

DIARY DATES

We are short of advance information. BUT please note that the advertised 3 November (Saturday) Anglican Renewal Ministries training day at St Luke's, Cranham, Essex 10–5.30 has been cancelled.

7 November (Wednesday) Southwark Diocesan DLC lunch-time meeting (12–2) on *Daily Prayer* at Southwark cathedral. No need to book—just come

20 November (Tuesday) 'Looking at Initiation', 10–4 at St Cuthbert's Conference Centre, Buckfast Abbey (details from Liz Simpson on 01769-572356)
[Praxis has no events till February].

WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

John Davies, vicar of Llanrhaeadr ym Mochnant, writes to report a diocesan service in St Asaph cathedral, a building which, he wants us to note, was perhaps autumnly cool within. The closing hymn included:

... Can we know that thou art near us,
and wilt heat us?
Yea, we can.

DIOCESAN REPORT (2001-2 CYCLE)—10 DERBY

This year started with a launch of 'Common Worship' at Epiphanytide in the Cathedral. The service included leaders from civic society and from other churches. During the year further Common Worship days have been held throughout the diocese—looking at Marriages and Funerals and Communion by Extension. A significant and very successful day looking at Music across the whole range of worship was held together with the RSCM and with John Harper as a keynote speaker. A further day revisiting the Lectionary is planned for 11 October. On the whole the transition to Common Worship seems to have gone well in this diocese, giving many parishes the opportunity to think through their liturgies creatively.

(Canon) Sheana Barby
Secretary

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 2002 £8.50 (by air £12.00, US\$24.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 322

October 2001

EDITORIAL

The September NOL was being printed as the suicide planes flew into the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York, and that edition therefore made no reference to the event, and will have read like a missive from a now far-gone world. By October who can add to the world's non-stop media coverage? As this goes to press the military action in Afghanistan is just beginning, but no-one knows what it will be like when this lands on your doorstep. But who can write as though the world were still the same?

I got my cue from *Church Times* of 21 September. The headlines treat of world leaders talking about 'crusades'—with warnings from bishops of how even using 'crusade' as a metaphor sounds threatening (and paranoia-inducing) to the Islamic world. It is, of course, so easy nowadays to use 'crusade' as the equivalent of a 'purposeful thrust' that even US presidents may forget the word's origins—and forget what those origins mean in the Islamic memory. In broad terms the significance of those headlines is inevitable—they reflect the changed world which we entered on 11 September.

But Caroline Chartres on an inside page describes taking an ailing hamster to a pets' hospital, and does not attempt to address the world storm-clouds. The contrast struck me—and struck me because I live in both worlds at once, and not least when I am in the editor's chair. I have been reminded inexorably of families in my past experience in sudden and life-changing bereavement, say through the unexpected death of a parent; what happens is that an enormous cloud, a whole atmosphere, forms over a household and over all their world, and it is *there* day and night. Yet under it, even in the central days off work preparing for the funeral, people have to shop for food and prepare and eat it, children have to go school and do their homework, adults have to pay bills and keep the clothes ironed—the sick hamster still needs the vet. It is easy then either to say 'I cannot face the shopping' or, alternatively, to say 'I feel vaguely guilty because I *can* get ordinary things done *without* being incapacitated'. Not only do these two responses clash within each of us, but they also put a distance between friends and colleagues, for the 'I cannot face the shopping' contingent not only cannot understand the 'I can get ordinary things done' brigade, but can actually feel outraged that ordinary life attempts to go on without people around them being paralyzed under such a cloud—and the 'I can get ordinary things done' brigade may then be made to feel more than vaguely guilty because life is going on.

So this has been. The world-encompassing cloud is certainly *there*. But so is the hamster. I find on this occasion I am one of those who 'can get ordinary things done', and so this NOL looks much like all the others. Before that makes you impatient, please read the first paragraph again. I do know the world scene we are in. I do have to respond to it directly; for the nephew of a close friend was in one of the towers and I have to write to the family. But here I am on the other track, one in which the newspaper headlines about a changed world on the morning after the attacks reminded me forcibly of headlines I remember from 1945—I have a firm picture in my mind of a four-page *Daily Express* (or was it the *Telegraph*?) on the day after Hiroshima—three pages about the atom bomb, and then a page 4 headed 'Page of news from yesterday's old world'. This NOL, encouraged by Caroline Chartres' unwitting hamster, is largely pages of news from yesterday's old liturgical world, and thus runs every risk of appearing irrelevant, uncaring, or even immoral to the 'I cannot face the shopping' people. Believe me, I do find myself frequently in those first three pages. This, however, is page 4.

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 2001

General Synod meets 13-16 November. The nearest item to liturgy on the agenda appears to be the report, *For such a time as this*, the examination of the diaconate.

AN ECUMENICAL POINT

The General Synod of the Anglican Church in Canada approved in July the entry into full communion with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada on a basis similar to the Concordat in the USA. Ministers of both churches become interchangeable, and the Lutheran bishops, are fully recognized *as* bishops, and those whom they ordain as truly ordained.

CENTENARY OF GREGORY DIX

Gregory Dix was born on 4 October 1901, and bestrode the liturgical world of the twentieth century even though he lived for but half of it. In an essay on him which I wrote last year in *Churchman*, I spelled out a general characteristic:

It is not necessary here to reflect at length on his character, not because it is irrelevant, but because it came in such bold colours as to be fairly available at sight—I read him as a kind of combination of Denis Skinner and Tony Benn, with the love of outraging of the former, and the unshaken confidence in his findings of the latter, and the holding to a sweepingly extreme position with the tenacity, humour and a flair for propaganda of both. His scholarship in his own field may have outstripped these worthies in theirs, and certainly he won (and keeps going today) a worldwide army of scholars and students of liturgy to wrestle with his writings. And he irresistibly reminds me of my ancient history tutor of my Oxford days, whose dictum was 'Make your sources work for you'—a strictly unethical commendation of a process of positing a conclusion first, and then organizing the evidence to lead to it.

I imagine most of us say 'Please' in our personal or extemporary prayers. In CW, as in earlier liturgies, we do say "Thank you" to God, but never, as far as I can see, 'Please'.

Perhaps there are no Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek words that translate exactly into 'Please' in English, and so the word just got left out? But the thought is there in the Hebrew 'to bal'—'if it please the king' (Neh.2.5,7 and Esther 1.9; 3.9; 5.8 and 7.3); and in 'yaal'—'let it please you' (2 Sam.7.29); and in 'chaphets'—'if it please you' (1 Kings 21.6).

Is it thought to be too matey, or are we still wanting to order God about to suit our desires? I confess that, to me, some prayers do sound very much like orders to the Almighty. Or is there some other good reason why we should not set an example to younger and secular people by using the word 'please' in church, when we ask God for good things for others or for ourselves?

Yours

David Steele—Abbots Worthy

Dear Colin,

I offer the following commentary on the letter from Simon Law in the September edition of *News of Liturgy*.

The Calendar Lectionary Collects process was the only one of the Synod processes leading to Common Worship which I was not involved in, so I cannot speak 'from the horse's mouth'. It seems evident, however, that the 'Calendar' part of the exercise was consistent in not describing any person as 'Saint', 'Holy', or 'Great'. The Collects, however, had a concern to reflect the Prayer Book origins and the inconsistency noted by Simon Law is reflected in the Prayer Book. While it is arguable that there ought to have been some 20th century tidying up, you would really need to ask Thomas Cranmer whether there was some hidden significance in the various ascription of sanctity or holiness to the Apostles!

David Hebblethwaite

Dear Colin

I was intrigued by your note in NOL about Liturgies for deconsecration of church buildings. I believe they have a simpler method in the Church of Ireland.

Twenty or so years ago I did a holiday locum in South West Ireland and my wife and I were asked to tea by the Archdeacon. I had just been elected to our Diocesan Pastoral Committee and we talked about various DPC—like questions and about the difficulties run across in the closure of churches in the Church of England. He said they had a simply way in the Irish Church. The Bishop would enter a church fully robed. He would then remove his robes and put his hat on—this had the effect of desecrating the church which could then be closed without further ado.

This is not just another Irish joke! The Archdeacon who told me is now dead, or I'm sure he would vouch for its trust!

Yours sincerely

John Porter—St Anne's Rectory, Denton, Manchester

p.151: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'
 p.320 'he sent forth . . . your holy and life-giving Spirit'
 p.359 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'
 p.398,407 'show forth in our lives'
 p.413: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'
 p.426: 'plenteously bringing forth'
 p.429: 'bring forth the fruits of holiness'
 p.440: 'to show forth his death'²
 pp.594ff (The Psalter) Pss.17.2; 19.5; 57.4; 60.10; 67.6; 68.6,27,33; 72.3; 78.2;
 104.16,25,32; 105.43; 107.20;119.171; 121.8; 125.2; 138.7; 145.7; 146.3; 147.16,19.
 p.785: 'you send forth your Spirit'
 p.786: 'waters shall break forth in the wilderness'
 p.787: 'from this time forth and for evermore'

Pastoral Services

p.137: 'give forth fragrance'
 p.162: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'
 p.170: 'earth puts forth her blossom'
 p.179: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'
 p.229: 'N, go forth from this world'
 p.324: 'before the mountains were brought forth'
 p.376: 'N, go forth from this world'
 p.394: 'they will shine forth'

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

I have wondered for some time, why, while we think it is important for ourselves and for our children and grandchildren to say 'Please', yet those who compose Anglican liturgy never allow Christians to use that word when speaking to God in liturgical worship?

The publication of Common Worship has made me think about it again.

- 2 The business of 'showing forth' Jesus' death includes a double peril—it is not only stained-glass-window language, but the stained glass contains a real error. The background is the AV where 1 Cor.11.26 reads 'as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until he come'. The Americans have homed in unerringly on this 'forth' also, so that another eucharistic prayer includes 'that we might show forth his death', apparently as a way of implying eucharistic sacrifice, whilst protestants have regularly interpreted the bread and wine as somehow *demonstrating* the Lord's death to us. I am typically cautious, and I merely recommend caution. But it is very clear to me—and I had this first brought home to me by Arthur Couratin—that in 1 Corinthians 11.26 the translation 'show forth' is virtually impossible, and thus it is no precedent for treating the sacrament as somehow 'showing forth the death of the Lord' simply by the following out of the action. No, the truth is that the Greek verb is *katangello* and it must mean 'tell out', and its mode must surely consist of articulation—that is, it is oral telling out, and there is no dramatic 'showing' at all, *unless* that simply means 'articulating', which is not the understanding we are picking up here.

There is some of that in all of us; there was plenty of it in Dix. Stephen Neill once wrote about his scholarly methods as follows:

' . . . let us be scrupulous in making the distinction between what is certain, what is probable, and what is merely conjectural.

'Unfortunately, this is a distinction which Dom Gregory, though he recognizes it, is always inclined to forget. All his writings reveal the same tendency to mistake inference for evidence, and possibility for certainty. Again and again in his chapter [in *The Apostolic Ministry*] we shall find the same process at work. On some rather tricky point of evidence (such as the identity of the *ellogimon andron* of Clement 44), Dom Gregory will state alternative views and come down on the side of that which he regards as the more probable. A few pages later, this probability is re-stated as a certainty, and some inference is built upon it. Then that inference is itself treated as certain, and something else is erected on it. The argument is very skilfully knit together; and the final conclusion has every appearance of certainty, and of depending on irrefragable evidence; it is only the careful reader who notices the points at which possibility has been treated as certainty, and who is able to assess the balance of improbability in the conclusion of the argument.

[This applies to the idea of an apostle as a *shaliach* . . .]¹

When I joined the Commission in 1964, it was Dix' contemporaries who gave it its character—Edward Ratcliffe and Henry de Candole (both born in 1897), Arthur Couratin (born in 1904), George Addleshaw (born in 1906)—and I have often speculated what dynamic and direction a 63-year-old Dix would given it, had he lived. For the moment I can only commend his (fairly recent) biography, *A Tactful God*, and Kenneth Stevenson's early Grove Liturgical Study no. 10, *Gregory Dix—25 years on*; this latter, a *multum in parvo*, is sadly out of print, but worth giving your shirt for a secondhand copy.

If we arrange Dix' main titles under Lima headings, basic reading in Dixiana would be:

Baptism (and confirmation)

'Confirmation or Laying on of Hands?' (*Theology Occasional Paper*, 1936)
The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism (1946)

Eucharist

The Shape of the Liturgy (1945)

Ministry

The Question of Anglican Orders (1942)

'Ministry in the Early Church' in K.E.Kirk(ed), *The Apostolic Ministry* (1946)

But there is a host of others—not least in his controversy with George Timms about Cranmer—GT contributing *Dixit Cranmer* and GD responding *Dixit Cranmer et non timuit*.

But, I say again—suppose he had lived on like Jimmy Crichton who follows . . .

COB

1 Stephen Neill in 'A General Survey' in S.C.Neill et al, *The Ministry of the Church* (Canterbury Press, London, 1947) p 15.

IN MEMORIAM—JIMMY CRICHTON

Mgr James D. Crichton ('Jimmy') died on 2 September at the age of 94, very nearly a contemporary of Gregory Dix, who died almost fifty years ago. I knew him as 'Jimmy', as in the 1960s he was the Roman Catholic observer on the Church of England Commission—a delightful companion he was, perhaps encouraging me all the more by his relaxed and outspoken informal lack of respect for Roman authority. I cannot pretend to know all there was to know about his 94 years (there was a reasonable obituary in *The Tablet* on 8 September), but I offer one or two insights.

Firstly, I knew him as an author. I think his *The Church's Worship* (1964) was the first commentary I saw on the Vatican II Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy from December 1963. I note that the blurb on the back of my copy says that JDC has been 'eminent in the liturgical movement for the past thirty years' (italics mine). What other English Roman Catholic from long before the Second World War could be relied on to be so forward-looking so quickly? I also have a book on the Constitution which he edited, *The Mass and the People of God* (1966). My own shelves then reveal the three volumes of his *Christian Celebration* triad—*The Mass* (1971), *The Sacraments* (1973) and *The Prayer of the Church* (1976); and these are followed by *The Once and the Future Liturgy* (1977). Wonderfully, in 1996 I received *Lights in the Darkness: Forerunners of the Liturgical Movement*, a magisterial sweep of many characters in many lands over several centuries (and he must have been 88 when he wrote it).

Secondly, I knew him in person, and particularly for one little (but perhaps highly significant) point. Back in the early 1980s, I was in an unfinished correspondence with him about the significance of publishing rites with the eucharistic prayers with the words 'THIS IS MY BODY' printed in large capitals, or bold capitals, sometimes on a line of their own, centred and highlighted. I was pressing Jimmy that this emphasis (along with genuflection, elevation, bell-ringing etc) demonstrated that Rome was tied absolutely to a particular doctrine of what effects consecration. Jimmy would not have it—the style does not of itself prove anything.

When I came to write my Booklet no.148, *Eucharistic Consecration*, my mind went back to Jimmy's caution, and I contacted him and asked him to be more specific—but meanwhile I had also gone to the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, where transubstantiation is defined and asserted, and I had discovered (which perhaps I should have known earlier) that no means or method of consecrating is described or imposed as an article of faith by that, or any other, Council. Sure enough, Jimmy (now past 90 years of age) confirmed this lacuna, and added that not only had Rome not defined the means of consecration, but she could not do so—for she sheltered Eastern rites under her aegis, where any change in the elements would be associated not with 'This is my body', but with the (later) epiclesis.

Thirdly, Jimmy's life as a columnist blossomed in his old age. Earlier he had edited first *Music and Liturgy* and then *Liturgy*. In his latter years he appeared again in *Music and Liturgy* (the 'Magazine of the Society of Saint Gregory') with 'Musings

- Encourage Continuing Ministerial Education (CME) Officers to integrate liturgical formation with other aspects of CME.
- Be willing to take part in courses and activities to enhance their own liturgical formation and thus model a 'lifetime learning' approach.

[The next parts of section ('2 Action') will—hopefully—follow next month.]

A FORTH TO BE RECKONED WITH

It has always been my persuasion that the Americans, when they want to sound religious—or even liturgical—slip in a 'forth' as often as possible in order to convince themselves of the spiritual world they are thus inhabiting. It was the prevalence of 'forth' in the American Book of Common Prayer, first published in 1977, that helped the drafters of the ASB to be very careful not to go forth anywhere at all (though one or two tiny ones slipped through the net). This point more or less escaped the drafters of Common Worship, and I have been meaning to make the point for some time.

However . . . it has come to a head in my life in California. As I write this I have just returned from a first Sunday in church here. I could not in a cartoon liturgy have imagined the plethora of 'forths' to which we were treated at the end of the eucharist. Mind you, we had been spared the first of the new eucharistic prayers in *Enriching our Worship*, which includes 'You gave the world into our care that we might . . . show forth your bountiful grace'. But the conclusion of the rite went as follows:

Post-communion prayer: . . . **Now send us forth
a people, forgiven, healed. . .**
Sending communion to the sick: *There was a text accompanying the giving of
vessels to laypeople to take communion to the sick—
and the text included a 'go forth' . . .*
Final hymn: 'Go forth for God' (with four verses each starting
with these words)
Dismissal: Let us go forth in the name of Christ.
Thanks be to God.

Well, Americans will be Americans. But the indulgent smile with which I want to be able to say that is wiped off my face by the 'forths' I now endure in Common Worship. The list that follows occurs entirely within 'contemporary' language texts—I have not troubled to look at the BCP texts.

Common Worship—Initiation Services (the 'Green Book')

p.114: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'

p.116: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit' [and so in the parallel passages]

Common Worship—Main Book

p.32: 'you drew forth the world'

p.55: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'

p.112: 'bring forth the fruit of the Spirit'

amounted to a cross-heading ('THE STRATEGY') and then, under it, to **1 Aims**. This had three sub-headings: 'Mission', 'Spirituality and Formation', and 'Common Worship.' Here we continue with the first three sub-headings under the next cross-heading:

2 Action

The present situation

The current involvement of the Church at national level in promotion, development, use and understanding of liturgy is minimal; there are many worthwhile but unco-ordinated initiatives at a more local or voluntary level. One of these is the appointment since 1997 of a National Education Officer by the voluntary organization *Praxis*. This Officer (the Revd Mark Earey) is based at Sarum College in Salisbury and funded on an *ad hoc* basis from a number of grants but increasingly from the *Common Worship* budget. The post has more than proved its worth in the context of launching *Common Worship* and its continuance, with the backing of the National Institutions, would foster co-operation and co-ordination of local initiatives and a minimizing of wasteful duplication of effort.

Action by the Archbishops' Council

The following will be needed—

- Policy decisions clearly committing the Church to serious engagement with the need for liturgical education and formation at every level.
- Support for a raised profile for liturgical education, highlighting its connection with the mission of the Church.
- Liaison with the House of Bishops in offering advice on ethos and membership of the next Commission (2001-6). (Appointments are made by the Archbishops after consultation with the Appointments Committee.)
- Financial commitment supporting a 'national' element in the strategy with appropriate resourcing, including human resources. If the prevailing ethos of the next Liturgical Commission is to focus principally on education and formation rather than on the drafting of texts, its staffing arrangements will need to reflect and give support to such a changed ethos.

Action by individual members of the House of Bishops in their Dioceses

No strategy at national level will succeed if there are not diocesan strategies to resource. Each bishop needs to—

- Consider how best to monitor the work of liturgical committees and advisers to ensure that they work within and are complementary to a nationally co-ordinated strategy.
- Be willing to entertain liaison with the Archbishops' Council and Liturgical Commission to secure a consistent approach in the provision and resourcing of diocesan liturgical initiatives.

from my Hermitage', and it was there I read him with great appreciation in each issue—he was scholarly, but pastoral and radical. Marvellously the Summer 2001 edition contains five pages of A4 of interview with him, and he muses there typically on events and trends covering the whole of the twentieth century. It is a wonderful, if unwitting, farewell to the twentieth century; and it reads as a very fitting signing off whilst in bursting health of personality by a delightful Roman Catholic of the twentieth century.

COB

BOOK REVIEWS

Mark Earey, Perran Gay, Anne Horton, *Understanding Worship* (Praxis, 2001, 0 264 67505 3, £25)

This is a *Praxis* Study Guide, and, as we have come to expect from *Praxis*, it is clear and helpful. It was unfortunate that publication was held up and it wasn't available in time for Lent, but I have used it in a home study group, so this is written from experience!

Initial chapters cover the history of Anglican worship, with a glance at how we use words and symbols, and then move on to look in detail at the most-used services—Service of the Word, Holy Communion, Initiation, wholeness and healing, marriage and funerals.

I used the first half of the book with my parish group, not going into detail on the pastoral services, but spending plenty of time on the history, and the elements of our Sunday worship. Each chapter provides questions for discussion, which ground the material in the groups experience, and photocopyable handouts and OHT's (which can also be downloaded from the *Praxis* website). There are helpful suggestions for worship at the beginning and end of each session.

This is a resource which could be used in a variety of parish groups, whether for Lent or study groups, or for use with a PCC or an away-day for leaders. It is capable of being tweaked to suit different situations, and has material in it which can be adapted according to the background of the group members.

The *Common Worship* material has created an opportunity to look afresh at our worship, at how and why we do things. Ordinary church members are asking questions about liturgy—this is a good resource to help make the most of that opportunity, and to teach about the faith through looking at the worship of the church.

It's a pity the price has been put up—but, bearing in mind that you can photocopy anything you like, and download the graphics, it's still worth the money.

Liz Simpson
South Molton

Leslie Houlden and John Rogerson (eds), *Common Worship Lectionary: A Scripture Commentary Year A* (SPCK, 2001, 296pp, £20)

There are now books aplenty (and, indeed, websites aplenty) whose aim is to help the busy preacher to prepare a sermon based on the Revised Common Lectionary, or its variant, the Common Worship principal service lectionary. Many of them fall into the trap of trying to find a unifying theme to link the readings; some of them merely provide 'thoughts' on the passages; some present almost ready-to-use sermons.

This book falls into none of those traps. It is what it says: a Scripture commentary. Each of the three main readings (Old Testament, New Testament and Gospel, but not the Psalm) are covered and each Sunday or major Holy Day gets between three and four pages. There is no attempt to provide a paragraph which looks at 'this Sunday' in some overall way, and so no temptation to try to link the readings.

The book is most like a summary of what you would find if you looked through three or four recent commentaries, and as such, is most likely to help the sort of preachers who would normally look at the commentaries before preaching, but find themselves too busy, or are looking for someone to make sense of the different threads. I found here plenty of useful insights or foundation thoughts on which to build a sermon, but (mercifully) no attempt to write the sermon for me. Anyone looking for jokes, illustrations or all-age suggestions, will be disappointed: it is not meant to be that sort of book.

Anyone who has bought the (much thicker) *Texts for Preaching, Year A*, published by Westminster John Knox (and based on the RCL, not its Common Worship version), will find that some of the contributions from that book are reproduced in this offering from SPCK.

Of all the books designed to help with preaching the new lectionary, I find this one of the most useful, but, as with all such books, its usefulness depends enormously on your style and approach in preaching, and the sort of help that you are looking for.

Mark Earey

Anne Coles, *Music to the Lord* (New Wine International Publishing, 2001. 62 pp pb, ISBN 1-902977-10-6)

New Wine started life as a summer conference for charismatic evangelicals, centred around the ministry of Bishop David Pytches at St. Andrew's Chorleywood. A decade later and it has become an international brand, sponsoring many more conferences, a network of leaders and churches, and Soul Survivor (for young people). Its distinctives are 'worship which is passionate, intimate and biblical and ministry in the power and gifts of the Spirit'. New Wine has 'an especial, though not exclusive, concern for the Church of England from which New Wine emerged, and other traditional churches'. It now has a publishing arm, with a number of booklets uncannily like Grove Booklets in their size and price.

Anne Coles has written this booklet about 'bringing renewed worship to your local church'. Worship leader at St. Barnabas' North Finchley, she is married to John, the former Vicar there, who is now to work full time for New Wine. In this booklet 'renewed worship' is actually renewed music accompanied by guitar and worship band, as opposed to the organ (which is 'traditional'). If you're familiar with all this, then the booklet will be of practical help: there are good sections on how such bands can develop, PA systems, and leading worship musically. There's also an interesting chapter on singing in tongues, which seems to have gone out of vogue in the last few years.

However, there is no real definition of what worship is, no discussion of what might constitute a whole act of worship, no real treatment of the difference between a worship leader and church leader, and no sense that there may be any value in the 'traditional', beyond it being what some people might like and we wouldn't want to frighten them away. The rise of the 'worship leader', personally dictating a 'time of worship' with participation (ie following) by the rest of the assembly but no real collaboration, is a key feature of recent charismatic development. Anne Coles takes it as axiomatic that there should be such a person in each church, and that renewed worship is all about there being a time of sung worship, and, er, that's it (in this booklet at least).

This is a shame, especially as the booklet is designed to help people worship in their local church, and aims to move people from traditional to renewed. Many charismatics find themselves nourished by 'liturgical' services, and all acts of worship are structured in some form. Even the section on 'introducing renewed worship in a traditional setting' simply encourages people to do the New Wine stuff in small groups, and then get bigger by starting a new service, not renewing the old one. And however much renewed music is about songs sung to God, not about God, there is a worrying flavour of individual emotional response pervading much of what is written here.

Even taken on its own terms this booklet is only helpful to those well within its own culture. More broadly it raises worrying questions about unthinking adherence to unstated norms about what worship is and who leads it. I write this as a charismatic evangelical who has an especial concern for the Church of England, and who attends New Wine as his conference of choice, being committed to the renewal of worship by and through the Holy Spirit. I fear that there are better ways to do it than this.

Jeremy Fletcher

LITURGICAL EDUCATION AND FORMATION STRATEGY?

The little GS document labelled 'Annex' which came with the GS mailings in July was in fact an Annex to the report of the Liturgical Commission. It has its second instalment here. In August we reproduced pages 1-2 following the preamble. This