

Maundy Thursday re-visited

The excellent *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* publication was probably at its weakest in its suggestions for Maundy Thursday evening. Apart from the foot-washing in a communion service there is mention of an agape meal. However, the book gives only the sketchiest of outlines. We have come across a number of churches whose members have written their own 'Christian Passover' for use on that evening. Whilst rooting this firmly in the Christian tradition, the compilers have drawn upon Jewish insights juxtaposing question and answer, food and faith, taste and teaching. For instance, at Holy Trinity Dartford the pattern has been as follows:

A group of people, perhaps a family, prepare the meal in the Church Hall reflecting the preparations made by some of the disciples (Mark 14.15). The hall then 'becomes' the upper room.

People gather at the Vicarage and, after a prayer and Bible reading, process to the hall which is now candlelit. On entry, everyone has their hands washed by the Clergy and Churchwardens. The procession reflects the journey to the Upper Room (and is a witness to passers-by) while the hand washing puts the foot washing within our culture.

As the meal proceeds, the courses are interspersed with questions and answers and Bible readings. There are three courses: fish, roast lamb and fruit. Each is introduced by the question 'Why are we eating . . . ?' allowing a particular significance to be developed:

Fish—Jonah (1.17—2.10) repentance and turning from sin

Lamb—The Exodus (Exodus 12.21-27) linked with Jesus as the Lamb of God (John 1.29-31) the cost of redemption

Fruit—The fruit of faith (Galatians 5.22-23) linked with Jesus as the vine (John 15.1-5).

Water—The Exodus linked with Christian Baptism.

At the end of the meal the question 'Why are we here tonight?' was asked. This was answered by a 'witness', a person who spoke briefly about the way he or she came to faith. Then followed two readings centering upon the Last Supper after which bread and wine was passed from person to person.

After prayer, everyone processed into the Church to stand under a large cross suspended from the chancel arch where a hymn was sung. The Church then 'became' Gethsemane, a place of vigil until midnight.

We would be interested in hearing how other Churches or Committees are developing Maundy Thursday observance following the lead of *Lent, Holy Week and Easter*.

ISSN 0263-7170

28p

Postal Subscription for 1991 **£5** (by air **£6** or **US\$13**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,
Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-51818; Fax 0634-573549)

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

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 733292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 199

July 1991

Editorial

THE GREAT INITIATION DEBATE

General Synod took its crack at the initiation issues on Saturday 13 July. In essence the day was in two parts—a morning on baptismal issues, and an afternoon on the admission to communion. The two debates were very different from each other.

Infant Baptism

In the morning much kind reference was made to the Reardon Report (reviewed here last month), and even to Martin Reardon's stress on holding two good ideas in tension. However, the advocacy of the Archbishop of York set the Synod running cheerfully, and without any sense of being in tension with anything, for a very 'open' approach to infant baptism. The only person to query that direction at all was Canon Michael Saward, and he was felled, not so much by the merits or demerits of the platform case, as by the sheer rush of the wild buffaloes. I began to think that I could myself easily compose a speech which was liberally littered with key phrases and words—e.g. 'welcoming', 'infinite grace of God', 'the child is being baptized, not the parents', 'opportunity', 'national church', 'not giving any sense of rejection'—by which I could get the gallery cheering. Far from being too easygoing, the existing Canons were viewed as impossibly restrictive—in many cases baptism could not be main services; it was ridiculous to call for confirmed godparents, etc. etc. The charge of the buffaloes had become quite menacing. Even the Bishop of Taunton, Bishop Nigel McCulloch, joined in—though the report from the Board of Mission, *Good News for our Times*, held the balance (like the Reardon Report) and obviously envisaged that some baptismal policies could well serve the ministering of the gospel, but not so the chairman of the Decade of Evangelism. Bishop Nigel insisted that welcoming all comers without strings attached was the only way to pursue serious evangelism. He also took issue with me, in that he claimed that many sets of parents come to adult confirmation themselves that way (something which, on the media, I had queried from my own experience of officiating at confirmations and talking to the candidates).

Well, there was one MORIB hero who was ready to undergo trampling, but that was not the president. Gordon Kuhrt had an amendment to propose to the motion by which the attempt to write in 'willing and able' to the Canons was abandoned. In essence he simply wanted to affirm the existing Canons, but the blind rush of the buffaloes put him surely underfoot as well.

So what of the president of MORIB? Well, I had had three weeks of being bidden and induced to go on TV and to talk to newspaper reporters. At each point I had said that I did not intend to speak in the baptismal debate, but they wanted to talk to me as national president of MORIB. Some of them started off by saying 'I assume you do not baptize any infants in your own parish?'—and were astonished when I replied 'On the contrary, I am

baptizing a seventeen-month-old child next Sunday. So two different channels appeared at our baptism-in-a-family-service on 7 July, and our service duly appeared briefly within those two channels on the Monday's broadcasting. (The reason the girl was seventeen months old was a good one; the mother had asked for baptism a year before, and had backed off when she learned it was about membership—and she had not been bitter at the church, but had had a hard look at herself and had decided that she ought to come to church and qualify her daughter for baptism in the authentic way—and *had done so*).

The reason I wanted to hold my fire was because, although the baptismal debate was, in effect, a call for a standstill, the later debate due in the afternoon involved a U-turn, and I needed to pitch in there. As I detected that the buffalo-charge was running so powerfully, I was confirmed in my view that evading the conflict was better than being trampled to death for no useful result. So (with both difficulty and relief) I took no part. But my conscience towards both Roger Godin (the vice-chairman of MORIB, who began the Synod debate in 1989) and towards MORIB members generally has certainly felt uneasy. I apologize to them for not laying myself down before the buffaloes as a gratuitous martyr—and I confess that gratuitous martyrdom has sometimes led to amazing results. I can only apologize.

I should point out that, despite all the media reports, in constitutional terms no-one had moved a motion to tighten the official requirements, no one had lost such a motion, and no change had been made to the canonical position of the Church of England.

Admission to communion

In the afternoon a different story unfolded. Now the Bishop of Guildford led from the platform, and, although the motions he was bringing were sharp-edged and reactionary (and were set out in NOL last month), his tone was conciliatory, and his thrust was to say that the debate was exploratory, testing the waters, rather than determinative. To many in Synod this sat ill with the third part of this motion, which agreed that existing 'experiments of admission to communion before confirmation should be discontinued'. At a later point the Bishop of Guildford revealed that he spoke as a representative of the House of Bishops rather than as chairman of the Board of Education—a distinction which was probably necessary, in view of the general will of diocesan Boards of Education to encourage communion before confirmation. It did, however, leave one wondering whether the chairman of the Board would have had a different voice.

Well, the debate went on for some time. The Bishop of Derby acknowledged that he, along with many other bishops, had thought there was no mind or will in the church for change (bishops have been rarely approached, it seems, for permission which they cannot lawfully give, and this had made many bishops think there was no desire). But Bishop Peter Dawes discovered otherwise, simply by asking a question in deanery visitations—and thereby discovering that 70% of his clergy wished for such a change. The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Bishop John Dennis, weighed in with a plea for the original Knaresborough, along with a concern to allow two disciplines to exist alongside each other in the

unhappy with this position on the grounds that, until the incumbent is inducted and installed, he or she cannot begin ministry. That went hand in hand with a plea that he or she should be given a bigger part in the service. Why not let him or her preach? What an opportunity to preach to a congregation likely to include a good number of non-regular attenders. Perhaps they might like what they hear and decide to come again; (perhaps not). We might suggest this to our Bishop as an option. At the same time, we wanted to recognize that this was the Bishop's service. Perhaps there needs to be a strong element of episcopal oversight and even direction requiring him to preach. Indeed, we are in favour of the Bishop having a creative role, for example, in the choice of readings. We are offering him a selection of collects especially written to reflect both the occasion and a particular season.

A litany for a new ministry

Another request which has come our way was to suggest a litany appropriate for an ordination service. Leaving aside, for a moment, the legality of substituting an alternative to the one in the ASB we applied ourselves with enthusiasm. Our first efforts failed to win over those in high places. Here is our most recent offering. It is in the style of Taizé and, incidentally, might be appropriate for occasions other than an ordination when a new ministry is beginning.

Let us pray for the candidates and for the church and let us thank God for his goodness

Cantor: God who made the heavens and the earth
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: Christ who redeemed and saved mankind
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: Spirit who brings love joy and peace
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: We praise you for your love which gives us life
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: We praise you for your grace which knows no end
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: We praise you for your gifts you give your people
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For calling these your servants by your grace
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For those who brought them to this sacred moment
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For your promise to uphold and to equip them
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For all the saints of God with whom they serve
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For bonds of peace and love and unity
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For the preaching of the word and works of God
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: For the care of all who need your healing touch
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: Glory to the Father, Son and Spirit
Response: . . . **Adoramus te Domine**
Cantor: Now and ever more. Amen.

IN MEMORIAM—CYRIL TAYLOR

Cyril Taylor's death was noted last month, but too late for any account of his life to be written. Even now, I fear that I can offer less than a fully rounded appreciation, but rather offer a word of tribute concerning the points at which our paths crossed. And mostly, of course, this was on the Liturgical Commission.

Cyril Taylor in those years from 1968 to 1980 was canon residentiary of Salisbury, a musician (who probably had a cathedral title which I have forgotten) with a care for the Choir School. I once got a tiny spy-hole into this pastoral side of his life when TV showed him testing applicants for the choir school (at age seven or thereabouts). He had a gift for putting these small boys at their ease, and getting their best from them.

On the Commission, he was always sweetly irenic and quite un pompous about his own music speciality. He had his sticking-points (my recollection is that an unpointed non-metrical psalter went beyond all his sticking-points, and he worked hard at pointing all provision for liturgical psalms or canticles, including the whole 'Frost' psalter, lest they ever get into circulation limping). But in general he was very open to all the ideas that blew, and would cross-examine them diffidently and courteously, never wanting to discard anything simply because it was new on his horizons

I once asked him if ABBOTS LEIGH, his enduring monument in English Church Music, reflected time he had spent in the village of that name on the South side of the Avon Gorge (where I preached once myself as a student). And, yes, he had been vicar there during the war, and his hymn-tune sprang from that time.

And finally, he was at that memorial service to Ronald Jasper in York Minster a little over a year ago, and I travelled back on the train with him. He had gone the length of the country (he was around 83), and helped the sense of the complete reunion at York, to which I drew attention in my report then. His person breathed unpushy goodness, sheer traditional Anglicanism, and child-like curiosity and love of a good story or a good joke. There was always a smile near his lips, and I judge there was God's smile on his heart. Cyril was a delightful rarity. COB

DIOCESAN REPORT 8—ROCHESTER JOTTINGS

Re-inventing the wheel.

These reports from the Dioceses are fast becoming variations on the same theme. For we in Rochester have also been asked to draft a new institution/collation and induction service. Clearly, here is a flourishing local industry prompted perhaps by conversations between bishops. However, there seems little cross-fertilization as each Committee ploughs a somewhat lonely furrow. May of the matters mentioned in Mr. Thewlis' report (March NOL) have been discussed by our working party. Is there not a case for some co-ordination?

I resist the temptation to go over this ground again; I merely note that we are having trouble with the induction; where it comes, what it has to compromise and even to what extent it is actually necessary. The Southwark eighth draft (or was it the ninth?) interested us in that it placed the induction right at the end of the service after the Bishop had retired and allowed the new incumbent to lead the people out. Some of our groups were

future. The movers of amendments had a go too in the general debate. And your editor got the chance to express his distance from the House of Bishops' motions.

Then came the amendments. The first one would have affirmed that baptism is a complete sacrament, and that communion should precede confirmation, and that would have virtually implemented Knaresborough on the spot. This perished with little support. The next amendment would have sent a Knaresborough question down to the dioceses, and this did a little better. The third would have asked the House to evaluate existing 'experiments', and this did tolerably well, though clearly lost. My own amendment came next and simply added to the first section ('That this Synod affirm the traditional sequence of baptism-confirmation-admission to communion as normative in the Church of England') a proviso 'without prejudice to the various provisions of Canon B.15A'. B.15A, I should add, not only provides for unconfirmed but communicant guests from other denominations to receive communion, but also has a category of 'other baptized persons' to be admitted under any regulations of General Synod. The Bishop of Guildford *accepted* my amendment (while making it clear that B.15A would stand whether the Synod accepted the amendment or not)—and the Synod then *defeated* it by 190 votes to 155 (possibly because not enough Synodspeople knew enough about B.15A).

There were one or two other minor amendments which got swept away—and the Synod came to Brian McHenry's major one: to leave out the whole section about discontinuing experiments. The Bishop of Guildford fought hard, but the Synod clearly disliked this section, and the amendment succeeded by 252 votes to 161.

From then on the air was easier, and the sense of going into reverse was greatly relieved. The Bishop of Chester got through easily his amendment to add a section asking for a rite of 'commitment'. In his speech, he commended it on the grounds that confirmation at seven would include a credible profession of faith, but such a profession could hardly be taken as a *commitment for life*, and a later rite would be needed. However, the amendment did not so link the provision to early confirmation as to mean that it will have to happen that way.

A tiny further amendment included the Board of Mission in those being asked to prepare a paper on nurture, and then the amended motion was passed overwhelmingly on a show of hands in the following form:

'That this Synod

- (a) affirm the traditional sequence of Baptism-Confirmation-admission to Communion as normative in the Church of England;
- (b) accept that within this sequence Confirmation can take place at an early stage when this is deemed appropriate by the parish priest and the bishop;
- (c) ask the Liturgical Commission to prepare a rite of Adult Commitment as stated in paragraph 134 of GS Misc 366;

- (d) ask the Liturgical Commission to prepare a series of rites described in Route Three in GS Misc 366 for the renewal of baptismal vows, for reception of members of another church, and for reconciliation and healing;
- (e) ask the House of Bishops, in consultation with the Board of Education, the Board of Mission and the Liturgical Commission to prepare a paper on patterns of nurture in the faith, including the Catechumenate.

Finally came the Rochester diocesan synod 'following motion':

'That this Synod request the House of Bishops to prepare draft regulations that enable children to be admitted to Holy Communion before confirmation, so that discussions can take place within the Church and conditions for such admissions, if any, can be considered.'

Canon Peter Lock moved this, pointing out that such draft regulations could be considered widely by the whole church, and that they therefore would enable the 'testing' to continue. The Bishop of Guildford said the House of Bishops would have to consider the matter anyway, and asked him to withdraw the motion, but he persisted. Time had run out, and there were virtually no speeches. Then came the vote. On a show of hands it looked very close. The chairman ordered a count through the doors, and as that was being organized it was overhauled by a further call for a count by Houses, and this was accepted. And the count produced the following figures:

	<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Bishops	7	34
Clergy	112	105
Laity	116	102
Total	235	241

So—the motion was defeated solely by the weighting of the House of Bishops, which to my mind confirmed the impression that there had been a loss of touch between the bishops and the hopes of the parishes. It also came clear that some members had voted against the motion because they did not like the precise *procedures* outlined in the motion, even whilst they would wish to endorse the 'Knaresborough' principle. If the heavy defeat of the section about discontinuing existing experiments is put with the voting on the Rochester motion, then clearly the House of Bishops has something major to consider.

I will try to do something further on the implementing of 'early confirmation and later "commitment"' next month.

I depart on 5 August for the Fourth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Toronto (also on initiation), and hope to report that in next month's NOL. One feature of it is immediately clear—that is, that it is a larger and more representative gathering of the Communion than any of

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

As one of the 'band of bright young(ish) men' who contributed to the two books discussed by Jean Mayland (NOL 198), perhaps I may be allowed a rejoinder (even though she was not discussing my particular contributions).

Jean is correct to remind us of the importance of the ecumenical dimension of the lectionary, and it is also important that the Church of England does not act in isolation from other churches. However, she misses the point that even in the 1960s the JLG took a decision to continue in a direction quite different from that consensus which was emerging in a number of other churches based around the new Roman Lectionary. Furthermore, as far as I recall, the present JLG did not *consult* the present Liturgical Commission about its new proposals, but simply through our representatives informed the Commission of what it was doing. The JLG persisted in this venture even though it was aware that it differed from the thinking of the present Commission, and, perhaps more important, from ELLC. Revision should be done ecumenically, but across the (Western) churches, not just in the UK. The proposals of the Commission were a signal that we need to be more widely ecumenical, and should not pursue the former isolationist path of the JLG.

Rather than send Jean Mayland to the stake, let's simply burn the new JLG lectionary proposals.

Bryan Spinks

(NB: My own recollection would be that the JLG Calendar and Lectionary in Britain *preceded* any public changes from Rome—and it must be remembered that Ronald Jasper was secretary of JLG in the 1960s, whilst being 'our' observer on Roman liturgical changes. There is a case for further research here . . . And there is a further letter of Jean Mayland's already submitted to come next month, even whilst she has need to start replying to the above. And is Michael Vasey, member of both the Liturgical Commission and JLG to-day, to be similarly rent by our correspondent? COB

A CREATIVE COMMITTEE IN KENYA

Bishop David Gitari, chairman of the Liturgical Sub-Committee of the Provincial Board of Theological Education in the Province of Kenya, forwards a great package of creative material. There was a provincial residential conference on liturgy held at the end of April in Kabare, and it is very clear from this that the Province as such has loosened its attachment to 1662 (as we have already seen with its modern eucharistic liturgy). The most significant feature of it all for this issue of NOL is that there was emphasis upon the sacramental completeness of baptism as Christian initiation, and the conference was recommending that admission to communion should come at around 6 or 7 years of age, and that the parish priest could himself do the admitting. Confirmation would follow at 11, 12, or 13.

We hope next month to include other features of this creative work in Kenya.

Church in Wales

1. Calendar

The Liturgy Committee was to ask the Bench of Bishops for authority to bring forward an authoritative list of additional commemorations.

2. Liturgical Inculturation

A working group had been established in conjunction with the Doctrinal Commission to make progress on this in relation to the Celtic spiritual tradition. Hopefully, the working group would be later joined by co-opted appropriate persons for the other Christian traditions in Wales.

(Editorial health warning—the paragraph which follows below is not from the JLG official news service, but strictly from COB, and it is included here simply because it appeared to fit at this point in our columns).

3. Services of baptism and confirmation

The Church in Wales has now followed its own pattern in respect of the eucharist in providing *An Alternative Order for the Baptism of Infants, and an Alternative Order for Baptism with Confirmation* (C/W Publications, Penarth, South Wales). The official Prayer Book of the Church in Wales is in 'thou' form of address to God (a bus was badly missed there), so modern language 'alternatives' are being produced. These ones were agreed for 'experimental use' at the Governing Body in 1990, and are now published in a glossy A5 booklet, with a card also available for the infant baptism rite. They are, of course, bilingual.

At most points the Welsh have followed the principles in the ASB. However, it may help to pinpoint the places which differ:

- (a) Structurally the 'Blessing of the Baptismal Waters' comes last thing before the actual baptism, thus separating the vows from the baptism in line with 1552/1662.
- (b) Oil receives much greater prominence (including chrism at infant baptisms), and has spoken texts provided to accompany the ceremony (as has the robing in a white garment).
- (c) There is a presentation of baptismal candidates (minimal for infants, quite prominent for adults).
- (d) There is no 'Welcome' (Called 'The Thanksgiving') after adult baptisms—for reasons which can be easily guessed, but which were not thought determinative in England. It curiously means that an infant baptized in the 'adult' rite (which provides for households etc.) will not be welcomed, whereas one baptized at the infant rite will . . .
- (e) The rubrics offer the alternatives of 'immersion' or pouring. A commentary I have seen from one member of their Commission suggests that by 'immersion' they exclude 'submersion'—in other words they have taken NOL's linguistic point, whilst on the point of substance declining to 'go all the way' into the water . . .
- (f) At the end of the book there is a short rite of 'Commitment to Christian service'.

the previous three Consultations. I stay on in Toronto the following week for *Societas Liturgica*, which is studying 'The Bible and Liturgy'. I then go to Los Angeles for a weekend, followed by a week's teaching on worship at a pastors' school in Lima (do not expect a new Lima text). Then I have a fortnight in New Zealand and six days in Australia, so again should have things to report. I am back in England on 21 September, and there is little point in writing to me in the meantime.

Colin Buchanan

Footnote: I have been well taken to task about an omission in the notice I gave month of the Reardon report. I confess my sins, and correct the record. I had been expecting a review from someone else, but it did not come, so I wrote at the last minute myself about material which I had personally seen at each stage of drafting (which was why I did not want to review it). Because of these factors I inadvertently gave no mention to a new appendix from Bryan Spinks 'Reflections based on a study of Church of Scotland reports'. It is largely a critique of Gordon Kuhrt's book *Believing in Baptism* and of Mark Dalby's *Open Baptism* (and their two appendices here which reflect their books). His references to the two Church of Scotland reports are actually sketchy, and, whilst his own explorations clearly run towards 'open' baptism, it is unclear from his contribution how far the two reports themselves weight the issue of *which* infants should be baptized (NOL was reporting only a month ago that the General Assembly of the Kirk was only now even *allowing* 'open baptism'). His final section deals with the 1986 rite of the Church of Scotland, and he enjoys the concept of promises following baptism rather than preceding. I apologize to Bryan Spinks for the short straw in our columns—he was the one who was omitted from the list of Commission members in March. But there is no inbuilt malice, and he is a regular contributor to NOL, and has a (robust) letter in this issue.

COB

ALSO AT SYNOD

Very little else of a liturgical nature happened at Synod, but there was one question of some interest. Canon Michael Saward asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

'Given the uncertain legality concerning the practice of concelebration, could the Chairman of the House of Bishops give an assurance that the House will give early consideration to its theology, desirability and the growing practice of requiring clergy, especially the newly-ordained, to participate in such acts?'

The reply was:

'I will certainly raise the question with the standing committee of the House.'

However, there then followed supplementaries (including attempts under the form of a question to demonstrate that that odd note in the ASB ordinal, concerning the propriety of the newly ordained exercising their new ministry that day, refers to 'concelebration' by the new presbyters with their bishop). The Archbishop said he would need evidence of pressure being brought, but if there were pressure, he would have the matter followed up.

PRAXIS

Doing what's 'right and proper': the funeral of the future

The controversial Labour MP Ken Livingstone has been quoted as saying that he regards Church of England funerals '... as about as moving as a supermarket check-out.' Though they might not have expressed it quite like that, a group of seventy-five clergy and lay people—including at least two funeral directors—who met together recently, tended to agree that much more can and should be done to help make funeral services more helpful for all concerned

The group gathered in London at the latest Open Seminar event organized by PRAXIS, the Anglican venture sponsored by the Liturgical Commission, the Alcuin Club and the Group for the Renewal of Worship. Two well-known authors, Trevor Lloyd and Michael Perham, both members of the Liturgical Commission, led a study day which included an opportunity for those present to share their experience (good, bad, hilarious or disastrous) of funerals they had attended or officiated at. Such stories only served to highlight the need for much more thought to be given to the structure of funeral services, the need adequately to express a balance between the public and the personal aspects of funeral arrangements and the need for appropriate symbolism to enable mourners to channel their motion into some significant action or gestures of farewell to the loved one they have lost.

Among those 'significant actions or gestures of farewell' the sprinkling of the coffin with water (full of allusion to the water of Christian baptism), the use of the Paschal candle (with its reminder of Easter) standing near to the coffin and the placing of a Bible or a Cross on the plain coffin top were all discussed. In short, it was felt by many present that the Church of England had much to learn both from other denominations and from other cultures about ways of expressing our feelings and thoughts on such important occasions. It was suggested by some present that perhaps in the future Church of England clergy might find themselves invited more often to function as 'life celebrants' at the funeral of someone with no Christian faith who requests a non-religious service.

Michael Perham went so far as to suggest a new shape (closely related to the shape of current eucharistic liturgies) for the funeral service of the future. After an introductory section setting the scene, welcoming and briefly explaining the purpose for gathering, the Ministry of the Word would follow. After a short homily and prayers the Commendation and 'Farewell' would include a variety of options of things to do. Perhaps it would not be necessary for clergy always to officiate at a funeral, he suggested, but rather trained and episcopally authorized lay funeral leaders could minister in this way.

Whatever the funeral of the future will look like, one of the undertakers was quick to remind the group that most mourners are especially concerned that neighbours and friends see that what is done at a funeral is both 'right' and 'proper'.

Dick Hines

This month's Booklet . . .

Is Worship Series no. 117, *Interfaith Worship and Christian Truth*, by David Bookless, who has done research in this area at Bristol, and is about to be ordained to serve in multi-ethnic Southall. Our previous title in this series had become dated, and this particular issue of interfaith worship is contemporary both in its implications for our hold on the uniqueness of Christ, and also for the kind of message we ourselves give out, if we participate unreflectively at syncretistic civic (or funerary) events.

. . . and next month's

is Evangelism Series no. 15, *Evangelization through the Adult Catechumenate*, by Malcolm Grundy—and another bit of Grove brinkmanship in Spirituality Series no. 38, *Praying to God as Mother*, by Phillip Tovey. It should be noted that this latter is not a fruit of embattled Christian feminism (the author would never strike anyone as coming from that stable), but is a careful picking over a series of scriptural and traditional strands in the life of the church, and the outcome is well worth weighing.

. . . and some titles back in print

include (old) Liturgical Study no. 48, *Anglican Confirmation*, by COB, and Pastoral Series nos. 38, *No-Gay Areas?—Pastoral Care of Christian Homosexuals* by Lance Pierson, and 41, *Those Tiresome Intruders* by Graham Dow.

. . . and a new Stock List

is also available.

DENOMINATIONAL REPORTS

(From the Joint Liturgical Group, March, 1991)

Church of Scotland

1. *Revision of Book of Common Order*

The Editorial Committee met for three days during Easter Week to make final adjustments to the draft texts. A Report on progress made was submitted to the General Assembly in May.

2. *Publications*

Worshipping Together was now published, and *Clann ag Urnaigh* (Children praying) was about to be published.

The *Report to the General Assembly* discusses 'Participation in Worship' and encourages ministers and musicians in particular to co-operate in leading worship. It also provides an extended statement on the relationship between Worship and Mission.

Scottish Episcopal Church

1. *Calendar*

The new Calendar was to be repropounded in early June to the General Synod for its second and final reading before promulgation.

2. *Rites of Initiation*

The Liturgy Committee was working in consultation with the Doctrine and the Education Committees on a new approach to the question of Initiation. It was hoped to produce in due time or not just a set of liturgical texts, but a complete policy of nurture and education derived from the teachings of Doctrine, Liturgy, Development Psychology and the current situation.