

Review of activity Summer 2002

Now that most parishes have come to grips with the majority of *Common Worship* texts, two main initiatives remain high on the London agenda. First, to continue to develop the role of area liturgical groups—the only sensible way of keeping in touch with parishes within such a large, high density city in which the travel system seems to be coming ever closer to the verge of overload and collapse. Secondly, to offer parishes a service of worship evaluation. Avoiding the term ‘liturgical audit’, we have opted for the more user-friendly title *Growth in Worship*.

Careful trialling has produced a package that is almost ready for dissemination by the area groups, which will each offer a limited number of *Growths* in the first year. The process will be tight—lasting about three weeks—and focussed. However, some questions remain about the visiting team: may it include a member of the parish; from how nearby may team members be drawn? We have ruled out the same deanery.

And there is a deeper issue that other liturgical committees may have encountered. Are these resolutely friendly evaluations concerned principally with technical issues—effective organisation, welcome to newcomers etc—or may they address the worship content? Common sense would suggest the second route, but what I find superficial others may find uplifting. Only time and critical self-reflection will enable the area groups and all those involved with *Growth in Worship* to determine what may productively be laid on the table.

At our last meeting, we discussed the new provision for daily prayer. While most of us felt that it is useful for the clergy, there was a general sense that more needs to be done to support daily prayer amongst the laity. A ‘beefed up’ single office, either for the day or the night, was felt to be one answer. And shouldn’t prayer within families also be a matter of concern for the Liturgical Commission?

Alan Everett
Convener

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 333

September 2002

EDITORIAL

On 11 September, Thought for the Day on BBC4 was delivered by Rowan Williams. He had, of course, the amazingly coincidental qualification that he was over there, preaching at Trinity Church in Wall Street, within a stone’s throw of the twin towers. He drew us into his address by pointing out that photos of the devastation generally ‘leave us on the outside’, but, for a brief period, he had himself had the experience of being ‘on the inside’ of what the photos show. He went on to say that, although we are used to taking a distant, detached, and wide-angle view of tragedy by standing back, there is no such long view with God: God by definition does not deal with a general scene; he is close up to tragedies (and joys), relating to the individuals and the particularities with close involvement.

I found myself reflecting on the reverse situation, the one in which we who worship with a liturgical programme find ourselves. By this illustration our worshippers are, I suggest, removed a vast distance from the ‘pictures on the screen’. While a baptism or a wedding may have us individually close to God, texts of scripture (perhaps psalmody most of all!), hymns of enormous and sacrificial self-giving to God, sermons of equal demand for commitment, a eucharist holding out the promise of life through the death and resurrection of Jesus—these can all pass across the screen as though for us we are looking again at the picture of the twin towers collapsing. It is all ‘there’—and ‘there’ is nowhere near ‘here’. Indeed, when the blessing has been given, and the pictures on the screen switched off, we are (it may be?) all relieved to be back here, without only the very minimal discomfort or distraction from having glimpsed far off the ‘there’.

If I have got this right, then what is happening is that most of us have picked up far back along the way that ‘ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven’ is not a charter for life in Christ Jesus, arresting and directing me hourly, or at least putting me on notice each time I open my wallet, but instead a passing image on a screen which, at my discretion, will give me a two-dimensional remote view of somewhere else as long as I choose to see it.

Well, so can we all relax, and feel safe from intervention? Ah, but Rowan Williams’ three minutes included two further twists, and might restore some godly discomfort to us.

Firstly, in his opening words he pointed out that, briefly, he had himself been ‘there’—‘I was on the inside of the picture’—and that meant, I take it, that he could never look at the pictures in the same way as mere England-dwellers. Perhaps liturgy should work like that—that all the time the worshippers should have a strong sense

'I was there'. Indeed perhaps (perhaps a somewhat bigger perhaps?) *that* is what baptism should mean in the lives of the baptized. But a lively recollection of those times of the dread and/or joyful immediacy in our lives of the living God, that also should have us saying 'I was there'.

Secondly, however, the developed point of Rowan Williams is that God is never distancing himself the way our subconscious or inadvertence (or guilt?) will distance us. When we are glimpsing a distant scene on a small screen which we can at ease turn off, that scene is *not* where God is. I suppose that a true liturgical theology will have us reflect on the participants as the dwelling-place of God through his Spirit. And that should make the comfortable seat uncomfortable, and the disturbed life settled.

But I suppose even Rowan Williams on the radio, let alone COB in this editorial, may still strike you as ephemeral words on a fairly small screen.

Colin Buchanan

THE NEW ARCHBISHOP'S TRACK-RECORD ON LITURGY

Rowan Williams is now on his way. I do not know when Her Majesty will require the College of Canons of Canterbury Cathedral to elect him (though I anticipate they will duly do so when bid); nor do I know when that election will be confirmed (nor indeed *where* it will be confirmed, as the process for other diocesan bishops has recently moved from the crypt of St Mary-le-Bow to Lambeth Palace Chapel, *at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury*; as, by definition, there will be no Archbishop in post to issue such an invitation in this case, perhaps they will revert to that unfrequented crypt). It looks, however, as though these will come in January. There is some good reason to think that the enthronement in Canterbury will come on 27 February—and I ventured an interest last month in whether he will get the Nicene Creed into the enthronement liturgy, so as to follow Robert Runcie in thereby having a chance to omit the *Filioque*, as a gesture towards the Eastern Orthodox, for whom, like Robert Runcie, he has a considerable affection. When I sounded out a usually reliable source in Wales about the Archbishop's liturgical interests (and track-record), among the juicy bits I picked up were overheard queries by him as to whether (in considering the ELLC text) we could confidently say that Jesus was 'incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary', there being a problem in that the Holy Spirit is not carnate. He also doubted 'became fully human', on the grounds that it sounds as though it is distinguishing the form of Jesus' incarnation from another form of life which is 'partially human'! (Perhaps that is exactly right, and some of the fourth and fifth century Christological heresies were damaging or diminishing the humanity of the incarnate Son of God . . .)

But are there any actual texts that can be traced to his handiwork? Yes, my informant thought, for there had been a few ripples about the Roman 'offertory prayers', which appear in the appendix to the 1992 *Alternative Eucharist*—ie which

the several petitions in the model Prayer our Lord has given us, presumably because we can be confident of God's ability and willingness to provide these needs, and we are really adjusting our own minds to realize this more confidently. However, when Jesus praying in Gethsemane asked that this cup might be removed, and added the words: 'nevertheless not my will but yours be done', that might be construed: 'if it pleases YOU'; it certainly cannot be construed as 'to please ME'.

Yours sincerely

Julian Richards

Alton

Dear Bishop Colin

In connection with your editorial in NOL for August on the vesture of priests, I send some thoughts on the matter which is still in existence in the Diocese of Sydney.

When Bishop Broughton (1788-1853) was Bishop of Australia, being sympathetic to the Catholic cause, there were no problems.

In 1909 Archbishop Wright, the second Archbishop of Sydney, formulated a Canon through Synod due to the puritan element in Sydney, that priests (ministers) will not wear chasuble, dalmatic, tunicle, alb, or stole in any parish in the diocese. He also maintained that the cope was in fact allowed in cathedrals in Britain. They are not worn in St. Andrew's Cathedral in Sydney.

Archbishop Wright would not license a priest (minister), unless he signed the statement not to wear any of the vestures which were banned by Synod. Over the years, the few Catholic parishes in Sydney, now use the cope, dalmatic, tunicle, alb and stole for celebrating the eucharist, and cope, stole, surplice for evensong. Clergy in St. Andrew's Cathedral in Sydney wear black scarf, and bishops convocation robes. There are no stoles.

In some parishes in Sydney, the celebrant wears his ordinary clothes, and it also has been reported that a Bishop took a confirmation service in ordinary clothes.

Just to add, candles and crosses are not allowed in St. Andrew's Cathedral in Sydney.

I trust this might interest your readers.

Yours sincerely

Michael Geary

Queensland

STOP PRESS

We understand a new and bumper third edition of *Patterns for Worship* is to come in November—more details next month.

... and how are you doing for backnumbers?

An enthusiastic subscriber to NOL and booklets has recently retired and would like to sell sets of Grove publications. Such complete sets are rarely found, and probably should not be broken up—there may even be libraries which would be interested. He invites offers for the following:

NOL: Nos.1-324

Worship booklets: 1-169 (bar no 8)

Ethics booklets: 1-125 (bar nos. 1,2,9,53 and 90)

Pastoral booklets: 1-89 (bar nos 18 and 52)

Evangelism booklets: 1-58 (bar nos 10 and 57)

(Old) Liturgical Studies: 1-25 (bar no 3) and 32.

The vendor is the Rev Henry Whyte, 6 Horn Park Lane, SE12 8UU. It is also worth noting that anyone wanting missing items to complete sets may write to Cambridge (or to COB re NOL) and enquire.

CORRESPONDENCE (DOVES ARE 'IN' STILL ...)

Dear Colin

What happens if the newly-released dove performs the unsocial function often done by frightened birds? What does this prophesy for future ministry? Will it all be sugar-sweetness and light, or will it be the other?

John Porter, Haughton, Manchester

Dear Colin

Another item for a 'silly season' NoL, taking up the item of the dove, at the foot of page 7 in the current issue. When I was visiting Compostella for the feast of St. James many years ago, one of the celebrations was the sending of an artificial dove, stuffed with a lit firework, down a wire the length of the Cathedral on to a bonfire in the plaza which the dove and firework ignited. It was perhaps a visual aid on the power of the Holy Spirit, but I do not see how it related to St. James. Its precise liturgical significance is also a mystery. Nevertheless it was very dramatic. I have always wished to copy this, but, perhaps fortunately, have lacked both the technical expertise and a Liturgy Committee with a pyromaniac.

James M. Cassidy

Dear Colin

In *News of Liturgy* for August 2002; your correspondent, my brother in Winchester Diocese, David Steele, wants the liturgical group to consider including 'please' in prayers. I hope you will disagree on the grounds that there is no 'please' in any of

were drafted in his first few months as a bishop in Wales. Fussing about 'this bread to offer' and 'this wine to offer' had not been the point of concern, but the last line of the 'wine' prayer reads in Wales 'It will become the cup of our salvation', rather than the more widely preferred 'It will become our spiritual drink'. The weighting of this text stems, it seems, from Rowan Williams saying that the latter alternative (a) has no biblical echoes, and (b) damns by faint praise!

More generally, he has been heard and seen to show affection for ancient Eastern forms (see above), for Porvoo mixed bathing, and for the text and style of 1662 itself. If there is a catholic self within him (which was once taken for granted by his friends), it is also true that there is a strong bent towards Lutheranism, and an interest in the Reformation itself. Michael Ramsey was the last Archbishop of Canterbury before Rowan Williams to have been a Professor of Theology—our new man, whether or not he counts himself a liturgist, is uniquely well equipped to make a strong contribution, not simply to any textual changes or additions but also to the whole ethos and theology of Anglican worship today.

Perhaps the Ordinal will be his first test in England.

FURTHER TO THAT BOWING QUESTION

It so happens I have been grubbing about a bit in the seventeenth century this Summer, as I am preparing an edition of the Savoy Conference material for the December Joint Liturgical Studies series (no.54, *The Savoy Conference Revisited*—dare you do without it?). I was aware of Puritan concern about bowing, but I found myself chasing it up a little more. It does not enter directly into the Savoy Exceptions and Answers relating to the text of the BCP, as there is no mention of bowing within the BCP; but it was strongly in the atmosphere, and in the interest of disinterested study I have pulled together some material here. The clue came in *The first Address and Proposals of the Ministers*, made in the Summer of 1660

'And that the use of the Surplice and Cross in Baptism, and bowing at the Name of *Jesus* rather than at the Name of *Christ* or *Emmanuel*, or other Names whereby that Divine Person, or either of the other Divine Persons is nominated, may be abolished' (Matthew Sylvester, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, 1696, p 236)

You can see how the four 'excepted ceremonies' of Queen Elizabeth's reign and the Hampton Court Conference have changed slightly: in 1660 the ring in marriage is no longer one of the major four, but bowing 'at the Name of Jesus' has replaced it. The same four recur in the Puritan response to the Worcester House Declaration of 25 October 1660 (the high point of concessions from the monarch). The origin of this change is undoubtedly the Canons of 1604, produced after the Hampton Court Conference, and not therefore figuring in its proceedings. Canon 18 of 1604 says:

'18. A Reverence and Attention to be used within the Church in time of Divine Service In the time of Divine Service, and of every part thereof, all due reverence is to

be used; for it is according to the Apostle's rule, *Let all things be done decently and according to order*; answerably to which decency and order, we judge these directions following: No man shall cover his head in the Church or Chapel in the Divine service . . . All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief . . . and likewise when in the time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world . . . [the rest of the Canon is about keeping quiet and listening well]

One can almost hear how this clashed on the Puritans' ears and consciences—their protest is about the valuing of the letter of the Canon, whereas they themselves would claim to worship according to the spirit of the reverence required. I should perhaps add that the Canons of 1604 were still in force when I was ordained, and I heard of a scrupulous cleric who avoided reference to Jesus Christ in his sermons, so as not to be bobbing up and down like this. Indeed, do my more 'Catholic' friends talk about 'our blessed Lord' also to avoid mentioning 'Jesus Christ', *literally by name*, in their sermons, and somehow it spills over into ordinary life?

But the Puritans of 1660 were also haunted by the memory of the proposed Canons of 1640, drafts which represented the summit of Laudian schemes for the Church of England. They were mostly about church courts and discipline, but Canon VII ran as follows:

Canon VII—Place of Table

[The table to be against the East wall]

And we declare that this situation of the holy table, doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed as true and proper altar, whereupon Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is and may be called an altar by us, in that sense in which the primitive church called it an altar, and in no other.

And lastly, whereas the church is the house of God, dedicated to his holy worship, and therefore ought to mind us both of the greatness and goodness of his divine majesty; certain it is that the acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in it self, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well affected people, members of this church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeysance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the primitive church in the purest times, and of this church also for many years of the reign of queen Elizabeth. The reviving therefore of this ancient and laudable custom we heartily

in the twenty-first century. It will be important to maintain contact with the Roman Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, and to observe the principles set forth in *Liturgiam Authenticam*.'

Not much comfort there for those who fear the upshot of *Liturgiam Authenticam*—it looks as though it is carrying all before it.

COB

This month's publication . . .

. . . is Joint Liturgical Study no 53, *Public Worship and Communion by Extension*, by Alex Hughes. This is a thorough look at the meaning of administering and receiving communion away from the place of a true celebration of the eucharist, and the well-based theological reflections give rise to some very awkward questions for the rite and its practitioners. There is a strong reference to the new Church of England rite, but the principles are handled on larger canvas.

. . . and next month's is

Worship Series no.172, *The Laying on of Hands and Anointing*, by Carolyn Headley. This is a major re-writing of her earlier (very widely acclaimed) booklet no. 104.

Although it contains material first offered in that booklet in 1988, this substantially different publication takes into account the many developments in this ministry since then: the increased ministry by lay church members, the influence of the renewal movement, and the C of E reports and new liturgical provision. It covers a number of pastoral and practical issues and the use of these kinds of ministry in a variety of contexts, as well as providing the biblical and historical background. It serves as a companion to COB's booklet (W161) which introduced the new CW services, but this concentrates more on being a practical handbook.

. . . and next year's publications

include various changes from this and preceding years:

- (a) the number of Worship booklets goes down from six to four per annum (which was the regular pre-1999 ration, but it was bumped up to six to match the rate of new rites as Common Worship was authorized);
- (b) the number of Joint Liturgical Studies goes down from three to two per annum (and fits into the bi-monthly rota of Worship Booklets, taking the June and December slots);
- (c) a transitional phase is reached with *News of Liturgy* and *News of Hymnody* in which it is hoped new patterns will emerge by January 2004.

Recent meetings of Bishops and ICEL and the Congregation for Divine Worship have considered how best to proceed with a faithful and speedy translation of the Missal. There is no date set, but all the signs are that the translation will be achieved within two years, or so. For all sorts of reasons the English speaking Church has had to continue using the first ICEL translation of the Missal well past its “best-before” date . . .’

Well, what do we read between the lines? Am I being over-suspicious when I revert to troubles last year (still recurring in the correspondence columns of *The Tablet*) about *Liturgiam Authenticam*? Are the faithful being softened up to believe their present translations to have gone stale or dismal, in order to get a better reception for translations produced by new Roman process? I don’t myself think the translations are wonderful, but I fear what the latinists may yet give to Roman Catholics.

Music and Liturgy, in its Summer 2002 number, reveals what I assume to be more exactly a follow-up to *Liturgiam Authenticam*. The report reads:

‘The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (CDW), the Vatican office with responsibility for liturgy, has created a new body to monitor translation of liturgical texts into English.

‘In recent years the Vatican, despite prior approval by Bishops’ Conferences, has rejected a number of translations prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy, causing delays of several years, in granting *recognitio*—the official approval of texts, without which they may not legitimately be used.

‘Reports indicate the principal purpose of the new body, called *Vox Clara* (Clear Voice), will not be to carry out translations itself, but to collect input from selected English-speaking experts and to provide advice to CDW when new texts arrive for *recognitio*.’

Interesting—not only because ICEL is the ‘International Committee on English in the Liturgy’. So we must look forward to hearing the names of these ‘English-speaking experts’ who will advise those who do the vetting in future; it is not entirely clear who will process the existing logjam; nor are the credentials of CDW as the place of censoring very convincingly put.

I had got so far in trying to understand what was happening, when I received the September issue of *Liturgy Newsletter*. This has not a word about *Vox Clara*; so was *Music and Liturgy* wrong? Or is *Vox Clara* not relevant to English translations after all? No, what *Liturgy Newsletter* is reporting is ICEL’s doings—and the appointment of Bishop Arthur Roche, Coadjutor Bishop of Leeds, and chairman of the Liturgy Committee of the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales, as chairman of ICEL. Alongside him Fr Bruce Harbert has been appointed Executive Secretary to ICEL—and he is quoted as saying:

‘It will be a privilege to work with the international team . . . and to continue the task of handing on the Roman rite to the English-speaking world in a form that is faithful to its Latin original and meets the needs of Christians

commend to the consideration of all good people, not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion table, the east, or church, or any thing therein contained in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the holy eucharist, upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God’s majesty, and to give him alone that honour and glory that is due unto him, and no otherwise; and in the practice and omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite, despise not them who use it not; and that they who use it not, condemn not those who use it.’

Well, it was agreed in 1660 that these Canons had no standing (being passed by Convocations after Parliament had been dissolved). And they ‘commend’ a practice rather than enforcing it: they guard their eucharistic doctrine against anything that smacks of Rome: and they are focussing on entering and leaving the building only. But this sort of programme and the threat it contained to the ethos of Puritan worship was clearly still stalking that 1660 generation of Presbyterians; it was they who had brought back the King, but were now wrestling with threatened reversals to Laudianism which they might have unwittingly brought back with the monarch.

And the rest you know—but you may still like to have *The Savoy Conference Revisited* when it comes.

COB

SOCIETY FOR LITURGICAL STUDY—BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, COLLEGE OF THE RESURRECTION, MIRFIELD, 27-29 AUGUST 2002

‘The Place of Prayer’ was the theme for the Society’s conference at its new venue of the College of the Resurrection at Mirfield. The northern skies cleared and the sun shone on our ecumenical gathering of nearly forty liturgical scholars from a wide variety of backgrounds and interests.

Four major papers were offered this year and we began our conference, not inappropriately, with a paper from the principal of the college, Christopher Irvine, ‘The art of Transforming Worship: Liturgical Celebration and Christian Formation’ in which he suggested how worshippers become God’s art, ‘formed in the likeness of Christ’ through the work of the Holy Spirit. We then passed from theology to rite with Graham Woolfenden’s contribution on ‘Movement, Rite and Ceremony’. Here was an argument against the rift between those who saw liturgy as text and those who view it as rite; he urged that there is no support for this dichotomy, our spiritual lives are expressed by the body. Robin Gibbons explored the question of how Christians can make sense of where we are in the worship space and how we can encounter God there in, ‘From East to West: A Theology of the Worship Space’. The culmination of our reflection on ‘The Place of Prayer’ came in the form of a practical workshop led by Paul Jenkins. Here we were presented with the problems faced by the College itself as it approached the task of re-ordering the collegiate chapel.

A regular feature of our conferences are the Short Papers which may be on any liturgical subject. Stefan Scot gave us a fascinating account of his adaptation of the office of Tenebrae for use as a parochial Holy Week service. Adrian Burdon asked us to consider the relationship, or lack of it, between worship and mission in the twenty-first century. New to the conference are the Research Communications, where scholars, in the process of researching for higher degrees report on the fruits of their labour. Susan Farrimond is in the course of an investigation of the rituals surrounding the marriage rite; Ben Gordon-Taylor gave us a 'snapshot' of his work on the place of 'Mystery in the liturgy from the fourth to the ninth century.'

The conference invariably concludes with the Patriarchal Paper. This year we had hoped to welcome Professor Edward Yarnold into our midst. But, sadly, this was not to be because of his sudden death. Anthony Gelston, a long-standing member of our Society, stepped into the breach with a fine, erudite, paper on 'Some aspects of Common Worship: Daily Prayer'.

Needless to say worship forms an important part of this event. We began in monastic mood by joining the Community for evening prayer, and enjoyed contributions from our Roman Catholic, Anglican and Methodist members.

This was Christopher Irvine's last conference as our chairman. The conference expressed its gratitude to Chris for 'bringing us up North' and to his team at Mirfield for extending true northern hospitality and a warm welcome to all our members. Robin Gibbons was duly elected as our new Chairman.

It was heartening to meet up with so many enthusiastic liturgists. However, Christopher Irvine and our President, Donald Gray, echoed the thoughts of us all as they reflected on the decline of liturgical studies in our universities and a worrying lack of interest in the study of liturgy in the major denominations.

Those interested in the work of the Society should contact the Secretary, Dr Carol Wilkinson, 52, Lowick Drive, Poulton le Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 8HB, e-mail: cwillkinson@swilkinson.ndirect.co.uk

BOOK REVIEWS

Jack McArdle, *And that's the Gospel truth: reflections on the Sunday Gospels. Year A* (Columba Press 2001, 256pp, paperback £9.99)

This book, although for Year A, is the last of a set of three. It is intended not for the preacher but to help 'the ordinary punter in the pew' to prepare for each Sunday's Gospel, or to reflect on the reading at home. Each week conforms to a set pattern setting out the theme and teaching, offering modern stories and parables, and presenting a challenge for response and practice.

If you like that sort of thing you might like it, but for me there were too many drawbacks. The book comes from an Irish Roman Catholic context (although there is no indication of this on the cover or title page) and so the calendar and the readings differ significantly from those in the Anglican lectionary. In this book the Sunday

we know as Trinity 11 (or this year Proper 14) is the 19th Sunday of the year. And there is no scripture index to help you to locate the Gospel readings in their yearly position. Nor is there any reference to the other 'readings of the day', which restricts its usefulness as preparation for Sunday worship. I read a month or so's reflections, and found the rigidity of structure to be something of a strait-jacket. It was rather like the old broadcast daily service's 'a story, a hymn and a prayer' and would (for me) quickly pall. Whether you want weekly meditation or ideas for sermon illustrations there are better books available which are easier to use in an Anglican world.

Anna de Lange
Durham

Angela Ashwin, *The wine danced: meditations on Eucharistic themes* (Eagle Publishing 2002, 174pp, paperback £7.99—BUT, please note, Eagle went bankrupt as the book was published, and it is now handled by IVP)

Angela Ashwin, a member of the Liturgical Commission, has produced an inspiring book of short meditations. There are 64 of them, plenty to use as preparation for Sundays and feast days for a year, but with other possible patterns of use as well, as they are not tied in any way to the calendar or the readings. Each takes one image or idea from the Holy Communion service, provides a Bible verse to earth it in the Word, and then uses poetry, 'sound-bites', prayer and thoughtful challenge to help us to ponder the image. The layout encourages the reader to slow down, to take time and to let the words sink in; the variety of style means that each meditation is fresh; and the close of each meditation is a few words 'for weaving' into our prayer during the service or throughout the week.

Why call it 'The wine danced'? Before stepping onto the moon's surface, astronaut Buzz Aldrin poured wine into a chalice—and under lunar gravity it swirled, curled and danced in the cup. This is a delightful book for leisurely chewing that will enrich our response to the weekly liturgy and enable us to worship with our hearts and our imaginations as well as our minds.

Anna de Lange
Durham

ROME AND NEW TEXTS

The May 2002 issue of *Liturgy Newsletter*, the journal from the Liturgy Office of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, announced

'The new edition of the Roman Missal was published in Rome on 18 March 2002... Perhaps the most significant revision is the revised General Instruction... It will still be some while before there is an official translation of the Missal.