

THE CHAIR *Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin* took the Chair at 8.30 p.m.

The Chairman: Ladies and gentlemen, before we start the evening session, I have been asked to bring to the attention of Synod that Vera Hunt is in hospital. She broke her arm on her way to Synod, so perhaps we can remember Vera Hunt, who has had to have surgery today.

I call on the Archbishop of York to introduce and welcome the Archbishop of the West Indies.

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): Members of General Synod, on your behalf and on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury, it gives me great pleasure to welcome this evening Archbishop Drexel Gomez, the Archbishop of the West Indies and Nassau, which means that the Bahamas are included. As chairman of the design group, he will be addressing us tomorrow on the Anglican Covenant. In the culture from which he and I come, you cannot introduce someone and then expect him not to speak, so I am giving him a chance for one minute to greet you in the name of Jesus Christ.

The Archbishop of the West Indies (Most Revd Drexel Gomez): Mr Chairman, Your Grace, members of Synod, I deem it a great honour and privilege to have been invited to participate in your discussion on the Anglican Covenant. For me it is a great joy and delight to be able to share in a synod from the other side; I am usually presiding. It is a good thing to see how it is done in other contexts. Thank you very much for your welcome. I pray that the Holy Spirit of God will lead and guide you in your deliberations. (*Applause*)

TRANSFORMING WORSHIP: Report by the Liturgical Commission (GS 1651)

The Chairman: Under SO 97 members of the Liturgical Commission and Professor John Harper will now make a presentation.

(Audio/visual presentation – Music: RSCM Choristers' Prayer)

Ms Dana Delap (Durham): Good evening, Synod. This evening we want to raise questions about the ways in which we are transformed in worship and the way that worship transforms us. As the prayer says, what we say and sing can enter our very beings and change our lives. That prayer was sung by 30 young people, gathered from churches round the country as the Royal School of Church Music Millennium Youth Choir.

It is with music that we begin our exploration. The Choristers' Prayer that we have just heard was set to music by Professor John Harper, Director General of the RSCM. John has a passion for bringing well-crafted music in the most appropriate style to each parish church, whatever its resources. John, we welcome you on behalf of the General Synod.

Professor John Harper (Director General, Royal School of Church Music): Sometimes the sheer range of musical expression available to us can be overwhelming. Never before has there been such a rich palette of styles and resources on which we can draw to express our praise and our prayer.

For all those 300 years music for the people in the Church of England was largely confined to metrical psalms. Now we can choose pretty much what we like. In this we are unlike some of the Churches within the Anglican Communion that determine which songs and hymns may be used from an authorized book. That freedom to choose is both a privilege and a responsibility.

With all these choices, all these cultural reference points, all these diversities, it can be easy to overlook the fundamental power of music to express worship and to change those people who share that experience of music in worship: the innocence of the voices of young children; the inspiration of a hymn sung by a great assembly; the exuberance of a praise band; a youth choir or a mighty organ; the unfathomable depth that may confront us as much in a simple African-American spiritual as in the majesty of the closing chorus of Bach's *St Matthew Passion*; or sometimes the still, small voice of God, which we may discern as we share together an Iona song, a Taizé refrain or an anthem sung with prayerful commitment by our own parish or cathedral choir, all performed in the beauty of the music of silence.

Music can so affect our sense, so free us to worship God beyond words, so take us individually and collectively out of ourselves and wrap us in the power of the Spirit; it can be transforming whether we are listeners or participants. It is far more than a tool to enable active participation or something to cover up taking the collection. The vision of music transforming the worship of the Church can be far from the reality. All of us must have experienced the stultification, the frustration, even the pain, of music done badly in church, or the desolation of a few scattered voices trying to sing something too high or too hard. There are those places that have no-one to lead or co-ordinate the music, and other places where the music seems to be an obstacle or a distraction. Too often we lack the understanding to know how to use music well. Too often both our musical leaders and our worship leaders lack sufficient knowledge of how and when to use music to best effect. Too often there is just no competent person to enable the music at all.

If we want music to play its full part in transforming worship we have to commit to a patient and long period of practical transformation of people through education and training. That will require either

enormous resource or, more realistically, imaginative partnerships – partnership between the Church and charities such as the RSCM, committed to the education and training of church musicians, and the educational sector. With very limited funding we have to seek to build these creative partnerships at local, diocesan and national levels and to enable that network of levels to join up, and we have to think imaginatively. For instance, there may be far more musical talent and inspiration in our local church than we thought, but it may not always come in the form that we expect it. With such a discovery we may find opportunities to extend music beyond worship for the enrichment of the whole of our parish life.

If we believe that music in worship matters we have to recognize that it will require nurture and attention over several decades. We all need to engage with the issues and become part of that active network of involvement. Above all we have to hold on to the vision of worship, transformed and transforming, with a kaleidoscope of good, well chosen and well used music, music through which the priesthood of all believers is strengthened in faith and made confident in proclaiming the Gospel in the world.

Ms Dana Delap: Thank you, John, for that inspiring vision of formation in music and worship in our parishes.

Like the RSCM, the Liturgical Commission is committed to making connections between our lives and the worship that we experience. The following stories might help us to make those connections. They show how worship transforms the lives of individuals and sometimes of communities.

We want to leave you with this question: is the worship that we experience transformative? Does it draw us towards God and towards others? If not, why not?

Mrs Gillian Ambrose (Ely): Meg was a good trumpeter who played in the school band. When the vicar came to school to do an assembly, he asked for musicians to play at the summer town picnic in the park. The local Churches wanted to put on a short service at the picnic as a bridge between the Churches and the local community. When she arrived at the rehearsal, Meg found that there were young people from at least four local churches with differing musical backgrounds as well as people, like her, who did not go to church at all. The service went well. The different Christians worked together and it was good. Afterwards, the conductor asked whether she would come to church and help with the church band. Her experience of the service made her say Yes. Meg helped with the band and in time she was drawn into the worship at St George's. She was confirmed; her faith grew. That was four years ago. Meg is off to university now and she is wondering whether she may have a vocation to the priesthood.

Revd Jonathan Baker (Oxford): Prayer Book evensong at St John's had reached a critical point. Only three or four people gathered each week with the vicar and the PCC wondered whether the service ought to be discontinued. One of the churchwardens suggested trying something different for a while. The vicar was asked to focus the preaching on the psalms and they built in an opportunity for discussion, relating the worship and the preaching to life at home and at work. Within a few weeks, the congregation was asking for longer periods of silence for reflection and prayer. Word soon got out that this was the time in the week when there was space to think, space to pray, space to be, space to encounter God, and slowly the congregation grew. The reflections on the psalms and the time for discussion helped people to make real

connections between worship and daily life, and the stability of the familiar BCP form of service meant that it was a safe place in which to make those connections. Prayer Book evensong at St John's, and those who attended, was being transformed.

Revd Rhiannon Jones (Ely): Sarah had not been to church for several months, but this Sunday she knew that she needed to be there. Geoff, her husband, had finally received his test results and the prognosis was not good. As she knelt down in the service, it felt as if every word of every reading and every word of every prayer had been written especially for her and for her husband Geoff. Sarah had come into church that morning feeling desperate, helpless and fearful for the future. However, she left in quite a different state, convinced of God's love for her, totally forgiven for months of absence from God and with a real sense of hope for the future. What had brought about the change? Maybe the familiarity of the prayers, the silence after the sermon, the love shown to those in need during the intercessions, the sense of belonging that came from receiving the bread and wine with the other people in church, maybe knowing that she had met God in the worship, that as the Bible had been read and Communion shared, her life had been brought to a turning point and she was changed by the knowledge that the worshipping community would be there for her and for Geoff in the days ahead.

Revd Canon Carl Turner (Exeter): St Mary's had always had a good service on Christmas Eve. It was well attended, a beautiful and awe-inspiring occasion, but one of the children's leaders was concerned that there was nothing in the service for children. So the church decided to try holding a crib service early in the afternoon. They printed 100 service sheets and the Sunday school practised their nativity drama for weeks beforehand. As dusk fell, people streamed towards the church, the church filled and it was not long before they had run out of service

sheets. There was a real buzz of excitement. The children had never before gathered with their families on Christmas Eve in that parish. Everyone agreed that the drama presented by the children was fantastic and there was no doubt that all the hard work had borne fruit. Christmas worship for those with young children had been transformed. The crib service soon became a parish tradition.

Jack had taken part in that first crib service and the experience had stayed with him. A couple of years later, as he went with his family to that service, he volunteered 'I love Christmas Eve. You can really feel that Jesus is in the church with us'. He had found a way into the worship and a way of recognizing God's presence with us.

(Audio/visual presentation – Transforming Worship: Multi-media presentation)

The Chairman: I call on the Bishop of Wakefield to move Item 16. He has up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Wakefield (Rt Revd Stephen Platten): I beg to move:

'That this Synod

- (a) affirm that the worship of God is the fundamental purpose of the Church, crucial for transformation and mission;
- (b) welcome the Liturgical Commission's Transforming Worship initiative for liturgical transformation and training;
- (c) commend the Commission's report *Transforming Worship: Living the New Creation* (GS 1651) to the Church of England for study, reflection and action;
- (d) endorse the recommendations set out in Chapter 9 of the report; and

- (e) request the Commission to report to the Synod on the progress of the Transforming Worship initiative before the end of this quinquennium.'

Fourteen years ago this May I was with the then Archbishop of Canterbury in St George's Cathedral in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia. We were honouring their patron saint, whose patronage we in England, of course, share. It was for all of us an amazing experience. The church was packed, and in the four-hour liturgy – the Orthodox do not do things by halves, as I am sure Archimandrite Ephrem will confirm – hundreds and hundreds of people came and went. There were all sorts and conditions of women and men, from babes in arms to people in their eighties, from teenagers to middle-aged marrieds. More remarkable still, everyone seemed to know what to do and why they were there. In spite of 70 years of enforced atheism, here was a community formed both by and for worship.

This sets the context of the report that you have before you. The report underpins and informs the work not only of the Liturgical Commission but of all of us, hopefully, for the next five to 10 years. That work itself, as we have already seen, is about transforming worship – words that deliberately have a double effect. A remarkable phenomenon of the 20th century – the ecumenical century as it is often called – was the Liturgical Movement. It swept through God's Church, renewing its liturgy and worship, and in so doing it has known no boundaries of confession or communion. In the space of 50 years the worship of all the mainstream traditions has been regenerated and enriched in a way that has brought the Churches closer together. Evidence of this is there simply with the new texts – from the *Missa Normativa* to the Methodist Worship Book, from our own experimental services back in the 1960s and 1970s to *Common Worship*. However, all too easily this extraordinary phenomenon – and it is extraordinary if you think of the

time span in which it has happened – has been seen as very largely instrumental and practical. Too often, worship has been seen as a means to an end in itself, and concern has been with the details of precisely what we do or do not do in church. So the Liturgical Movement has been seen in terms of texts and of new rites, but its impact goes far deeper than that.

Anglicans like Gabriel Hebert and Gregory Dix made a great contribution to that Movement in earlier generations, but I would like to focus for a moment on the liturgical scholarship that issued from Belgium and Germany. Let me offer you just two names, both of them Benedictine monks – Dom Lambert Beauduin and Dom Odo Casel – who offered insights that are essential to our work in the coming years. Beauduin was clear about worship's transformative power in what he saw as an increasingly secularized world. He was convinced that worship must be participative. That did not mean that everyone had to recite a line or play a part, rather like a theatrical performance. Instead it meant that the entire community should become immersed in a living liturgy of which they themselves were an integral part.

This insight takes us on to my other key witness so to speak. Odo Casel, from the abbey of Maria Laach in the Rheinland, also began with that same key concept of participation. This time, however, his key word was 'mystery'. Mystery is of course a biblical concept, and Paul speaks of 'the mystery that has been hidden throughout the ages and generations but has now been revealed to the saints'. It is also a key word elsewhere in the Christian tradition through the ages. Casel was clear that the mystery for Christian people is the life and ministry, the passion and resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and that that mystery is represented and lived every time we celebrate the Holy Communion. In the Eucharist, as individuals and as a community, we are taken down

into the mystery and formed by it; and, because it is of God, we are both formed and transformed.

Now much theological and liturgical water has flowed under the bridge since Casel and Beauduin wrote. Even so, mystery and transformation remain essential. That is why the deliberate ambiguity, the double meaning, in our title *Transforming Worship* is so important. Yes of course we do want to transform worship to make it of the best, using the rich treasury of textual material now available to us. Indeed, without good worship our missionary efforts will be stunted. Mission stands at the heart of worship and worship stands as the heartbeat of mission. Good worship, encountering the mystery, will both magnetize people to Christ and keep them so magnetized. It will mean a true encounter with Jesus, who shares our lives and changes them. Unless the people who are drawn into our life experience worship that is vibrant and engaging, our missionary efforts will be in vain.

The other side of the ambiguity means that the worship is itself transforming, as indeed Casel and Beauduin hinted. Participation in worship forms us after the image and likeness of Jesus Christ; it shapes us through the patterning power of God's Kingdom.

I should make it crystal clear that the Transforming Worship initiative is not about the Liturgical Commission somehow telling others what to do or even doing it for them. We all know the famous old saying that liturgists are less biddable than terrorists, but the style and mood of this report suggests, I hope, the very opposite: it is about an enabling, facilitating process. Yes, I know that those words come very near to the top of my list of most abhorred clichés, along with 'partnership', 'outcomes' and 'delivery', but behind those two words stands a real commitment to transforming worship.

The later chapters of the report set out practical ways in which our whole Church can engage in and make possible transforming worship. We have tried to touch on a wide range of contexts for worship and show our commitment to working across the breadth of worshipping traditions within the Church of England, for ultimately our hope is for transformed communities which themselves will transform our world.

When I visit a church or celebrate the Eucharist there, I sometimes say to people, 'If you were not already part of the Church, would your experience of worship make you want to join?' It is a sobering question. Does participation in worship where you are feel like being part of the new creation that Paul talks about? That question itself brings us to the sub-title of the work before us in the coming years – *Living the New Creation*. In II Corinthians V.17 Paul writes: 'so if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new'. Indeed, so much of that rich material in the first chapters of II Corinthians is about 'living the new creation'. How often does our worship in parishes, schools, hospitals, prisons and in so many other places feel like the new creation?

The motion reminds us that the worship of God is the fundamental purpose of the Church, crucial for transformation and mission. That was our experience on that day in Tbilisi, for in worship we meet with God in Christ, we are formed and we are transformed and we are sent to 'live the new creation'. Can we help others believe that they are part of that?

Revd Professor Paul Fiddes (Ecumenical Representatives, Baptist Union): I am very grateful for being called to contribute to this debate. It is a little embarrassing to be called so early and then to direct your attention to Appendix 1 of the report. I had thought to make a small contribution somewhat near the end of the debate when all the greater

issues would have been covered, but this is definitely not the sort of appendix to be ignored until it becomes inflamed or is surgically removed.

As an ecumenical representative I welcome what is said in the appendix about Christian initiation and point out that there are opportunities here for the experiencing of shared worship with ecumenical partners. In affirming the report and the motion, therefore, I want to urge the linking of Appendix 1 on initiation with paragraph 6.3 of the main body of the report, which is headed 'Working together ecumenically'. Section 6 actually says nothing about sharing in occasions of baptism, yet these can be key points for mutual understanding, for deepening common discipleship and for being transformed. The opportunity is there because at the moment there is an increased consensus among the Churches that baptism is one moment within a journey of initiation – a journey of Christian beginnings.

This appendix highlights the image of a journey as underlining the *Common Worship* texts. It draws attention to the implications of this journey model for mission, nurture and discipleship. I take it that this means not only the journey of faith, which lasts throughout the whole of life, but also the opening part of the journey, which marks the beginning of the Christian life. Initiation itself is a process, or a journey, which includes not only baptism as the central moment but also Christian nurture, owning faith for oneself in saying 'yes' to God's 'yes', commitment to serving as a disciple in the world and sharing in the Eucharist for the first time. All this is part of Christian initiation, the beginning of the Christian life. This understanding of the journey of initiation is embodied in the document on the Anglican-Methodist Covenant, in the recent conversations between the Church of England and the Baptist Union, and it will have a central place in the new Faith and Order document on baptism from the World Council of Churches.

The use of this image of a journey in services of baptism makes it possible for Christians of many different confessions to recognize their part in the journey, even if they differ on the placing and the ordering of the stages on the way. They may place baptism and personal faith in a different sequence, for example, but they can still recognize the validity of the journey as a whole.

Common Worship declares that as children who are baptized grow up, they will need the help and encouragement of the Christian community so that they may learn to know God in public worship and private prayer, follow Jesus Christ in the life of faith, serve their neighbour after the example of Christ, and in due course come to confirmation. This is a theology of journey that I believe will draw all Christians together.

I want to suggest that as we think about worship we should use our imagination in planning common celebrations of baptism with ecumenical partners, including candidates for baptism who are both infants and adult believers. In such worship together we can at least grasp the hope of initiation into the one Church of Jesus Christ. Beyond what is possible in official doctrinal texts people can experience together the joy of beginning the Christian life and make this an opportunity for the renewal of baptismal vows by the whole community. We can live the new creation, not only through hospitality at the Eucharist but through sharing in baptism – baptism that offers the rich symbolism of life-giving water, linking daily life with sacramental life, baptism offering the opportunity to share in those movements of death and resurrection that are at the heart of the Triune God.

What I want to say is that, at least in your imagination, please transplant Appendix 1 on initiation into the main body of this splendid report.

Revd Canon David Bird (Peterborough): The paper *Transforming Worship* is helpful, and I particularly enjoyed the presentation that was given just a few moments ago, laying before us some of the issues around worship and liturgy in the wake of many changes that we have experienced over the past few years, particularly in the production of *Common Worship*.

I have some concerns, however, about this paper, for it feels to me a little top down, as though it recommends dioceses, bishops, diocesan liturgical committees and deaneries to do something about worship, yet saying 'You are not doing it now'. I have to say that much is happening already, and I think that we need to affirm that as well. I believe that by all means this document should be out there in circulation to help us in our discussions and enliven our debate. However, I am not convinced that endorsing the 29 recommendations and asking for a progress report will actually do a great deal for us. In that respect I would encourage you to think carefully about the amendment that is to be moved later by Anne Toms.

It seems to me that the report is – and I say this in the nicest way – a little churchy. There is very little mention of the huge influence of bodies such as New Wine and Soul Survivor, of large charismatic churches whose worship is drawing people into encounter with God.

We have to recognize that there is huge variety in the Church. Last weekend I went with a number of folk from my parish to two ordination services in the cathedral. I have to say that I found it very difficult to worship there because, with the material with which I was presented, I found it quite difficult to get into some of the hymns that I did not know and so on. That is not a criticism of the cathedral; it is just a recognition that we are in a Church that has a huge amount of variety.

I would have loved to see in the report a little more about that variety and a little more about what is going on in the Church through organizations such as New Wine.

I want to make another couple of points. The first is about the use of the new technologies that we have had illustrated to us in the presentation this evening, which are regular features of a number of churches, in respect of which some mention has been made of the help given by diocesan liturgical committees. However, I have to say that in my experience they are not the people who are particularly skilled in this area, and neither are the DACs.

Secondly, in the past 12 years that I have been a member of Synod, I have raised a number of times the scandal that we do not have liturgical material for use when children are present at the Eucharist. I note that the diocese of Durham has a motion on this, and I gather that it is also progressing through the systems of the dioceses of Peterborough and Liverpool; I hope that we shall do something about this. In addition, there is nothing in the document about worship in small groups, which is quite significant in many churches, whether Lent study groups or regular weekly house groups.

I am thankful for this report. In many ways it is helpful and I will use it, but I am not sure that I want to go all the way with it in the form of the motion that is before us today.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ms Kathryn Spall (Southwark): – a maiden speech. I welcome the attention that this report draws to liturgies being more than texts, especially to Fresh Expressions as a particular source of creativity and energy in this area.

A couple of years ago I took on what the report describes as dual citizenship. My yearning to worship in a more creative, less wordy way led me to join Moot, an emerging church community and a congregation of St Matthew's, Westminster. This community encourages, even expects, all its members to contribute to the preparation and leadership of the liturgy. The way in which this works in practice is that every week a different person or group of people prepare, curate and lead public acts of worship. This has enabled me to develop my skills and discern my vocation as an experimental liturgist, so it has been a transforming experience for me.

Most of our community would not see their vocation in church leadership, ordained or lay, and would be very unlikely to access formal liturgical formation and training. However, their vocations and insights as teachers, artists, actors, civil servants, architects and more only add to the depth and richness of our worship; and many of these people can, to borrow a phrase from the report, liturgically 'bend it like Beckham'.

I appreciate that for the clergy this constitutes quite a risk, and it is through the support, courage and vision of the vicar and curate that Moot as a community is able to engage in worship that maintains the integrity of its Anglican context and tradition while also maintaining the integrity of the community's creativity and the reality of our lives. All our worship is entirely consistent with the requirements of *Common Worship* and it does not inhibit us. Our liturgies include video, all kinds of music and visuals and liturgical objects, ranging from candles, water and stones to magnetic LED lights, UV marker pens, mint plants and mud, all contributing to profoundly thoughtful, moving and high quality acts of worship.

It is through this level of liturgical involvement that many in our community have a deeper understanding and appreciation of the liturgical wisdom and resources available to us within our own community, within the traditions of St Matthew's, within the wider emerging Church movement and the Anglican Church. For many of the community it is transformative. It enables a new and previously unimagined engagement with worship, with the Church and with God.

I hope that this report and the proposed training will encourage all those involved in preparing liturgy and leading worship to consider how to open this up to more people, to take some risks and to think about the kind of support and structure that they can offer within which people can be creative.

Mr Nick Harding (Southwell and Nottingham): I would like to speak in general support of this report, even though, as both a member of a diocesan liturgical committee and as a diocesan children's adviser, at least 15 of the 29 recommendations relate directly to me. At the end of this debate, I will be asking my bishop for some more time!

I doubt that anyone here will not have noticed the connections between yesterday's presentation from Sir Al Aynsley-Green and parts of this report. This speaks of the inclusion of children, how much children can contribute to the worshipping community and how much we as adults can and should learn from children and young people. To repeat briefly what has already been said, it remains difficult to do that in the context of the Eucharist. I look forward with eager anticipation to not having retired before we have a Eucharistic liturgy that is accessible to children, dare I say of all ages. I consider it vital that the Church continues to encourage all generations to worship together. Although the report mentions children's worship and youth worship, I would strongly

encourage us to stick with all-age and intergenerational worship to provide a model for a fractured society.

As the chairman of the trustees of Godly Play UK – another of my trustees is in the hall now – I am delighted to see that all that Godly Play has to offer is highlighted in this report. However, Godly Play UK is a young charity with little finance, so each diocese will need to think seriously about realistic budgeting to see this move forward as an aid to children's worship and spiritual growth.

There are references in this report to good liturgy and good worship, but I have found no clear definition of the word 'good'. In Ofsted terms my 'good' worship may be condemned by some of you as unsatisfactory. If our duty is to worship God, how do we assess that? I am looking forward to a reply to that.

Finally, I am pleased to see a clear recommendation that ministers should be trained in delivering school worship, but I am not sure how deliverable that is. My experience is that those who are willing to be trained are good at leading school worship anyway, and that many of those who do not attend training think that they are good at it but are most definitely not.

Revd Canon Andrew Nunn (Southwark): I welcome very much this report. I share my brother's feelings, though perhaps a little more, for I am a precentor, I am the chair of the diocesan liturgical committee, I teach on IME and CME, and I have organized conferences on liturgy as they have poured off the presses for about the past 20 years. So I really did feel that this report was setting my agenda for my future work.

Going around teaching and preaching as I do, I am convinced that there is a real need and a desire for people to learn the vocabulary of liturgy. People are attracted by our liturgy and when attracted they want to know more. We have certainly experienced that at Southwark Cathedral, where I work and where I hope that through good and intelligent liturgy people – many of them without the kinds of background that most of us have – have been attracted and brought into the Church. They are desperate to know more so that they can read the liturgy as I was taught to read the liturgy, to be able to understand it so that it touches the very deepest parts of their lives.

I therefore welcome the recommendations in this report for more training and teaching, not just for laity but for clergy as well, not all of whom are well versed in the language of liturgy. Much of my time is spent working with clergy who are equally desperate to be able to teach the congregations committed to their charge.

There is a huge agenda here for all of us. I am always drawn back to the story of the disciples on the road to Emmaus and how their hearts burned within them as they experienced the Lord opening the Word to them on the road. That is the first stage. In order for that flame to continue, I think that we need to have education, training and learning in liturgy so that all our people, all of us, can share the Good News of the resurrection of Jesus Christ with those with whom we minister.

Mrs Anne Toms (Peterborough): The purpose of the amendment standing in my name is to welcome and commend the report *Transforming Worship* while preserving the greatest flexibility for the Church to pursue a variety of methods of both progressing the initiatives in this report and reviewing their outcomes in the most timely way, thus sharing good practice as fully, widely and speedily as may be done. My reasons for seeking to achieve these purposes include

subsidiarity, decentralization and acknowledgement of local capability and creativity.

On page 16 of the report we read that it tries to suggest how this work could be more effectively co-ordinated and that its strategy therefore has an open-ended character. I suggest that the dioceses are best placed to know how the work could be more effectively co-ordinated on the ground. Although setting certain processes in motion without wanting to control the outcomes may be a brave thing to do, I suggest that the dioceses will wish their own ministers to set them in motion in a manner of their own choosing, within a timescale that fits their existing diocesan priorities and with a structure that fits their own existing frameworks and networks. The same can be said of all providers of training for ministers, whether for CME or initial formation and whether or not in specialized sector ministries. My amendment has an enabling effect rather than the restrictions of the main motion.

With the publication of *Common Worship* and a comprehensive series of additional materials the Liturgical Commission has achieved great things in recent years. I suggest that this may be the moment to consider a decrease in its activity at national level – in other words, that it considers becoming a commission lite, where the word 'lite' is spelt in this context as a four-letter word as used in the texting language of our present day!

I think it was the late Bishop David Sheppard who said that the Church of England is very good at starting things but not so good at stopping them. It may well be that in days gone by commissions were appropriately established. Today, however, when there is such a rapid and unrelenting pace of change, the better terminology may not be "commission" but "task and finish group" where equal emphasis is placed on words one and three – "task" and "finish".

The largest benefit to be expected from the passing of my amendment is linked not to resources but instead to simplicity – a clearing of the deck to enable a better focus on other things at the centre, a focus on the concerns of highest priority today after the decades during which a major liturgical revision was our key priority. (*The Chairman rang the bell.*)

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Tom Wright): I very much welcome this report. From the moment I saw the title *Living the New Creation* it rang all sorts of bells with me. I am sorry though that I do not think the new creation theme has really been woven through in all the ways that it might be. I was expecting to see Revelation IV and V feature prominently as an example of inaugurated eschatology and it was not there. Nevertheless, it is a great theme.

I probably will not have time to mention them all, so I will just pick the main ones. On page 44 and following (paragraphs 6.4 and following), I would love to see more emphasis on the fact of spontaneity, the romantic or existentialist notion of spontaneity, which often passes for spirituality. People think that it is better than formal liturgy, producing a kind of liturgical pelagianism where we insist on doing it 'my way' rather than accepting that the wisdom of the Church now triumphant may actually have a great deal to teach us. It does not mean that there is no room for reformation, simply that spontaneity is not always what it is cracked up to be.

A few points could be made about the remarks on Scripture on page 46. I want to say that Scripture is not only God's word to us, which can become our word to God, but God's story, the recitation of God's mighty acts. When we recite those mighty acts that itself is an act of praise

which then folds us into that narrative, and I would love to see the category of story explored more.

With regard to the reference on pages 50 to 53 to children and young people in the Eucharist, we in the diocese of Durham are proud to be in the vanguard of this – as of so much else! When we talk about children coming to receive Communion before confirmation, it is odd that we allow them to do that at precisely the age when children are stopping what they do when they are very young, which is to discover about everything by putting it into their mouths. I think there is something interesting there about a theology of creation, which we should ponder.

Then particularly on page 61 about hymns and psalms – John Harper’s freedom to choose – there is a real danger that people come back from wonderful things such as New Wine, at which I have spoken very happily, imagining that the way to revive the parish is by getting everyone to sing those songs when in fact the parish is just not ready for that at the moment. If they try to, there can be a sense of dislocation and it can be disastrous. Someone mentioned earlier the difficulty about not knowing the hymns. We need to make sure that we are constantly inculcating the best hymnody in all traditions, especially the psalms. Isn’t it ironic that in the evangelical and biblical sections of the Church the psalter very often seems to be put at a discount?

When it comes to worship leaders (paragraph 7.6.6) yes, that movement has had a wonderful, energizing effect on the Church as a whole. However, it is surely time for us to stop and ask ourselves some questions, from within as well as from without that tradition, about what we do when we have people arrayed at the front of a stage, facing the congregation like a rock group, with applause at the end of songs and with the kind of posture that is actually very un-Anglican. I love praise bands but I would love to see them either on the side or at an angle.

This is not to diminish the great contribution that they make, but the musical style, which owes a great deal to the disjointed music of post-modernity, where you deconstruct the tunes and often the words as well, needs to be looked at very seriously. I am happy to tell you that when I said this at the New Wine conference two years ago, I received a prolonged round of applause – so clearly this is not anti-New Wine, but let us make it even better.

Revd Tim Stratford (Liverpool): Some of you witnessed my dexterity at lighting candles on Friday night. You will probably have recognized instantly that I must be a member of the Liturgical Commission. The moment you saw that the Bishop of Winchester was required to help me make the thing catch, you may also have guessed that I must have come from an evangelical background.

I speak as a member of the Liturgical Commission but not as a member of a diocesan liturgical committee: the diocese of Liverpool does not have a diocesan liturgical committee. For dioceses to release resources they sometimes need a little push from here or there, and you might bear that in mind as you think about Anne Toms's amendment.

You will no doubt have noticed that the Transforming Worship project that we have put before you today does not come from just one or other tradition in the Church. Worship is the concern of every one of us. It is right at the heart of what we are and what we do as a Church.

I would like to set out for you a few headings that I suspect tax every one of us here. The first is unity. It is in the context of worship that Christian people are most likely to come together and express their commonality. Here we offer our penitence and find some forgiveness for division. When the Church attends well to its worship God's spirit will transform our disunities into something much more wholesome.

Secondly, vocations: it is in the context of worship that lives are offered to the service of God, whether that be expressed in industry service, family, the academy or Holy Orders.

Thirdly, finance: through worship and in prayer, we bring our thanks to our Creator for all that we have been given. It is in the light of God's generosity that we respond with ours.

Finally, mission and evangelism: the incorporation of enquirers and ourselves as disciples into the worship of the Church is the way we grow. It is how we give one another the support and spiritual foundation that we need to follow the way of Christ.

None of this depends primarily on anyone's ability to perform our rituals in prescribed ways faultlessly – or even light candles! These are not the concerns of this report to you. What matters is that we give our worship the priority that it deserves, that we deserve and that Our Lord and God deserves; that we gather in the expectancy of an encounter with the living God, who meets us and the others around us to bring change and transformation.

Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams (Exeter): – not a member of a liturgical committee but a member of our diocesan liturgical group.

We encompass a wide range of experimental and traditional liturgies in helping people to learn how to use them. You may have noted in the report, which I welcome wholeheartedly, the mention of mission communities. This is something towards which we are working in my diocese. We are hoping that as we have fewer clergy more and more laypeople will become involved with worship, and that in every community there will be a living Christian presence – someone who is

there to lead worship week in and week out, so that there is a service every week in every church and they have the occasional treat of a Communion service when a priest is available.

This report refers to music, which I love. John Harper talked about well-crafted music and the pain of music done badly. My anxiety relates to why we accept the spoken word done so badly. I am a tutor with the College of Preachers, and from the diocese I go round the country training laypeople and clergy in voice work and allied subjects such as reading, how to use silence, how to use pause and how to make words sound with the meaning that they are intended to convey. I say, 'When you are asking the Mothers' Union to do the teas at the fête, it is no good saying "We'll ask the Mothers' Union to do the teas" – they think 'Oh yes' – but if you say, "We'll ask the *Mothers' Union* to do the teas', it makes it sound special. Then of course we have within our grasp the best stories of all, which as in the *Just So Stories* start with 'My best beloved'. Isn't it wonderful when we hear someone reading in church, 'And Jesus said...'?

Revd Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): Perhaps predictably from where I come, I welcome this report and I welcome the direction that it gives. Although I do not get out as much as many of you, a never failing source of sadness in the Church of England is the general status of our worship. It is not good. I know that there are some good things about it, but it is not nearly as good as it could be, and I hope that if anything happens as a result of this report it will be the serious and sustained attention given to the ordered worship of God that I think we should give.

I welcome the report for its emphasis on the paradox of 'transforming worship': that this is something that Christians do but also something that Christians are done to; that Christians shape the liturgy but the

liturgy shapes Christians. I have some worries about the use of both terms 'worship' and 'liturgy'. My big worry is that there is a risk of thinking that liturgy is a subset of worship rather than the other way round. At one level you could argue that everything is a subset of liturgy, if by 'liturgy' you mean the response of sinful humanity, transformed, justified, sanctified. I believe that that is the core meaning of liturgy.

I am sorry to be a systematic theologian, but I think that this report lacks a sustained engagement of what it means to be in Christ, of which liturgy is the result, which is why it is without ceasing, why it includes everything that we do from cooking to the very creation. It includes everything; it includes the second coming. Perhaps I can quote from the Liturgy of St John of Chrysostom, which contains the prayer:

'Remembering thy passion
thy resurrection
and thy second coming
Thine own of Thine own do we offer Thee'.

It includes the second coming, which is why I think we need more of that new creation, that revelation, that aspect of the new world that comes with Jesus Christ – that one who came one early morning, not held by death, but belonging to our time and encountered us.

I hope that the Liturgical Commission will not be brought to an end but that it will enter into some serious theological reflection on what we are doing. There is just a hint that we know what we are doing when we celebrate the liturgy; we do not, because it is God who is doing it and God who is doing the transformation – that wonder, that 'incompatible encounter', to quote the sermon of the Bishop of Worcester this morning. That incompatible encounter is at the heart of our liturgy and we – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*)

Mrs Anne Toms (Peterborough): I beg to move as an amendment:

'At the end of paragraph (b) *insert "and"* and *leave out* paragraphs (d) and (e).'

The Bishop of Wakefield: I am very grateful for much of what Mrs Toms has said, but the very point of the report is that we want a great variety of methods that happen in the dioceses, though we also feel that it is important that our Church as a whole takes responsibility for this. That is why we now have a national worship development officer. All I want to say is that it should be 'both ...and'. In no way are we making these requirements or suggesting that anyone should; they are recommendations. Therefore, I very much hope that you will resist the amendment so that we can do this together as a Church in any variety of ways, as Mrs Toms suggests.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): The only reason I want to support the amendment is because this is about old ways of being Synod, and I am very glad that at last someone has had the sense to cull one of these reports. It is a great report and we can offer all the plaudits that we want to about its proposals, but I am not sure why we are debating it, except to make the Liturgical Commission feel good. What will actually be the effect of our debating it is a moot point. In section 9 for example the report asks us to support no fewer than 29 recommendations. This is fantasyland and we ought to be honest and admit that it is fantasyland. Most of the dioceses that we represent will not implement those 29 recommendations. This is not the way in which we should do these things.

Although I am very glad to have the report and think that it is absolutely important that we implement its suggested proposals, we should probably eschew this daft way of suggesting that passing a

motion with recommendations to every subsection of the diocese, and a few more, will result in anything taking place. I would suggest that the boards and councils of the Synod should stop producing reports with these kinds of recommendation to us but instead say, 'Actually, this is not going to work. Let's find a networking way of putting these things into practice'. I want to see precisely what is said in this report carried out, but that will not happen by making all these recommendations.

If we pass the amendment it would take out the recommendation to support section 9. I suggest that that would be quite a good way of sending a signal to the boards and councils, because it would say to them, 'For heaven's sake, stop pretending and fantasizing that by passing recommendations you will achieve anything for the Kingdom of God. Let's find a different way of doing it'.

Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool): I am totally in favour of the original motion and opposed to the amendment. I do not want to lose some of those recommendations. I do not want to lose the ecumenical aspects of them. In our diocese we have a church that has made use of the iron men on the beach at Crosby to emphasize the ecumenical aspects, and that is a witness to other people. One of my patients has come back to his church through attending a nativity service there. I do not want to lose that kind of thing. I do not want to lose the recommendations about Fresh Expressions nor do I want to lose the recommendation about the media. I want us to stay with those recommendations.

I am sorry but I disagree with the bishop. It may be fantasyland to him, but I believe that many of these things are happening throughout the worldwide Anglican Church today and that we need the impetus to put them into operation right across the Church. I believe that we are doing a lot of these things, as the bishop said, but I also believe that

some places are not aware of them and that some places need that little impetus to become involved.

I can better the Bishop of Wakefield's four-hour service at St George's. I went to an African Methodist Episcopal Church of Zion for a joint church service. We were still going after four and a half hours and it had started 20 minutes before I got there – and I got there on time! It was blessed, it was good worship and I really did not want to leave, but I had to go to work and see patients the following morning, so at half-past-eleven that night I had to leave. That is the kind of thing that is a part of what we could lose.

I want worship that transforms us and I think that as a Church we need worship that transforms us. It is not optional; it is something that we must have. We are a Church that needs this and needs it now.

Revd Dr John Hartley (Bradford): On a point of order, madam Chairman. May we have a statement on the cost savings of not passing paragraph (e) of this motion? (*Some dissent*)

The Chairman: I remind Synod that at the very outset I drew your attention to the sixth notice paper containing some comment on the financial aspects of this particular issue.

Revd Dr John Hartley: It does not comment on the cost savings of not approving paragraph (e).

The Chairman: I am afraid that you will have to be content with what you have this evening.

Canon Dr Susan Atkin (Chelmsford): On a point of order, madam Chairman, I beg to move:

' That the question be now put'.

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and carried, 148 voting in favour and 117 against.

Revd Dr John Hartley (Bradford): On a point of order, madam Chairman, I beg to move:

'That the question be now put'.

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Wakefield, in reply: I begin by thanking all those who have spoken. I was particularly pleased that Professor Paul Fiddes, as an ecumenical observer, was the first to speak. I think that his point about baptism and journey is one that we should take more seriously. It was one of the matters that helped the growth of the catechetical movement and showed how important worship can be for education and nourishing our Christian life.

Canon David Bird said that it implies that we are not doing it now. Of course, many places are worshipping with excellent worship, but by no means every one. I can assure you that if you went about as I and most of my colleagues do, you would find many places where it could be done a great deal better than it is. I always say that to my archdeacons and they say, 'Yes, but you have to remember that if you are going there, they try to do their best'.

With regard to diocesan liturgical committees, it may be that some are not as good as they ought to be, but that is the responsibility of the

bishop and the diocese. If the right people are not on them, they will not do the work that they should be doing.

I was grateful for Kathryn Spall's maiden speech, which in a way began to respond to some of David Bird's points, particularly about Fresh Expressions. Similarly I was grateful for Nick Harding's reference to the inclusivity of children. If you read it carefully, you will find that these items are actually contained in the report: we have tried to be as comprehensive as possible.

I was very grateful for what Andrew Nunn said. That is exactly what the report is about – that we should know more about liturgy and, through liturgy, know more about our faith and live it more effectively.

I loved the Bishop of Durham's comment about spontaneity being like liturgical pelagianism, but all members' comments have been very helpful to us in strengthening some of the points made in the report.

Tim Stratford rightly pointed out that we have tried to make it as clear as possible that we represent a variety of traditions. That occasionally led to some lively debate in the Commission, but always there was unanimity in the final result and in the production of the report.

Thank you to Shirley-Ann Williams: I agree with her that it is just as important to get the spoken word right as to get our music right.

To Fr Thomas Seville: when you have produced a reasonably lengthy report, it is very nice for someone to say that it should have been longer. I agree with his basic point: if we had had more space we would have said more theologically about what we mean about being in Christ, and about the new creation picked up by the Bishop of Durham.

The amendment has been passed, but all those recommendations remain and I very much hope that we will take them seriously.

I was as amused as ever by the seasoned synodical reflections of the Bishop of Willesden – slightly world weary, I thought, on this occasion – but he made two points that struck me. Why are we actually debating it? We are debating it because worship is at the very heart of all that we are and are called to be, and we very rarely debate worship in that sense. We debate endlessly the subject of what may or may not be included in services, but we rarely debate what we are really called here to be.

Secondly, if it ain't going to happen...? I hope that it will happen, because if we take a cynical approach to anything, it will almost certainly be a self-fulfilling prophecy. I think some people felt that having this kind of debate was really like debating motherhood and apple pie, but if you go round our churches week by week, you will discover that it is not about that at all.

Our worship desperately needs to be nourished. If it is not, in the end churches will die, because it is worship that stands right at the heart of where our faith begins and ends. I would therefore plead with all members to make sure that these reflections are taken seriously and that we respond to the recommendations at every level in the Church.

I am very grateful for all the contributions and I hope that in the end it may lead us to deepen our worship still further.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

'That this Synod

- (a) affirm that the worship of God is the fundamental purpose of the Church, crucial for transformation and mission;
- (b) welcome the Liturgical Commission's Transforming Worship initiative for liturgical formation and training; and
- (c) commend the Commission's Report *Transforming Worship: Living the New Creation* (GS 1651) to the Church of England for study, reflection and action.'

The Session was adjourned at 10.00 p.m.