

NOTICE BOARD

This Month's Publication...

...is Joint Liturgical Study No 36, *The Ritual Kiss in Early Christian Worship*, by Edward Phillips. The author, an American from Union College, Kentucky, has carefully put together an amazing thesis—well argued and rarely speculative—that the sharing of the 'holy kiss' from St Paul's time onwards is more closely related to sharing the 'breath' or 'spirit' (or Holy Spirit) that one can impart to another when in Christ than it is to the simple expression of unity and perhaps reconciliation, when approaching the communion, which are the standard expositions (for which see, eg COB's Worship Booklet No 80, *The Kiss of Peace*).

1997 Office Almanack

Hillfield Friary (Dorchester, Dorset DT2 7BE) have now available, *Celebrating Common Prayer, 1997* (send them an SAE with 50p), the 'almanack' which relates the CCP calendar and lectionary to the particular year. Or you can write to COB on the same terms (but note CoA at the end of this edition).

International Anglican Liturgical Consultation

The next full IALC will almost certainly be held in India in 1999 in juxtaposition to the Congress of *Societas Liturgica* due to be held in Kottayam in Kerala that year. However, as in 1993, there will be held in 1997 an 'interim' Consultation at Jarvenpaa in Finland from 4 to 9 August, preceding the *Soc Lit.* Congress which runs from 11 to 16 August at Turku. The distinguishing feature of the 'interim' Consultation is that it is open to all Anglicans attending *Societas*, but there are no subsidies or grants available to help Third World and other needy persons to come. The major theme will be orders and ordination.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

From 19 December I can be found at 8B Hillyfields Crescent, London SE4 1QA (0181-469-0013, FAX 0181-694-8309). This is a temporary address and there will be a further move to Forest Hill in April.

COB

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address till 19th December: 173 Canterbury Street,
Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA
Telephone (01634) 851818 or 855252 Fax (01634) 573549

Postal subscription for 1997 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 264

December 1996

EDITORIAL

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ON—WE GOT THERE

In 1971 my daughters, then aged 6 and 4, asked why they were not given the bread and wine at the family communion service. I explained to them that the Church of England was somewhat antiquated and stuck in its ways (which the grown-ups will recognize as a simple rendering of 'the Anglican tradition')—but was joyfully able to add that an enlightened Ely Commission had recently had a hard look at the issue and I had good hope that the Church of England would shortly change its rules. A little while later they asked me if the Church of England could hurry up and get on with it. I hope I answered discreetly. In due course they went through the Church of England's traditional system—and are now 31 and 29—and I have sometimes thought 'the summer is past, the harvest is ended, and still we are not saved.'

But now it has happened (well, I think it has). On the afternoon of Wednesday, 27 November, the General Synod addressed the report of the House of Bishops which I outlined here in the August issue. A large part of the debate was anecdotal, which is what encourages me to go anecdotal above. We had all been circulated with a tough paper by Nigel Atkinson of Latimer House, which urged us to stay with the tradition—and I suppose that this had raised some fears that an evangelical backwoods reaction might be expected (evangelicals have been notoriously bad at understanding the issues, and the reactionary instinct we had seen in respect of the eucharistic prayers in February). But in the event it was not so—there were sixteen speakers in the main debate, and only one was opposed. The more noticeable tone of the speeches was a complaint that the House of Bishops was too grudging and reluctant, whereas they should be giving a much clearer lead. On the day, the fact that the Bishop of Salisbury stood in for the advertised mover may have helped, for his own enthusiasm outstripped the tone of the (wildly unexciting) episcopal document, which was summarized here in the August *NOL* edition. People spoke up from several of the dioceses which had passed motions over recent years calling upon General Synod to take this step. The ecumenical observer from the Church of Scotland put in a good word. One or two were hesitant about age of 'discerning' and about varieties of practice. But no advocates of the 'Mason-Dix' line emerged, and no bishops were heard to mutter that it would be the end of confirmation.

The first part of the debate was on a motion to 'take note' of the report. The

second half was on a motion asking the House of Bishops to implement their guidelines, and this provoked further debate, in the course of which William Challis of the staff of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, complained that he could not find literature to enlighten him about the nature of confirmation (bar a monograph from Grove Books with a picture of COB on the front)—and that he does not know what it is. I have a strong suspicion that this is symptomatic of the whole C of E.

When a vote was called on the motion to ask the House of Bishops to implement their guidelines, there was an attempt to get a 'vote by Houses'—a procedure which, in a close vote, could get a motion defeated in one of the three Houses, and thus is a tactic of late resort when you think you are losing. But, lo and behold, the opponent could not find 25 persons to stand to support the procedure. The motion then went through overwhelmingly (perhaps 15-20 against) in this form:

'That this Synod welcome the House's Report and ask the House to confirm the accompanying guidelines as soon as possible.'

It is possible that the House may re-touch the guidelines slightly (there were some sensible adjustments suggested), but we shall publish them as soon as they are firm.

And I have a suspicion that not every pastor, parent or youngster will be waiting until those guidelines appear. And history should record that it was not a battle at the end of the twenty-five year process—but a virtual consensus. Hallelujah!

AND ALSO TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ON

New Year's Eve at the end of this month is a milestone for Grove Booklets. Grove Books as such published single 'once-off' pamphlet-type titles from Summer 1970 onwards; but the concept of a series (originally to be less than twelve titles) of standard-format, fast-moving, booklets only grew amongst the group that is now the Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW) during 1971; and, when the series did start, it started with authors outside of our membership, and sufficiently diverse for the series to be called 'Grove Booklets on Ministry and Worship.'

The series was actually precipitated by the Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist. Julian Charley, a professed evangelical and vice-principal of St John's College, Nottingham, was a member of ARCIC-1, which started work in 1969. In September 1971, he returned from a meeting of the Commission at Windsor, and told me he had signed an agreement on the eucharist with the Roman Catholics (as a matter of fact I have reason to think he had been very influential in the drafting). It was at the time unthinkable that two theological

occasions. Although it has rightly been said that the mitre is a relatively late medieval development, that does not of itself make it undesirable. If we were to take such a view, anything and everything introduced after the fifth century would necessarily be illicit!

You say that 'mitres are aesthetically absurd.' Well, that of course is a rather subjective view-point and absurdity—or beauty—is ever in the eye of the beholder. Some later developments are absurd in the exaggeration of shape and decoration, but the earlier more modest style advocated at the beginning of this century by Dearmer and some members of the Alcuin Club can often be pleasing and dignified in appearance—to those who are pleased by and see dignity in such headgear, that is. Again, a subjective point-of-view! It is interesting, however, to note just how many of your episcopal brethren in both our communion and the Roman have increasingly opted for this simpler type of mitre, usually going for plain gold for ordinary use and plain white for penitential occasions.

In (b) you say that 'mitres represent a very short tradition in the Anglican Communion—largely traceable to Bishop King of Lincoln.' I am not at all sure it is as simple as that. Although he was as far as we know the first English bishop in modern times to *regularly* wear a mitre, there is some evidence that he was not the first by any means to make use of it on an *occasional* basis. Thus, Cox and Harvey in *English Church Furniture* (Methuen, 1907, 1908) on page 56 discuss the silver-gilt mitre of Bishop Matthew Wren of Ely (uncle of Sir Christopher) which is preserved at Pembroke College, Cambridge. They say: 'It is fitted with a cap of crimson satin lined with white silk; the condition of the lining shows that it was worn and not treated merely as an ornament.' (My emphasis) They are not alone in citing this kind of evidence. In Wickham Legg's *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (Longmans, 1914), in discussing the use of the cope, he quotes an eye witness account of the coronation of Queen Ann (1702) in which it is said, 'The Dean of Westminster and the prebends which assist the Arch-Bishop in the Cerimonies are arrayed in very Rich Coapes and Mitres, black velvet Embroyder'd with gold Starres or Else tissue of gold and silver.' (p 370) Later he quotes Cesar de Saussure who describes the first installation of knights of the newly created Order of the Bath in 1725 in Westminster Abbey and says that the Dean, being also Bishop of Rochester, was vested in a cope and 'in one hand carried a mitre.' Some years later he also compiled an account of George II's coronation. To quote again: 'The bishops wore rochets and big cloakes and copes, all their garments being of silver cloth; and in their hands they all carried mitres of the same cloth of silver. The Archbishop of York was in his rochet, and cloak of gold cloth, carrying his Archbishop's mitre of the same cloth in his hand.' (p 371)

This is the first instalment of a long letter from Tony Pendert Moore of Alford, Lincs. The rest will follow next month...

ciation of the mysteries described. However, this is a concise and clearly laid-out little book, and a useful summary.

Gilly Myers

Dennis G Michno, *A Priest's Handbook: The Ceremonies of the Church* (Second Edition) Morehouse Publishing, Harrisburg, 1983, 1986, pp 303).

This is a volume of ceremonial for the *Book of Common Prayer* 1979 of ECUSA. It is full of detailed instruction for a fairly 'high church' liturgical programme, covering the eucharist and the Christian year. This might seem fairly irrelevant for the average *NOL* reader, but it would be of some help, if you are asked to fill in for someone, or look after an interregnum. Indeed it is often curates who get plunged into helping out and this might help them have confidence, when faced with a censor.

It is simplistic to dismiss ceremonial and such books. Thus it was pleasing to find a very sane introduction, which does not claim to be writing a definitive work. It encourages spontaneity that is grounded in the incarnate Word and local adaptation. It also sees the danger of liturgy that 'abolishes mystery.' Indeed, I find myself saying amen to its vision that, 'Liturgy centred in God rests in the Word of God, celebrates the presence of God, and points to the Kingdom of God.'

Philip Tovey

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

May we have a competition for a Christian image, *eikon*, for the Millenium. Could you launch a competition through *NOL*, with a prize of a place on Lambeth Bridge, to watch the Bishops casting their mitres into the River Thames in 1998!?

Yours sincerely

Brian Duckworth
Worcester Park (Methodist)

Dear Bishop,

I read your article on mitres in October's *News of Liturgy* initially with some concern thinking it was an evangelical onslaught on yet another aspect of catholic practice, but latterly with considerable amusement. In spite of my fears I have to admit that I agree with some at least of what you say. However I am not sure I want to go all the way with either Richard Holloway or yourself and aim for the wholesale disappearance of the mitre from the ecclesiastical scene. As one who is most unlikely to be faced with deciding whether to wear such a thing or not, I want to say that I do like to see bishops wearing mitres on all appropriate

positions so mutually exclusive could be honestly reconciled in a single statement, so his own credibility (and thus his ongoing usefulness to the Commission itself) was at stake. I urged him to write a commentary or apologia to be ready for the scheduled date of publication, 31 December 1971. He agreed in principle, but showed little sign (in a busy Autumn term at College) of actually doing so. The point then arrived where (with an eye on the projected Grove Books series) I put it to him that Grove Books was the only firm left with a chance of hitting the deadline (made possible through very co-operative local printers, Hassall & Lucking of Long Eaton). He then got down to business, wrote the commentary, and met the deadline. When the day came, this was the only commentary in print anywhere in the world to go on sale alongside the official statement. And so the series was born—and the 'Ministry and Worship' series in 1975 gave birth to 'Grove Liturgical Studies' which intervened in the monthly routine once a quarter until the end of 1986. In 1979 the Group split and a 'Pastoral Group' was formed, taking up another month each quarter with 'Grove Pastoral Series,' and the 'Ministry and Worship' titles became, from no. 70 onwards, 'Grove Worship Series.' Soon after another dividing of the Group led to the Spirituality Series. And so one could go on, right through to the recent launching of Grove Biblical Series. Whilst the first two years saw enormous expansion with good cash-flow (provided through the Group having ample materials ready for the authorization of Series 3 communion in early 1973), later years saw expansion without corresponding increased cash-flow, and this led (by routes elderly readers may remember) to the formation of the Company, Grove Books Ltd., which started trading a fortnight before I became a bishop—to my great relief. The Company, a charity, has expanded the business from a much better financial base, and I have been slowly distanced from administrative responsibility for it, so that I am now convenor of GROW and editor of *NOL*, and chairman of the Joint Editorial Board for Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies, and answerable to the Company in all these respects, but am not myself 'of' the Company. The Worship series has now been running at one a quarter since 1980, but the Group (with the Company's connivance) plans to have a fifth title in 1997 (in August) and thereafter to run six titles a year till 2000, as the official revision of our liturgical texts starts to call for a fast rate of matching guides and commentaries from GROW. *NOL* itself celebrates its twenty-second birthday at the point where the Booklets celebrate their twenty-fifth.

GROW (with the friendly backing of the Board) has been planning for nearly three years to celebrate the Silver Jubilee of Booklet No 1—not literally over the New Year, but as soon after that as possible. We also have discerned that our idea of running a residential conference might well come at just the right moment in the official revision process for a stopping of the clock for 48 hours to look where we are going to be helpful in its own right. We have, after careful thought, labelled the Conference 'Evangelical Anglicans and Worship beyond 2000,' and invited people to join on that basis—partly because GROW itself

comes out of the evangelical constituency in the Church of England, but partly also because we detect vastly different trends amongst evangelicals in both their programmes of worship, and the principles upon which they wish to act. We are hoping too for plenty of people at the Conference who would not think of themselves as evangelical, because we believe that, whereas a 'catholic' programme is always being well displayed to the whole Church of England, non-evangelicals have often little idea what priorities are motivating evangelical initiatives in the field of worship.

So we convene at Swanwick at 11am on 6 January 1997, the Feast of the Epiphany. We (GROW) are all paying our own way, and providing virtually all the speakers and leaders, thus holding the costs down. Over 200 people were booked in as we went to press, and there is still room for more. There is ample scope for exhibitions, secondhand books (and cast-off copes and candelabra), fringe meetings, a market of good ideas, and a review—as well as serious probing into the future, a missionary future for a church at worship. Get in touch quickly with Mrs Judith Read (at St James Rectory, Great Cheetham Street East, High Broughton, Salford M7 0UH—tel 0161-792-1208) and get aboard. I genuinely think that, when you read about it afterwards (and, yes, you will find it takes a page or two here) you will wish you had been there—and if you are at Swanwick, then you will be glad in another twenty-five years to tell your grandchildren about it. And do pray for us.

With that 'heavy' as a run-in, I wish you a happy and Christ-related Christmas.

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1996

The rate of handling liturgical business is hotting up. The total programme of the November Group of Sessions of November 1996 included the following:

Wednesday 27 November: **Calendar, Lectionary and Collects**—these were duly approved from Advent Sunday (30 November) 1997 'until discontinued by further resolution of this Synod'—which is the first time this formula has been used for a 'service,' though it is the obvious implication of the Worship and Doctrine Measure, and similar to the open-ended commendation given a year or two back to the use of the 'Revised Catechism.' There was little debate in General Synod—a plug by Michael Vasey for the 'open season' for the lectionary (a debating point which could not be an amendment at Final Approval), and a contribution by Jane Sinclair which I later discovered had been invented partly to advertise the informal lunch-time meeting on eucharistic prayers the next day—which she did. The Bishop of Sheffield responded that Michael Vasey was taking the lectionary too seriously and that, in his own incumbency days 'I invariably used the readings appointed—unless there was a good reason why

Tanzania: A complete service book in Swahili has recently been produced. The eucharistic rite is unadventurous and not far on from the 1973 liturgy—but the important thing in Tanzania is the need for integrating the (strongly) evangelical North with the ex-UMCA South (of Frank Weston fame). And on that point there is continued progress.

Nigeria: In September this year the Provincial Synod accepted a complete new BCP, and also a book of occasional services and a hymnbook. There is little expectation that these will prove radical.

We look forward to carrying news of other Provinces as it comes to hand, but this is the major part of what was reported in Jo'burg.

COB

MEANWHILE IN AUSTRALIA

The Diocesan Synod of Sydney has rejected *A Prayer for Australia* for full authorization—for the Canons require Diocesan Synod consent—though some use of some parts may be allowed under the heading of experimentation.

BOOK REVIEWS

Jan Michael Joncas, *The Catechism of the Catholic Church on Liturgy and the Sacraments* (Resource Publications, 1995, pp 58, np).

It may be odd for me to begin at the end, but Jan Michael Joncas concludes his book by describing it as a 'few reflections on the sacramental life of Roman Catholic Christians'—and that is very apt. Taking the Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) as his basis, Joncas describes and comments on the liturgical teaching it contains. Despite a multitude of quotes from the CCC, the book is still fairly readable, although it would be more interesting to follow if you had a copy of the CCC at hand. Indeed, you may feel compelled to dash round to your local RC priest to borrow one if, like me, you are intrigued by all-too-brief references—to indulgences, for example, in the section on *Penance and Reconciliation*—and want to find out more.

Not surprisingly, Joncas concentrates on sacramental worship, although mention is made of liturgical space and furnishings, sacramentals and 'popular' devotions ranging from pilgrimages to religious dance! It is refreshing not to find merely reporting but also discussion: questions are raised over various points including the warrant of the Church for its position on *seven* sacraments, the separation of confirmation from baptism, and the CCC's reasoning against the ordination of women. Disappointingly there is nothing about liturgical formation or how people might be taught how to grow in knowledge and appre-

NEWS FROM AFRICA

I was privileged in mid-November to visit South Africa for the first time in my life—to Johannesburg (Sharpeville, Soweto, etc.). I went as one of the four elected members of the Steering Group of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations, and we duly did that business, and the planning is reported under the 'Noticeboard' details on page...above. But we had chosen to meet in Johannesburg because the Church of the Province of Southern Africa was hosting there the second Consultation on Anglican Liturgy and African Culture (you may recall I attended the first one at Kanamai near Mombasa in June 1993, and the Kanamai Statement was circulated as part of the July 1993 *NOL*—and was then incorporated into Joint Liturgical Study 28: David Gitari (ed), *Anglican Liturgical Inculturation in Africa*). David Gitari, who convened the Kanamai Consultation under the aegis of the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa (CAPA), was unable to attend the Jo'burg follow-up as he was needed elsewhere as the Electoral Body of the Church of the Province of Kenya was busy choosing him as their Archbishop at exactly the time were meeting.

The Consultation was shorter than its predecessor and less obviously purposeful (and was saddening in that—for well-known reasons—there were no representatives of Zaire, Rwanda or Burundi present). There was no formal outcome, save the reconstituting of the organizing committee. There were, however, some informal reports given from some Provinces, from which the following points were gleaned:

Southern Africa: the original 1989 Prayer Book was published in eight different languages simultaneously. There are now two more languages to be added—with full Books in these two in preparation. The Committee has also done new work, and has in recent years published as follows: Occasional Services (1993), Praying at Home (1994), Episcopal Services (1995), Common Forms (1996). They have prepared *Saints and Seasons* (an exposition of the Calendar), and are editing 'separates' of some services and revisions of others. They have also been involved in creating the Church Unity Commission rites (see Editorial), and have a hymn-book in the pipeline and work on a 'children's eucharist' just started.

Central Africa: This scattered Province has for most of this century looked towards Southern Africa, and used its Books; but there is some use of the English ASB also. There seems to be little of creativity from the Province to record.

Uganda: There is a Provincial Commission, and there is a draft eucharist in use at Bishop Tucker Theological College at Mukono. But the Commission has had to address Canon Law before being allowed to look at liturgical texts.

not.' We then trooped through the doors and the approval was granted by majorities of:

Bishops 29-0 Clergy 170-2 Laity 181-4

Later that afternoon came the question of admission to communion. I have reported that above in my editorial.

Thursday 28 November: (Lunch-time) Liturgical Commission runs open meeting on:

Eucharistic prayers (see report elsewhere)

Initiation Services (Revision Stage started on Thursday and ran on till Friday morning—also reported elsewhere).

Friday 29 November:

Extended Communion (This Report from House of Bishops for General Approval was not reached, because the Initiation services ran over to the Friday).

In addition on the Thursday there was the 'Porvoo Act of Synod' Declaration and in the evening there a service in Westminster Abbey (with ecclesiastical nobs from all over Northern Europe present) to celebrate the inauguration of the Porvoo Declaration.

LAUGHTER IN LITURGY (OR THE PUNCTURING OF PRELITICAL POMP)

I was reliably informed the other day of a curious side-effect of the ordination of women in one of the parts of the Communion where such ordinations have been conducted. It so happened that the bishop of the diocese in question was in the habit of removing his episcopal ring and placing it on the holy table when presiding at the eucharist—why, I cannot think (nor have I to my knowledge seen this ceremony myself), though a recondite rubrician tells me that, in days when bishops wore gloves for communion (which again I have never seen), the ring was worn *over* the glove, which may or may not be connected with this man's practice. Anyway, this rare episcopal ceremony did not go unnoticed, and, when the man concerned decided, at the ordination retreat prior to the great initial day of women's ordinations, that he would himself instruct the women on the retreat as to how to preside at the eucharist, he was immediately asked by one of the women 'Are we supposed to take our wedding- or engagement-rings off when we begin the eucharistic prayer?'

Information from anon (name and address supplied)

CALLING IN THE BANNS

A Private Member's Motion in General Synod went through in a matter of minutes and virtually unopposed as follows:

'That this Synod, recognizing that the majority of those whose Banns of Marriage are called in Church are generally unknown to the congregation, request that the Standing Committee investigate ways which would lead to the finding of an alternative procedure, which would obviate the needs for Banns of Marriage to be read aloud in church on three Sundays during the time of Divine Service, and to report back to Synod.'

THE FUTURE OF EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

We had the promised Thursday lunch-time 'fringe' meeting of the Liturgical Commission during Synod week, and about 60 people packed out Room 301 in Church House for the meeting. Three Commission members gave us brief introductions to various aspects of the issue facing them and Synod, and about 20 contributions were made from the floor. The main presentations went roughly as follows:

Kenneth Stevenson (Bishop of Portsmouth): There is plenty of precedent for having a number of alternative eucharistic prayers; but to be a recognizable member of the species a prayer is usually expected to have six 'building blocks':

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. A thanksgiving for the works of God | 4. A 'remembrance' paragraph |
| 2. The Sanctus | 5. An invocation or epiclesis |
| 3. The narrative of Institution | 6. A doxology |

Trevor Lloyd (Archdeacon of Barnstaple): The actual process of providing the recent six prayers (for which see a certain Grove Booklet) was a lengthy one—and goes back well before the publication of *Patterns* to the field-testing we did in advance of that (and we want to use the canonical provision for field-testing more widely in the future). Two particular initiatives we have viewed ourselves as taking are, firstly, having responsive material that 'takes the action forward' (instead of providing a mere echo), and secondly, getting beyond the 'truce' (for so he termed it) of 1980 in respect of the anamnesis.

Michael Perham (Canon-Residentiary of Norwich): So what do we do now? Is there a case for prayers from Rite A (eg. nos 3 and 4?) going forward into Rite A Revised? We shall certainly have to be alert on five fronts:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| (a) Trinitarian structure | (c) New rites around the Anglican Communion |
| (b) Eucharistic doctrine | (d) Appropriateness for use with children |
| (e) responsive material | |

In discussion there was expressed desire for: fewer words, intercessions in

eucharistic prayers, meeting needs of handicapped, instruction for clergy, *some* uniformity, voting separately on each of a number, not being simplistic...

And so the hunt goes on.

THE INITIATION SERVICES

The Revision Stage of the Initiation Services saw motions for re-committal of the rites to the Revision Committee in respect of five different sections of the rite. The Committee was due to meet again anyway, as it had not completed its work on the rites for a healing ministry—and the Chairman of the Steering Committee, Bishop David Stancliffe, was remarkably accepting of the motions, and probably himself helped two of them to succeed. The full record went:

1. To re-commit section 10 (the initial part of the Presentation)—defeated.
2. To re-commit section 11 (the renunciations and vows)—passed by 206 to 125.
3. To re-commit section 12 (signing with the sign of the cross)—defeated by 139 to 177.
4. To re-commit section 14 (the prayer over the water)—defeated by 138 to 186.
5. To re-commit section 16 (the baptism itself)—passed on a show of hands.

It might be surprising that the section of the baptism itself should be re-committed, but this arose partly through the requirement:

If the candidate(s) can answer for themselves, the president addresses each by name, saying

N. do you believe?

and each candidate answers in their own words or

I do.

Probably we on the Revision Committee meant to make this optional. The Synod was much amused by a speaker who said (and this is not an exact quote until the last thirteen words): 'The candidates have come to church, have been presented, interrogated, signed, and brought to the font—after all that, if we ask them if they believe the only sensible answer for them to make is "Yes, of course, which planet have you been on these last few minutes?"'

The movers of these motions (nos 2 and 5, that is) have made liturgical—or at least canonical—history. They have persuaded the Synod for the first time to use its own standing orders and re-commit sections of a service to the Revision Committee. David Bird of Peterborough had offered to withdraw no 2 above and the Synod would not let him. This means that 'proud rebellion' will get another look... (the Bishop of Wakefield, once of Taunton, said that in Taunton 'rebellion' means the day the town declared the Duke of Monmouth King—and they are still 'proud' of it).