

AND APOLOGIES TO NEWCASTLE DIOCESE

John Chamberlin, who reported from Newcastle in the February NOL, writes in that we omitted a word in his report. The sentence six lines up from the bottom should have read:

'Worship is the area where the whole people of God join together and do theology . . .'

He kindly blames gremlins—we believe we got it by E-mail, but still should do our proof-reading more carefully, and so offer apologies.

CAN ANYONE HELP?

Donald Gray (of 3 Barn Hill Mews, Stamford, Lincs PE9 2GN) is working at a chapter in a history of St Paul's cathedral (yes, I know and he knows that he was himself at Westminster Abbey, there's no need to write in). In the course of it, he is trying to track down the famous story of Dean Inge, who, when asked if he was interested in liturgy, apocryphally replied: 'No, neither do I collect stamps'. Ah, but whence came the story? Who knows its source? Mere hearsay or confirmation of apocryphality is not sought, but a well-documented tracing to the Dean himself will elicit a reward of used stamps for your collection from Donald Gray.

And, while we are seeking information, does anyone out there have memories of Charles Whitaker? Bill Kelly (of 73 Upperby Road, Carlisle CA2 4JE) is writing a memoir of him. I think we have asked this before, but Bill Kelly has now started drafting, and so this is really a last trawl. There must be more to tell than he has got.

AND OUR APOLOGIES TO THE BISHOP WHO IS A CASTLE

We reported last month on the consecration of the new Bishop of Tonbridge—but, our eagle-eyed readers inform us, we reported him as being 'Brian Clark'. Our deepest apologies—he is in fact Brian Castle—though, for all we know, he may by now be Brian Tonbrigiensis and thus swallow up our thoughtless (and possibly Freudian) error.

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 327

March 2002

EDITORIAL

I said last month that I hoped to write more on confessions and absolutions, and as it is still Lent when I write, now seems to be the time. To do so, I have to take you back over some history of the last 21 years, history I did record at the time, but realize it may have slipped from memory.

In December 1980, I dissented from a proposal of the Liturgical Commission to incorporate a text 'I absolve you from all your sins' in a draft 'Reconciliation of a Penitent' rite. (Hugh Craig, whose obituary follows here, dissented from the whole rite.) The background, of course, was the 1662 provision for an absolution given to the dying within the service for the Visitation of the Sick, and that itself had a background in the changes made from 1549 to 1552 (which I described in passing in a review of Ashley Null's book about Thomas' Cranmer doctrine of repentance in the February NOL). The upshot was a first person 'indicative' absolution quite unlike the absolution in Morning and Evening Prayer (third person declaratory) or the one in Holy Communion (precatory). I opposed the 1980 proposal to authorize this text:

- (a) because I think that the first person indicative form is stretching gospel truth (that God alone forgives (Mark 2.7, 10) to its utmost (though it might be just possible for someone dying);
- (b) because I thought that the provision for the dying was not of itself a warrant for the universal form for absolving healthy penitents;
- (c) because I thought it quite unnecessary to provide by two-thirds majorities in General Synod for liturgical forms which were to be used in private ministry;
- (d) because it would have been improper to set up 'The Reconciliation of a Penitent' as an 'alternative' to the Visitation of the Sick in the Prayer Book, and other forms were in fact being authorized for just that purpose anyway (entitled 'Ministry to the Sick'). Ergo, the Reconciliation rite was not 'alternative' to anything in the BCP, it dealt with a situation 'for which no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer' (Canon B 5) and any text under that heading could be used or not according to the minister's discretion.

That's my own story so far. I tabled questions in General Synod in 1981-2, asking what forms were the lawful requirement of the Church of England for giving absolution to physically healthy penitents. I invariably got the answer that the form in the 1662 Visitation of the Sick was *the* lawful provision, and nothing else could be used. I concluded I was up against the (not unknown) judgment of policy, rather than one of law. Well, the day came—the Reconciliation rite came to its final

judgment. We had separate votes in the Convocations and in the House of Laity (a process used then for the first time ever and only repeated since in relation to the ordination of women as presbyters). In the House of Laity (in February 1983) there was no two-thirds majority on the separate vote. On the next day, the Synod members found on their seats a fuller legal opinion from the Registrar, which stuck to the judgment that no text for private absolution could be used unless it were authorized as an alternative service. But the House of Laity duly defeated it.

That legal opinion is what I call a first 'tight' judgment. I had guessed all along that the lawyers would change their minds if the Reconciliation rite were defeated. Sure enough, when the Commission provided *Lent—Holy Week—Easter*, to be (not authorized but) commended by the House of Bishops, the lawyers had apparently no problems with page 56, which provided 'A Form of Absolution which may be used for the quieting of the individual conscience'. The text had, as its punch line, 'I declare that you are absolved from your sins . . .'—but the text (though irenic) is almost irrelevant, because the point is that a 'commended' text is, by its very existence, a statement that there is no authorized text in this field, that there is no need for an authorized text in this field, and that this field is wide open for any minister to use any form he or she chooses. Thus by 1986, when the texts were published, the lawyers had done their *volte-face*, they had become 'loose'

Ah, but all was not over. When a Service of the Word started on its official path to authorization in the early 1990s, the lawyers decided at Revision Committee stage that the outline structure should not order a confession and absolution unless texts were provided, and the one-page, structure-only, rite suddenly took on pages of appendix about texts for confession and absolution. The tail had far outgrown the dog, and the result can be seen in Common Worship, and in the careful notes and rubrics and authorized forms for confessions and absolutions in it (some of which are quoted by my correspondents below). Woe betide anyone who pronounces any absolution which does not have General Synod authorization behind him. I wrote up some of this in a contribution to the *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* in 1996. The lawyers had again gone 'tight'—though, I suppose, it might be argued that this was public worship and was different (but then part of the original point about private absolutions had been that they were (metaphysically?) part of public worship . . .).

But times have moved on since then; and, I gently suggest, the lawyers (or Brian Hanson in his last months) have tacitly and unobtrusively done yet another *volte-face* in Common Worship. I refer to the rite entitled 'Ministry at the Time of Death' in *CW Pastoral Services* pp 217-235. On pages 220-221 there is a section entitled 'Reconciliation'. Sure enough, it anticipates that the minister is preparing someone for death, with just the two of them present (see the Note at the top of page 217, and the further rubric at the top of page 222). The minister invites an expression of penitence from the dying person and then gives an absolution to that person (page 221), and now the guts of the text look like this:

Indeed, it was in the area of law that he exercised himself most polemically, and in 1965 he wrote in an essay entitled 'Lawful Authority and Prayer Book Revision' (contained in G.E.Duffield (ed) *Towards a Modern Prayer Book* (Marcham Manor Press)) about the battles in the 1950s to ensure that the Alternative Services Measure contained no loopholes of unexplored areas where clergy could innovate at pleasure. He was adamantly opposed to options and freedom within services for the officiant to please himself or herself—his argument always being that 'the clergy will choose what they personally want upfront, whilst the laity will simply have to put up with the choices the clergy make'. The idea was abhorrent to him, and he bared his teeth and attacked it—even, it seemed, forgetting on occasion that he was himself a Reader (and, I suspect, one to keep his incumbent in good and lawful order). The clergy were all too often the bad guys in his book.

From 1971 to 1980 Hugh was on the Liturgical Commission, to strengthen both the evangelical participation and the liturgical voice in the House of Laity. I am not sure he was ever happy in this role (though he was always ready to contribute within discussion), but (like Samson) he struck a blow at his point of departure, dissenting from the Commission's proposals in December 1980 for Blessing of Oils and a Service of Reconciliation—and duly seeing both through to defeat in General Synod. In latter years his contributions in General Synod always appeared to me to be those of anti-clericalist and disappointed loner.

COB

DIOCESAN REPORT (2001-2 CYCLE)—13 CHESTER

Since the part-time appointment of a Diocesan Worship Adviser in March 2000, one of the most exciting developments has been the establishment of the Worship Adviser's Support Group (in effect the Chester DLC resurrected). The members of this group have facilitated an ongoing series of training events in relation to the introduction of Common Worship by offering specialist advice and working in sub-groups on specific tasks eg the revision of diocesan services. The focus of liturgical activity for 2002 includes deanery visits with the Healing Advisers to encourage the introduction of Wholeness and Healing Services, discussions in parish clusters on the recently published resource for Daily Prayer, and a trio of morning workshops on new music to accompany CW Morning and Evening Prayer. Two members of the group are active in Praxis NW, helping to organize the 2-3 conferences held per year, and utilizing the valuable information received from them to underpin diocesan initiatives. Like many dioceses, the focus of our future activity will be to explore with congregations how our worship not only reflects by also affects our identity as evolving Christian communities. The mechanisms by which this exploration occurs are still to be discovered. However, seeking for the tools to assist us promises to be a far greater challenge than unpacking the new texts the Church of England have just received.

Sally Stutz
Diocesan Worship Adviser.

More information and the files themselves can be found at:

<http://www.cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/resources/indexres.html>

ORDINAL CHANGES LISTED

If you were unsure how the ASB Ordinal was amended in 2000 to bridge the gap between the ASB and the new Common Worship Ordinal (due in 2005), then a list of changes is now available.

More information can be found at:

<http://www.cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/other/ordinal/amend.html>

DESKTOP ORDERS OF SERVICE TRAINING COURSE

March 13 2002. Take a day out to produce the elegant Order of Service you have always wanted for your church. Put the principles of good liturgical design into practice and take your work away on disk. The course will be led by Rev Martin Short, Head of Communications Training and Development with the Church of England. He is also a broadcaster, TV adviser and was a communications officer for the Diocese of Bradford. The course takes place in Church House, Westminster, London. Cost is £50 inc. VAT.

To check availability or to book a place, please visit

<http://www.commstraining.cofe.anglican.org/> or telephone 020 7898 1458/65

FINAL WORDS [as in previous letter]

IN MEMORIAM — HUGH CRAIG

Hugh Craig died in late February at the age of 77. He was not only a survivor of the Church Assembly days—he actually had 20 years in the House of Laity of the Church Assembly (1950-1970) before doing 25 further years in General Synod. He represented several different dioceses in that time, but always managed to get elected in his new place of residence, and so sustained the 45 years in action. Many of his synodical activities were not connected to liturgy and are passed by here.

Hugh was a doughty and embattled evangelical; he was also (perhaps typically of his generation) strongly reactionary; and he was also (perhaps because of those 20 years in the CA) strongly anti-clerical. In liturgy he was deeply involved in the defeat of Series 1 confirmation service in the Laity in June 1966; he was vigorously opposed to the Series 1 and Series 2 proposals for burial services, largely because of prayers for the dead; and he had a key role in seeking alternative (and unitive) ways forward from those innovations. His stance was well expressed in his own words: 'We can let Oswald Clark pray for the dead, so long as I can write the prayers he uses'. He had great trust in the law . . .

. . . By the ministry of reconciliation
entrusted by Christ to his Church,
receive his pardon and peace
to stand before him in his strength alone,
this day and evermore.
Amen.

Now this might well be thought, as a text, to be a great improvement on the 1662 form. But the point of interest is again not the text, but the *category*. Turn to pages 403 and 404, where the kind of authorization of texts is listed, and you will find the funeral rites are shown as 'authorized', but Ministry at the Time of Death is 'commended'. The heading on page 404 says that the House of bishops 'commended' the texts 'pursuant to Canon B 2'; but that, I venture to submit, is not possible—as Canon B 2 only provides for 'authorization' (ie by two-thirds votes in three Houses in Synod), or for a local extension of the use of a service which nationally has lapsed. It has no room for 'commended'. Canon B 4 opens up the category of services for which 'no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer' (B 4.1), and (in my October 2000 printing of the Canons) has a footnote saying that a list of 'commended' forms will be found on page 182 of this printing of the Canons. The assumption here is that one of the authorities listed in paragraphs 1-3 will 'approve' services, probably (but not necessarily) from the 'commended' rites. I doubt if they have done so or will do so—and that delivers us instead to Canon B 5.2 which gives the local minister permission to use forms thought suitable by him (or her) for occasions for which no other provision is made. It is here that 'commended' texts come into play—for the Category of 'commendation' by the House of Bishops was deliberately chosen in order *not* to cramp local choice.

I could stay further on that category question (let alone the heading to page 404), but the main point I am trying to make is this: that ministering at the time of death is now viewed as a service 'for which no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer' (Canons B 4.1 and B 5.2). This is, of course, marginally ludicrous—the Visitation of the Sick in the BCP virtually anticipates that the beneficiary of the Visitation ministry will peg out shortly and be in some breach of contract if he or she fails to do so; and it is quite specific in relation to confession and absolution that these are prompted and given in the expectation of death. So one might have thought that 'tight' legal judgments would make the CW provision for 'Ministry at the Time of Death' a service for which the BCP *does* make provision. Ergo, the new legal judgment is not tight. Seen in an historical context, I venture the thought that in 1981-83 we were being told that the provisions in the BCP Visitation of the Sick applied to every class of person who made private confession, whether sick or not, whether visited or not; whilst in 1999-2001 we are being told the same provisions do not even apply now to the dying! (And I think it was the same Registrar who must have given the advice—and I confess I did myself see the point when the House of Bishops was being asked to 'commend' the Ministry at the Time of Death

material, but, as in this case I was happy to see the lawyers blow a hole in their own judgments, I kept quiet, and voted for 'commended'.)

Finally, we look at what the rite says on page 221. I have already remarked that, if it is to have any official standing, it is a much less misleading text than the 1662 first person singular indicative one. But the point I am making above is that the lawyers are now saying that any minister has discretion to provide any forms of confession and absolution he or she thinks fit. A 'commended' rite does not have a monopoly in its field—it is 'commended' specifically in order to allow the local discretion to remain. And I thus conclude (till the E-mails flock in) that the lawyers have now abandoned all attempts to control the forms of absolution used in a private ministry, let alone identify one form as the Church of England official form—and that in turn makes me doubt whether the 'tight' rigidity of forms for absolution in rites for public worship will prove very enduring. Note Anna de Lange's letter opposite. But we shall see.

Colin Buchanan

THE PRAXIS CONSULTATION, FEBRUARY 2002

We mentioned in January that Praxis had asked for a consultation with its parent bodies, the Liturgical Commission, the Alcuin Club, and the Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW). This was duly held for 24 hours at Whirlow Grange in Sheffield from 14 to 15 February, and it was then succeeded by the Praxis Council's own annual overnight conference. What came out of it?

From Praxis' point of view, the consultation coincided with Mark Earey's return to parish ministry (see February NOL), with a re-examination of *Praxis News* (not least in the light of NOL and the differences and similarities), and with a desire to revisit the administrative processes which have been provided for many years through the generosity of St Matthew's, Westminster.

The upshot is not spectacular, but a true reflection of the position. Gilly Myers is taking over the editorship of *Praxis News* from Mark Earey (and the next issue is under preparation, but there is no promise anywhere of the rate of production); and, there is a careful exploration afoot as to what premises or agency might provide an administrative HQ for Praxis. The administration of Praxis Regional groups is usually handled in the regions anyway—and it was the regional provision on the whole which aroused the most enthusiasm at the Consultation.

Within the broader Consultation, *News of Liturgy* and *News of Hymnody* received some extended consideration. The starting point is that NOL (the senior journal) has a genuine standing as the semi-official journal of liturgy of the Church of England, since the Commission asked it around 13 years ago to add extra pages to include diocesan reports. There has been no idea so far as to how a monthly journal can continue if, as and when NOL and its editor cease—yet it is monthliness which ensures 'news'. The Consultation recognized the position, and (quite properly) handed all decisions back to GROW. GROW meets in July and should take far-reaching decisions then.

ROOTS PROJECT LAUNCHED

Roots is a new ecumenical project that provides a lectionary-based resource programme for all churches. The Roots magazines and web site together provide dated material linked to The Revised Common Lectionary to support the worship and learning of the whole Church community.

Roots will be available from May 2002, ready for use in September 2002. The web site is now up and running to provide an early glimpse of what is coming with full details of how to subscribe.

More information can be found at:

<http://www.rootsontheweb.co.uk/>

DESKTOP ORDERS OF SERVICE TRAINING COURSE

March 13 2002. Take a day out to produce the elegant Order of Service you have always wanted for your church. Put the principles of good liturgical design into practice and take your work away on disk. The course will be led by Rev Martin Short, Head of Communications Training and Development with the Church of England. He is also a broadcaster, TV adviser and was a communications officer for the Diocese of Bradford. The course takes place in Church House, Westminster, London. Cost is £50 inc. VAT. To check availability or to book a place, please visit

<http://www.commstraining.cofe.anglican.org/>
or telephone 020 7898 1458/65

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 so that we can update your details. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Best wishes

David Green

Electronic Projects Manager, Church House Publishing
Church House, Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3NZ.

Tel: 020 7898 1582, Fax: 020 7898 1449

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

www.chpublishing.co.uk

David Green's E-Mail of 8 March reads

COMMON WORSHIP EMAIL LIST

I am writing with news of Common Worship.

DAILY PRAYER RTF FILES NOW AVAILABLE

I am pleased to announce that RTF files of the material in Common Worship: Daily Prayer has now been added to the existing provision in both PDF and ordinary web page (HTML) formats.

DIARY DATES

- 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.
- 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)

WHAT THE SPELLCHECK MIGHT HAVE SPOTTED

(but didn't, as it came from pre-Spellchecker days)

Mark Earey reports seeing on a vestry noticeboard, under 'A Guide for servers', what may have been an ancient notice:

'The crucifer will lead, followed by the Aka lights'

Next month's publication . . .

. . . is Worship Series no 169, *How to . . . lead the prayers* by Anna de Lange and Elizabeth Simpson is the first of a new style of practical booklet designed to be used by one person as a workbook or a group as a training course. It covers issues from 'why pray at all?' to 'how loud should I speak?' and will help to get you out of a rut, or to start a new prayer team going.

THE HORSE'S MOUTH — GREEN WITH INFORMATION

David Green's E-Mail of 22 February reads
COMMON WORSHIP EMAIL LIST *****

I am writing with news of Common Worship.
'SERVICES FOR TODAY' NOW AVAILABLE

You may have noticed on the Church of England web site that you are able to access Morning and Evening Prayer daily from The Book of Common Prayer. We are pleased to announce that this service has now been updated to offer Common Worship: Daily Prayer as well.

More information and the services themselves can be found at:
<http://www.cofe.anglican.org/services/index.html>

DAILY PRAYER—ODD POINTS COME IN

COB having raised here in February questions about the place of penitence in Daily Prayer, we have an answer direct from the stable (the next-door stall to David Green's). David Hebblethwaite, secretary of the Liturgical Commission, writes as follows:

'The form of *A Service of the Word* which was authorized in the mid-1990s was explicit that "*Authorized prayers of penitence are to be used here or in the prayers*"; The revision of *A Service of the Word* which was authorized in the late 1990s and is now incorporated in *Common Worship* was deliberately worded "*authorized forms of penitence may be used here or in the prayers*". At the same time Note 2 (*Common Worship Main Volume*, page 26) was rephrased and expanded to meet precisely the point you raise in your editorial. Notes are, as you will realize, as authoritative as the rubrics. It is the revised form of *A Service of the Word* with its expanded Note 2 which is reflected in the provision for Daily Prayer.'

Then the E-mails came, of which the following is the most substantial . . .

Dear Colin

I read your piece about Penitence in Daily Prayer (and more generally in *A Service of the Word*) with interest. No, you do not have to have penitence (or a creed) in absolutely any service that comes under the provisions of ASOTW. Note 2 on page 26 of the main CW book is pretty clear "[Prayers of Penitence] may be omitted except at the Principal Service on Sundays and Principal Holy Days." Note 8 has similar wording about the sermon and the creed. Therefore pages 78 and 79 in Daily Prayer are correct, and penitence IS optional on most occasions when the Daily Prayer book is in use, although there may be occasions when it is particularly appropriate so prayers are provided. In the main CW book bold type is used for clarity, not to give any indication of the mandatory nature of the elements of the service.

Moral—read the notes and rubrics as well as the Outline Order! (Sorry for appearing to teach a bishop to suck eggs! . . .)

As and when you do come to look at the 'overall provision of confessions and absolutions' it is important to note the rubric hidden away on page 133 of the main volume: '*Short sentences may be inserted between the petitions of the Kyrie, suitable for particular seasons or themes. The insertion of such sentences may replace any form of confession, provided that the sentences are of a penitential nature and are followed by an authorised form of absolution.*' Which I take to mean: you can write your own confession as long as it IS a confession, and as long as it is in a Kyrie form.

Blessings upon you . . .

Anna de Lange

I return (well taught) to sucking eggs. Meanwhile I have been ruminating during Lent on why the 'Opening Prayer' in Morning Prayer (CW Daily Prayer pp89,94

etc), to which I became accustomed when using CCP, disappeared when we reached Lent (see p.210, 216). What E-mail will relieve me of this distress?

And those ribbons. A kind donor sent me some—I rejoice: gray ribbons.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

In NOL 326 (Feb 2002) you wonder why the texts of the Lord's Prayer are printed on the last page. This seems to be as a handy reference point since these texts are not printed in the body of the offices (we have some attractively printed bookmarks with the texts on). Of course the texts are rather well known, but it might be useful for some to have an (easily accessible) reminder of the less familiar words if these happen to be used—and if leading the office it is as well to have the words to hand: I recall once starting 'Our Father . . .' as I had been taught to emphasize the first two words of texts for 'all'—and we lapsed into a confused mess, even though we ALWAYS use the 'modern' version. It is easy to be distracted.

I am curious about the theory behind the wording of the seasonal prayers pp324ff. For example p338, no11 for Lent contains:

For the sick in body, mind and spirit,
that they may know your power to heal,
Let us pray to the Lord: R

Well the first two lines are addressed godwards, and the third is apparently supposed to join the speaker with the congregation: but the implication of the 'you' language is that 'us' is the speaker and God. I thought the reason suggested for moving away from 'Let us proclaim the mystery of faith' to 'great is the mystery of faith' was precisely this.

This set is particularly confusing because the first petition starts 'For the people of God . . .' where the logic of the rest would demand 'For your people . . .'

So some such change as 'your' becomes 'God's' or the bidding becomes 'we pray to you O Lord/God' would seem indicated.

Just flicking through, set 15 (p340) look OK, set 19 are mixed, set 5 are OK, set 9 need some attention.

Best wishes

Mark Bennet

(curate, St Matthew's Chapel Allerton)

Dear Colin

I have a case of a burial of retained organs of a baby buried in our churchyard 19 years ago! This is a new thing here, but I gather this might be the first of several / many. I know it has happened elsewhere (Liverpool springs to mind) and wonder if anyone has devised a liturgy for this. If you know of anything or can put me in touch with e.g. Liverpool's Sec. that would be a big help, but longer term might it be something to float in NOL as it is bound to recur elsewhere?

Best wishes

Bruce Carlin

brucecarlin@freeuk.com

Daily.Prayer@durham.anglican.org

[Whilst (in the words of Trevor Lloyd's Booklet title) we have provision for dying step by step in CW, this lies well beyond those steps. Trevor, any work in hand?—COB]

LITURGICAL EDUCATION AND FORMATION STRATEGY?

We began publishing last year the Annex to the Liturgical Commission's report on the quinquennium 1995-2000. Last month we completed the section labelled '2 Action', which we began (in the October NOL). Now we continue with '3 Key People'

Any national strategy for liturgical education and formation will rely on key people.

- Parish clergy supported by Readers and parish worship teams
- Diocesan Bishops
- Diocesan human resources—CME Officers, Reader Trainers, etc
- Ordination Training Courses and Colleges
- Diocesan Liturgical Committees (or equivalent bodies) and diocesan officers/advisers where these exist
- Publishers of training and discussion material, including a well-resourced Church House Publishing
- Those who enthuse and run voluntary bodies such as Praxis, the Group for Renewal of Worship (GROW) and the Alcuin Club
- A national-level Office able to co-ordinate and 'network' between the range of key players. Such work would often be most effective on the basis of regional co-ordination/grouping and for that to happen somebody needs to be charged with responsibility for co-ordination.

For the future the Liturgical Commission will be the appropriate body to be responsible for continuing education and communications work, currently being undertaken as part of the Liturgical Publishing exercise, and, for the moment, drawing on the resources of Church House Publishing's Marketing Department.