

A LAST-MINUTE CORRESPONDENT WINDS UP A GREAT DEBATE

Dear Colin

I thought you might like this brief extract from a book I am currently reading called *Laughter at the Foot of the Cross*, by the not inappropriately named Michael Screech. It concentrates on the Renaissance (and notwithstanding its title is rather heavy going!), but from the following we can imagine that General Synod's recent labours will have given Erasmus much mirth:

Erasmus could always get quiet amusement from pretentious error in tiny matters, especially when Greek was involved. The Greek *ek* (from) is sometimes translated into Latin by *ex* (from) and sometimes by *de* (of). Latin is like that. Greekless theologians find deep mysteries in those *froms* and *ofs*. A generation before Erasmus, Laurentius Valla had already found that silly. He had laughed at those who found mysteries in the grammatical variations of the words of the creed in Latin: "Conceived of the Holy Ghost; born *from* the Virgin Mary."

Yours sincerely, Bruce Carlin
Durham

AND A LAST-MINUTE COMMERCIAL

Time is running out re the cheapest rate for the GROW Conference—'Common Worship and Beyond'—at Swanwick from 8 to 11 January. The £99 rate for the four days is available till the end of August (deposit £30), and then the cheapest rate becomes £110. There is the further great gain of putting in the full fee of £99 and adding simply £6 more to get a day-of-publication (and greatly subsidized) copy of *Common Worship Today*, the GROW accompaniment to Common Worship, in the tradition of *Anglican Worship Today* in 1980. There is good hope of getting this published by early December, and the price is currently being established, but is likely to be in excess of £15. It is a 256-page, four-colour, hardback, and a brilliant adult confirmation present. We shall be giving further news of it in this column in future months, but for the moment, get yourself that cheap copy by booking in quickly for Swanwick. Details from COB's address below (cheques made out to 'GROW').

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ
Phone 0208-699-7771 Fax: 0208-699-7949
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 2000 £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 308

August 2000

EDITORIAL

The last bit of liturgical text to come before the General Synod was debated at the July group of sessions. It was 'Extended Communion', not intended as a regular part of Common Worship, and presented as an emergency fall-back provision only. It has to be distinguished from true 'extension' to the sick, for its intention is to provide a main communion service for full-blown congregations.

It ran into a large amount of predictable trouble. I found myself weighing carefully two self-contradictions which have been running in the debates, and eventually (in some tension) I voted against this Final Approval. The self-contradictions were these:

Firstly, that we were being told how good and sufficient a communion service could be held without it being a full eucharistic celebration, including the eucharistic prayer. Yet the guidelines for children receiving communion before confirmation are very strong indeed about the necessity for the children to be present for the eucharistic prayer. I found I could not vote for this new provision and simultaneously affirm the children's guideline.

Secondly, there has arisen a total imparity, in which those who want to reserve eucharistic elements (both elements, one dares to hope) say to those who don't 'Do not be dog-in-the-mangerish—just because you don't want extended communion, surely you should not mind us being able to use it?' But the non-reservers are not, it seems, allowed to say back 'Do not be dog-in-the-mangerish—just because you do not want lay presidency, surely you should not mind us being able to use it?'

Tim Royle, he who ran the Private Member's Motion on lay presidency, announced he would, with heavy heart, vote for extended communion and did so. Perhaps he therefore swung the day. Then the rite got its necessary two-thirds majority in each House with the following figures:

Bishops: 38-2

Clergy: 137-34

Laity: 131-64

The last figure there caused a gasp. It was a close-run thing.

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD AT YORK 7-11 JULY 2000

The report of the Bishop of Chelmsford's working party, *A Time to Heal: A Contribution towards The Ministry of Healing*, was debated on the Saturday, and the following motion was passed:

That this Synod

- (a) affirm that the healing ministry is an essential part of the Church's ministry and mission, in line with the Gospel imperative to heal the sick;
- (b) request the Archbishop's Council to consider the main recommendations in the Report; and
- (c) request dioceses to debate the Report at diocesan and deanery synods and in PCCs, with a view to encouraging wider awareness of and to developing the healing ministry at every level.'

It has to be said that the motion stopped a long way short of endorsing the report, and it did in fact encounter considerable criticism. Even the chapter on complementary medicines took a knock. But the liturgical side of things was hardly mentioned.

The Liverpool diocesan motion on baptism (see July NOL) was debated on the Sunday. It was moved by Keith Cawdron, the diocesan secretary, in this form:

'That this Synod believe that the baptismal practices should be reviewed with the aim of securing consistency both between local churches and across the country as a whole.'

An amendment was moved by Maggie Swinson, also from Liverpool, and this virtually wiped out the original and left the text looking like this:

'That this Synod, believing that baptism provides a unique missionary opportunity for the Church:

- (a) recognize that enquirers should be offered relevant preparation from the Church which relates faith to life and commend the use of material already widely available;
- (b) urge all churches to examine ways to help the journey of faith that is marked at baptism to continue; and
- (c) encourage PCCs to discuss and prepare a baptism policy in consultation with the bishop to be made available to enquirers.'

It has to be admitted it still does not say very much and, like all too many synodical resolutions, probably ends in thin air rather than in much 'encouraging' of PCCs to do anything. But I would happily be proved wrong.

Probably the largest amount of liturgical discussion and comment came at the end-of-term concert. But that is not for repeating here. The Synod duly dissolved, and the elections come in September. The next Synod will be addressing the Ordinal and perhaps daily offices as the main liturgical preoccupations—and, presumably, a new Commission with a new chairman will be appointed in the Spring of 2001.

BISHOPS ALL OVER THE PLACE

It is quite possible that Judith Rose's Private Member's Motion on women as bishops was the real centrepiece of the York Synod. It came on the Sunday afternoon, and she moved the following motion:

'That this Synod ask the House of Bishops to initiate further theological study on the episcopate, focusing on the issues that need to be addressed in preparation for the debate on women in the episcopate in the Church of England, and to make a progress report on this study to Synod within the next two years.'

Most of the speeches were in favour of the motion, and not least because they were in favour of the central point of substance—that the episcopate of the Church of England should be open to women. In almost every case this was viewed as the natural concomitant of making women presbyters, a point that was supported, for instance, by a very moderate speech by Geoffrey Kirk, the leader of Forward in Faith (though he does not think we actually have made women presbyters...). There were some attempts at amending the motion in respect of its proposed procedure—Bernice Broggio trying to speed things up by saying the theology already existed and the task now was to draw up the legislation and get on with it, others trying to get in ecumenical considerations and other potential hazards. One of these amendments was only defeated by 260 votes to 227, but overall the motion went through untouched and was itself accepted by: (Bps) 36-1; (Clergy) 154-39; (Laity) 165-49. Judith Rose had occasion to point out that she was not asking for all problems to be solved against the clock, but only for a 'progress report'.

Meanwhile your editor went on in question-time trying to elicit from the secretary-general an admission that women bishops in New Zealand and North America are true bishops and their confirmations and ordinations are true episcopal acts. Watch this space—it is hard work getting an answer that addresses the question.

Bishops had a different sort of outing the previous day. We were debating the report of the working party reviewing the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod, and it was a debate which raised some passions. The report itself (GS 1395) is substantial-looking and it had been through various drafts, arising partly from the two visits made by the working-party to the House of Bishops. There was, however, a serious assault made upon the report in the Synod, on the grounds that it was solely concerned with difficulties experienced by the 'Resolution C' constituency, and not at all with barriers erected against women clergy. My own judgment would be that this orientation of the report was not surprising, and perhaps not worth contesting—the original Measure had made provision for a qualified ordination and deployment of women presbyters, and, although this might have brought a measure of discomfort or displeasure to some women presbyters, that was built into the original provisions; whereas the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod involved a venturing into unknown fields with a devising of expedients *ambulando*, and it was proper to review the workings of the Act.

My own concern, when addressing the working party after seeing earlier drafts and again in Synod (but I did not get called), was to look carefully at the concept of 'impaired communion'. The section of the report which tackled this ran as follows:

'... in some respects the Church of England today is a divided church, with some members believing that their communion with others is impaired because of the ordination of women as priests. Some say that the celebration of the Eucharist is impaired where the president is a person who seems to have departed from the traditional practices of the Church.' (para 2,15, p 8)

I find this attempted definition highly unsatisfactory and subjective. To locate a major change in the internal relationships of the Church of England in 'some members believing ...' and 'Some say that ...' is a terrible indictment either of the minority grouping which cannot give a better account of itself, or of the working party which has so misrepresented them. For look what it says: not that some Anglicans cannot recognize the presbyteral acts of a woman presbyter as providing true sacraments; nor even that they have renounced communion with bishops who ordain women (even though they are still viewed as true bishops); but that the problem is located with a eucharistic president 'who seems to have departed from the traditional practices of the Church'. The verb 'seems' makes it subjective enough, for it is wholly unclear by what criteria this (virtually penal) 'departure' is to be adjudged. Does a Rural Dean who, though opposed to the ordination of women, assists at the institution of one in his deanery, 'seem to have departed'? Does a clergyman who, after a ministerial life of strict male rectitude, receives communion from a woman hospital chaplain 'seem to have departed'? Does Geoffrey Kirk himself, who denies that there are women clergy, nevertheless 'seem to have departed' if he sits in a (mixed) House of Clergy in General Synod? (To be fair, he would have a more scrupulously exact set of criteria than the working party manage to report—but perhaps they could not follow his exact logic.) Above all, dare I say it, does the Archbishop of York, who presided at the squeaky-clean London Arena celebration of communion, but who provides for the ordination and deployment of women in his diocese, does he 'seem to have departed'?

I have long since abandoned any thought that the dissenting minority are accusing the rest of us (and especially bishops) of having tainted hands. But the new definition not only 'seems' to run so much wider than rejecting the eucharistic presidency of bishops who do (or least *would!*) ordain women, but also to rest on such a subjective assertion of guilt-by-association that it can be applied to almost any other male presbyter who 'seems' to qualify for it.

And there is surely a concealed laugh somewhere behind the periphrasis 'to have departed from the traditional practices of the Church'? How many 'traditional practices' is one allowed to abandon and still be in good standing? Did Henry VIII abandon 'traditional practices'? Or Thomas Cranmer? Or did the early Tractarians depart from (other) 'traditional practices'? Did Vatican II? Or Series 3? Or those who made women deacons? Which 'traditional practices', so coyly hinted at, are the touchstone of being in communion, and how many can one safely abandon? Of

course the paragraph is about the ordination of women—but it appears that people who merely *think* it right to ordain women, or those who think it wrong but accommodate themselves to it, have by their thought-life 'departed from the traditional practices of the Church'.

You may think I am going on a bit. But I return to this concept of 'impaired communion' which sunders our Church of England and is apparently based upon somewhat less than 10% of the clergy providing a somewhat fuzzy-edged register of over 90% of the clergy whose sacramental ministry is damaged beyond recognition—because of what 'some say' they 'seem to have done'. Did the working party really do its best to report the minority accurately? If they did, then one has to say that they have in the process made them incredible.

Oh yes, and I should get back to the Synod debate. Various people were threatening to vote against the (anodyne) 'take note' motion; and Dr. Christina Baxter galloped to the rescue. As the important feature of the debate was simply to enable people to hear what was said, and nothing hung on the vote, she moved that the Synod pass to next business—i.e. without taking a vote. Uniquely in my experience, the mover of the motion (that is, the Bishop of Blackburn) accepted the procedural motion, and we all heaved a sigh of relief and managed not to vote for or against taking note.

And the third move about bishops? Ah, that was at the Methodist Conference in June. The Conference received a report on 'Episkope and Episcopacy' from its Faith and Order Committee; then, after a little amending, it voted for the following resolutions:

1. The Conference adopts the Guidelines set out in this report as a summary statement of its position on *episkope* and episcopacy.
2. The Conference affirms its willingness in principle to receive the sign of episcopacy on the basis of the Guidelines set out in this report.
3. The Conference receives the report and commends it to Youth Conference, the Districts, Circuits and local churches for discussion.
4. The Conference invites the Youth Conference, Districts, Circuits, local churches and individual Methodists to send comments on paragraphs 89 to 109 to the Secretary of the Faith and Order Committee to report to the Conference of 2002 on the comments received.

It is the second of these which contains the real change for the future. The original proposal from the Faith and Order Committee envisaged the Methodist Church becoming episcopal as part of a deal with the Church of England (it used the words 'in the context of appropriate ecumenical developments'); but the Conference omitted this phrase, in effect saying that if the episcopal deed were worth doing, it would be worth doing on their own if necessary, and not simply or only as a condition of becoming kosher with the Church of England.

COMMON WORSHIP IN THE OFFING

We hear on the grapevine that the Liturgical Publishing Group, whether or not they had read NOL's March editorial, has decided to put cross-referencing page-numbers into the mentions of the different eucharistic prayers in Order One, and to that extent the 'Sample' text (and NOL's comments on it) are out of date. Whether that slight clarification will enable the average worshipper actually to follow any particular eucharistic prayer when using the officially published text must remain a little doubtful, but the LPG have softened their iron front a whisker and it should be counted to their credit.

Is it about time to point out that, to be strictly legal, any Common Worship text for Sunday use needs PCC approval before coming into use. This in turn needs a careful look at the future. Watch this space next month for helpful tips.

PDF FILES TO BE MADE AVAILABLE SHORTLY

The following came on E-mail on 20 July:

The Liturgical Publishing Group took a radical decision yesterday to allow access to complete and correct electronic texts earlier than the previously announced publication date of November 2000.

Although Visual Liturgy and the full Common Worship web site will not be ready until November, the LPG decided to release PDF files of the books as soon as possible after the files are sent off to the printers, which happens in stages over the next few weeks. The PDF files will be printable but also 'copy and pastable'. However, the files will not allow on-screen editing. Texts have to be copied down into a Word Processor package or DTP package from where editing could take place.

The Communion Services PDF file which is currently available will also be updated to provide the most accurate text available. The files should be available by the end of August although we are unable to confirm dates yet.

WEB SITE TO BE UPDATED SOON

The Common Worship web site will also be updated soon with news of the RSCM's plans for music and details of their publications. The new Bulletin 10 will be made available to download and there will be more besides! (However it is not expected that the new PDF files will be part of the next update, see above).

FINAL WORDS

The Common Worship web site can be found at <http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/> If at any time you wish to unsubscribe from this list please

email me at this address and I will remove your name. If your email address changes, do let us know. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

David Green, Marketing Executive, Church House Publishing,
Church House, Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3NZ.

Phone: 020 7898 1582, Fax: 020 7898 144

Email: david.green@c-of-e.org.uk

Visit our online catalogue at <http://www.chpublishing.co.uk/>

IN MEMORIAM— ROBERT RUNCIE

Robert Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1980 to 1991, died on 11 July, after a long struggle with cancer. He became Archbishop of Canterbury when the ASB was already decided and the text at the printers, and it is not clear that he made any great contribution at any stage to liturgical revision or the story of Anglican liturgy. I noted last month, in the tribute to Donald Coggan, that Robert Runcie was on sabbatical when Rite A came to General Synod and the House of Bishops had the decision to take as to whether or not to have debated an amendment to delete the *Filioque* clause or not. If Runcie had been there, then *Filioque* might well have been banished—but he was not, and it was not.

He got his revenge (if that is the right word) when he came to his enthronement in 1980. He went out of his way to insert the Nicene Creed into his enthronement—and inserted it without *Filioque* as a special gesture to his Eastern guests. In one sense this was merely slightly amusing; but from another it was actually misleading to guests and home team alike. It became a well-worn joke when George Carey, eleven years later, presumably advised by Lambeth records, repeated both the Creed and its omission, and then (as video recordings confirm) found himself saying by heart that which his text had omitted . . .

But it is Robert Runcie whom we commemorate here. His greatest liturgical moment (in England at least) must have been the Pope's visit to Canterbury in 1982, and the Peace shared with the Church of England's bishops. His greatest contribution to the liturgy of the Church of England must lie with his appointment of the 1985 Liturgical Commission, which brought in Colin James as chair, gave a strong starting point to David Stancliffe to succeed him, and put Trevor Lloyd, Michael Perham, Jane Sinclair and Michael Vasey into the phalanx of liturgical policy makers and text-drafters. And in *their* work the impact of his decisions comes upon us this Autumn. Having just missed the creation of the ASB, he has also now missed its demise. But it was he who lit the fuse for the funeral pyre.

COB

This month's publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no.159, *Common Worship Communion: The Shape of Orders One and Two*, by Jeremy Fletcher. Jeremy Fletcher is a member of the Liturgical

Commission and was a member of the General Synod and of its Steering Committee on the rites. He is chaplain to the Bishop of Southwell. The booklet looks in detail at the different shapes of Orders One and Two, outlines some of the reasons for their final form, and gives some handy hints about making the change to Common Worship communion.

. . . and next month's

is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no.47, the second half of *Mysterium Ambrosianum* by Cesar Alzati, translated by George Guiver.

BRIEF BOOK MENTIONS

Flora Winfield, *Releasing Energy: How Methodists and Anglicans can grow together* (CHP/Meth Publishing house, 2000, x/36 pp., £2.95).

This attractive guide is largely not about worship (which does not figure, for instance, in the list of contents); but the case studies which are included do incidentally illustrate ecumenical worship possibilities.

Common Praise (Canterbury Press, Norwich, 2000—'Full Music edition' hb, xvi/1351/lxxxv pp, £19.99; words edition £xx.xx)

This new hymnbook, containing 628 hymns, was published on 30 June, the latest in the 'A & M' dynasty. It will be very fully reviewed in our sister journal, *News of Hymnody*, though there the editor, Chris Idle, has himself contributed half a dozen items and might be viewed as a compromised witness. Here we simply note that the 'worship songs' have crept in (warily), and that there is a strong sense of the liturgical year. There is a section entitled 'General Liturgical Section'—but it has only four items (360-363); and then almost half the book (nos 364-628) is labelled 'Hymns Through the Year', but I think that simply means what was once called 'General', as there is no indication at what point 'through the year' they might come . . .

We have also been sent a Churches Together in England leaflet publication called, *Help break the Silence . . . on violence against women: a liturgy resource*. The central feature of its suggestions is a 'Commitment by the church and congregation'—a responsive congregational declaration, of which this a sample couplet:

In memory of all the women who have known suffering and death
facing their pain with a courage born of their own dignity;

We break the silence:

and raise our voices in anger and hope.

The 8-page leaflet is available free from CTE.

BOOK REVIEWS

Donald Gray, *All Majesty and Power: An Anthology of Royal Prayers* (Hodder and Stoughton, 2000, 147pp. £9.99)

This book contains a selection of royal prayers. Compiled by a Queen's chaplain the collection shows a familiarity with this aspect of intercession. There are prayers both by royalty and for royalty. Sources are drawn from private devotions, prayer books, and the Bible. The introduction leads us from David to the present. The book is much enhanced by comments from Scottish traditions, which gives a different perspective. We are told in the introduction that the present Queen is concerned that people pray for her but not how. This created for me a dissonance, if the book is to be viewed as a collection to be used. Indeed, the interesting introduction about royal intercession seems to flag with the lament that too few intercessors today have a 'sufficient sense of history and knowledge of our constitution' to pray for the Queen. This seemed to be a rather lacklustre exhortation for emphasising royal prayers, the book itself not helping us much with the latter point. While there are prayers from the Coronation service and Silver Jubilee prayers I would have been interested to see some mention of the Royal Maundy (the picture is on the back) and even the Touching for the King's Evil (maybe Prince Charles will revive this). I suspect the book will sell. However, while I will pray for the Queen, I think I will rely more upon my extemporary intercessions.

Phillip Tovey

A tradition of prayer (SPCK London, 2000) £9.99 ISBN 0281 05271 9

Very nice, but what is it for? This book is a collection of texts, in clear modern English, as translated by the Roman Catholic International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL). The titles of the seven sections will give an idea of the flavour of the contents: Mass and Holy Communion; Creeds and Canticles; Consecrations and Litanies; Our Lady; Angels and Saints; Times and Occasions; Invocations. It is interesting to read for example, a prayer of Thomas Aquinas in preparation for Mass, a Litany of the Sacred Heart, and 'The Universal Prayer' of Clement XI, and interest is heightened by the brief historical notes printed after some of the items. However, the two creeds, three lucan canticles and three psalms, offer me little other than an opportunity to compare translations. (If you're wondering: 'by the power of became incarnate from.')

The three-page introduction explains that the book is intended to 'foster further prayer among the faithful', which I take to imply personal devotions. However, the book seems to fall between two stools: being only slightly smaller than A5 in format, it is too big to fit easily into pocket or handbag; and yet for regular home use the 53 texts are limited in number and eccentric in their variety.

'An excellent gift for a new or young Christian' says SPCK, and it may sell well as such—a gift, I fear, excellent in that it is holy, good-looking and not expensive for the giver, but a gift of little practical use to the recipient.

Ian Tarrant

QUICK BOOK NOTICE

Dana Delap and Gareth Lloyd, *A Simple Guide to Common Worship: Introducing the new services in your church* (Canterbury Press, August 2000, xi/93 pp, £4.99)

This is a preliminary notice, and a fuller review will follow. These two authors, the heart of the enterprising Durham Diocesan Liturgical Team (see the recent report from Durham in these columns), have jumped the gun and got their Guide out before the great publication day. Its contents are based on their own parish training experience, and their kind of coaching about knowing the Common Worship materials and how to introduce them is extremely practical and helpful. But the book has only just been glimpsed as we go to press.

COB

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

I . . . throw in my own piece of anecdotal evidence regarding the baptism of babies of unmarried parents. I have twice been asked to do this and twice refused, strongly offering instead the alternative of a thanksgiving service, to which we accord just as much prominence as a baptism in our church, but without the awkward promises. The line that I have taken is that the Chichester diocesan baptismal certificate lists on the back the duties of those who come for baptism as laid down by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. It includes the commitment 'to uphold the standard of marriage entrusted by Christ to his church'. I explained to the couples in question that it was impossible for them to uphold that standard, thus undermining the meaning of baptism, and making it impossible for me to support them.

I must admit, it went down badly in both cases, but in both it has turned out well in the end [one couple had a thanksgiving, kept attending church, got married, and then had a baptism; the other couple went elsewhere and got a baptism from a clergyman who ignored the canons, but 'friendly relations have been restored'].

Name and address supplied
Sussex

and the anonymous 'silent music' correspondent last month

had his name omitted by error (not by design, like the correspondent above)—and we apologize; he was Jeremy Pemberton.

DIOCESAN REPORT (1999-2000 CYCLE) NO. 15 -GUILDFORD

We have four meetings a year but often subgroups meet to deal with specific needs or to prepare a particular piece of work. A regular requirement is to produce the worship for various diocesan occasions: meetings of diocesan synod, the annual Holy Week Chrism Eucharist and currently assisting in the preparation of the worship to be used at our triennial clergy conference this autumn. Returning a moment to the Chrism Eucharist, we are endeavouring to broaden its appeal and content, so that it can become a wider affirmation of all authorized ministry. Recognizing that it is a special service that reflects the relationship between a bishop and his clergy, we feel it is important to emphasize the corporate nature and responsibility of ministry. Increasingly over the last few years as we have gradually adapted the service, numbers from a wider spectrum of parishes have attended. We would be interested to hear of other dioceses' experience of this service, its timing (would the Tuesday Evening in Holy Week be a better time for more to attend?), and any particular format or symbolic act that can reinforce this wider agenda.

Over the last few years we have produced various booklets for parochial use in the diocese to cover a wide range of pastoral and liturgical need. These have included a Thanksgiving for Marriage and the Renewal of Marriage Vows; the Commissioning of a Youth Worker; All-Age Worship; Admission of Children to Holy Communion; Taizé Worship; the Blessing of a Home; Music at the Eucharist; Psalms are for Singing. All parishes in the diocese are sent sample copies free and further copies can be ordered at a modest price.

We run a couple of worship day conferences each year. Most recently we held a well attended day on Children's Worship, and a wide ranging Music for Worship Day held at Guildford Cathedral led by Geoff Weaver from the RSCM. This covered everything from plainsong to worship songs, Iona and Taize, and the composer Margaret Rizza came to teach us a new setting she had composed. Next year we have invited John Bell from the Wild Goose/Iona community to lead a further day on music in worship.

Like every other DWC/DLC we are charged with the responsibility of helping parishes prepare for Common Worship. We had an extremely worthwhile and entertaining presentation from Mark Earey of Praxis on the new Eucharistic rites. Over a hundred people attended. Preparatory articles have been written in our diocesan newspaper, and visits are being made to Deanery Chapters. A workshop on Common Worship is being offered at the annual Churchwardens Training Day. The Triennial Conference will also offer us further opportunity to alert and prepare clergy this autumn.

Finally, it is important to stress that the Committee does not work in isolation from other facets of the life of the diocese. We are now part of the diocesan Department for Mission, Evangelism and Parish Development, but we also link up with other departments as necessary, especially Education and Ministerial Training.

Ian Brackley
Bishop of Dorking