

Like other committees, I suspect, we regularly come up against those who are quite ignorant of our existence and those who say, 'Who do they think they are?'

Communication and information then remains a priority. We periodically send out a leaflet of news and information with the diocesan mailing. This includes reviews, notices of meetings, comment on recent liturgical events and liturgical ideas.

We have found the idea of days on particular themes to work quite well and most recently had a day on the occasional offices etc in the context of the decade of evangelism. We tried to explore whether these opportunities with 'non-regular churchgoers' are well-used and heard about different churches' ways of using these occasions. It proved an interesting day (under the title 'Decade or decayed?') with Canon Kenneth Riley of Liverpool Cathedral telling us very entertainingly about how he used the opportunities of the cathedral to involve in real worship those who are normally on the fringe. (We invited him because of his involvement with the televised Hillsborough Memorial Service). The day included workshops on Baptisms, special occasions such as Mothering Sunday, Harvest etc, the Great Festivals and other one-off services. The day was 'framed' in worship that drew on the resources of *Patterns* and *Promise*, linked to the themes of the day.

We hope in the next months to have another day on the *Promise of His Glory* and how it might be best used, and in due course a day—or days—on *Patterns for Worship*.

We find ourselves beginning to be invited to help the diocese in different ways on liturgical matters—at deanery level and also in lay training. This presumably will develop as the work becomes better known.

Our major project at the moment is a set of guidelines for All-age Worship in the light of the report *Children in the Way*. This has become a very comprehensive and thorough document covering many areas and including detailed suggestions and outlines for such services. We have stayed within the rubrics and found them to be flexible enough, though many feel all the more strongly now the need for an alternative children's eucharistic prayer is not really provided yet by any of the new material.

Our plans include turning our attention to the area of music in the liturgy and we are aware of gaps in our committee in this field. We need perhaps to work more closely with other diocesan committees and there might be some contribution to be made to 'liturgical formation' of clergy in the diocese as well as lay people. It remains however, true for me that one of the most interesting features of the committee's work in the diocese is the extent of interest in liturgical matters that is uncovered amongst lay people.

Simon Bailey, Chair, Sheffield Diocesan Liturgical Committee

ISSN 0263-7170

28p

Postal Subscription for 1991 £5 (by air £6 or US\$13)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,
Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-51818; Fax 0634 573549)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS
(Tel: 0602 430786 Fax: 0602 220134)

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 733292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 194

February 1991

Editorial

In last month's Worship Booklet (no. 115, *Readers and Worship in the Church of England*) Carolyn Headley made a strong plea for permission for Readers to be allowed to give baptism. The Canons (quoted in the booklet) do not provide for this, and, if I have my ear to the ground correctly, I suspect there has developed a sense of caution about this kind of 'issue' in the Church of England, as though some important principle about ordination (which is where most Church of England issues seem to terminate) is at stake if Readers cross this boundary. My own reflection, a month on from proof-reading the booklet, is that Carolyn Headley was really rather restrained, that no barrier of principle exists to prevent Readers baptizing, and that we are (not for the first time) encountering forward trenches dug in places where the actual location is itself not worth defending, but that determined resistance there may prevent anyone yet storming the central bastion of orders. We had it in the past in respect of baptisms to be given by Methodist ministers (yes, and by Anglican deaconesses in the days before they were made deacon) in different bits of proposed legislation, and these bits of ground, having been defended for a while for the sake of the principle of episcopally conferred orders, were then abandoned under weight of popular opinion. Have we now reached the same point in respect of Readers giving baptism?

I want to argue the matter doctrinally—that is to say, to argue that nothing doctrinal hangs on the issue. But we might note some current anomalies of a practical kind. Readers are permitted to conduct funerals—but for wage-earning or salaried Readers this is a useless permission, as they are not available at the times the undertakers are working and the cremes have lit up. Baptisms on the other hand come on Sundays—and if they come in a eucharist over which a presbyter presides, then there is sense in his delegating the baptizing to some other liturgical officer, rather than officiating personally at each stage of the rite. If baptisms are to come at a non-sacramental service, as may happen both at family services and in rural areas where only a Reader comes to lead worship on many Sundays, then an ordained person may come to be shipped (though I recognize that the women deacon may be at some such services and it is natural for her then to baptize—and there might be a man deacon, for such still exist). If a Reader has a share in the pastoral and evangelistic work of a parish, then he or she may also be visiting in their homes parents who are requesting infant baptism, and may be giving preparation as part of the church's front-line forces. If the child is then to be baptized, how appropriate that the Reader should administer the rite—though I recognize that this argument, if pressed much further, would also be a plea for any lay visitors to be also ministers of baptism.

So what scripture, history, tradition, and law might bear upon the matter? Well, readers of NOL may recall that last month I quoted a couple of snippets from *Episcopal Ministry* which taught, in a bare-faced and

unqualified way, that the bishops was *the* minister of baptism in the pre-Nicene church. This is so directly contrary to the evidence as to suggest that the contemporary wish was mother to the historical thought. Let me spell this out.

In the scriptures there is virtually no emphasis upon who performs the baptisms. There is an active verb in Matt. 28.19, which *could* mean that the eleven were to give the baptisms in their own persons, but that is fairly implausible. It would mean that only apostolic persons could give teaching also, that no catechists, indeed no Readers, had any future part in giving Christian teaching. We would do better to understand the Great Commission as given to the whole church (then and thereafter), requiring all the church to make disciples, and the church at large to give baptisms and convey teaching as the method of making disciples. This would not tie the actual officiating at baptism to any one group within the church.

In the Acts of the Apostles there is a standard use of the passive 'to be baptized'. The Acts 2 account is typical of many—Peter says 'Repent and be baptized' (2.38), and Luke records 'Those who accepted his message were baptized' (2.41). We never learn who administered the 3,000 baptisms. A similar, if not stronger, case comes with the baptism of Cornelius' household in Acts 10. As the Spirit fell on the Gentile hearers as Peter preached (10.44), so Peter responded quickly 'Who can forbid water . . . ?' (10.47), and Luke records 'He commanded that they should be baptized' (10.48). If it is not clear in Acts 2 who actually officiated, it is clear in Acts 10 that the chief apostle and evangelist present, Peter himself, did not. Baptism was administered by some anonymous minion perhaps? And the only place where the active transitive use of the verb comes in Acts is in 8.38 where, because there was a 'one-and-one' situation, we might plausibly have guessed that Philip administered the baptism himself anyway. We could not even tell for certain from 9.18 (or 22.18) that Ananias personally baptized Paul. He may have—or some other, less notable, Christian may have.

The Pauline letters are also almost unanimous in reporting baptisms in the passive ('As many of us as were baptized into Christ . . . etc.). Comically, the active is only used in 1 Corinthians 1, where Paul is denying that he himself did the baptizing: 'I thank God that I did not baptize any of you . . . for Christ sent me not to do the baptisms but to do the preaching of the gospel' (1 Cor. 1.14, 17—my translation). The apostolic task was the evangelistic preaching: the baptizing was done by a junior assistant of some sort (though, to be accurate, Paul admits baptizing a handful, presumably when his assistant was ill or in prison . . .). I stick by my translation, because it is clear that Paul in general saw submission to baptism as submission to the gospel, and *vice versa*. The two were inextricably linked. He could only oppose preaching to baptizing in respect of the literal performance of the two activities—and that opposition he does make for the sake of his particular argument, and then, of the two activities, giving baptism was not a usual apostolic task—whilst preaching the word obviously was (and for that he has to point to the sheer *content* of what he preached for the sake of the argument).

Interestingly the early church developed its baptismal practice more or less exactly in accord with this. Admittedly, the Didache's instructions

speedily and agreeably, but it hit the log-jam and the next annual Licensing of Readers took place. The officiating bishop did his best to redeem the afternoon but the Dean, for whom this was one of his first major diocesan services, was left speechless. There is no doubt that by next year the new order will have been approved.

The other major piece of work undertaken by this Liturgical Group was the order for commissioning of Rural Deans. Here the good Lord, and the Archdeacons, stepped in. The Liturgical Group themselves were well content with their revision. The first Rural Dean to be appointed after the new service was complete (but not authorized) was the Chairman of the Liturgical Group. The Archdeacon readily agreed to use the new service. The second Rural Dean to be appointed was a member of the Liturgical Group and his Archdeacon also readily agreed to use the new service, and has used it on a subsequent occasion. Is the moral of this that it is better to use a back-door approach to liturgy or to ensure that the composition of the Liturgical Group is appropriate to the task in hand?

The York Conference provoked an interesting response from the Liturgical Group's representative. He felt it to be a very unrepresentative gathering with Anglo-Catholics predominating and insufficient attention paid in the presentation of the Liturgy to appealing to the evangelical wing of the Church. It is the Evangelicals who need persuading to use the forms suggested in *The Promise of His Glory* and *Patterns for Worship*, whereas Anglo-Catholics more readily accept such ideas.

Again, it is the blockage that prevents usage. The fact that *The Promise of His Glory* hangs around the Calendar and Lectionary, and these are not authorized, invites the breaking of the law and of one's oaths. This is not good and if General Synod cannot or will not act then the House of Bishops needs to authorize greater experimentation.

The Liturgical Group hopes, in conjunction with the Director of Training and the Lay Training Officer, to hold workshops throughout the diocese after these books have been published, and also to publish lists of permissible alternative material, but it is less than optimistic at being allowed to order the liturgy for the big diocesan occasions.

DIOCESAN REPORT 3—SHEFFIELD

The Sheffield liturgical committee seems to have begun life—before my time—organizing a large-scale diocesan service in 1984. It seemed like a 'good thing' to have and so continued, under the wing of the Diocesan Mission and Unity Committee to which we still report. Gradually in recent years work has developed and the committee has stabilized with a membership that attempts to reflect varieties of churchmanship, expertise, and outlook, as well as including both women and men, laity and clergy.

Last year we completed a major diocesan exercise in reviewing the A.S.B. and its use throughout the area. With chapter and synod consultations as well as special sessions in different parts of the diocese we drew together a mass of reflection on the impressively wide use of the book. This then formed the basis of a report which was passed on to the Liturgical Commission as part of its planning for revision. The exercise also had the effect of raising a little awareness in the diocese of the work of the committee.

alone. In black Africa, we ask God for food in the Lord's Prayer—the fruit of our land and of our culture; but at the Lord's Table, we use a food that is the fruit of another land and another culture.

Our difficulty in translating the names of the imported Eucharistic elements into our local languages is a measure of the foreignness of the Eucharistic liturgy in our African communities. We are always struck by the lack of symbols of the Eucharist. Monsignor Anselme Sanon has affirmed with rare courage:

'Deny it as we will, the Eucharist is an artificial meal, prefabricated and not the fruit of our culture. We observe this often at the time of the Offertory, when the congregation brings its offerings. When the offerings are concrete and truly come from the people, the Offertory is an interlude in the rite. But if there is no ceremony of offerings coming from the people, the meal and the sacrifice are prefabricated.'

Instead of reproducing a style of celebration marked by a foreign culture, our Christian communities should strive to create, in the Spirit, our own way of manifesting the One who has the power to free us through the gift of his Body.

DIOCESAN REPORT 2—BATH AND WELLS

Did Cranmer have his work scrutinized, re-ordered and argued over by a Liturgical Group or Bishop's Staff? When writing a ninth draft of a service of Institution and Induction that question frequently recurred in the mind of the author. It was not that the first draft had been condemned as inadequate: quite the contrary, and indeed many suggested revisions were not only wise but also added light and colour to the liturgy. However, the long-suffering author, and others, began to feel that the finished product would be the proverbial camel—a horse designed by a committee. Some of the problems encountered resulted from the bishops having different ideas on what they felt to be the best approach to the combination of welcome, worship, legalities and preaching: others from such things as whether or not the clergy wife could or should receive a blessing, the role of the Lay Chairman (always a difficult one, especially when they had themselves requested a service of Commissioning. Commissioning for what? Chairing a meeting?), the logistics of eight or ten churchwardens perambulating round a small church in a united benefice.

However, problems were seen as challenges and opportunities for growth, and by the ninth time of asking, the Liturgical Group felt well satisfied with their efforts and diplomacy. It was then that the final draft hit the immovable object. The Bishop's Staff had such a log-jam of business that they were unable to give it the attention it deserved and so it lies on the pile waiting to reach the top of the agenda and be either accepted or sent back for further revision! The sincere episcopal apologies only go some way to alleviating the frustration felt.

The same log-jam nearly caused the new Dean to have apoplexy. After enduring a service for the Licensing of Readers the bishop sent an urgent S.O.S. to the Liturgical Group not to revise the service but to write a completely new one that was not 'without form, and void'. This was done

bear little upon the issue. But Ignatius of Antioch writes 'It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold an agape' (*Smymnaeans* 8). But the 'not . . . apart from' does not determine that the bishop administers baptism himself—indeed the sense is rather that the church (at the hands of someone quite undetermined) gives baptism as and when the episcopal presidency sees fit. And when we come to Justin Martyr and Hippolytus the pattern is very clear indeed: a junior minister of some sort administers baptism in a separate room, and the newly baptized are then ushered into the assembly where the bishop is presiding over the eucharist, and they are welcomed by the assembly with the kiss of peace, participation in the prayers, the laying on of the bishop's hand (in Hippolytus but not in Justin), and the sharing in communion. Whatever else the bishop does do, he does *not* do the baptisms. Perhaps we can ascribe to the second and third century bishops exactly the role of Peter in the household of Cornelius—their role in relation to baptism was that they 'commanded that the candidates should be baptized'. In Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 17) the 'supreme right' of giving baptism does belong with the bishop, but it is also delegatable—and presbyters, deacons, or lay persons, could receive the delegated function and fulfil it, though he obviously envisages this as an emergency procedure rather than a regular one, and is horrified at the thought of women administering baptism. In the East similar though not identical provisions obtained: in the Apostolic Constitutions (c. 16) the bishop may baptize in his own person, or may delegate to a presbyter, but it looks as though a deacon (or deaconess) 'receives' the candidates either in the water, or as they come out of it. In other Eastern writers the 'priest' both interrogates the candidates and baptizes them, but there is an emphasis in the East (as, for instance, in Chrysostom's *Baptismal Instructions*) that 'The priest—does not say "I baptize so-and-so" but "So-and-so is baptized" in the name, etc., showing that it is not he who baptizes but the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit'. The passive formula in the East (first found in the Didache) is close to the New Testament terminology, and takes much of the emphasis off issues of who is the minister of baptism.

Later Western developments took the whole decision-making and administration of baptism away from the bishop, and left it first in the hands of local clergy and then, in the medieval period, often in the hands of midwives. Indeed the exceptional, i.e. clinical or emergency, baptism, then became the regular practice.

The puritans objected to private baptism and baptism by laypeople, because of their tight identification of the ministry of word and sacrament as the distinctive duty of the ordained clergy. But that is nowadays exactly the point at issue—an official ministry of the word has been conferred on Readers; so why not (as with deacons) the task of giving baptism also? I should add that on the grapevine I hear that not only Readers are already baptizing in some places, but bishops are conniving or even reckoning they are permitting this to happen. And of course this is *public* baptism, so the parishes concerned could easily be traced and spotlighted. I also hear of working parties on the matter. Who will soon show us some sensible way forward?

Colin Buchanan

GENERAL SYNOD JANUARY 1991

General Synod came earlier than usual, both to say good-byes to Archbishop Runcie, and to allow representatives to the WCC Assembly to get off in good time to Canberra. And the agenda included virtually nothing about liturgy, as noted last month. All I can report is a few questions.

I asked the Chairman of the Board of Mission and Unity what 'other authorizations' of forms of worship LEMs fall within lawful authority apart from those provided by a bishop's 'Instrument' under Canon B44. This arose from a written answer in November 1990 where I was told of these 'other authorizations'. I learned in reply that some bishops do give such authorization 'other than by formal instrument' in partnership with other Church leaders. But I did not learn much by that.

The Synod then received further assurances that Martin Reardon's paper on baptismal issues, arising from the 'Godin' motion a year ago, would be brought by the House of Bishops before the July Synod. The secretary-general wrapped in to this reply the information that the standing of clergy who had undergone a 'second baptism' would be dealt with by the House of Bishops at the same time.

Another question asked why we used the 1662 communion rite at the opening of Synod in November 1990. The answer said that Rite A was used in 1980, and Rite B in 1985, and therefore 1662 was due in 1990 on a strict rotation basis. This prompts the idle speculation that a rotation turning in this way might provide either Rite C or 1548 in 1995—or it might provide Rite A just when everybody is giving it up.

There are no recorded questions to the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission. The Chairman of the House of Bishops had to clarify which draft rites the House has in recent years 'commended', and what the status is of materials (such as those in *Patterns*) not yet commended.

THE LITURGICAL COMMISSION

Whilst there has been no public announcement yet, it seems fairly clear that invitations have already gone out to various persons to form the new Liturgical Commission. It had been known some time ago that the Bishop of Winchester would continue as chairman.

PRAXIS LOOKS AT NEW EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS IN PATTERNS

Less than twenty four hours after the official launch of the recently formed group PRAXIS (an occasion graciously hosted by Canon Donald and Mrs. Joyce Gray in their delightful home in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey) the latest event—a one-day 'Open Seminar' on the proposed eucharistic prayers in *Patterns for Worship*—was held at the Institute of Christian Studies, Margaret Street.

About forty people—lay and ordained—responded to the opportunity to hear Kenneth Stevenson set the compilation of the latest eucharistic prayers on offer from the Liturgical Commission, into some sort of historical context. Having sought to answer the question 'What is a Eucharistic

redemption becomes real in every liturgical celebration of the mysteries of the faith where the church is again the gathered community and where the force of the Word of God makes it the Body of Christ. In this way, liturgical acts bring us the mystery of the presence and the action of Christ by using the basic signs of Christianity. Can the African church participate in this mystery by limiting itself to ready-made texts and prayers translated into the vernacular, with the possibility of adding indigenous musical instruments?

Perhaps we will no longer celebrate the liturgy of the four European seasons of winter, spring, summer, and fall. Such a liturgy has no meaning in the tropics, where people organize their lives around the dry season and the rainy season. This is particularly true of the grasslands of the Sahel. Similarly, why is there so little interest in designing African liturgical vestments in a culture that could restore to Christianity this rich symbolism of forms and colours—especially when these symbols are missing in the cultural context of the West? The old rites used a variety of colours, which were linked to the liturgical seasons and the nature of the religious festivals. Over the course of time the liturgical colours for the dead have changed from black to violet—a violet that drifts frequently into light pink, as if to brighten up the celebration of Christian death. Some colours used in the liturgy have a universal meaning, but such is not the case with white and black. Why can't the symbolism of colours in the Christian liturgy be inspired directly by nature, and by the location of the church? This is an important question, because it is not evident to all people, for example, that Africans find no meaning in the violet vestments worn by the celebrant of a Eucharist. Why use white garments for the newly baptized in a culture where white is the colour of the dead? In black Africa, red is the colour of life and of the victory of life over death; red alone can symbolize the participation of the baptized in the glory of the Risen One.

Again, does pouring water over the head of the baptized adequately express the mystery of the death and resurrection of Christ in which we participate through baptism? Doesn't immersion in running water have more meaning? Likewise, has anyone reflected on the importance of Christian names, taking into consideration the importance of the African symbolism of names, and the biblical tradition wherein people carry a name corresponding to their assigned role? How can we use traditional African names and give them a Christian meaning?

The great theme of African sacred history is that, since after the withdrawal of God, human beings still feel a nostalgia for communion with the divinity. But does the Eucharist as it is celebrated in our African communities adequately make use of the basic theme of a meal—an event at which human beings are graciously given food that lets them live in nearness to God? The question is raised because African cultural traditions have developed an authentic symbolism of the meal. The church has correctly insisted on the sacrificial character of the Mass. However the changes that have occurred throughout the history of Christian worship demonstrate that the church has settled on normative elements for the Eucharist, which fail to convey the great richness of this mystery to all ways of thinking and all peoples. Today we encounter the Risen One in a liturgical action where the breaking of bread and the sharing of wine do not form part of an actual meal. For a long time the symbolism of a true meal has been abandoned for communion with bread

than that perfunctory church door rite . . .). He rescues himself in time ('I am not suggesting that confirmation be reduced to bishops standing around in porches' (p.78)), but that leaves confirmation to carry quite a bit of theological luggage, even if shared with the porch missa. In particular he wants to load it with commissioning for service, and the question thus arises as to whether that does not *unload* that element from baptism. (I think he can get off this hook, but it will take some wriggling.)

- 4 There are some hints that this laying on of hands (let alone porch hand-shaking) might be repeatable. Certainly it 'would need to be accompanied by variable formulae for a number of different occasions', so any one candidate might appear for 'different occasions'.

So I suppose I find myself intrigued at a pattern which has strong but not determinative links with scripture, strong but not determinative links with Western history, strong but not determinative links with the RCIA, and strong but not determinative links with received Anglican practice. The difficulty is in finding what *is*, in the last analysis, actually determinative of his programme. Is there that which in Nicholas Ridley was called 'the singularity of his own wit'? If so, I would rather have the singularity of this wit than of many others, but am still left to question whether his or anyone else's own wit is quite self-authenticating?

COB

This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Spirituality Series no. 36, *Reconsidering the Rosary*, by Anthony Price. If Grove Books took one set of risks in January with Ethical Study no. 80, *Evangelical Christians and Gay Rights*, it now takes another sort of risk. Like the Ethical Study, this appears less risky when you actually read it. Indeed, from one point of view this Booklet provides a biblical pattern of prayer, with virtually no hint of the BVM crossing the path. Such is, it seems, still to be labelled 'praying the rosary'. And if you want greater attention to the BVM—whether within the bounds of scripture or beyond them—then our author will sportingly help you with that too.

. . . and next month's publication

is Joint Liturgical Study no. 17 *The Methodist Preaching Service*, by Andrian Burdon. This Study traces out the origins of the distinctive Sunday tradition of Methodism, rooting it in both the outdoor evangelism and preaching of John Wesley as well as in the simple preaching services of his Methodist societies.

TOWARD AN AFRICAN LITURGY

An extract from J. M. Ela, *The Faith of an African*, (Geoffrey Chapman, 1989)

By its very being, the Christian mystery is gesture and sacrament. Ever since God fashioned a body for his Son (Heb. 10.5), the communication of human beings with God has taken place on the level of symbols. The universe of signs is the realm where, through faith, we can touch the body of the Risen One. In that universe, through gestures rooted in the great acts of God throughout history, Christ reaches us in person, symbolically, through the action of the Holy Spirit.

The Second Vatican Council proclaimed that the work of salvation accomplished by Christ is realized in the liturgy of the church. The work of our

Prayer?' he went on to suggest several reasons why the eucharistic prayers from the *Alternative Service Book, 1980* currently in use should not be regarded as the last word in such prayers. Shorter prayers, prayers for use with children present at the eucharist and prayers in which the congregation had more of an opportunity to participate with the president in the eucharistic prayer had all been called for during the last ten years. In many respects the proposed prayers in *Patterns* represented the response of the Liturgical Commission to what the Church at large had called for. During the course of this scene-setting introduction Kenneth (who later described himself as 'an inveterate, rather cranky liturgical historian'!) gave those present a fascinating insight into the comparative rush and chaos that surrounded the composition of some of the four Roman eucharistic prayers now available, and revealed how a fifth prayer (the work of Louis Bouyer) never saw the light of day because of a tied vote on the working party that produced it.

A detailed look at the new *Patterns* prayers included the veil being lifted as to which members of the Liturgical Commission were responsible for the original drafting of which prayers (I confess to being surprised, and would never have guessed!). In addition Kenneth pleaded his case for the inclusion of the word 'plead' in the anamnesis of Eucharistic Prayer B. We also heard one of the prayers referred to as 'the thought for the day' eucharistic prayer; the proper 'thought' is to be inserted in the place where the Preface usually belongs (see draft Eucharistic Prayer D).

In a brief 'Look into the Future' Kenneth dared to say what he would like to see in the way of Eucharistic Prayers in any new book, perhaps about ten years from now. He called for 1: A standard ASB type prayer (say First and Second combines and improved, with lots of fully Prefaces provided); 2: A traditional BCP-style prayer, not unlike our present Fourth?; 3: A prayer which represented a combination of *Patterns*' A and C; 4: A prayer which was a 'stretched' and improved version of *Patterns*' prayer B; 5: A prayer for use with children, i.e. when children are present!; and 6: An adapted prayer from one of the other Anglican Provinces, where much of value was to be found.

At one point Kenneth asserted—and those present clearly agreed—that clergy in particular must take seriously their responsibility to teach congregations about the worship of the church. New forms of worship and new prayers alone will not suffice. This was all very encouraging for those members of PRAXIS who were present.

All in all the day was immensely worthwhile, the whole Seminar being underpinned by a strong sense that Kenneth knew what he was talking about and that we knew it too. And it was characteristically spiced by Kenneth's naughty indiscretions and enjoyable humour. The next Open Seminar event will be held on 2 July when Michael Perham and Trevor Lloyd of the Liturgical Commission will speak about 'The Funeral of the Future'.

Further details about PRAXIS are available from 19 Maunsell Street, Westminster, London SW1 2QN.

Dick Hines, Oak Hill

Book Reviews

David Jasper and R.C.D. Jasper (eds.) *Language and the Worship of the Church* (MacMillan Press, Basingstoke, Hants., 1990, £35.00).

This is a very timely collection of essays published as part of the series 'Studies in Literature and Religion' (general editor David Jasper). The series as a whole is designed to provide an interdisciplinary introduction to the study—literature and religion. *Language and the Worship of the Church* is not an easy introduction to the subject. To make the most of the essays some detailed knowledge of the current state of liturgical writing in English is required, and familiarity with some of the jargon of sociology and linguistics is helpful.

That having been said, this volume contains for liturgists some important and provocative material. Essays vary from those giving a general overview of a project area (P. W. Dillistone on 'Liturgical forms in Word and Act', a stimulating essay by D. Crystal entitled 'Liturgical Language in a Sociolinguistic perspective'), to highly technical discussions on linguistic points in liturgical texts (D. Sheerin on 'The Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: stylistic Notes', and M. Warner on 'Philosophy, Implicature and Liturgy'). Among the essays is a welcome if brief piece by C. Cuming, 'Thomas Cranmer, Translator and Creative Writer', and a fascinating analysis of texts from the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* by P. Mack ('Rhetoric and Liturgy'). Cuming and Mack, from the perspectives of liturgist and English specialist respectively, come to differing conclusions about the circumstances which shaped Cranmer's own liturgical writing. This pair of essays will be of interest to any student of sixteenth century English liturgical writing.

The remaining three essays in the volume open up areas for further research. G. Kennedy ('The Rhetoric of the Early Christian Liturgy') raises questions about the nature of the development of second century and early third century liturgical writing. His essay contains an interesting literary analysis of the prayer for the consecration of a bishop given in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*. The volume is completed by two essays which survey hymnody and music in liturgy (J. R. Watson, 'The Language of Hymns: Some Contemporary Problems', and R. Warren, 'Music and the Liturgy'). Watson's essay in particular gives a useful review of a wide range of current styles of hymnody in English, with perceptive and not entirely unsympathetic comment about the range and content of some chorus material.

This is a beautifully produced and, for its size, expensive volume; probably not one that an individual will buy, unless he or she has a specialist interest in the subject. Nonetheless *Language and the Worship of the Church* is an important book to have in any good theological library, to be consulted by liturgists and linguists alike.

Jane Sinclair, St. John's College, Nottingham

Arcic II Church as Communion (ACC and CIS, 1991, 39pp., £1.25)

This is not so much a review as a notice—i.e. we notice that this new Statement has been published, and welcome it. But it is not a review as the Statement is about the character of the church, as *koinonia*, rather than about eucharistic communion, or other liturgical concerns. There is a brief mention in para. 10 of an 'effective sign' (and an extended footnote

also); and there is an equally brief statement in para. 24 that the sacramental nature of the church 'is especially manifest in the common celebration of the eucharist . . .'. Then there is a conclusion which looks as though it will treat of the issue of inter-communion. There is a tracing out of ways in which members of the two communions may now pray together (para. 51). But we never quite learn *why* we are not able to communicate with each other. I write that without importing any values or preference into the notice. And I may have missed something—I often do.

COB

David Stancliffe 'Confirmation and its Future', chapter 8 of Michael Perham (ed.) *Liturgy for a new Century* (SPCK, 1991, 111 pp., £6.50).

I had the advantage of private correspondence with David Stancliffe before I saw this chapter, so I suppose that I knew what was coming. And I mentioned in January NOL that I was relieved not to have another dose of Mark Dalby on infant baptism—the book has a lacuna there. Well, the heart of the surprise and joy in what David Stancliffe propounds is:

'It is this theological perception, that baptism is our personal Pentecost in fulfilment of Joel's prophecy (2.28-9), that has united with liturgical scholarship to make it well-nigh impossible to believe that confirmation adds some special ingredient to what was given in water baptism, in other words that baptism is only the entry into the dying and rising of Christ, which confirmation completes in the out-pouring of the Spirit, much as Pentecost in Luke/Acts completes Easter.' (p.75).

So far, so good, and much better than I would have expected. In terms of the relationship between baptism and confirmation, and of the completeness of sacramental initiation in baptism, I could hardly have looked for better. It looks as though, for instance, he would view such a baptism as sufficient sacramental admission into the communicant life. However, a total reading of David Stancliffe's thought suggests that this basic statement has to be heavily qualified in the context of the totality, and it is perhaps an open question as to whether or not it has actually been qualified out of existence.

So what are these 'qualifications'? I attempt to systematize them, though they come in an unsystematic way in the chapter:

- 1 He is very interested in a 'staged' rite, modelled on the Roman Catholic RCIA, and that in practice is bound to give indistinctness to his affirmations about confirmation.
- 2 He has a notion of chrismation which is to follow baptism, and is the nearest approach to the second half of baptism in his presentation. He appears (as, e.g. on page 80) to view *this* as the 'seal of the Spirit', which amounts to an enormous—perhaps even fatal—qualification of his basic assertion quoted.
- 3 He has a reduced (if intriguing) role for 'confirmation' as 'coming to the bishop's hand'. He even suggests that the bishop's handshake in the church porch is a more lingering memory than the liturgical laying on of his hand—there is a personal 'missa' (or sending out) which the bishop performs in this personal way (though I confess, from experience both in ministering confirmation and supporting offspring and godchildren, that if there are seventy candidates (with two hundred personal supporters) they don't get much from the bishop at the church door, and if there are twelve they get a better conversation