

## Process

Each Province should develop its own process for the liturgical commemoration of holy people. The process should include the following.

- a. A climate in the church which is hospitable to local commemorations.
- b. Recognition by bishops and other church leaders that they have a responsibility to review local commemorations and to encourage or discourage them as they appear (or do not appear) to foster devotion and holiness.
- c. Provision for dioceses to suggest the names of people commemorated locally to an appropriate body of the Province for review (e.g., a Liturgical Commission or a sub-committee of a Liturgical Commission).
- d. Provision for a body of the Province to test the acceptance of commemorations with a larger representation of the church.
- e. Provision for the governing body of the Province to adopt names to be included in the provincial calendar, to assign them to a particular proper prayers and readings.
- f. Support for the preparation and publication of accurate biographical material on those who are commemorated.
- g. A process for the regular review of provincial calendars and for the 'retiring' of names which no longer command significant attention. (This should be done by the same provincial body which receives and reviews suggested names and tests their acceptance with the church, and in the same consultative way.)
- h. A process for sharing calendar revision among the Provinces of the Communion.
- i. Commitment to protecting Sundays as the weekly commemoration of the Lord, as well as the integrity of the great feasts and seasons. (If a holy person died on Christmas Day, for instance, it may be appropriate to commemorate him/her on his/her birthday or on the date of some other significant event in his/her life.)
- j. Commitment to the commemoration of persons whose witness provides models for Christian life in the present context.

## RESOLUTION 22—Coordinator of Liturgy and International Anglican Liturgy Consultation

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council commends the work of the Revd. Paul Gibson, Coordinator of Liturgy, and endorses his continued cooperation with the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this meeting encourages the Provinces to respond positively to appeals for financial assistance to further the work of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation.

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. 218

February 1993

## Editorial

Topics for editorials usually come from snuffing the wind—that is, the matter is simply a question of what issues have been blown across my desk more than once in the month. And clearly the liturgical issue of the month is that rarest of all bits of liturgy, the Coronation Oath. It has figured in questions in General Synod, it has figured in the discussion by the Archbishop of York in the *Heart of the Matter* BBC programme, it has figured in the correspondence (and editorial) columns of *The Times* and other papers, it even got onto the agenda of the Council for Christian Unity. By sheer coincidence, I found myself on a weekend off reading Edward Carpenter's definitive biography. *Archbishop Fisher: His Life and Times*, which has a very full account of the present Queen's coronation. I have also found myself surreptitiously consulting Wickham Legg (in *Liturgy and Worship*), Eeles (on George VI's coronation), and Ratcliffe (on the Queen's one)—partly because I wanted to be sure what the text and the standing of the Coronation Oath is. Within the Coronation service in Westminster Abbey comes the 'Coronation Oath' as follows:

*'Archbishop:* Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God and the true profession of the Gospel? Will you to the utmost of your power maintain in the *United Kingdom* the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? And will you maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of *England*, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, as by law established in *England*? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of *England*, and to the Churches there committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges, as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them?

*Monarch:* All this I promise to do.'

Up until now I have turned away questions by saying that the issue is really very remote, and might not arise in earnest for another thirty years. Whilst there have been suggestions at intervals that the Queen might abdicate at some point in favour of the Prince of Wales, you do not have to see the video *Diana* (based in a spitting image way on Andrew Morton's book)—a curious experience which came my way the other day as a prelude to a Sky TV studio programme—to guess that such abdication is not a likely event of the next year or two.

However, there must remain an hypothesis that the Queen might die. I have mentioned before that Ronald Jasper arrived once at a Liturgical Commission meeting saying 'I have just come from planning the Queen's funeral'. I mention this not because I have very much clue as to what is in that hypothetical rite, but because it illustrates that the Palace itself must at intervals entertain the hypothesis and take measures to anticipate it.

Once the hypothesis is up and running, something else follows closely on its heels—that, *unless prior steps are taken*, the Prince of Wales succeeds *automatically* to not only the throne but also the Supreme Governorship of the Church of England. Let there be no doubt about this: the role is not conferred upon a new monarch by press, Parliament or prelate—it is *inherited*. In the scenario we envisage here the role would exist from the moment the new monarch succeeded. That does not mean that the Oath itself might not be renegotiated, but the time would be short. As I have been reading in Edward Carpenter's biography of Geoffrey Fisher, it is clear there (in a very well researched chapter) that the hairline decisions which had to be taken at almost no notice to provide the Coronation service fifteen months from the point of succession were numerous, were at intervals to be made by somewhat indeterminate authority, and were at points then made on too conservative a basis.

I could not help noticing in the above-mentioned Sky TV programme that the Archdeacon of York, whilst stating that he had always been a strong supporter of the establishment, was very doubtful as to whether (on well known grounds) he wanted the present heir to the throne as the supreme governor of the Church of England. That would suggest that the senior appointments report (which Synod was debating this month) has got it completely wrong—it was concerned with getting the substance of power into the hands of churchly bodies, away from 10 Downing Street, *but retaining a cosmetic role for the monarch*. Yet now it is the very cosmetic role which is under question.

So perhaps some work needs to be done urgently upon the actual implications of the supreme governorship—and therefore of the Coronation—before the issue becomes immediate . . .

Colin Buchanan

### GENERAL SYNOD FEBRUARY 1993

General Synod met from 14 to 16 February in London, its last scheduled February group of sessions, as in 1994 it begins a routine of meeting twice a year only. There was one major theme not on its agenda which was nevertheless near the surface in many minds—a theme which led to accusations of a 'walk-out' when a sectional meeting was fixed for during synod time, and there were absentees from the floor attending it. (And it is possible that it was tension on *that* front which brought on an extra edge to questions about theological training, though the subject was already fraught . . .)

We had the first round ('General Consideration') with *The Service of the Word*, brilliantly introduced by Trevor Lloyd, with strong emphasis upon the need for local adaptation of the liturgy, and yet a concern for an overall framework, and (which was basic to the material) bringing informal and 'family' services within the frame of official services. A fair debate followed, memorable as much for a protest from one traditionalist who did not wish to be greeted at the beginning as for positive principles enunciated or horror stories told. The text (printed in NOL in December) now goes to its Revision Committee, and will initiate the first use of the standing orders for liturgical business for over ten years, and the first use of the actual standing orders themselves as they were revised during those ten years and have been awaiting a guinea-pig rite.

Similarly, the word 'canonized' should not be used as though it implied human knowledge of divine judgment. There is, in fact, no compelling reason for Anglicans to appropriate the term, although it has been proposed in at least one province. A process of recognition after the cult has begun and historical statements have been attested will be valuable and may be called 'canonization', but the term should not be used as though people become saints as a result of such a process; they become saints, if at all, through holiness of life and witness to the gospel.

- h. While commemorations begin at the local level, among those who knew and remember a holy person, it is not inappropriate for them to spread more widely, especially if the style of holiness expressed in the life of a person addresses in a striking way the aspirations of a particular generation of Christians. The love and courage of some people makes an almost universal appeal as their story becomes known. In such cases the boundaries of geography and divided Christianity make little sense. It is not surprising that some Anglican calendars contain the names of people who lived in other parts of the world or belonged to other Christian Communion.
- i. Reports of extraordinary phenomena (miracles, appearances) in association with a cult are not to be equated with evidence of holiness of life and witness to the gospel. They should be treated with caution, and not encouraged among those who may wish to promote a commemoration.
- j. The following traits will be found in those who are commemorated.
  - i. **Heroic faith**, i.e., bearing witness with great generosity to Christ and the gospel. Historically, the primary model of heroic faith has been witness to death, but the term may also include persistent risk-taking as well as a life in which other values are set aside for the sake of devotion and service. True heroic faith is healthy and life-affirming; it is not masochistic or suicidal.
  - ii. **The fruit of the Spirit**. We may expect those commemorated to have exhibited in an exemplary way the fruit of the Spirit to which Paul refers in Galatians 5.22, 'love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.' Their lives may not have been perfect, but those who knew them should have been aware of this complex but unified goal within them.
  - iii. **Christian engagement**. We may expect those who are commemorated to have participated actively in the life of the Christian community and to have contributed to its sense of mission and to its life and growth.
  - iv. **Recognition by the Christian community**. The commemoration of holy people should have spontaneous roots and should grow from the testimony of those who knew them. The task of authority is to prevent the spread of inappropriate or misleading devotion, not to impose a commemoration which promotes a line of thought or boosts regional self-esteem. The larger church is not obliged to approve such recognition as local Christian communities may give to particular people; however, it should take them seriously.

person involved and testify to his/her holiness. Authority enters the process to encourage or discourage its continuation. (One of the ways in which the cult emerges is in the naming of churches and chapels after people who were known for their holiness of life, e.g., the John Keble Church in Mill Hill, London. The role of authority in such cases is to make sure that the criteria for this practice are holiness and witness and not power or wealth.)

- c. Calendars should be developed to honour and expand the thankful remembering of Christian people. They should not be developed to meet pedagogical, regional, or sectionalist goals. The names of Christian heroes and heroines, however holy, should not be imposed onto the worship of people to whom they mean nothing.
- d. A lean calendar may have more meaning and greater impact than a full calendar.
- e. A process for trimming calendars may be as important as a process for developing them.
- f. Originally, the word 'martyr' meant simply 'witness,' but it was attached at an early date to those who persevered as witnesses to the point of death and whose death was itself the ultimate act of witness. The concept of martyrdom has become more complex in the intervening centuries. Is it to be restricted to those who might have avoided death but chose to remain firm in their resolve? Does it include those who were killed for their faith without the option of escape? Are only those who were killed by persecutors who were hostile to Christianity as such to be accounted martyrs (some provinces in the Communion have so ruled), or does martyrdom include those who have suffered at the hands of other Christians, perhaps for their doctrinal position or for their engagement with social evil?

In societies which are nominally Christian it may be necessary to define martyrdom to include the killing of Christians by Christians. It is more than possible that those who were responsible, directly or indirectly, for the murder of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Oscar Romero, to name but two, were not only technically Christian (i.e., baptized) but acted on the basis of values which they misguidedly perceived to be Christian. The question is not who killed those witnesses, but whether they died for the authentic gospel.

- g. Some calendars restrict the word 'saint' to pre-Reformation figures; others do not. Anglicans should be neither intimidated nor beguiled by the technical terminology used traditionally and by Christians of other Communions in regard to the commemoration of holy people and heroes and heroines of the faith. The word 'saint' means only 'holy person' and should not be used as though it separated a loved and respected Christian from the ordinary levels of humanity. The use of the term is optional.

We had the Revision Stage of the liturgical Canons. The Revision Committee had smoothly absorbed or seen off most would-be amendments, and I noted that they had dropped the nonsense of a 'form of worship', and had removed the cassock from liturgical vesture (an error in 1964), whilst their main changes were to provide greater powers to the two Archbishops to permit experimentation 'with a view to authorization' and to remove the necessity of robing to read Morning and Evening Prayer from Monday to Saturday. I persevered with two amendments of my own—one to remove the absolute necessity of wearing liturgical vesture from Sundays also, and the other to simplify (and make realistic) the provision for where Morning and Evening Prayer are said. Although the Revision Committee had gone to a tie on the first issue when I appeared before them in October, I now failed to raise the necessary 40 supporters to enable the debate to continue in Synod. On the second issue I failed to raise *any* supporters . . . However, the only other would-be amender, David Butterfield, wanting vesture for the president of the eucharist to be used 'normally' (instead of invariably), went near to getting a majority. So the Revision Committee came out unscathed.

I slipped in a question to the Bishop of Winchester at question-time, concerning the Toronto statement, and when its signatories would report to the Church of England. Whilst his reply was typically stalling, he did kindly cite the Cape Town resolutions (see pages 8-12 below) and, in a reply to a supplementary, did hint that Toronto might yet get referred to the dioceses.

#### IN MEMORIAM—ERIC MASCALL

Eric Mascall died in mid-February at the age of 87. He was one of the last of a great crowd of anglo-catholic scholars (Gregory Dix was only two years old than he), and he was a benediction to know. I do not suppose I would in fact have known him had he not been one of the four who wrote *Growing into Union* in the days of the old Anglican-Methodist scheme. As it was, he, with Graham Leonard and Jim Packer, enriched my Autumn in 1969 in a way I shall never forget. He was a man of utmost modesty and humility, and by nature's rules he ought to have been a wonderful grandfather (in fact he was a bachelor).

He did not view himself as a liturgist, though he wrote extensively on the eucharist (of Arthur Couratin he said to me 'He was obsessed with second century *words* rather than with meanings'). I recall him complaining that, when he wanted to teach second year students at King's about the eucharist, he found that their first year New Testament lecturers had convinced them either that the Last Supper had never happened, or, if it had, nothing had happened at it! In the writing of our book, he was accused (by his friends) of having changed his mind in his mid-sixties: 'Even an amoeba changes' he replied 'and I count myself a higher form of life than an amoeba.' I had not seen him since 1972, but I miss him—the Church of England is emptier without him. He was cast in a rare mould of God's.

COB

## Book Reviews

Colin Buchanan, *Infant Baptism in the Church of England: A guide to the official position of the Church in its formularies* (Grove Books Ltd., 17pp. 1992. £1.25)

The C. of E. is indebted to Colin Buchanan's series of booklets on the theology and practice of baptism which started with *Baptismal Discipline* in 1972. This little booklet is different. It consists almost entirely of the texts of relevant Canons and excerpts from the ASB rites of Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child and of Infant Baptism. On the facing page in each case is some simple commentary. The aim is to show that the Church does not offer baptism automatically and without conditions. On the contrary 'baptism is in principle to be administered in families where the gospel is being received, and those receiving it are being truly incorporated into the life of the church.' Quite right too!

We get Canons B21 and 22 but the footnotes on page 4 are chaotic. I think the note marked 1 refers to 2 in the text, and note 2 refers to Canon B22. (There are several other typographical errors, and my book should be dated 1987 on p.16). We also get Canon B23, but should have B26 as well which speaks of the obligation on ministers to instruct children and young people and on parents to 'take care that their children receive such instruction'. (The full Canons are provided in my *Believing in Baptism* ch. 9).

There is a page on Appeals and Grievances. This startlingly omits the widespread grievance of faithful church members who are embarrassed and offended by apparently indiscriminate baptism of infants, often at private services and with minimal or no instruction. To whom can they appeal?—the bishop, of course!

There are brief references to Lima, Lambeth and Toronto statements but no mention of the important Discussion Paper by Martin Reardon *Christian Initiation—a policy for the C. of E.* (1991).

Who is it for? It is good for ordinands, clergy and PCCs to know the relevant *Canons*, but the services are in the ASB. If it could be used for discussion groups in PCCs and Deanery synods—great! If only we observed our Canons with pastoral sensitivity, there would be a clearer understanding of gospel and faith sharing in England. Reardon concluded 'Christian initiation matters to the whole congregation. It is far too important to be left to the vicar to arrange privately with the family' (para. 138).

Gordon Kuhrt

[our reviewer is quite right about the transposition of footnotes on page 4—our apologies. COB]

Peter Jeffery, *A New Commandment: Toward a Renewed Rite for the Washing of Feet* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1992—imported by Columba Book Service, Dublin, 80pp., £3.99)

There is a draft liturgical text in this book. But the book has been written centrally on behalf of the liberation of women. What connexion has that with foot-washing on Maundy Thursday? By accident of Roman Catholic history women have been *banned from receiving the washing of feet*. As one can imagine, the arguments for change are overwhelming. The astonishing thing is the need to mount an embattled campaign at all . . .

COB

## RESOLUTION 18—Christian Initiation

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC, urges the Provinces and member Churches of the Anglican Communion to study and reflect on 'Walk in Newness of Life,' the statement on initiation of the 1991 International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, with a view to further discussion of the issues it has raised at a future meeting of the Primates and the ACC.

## RESOLUTION 19—Filioque Clause

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC, urges the provinces and member Churches of the Anglican Communion to respond to the requests of the 1978 and 1988 Lambeth Conferences, ACC-4 and ACC-8, that, in the words of Lambeth 1988, 'in future liturgical revisions the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed be printed without the filioque clause', and to inform the Office of the Anglican Communion of their action.

## RESOLUTION 20—Translation of Study Documents

RESOLVED, that this joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC, welcomes the provision made in the budget for translation of documents distributed for study into the languages of the Communion and requests the Secretary General to explore ways in which translation may be encouraged.

## RESOLUTION 21—Calendar Revision

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC, adopts the following principles, criteria, and process for the recognition of men and women who have lived godly lives by including them in the calendars of the Churches for remembrance, having in mind that the revision of calendars is an on-going process which is one of the ways in which the church holds the Christian hope before the people of God, to enable their growth as a holy temple in the Lord (Eph. 2.21).

## Principles and Criteria

The following principles and criteria are suggested:

- a. The commemoration of holy people is always an act of *anamnesis*. We remember not only the person's historical events but the power of grace in their lives and consequently of, 'Christ in us the hope of glory.' A calendar is an instrument for worship, just as much as a eucharistic prayer. We may learn from both, but we use them primarily for worship.
- b. In worship, the practice of devotion (cult) precedes law. Law exists to protect cult from deformity, not to shape it. The first step in a process of commemoration is the spontaneous devotion of people who knew the

**RESOLUTIONS FROM THE JOINT MEETING OF  
THE PRIMATES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND THE  
ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL JANUARY 1993**

[The joint meeting in Cape Town issued a major set of Resolutions of which the following affect liturgy and liturgical life. At some points the text appears somewhat unedited.]

**RESOLUTION 15—Revised Common Lectionary**

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC:

Welcomes the publication of the Revised Common Lectionary (1992), which is now offered for use throughout the world, as a notable way forward in ecumenical liturgical cooperation, and

Commends it to the Provinces and member Churches of the Anglican Communion for study, testing, and consideration of its use, and for evaluation to be reported to the Coordinator for Liturgy.

**RESOLUTION 16—Advisory Body on Prayer Books**

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC, in reference to Resolution 18 of the Lambeth Conference 1988 (requesting the appointment of an Advisory Body on Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion), endorses the general recommendation made in the Report of the Coordinator for Liturgy and in particular the recommendation that the various Conferences, Councils, and Provinces of the Anglican Communion recognize and use these Consultations as the appropriate channels through which liturgical issues can be discussed and liturgical norms discerned; and

Requests the Coordinator for Liturgy to facilitate work in this area.

**RESOLUTION 17—Liturgical Revision**

RESOLVED, that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the ACC recognizes the need for clear educational materials to facilitate [the task<sup>1</sup>] described by Resolution 18 of the Lambeth Conference and section 3.2 of Appendix A of the Report of the Coordinator for Liturgy ('An Advisory Body on Prayer Book Revision: A Statement on Behalf of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation'), viz

the public reading the Scriptures in a language understood by the people and instruction established on them;

the use of the two dominical sacraments (baptism with water on the threefold Name and Holy Communion with bread and wine in intentional obedience to our Lord's command);

episcopal ordination to each of the three orders by prayer with the laying-on of hands;

the public recitation and teaching of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds;

and the the use of other liturgical expressions of unity in faith and life which nurture the people of God and reflect awareness of ecumenical liturgical developments.

<sup>1</sup> [Clearly some such words have to be supplied in the text released—COB].

Peter Hobson, *A Voice in the City: Worship For Urban People* (CPAS/SU, 1993, 96pp. £5.95)

Peter Hobson has spent all of his ministry in the inner city and has been particularly concerned to engender suitable forms of worship in urban parishes. This book is the fruit of his thinking and practice over the last 15 years but especially out of the last ten years when he was Rector of St. Bride's, Old Trafford, a multi-ethnic UPA parish. (He is now Team Rector of Hackney Marsh).

The book is not simply a list of dos and don'ts but is firmly grounded in the realities of urban life. Therefore it begins with descriptions of life and faith in the city because worship has to be inculturated and worship in urban churches needs to reflect urban life. Anyone who wishes to find quick insights into what it is like to live in the inner city should read the first three chapters of this book; better still they should go and live there!

Topics covered include church buildings (St. Bride's built a new one while Pete was the Rector), politics, hurt and healing, charismatic gifts, language, race, children and evangelism. All these and more are issues which St. Bride's has had to face in the last few years. In facing them, they have tried hard to ensure that their worship reflects their wrestling with such issues. This book takes you through some of that thinking.

When I first read this book, I half wondered if it should be subtitled 'St. Bride's did it my way'. However, this is a church I know well and I know that their developments in worship and church life have come through consensus and discussion, and not because Pete has imposed things on them. Nonetheless, this is, in many ways, a very personal and local book. The reader will quickly see that St. Bride's belongs to the evangelical/charismatic wing of the Church. Yet it would be a pity if those of other persuasions did not read this book and engage with it. For the same reason churches in the countryside and the suburbs should read it too.

I found myself agreeing with almost everything Pete had to say. The presentation of the book includes suitable quotes and case studies as well as think spots so that the book could be used as a discussion aid in worship committees, PCC's etc. I was, however, surprised that Pete engages with questions of race and age in worship but not with questions of gender. I am all the more surprised since I know that St. Bride's has faced gender issues not just in terms of women leading worship but also in terms of inclusive language. That these issues are missing from this book I find quite surprising. (Similarly, there is no mention of worship and gay/lesbian people).

This is a book which I wholeheartedly commend for individual and group study in all sorts of parishes. It deserves a wide circulation but more than that, the issues it raises need to be addressed by all congregations.

Charles Read

## THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION AND THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

We continue our pirating of the document we began last month.

### PBS SUBMISSION

- 2 We appreciate the intention of the Commission to look for a modern liturgical language that is less 'flat' than some (but not all) of that in the *Alternative Service Book*. The success of such attempts will have to be judged by their results, but the Commission will have to be aware of two dangers:
  - (i) Fine writing is not as a rule achieved by trying to write finely, but by saying what you want to say in a plain and heartfelt manner.
  - (ii) In modern conditions, the language people use to express strong convictions is often charged with a particular ideology which is not universally shared. To pray for those 'who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness or any other adversity' can be done in any time or place. To pray for 'the unemployed and the marginalized' invites one to share a particular socio-political perspective.

### COMMISSION RESPONSE

- 2 The Commission is aware of the difficulty of writing good liturgical words, especially in our own age of informality, where the whole style of public communication has changed. But, just as the writer or poet struggles to find the right rhythms and images to express truth, so the liturgist, while seeking to say what he or she intends in a plain and heartfelt manner, needs to work away at finding the very best way to give expression to the Church's worship.

We share the view that it is easy to take on board too much of current ideological fashions. We need to be wary of enshrining these in liturgical texts. The broad sweep of the Prayer Book's approach to intercession can be very refreshing after the particularity of some modern styles. But there is, of course, the opposite danger that the broad sweep is not earthed in the realities of daily life. There is also more evidence of particular ideology in the Prayer Book than the submission concedes. A very definite line is taken on, for instance, the nature of temporal authority.

### This month's booklets . . .

are Evangelism Series no. 21, *Demolishing Strongholds*, by Andii Bowsher, and Spirituality Series no. 44, *Praying the Psalms*, by John Goldingay.

### . . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 53, *Women in Ministry*, by June Whitfield, Sue Rose and Helen Chantrey.

### . . . and liturgical titles?

These look difficult to come by: the one by John LeMarchand due in January has not yet surfaced, and there was no Alcuin/GROW Joint Study due in March. However, in April the next Worship booklet (by COB) will be accompanied by the next Ethical Study—and it is no. 89, *Ethics and Liturgy* by Oliver O'Donovan, the edited form of the lecture he gave a year ago at the Grove Books twentieth birthday party.

### . . . and a Conference on John Cosin

is to be held appropriately in Durham, from 2 to 4 July. Details from Margot Johnson, 37 Hallgarth Street, Durham DH1 3AT.

## Correspondence

Dear Colin,

Michael Saward really cannot be allowed to get away with such hypocritical self-justification. (NOL 217 January 1993) He admits that he was part of *Jubilate Hymns* who sought to share in publisher's profits. The publication of *Hymns for Today's Church* was a high watermark in the annals of copyright hypocrisy. Some of the church's best loved hymns, by Wesley, Newton, Bianco da Siena, Watts etc., were subjected to the odd change and put into 'you' and 'your' language instead of 'thee' and 'thou' and *then they were copyrighted by Jubilate Hymns!* Didn't Michael Saward notice the 'theft, pirating and alteration' in those instances? I suppose a double standard operated; you can pinch hymns from the dead who can't answer back or sue you, but don't you dare touch my creations.

To Peter Mullins I would advise that he assume that 'use on a single occasion provisions' are generously given by the enlightened, and home produce accordingly.

Yours sincerely,  
Ian Cooper

Dear Colin

The proof of the liturgical pudding is in the eating. I would therefore like to encourage NOL readers to try *Celebrating Common Prayer*. (I speak metaphorically, you understand). Mowbrays tell me that currently the book has sold 10,000 copies and is now in its third printing. I suppose that this either makes it a rare dish, or flavour of the month.

Yours prayerfully  
Paul Roberts

Dear Colin

I have just got round to reading the last few pages of Janaury's NOL, and find a question raised by the 'non consecratory' prayer on page 10. The third paragraph describes Jesus as human, mortal, tired and tempted as we are. Of course it would be heresy to see Jesus as other than human, and I don't, but the use of the two words, human and mortal, makes an evident distinction between their meanings—and can one really say that Jesus was mortal? I have tried the question on a few people, with resulting looks of bafflement, but no answer.

My thinking runs along the lines of: Adam and Eve created human, (but not mortal?) becoming mortal when they fell. Jesus having no original sin, and no actual sin (though of course he took ours—and God forsook him . . .) and Jesus laid his life down, and took it up again—it was not taken from him (Jn. 10); death—sacrificial, not inevitable. So was he?

Yours sincerely,  
Carol Snipe