

the Area RSCM Committee and Diocesan Working Party on Church Music set up to bring *In Tune with Heaven* down to earth at the local level. We are providing the 'What can you do with new services?' slot in local 'sampler' evenings for all kinds of Church people. These 'sampler' evenings are being developed into full workshop evenings later when people's real needs are discovered as a result of these evenings. We have also expressed concern for worship in small churches and have backed the Area RSCM's initiatives.

One major need which has been apparent, particularly in our rural areas, has been the ability to handle change. We have shared in a churchwardens' training day on 'Coping with Change' and hope to develop this further. Worship in the countryside is a particular concern given their small resources and we are fortunate to have the Bishop's ACORA officer as a part of our committee.

Inevitably we have got caught up in the revision of the institution/licensing services. We hope that the emphasis on grace rather than law and duty will prevail—though looking at recent service examples, this is not to be relied on.

In our current work we have given some copies of the short *Celebrating Common Prayer* to selected parishes for use with lay people and hope to monitor reactions. Also on the stocks is a booklet on the Saints of Essex which will provide brief biographies and worship material on the lines of a local *Cloud of Witnesses*. We are also looking for any practical pamphlets on the care of altar linen as this seems to have been rather neglected in many parishes.

Despite the 'ageism' of *News of Liturgy* ['looking for younger liturgists'] older Essex liturgical man and 'gal' are in good heart. But having recognized the great liturgical formation needs of such a large diocese we wonder how long it will be before a travelling liturgical evangelist will be accepted in the parishes and proper resources will be given to this.

David C. Knight (Secretary)

[NOL is by definition *not* 'ageist'—indeed it is ageing. The 'looking for younger liturgists' was an initiative taken elsewhere, and—again by definition—it did not and could not include the editor of NOL. COB]

NON-LITURGICAL FOOTNOTE

Grove Books Limited moves this Summer from St. John's College, Nottingham to Ridley Hall, Cambridge (in pursuit of its chief employee, Mrs. Susanne Thompson, who handles all distribution and sales, and moves as her husband is appointed from the staff of one Theological College to the staff of another). Whilst 'The Grove' is the old house round which St. John's College was built in 1970, there is no plan now to change to a Cambridge name—we shall not be 'The Backs Books Ltd.' or suchlike.

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Postal Subscription for 1995 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

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

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. (01634) 851818 or 855252; Fax (01634) 573549)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

BRAMCOTE NOTTINGHAM NG9 3DS

(Tel: (0115) 943 0786 Fax: (0115) 922 0134)

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0115) 973 3292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 244

April 1995

Editorial

I want this month to tackle the recent report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry* (published for ACC and The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity by CHP and CTS, London, 1994, 13 pages, £1.95)

At a risk of wasting space, I repeat here the full title on the title page, *viz.* 'Clarifications of Certain Aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of the First Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, President Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity'. This elephantine introduction is actually very important to a booklet which may prove to have a significance far beyond its slim size. What appears to have happened is that ARCIC-2 was somewhat dismayed by the 1991 response of the Holy See to the Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of ARCIC-1, and so the second Commission decided to have a go at answering the queries raised by the uncomprehending and unsympathetic and barely polite papal evaluation of the work of ARCIC-1. If any need to refresh their memories, there has recently been published Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold (Eds.) *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (SPCK/CTS, London 1994); this has a very comprehensive range of primary and secondary documents (along with some individual essays), and it includes the slightly smoothing job done by the Roman Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales in their statement which endeavoured to maximize on the few appreciative remarks in the papal response, and it also includes George Carey's own personal comment on the response, which states that the Holy See has mistaken the methodology of ARCIC.

We can then sympathize with ARCIC-2 when, confronted by this papal brick wall, they have said to each other 'A papal wall is a papal wall, and one does not quickly bang one's head against it—for that is both painful and unsuccessful. So let us find some way round the end of the wall, even if it means changing our route a little, and then it will not matter how thick or how ineptly placed the wall may be, and we may yet get to the Promised Land.' It will be obvious that this is a very different procedure from the Archbishop of Canterbury's, which was in fact a frontal assault—unsuccessful certainly, but in principle protective of the route previously taken, and assertive of the propriety of continuing on that route. The dynamics of an inter-church Commission would not, however, readily permit of that approach for ARCIC-2. Hence the Commission embarked on *Clarifications*. They were rewarded by the much-more-accepting letter from the President of the Pontifical Council which is published at the back of the booklet.

I first learned of this when *Clarifications* was introduced to the Church of England's Council for Christian Unity on which I sit. What I learned then raised my suspicions about the way ARCIC-2 had set about this task, and

thus, irrespective of the actual clarifications conveyed, I want to issue three procedural warnings before I tackle the content. Here then are the warnings:

1. The whole Anglican world responded to the Statements of ARCIC-1 as contained in *The Final Report* (1982). The respondents (as, e.g. the Church of England, or the 1988 Lambeth Conference) have gone on record with their definitive findings. They knew nothing of the material here, and it is at least arguable that they would in some places have spoken differently if they had done. The existence of *Clarifications*, if it is worth anything, in principle puts in doubt every previous response to the Statements on Eucharist and Ministry.
2. Whilst I am sure that ARCIC-2 was deeply provoked by the Holy See's response—and was, for all I know, possibly nudged by Lambeth Palace or the ACC into providing *Clarifications* (though they never mention it)—it does appear very doubtful for a second Commission to offer what must by definition (if it is to be useful) be an authoritative gloss on ARCIC-1's Statements. I dare to opine that not everybody on ARCIC-1 would necessarily have endorsed this gloss, and, if that is true, then the *Clarifications* have a very odd standing. I concede that a 'Drafting Group' of ARCIC-1 persons was present at the ARCIC-2 meeting, but we do not know whether what we have is as they drafted it. The introduction by the two chairmen makes no reference to their role, and the whole thrust is that it is ARCIC-2 which takes responsibility for it.
3. An even more extraordinary feature of *Clarifications* is that they are specifically addressed to only one Church. Anglicans are not being addressed, and we are simply allowed to look over the Commission's shoulder as the members specifically address (and scramble round) the papal road-block. This is quite unlike ARCIC-1's approach with *Elucidations*—then criticisms and queries from all sides were addressed in explanatory statements addressed to all sides. This may have been a difficult task (and not all elucidations elucidated), but it was a rightful task and procedurally above-board. The readiness now to address purely papal problems in what is in effect a letter to the Pope should be matched, I would have thought, by a comparable letter addressed to evangelicals. And, if that were done, then the Commission would have to ensure it was speaking in harmony with itself.

If we put the three procedural points together, we find a Commission which did not make the Statements, now issuing an out-of-time quasi-authoritative gloss on them, deliberately intended for only one party's consumption. A reviewer can only say that in that case the Anglican world ought to state (and state in the hearing of Roman Catholics) that *Clarifications* has no standing, cannot be viewed as other than private opinions about *The Final Report*, and probably ought to have advertised its statusless character much more visibly. We ought to insist that all discussion of ARCIC-1 documents proceeds without reference to *Clarifications*. This imperative precedes any discussion of their content, and impels us to warn against ARCIC-2 ever doing it again—it is a matter of principle, prior to all issues of the actual material. To allow an elimination from the list of candidates in an election, after the votes have come in, is hazardous to all parties, even to those who might seem to benefit from it in the short term.

Other events and activities 'in the pipeline' include guidance concerning various ministerial roles and functions at the Eucharist, attending to the recommendations contained within *In Tune with Heaven*, advice and guidance on the planning and implementation of Services of the Word, and advising the Provost of the Cathedral on a Service for Victims of Road Accidents. Finally, the Committee is preparing the worship booklet for use at the September Clergy Conference at Swanwick, using *Celebrating Common Prayer*, and, hopefully, subject to episcopal consent, proposed new eucharistic prayers.

In Leicester, therefore, we believe there is considerable life and activity after David Silk, although much of the above is rooted in the important place liturgy has within the life of the diocese, which experienced fourteen years of that particular whingeing pom's liturgical enthusiasm.

David Jennings
(Member of the Liturgical Committee)

DIOCESAN REPORT: 4 CHELMSFORD

The role of and operation of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee is showing signs of change. We are the *Diocesan Bishop's* Liturgical Committee rather than being part of the synodical structure, but increasingly find ourselves relating to the education and training parts of the Diocesan Resource Team and other Diocesan groups. One of our greatest problems is the sheer size and variety within the second largest diocese in the country. The task of liturgical formation within the diocese has stretched us beyond our available human and time resources. Having run short courses on everything from *All Age Worship* to *Promise of His Glory* we have found it difficult to market, run and provide all the input necessary to continue this approach. All of us do this in our 'spare' time and it is often difficult to keep properly up to date. Change has been forced upon us and we are looking forward to a meeting with our Bishop for some strategic planning. How many DLCs actually meet with their Diocesan Bishop—even occasionally?

Lately we have been cooperating with Continuing Ministerial Education where they have provided the administration and finance and we have provided the planning content. We have just done a highly successful day on 'presiding' with excellent input from Geoffrey Steel of Ushaw College. As part of this day we put together some of our own revealing video material for analysis by participants. We have found that a national 'name' is suitable bait when local clergy are suspicious of local talent—even when one of our number has produced a book on the subject! Through our membership we have also had much input into our Diocesan Course in Christian Studies and Reader Training. We are hoping that the Liturgical Formation Syllabus, *At All Times and In All Places*, will provide the backbone to the liturgical aspects of this training.

Another of our concerns has been *In Tune with Heaven*, which has almost as much liturgical material as musical. We have been co-operating with

Under our new chairman, the Rev. Ian Harrison, vicar of St. Anne, Leicester, the Committee, over the past year, has engaged upon an imaginative and adventurous liturgical extravaganza entitled 'Worship Through the Ages'. Worship from past ages was undertaken, reflecting the forms, words, and, as near as possible, appropriate locations and venues. These were not theatre, but rather genuine and participatory (to a greater or lesser extent!) acts of worship. The purpose was to enable people to both experience past forms, and, furthermore, to appreciate significant liturgical change and development. Such would counteract the all-too-widespread view that liturgical change is a modern invention. This was particularly true in respect of the contrast between a Sarum (Latin) Mass on the eve of the Reformation, as it would have been celebrated in Leicester Abbey, and a simple said (English) 1552 Communion Service in a Leicestershire village. The programme was:

1. Sarum High Mass (St. Margaret, Leicester)
2. 1552 Holy Communion (St. Nicholas, South Kilworth)
3. 1662 Holy Communion (Trinity, Staunton Harold)
4. Seventeenth Century Baptist Preaching Service (Arnesby Baptist Church)
5. Eighteenth Century Evensong (St. Mary, Barkby)
6. Nineteenth Century Matins, Litany and Sermon (Holy Trinity, Ashby)
7. Nineteenth Century Anglo-Catholic High Mass (St. Saviour, Leicester)
8. Worship 2000 AD (St. James, Birstall).

The Liturgical Committee produced a booklet giving the background, context and framework of each service. Copies at £1 each, plus 30p post and packing, can be obtained from Canon Anne Horton, The Rectory, 157 Main Street, Swithland, Loughborough LE12 8TQ (cheques to 'Diocese of Leicester'). Also a video production is being prepared, each service having been recorded, and enquiries about purchase can be made to Canon Horton (01509 891163). There was great enthusiasm and support for the services, and the Committee felt that the whole programme provided an important piece of liturgical education and experience.

The Committee is also undertaking worship audits throughout the diocese. Many parishes indicated their desire for such in the Archdeacons' Visitation Questionnaire, and these are being followed up with the use of specially prepared consultants, meetings with PCCs and Worship Committees, and a flexible audit questionnaire, the latter having been piloted in two contrasting parishes.

A weekend at Launde Abbey, entitled 'Risen Indeed', was successfully undertaken for those wishing to learn more about, and experience the use of *Lent—Holy Week—Easter*. It was felt that, even after ten years, many parishes and congregations still had to experience the variety of material and forms available in *LHWE*, and that such need not be restricted to, or seen to be the prerogative of any one ecclesiastical tradition.

So to the content: and, firstly, as to the eucharist. The issues the Vatican wanted 'clarified' were (1) the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ 'which it makes sacramentally present'; (2) the application of the 'propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice' to the whole Church, including the dead; (3) the 'certitude' that Christ is 'present sacramentally and substantially' when 'under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of his Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity'; and (4) 'adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament'.

That is a hatful indeed. The Commission, as we have seen, is more keen to find a way forward than to honour the existing documents, so they come at it as follows:

On (1) they say that the unique historic sacrifice of Christ is made present. But ARCIC-1 said the memorial is 'the making effective in the present of an event in the past', and the *Elucidation* remained within that limit. Now ARCIC-2 has bust it—for we are interested not only in whether this is a repetition of Calvary (which *Clarifications* denies), but also in whether it *is* Calvary (which it asserts). We have crossed a line into the perilous territory of 'actualization'. But this is an actualization of a *death*. The question (to which Francis Clark, for instance, addressed his enquiry) is not only 'Does Christ die again in our celebrations?' but, more simply, 'Does Christ die in our celebrations?' A robust no-nonsense Anglican answer (despite Dix, Hicks, Hebert et. al.) would have to be 'no'. But how is Christ's once-for-all sacrifice 'present' without his death? And how is what was 'once-for-all' (and finished) continuously happening throughout Christian history and across the earth's surface? We remind ourselves again that all can agree with ARCIC-1 and the role of a sacrament to 'make effective in the present an event in the past'; but that is *not* 'to make present an event in the past'. ARCIC-1 stopped short of 'actualization'.

On (2) they say that, because the 1662 BCP prayed that 'we and *all thy whole Church* [ARCIC-2 italics] may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his passion', the Church of England in 1662 was engaged in requiem masses offered propitiatorily on behalf of the dead! That is not the wording they use, but it is what they must mean, and certainly what they want the Pope to think they mean. It is no doubt good to find a Commission arguing liturgical theology from liturgical texts (the failure in which was a weakness in ARCIC-1's approach), but this goes to the wildest excess of interpretative imagination. It is virtually certain that Cranmer (who in 1552 eliminated all mention of the departed from the Prayer for the Church: it was for the 'Church Militant here on earth') would normally have defined 'church' as 'the blessed company of all faithful people' without particular reference to the departed: but, whether that is so or not, any optional, post-communion, prayer of this sort can hardly be an integral interpretative feature of an otherwise unstated 'eucharistic sacrifice'; and the petition in question, even if it is (improbably) a prayer that the dead may participate in the benefits of Christ's passion, is distinctly *not* a prayer that the eucharistic sacrifice may avail for this purpose. To Cranmer a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' was, very clearly, praise and thanksgiving offered sacrificially. Only determined and perverse inventiveness could ever conclude otherwise. ARCIC-2 should have declined to go further than ARCIC-1, which, in its deliberate echoing of the

same 1662 prayer, says that the members of Christ 'entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church'. The 'entreating' is done by 'the members', not (as far as we can see) by some aspect of the eucharistic sacrifice.

On (3) the Commission defends the ARCIC-1 text fairly carefully, though it does lean even further over the brink on which that Commission trembled . . .

On (4), ARCIC-1 had discussed reservation in its *Elucidation*, and had virtually said that Anglicans were divided about the rightness of adoration. This would not do for the Vatican. ARCIC-2 could not go far beyond ARCIC-1 here, but amusingly quotes the closing rubrics of 1662 to show that the requirement of the reverent consumption of remains demonstrates the 'reverence' in which Anglicans hold the consecrated elements. What ARCIC-2 declines to mention to the Pope is that the very same rubric is the very point at which the Church of England from 1662 until within living memory forbade all reservation of consecrated elements. Surely the Vatican must know this? For this demonstration that the Church of England insists that all consecrated elements should be reverently consumed is an extraordinary way of demonstrating that Anglicans have *any* view at all about reserved elements which, by definition, could not exist under that very rubric. Furthermore the same set of closing rubrics also says that '*to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten*'. In other words, 1662 says that the bread should be (a) such that it can easily shed crumbs, and (b) such that it can hardly be reserved—which effects will '*take away all occasion of . . . superstition*'. Come on ARCIC-2, sauce for the papalists is sauce for the protestants too—and if you are to quote the 1662 closing rubrics for the Pope's benefit, quote him the lot (including not only the ones I have expounded, but also the Black Rubric, with its brutal 'the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour are . . . not here'). Leo XIII for one would not have swallowed this; nor would Gregory Dix; nor for that matter, would any one else who actually inspected 1662 seriously. However, the Pope wanted *all* Anglicans to agree to adoration of the reserved elements and ARCIC-2 cannot quite deliver that; so Cardinal Cassidy has to comment that it was the implications of diverse Anglican practice and attitudes on this issue which worried the holy See. Of course, I agree with him. It worries me a bit too . . .

I surprise myself. I was always ready to defend ARCIC-1 on the eucharist, even in its brinkmanship. But, as the letter from Cardinal Cassidy says, *Clarifications* 'have indeed thrown new light' on the issues! But if I am driven into treating this stuff as somehow integral to ARCIC-1's statements I shall find that I not only have to stand on my scholarly head in relation to the contents of 1662, but I shall also thereby be driven towards the arms of the Pope, not in ecumenism but in surrender. I would be glad if readers would write in.

And ARCIC-2 on the Ministry statement is held over till next month.
Colin Buchanan

(b) The promised extract from the Diaries of Harold Nicholson
V.E. Day 1945. The normality continued in the morning. I attended a meeting of the Institut Francais and lunched at my club. By that time things began to liven up. There was some cheering in the streets and crowds in Leicester Square. But when I had finished my luncheon, I found a very different scene. The whole of Trafalgar Square and Whitehall was packed with people. And through the cheerful, but not exuberant, crowd I pushed my way to the House of Commons. In Palace Yard I paused to recover myself, and seeing that it was approaching the hour of 3 p.m., I decided to remain there and hear Winston's broadcast which was to be relayed through loudspeakers. As Big Ben struck three, there was an extraordinary hush over the assembled multitude, and then came Winston's voice. He was short and effective, merely announcing that unconditional surrender had been signed, and naming the signatories. 'The evil-doers', he intoned, 'now lie prostrate before us.' The crowd gasped at this last phrase. 'Advance Britannia' he shouted at the end, and there followed the Last Post and God Save the King which we all sang very loud indeed. And then cheer upon cheer.

I dashed back into the House and into the Chamber, and Winston, looking coy and cheerful, came in. The House rose as a man, and yelled and yelled and waved their Order Papers. Then he started to read us the statement that he had just made on the wireless. Then he proposed that 'this house do now attend the Church of St. Margaret's, Westminster, to give humble and reverent thanks to Almighty God for deliverance from the threat of domination.'

After this I walked back through the happy but quite sober crowds to Trafalgar Square. The National Gallery was alive every stone outlined in flood-lighting, and down there was Big Ben with a grin upon its illuminated face. The statue of Nelson was picked out by searchlight, and there was the smell of distant bonfires in the air. I walked to the Temple and beyond. Looking down Fleet Street one saw the best sight of all—the dome of St. Paul's rather dim-lit, and then above it a concentration of searchlights upon the huge golden cross. So I went to bed.

That was my victory day.

DIOCESAN REPORT 3: LEICESTER

IS THERE LITURGICAL LIFE AFTER DAVID SILK?

In his enthronement sermon, the new Bishop of Ballarat referred to himself as a 'whingeing pom'. As chairman of the Leicester Diocesan Liturgical Committee, the then Archdeacon David was never a whinger, but always a liturgically enlightened and imaginative pom. Like the editor of *News of Liturgy*, we in Leicester Diocese look forward to Australian liturgical developments, knowing that such will reflect the best of Anglican tradition, and which we feel will have roots in the liturgical experience of our diocese.

VE-DAY PROVISION

[We print a bidding sent us from Durham, and also the Harold Nicholson extract. Any part of the service can be reproduced free.]

(a) Alternative Bidding: Durham Cathedral

Churchill quotation to go on inside front cover

'In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity and in peace, goodwill.'

(Winston Churchill)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION FOR THE SERVICE ON 7 MAY 1995

We welcome all of you who are present for this service dedicated to lasting peace and goodwill amongst all people.

From 1939-1945 men, women and children throughout Europe and many other parts of the world fought and suffered the horror of the Second World War. Today we remember in particular the peoples of Europe whose countries were invaded, their cities destroyed and their millions made homeless. Countless numbers were maimed physically and psychologically for life and millions died in battle, through bombing or systematic brutality. Nothing in history affected the whole population as much as that war. But under God and at great cost peace came and although there has been warfare, for the most part, peace has been sustained.

Fifty years on we who have survived and those who are too young to remember join together in thanking God for the good things which were achieved half a century ago, and we pray that, despite the wars and disturbances which still afflict our continent, peace will come to be for all of us.

Our first reason for coming to Durham Cathedral today is one of thanksgiving. Devoutly and sincerely we give thanks to God remembering those things for which we need his mercy and forgiveness. We hear God's call to find our way forward through reconciliation to peace; to rediscover that 'Swords can be beaten into ploughshares, spears into pruning hooks', and that the worst of enemies can learn to become the firmest of friends.

The fact that we have gathered here, representatives of all walks of life and of all ages, shows to all who wish to see our determination that things must never be as they were then in the dark days of the war. This morning we ask God for his blessing, not only on the nations of Europe and the world but, recognizing the part each one of us has to play, also on us as individuals. We pray that we may go back to our homes with the determination that this service and all that we have remembered here will not have been in vain.

So, we pray to our one Father . . .

CHILDREN IN COMMUNION

In my editorial last month on *On the Way*, I said I would probe a bit deeper this month on the issue of admitting baptized but unconfirmed children to communion. It will be recalled that this had been recommended by the Ely Commission in 1971 and the Knaresborough working party in 1985; it had been the subject of around a dozen diocesan synod motions in the last seven years; and it had been blocked in the General Synod in 1991 by the House of Bishops. The Bishops were left with just enough denting to make them realize they had not seen off the issue forever, and they invested hopes in two future bits of work. One was the Culham working party on the actual effects of admission of young children to communion in the (illegal) parishes where this was already done, and this working party reported in Summer 1993—indicating that the practical effects in the round hundred of parishes they had surveyed were broadly beneficial. The other place of hope was the group which has produced *On the Way*, and thus that report's treatment of this specific issue is of some consequence.

Meantime, the fourth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation had met at Toronto in August 1991, and had issued its recommendations and its statement 'Walk in Newness of Life'—documents which took exactly the opposite view from that of the majority in the House of Bishops. (This was commended for study in all Provinces by the Cape Town meeting of Primates and ACC in January 1993, but the Church of England does not seem to know who would actually insert it into our discussions and at what point and by what means. A good part of it is now in an Appendix to *On the Way*, and the whole Statement is available from Grove Books (W118) and the volume of essays, *Growing in Newness of Life*, imported from Canada by Canterbury House, is also available postfree from COB (address on back) at £7.50).

Now, however, *On the Way* has given a new mainstream thrust to the whole project. Obviously, its compilers wish to think 'integratedly'; they do not think that admission to communion is an issue out on its own. However, it looks as though this is a test case, and, depending upon the decision taken about it, the Church of England will pursue one of two or more different routes into the future of initiation, and other issues will have to try to fit around that determinative step. So what says *On the Way* about it?

In chapter 3 the report sets up the sufficiency of baptism for sacramental initiation, and rightly pooh-poohs the 'Mason-Dix' line that a large part of the weight of sacramental initiation lies in confirmation, not in water-baptism at all. It traces the historical rise of interest in confirmation which apparently put Anglicans on the wrong course from the mid-nineteenth century until 1970. It states that, within the inherited rite 'The difficulty is . . . the over-concentration of too much theology on one moment in the process'. (This is a kind of debating point made over against the slogan 'a rite in search of a theology', but it has the happy effect of inviting us to strip away from the rite some of its over-stated theologies, and surprisingly delivers us to the same point as we reach if we decide that the rite has no theology anyway!). On the next page (p.68) the report also helpfully dis-cards any notion that we should be 'reintegrating' some supposed

fragmented rite of initiation; for that quest prejudices all sorts of issues incorrectly.

In chapter 5 the issue comes to a head. We are told (slightly surprisingly) that the 1991 debate appears to have established *three* patterns of beginnings in the Christian life for the Church of England. The third of these is 'admission of the baptized to communion with confirmation coming later as the gateway to Christian adulthood'. Without investigating *how* 1991 established such a pattern, we ought to welcome it, and run with it. The issue to-day in the Church of England is much more how two (or just conceivably three) patterns can run alongside each other, rather than which one is ultimately 'right'. But it is the conviction of not a few that this pattern will in fact drive out the baptism-confirmation-communion order . . .

Then in chapter 7 comes the heroic statement of 'five aspects of Christian initiation . . . which have come to be focused on confirmation'—*none* of which is admission to communion! That has simply disappeared *sotto voce* . . .

TWENTY YEARS OF NOL—A QUICK SURVEY OF THE 'NEWS'

[We continue our recap]

1987: Jan—General Synod is to debate 'Adaptations to Rite B' in February; Feb—Absurd report of John MacQuarrie on Reconciliation of a Penitent published (it appears no-one told him *why* he was being asked to write it . . .); Mar—General Synod at the end of Feb 'passed to next business' when faced with Rite B; Apr—Archbishops issue guidance re AIDS and the cup; May—correspondence about conordination; Jun—that Synod motion by the Bishop of Bath and Wells on restoring the archaic Lord's Prayer is top of the list for next month's Synod; Jul—the Bickersteth motion is amended to call for parallel columns (for the later history see my recent Grove Booklet); Aug—Second International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Northern Italy opposes the ACC proposal for an international 'Liturgical Commission' and asks for recognition in its own identity; Sep—NOL starts a monthly column by Kenneth Stevenson (noted as a 'risk' by COB); Oct—tribute to liturgical work of CSI; Nov—Synod requests the House of Bishops to introduce a rite for the Reconciliation of a Penitent (the House later declines to do so); Dec—suicide of Gary Bennett and, almost simultaneously, consecration of one Carey for B & W.

1988: Jan—first production of new Liturgical Commission, a dreadful document on *The Liturgical Ministry of Deacons*; Feb—news of impending *New Zealand Prayer Book*; Mar—deaths of Geoffrey Cuming and Charles Whitaker ('in death they were not divided'); Apr—the draft Kenyan rite gets outings in England; May—report on worship at (evangelical) Caister; June—publication of Ecumenical Canons (i.e. rules, not anaphoras); Jul—obituary to Arthur Couratin; Aug—Lambeth Conference highlights; Sep (up to ten pages)—first sight of a new eucharistic prayer from the Liturgical Commission; Oct—House of Bishops reveals its own use of 1662 (almost nil); Nov—COB president of MORIB; Dec—publication of *Making Women Visible*.

CONFERENCE ON INITIATION

Rochester Diocesan Liturgical Committee are staging a conference on 'Baptism and Confirmation—Growing in Discipleship' on Saturday 6 May at Wrotham. The main speaker will be Michael Vasey, a member of the Liturgical Commission and chief drafter of *On the Way*. Workshops will consider 'Baptismal policy', 'Children at Communion', catechumenate issues, the meaning of confirmation, the new *Hands On* video, etc. etc. Cost £3 per head (£10 for four from the same church); bring your own sandwiches. Apply to COB's secretary at the address on page 12 below.

The conference is at Wrotham School from 10 until 3.45. The School is on the East side of the A227 just North of Borough Green (very near M25, M26 and M20), and has plenty of carparking space. From Borough Green station (around 45 minutes from Victoria) it is only a five-minute walk with a frequent train service. No need to book in advance to come.

MARRIAGE ACT 1994

The new Marriage Act came into force on 1 April in England and Wales. It permits registrars to solemnize marriages on various kinds of premises, as, e.g., in hotel lounges or other attractive surrounds. It has no direct effect on church weddings, save that many of the 'frills' which Register Offices could not offer are now available in the secular sphere, and that might affect the level of demand.

LITURGICAL COMMISSION CONFERENCE

The Commission has more or less let it be known that it is holding a residential conference for Diocesan Liturgical Committees at Selwyn College, Cambridge, from Monday 25 to Wednesday 27 September this year. Information so far suggests that numbers will be limited, and DLCs will be informed soon as to how many may go.

This Month's Publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 132, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, by John Leach (the author of *Liturgy and Liberty*, a few years back). This is the first Grove Booklet by John Leach, who has been a member of GROW for some years. He explores here appropriate styles for using differing kinds of church music in contemporary worship.

Some book news

Church House Publishing announce that *Patterns for Worship* (i.e., those parts which are simply 'commended' by the House of Bishops and do not need authorizing) will be published on 29 June.

The oddities available from COB (at editorial address, not Nottingham) include that elusive Lit. Stud. 44 @ £2.75, and single copies of Booklet 51, *Encountering Charismatic Worship* (1977), and of Booklet 69, *The Attractive Church* (both @ £1.95), and of COB's original and now rare collection of eucharistic liturgies, *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968* (Oxford, 1968) @ £17.50. All prices include postage within the United Kingdom.