

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 190

October 1990

Editorial

Over the last twelve months I have given one or two hints of concern about architectural principles in baptism. Perhaps I could set out these rumbling concerns, not necessarily with good documentation, but as a 'sensed' report and evaluation, based on passing snippets of conversation more than anything else.

Firstly, I detect a widespread desire to incorporate true tanks for dunking purposes in new and re-ordered church buildings. The purists may *still* tell us that 'the early church placed the candidates in water and poured water over them' (which, it seems – or did when the House of Bishops handled it a few years ago – some to-day want to call 'immersion' and by this terminology distinguish it from the term which I honestly believe I brought into baptismal vocabulary myself, i.e. 'submersion'!). But there is no doubt what candidates for the tank think they want to happen to themselves – and, I would add, they are not to be dissuaded from it by a wholly unpastoral and insensitive argument that 'the early church didn't do it this way'. The point so often is that the Baptists, Pentecostals and other Anabaptists do, and the models are here and now, not in the fourth century. (Furthermore, I do wonder whether the patristic citations are convincing even as themselves – there is little or no baptismal architecture from the pre-Constantinian era; we cannot tell what was typical; and the accounts in, say, Justin and Hippolytus could well be interpreted as submersion. We should perhaps add, however, that if a candidate thinks that submersion is *requisite* in order to portray 'death and resurrection' (as is the metaphor in Romans 6) then we have to demur – and we make it clear we are *not* so engaged in slavish dramatizing by giving a *threefold* submersion, not a single one . . .).

However, I am straying. The House of Bishops in June had a trailer about baptismal architecture to come in the Autumn, and I would like to pitch in before I become party to anything official (see my footnote below). I offer the following propositions for consideration:

- 1 It is not actually necessary that the font or tank be visible to anyone entering the church (it will not be if there is a detached baptistry – nor will it be if it is under the floor and covered over – nor indeed will it be if it is a fruitbowl which is produced in front of the people wherever is appropriate to the numbers present and their seating plan).
- 2 Equally, it is not a problem if two or more places of baptism can be seen – or are known to exist even if they are not seen. I knew churches in Birmingham which went to Edgbaston reservoir for baptisms in Summer, but conducted them in church in the Winter. I knew at least one with a birdbath font which also created temporary dunking facilities with an inflatable paddling pool when desired. And I knew

one which shared premises with a (sometime Churches of Christ, and therefore dunking) URC congregation – so that, when a dunking was to happen they opened the screens and took over the pool, but on other Sundays they might well baptize infants in their ordinary font at the other end of the building. No-one minds two hoots if more than one holy table is found in a building (though we all share a common loaf); no-one minds two hoots if there are two or more places from which a speaker may address a congregation (though there is but one gospel – and one Lord and one faith); so why should anyone mind if there are two places of baptism (though there be but one baptism)?

- 3 Thus whilst some pundits say that, if a tank is used, a sprinkling arrangement must be juxtaposed or interposed into it, I cannot see the logic. Indeed a tank sets considerable visual problems – it is usually inexpedient to leave it full and open to visitors etc. (though you may then collect wishing-well pence in it!), and it is therefore generally kept empty. In such a case it both occupies quality space, and also offers a yawning and unaesthetic nothingness as a symbol – so it is better covered up. A font on the other hand can be kept nicely on display out of service time – even if not in the place where it is going to be used if there are baptisms. I have even met fonts on noiseless rollers . . .

Simple stuff? Yes, but watch out for the theorists. And hard information on how *you* have reconciled all the principles will be gladly received.

Colin Buchanan

Personal footnote: I have tried to keep my doings – and non-doings – out of these columns since I moved to Kent and Rochester diocese a year ago. I can however report that, although I am still without gainful employment (though neither starving nor idle), I was elected as one of the six southern 'suffragans' in the House of Bishops for the coming quinquennium. I have spent many years tut-tutting about the caution and sometimes wrong-headedness of their corporate lordships, and now I find myself part of them. Whether I can distance myself from any future follies (if such there be), or whether I shall be caught in collective responsibility, remains to be seen. I recall my previous days on the Liturgical Commission and the Synod, and I always attempted in these columns to be consistent and to convey a conviction that truth lay on my side of all arguments.

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1990

General Synod begins its new quinquennium with a communion service at Westminster Abbey at 10 a.m. on 13 November, followed by a short ceremony at 12.15 p.m. The Queen will be at both events.

Synod agenda has no distinctive liturgical business on it. There had been some hints in the Spring that there might be another policy document, comparable to *The Worship of the Church*, which was debated in November 1985. However, if the Liturgical Commission (or Policy Sub-Committee) are preparing such a document there is no hint of it.

The diocesan synod motions carried forward from previous occasions include two (from Rochester and Ely) urging action on communion before confirmation. However, the Standing Committee's report on the agenda tells us that the Standing Committee has directed that those motions should not be taken at this session, as this 'is one of several subjects related to Initiation on which the House of Bishops is expected to report to the Synod next year.'

The nearest approach to liturgy in the remaining diocesan motions is one from Exeter, standing first in the list (and therefore almost certain to be taken), and it raises a teaser for the bishops:

'That this Synod requests the House of Bishops to re-examine the question of what constitutes a nuptial blessing and who may impart it.'

The background to this motion is that, when women were first to be made deacons in 1987, and to begin to officiate at weddings, the House of Bishops agreed:

' . . . in cases where a deacon officiates it is right, as an exception to general practice, for the deacon, having solemnized the marriage, to pronounce the nuptial blessing. But in respect of the final blessings for which provision is made in the Marriage Services, the deacon should follow the normal practice of using the "us" (rather than the "you") form.'

(*House of Bishops minutes of 3 February 1987*)

Now, that decision by the House of Bishops was a very curious one, and, I urged at the time and repeat now, one without any basis in law. But, I confess, I was concerned about the oddity required in the final 'blessing'. I wrote at the time 'Perhaps we now have the amusing possibility that a deacon . . . *can* after all give a blessing in "you" form – but only to a maximum of two persons!'

So, a re-examination by the House of Bishops might be a good idea. But closer inspection reveals that the Exeter diocesan synod views the *nuptial* blessing as the one requiring attention. So are they wanting to standardize by eliminating the little concession the bishops gave? Well, it is worth a debate.

CELEBRATING MARRIAGE : ROMAN STYLE

The Roman Catholic National Liturgical Conference met at the University of Surrey in Guildford in September and devoted its time to considering the proposals for new marriage services. I was there as the Anglican observer and to assist with a workshop on inter-church marriages.

Vatican II allows individual parts of the Roman Communion to compose their own marriage rites and England and Wales has taken advantage of this opportunity. The new services are, in many ways, radically different to those presently in use. The most obvious change is that the new proposals are *staged* or *phased* rites. In this they are like the Roman funeral rites and RCIA.

The proposals begin with material for celebrating an engagement in the home or in the church and continue with material for use as opening acts of worship at marriage preparation groups and even includes blessings of food and drink in the home. This latter material is envisaged for use when the couple have a meal in the home of the prospective in-laws.

The marriage service itself begins with the first part taking place at the church door. There is a statement about Christian marriage followed by questions to the couple and to the congregation to establish that they share this Christian understanding of marriage and that there is no legal reason why the couple cannot marry. There is then the giving of consent by the bride and the groom, followed by an affirmation by the families concerned that they will uphold and support the couple. After an opening prayer, the procession moves to the front of church.

The liturgy of the word then follows, itself followed by the liturgy of marriage. This includes the exchange of vows (two forms are given, one of them interrogative), the declaration by the priest that the couple are married, and acclamations by the congregation. The registers are signed at this point.

The service then has what it calls illustrative rituals, which are the blessing of rings, the exchange of rings (and of gifts), the lighting of wedding candles and giving of a gift by the congregation. The nuptial blessing occurs at this point and various forms are given. The prayers include prayers which the couple may say, as well as opportunities for members of the families to pray. The eucharist follows, commencing with the presentation of the gifts.

The wedding itself can be conducted outside the Mass and the proposals also include rites for blessing food (e.g. at a wedding reception) and the new home. There are, in addition, services for celebrating anniversaries and renewal and reconciliation (e.g. if the couple have been separated for a while for some reason). There are also guidelines for such pastoral situations as weddings of the elderly, inter-faith weddings, and weddings involving non-believers.

The group which has prepared these new services does not think that every couple will use all of them. Many couples may still end up with a very traditional wedding service. What has been achieved here is the provision of a whole variety of rites which attempt to join what are usually secular ceremonies surrounding marriage to a Christian understanding of the concern of God for the whole of life.

Apparently, it will take about five years to get all of this through the appropriate channels for authorization. It is to be hoped that the ASB, when it is revised, will include many of the good points from these new Roman services.

Charles Read, Curate, St. Clements, Urmston

CHURCH OF IRELAND AFFAIRS

We reported in May the Church of Ireland's synodical decision to make women presbyters and, if duly elected, bishops – and in June we reported that the first ordinations had occurred. Both reports simply spotlighted the central feature. But we have also a report from Harold Miller from their Synod which fills in detail a bit, though a little more dated.

Our General Synods are not often of great interest to members of the Church of England, but this year's was an exception. It was, perhaps (or so people were saying) the most important in the history of our Church, and it will be bound to have an effect on the other member churches of the Anglican Communion in these islands. All of this 's, of course, because we decided to allow the ordination of women to the presbyterate and the episcopate. The headlines in the press have been shouting the news abroad: 'Late flowering of Ireland's lower church', 'St. Paul defied as Irish hail lady priests' 'Rift on women priests', etc. A few things are worth mentioning.

The final Irish irony is that we have gone ahead quickly, and without looking over our shoulders too much, on this; but we do not yet have a new Ordinal. Although the Liturgical Advisory Committee has been working on this for ages, and sending drafts to the House of Bishops, we have not reached a satisfactory conclusion. Speed must now be of the essence in this. Isn't it amazing to think that the first women to be ordained in the Church of Ireland in June 1990 were ordained according to the Book of Common Prayer with a few 'she's and her's' thrown in. [Yes, so it was – BCP ordinations – ed.]. How Irish can you get!

I should also report that the Church of Ireland has now a new service for 'The Institution of an Incumbent'. The LAC preferred the American title 'The Celebration of a New Ministry', but one or two (rather fussy in my opinion) people thought it wasn't accurate enough, and the amendment was carried. The service is normally in the context of Holy Communion, and the Declarations may be taken in the vestry beforehand. The Victorian phrase 'receive thy care, which is both mine and thine' is warmed up, modernized, and given the context of the body of Christ, in the words:

'I confer on you the care of God's people in this parish which is entrusted both to you and to me within the body of Christ'.

Our ever-conservative Bishop Gilbert Wilson tried to amend this to put the Bishop first, but failed. We have also at every point moved away from 'Reverend Father-in-God' to simple 'Bishop'. This was not hard to convince the Synod, facing the possibility of 'Reverend Mother-in-God'!

Another area in which change has taken place is in relation to hymnody. The Church of Ireland has always had an authorized hymn-book as a base to start from. We now at last have a superb supplement of 147 hymns and songs, including four in Irish (with singing translations by Bishop George Simms). It is in a wide variety of musical tones, and includes a good deal of new material. Published by APCK/Oxford, it can only be sold in Ireland, but I hope *News of Hymnody* can get its hand on a copy for review purposes. It is first rate!

Like many Liturgical Committees, we in Ireland are coming to the end of the first major round of revision, (presupposing that we will soon have a new Ordinal), and the Committee was to go away for two days in June to the Liturgical Institute in Carlow to reflect on the next stages, in the light of Lambeth, the Anglican Liturgical Consultation, and the changes which are taking place in the rest of the Communion.

Harold Miller, Cork

THE NEW EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS IN PATTERNS FOR WORSHIP

A note by Bryan Spinks from within the Commission

The new eucharistic prayers in *Patterns for Worship* have been warmly welcomed by many, and this was evident from the comments made at the recent Liturgical Commission Conference held at York for Diocesan Liturgical Secretaries and others. Nevertheless, there are still noises from some quarters of 'officialdom' that four are far too many, and that some are the 'wrong' shape.

It tends to be the case that those who are content with new proposals remain silent ('silence means consent'), and only the malcontent speak out and make their feelings known. If *NOL* readers have strong feelings about the number of new eucharistic prayers, especially four new ones, they might make their feelings known to the Liturgical Commission and their diocesan bishop. Regrettably, in the Church of England, silence is not taken as a sign of consent, but of passive resignation in the face of the decisions of 'officialdom'.

In the revisions of *Patterns* there will no doubt be minor textual changes. It is possible that those with the 'wrong' shape could be used with the standard ASB responses. In prayer C this could be easily achieved (have any *NOL* readers already tried it?) by simply inserting after 'comfort us in distress', 'Therefore with the whole company etc'; after the Sanctus (and benedictus) commencing 'Father, we glorify your name for ever. You show . . .'; after the institution narrative inserting 'Christ has died'; and at the end, after 'praise your name', adding 'Blessing and honour etc. . . .'

This month's booklet . . .

is Worship Series no. 114, *Worship in the Countryside*, by David Cutts (who previously wrote no. 108 on worshipping in small congregations). This concentrates on the chapter in the Countryside report on 'Worship and Spirituality', and asks how the chapter has handled the 15 items he had previously identified as the pressing issues in the countryside. He is marginally kinder to the report than was *NOL's* editorial last month, but it is by no means uncritical.

. . . and next month's

is Evangelism Series no. 12, *Dialogue in Evangelism*, by Peter May. This booklet makes widely available a thoughtfully thought through lecture which the author gave to the Christian Medical Fellowship this year, and it will be sent to members of the CMF, over and above the ordinary standing order system. In November there will also be Spirituality Series no. 35, the third in the 'Clare College Sermons' set, this time on 'Christian Spirituality in the 1990s'.

. . . and a reprint

is Spirituality Series no. 2, *A Beginner's Guide to Spirituality*, by Michael Botting. There is also an 'extension' of Grove Liturgical Study 30, *Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass*, by Bryan Spinks (£2.50).

ISSN 0263-7170

25p

Postal Subscription for 1991 £5 (by air £6 or US\$13)
Editorial Address: Shipbourne Vicarage, Tonbridge, Kent TN11 9PE
(0732-810001 FAX 0732-810073)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS.
NG9 3DS (0602 430786 Fax 0602 220134)

Book Review

The United Reformed Church in the United Kingdom Service Book (Oxford, 1989).

The uniting with the Disciples of Christ, inclusive language, and liberation theology, have been some of the factors in the production of a new book by the URC. Even this introduction comments on the irony that for a tradition that does not regard a book as binding, the production of two books in ten years (the last being printed in 1980) is quite a feat.

Some of the Dedication and Commissioning services have been left out of the new book, and in comes the Order for the Renewal of Baptismal Promises. The Introduction sees the book in a Jesus – Calvin – Westminster Directory tradition.

There are two Orders of Worship (i.e. for the eucharist). The first enriches the 1980 material for the preparation. The Offertory section has introduced a strong note of oblation at the beginning of the Lord's Supper with the inclusion of the Roman Offertory Prayers and they are extended by the addition of:

Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation.
Through your goodness we have ourselves to offer,
fruit of the womb, and formed by your love.
We will become your people for the world.

I'm not sure what Calvin would have thought about this section! Were the Lima variations of those popular prayers more in the Reformed line?

Reformed theology comes out in the pattern of a reading of the Narrative of Institution (one version is a creative responsive form) followed by the eucharistic prayer (sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer). These prayers are all new. The first has strong Old Testament themes of Exodus and Promised land in the Preface – a Liberation theology influence. It is perhaps the best of the three and was written by Charles Brock of Mansfield College. All have an epiclesis (in differing positions but never split). The first gets closest to being consecratory:

Send down your Spirit upon these your gifts
that they may be for us his body and blood.

The oblation is also in the Book of Common Order tradition in the first prayer:

remembering the work and passion of our Saviour Christ,
and pleading his eternal sacrifice,
we set forth this memorial.

Two of the prayers include reference to various saints before the doxology. One includes intercessions. All this is quite a contrast to the ASB.

Surprisingly the peace comes after the Lord's Prayer (rubrics allow it earlier) and the wine is described as 'poured' (a five fold shape?). Prayers and canticles conclude the service, with dismissal coming before final blessing!

The Second Form is based on the tradition of the Disciples of Christ. There is option for separate blessing of the bread and wine or both at once. The brevity of these prayers means a more limited thanksgiving for the saving acts of God. In extemporary form there could be the danger of them degenerating into little more than: Bless this bread. The Jewish roots may have

done that but the Passover also includes a long section on the Acts of God which is more full than a reading of a few (even if relevant) words of Paul. The epiclesis is stronger than in the first order:

By your Holy Spirit sanctify us and this loaf,
but perhaps one could have hoped for more influence from modern studies of the nature of eucharistic prayer. Dix's four- and seven-fold shape could bring more fruitful dialogue with Free Church liturgists and other studies could lead to an enrichment of eucharist in this tradition.

This book has only one baptismal service. Children and adults are dealt with in parallel columns. The Baptismal Prayer asks for blessing of the candidate and not the water, unlike the Church of Scotland 1940 and 1968, the previous book (or the ASB). Its position after questions about belief and commitment removes the liturgical link of baptism and faith, which the ASB encapsulated. There are no secondary symbols in the previous book so the inclusion of the lighted candle is a surprise. At this point BEM section 19 might have suggested other signs (cf. Max Thurian's ecumenical rite of 1983). Believers are confirmed immediately, infants later. Both receive a laying on of hands with a pneumatological prayer (even if they are different) and the right hand of fellowship.

The marriage service includes a good prayer for the couple after the vows and rings. The ordination is amazingly performative:

FILL YOUR SERVANT . . . WITH YOUR HOLY SPIRIT AS . . .
WE ORDAIN HIM/HER TO BE A MINISTER IN YOUR CHURCH.

The capitals and bold are from the text. I am unsure of their significance. The last service in the book is that for Healing, reflecting the importance of the modern healing movement in the church.

With much to welcome in this book, but still some differences from Anglicanism, there would seem to be great scope for both further dialogue and greater interaction with the Reformed tradition.

Phillip Tovey

DIocese TO DIocese?

Well, no, our two editors have been pensioned off, and a new deal is awaited. The expectation is that from January 1991 onwards there will be two, or two-and-a-bit, pages given to uncensored reporting (including comment), sometimes from individual Commission members, sometimes from diocesan liturgical committees, who are busy forming themselves into a rota at the moment. Meanwhile, along with reports from other Churches (see above), a long-delayed item gets its opportunity below . . .

COB'S LITURGICAL DIARY

Readers have had a long break from this, but I have not been wholly idle, and here are some slightly more memorable bits:

January: (13) Installation of new Dean of Rochester – first time I have ever heard the Royal Mandate for such installation – HMQ sounded a little vague as to who was in charge ('to the Right Reverend Bishop of Rochester, or his vicar-general, or whosoever else hath authority in this matter', – but the Bishop seized the nettle, and the Dean got in; (28) dedicating new Sunday School and similar rooms in very ancient church building at Cobham, where no fewer than five such rooms have been smuggled into fabric guarded by English Heritage against all defilers – no prepared rite for dedication, so I asked for each of the Sunday School and

similar teachers to be interviewed by the vicar at the door of his or her teaching room about the work that went on there, and then led the congregation in extemporary prayer for the youngsters and teachers there.

February: (9, and 12-16) I am in charge of the chapel at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, attempting to expand their liturgical experience a little – we use Rite C eucharist and the 'Service of the Word' from *Patterns*: we declare Wednesday morning Easter Day and run a Vigil and service of light and of renewal of baptismal vows (and give a buttonhole to each at entry); we have an agape-eucharist on the Thursday evening; and we have a very moving ministry of healing (in an ante-communion framework) on the Friday morning – with various needs shared, including a family with haemophilia seeking prayer, laying on of hands, and anointing together: the whole week much helped by instruments, and particularly a sax . . . (11) worshipping with the Mar Thoma London congregation in a city church (without curtains for the sanctuary!) – and they present me with a rose-lilac lightweight cassock just brought over for me from Kerala, a gift from my time there (and I think they wanted a new place to worship in Central London – preferably with parking space – any offers?); (18) I begin three separate Sundays in Ash, a vacant parish up the road – progressive thinking in a Rite B framework, so something will give . . .

March: (3) the other side of the episcopal ministry – attending a confirmation elsewhere as a godfather – no further comment; (4) my first Rochester confirmation, at Weald, where 250 people have gone through the doors on a Sunday, of a population of 1600 – not quite like Brum; (18) third occasion at Ash, and, as they want to hear about modern services, I stand in the centre aisle and they ply me with questions.

April: (6-8) consultation at St. George's Windsor, and all the dated glorious BCP style of St. George's chapel – one real oddity is early Saturday eucharist in side-chapel, where a tomb *in front of* the Table overtops it and dominates a congregation otherwise looking modern in a half-moon shape; (18) Easter morning at vacant parish in Penge – multi-ethnic, casual, free, uninhibited, and joyful in the Lord – nearest thing to inner Birmingham in these parts; (23-25) away on a parish weekend, we try out Rite C rigged with resurrection propers – great; (28) I trek to Hereford for Memorial service for Bishop John Eastaugh, who died some weeks before – and it is a riot of liturgical fun: there are pilgrims in knapsacks, sacred dancers imitating the can-can (and the Red Arrows) in somersaulting past each other up and down the aisles; confetti floats down on the inside of the Tower, and great singing is interspersed with readings from Bishop John's findings at his rural consultations – and I think he would not only have enjoyed it, but would have loved watching stuffed shirts letting their faces crack . . .

May: (1) Not special liturgically, but very encouraging to me – I preach at patronal festival of Ss. Philip and James in West Bromwich, and many Birmingham friends come to join me; (13) a confirmation in deepest Devon, where a friend has adult candidates in Hittisleigh, in a tiny church building that would never host a deanery do, but is right for a wandering bishop doing three candidates only (my thanks to the Bp. of Exeter for encouragement); (26) preaching at 'Eve of Pentecost' Praise in Rochester Cathedral – actually Eve of Ascension 1! – acoustics apparently poor, but full nave very joyful, some uncertainty perhaps as to how to finish a non-eucharistic OTT charismatic event.

June: (2) Memorial eucharist for Ronald Jasper, reported in June *NOL*, and in the evening (true) Eve of Pentecost Praise in St. Albans Abbey and Bishop John Taylor in welcoming the people says the cathedral staff are always nervous when Pentecost fire is mentioned; the next morning (3) I am in deep rural Kent at Collier Street, where it proves an actual fire some years ago enabled them to build kitchen and loos with the insurance – great gain in a parish of 1100 – after communion the NSM says we will now experience what 'tongues' were like on the Day of Pentecost, and we sing 'Seek ye first' as a round . . . in the evening I preach at Tonbridge Parish Church (where the editor of *Church Family Worship* and of a host of other worship materials is vicar) and in passing baptize and confirm a Reader who, on application for further office in the Church of England, had just discovered an omission in his Christian origins – we all try to strike the right balance between mirth and devotion; (17) I am *vagans* again – this time confirming at St. Andrew's, North Oxford, and then going on to Festival of Liturgy for a week at Salisbury Cathedral – the first evening of which takes us through highspots of *Lent Holy Week Easter in just over one hour!* Later in the week we have dancers, Iona singing, seminars, a trip to Old Sarum (no sign of the liturgy-copying rooms, but the clear ground-plan of the Norman cathedral) and to Bemerton, George Herbert's parish, and a plethora of riches; (26) confirmation at Higham where a notable anglo-catholic vicar and I have negotiated by correspondence to a true blending of our liturgical concerns – and, out of generosity and to make the scene look right, he and his congregation present me with a staff at the outset, before I march up the aisle – as I never owned one of my own before, the Aston one being an appurtenance of the mythical 'see'; (28-30) ordination retreat – after sounding out the fellows (no women on this one) I borrow some *Songs and Hymns of Fellowship* and we prepare with not only silence but lots of songs – I have a suspicion that the shape of ordination retreats is handed down like those of the Medes and Persians and tends to look just like my own retreats in 1961 and 1962 unless someone blows them open.

July: (1) ordination at Rochester – I am more conscious than in other years of the MOW vigil waiting outside as we go in, and I try to give them a boost in my sermon – Rochester is very difficult for a big ordination, because of its 'two-room' character; (9-10) GROW at Nottingham – and we get the Commission members to give us from *Promise* a service of light in the evening and an Epiphany celebration in the morning – very encouraging response, though I am beginning to think that the programme for the next decade is looking like 'candles with everything' (especially if you reckon on those 'launch' services for the Decade – all of *them* with candles too); (20) the Matronal Festival for St. Margaret of Antioch in Rainham – and a eucharist in the vicarage back-garden – I find I can shout out on the amplification equipment the heckling kids next door, but have to yield to a low-flying chopper – a warm, balmy Summer evening (I later discover that the vicar, who is on the Crown Appointments Commission, has just come back from choosing B & W for a certain post); (21) guest at a classical-cum-charismatic wedding with extemporary prayer – beautifully planned and done.

(I will catch up with other experiences since then later in the year).