

Now there is certainly a debate about the compatibility of same-sex sexual relationships with the Christian revelation. It is an international debate, running right across the Anglican Communion. But the debate is foreclosed the moment the rites of bonding in a sexual relationship are authorized. That is what has happened in New Westminster.

How does this bear upon the ordination—and particularly the ordination as bishops—of men who are in gay relationships? A letter in *The Tablet* on 15 August made a very strong point—that the issue of same-sex blessings is actually prior to the issue of ordination. If we legitimize the pairings, then we can proceed with ordination. If we wish even to leave the issue of pairings open for debate, then we pull out the rug from under that wish when we ordain those in openly gay relationships.

While the logic that puts the blessings prior to the ordination question easily escapes us, the blessings themselves have been carefully excluded in *Issues in Human Sexuality* (to which a new *Guide* from the House of Bishops will shortly be published), in the Lambeth Conference resolution of 1998, and in the recent statement by the Primates of the Communion. That at least leaves the question open. But the point of logic has become ever clearer—that, if the blessings are approved, then the ground for resisting ordinations is greatly weakened; while, if the blessings are ducked, there is no known point of principle (save that couplings do, or will, happen) which can be brought to bear on the ordination question.

And that is part of the misty problem the Church at large is encountering. We have no official institution of same-sex coupling, and we are presented with what therefore appear to be *ad hoc* relationships, with little way of defining them or inaugurating them or of knowing what would amount to a breach of them. I write that without prejudice to what *ought* to be the case. It is an interesting (if academic) question as to whether there is greater liberty with an institution or without. But if the Church creates an institution, it virtually sanctifies it—and closes the debate.

And the debate is on, undoubtedly. And actually, I know where I stand in the debate. But that is not the theme of this discussion.

COB

---

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 2003 **£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 344

August 2003

## EDITORIAL

In the June issue of NOL I sifted the pre-NEAC book, *Fanning the Flame*, to see whether those who were writing on the cross and its saving and healing power would reflect on the texts in Common Worship. They notably failed to do so, so I thought that I would this month do it for them.

The background is Cranmer. He has often been castigated (at least in the second half of the twentieth century) for concentrating narrowly upon the cross of Christ—and there is truth in that, though the attack has often been launched by those to whom the eucharist was the sole public worship of Sunday, and the narrow doctrinal focus of the 1552/1662 rite has therefore stood out very strongly. In Cranmer's own context, however, the Lord's Supper might in theory have been on offer every Sunday, but the provision was not only in the context of Morning and Evening Prayer and their round of reading the whole Psalter once a month and the Old Testament once a year and the New Testament three times in the year. Thus a great objectivity, with virtually no selectivities, was given to the whole round of God's revelation; and that has to be remembered when accusations are levelled. Indeed, for the hundreds of years in which parishes had communion once a month or once a quarter, the 'narrow focus' on the cross was hardly dominating people's liturgical lives.

Cranmer's central drafting, which has attracted the attack, comes as follows:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient, sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the world, and did institute and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Cranmer had, I suggest, three main reasons for this drafting:

1. He had concluded that the death of Christ was the great point of reference in the Lord's Supper—a perpetual memory of that his precious death—and it therefore was most appropriately worked into this paragraph which provided the doctrinal backcloth to the narrative of institution which followed.
2. He had also taken aboard the Reformation principle of justification through faith, on the basis of Christ's vicarious death on behalf of his people. For a fuller overview of his doctrine of justification see Articles IX-XVII in the Thirty-Nine Articles—it is all there in great detail. Thus he had a double conclusion: both that Christ's death alone secured our justification and also (as shown in 1 above) that his death was the great point of reference in the Supper. The

linkage of themes was becoming very tight indeed.

3. There was also a polemical or controversial note being struck. The medieval doctrine taught that the mass was itself the offering of a sacrifice (the Council of Trent said a 'propitiatory' sacrifice) to God. Cranmer, by reverting to the 'once-for-all' language of Romans, Hebrews and 1 Peter, not only asserts the weight and efficacy of Calvary, but by his choice of language rules out any other sacrifice of any redemptive power. The distinction in this is total—Christ made his one atoning sacrifice 'there', while what we offer responsively as thanksgiving 'here' (after communion) is 'ourselves, our souls and bodies'. Cranmer was ruling out all confusion, all error—and it was in connection with receiving communion that the clarifications had to be made.

Although this drafting was so distinctly Cranmer, it echoed on in Anglican eucharistic rites which were in other ways distancing themselves from 1552. There was little change in the wording about the cross the Scottish 1637 and 1764 rites; there was little change either in the American 1789 rite; and the same terminology persisted in 1928, in the 'Interim Rite', and in 'Series 1' communion. From there it passed into Rite B in the ASB, and into Eucharistic Prayer C (traditional language) in Common Worship Order One, and in the 'traditional' Order Two. A modern equivalent is to be found in the 'contemporary language' rites.

This was part of the package of initial problems I faced when I joined the Liturgical Commission in May 1964 and received the first draft (from the hand of Arthur Couratin) of Series 2 communion. As one who valued the emphasis in the 1662 rite, I found in the draft that everything about the cross of Christ which preceded the narrative of institution in Cranmer had simply disappeared. The saving work of Christ was now to be found in the anamnesis—and that merely mentioned 'his saving passion', and went on to offer the bread and cup to God. Clearly the oblation had to be sorted before the question of the weight to be accorded to the cross could be addressed. It was sorted, Series 2 passed into use; and the Commission started to prepare for Series 3. There was enough come-back (including the returns from questionnaires) to suggest that many who wanted to move into using modern rites were also hesitating because of the excision of any central mention of Christ's death and its significance. I think we did better next time round, and the anamnesis now read;

Therefore, heavenly Father,  
with this bread and this cup we do this in remembrance of him:  
we celebrate and proclaim his perfect sacrifice  
made once for all upon the cross,  
his resurrection from the dead and his ascension into heaven;  
and we look for his coming in glory.

The concept of 'celebrating his sacrifice' and of locating his sacrifice as 'once for all upon the cross' were great advances in terms of biblical teaching, though there remained a question as to whether the sequence of objects of 'celebrate and proclaim' enabled a sufficiently distinct identifying of the cross as the central point of reference

... and last month's

is an extra, an unnumbered 'one-off' Grove Booklet by COB. It is a 36-page job at the usual £2.50 price, entitled *Is Papal Authority a Gift to Us?* It took its origin in the editorial of NOLI wrote in 1999 when the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission produced its report, *The Gift of Authority*. It now looks as though this official report will come to the sessions of Synod in February 2004, and the Latimer Trust has commissioned the study, initially to provide free copies for members of Synod. Others may have it postfree for £2.50. It is not exactly liturgical—but it is worth a mention here. How can you manage without it?

## FORTHCOMING EVENTS

*Visual Liturgy 4* will be demonstrated with all possible coaching help by David Green of Church House Publishing at Southwark Cathedral between 12 noon and 1.45 pm on Wednesday 15 October. Please note the date now—no charge, no advance booking, bring your own sandwiches. This is right by London Bridge Northern, Jubilee, and surface stations, at the South end of London Bridge.

## SAME-SEX BLESSINGS

During the first week of August the BBC headlines (outdoing Iraq, the heatwave, the enquiry into the death of a government adviser, *et al*) were on two or three days given to the election of an Anglican bishop in the USA. It provided a reminder in reverse of the day when *Honest to God* made it to the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*. But this election was not only a watershed in itself: it was also the climax of a series of events which have kept the handling by the Anglican Communion of same-sex relationships well before the public media. These were: firstly, the decision by New Westminster diocese in Canada, the diocese of Vancouver, to provide for same-sex blessings; secondly, the Jeffrey John tragedy in the Church of England; and, thirdly, this election itself.

It is the projected or actual 'same-sex blessings' which bring the topic into NOLI. It has been my consistent concern to stick to my liturgical theme, and let these controversies pass by at a distance. But it is clear that morality and ethical policy are reflected in liturgy, and the same-sex blessings bring that linkage to the fore. So this once—and, I trust, once only—I stick out my neck. I am not, however, printing any liturgical texts, though I have seen some; I am rather reflecting on the policy background.

I have been reminded of the days in the late 1970s when Bishop John V Taylor tried to include in the peri-natal provision a prayer to be used after an abortion. The General Synod was keenly aware that, whatever the pastoral need of people who had been through this particular agony, there could be no approval of an official prayer without the built-in sanctioning of abortion itself. The Synod declined the amendment for that reason—it would be taking a long-term ethical decision under the rubric of pastoral liturgy.

use. Thus a typical heading to a section is

24 May                      **John and Charles Wesley**                      White  
                                    Evangelists, Hymn Writers  
                                    England: Lesser Festival—Wales: V  
                                    3 March—Scotland: Commemoration

This indicates that two countries keep the brothers' festival on the day when John Wesley had his heart 'strangely warmed'; the Scottish Episcopal Church (for reasons which escape me) keep it on 3 March; and the Church of Ireland does not keep it at all. The heading is (typically) followed by a short prose description of the life and ministry of the brothers, a collect, Old Testament (Ezek.2.1-5), Psalm 33 (text from CW), New Testament (Eph 5.15-20), Gospel (Mark 6.30-34) and Post Communion.

It is a massive undertaking (I have not checked it against its sources for errors, but would not expect to encounter them). It is, by the happy timetable of its publication, dedicated to the memory of Tristram who died on 28 December last year. And I shall delight in it for many a year ahead.

COB

### WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

Mark Earey (an eyrie has an eagle-eye) writes that he found himself recently officiating at a wedding. It partook of that all-too-frequent sad practice, that the bride wanted to sing *All things bright and beautiful*, as the major religious item remembered from primary school days. In the printed service-sheet the tinnest of misprints caught the eagle eye:

'The sunset *in* the morning  
which brightens up the sky . . .' (italics by COB).

It was not, however, this contradiction in meteorological terms which most moved Mark. Printing mistakes do after all happen. No, the problem was that the congregation did sing the hymn, and did sing it unsmilingly as printed, and (presumably because no-one expects the words and sentences of hymns actually to say or mean anything) apparently never noticed what they sang. Mark compares it with their unblinking rendering of:

'The rushes by the water  
we gather every day.'

Those rushes, though unlikely, were at least drafted that way and are presumably possible. But cumulatively one is tempted to ask at what point evident incredulity would set in. Could such a wedding congregation be given *anything* to sing?

### This month's publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no 176 by Anne Harrison, *Sing it Again: The Place of Short Songs in Worship*. Anne Harrison is editor of *News of Hymnody* (for this year only), and her expertise is widely recognized. The 'short song' is (we think) a slightly new bit of nomenclature in a sea of mixed descriptions.

in the Supper. Furthermore, for good measure the confession included a line which Cranmer himself had never had:

For the sake of your Son Jesus Christ,  
*who died for us,*  
forgive us . . . (Italics mine)

And so we went on to Rite A in the ASB. We then got the natural outcome of the direction the anamnesis had been taking:

Therefore, heavenly Father,  
we remember his offering of himself  
made once for all upon the cross;  
and we proclaim his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension.  
As we look for his coming in glory,  
we celebrate with this bread and this cup  
his one perfect sacrifice.

This, to my mind, met all the desiderata which could be sustained within a rite which was to embrace a full round of Christian doctrine. And in the Third Eucharistic Prayer (the one by Brindley out of Hippolytus) the anamnesis was touched up to read:

And so, Father, calling to mind his death on the cross,  
his perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of all men,  
rejoicing in his mighty resurrection . . .

The unique, redemptive work of Christ on the cross was, I judge, sufficiently defended and proclaimed and related to the eucharist by these forms of words. So how does CW Order One come out of the same test? I take the eight prayers in letter order, quoting from the anamnesis except where otherwise mentioned:

- A. [As the First Eucharistic Prayer from Rite A above, but with the last three lines weakened]
- B. [As the Third Eucharistic Prayer from Rite A above, but with 'of all men' changed into 'of the whole world']
- C. [This has the modern language form of Cranmer's text quoted above]
- D. Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup  
we celebrate the cross  
on which he died to set us free.
- E. So, Father, we remember all that Jesus did,  
in him we plead with confidence his sacrifice made once for all upon  
the cross.
- F. Therefore we proclaim the death that he suffered on the cross,  
we celebrate his resurrection, his bursting from the tomb,  
we rejoice that he reigns at your right hand on high  
and we long for his coming in glory.  
As we recall the one, perfect sacrifice of our redemption,  
Father, by your Holy Spirit let these gifts . . .
- G. Father, we plead with confidence  
his sacrifice made once for all upon the cross;

H. [In the Preface] **He opened his arms of love upon the cross  
and made for all the perfect sacrifice for sin.**

[Anamnesis] As we proclaim his death and celebrate his rising in glory,  
send your Holy Spirit . . .

Of course a line or two may not register strongly with individual communicants during the actual event of worship, but the traditional concern (a strong concern of evangelicals) has been that objectively true doctrine might be enshrined, proclaimed, and sustained through its incorporation into liturgy. Put together, the new texts surely come out on the right side of the line? And, that said, surely we can genuinely worship with and through them? I wonder how far they will be noticed at the Blackpool Congress in September, where 'The Cross' shares with 'The Bible' and 'Mission' as one of the three controlling themes.

Colin Buchanan

PS: The Blackpool Congress runs to 23 September, so I think it unlikely that it will be reported in the September issue of NOL.

#### IN MEMORIAM—DIANA McCLATCHEY

Diana McClatchey died in early July well into her 70s, and she received rich tributes in various obituaries, all of which related to her (Pankhurst-like?) pioneering role in battling for the ordination of women in the Church of England. However, I do not think any notice I have read has referred to her part on the Liturgical Commission in the 1970s. I do not think I can locate specific texts which owe their origin to her—but she was on the General Synod as well as on the Liturgical Commission, so she was part of the core personnel who kept the texts flowing in the right way. She was by no means one-eyed about her main cause, and it was a pleasure to have her involved in liturgical drafting and advocacy which did not touch on feminist concerns.

COB

#### AND WILLIAM JARDINE GRISBROOKE

I learned at *Societas Liturgica* in Holland (see page 7 below) that Bill Jardine Grisbrooke had died some time in the last two years—in other words, since *Societas* last met. I have not discovered at what point this occurred. I only met him once (I think at an SLS meeting), but I salute his scholarship. His *magnum opus* was his collection of *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Alcuin/SPCK, 1958), a unique and exhaustive bit of trawling around official and unofficial compilations which could claim some connection with Anglican Churches in those centuries—edited and reproduced with scrupulous care. More recently he had joined the Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies series, providing in 1990 the first double volume, nos 13-14, *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions*. I believe he was an Orthodox

tribute" . . . these tributes would fall foul of the Trade Descriptions Act. We are asked to recall that Bob . . . was a married archangel with four children and 15 grandchildren. He was brilliant at his work at the bank where everybody loved him . . . He kept a superb table, never failed to bring his wife flowers every Friday, and he was always effervescently happy. Well, Solon said, "Call no man happy until he's dead", but I hardly thought he meant that a man had to wait until after he'd died to effect such a remarkable character change—from an ordinary man, with ordinary virtues and vices, to a paragon of virtue. I suppose it's a blessing that most of the speakers haven't the faintest idea how to project the voice, and so the sentimental drivel cannot be heard at all beyond the third row.'

He is clear that a memorial service is an addition to a funeral, not a substitute for it (though occasions when people are drowned at sea and there is no actual body must run close to assimilating the two to each other). He is also clear that any tendency toward secularizing (perhaps with the famous who have not been very Christian) should be resisted. Apparently the habit of memorial services began with nineteenth century royalty (and the Duke of Wellington in 1851), and, at the Abbey (which was, of course, Donald Gray's own hunting ground) the first non-royal was Charles Kingsley in 1875; and a notable later one General Gordon in 1885. The growth of such events clearly reflects the growing mobility of the population (which means people can gather) allied with great busy-ness, which means the gathering does better with some weeks warning—and long advance notice is with actual funerals hardly possible.

The rest of the chapters are about planning, with specific attention to such issues as corporate tragedy, and the balance between family and wider considerations, and between the celebration of a particular life and the giving glory to God. Finding the right scriptures and the right hymns can be exacting—and the planning itself requires close co-operation of the 'professionals' with those most intimately involved with the deceased. The exemplars display much of this balance.

The Common Worship provision gets some passing mention, though perhaps not as much as its own greatly increased scope would deserve. The outline of its 'sample service' is reproduced as an appendix. Trevor Lloyd's very helpful Grove Booklet no 160, *Dying and Death Step by Step: A Funerals Flowchart*, is omitted from the resources.

COB

Simon Kershaw (ed), *Exciting Holiness* (SCM-Canterbury Press, 2003, 702pp, hb, £25).

The first edition of *Exciting Holiness* was compiled by Brother Tristram SSF and published in 1997. It picked up the work, in which he had been involved, of recreating the calendar for the Church of England and making liturgical provision for both Temporale and Sanctorale. Now, however, the three other Anglican Churches of Britain and Ireland have in various ways provided their own Sanctorale, and this volume brings all four together into a notable companion for all four Churches to

in his time as a student, there had been donated to the College a handkerchief (yes, a handkerchief) of the great man, and the poker-faced principal of the time expressed thanks before the whole college and ensured it was displayed among the memorabilia. On Paul's account, the students were (very properly) shaking with silent laughter during this ceremony; and they prepared a scenario to outdo the handkerchief. Among them was one Nigel Wright, now an eminence at the College . . .

They took a slice of toast, buttered it and spread marmalade on it, and took a bite from one corner. They then let it moulder for some days or weeks. Finally they went at night and put it among the memorabilia, under a glass case, and labelled carefully as 'Spurgeon's last meal'. History does not record whether it was scientifically tested for its dating by those who found it.

### AND THE KENYAN PRAYER BOOK

Is now available from the editorial address below in both hardback and soft-cover editions. The arrival of the latter has slightly depressed the price of the former—please send £10 for the former, £6 for the latter, both sent postfree within the purchase figure.

### BOOK REVIEWS

Donald Gray, *Memorial Services* (Alcuin Liturgy Guides 1, SPCK, 2002, viii/84 pp, pb, £9.99)

It seems appropriate to be doing this review as well as the next within days of the *Societas Liturgica* Congress devoted to 'A Cloud of Witnesses' which Phillip Tovey reports above. The book responds to an apparently growing phenomenon; and it is composed of 37 pages of five (Gray-length) chapters on principles, followed by 40 pages of a chapter of 'Exemplars'. These prove to be Eric Heffer at Westminster Abbey (1991), Robert Runcie also at the Abbey (2000), Dunblane schoolchildren (Dunblane Cathedral, 1996), and those who died in the *Marchioness* disaster (Southwark Cathedral, 1989). The first two, of course, had died full of years and perhaps had a naturalness to their departure; the group memorials at Dunblane and Southwark arose out of tragedies and the services were catering for large numbers in the congregations who were in both grief and shock.

What then of the principles? Donald Gray dismisses anything too eulogistic, and quotes Peter Mullen (one of the great opponents of all contemporary trends in church life):

'... Three or even four of the deceased's family and friends will get up to "offer a

lay person—but would be grateful for any helping out on this notice that can be provided.

COB

### LITURGICAL FORMATION

The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation holds a (less formal) 'Conference' at the mid-point between two full Consultations, which come four years apart. The last Consultation was in Berkeley, California, in 2001 and produced the 'Berkeley Statement' on ordination rites, 'To Equip the Saints' (published as Grove Worship Series 168, Paul Gibson (ed), *Anglican Ordination Rites*). The meeting at Cuddesdon from 4 to 9 August was therefore a 'conference', and it tackled 'Liturgical Formation'. Seven papers were given, but no attempt at producing 'findings' was made, so the days at Cuddesdon were more leisured than at a Consultation, and the more so for being during a heatwave. There are no direct bursaries given for a conference, so it is inevitable that there should be a bias in attendance towards the more developed countries—but we had participants from Nigeria, Kenya and Southern Africa and also from the Philippines and Japan, and Spanish-speakers from North America to give some sense of a comprehensive world coverage among the 60 or so who attended.

The 'formation' word, though rich in allusiveness, proved elusive in terms of sharp definition, and it is the sorting of two emerging distinctions in relation to its meaning which gives shape to this report.

Firstly, although the second Consultation (in 1987 at Brixen in Northern Italy) had tackled 'The Liturgical Formation of the People of God' (and the papers are available), there was a general awareness that 'formation' has usually been a ministerial word. Colleges, seminaries and monasteries have been given to the task of the 'formation' of particular key persons in the life of the church—they have been 'formed' for specific ministerial or comparable responsibilities by carefully designed shaping of their daily lives, their relationships, and the input into their minds and spirits. We did spend some of the Cuddesdon time on that more traditional meaning of formation.

There is then a suspicion around that, once this particular mould has been superseded, the next meaning of 'liturgical formation' is one of helping people adapt to being able to maximize on the liturgy. They are formed into persons who worship well—who know the flow, the expectations, the spirituality, which makes their participation both significant and fruitful. If we go back to the famous Pius X word at the outset of the Roman Catholic liturgical movement, we are 'to pray the liturgy, not pray at the liturgy'. People who take that aboard are being 'formed' for the liturgy.

But we were going beyond that. The real question is the life question: are the participants in liturgy being 'formed' for lifetime discipleship outside of the liturgy as well as within it? I would myself want to put it as the question as to whether, by the liturgy, people are being formed as God's mission on earth. There was a strong sense at Cuddesdon that we must view such formation as God's work in his people

(hence my passive verb above). But we still have perforce to be the organizers of worship—the facilitators if not the creators of liturgical formation. What kinds of liturgical programme, what kinds of lay participation, what kinds of coaching and preparation will (from our standpoint) be the assistance we can give in God's 'forming' of his people?

Along with these distinctions as to what liturgical formation is, we handled a second pressing need of a distinction, this time to rule off and separate what is not formation from what is. Most of our speakers (from round the world) wanted a sharp division between 'education' and 'formation'; education is (on this basis) an information-imparting exercise, which may fill up some grey cells, but leave the rest of the person untouched—ie, unformed. That still leaves questions open—notably, how formation is achieved, and whether education has any part in it. Some of the most evocative suggestions from speakers were that reflection—probably reflection together—has most chance of enabling worship to 'form' disciples.

However, my own view (which I attempted to air) is that we should not too easily polarize education from formation. My analysis of Western Christianity would be that, on the whole, the people of God are expecting (and expected) to thrive on too thin a ration of the word of God. There has grown a widespread assumption that people will not know their Bible—possibly will not even possess it—and that assimilation into the life of a congregation (which happens when people like the atmosphere and the welcome) is the way to Christian maturity, and well-conducted liturgy will both attract more in the first place, and satisfy more in the second. But how is it forming them for mission? And that leaves me with my next open question—when we have prodded and poked from different angles at 'formation' and 'education', is not a slightly different New Testament verb more appropriate—namely, to 'edify' or 'build up' (see 1 Cor 8.1; 10.23; 14.3,26; etc)? This goes beyond head-knowledge (see 8.1), and clearly involves assessment and discernment and self-discipline—and love. It involves communication between people in relationships (ch.14), and it issues in actual results ('being built up'). Perhaps it straddles education and formation.

COB

### WORSHIP IN BEING HUMAN

The Doctrine Commission report, *Being Human: A Christian Understanding of Personhood with reference to Power, Money, Sex and Time* (CHP, xii/148 pp, pb £9.95) was published in July. While its sub-title makes clear its specific content, there are some passing *bons mots* in the Introduction, and I pass a couple on for your edification:

[In relation to time] Time is not a divinity, nor on the other hand is it the realm of fallenness and futility. It is within this life that we taste and enjoy through the Holy Spirit the second gift of time redeemed by Jesus Christ. This should transform our understanding of the significance of worship. Far from being a "spare time" activity, in a life dominated by clocks, worship opens us

out onto the "time of our lives", creating and nurturing habits of life in attentiveness and joy.' (p10)

'So in considering power, money, sex and time our first and most basic practical teaching is: join in a regular worshipping community. There will be found the wisest way of shaping life in the world, by praising and thanking God. confessing sin, receiving forgiveness, learning from Scripture, praying for others, participating in Jesus Christ, and being sent to take part in fulfilling God's purposes in the world.' (p13)

### SOCIETAS LITURGICA—SAINTS AND HEROES

*Societas Liturgica* is a world wide ecumenical academic liturgists' society. It meets every two years, this time (from 11 to 16 August) in Eindhoven in the Netherlands. Almost 200 liturgists gathered from all over the world and this meeting place was bound to produce some significant networking.

The theme was on 'A cloud of witnesses', i.e. about saints; and the conference speakers looked at this in a variety of ways, not least in contrast to the secular cult of celebrity e.g. the divinization of David Beckham. Two of these stood out, that of Gabriele Winkler who spoke on the holy and the sanctus, and Geoffrey Wainwright who looked at differences and ecumenical convergence over the saints. You will be able to read these in *Studia Liturgica* later. There were then over 60 case studies from all around the world, a panel on ancestors, and a number of short communications. This was a varied fare. On the day trip to Utrecht I was able to visit the Old Catholic Cathedral there for the first time.

While perhaps this was not the most exciting of themes to me, it was a great chance to meet people. One object of conversation by all was the cold wind that is blowing through the Vatican and its break on all sorts of developments. There were a number of good case studies e.g. 'Marian devotions in the East Syrian Tradition' was very anti the western tradition of intercession to saints rather blessing God for their lives and roles in the economy of salvation, and celebrating Mary with fasts and feasts (sounds quite Anglican, almost). So I could go on. We meet next in two years' time in Dresden. It would be good to see more British liturgists joining.

Phillip Tovey

FOOTNOTE BY THE EDITOR (who could not resist this item):

Paul Sheppy, a rare English Baptist liturgist, made a presentation under the title 'What, no saints?'. However, while he despatched actual saints from the scene, he acknowledged a widespread Baptist interest in memorials and commemorations (including photos in the vestry, furniture donated in remembrance of various persons, church anniversaries, and plaques around the building—and even a kind of All Souls Day . . .). In passing he recalled the cult of relics when he was a student at Spurgeon's College, the Baptist Theological College in South Norwood—for the Library there has apparently a corner (or a whole floor?) of C.H.Spurgeon's memorabilia. He told us that,