

IN MEMORIAM—PETER HAMMOND

Peter Hammond died on 1 March, and NOL apologizes for being slow to record his departure. I did not know him, nor recall talking at any length to those who did. He seems to have been a very unassuming Anglican clergyman, though involved in some major re-thinking about church architecture in the 1950s. He put down one big marker for the twentieth century with his main book, *Liturgy and Architecture* (Barrie and Rockliffe, 1960), which is the main reason why his name is known. On my shelves it sits a little along from Addleshaw and Etchells; and is mentally earmarked by me as 'Architecture for the Future' as over against the two historians who are so clearly 'Architecture of the Past'. I am pretty sure, at forty years distance, that it was Peter Hammond who started me thinking about buildings as envelopes around the liturgy, both reflecting it and shaping it.

So I salute his memory.

END NOTE—WHOSE IS THE 'HEAVY EDITING'?

COB

On 7 May the *Church of England Newspaper* had an entry in its 'Buckleuch' column about the tribute to Michael Vasey, *Michael Vasey—Liturgist and Friend* (Grove Books Ltd., £3.75). The entry was headed 'A tribute to Michael Vasey, with heavy use of editing pen'. The column said nothing at all about the contents but instead says the tribute 'interestingly does not pose any questions about Michael's crusade on homosexuality'. I wrote in protest:

'Some of Michael's friends in the field of liturgy wished to pay tribute to his memory and to his very distinguished contributions to that field. We were not attempting more than that, and said so. Your cross-heading "a Tribute to Michael Vasey, with heavy use of editing pen" is even more wildly absurd—and, as editor, I ask *where* in the book you can possibly think you detect the "heavy use" of an editing pen.

'It struck me as near to prurient that a responsible commentator could pick up a publication which is avowedly about one subject and ransack it in the vain hope of finding it was actually about another (presumably more newsworthy) subject . . .'

The editor of the CEN did not acknowledge my letter, and did not apologize, but on 21 May reprinted the blander part of my letter, omitting most of what is above. So whose is the 'heavy editing'? NOL really does attempt to apologize if it makes a mistake. Does the CEN?

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ

Phone 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949

E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1999 £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 294

June 1999

EDITORIAL

THE LATEST ARCIC REPORT—ON AUTHORITY

There was published on 12 May the latest report from ARCIC, *The Gift of Authority: Authority in the Church III*. (ABC, Toronto, and CTS, London, and CPI, New York, 45pp, £3.50). It may not be overtly about liturgy (though liturgy is always there as a secondary issue when authority is the primary one), but in any case I deem it worth an editorial. At first sight it appears an exercise in yet further adjustment of worldwide Anglicanism to a Roman Catholic framework of thought—both in the enthroning of a virtually autonomous and irreformable Tradition (which it seems, contains scripture but is not judged by it; and is consistent and identical with itself whether in Rome or in Canterbury), and in the climactic conclusions on the episcopate, the ecumenical councils, primacy and the papacy. On Tradition I have said my say in my own book on ecclesiology (*Is the Church of England Biblical?*—the first chance I have taken to mention it). On the papacy it must be remembered that ARCIC I said that the two Communions differed. The ARCIC I statements on authority were a problem because they simply debated 'bishops-versus-Pope' without due reference to the whole body of the faithful. This report throws a few more bones to the lay role, which might be gain, but it resolves the 'bishops-versus-Pope' issue in favour of the Pope. Apparently, the terms of the problem (or the viewpoint of the conversationalists) have changed, for now there is unanimous agreement on the papal outcome. Yet it is centrally couched in terms which could just be a reversible proposition:

'It is thus the wholly reliable teaching of the whole Church that is operative in the judgement of the universal primate . . . It is this faith which the Bishop of Rome in certain circumstances has a duty to discern and make explicit. This form of authoritative teaching has no stronger guarantee from the Spirit than have the solemn definitions of ecumenical councils. The reception of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome entails the recognition of this specific ministry of the universal primate. We believe that this is a gift to be received by all the church.' (Para 47)

Reversible? Well, not all of it. But have another look at that 'no stronger guarantee' stuff. Suppose 'General Councils may err' and 'the Church of Rome hath erred'—then the 'no stronger guarantee' leaves Councils and Pope bracketed together and a long way short of 'guaranteed' truth.

What the statement does not cite are the Anglican affirmations of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture (as in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which says the

Scriptures are 'the rule and ultimate standard of faith' or the Church of England's Preface to the Declaration of Assent which says that the Christian faith and our doctrine are 'uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures'. As I have had occasion to discuss at length elsewhere (see my book mentioned above), Article VIII of the XXXIX says that even the Creeds are to be believed because 'they may be proved by most sure warrant of holy scripture'—and not because they are conciliar in origin, or traditional in use, or widely agreed across the world. The Anglican position is that everything must come to the test of scripture; it is that which has supreme authority in and over the church.

There are in this report issues about both episcopacy and primacy which will cause grave questioning amongst Anglicans. But *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae Romanae* is the papacy. It has to be tackled, because it is there. So the hub and goal of the whole report, to which everything else approaches in a circling way (like planes moving downwards in cloud through a spiralling route into Heathrow airport) is papal infallibility. In para 42 we learn that in some circumstances 'those with the ministry of oversight . . . may together come to a judgement which . . . is preserved from error'; then, after other discussion of primacy, para 47 begins 'Within his wider ministry, the Bishop of Rome offers a specific ministry concerning the discernment of truth, as an expression of universal primacy'; then para 47 refers to 'every solemn definition pronounced from the chair of Peter' (which tells us the 'discernment' just mentioned is employed in defining doctrine), and goes on that any such definition 'is pronounced *within* the college [of bishops] . . . and not outside that college' (which, in the light of actual papal definitions, appears to be some kind of metaphysical assurance—if we care for such metaphysics). Thus 'When the faith is articulated in this way, the Bishop of Rome proclaims the faith of the local churches.' After this comes the quotation above, beginning 'It is thus the wholly reliable teaching . . .' And then, after the spiralling down unsuspectingly through the clouds, we find we have duly landed at the papal Heathrow.

Let me respond as robustly as the text seems to require. If I believed in 'authority' the way this report sets it out I would have been a Roman Catholic long since. Such convictions about the Bishop of Rome are not simply a construct of what powers the 'chair of Peter' would hold in some future fully united single world church: no, they are a statement of *existing Roman Catholic belief*. They have to be—for how would any loyal Roman Catholic otherwise put his or her hand to it? There is some softer formulation of it than the most naked insistence we have sometimes seen in the past, but it is not so capable of reformulation as the eucharist, for instance, has seemed to be; and the given universal primacy and guaranteed infallibility of the Pope come through, as they must have been designed to do, unequivocally. So how, I find myself asking, would an Anglican who had agreed this statement then find ground for *not* being a Roman Catholic immediately? I find on the Anglican team both personal friends and two English bishops to whom I have been an assistant, but I still think the question presses. There appears to be no critique of

Margaret Withers, *Welcome to the Lord's Table: Preparing Children for Holy Communion* (Bible Reading Fellowship, 112 pp., A4, 1999, £12.99)

Margaret Withers, *Welcome to the Lord's Table: Activity Book* (Bible Reading Fellowship, 32 pp., A5, 1999, £2.99)

My two first thoughts on seeing these two matching books were, firstly, that the Bible Reading Fellowship has become imaginative and highly productive (not my old image of it), and, secondly, that these two books look like fun. Further inspection suggests my first impressions were right.

The basic assumption, encouraged by the style of the House of Bishops' guidelines, is that children are to be admitted to communion before the age of confirmation but at an age (7-9 years is posited) when they can receive preparation and respond to instruction. If some of us would like to go the whole hog and begin baptized infants in communion with their parents, that is not where the Church of England currently is. So this book is exactly right for the present realities. Margaret Withers is Children's Officer for Chelmsford diocese (I knew her previously in Rochester), and is very professional in her approach to her work, and to the crafting of these materials. The illustrations by Andy Robb are a brilliant accompaniment, and the upshot is terrific. Even the page-numbers are fun.

The 'Preparing Children' book is the chief book. It has five introductory chapters—one on scripture, three on the people who give context to children at communion (the congregation, the children's leaders, and the family), and a fifth one on the shape of the Course which follows. The Course is almost three-quarters of the book, and consists of ten Units, with special occasions interspersed, which are labelled 'Marking the Journey'. And the Units progress very skilfully from 'Who am I?' to 'Jesus is Risen' (Unit 8), 'Let's Have a Party' (Unit 9) and 'Let's Share a Meal' (Unit 10). From the point of view of the teacher the Units are bursting with good ideas—'Teaching Time', 'Activity', 'Craft', 'Music' (etc. etc.). Incidentally, Margaret Withers is herself an organist and parish director of music, and music ranks very high among her priorities for children.

The 'Activity Book' is the well-integrated companion guide for the kiddies. If you buy direct from BRF you can get 10 copies of the Activity Book with the main one for a total of £25 plus postage (or add in two more of these small ones and you'll save the postage too). This one is to enable children to learn by doing—filling in blanks, answering questions, following puzzles, and colouring pictures. You know the style—well, believe me, this looks to be well adapted to a variety of skills in quite a wide band of ages, and should make the total Course both fun and instructive. I have not attempted all the Activities yet myself, but I am sure they have been well tried and I hope to have a go yet.

COB

- (iv) Working nationally on behalf of baptismal integrity (going back to being the curate of almost the first evangelical to take the issue seriously—Philip Wood of Christ Church, West Croydon);
- (v) A highly proactive member of the Revision Committee on Rite A in the General Synod, in the run-up to the ASB in 1978-79;
- (vi) A highly innovative practitioner in his two incumbencies in St. Matthew's, Fulham, and St. Mary's, Ealing.
- (vii) A passing historian of evangelicals and liturgy in his book, *Evangelicals on the Move*.

I fear that we get little sense of strategic development in the liturgy (or in anything else) from Michael Saward—instead we get the sending up of platitudinous extemporary prayer meetings, an uproarious account of his first funeral after ordination, how the Queen had never sung a Saward hymn when he first met her (she has since, though just possibly without recognizing the authorship), quite a bit about his (discerning) musical judgment, the family service at Fulham (dubbed 'Fulham Weekend Television')—oh yes, and his institution at Fulham for which 'With all due humility, I chose five of my own hymns, all suitable . . . ' So this is hardly 'A History of My Own Times'—instead we need to be clear that it is a highly readable, colourfully anecdotal, frequently intriguing, overtly loaded, yet perhaps ultimately dispensable, 'History of Me'. Once you detect that unparalleled framework of thought, you can see how liturgy (and all other topics—not least sex, cricket and nobs) will come across in that all-encompassing context. Should we have expected otherwise?

COB

Richard Giles, *Re-Pitching the Tent: Re-Ordering the Church Building for Worship and Mission* (Revised and Expanded Edition) (SCM-Canterbury, 1999, xvi/256 pp. pb., £16.99)

The original edition of Richard Giles' book got a glowing review by Jeremy Fletcher in these columns in 1996. Apparently that edition was reprinted the following year, and demand now brings a third printing, in a 'revised and expanded' form. The author has failed to list or describe for us what is new in the expansion, so, unless one reads the 1996 text alongside the new one, it is hard to spot the growth. The back-cover tells us that at least many new photos are included. I should add as my personal note that much of the contents of the book (nowhere else covered by Anglican writers of the last two decades, as far as I know) convey an extra 'buzz' to those who know the author.

I doubt if those with the first edition will want to pay again for this expanded one; but those with a serious interest in space, furnishing, functionality and aesthetics in worship areas will be wise to get this one if they do not have the earlier one. Clearly public confidence remains high.

COB

the papal institution nor even a question raised about either past or present exercise of papal powers—it is a total capitulation. Is *all* that Anglicans have to say about the papacy that the Roman Catholic Church has got it right all along?

Quite apart from any theoretical future deployment if these infallibility attributes of the Bishop of Rome, I would like to start the argument with known facts which have to be taken into account in commending the papal system to those who do not have it.

Firstly, no-one reading scripture in its overall balance could ever think that all the assertions here about bishops, councils, primacy, papacy, the see of Rome and infallibility were really involved in the primary revelation of God at all. Anglicans surely dare not make anything in these categories primary and *de fide*, dare they?

Secondly (as an illustration, not as an exhaustive statement of the charge), there is Keenan's *Catechism*. You've never heard of it? Ah, but I had, for it figures in Salmond's *Infallibility of the Church* (I hope you have heard of *that*). But recently I found the two necessary editions of Keenan on sale together on a secondhand list, so I bought them. They are strongly anti-Protestant handbooks for controversialists. The 1851 edition (updated from an earlier one, with the *Imprimatur* of the Scottish Roman Catholic bishops) has this question and answer within the section 'On Councils' on page 102:

'Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?

A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body; that is, by the bishops of the Church.'

Well, 'a Protestant invention' indeed! The Protestants knew Rome better than its own bishops perhaps? At any rate, you can see what is coming—my 1896 edition (revised by a new editor) has on its comparable page 118 an identical set of surrounding questions, but within the set the 'Protestant invention' one is missing. Instead, at an earlier point (in the section 'On the Head of the Church' on page 112) there is a question about infallibility, then a further question about how at an earlier point it had been possible for Catholics (and indeed earlier editions of Keenan's *Catechism* itself) to deny the infallibility—and the answer was that, even whilst denying it, they were 'implicitly' asserting it. Am it in turn due to say that, whilst I deny papal infallibility to-day, I am actually implicitly asserting it? I hope I am not that kind of person in that kind of realm of illogic.

Thirdly, I think we have to consider the two usually quoted instances of infallibility in action (not a hint of these in the ARCIC report)—the 1854 definition by Pius IX of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary and the 1950 definition by Pius XII of the Bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mary. Both of these are highly inferential and speculative constructs built upon the doctrine—*itself* speculative—that Mary was without sin, and that it was by this means that Jesus took humanity but was sinless and free of original sin. No-one holding to the supreme authority of the scriptural revelation would ever conclude that these constructed doctrines were certainly revealed in scripture—the highest that could ever be asserted would be

that they were not completely ruled out from speculation. But the infallible discerner has defined these two doctrines as *de fide*. Do our Anglican team on the International Commission believe the two Popes got it right? Or are they prepared to say they may have been wrong? If the former, then they are consistent in their advocacy of papal infallibility, but should they still be Anglicans—and why do they not mention the two decrees? If the latter, then why are they pussyfooting round the whole issue of infallibility in the report, when they personally believe the two Popes to have been not only wrong in what they believed, but wrong to promulgate those beliefs as *de fide*, and wrong to believe they had the power and duty to do so. And of course there are many other papal statements which we cannot think were correctly ‘discerning’—whether the Syllabus of Errors (1864), or *Apostolicae Curiae* (1896), or *Humanae Vitae* (1968), or the recent total abjuration of women as candidates for ordination. Roman Catholics may have to go through the convolutions of measuring how far these authoritative statements lack infallible authority and thus can be ignored—but I cannot think how anyone can want those not already in this papal system now to have to submit to it.

Do I have to add here how appreciative I am of Vatican II and of a renewed spirit in Roman Catholicism in my lifetime, which is wonderful to experience? But all that means that we are wise to sustain our own critique of the least acceptable but apparently most inflexible parts of the system. And if that is so, then at the very least the Anglicans on the Commission have here been very unwise.

I shall be writing on the report at greater length elsewhere in the near future.

Colin Buchanan

NEWS OF NEWS OF HYMNODY

Subscribers to NOH have been wondering where the January and April issues have been. The answer is that Janet Henderson, who teaches liturgy at Ridley Hall and has been editing NOH since the beginning of 1998, has been under the weather and unable to meet the deadlines for these two editions, even whilst hoping for the kind of recovery that would have caught her up successfully. Having gathered much material, she has yet found herself unable to deliver, and has sadly had to resign. So, where should those responsible turn for an editor? The answer: one Christopher Idle, superannuated editor of several years since (and a clerical resident of the Woolwich Area, where he has returned to the neighbourhood of the Old Kent Road where he did a first curacy upwards of three decades ago). I need hardly set out his qualifications—readers who have not known him in the past will quickly see his merits. The first of the four issues he is editing this year, the ‘pseudo-January’ one should come with this, or be in your hands soon. Pseudo-April will come soon after that.

texts require less believing than modern ones! ‘Thus it [1549] may draw into church many who would not count themselves as believers.’ And, for several good reasons, it may not.

The blurb on the dust-cover says that Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding ‘led a Christian community which continued to use the 1549 Prayer Book.’ Van de Meyer once belonged to Little Gidding, so ought to know what he is writing about. But I find no mention of this practice in the biography of Ferrar; and, as Little Gidding was built around Morning and Evening Prayer, I am unsure what would count as preferring 1549 to 1604—certainly nothing of great moment.

I have criticized in Synod attempts to streamline Henry VIII’s legislation about appointing bishops, suggesting that this is like digging up the *Mary Rose* and adding an outboard motor in the hope of making it go to-day. This book reads as the exact parallel in liturgy. Let us honour our antiques as treasures of their own times—but God forbid we should get into this outboard-motor frame of mind about them. Most of us will not need much dissuading.

COB

Michael Saward, *A Faint Streak of Humility: An Autobiography* (Paternoster, 1999, xii/468 pp. pb, £9.99)

Nearly 500 pages for under £10—at first sight, that’s a rare bargain. And it can never be said that Michael Saward has been short of words; indeed the wonder is that he cut his account of himself as short as he has. One of the quotes which commend the book (a Saward touch in itself) says he knows himself well, and we have to trust the title therefore (even if we would never have dreamt of it ourselves as a way to describe him) as indicating deep self-knowledge, and greatly to be respected.

But NOL is a liturgical journal, not simply a review of *Crockford’s* entries. So what has this ageing young Turk contributed to worship? And, to get inside the ethos of the book, how does he himself see his contribution? It has to be discerned by a toothcombing process (there is no index—and if there were, one senses it would be confined to famous names, and a faint mention of his own), as any one theme is secondary or even tertiary to his aim (the main thrust of which should now be clear). Some indeed of the following are not visible in this book at all, but are my own memories—yet, if he is celebrating his own life-story, I doubt if he will mind if I add a positive touch or two:

- (i) Involvement with the CPAS Family Service venture in the 1960s;
- (ii) Hymn-writing and producing with Jubilate from *Psalm Praise* to the present day (and he recounts all the fun in 1982 over re-touching the National Anthem . . .);
- (iii) Part of the joint Eclectics and Latimer House team that produced a monograph on baptismal liturgy in the 1960s;

he was doing. Anyone interested in the sixteenth century text must be headed off by rotweilers; this publication is strictly for those who are going to revive rural worship to-day by its lay-led congregational use. The services are in the wrong order, ending with the litany (which should be after the communion service) and the Collects, Epistles and Gospels (which should have proper Psalms and come before the communion). One or two have the wrong title (how my exotic friends will miss 'commonly called the mass'). They omit bits (where is Quicunque vult? or Private Baptism?). They divide items which belong together (the confirmation rite has no catechism—which has been separated off—so has no reference to baptismal vows at all). They add that which 1549 never contemplated (like a sermon at Matins). Time and again explanatory or directive rubrics do not appear. It is not the 1549 Book.

Secondly, the introduction is laced with error, largely (I would judge) stemming from the editor's dogmatic conviction about the usefulness and relevance of the Book to to-day, a dogmatism that is not easily dented by hard evidence from history. I think the point is worth proving, so the cross-examination by the prosecution starts here. The salient points follow.

Firstly, the title of this publication (*The First English Prayer Book*) is used throughout in its italic form as though it were the title of the 1549 Book. It was not. I refer to Cranmer's original as '1549' hereafter, for convenience. But no-one has ever thought Cranmer called it what Van de Meyer calls it.

Secondly, we are told that 1549 is 'ideally suited' to being led by lay persons, as over against modern rites—and the evidence is that it has 'in past centuries sustained many parishes without a resident priest'. Again the imagination boggles—rural parishes up and down England in several centuries unable to get a resident ordained vicar, but rescued by lay persons armed with 1549.

Thirdly, we are told that the instructions were printed in red, and were thus rubrics. I wonder if Van de Meyer has consulted Edwardine printings of the Edwardine Prayer Books. None of the ones I inspected in the British Library when editing texts myself (still available as *Eucharistic Liturgies of Edward VI*, no.34 in the old Grove Liturgical Studies) had red rubrics—a luxury, I suspect, of medieval manuscripted books of worship. The convention in printed books was a different typeface, all in black. His version looks none for the worse for it, but I don't think his history will stand up (and he never states his firsthand sources for his text).

Fourthly, we are told that the English people 'were reassured that no new ideas or rituals were being foisted on them'. I think he needs to read the complaints of the Devon rebels.

Fifthly, Cranmer, we gather, got it right in 1549, but 'he was soon overwhelmed by cries for more extreme reform from clergy committed to the Protestant cause'.

Virtually all other historical descriptions are either too skimpy for testing or wrong in detail. The contemporary need for 1549 is spelled out in terms on which I have touched above—but it is wonderfully compounded by a final commendation of this time-encrusted text as meeting to-day's needs, on the grounds that ancient

GENERAL SYNOD PREVIEW

General Synod meets in York from Friday, 9 July, to Tuesday, 13 July. This looks like a big heave on the liturgical front, and the following will probably be on the agenda:

First Revision Stage:

Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child

Marriage

Funerals

Eucharistic Prayers

Final Approval

The Lord's Prayer

In the July NOL we will be printing the complete text of the eucharistic prayers as they are proposed to Synod, however much that squeezes other items. The report of the July debates will come in the August NOL.

WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

I found myself last month in a place of worship where I was reading a psalm that went:

'They that rust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion'

And the Saward autobiography (briefly mentioned elsewhere in this issue) has a photo of the autobiographer with a well-known politician, and it is captioned:

'Interviewing Edward Health . . .'

This Month's Publication . . .

. . . is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no.43, *Baptism in Early Byzantine Palestine, 325-451*, by Juliette Day. Juliette Day read a fascinating paper on this subject at the SLS Conference in 1998, and has now turned it into a published Study. It is distinguished by her great care about issues of both topography and dating in relation to Palestine, and in the process she both corrects other scholars and gives a notable overview of a special period.

. . . and next month's

is Worship Series no.153, *Worship for the New Millennium*, by Christopher Byworth. We have noted in these columns before that the Millennium Office publications are running somewhat late, but Christopher Byworth has been allowed to work with Book Two of the official texts before it is published, in order to bring an up-to-date discussion, commentary and commendation of this material—as well as setting it all in a larger millennial context.

KINGSWAY GOES LITURGICAL

'Worship Together' is a large conference run by Kingsway, who produce the magazine of the same name, every couple of years in Eastbourne and Southport. The ethos of the conference is largely Free/New Church, even though about 40% of those attending are 'Anglican', and members of GROW have in the past been asked to do the odd seminar on liturgy, just to keep the few anoraks who like that sort of thing happy. But such has been the demand that this year we were asked to run a 'liturgical stream' involving six seminars and three liturgical celebrations. As well as a couple of Services of the Word (the preacher at one of which was to be Gerald Coates) we were asked to do a full works Anglican Communion on the Sunday morning. So it was that Mark Earey walked onto the main stage in the Congress Theatre in front of 1300 people to celebrate Order 1 with Prayer F.

Mark had the congregation eating out of his hand from the moment he stepped onto the stage in white alb and said 'Fear not: it is not a ghost; it is I myself!' The liturgical texts were projected over his head via Powerpoint, and Mark briefed the congregation on how to join in with liturgy, and then led them with great user-friendliness. Music was provided by Matt Redman (it may have been that fact, rather than the implicit attraction of liturgy itself, which drew the crowds) and with great skill and sensitivity Matt and the band led two worship 'slots' as well as playing so that the Eucharistic Prayer could be done as a voice-over, with repeated sung responses 'Come, Lord Jesus . . . pour out your Spirit on us today'

We weren't allowed incense because of the smoke-alarms (surely an invention of the Enemy to stop God's people from worshipping properly), but everything else was there: huge candles and full vestments meant that the president wasn't dwarfed into invisibility on the cavernous stage; bread and wine in vast quantities (not quite vast enough, sadly, for a few rows at the very back of the circle). Unfortunately the logistics meant that people had to receive communion in their seats, served by an army of stewards, but a good time was had by all, and many people, I suggest, will have left the conference with some illusions about deadness, formality and vain repetition soundly shattered.

But the high spot was an unexpectedly delightful moment during the Eucharistic Prayer. In order to make it even more responsive and participatory, Mark had split the penultimate paragraph into separate phrases, each repeated after the deacon's lead:

Bless the earth!

Bless the earth!

Heal the sick!

Heal the sick!

Let the oppressed go free!

Let the oppressed go free!

Fill your church with power from on high!

Fill your church with power from on high!

at which point the congregation erupted into spontaneous cheering, shouting and

clapping. It was reminiscent of Clement of Alexandria's suggestions about the Thanksgiving, but it also showed them that we Anglicans do actually believe in the Spirit (some of us, at least) and it showed me personally the sheer power of the words, which we might miss through familiarity but which can bring others to their feet in applause.

Watch this space for more liturgical developments among non-Anglican charismatics.

John Leach

BOOK REVIEWS

Robert Van de Meyer (ed.), *The First English Prayer Book* (Arthur James, now an imprint of John Hunt Publishing, New Alresford, xii/146 pp., pocket-sized hardback, £9.99, 1999)

This is a wildly bizarre publication; but it has to be acknowledged as the only book so far to come NOL's way as an English marking of the 450th anniversary of the 1549 Book. To that extent, it scoops the market. But in a shrewdly discerning, if not actually competitive world, what market would it genuinely meet? Obviously, only a description will answer this question, but I cannot kid myself that a description will itself be value-free.

The main part of the book is, of course, the 1549 text. It is presented in a format very like a modern liturgical text, notably the ASB (though with rubrics in red, not blue). Congregational parts, for instance, are printed in bold though not usually 'lined' out. The blurb on the dust-cover says that 'the publishers hope that churches and informal Christian groups may use it for occasional—or even regular—acts of worship', but inside the editor (whose engagement with reality at times seems exiguous) goes further: 'The First English Prayer Book is a means—perhaps the only means—of preserving worship in England's country churches.' (p.x) Well, in all the arguments and reports about the church in the countryside, in all the diagnosis of trouble and in all the prescriptions to meet it, the one answer no-one seems to have proposed—when it was sitting there all the time, just waiting to solve our problems for us—was the reprinting in usable style of the 1549 Prayer Book. What fools we have all been, how blind, when what is perhaps the 'only means' of preserving worship in the countryside lay ready to hand, and we have ignored it.

That said, one would have thought that a review would then write itself—for the text would be a faithful following of the 1549 Book, and the five-plus-page introduction would uncontroversially tell us how it originally came about and why we need it to-day. I am sure the editor thinks he has done this; but I have to tell you that text of the 1549 Book is not what you might think, and the introduction is astonishing. Let us take it in those two stages.

Firstly, the text is not 1549 at all. It has been edited to help it to be useful—so a student will never find out from it what (if I may quote a phrase) Cranmer thought