

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 315

March 2001

EDITORIAL

I have one genuine niggle about the CW eucharistic texts—it is the ‘set before’ on page 291 I referred to it when I gave the Vasey Memorial Lecture last May, and I quote here from the edited version of that which was published in *Anvil*.

‘When work began on the Common Worship texts Michael Vasey left his footprints again. He persuaded the Commission to propose a version of the Roman prayers which says “through your goodness we have this bread to set before you”. I argued with him about this. I (or maybe it was others) even persuaded the Revision Committee on Eucharistic Prayers to knock out “set before” from the anamnesis of Prayer E, and it now reads “bringing before you [the bread and cup]” a text pioneered in the Third Eucharistic Prayer of Rite A, and let through somewhat uneasily by the Revision Committee to which Messrs. Brindley and Beckwith proposed it then. But it was impossible to disturb the occurrence of “set before” in those prayers at the preparation of the table, though I confess that I doubt if texts for those prayers currently in actual use will change, and that Michael Vasey’s typically tough (but to my mind incomprehensible) advocacy of “set before” will actually have achieved anything. It is an interesting question as to whether “set before” is different from “offer” in its import—though you might also press me as to why I do not like “set before” although I had coped in 1978-79 with “bring before”. “Set before” appears to have an intermittent history—I note the reply of the Anglican Archbishops to *Apostolicae Curae* in 1897, the central verb in the anamnesis of 1928 (which of course perished from history), the similar verb in the pirate diocesan publication of the diocese of Southwark in 1964, and the same wording in a slightly different context in that initial Brindley-Beckwith proposal in 1978. The Roman Prayers—or the Vasey variant—are obscure in what they are saying—are they here and now currently, and before we even start the sacramental action, offering simple bread and wine to God? Or are they stating that, having now furnished bread and wine at the table, we shall be in position shortly to offer it, once consecrated, as a highly symbolic sacrificial offering to God? Or is it even somewhere between these two—that it is in offering elements to God that they are consecrated? It is worth noting that the form and content of these Roman prayers might well be represented as mini-eucharistic prayers—is it then possible that, if the “offertory prayers” are used, the consecration is already complete before the main eucharistic prayer begins?’

The other was his almost single-handed attempt to stop Rite A from being authorized (though John Bickersteth, quoted here recently, was in support). He spoke very bluntly against both provisional approval in July 1979 and final approval in November 1979. He had, he said, ‘found beauty and theological satisfaction in both Series 2 and Series 3’, but ‘something went seriously wrong with the whole process of this most recent revision.’ He was almost on his own, a brave Horatius at the bridge. And I doubt if history even twenty years further on would endorse his contrasting evaluations of the rites then around.

It is odd how both these issues led to such a determined stand by a man whose many major and much admired interests clearly lay elsewhere.

COB

This month’s publication . . .

. . . is, of course, *Common Worship Today*, edited by Mark Earey and Gilly Myers and published by HarperCollins (technically on 19 March, but copies will be around before that)—but its contents spring from the whole GROW team. Send £19.99 to the editorial address below, for a postfree copy—or shop around for a cutprice one. We hope for a full review next month.

. . . and next month’s

is Worship Series no.163 by COB, *Infant Baptism in Common Worship*. No 145, done jointly by COB and Michael Vasey on the original complete package of initiation services, has been out of print for some time; and the smaller COB booklet, *Infant Baptism in the Church of England*, depends quite heavily on the ASB rite for infant baptism, so now becomes out of date. No.163 is an attempt to put together a brief case for infant baptism, a handling of a ‘covenantal’ view of infant baptism, an outline of liturgical principles in infant baptism as exemplified in the Common Worship provision, and an appendix containing the relevant Canons and an exposition of the law.

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ
Phone 0208-699-7771 Fax: 0208-699-7949
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 2001 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

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

I have since reflected further in whether I have been justified in finding 'bring before' acceptable and 'set before' not; and I think I have at least located an answer in my own thinking, which might possibly be also 'there' objectively in revealed theology. Funnily enough I got the clue from Leviticus. Here is how the reasoning goes.

To 'bring before' in, eg, Leviticus 3-5 is a preliminary to 'presenting' a sacrifice. Its connotations are largely spatial—the animal or whatever is physically 'brought'—and stop short of much ritual significance (note also the eating and drinking 'in the presence of your divine majesty' in Prayer A). On the other hand, when in the Scriptures food is 'set before' visitors, it is clearly a gift or offering to them. Certainly, 'set before' was the verb chosen by the two Archbishops in 1897 to *demonstrate to the Pope that Anglicans have a true eucharistic sacrifice in the 1662 Book!* And certainly the Revision Committees in 1978-9, in 1995, and (on the eucharistic prayers) in 1998-2000, have always changed it. But the oddity remains on that stubborn page 291, simply because that Committee had largely finished its work (and been pushed by the oh-so-dogged Vasey) before the Committee on the eucharistic prayers began its task, and co-ordinating was not properly attempted.

Not that that makes me sigh (my nostalgia line?) for 'we have this bread to offer'. On a formal point, I could not so sigh. Why not? Why, because (though it is widely forgotten) the Roman offertory prayers are not there in the ASB.

Colin Buchanan

WHAT CAN ROME ALLOW?

J.D.Crichton, now in his 90s, writes in *Music and Liturgy* (Winter 2000) about Rome's control of local translation of Roman Catholic liturgy. There is, of course, a background in the great delays in getting Rome's approval of new translations, and its reputed nitpicking at the wrong things. He writes:

'There have been complaints that [ICEL] has been dilatory in getting out texts. Yet the re-translation of the Roman Missal into English has been with the Roman authorities for a very long time and there seems no hope it will be "confirmed" for use in the foreseeable future.

'Worse, a ritual for marriages for England—and so nothing to do with ICEL—has been with Rome for several years and there is still no sign that it will be issued for use.'

What Jimmy Crichton is urging is both that texts should be initially drafted in the local vernacular, and that they should only be submitted to Rome when the local bishops themselves had doubts about the orthodoxy of their drafting. This would be a revolution indeed, and he envisages its being discounted as disruptive of the 'substantial unity' of the Roman rite of which the Vatican II Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy spoke. His reply is to say that the 'substantial unity' has already been broken—simply by translation into vernacular languages. A vernacular mass,

What surprised some of us, though, was that the new material appeared to be so unfamiliar to a significant number of participants. And it is still much too early to say whether the people's interest was in the material itself, or rather in simply being able to cope with it. Certainly, it will be very interesting to see what happens in cemetery and crematorium chapels now that the new funeral services have so much choice (is it thirteen commendation prayers, or eighteen?).

But anyone who fears that Common Worship has completely changed the life of our committee will be reassured by news that we are looking at the Maundy Thursday chrisem rite; we are preparing a diocesan service for Pentecost once more; we had a big and significant input into the liturgy for the Readers' Licensing service, for which a reader member, Diane Craven, was largely responsible; and, yes, we have revised the Collation/Institution and Induction Service once again.

John Thewlis, Secretary

IN MEMORIAM — JOHN V. TAYLOR

John Taylor died on 30 January. I confess I wonder whether it is unfair to introduce his name here at all, as it is a name so greatly honoured in so many departments of the life of church, and his role in liturgy was slight. But I want to share in rendering the honour—I know Uganda a little, where he laboured long; and I read his CMS Newsletters for years with unstinted admiration and great profit; and I once shared with him in sending a letter round the members of General Synod when Robert Runcie (then at St Albans) first of all in 1973 carried the Synod for full communion with the Church of South India, and then, after going back to the House of Bishops, under pressure receded cravenly from his bold stance—and JVT, Geoffrey Lampe and I asked the Synod not to receive the House of Bishops report.

And liturgy? Just as being a bishop (he was Bishop of Winchester from 1975 to 1985) never seemed to fit him as well as being Max Warren's successor at CMS, so liturgy in Synod never fitted him as well as being the world missionary statesman. But he made two memorable interventions in General Synod, both unsuccessful—one to introduce a new departure, the other to express caution about Synod's impetuous decision-taking.

The first of these was his attempt in November 1978 to bring into the prayers reperi-natal death one which was to follow an abortion. The Revision Committee on Initiation Services Series 3 had turned him down, and he took it to full Synod—and gained the support of Donald Coggan. But he was defeated in two of the three Houses, perhaps unsurprisingly; for the Abortion Act itself had only been in force eleven years, the General Synod had twice passed motions unequivocally condemning induced abortion, and it was not politic to write official prayers as though we officially accepted abortion.

So what next? Three main topics are on our agenda at the moment:

- We are trying to find good ways of sharing information and good practice about liturgy across the diocese. This includes regular features in *Spotlight*, our diocesan newspaper and a new link from our diocesan web-site which we hope will be up and running soon.
- Training events for clergy and readers on the new Pastoral Services, funerals in particular. Here we are working closely with our diocesan adviser for care and counselling, to ensure the agenda is truly both pastoral and liturgical.
- And finally, we are getting ready for our diocesan clergy conference at Swanwick in April, freshly inspired by the GROW conference held there in January.

To end, I can't resist sharing something "the spellcheck won't tell you" from our Cathedral weekly newsletter. The choir were startled to discover that the composer of the anthem they were due to sing at a special service in St Paul's Cathedral was not by Bairstow but BARSTOOL. As the ASB once put it, "O Lord, open our lips" . . .

Cheers!

Adrian Daffern

Secretary, Lichfield Diocesan Worship Team

DIOCESAN REPORTS (NEW 2001-2 CYCLE)—2. SOUTHWARK

In respect of the genesis of Common Worship, our committee at Southwark has perhaps been unusual. The presence alone of our chairman (your learned editor) has guaranteed that regular and detailed accounts of Common Worship's confinement have been available to us. But where we at least have been like a Hanoverian cabinet waiting in an antechamber upon a royal birth, clergy and congregations in the diocese have been rather less fortunate. So for the past two or three years we have visited deanery synods and run pilot conferences to show the sort of material that the Commission has been writing and testing. Yet we always knew that 2000 would see us at our most active, and so it has proved.

There is no doubt that we were very blessed by strokes of good fortune. The clergy had only two days before received their draft copies of the eucharistic rites when delegates from a large number of parishes throughout the diocese met at a secondary school in Stockwell for a Saturday conference on 8 April. We were helped a good deal by this, and by some remarkably fine weather. But it was our impression that inviting block bookings from parishes helped swell the numbers in a remarkable way, and it is a lesson we are bearing in mind for the future. We did not expect such a big turnout for a second conference, on Tuesday 7 November: but to our astonishment we got it—vast numbers of clergy, readers and laity flocking to the cathedral throughout the day to attend workshops on virtually every liturgical aspect of the new book. The faultless organizing skills of three of our members—John Ansell, Gordon Jeanes and Andrew Nunn—left the speakers and workshop leaders on both occasions free to do their job without any hint of strain.

he says, looks and feels very different from a Latin one, so that the unity is not self-evident—and different vernaculars provide further kinds of contrasts in inculturation. (I found this interesting not only for its current implications, and the thrust of Jimmy Crichton's proposals, but also because it backs my theory that in 1549 Bishop Gardner, who could mentally move between Latin and English without trouble, could say that the new English rite was not distant from the previous Latin one, whilst the West country rebels, whose understanding of Latin was probably minimal, took the view that the familiar rite they knew as a fixed cultural landmark had been totally overthrown.)

But when will the Crichton message get into the system? And are the Roman Catholic bishops of England and Wales sympathetic to it, and ready to promote it?

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

- 27 March (Tuesday) at St Hugh's, Lewsey, Luton 10 am-4 pm on 'Common Worship Weddings' led by St Albans DLC (book with Canon Michael Sansom, 01727-833777)
- 26 April (Thursday) at Gloucester Cathedral Chapter House 10.30 am-4 pm on 'Liturgy for Rural Churches: Making the most of Times and Seasons' led by Robert Paterson, Andrew Bowden and John Whitehead (book through Praxis Office)
- 28 April (Saturday) Southwark DLC at St. Barnabas, Dulwich, on 'An Equal Music?' (re music for Common Worship) led by Geoff Weaver of RSCM (no need to book—probably £2 at the door)
- 1 May (Tuesday) Praxis East at Bar Hill Church, just outside Cambridge 10.00-4.00 on 'Music and Common Worship' for the five dioceses, Norwich, St Edmundsbury, Chelmsford, Ely, St Albans & Peterborough. Speakers are still being confirmed.
- 3 May (Thursday) 'Introducing Common Worship, especially Services of the Word' for Readers (details from Canon Paul Iles (01432-266193))
- 12 May (Saturday) 'Introducing Common Worship, especially Services of the Word' for Readers (details from Canon Paul Iles (01432-266193))
- 22-24 June (weekend) Residential conference 'The art of liturgical Preaching' led by John Melloh (details from Praxis, at St Mathew's House, 20 Great Peter Street, SW1P 2BU—020-7222-3704)

[The expectation is that four months at a time will appear each month, so that in April the August and September fixtures will be added—but there may be plenty more to appear within the months aired above still. Do send your information in—and if you are an organizer, are you getting the up-to-date Grove Booklets (and *Common Worship Today*) to exhibit on sale-or-return, without which your day will be incomplete?]

COB

BOOK REVIEWS

Jill Y Crainshaw, *Wise and Discerning Hearts. An Introduction to Wisdom Liturgical Theology* (Pueblo, 2000, 284 pp, £32.95).

I enjoyed this book very much. It builds on the discussion about liturgical theology, which has been happening in part through Pueblo e.g. Kavanagh, Irwin, Fagerberg, and in other publications e.g. Lathrop. This discussion forms one part of the thread, the others being the theological work of Edward Farley, and developments in Biblical Studies around wisdom.

One of the key theses of the book is that the liturgical movement is still hitched to an outdated method, one which is too based in enlightenment philosophy. This relates to the use of history in liturgical revision and how it can shade into patristic fundamentalism. Schon's critic of professional education is used here to link into discussion of primary theology in the liturgical event. The plot is developed by connection this to inductive method in pastoral studies, as for example in the discussion of theological reflection. Here the work of Farley is key, both in philosophy, method, and in critique of theological education.

Crainshaw then criticises much liturgical revision as being hitched to a salvation history approach e.g. in eucharistic prayers, and suggests that this presupposition only looks at one biblical method. In the context of postmodernism she suggests that wisdom has much to commend it, as it starts from below and has more to say on creation and anthropology. Wisdom therefore would be a more persuasive and plausible approach.

This is a significant addition to the discussion on liturgical theology. Its linking into pastoral studies and wisdom literature was refreshing. The lateral approach was one of the delights of the book. I commend it to be read alongside the others I have mentioned earlier.

Phillip Tovey

Paul Bradshaw, *Companion to Common Worship Vol I* (SPCK/Alcuin Club Collection 78, January 2001, xiv/274 pp, £19.99)

I now add two more chapters to the commenting on the separate chapters of this book. Last month I gave it a warm welcome overall, and then added a small 'but' in relation to the first six chapters and the last. Here goes with the brief notes on chapters 7 and 8.

Chapter 7 is 'Initiation Services' by Simon Jones and Phillip Tovey. Their history looks mainstream, though they are thin on the origins of infant baptism and do not point out that Tertullian was opposing it. They are also equivocal on whether confirmation is to be discerned in the New Testament. Surely too the burgeoning medieval practice of 'clinical' baptism by midwives owed much more to Augustine's teaching about the perils of dying unbaptized than to any worry about babies disturbing the Sunday mass (p.153)? The Reformation stuff looks good, though the

the Liturgical Commission realize how hard it is for the Mum to get one set of clothes on the baby and be at the church on time without having to take another with her! What world are we in? Moreover a serious scholar and pastor like Charles Whitaker was doubtful whether it had happened much even in the early Church.

I admit there are some good things: the sense of movement in initiation, the pastoral sensitivity of the funeral services and the eucharistic prayer which describes God as acting 'like a mother' included after the efforts of the Bishop of Oxford. There is, however, liturgical tinkering which was quite unnecessary like that which has ruined any poetry in the preface to the wedding service. There is much 'churchy' language and also 'wooden' language—especially in the eucharistic prayer for children. This and other eucharistic prayers are dominated by the concept of substitutionary atonement which is dear to evangelicals and a travesty of truth to others of us.

Jean Mayland, Grays

[This is half of Jean Mayland's protest—the other half is held over—Ed.]

DIOCESAN REPORTS (NEW 2001-2 CYCLE)—1. LICHFIELD

Common Worship was officially launched in the Lichfield Diocese on 18 November last year. A *Service of the Word* specially created for the occasion was held in the Cathedral, with a free book for every church (nearly six hundred) and a great sermon from Michael Perham. As a Diocesan Worship Team we felt rather proud, I think, of the work we'd put in over the previous two or more years in getting ready for the launch of CW. Like many of you reading this, we've spent many hundreds (thousands?) of hours at PCCs, chapters and synods, as well as holding training events and study days right across the diocese.

Recently the work of our Team has been greatly strengthened by the addition of some new blood: permanent members of the group include one of our Cathedral organists, our Diocesan Communications Officer, our new RSCM education officer and an Archdeacon. Their input, together with that of the other ordained and lay members of the group has been splendid, and has enabled us to do some good work.

Some of that work has been closely developed with our diocesan Board of Ministry, with whom we now have a major role in terms of CME, Reader training and other ministerial formation.

Alongside our developing training role, we have worked closely with the Bishop's staff, producing a template for Confirmation services within the diocese, and a new form of licensing service, *Celebrating New Ministry*, which can be adapted for use for an Archdeacon's Collation, the institution of a parish priest, or commissioning new youth workers, etc. *Celebrating New Ministry* has just been authorised for a year's trial: reactions so far are good, and we look forward to seeing how the service will develop. We continue also to produce liturgy for all manner of services and celebrations throughout the Diocese and in the Cathedral.

‘COMMON WORSHIP’ WHAT DOES IT SAY ABOUT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?

When the TV commentator spoke of the 15 years of work on *Common Worship* and said that it would be a very long time before the Church of England changed its liturgy again, my heart sank. *Common Worship* is a backward-looking collection which testifies to an inward looking Church setting up barriers against the world and even against ecumenical co-operation.

If my beloved Church of England cannot change its attitude and its worship again and before too long—then the outlook for its future is grim. Remember the Church of England is above all a Church which is known and defined by its worship which also ‘forms’ its people.

As a member of the Liturgical Commission which prepared the ASB, I always believed that those who loved the Book of Common Prayer should not be deprived of it. My husband always provided 1662 services in the parish and as long as Ronald Jasper was Dean of York one main Sunday morning eucharist a month was according to the rite of 1662 in addition to evensong and said services. This, however, was not enough for the 1662 lobby. 17th century services must be included in the new book and parishes must pay to have them there even if they never wanted to use them (letter to *The Times* by Bill Beavers).

This may please a small but vociferous and powerful lobby of public persons, princes and poets but it does not meet the needs of wider society in England. Even this, however was not enough. 1662 collects and 1662-type language must be reintroduced into the ‘new’ services. So we are treated to long wordy collects whose sentiments are more suited to the 17th-century than to the new millennium. Add to these the new post-communion prayers which are mostly very churchy and concentrate on building up the cosy community, we can go through a eucharist, the celebratory and challenging covenant banquet of God’s new and living community and pray only to be kept safe in a nostalgic church ghetto. Only if one of the ASB post-communion prayers is added is there anything about the world or witness or service or God’s call.

Along with the 1662-type language go signs of the current evangelical domination of the Synod and the Church. The new baptism service may be fine for the baptism of a teenage evangelical who wants to tell God everything but is useless for the northern working man who wants to do his best for his child but for whom standing up and saying anything in church is acutely embarrassing. If I were a parish priest it would always be a ‘pastoral necessity’ to use the ASB words of ‘turning’ and commitment. I would not even be prepared myself to use words about devils and rebellion. Moreover ‘submit’ is always a negative word especially for women who have faced centuries of submission to and violence from men. It does not seem to me that it is a word which the Jesus of the Gospels would care for much either.

It also seems the height of absurdity to move the giving of candle to the end of the service especially in order to make space to change the baby’s clothes. Does not

1662 part would be pointed up better if the title ‘of Riper Years’ were accurately rendered, the reintroduction of a ‘sanctifying’ of the water were mentioned, and the requirement of the confirmation of those baptized in riper years were highlighted. In the more recent history, the 1959 rites were the ancestors of Series 2 and 3, but are omitted (though mentioned later on p.169)—and the 1928 rite of confirmation was in 1966 defeated in the Church Assembly as Series 1 (quite a crucial point). In the ASB the ‘integrated rite’ was not simply for adults, but for households (p.159)—and my nitpicking instincts would drop on several other features. In the debates about communion before confirmation (p.160) the General Synod debacle of 1991 is crucial, and the attitude of the House of Bishops from 1985 to 1995 accounts for that.

With the CW rites, there is less reason to nitpick, though I think they are just off the point re parental responses for infants, and out of proportion in their long discussions of the sign of the cross and the prayer over the water. I am interested that they know that the (to me nearly incomprehensible) practice of anointing at confirmation is increasing (p.176)—and horrified to think that chrismation at baptism is a kind of confirmation (I suppose they would say the same for infants?).

Chapter 8 is ‘Collects and Post Communion Prayers’ by Bridget Nichols. It has a five-page general introduction about principles, and then 41 pages of comment on each collect or prayer. I found myself unexcited, and therefore delivered from nitpicking, and commend the commentary to all collect-devotees.

COB

Raymond Chapman, *Leading Intercessions: The Common Worship Edition* (Canterbury Press, 2000, xiii/171 pp.)

This ‘Common Worship’ edition is, in fact, simply a light revision of the 1997 edition of the same book. The revision includes the addition of a brief invitation to prayer and a concluding sentence for each set of intercessions, and slight changes of wording in some cases. If you have the original edition you don’t need this revision—but if you missed the original then you probably do. Was anything missed in the revision? Perhaps the opportunity to suggest responses (as alternatives to ‘Lord, in your mercy’ or ‘Lord, hear us’). For these you will still have to use your imagination or look elsewhere for inspiration—*Patterns for Worship*, for instance.

These intercessions are concise, evocative and memorable. They are intended for use at the eucharist, and draw on the readings (mainly the NT ones) from the principal service lectionary. A set of intercessions is provided for each of the three years of the lectionary: they could also be used at Evening Prayer, for example, but the connections with the readings would be lost.

This is one of the best one-person collections of intercessions around, and they work well either as they are or as a jumping off point for your own ideas. The ‘Afterword—on Leading Intercessions’ (a literal 10 Commandments for intercessors) should be compulsory reading for anyone who is involved in this ministry.

Mark Earey, Sarum College

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

It's good to see so much interest in the sources and development of the Eucharistic Prayers in Common Worship. But there's one anecdote which is a delight to share over the eleventh hour revision of the latter part of Prayer G. You will know already that the 'living temple' image in the latter part of the epiclesis is inspired by ASB Prayer 2, because the 'renew us by your Spirit' enthusiasts won the day in the elision of ASB 1 and 2 into Prayer A. But what has not so far been pointed out is the origin of the beginning of the final paragraph, 'bring us at the last with all the Saints to the vision of that eternal splendour for which you have created us.'

I was staying at Quarr Abbey at the end of September, 1991, on retreat, reading Kenneth Kirk's *Vision of God*, which Henry Chadwick once described to me as one of the greatest Anglican works of theology in the twentieth century. On the last morning of my retreat, I decided to get up early in order to finish the last chapter before the Community's Mass at 9 am. The last chapter is one of the most powerful passages of Kenneth Kirk, in which he weaves all kinds of themes together, such as disinterested service and pure love. In short, it was rather moving to go straight from my room at the Abbey Church. No one in the Community knew what I was reading, but the deacon at the Mass commemorated the departed with the following final bidding: 'may they enjoy the visions of God for which they were created.' I immediately wrote it down, hoping that one day there might be a use for it. Eight years later, whilst that latter part of Prayer G was being revised, Kenneth Kirk was able to figure in the praying life of the Church.

Yours etc

Kenneth Stevenson, Bishop of Portsmouth

Dear Colin

I much enjoyed your January comments on the new Eucharistic Prayers, all of which I have now used—some of them more often than others!

I would have preferred that all the prayers had the same shape as the ASB and agree that the post-Institution epiclesis poses problems for those using Western ceremonial. The Eastern rites appear to have an elevation at the Institution narrative (though probably not for adoration) and then the deacon asks the priest to bless the bread and cup before the epiclesis. Elevating at the doxology seems the only consistent solution for those who want to elevate.

But what then of Prayer H which finishes with the Sanctus?

My own particular *bête noire* is the new office lectionary. The compilers appear to believe that you can take two lectionaries based on different principles and developed independently and appoint one for morning and one for evening use. Each lectionary may well be excellent on its own but they do not bond together.

Just two examples.

1. Apart from holy-days there has not been a lesson from the gospels from 8 January. From 26 February however there will be John in the morning and Matthew in the evening. In the past lectionary compilers have appointed Gospel readings at one office and non-Gospel NT readings at the other. (From 1549 on!)
2. Because the two lectionaries have been separately compiled there are repetitions. Today we began reading Ruth in the morning. In a week's time we shall begin reading the same book at Evening Prayer.

I write as one who has had experience of lectionary compilation. I was the prime mover in the Church in Wales weekday lectionary which has now been in use for over 30 years and which avoids the situation I have mentioned.

Every good wish

Geoffrey Davies, Liverpool Cathedral

Dear Colin

As one who has been preparing service booklets for some years I was interested in Malcolm Torry's letter in NOL in February about user-friendly and readable texts as well as options in such booklets. I agree with his (and your) comments about the CW book's colour schemes and typography. In my opinion user friendliness implies enabling the worshipper to play their part in a service fully and not as a puppet whose strings are being tugged frequently by a clergy person up front. Rubrics need to be minimal but easily read and intelligible to a visitor. Options are, I would urge, essential, within practicable limits, to get people used to variations and avoid them getting into ruts. Omitting options is not in the long-term good for worshippers, in my view.

The best way I have found for including options is to put each eucharistic prayer onto a card (A4 portrait folded lengthways) and issue the appropriate one for each service. The service booklet tells worshippers that the prayer is on a separate card and the card refers them back to the booklet for the Lord's Prayer.

Assuming an A5 booklet, it is possible to put most other options into two parallel columns. (Occasionally a one point size reduction is needed.) A rubric says, '*we say one of the two following prayers*'. Users easily pick out the right one,—it is hardly a case of skipping bits. There is then no need for clergy to break off to tell them which we are going to say (though I do wish some clergy would realize this!). For just the few options which cannot go into columns, (notably the Prayers of Humble Access,—long lined and wordy), the words '*Either*' or '*Or*' need to be set out distinctly in the margins so as to be easily seen. This also needs a careful control of page breaks so that both words are visible in one view.

These provisions seem to work well in our team parish. I seldom see strangers confused by them. And it enables us to have some variety but to do so simply.

Yours sincerely

Peter S Johnson