

the possibilities of the new material. More information can be found at:  
<http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/resources/indexres.html>  
and click on RELATED PUBLICATIONS

#### INFORMATION BULLETIN 11

Information Bulletin number 11 will be landing on doormats around the country very shortly! It will focus on Daily Prayer but will also include information on everything Common Worship that has been happening in recent days. It will be piggybacking in the same envelope as the Parochial Fees Table.

If you don't usually receive a Parochial Fees Table or even if you do, the text of the bulletin is now available to download from the web site as an RTF file. More information can be found at:

<http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/resources/indexres.html>  
and click on DOWNLOADS

#### LECTIONARY 2001 to 2002 DOWNLOAD AVAILABLE

In order to conduct an experiment into the interest in such electronic products, the Liturgical Publishing Group have authorized us to make available a free downloadable file of the Annual Lectionary 2001 to 2002.

Usually such material would not be free, but since it is an experiment with the hope that we will gain plenty of feedback on the usefulness or otherwise of the data, it has been made available free for one year only. More information can be found at:  
<http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/resources/indexres.html>  
and click on DOWNLOADS

#### MORE VIRUS ATTACKS

We are currently being bombarded by the latest fast spreading virus BadTrans B. It has already infected many of our diocesan contacts and, as a result, we are now starting to receive emails from Common Worship web site users who have been infected by the virus. Please make sure that you have up-to-date virus protection. If you want to read up about this particular virus, then look up  
[http://www.datafellows.com/v-descs/badtrs\\_b.shtml](http://www.datafellows.com/v-descs/badtrs_b.shtml).

#### FINAL WORDS [as usual]

David Green

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](mailto: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 324

December 2001

## EDITORIAL

### ANGLICAN-METHODIST UNITY?

This month sees the publication of the report of the formal conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church. Before I print the recommendations and venture my own conclusions, the under-50s may like to be reminded of the slow history of this relationship:

1946 Geoffrey Fisher preaches his 'Cambridge Sermon', and suggests the Free Churches might take episcopacy into their own systems.

1947-50 The C/E converses with Free Church representatives about the initiative.

Their report, *Church Relations in England* (1950), sets out the options.

1950-54 The Free Churches, all except the Methodists, say 'no'. The Methodists say a qualified 'yes' and receive a qualified 'yes' back from the C/E.

1956-63 The two teams meet, and work for seven years on the principles (centring on the 'Service of Reconciliation', whereby the ministers of both Churches lay hands on each other' and the addition of a vague but necessary Stage Two of full union). Four out of twelve Methodists dissent at the finish.

1963-65 The report is in the two Churches and receives sufficient endorsement from both the Methodist Conference and the C/E Convocations for a continuing Commission to provide a Scheme.

1965-68 The Scheme is compiled and published in two parts, the joint Ordinal and the rest of the Scheme. This latter still includes the Service of Reconciliation. The Methodists (a team of supporters) are now unanimous, but Jim Packer is dissenting on the C/E side.

1968-69 The Scheme is sent down to parishes and circuits, and comes back, but is defeated in the C/E Convocations. (Liturgists may like to note that the Ordinal, drawn from the CSI Ordinal, aroused no controversy and thus became the parent of the ASB Ordinal, and a clear family lineage is easy to trace—see my *Modern Anglican Ordination Rites* (Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no 3, 1987).)

[1970 A group of four Anglican opponents, of whom I am one, publish a very strong critique of the Scheme with a finger-in-the-wind alternative ]<sup>1</sup>

1971 In the new General Synod a Private Member's Motion asks for the issue to be reopened with a 'clarifying' of the Scheme. (Those of us who thought the

<sup>1</sup> Colin Buchanan, Eric Mascall, Jim Packer and the Bishop of Willesden (Graham Leonard), *Growing into Union: Proposals for forming a United Church in England* (SPCK, 1970). This has long been out of print.

Scheme actually depended upon an enshrined unclarity could hardly conceive how this could be done.) But it is sent to the dioceses.

1972 The Scheme is finally defeated in Synod.

1973-76 The attempt is made to draw all the ecumenically disposed Churches in England into a new conversation. This results in 1976 in 'Ten Propositions'. These are duly sent down for debate in the Churches.

1978-80 The Ten Propositions receive sufficient support for the Churches Unity Commission to be set up to draft a 'Covenant' between the Churches, with a view to non-episcopal Churches becoming episcopal, but all existing presbyters being recognized and accepted for purposes of interchangeability without any 'topping up'.

1980-81 The Covenant is debated in the Churches, and looks as though it has the assent of the Methodists, URC, and Moravians. In the C/E General Synod it is defeated for a new reason—it will admit women presbyters into our ranks by a back door without any theological debate or actual stated decision on women ministers being taken.

1981-88 The quest is on for local steps to be taken in lieu of Schemes and this leads in the C/E to the Ecumenical Canons B.43 and B.44, which are Canons which were authorized unilaterally within the C/E and are not dependent upon agreement with anybody else.

1989-94 The Canons are gently implemented, often giving a cloak of legality to that which has been happening for years, and actually making Anglican presbyters truly interchangeable with non-episcopal presbyters in the Local Ecumenical Projects (LEPs) which are thus sanctioned, and separated off (by Canon B.44) from the operation of the normal Anglican Canons on worship and ministry. During this time also the C/E is working at the Porvoo conversations and agreement and has little central energy for talks between denominations in England.

1994-96 The Methodist Church requests an exploration with the C/E about union. The informal 'talks about talks' are set up. They report in *Commitment to Mission and Unity* (1996), setting out areas where agreement is needed, though going further than that in proposing an actual (retrogressive!) way of integrating ordained ministries.

1997-98 Both Churches agree to set up 'Formal Conversations', though (it seems) with a brief only to provide a statement of common faith. The present teams are appointed. Alongside them, in response to a plea from the URC (and some conscience about the URC in the Anglicans and Methodists), there is created a set of informal trilateral conversations between all three Churches. There is some overlap of membership to ensure 'joined-up' approaches to the issues, and both sets of conversations agree to admit the other into their 'circle of confidentiality' in relation to their drafting. I am myself the Anglican co-chair within the trilaterals conversations.

that belonged to the church. It was hard to see who was being dedicated to what in this dedication service!

Conclusion: There is nothing new under the sun.

Mark Earey

### This month's publications . . .

. . . are, firstly, Worship Series no 167, *Communion by Extension*, by Phillip Tovey—previously advertised wrongly in September as the prospective October Booklet, and, secondly, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no 51, *Early Jewish Liturgy: A Sourcebook for the use of Students of early Christian Liturgy*, by Alistair Stewart-Sykes and Judith Newman.

**Next month**, of course, sees the official publication from CHP of *Common Worship Daily Prayer: Preliminary Edition* (which should be £10 and match the *Services and Prayers* main book).

And the **CCP Almanack** for 2002 (not 2001 as advertised last month) is available by sending an SAE to the editorial address.

### DIARY DATES

We have only Praxis dates to hand - have all other fixture-managers given up?

7 February (Thursday) 'Liturgy for Rural Churches' at Gloucester Church House (by the cathedral) 10.30-4 led by Robert Paterson, Andrew Banks and John Whitehouse. Details from Praxis, 0207 272 3709.

28 February (Thursday) 'Daily Prayer' at St Nicholas Church, Durham, 10-3, led by Paul Bradshaw and Jeremy Fletcher. Details from Dana Delap, 0191 384 3834.

7 March (Thursday) 'How long, O Lord, how long . . . [making the baptism service work]' at Carrs Lane Church Centre, Birmingham, 10 - 4, led by Mark Earey and Gilly Myers. Ring Peter Furber, Christ Church, Malvern, on 01684 574 106

### THE HORSE'S MOUTH—GREEN WITH INFORMATION

David Green's E-mail of 4 **December** reads:

COMMON WORSHIP EMAIL LIST

I am writing with news of Common Worship.

DAILY PRAYER ONLINE SOON

*Common Worship: Daily Prayer* is scheduled for publication for January 31. We have had questions asking when the texts will be made available online. The answer is that we hope to publish simultaneously in both print and online.

The text will be available, as usual, as regular web pages as well as both PDF and RTE. Watch this space for more in the New Year.

USING COMMON WORSHIP: DAILY PRAYER

The next title in this popular series will be published on 31 January 2002.

Written by Gilly Myers and Jeremy Fletcher, the book continues the series tradition of combining theological background with hands-on, practical advice to open up

## HOW THE OTHER HALF CELEBRATES BIRTH from the Praxis National Education Officer's liturgical diary

Sunday

Finding myself in (a major city in England), went to the nearby Vineyard Church (meeting in a secondary school hall). Found that the service included Infant Dedication. The purpose of this service was threefold, the worship leader told us:

To say thank you to God for the child.

To ask God's blessing on the child.

For the parents of the child to make public promises.

The pattern of this part of the service was as follows:

First, the parents of the child gave testimony about the birth.

Secondly, the leader read the Bible passage about Jesus blessing the children and commented, this dedication service is not something we've just made up. The leader then took the child in his arms and said a prayer of thanksgiving (before which we were all told to shut our eyes). The prayer included echoes of phrases from the ASB service of Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child (though no books were in evidence for us or the leader).

Next, the parents read out a prayer which they had written themselves. The prayer asked God to help them and acknowledged the need of further help from family, friends and church; but no public promises were actually made (see 3 above).

Finally a godparent (their phrase) was called forward from the congregation. She prayed a (fairly long) prayer of blessing over the child—a prayer which did not bless the child, but, in effect, asked God to be active in the child's life. We were all told to close our eyes for this.

At this point children were invited forward to see and touch the baby and to pray for her. Other members of the family and friends from the church were also invited to come forward and pray for the child or the family (an opportunity which many took advantage of). While this scrum was taking place the church leader said a prayer and then gave the notices!

The positives:

- a) Involvement of the children of the church.
- b) Opportunity for testimony (lacking, I would guess, in most infant baptisms in Common Worship).
- c) The integral involvement of a church godparent.
- d) The chance for parents to compose their own prayer (which was planned and written in advance).

The negatives:

- a) The event lacked a sense of drama (for instance, the congregation were seated throughout).
- b) We kept being told to close our eyes, at points when we most wanted to be watching.
- c) The parents were not questioned by the rite about their intentions as parents, either humanly or spiritually, with the result that we became an audience to a ritual which reflected a personal view of parenthood, rather than something

1999-2001 The formal and informal conversations go to work alongside each other. The informals report in September in *Conversations on the way to Unity 1999-200* (United Reformed Church, £1); and the formal conversations are now reporting also.

The 'bottom line' of the formals' report is a 'Covenant'. The text runs like this:

### **THE ANGLICAN-METHODIST COVENANT**

We, the Methodist Church of Great Britain and the Church of England, on the basis of our shared history, our full agreement in the apostolic faith, our common understanding of the nature and mission of the Church and of its ministry and oversight, and our agreement on the goal of full visible unity, as set out in the previous sections of our Common Statement, hereby make the following Covenant in the form of interdependent Acknowledgements and Commitments. We do so both in a spirit of penitence for all that human sinfulness and narrowness of vision have contributed to our past divisions, recognizing that we have been impoverished through our separation and our witness to the gospel has been weakened accordingly, and in a spirit of thanksgiving and joy for the convergence in faith and collaboration in mission that we have experienced in recent years.

### **Acknowledgements**

- 1 We acknowledge one another's churches as true churches belonging to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ and as truly participating in the apostolic mission of the whole people of God.
- 2 We acknowledge that in both our churches the word of God is authentically preached, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist are duly administered and celebrated.
- 3 We acknowledge that both our churches confess in word and life the apostolic faith revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the ecumenical Creeds.
- 4 We acknowledge that one another's ordained and lay ministries are given by God as instruments of God's grace. to build up the people of God in faith, hope and love and for the ministry of word, sacrament and pastoral care.
- 5 We acknowledge one another's ordained ministries as possessing both the inward call of the Holy Spirit and Christ's commission given through the Church.
- 6 We acknowledge that both our churches embody the conciliar, connexional nature of the Church and that communal, collegial and personal oversight (*episkope*) is exercised within them in various forms.
- 7 We acknowledge that there already exists fundamental agreement on the principles of episcopal oversight as a visible sign and instrument of the communion of the Church in time and space.

### **Commitments**

1. We commit ourselves, as a priority, to work to overcome the remaining obstacles to the organic unity of our two churches, on the way to the full visible unity of Christ's Church. In particular, we look forward to the time when the fuller visible unity of our churches makes possible a united, interchangeable ministry.

2. We commit ourselves to realize more deeply our common life and mission and to share the distinctive contributions of our traditions, taking steps to bring about closer collaboration in all areas of witness and service in our needy world.
3. We commit ourselves to continue to welcome each other's baptized members to participate in the fellowship, worship and mission of our churches.
4. We commit ourselves to encourage forms of eucharistic sharing, including eucharistic hospitality, in accordance with the rules of our respective churches.
5. We commit ourselves to listen to each other and to take account of each other's concerns, especially in areas that affect our relations as churches.
6. We commit ourselves to continue to develop structures of joint or shared communal, collegial and personal oversight, including shared consultation and decision-taking, on the way to a fully united ministry of oversight.

So that's it. I gently submit that, 55 years on from Geoffrey Fisher's post-War initiative, we might credibly maintain that we are actually further back than when he preached that sermon—he at least made a proposal about episcopacy in Free Church systems, and also stated why he did not for the moment wish to go further. Our present 'Covenant' neither mentions episcopacy in Methodism nor specifies at any point what are the 'further obstacles' to be overcome. And the term 'Covenant' is under grave danger of further devaluation, as the mutual 'commitments' in the second half are either Utopian (and thus incredible) or piffling (and uselessly credible).

How can I say that? On the Utopian point, I do not believe that the Church of England (and here I refer only to the Church in which I have a voice) will *as a matter of priority* work to remove those 'remaining obstacles' to 'full visible unity' (Commitment 1). Commitment 1 appears self-contradictory—presumably the 'full visible unity' in the first sentence is about a single church body, whereas the second sentence (and its cautious 'fuller') seems to be about two churches in a different mutual relationship. This latter seems to be as far as the teams can see, and there are no proposals and no commitments that give any shape to even that tiny step. But 'full visible unity' in the sense of the first sentence would surely mean a single governmental structure and organization, a separation from the state, the provision for women bishops, and a new shape for international connexions (including overseas missionary societies on the one hand, and a new focus for the Anglican Communion on the other)? These are a few of the 'remaining issues' and the commitments are silent on them.

Curiously, the very limitations of the report just possibly give the United Reformed Church a chance of joining future planning and even possibly becoming part of a trilateral union. So, in signing the report of the trilaterals (see bottom of page 2 above), I added my own (somewhat dissenting) note to the report, urging that the bilateral report be officially referred by both General Synod and Methodist Conference to the United Reformed Church.

-----  
 Meanwhile December brings its anniversaries. It is the month in which we actually reach thirty years of Grove Booklets (no 1 was published on 31 December 1971) and

On inspection this passage is full of amazing promise:

- (i) We will provide you from Rome with a new English language for worship;
- (ii) There is every chance that it will quickly (or from the outset) be obsolete in relation to the living language round it;
- (iii) This obsolete form will be so unaffected by changes in the vernacular around it that it can thereafter continue unchanged forever.

Roman Catholics seem to be up in arms about it all over the English-speaking (and, I think, the German-speaking—and I do not know about the Welsh-speaking) liturgical world. Ah, but Rome has one old friend rallying to its support:

'I love the emphasis of *Liturgiam Authenticam* (the Holy See's latest initiative to prevent liberal liturgists from perverting Catholic worship under the guise of "translation" and "inculturation") on fidelity to classical and biblical formulae: its insistence that politically correct agendas must not be smuggled into "translations"; and its desire for genuine dignified vernacular dialects to emerge.' (John Hunwicke, Head of Theology at Lancing College, in September *New Directions* p.10)

If a genuine, undating, irrelevant, special language of liturgy with classical formulae extant within it, is needed, would they not all do better (at Rome, Westminster and Lancing) to use the Latin language and avoid any mutual accusations about wooden horse implications of 'translation' (so-called)? Just a passing irresponsible editorial thought of NOL.

COB

#### WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

Philip Hughes writes from Pershore to record brilliant variants in the narrative of institution at an ASB celebration (place undeclared, but he was presiding) two years ago. It was in the First Eucharistic Prayer that both the following occurred:

'... who, in the same night that he was betrayed,  
 took bread and gave you thanks;  
 he broke in, and gave it ...'

'... as we look for his coming in glory,  
 we celebrate with this bread and this cup  
 his one perfect sacrifice.'

No wonder the text needed revision, though I never heard these reasons alleged in Synod. Philip Hughes also has a nice closing touch from the (old) Jerusalem Bible. The particular lectionary book he was using (in the 1970s, pre-ASB) provided the JB text for Romans 4.14 thus:

'If the world is only to be inherited by those who follow the law, then faith is pointless and the promise worth noting.'  
 But that was before wps and spellchecks ...

one theologizes about deacons, they will inevitably be perceived as holding an 'inferior office' while we continue to require presbyters to be ordained from their number, even if a significantly larger number than at present are not also ordained as presbyters.

Poets, painters and musicians are all artists but we would not expect a painter to have been apprenticed as a poet first!

Those of us who are of the view that a distinct diaconate is (would be?) a valuable asset to the Church might perhaps be better occupied asking questions about the role of licensed readers, questions about which I have come to no conclusion yet.

Robert Paterson

Dear Colin

Thank you for your clear account in NOL of the troubles of ICEL and the example of yet another exercise of power by the Roman Curia.

At a Praxis day last year we were given an insight into the careful work that was being done to produce a more accurate and acceptable English translation of the Latin. It must be painful indeed and a tremendous strain on anyone's loyalty to have that stamped on.

It has long amazed me that the current deplorable versions ever got authorized, something that could hardly happen under the new regulations. The existing text does not deserve the term 'translation'; at times it is hardly a paraphrase. Often the prayers say almost nothing at all. How papalist Anglicans can bear to use it is beyond me, though sometimes as a supply priest I just have to grit my teeth. Whenever I wanted to borrow something like a saint's day collect from the *Missale Romanum*, I made my own translation, which brought home the inadequacies of what is currently inflicted on English-speaking RCs.

Yours sincerely

Graham Palmer

London SW1X 7PL

**Editorial note:** This letter keeps moving an issue with a lot of miles yet to run. BUT this is what the original *Liturgiam Authenticam* (2001) says *inter alia*:

'Indeed, it will be seen that the observance of the principles set forth in this Instruction will contribute to the gradual development, in each vernacular, of a sacred style that will come to be recognized as proper to liturgical language. Thus it may happen that a certain manner of speech which has come to be considered somewhat obsolete in daily usage may continue to be maintained in the liturgical context . . . These principles, in fact, should free the liturgy from the necessity of frequent revisions when modes of expression may have passed out of popular usage.' (para 27)

twenty-seven years of NOL. In the coming year there is to be in February a consultation between Praxis, Alcuin Club and GROW about the best provisioning of the Anglican constituency with liturgical material, and NOL (with NOH) will come under scrutiny. The present editor fully accepts the need for this, and is ready to surrender his quill-pen and his pages-of-type for something more akin to the twenty-first century. Our parent company, Grove Books Ltd, has passed its millionth Grove Booklet, and claims that it was its Harry Potter title that did it.

But the anniversary is really that of the birth of Jesus Christ. A very happy Christmas.

Colin Buchanan

## GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 2001

As anticipated, there was very little to report of liturgical matters (plenty re world crisis, and a Southwark motion about getting Downing Street and the Crown out of the appointment of diocesan bishops was handled, but not liturgy). We duly had the consultation on reforming the marriage law 'but no vote. We had a very sceptical debate on deacons ('Some of my best friends are deacons, but . . .'), and we first of all 'took note' of the report *For Such a Time as This*, and then passed a motion as follows:

'That this Synod

- (a) Commend the report for study in the Church of England and encourage appropriate national and diocesan bodies to consider the implications of the report for mission and ministry; and
- (b) invite responses to the report from ecumenical partners.'

Finally we passed this motion:

'That an extended period of authorization from 29 November 2004 to 31 December for the Liturgical Business entitled "Weekday Lectionaries" be considered by the House of Bishops.'

It was not greatly breathtaking.

COB

## BOOK REVIEWS

Gill Ambrose and Simon Kershaw, *Come to the Feast: A Companion to Common Worship Holy Communion* (Canterbury Press, 2001, 160 pp A5 pb, £6.99).

This simple companion is in its format a classic kind of companion. It has a Part One of just over 100 pages in which the Order One (contemporary) texts are printed on the right-hand (recto) page, and simple commentary, partly indicating sources, partly adding 'devotional' elaboration to the text, is printed opposite the pages of texts on the left-hand (verso) page. There follows a Part Two (which might perhaps have come first) which gives a more over-arching look at the rite, including some history, theology and explanation of the structure, along with suggestions for further reading and a brief glossary.

The commentary varies considerably in its weight and scope (and, incidentally, was the idea of having the commentary on the left-hand page a way of making it easy to blot out the text from one's gaze and follow simply the liturgical text during a service, or alternatively was it to make the book difficult to read by giving commentary first and text second?). There are some pages full of fascinating material, some which are almost a total blank. I wondered whether the two authors have separate signatures in the contrasting length of the commentary paragraphs—or whether they could in fact justify the variations as based on the sheer character of the right-hand page texts? There is a certain two-dimensional feel to their contributions, as they will say 'This comes from Romans', or 'This is the epiclesis' or 'Here we acknowledge our sins', but rarely does the comment handle the larger questions as to why a particular item comes where it does, or how it relates to other items in the unfolding structure of the rite, or for what reason its text has been changed since the ASB. A few of these questions are brought into the discussion in Part Two, but the answers are not too easy to discover for anyone simply reading text and commentary.

Hardly surprisingly, one third of the book is devoted to the eucharistic prayers, but much of the commentary material simply repeats what was said before (as, eg, re Isaiah in the temple and the angels' song of 'Holy, holy, holy'), and hardly anything touches on the distinctive character of the individual ones. They interestingly omit the 'set before' texts drawn from the Roman offertory prayers, but print out the 'With this bread / **We shall remember Jesus**' texts. Their theology is probably in the last analysis receptionist, but they never seem to get quite close enough to the texts to make a case—and there is a touch of untutored romanticism about their affirmation that we 'make present the sacrifice of Calvary' (p.147).

Ever nitpicking when reviewing others, I noted the following:

Page 32: the commentary on NOL's *bête noire* in CW—page 176—misses tricks which admittedly page 176 conceals. It is not true to say 'As the prayer continues we pray that God the Holy Spirit will be on us and the gifts of bread and wine'. No epiclesis (a word the book uses regularly further on) prays that the Spirit will be 'on...the bread and wine', and in four of the eight prayers (A,B,C,E) the epiclesis comes before the narrative of institution (as in the ASB), whilst this commentary sentence clearly refers to a point after the narrative.

Page 34: the commentary on page 177 fails to guide us through that maze, and, whilst mentioning the origins of '**Blessing and honour...**' and of the Prayer F responses, it is silent on the genesis of 'This is his story / **this is our song**' (which does have roots, surely?).

Page 36: the commentary on the Lord's Prayer refers us to a short chapter at the end of the book on it—and takes the modern C/E text for granted. But it never mentions or discusses in either place the traditional text (though, delightfully, ELLC gets a mention).

Page 38 (and elsewhere): is the breaking of the bread a symbol of the body of Christ 'broken on the cross'? The Bible does not say so, and the liturgical texts steer clear of it.

Page 48: the Series 3 eucharistic prayer (ancestor of Prayer A) was not 'largely written in 1972' (who can have had that idea?).

But I do nitpick. There is healthiness and a commonsense approach here in a book which I would expect find being given to at least some of the candidates whom I meet at their confirmation.

COB

Church of Ireland, *The Calendar and Collects According to the use of the Church of Ireland* (Columba Press, Dublin, 2001, 144pp A5 hb, £8 sterling, or Eur12.70)

This is a neatly produced forerunner of the intended Irish BCP of 2004. The Collects are produced in what the introduction calls '16th/17th century style' and '20th/21st century style', and are then labelled 'Collect One' and 'Collect Two' for each occasion (and a contemporary post-communion prayer is thrown in for good measure). For the sake of comparison (and to see if Wakefield diocese would be mollified) we print the text of the CW Advent 2 Collect (to which the 16th/17th century text in Ireland corresponds) and put beside it the new Irish collect

<p>O Lord, raise up, we pray, your power and come among us, and with great might succour us; that, whereas, through our sins and wickedness we are greatly hindered in running the race that is set before us, your bountiful grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with you and the Holy Spirit, be honour and glory now and for ever. Amen.</p>	<p>Father in heaven, who sent your Son to redeem the world and will send him again to be our judge: Give us grace so to imitate him in the humility and purity of his first coming that when he comes again, we may be ready to greet him with joyful love and firm faith; through Jesus Christ our Lord.</p> <p>(Acknowledged as from CCP)</p>
--	---

So I am inclined to say that those who want illegal (but 20th/21st century style) collects—at least for the sake of comparison, if not actually daring pray with them in England—might find that

If you ever worship in the Church of Ireland,  
then maybe at some eucharistic rite  
you will pray a collect written for this era  
and smuggle it to England out of sight.

COB

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

It was interesting to read your musings on the Diaconate in NOL November 2001.

Something which has struck me since participating in a Swedish ordination shortly after the Porvoo Agreement was ratified is that only when the principle of *per saltum* (direct) ordination to the presbyterate is established will we be able to shake off the view that the diaconate is essentially about probation. However much