

the benefices which (from all accounts) most needed to hear him did not appear. It was, however, a very good day and the tapes of it will be in use!

The Bishop summoned the secretaries of the Church Music and Liturgical Committee to two meetings in the year, which we found attended by some of the top brass of the diocese. These small but daunting assemblies seemed to be concerned mostly with the fact that the Church Music represented officially in the diocese is increasingly distant from the musical idioms fostered in churches with music groups, and the fashions of the charismatic renewal. There is a good deal of antagonism on both sides, and always the danger that we shall end up discussing 'good' and 'bad' music, judged by different criteria. Our hope is that by asking the right questions about what our liturgical aims are, and then what resources are possible to get near them, we can get round the violent reactions of one camp against the other.

The Committee shared in a day run by the Music Committee for church organists in November. We fielded two clergy: one with a traditional and cathedral-style style of music (Byrd to Britten) and the other with a church meeting in a hall on a housing estate with drums and speakers big enough for a Tina Turner concert. The conversation which arose was lively and helpful, aimed at asking the right questions about the resources, hopes and fears of church communities in different places. It also tackled the problems of the relationship between clergy and musicians.

Next year we are intending to take part in a day at the Cathedral to which three different parishes have been invited to go in order to share their views and problems in organizing worship. We have also indicated that we would welcome contact with as wide as possible a spectrum of worship styles, including the 'Renewal' churches; and the Bishop's meeting may well provide a place to draw together the various interested groups. We shall see . . .

In the meantime our priority is to continue to explain the possibilities available in the published books; to advise on particular points of what is allowed; and to keep in touch with the creative work which is being done in many places to make liturgy appropriate and moving.

Keith Jones, St. Mary le Tower Church, Ipswich
Secretary of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee

6 FEBRUARY—A VERY HAPPY ANNIVERSARY

Our Queen reaches the fortieth anniversary of her Accession on 6 February (and we, along with the Prayer Book Society, will be using the BCP rite of thanksgiving for it). We wish Her Majesty every happiness.

MORIB OPEN DAY

MORIB invite all readers to an Open Day at CPAS headquarters at Leamington Spa on Saturday 14 March. Details and registration with the Rev. D. Foster, 24 Geldart Street, Cambridge CB1 2LX (0223-63545).

ISSN 0263-7170

Postal Subscription for 1992 **£5.50** (by air **£8** or **US\$16**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel: 0634-851818 or 855252; 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. 205

January 1992

Editorial

There are many issues for 1992, and General Synod next month will have its first renewed crack at the ordination of women, on which we have commented before, and will do again. We make no apology (though one or two have asked us to desist), as the candidates or victims in liturgy are as much part of the substance of the event as the text or rubrics. Indeed worship without worshippers is slightly difficult to conceive, and liturgy is a function of the *people*, and we reserve our right to air the people as well as the programme. Women as candidates for ordination to the presbyterate are bound to invade the agenda all through 1992.

That said, we pick up lighter-hearted issues. Grove Books duly held the twentieth birthday party for the 'Booklets' on 18 January in their birthplace, St. John's College, Nottingham (and welcomed Julian Charley, the author of the first ever 'Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship'). It was a very happy day for the 60 or so who came, and included lectures, workshops, eucharist, funny stories, birthday cakes and champagne. Notable in this colourful day was a lecture by Oliver O'Donovan, erstwhile founder of the Grove Ethics Group, now Regius Professor of Moral Theology at Oxford, on 'Liturgy and Ethics'. This may yet see print, but a summary of it will give a good start to NOL's 1992.

He began his lecture with a quotation from Paul Ramsey, to the effect that if liturgy functions independently of moral theology, then it can totally overlook the challenges of the world in which people are placed; and if the moralists function independently of the liturgists, then they can fail to respond to the challenges in relation to the 'inner life'. He reinforced this with a quotation from Barth to the effect that 'ethics is invocation of God! On the basis of this he conducted a trenchant critique of the concept 'laborare est orare', as its insufficiency emerges immediately in that it fails to handle the transcendent. There must be some 'orare' which rises *above* 'laborare', and is not simply contained within it without remainder. He went on to assert that 'speech gives action its intention', which means that, as it turned out in discussion afterwards, it is in *words* that the moralists and the liturgists meet, and their words must be in essence the same on both their two fronts.

He then went on to apply his principles to a whole series of liturgical acts—preaching (on which he expounded his own homiletical principles), and more strictly 'liturgical' areas such as the decalogue, the post-communion, baptismal promises, the purposes of matrimony, the objectivity of the lectionary, the carving up of the Psalms, and ways to pray in relation to, e.g. the Gulf War. His most memorable proposal in this amazing array was that we should restore a corporate service for the public reconciliation of penitents, in which not only would they be visibly reconciled (as in existing Roman Catholic practice), but that they would actually have the sins for which they were penitent *named* in a Cathedral service once a year. There was some visible hesitation about this amongst the hearers. He laid an intriguing weight upon the freedom given by the pronouncement of forgiveness, and contrasted it with the mere suppression of particular sins, and the hope that time would heal. The liturgists present recognized that he had truly engaged with their agenda, and had stretched them beyond where many of them had ever even thought of previously going, whilst giving a practical credibility to his programme which meant that they had to take it very seriously.

Colin Buchanan

WHITHER THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION?

When I was reappointed to the Liturgical Commission in March 1991 it was anybody's guess as to how the pace of liturgical work would develop in the course of the next 12 months. On the last Commission we had worked—at times frenetically—on *Making Women Visible*, *Patterns for Worship*, and *The Promise of His Glory* amongst other projects. We had drafted GS Misc 364, *The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium* containing our reflections on possible ways ahead for liturgical revision in the 1990's. By March 1991, the '86-'91 Commission knew that it was time to pause . . . to pause for the new General Synod, and for the House of Bishops to take a measured look at what lay ahead on the liturgical horizon: Revisions of the ASB? Eucharistic prayers for use when children are present at the eucharist? More on inclusive language? Initiation questions? and so on . . .

And pause we have. The General Synod duly debated GS Misc 364 in November 1991 (see COB's report in the November edition of NOL) but we await directions from the January '92 meeting of the House of Bishops before any substantial work may be undertaken by us.

Some informed New Year crystal-ball gazing is nonetheless possible. In the first instance it looks as if the Commission's energies will be directed towards responding to the liturgical requests contained in the General Synod motions approved last July, and concerning Christian initiation. The Commission has been asked to prepare 'a series of rites . . . for the renewal of baptismal vows, for the reception of members of another church, and for reconciliation and healing'; 'to prepare a rite of Adult Commitment . . .'; and to be consulted by the House of Bishops as they 'prepare a paper on patterns of nurture in faith, including the Catechumenate'. Much work on the first of these requests was done by the '86-'91 Commission, so it is to be hoped that revised suggestions may be forthcoming reasonably soon from the new Commission. What remains something of a mystery is how the Commission will respond to the task of devising a rite of Adult Commitment. It was entirely unclear from the synodical debate as to how the Bishops or other members of the General Synod understood such a rite to relate theologically or liturgically to the renewal of baptismal vows, and to confirmation. Presumably, any provision for a rite of Adult Commitment will also need to be viewed within the light of the proposed episcopal report on patterns of nurture in the faith. Roman Catholic experience of their recently published Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults (RCIA) is likely to be important here. But, as the Commission advises the House of Bishops, it would also do well to draw on the extensive experience of nurture groups such as those formed during Mission England, or currently resourced by such para-church organizations as Scripture Union, the Church Pastoral-Aid Society *et al.*

The November '91 General Synod saw a further urgent request being made to the Liturgical Commission, this time on the subject of making provision for eucharistic prayers for use when children are present at a service of Holy Communion. Past Commissions have fought shy of making such provision until such time as the issue of the admission to Holy Communion of baptized but not yet confirmed children had been resolved by the General Synod. The July debate answered some, but not all, of these questions and recognized that, confirmed or not, substantial numbers of children are often present at services of Holy Communion—during Sunday worship, and in some church schools. Whilst the Commission

During the last eighteen months we have also been consulted on the problem of how communication from the reserved sacrament should be 'staged' where there is extended communion. The Bishop has been making careful provision for this while aware that the whole business is highly controversial. The Bishop did issue his guidelines, but we want to know a little more about what is happening and whether they are working.

When there are no special jobs given us to do, we make plans to encourage well-arranged and coherent acts of liturgy in the parishes. Apart from the commercial and industrial town of Ipswich (which is a place quite out of scale with the rest of the county) the diocese of St. Eds. and Ips. is countryside: ACORA heartland, indeed. Some is even now quite comfortable farmland; but there are some surprising places. There are, for example, large military bases, overspill estates, seaside resorts and isolated, impoverished hamlets whose main building may be a vast and elaborate wool church. Ipswich is now only just over an hour from London (too often four hours by BR) and many people try to commute. Roads are continually being widened and the population is still increasing.

Somebody once remarked that the natural religion of Suffolk was Strict Baptist. In the past, the grim rural life fostered tight communities of the saved, with sometimes violent antipathies between church and chapel, between farmer and labourer. Churchmanship is frequently 'low', with a few centres of anglo-catholic worship dotted about in town and country. The main problem in rural areas is, as might be expected, tiny congregations of chilled faithful making do with a primitive organ (at best) and a cleric travelling at high speed from church to church on a Sunday.

In the past few years the DLC has co-operated with the Education department and the Children's Work department and the Music Committee in putting in days of workshop and presentations connected with arranging services. The subjects hardly needed to vary: how to do all-age worship when you had ten people on a Sunday morning, four over 80 and under 10 . . .; how you did justice to the great tradition of psalmody when Mrs. Bugg who played the piano had chilblains; should the church buy a synthesizer or start an organ fund; and how should you organize a family service. In November of 1990 we had well over 100 people at Framlingham College sharing in such subjects. Our format has included a theme talk, and then workshops on all kinds of subjects, and an opportunity to share lunch. We also had a workshop on church architecture and worship, run by Tony Redman, which indicates our wish to be in contact with the DAC when plans for reordering churches are put forward. This was very popular and useful in a diocese where buildings are a special problem.

This year we decided not to run a major day. Instead our hope was to make local contacts and address deaneries or groups of parishes. *The Promise of His Glory* was a natural theme for such 'Roadshows', and we enthusiastically contacted Rural Deans and put forward our claim to attention. Well, we did one modest one. Another, grander affair was all organized but then cancelled from lack of support (much to the Rural Dean's chagrin). We may need to put on another full day soon.

In compensation for that we have got two bookings already for 1992; and one Deanery bravely organized a visit by Michael Perham which got a fair turn-out from a large Archdeaconry. It was, I think, only fair, and some of

Haddon Wilmer (ed.) *2020 Visions: The Futures of Christianity in Britain* (SPCK, January 1992, 154pp., £9.99)

This is the book which created headlines through the brief extract from the essay by Barry Rogerson, the Bishop of Bristol, in the national press. That led to the Leader in *The Times* reproduced on page 4 above.

The book itself was originally guest lectures in the University of Leeds, and is hardly concerned with liturgy, and the lectures are necessarily brief (though distinction is added by the presence of Adrian Hastings among the contributors). But what did Barry Rogerson say in his chapter on 'Growing Together', which is largely about ecumenical issues in the decades to come? Well, he gave just one page to liturgy. He did actually say 'we have, to put it bluntly, liturgical anarchy, or a liturgical super-market' (p.31). But he did *not* wring his hands. Indeed he is more concerned lest we have 'drawn a tight circle round the local congregation' (with the Parish Communion), than he is about loss of uniformity or expansions beyond the range of *Hymns A & M*. One can only conclude therefore that the press extract and headlines were hyped sensation-seeking. For the broad-minded Bishop of Bristol himself contents himself undogmatically with saying 'some will like it one way, some another'. Whether this is sufficient grappling with our liturgical future for a book of this title others must judge. But then he wasn't really trying to. COB

This month's booklet ...

... is Worship Series no. 120, *Methodist and United Reformed Church Worship: Baptism and Eucharist in two 'Free' Churches*, by David Kennedy and Phillip Tovey (the wrong author was given last month—our apologies). This is a straightforward account of the rites and styles for the two great sacraments in these two major Churches in England.

... and next month's

is Evangelism Series no. 17, *Jewish Evangelism*, by Michelle and Peter Guinness—a sensitive handling of a very hot potato.

DIOCESAN REPORT 17—ST. EDMUNDSBURY and IPSWICH

The Committee in this Diocese is appointed by the Bishop and has a budget to cover its (mostly travelling) expenses from the Diocesan Synod. First place on the agenda is work handed to us by the Bishop. This has not been happening lately to anything like the extent it was happening some years ago. In fact we did wonder at one stage whether we had been overlooked, and began to have jealous pangs when work was commissioned elsewhere.

Our more adult reflection told us not to be silly, but to get on with what we could.

This year we were asked to consider what form of prayers before a Diocesan Synod were appropriate. The advice we gave was based on reflections on the form used in the Chelmsford Diocese. We opted for a simple set of guidelines rather than an office format, including praise and intercession.

may begin to circulate some new draft prayers for discussion, much more immediately important will be the Synodical treatment of the four eucharistic prayers already published in *Patterns for Worship* (see below). Eucharistic prayers C and D are substantially shorter and simpler than any of the ASB eucharistic prayers; and all four eucharistic prayers in *Patterns* make greater use of graphic, as opposed to conceptual, language than any currently authorized. Synodical reflection on these prayers may help to focus the theological questions raised by the task of devising eucharistic prayers with a particular 'user-group' in mind.

Material from *Patterns for Worship* which ought to receive full synodical authorization will probably be sent from the January meeting of the House of Bishops to the July session of the General Synod. The material to be authorized will include the four eucharistic prayers, the penitential material, the affirmations of faith, and the rubrical provisions for Rite C. Once set on the course of Synodical revision and authorization, the earliest that we may expect any of this *Patterns* material to be authorized is late 1993 or early 1994. And, although the current synodical edition of *Patterns* is out of print, it is expected that *Patterns* material not needing synodical authorization will be produced in a 'report edition' during 1992, to parallel what will be a further 'synod report' edition of the selected texts and rubrics for revision and authorization.

The current synodical process of revision and authorization is a long one—and a daunting prospect when viewing the volume of liturgical work which might be generated by a revision of the ASB prior to the year 2000. This prospect combined with unease at the *ad hoc* development of episcopal 'commendation' of liturgical materials has led to calls for a revision of the synodical process of liturgical revision and authorization. Discussions of these issues are now in hand, involving church lawyers, Synod members and the Liturgical Commission. It may be the mid-1990's before any changes can be implemented to the General Synod standing orders (there will be no need to amend the 1974 Worship and Doctrine Measure), but it looks likely that the way forward will lie in making a distinction between 'core' liturgical materials which would always need a full revision process, and other 'uncontroversial' materials which might be authorized with a minimum of synodical revision. 'Core' materials would include materials such as eucharistic prayers, absolutions, affirmations of faith etc.; 'uncontroversial' materials might include collects, canticles, forms of intercession etc. The process of consultation and revision will be further helped if the House of Bishops' call for the amendment of Canon B5A is acted on. This would enable greater flexibility in the experimental use of liturgical material prior to authorization.

And finally—the Commission has appointed two consultants: Bro. Tristram SSF, and Canon Donald Gray. These appointments are to be welcomed as maintaining the Commission's links with the religious communities and with the Joint Liturgical Group respectively. In addition, the Commission has revived the 1960's practice of exchanging observers with the Roman Catholic Pastoral Liturgy Committee. We warmly welcomed Fr. Geoffrey Steele (lecturer in liturgy at Ushaw college, Durham) to the last meeting of the Commission, and we have arranged to send Michael Vasey as the Commission's observer to the Pastoral Liturgy Committee in return.

The next four years look like being busy ones ... Happy 1992!

Jane Sinclair

LITURGICAL ANARCHY

The Bishop of Bristol writes in a new book: 'We have, to put it bluntly, liturgical anarchy, or a liturgical supermarket.' *The Times* on 6 January picked up the reference to 'liturgical anarchy' and gave a third leader to the subject. We append the full text by permission and the book is reviewed on page 10.

UNBENDING BISHOPS

Second to Shakespeare as the English writer most cited in the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations* is Thomas Cranmer, author of the bulk of the Book of Common Prayer. The 1662 prayer book courses through the veins of English culture, and its replacement in many churches with the Alternative Service Book has caused anguish, most publicly amongst royalty. The Bishop of Bristol, the Right Rev. Barry Rogerson, is the latest to criticize the 'liturgical anarchy' in the Church of England, which, he claims, puts the cohesion of the church at risk.

Should the Church of England be worried about the fragmentation of its liturgy? A characteristic of the established church is that it is hard to define, for it embraces so many different traditions. When the 1662 prayer book was used in all services, unity could be expressed by common worship, whatever the high or low church inclinations of different congregations. But in the 20th century, many in the church have fretted that the archaic language of the 1662 book excluded Christians from church attendance. In 1928, parliament blocked the introduction of a new prayer book, and it was not until 1980 that an Alternative Service Book was authorized.

As soon as the spell of uniformity was broken, forms of worship started to fragment. There is now such a proliferation that Anglicanism cannot really be said to have a common worship. In one church, traditional language is joined by the solemn music of Palestrina. In another, colloquialisms rule, and gospel songs are accompanied by guitars, tambourines and handclapping.

But does this matter? The Church of England is still one church in its diocesan structure and institutions. The same system of law applies throughout and members are represented at the General Synod. Senior churchmen may wring their hands at the diversity of forms of worship in individual churches. But most important is to ask whether life in the parishes is healthy.

Individual churchgoers are, in the main, not exercised by the variation in liturgy. Quite the contrary. In towns and cities at least, such diversity gives them more choice. Increasingly, urban churches are tending to serve not just their own parishioners, but everyone in the area who likes their type of worship. So evangelical Christians, for instance, can now drive across town to attend the service that appeals to them.

This liturgical 'anarchy', then, may be the best way of maintaining levels of church attendance. As in many other forms of life, the English have become more discriminating. Bishops should welcome the growing self-assertion of their parishioners, not try to stamp a stalinist uniformity on them. As ever, there is an apposite quotation from the 1662 prayer book: 'It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it.' Bishops, beware stiffness.

(Copyright Times Newspapers Limited 1992. All rights reserved. Reproduced from *The Times* 6 January 1992 by permission.)

As someone who was wanting to get a fresh perspective on children in worship I found most of these articles very helpful. Those that weren't that helpful were either too brief or too specific to the American Catholic scene. But in general there was much food for thought. Particularly stimulating were the essays on children in liturgy, identifying amongst other things their need for ritual, ways in which they become participants, the importance of the relationship between celebrant and children, and ways in which adults can learn from children. However it may surprise some readers to discover that none of the articles pauses to consider whether having non-communicant baptized children present at Mass is an inherent problem relating to participation. Perhaps American Catholic parishes don't see it as a problem.

Various unhealthy approaches to involving children in liturgy are also identified e.g. trying to combat boredom with an 'entertainment' liturgy, or making a liturgy simply a 'kids' show', not involving the adults present. Warnings are repeated when it comes to considering music and children, writers pleading that children be weaned off trite music, or as one of the contributors delightfully puts it, 'bubble gum' music. Perhaps I will be allowed space by *NOL* to indulge in passing on one quoted example of a trite hymn:

Give me gas for my Ford,
Keep me trucking for the Lord.

Give me umption for my gumption,
keep me function, function, function,

Give me oil for my lamp,
keep me burning, burning, burning.

Give me salt for my fritos,
God is neat, neat, neat. (p.94)

I would thoroughly recommend this book to any who are concerned with 'All-Age Worship' and the demanding yet exciting task of enabling our children to be not learners only, but those able to take their part in the Christian community's celebration of worship.

James Steven

Michael Perham, *Liturgy Pastoral and Parochial* (SPCK, 1984, £10.99)

SPCK have kindly sent us a copy of this book for review but it proves to be a wholly unrevised third impression of the original 1984 book. I think such a reprinting deserves one small grumble, as follows. This is a very good book, but it shrieks for updating. The author has himself stood in the middle of the post-1984 liturgical creativity of the Church of England, and has written effortlessly upon great areas in which he has been involved. But this book not only knows nothing about *The Promise of His Glory* (which could just be forgiven), but also missed out originally on *Lent, Holy Week, and Easter*. There is not even an opening note saying that these things have happened, and that the book is reprinted unchanged simply because he is too busy to bring it up to date (or whatever the reason is). A new edition would be exciting—a reprint looks suspiciously close to an attempted and cynical cashing in on a good thing by the publishers at the expense of the public. And I have to confess that it will probably sell, for it is very good and there is nothing else quite like it. COB

The offerings of the people are postponed until the end of the service. The reason for this is that the committee felt that presenting the offerings while the consecrated elements were on the holy table would be confusing and unhelpful. Incidentally the position at the end is reminiscent of the old post-communion prayer of oblation.

The sentences (*Patterns for Worship* p.235, 72.3; 72.4) accompanying the presentation of the offerings effectively include the dismissal.

Prayers for the recipient congregation at the Eucharist are included. (See below for other considerations about the relationship between the two congregations.)

In the course of working out the material, other groups were concerned more with the ministerial roles involved, and the Liturgical Committee found itself concentrating on the congregational aspect. Among its suggestions were:

1. That approval for use of the service by the PCC or relevant Church Council be necessary.
2. That on two or three occasions in the year the two congregations should meet for a social gathering and worship—not always at the primary assembly's place of worship.
3. Should there be some guidance to encourage the two celebrations to be on the same day, i.e. in dynamic relationship?
4. Might the relationship between 'host' and 'recipient' church be reciprocal? i.e. Should a mother church receive communion by extension just as the daughter church does? Otherwise this kind of service could exaggerate the unequal relation between some churches. (Practical problems have since made this suggestion difficult to envisage happening.)

Gordon Jeanes, Secretary, Durham Diocesan Liturgical Committee

Book Reviews

Virgil Funk (ed.) *Children, Liturgy and Music: Pastoral Music in Practice 2* (The Pastoral Press, 1990, 130pp., £7.50, imported by Columba Press, Dublin).

The aim of this publication is to help Roman Catholic parishes realize in fuller measure the implications of the 1973 Directory for Masses with Children. 15 articles, all of which had been previously published in the Catholic journal *Pastoral Music*, have been brought together and address the issues of the role of children in ritual and of how to help them express their faith in song.

Taken as a whole the articles cover quite a lot of ground. The initial two articles are introductory and address the primary questions of what it means both to participate in the liturgy and to be an assembly that is truly alive (all that a traditional 8.00 a.m. Communion isn't according to the answers given!). The next section of essays tackles basic issues of involving children in liturgical celebrations (the primary point of reference here of course is the Mass) and then the volume has two final sections on the role of children's choirs and music education for children in school (Catholic) and parish.

COMMUNION BY EXTENSION

The Diocesan report below (from 'Eds and Ips') includes reference to 'extended communion'. In broad terms this issue has lurked around the liturgical corners of the Church of England (and of Anglican Churches around the world) for many years. It is perhaps worth airing some of the pressures which have brought it to the surface.

1. Sixty years ago anglo-catholics were marching and counter-marching over the issue as to whether each each priest, *qua* priest, had the 'right' to use permanent reservation. Clearly, behind the 'front' put up of the needs of the sick there was the desire for extra-liturgical devotions to or towards (or before?) the consecrated wafer. Evangelicals were correspondingly antipathetic, viewing such uses as fuelling superstition.
2. In the post-Vatican 11 years, the Roman profile of extra-liturgical devotions grew less and less, and anglo-catholics seemed to be less threatening to others accordingly. Others were themselves having to handle issues about communion of the sick in any case. Some evangelicals in the 1970s were found to be in favour of extended communion for these purposes.
3. The General Synod finally authorized services for use with the sick in 1983, and for the first time there was official provision for 'extension' (the terms 'extended' and 'extension' were excluded at the time, but have since returned in force).
4. During the 1980s there was a growing interest in the use of extension to provide communion from one place of worship to another (which thus went beyond the needs of the sick), or from one time of worship to another time in the same building. The rising numbers of deaconesses (from 1987 of women deacons) helped fuel this interest. Many unofficial efforts arose—and, for instance, erstwhile Carlisle regulations are printed at the back of Grove Worship Series no. 96, *Extended Communion—An Experiment in Cumbria*, by David Smethurst.
5. At some point in the late '80s, the House of Bishops produced guidelines for itself. These have not yet been made public, but apparently included an agreement by the bishops not to go beyond the ministering of communion to the sick in the kinds of provision they would allow. Bishops nowadays make their own regulations, conforming them broadly to these hidden guidelines. Large numbers in the country are ignorant (sometimes deliberately) of either their own diocesan's regulations, or of the hidden House of Bishops guidelines.
6. Thus considerable liturgical material exists of an unofficial, and sometimes actually prohibited, sort. Phillip Tovey (of 10 Hardwick Park, Banbury) collects such material on behalf of the Group for Renewal of Worship, and readers are invited to send samples (and especially collector's items) to him.

Meanwhile, Gordon Jeanes, the secretary of the Durham diocesan liturgical committee, has sent us a text (with his own comments) which his committee has produced. It is only a draft. It has no standing in the diocese of Durham or elsewhere. But it is printed for interest.

DRAFT FORM OF EXTENDED COMMUNION

NOTE: *While the form of service is based on that of the Order for Holy Communion Rite A, it must be made clear that the service is not a celebration of the Holy Communion. The minister leading the service should not do so from the holy table, (nor if possible from the place used normally by the president at a celebration of the Holy Communion).*

FORM OF SERVICE

The consecrated elements are reverently brought to the holy table. A hymn may be sung. The the minister says:

The Church of God gathered in . . . have taken bread and wine and given thanks over them according to our Lord's command. I bring from the Eucharist at . . . these holy gifts that we/you may share in the communion of his body and blood. We who are many are one body, as we the people of . . . join our worship with theirs, and all share in the one bread.

The Lord is here.

His Spirit is with us.

The Service is conducted according to Note 24 A Service without Communion (ASB p.118) as far as section 28, and continues to section 30 (the Peace).

A hymn may be sung.

A member of the congregation reads one of the following readings.

Luke 24, 30-34, John 6.53-58, 1 Cor. 11.23-29, Rev. 19.6-9b
(ending . . . of the Lamb.)

The minister says the following collect:

Almighty and heavenly Father,
we thank you that in this wonderful sacrament
you have given us the memorial
of the passion of your Son Jesus Christ.
Grant us so to reverence
the sacred mysteries of his body and blood,
that we may know within ourselves
and show forth in our lives the fruits of his redemption;
who is alive and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and for ever. **Amen.**

Ps 116.11-13, 16-18 may be said:

How shall I repay the Lord: for all his benefits to me?

I will take up the cup of salvation; and call upon the name of the Lord.

I will pay my vows to the Lord: in the presence of all his people.

I will offer you a sacrifice of thanksgiving; and call upon the name of the Lord.

I will pay my vows to the Lord: in the presence of all his people,

in the courts of the house of the Lord; even in your midst O Jerusalem. Praise the Lord.

Silence may be kept.

The Lord's Prayer is said (section 42).

(The minister does not break the consecrated bread, and section 43 is not said.)

The anthems, Lamb of God, . . . or Jesus, Lamb of God, . . . (section 44) may be said.

The minister approaches the holy table and invites the people to communion (section 45).

Any consecrated bread and wine which remains after the distribution is consumed or reserved for purposes of communion.

After Communion, the service continues as in sections 50-53. There is no Blessing (section 54).

The offerings of the people may be collected and presented. The following words are used:

Either:

Lord Jesus Christ, you emptied yourself, taking the form of a servant.

Through your love, make us servants of one another.

Lord Jesus Christ, for our sake you became poor.

May our lives and gifts enrich the life of your world.

or:

The free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

By his mercy we present our whole lives to God as a living sacrifice.

Though many, we form one body in Christ.

We belong to one another.

By God's grace we have different gifts.

We will use them in faith.

Rejoice in hope, stand firm in trouble, be constant in prayer.

Filled with his Spirit we will serve the Lord.

The minister and people depart.

FORM OF SERVICE AT THE CHURCH WHERE THE EUCHARIST HAPPENS

The secondary assembly should be remembered in prayer at the eucharistic gathering of the host church. Either at the preparation of the gifts or at the start of the distribution, the president says,

We remember in love and prayer God's people at . . . who will share with us in the body and blood of Christ.

Other prayers may be said, here and/or in the intercessions.

Some personal comments on the Durham Diocesan Liturgical Committee's Draft

The service is, as it says, based on the Ante-Communion, and is not intended to resemble a Communion Service. The administration of communion is preceded by devotional material: a reading, collect, and psalm. The committee envisaged that the reading would be read by an ordinary member of the congregation.