

value in providing light but efficient co-ordination and information exchange to increase an awareness of good practice and avoid needless duplication of effort.

[We still hope to print out the rest of the Annex in similar easy stages]

#### DIOCESAN REPORT (2001-2 CYCLE)—11 BRADFORD

Sad to say 'there's trouble at 'mill'. I don't suppose it is confined to (West) Yorkshire but there is a marked debate currently about the perceived difference between 'worship' and 'liturgy'. Simply (and frequently) put: liturgy is for the clever clogs who want to worry about the fine print; worship is what we do on Sundays and we can sort ourselves out over that one, thanks very much!

Evelyn Underhill, in her chapter on 'The Anglican Tradition' in *Worship* (1936) sums up this aversion to outside expertise rather well: 'Even before it became articulate in the Lollard Movement, the Biblical, anti-institutional temper was present in our national religious life.' She picks out by way of example, Richard Rolle 'the father alike of English mystics and English lay preachers—the Yorkshire hermit with his independent spirit and apparent aloofness from institutional practice.' (pp320-1)

I suspect that this is a phase of the Church's liturgical life which will challenge us all as the new texts grow in familiarity. The requests for new and effective ways of performing various rites are liable to overshadow the study of shape, text and symbolic significance for all too many church members. It seems to be me that this is exactly the time to be pouring resources into good liturgical formation (nationally and locally) lest we succumb to the demand to simply provide services that will appeal—crucial though that also is.

Good developments in the region have been the take-up of places on the new Music and Liturgy MA being taught jointly by Leeds University and the College of the Resurrection at Mirfield, and the inclusion of one of our number on the working party on new collects, being chaired by Paul Roberts of Bristol. Popular or not, liturgy is alive and well among these dark, (angelic) mills.

John Burniston  
Bishop's Adviser in Liturgy, Bradford

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 2002 **£8.50** (by air **£12.00**, **US\$24.00**)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**  
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU  
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 325

January 2002

#### EDITORIAL

The publishing event of this month is *Common Worship: Daily Prayer Preliminary Edition*. It has xvi/816 pages, it matches *Services and Prayers* in format, size and price (ie it should be £10 at the outset). And it contains few surprises. It is neither 'authorized' nor 'commended'; it has not seen the House of Bishops or the General Synod; but it is perfectly lawful. It falls under the provisions of *A Service of the Word*. And it is provisional (or 'preliminary') in that it is provided with a response form at the back, and the Commission hope to hear from you early in 2003, so that they can re-touch it (or 'tweak' it, perhaps?).

The nearest thing to a surprise is that 'Prayer during the day' which we reported (on the evidence provided during the Liturgical Commission day for DLCs) in the November NOL. Perhaps it is here the odd eyebrow may rise a centimetre. Do tell us at NOL, if so. I found the Lord's Prayer in two places, but little more notable than that.

But I am not stopping to provide deep evaluation at this point—and not only because the columns are full; not only because the text is hardly in my hands as NOL goes to press; but also because I take the argument of the Commission seriously, that you find out by doing. I would like to hear as you and I do with it.

Colin Buchanan

#### CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF LITURGICAL AGENCIES

Praxis have convened an overnight conference of their sponsoring agencies in mid-February in Sheffield. The participants will be existing members of Praxis Council, along with representatives of the Liturgical Commission, the Alcuin Club, and the Group for Renewal Of Worship (GROW—the stable NOL comes from). There is much overlap of membership, but the consultation should provide a wide coverage of interests and insights—but the main aim will be to clarify the coaching and training needs of the C/E parishes, and look at ways of communicating information and facilitating liturgical formation.

An obviously live issue is the future of journals. *Praxis News*, edited by Mark Earey, has been a great success, but he goes to become an incumbent in Yorkshire at that time, and his own output is bound to be seriously affected. This journal, NOL, and its side-kick, NOH, are being put into the same melting-pot, partly because NOL's editor has no special gift of longevity, partly because there is a clear overlap

of the aims of *Praxis News* and NOL. So what would you like to come out of that? Ideas on a postcard to Paul Roberts, please.

### THAT ANGLICAN-METHODIST REPORT—WHAT OF PRIESTHOOD?

The report, *An Anglican-Methodist Covenant*, which was published last month and was the subject of the editorial here last month, needs some revisiting this month. The thrust of last month's editorial was that the report and its recommendations are really jejune—they register agreements already taken for granted, they propose a covenant which leaves us more or less where we already are, and they evade every difficult issue that actually divides the two Churches. This month I want to pick on a particular issue where the report is plainly wrong, and it is astonishing that an Anglican team could unanimously agree it. I refer to paras 153 and 154 on pages 47-48. They follow a reference to the whole people of God as having a corporate priesthood. The two paragraphs then run as follows:

'153. The Church of England also believes that there is a distinctive priestly ministry which is also derived from Christ himself and which is exercised by those ordained priest.

The special ministry is ordained to speak and act in the name of the whole community. Its authority and function are therefore not to be understood as simply delegated to it by the community. Consequently, in so far as its ministry is priestly, its priesthood is not simply derived from the priestliness of the whole community. Rather the common priesthood of the community and the special priesthood of the ordained ministry are both derived from the priesthood of Christ (*The Priesthood of the Ordained Ministry*, 1986, paragraph 142).

154. *The Priesthood of the Ordained Ministry* goes on to say that, "in the exercise of their office", the ministry of bishops and presbyters is "an appointed means through which Christ makes his priesthood present and effective to his people" (ibid.). The report then shows how the ordained priesthood relates to the common priesthood:

The ministry of those who are called to the episcopate and presbyterate fulfils a particular service . . . Their ministry may be called priestly in that it is their vocation to help the whole people to realize their priestly character (ibid. paragraph 143).

I repeat that I find it grievous that this new report should be pumping out as universally agreed that "The Church of England . . . believes that there is a distinctive priestly ministry which is also derived from Christ himself and which is exercised by those ordained priest." I respond:

1) We are told a fraction higher (in paragraph 151) that the Methodist Deed of Union, and its rejection of 'a separate priestly caste, claiming exclusive priestly powers and mediating between the Christian and God', do not apply to 'the Church of England doctrine of presbyteral ministry'. Indeed, the paragraph

7 May (Tuesday) 'Getting the most from a Service of the Word' at Bar Hill Shared Church, Bar Hill, Cambridge, 10—4, led by Mark Earey for Praxis East. Bookings (cost £15 including lunch) via the Rev Brenda Wallace, the Rectory, 175 Rayleigh Road, Brentwood, Essex CM13 1LX.

24 May (Friday) 'Enacting the Drama of Worship' at St Nicholas' Church, Durham, 10—4, led by Anne Dawtry and Bishop David Stancliffe for Praxis North East. Bookings (cost £12) via Dana Delap, 9 Wanless Terrace, Durham DH1 1RU (0191-384-3854; E-mail Dana@dunelm.org.uk)

### LITURGICAL EDUCATION AND FORMATION STRATEGY?

We began publishing last year the Annex to the Liturgical Commission's report on the quinquennium 1995-2000. This month we complete the section labelled '2 Action', which we began (in the October NOL) with paragraphs headed 'The present situation', 'Action by the Archbishops' Council' and 'Action by individual members of the House of Bishops in their Dioceses'.

#### Action in the Parishes

The primary need for resources for liturgical education and training will be in the parishes. A national strategy could enable—

- Accurate and accessible communication about liturgical change.
- Access to training material and courses for leaders of worship.
- Opportunities and resources for worshippers to study and deepen their understanding, particularly the connections between corporate worship and daily life.
- Opportunities and resources to help make connections between public liturgy and private prayer.

#### Action by the Liturgical Commission

To fulfil its terms of reference the Liturgical Commission needs to—

- Listen to and respond to views and information coming from parishes and dioceses.
- Brief and resource diocesan liturgical committees (or equivalent bodies).
- Liaise with others over the delivery of the strategy, eg CME and Adult Training Officers, and voluntary bodies such as *Praxis*.
- Take account of the education and formation implications in any new work undertaken at the request of the House of Bishops or Synod.
- Work with others, such as RSCM, CCC and Church House Publishing to encourage the availability of suitable resources for liturgical education.

Although the Commission's role is to co-ordinate and liaise between local initiatives, not to seek to 'impose' any national strategy, for the Commission to fulfil this brief and support and resource locally-based initiatives, its staff support needs to include an Officer with appropriate skills. As in other areas of church life, there is

Number of respondents = 38

- a) Complete alternative set required: now answer Question 5 = 29
- b) Alternatives only required for a limited number of collects—now answer Question 5 = 7
- c) No alternatives are required: I think the Common Worship collects are fine as they are. (You do not need to answer Question 5) = 2

If you think that either a limited number or a full set of alternative collects is required, which of the following ways forward would you favour?

Number of respondents = 37

- a) Make rubrical changes which would make it legal to use collects from other Church of England sources (such as *Promise of His Glory*). = 7
- b) Make rubrical changes which would make it legal to use collects from sources in the Anglican Communion (such as A New Zealand Prayer Book). = 8
- c) Make rubrical changes which would make it legal to use collects from an approved list of sources (provided by the Liturgical Commission, after consultation, and approved by General Synod). = 5
- d) Provide centrally (via the Liturgical Commission and the Synodical process) an alternative set of collects (or a limited selection of alternatives) specifically for the Church of England and make rubrical changes to make other material legal as well. = 25
- e) Provide centrally (via the Liturgical Commission and the Synodical process) an alternative set of collects (or a limited selection of alternatives) specifically for the Church of England make no other material legal as well. = 8

## DIARY DATES

We have largely Praxis dates to hand—have other fixture-managers given up? What is your DLC doing?

- 7 February (Thursday) 'Liturgy for Rural Churches' at Gloucester Church House (by the cathedral) 10.30-4 led by Robert Paterson, Andrew Banks and John Whitehouse. Details from Praxis, 0207 272 3709.
- 28 February (Thursday) 'Daily Prayer' at St Nicholas Church, Durham, 10-3, led by Paul Bradshaw and Jeremy Fletcher. Details from Dana Delap, 0191 384 3834.
- 7 March (Thursday) 'How long, O Lord, how long...[making the baptism service work]' at Carrs Lane Church Centre, Birmingham, 10—4, led by Mark Earey and Gilly Myers. Ring Peter Furber, Christ Church, Malvern, on 01684 574 106
- 27 April (Saturday) Southwark DLC will hold a whole-day conference on daily prayer (for laypeople as well as clergy) at Southwark cathedral. Details from the sub-dean, Canon Andrew Nunn
- 29 April (Monday) At 7.30 pm in St John's College, Durham, the next Vasey Memorial Lecture will be given by Richard Giles, Dean of Philadelphia (but known in England for *Repitching the Tent*). No need to book—simply roll up.

goes on to say 'It is well known that the word "priest" derives from the word "presbyter"'. Fine, we might respond—now that etymology is invoked, we know that when the word 'priest' is used of the ordained ministry in the Church of England, it simply means 'presbyter'. But what, in paragraph 154, is then 'distinctive', and 'distinctive' in the sense not only that it distinguishes the presbyter from the lay person, but that it distinguishes the Church of England's beliefs from the Methodist ones (which must be integral to this comparison between the Methodist statements and the Anglican ones)? In paragraphs 154 and 155 the priesthood of the ordained ministry is clearly being derived from the priesthood of Christ—so, we have to reply, could this argument be sustained if we talked about the 'presbyterate' of Christ instead of his 'priesthood'? And the answer is, obviously, 'no'. The whole discussion of the priesthood of Christ, the very application of the term 'priest' to Christ, stems entirely from the Epistle to the Hebrews; and the argument there is about a distinctive priesthood, one which simply could not be sustained by using the word 'presbyterate'. Indeed, as is transparent to anyone who reads the Epistle carefully, the appointment and functions of Christ's priesthood are not transferable, but are uniquely and unalienably his. The highly doctrinal concept that the ordained ministers have a 'special priesthood' derived from the priesthood of Christ is totally without scriptural foundation.

- 2) Without going further into the two quotations from the report *The Priesthood of the Ordained Ministry*, perhaps we could draw a line across, and insist that that report is the most unreliable document imaginable for summarizing or propounding what Anglicans believe. Memories are clearly very short, for the history of this document pulls out any rug of credibility from under it. It came to the General Synod in November 1986, in order to provide a secure basis for a whole range of issues about ministry with which the Church of England was then confronted. But the attempt to get the Synod to affirm its contents failed miserably. First, an amendment was moved asking the Synod to view chapter XIII (which sought to entrench a distinctive priesthood of the ordained ministry) as inconsistent with chapters I-IV (which demonstrated that the New Testament knew no such concept). This amendment failed by 224 votes to 207, and the report was then dead in the water. Its sheer continued existence was sustained only by a second amendment which, instead of welcoming chapter XIII 'as a contemporary Church of England expression of the Anglican understanding of the priesthood of the ordained ministry', said it was 'a stimulating contribution towards the development of a contemporary ...'. This amendment was passed by 200 votes to 170; and the amended motion was then itself accepted by 318 votes to 137. In other words, the Synod knew that Chapter XIII would not stand up, and *declined to give it any status whatsoever*. It is frankly appalling to find paragraphs from that controverted Chapter XIII now quoted as though they were some kind of official formulary of the Church of England. (One could go on to point out in other fields, such as

ARCIC, that the mere fact that reports are in print does not give them any status, and we should not be deceived by their published form.)

In the event, whether we take the conspiracy view of history or its alternative, the Anglican-Methodist document turns wholly peaceable at the end—'We believe that there is a common understanding of the presbyterate, and this provides a sound foundation to the eventual interchangeability of presbyteral ministries' (paragraph 157). Having laboured, therefore, to give the Church of England a distinctive doctrine of the priestly ministry of the ordained (one which we all are supposed to believe), at the end we are told that the complex labouring actually amounted to nothing—'there is a common understanding ...'. Well, I have to conclude, what an escape—with one bound Jack was free.

Colin Buchanan

### GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 2001—CORRECTION

We misreported in last month's NOL the November debate in General Synod on deacons; we did indeed 'take note' of the report *For Such a Time as This*, but there were clear signs of frustration (of which we did give a hint last month), and the Synod then amended the motion originally moved. It was the unamended form we published in December: the amended one actually carried ran as follows:

'That this Synod, disappointed that the report (GS 1407) has not taken the opportunity to examine thoroughly the offices of Reader, Pastoral Assistant and Church Army Officers, request that the report is referred to the Ministry Division for further consideration.'

This suggests that we shall hear little further about a rationale of 'permanent deacons' and probably not encounter practical proposals for reforming the office of a deacon.

COB

### BOOK REVIEWS

Douglas Dales, *Christ the Golden Blossom: A Treasury of Anglo-Saxon Prayer* (Canterbury Press, 2000, 180 pp £9.99)

This is a superbly produced book, beautiful to handle, with a very helpful scene-setting historical introduction. Almost half the book is organized as a *Temporale*, with reading and prayers for the festivals of the Christian year. The other half is a *Sanctorale*, commemorating the Saints of the Anglo-Saxon church, reminding us afresh of some we might have forgotten

This is an excellent way of getting into the history, spirituality and main liturgical sources of the Anglo-Saxon period. Most of the contents come from three sources: the Nunnaminster Codex, a collection of private prayers from the early ninth

If there are particular collects which you consider to be especially unsuitable for your context, please list them below (by liturgical date, such as 'Trinity 4')

Number of respondents = 20

The top collects cited for criticism were: Advent 2 (15), Lent 2 (11), Lent 4 (7), Easter 2 (11), Easter 5 (12), Trinity 4 (9), Trinity 8 (7)

4 respondents said 'all' or 'too many to itemize'

Which of the possible problems listed in Question 1 do you think apply to these collects? (Indicate using the letters from Question 1. If different reasons apply to different collects then indicate this in the grid above by associating the relevant letters with the respective collects)

Number of respondents = 11

Of the possible problems suggested in Question 1, the order of problems cited was: c) = 6, b) = 5, a) = 4, e) = 3, d) = 2, f) = 1, g) = 1

### SECTION B—New Collects

If you are using collects from other sources to supplement or replace some or all of the Common Worship collects, please indicate which of the sources listed below you are using:

Number of respondents = 38

- a) The Alternative Service Book 1980 = 7
- b) *The Promise of His Glory* = 6
- c) *Patterns for Worship* = 7
- d) Common Order 1994 (Church of Scotland) = 0
- e) The Missal (Roman Catholic) = 1
- f) 'Opening Prayers' from ICEL (Roman Catholic), published by Canterbury Press = 4
- g) The Methodist Worship Book of 1999 = 2
- h) Anglican Church of Canada: Book of Alternative Services 1985 = 2
- i) Anglican Church of Australia: A Prayer Book for Australia 1995 = 1
- j) Anglican Church of Aotearoa—New Zealand: A New Zealand Prayer Book 1989 = 5
- k) Janet Morley = 4
- j) David Adam = 4
- l) My own local adaptations of the Common Worship collects = 9
- m) Other (please state what): = 2 (different answers)

Note that in this question there was a distinct variation between those who filled in the questionnaire given out on the DLC Repts Day and those who used the version in NOL. NOL respondents were far more likely to (admit that they) use alternatives!

Do you consider that a complete set of alternatives is required, or do you think that alternatives are only required for a limited number of the most problematic collects?

Legal advice to the Commission has confirmed that any alternative set of collects will need a full synodical process. Therefore, the group aims to produce a draft as quickly as is reasonably possible, so that, subject to synod's budgetary and time constraints and the House of Bishops' approval, an initial consideration may take place within the current synod's quinquennium.

I have collated the results from the questionnaires received up to the day of the Liturgical Commission's meeting, and these are enclosed should you wish to publish them. I would be grateful if you could inform readers that the questionnaire consultation is now over. Collating and analyzing the replies takes some time, and, having conducted a straw poll, we now need to turn our energies to writing liturgy.

One interesting result of the poll is the number who expressed a preference for both an approved alternative set of collects, and the rubrical freedom to use collects from other sources. However, to alter the rubrics of (say) Common Worship Holy Communion would probably need the whole rite to pass through full synodical revision again. The discussion of the collects has raised to my mind much larger issues about the way the Church of England authorizes its liturgy, and whether the whole process (contained in Canons B1 to B5A) needs updating to meet the needs of worship and mission today. Of course, this opinion is my own, rather than that of the Commission.

With best wishes  
Paul Roberts

### The Collects Questionnaire: The Results

All questionnaires received before the Liturgical Commission meeting of 10 December have now been analyzed. The results are as follows:

Total number of questionnaires received = 40

#### SECTION A—*The Existing CW Collects*

Please tick boxes below to indicate which (if any) of these general criticisms of the collects you consider to be true in your experience of using them:

Number of respondents = 40

- a) They are too long (even with the long Trinitarian ending omitted). = 18
- b) The vocabulary is too complicated. = 30
- c) They are too complex in their sentence structure. = 34
- d) They do not relate to the readings (Note: they are not intended to, but some people would like them to). = 5
- e) Some of them are so close to their Prayer Book originals that they are unusably archaic. = 31
- f) Some of them are too bland and not 'poetic' enough. = 6
- g) Other (please state): = 8 (no clear trends)
- h) The Common Worship collects are generally fine as they are. = 5

century, the Canterbury Benedictinal (the official liturgical book of the Archbishops of Canterbury for blessings at festivals), and the Portiforium of St. Wulfstan (the prayer book of the last great Anglo-Saxon Bishop, a Benedictine monk, who died in 1095).

Through this book we encounter many things about the Anglo-Saxon church which are so different from the medieval church which followed it, and come to us with a freshness which makes them relevant to today. It is appropriate that the book includes an Anglo-Saxon time-line: Michael Swanton, in the introduction to his translation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* points to the importance of marking the passage of time for the literate Anglo-Saxon with both agricultural and religious festivals: 'the passage of year on year was no less important as the Millennium approached and the Second Coming of Christ was confidently expected.' There is a strong sense of immediacy, a real expectation of God's presence, the sense of the supernatural combined with the practical in very down to earth Christianity. This makes it a spiritually rewarding book, and not just an archeological one.

Trevor Lloyd

George Guiver (ed), *Priests in a People's Church* (SPCK, 2001, x/148pp A5 pb, £10.99)

Here is a team of modern Mirfield (ie in favour of the ordination of women and somewhat Aff Cath) providing a symposium designed not really to highlight 'priests' as such (George Guiver's introduction says that cannot be done—read it to see why); rather it is to renovate the colours of the backcloth of the stage on which priests are set and thus to present the occupants of the office in a more vivid context. In part this arises from being the successor to *The Fire and the Clay*; in part it arises from the artistic and similar interests of the present team. Here, in unfairly shortened terms, is a summary:

Benjamin Gordon-Taylor invokes a category of mystery, and deploys it to show that 'the ordained priesthood is a sign of a hidden reality as well as a visible functional office' (p12). This enables him to go on 'It is a participation in and not a complete or exclusive identification with the priesthood of Christ.' The upshot is a 'sacramental, mysterious relationship with God's people' (p15)—and his verbal play with 'hidden-and-disclosed' leaves his thesis beyond falsification. But perhaps I am an evangelical scholastic?

John Gribben, CR, has a chapter entitled 'Screen Idol'. His thesis seems to be that we identify with the convincing advocate (or rabble-rouser) on the screen, and 'In a way, that is what the Christian priest is called on to do for the people of God in a parish' (p27)—ie being 'a representative, an icon, a curtain-raiser' (p27). However, the power to do this comes not from dramatic abilities but from the 'authority endowed upon that person'. I wondered whether that 'authority' point did not negate all the previous ones . . . And when he goes on with Aaron and his breastplate—and modern priests with their stoles (worn by the angel announcing

the resurrection (p29) according to Gribben, who actually says it was 'a white *stolas*' in the Greek of St Matthew, but I studied Matt.28.3 and failed to find the angel's stole—I fail to follow. There is more, but *caveat lector*.

Charles Pickstone, a notable Woolwich incumbent, deals with priests in the media—the vicar of Dibley and all that. He is himself concerned to portray priests as those who (alone) 'retain something of this vanished world [of ancient spirituality]' (p39). But there is something of sacredness in 'space' (and the acres of graves around the Somme are his illustration), and the ways the media crowd and limit space deprive us of a proper picture of priesthood. However, after a circuitous stroll around the media, the priest must positively use the media and 'must set up his [his?] stall alongside the spiritualists, crystal-sellers and faith-healers, alongside the ecowarriors, animal liberation, and social action groups'—expressing real reality (p48).

Margaret Selby offers a chapter on the laity, and rightly insists that priest and people together are the church.

Sister Barbara June, SLG, deals with being a pioneer priest in a women's community which, by definition, never had priests before. Her emphasis is upon prayer—'Monastic priesthood is at least as much to do with the life of the cell as with life in the sanctuary.' (p71)

George Guiver himself writes 'priest and victim'. The title sounds like a high church phrase about Jesus himself, but at root George is talking about priests being, *qua* priests, vulnerable and victimized in society. He also follows circuitous paths, including passing through a mist called 'mystery', and telling us that, in the eucharist, 'We encounter Christ just as closely as anyone in a village in first-century Galilee, and *just as physically*' (p81, italics mine).

Nicholas and Christine Henshall have four vignettes of clergy marriages, with every kind of subtle shading between marital joy and marital strain, including variations within the life of any one couple. The constant question is the effect of the marital relationship upon the discharge of the office.

Peter Allan is a CR religious who writes on 'The Priest, Sex and Society'. I duck this one—it is remoter from liturgy and difficult to epitomize.

Ben Gordon-Taylor has an unromanticized (but quite possibly overstated) concept of the aloneness of the priest (called 'detachment' in his title), and he has us peer in on his subject praying alone, contemplating alone, hermitting, with an inner hiddenness in which even the participation in the life of the church has an essential aloneness.

Finally, George himself gives 'priest as focus', and this does link the inner life with the outer activity—and a eucharistic angle. And . . . 'the priest is the pilot light in the parish's geyser . . .'

COB

#### IN MEMORIAM—BISHOP ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Alexander Hamilton died on 22 December at the age of 86 (not 77 as in *Church Times*). He was Bishop of Jarrow from 1965 to 1980, and was a member of the Liturgical Commission from around 1976 to 1981, possibly because he was one of

the three Northern suffragans elected to the House of Bishops in 1975, the first time that suffragans ever sat in that House (and, it will be remembered, the chairman of the Commission was Ronald Jasper, Dean of York in that period, but not a member of the House of Bishops and therefore needing advocates there). I cannot say what role Alex Hamilton ever fulfilled in that House—I certainly cannot recall any part he played in General Synod in that frantic period of activity from 1976 to 1979 as we put the parts of the ASB through the sausage-machine. But maybe I am wrong—perhaps his claim was that he could be regularly in touch with Arthur Couratin, who had retired in County Durham . . . I do not recall either that he had notable academic or liturgical qualifications. But he was a delightful person—and I say that having known him in his Durham DDO capacity, rather than as a liturgist.

COB

#### Next month's publications . . .

. . . is Worship Series no 168, *Anglican Ordination Rites: The Berkeley Statement 'To equip the Saints'*, edited by Paul Gibson; and comprising the Berkeley Statement of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation agreed by 70 participants in California last August, on ordination and ministry. It forms a triad with the 1991 Toronto Statement on initiation 'Walk in Newness of Life' (published in Grove Worship Series no 118, *Christian Initiation in the Anglican Communion*), and with the 1995 Dublin Statement on the eucharist (published in Grove Worship Series no 135, *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*)

And the CCP Almanack for 2002 is still available by sending an SAE to the editorial address—and, lest you fear a clash in February with your shiny new Common Worship Daily Prayer, Bro Tristram reassures you the CCP calendar has now been harmonized with the CW one.

#### COLLECTS UPDATE

Dear Colin

Thank you for publishing the questionnaire that was distributed to the representatives at the DLC day in October. We have received responses both from the day itself, and the version published in NOL. In the light of the obvious interest in the matter, readers might appreciate some update on the current state of play.

The Liturgical Commission received its 'marching orders' from the House of Bishops following the Synod motion at our December meeting, and a sub-group has been duly constituted under my chairmanship. The other members are John Burniston (Bradford Diocese), Dana Delap (Liturgical Commission, General Synod, Durham Diocese), David Scott (Winchester Diocese) and Angela Tilby (Liturgical Commission, Westcott House). The other corresponding members from the Commission are Peter Craig-Wild (Wakefield Diocese), Jeremy Haselock (Norwich Cathedral) and Christopher Cocksworth (Ridley Hall).