

DANCE INTO THE MILLENNIUM

'We have touched with our own hands the word, who is life' (1 John 1.1). Can you touch a word? Can you grasp the Word of the Lord? Much of our Christian tradition has prevented us entering fully into the physical nature of the faith experience, leaving us instead with an abstract theology of beliefs and ideas. Henri Nouwen wrote 'The real spiritual life is an enfleshed life. That's why I believe in the incarnation - that God becomes flesh, God enters into flesh, into the body, so if you touch a body, in a way you touch the divine life.'

Within the Christian community, which Paul describes as the body of Christ, we encounter in the flesh other men, women and children. We share a tangible sacrament of bread and wine - not as something to contemplate from a distance or to hide away in a holy cupboard. We reach out with hands to touch and hold, to taste and swallow, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Dance is about bodies moving with vigour, energy, spirit. In movement and dance we uncover ourselves our souls and bodies and offer to God our living sacrifice. Some will see this as daring or shocking; as when King David danced before the Ark of the Covenant (2 Samuel 6.16) *Dance into Worship* is a national network of groups and individuals working to develop such discipline, skill and imagination as will enrich and enliven both faith and worship (foundation document of *Dance into Worship*).

We hope that readers of *News of Liturgy* will be interested to know of our next special event called *Dance into the Millennium*. This will be an exploration in movement and dance at **Coventry Cathedral, 17-19 September 1999**, for all who are ready to move on from the past, to stand firm in the present and to step forward into the future.

The event is open to everyone, beginners or experienced dancers, and is facilitated by *Dance into Worship*. The cost of the weekend is £80, including student accommodation at Coventry University, including all meals with tea/coffee/juice as required. Non-resident cost is £40 including lunch and supper. Information about alternative accommodation is available from:

Judi Tarrant—*Dance into Worship*
107 Old Road, Headington, Oxford OX3 8SX

If you, or anyone you know, would be interested in taking part, please give names and addresses to Judi Tarrant, telephone: 01865 767329.

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ
Phone 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1999 £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 295

July 1999

EDITORIAL

The account below of the Synod debate on the draft eucharistic prayers highlights a small COB denting of the platform texts (one which sufficiently surprised me as to make me think I had lost the vote when I had won it — I must be getting paranoid about the number of lost causes I have espoused in Synod . . .). But we have at last got a charter for the Revision Committee to come up with a truly responsive eucharistic prayer. Some members of Synod may have thought that the existing prayers could be adapted, but it is more realistic to reckon that a totally new one should be added. From conversations with members of the Committee after the vote I get the impression that they were nervous of adding one more (lest they be criticized for the total number), and they understandably did not want the present prayers too greatly re-touched. But it is my own belief that the right kind of further prayer would be well received, and would not be viewed as making the range too heterogeneous or sheerly numerous.

For the sake of the record—and to lead into the suggestion in my last paragraph—I set out here a bit of history. The South India rite of 1950 which triggered much of the Anglican revising of the last half-century brought in Syrian responses—and was noted, and in various ways imitated. There is a pattern of a tentatively responsive prayer in the St. Mark's-in-the-Bowerie New York rite which John Robinson (a one-time Bishop of Woolwich) aired in *But that I can't believe* in 1967, and the knowledge of this was around and was raising some interest in England from then on. But it must be remembered that the main interest in the 1960s in revising eucharistic prayers was how a Ratcliff-Couratin theory of the patristic precedent ('getting behind the Reformation') could be so written as to gather the less sophisticated Anglican Catholics and pull the wool over the eyes of the Anglican evangelicals. Thus Series 2 communion in 1967 had no congregational role over and above the existing Sanctus. Exactness of wording was the great issue in the official texts. However, there was another powerful set of possibilities germinating unseen—and this broke surface with the publication in 1968 of an experimental rite by Christopher Byworth and Trevor Lloyd entitled *Eucharist for the Seventies* (which incidentally started to popularize a certain backstreet publishing house). This used the narrative of institution as a 'warrant' text prior to the Great Thanksgiving itself, but then presented congregational material for the approach to the table and for the 'Taking', and followed that with a Thanksgiving which (if lined out, which it wasn't) revealed a total of around 40 lines of text of which 19 (which were lined out) were for congregational responding—culminating in the Sanctus (which

should have pleased Arthur Couratin, though I doubt if it did). The Roman prayers came out at the same time and (like South India) included acclamations after the narrative of institution (and enabled a neutral lodging to be found for the phrase 'mystery of faith' which had previously been embarrassingly attributed to our Lord as something he had said in the course of instituting the Supper at the Last Supper . . . which would take some demonstrating). So it was not too difficult for acclamations in the same place to be slipped into Series 3 communion—and a responsive doxology from Revelation to come at the end also. A trend was being set, it seemed. Responsiveness was developing with roughly one new congregational couplet or triplet per decade finding its way into liturgical revision.

When the Liturgical Commission was re-touching Series 3 in order to form Rite A in the ASB, for the first time we looked at the issue of having more eucharistic prayers than one (up until then it had been viewed as a miracle if we could agree as many as one!). Partly this was to accommodate those who said they wanted the Series 2 prayer in modern English (i.e. without being adapted so as to become Series 3). Partly it was because, in the wake of Roman Catholic revision, a vocal party in the Church of England, which had always thought there *could* only be one canon (which it was why it was *the* canon), had discovered almost overnight that four was the real pastoral necessity. But the possibility of more than one enabled us to send to the House of Bishops six draft prayers, one of which was responsive in a way not unlike *Eucharist for the Seventies*. The House of Bishops' small liaison group declined to accept this prayer (and the one for use with children . . .), but said it was important that work of this sort should be put in hand *in the near future*. That was in 1978! So Rite A went through with Sanctus and acclamations now canonized and invariable, but also seen as the 'normal' and even 'traditional' limit of congregational responding.

The question then becomes one of whether the same instinct for development has characterized the work on eucharistic prayers since 1980. And I think the answer is that there was a good step forward in the draft material of the late 1980s, refined a little and then published in the first edition of *Patterns for Worship* (November 1989). There has been a step backward since then, in my judgment, though in the six prayers which were rejected in February 1996 there was some recovery of the lost ground. The sixth of those prayers particularly exemplified such responsiveness, but others also contained it. I personally was further motivated in this direction by editing the Lambeth Conference materials, which displayed some very rich responsive rites from other parts of the Anglican Communion.

So perhaps we will get something truly contemporary and participatory now. Do send yours in to the Bishop of Salisbury—and to me.

PS: I am away in South India for much of August, at the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation on ordination and ordinals, and at the Congress of *Societas Liturgica* on 'Liturgical Theology'. Correspondence is unlikely to be acknowledged personally until the second week in September. I miss the eclipse, but then we can get back to the millennium.

But the fact of the matter is that 1688 *did* pass into liturgy as a focus for thanksgiving. No new service was created, it is true. But new prayers were written, that is also true. William and Mary did not 'leave well alone'. And no prizes are now offered for spotting the gap and seeing what did happen. Here then is the correction.

After the Glorious Revolution, the three royal services were updated and reissued 'By her Majesty's Command' on 6 October 1692, and it is (I think) that revised text which survived till 1859. And it was the earlier 5 November rite which now, by happy coincidence of dates, wrapped in the Glorious Revolution, and the text was changed. Quite apart from printed copies post-1692, it is briefly explained in Wheatley. Its title became:

A FORM OF
Prayer with Thanksgiving
TO BE USED YEARLY UPON THE FIFTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
For the happy deliverance of King James I, and the three estates of the
Realm, From the most traitorous and bloody intended massacre by
Gunpowder; And also for the happy arrival of his present Majesty on
this day, for the deliverance of our Church and Nation.

The prayers too are changed, and one includes the following:
'[thanks re the Gunpowder Plot] . . . and didst likewise upon this day
wonderfully conduct thy servant our present King, and bring him safely into
this Kingdom, to preserve us from the late attempts of our enemies, to bereave
us of our Religion and Laws . . .'

So how was it that MacCulloch thought that all this was deliberately silenced? Could it be that, having inspected the 1662 text as promulgated in 1662 (because in this case 1662 *was* 1662 in his edition) and having (unsurprisingly) found no reference there to 1688, he concluded that it never thereafter happened? But it did. Homer, I would add, nods but rarely.

COB

This Month's Publication is . . .

. . . *Worship Series no.154, Liturgy and Technology*, by Tim Stratford.

EUCHARIST ON THE MOVE

Is this a first? The annual conference for Adult Education Officers was held in Paris this year and the intention was on the way back to have an outside Eucharist in the French countryside. However, loss of time made this impossible so we had a Eucharist under the Channel. Getting out of the coach we stood in the bare compartment with one of our number acting as the altar/table (holding the elements) with another leading. Starting near Calais we finished just before surfacing on the English side. We resisted the temptation to sing old favourites like *Make me a channel of your peace* and *For those in peril under the sea*. Whose See were we in or under? It was a meaningful occasion because of the group dynamic but one could not help commenting 'it was a moving occasion'.

Best wishes

Peter Ballantine, Director Chiltern Christian Training Programme

How wrong I was a month or two back to say no-one in England was noticing the 450th anniversary of the 1549 Prayer Book. Here is another substantial contribution with a well-famed scholar writing the Introduction. The heart of it is the 1662 Book, which at first sight is a non-negotiable given text. However, it is the 1999 text of 1662 which is given; it is in contemporary spelling with the 1922 lectionary alongside the 1662 one, with the current state prayers, and the small alterations to the rubrics of the 1960s to complete the picture. Possibly the copyright presses will not give permission for the reproduction of 1662 in any other form, but this is not a reprint of the 1662 of 1662, not a museum-piece pure and simple, but a coach and four wanting to go on to-day's motorways. It includes (as in most printed Prayer Books) the Psalter, the Ordinal and the Thirty-Nine Articles.

It seems a bit late in the day to review the 1662 Prayer Book, so what does this book have over and above the updated 1662? Before the text we have the MacCulloch Introduction (which is largely a vaunting of the language of the Prayer Book as formative (along with the AV and Shakespeare) of the English people). He makes two small mistakes I have picked up, noted at the right points below. The linguistic emphasis of the Introduction is reinforced by a 'Chronology' table (12 pages in length) which runs from 1485 to 1689 in two columns—on the left 'History of the Prayer Book and Historical Background' and on the right 'Literary Context'. The balance between the columns is sustained partly by putting Luther, Tyndale, Erasmus, More and Calvin in the 'Literary Context' (where they join Machiavelli and Rabelais); and the oddity is all the clearer when Zwingli and Calvin, for instance, are 'Literary' when they write, but 'History' when they die. I think MacCulloch has nodded in calling the Cologne rite of Hermann Von Wied *Pia Consultatio*—its Latin title was *Simplex et Pia Deliberatio*, and its English translation was called a 'Consultation' (I owe this to Geoffrey Cuming's persistence!). The Articles are Prayer Book History, but the Homilies are 'Literary Context' . . .

The appendices are two sorts: firstly the title page, communion service and funeral service from 1549 (with modern spelling), and secondly the three 'royal' services annexed to the 1662 Book for 5 November, 30 January and 29 May. These, it will be recalled, ran from 1662 to 1859; but they (unlike the 1662 Book itself) are presented in this book in their 1662 form, with prayers for 'our gracious King Charles', not for QEII. And that has given rise—rather amusingly, in my opinion—to the second error of the scholarly MacCulloch. There is a forceful, but misleading, passage on page xx of the Introduction:

'Curiously, the most momentous event in later English history never received equal commemoration: the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, in which the nation's leaders decided that they had had enough of Catholic James II. The Church of England, like many leading politicians at the time, were never quite sure how to justify James's removal, and it seems to have decided to leave well alone, rather than cause unseemly argument in church services by creating a new liturgy of thanksgiving for the *fait accompli*.'

THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS—THE SYNOD DEBATE

The draft Eucharistic Prayers were duly presented to the Synod by the Bishop of St. Albans for their first Revision Stage on Saturday morning 10 July. Technically, his task was to present the report of the Revision Committee. The texts they had produced were published in NOL last month.

The bishop very sweetly referred us back to St. Paul and 1 Corinthians 11, but also said that those who simply tried to jump from the scriptures to the present day were thin and unthinking in their attitude to history, and revealed a mixture of arrogance and lack of confidence. Bishop Kenneth Stevenson followed with typical reference to '[Christ's] sacrifice eternally offered' and a strong defence of 'plead' in two of the prayers (which a later re-committal motion of my own was seeking to send back to the Revision Committee). Archdeacon David Goldie was delighted to find one reference (in prayer D) to Christ's blood being shed 'for you and for all'—as the 'many' of the Greek must mean that. David Butterfield wanted to get prayer A back to its Rite A form (this was the subject of another re-committal motion of mine, due to come up later). I put in a word about the 'Prayers at the Preparation of the Table' in the main eucharistic rite; for those phrases 'this bread to set before you' and 'this cup to set before you' involved a controversial verb ('set before') which has meantime been removed from the eucharistic prayers—so should it not also be removed in the main rite from those 'Preparation' prayers? The Bishop of St. Albans in reply said I had raised an important point, and that consistency between the two parts of what would in due course be one rite must be watched.

Then we came to the first re-committal motion. It was mine:

'That the Liturgical Business entitled Eucharistic Prayers be re-committed to the Revision Committee for further revision of the responsive material.'

I contended that the six prayers proposed, whilst they had responsive material in them, usually displayed it only in a form like a prompted 'Hear! Hear!', which is encouragement to the president to proceed, but not actually adding anything itself. As the Bishop of Salisbury was nervous of a re-casting of eucharistic prayers which in large part were surviving untouched, he replied that this would be awkward. Three speeches then backed my motion in differing ways, and the Bishop of Salisbury conceded it would need a new prayer, and the motion succeeded by 180 votes to 143.

The next stages came on the Monday. The attempt to restore to Prayer A the lines currently in the first eucharistic prayer in Rite A—'looking for his coming again in glory' and 'we celebrate his one perfect sacrifice'—failed. So did my efforts to look again at the use of the verb 'plead'. But the petition to re-commit the epiclesis in prayer E had a more positive run. This reads

'Send your Holy Spirit on us and on these gifts
that broken bread and wine outpoured
may be for us the body and blood of your dear Son.'

My objection was that the calling the Spirit 'on these gifts' goes beyond any previous Church of England usage and suggests a localized infusion of the Spirit into the bread which goes far beyond scripture. The Revision Committee in its report had said that this form was in one of the prayers defeated in February 1996, where it had not seemed to be a problem—but I was able to reply that it was not in the final form as *that* Revision Committee had taken the point and had revised the text (this can be checked in Worship Series no. 136 on page 13), and was being misrepresented in the report of this present Committee. Two bishops then rose to defend this form, and it appeared to be in trouble—but Christina Baxter restored the balance, and said the Revision Committee ought at least to consider it; and the Bishop of Salisbury then replied that he would be ready to take it back to the Committee. The floor of Synod cheerfully responded; so it gets another screening.

Finally the Bishop of Oxford weighed in with a request for the first half of the 'ICEL' prayer (the 'silent music' one which, somewhat amended, is on pages 12-13 of that Worship Series no.136). This first half, he said, could best come as an alternative extended preface to prayer F of the present collection; and the Bishop of Salisbury accepted this proposal. Thus the Revision Committee returns to work with three tasks to fulfil by the time of the November Synod.

THE PASTORAL RITES'

This time last summer General Synod gave the whole set of Pastoral Rites a scandalous 45 minutes in the General Approval debate. A year later, Synod redeemed itself for the squeeze. The three rites were dealt with in separate 'take note' debates, which ensured that each one was given individual attention.

1. Marriages (GS 1298F)

The Bishop of Gloucester outlined the Marriage Service, pointing out that the Revision Committee had been aware of two major concerns concerning the structure of the rite:

- i. the eucharistic 'feel'—the service does not now have a 'eucharistic' shape, but two distinct sections;
- ii. the early positioning of the readings and sermon between the Declaration and the Vows—which are still in this position (though they may take place after the Blessing of the Marriage '*if occasion demands*').

Synod clearly felt this latter point to be contentious. Rosalind Campbell moved that the optional order should become the normative one, and a fair amount of time was spent debating whether or not this should be the case. It came to the vote, which was pretty close—154 for, 187 against—but it was defeated.

Synod felt more strongly in agreement with a motion by Bob Baker to recommit the rite for revision of the words 'forsaking all others' in the Declarations. His point was that 'forsaking all other' (with no 's') would be better because partnerships can

He is the one foretold by all the prophets,
whom the Virgin Mother bore with love beyond all telling.
John the Baptist was his herald
and made him known when at last he came.
In his love Christ fills us with joy
as we prepare to celebrate his birth,
so that when he comes again he may find us watching in prayer,
our hearts filled with wonder and praise.
And so, with angels and archangels,
and with all the company of heaven,
we proclaim your glory,
and join in their unending hymn of praise.

BOOK REVIEWS

Kenneth Stevenson, *All the Company of Heaven: A companion to the principal festivals of the Christian year* (Canterbury Press, 1998, 199 pp., £9.99)

The first part of this book runs through the major saints' days and festivals of the year (including Christmas day) in date order, beginning with the Naming and Circumcision of Jesus on 1 January. The second part tackles the Easter cycle, from Ash Wednesday to Trinity Sunday.

Each saint or festival gets about three or four pages, in the space of which Stevenson looks at the meaning of the day or saint, some background history about the evolution of its liturgical celebration, and the biblical readings set. There follows some comment on the collect of the day and each chapter finishes with a quotation from an Anglican writer 'ancient or modern'. For me, he manages to pack an enormous amount of information and insight into a remarkably small space. His own breadth of knowledge and interests serves to widen the reader's perspective.

This is a book I have already reached for on several occasions. Concise and eminently useful, it seems to say neither too much nor too little. It would make an ideal book for someone in the congregation who wanted an accessible introduction to the 'special days' of the church year. Preachers will find it a valuable reference for that vital extra bit of information to enrich a sermon. It would also make a useful devotional aid on saints' days for either corporate or private daily prayer.

Mark Earey
Institute for Liturgy and Mission, Salisbury

Diarmaid MacCullough (ed.), *The Book of Common Prayer: 1662 Version* (includes Appendices from the 1549 Version and other Commemorations) (Everyman's Library Edition, David Campbell Publishers, xxxviii/528 pp., A5 hardback, £12.99)

(b) (if item 606 is passed) 'that this Synod ask the House of Bishops to reconsider the priorities of presentation of modern-language texts of the Lord's Prayer and then report to Synod urgently if the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales gives official sanction to the international (ELLC) text in any authorized English-language rites it publishes.'

These motions will re-appear on the agenda when the Final Approval of the Lord's Prayer now comes in November.

COB

AND ALL THE REST OF SYNOD ON LITURGY?

Yes, there was quite a bit though 'Extended Communion', like the Lord's Prayer, was never reached. The Weekday Lectionary and the Rules to Order the Service received General Approval, and the extension of the currency of the ASB Ordinal from 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2005 gained Final Approval (Bps. 22–0; Clergy 13–1; Laity 137–3). Two Canons which touch on liturgical matters—one about the powers of a bishop in respect of permitting existing rites to continue to be used in particular parishes when their time is up nationally, and the other about using languages other than English—made further progress. And the November group of sessions looks as though it will be pretty busy.

EXTENDED PREFACES OF THE DRAFT EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

The following are the long extended prefaces 'to replace all the material . . . [in prayers A, B and E] . . . before the Sanctus'. Others will follow in future months.

From the First Sunday of Advent until 16 December.

It is indeed right and good to give you thanks and praise,
almighty God and everlasting Father,
through Jesus Christ your Son.

For when he humbled himself to come among us in human flesh
he fulfilled the plan you formed before the foundation of the world
to open for us the way of salvation.

Confident that your promise will be fulfilled
we now watch for the day

when Christ our Lord will come again in glory.

And so we join our voices with angels and archangels

and with all the company of heaven

to proclaim your glory

for ever praising you and saying:

From 17 December until Christmas Eve

It is indeed right and good to give you thanks and praise,
almighty God and everlasting Father,
through Jesus Christ your Son.

flounder when *anything* assumes too great an importance beyond the marriage, not only relationships with other people. Bob's memorable example is of the woman who said: 'My husband spent all his time on his boat and we simply drifted apart' (*sic*). Despite resistance from Trevor Lloyd on the platform, Synod voted clearly to send this back for reconsideration.

2. Funerals (GS 1298G)

In his introduction to the Funeral Service, the Bishop of Gloucester said that a major issue that the Revision Committee had faced was that of prayer and the departed. It was rather surprising, therefore, that nobody who stood to speak subsequently, was at all worried about it. In actual fact, prayers that might not be usable by all sections of the church have been moved into an appendix, and it would seem that everybody's happy with the outcome. Even Colin Buchanan didn't propose any re-committal motions, admitting that this was to pay the highest possible tribute!

A little more was said about another major issue—the use of symbolism; Angus MacLeay feared that opening up the possibility of symbols could raise more problems for the minister and could even represent features of a person's life that one wouldn't want to be celebrating, if they were symbols that pointed away from Christ. However, there is much to be gained by good symbolism, and there weren't enough people willing to carry on a debate on the motion. The whole business was neatly rounded off later by the woman in the Chair, who made a request that her dog be placed on her coffin when she pops off! Maybe NOL should launch a new competition on the subject.

Some concern was expressed about various favourite texts now missing from the main text—but we were assured that there's lots of space to incorporate additional material, and the Outline Order also allows the freedom to devise funeral services from first principles.

3. Thanksgiving for the Gift of a Child GS (1298E)

You will spot the new title and, as it suggests, the service is more inclusive than ASB version, and could be used after birth and by adoptive parents. The wide variety of additional prayers in an appendix also give recognition to all sorts of family members, and give opportunity to those who have experienced a difficult birth to express something about it.

This useful little service was introduced to General Synod by Margaret Baxter—and it was so refreshing to see a woman speaking from the platform during liturgical business (I think that she was the only woman to do so throughout the whole group of sessions, despite the fact that the agenda was jam-packed full of liturgy).

There were just two recommittal motions. Jeremy Fletcher pointed out that the phrase 'natural parent' in one of the additional prayers was not the terminology employed in adoption circles, and that 'birth parent' is. Sadly, though, Synod wasn't bothered enough to send the service back for a second revision, which was a shame—especially since, by that stage, the Revision Committee was bound to meet for the Marriage Service, anyway.

In general: it is worth noting that there is a wealth of extra material to accompany all the Pastoral Rites, drafted for commendation by the House of Bishops, in GS Misc 564. Also, in both the Funeral and Marriage rites there is a short introduction for personal reflection. It's a user-friendly touch which will be worth having for services at which the congregation come into the building in advance of the service.

In conclusion: Neither Funerals nor Thanksgivings are being re-committed for further revision. Instead, they will go to the House of Bishops, and come back later for Final Approval from Synod. The Pastoral Rites Revision Committee is having to reconvene merely for the sake of one letter in the Marriage Service! Whichever way it goes, it will turn out to be an expensive 's'.

Gilly Myers

THE NICENE CREED GETS AN EXTRA INNINGS

It will be recalled that, when the House of Bishops met in January, we declined to go with the Thiselton amendment made to the proposed text of the Nicene Creed in November. Tony Thiselton had proposed the ASB form

'By the power of the Holy Spirit
he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary.'

The House of Bishops decided nevertheless to revert to the ELLC text:

'was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.'

This was reported (along with the original ELLC commentary) in the May NOL. We have also since established that House of Bishops voting should be reported to the Synod, so we now can state that the January voting in the House of Bishops was 36-1 in favour.

However there is some time in hand; and, in any case, the Creed is simply a small part of the eucharistic rite awaiting Final Approval, and it would be appalling to lose the whole rite simply on the grounds that the House of Bishops had over-ruled the text agreed by Synod in respect of one line of the Creed. So the House brought a report (GS 1353) back to Synod this time for a 'take note' debate. The Bishop of Rochester (Michael Nazir Ali) kicked off, sticking with the Greek original (where the same preposition—*ek*—governs both the Spirit and the Virgin Mary) and pointing out that the ASB text had no earlier precedent than the 1970s. The Bishop of Liverpool (James Jones) revealed himself as the minority of one in the House of Bishops and made several telling points, raising questions about what text *is* the original, invoking the precedent of the Filioque, and pointing out that, although (as GS1353 says) *ek* is common to the texts about the Spirit (Matt.1.18) and about Mary (Gal. 4.4), it follows different verbs and leaves a distinction of meaning between the roles of the Spirit and the BVM. Tony Thiselton then weighed in also—scoffing gently at the House of Bishops' assertion 'there is no doubt that the Liturgical Commission's proposed version [i.e. the ELLC text] is the most literal translation possible of the original'. 'Of course there is doubt' he said 'that is why we are having this debate'. But he also said he respected the role of the bishops, did not view ELLC as impossible, and would not vote against taking

note, Amongst various other speakers most notable was the Archbishop of York, David Hope, who learnedly cited evidence from different past centuries to show that there is not such a disjunction between East and West as was being alleged. At the end there was an odd vote on the 'take note' motion (which has no implication about agreeing with the House of Bishops, though the message of disagreeing can only be given by voting against it). The vote to 'take note' came out (on a vote by Houses) as:

Bishops 37-1 (no change!) Clergy 164-21 Laity 107-82

The Laity vote looks like a kind of wild card in the pack, and possibly reflects a half-disclosed notion around amongst the more protestant members of that House that somehow the ELLC text, in apparently putting the Virgin Mary on a par with the Holy Spirit, runs too near to giving her some superhuman status. Speakers on both sides of the debate had emphasized that this was not the issue, but suspicious people may not have been so easily reassured! However, it may equally possibly have been a protest that the Synod accepted the text in a certain form last November, and the House of Bishops ought not to be attempting to over-rule it. At any rate, the House of Bishops can now reflect again on the debate, but I doubt if there was sufficient (in a rivetting debate) to make the 37 change their minds.

BUT THE LORD'S PRAYER GOT NO INNINGS AT ALL

Final Approval for the Lord's Prayer was scheduled for the end of the last day at General Synod, but was (like Extended Communion) not reached, and it will presumably now come in November, I had tabled a question about it to the chairman of the Liturgical Commission; and received a written answer (with no opportunity for a supplementary):

Qu: In which English-speaking Anglican Provinces or Churches of other denominations throughout the world is there in use a modern text of the Lord's Prayer including the words 'Lead us not into temptation', where that version has been authorized since 1990?

Ans: So far as we can immediately ascertain only the draft baptismal rite of the Church of Ireland in the Anglican Communion.

So that points very strongly to the sense of going for the ELLC text in the Church of England, irrespective of the Synod's mind of last November. My ultimate fall-back had been to table two following motions. In the text which follows below 'item 606' is the Final Approval of the Lord's Prayer, with the ASB text in the prime position. These are the motions as tabled, alternative to each other.

(a) (if item 606 is not passed) 'that this Synod ask the House of Bishops, in the interests of practical ecumenism, to arrange as swiftly as possible to bring to the Synod proposals for the printing of the Lord's Prayer which will give the international (ELLC) modern-language text priority in the presentation of alternatives.'