

Nicol Blount, *The Eucharist: not a static concept* (Published by Nicol Blount, 74 Branksome Drive, Filton, Bristol BS12 7EF, 1992. 68pp. £2.95).

This short book, published by the author himself, is full of passion and energy. Nicol Blount is a man in his late sixties who has spent most of his working life with aero-engines and has clearly spent much of his devotional life enthralled by the Eucharist. His book is an attempt to bring these two worlds together by drawing every aspect of life into the giving of thanks and by seeing the sacramental bread and wine as foci for the presence of God in all things and the sacrificial giving of God through all things.

As the writer developed his thesis I found myself disagreeing with the details of his argument at almost every point. His arguments are difficult to follow with contradiction, repetition and theological naivety throughout—including a denial of the *creation out of nothing* with no awareness of the implications of such a rejection. But this is not a book to be analyzed with theological precision, it is an essay to be received within the terms of its own literary genre, that is, the reflections of, in the words of Barry Rogerson's Foreword, 'an ordinary lay member of a congregation'. Here is a person who has been nourished by the Sacrament for many, many years but who has found the theology of the liturgy crushingly narrow. The easiest response is to say that the writer has simply misunderstood not just the theology of the liturgy but the actual doctrines of which he is so critical. The more difficult response is to hear the call of a man who longs for the liturgy to help the people live the eucharistic and sacramental life to the full in every moment of their lives and in every part of their beings. The book challenged me to find ways of enabling the people who experience the Eucharist week by week to articulate the effect it has had on them (as Nicol Blount has done), and then to listen to what they are saying with the sort of sensitivity which hears the core before trying to correct the presentation.
Christopher Cocksworth

Thomas M. Finn *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria*, Message of the Fathers of the Church 5, (Michael Gazier/Liturgical Press, 1992, pp.218, £14.50 from Columba Book Service, Dublin).

This is a fine collection of texts on baptism in the Syrian traditions. It includes a number of documents that are difficult to find including the first English translation of one of the poems of Jacob of Serugh. It will be a most useful addition to Whitaker. The introduction discusses both eastern and western texts, which seems a pity in a book that is only Syrian in scope. Because a rigid division is made between East and West Syrian, the early common material, Ephrem, Odes of Solomon, become East Syrian. Also Jacob of Serugh is classified as East Syrian which seems rather odd. Indeed this makes me question the book's classification system. These two weaknesses, however, do not mar its virtue of being a most useful collection of texts.
Phillip Tovey

DIOCESAN REPORTING

We are carrying no diocesan reports this month, due to our slowness in alerting Diocesan Liturgical Committees. However, a new rota has been arranged, and there will be diocesan news from February onwards.

ISSN 0263-7170

35p

Postal Subscription for 1993 **£6.00** (by air **£8.50** or **US\$17**)

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. 217

January 1993

Editorial

I have taken the view all along that, if the right majority were reached for the ordination of women as presbyters to go ahead, then the majority could afford to be very generous to the minority as to the terms on which the latter might remain in the Church of England. In other words, whilst the legislation takes certain steps to allow differing doctrinal consciences to live alongside each other, the actual working out on the ground was bound to depend upon action by bishops and others (including the possibility of further legislation) to make the process more viable, without so constricting the ordination of the women as to make that non-viable.

Well, it becomes clear that the minority fall into several different camps. A rough categorization would look like this:

- (a) Evangelicals who oppose the appointment of women to incumbencies (as involving 'headship'), and see no way to hedge that point around if women are qualified for such appointment by ordination.
- (b) Catholics who think they will have difficulty trusting their own bishops (which is a crucial point) if he ordains women, but might just manage it.
- (c) Catholics who are sure that it will be improper to remain in visible communion with their own bishop if he ordains women, but are ready to look for other ways to remain in the Church of England.
- (d) Catholics who are sure that, once the Canon has been promulgated, the entire Church of England will have lapsed or at least will not be a safe place to remain.

It has also become clear that these divisions are not just between parishes, but often exist within them, and that at that point they can become very painful. I suspect that the minority have been all the more rocked because in their heart of hearts *they did not think it would happen*. The women deacons (who in many cases also did not think it was going to happen) have behaved with remarkable restraint, and have done little or nothing to provoke the agonies of those now squeezed. But they can afford to behave with dignity—history appears to be on their side.

The House of Bishops issued a Statement on 14 January in which they set out ways in which they would try to meet categories (b) and (c) above. They would explore the possibility of having one bishop in a diocese not ordain women; they would look at whether a bishop from a neighbouring diocese could help; they would seek a regional arrangement; and there might be reason to provide 'Provincial Episcopal Visitors', bishops, specially consecrated if necessary, to minister to particular congregations and also to represent their interests in the episcopal college.

It looks as though those in category (b) above *might* be helped this way. If the distrust of one's bishop is personal (i.e. because he has taken what is

viewed as a wrong-headed action) rather than doctrinal (that is, that he has lapsed from the faith and put his sacramental and ecclesiological actions at risk); then a more sympathetic, more trustworthy bishop, nevertheless acting under his aegis, might be of help. I suppose the issue is much more whether category (c) will be helped at all.

If it comes to the question of new bishops, then a hatful of other questions arises. The only plausible way of consecrating them is to create Suffragan sees, presumably in the archiepiscopal dioceses of Canterbury and York. This requires a submission to the Dioceses Commission, showing why the *diocese* concerned needs such an extra post to sustain its episcopal ministry. The case that the man was to be a spare bishop for the Province would be interesting, and I wonder how the Dioceses Commission would view it?

A Provincial Episcopal Visitor would have to be nominated by the diocesan of his suffragan see in the usual way, would have to be appointed as a suffragan, would have to be consecrated by the Archbishop of the Province with other bishops assisting, and would have to operate in any diocese by the invitation or permission of the diocesan. Would this meet those in category (c) above? The major point, one assumes, at which he would be able to join easily with them is that he would be an opponent of the ordination of women as presbyters. I wonder what kind of man would qualify both to be chosen and to be accepted for this sensitive role?

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD FEBRUARY 1993

General Synod meets from 16 to 18 February in London, and the agenda have just been published as we go to press. There will not be the Revision Stage of the reform of the Liturgical Canons, but there should be the General Consideration Stage of the 'Service of the Word', the whole text of which we published next month and of the 'Affirmations of Faith', which we described then. (The publication of the 'Service of the Word' materials drew from a member of the Church in Wales Commission a suggestion that we might simply import their comparable provision, published as part of the modern language offices. We set it out below.)

'AN OUTLINE FOR WORSHIP' (FROM WALES)

The text which follows comes from the section 'Ordering Worship' in the modern book.

AN OUTLINE FOR WORSHIP

This additional guidance is provided for those occasions when a special form of worship is appropriate. Careful preparation is required of the minister and all participants.

Any order should contain the following:

Penitence and declaration of divine forgiveness

Praise

The Word (*including one or more Bible readings, at least one from the New Testament, with comment*)

Intercession

Affirmation of Faith (*where appropriate*) or some other opportunity for response to the Word.

With pure prayer and abundant hope
may we leave with you those things
that are past and devote ourselves
afresh to your service.

R. Lord have mercy

Grant us to receive the Holy One
and to be hallowed by the Holy Spirit. **Amen.**

Grant us to share in the peace of Christ
through the sacrament of peace. **Amen.**

May this holy communion bring us
to new life in your kingdom
and unite us with all your Saints. **Amen.**

As our Saviour has taught us, so we pray:

Our Father in heaven ...

(From the Deacon's Proclamation Liturgy of Addai and Mari)

Michael Perham (compiler), with Trevor Lloyd, David Silk, David Stancliffe and Michael Vasey, *Enriching the Christian Year* (SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1993, xviii/238pp. hardback, £15)

This is the book which I have been mentally dubbing *Corpus Christi to Assumption*. It confirms the Commission's undeclared policy of publishing on the side that which it does not want to risk with the House of Bishops. I suppose the contributors may also draw royalties to their comfort, which the official stuff will never pay, even if the H/B does give it a tick.

The heart of the book is 'Propers' for the parts of the year and the special occasions not covered by *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* or by *Promise of His Glory*. This includes a few occasions *within* the respective periods of those two books, either filling a gap or 'enriching' an existing provision. And the book has been designed (as not all official ones have been) to provide the eucharistic prayers from Rite A in the centre pages, so that the book most often falls open at those 'bankers' whilst requiring turning to the actual occasions for the Propers.

So what do we have? Answer: Lent, Mothering Sunday, Passiontide, Eastertide, Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity Sunday, Transfiguration, Michaelmas, Dedications; then, after the break, the BVM, Apostles and Evangelists, Saints, Creation, Justice and Peace, Healing and Reconciliation, Baptism, the Word, Eucharist, and Ministry. So *Corpus Christi* is lost in 'Eucharist' and 15 August in BVM. I shall enquire little further.

There are texts for Invitation to Confession, Penitential Kyries, Intercession, Acclamations (all-purpose). Simple and Solemn Blessings, Introduction to the Peace, Eucharistic Prefaces, Words at the Breaking of the Bread, Invitation to Communion, and Prayers after Communion. There is also a range of 'Light Prayers', Canticles and Lectionary provision.

I suppose only use will tell whether it measures up to its dignified promise. I detect that the greatest problem will be in the use of its depth of responsive material (which they believe to be integral to the project). For responsive material requires a text in the congregation's hands—yet this is so self-evidently an officiant's book, and the corresponding book in the congregation's hands would have to be thinner and less lavish. Well, it might be but equally the source material might be pirated and re-arranged into purpose-built liturgies elsewhere.

Book Reviews

Scottish Episcopal Church *Communion: The Administration of Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament (when the minister is a deacon or lay person)* (General Synod of SEC, 1992, 1992).

This small booklet, a kind of ochre match to the eucharistic blue booklet, is published on behalf of the Scottish Bishops and has been in use for nearly a year. Scotland is, of course, less coy than England in giving official credence to 'reserved sacrament'—for this has, we understand, been an uncontested feature of Pisky life since the eighteenth century.

The provision is short and uncomplicated, The consecrated elements are put in an aumbry or on a credence table; the Service of the Word is conducted; and then the elements are prepared. The minister stands 'at the altar' and says:

'We remember in prayer those who celebrated the eucharist at . . .'
(*here naming the congregation and the service at which the elements were consecrated*), 'with whom we now share in communion through this consecrated bread and wine.'

There is then a choice of one out of three 'thanksgiving prayers', which must clearly not be viewed as consecratory, but as somehow giving a 'eucharistic' dimension to the ministry of the sacrament which it would otherwise not have. The third of these is the 'General Thanksgiving' in its 1662 form, to be used with the 1970 rite. The other two are innovatory, and we append the first here (with a view to printing the other next month). The thanksgiving concludes with the Lord's Prayer and the administration follows. The post-communion is also as usual.

God of all love
we draw near with awe and reverence
to the mystery of our Saviour's Body
and Blood.

R. Lord have mercy

May we commemorate his passion
and recall his resurrection
with pure hearts and unclouded faith.

R. Lord have mercy

For our sake he took body and soul,
human, mortal, tried and tempted as we are,
and by his preaching of the kingdom
called us to the knowledge of your truth.

R. Lord have mercy

When he had fulfilled all your mind
he was lifted up upon the cross,
and rose from the dead,
and was taken up into heaven
to be the first-fruits of our human nature,
the author and perfecter of faith.

R. Lord have mercy

Now he calls us to his table
to become partakers of his grace.

R. Lord have mercy

With a humble will and with
overflowing love may we receive
your gift of everlasting life.

R. Lord have mercy

IN MEMORIAM—CHRISTOPHER WANSLEY

We were unable last month to note the death of Christopher Wansley, who died in mid-December at the age of 82. Now we salute his memory. It would, of course, be possible to recall him as a synodical court jester. He was a cousin of Michael Ramsey, and used to refer to him as 'Cousin Michael'. It would be possible (and highly timely) to recall his constant warfare on the establishment of the Church of England. Certainly we should note his book *The Clockwork Church* (Becket Publications, Mowbray, 1978), in which chapter after chapter finds him rowing his own single-seater boat upstream against the flow of the times and often making progress at it. Off the cuff we owe to him his *New Testament Psalms*, which, despite the rather Marcionite introduction on the record, in the early 1960s pioneered the turning of New Testament passages into Psalm-like canticles (sometimes from the NEB, then recently published). His work was seminal—everybody does it now. Similarly, he pioneered the 'dry run' for infants, producing his own 'Naming and Blessing' rite in the 1960s, thus driving first the diocese of Chelmsford and then the whole Church of England to give official space to a similar rite. Family services owe him a debt too, he was in at the early stages of them.

He gave up baptizing infants in the early 1960s, and weathered various denunciations to his bishop (just as he had earlier weathered a court-case). I suspect his own impish sense of humour continually got him out of tight scrapes, and clearly his pastoral ministry led many to bless God for his presence among them (and *that* helps too when in trouble from the ungodly or the authorities . . .). There was always a likelihood of the unexpected about him, and a risk of considerable embarrassment if you allied yourself too closely to him. I was delighted when he showed up in the late 1980s in MORIB, still with the light of youthful enthusiasm in his eye.

COB

EXTENDED COMMUNION

The House of Bishops' minutes from the January meeting (reported in our editorial above) will show that the House discussed 'Extended Communion'. The kind of issue before the House is:

- (a) Should the existing Guidelines be revised to provide generally for communion being taken from one church to another, for a main service there on the same day as the first celebration?
- (b) Should there also be provision for the retention of the elements from one celebration to a later service in the same church building (thus covering the vicar's holiday period!)?
- (c) Should Guidelines be issued along with new texts? (The Liturgical Commission is working on drafts, but the Registrar of General Synod has ruled—quite correctly, in our view—that in law such provision would require full synodical process to be authorized, so that the Guidelines would then have to wait till the end of the process, rather than being issued at the beginning, if they were actually to match the texts).

Well, watch this space for the next ten years or so. (See also page 10 below).

This month's Booklet . . .

has very sadly not come to pass. We noted last month that John LeMarchand, the author of the Booklet (on liturgy for the deaf), had died in November. It has proved harder than we expected finding the text on his computer files, and so, whilst we still hope to publish it soon, the advance announcement last month was incorrect. We not only want to honour his memory—he also had far-reaching and important things to say.

. . . and next month's

is Evangelism Series no. 21, *Demolishing Strongholds: Evangelism and Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare*, by Andii Bowsher. There is also Spirituality Series no. 44. *Praying the Psalms*, by John Goldingay.

. . . and a 'New Titles' brochure

should have come with this.

. . . and a rare offer

is paperback copies of COB's *Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975* at £10.50. Send cheque with order for postfree delivery. (Hardbacks are £17.50).

EUCCHARISTIC PRAYER FOR USE WITH CHILDREN

In NOL of October 1992, we published the draft text of a eucharistic prayer leaked by the Liturgical Commission to the annual meeting of Diocesan Liturgical Committee representatives. This was picked up by the Anglican weekly journal in Australia, *Church Scene*, and their leading article on 11 December published the text under the heading 'A place for Simple Liturgy?' along with some of COB's comments. They then continued:

Dr. Charles Sherlock, of our Australian Liturgical commission, responds to the draft liturgy rather more sharply.

'I hope the English commission buries this—and deep!' he says.

He resoundingly endorses Bishop Buchanan's point that it is hardly possible to write a thanksgiving prayer for non-communicants, and adds the question 'is it worth writing any fixed forms of prayer especially designed for young children?'

But he raises more problems with the prayer itself:

What of the actual prayer provided? I am not enthusiastic here either: First, it is too long (if it is supposed to keep children's attention), and surprisingly complex (see COB's points 1-3). Second, it has some dubious theology. How can God's heart 'delight in each other's joy and feel each other's pain'? Are 'saints and angels' only 'there' in heaven? Third, it is defective in its eucharistic theology: where is the death of Christ proclaimed—the repeated emphasis on 'life' is not good enough. Would children (or adults) understand what is meant by 'he gave himself into our hands'? Whatever does 'hold before you this bread and this cup' mean? Is it really the case that Jesus is (rather than was) 'the sacrifice who brings us peace with you?'

THE SUBMISSION

We very much appreciate the willingness of the Commission to consider the sort of views that are represented by the Prayer Book Society. We believe that the opinions expressed in our submission are also shared by many who are not members of the Society but who have at heart the well being of the Church of England, and we hope that they will be considered on their merits.

1. The dominant concern of the Society is that the Book of Common Prayer and with it the Authorized Version of the Bible, should remain in the mainstream of Anglican worship, and this for three reasons:
 - (i) They provide a source of spirituality for all Christians which derives from and serves to define the Anglican tradition;
 - (ii) They are among the finest works of literature in the English language;
 - (iii) They have been powerful Christian influences in English culture, character and language.

We accept that there is a case for services and biblical translations in a more modern idiom but we do not think they will ever be able to replace the older books because:

- (a) The current state of the English language is not such as to favour the production of such masterpieces of public utterance;
- (b) the felt need to reflect the changing language of the times makes for frequent revision.

THE COMMISSION'S RESPONSE

We are grateful to the Prayer Book Society for both the tone and content of its submission. If our response seems to take issue with it, it is only in order to further a constructive debate, and to help us understand one another's minds. There is much in the submission that the Commission would wish to affirm.

The numbered paragraphs of this response correspond to those in the submission.

1. The Commission shares the view that the Book of Common Prayer and the Authorized Version of the Bible should remain in the mainstream of Anglican worship and, to the extent that this has not been so in the last generation, the Commission believes that Anglicans need to take seriously and to recover their heritage.

We do not see the process of liturgical revision continuing unabated in each succeeding generation. We should be wary of a return to a fixed form, in which new texts had no chance of acceptance and authorization, for that would prevent a natural liturgical evolution. It is only when evolution is impossible that change comes in a way that seems to deny the past and abandon the heritage. We have been living through such a change, just as Anglicans lived through a comparable change in the sixteenth century. After a period of frequent revision our forebears achieved liturgical stability. We believe that a period of comparative stability can and will emerge again.

(To be continued)

APPEALS FOR HELP

An interesting copyright question has come up by a side-wind. It has already been noticed that the American Psalter was included in *Celebrating Common Prayer*. This text has, of course, no official standing in the Church of England: it has not, like the Collins' *Liturgical Psalter* in the ASB, been approved by General Synod under the Versions of the Bible Measure: and it has not, as far as we know, been used by the Liturgical Commission in any of its official work. HOWEVER, it is much further down the inclusivization road, and it has made one or two earlier appearances in England in unofficial publications. Now that the Commission is becoming keen to do some of its best work with tradespeople at the back-door, rather than with its episcopal lords and masters at the front, is it possible that trade considerations are beginning to dominate? In other words, is it that there are no copyright charges on American texts? Certainly that is the general standing of American BCP, and it almost certainly covers the Psalter as well.

But if it *is* a vulgar back-door deal with the tradespeople, then the question of comparative and competing commercial offers may arise. To put it in bluntly back-door language, have Collins priced themselves out of the market? Is it their charges which are making the difference (after all the Commission, once it reaches the back-door, is bound to be commercially responsive)? Of course, there might be inclusivization issues (but we were reporting rumours that Frosted solutions *could* be found to them—presumably at a price also?). But the suspicion remains that free American imports have tipped the market—will cheap Psalms drive out expensive ones?

MORIB (need we spell it out?) is appealing for help in respect of future revisions of the baptismal services. Those with bright ideas are invited to write to the editor of MORIB's journal *Update*, the Rev. Stephen Corbett, St. Cuthbert's Vicarage, 85 Wolves Lane, London N22 5JD.

St. John's College, Nottingham, are still seeking a lecturer in Worship, but applications close on 8 February, which may be tight by the time you get this. (A tip: if you want to FAX St. John's, you can use the Grove Books FAX number, 0602 220134—Big Brother borrows it, not having one of his own.) Incidentally, we congratulate the outgoing lecturer, Jane Sinclair, on her appointment as Canon Precentor of Sheffield Cathedral.

THE COMMISSION AND THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

There is just being published a document entitled *An Exchange of Views between the Prayer Book Society and the Liturgical Commission* (GS Misc 407, obtainable from Church House Bookshop, Great Smith Street, London SW1P). Lacking other Commission contributions to NOL, we venture to pirate this production. The original 'Submission' has an introduction and twelve paragraphs. We publish here on the facing page the introduction and the first paragraph; also we print the corresponding 'Response' of the Commission.

Finally, much of the language is still adult: 'blessed is he', 'sacrifice', 'feast in your kingdom' etc. And this I think is the real issue. Are our present thanksgiving prayers sufficiently clear and direct for adults? And which adults—regulars or visitors? Should we retain rich biblical imagery, trusting that in time it will do its own work of deepening faith?

What is the real issue here? It seems to me that it concerns our attitude to 'fringe' people, now that holy communion has displaced morning prayer as the commonest main Sunday service. Is this thanksgiving prayer symptomatic of a church caught 'between the times'? We still think of liturgy as a 'public' event, open to all—baptized or not. Yet we are increasingly living as 'closed' congregations, as in pre-Constantinian times, having eucharistic liturgy at our heart. That it seems to me is the real issue. But we ought not place the burden of this problem on children!

If one is in nit-picking mood, it can also be asked why, having declared 'Jesus gave us the Holy Spirit' one moment, the president prays 'As we rejoice in his gifts, send us your Holy Spirit . . .' in the next.

But [*Church Scene* continues] we have not published this draft liturgy in order to knock it down. In fact, it is not for its intended use with (non-communicant?) children that we draw attention to it.

Let us suggest a few reasons why it—or something broadly like it—may have a place in our eucharistic smorgasbord one day.

1. Those of us with children who have been admitted to communion (before or after confirmation) must face the fact that eucharistic rites such as AAPB's second range options, contain a bewildering cacophony of biblical imagery which will keep even a mature, well-informed Christian adult thinking quickly, if he or she does not move into auto-pilot.

Few teenagers or recent converts will have the background of biblical knowledge to understand what is being prayed for them.

This is not to suggest, for a moment, that there is no hope that this biblical formation will be developed, but we don't usually expect babes or toddlers to accept roast beef as their normal diet.

The barriers to new converts finding a confident place in our fellowship are too great, need to be recognized, and cry out for reduction where that can be achieved. Particularly for recent converts, there is a whole culture of hymnody to confront, which can be even more daunting than our liturgical culture.

2. More than any of the authorized rites in use in Australia at the moment, this draft liturgy provides for repeated congregational contribution and response. This can be most helpful, particularly in a chaotic family service with crying babies and restless toddlers making a lot of listening difficult.

3. The English Commission may have conceived this liturgy for its use with children. It may be that we do better to set that intention aside completely, and consider this rite on its own merits, both as to its approach and also its content.

Gerald Davis

Correspondence

Dear Colin,

I am seriously worried that NOL is showing signs of unfair criticism of *Celebrating Common Prayer*. In NOL 215 November 1992 Charles Read thought the book disappointing from a Liturgical Historian's point of view. In NOL 216 December 1992 an Evangelical Clergyman finds the book too complicated and in the same issue A Jaded Reviewer repents that in his earlier review he omitted to list the contents of the book and repeats his misgivings about it. Who are these writers? Why none other than Charles Read AGAIN. Is he yet preparing a fourth critique under the title *Celebrating Common Prayer—An Ante-Nicene Biblical Christian Anathematises?*

O.K. we get the picture that Charles Read is less than delirious about the book though he grudgingly admits it's better than the meagre fare of the ASB. But should NOL use four pages over two months for character assassination? (My worry about NOL unfair treatment led me to look up the review of the book's predecessor in NOL 87, March 1982 which displayed a similar antipathy.) As to the book itself, I know that the Society of Saint Francis, in the shape of Brother Tristram in particular and the members of the Liturgical Commission have spent years of painstaking time and care to produce a daily prayerbook that is accessible, user-friendly and yet has rich resources for the Christian year. My own use of the book since its publication has led to a deep appreciation for the compilers' efforts and I would warmly commend its use unreservedly for clergy and laity alike.

But then perhaps *Celebrating Common Prayer* doesn't need me to defend it. I understand it is already into a second printing; those who pray are making their own judgment.

Yours sincerely,
Ian Cooper

Dear Colin

Greg Forster's complaint about copyright fees is very understandable at first glance but he, and other readers who might share his views need to consider the other factors involved. I had to face up to this over twenty-five years ago when my earliest hymns began to be published. Obviously my motive was to write for God's people and to God's glory. Getting paid for it wasn't initially a factor that entered my head.

But two things soon became clear. First, if no recognition of copyright, and some protection inherent within it, was adopted then anyone could cannibalise anything (and some did!). Secondly, publishers were not going to invest large capital amounts on hymnbooks if anyone was free to photocopy their material. I recall even in the early 1970's one parish that stole copyright material in large quantities, produced its own book in quantity, acknowledged nothing and paid nothing. They weren't alone! It was flagrant in its breaking of the Eighth Commandment.

The answer was proper respect for copyright and nominal fees. Jubilate Hymns were pioneers in this field. In our view we were not writing to make money but we were, we believed, entitled to share in a publisher's profit (if any) and to exercise some control over theft, pirating and alteration of our material.

I'm sorry if Greg Forster questions that stance. He might perhaps, more fairly, question those parishes, colleges, editors and others who filched material quite shamelessly for years. It saddens me that he doesn't even mention that in his letter.

Yours sincerely,
Michael Saward

FAIRY-TALE

by Peter Mullins

Once upon a time there lived an Honest Team Vicar. His home was on the sort of estate which publishers think is a far away land. His house was on the sort of substantial Vicarage which his neighbours think is palatial. From time to time a Wicked Witch would visit the Honest Team Vicar and try to persuade him to cheat the Noble Copyright Holders. But the Honest Team Vicar would not give in.

Before I tell you about some of the adventures he had, prosaic readers may wish to have some basic information. The Honest Team Vicar's church was a modern multi-purpose hall shared with the Methodists and U.R.C. It had 58 members who between them raised a very respectable income of just over £4 per head per week. 60% of this goes on Quota. The church just about gets by on the rest. But back to the story . . .

(1) In 1991 the Honest Team Vicar organized a Lent Course on prayer for a group of local churches. He wrote to a Noble Copyright Holder and said 'Please may I reproduce something of yours on one side of A4 for up to 70 people—I will encourage those who read it to buy your book?'. The Noble Copyright Holder said 'Give me £50 first'. The Honest Team Vicar said 'Perhaps I'll try to use something else instead'. The Noble Copyright Holder said 'Alright, I'll let you do it for free this once—but remember the author needs to earn his living'. And the Wicked Witch whispered 'Actually the author was being paid an Anglican stipend just like you when he wrote that—anyway he's dead'.

(2) In 1992 the Honest Team Vicar organized a Holiday Club as outreach to local children. He telephoned a Noble Copyright Holder and 'Please may I copy up to 70 copies of an A4 worksheet of yours—I could pay you 5p a copy to cover your originating costs'. The Noble Copyright Holder said 'No, you must buy 70 copies of the whole book of worksheets'. The Honest Team Vicar was sad and told a Wonderful Diocesan Official how sad he was. The Wonderful Diocesan Official telephoned the Noble Copyright Holder and got him to change his mind. And the Wicked Witch whispered 'That's the second time you would have missed out on good material if you'd taken them at their word'.

(3) The Honest Team Vicar's church is saving up for a fourth hymn book because they would like more variety than is provided by the three they have got. Meanwhile, two or three times a year they think how nice it would be to try out a new song. So The Honest Team Vicar bought a Directory which indicates the attitude of many Noble Copyright Holders. He noticed that one time reproduction of many of these songs came at £4 or £5 plus VAT. The Team Vicar is not only honest but also good at Maths. He thought 'If this is the true value of a single printing of each of these songs, then a song book of 300 would retail at more than £1,500 a copy'. And the Wicked Witch whispered 'Why try reasoning with them—this lot don't have the first idea what it is like trying to give life to a small struggling congregation'.

(Peter M. Mullins is a Team Vicar on an estate on the edge of Scunthorpe—Ed.)