

Convocation (possibly by amending Canon 30), some creation of national pastoral criteria for such marriages, a locating of responsibility for decision-taking with the incumbent, and an advisory role for bishops. A Service of Prayer and Dedication would continue (which is, in part, how this stuff got into NOL, though issues of who are the right candidates for rites of passage has always been within NOL's purview). The Winchester report did not recommend any alteration in the marriage rite itself, though that question has always been in the offing, and an official example of such is to be found in the Southern Africa Prayer Book.

Canon B30 reads as follows:

1. The Church of England affirms, according to our Lord's teaching, that marriage is in its nature a union permanent and lifelong, for better for worse, till death them do part, of one man with one woman, to the exclusion of all others on either side, for the procreation and nurture of children, for the hallowing and right direction of the natural instincts and affections, and for the mutual society, society, help and comfort that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.
2. The teaching of our Lord affirmed by the Church of England is expressed and maintained in the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony contained in *The Book of Common Prayer*.
3. It shall be the duty of the minister, when application is made to him for matrimony to be solemnized in the church of which he is the minister, to explain to the two persons who desire to be married the Church's doctrine of marriage as herein set forth, and the need of God's grace in order that they may discharge aright their obligations as married persons.'

It should be noted that, although civil law makes no distinction between the single and the divorced as to their freedom to contract matrimony, it does allow, as an exceptional provision, that clergy may conscientiously decline to officiate where one or both of the two parties are divorced. It is this liberty which the 1957 regulations (better would be 'resolutions') of Convocation turned into an almost iron principle; and it is the norm to which that liberty is an exception which currently means that clergy who wish to officiate at the marriage of a divorced person can do so—and, ever since the synodical debacle of 1983, rising numbers of clergy have been doing so.

[Next month there will be more about the Diocesan returns]

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

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 318

June 2001

EDITORIAL

What do you do if the imagery doesn't fit? I was introduced as an undergraduate to the problems of getting agricultural imagery (let alone the 'Lamb of God' imagery) understood amongst the Eskimos, and I have, I suppose, wrestled with it at intervals since. Is the imagery of kings and thrones sufficiently beneficent to register aright in republican parts of the earth (or sufficiently actually powerful as to cut through the mental processes of those of us in a constitutional monarchy)? I can identify in my person (which once upon a time participated in competitive athletics) with Paul's intention to train and 'keep under' his body, and thus with his expectation that there would be a victor's crown (or wreath) awaiting him on death; and I can just about translate that into marathon running (never my scene) when I read that those who wait upon the Lord 'shall run and not be weary'—though I have some difficulty with the idea of mounting up with wings as an eagle. I also recall objecting (in the compilation of Series 2 communion in 1965-6) to a text which spoke of God 'pouring' the Holy Spirit (cf Acts 2.17; 2.32). I did not object to the metaphor in itself (how could I? It is scripture), but I did wonder whether its unrelieved use (we only had one eucharistic prayer in view in those days) might not diminish it as metaphor. It has in fact returned in Prayer G, but the provision of eight prayers should enable metaphors to come and go and remain fresh; and if at another point in history I drew the line at 'pour your Holy Spirit over us and these gifts' (on the grounds that it inevitably drew my mind towards custard), it was the very specific nature (and aim) of the pouring which was worrying me then, not the use of the word 'pour' in itself.

We do, however, get a hint of the possible breakdown of old metaphors in the words in Eucharistic Prayer D 'Good Father'—a recognition that not all believers to-day can respond well to the imagery of fatherhood, and particularly those who have been abandoned or abused by their earthly fathers. 'Good Father' reconstitutes the image, and invites even those who lack the good experience to let their imaginations run towards the possibility of a good and loving father. I have also reflected in these columns before on the confession now to be found in CW page 128:

'... Our love for you is like a morning cloud,
like the dew that goes away early.'

Here, I submit, the metaphor of Hosea 6.4 has been completely reversed by the British climatic context! In Hosea's thought a morning cloud and dew at sunrise are good effects, which disappear during the morning, and leave a brazen sky and an iron-dry terrain. In English thought to-day, whilst the cloud and the dew may

vanish quickly (and it could be only the quickness on which we should concentrate), actually the morning cloud and the dew are if anything unwanted, and a clear sky, a sunny day, and walking dryshod are desirable good things which come later. I think other scriptural metaphors may also be invented today.

But I was warned of particular traps for the unwary by a couple of events when I was an incumbent in the Medway a few years back. One was the experience of ministering to the deaf. Whilst the deaf have to know what hearing is (though that is a great puzzle, sometimes an insoluble one, to those born deaf), it is unfair, I learned, to burden them with 'hearing' concepts in their prayers. So instead of saying 'Lord, in your mercy, hear our prayer', I would be saying (for others to translate into sign language) 'Lord, in your mercy' for the congregation to respond in sign language 'receive our prayer'. I do not recall having to deal with issues of the Lord's ear being open to our prayers, but it is obvious that retranslation of such anthropomorphisms would be appropriate—it would appear that if the *anthropoi* in front of me have not got the requisite *morphe* themselves, the anthropomorphism not only lacks usefulness, but can actually offend.

I have had this first point reinforced to me recently by John Hull, the Birmingham lecturer in theology who went blind some years ago. He has published a book about blindness, and I heard him on the Radio 4 *Sunday* programme saying that he thought the Bible had it in for the blind especially—and he was citing 'How shall the blind lead the blind? Will they not both fall into a ditch?' His own answer was that the blind were much more at risk when being led by their sighted friends than they are when leading each other—but getting the right answer to the question hardly matters, as it was used by Jesus as a rhetorical question. What came through very strongly was that John Hull had problems about the Pharisees being treated as 'blind', and thought himself diminished by all pejorative uses of the metaphor of blindness in the scriptures. And I am aware that, just as I must not tell a black person that there is no racism in any particular part of South-East London (or, perish the thought, in any Anglican congregation)—for it is only the recipient of racist abuse who can truly judge that it has ended—so I cannot tell John Hull not to take offence, but rather to take it on my word that the business that hurts him is all harmless in reality.

My other reminder came rather earlier from the angry letter of a woman in a wheelchair. She said that, at some event I was leading, I had made her sing 'Stand up, stand up, for Jesus', and to have such words given her was insulting and hurtful. I have often reflected on this complaint, and it came to mind immediately when I heard John Hull. My reflection led to the following dichotomous finding:

- either* we avoid all metaphors which might hurt a section—even an as yet unnoticed section—of the community;
- or* we go ahead as before (but now knowingly, rather than innocently) and wave aside all complaints.

What might we not use, if we were avoiding hurtful metaphors? I list some first thoughts:

The Revision Committee could, at the very least, be accused of importing an ambiguity. God bless.

Ian Cooper

WHAT THE SPELLCHECK CAN DO TO YOU

Mark Earey writes in with an extract from an ordinand's essay (and nowadays one assumes that this was word processed (or even downloaded from some infallible source). But the ordinand's spellcheck had not been properly initiated into Christianity, as the sentence at issue read: 'Though the Roman Catholic Church held that there were seven sacraments, the Reformers reduced this to the two demonical: baptism and the eucharist.'

A little lateral thinking took the editor back to pre-computer days when he was an undergrad, and learned that a (not-very-believing) Yorkshire woman student in a history seminar, on being asked how many sacraments Cranmer retained at the Reformation, replied 'Three—baptism, 'oly communion, and matrimony—only matrimony weren't necessary for salvaytion'.

ANCIENT AND MODERN?

What carry-overs from traditional texts have you found when either editing or simply using contemporary ones? One of the obvious ones which can happen to an officiant away from home is to say 'The Lord be with you' (as, e.g., to a choir after a service) only to get the response 'and with thy spirit'. But that arises from a misexpectation on one side and total (if traditional) innocence on the other. The real mix comes in the following ways:

- (a) A modern Lord's Prayer which lapses into 'as it is in heaven' in the fifth line.
 - (b) A modern doxology which nevertheless begins 'Glory be to the Father . . .'
- So which have you encountered? Do let NOL know.

MARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE

The enquiry round the dioceses about the response to the Winchester report, *Marriage in Church after Divorce*, is now complete and the results, which had to reach the House of Bishops by the end of April, have been collated.

There were two questions. The first ran,

Do you accept the principle that there are circumstances in which a divorced person may be married in church during the lifetime of a former spouse?

The dioceses handled the questions in various different ways (sometimes going as far as individual PCCs). But it appears that every diocese said 'yes' in some way or another to this question. That would appear promising in terms of creating a policy or cementing a discipline. But those of us who were around in the famous General Synod debate in 1983 might well have guessed what was coming. It hinged on the second question, which itself had two parts:

- (a) Do support the recommendations of the Working Party summarized in chapter 9 of the report as being the right way to proceed?
- (b) If not, what do you consider to be the shortcomings of the recommendations? The recommendations mentioned would include the end of the existing Acts of

our parishes has shown that there have been no great difficulties encountered from congregations, but that there is great debate among the clergy over the new baptism rites. Of all the revisions this is the one that generated most debate before its introduction and as I say continues to rumble on.

Along with our colleagues in CME we have held two workshops, one on Wholeness and Healing and the other on the Eucharist. A workshop for the retired clergy on the Funeral Rites was poorly attended and we can only assume that the revisions held no terrors for them.

Since the introduction of Common Worship the committee have revised the Eucharist for use at the Chrism Service and also for the service at the Cathedral for the Easter Liturgy and Confirmation. Revisions have also been made to the Ordination services. The committee is working on some proposals to forward to the Liturgical Commission with regard to the revision of the Ordinal.

Other revisions include the Institution and Induction service, having regard to both Team Ministry and also that the first OLM's are due to be ordained in the diocese. We have other plans for further workshops with CME and we hope that in November we will be holding a day to look at how revisions in liturgy are affected by and affect the re-ordering of buildings. The details of this are not yet finalised!

Since the last report we have established regular meetings with the RSCM and in February a joint workshop on Music for the Eucharist was well attended. Further joint initiatives are planned and these will be explored further in September.

Iain Rennie

Blackburn SLC Secretary and Diocesan Liturgical Development Officer

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

I see that my request was not published in NoL. May I remind you what it was.

Communion by Extension

The publication of the service booklet *Communion by Extension* will require dioceses to review their policy and do some adjusting. I am trying to find out what is happening in each diocese. I know that some bishops have made known that they will not allow extended communion, others have rewritten their previous approach to fit with the House of Bishops' Guidelines. If you are involved in this could you please email me phillip.tovey@virgin.net to tell me the policy in your diocese.

Thanks

Phillip Tovey

Dear Colin

Thank you for airing my concern over the Acclamations in CW in NOL 316 and resisting the harmonizers in NOL 317.

A Community of nuns near here never uses the Acclamations in any of the eight prayers despite the rubric printed in prayers A,B,C,E and G. Could they justify their preference by citing the rubric on p.176 as their guide?

Metaphor

Sight, seeing

Hearing

Speaking

Walking, running, all motion

Washing, cleansing

The wine of the Spirit

Fighting the good fight

Christ loving his bride, the church

Marital union of Christ with the church

Soaring

Singing praises

Category open to being offended

Blind

Deaf

Dumb

Lame

People with skin conditions

Teetotallers

Pacifists

Homosexuals

Sadly unmarried

Those afraid of heights

Tone-deaf

I put the last one in, because it is getting near my own bone . . .

However, having taken aboard all that the complainants may offer, I find myself wanting to respond vigorously—even though I am among the healthy majority in most cases above, and may therefore be guilty of oppressing the minority into whose condition I have not sufficiently entered. Here then goes on an interim vigorous response, reflecting my first semi-coherent thoughts:

- (a) This is, after all, metaphor; we understand about being thrown in the deep end, going back to square one (I learned this one's origins and referent only recently), spiralling out of control, and going for the bull's eye. If we were to ban metaphor, lest it catch out and hurt the person who cannot apply the metaphor in its literal sense, we do not know where we would have to stop. Much of the innovations in Common Worship has been to enrich the language, and free-ranging metaphor is a major part of that.
- (b) It can always be understood eschatologically. That is how I approach all the stuff about singing God's praises. Of course, I do have a go now (and forty years of standing near choirs has, I am told, had some slight therapeutic effect on my efforts); but by all divine tests of singing God's praises satisfactorily, I am fairly confident I would fail. Yet one day—in the twinkling of a metaphorical eye—my vocal chords will be transformed, and I shall really get stuck into the angels' song, in harmony with them too . . . And on that day the lame will run, and the deaf will hear—though perhaps there is metaphor built into even those descriptions of reality.
- (c) The complainants must not hide in their own self-protection. I can see I must be considerate of the deaf—and the crippled—but Christian maturity does not spend its time saying 'Please do not trample on my toes' (or whatever the plain protest would be), and the joy is when the handicapped are still free enough to take up cudgels (oh, another one) on behalf of some *other* disadvantaged group. Of course, the linguistic oppressors must not tell the oppressed all is well with them, and metaphors should be gently tweaked in the interests of not offending the oppressed; yet the oppressed have

themselves to be free of self-pity and to be outgoing in love (and defence of rights) for others.
But what do you think?

Colin Buchanan

LITURGICAL COMMISSION — FURTHER MEMBERS

The secretary of the Liturgical Commission, David Hebblethwaite, tells us of further appointments (as we forecast last month). The second bishop is in place, that is, Colin Bennetts, the Bishop of Coventry; but the other vacant place has not yet been filled. On the other hand, the new Commission has now met and has been able to propose names to the Archbishops for co-opting (these have to come from the Synod members), and the outcome of that process is the arrival of Bro Tristram (an old hand) and Mrs Sarah James. The Commission also appoints its own consultants and in this capacity we have so far heard of Andrew Burnham, Bishop of Ebbsfleet (a member of the previous Commission), Trevor Lloyd (forecast last month), Anthony Gelston, Anne Dawtrey, John Harper (of RSCM), and Kenneth Stevenson, Bishop of Portsmouth (a former member, now on the Doctrine Commission).

THE CHAIR OF PRAXIS

The chair of Praxis is, by its constitution, an appointment made by the Liturgical Commission from among its members. We published the list of members last month, and now hear that Paul Roberts has been asked to chair Praxis. He wrote a recent Grove Booklet, *Worship no 155, Alternative Worship in the Church of England*, and brings both learning, parish experience and boldness and vigour to the task.

1995-2000 LITURGICAL COMMISSION: END OF TERM REPORT

At the end of May there was circulated to General Synod members a document entitled *Liturgical Commission 1995-2000 End of Term Report* (GS Misc 642, £2). It actually dates from August 2000, and was available at the National Liturgical Conference in September 2000, but it now has an updated Preface by the Bishop of Salisbury. It is a brief 'popular' work (listing, for instance, the interests and hobbies of its members), setting out its 'style' ('an open style, "leaking" . . .'), and modestly asserting its 'achievements'. One point it mentions about future work which was not in NOL's short list last month is 'a volume of essays on the subject of reconciliation, building on some of the plans and work of Michael Vasey'.

DAILY OFFICE JUST OVER THE HORIZON

The words 'watch this space' in the May NOL had three Liturgical Commission topics in view—and the first of these was the Daily Office. At any rate, it is all

DIOCESAN REPORTS (2001-2 CYCLE)—5 DURHAM

First of all, the good things we're pleased about—two of our DLC members, David Kennedy and Dana Delap, have been invited to join the new Commission; our Music Wing has produced a CD of helpful ideas for churches with limited musical resources; 'Durham' Daily Prayer is to be published commercially by DLT; and *A Simple Guide to Common Worship* topped the *Church Times* book list for a good while last summer.

As I write this we have just completed the first training course for those who will be leading services of Communion by Extension. Other projects still underway include the provision of resources for Inaugurating a New Ministry, and a parallel set of resources for licensing Shared Ministry Parishes and Teams. We are also continually involved in drafting and producing worship for diocesan occasions.

Our Common Worship Officer, Dana Delap, writes:

All of us agree that the process of introducing CW was not as coherent as it might have been—particularly when texts were delayed. This was highlighted by the manic exchange of CD ROMs between Durham and Church House Publishing just prior to our *Visual Liturgy III* training event. I breathed a sigh of relief when the golden disk arrived the day before the event, and I loaded it onto 25 PCs. There have been highs and lows in use of CW in Durham diocese over the past year, lots of urgent queries ('so, can I do that with this text?'), and a particular highlight—our second diocesan liturgy conference. Finally, I had a nightmare a couple of years ago that I would wake up on 1 January 2001 to find a mountain of redundant ASBs outside my front door. Now my nightmare is becoming a reality—my children are climbing over old service books on their way up the stairs, since our house has become the local recycling point!

Sadly, and presumably in common with other dioceses, liturgy in Durham is suffering the financial axe and one consequence of this is that Dana's post is ending this summer.

However, Dana is forming a new North East region of Praxis and drawing people from Durham and from neighbouring dioceses too. The programme starts with a conference on Daily Prayer on 28 February, 2002, with Jeremy Fletcher and Paul Bradshaw in Durham.

Adrian Beney
University of Durham

DIOCESAN REPORTS (2001-2 CYCLE)—6 BLACKBURN

When the committee last reported we were in the thick of preparing for Common Worship even though it was still some 16 months in the future. Now it is past and the tasks set by that introduction have faded and the members of the committee are not engaged to a great extent on talks to Deanery Synods, PCC etc. A survey of

[The expectation is that roughly four months at a time will appear each month, so that in July further November and December fixtures will be added—but there may be plenty more to appear within the months aired above still. Do send your information in—we await DLC and Praxis plans for the coming Winter.]

COB

BOOK REVIEW

RT Kendall, *Total forgiveness* (Hodders, 2001, 178pp ISBN 0-340-75639-X)

Subtitled '*Achieving God's greatest challenge*', this book is about totally forgiving those who have wronged us, and being totally forgiven by God.

The third chapter (26 pages) is on the Lord's Prayer and forgiveness. The author considers the verses which follow the prayer in Matthew's gospel ('For if you forgive...') to be evidence that Jesus considered forgiveness to be the most important theme of the prayer. Other chapters deal with issues such as judging others, and forgiving ourselves.

Whether you are about to preach on the Lord's Prayer and/or forgiveness, or you would just like a Bible-based refresher on the topic, you will find RT's book gently thought-provoking.

Ian Tarrant

This Month's Publications . . .

. . . are, firstly, Worship Series no 164, *Reflecting on Preaching*, by Phillip Tovey and Charles Chadwick. Have you ever thought of the history of your preaching ministry? Are there lessons to be learned from our own preaching? This Booklet develops the ideas of reflective practice, and applies them to preaching with many practical suggestions on how to do this.

. . . and, secondly, Joint Liturgical Study no 49, *The Syrian Liturgy of St James: A Brief History for Students*, by Dr Baby Varghese of the Syrian Orthodox Seminary in Kottayam (where the last *Societas* congress was held). This is a Study which will open windows galore for Westerners, for not only is the history as recorded likely to cover ground untrodden by most English-speaking liturgists, but equally the surrounding field of study and its other scholarly occupants (who are laid heavily under contribution) will also be largely unknown. Well, yes, I may be universalizing from my own ignorance, but I rest my case and await sufficient correction to falsify it. A better way of putting it is that, if you even suspect you have a lacuna in your studies at this point, make sure you get a copy and read it. There is a whole world of liturgy in the East, explored from within by an expert, in this Study.

. . . and a new edition

of no 158, *The Eucharistic Prayers of Order One*, by Colin Buchanan and Charles Read is now available.

happening. The last Liturgical Commission had a group which did the major part of the work, but the final decision (which, as will appear, was not really final), awaited the say-so of the new Commission. This body met for the first time in May (and did its first bit of proposed co-opting, as shown above) and agreed the report on the Daily Office, and it has gone to the printers. The chairman of the Commission, Bishop David Stancliffe, stated it should be published 'on or around All Saints' (which is exactly the basis on which the Southwark Diocesan Liturgical Committee is arranging a lunch-time conference—centrally for clergy—on Wednesday 7 November: watch this space for venue).

Various ground-clearing points should be registered at this stage.

Firstly, there have been complaints around that 'Common Worship doesn't include a daily office'. In the explicit terms of services labelled 'Daily Office' (or 'Morning and Evening Prayer through the year'), it is true that there is no such provision in the books and rites so far authorized as Common Worship—and the omission is apparently pointed up the more flagrantly because the main CW book (when will we find an easy agreed name for it?) does contain 'Morning and Evening Prayer for use on Sundays'. I have even come across people who not only complain about the lack, but even take the view that, because the ASB has lapsed and become illegit, no forms of daily office except 1662 itself have any standing in the C/E today.

The truth is that A Service of the Word gives a legal framework for almost anything. The Sunday services mentioned were not authorized by synodical procedure—they were simply commended by the House of Bishops as being a useful, even fruitful, way of fulfilling the terms of reference of A Service of the Word. The ASB rites (or *Celebrating Common Prayer*) would similarly fall under this heading if desired. Add in the Durham office—and a host of other home-grown ideas, no doubt—and you are still in the broad pathway of office-saying righteousness. The commendation of the House of Bishops does not authorize a rite; it merely marks out one way of doing things as good practice within the legal framework, and gives a strong 'steer' to that practice. The 'steer' is then assisted by the commended material being published as official liturgy of the C/E—whether under the CW (and CHP) imprint or by some other route. The category of 'commended' is permissive; it does not rule out other uses (a point to which I shall return next month). In this case, the only lack in daily offices at the coming of Common Worship is that, thus far, the House of Bishops has not commended any particular daily office proposals.

So what happens when the Commission's material is published in (we hope) early November? The usual practice has been for the House of Bishops to look for one (seminar-type) debate in the General Synod, then to ask the Commission to do any re-touching they think fit in the light of the debate, then to commend the revised product and put it on the market in that way.

However, we understand that this time there is a distinctive new proceduralist coming. The Commission themselves are advertising their draft offices as

provisional, and what they want is instant and interim and yet sustained use for two years, and then a garnering of user-opinion. The character of their midweek lectionary will be part of this 'try-it-out' process (it has only been intended to run for four years from 2000). And then, towards the end of this Commission's quinquennium, there will be a refurbished office which, the Commission will hope, will then have a longer life-expectancy.

This new procedure is dependent upon use starting almost immediately upon publication, and without fear of its being revised for the first two years. This, I suspect, means that the Commission may not even be looking for the House of Bishops' commendation, or, if it is so looking, it will not want any steps that may hold up the process. And so the Synod will probably have no genuine debate. They might perhaps get a seminar or even a fringe meeting in November.

And a passing final thought: will these materials also be published in 1662-form as well as a somewhat more modern one? Or is the existing 1662 material in the main CW book sufficient to have expressed the ideology?

COB

AN UNKIND CUT

Our friends at *Church Times* published a review of *Common Worship Today* on 4 May. After the very friendly review by Paul Bradshaw in these columns, I suppose the editors of the book and its contributors were looking forward to rave reviews elsewhere. The CEN has been silent; but the *Church Times* review, by John Methuen, the Dean of Ripon, damned the book with faint praise. A high proportion of the review was devoted to nitpicking, of which an extreme example relates to the title of the 'communion service' (which he thinks is partisan, and reckons 'eucharist' to be more 'irenical'). Whilst it looks unsporting to write to CT to complain, an acknowledgedly partisan editor may perhaps respond a bit here.

In both the ASB and CW the main title chosen for the rite in question is 'Holy Communion' (see CW page 155). Many of us are happy calling it 'the eucharist' (not least because we need the adjective 'eucharistic'); but in many parishes the title is not used, and may either be not known or would not be viewed as 'irenical'; and the book was intended for the layperson.

The title quoted from the ASB and CW also gives the clue to the answer to another complaint by the Dean of Ripon, for, after the main title, it continues '*also called The Eucharist and The Lord's Supper*' (and use of either secondary title might indeed be slightly partisan, but falls easily into the C/E framework).

The Dean then cites this phrase in CWT 'the word "mass" has no formal place in Anglican terminology' as evidence of ecclesiastical bias. But the statement was made as a straight point of history, for which the triple title in ASB and CW is strong support—although giving three titles expresses a breadth and comprehensiveness, nevertheless a fourth possibility, 'mass', does not appear. The Dean's determination to diminish CWT's objectivity is astonishing, as he casts

about for evidence of a 'formal place' for 'mass' in Anglican terminology; he writes 'despite the 1549 Prayer Book, Christmas, Michaelmas, and Midnight Mass'. To this we must reply that 1549 has no formal place in Anglican terminology and was abolished in 1552; that Christmas and Michaelmas may have 'mass' in their ancestry, but virtually no-one using their titles to-day would have any notion that they were really in formal terms naming the communion service (if I may so call it), and 'Midnight Mass' does not appear anywhere official—in CW it seems to be 'Christmas Night' (which has its own oddities).

Another nitpick is his rejection of 'the old chestnut that medieval laity had no access to liturgical texts, whereas the only qualification was in fact the ability to read'. But is he trying to tell us that a literate layperson in the fourteenth century would go to church with a manuscript congregational text in his or her hand? A monarch might; monks might; but who else lay might? The point about the Middle Ages is not centrally one about the priest deliberately keeping the text away from people, but one about both the inaccessibility of Latin to vast numbers of worshippers, and the unavailability of actual texts in the days before printing. I think the chestnut has still some mileage.

Another nitpick is 'lack of Catholic imagery (you would think that no Anglican priest wears a chasuble)'. I have checked back, and chasubles figure in one way or another on pages 31, 59 ('High Mass with vestments'), 99, 100, 153, 159, 163—but perhaps the complaint is that there are no *pictures* of priests (or presbyters, another problem the book causes him) in ponchos. But the text on the pages quoted should have reassured him; and no-one reading those pages could have concluded 'no Anglican priest ever wears a chasuble'.

I think that nearly two-thirds of the review are of this tendentious (indeed dismissive) sort. But perhaps *Common Worship Today* can outlive the dismissal. Will the CEN do us better? Perhaps there a Reform reviewer will object that the team's references to chasubles are all too friendly and accommodating . . .

COB

DIARY DATES

- 7-9 September (weekend) Residential Conference 'Liturgy and Ethics' convened by the Society for the Study of Christian Ethics in Oxford. Details from the Rev. Dr Colin Hart at St John's College, Nottingham (0115 925 1114).
- 15 September (Saturday) 'Using Common Worship' for Hereford clergy (details from Canon Paul Iles (01432-266193))
- 4 October (Thursday) 'Using Common Worship' for Ludlow clergy (details from Canon Paul Iles (01432-266193))
- 23 October (Wednesday) Liturgical Commission's meeting with diocesan liturgical committee representatives (London)
- 3 November (Saturday) Anglican Renewal Ministries training day at St Luke's, Cranham, Essex 10—5.30 on 'Bringing Common Worship to Life' (cost £10, ring 01708-222562 (mornings))