations (and denominations) then appropriate the lectionary in a way that fits with their own paradigm. For instance, Protestants may use a lectionary, but they treat it as optional rather than compulsory and they select perhaps only one or two readings to use in worship.

In the latter part of the book West shows how an understanding of the Calendar-led lectionary approach is vital if we are to preach on the three-year lectionary with integrity. He gives examples from the Christmas and Easter seasons of what he calls the 'memory patterns' of the lectionary. Effectively he is saying that the three-year lectionary is not without themes, but theme is dealt with in a multi-layered way.

If you want to understand the three-year lectionary at a level deeper than 'help—there are no themes!' then this rich and stimulating book would be a good place to start.

Mark Earey

Institute for Liturgy and Mission, Sarum College, Salisbury

### WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT THE PSALTER?

(The above title headed a letter from Canon Jane Sinclair in Church Times on 23 January; a letter of some significance in the light of the letter in December from the Cambridge hebraists. The issue was raised again in question-time in General Synod in February, but it looks as though this letter is the nearest to a definitive statement from the Commission—and in Synod there was an apology for representing 'some students at Westcott' as 'Cambridge biblical scholars'!)

Sir,—Professor David Frost (Letters, 16 January) speaks disparagingly of the proposals set out in *A New Psalter for Liturgical Use in the Church of England* (GS

to agree with Chris Jenkin's point in his letter with respect to this particular prayer. However I did not read this till after the discussions with my fellow parishioner. She had suggested a simpler 'We have before us the bread of life...' but then a more daring 'We see before us the bread of life and cup of salvation.' That I believe is an example of living faith from someone who has learnt a lot about the gospel from the communion service.

My own contribution to the debate is much more pedantic and based on my Latin upbringing. I was fascinated by the reference to our Archbishops' reply to *Apostolicae Curae*. The subtle links between 'offerō' (a compound of ob+fero, with the past participle 'oblatum' giving us that weird word 'oblation') and 'praesento' and pro+pono give us a range of translations:

offerō=I bring, carry bear before or to you...  
propono=I put, place, set in front of you...  
praesento=I present, set, place before you...

but with 'sacrifice' as the object of the sentence this of course creates consternation amongst those of us who wish to keep within the bounds of the New Testament and God presenting Jesus as a sacrifice (Rom 3.25).

Keep up the good stirring

Yours in Christ

James Ambrose

(CPAS Ministry and Vocation Adviser)

*[Editorial note: last month's editorial produced considerable learned response, some of which we hope to air in future months.]*

### BOOK REVIEW

Fritz West, *Scripture and Memory—The Ecumenical Hermeneutic of the Three-Year Lectionaries* (The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1997) \$24.95, 228pp + xii

In this fascinating study West begins by developing what he calls a 'hermeneutics of the liturgical reading of Scripture.' He leads us through what happens to a passage of Scripture as a lectionary takes it from its biblical context and places it in the interpretative framework of the Christian year. He then divides the approach to Scripture in two 'paradigms.'

In the Catholic paradigm Scripture is 'carried' by communal memory and is encountered by being heard in a calendar-led liturgical context that is overwhelmingly Eucharistic (and therefore Christological).

In the Protestant paradigm Scripture is 'carried' by written memory, the Bible, and is encountered primarily by being seen in a book. Individual passages are interpreted in the literary and theological context of the printed Bible. Hence Protestants are intrinsically nervous about lectionaries, which they suspect of

### IN MEMORIAM—ENOCH POWELL

Enoch Powell, a well-known lay theologian, died on 8 February 1998, aged 85. In with speculations about the accuracy of the Gospels, he held forth occasionally on establishment issues, and, as a Parliamentarian, opposed in the Commons the passage of the Worship and Doctrine Measure in 1974, backing his judgment with a loaded description of the early Church as always having been preserved from outstanding error by the secular power. He also led the successful attack in the Commons on the Appointment of Bishops Measure in 1984.

He was also, we understand, well known for his political views.

COB

### HOW DO WE CONTINUE ASB SERVICES AFTER 2000?

There are signs of nervousness round the country about the fate of ASB services after their expiry date on 31 December 2000 (once innocently thought to be the end of the millennium). The ecclesiastical lawyers have therefore concocted a new proposal for extending their use without the full synodical procedure. Draft amending Canon No 22, cleared by the House of Bishops in January, was brought into Synod for 'General Approval,' proposed by Ian Cundy, the Bishop of Peterborough, in February. The proposal would be to amend the existing Canon B2, to give powers to individual bishops to continue the period of use of a service already in use under the normal provisions of a two-thirds majority in each House of the Synod.

There is one snag to this bright idea, and it so happens that the editor of *NOL* is the trustee of the snag, so readers will at this point be subjected to his partisan view. In expounding the view, he hastens to add that he is not taking a view as to whether the provisions of the Canon are desirable or not—he is merely pointing out that he believes them to be self-evidently illegal under the Worship and Doctrine Measure, and the Measure itself would have to be amended to make the draft Canon enactable. And, for good measure, he adds that he has corresponded with the Registrar of Synod, has approached other lawyers, and has participated in the Synod debate (in which the mover replied 'The Bishop of Woolwich is not a lawyer'). And he is totally unpersuaded, not because his knowledge or skill with the law is greater than that of others, but because he has failed so far to get the supporters of the draft Canon to address the relevant part of the text of the Measure at all.

Clause 3 of the Worship and Doctrine Measure reads as follows:

'No Canon making any such provision as is mentioned in Section 1(1) or 2(1) of this Measure [ie authorizing the use of 'alternative' services] shall be submitted for Her Majesty's Licence and Assent unless it has been finally approved by the General Synod with a majority in each House thereof of not less than two-thirds of those present and voting;

and no regulation under any Canon made under the said Section 1(1) nor any approval, amendment, continuance or discontinuance of a form of service by the General Synod under any such Canon shall have effect unless the regulation, the form of service or the amendment, continuance or discontinuance of a form of service, as the case may be, has been finally approved by the General Synod with such a majority as aforesaid in each House thereof.'

The Clause is divided in half as set out above (though not in the official text of the Measure) in order to bring out the two-tier character of the requirements. On the one hand the first half demonstrates that Canons themselves require two-thirds majorities in each House (and that is conceded by the lawyers in this case). On the other hand the second half equally clear demonstrates that the terms of the Canons must themselves ensure a two-thirds majority *in each House*, for each 'approval, amendment, *continuance*, or discontinuance' (italics here editorial) of a form of service. The editor here complains that the lawyers, in all communications so far, have failed to address the text and have simply replied 'We think not so.' But, the editor persists, is not the unlawful character of the proposed Canon *self-evident*? As he is a persistent kind of fellow he is pursuing it further, and expects to report further in these columns.

#### TRIALS AND TEMPTATIONS OVER THE LORD'S PRAYER

Our story begins outside Church House, Westminster, where a luckless ITV reporter has been sent to do a *vox pop* on the Synod debate on the Lord's Prayer. He is asking people what they think about ditching the traditional Lord's Prayer. He approaches a passing clergyman and asks him about it; but our reporter's luck is out, for this is Pete Broadbent, Archdeacon of Northolt, who says 'Well, it depends what you mean.' Camera and mike are put away for a while, because that kind of answer is definitely bad *vox pop* and Pete explained just what is going on in the debate.

Later, inside, Synod is asked generally to approve the suggestion that the new liturgies take the 'modified traditional' version of the Prayer and the ELLC modern one ('Save us from the time of trial'). These will be printed side by side as is the current practice with the *ASB* version ('Lead us not into temptation') and the modified traditional text.

The Bishop of Salisbury opened the debate by mentioning that he had had correspondence ticking him off for tampering with the 'original' Lord's Prayer (ie the *BCP* version). The *Daily Mail* made the same silly error that same day ('the original is 450 years old'). The debate included good contributions from Paul Godfrey on how many people under 40 in churches had been brought up on a modern version. The needs of mission among young people demanded a modern prayer—they thought the modified traditional version and *BCP* version sounded odd (and indeed my 8-year-old thinks they are either in a real

foreign language akin to French or asks me to translate other everyday phrases into what he call 'old-fashioned')

Then there was the Norwich growler. The bishop of this well-known urban diocese put up a following motion that only the traditional prayer be put in the main text of services and the modern version go to an appendix. His reason? Everyone knows the traditional version. Several speakers remarked that many schools used no version at all and many Britons actually know no version at all. Gavin Reid produced some statistics to suggest that the over-25s said they could recite the prayer in its traditional form (but I don't think Gallup Polls actually asked them to, so its another case of lies, damn lies and statistics). My Lord of Norwich extolled the virtues of his cathedral where all services used the traditional version. The Dean of Wells—not conspicuously himself an under-40—replied that in Wells they always use the *ASB* version. Was he now to be relegated to an appendix (even a grumbling one)? The *ASB* prayer was part of his spiritual bloodstream.

If mission in diverse places such as Norwich and Nottingham demand both a traditional and modern Lord's prayer—which are they to be?

Jessie Axtell reminded Synod that the word *peirasmos* needs to be seen and translated in context. Sometimes in the NT it means 'trial' and sometimes 'temptation.' In the Lord's Prayer, it clearly means 'trial' or 'testing.'

Synod overwhelmingly agreed to refer the matter to a Revision Committee (you can write in, but need to do so by 13 March). As to the Bishop of Norwich's following motion: the Dean of Wells is safely in the main body and is not in danger of appendectomy; the Synod threw out the motion to relegate a modern version to an appendix by 272 votes to 68. But *which* modern version will win through? Wait and see!

Charles Read

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin,

Thanks for the extra stirring about 'setting before' God in January's *NOL*.

Our parish (St Mark's, Leamington) happens to be one of the experimenting churches and although I was away on Sunday last, a member of the church passed me a copy of the Eucharistic Prayer E service which they had used. She said that the communion service wording was most refreshing.

When I asked her what she understood by the phrase 'setting before' she suddenly realized that it was an odd expression to use. 'Surely it's God that gives us the bread and cup,' she said. But then she pointed out that the word 'plead' was also strange in the previous sentence as being not the sort of word we use unless we are begging for something! 'Perhaps "acknowledge" would be better.'

No doubt all this has been discussed in the Commission already but I tend