

continue to be available in the successor publication (probably *Praxis News of Worship*), to be published quarterly by Praxis. It will include a column from Colin and some of the material currently published in *News of Hymnody*, and will also continue giving news from around the dioceses. This will be combined with book reviews and other material currently published in *Praxis News*, and the whole will be edited by Gilly Myers of Durham cathedral.

'Sadly, this new publication will not be available on its own from Grove. To receive it you will need to affiliate to Praxis at a cost of £10 per annum. Included in this affiliation will be information on and discount for attending Praxis events around the country.'

That makes the situation clear. Our expectation is that in October we will circulate full details of how to subscribe to the new journal (by affiliating to Praxis). There will not be, in the strict sense, a renewal form such as the publishers have usually sent out in the Autumn. Instead your sub to NOL will lapse as NOL lapses; and a new start must be made with Praxis. But we will do our utmost to ensure that is easy for you.

COB

At this point the Editor left for Blackpool and failed to finish this.

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 345

September 2003

EDITORIAL

I have not checked when I last wrote on this subject, but I this month address the subject of oil. (There are allegations that oil dictates all American global policy, and this reminds me of the days when anglo-catholics in some dioceses were accused of following Smith's Rhodesia and smuggling oil across frontiers—but the liturgical oil under review does not come from oil wells, and the very mention of pre-1980 Rhodesia is simply a reminder that I am long in the tooth.)

I am invoking the privilege of the elderly to cite events long since past. Oil was simply not on the agenda in my first fourteen years on the Liturgical Commission. Oil for use with the sick was mentioned in the canons of 1969, but such oil was to be 'blessed', according to the canon, by the priest who was to use it, and no liturgical text was provided. Its purpose related solely to the sick.

In the sphere of 'initiation services' the question of oil did not arise. For all that the Commission had first produced tripartite services (for baptism, confirmation, and communion) in 1960, and in 1975-77 we were producing the second round of revising such texts, no mention of oil got into their texts. However, the Liturgical Commission had been approached by some radicals or enthusiasts who wanted provision for oiling candidates to be included. The Commission very mildly replied that we were in no sense opposed, but we would want to lay out the rationale—a theological rationale—for the use of oil if we were to recommend it. Our own clear view was a theology should come first, but the foot was in the door: the oil had been named. The Revision Committee did not accept any proposals for including oiling in the rites; but a 'catholic' revolt on the floor of Synod produced an enormous effect. Bluntly, speakers rose to say that unless amendments to the opening notes were passed to permit the use of the oil, they would reject the whole package of services. This was leverage not far distant from blackmail, and the platform duly caved in, and the note was added. This was, of course, exactly what the Commission had tried to avoid—the use of oil without overt reasons for it.

The profile rose quite quickly. David Silk worked on the Revision Committee to include rubrics in the calendar and lectionary for the ASB to provide readings for an occasion previously not known in the Church of England—an optional use of 'blessing of oils' on Maundy Thursday. There was no doctrine, no overt purpose, no attached explanation that told us to what end we were 'blessing the oils'. Indeed, at that stage we would not officially have known how to bless oils, as the calendar and lectionary committee could hardly slip that one in. So we now had oils for the sick in the canon (but no text for blessing them); we had oils at baptism and confirmation

in permissive notes at the beginning of the rites (but no rationale); and we had readings in the lectionary for an occasion on Maundy Thursday of which most Anglicans—clergy included—were totally unaware.

That is not to say that there was no Maundy Thursday experience. It was a well-known Roman Catholic practice (naturally with texts accompanying) for the bishop to summon his clergy to the cathedral for the rite of blessing oils on Maundy Thursday morning. The idea (lying much further back) was specifically to renew baptismal oil ready for baptisms at Easter. Hardly surprisingly, there were Anglicans who wanted to match this, and, while I was never present on such an occasion, I believe that from the early 1970s there were dioceses where the diocesan, or a suffragan commissioned for the task, would bless oils at a eucharist on Maundy Thursday morning—but this was a voluntary and somehow connoisseur (not to mention exotic) event for a sacramentalist section of the clergy who particularly wanted the oil blessed by a bishop on the 'correct' occasion. It would be interesting to trace when this began—and, equally, interesting to trace when the event first 'came out' into a major cathedral event at which all the clergy were invited (or pressed) to attend. I suspect this was happening in several places by the late 1970s—perhaps led by Mervyn Stockwood, bishop of a well-known diocese, who started it around 1976. To that extent David Silk was marching with his own times, for all that he was also striving to entrench the practice. And the popularizing included the element, new in Rome, of renewing ordination vows, which perhaps gave more credibility to the rite for those who would not have dreamed of using oil at baptism or confirmation, and were only dreaming of using it with the sick. My own recollections, for what they are worth, go back to 1981, when I was the preacher in Liverpool cathedral (where, of course, the bishop, David Sheppard, had been suffragan to Mervyn), and this was the pioneer occasion in that diocese. I think it was the following year, 1982, when my own diocese, Southwell, took it up also. And I went in 1985 to Birmingham diocese, where Hugh Montefiore, also ex-Southwark, was having some difficulty as he believed one oil would do for all purposes (it was known as multi-grade . . .), and the users of the oil did not share his conviction. But that is to run further ahead.

The synodical action came soon after the authorization of the ASB. The Liturgical Commission produced in December 1980 a set of services for use with the sick, including provision for the distribution of communion to those 'not present at the celebration'. Along with the main rites there were two ancillary ones, both treated as separate services for authorization purposes—namely, the blessing of oils and the 'reconciliation of a penitent'. In my own judgment neither of these needed a full two-thirds majority in each House of Synod, as neither was 'alternative' to rites in the BCP—but the proponents wanted this authorization. As it turned out, both these ancillary rites ran into trouble—the blessing of oils having a shaky start anyway, because Synod included quite a swatch of people who neither wanted to 'bless inanimate objects' nor to anoint at baptism and confirmation. Its chances were gravely further weakened when, at Revision Stage in full Synod, the hymn which is used on Maundy Thursday in Roman Catholic rites was inserted into the text by an

John Koenig, *The Feast of the World's Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission* (Trinity Press International, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 2000, xvii/300 pp, paperback, price unknown)

I was given this book when I was teaching in Pittsburg fifteen months ago. It was being heralded by the students; and so I expressed an interest, and I apologize for taking so long to review it. The author is sub-dean of General Theological Seminary, New York, and his purpose is twofold—firstly, to entrench an understanding of the eucharist more widely and deeply in the New Testament (which obviously involves treading some familiar ground), and, secondly, to establish far more strongly the 'missionary' dimension of the eucharist (hence the 'redemption' in the title and the 'mission' in the subtitle), which involves moving readers onto somewhat less familiar ground.

But at root, while it is lengthy, detailed and compelling, his thesis is essentially simple, easily readable, and perhaps not entirely novel. He openly acknowledges his indebtedness to Alexander Schemann, J.G.Davies, and Geoffrey Wainwright, and to their writings of around thirty years ago. The thesis is that the eucharist both opens the gospel to an unbelieving world, but, more closely to the point, it draws believers into Christ's mission on earth, and thereby precludes a mere sitting comfortably at the table. He reckons he has gone a fraction further than these authors did, and finds some of his new exploration in the book of Revelation. It's very persuasive, at least to me.

COB

FORTHCOMING EVENT

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 Northern, Jubilee, and surface stations, at the South end of London Bridge.

THE FUTURE—A WORD FROM THE PUBLISHERS

Ian Paul, the Business Manager of Grove Books Ltd, the present publishers of NOL, NOH, and all the Grove Booklets, has been in close touch with Praxis about the proposed arrangements for transition. He now provides the following statement.

'As readers will be aware, NOL will cease to be published in its current form after the end of this year. The good news is that much of its content will

- (d) I am very interested in his reversion to Colleges to make his points. This does of course take us back to ministerial formation—and, if my memory serves me, the interest in that description of training varies very much from tradition to tradition. ‘Formation’ does not come naturally to all seminary staffs.
- (e) So I am still searching a little—is there a common discipline called ‘liturgical formation’, and does it matter if the terminology is thought unnecessary and other ways of describing what is the same in substance are used?]

AND THE KENYAN PRAYER BOOK

Is now available from the editorial address below in both hardback and soft-cover editions. The arrival of the latter has slightly depressed the price of the former—please send £10 for the former, £6 for the latter, both sent postfree within the purchase figure.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Staffordshire Seven, *Seasonal Worship from the Countryside* (SPCK, 2003, ISBN: 0-281-05446-0)

This collection of material for worship in the countryside has been a rich resource for our seasonal worship. It has certainly lived up to the hopes expressed in the foreword. In a rural Team Ministry we have used much of the material through the seasons of 2003 and have found the ideas imaginative and innovative, yet rooted in the age-old rhythm of the countryside. The services expressing the farming year, such as the Lambing service, Rogationtide and Lammas, have been well received and much enjoyed by the farming community. There are good resources for Easter, Harvest and Christmas. The background information provided means there is much that could be adapted for use in many parishes, whether rural or inner city. The book is well organized and clearly set out. The Community Occasions section contains valuable resources for services which link the secular and sacred year together. This is a resource that would be valuable in the collection of anyone who plans worship.

Sarah Lunn

amendment on a bare majority. Its whole ethos was so far from the theology and spirituality of many members of Synod, and its proposed use so recondite, particularly to lay persons, that at Final Approval, when two-thirds majorities were needed, the rite was defeated in the House of Laity. The services for the sick themselves went through Synod, making provision for the first time since the 1549 Book for the anointing of the sick. So all was now in place for a great drive forward on the oiling front—save only that there was no official text for the blessing of the oils. Clearly there did not have to be, as the 1969 canon assumed each priest would provide his own wording, but the Maundy Thursday rite was a much bigger event than the canon anticipated. In the event, each bishop had to go on writing or rummaging to have a worthy prayer over the oils to utter (just as he also had to do for the renewal of ordination vows).

It is amazing on reflection how the use of oil spread in the 1980s—not only for the sick, and not only for baptism and confirmation. Anointing the newly ordained came in fashion in some places; anointing all the clergy (and possibly their spouses) at the Maundy Thursday rite has also been known; and anointing bishops at their consecration and/or enthronement has also been intermittently practised. But *still* there is little official explanation or rationale. The nearest we have got is the highly speculative (and perhaps romanticized) prose at the front of the 1998 baptism, confirmation, affirmation and reception services (page 100 in the full 1998 edition):

‘Where it has been agreed that oil will be used, pure olive oil, reflecting the practice of athletes preparing for a contest, may be used for the Signing with the Cross. Oil mixed with fragrant spices (traditionally called chrism), expressing the blessings of the messianic era and the richness of the Holy Spirit, may be used to accompany the confirmation and/or affirmation . . .’

Remember that there is still no theological statement and no spoken texts which might be explanatory. I suppose in a remote way I let the note quoted above go forward, and I also suppose (some years after) that I must have been saying that if the romantics wanted such explanation they were entitled to it. For myself (and I have been a track runner in the 1950s and fully understand about embrocation!) it leaves me quite unmoved, and the explanation does make oiling sound like a rite looking for a rationale. I am unaware of any consistent ideology of oiling in this strand of thought such as to give the athlete a mainstream or conventional role in our understanding.

I want to come back to the above. But I also want to divert for a line or two to pick up the anointing for healing. I have always seen this as biblical, if not quite of dominical command, and I have written it up and commended it for a quarter of a century and more—and I practise it. It is the only oil I collect for myself on Maundy Thursday. I do, however, have one small caution to issue, and it is this: the biblical term used in both Mark 6.13 and James 5.14 is *aleipho*. This undoubtedly means ‘to rub on oil’ (indeed ‘embrocate’), but it is not as lofty a sounding word as *chrizo*, the word which lies behind ‘Messiah’ and ‘Christ’. Perhaps ‘anointing’ will do as a translation, but the Greek looks nearer to actual medical application to the skin than

ritual and symbolic action with inner power. I say 'nearer'—others will have to judge. But I have stopped to reflect on what I have myself written in the past.

What is clear to me is that the Bible has nothing that would amount to anointing at baptism or confirmation. There is no reference to anything like it in any baptismal account. Confirmation itself is so devoid of scriptural basis as to make a quest for anointing in connection with it a waste of time. It seems that anointing (found in Hippolytus, but not in Justin or Tertullian) arose as a good idea, and, once in place, started to be identified with the Holy Spirit, the 'seal' (*sphragis*) of the Spirit, or other initiatory concepts.

But its basis in scripture is exiguous. It has come fast in the Church of England through the well developed habit of so many clergy saying 'That's a good idea—we'll use it'. And the Maundy Thursday event—does every diocese have one?—has reinforced the concept. We are not given water blessed by the bishop for baptism—that is a lowly element we can provide locally, presumably? So water is taken for granted, and oil receives all the headlines. Can that be right?

Well, I cannot at this stage bother too much whether I am losing readers from NOL (a safer journal awaits you). And I have, as a matter of fact, not been brooding on this for a long time, but have discovered the strength of my own conviction simply by beginning to write this diatribe, as it has become. But, when the doctrinal arguing is over (and actually I don't think it has started . . .), then I have a practical objection to bring to the practice. I do compliantly anoint all whom I am asked to anoint at baptism and confirmation. I do not deliver myself of the strong hesitations I have expressed above. But I find that, not only do I have little doctrinal confidence or romantic attachment in relation to the oiling, but also that, visually, it is a non-event. To stick a finger or thumb into a small oil bottle or stock being proffered, and to touch (or cross) a forehead with the smear of oil, has no visual impact whatsoever (no-one in the congregation can see it), and to the recipient it will not 'feel' *all* that different from a dry finger or thumb making the sign of the cross (which is the natural understanding of the baptismal rubrics). It is actually slightly worse than that—for if a confirmation candidate, kneeling at a rail, drops her (or his) head, so that hair falls down over her (or his) forehead, then the left hand which I wish to laying on as the authorized 'outward sign' in confirmation, in fact becomes into play in order to adjustment the head concerned, in order, it would seem, for my right hand then to do the 'real' thing, which is to anoint that now visible forehead!

Of course, if we were to do what the well-worn American Roman Catholic video, *This is the Night*, propagates, and pour a jugful of oil over a candidate, then the impact in every sense might be different. But what are we doing? We are using a pleasant enough element in a virtually invisible way for a quasi-sacramental purpose for which we have no particular warrant or sacramental explanation. Yes, I am pliable enough to do it when asked; and, yes, I expect some explanation has been given to the candidate. And, yes, most Anglicans (except the diehards on scripture, of whom I must be one) seem to love multiplying ceremonies for the sheer joy of having them. But how can we be serious about this ceremony?

'basics' have become instinctive and music can be interpreted and played in quite a different manner.

Perhaps a good liturgist is someone who has trained a good instinct for what is liturgically right in a situation? In this case the 'information' would not be seen as an end in itself but as a step on a journey towards a different end.

Similar thoughts on a wider canvas emerge from reflection on the insights of virtue ethics. Revd Dr Sam Wells has written for example of the capacity for liturgy to form the character of a community in quite specific ways (see *Journal of Christian Ethics* vol 15.1 on 'Liturgy and Ethics', which contains a number of other interesting essays too). In my own experience as a curate, the family service group at St Matthews Chapel Allerton with its overt goal of producing a family service once a month also acts as a training ground in which liturgical competence is nurtured through prayer, discussion, debriefing, working together. In both these examples the scope of formation in liturgy extends beyond liturgical expert or trained functionary to creating a continuum which involves both lay and ordained. Liturgy is not an individual activity, so any notion of formation should take into account the nature of the liturgical community.

A final problem for the Anglican Communion is the extent to which formation is seen as being in a 'party' tradition—which is the form of training mainly nurtured in the English Theological Colleges, which mainly have explicit or implicit allegiances to the sub-traditions of 'Anglicanism', or in 'the Anglican way' of doing liturgy which seems to involve texts being worked out between interest groups formed in their own convictions and practices in conflict and negotiation. Formation would mean very different things, I suspect, to different party groups. So should we even be looking at a common definition or idea of formation—or rather keeping alive rather different but vibrant traditions and especially the dialogue between them?

Mark Bennet
Curate, St Matthew's Chapel Allerton

[The editor annotates the above as follows:

- (a) I did say 'But we were going beyond that. The real question is the life question: are the participants in liturgy being "formed" for lifetime discipleship outside of the liturgy as well as within it?' Does that go anywhere near making discipleship a 'paradigm for formation', which he asseverates had been omitted?
- (b) That said, I recognize that many of his points are quite profound, and will repay further thought—such as the question as to whether people are 'corporately formed'.
- (c) I have, defensively, to say that we did not handle all his points at Cuddesdon, and that, in a broad way, I was trying to represent what I had heard at Cuddesdon, rather than treat the subject from scratch. And—obviously—I did not handle *all* I heard at Cuddesdon.

'Chants from Taize, sung prayer responses from the Iona Community, songs from the world church (like "Amen siakudumisa", sung at Rowan Williams' enthronement)—the effectiveness of these often depends on their being sung a number of times. Are there parallels here with musical repetition in charismatic worship, or with the ancient traditions of Orthodox prayer? Anne Harrison's booklet explores the background to aspects of contemporary song, and the significant role which music can play in mission, worship and renewal.'

It is doubly necessary to get this one clear, as the CEN on 12 September gave a very good puff to the Booklet, but totally failed to say it was a Grove Booklet or give any mention to the publishers. Astonishing!

... and next month's

is *Worship Series (WHAT?)*, *How to . . . read the Bible in church* by Liz Simpson and Anna de Lange, which is a companion to their best selling W169 on leading intercessions and is in the same easy-to-browse format. Suitable for use by individuals or as a training manual for a team of readers, it starts with 'why read the Bible at all?' and finishes with a range of good ideas for making the reading catch the attention of listeners and some tips on practicalities of preparation and delivery.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

I was interested to read your piece in August NOL on liturgical formation—in part for what it omitted as well as for what it contained. For example, there was no mention of discipleship as a paradigm for formation, though this would appear to be the dominant New Testament model. Then again, a colleague recently pointed out in a discussion on training that the word 'formation' is so frequently used that the idea of being formed into the likeness of Christ is almost completely lost.

Another aspect of this kind of discussion which causes concern is the kind of reductionist 'information OR formation' debate which goes on. I have long thought that the first (and greatest) commandment 'heart, soul, mind, strength' directed to God in love should be a decisive theological counter to such reductionist thinking, and also throw up some blind spots (strength?—when?, where?, how?). The mind is an important part of the whole, not to be neglected—but not to be idolized either.

It seems to me that there are models of formation in skills which could inform reflection on liturgical competence. For example, in learning a musical instrument there is much practice of basic disciplines—the purpose being not to have a conscious awareness of what is happening as one plays, but to get beyond that to where the

Well, I began this without realizing the depth of my concern. I would not be surprised to get the odd letter of contradiction.

Colin Buchanan

FOOTNOTE: The end is nigh and NOL will cease in December, and that is very overt in this issue and will be in the next three. There is guidance about booking its successor on a later page. But for the moment, I wonder whether readers have any topic on which they would like me to expand, while there is space (you will realize that a quarterly journal, full and rounded though it will certainly be, will not have space to spare for excursions). I may be dropping in some autobiographical stuff; and I am striving to think how to go off the air at a peak rather than in a trough, but (as my Editorial above will indicate) I have entered the era where I no longer need to engage in my customary fawning and flattery in order to retain weak subscribers but instead can tell it the way it really is. So do let me know what you would like.

IN MEMORIAM—GEORGE EVERY

George Every died earlier this month. He was, of course, a Roman Catholic, but he had for most of his life been an Anglican. He must have been born around 1913 (the obituary in *The Tablet* does not tell me), so he died in advanced old age. He was a lay brother of the Society of the Sacred Mission (SSM) at Kelham, and he taught church history and (I imagine) liturgy in the College at Kelham until it closed. I knew him particularly because, when in ante-diluvian days, I was engaged in helping move the present St John's College, Nottingham, from its previous site in Northwood, Middlesex, George was one of those whom I encountered in Nottingham—for there was a plan to network Lincoln and Kelham and St John's into a vocational pass degree (ie the B.Th) at Nottingham University, so we got into academic cahoots. (It was, I later learned, a matter of interest in the University department that out of Kelham and St John's, one had a medieval church historian but no-one there taught the Reformation, and the other was strong on Reformation history but unaware of the middle ages. I would suppress the disclosure as to which College offered which syllabus, but I suspect that, as this is written in the context of George's departure, readers will already have guessed the answer.)

George was never on the Church of England Liturgical Commission, but he was a ready writer on liturgy (if it was not too modern). The titles I recall from his Anglican days were *Basic Liturgy* and *The Baptismal Sacrifice*—but I confess I have neither on my shelves and cannot give dates for them. Both were, I think, in the 1960s. The one I do have from his Roman Catholic days is the historical illustrated glossy hardback, *The Mass* (Gill and MacMillan, 1978), which is both beautiful and informative.

George was unlucky, in that Kelham folded up under him when he was around 60 years of age (he later told me that he would have had clearly different options if

he had been either 40 or 80!). I think I might have expected him to join the Orthodox (he was very strongly orientated, loved ancient Byzantium, and for eleven years edited *The Eastern Churches Review*). But when the time came, he left his final year students of Kelham to learn liturgy from me (what a come-down) and departed to the Church of Rome. He had no need to defend his orders—for he had none, he was lay. He then found his way to Oscott in Birmingham (which is where I met him again after fifteen years). A cynic once said to me that George had simply sought the architectural surrounds which most reminded him of Kelham . . .

The review in *The Tablet*, by the RC Bishop of Northampton, includes this gem about his lectures (which is what I mean about the 'come-down' I mention above):

'One former pupil described his church history classes as being like a guided tour through the back streets of fourth-century Ephesus.'

What climax to an obituary could better that?

COB

BILL GRISBROOKE

I wrote last month of Bill Grisbrooke's death, and asked for more detail. Two very helpful replies came in. First, Frank Pickard writes:

'I have known Bill since 1954, when he was a fellow student at St Stephen's House. Couratin threw him out after one year; few of us understood why. We put it down to his independent mind and willingness to take on in public "old boys" who were somebodies!

'Bill came to Oxford from Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, where he had read Ecclesiastical History. His great mentor was Dean Casey who (he claimed) combined a disbelief in God with an ardent devotion to our Lady! Bill's quip was, "His credo was, 'There is no God, and the Blessed Virgin Mary is his mother!'"

'After being sent down from St Stephen's House, Bill married Maureen (who died barely a week after he did), and the pair were received into the Greek Orthodox Church. Bill had greatly wished to receive ordination in that communion, but was to be over the years disappointed. Notwithstanding this, Bill and Maureen were practising Orthodox all their lives.

'Bill never had a progressive career as such. He did this and that. He will be remembered for his years at the Queen's College, Birmingham, where his clarity as a lecturer in liturgy was widely appreciated.

'His *magnum opus* you mentioned. He wrote numerous articles and "chapters", and I can recall a series of articles in the Roman Catholic publication, *Liturgy*, in which he examined the then newer Roman Catholic rites with both sensitivity and perception. I wish I had preserved some of his personal letters; his comments on "what was going on at the time" were acid and poignant!

'Following the reconciliation of the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox, Bill

became heavily involved with the diocese of East Anglia and its Liturgical committee. I recall over ten years ago asking him whether his contact remained centred on the Greek patriarchate or was he tempted by the Antiochene (whose encouragement to ex-Anglicans wishing to be ordained was becoming known). He replied, "Well, currently I have more to do with the patriarchate of Rome than with either."

'He retired to Castle Acre in Norfolk and typically named his house *Jokers*. Perhaps that is a good comment on his life. Circumstances conspired to deny him what his ability merited: ordination to the priesthood and a developing career in the academic world. Typically, this did not make him bitter; he treated life's disappointments as a joke.'

John Harwood (librarian of the Missionary Institute London) adds:

'He died on 16 February 2003, aged 71 . . . They [he and his wife] were both interred together at Castle Acre (Norfolk) churchyard with Orthodox rites on 17 March.'

FIRST ON TV

The recalling of the role of television in the coronation in June 1953 has prompted two more claims to 'firsts':

Peter Johnson writes:

'What was billed as the first communion service on TV came from Liverpool parish church later that year [ie 1953, coronation year] or early 1954. There was the usual predictable multi-faceted correspondence in the *Church Times* and afterwards quite a supportive report, as I remember it. This was one of the factors which led me to seek out that church when I moved to Merseyside later in 1954 . . .'

John Perry (the one who was once archdeacon of Middlesex) writes:

'I do not know the actual date . . . but it was in 1958-9 that the first full service of an Anglican eucharist from Independent TV was from St Peter Beauvoir Town in the Hackney and Stoke Newington Deanery. I was the incumbent and presided ("celebrated" in those days) and the Rev Martyn Grubb (son of Sir Kenneth) preached . . .'

Last month's publication . . .

. . . was Worship Series no 176 by Anne Harrison, *Sing it Again: The Place of Short Songs in Worship*. We do not usually advertise Grove Booklets again after their month of publication but NOL had, culpably, omitted the blurb we had received, and now we want to make amends. Here goes: