

of hasty imperfectionism of NOL will be ironed out with a smoothly efficient and carefully produced quarterly.

The authoritative press release will follow—next month, we hope.

COB

### AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

During August the biennial international get-togethers of liturgists occur—in Europe this time. The ‘Conference’ mode of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC) happens at Cuddesdon from 4 to 9 August (and tackles liturgical formation). Societas Liturgica meets at Eindhoven in Holland from 11 to 16 August and is tackling ‘The Communion of Saints’. Your editor will be at each and will report next month.

### AND FINALLY—A LAST WORD ON SAINTS

Bruce Carlin writes from Durham that my wondering aloud whether the saints (more or less in glory) know that they are saints is ‘overlooking the fact that while we are constrained by the limits of time, the saints are now in eternity. Or, as someone once put it, “we feebly struggle, they in glory shine”!’

Well, the ‘someone’ is Walsham How, first Bishop of Wakefield, in ‘For all the saints’. But that is simply praising God for them, and is not demarcating the limits of them. My old-fashioned obstinate protestant problem is that, once there is a category of saints who can be usefully (profitably?) invoked, then there must also be a boundary, beyond which are lesser immortals, whose prayers are not sought because they are not in the ‘canon’. And my question remains as to whether they get there at death, but are only discerned there later (and the discernment may even be mistaken); or whether they get there when they are ‘canonized’. Carlin and How notwithstanding, I think it is a proper question.

COB

---

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 343

July 2003

### EDITORIAL

I found myself using the ‘Frost’ confession the other day (from Common Worship Main Book page 165, or 257, or 276):

**... in what we have thought,  
in what we have said and done,  
through ignorance, through weakness,  
through our own deliberate fault.**

And, no, it was not the next lines (‘... wounded your love and marred your image’) which struck me, but the simple ‘through ignorance’. There was a history to this—the New Zealand liturgy of 1970 had a confession:

**... in what we have thought, and said, and done.  
We have sinned in ignorance;  
we have sinned in weakness;  
we have sinned through our own deliberate fault.**

This was changed from the NZ 1966 rite, and so must have been constructed in, say, 1968-69, and it was in front of David Frost in 1970, when the C/E Series 3 text was being produced. It remained in use in New Zealand until the 1989 Book, when the ‘thought, word and deed’ part of this was changed, but the next three lines remain intact to the present day.

So why was this biting me? Ah, because of the less-than-Frosty main text in Order One, the text with which I more often find myself confessing my sins (page 169):

**... in thought and word and deed,  
through negligence, through weakness,  
through our own deliberate fault.**

The change from ‘ignorance’ (NZ and Series 3 and Frost survivals in CW) to ‘negligence’ (ASB Rite A and CW Order One) came in the Revision Committee of Rite A in Autumn 1978. A lobby of synodsfolk arrived at the Revision Committee to tell us we could not sin through ignorance, for ignorance exculpates rather than condemns. It is true, they conceded, that ignorance of the law is no excuse in the English courts—but, I suppose they might have added, to know you should not exceed 30 mph in a built-up area is one thing (and everyone should know it), but to enter a village on a main road at 40 mph, when there is no visible ‘30’ sign (because a bush has grown and obscured it), might rank as a good and exculpating defence in court.

But there is a deeper background. The litanies of the Church of England have always included ignorance: ‘to forgive us all our sins, negligences, and ignorances’

in Cranmer, but (with a view to Frost?) 'forgive us our sins of negligence and ignorance and our deliberate sins' in ASB and CW. This latter text of course originated in Series 3 Morning and Evening Prayer in the earlyish 1970s, and thus survived the attack made on the Frost confession in the Rite A Revision Committee.

It is clear from the above that the Church of England cannot be viewed as having a *doctrine* that one cannot sin through ignorance. Plenty of such misconduct remains. It has perhaps a preference for seeing sin as offending against what light we have. But there could be issues of original sin underlying it all.

What I think was also hitting me was that the New Zealand original and Frost early copying had a kind of crescendo that moved from ignorance, though half-knowledge, to total knowledge. When Cyril Bowles led our Committee in eliminating 'ignorance' did we also settle for a much less cogent sequence in 'negligence . . . weakness . . . our own deliberate fault'?

At any rate, I for one, in this one instance, found myself responding sharply to saying 'ignorance'. I think I need to go on saying it.

Colin Buchanan

### CORONATION LITURGY ON TV

David Hebblethwaite raids his memory in the light of my remark that I was on the Mall on the 'eve' of the coronation (and thus saw nothing on TV). He, being slightly younger, was at home and reports as follows:

'It would be true to say that the coronation was my first vivid and memorable encounter with liturgy (as performance rather than text) and the details of the Abbey service are still vivid. The commercial film and subsequent edited replays of the BBC coverage always omit the Communion service.

'On the day TV cameras twice focussed on the altar of Westminster Abbey rather than on the action. During the anointing the altar cross against the white damask dorsal was shown. From the beginning of the Prayer of Humble Access until after the communion (of officiating bishops, sovereign and consort only) the TV showed us the mosaic of the Last Supper which is usually on view in the Abbey reredos. It must have been a pre-filmed shot because, as I have said, on the day itself the mosaic was covered by the 1911 George V dorsal. The *words* of the Prayer of Consecration were heard—but not the *sotto voce* words of distribution (covered in my case by Vaughan Williams' "O taste and see").'

So I wonder when the act of communion first came on T.V.

### BOOK MENTION

It is not exactly on liturgy, and not exactly for sale (you can get a free copy as under), but Jubilate Hymns Ltd have just published their own story in a 40-page booklet form—*Jubilate Everybody: The Story of Jubilate Hymns*. The cover picture is of Steve James (hear him at NEAC), Michael Baughen and Michael Saward. Michael Saward is the naturally self-effacing author of the story—and it is a good story, going back to around 1960 (which takes you to the pre-charismatic era). At any rate, you can have a free copy by sending an A5 addressed envelope with 40p in stamps on it to Canon Michael Saward, 6 Discovery Walk, London E1W 2JG, and he will be delighted to oblige.

### PRAXIS—AND THE FUTURE

Praxis are preparing for the coming twelve months, and are hopeful of having their programme of meetings in print very soon (watch this space next month). Individuals can join Praxis by subscribing £10 per annum, payable to 'Praxis' and sent to Mrs Penny Neary, Cleveland Lodge, Westhumble, Dorking, Surrey RH5 6BW (Tel: 01306-872829; email: [praxis@praxisworship.org.uk](mailto:praxis@praxisworship.org.uk)). Subscribers will of course receive *Praxis News*, of which we understand issue no 21 will be distributed shortly.

The above is a trailer for Praxis that currently is (and the historians will recall it began in 1990 through the co-operation of the Liturgical Commission, the Alcuin Club, and the Group for Renewal Of Worship (GROW)). After this we get into the exploration of the still slightly misty future—and particularly the future into which NOL is to phase itself.

The expectation at NOL goes something like this. The last issue of NOL itself will come in December (no 348)—and we would like suggestions about how we can sign off appropriately. As early in the Autumn as possible we will be indicating to subscribers how they can get aboard the successor to NOL (which subscribers to Praxis, as above, will almost certainly already have achieved). The successor is probably to be entitled *Praxis News of Worship*, and it will be published quarterly, and will be edited by Gilly Myers (of Durham cathedral), though she will be operating within an editorial team. Anne Harrison (see page 8 above), who is currently editing *News of Hymnody* in its last year, will add her musical input (she lives in Durham too); and COB may well be writing a column. The total product should then have eight A4 pages, and will almost certainly have illustrations, pie-charts, diagrams and other visual treats which NOL never gives you.

But this is in the form of 'expectation', based on discussion and mind-forming, but not as yet in authoritative form from Praxis Council. We anticipate sharpening the focus in each of the coming months. The move from a monthly to a quarterly will change some elements—as, eg, in no longer forecasting General Synod 'next month' (which we failed to do last month anyway!). It is a matter of some regret that no-one could be found mad enough to edit a monthly news-sheet, but that means the policy

## DIOCESAN REPORT (2004 CYCLE)—4 SOUTHWELL

Since we last reported for NOL, the Southwell Diocesan Liturgical Committee has seen some changes—most obviously, a number of members have left the diocese, and we have recruited new faces to serve on the committee, but secondly, the liturgical scene has changed, with Common Worship having been adopted in most parishes.

So what have we been doing? We continue to arrange training events intercessions—a week-day evening and a Saturday morning were each very well attended

*Visual Liturgy*—an afternoon using the computing facilities in a local school, with the expertise of David Green who travelled up from London for us. We almost cancelled this for lack of participants, but advertised it to Leicester Diocese, and this tipped the balance.

daily prayer—neither a week-day evening nor a Saturday morning proved attractive, so we cancelled this event completely.

weddings—last year we put on an evening where we tried to tackle both the options for wedding preparation, and the service options in a few hours; this proved a bit rushed, so this year we ran a morning on the service itself, theory and practice, mainly for new curates but open to others.

healing—in the context of a diocesan clergy day on healing, we ran a workshop on services with prayer for healing

buildings—together with the Diocesan Advisory Committee, we organized a day when we considered the use of our buildings, and possible reorderings, by visiting four quite different churches in Newstead deanery.

*New Patterns*—one session well-attended and appreciated, the other cancelled for lack of punters.

We ask people to register in advance for training events. Sometimes the lack of interest shown disappoints us, and raises questions about what people really want or need us to do.

Some of our members have been involved in Midlands Praxis, which arranges events in Birmingham, and other folk from our Diocese attend.

Alongside training events we try to resource the liturgical life of the diocese, by contributing to the planning of major services, such as the annual Family Care Offering service, and services relating to the Bishop's Certificate in Lay Ministry course  
organizing worship at the Diocesan conference and by providing advice and templates on our website for local services such as confirmations and institutions.

If you have time to visit, take a look at our website, by following the link from [www.southwell.anglican.org](http://www.southwell.anglican.org).

Ian Tarrant  
Chaplain to Nottingham University  
Secretary

## THOSE ALTERNATIVE COLLECTS

General Synod was handling the Revision Stage of the process of authorizing the 'Additional Collects' when it met this month in York. NOL is slightly shame-faced, as we clearly should have seen that Revision Stage coming and have announced it last month. In the event the Revision Committee finished its work in May and got its report written in time for it to come onto the Synod agenda for the Sunday afternoon, 13 July. Each of the draft collects seems to have come under review through the submissions made to the Revision Committee, and, out of a total of 69, 33 were retouched and four totally rewritten as a result of the submissions. One interesting new provision arose from Tim Stratford's proposal in the February debate, a proposal for which, as himself a member of the Committee, he then won the support of the Committee. First, however, we print the collects of the Sundays in August, just as illustration of the kind of work done, which in fact shows two Sundays out of five with tiny changes. Although August is next month, these are published here (it goes without saying) not with any intention that anyone should pray by use of them at a time when a collect is needed (for that would still be illegal)—though they can, of course, be tried out as prayers at any other point in the week.

<b>Sunday</b>	<b>Original draft Collect</b>	<b>Revised draft Collect</b>
3 August <i>(7 after Trin)</i>	Generous God, you give us gifts and make them grow: though our faith is as small as mustard-seed, make it grow to your glory and the flourishing of your kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord.	Generous God, you give us gifts and make them grow: though our faith is as small as mustard-seed, make it grow to your glory and the flourishing of your kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord.
10 August <i>(8 after Trin**)</i>	Lord God, your Son left the riches of heaven and became poor for our sake: when we are prosperous save us from pride, when we are poor save us from despair, that we may trust in you alone; through Jesus Christ our Lord.	Lord God, your Son left the riches of heaven and became poor for our sake: when we prosper save us from pride, when we are needy save us from despair, that we may trust in you alone; through Jesus Christ our Lord. <span style="font-size: small;">[TINY CHANGES]</span>
17 August <i>(9 after Trin)</i>	Gracious Father, revive your Church in our day, and make her holy, strong and faithful, for your glory's sake in Jesus Christ our Lord.	Gracious Father, revive your Church in our day, and make her holy, strong and faithful, for your glory's sake in Jesus Christ our Lord.

24 August (10 after Trin)	Lord of heaven and earth, as Jesus taught his disciples to be persistent in prayer, give us patience and courage never to lose hope, but always bring our prayers before you; through Jesus Christ our Lord.	Lord of heaven and earth, as Jesus taught his disciples to be persistent in prayer, give us patience and courage never to lose hope, but always bring our prayers before you; through Jesus Christ our Lord.
31 August (11 after Trin)	God of glory, the end of our searching, help us to lay aside all that prevents us from seeking your kingdom, and to give all that we have to gain the pearl that has no price, through our Saviour Jesus Christ.	God of glory, the end of our searching, help us to lay aside all that prevents us from seeking your kingdom, and to give all that we have to gain the pearl beyond all price, through our Saviour Jesus Christ.

[TINY CHANGES]

The Bishop of Sheffield chaired the Revision Committee, and he, in introducing the report (GS 1493Y), drew attention to four points of principle where the Committee had especially addressed the texts.

- (a) The texts had in total been somewhat short of reference to the atonement (and changes had been made);
- (b) There had been the criticism about telling God what he already knew, but they had stuck to their guns (perhaps NOL had helped here?—ed);
- (c) There had been a confusion of ‘liturgical time’ with ‘real time’ (an interesting contrast). This referred especially to ‘as we wait with Mary’ in Advent—and is now ‘as Mary waited . . . so we wait . . .’
- (d) There had been six submissions wishing to be shot of ‘Magi’ and to reimport ‘wise men’. The Committee came back strongly—with Bishop Jack saying ‘Matthew used an exotic word to emphasize their exotic character’, and in the printed report they venture the opinion that ‘the visitors were not necessarily wise and not necessarily men’!

But there were no motions to refer the retouched batch (or any one or more of them) back to the Revision Committee, so, unless the report were thrown out, under the existing standing orders the collects had to go through to the House of Bishops for last adjusting before coming to Synod for final approval. That did not wholly prevent some speeches from people who wanted things altered (without having put down the reference back motion that alone could have secured change), though one in (irrelevant) defence of BCP collects should, in your reporter’s opinion, have been ruled out of order. Another was ready to go to the stake for ‘stir up’ collects, which are not there in this set.

The Stratford proposal was (in accordance with last Summer’s Grove Worship Series no 70) to provide a collect of each season to be used for many weeks on end, and thus get known. The Committee accepted this proposal and starred the occasional one (see 8 after Trinity above).

both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the primitive church in the purest times, and of this church also for many years of the reign of queen Elizabeth. The reviving therefore of this ancient and laudable custom we heartily commend to the consideration of all good people, not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion table, the east, or church, or any thing therein contained in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the holy eucharist, upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God’s majesty, and to give him alone that honour and glory that is due unto him, and no otherwise; and in the practice and omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite, despise not them who use it not; and that they who use it not, condemn not those who use it.

I think Robert Paterson has got this right; and, although the Canon was anathema to the puritans, it is actually not only restrained, but deliberately excluding various practices open to misunderstanding. Indeed it almost looks as though the draft Canon was busy precluding practices which had not yet arisen in 1640, but which were being anticipated in respect of later centuries.

Secondly, as far as the carrying in of a eucharistic table during the Peace is concerned, I am to be found obstinately in favour of this in some architectural surroundings. I have no greater problem about not seeing a table during the ministry of the word than I have with not seeing a lectern during the ministry of the sacrament. Is not Coggan’s ‘bi-focalism’ observable in sequence rather than simultaneously? Textually, most modern eucharistic rites have refrained from verbal reference to the eucharist in the first half of the service, and that first half can stand on its own as a Service of the Word. If the visible space to be occupied by table and ministers for the eucharist is needed at an earlier point for bishop (with or without chair), for candidates for orders, and for others participating in the laying on of hands, then that is fine by me. I have been involved in such arrangements myself (most recently on St Peter’s Day last month), and find myself unmoved by the quotations from Donald Coggan.

## FORTHCOMING EVENTS

*Visual Liturgy 4* will be demonstrated with all possible coaching help by David Green of Church House Publishing at Southwark Cathedral between 12 noon and 1.45 pm on Wednesday 15 October. Please note the date now—no charge, no advance booking, bring your own sandwiches. This is right by London Bridge surface, Northern and Jubilee stations, at the South end of London Bridge.

... and next month's

is Worship Series no 176 by Anne Harrison, *Sing it Again: The Place of Short Songs in Worship*. Anne Harrison is editor of *News of Hymnody* (for this year only), and her expertise is widely recognized. The 'short song' is (we think) a slightly new bit of nomenclature in a sea of mixed descriptions. Expect a fuller description next month.

### CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

I was interested in the comments about 'Bowling in Via' at Wakefield.

No doubt someone will correct me if I am wrong but the never-enacted Canons of 1640 refer to bowing on entering and leaving a place of worship as a recognition of the presence of God; I don't think there's any mention of bowing at anything in particular.

Perhaps a more important concern arising from NOL's observations is that an ordination eucharist is not an ordination with a eucharist appended but a eucharist during which an ordination takes place. One of the many consequences of that understanding is that the altar should be seen to be in place throughout the service and not carted in when the ordination is done and there is room for it! Archbishop Donald Coggan is famous for reminding us that 'Anglicanism is bi-focal', a church of word and sacrament in which the physical presence of the places where the word is proclaimed and the sacraments celebrated are fundamental in their symbolism. Away with 'poor, paltry little stands' [Coggan] for the word, and mobile altars of convenience for the sacrament!

As ever

Robert (Paterson).

3 Heol Pentre'r Felin, Llantwit Major, CF61 2XS.

### RESPONSE BY THE EDITOR

Firstly, I can indulge Robert Paterson by quoting Canon 7 of the aborted set of Canons of 1640:

And lastly, whereas the church is the house of God, dedicated to his holy worship, and therefore ought to mind us both of the greatness and goodness of his divine majesty; certain it is that the acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in it self, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others. We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well affected people, members of this church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeysance,

### THE ANGLICAN-METHODIST COVENANT

The Covenant came back from its year in the Methodist circuits and Districts and in the Anglican dioceses. These latter had given it about 95% support, though the figure might well reflect the difficulty of voting against such a bland concept—there had much talk during the year of the 'motherhood and apple-pie' character of the Covenant thus far—motherhood is easy to vote for, all are in favour, little progress has been made when the vote has been recorded. This General Synod debate was not far distant from that—the vote being 332-32 in favour. The motion asked dioceses, deaneries and parishes to 'implement the Covenant' (a somewhat slippery concept for a somewhat unspecified new arrangement), and it also authorized the setting up of the Joint Implementation Commission to carry the task forward. The Commission for its part was to 'monitor and promote the implementation of the Covenant', but it was also to consider theological issues and 'make recommendations to the two churches about any future formal work'.

I had a personal part to play at this point. I was responsible for a Southwark diocesan following motion:

'That this Synod, having voted in favour of the Anglican-Methodist covenant, believes that such a covenant entails a movement towards the interchangeability of presbyteral ministries, and requests the Joint Implementation Commission to bring forward recommendations in order to bring about that change.'

The Synod was led by the Council for Christian Unity to reject a following motion from Newcastle which asked that the Implementation Commission should identify by July 2005 the obstacles to organic unity. This did not look promising for the Southwark one. The CCU did indeed oppose the Southwark motion, incomprehensible though it seemed to me why they should. At any rate, the argument against was thin, and the Synod carried the motion by 137 votes to 119—a cliffhanger that may yet do some good.

If it is to come to General Synod in February (there is no November session this year), then it should be before a Revision Committee between February and July next year—but it might then get its Revision Stage in July and Final Approval the following February (ie in 2005).

### COMMON WORSHIP ORDINAL

The report of the Bishops' Meeting in June (ie the meeting of all bishops, not simply the House of Bishops) reveals that they were discussing a draft ordinal submitted by the Liturgical Commission. It was not forwarded immediately to General Synod, but will (one assumes) come to the House of Bishops in October (or January), ready to start on its synodical course in February. There is at the moment no signal allowing us to release anything about the content.

## ROYAL WARRANTS

A question was asked in General Synod of the chairman of the Liturgical Commission about who has authority to determine the prayers for the Royal Family. The Bishop of Salisbury duly replied that Her Majesty herself makes the determination. This gave your editor the chance to ask a supplementary, noting that the Queen Mother's name has only recently been excised from the prayers, well after a year beyond her death, and asking whether, if the monarch were to die, a more expeditious change could be made. To this the Bishop made a reply as though the year's delay after death were doctrinally motivated—apparently it is a point after which we can be confident any (initial) purgation is over, and then we can cease praying—a strong hint that we might well be praying for Queen Elizabeth up to a year after her death, though whether as 'Queen Mother' or 'Queen, deceased' or even 'Elizabeth, our ex-governor' I do not know.

## NATIONAL LITURGICAL OFFICER

The notion of a National Liturgical Officer, employed by the Archbishops' Council, in succession to the role once played by Mark Earey, is obviously still alive. How would one learn that at General Synod? Why, in the financial debates, of course, where the chairman of the Finance Division told us that the budgetting for 2004 left no room for a National Liturgical officer.

## WHAT THE SPELLCHECK WON'T TELL YOU

Bishop John Hind, Bishop of Chichester, told in Synod how he had once been on the way to a parish eucharistic event when his chaplain had pointed out to him the text of the Prayer of Humble Access printed in the parish edition of the First Order in Common Worship. It went

'We do not presume to come this your table, merciful Lord,  
rusting in our own righteousness ...'

## THIS MONTH'S ANNIVERSARIES

An interesting anniversary has been drawn to my attention—the *last* lawful use of 1552 will surely have been in July 1553, an exact four and a half centuries away this month?

This, however, appears not to be the case. Although everyone who could see which way the Marian wind was blowing and thought it wise to go with it probably reverted to the Latin mass, the 1552 uses were not actually illegalized until the Act of Parliament later in the Autumn which restored 'Henrician' Catholicism from 20 December 1553—and bold souls of the Reformed persuasion continued to use them.

## PLUS IN MEMORIAM—EUGENE FAIRWEATHER

Eugene Fairweather died in April 2002. In the brief obituary in NOL in May 2002 we acknowledged the shortcomings of our tribute, and asked for amplifying comment or information from others. Nothing happened, but now it has come. The edition of *Liturgy Canada* of Pentecost 2003 is devoted entirely to the Fairweather story. It picks him out as the 'grandson' of the Oxford Movement, who in 1964 wrote a book entitled exactly that, *The Oxford Movement*. As he carried such weight of scholarly trust by anglo-catholics, it was clearly a very deep disappointment when he came out in favour of the ordination on women (women were ordained as presbyters in Canada in Autumn 1976, slightly before the USA women). But the long tribute by David Holeton concentrates on his role in relation to initiation, a role which lay behind the mention I gave him last year for his part in the 1985 Boston Statement on admission of children to communion. The history reveals that in the 1970s the Canadian Doctrine and Worship Committee was moving towards baptismal rites based broadly upon the concept of baptism being full sacramental initiation and of itself the sufficient (and logical) gateway into the reception of communion. All this was upset in 1979 by a paper from the House of Bishops which David Holeton describes as a *volte face*, reverting to something more like the old Prayer Book pattern. Then in 1980 General Synod decided on the 'BAS', and put Eugene Fairweather onto the Doctrine and Worship Committee. The Committee had no way to proceed in the face of the House of Bishops' *volte face*. But they were bolstered by Eugene Fairweather, and not least by a paper of his in 1982 entitled 'Christian Initiation: Our Present Situation'. Holeton calls this 'Fairweather at his best', and it includes:

'In the wake of the General Synod decision of 1971 . . . many thousands of Canadian Anglican children have begun their communicant life at an early age . . . we may well ask our church as a whole to weigh the spiritual harm done to many parents by the on-again off-again effects of our present confusion . . . the real question is this: Can we, in the midst of our current disagreements, find a responsible and sensitive way of dealing with our Anglican families? If we decline to work at that question, we had better start formulating some good answers for use on the day of judgment.'

## This month's publication . . .

. . . is an extra, an unnumbered 'one-off' Grove Booklet by, er, COB. It is a 36-page job at the usual £2.50 price, entitled *Is Papal Authority a Gift to Us?* It took its origin in the editorial I wrote in 1999 when the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission produced its report, *The Gift of Authority*. It now looks as though this official report will come to the sessions of Synod in February 2004, and the Latimer Trust has commissioned the study, and provided free copies for members of Synod. Other readers may have it postfree, by sending a cheque (or cash) for £2.50. It is not exactly liturgical—but it is worth a mention here. Indeed you shouldn't be without it.