

Post-ordination training is another area we feel must be tackled. Many, perhaps most, newly-ordained curates acquire their liturgical habits from their first incumbent. But if the latter has not come to grips with the practical implications of, say, Rite A, then we will continue to see presidents behaving as though it were 1662.

Finally, on a personal note, I have been following with interest the correspondence initiated by Martin Dudley re Inductions/Farewells. When I left my last parish in August '90, I tried to mark the end of that relationship within the liturgy. The 'farewell' Parish Eucharist happened to coincide with the Youth and Community Celebration at the conclusion of the annual Summer Community Youth Project which, appropriately enough, focused on the theme of 'Travelling'; and the young people—over 100 of them—took a major part in leading the songs, reading, prayers and drama within the service.

After communion, the curate and churchwardens joined me and my family in front of the congregation for what we called 'The Deduction' (for want of a better term). Reflecting, but also reversing, some actions of the Induction rigmorale, I handed back the church keys to the wardens—'symbol of your rights and responsibilities during the interregnum'—and then removed my chasuble and gave it to the curate with an exhortation to him to be faithful in administration of the sacraments, in pastoral care, teaching and preaching. (But I refrained, with difficulty, from following this by instructing the congregation, in the words of Abraham, to 'stay here with the ass while I go yonder . . .') The curate then assumed the liturgical presidency; I and my family departed during the last hymn, after which he dismissed the people. Not a dry eye in the house . . . but whether the tears were of sadness or relief is not for me to comment.

However, it didn't stop the coachloads coming to my Induction a fortnight later; nor, do I think, would the new parish have wished them to stay away. The people were pleased to welcome them; not least because it gave their new start a great boost to see their church full for the first (and possibly last) time in years! But the extent to which that should be part of the purpose of the Induction service remains open to debate.

Charles Taylor

#### FOOTNOTE—PRAXIS

Praxis hold a 'National Consultation' on Evangelism and the Catechuminate at St. Martin in the Fields on Wednesday 29 May from 11 till 5.45.

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. 196

April 1991

## Editorial

The liturgy of the month has been the enthronement of the hundred and third Archbishop of Canterbury, at 3 p.m. on Friday 19 April (a concealed factor in the choice of date is probably the enabling of the members of Her Majesty's Government to attend—Friday is slackening-off day in the Commons).

Something went wrong with the advance publicity. Word got around that we were in for guitar-based street-level ephemeral charismatic choruses, the assumed choice of George Carey. Most would have anticipated that, even if he were going to appear on *Songs of Praise* on BBC TV on the Sunday evening following, in order to introduce his own favourite Christian songs and hymns, his own favourites were to have very little place in this great line-up at which he was to be enthroned—or, to be accurate, he could only have what he might personally choose if it coincided with the cathedral musical tradition for enthronements.

So there was some surprise when the word got out a week in advance that religious enthusiasm married to cultural philistinism was to be the order of the day at the enthronement. In fact it was to be a highly select rendering of songs by the highly select All Souls Ensemble which was to be the background to a sharing of the Peace. But the very suggestion of varying a jot or tittle raised hackles. Immediately we had on the radio and TV one Dr. Webster of the Royal College of Organists who expressed himself thus (and I took it down *verbatim* as he spoke and I quote his *ipsissima*):

'The occasion belongs to Parry, Purcell, Vaughan Williams . . .' (COB still entertained a hope that it belonged to God, George Carey and a large congregation in that order, but apparently these parties were there primarily to honour the music . . .)

' . . . departure from good taste . . .'

' . . . music with unsavoury secular associations . . .'

'we have that sort of stuff all the week already; we don't want it on Sundays, and we don't want it at an Archbishop's enthronement.' (The idea that the Archbishop himself might 'want' something with personal importance to him himself does not seem to have been in his thinking.)

So what were these enormities to be? I heard Peregrine Worsthorne on the Sunday before complaining about an electronic saxophone. I read in *The Independent on Sunday* mention of a 'bongo-crazed liturgy': But all the fears were in vain. The songs were not 'Bind us together' (all holding hands), nor were they 'Lord, the light of your love is shining'—with Kendrick and the arm-waving. George Carey was not asking royalty to sing 'If one were a butterfly'. What we got was still very traditional—motets from William Byrd etc., fanfare of trumpets by the Royal Marines, Parry's 'I was glad', a newly composed *Te Deum* (with BCP words), a setting of Psalm 8

by Alan Ridout, plainsong *Veni Creator Spiritus*, 'All my hope on God is founded', etc. etc. All just what we would have expected. But mixed in with it was this small notice: 'Also taking part, at Dr. Carey's personal request, is the All Souls' ensemble under the direction of Noel Tredinnick, which will sing three songs at that informal moment when the congregation exchange the Peace and the Archbishop meets the ecumenical guests.'

On the day, when the time came, because the Peace was on in the Choir where I was, and because someone turned the Ensemble down a bit (I think), one could have missed the whole item. The Ensemble did sing 'We are marching in the light of God', but they were simply heard politely and 'Siyahamba' never gripped the 2,000 people—we were not supposed to sing, and in Canterbury we keep the rules: Ah well—there's always next time.

There was one odd liturgical echo of last time. We said the Nicene Creed—no necessary part of an enthronement, and in my experience jolly rare. Furthermore we said it without the *Filioque* (apart from those on automatic pilot, who said 'and the Son' although it was not printed, and felt foolish for days after). So we were clearly back at the point NOL took up in Spring 1980—this liturgical item had been slipped in then especially to make a point towards the Eastern Orthodox, and NOL berated the then Archbishop's advisers who had so exposed him. The point is that the Church of England had not, and has not, abandoned the *Filioque* and therefore the text at Canterbury, in 1980 or 1991, was without precedent or authority. At best it was a personal step by the Archbishop, airing his own stance. The interest must lie in the question of which Adviser slipped in the amended text at this point. Or was it still on the word processor from 1980 and got in unnoticed?

Some got hot under the collar at the absence of the Queen. But this is apparently her way of ensuring that the day belongs to the new Archbishop, and she does not steal his thunder. The story nearly holds, though I suppose I did find myself asking what a Derby Winner had got that the new Archbishop had not.

But we got a fine sermon, we had a good view of the splendid cope Juliet Hemingray had made him (other bishops and cathedrals may note), and something has happened to our Anglican atmosphere, with George Carey at Canterbury—and Eileen. We like it. *Vivant*.

And of course we *did* discover his personal favourites when *Songs of Praise* came on.

Colin Buchanan

P.S. There is a truly elusive service in the offing—a 'termination of hostilities in defence of Kuwait' service, to be held as a kind of national and even governmental event in Glasgow cathedral on 4 May. The Archbishop of York is to preach, but at the time of going to press no details of the Service have been released, and the 'deal' is one between the minister of the cathedral and Her Majesty's Government. We hope to review this next month.

## DIOCESAN REPORT 5—WINCHESTER

In recent years, the Bishop of Winchester's Liturgical Committee has undertaken the typical tasks required of similar bodies in other places—the revision of diocesan orders of Induction, Confirmation, Consecration of Graveyards, etc.; and has also endeavoured to contribute to liturgical formation by the provision of Study Days for clergy and laity on *Lent, Holy Week, Easter, Patterns* and *Promise* as they became available. And, at the end of 1990, the Committee attained its most notable achievement—it abolished itself!

Because part of Winchester's strategy for the 'Decade of Evangelism' has been to set up various new groups to affirm, encourage, stimulate and renew different aspects of the Church's mission . . . spirituality, education, evangelism, social responsibility, etc. . . . and worship, there seemed little point in having *two* worship groups working either in parallel or in competition; and we took the opportunity to change both the constitution and the function of the Liturgical Committee.

Previously, it had been constituted on a 'representational' basis, (i.e.: a left-handed clergyman of catholic tradition from the northern archdeaconry had to be complemented by a dexterous evangelical laywoman for the south, irrespective of liturgical expertise), and in function was essentially 'reactive', responding to requests from the Bishop and developments in the wider church. The new Worship Group, by contrast, is recruited from clergy and laity offering specific skills (liturgical theology, music, art, dance, drama, architecture, etc.), and will, it is hoped, be more 'proactive'.

The aim of the Group, in relation to the Decade, has been defined as 'to encourage laity and clergy to appreciate worship as an agent of mission, and to promote good liturgy which responds and relates to their experience of God in the world'. The Group will pursue this aim by, among other things, providing resources for parishes to make an objective examination of their worship, with the intention that every parish should undertake a 'liturgical audit' within the first three years of the Decade; by co-operating with the Diocesan Training Team in providing courses for clergy and laity; by keeping the Diocese informed as to current liturgical thought and developments; and, of course, providing special forms of service for use in the Diocese as required. Members of the Group will be available, severally or individually, as a 'travelling roadshow' to visit parishes and deaneries if invited.

Mention of the Diocesan Training Team moves me to explain that this Diocese is extremely fortunate in the provision of In-service Training for clergy. Every stipendiary minister is required to select and attend at least one course, (usually residential), each year from a wide variety on offer, ranging in diversity from 'Care of the Dying' to 'Listening to the World of Live Theatre'. But, while some, including the two examples just given, have liturgical implications, there has hitherto been very little available which is *primarily* liturgical. Now, thanks to the encouragement of our former Director of Training, Canon Paul Bates (now gone to join Donald Gray in that home of radical liturgical innovation, Westminster Abbey), the deficiency is being addressed; and this year's menu includes a three-day course to be led by Michael Perham, evaluating recent developments and looking ahead to the new century.

### Also received—and intended for comment

Michael Perham and Kenneth Stevenson *Welcoming the Light of Christ* (SPCK/Alcuin) pp.viii/112m £5.99. This was published on 25 April, and derives from the existing (and actually unobtainable) text of *Promise*, while relating to the one coming out in the final report in July.

Tony Walter *Funerals and How to Improve Them* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1990) pp.306, £8.99. This is a serio-comic reflection on how we end our days on earth, on the pretensions we make, on the anodyne fare the clergy usually provide, on being real (and thus releasing pain, to allow it to hurt), and on how apple-carts get upset. It is a good read, for all its unlikely title. Get it and give your relatives a good send-off.

*The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium* (GSMisc 364) (CHP, 24 pp., £1.25) was published on 30 April, and it provides a scene setting for liturgy of the future from the Liturgical Commission. More next month.

### This month's booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 116, *Introducing Promise of His Glory* by Trevor Lloyd, Jane Sinclair, and Michael Vasey. This is the team which brought you *Introducing Patterns for Worship* last year, and it is a formidable team. The booklet is ahead of the official report, due in July, but page-references have been cross-referenced to that final report.

### CHILDREN IN COMMUNION—LIVERPOOL DIOCESE

We have received minutes of a Liverpool Diocesan Synod this last Winter in which the Liverpool North Deanery Synod brought a motion as follows:

'That this Synod, having regard for changes in the theology and practice of Christian initiation since 1975 (e.g. the Boston statement of 1985), new policies in other Anglican Provinces, the *Children in the Way* report, and the House of Bishops' January 1990 statement), urgently requests the diocese, in anticipation of the General Synod debate in 1991, to review the matter of the admission of children to holy communion and the deferring of confirmation as an act of adult commitment. It further requests the diocese to bring forward its own proposals, for consideration by General Synod in that debate, to enable children, after preparation, to receive the sacrament.'

The Bishop expressed his own opposition to this, and advised that General Synod would be handling the subject anyway, so that it was, in his view inappropriate to pass the motion in the diocese. There was then a reasoned amendment, which replaced the last sentence with,

'This Synod urges our General Synod members to support proposals to enable children after preparation to receive holy communion before confirmation.'

The minutes do not record whether the Bishop then supported the motion—but the Synod overall voted by 98 to 10 in favour with 1 recorded abstention. NOL simply comments that the size of the majority is astonishing . . .

### 'CHRISTIAN' ENGLAND

No, this title is not COB having another knock at the establishment of the Church of England. It is the title of the *Marc Europe report*, a book of 270 pages, which presents the statistics gathered by the 'English Church Census', sponsored by this same independent agency and implemented eighteen months ago. The book was published in March, and the results of the census revealed. The inverted commas in the title indicate that there is no covert claim that England is Christian. Quite the reverse—that kind of issue was the very subject of the investigation. And, if the worshippers present are in any sense integral to the liturgy, then the report deserves mention in NOL.

We learn that on Sunday 15 October 1989 throughout England all Christian congregations of all denominations were polled. 38,607 assemblies received the form, and 70% responded. Within the form they were asked about the age and gender distribution of the congregation. They were also asked for a description of their 'churchmanship', so that we can, for instance, discover the distribution of 'catholic' and 'charismatic' churchmanship. They were also asked the age of their buildings, and the financial concern for the Third World (and how they wished to channel it). I shall not stop on these, but urban dwellers may care to imagine East Anglia's Anglican Churches—where over 1,000 church buildings (more than a half of all the buildings for worship of whatever denomination in the two counties of Suffolk and Norfolk) were built before 1500 A.D., and 800 of them before 1300 A.D. There is an impressive array of general population statistics for each area underlying much of the drawing of results from the statistics, and there is also a comparison with earlier statistical results. There had first been statistics available when the 1851 Religious Census was taken, and in particular Marc Europe had themselves run a census in 1979.

This column is not a serious review. I have met senior churchmen with some qualifications to set against the figures, and against their analysis and presentation. I certainly have not so toothcombed the report to catch the errors that I can evaluate the reliability of the conclusions. So I confine myself to impressions—and here are some quotes:

' . . . a brief rush of correspondence much of which criticized the Census on the grounds that *data collecting was unscriptural*.'

' . . . there are proportionately more elderly people (65 and over) in the church than in the population as a whole (19% against 15%) and they are not being replaced by younger people.'

' . . . the rapidly increasing dominance of the House Church Movement in the Independent sector. From just over one-fifth of the adult attenders [in that sector] in 1979 it increased to nearly two-fifths of the total ten years later.' (The tables show an increase from an estimated 44,000 attenders in 1979 to a fairly objectively measured 108,500 in 1989).

'The Afro-Caribbean Churches grew (in the 1970s), partly because of current immigration, and partly because of the ostracism by white church leaders during that period. This began to change in the 1980s, with the result that black people were more easily able to integrate into white congregations. Also the number of immigrants fell greatly in the 1980s so the natural growth . . . was curtailed. Now there is some flow in the opposite direction . . .'

But the bottom line most want to learn—and it is my bottom line for the moment—is how the Churches are doing overall. The global figure shown is church attendance of around 3.7 million adults out of a population (England only) of around 39 million—9.5% of adults: plus 1.2 million children, or 13.7% of a child population of 8.7 million.

The adult figure has been dropping over ten years, and the child figure dropping absolutely, but not as a percentage. But the interest must centre on age-groups, on men, on inner cities, and on fast-growing denominations. The poor old Auntie C of E does not come out so badly, once one grasps the basic desperate weakness which is fairly long-standing, and readers may remember may recall recently the Church of England's own denominational statistics. The age and gender factors look horrific when put this way (in comparison with 1979):

The net losses showed 194,000 fewer under-15s (two-thirds of them male).

The net losses showed 155,000 fewer 15-19-year-olds (rather more females than males—the report suggests that the males left at a younger age).

The net losses showed 95,000 fewer 20-29-year-olds (over half the drop being males).

For the over-45-year-olds there was a net increase.

Thus the overall loss of 513,000 is more serious than appears at first sight. The truth is that churchgoers have overall been ageing and dying, and if the total figure (adults and children together) in 1989 of 4.9 million represented an average churchgoing life-span of 65 years, then it appears that a new intake of around 75,000 would be needed each year in the lower age ranges to compensate. In fact it looks as though there has been a new intake which was still losing a net 51,000 per annum (513,000 in the decade) through death and drop-out. It is therefore reasonable to assume a continuing loss of children and teenagers, even from worshipping families, a failure to recruit people in the twenties and thirties, and a slow recruiting thereafter which still leaves the church haemorrhaging overall, and with its age structure constantly tilting further towards the old end of the scale. This is wholly in line with the Church of England's own statistics published in November last year. It does not need much extrapolation to discern the end point. We need to go back and learn from the more vigorous Churches, I guess.

COB

(Slightly re-touched form of an article first published in *Church Scene* in Australia, 21 March 1991).

### MARCH STOP PRESS—CORRECTION

We unparadonably omitted from the list of new Commission members Bryan Spinks. We apologize, and believe it was solely a function of haste. We cannot wholly swear off haste, however.

### Book Reviews

*A Shorter ASB* (CUP, Hodder and Stoughton, OUP, SPCK, March 1991, 260 pages, hardback, £3.95)

This is a reduced 'Sunday service book' for the pew, containing from the ASB Morning and Evening Prayer, Rites A and B, and post-natal services for infants. It has no calendar and lectionary, no shorter offices, no occasional offices (except infant baptism), no ordination rites, and no psalter. So it is precisely a Sunday pew book. It is handsome, and slim, and retains the original page numbering. It has a brief commendatory Preface by the new Archbishop of Canterbury (and must have been signed by him at the very moment he emerged from that odd liminal 'confirmation' ceremony in Holy Week). It is not far distant from what many people in the 1970s thought they might be getting as an ASB, without the full readings *in extenso* etc. But is it a bit late in the day now? The ASB is now well into the second half of its shelf life, and will congregations in 1991 or after really buy 100-150 copies of this attractive, if dating, volume? COB

Annibale Bugnini *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* (ET: Matthew J. O'Connell, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, USA, 1990, pp.xxiii/996—distributed by Columba Book Service, 93 The Rise, Mount Merrion, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Eire £46.75)

Annibale Bugnini stood on the inside of the whole of this story, half objective, half autobiographical, which he tells in magisterial detail. He was in turn secretary to each of the central bodies concerned with reform of the liturgy in the period under review, and he devotes Part 1 to a historical broad view 'The Main Stages' (around 300 pages). Six further parts then handle the liturgical material thematically, and three last parts tidy up 'Special Documents', 'Music' and 'Varia'. The Missal rightly gets 150 pages.

The personal story runs straight as die through the heart of the pages. The reason why the story of reform ends in 1975 is itself personal—in that year Pope Paul VI, for unexplained reasons, united the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship with the Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments, virtually subordinating the former to the latter, and thus easing Bugnini out of his secretary's post. He went off with his records and archives, and in a lonely six months wrote the book. He was then sent to Iran as Pro-Nuncio Apostolic and his liturgical labours were over. He was for six years a Vatican diplomat, and he died in 1982 at the age of seventy.

In some ways the Anglican can recognize the *genre*. There are elements in common between Ronald Jasper's *The Development of Anglican Liturgy* (S.P.C.K., 1989) and Bugnini—though Ronald had presumably seen the original of Bugnini and knew the *genre* before he wrote that way himself. And of course Bugnini is more thorough, and covers the whole world on the one hand, and nearly thirty years of back-seat driving in the most exciting times of ferment in Roman liturgy on the other. And he is more detached, or at least conveys more coolness to the reader. Yet at the heart of it there was great excitement, marvellous moments, and ultimately no small measure of grief when the role was closed down.

The story is personal inevitably—but no-one else could have written so fully from the inside of this breath-taking revolution in Roman Catholic liturgy. And there remains a strong suspicion that he was not just writing down what others were saying and planning—we reckon we can see his own hand at work through the story.

COB

## REVIEW OF JOHN FENWICK'S CHAPTER IN LITURGY FOR A NEW CENTURY

This is a short and at first sight rather odd chapter, but one that deserves further attention. It contains four important points. Firstly, that because of the ecumenical movement all our liturgies are looking more alike and less distinct. Secondly, that we ought to think in England of having a eucharistic prayer ecumenically agreed, perhaps Egyptian Basil. Thirdly, that we need to think out our position more clearly over churches in full communion. Why do they have to become part of an LEP in order to share buildings and ministry in England? Finally, in LEPs Anglican clergy are leading services of more than one tradition. What does this do to liturgical identity? Indeed on the last point John Fenwick seems to have failed to realize that this situation is already upon us—there are Anglicans who with bishop's permission are 'recognized and regarded' and treated as Methodist Minister. There are things here to ponder rather than immediate suggestions for liturgical revision.

Phillip Tovey

### Book Reviews

The Doctrine Commission *We Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Church House Publishing, March 1991, pp.viii/196, paperback £5.95)

This not directly a book about liturgy, but it is official in the Church of England, is related indirectly to worship, and is getting at least some passing attention. I have a personal story of my own built into its publication, which relates to the charismatic movement. In 1978 I moved a Private Member's Motion in the General Synod asking for a report on the movement. The Standing Committee of the time did their best to steer the motion into the sand, by trying to amend the motion so that it called for study but did not commission a report. The Synod declined this move, and the report was duly initiated. Somewhat comically, I then found myself drafting the report myself, and this was acknowledged in the text of *The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England* (CIO, 1981). That report was in no sense concluding the analysis of the work of the Spirit, and it was followed up firstly by Josephine Bax (*The Good Wine*, 1986), and then by the Doctrine Commission. I found myself on that Doctrine Commission (from 1986 until now), and, as I have now been dropped, it could appear that I (unpneumatic though I may be) was put on especially to give some continuity from the previous enquiry.

Whether that is so or not, I discovered on the Commission one member with very live links with one of the liveliest Anglican churches in the land—namely Sarah Coakley. I doubt whether it can be long concealed—at least in Lancaster—that her interviews with members of that congregation (and with a split-away group who have left it and become a 'House Church') provide the background data for chapter 2 ('Charismatic Experience: Praying in the Spirit'). The chapter notes on the Anglican parish itself 'worship had already become somewhat formalized and sedate before the split-off, and indeed for those who left this was seen as a loss of contact with the Spirit's drive and purpose. The Anglicans have in the meantime reverted to at least the outlines of the ASB's requirements.' (p.19)

The report continues with a chapter on how to test whether 'this' (of today's phenomena) is 'that' (of New Testament church life); and there are then further chapters on the relationship between the Spirit and Christology, the Spirit and structures, the Spirit and creation, etc. the future. But it is chapters 2 and 3 which raise live and contemporary questions about worship.

COB

## MINISTERS OF BAPTISM

We have received two somewhat confrontational but certainly weighty letters responding to COB's piece on whether Readers could or should minister baptism. Gordon Jeanes, lecturer in liturgy at Durham, tackles New Testament patristic matters, and Martin Dudley, erstwhile Southern dioceses liturgical correspondent for NOL, has a crack at the Middle Ages. Both appear here in full as articles rather than letters, and COB is pondering his response to them, which will come when space allows—or blinding light dawns.

### Early Christian Evidence—by Gordon Jeanes

In February's NOL Colin Buchanan took up a now familiar theme: 'Last month I quoted a couple of snippets from *Episcopal Ministry* which taught, in a bare-faced and unqualified way, that the bishop 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.' I nearly took up my pen in reply to his first piece, but his second is a challenge that has to be answered.

I would be prepared to acknowledge that the early evidence is by no means firm, but I really think Colin is going a bit far here. He did not argue (too much) about evidence from Ignatius, Tertullian and later writers about the bishop having a central role in baptism. I want to look more closely at what is meant by 'minister'.

Although Colin nowhere defines what he means by 'minister', I take it from his paper that he means the one who pours the water or immerses the candidate. I agree at once that it was rarely if ever the bishop who did this. But to define the 'minister' in such narrow terms is neither fair to the historical evidence nor helpful about guidance on how to conduct baptism today. In the early church the true situation was much more complicated, and Dix in his 1946 lecture, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, put the question thus:

'Who actually *administers* the Baptism of water in Hippolytus' rite? Is it the presbyter beside the water, who asks the questions? Or is it the Deacon in the water beside the Candidate, who lays a hand on his head at the actual moment of Baptism? Or is it conceivably the Candidate himself? Christian Baptism in water is undoubtedly derived from the Jewish Baptism of proselytes, which was a self-baptism in the presence of witnesses . . . Looking at the rite as it stands, I think the truth is that nobody exactly "baptizes", as we understand it . . .

'Perhaps I have said enough to suggest that we only misunderstand really ancient Christian evidence if we try to interpret it by our own post-medieval idea. Christian Initiation here is a *single rite of Baptism* . . . And the "minister" of it in our sense is the Bishop. It is true that Presbyters assist him in this in some capacities, as Deacons do in others. Presbyters "administer" the water and oil and chrism he has blessed, just as in the Eucharist which follows Presbyters "administer" to the Neophytes the three chalices of milk and honey, pure water and the Eucharistic wine, which the Bishop has consecrated. But the Bishop is unquestionably the *sacerdos* of the Eucharist, and so he is of the [single rite of Baptism] which precedes it.'

There are all sorts of caveats that I would like to place against this passage, but it is an exemplary attempt to read Hippolytus on his own terms, and, for all our caveats, a very good position from which to approach the New Testament and patristic evidence.

So what are we to make of the New Testament evidence? As Colin shows, Peter and Paul are portrayed as not actually 'doing' the baptisms. However, it is easy to exaggerate this picture, as I feel Colin is in danger of doing when he speculates, 'Baptism was administered by some anonymous minion perhaps?' Such a phrase opens the door to a devaluing of the rite which I am sure Colin himself would not want. In the case of the Gentiles with Cornelius, Peter's command that they be baptized is effectively his presidency over the baptism. In the situation described by Dix above, that presidency would be close to our idea of 'being the minister of baptism'. There is no reason, any more than with Paul in Corinth, to suppose that delegating the action implied that the delegator went off to do something more worthwhile with his time. If he was in the next room, presiding (in whatever fashion) over the eucharistic assembly, then, certainly by the logic of Hippolytus, he was presiding over the baptism which happened as an action of the assembly.

#### Conclusions:

1. The notion of 'the minister' is not self-evident. There is much to be said for identifying the 'minister' with the one who presides over the ceremony, even when the action is delegated to another. I have reservations about the way in which Dix uses the parallel with the eucharist, as though the blessing prayers for the water and oil were equivalent to the Eucharistic Prayer. I could be said that, in baptism especially, the minister of the sacrament is such because he presides over the actions of the community rather than because he says a particular prayer.
2. The New Testament and the early Church give the picture of Baptism not as administered by an 'anonymous minion' but by the whole church community or (later) hierarchy. The passive use of the verb 'to baptize' fits well with this picture.

#### With regard to the present day:

1. The problem is not just about ministers other than the bishop, but also about celebrations of baptism which are private rather than communal. By and large the two problems go hand in hand.
2. If the 'minister' is the one who presides, then much of the service may be delegated and Readers, involved laity etc., should take a part. However the rules about the minister—the one who presides—should stay as they are. The Church of England has held to the ideal of a ministry of word and sacrament, but has not drawn the conclusion that they are inseparable, let alone that being licensed to preach (something that has grown among Readers—it was by no means universal) entitles one to be a proper minister of the sacraments.
3. Looking ahead to further revision, why should not adult candidates be baptized with the ancient interrogatory formula, and thereby have an active part in the immersion?

#### Light from the Middle Ages—by Martin Dudley

I wonder if it is really fair to end the detailed account of developments affecting the minister of baptism early in the third century and to jump, via a brief reference to the medieval Western Church, straight to the puritans. The pattern that governed later thinking and practice followed Constantine's legalization of Christianity and the subsequent emergence of the parish system.

In the fourth and fifth centuries the bishop was the ordinary minister of baptism. As the Church grew, especially in rural areas, the collaboration of presbyters was required. The Council of Elvira [A.D. 306] provides for baptism, in case of necessity, by a deacon authorized by the bishop, and for occasional lay administration.

In the Middle Ages the licit administration of baptism was reserved to a priest having jurisdiction, the bishop of a diocese or the parish priest having cure of souls. Infants in danger of death and royal princes could be baptized in private residences but otherwise private baptism was illicit and violated the canons. Isidore of Seville holds that baptism is entrusted to priests alone. Theodulph of Orléans tells his clergy at the end of the eighth century that they should not refuse to baptize any sick infant brought to the presbytery. A widely circulated anonymous ninth-century address to the clergy tells them not to presume to baptize other than on the eve of Easter and Pentecost unless because of danger of death. These writers all presume that the priest will be the minister even when there is danger and the teaching of the short formula to midwives and others is only evident in the fifteenth century.

Acquinas states that 'baptizing pertains to the priestly order from the point of view of a certain fittingness and solemnity, but not because it is indispensable.' Baptism, he says, should be received from the priest having the cure of souls, or his delegate. As he holds that baptism is necessary for salvation, he holds also that, if a person would otherwise be deprived of it, then anyone may be the minister—man, woman, even an unbaptized person. But, St. Thomas continues, 'If a layman should baptize outside a case of necessity, he would surely sin but still confer the sacrament.' He also says that a layman should not baptize when a clerk is present, nor a cleric in the presence of a priest.

Although the Italian pattern did not prevail throughout Europe, the practice in the fifth century was to set up rural churches known as *ecclesiae baptismales*. They possessed, as their name suggests, a baptismal font, a jealously guarded prerogative which only the bishop could concede, and were surrounded by a cluster of other churches. These baptisteries were, before the twelfth century, the only genuine parish church with the cure of souls. Baptismal rights spread in the late medieval period, but as late as the fifteenth century Florence had 56 parish churches and one font!

We may conclude from this brief summary that (a) in case of genuine necessity, i.e. danger of death, anyone could baptize, though the priest was still the preferred minister, and (b) the ordinary minister was the priest who had the cure of souls. So the reason why Readers do not ordinarily baptize has more to do with the cure of souls than with the prerogatives of an order. Despite some appearances to the contrary, today's bishops continue to have the cure of souls of all the people of the dioceses and to share it with the parish clergy. These rights and responsibilities are enshrined in Canons C 8 and C 18. For as long as we remain committed to the parish system, I do not think that they should be set aside.