

not have a service with renewal of ministerial commitment in the Cathedral afterwards (with some penitence suitable for Lent)?

Perhaps others could also explain why the blessing of oils should likewise be an intrinsic part of our Holy Week and Easter celebration.

I trust that this letter will prompt some correspondence on this matter.

Yours,

James Steven

NOTICE BOARD

Next Month's Publication...

...is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 35, *Daily Prayer in the Reformed Tradition*, by Diane Karay Tripp. The title itself tells us of study in an area not well charted by scholars; and the publication draws from two articles the authoress published in *Studia Liturgica* five years ago, updates the material and turns it into a single monograph. The series is enriched by this contribution from the 'reformed' tradition.

A Prayer Book for Australia sold out of the full version almost before the June issue of *NOL* was circulated, and the importers tell us further supplies are not expected till September (though you are welcome to register for one and join the queue). The smaller version is still in stock here @ £11.50 post free. This version is 493 pages instead of 850, and lacks the Calendar, Readings and Collects, the Pastoral Services (especially marriage and funerals), the Ordinal and some of the 'Supplementary Material.'

The January Conference on 'Evangelical Anglicans and Worship Beyond 2000' (being held 6-8 January 1997 and hosted and resourced by GROW) is now receiving bookings daily, and the hope is that we shall have 200 participants (and there will be room for more by negotiation). The conference also celebrates the Silver Jubilee of Grove Booklets (the first one was published on 31 December 1971, to accompany the ARCIC-1 Statement on the Eucharist published that same day). A brochure was circulated with the July *NOL*, but, if you have mislaid yours, write to Grove Books, or to COB, or to the Conference Secretary, Mrs Judith Read, St James' Rectory, Great Cheetham Street East, High Broughton, Salford M7 0UH.

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address: 173 Canterbury Street, Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA

Telephone (01634) 851818 or 855252 Fax (01634) 573549

Postal subscription for 1996 £6.50 (by air £9.00, US\$18.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 260

August 1996

EDITORIAL

At the beginning of the General Synod in York (reported on later pages) members found in their pigeon-holes two documents about admission to communion prior to confirmation, documents which we are led to expect will lead to a debate in November. There is GS1212, *Admission to Communion in Relation to Baptism and Confirmation: Report by the House of Bishops*, an 8-page direct report of the House of Bishops; and there is Misc475, *Admission to Communion in Relation to Baptism and Confirmation: Report by the House of Bishops—Background Note*, a 'Note' by the secretary-general.

The latter report is worth looking at first. It gives some history (beginning with the Knaresborough Report in 1985), and includes in the more recent parts of the history reference to the 1991 debates in General Synod, the Toronto Statement, the Culham Report (on parishes which are already practising early admission of the unconfirmed to communion), *On the Way* and the various diocesan motions—the five latest of which are published as an appendix to this 'Note.' So at last there is some record of the odd route the issue has taken through synodical history.

The actual report of the House of Bishops acknowledges the 'primacy of baptism,' makes mention of those extraordinary events recorded in Acts 8 and Acts 19 as being where the laying-on-of-hands is 'rooted.' I doubt that, and have expressed my unease throughout the House of Bishops' discussions. On the other hand the treatment of confirmation in the Church of England is modestly done, and one might almost now see the bishops as more concerned about 'relationship with the bishop' than with pneumatic benefits to the confirmand (but, someone might argue, those two concepts are not a thousand miles apart from each other; and I cheerfully reply, no, not a thousand miles...).

But the report is always gently moving to the (bold-type) paragraph 11:

The view of the House of Bishops is that the pattern set out in §9 [viz, the sequential order of baptism, confirmation, admission to communion] continues to be appropriate for the Church of England, and that it provides a setting for the support of individual Christians in their journey of faith, and that it should be regarded as the normal practice in our Church.

After that the 'neverthelesses' begin, and they lead on to the (equally bold) paragraph 15:

Holding firmly to the view expressed in §11 above, the House of Bishops nevertheless regards 'communion before confirmation' as permissible in certain circumstances. Guidelines for this are appended.

There are two pages of the 'guidelines.' These include issues of nurture; of 'the time of first receiving should be determined not so much by the child's chronological age as by his or her appreciation of the significance of the sacrament'; keeping a register; some liturgical matters; commendation to other parishes when people move; and a note that the stuff about 'appreciation' should 'not be interpreted as barring persons (including children) with learning difficulties.'

Over the page from the guidelines comes the text of Canon B15A. An acute observer might wonder how the guidelines and episcopal 'permission' in them fit into the Canon, but the House is clearly determined to act transparently in juxtaposing the Canon to the guidelines.

We await the November debate.

Colin Buchanan

THE SIX EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

There were several questions asked in Synod about the future of eucharistic prayers, whether those defeated in February, or other new ones. The chairman of the Commission gave a single pantechnicon reply as follows:

Since final approval of the six Additional Eucharistic Prayers was withheld in February, there has been opportunity for members of the Liturgical Commission to reflect on the situation and the House of Bishops had some discussion of the issues when it met in June.

As Standing Orders do not allow for any reconsideration of those precise texts in the remaining life of this Synod, new work is required leading to further synodical processes: there is no authority for liturgical use of any of the texts rejected in February. In the final approval debate, it became clear that there is an enormously wide and as yet ill-defined range of expectations which the proposed Eucharistic Prayers did not entirely meet. Among its tasks, the newly appointed Liturgical Commission has to consider the overall provision of Eucharistic Prayers, and it is in this context that the discussion about different types and styles of Eucharistic Prayer needs to take place.

First, there needs to be discussion, initially with the House of Bishops, touching on at least three questions:

- (a) Is there a readiness to allow a variety of underlying structures to Eucharistic Prayer?—the point raised by the Archdeacon of Northolt;
- (b) to what extent are Eucharistic Prayers tailored for special constituencies or occasions acceptable?; and
- (c) How many prayers should there be in total after 2000?

bury but none could be found, and I had to read the Archbishop's message. No other had been briefed, but there was a visiting bishop present—Bruce Stavert of Quebec, and he was called out from the choir stalls on the spot without warning. But on the whole the service was well organized. It lasted just under five hours, including 70 minutes of greetings, and a great many songs by four or five choirs, mostly composed by themselves, and accompanied on electronic keyboards. The preacher in the event was Eustace Kamanyire of Ruwenzori, Uganda, as the Archbishop could not come. Altogether a very happy and joyful occasion.

Yours ever

Bill Norman

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin,

I left our Maundy Thursday Eucharist asking myself the question: What connection is there between this service and the celebration of Holy Week and in particular the Easter cycle of Good Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday?

I was struck most forcibly by the liturgical and theological inappropriateness of the renewal of ministerial commitment on the Eve of the Easter cycle. I accept that it is possible to link our ministries with the self-offering of Christ revealed in the events of the Passion, but is not the Easter cycle about Christ's ministry, not ours? Surely part of the discipline of Holy Week and Easter is to turn away from ourselves and attend to the love of God revealed in the Passion, rather than our love of him? The set Gospel for Maundy Thursday evening, the foot-washing in John 13, reveals that the disciples have to learn to receive the Lord's humble and cleansing service before they start to one another. Isn't it also rather odd that the very day when we remember that the disciples deserted the Lord, and that one of them betrayed him and then committed suicide, we should be renewing our commitment to ministry in the presence of our bishop, one another and God. Is this really the day to be presenting our faithful selves to God? In the light of the above, I would suggest that any renewal of ministerial commitment on Maundy Thursday obscures the Gospel rather than making it clear.

There is a line of thought that eschews any renewal of ministerial vows within the context of the Eucharist (e.g. the Roman Catholic liturgist Chris Walsh's article 'Indigestion at the Lord's Supper' in *Liturgy*, 13.3, 1989). But if we are convinced of its value, then perhaps we could find some alternatives. What about Ascension Day, which celebrates the completion of Christ's earthly ministry, and simultaneously the sense of anticipation of the disciples as they wait for the promised Spirit to continue the ministry of Christ (which in Ephesians 4 is linked to the ascended Christ)? Or perhaps a more pragmatic solution: if, as in the case of our diocese, clergy are invited by the bishop to Lent Lectures, why

THAT ZAIRE CENTENARY SERVICE—AN AMAZING ANGLE

Canon Bill Norman, once an expatriate missionary in Uganda, having his attention drawn to our report of the text of the eucharistic prayer in the Zairean (Anglican) centenary service at the end of May, now writes in with some amazing supplementary information (which no-one would have guessed without being present on the occasion). His account runs like this:

John Clark of PWM sent the piece about the Zaire Centenary at which I was present; he had intended to be there himself, but was ill and could not arrive until the day after the main event. He thought you might be interested in one particular curious feature of the service.

At the words of consecration, the escort of the Provincial Governor who was attending the service (they were armed soldiers in khaki) were called to attention; they were ordered to present arms; and a prolonged 'General Salute' was then sounded on a bugle by an elderly soldier who had presumably been trained to do this by the Belgians long ago and had been brought along by the officer especially for this purpose, as he was far older than any of the others; they were then given the command 'order arms' and 'Stand at ease.' They were lining the main aisle at the time.

The Archbishop continued with the consecration prayer throughout this performance. I thought that was a mistake, and that it would have been better if he had paused until the interruption had ceased. Many of those present were offended by this unwanted action by the troops, and it was certainly a distraction at a high point in the service.

However, I think there are two positive points to be made about it. First it was an acknowledgment in principle (though sadly not usually carried out in practice by the corrupt and oppressive and negligent government) that Caesar owes homage to Christ. Secondly, it was an admission that whatever it is that happens at the words of consecration happens whether it is an Anglican priest or a Roman priest who utters those words; in other words it is an acceptance of the validity of Anglican order. (Not of course that we could agree that the Lord is more 'really' present after the words are said than before.)

I was present four years ago at Bunia, Zaire, when the Province was inaugurated and the Archbishop enthroned, and the same thing happened then, so I was half expecting it. I have been told that the RCs have now stopped it, and I suppose that the Archbishop could have told them not to do it if he had been warned and if he had thought. It seems (though I did not question him about it) that he simply decided to ignore it altogether.

It was not a concelebration, but as you suggest a sharing round of jobs. The 'visiting bishop' had not been detailed beforehand. I think they had hoped that an English bishop would represent the Archbishop of Canter-

To that end I proposed to the House of Bishops that they might address these questions and bring their proposals on these issues to a debate in Synod (perhaps in July 1997). To resource such a debate there would be need for preparation on a less formal level, and the Commission has it in mind, for instance, to provide an opportunity for an explanation of the issues at a fringe meeting in November.

All this requires the Synod to engage with issues of liturgical revision and I am to meet with the Policy Committee in September to explore with it the implications for Synodical processes and timetables.

Once the House of Bishops has attended to these matters the Liturgical Commission will be better placed to work on new material which I believe should be tested in trial use. There are—and this addresses Mr Bryant's point—wider powers available under a revised Canon B5a than were available for the process which came to an end in February. I would hope that, when new drafts are available, the Archbishops will agree to designate a variety of congregations and parishes for experiment.

In the meantime the draft revisions of Rites A and B which are in members' hands can proceed independently of the provision of new Eucharistic Prayers. As you will see from the Third Notice Paper the drafts of Rites A and B Revised provide for 'any authorized Eucharistic Prayer' to be used. Until 2000 that means the existing Rite A prayers; by 2000 others might have been authorized and, conversely, authority might have been withdrawn from some of the existing ASB prayers.

But that is in the future and will only come after the various stages of discussion outlined earlier in this answer and indicate to Canon Brett that, except for duly authorized experimental use, it will be some time before there can be an officially authorized Eucharistic Prayer for use on such occasions as monthly parade services.

We later learned that there is to be an open meeting for members of Synod at lunch-time on Thursday 28 November, at which such issues can be pursued. There is also further discussion on pages 11 and 12 below.

GENERAL SYNOD JULY 1996

After Question-time was out of the way on the evening of Friday, 12 July, (see the report above), the first of the two main items of liturgical business came up on the Sunday afternoon, 14 July, and it was the Revision Stage (Stage 12 on your chart) of the Calendar, Lectionary and Collects. It was charmingly introduced by the chairman of the Revision Committee, the Bishop of Sheffield, who quoted at length from the Preface to the 1662 Book ('If any...shall take the pains to compare the present Book with the former; we doubt not but the reason of the change may easily appear'), attributing his extracts to 'the Revision Committee of 1662;' and the main character of the lectionary proposals does (of

course) stem from the international ecumenical *Revised Common Lectionary (RCL)* about which he said 'It would be scandalous to go off on our own... we cannot make those tiny alterations that seem so important to Calendar buffs.' Of the collects he became bold in a way that contrasted with the traditionalist Bishop of Sheffield we have often seen—he envisaged 'The 1996 collects having a place in the liturgical life of this Church comparable to those of 1549.'

In the event there were six motions for recommittal of the provisions to the Revision Committee over particular issues. They were good to have on the agenda as they began to demonstrate how the process works—the process that was so neglected when the eucharistic prayers were before Synod a year ago. One could understand the response of Michael Perham, the chairman of the Steering Committee, who was responding to these motions—he obviously hoped all such motions would fall flat and save reconvening the Committee and delaying the next stage by six months, but he also handled the motions more or less on their merits.

There were seven issues which came up, two of them within one motion so we voted on that in two halves. Six of the seven failed to get the necessary 40 members to stand to allow the debate to proceed after the mover and Michael Perham had spoken—and the seventh was defeated after debate. Here are the items moved:

1. Sundays in 'Ordinary Time' to be named 'after Pentecost' rather than 'after Trinity'—on which the Committee stuck successfully to its particular prejudices (and because the motion lapsed I did not get my chance to make my own speech in favour of Pentecost);
2. Provision of collects and readings for 'each Sunday after Trinity'—but this, we were told, is a concept which runs counter to the pattern of 'Proper 4,' 'Proper 5' etc, provision which relates to the calendar year not the church year—and that principle would be disrupted (and become unecumenical) if the switch were made;
3. Michael Vasey, a member of the Commission, tried to widen the 'open lectionary season' to that both suggested in *Promise* and actually provided in *A Service of the Word*. As it is, he argued, 'if the phases of the moon are right you can just squeeze in two Sundays [free of a lectionary "closed" strait-jacket] after the Presentation of Christ in the Temple.' Michael Perham thought the 'ordinary time' after Pentecost provided good scope, and also thought the new lectionary ought in any case itself to be used—and gives sequential readings for Sundays anyway, thereby reducing the need for private initiatives in that direction. In passing the mover mentioned a parish in Durham, now 'basking in a post-primatial glow,' in which there had never been any attempt to keep to a lectionary.

NEW LECTIONARY: FRESH PREACHING

Report of a PRAXIS Day: 4 June 1996

It seems likely that the Church of England will adopt a modified version of the Roman Catholic three-year lectionary, initially as an experimental option alongside the *ASB* lectionary from Autumn 1997 and then replacing the *ASB* lectionary from Autumn 2000.

At the PRAXIS event, Michael Perham set out some of the thinking behind the Revised Common Lectionary as it is called, and showed how the lectionary is supposed to function. Its rationale is very different from the *ASB* thematic lectionary (which is basically the Joint Liturgical Group lectionary mark 1).

In the course of his talk, he tackled some of the issues raised in John Goldingay's recent article in the *Church Times* where the RCL is heavily criticized. Michael described the *Church Times* articles as 'mischievous' and certainly John Goldingay does not seem to have fully appreciated how RCL is meant to work. There are, for example, two sets of Old Testament lections in RCL and if you want to read the Old Testament semi-continuously then you need to choose the appropriate set to enable you to do that. I suggested to Michael that his response to John Goldingay ought to be published in *NOL*, for although I count myself a John Goldingay fan on most things, here I think he is wide of the mark.

Chris Irvine then got us looking at how to preach from the RCL and this exercise was quite revealing in that the discussion showed that some people are guided by *ASB* themes and will find RCL a whole new ball game, while others ignore the *ASB* themes, look at the Bible readings as they are and are therefore already operating within the spirit of RCL.

Gordon Kuhrt gave a typically forceful lecture on preaching in which he was positive about RCL but not uncritical of it. Much of what he said would have stood anyway outside the context of a day about RCL and it is to be hoped that, despite his new job with ABM, Gordon can be persuaded to publish something on preaching. One of the themes of his address was that we should take Scripture seriously and preach from what is actually there rather than imposing our own structures upon the text. This is very clearly the spirit of RCL and, General Synod permitting, when the Church of England adopts RCL it could lead to a new awareness of Scripture in our congregations and a new openness to hearing what God has to say to us through the Bible.

PRAXIS is to be thanked for providing another stimulating day. A new programme for 1996/97 will appear before long—do make sure that you take advantage of the opportunities on offer.

Charles Read

variety of reasons for voting against were being alleged, clearly some arguments cumulated in some minds—and some who might have voted in favour in a debate strongly in favour actually lost heart during the debate and were found in the ‘no’ lobby out of general disaffection. However, with those disclaimers, there is some moderately hard evidence available. Of the 31, we believe the following figures are accurate:

Firstly, around 10-12 were old members, but over half were new.

Secondly, the reasons stated (sometimes two or more to a person) were:

- (a) 6 were virtually opposed to all modern liturgy
- (b) 16 said six prayers were too many
- (c) 6 thought the language and imagery were poor
- (d) 7 cited insufficient emphasis upon the sacrifice of Christ on the cross
- (e) 2 (total unclear) opposed change in structure (for ‘Catholic’ reasons)
- (f) 5 specifically mention children—usually to say these prayers were not adapted to them
- (g) 6 make mention of the impact of the speech by the Bishop of Birmingham, and his complaint that Anglican-RC relationships would be damaged by two of the prayers.

This is a very interim report. It does bear out the point that emerged during the debate—that people of all kinds of view were being brought together in opposition, and that it was actually difficult to discern any single determinative factor in the defeat.

We also heard from the dioceses about clergy (and even bishops) who voted against—and we heard quite a bit from members of all Houses who voted in favour—and they are showing enormous frustration.

We hope for a more detailed and complete analysis in a later issue.

DIOCESAN SYNODS ADDRESS THE LACK OF EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

Canterbury Diocesan Synod on 6 July 1996 passed the following motion by 78 votes to 1:

‘This Synod

- (a) deplores the lost opportunity for experimental use of new Eucharistic Prayers (caused by failure of the General Synod House of Laity to approve them by the required majority);
- (b) calls upon the General Synod and the Liturgical Commission to explore all possible means of providing as soon as possible a suitable Eucharistic Prayer (such as Prayer 5) for use when children and others unfamiliar with the liturgies of the Church of England are present.’

London Diocesan Synod is due to have a major debate on liturgy in November, and we can be sure eucharistic prayers will figure.

What other dioceses are addressing the gap? Are DLCs taking initiatives, or are they waiting for others to think of the issue?

4. The same mover had a further go, seeking to restore reference to the House of Bishops having powers to ‘commend’ alternative lectionary ‘packages’ which had been in the original report from the Commission, but had now gone—but this also got nowhere. Clearly this Perham of the Steering Committee was a harder-hearted and sterner-faced animal than the earlier Perham of the *Liturgical Commission*

5. On came the Archdeacon of Newark, David Hawtin, with two proposals about saints’ days—the first of which was to make ‘Peter and Paul’ on 29 June a lightweight alternative to ‘Peter’ (which is how it is in *ASB*), instead of making the dual commemoration primary as the Committee text has done (‘we do not have to link them in some collaborative team ministry...and Paul has plenty of scope on 25 January’). But it lapsed.

6. The other proposal was to move the ‘BVM’ from 15 August to 8 September—and on this his denunciations of ‘The Assumption’ won the 40 persons standing to allow the debate to continue. His second line of attack was that 15 August fell in holidays and was a bad date for that reason—only to find himself rubbed out by the argument that Good Friday and Easter Sunday also fall on holidays! In point of fact, I believe that the whole approach was mistaken—that a day called simply ‘BVM Day’ is a *death* day, as it is death days of which we keep the commemoration with simple titles; and any variation from the death motif (‘The Conversion of St. Paul,’ ‘The Birth of John the Baptist’) has to be named to be in view at all. Indeed, to leave a blank on 15 August whilst keeping the ‘BVM’ *simpliciter* on 8 September is to invite exotic Romanizers to fill the gap with an un-Anglican celebration! The debate quickly expired and the motion was lost. I found occasion to refer in a later debate to the Feast of the Departure from this Earthly Life of the BVM, which is as far as I judge it appropriate go.

7. There was a proposal for a celebration of ‘Our Lady of Walsingham’ on 24 September. Michael Perham comes from Norwich, and confessed to personal admiration for the Shrine. But a member of the Committee had called it ‘A Saints’ Day too far,’ and to commemorate any *places* (let alone this particular place) associated with saints would be a great departure of principle.

Now the provision is all referred to the House of Bishops for the final look there before the debate on Final Approval in General Synod in November.

The other liturgical issue before the Synod was the first consideration (‘General Approval’—stage 4 on the *NOL* chart) of ‘Rite A and Rite B Revised,’ which *NOL* considered in the editorial last month (and I fear that issue only got posted to subscribers long after Synod was over—so it was stale news, and I apologize). The debate came on the Tuesday morning as the last business of the York

group of sessions. Once again Michael Perham was steering us; and once again he made an excellent fist of it from a platform point of view.

About twenty people had a go, so perhaps the message about getting involved is slowly getting through. There appeared to be a strong evangelical lobby asking for the 'following the pattern of the BCP' order from Rite A (a pattern lacking from the texts before us); but in general there was little reference to the eucharistic prayers issue during the debate, though there had been some pressure about this during question-time (see pages 2-3 above).

One of the oddities emerged in the Creed. Apparently the Commission is for ecumenical agreement most of the time—and defends the ecumenical items it likes on the grounds they *are* ecumenical—but when the Commission does not like something (as, eg, Sundays after Pentecost in the Calendar, or 'became fully human' for 'and was made man' in the Nicene Creed) then it simply opts out of the ecumenical provision. So there does appear to be a confusion of principles underlying some texts.

Other points in debate included: keep penitence printed in two places; bring back the Decalogue-in-the-light-of-the-Sermon-on-the-Mount version; begin with a Trinitarian greeting; include the Athanasian Creed; put the text on the internet; lift all copyright restrictions; let 'Father of all' be congregational; inclusivize Rite B (or so the request seemed to be); should be 'in love and peace with everyone' (!); 'the Word of the Lord' needs strengthening; put an intercession into main text; and so on and so on.

Arthur Pollard insisted that, in resisting proposals here, he was not intending to join an ASB Preservation Society—nor indeed could anyone have ever thought he would. No, he told us, 'in 1662 God has noticed our existence—in 1980 God is to be pleased that we have noticed his.'

My own contribution was to urge people to put in eucharistic prayers or principles for them to the Revision Committee, and to urge the Standing Committee to have two Revision Stages in tandem, so that the Steering Committee would have to do its redrafting overnight and bring material back whilst minds were still engaged with the text.

Michael Perham once again demonstrated himself as the master of deeply sympathetic non-negotiation, and General Approval was duly accorded to the proposals, and the submissions to the Revision Committee must be in by that notable date—15 August.

COB

BOOK REVIEW

Gail Ramshaw, *Liturgical Language: Keeping it Metaphoric, Making it Inclusive* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1996, pp 50)

Liturgical language has been a topic which brings out passionate feelings one way or the other, whether it be about non-sexist language in the liturgy or

'traditional' versus 'modern' language. Some people, seeing that this small book is by an American woman liturgist, might dismiss it as being predictable and not bother to read it (either because they don't think it will teach them anything new or because they've already decided they won't agree with it).

In fact, Ramshaw attempts to cover a lot of ground in a short space. Much of the discussion is about inclusive language with regard to gender but there is material on language and race and class as well. Lest the arch-conservative still think that this book will only confirm his (or her) worst suspicions about American female liturgists, it should be noted that Ramshaw offers a critique at various points of some attempts at inclusivity.

She sets the whole discussion in the context of a consideration of how different types of linguistic images work. She also deals with theological issues such as God and gender and theological language. At every turn she is incisive and, to my mind, fair in her judgments. Above all, she urges that we bear in mind how language changes and how images can mean different things in different cultures. There is, for example, on p 44 a wonderful paragraph about addressing God as 'thou' where she points out that this was originally an intimate form of address and yet modern-day defenders of this usage want to preserve it so that we can demonstrate God's distance from us. The Prayer Book Society (and the Bishop of Maidstone) should take note.

This is a splendid book which would be suitable for DLCs and Liturgical Advisers to get to grips with. I hope every member of the new Liturgical Commission (and more importantly the General Synod) reads it.

Charles Read

WHY THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS WENT DOWN

We apologize for delay in publishing the results of researches through the dioceses about why members of the House of Laity voted 'no' in February. The ability and willingness of Diocesan Liturgical Committees to take on the enquiry has varied more than we expected. However, we have returns (not always complete, as individuals often do not reply to enquiries even when they are mounted) from 18 dioceses and almost exactly 100 member of the House—a return of around 40% so far. Some of the returns have told us little—as, e.g. in Coventry all members voted 'yes' (a rare phenomenon in this debate).

Of the 100 we have traced 31 voted against, which means our sample shows 31% voting against whereas on the day it was 37%. That may suggest that those who voted in favour are marginally more ready to answer an enquiry than those who voted against; or it may suggest that there was a slightly higher proportion in favour in dioceses where the Diocesan Liturgical Committee was ready to pursue an enquiry (though it would be difficult to turn that into anything like a causal relationship). Or it might be sheer random vagary...

It would be improper to seal people into hard-and-fast compartments. As a