

Ksh.250.000 [around £2,500]. Uzima also met all the printing costs. All this money was received between the years 2000 and 2002. This generosity is very kindly appreciated and acknowledged.

A Dream Come True

Concluding the Preface to the *Modern Service of Holy Communion* [1989], then Bishop Gitari had written: "These are the first fruits of liturgical renewal in the Church of the Province of Kenya and an exciting foretaste of the future new prayerbook." This book is the living proof of the wonders of trusting in God. We begun without money and we encountered many discouragements along the way but we confidently faced the challenge, trusting God for miracles. And so as the Archbishop numerously quotes: "Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." (Hebrews 11.1). We practised it and still do, and we have not been disappointed.'

We in the Liturgical Committee are truly happy to finally bequeath the Anglican Church of Kenya and the Anglican Communion as well, the actual taste of the dream prayerbook, and to our Archbishop and dynamic patron, The Most Rev. David Mukuba Gitari, a real cause as he retires on the 16 September 2002. And personally, I thank him so much for all the encouragement and drive he has given me and all of us in the committee as we struggled through the demands of the task.

May God bless you as you use these services, and may you be enriched and nurtured spiritually to the glory of the almighty God who lives and reigns in the unity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and forever. Amen.

My understanding is that publication day was exactly David Gitari's retirement day. While his legacy in Kenya covers many fronts (ecclesiastical, evangelistic, theological—and political), it may well be that the rest of the Communion will find his liturgical energies ripple out to us over many years to our benefit and God's glory. He has contributed greatly.

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 2003 **£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 336

December 2002

EDITORIAL

I have dropped plenty of hints of two notable anniversaries this month, both of them 75th ones. I try now to mark them both appropriately.

They happened almost simultaneously in December 1927, one on Thameside, one on Tyneside. The effects of both are with us still. Yet at the time it was only Thameside that got the publicity; while, in the light of 75 years, it is Tyneside which has had the greater impact over the years. I take them in that order, and it is Tyneside which makes this editorial.

At St. John's, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in December 1927, the vicar, one Noel Hudson, with his senior curate, Henry de Candole, led the Church Council of this fairly anglo-catholic parish into a new pattern of Sunday morning worship. Previously there was opportunity for the pious to receive communion (fasting) at the 8 am; there was then a 'children's eucharist' (non-communicating) at 10, and a high mass (without general communion) presumably at 11. All (or most) of this got turned into what became quickly known as 'the 9.15'—a parish communion as we understand it to-day, with preaching and communion, with adults and kiddies, and with choir and song. Naturally people still received fasting, and the celebration was followed by a parish breakfast (which also became foundational to the movement). It would, by today's standards, look very old-fashioned—Eastward position, very clericalist, probably quite a bit of Tridentine ceremonial, and not a hint of the Peace (which only arrived for the congregation in the late 1960s).

Henry de Candole, whom I knew well in the 1960s, wrote up this Newcastle event in an essay (originally a conference address) in David Paton (ed), *The Parish Communion Today* (SCM, 1962). He is scrupulously fair in noting all sorts of tiny starts of a similar sort (going right back to the 1840s); but in most such cases no continuity was established, and the watershed character of the Newcastle decision was that all uses of the parish communion since that date look as though they come within a single stream, a stream which began flowing there at that time and has flowed on increasingly ever since.

The further stages are well known. In the 1930s Gabriel Hebert wrote *Liturgy and Society* in 1935 (drawing now upon the continental Liturgical Movement), and then edited *The Parish Communion* in 1937. Brother Edward topped this up with *Sunday Morning—The New Way* in 1938. The literature was giving a theological undergirding to the parish changes; and the parishes giving evidence were growing in number all the country (though hardly all over the churchmanships, for all that the protagonists strove to present it as an across-the-board Anglican phenomenon).

Henry de Candole pops up again, as he became 'liturgical missionary' for the diocese of Chichester in 1937, and gave himself to teaching weeks in a succession of parishes, promoting the parish communion concept. The base was sufficiently well laid for the practice to mushroom after the war, assisted by the Parish and People pressure group. I have little space here to trace out those further stages, and they are part of the memories of at least some of NOLES readers. What is clear (very clear indeed to me as I look round the Woolwich Area) is that the Movement has changed the face of the Church of England, and changed it so deeply that it takes a great effort of will to recall middle and high church life before the parish communion came along.

However, I think it may be useful to include some of the resultant offspring of the Movement. The following quickly come to mind:

1. There has been a shift in 'catholic' thinking towards a fellowship meal, with an accompanying reduction of the insistence on 'offering the sacrifice' (which could be done without anyone sharing in the meal).
2. There has been a further consequence in terms of a 'one-room' ideal for liturgical celebration, sometimes seen in new buildings, more often in 're-ordering' of old ones—and chancels and screens have come under review. These were, I need hardly add, retained by Cranmer with a view to services taking place one side of them or the other; they were loved by Laud who pushed communion tables to the East end and ran services through the screens; they were ignored by the eighteenth century 'classical' church architects (who went for single-chamber square boxes with balconies); and then they came into their own again with the Gothic Revival in the nineteenth century (which taught most of the Anglican—and some of the non-conformist—world that the church-with-nave-chancel-and-sanctuary plan was revealed from heaven). Now, the fellowship meal concept was challenging the architectural shape.
3. The architectural and reordering changes led to Westward position. This is usually traced in England to Jock Cobham in The Queen's College, Birmingham, in the late 1940s, where the present chapel was, it is plausibly said, built for that Westward position. Leslie Brown in South India made the change about the same time, and a rubric in the CSI liturgy of 1950 recommended it. Even so, I doubt if 100 parishes in the Church of England reached that point before 1960, and the daring of the pioneers was less needed when Rome suddenly went flexible about the liturgy (and, yes, about the position of the president of the liturgy) in the post-1965 years, and Anglicans felt freer to follow.
4. There was an impact on liturgical revision. Despite John Robinson's best efforts in Clare College Chapel (see *Liturgy coming to Life* (1958)), 1662 was a poor main service of a Sunday, and very deficient for those for whom it was the only rite they attended. So the revision of the eucharist included Old Testament readings, more seasonal provision, more opportunity for lay people to lead the intercessions, more congregational texts—and that suddenly proactive 'Peace'.

This month's publications . . .

. . . are, firstly, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no 54, *The Savoy Conference Revisited*, by COB. The records of the Savoy Conference come from seventeenth century sources, and they were edited and reproduced in two nineteenth century volumes: E. Cardwell, *A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings connected with the Revision of The Book of Common Prayer; from the year 1558 to the year 1690* (1841, and 2nd ed. 1849) and G. Gould, *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity of 1662* (London, 1862). Both these present the Presbyterians' 'Exceptions' tabled at the Savoy Conference in 1661; and both also print the Bishops' (somewhat unyielding) Answers to the Exceptions—but neither editor brings the texts together. This Joint Study presents the General Exceptions in parallel column with their respective Answers; and for the Particular Exceptions there are four parallel columns—1. The Text in the 1604 Prayer Book to which 'Exception' is taken; 2. The actual Exception; 3. The Bishops' Answer; 4. COB's notes explaining both the background, and the outcome in its effect on the 1662 text. There is an Historical Introduction, Notes and Appendixes—and the volume runs to 80 pages rather than the usual 48, but the price is sustained at £4.95 so it is arguably good value on those grounds alone.

. . . and, also

Grove Worship Series no. 173, *Liturgy and Urban Mission*, by Tim Stratford This book draws on theological reflections of life in poor urban Liverpool to make a critique of liturgical developments and practice in the Church of England. Four areas of difference between working class culture and the dominant culture of the Church (language, relation to the world of education, use of money and personal identity) are directly applied to liturgical fundamentals such as literacy, imagery, preaching and offices that value the person. The book is upbeat about the lessons the wider church has to learn from communities it is often badly equipped to understand.

AND THAT KENYAN BOOK

At the address below we have been swamped with orders since last month's editorial, and have kept repeating our air mail orders. By all means ask us (cheques for £13.50 to the editor personally for inland copies, slightly more for abroad).

It may be of interest to readers not so much that we should give textual excerpts (though that does lie ahead, we anticipate), but that we should glance at the endpapers and learn something of the struggle to produce such a book in a 'developing country'. Joyce Karuri writes on page 303:

' . . . Funding

The publication of this prayerbook has been made possible because of the kind financial assistance we obtained from: Church Mission Society (UK): 14,000 sterling pounds; Archbishop of Canterbury Fund: 10,000 sterling pounds; United Thank Offering (USA): US\$34,000; and Uzima Press:

DIOCESAN REPORT (2001-2002 CYCLE)—19 HEREFORD

The big build up to the introduction of Common Worship two years ago has been followed by a quieter more reflective time. A considerable amount of time and energy ensured that information and advice was circulated as widely as possible in the diocese. We were able to use written material and presentations involving both clergy and laity to great effect. As a result the majority of parishes made the change with few problems. In the time since then we have been able to respond to questions and queries from individuals and parishes in an effort to help everyone make the best use of the material available.

In the time immediately after Advent 2000, the Diocesan Worship Committee worked closely with the training team in the diocese providing a range of CME events on all aspects of the new services. These were well supported, and provided an opportunity not only for looking at the new material in detail, but also for an exchange of ideas and experience. Throughout the emphasis was on using the new services effectively and encouraging good liturgical practice. Sadly we still struggle with those clergy who feel that they do not need any 'training', and yet are frequently the ones who need it the most! Any suggestions on how to tackle this problem would be welcome.

As part of the on going work of training and development we planned sessions which would address wider issues and areas of concern, in particular we looked to focus on All Age Worship, music and Visual Liturgy. We also looked at the possibility of an event to mark the launch of Common Worship: Daily Prayer. Unfortunately we seem to have reached saturation point at present, and attracted only limited interest in these events. As a result we are currently looking at the most effective way of sharing information and furthering the work of liturgical education and formation.

Much of our time recently has been taken up with the process of liturgical revision, and we now feel as a Committee that we need to look to the future, and in particular to the ways in which we relate to other diocesan groups and committees. Worship is part of the everyday life of our churches. If our worship is truly to speak of our faith, reflect something of our understanding of God, and provide a transforming experience for those who engage with it, then surely we must pay due care and attention to the ways in which we educate and support those in ministry. Worship and liturgy do not stand alone, and in considering the future we hope that there will be some discussion which will ensure that the Diocesan Worship Committee relates to and supports the work of the diocese.

The Revd Lesley Walker
Secretary, Hereford Diocesan Worship Committee

5. There was also an impact on children. I have always reckoned that the first children to come up to rails with their parents and to receive there a gentle pat and blessing are probably still alive today, could we but trace them (any offers?). It is the scandal not of non-reception simply (all 'catholic' families were always used to that), but of non-reception for those young children who are at the rail and their parents receive and they are refused. That's where the groundswell started, and the theologizing about baptism, about the relationship between baptism and confirmation, about what preparation is needed or appropriate—all that came in the wake of the actual practice on the ground of 'giving a blessing'.
6. And evangelicals? Well, they were traditionally very chary of this doctrinaire Sunday pattern; and their own liturgical (and sacramental) practice would have been hard to square with it. Admittedly, proponents of the parish communion would at intervals produce a token evangelical to prove it was an across-the-board movement (even one which superseded churchmanship divisions), but the evangelical constituency at large never bought into a weekly parish communion for the first forty years from the outset. The kind of reasons for caution came in the following categories:
 - (a) 'This is simply trying to make receiving the sacrament a panacea for all ills, or a fountain of all grace—and that is a thousand miles from the New Testament.' (In one sense that was right—not only was receiving communion taking a central place in the high church ideology, but ideals of self-examination and preparation (let alone the confessional) were fast dwindling.)
 - (b) 'It is cutting down preaching.' This was the case. In days when only the clergy and a very small set of clericalized lay readers could distribute the elements, then any growth in numbers at communion created a time problem. In many parishes an incumbent on his own might be taking bread to 90-100 communicants and going back and along each railful again to take the cup to the same people. The length of a service would be going up as numbers present went up, and the only flexible feature in terms of time was the sermon—and the tendency in the 1950s and 1960s was for sermons to be coming down to around seven minutes. Evangelicals found it easy to be horrified.
 - (c) 'It militates against evening services.' When I was a curate in the early '60s our evening service was packed out, the morning one slightly less so. The evening included a good proportion of teenagers who were going on after church to youth activities, and the whole Sunday evening was a package for them. Where the parish communion slogan—'The Lord's Service for the Lord's People on the Lord's Day'—held sway, all people who went to church once on a Sunday were being moved towards the morning instead of being split in their numbers between morning and evening. Evenings had already begun to decline in those circles when the

first BBC Sunday evening epic, *The Forsyte Saga*, came along and finished the job.

- (d) 'You can hardly ask unbelievers to a communion service'. In other words, the great hope of converting people by getting them present in church is harmed by a rite with too high a threshold of commitment for the outsider or enquirer to cross.
- (e) 'It has gone cuckoo about the "offertory"' . . . and it often had. This goes back at least to Gregory Dix identifying the offertory (of the elements) with the first of the four dominical acts, in his four-action shape.

Such was the response in 1950s and 1960s by the general run of evangelicals. But some bolder souls were saying, at least to themselves, that the eucharist had a claim to be at the centre of Sunday worship. To the astonishment of those not present, the Keele Congress of 1967 included a statement 'We determine to work towards the practice of a weekly celebration of the sacrament as the central corporate service of the church . . .' It has not all turned out that way, but at least evangelicals have engaged with their own pledge, rather than settling the matter by the slogans repeated above.

I think my own questions would be more about whether the parish communion has actually fired up the communicants for a mission to transform life and transform society. Somehow it has generally turned tame and conformist, not revolutionary or prophetic.

But for the moment, with this brief sketch and many loose ends, we join with the St John's, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and sing a restrained doxology.

December 2002 sees the 28th Christmas since NOL started its life in 1975. Readers will know its future is under question, and that should be resolved in the first quarter of 2003. I would be glad to hear from readers what they value and what they would cheerfully lose in any restructuring. Meanwhile, in a very uncertain and not-to-be-forgotten-in-our-prayers world, I wish you a happy Christmas, with every opportunity to praise the Lord built into it.

Colin Buchanan

AND THAT SYNCHRONOUS 75th ANNIVERSARY . . .

This other one happened on Thameside, in a glare of publicity. In December 1927 The Prayer Book Measure to authorize a single Prayer Book with alternative services all under one set of covers came to the Lords and Commons. (I hardly dare tell innocents in countries other than England why the Westminster Parliament was voting on a Prayer Book.) The Book had gone through the Church Assembly by 517 votes to 133; this seemed fairly convincing, though it also reflected a minority which was very unhappy, and which besought Parliament to reject the Measure. If I do not go into the arguments here—arguments largely surrounding reservation of the consecrated elements—it is because I am looking for the longer-term impact. At any rate the Measure got the backing

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AFTER DIVORCE (GS 1449)

We undertook in August to provide readers with the advice about remarriage in church offered by the House of Bishops in Annex 1 to GS 1449 referred to in the General Synod resolution reprinted in the August NOL. This is the fourth instalment. The whole Annex is substantial and may take some months, and there is a possibility of slight revision of it.:

ADVICE TO CLERGY

3. Issues and questions you may wish to consider in the light of the Church's doctrine of marriage

[3.1 (a)—(c) came in November]

(d) Would the effects of the proposed marriage on individuals, the wider community and the Church be such as to undermine the credibility of the Church's witness to marriage?

—Would the new marriage be likely to be a cause of hostile public comment or scandal?

(e) Would permitting the new marriage be tantamount to consecrating an old infidelity?

—While it would be unreasonable to expect that the couple should not even have known each other during the former marriage(s), was the relationship between the applicants—so far as you can tell from the information made available to you—a direct cause of the breakdown of the former marriage?

(f) Has either of the parties been divorced more than once?

—In the case of multiple divorces, the sheer complexity of relationships that may have developed will inevitably make any assessment by you more difficult. However, the Church witnesses to lifelong marriage, and should not find itself being a party to 'serial monogamy', hence neither of the parties should normally have been married and divorced more than once.

(g) Do the applicants display a readiness to explore the significance of the Christian faith for their lives so that their further marriage is not an isolated contact with the Church?

—Given that the provision of careful marriage preparation should be the norm for all couples seeking marriage in church, do the applicants possess an understanding of God's grace in relationships and show a willingness to be open to Christian teaching?

[There will be more in coming months—COB]

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC LATEST

Readers of *Liturgy Newsletter*, the quarterly journal from the Liturgy Office of the RC Bishops' Conference, will have found the front page of the November 2002 issue of some interest. Followers of Roman developments will know that the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments (CDW) produced in March last year the famous reactionary policy document *Liturgiam Authenticam*. This has been followed through by various policing requirements, not least in the control of ICEL (which I wrote up in the September 2001 NOL). This very issue of *Liturgy Newsletter* contains information about CDW rejecting ICEL's translation of the Rites of Ordination, which the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales had submitted to it. Apparently ICEL is having to rewrite its own work.

But the major news now is that there has been a change in the Prefect of CDW. We are told that Cardinal Estevez has departed 'upon reaching retirement age', and his successor has been appointed—Cardinal Francis Arinze, a Nigerian. *Liturgy Newsletter* makes much of his work as President of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, work which might suggest an open attitude to change. But a question or two remains—not least as to his generation, for he was made a bishop in Nigeria in August 1965 (and presumably then joined the Fourth Session of Vatican II—there cannot be many serving bishops who survive from then, surely?). So, after 37 years as a bishop (and 17 as a Cardinal), is he yet under 70 years of age? And what was his liturgical formation? What era does he represent? Is he hard on the heels of his predecessor—or is he a sign of a change of direction?

Watch this space.

COB

BOOK NOTICES

We cannot go as far as to call these notes 'reviews', as the books only came to hand as NOL went to press, and the books deserve proper reviews, which it is our intention they should get. David Green mentions above three titles published on 29 November. They are

1. *New Patterns for Worship*, a handsome hardback with x/502 pages @ £22.50. This is a considerable expansion of the 1995 edition, with not only a vast range of liturgical texts under a range of kaleidoscopic headings, but also more coaching material, which should be of great value.
2. Tim Stratford, *Using Common Worship: A Service of the Word: A Practical Guide*, a paperback in the well-known series sponsored by Praxis with x/114 pages @ £9.95. (You will find Tim Stratford in the Grove Worship Series this month also—see 'This month's Publications' on page 11 below).
3. Mark Earey, *Liturgical Worship: a fresh look, how it works, why it matters*, a genuinely refreshing paperback also of x/114 page @ £9.95.

of the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. It went to the Lords on 12 December and, after a three-day debate (yes, three days), it was passed there by 241 votes to 88. So on 15 December it went to the Commons. There it was defeated by 238 votes to 205, after a truly theological (if loaded and rumbustious) debate of seven hours. The famous epitaph is George Bell's 'In a single hectic night the House of Common had apparently destroyed the work of more than twenty years' (*Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 3rd ed. Oxford, 1952, p.1347). It is tempting to stay here on the debate (even the cold print of *Hansard* makes wonderful reading); it is also tempting to reflect on what the defeat (repeated with a larger vote but fewer ructions in June 1928) meant for Church-State relationships; but the full sweep of history (to be captured in brief compass by a journalist) leads me forward much faster than these side-trackings would allow, and I reluctantly let them go (but I might come back when I have space—or want to celebrate the 75th anniversary of that second defeat in June 2003).

I said above in my editorial that Tyneside had more long-term impact than Thameside. However, in a backfiring kind of way, the defeats of the 1927-28 Prayer Books have done much to shape the present liturgical scene. At the time the 'single hectic night' seemed to have flattened everything for which the majority was working; but that is not how hindsight necessarily sees it. The organic development of events from 1927-28 came as follows:

1. The Bishops decided to let the 1928 Book be printed as an ordinary publication;
2. They announced that 'in the present emergency' they would wink at the use of the Book;
3. They decided among themselves never to let liturgy go again to Parliament, but instead to seek a way of evading the need to do so;
4. The opportunity for seeking that new way arose through the 1935 Church-State report; and it led to the setting up of a Canon Law Commission in 1939, which, although it was to revise the whole code of Canons, knew in particular that a way of authorizing liturgy without recourse to Parliament was a priority in their work.
5. The Commission was held up by the War, and reported in 1947, with a draft Canon giving power to the Convocations to authorize alternative services in and for their respective provinces. This was fed into the Church Assembly pipeline for ultimate enactment.
6. Meanwhile the next Church-State Commission reported in 1952, and laid emphasis upon the role of the laity in decision-taking. The House of Laity in the Church Assembly made it clear that this must be applied in the procedures for authorizing alternative services—and the revision of the Canon then went on until 1964, and enactment of it in its final form was then permitted under the Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure 1965!
7. In those long years of delay since 1947 a whole battery of conditions had been built into the Measure. Services were to be authorized as 'alternative services' only by two-thirds majorities in the Upper and Lower Houses of both Convocations (each House voting separately) and the same majority in the

House of Laity. Such services could be authorized for a period of seven years only, and this period could be renewed once and only once, so the whole package would only last fourteen years and some further provision would then be needed. Furthermore, any alternative service would need the consent of the PCC before it could be used in any parish.

8. During the fourteen years to which I refer above, there had to be a longer-term provision. This came in the Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure 1974; and this provided for open-ended periods of authorization, which in time led to hardback worship books reappearing in the Church of England. But 1927 Tyneside remains more significant.

COB

THE HORSE'S MOUTH—GREEN WITH INFORMATION

David Green's E-mail of 20 November reads:

I am writing with news of Common Worship.

ANNUAL LECTIONARY 2002-2003 NOW AVAILABLE

In the ongoing experiment into the interest in such electronic products, a free downloadable file of the Annual Lectionary 2002 to 2003 is now available. Two different formats have been provided to cater for different user needs.

More information can be found at:

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

and click on DOWNLOADS FRESH WORSHIP RESOURCES from CHP

Alongside *New Patterns for Worship*, which is published at the end of this month, Church House Publishing are pleased to announce two new titles.

Using Common Worship: A Service of the Word is the latest in the popular series of helpful guides to Common Worship. The Revd Tim Stratford explores how to make full use of A Service of the Word and covers the varied provisions in both Common Worship and *New Patterns for Worship*.

Liturgical Worship: a fresh look, how it works, why it matters is a new book from The Revd Mark Earey that investigates what role structured worship plays in the life, ministry and mission of today's Church.

More information can be found at:

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

and click on RELATED PUBLICATIONS

FINAL WORDS

The Common Worship web site can be found at

<http://cofe.anglican.org/commonworship/>

If you have been forwarded this message and would like to subscribe for yourself or if you wish to unsubscribe from this list please email me at david.green@c-of-e.org.uk. If your email address changes, do let us know so that we can update your details. Finally, 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

THAT BAPTISMAL PASTORAL INTRODUCTION

The Bishop of Salisbury, Chairman of the Liturgical Commission, writes:

Dear Colin

In your last *News of Liturgy* [ie the October edition] you raised some questions about the Pastoral Introduction . . .

'Who wrote the text?' The answer is the text was written by the Liturgical Commission, and your forensic skills in source criticism might well enable you to discern whose hand lies behind the drafting!

'Who accepted it?' The answer to that is the House of Bishops. As is clearly stated on page 816 this text was commended by the House of Bishops and sailed on, past even your vigilant eyes, into production.

You might have asked a third question 'Who has done anything about it?' The answer to that is, that the error was spotted not long after publication, and, with the approval of the Archbishop of York (As Chairman of the Standing Committee of the House), I have already authorized the substitution of the phrase: 'We are born again by water and the Spirit. This reminds us of Jesus' baptism.' This correction will be incorporated in future printings of the main volume and (together with the other modifications made by the Synod) in the new edition of *Initiation Services* which will appear in due course.

Yours ever + David

The Chairman goes on to reflect on the Pharisees asking Jesus questions, pointing out that some questioners seek information, others are in effect engaging in polemics. So he raises the question as to the status of NOL's questions. I reply that I for my part had no prior knowledge that anyone had spotted the error, and that the House of Bishops which is responsible for the text (yes, including COB—I duly found myself out, it seems) had not been told of the error they had perpetrated. It looked therefore a little like a liturgical journalistic scoop. NOL has in the past earned the thanks of the liturgical management for discovering and disclosing errors. But of course we could have done it quietly. It sounds as though the Chairman has been correcting the heresy and the record quietly himself.

And I have no such skills at source criticism as to be able to detect the heresiarch on the Commission. Would someone else on the Commission please drop us a line?

COB