

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No. 238

October 1994

SOCIETY FOR LITURGICAL STUDY CONFERENCE 1994

SLS continues to thrive, with an excellent conference in Oxford. There was no theme this time, members brought their own research interests and shared them as papers. Thus some were the working out of academic research—Gordon Jeanes on Cranmer and baptism, Bridget Nichols on language, and Michael Fraser on the feast of the Encaenia. The latter may seem obscure (an ancient feast of Jerusalem), but proved to be fascinating, asking questions of how we use the Old Testament and of liturgy and mission to Jewish people. Other papers expressed personal interest and concerns. Bryan Spinks gave an argument from Luther against the ASB baptism rite. Chris Cocksworth spoke on the Trinity (perhaps a forthcoming book?). Graham Woolfenden examined origins à la Bradshaw. Jane Sinclair enlightened us on feminist worship. There were also reports from the Methodist and Church of England liturgical bodies on current thinking. I add a note on a Methodist one. At the beginning Kenneth Stevenson in the chair had said that we come to have fun. The conference lived up to that, one of the best in a few years. Don't miss out in 1996!

METHODIST CHURCH, 'AN ORDER FOR DAILY PRAYER'

As part of the revision of the 1975 Methodist Service Book, the Church has printed this order. Although there are some private suggestions for Daily Prayer, this will be the first official daily office for Methodists. The Office is very simple: sentence, invitation psalm/hymn, psalm, reading, canticle, prayers, for both morning and evening. Its attraction is in this simplicity, and those who find CCP too complex might like to look at this.

Phillip Tovey

CONFERENCE ON COMPUTERS AND LITURGY

Rochester Diocesan Liturgical Committee are sponsoring an open meeting at lunch-time on Tuesday 25 October on computers and liturgy. The meeting is at Meopham School, on the A227 to the south of Meopham village—about 15 minutes from the Dartford Crossing by car. It lasts from 12.30 till 2, costs £2.50, and will be led by Michael Perry, Richard Freeman, and Tim Anderson (of Hodder and Stoughton—and *Worshipmaster*). Bring a sandwich lunch. For more details ring COB on the number on the back of NOL, or ring Michael Perry's office on 0732 770962.

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Postal Subscription for 1995 **£6.50** (by air **£9.00** or **US\$18**)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-851818 or 855252; 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

Editorial

We usually note anniversaries as they occur, but on this occasion I want to note one in advance. The December issue of NOL, no. 240, will complete twenty years of the journal's publication, and it has appeared monthly (usually with a tight scramble) throughout those years. It was born in the days when the various Series 3 services were appearing fast from the Liturgical Commission, there was liturgy on the agenda of General Synod at each meeting, and the way was beginning to open towards the ASB. So there was plenty of actual news, and NOL, whatever its defects and prejudices (hints of which occasionally reach me from readers), has endeavoured to be a 'journal of record' for the Church of England, setting out actual decisions taken, actual texts published, and so on. After 1980 the 'news' became more intermittent, and NOL sustained itself by inventing and stretching news—though, we hope, so transparently that readers knew when they were being taken for a ride. The habit still continues. Originally the journal alternated between six and eight pages, all folding like a concertina. Then in the 1980s it crept up to ten pages, still folding. Finally, when the Diocesan Liturgical Committees were accorded reserved (and uncensored) space, the journal went to twelve pages, and ceased to be a concertina.

I mention all this now as I would like the January edition (which, with our new efficient Company Manager in place, will be processed in December) to mark the twentieth anniversary. Would readers write in with ideas—or even contributions. What do twenty years mean in *your* liturgical life?

Colin Buchanan

A NOT VERY LITURGICAL FOOTNOTE:

How did *Land of Hope and Glory* become the 'national anthem' for the England team at the Commonwealth Games? Is it not fitly understood as a joke item, paired with *Rule, Britannia*, for the last night of the Proms? Can anyone *seriously* sing

'Wider still and wider
shall thy bounds be set.
God, who made thee mighty
make thee mightier yet.'

I should have thought it would be extreme embarrassment to win a gold medal if that is the theological price to pay at the medal ceremony. And if we cannot *sing* the item, what is the tune doing as our theme song?

Oh yes, and do we hear aright that Germany wants to import it?

A PRAYER BOOK FOR AUSTRALIA?

Reports from Australia suggest widespread involvement in the process that is to lead to a new book, *A Prayer Book for Australia*, in 1995. The Liturgical Commission has sponsored 'Provincial Consultations' about a series of draft texts, and has endeavoured to provide good resources at each, and to hear what has been said back to them. We should note that a 'Provincial Consultation' is a fearsome thought—the Province of Western Australia, for instance, is about half the continent of Australia in size; and in Queensland distances comparable to that from London to the Mediterranean might have to be travelled. Still they happened in August and September, beginning with the extra-provincial diocese of Tasmania (only half the geographical size of England). As far as we can gather, 50-100 clergy and laity attended each one.

There is a significant limitation upon textual revision in Australia, and that is that 1662 is always waiting in the wings. It waits there as part of the legal basis of the 1962 constitution which gives existence and authority (somewhat limited) to the General Synod and its officers. Within Australia, too, there has been a dominant Sydney phenomenon, originally viewing itself as most true to 1662 and therefore in position, when a deadlock was produced, to insist on a 1662-based solution to doctrinal tensions. In the past the Sydney participants in national liturgical revision have in fact stretched their charity a long way to meet the rest of Australia—but have occasionally had to mind their own backs. A very irenic role was played in the early years by Don Robinson, who became Archbishop of Sydney for the 1980s.

Reading the reports of the Consultations, and without all the texts in front of us, it is hard to discern general trends. Clearly some general points were being addressed in various centres—inclusive language, flexibility, bold and colourful imagery, the impact of electronic technology, the ontology of Satan, and a host of small things. In New South Wales Sydney surfaced in the person of Bishop Paul Barnett who moved that the 'Second Order Service' of communion should express a full doctrine of the cross as 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world', and, seconded by one Philip Jensen, carried the motion by 21 votes to 16 (the Consultations had, of course, no binding force just as they had no statutory membership).

In Victoria the mirror image of Sydney was at work. There is a Bishop in Ballarat (whose name is well known in England) who submitted a 16-page memorandum about the communion. Some of it was easily agreed, as, for instance, his proposal that the narrative of institution should have the same form each time it came. But his main plea, typically conveyed under the rubric of inclusiveness and comprehensiveness, was for at least one eucharistic prayer which would suit him and others in the Catholic tradition. He said there was 'no eucharistic prayer we can use with honesty and integrity. They all seem to be drafted actually to prevent us believing what we do.' A particular plea in this was for a classic epiclesis.

The story is clearly unfinished. We will try to keep you posted.

TWO RETIREMENTS

Two of the five senior bishops of the Church of England announced at the end of September that they would retire in 1995. Both had had a profound influence in the field of liturgy, though neither would ever have been known as a liturgist or as one whose chief interests lay in liturgical matters.

The first of these is John Habgood, Archbishop of York. His great contributions were in the 1970s, when he chaired first of all the working party which led to the policy of having an ASB (I remember this well, as he chopped me up in Synod when I moved an amendment to provide for a much slimmer document!), and then chaired the small group which negotiated contracts with the publishers, and saw the ASB itself through Synod in its later stages. In the process he became our latter-day Sanderson, writing the Preface with two or three genuinely quotable quotes in it ('Hence those who seek to know the mind of the Church of England in the last quarter of the twentieth century will find it in this book as certainly as in those earlier formulations.'). But I remember also his chairing the Revision Committee on the ordinal, seeing the work through in one month (September 1977), dealing magisterially as usual with the Synod—and revealing his grasp of the material in his own ordinations (and consecration of bishops) ever since.

The Bishop of Winchester, Colin James, is the other. He was summoned to the chair of the Liturgical Commission in 1986 when he was 60, and he remained until David Stancliffe succeeded him last year. All agree that he brought an easy rein and great powers of persuasion and conciliation to the task, and it has been wonderful to see how the members, not a few powerful experts in their own specialisms, have responded so warmly to a non-liturgist as their chairman. The period has been one of high productivity and some quite new directions for the Commission, and much credit must go to Colin James. He too, in his apparently gentle way, is a wholly disarming target to take on in General Synod.

If you would see their monuments, go and worship, with the ASB for one and *Patterns* and *Promise* for the other.

A FAREWELL TO AN OPPO

The Roman Catholic equivalent of NOL is *Liturgy*. It is slightly more official (for it comes from the Liturgy Office of the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales), it is marginally less ancient (for it has been running 18 years, not 20), it is somewhat more substantial (for an issue has 50 pages, not 12), and it is measurably less frequent (for it has six issues a year, not 12), but it has to be said that it is never dull and it calls on a wide range of contributors. We note it now, as Volume 18, no. 6, carries the farewell of the original editor, Jennifer Demolder, who has edited it from the start. She writes 'Over [this period] its production has been part of my life, the content of the next issue always at the back of my mind, and no friend, happily discussing an interesting liturgical point, was safe from an invitation to "Write it up for the magazine".' I know that feeling, and perhaps my friends do too. She has apparently been invested as a Dame of the Order of St. Gregory in recognition of her services. We salute her, as a pioneer with great energy, imagination and skill, certain to be missed.

There are other unsatisfactory features to be noted:

1. By definition, this does not include the giving of the cup. It usually remains a 'half-communion', as the cup cannot well be given without the distributants' connivance.
2. It also gives a regular problem to the cup-holders. Children who do not receive, and know they are not to receive, usually keep their hands down, or behind their backs; but children who have just received the bread from their parents are much more likely to have their hands out for the cup, and, where a gap has arisen between the giving of the bread and the cup, those with the cup may well be deceived.
3. The method also depends upon the parent having both hands clear in order to be free to break the bread and share it with the children. But those with young children often have a babe in arms as well, or a child to be held or restrained—nor are there necessarily two parents present with every child—and then the breaking and sharing is difficult and clumsy.
4. The method also goes on building up in children's minds a deep sense that they are either doing something illegal in the name of the Lord (a real paradox), or that Mum and Dad are the only people who have got it right in a church which has missed the mind of Christ. This can hardly make for peaceful acceptance of church membership, or confidence in a Church's rules.
5. A further problem arises where not all parents have had their children baptized (as is often the case, at least in evangelical congregations). There are parents who would give the children communion, whilst not wanting them baptized; and there are others who resent the fact that *their* children *cannot* receive communion (even from their parents), whilst those who practise the (unsatisfactory!) baptism of infants also thereby qualify their children for communion.

I have always viewed the 'blessing of children at the rail' as an interim arrangement offered by the Church (I am trying to discover the origins of the practice) as a stop-gap until they could genuinely receive communion. We now have not a halfway usage, but a three-quarters of the way one. Surely we must get on with the last stage and make honest children of our younger members?

COB

[There are in stock at COB's address (see back page) copies of the Culham report on the existing quasi-official projects where young children are admitted to communion—it is *Communion before Confirmation* (£3 postfree). Also available is the international Anglican symposium, with essays on the Toronto Statement, *Growing in Newness of Life* (£7.50 postfree)]

ADDENDUM

Whilst the above account was in the press, the edition of *Church Scene* of 23 September carried the following report and press release, which we print entire. Apart from its liturgical importance, it shows the impact David Silk is having (including addressing MOW!).

The Australian General Synod Liturgical Commission met last week, to review the outcomes of the provincial consultations held around the country.

It issued this press release this week:

The last month has been a hectic one for the Liturgical Commission. The six Provincial Consultations provided intense and fruitful discussions. Several of the Consultations expressed regret at the loss of Thanksgiving Prayer 4 in the revision of Holy Communion (Second Order) 1993. While accepting the reasons given by the Commission, they asked that a prayer which reflected the style and range of imagery within it be considered.

Independently of this development, Bishop David Silk, speaking at the Annual Conference of the Movement for the Ordination of Women (held in Ballarat), suggested that a modified form of 'ICEL Eucharistic Prayer A' may be a useful addition to the current range. Discussions with some Commission members led to a form of this prayer being set before the Victorian Consultation, and that Consultation supported its consideration by the Commission. This Thanksgiving Prayer seeks to reflect both current liturgical scholarship, and also contemporary imagery for God's saving work. It needs some adaptation for Anglican usage, and that is what Bishop Silk (in consultation with Commission members) has put forward. The advantage of considering this prayer is that it is not an immature text, and it offers a distinctive style that complements the four prayers in the draft Second Order, and the two in the Third Order. It also offers a Thanksgiving Prayer that is longer and more fulsome than any of the other alternatives.

Members of the Commission met for three full days last week at Trinity College, Melbourne, to consider the responses of the Consultations. The Chair, Canon Lawrence Bartlett, invited Bishop Silk to join the members on Monday morning, and a very useful time of discussion took place on a range of matters. Later in their meeting, Commission members worked carefully through all the Thanksgiving Prayers in all three Orders. In the light of this review, a further revision of the ICEL-based prayer has been sent to diocesan bishops, asking them to consider firstly, whether such a prayer should be included in the draft book, and secondly to offer any particular comments on its wording. In this way the Commission believes that the requests made about this by the Consultations are being fully honoured, but with appropriate caution for such a significant matter.

Any readers who would like to comment on this proposal are invited to write as soon as possible, and preferably before 17 October, to the Secretary of the Liturgical Commission,
The Very Rev. David Richardson
27 King William Road
North Adelaide 5006

The proposed text is as follows:

[Opening dialogue]

Blessed are you, strong and faithful God.
All your works, the height and the depth,
echo the silent music of your praise.

In the beginning your Word summoned light:
night withdrew, and creation dawned.
As ages passed unseen,
waters gathered on the face of the earth
and life appeared.

When the times at last had ripened
and the earth had grown full in abundance,
you created in your image man and woman,
the crown of your creation.
You gave us breath and speech,
that all the living might find a voice to sing your praise.
So now, with all the powers of heaven and earth,
we chant the ageless hymn of your glory:

Holy, holy, holy . . .

All holy God,
how wonderful the work of your hands!
You restored the beauty of your image
when sin had scarred the world.

As a mother tenderly gathers her children,
you embraced a people as your own
and filled them with wonder and longing
for a peace that would last
and a justice that would never fail.

Through countless generations
your people hungered for the bread of freedom.
From them you raised up Jesus, the living bread,
in whom ancient hungers were satisfied.
He healed the sick, though he himself would suffer;
he offered life to sinners, though death would hunt him down.
But with a love stronger than death,
he opened wide his arms
and surrendered his spirit.

On the night before he met with death,
Jesus came to table with those he loved.
He took bread and blessed you, God of all creation;
he broke the bread among his disciples and said:
Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you.

This month's Booklet . . .

. . . is Worship Series no. 130, *Understanding Anglican Worship*, by David Kennedy. The study of liturgy should not be confined to the ritual programme being followed, but should also include the deeper questions about the 'formation' of the worshippers, and the impact of the liturgical programme upon them. The booklet does address these questions with a view to deepening participation and spiritual growth.

CONSECRATING BURIAL GROUNDS

We have a letter from a researcher asking what history is known of rites for consecrating burial grounds (and also for beating bounds). We occasionally get asked to offer advice for specific purposes (even including the transport of bones from an old ground which is being flooded to a new one), but cannot pretend to detailed knowledge. Are there diocesan forms anywhere?

SHOULD COMMUNICANTS BREAK BREAD FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN?

I find I am being asked more and more about this practice. What tends to happen is that an adult, receiving the sacramental bread, breaks it himself (or herself) and gives a portion to accompanying children—sometimes right down to the age of 2 or so.

I think I first encountered the practice at College communion services when I was at St. John's College, Nottingham perhaps in the mid-1970s, after the rejection of any change of 'initiation' patterns when the Church of England debated the 'Ely' report. A College has a real problem where married students belong to a local parish (or one of four dozen local parishes) as well as to college. Children could then be admitted to communion in one context and be debarred in another, and this is the scenario most authorities wish to avoid. So parents then take the issue literally into their own hands. The authorities are in no way conniving, for the distributant of the bread has usually moved on before the sub-distribution by the parent occurs—and presumably this can be done by parents in contexts where the authorities do not really approve, so the child need never be excommunicated from *that* practice.

A variant on this has been known in recent years in the Rochester diocese, where the last diocesan himself recommended the practice, and did not view it as involving any contravention of existing Anglican rules or standards. I have handed on such advice myself, and in my own context have witnessed a father of five walking along behind his family, who were all kneeling at a rail, administering broken bread to each in turn, handing it past the recipient's right ear! It is illogical for a diocesan or parish authority to be saying 'Here is the way for laity to begin a revolt against an improperly restrictive rule', as, by definition, a revolt should not be stirred by the authorities (unless highly Macchievellian)—but I have found myself doing it. In such cases, of course, parents have to take full responsibility for preparation and admission of the children, and the parish staff have no say in the matter!

another force of a different doctrinal persuasion had risen within the Church and was claiming that *its* position was the true historic Anglican one. And, despite the Gorham Judgment in England, evangelicals began to feel threatened by the phrase 'Seeing . . . that this child is regenerate' in the baptismal services. One of them, Charles Cheney of Chicago, omitted the phrase, and, when his bishop learned of it, he was put on trial, and, after two years of legal intricacies (1869-71) was deprived. (The parish owned the property and paid the Rector and backed him to the hilt, so he simply ignored the verdict and continued ministering . . .)

What then of Geroge David Cummins? He was a strong evangelical and famous preacher and was elected coadjutor bishop of Kentucky in 1866 at the age of 44. Evangelicals looked to him for leadership as the pressures came upon them, and he was much in demand up and down the country. But his own come-uppance occurred in New York. In October 1873 he took part in an Evangelical Alliance inter-denominational communion service at Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church there. This was, of course, just after the fuss in England over the 'Revisers' Communion', but it was 40 years before the 'Kikuyu Controversy'. One of the most amazing features of the service is that there was present the then Dean of Canterbury, Payne Smith, who came with a letter of good wishes to the Alliance *from Archbishop Tait, and himself presided at communion for the Alliance convention. The Dean was delated by a retired (UMCA) Bishop of Zanzibar to the Bishop of New York for schismatic behaviour for, it was claimed, no Anglican could so function in the diocese of New York without the Bishop's permission (suppose the Bishop of Derby treated Swanwick thus today . . .).*

Cummins saw himself as the true target. Vituperative letters hit the press; he had offended against all catholic order—and another trial was threatened, though this time of a bishop! Evangelicals, including Cheney, were urging him to lead them out of the catholicizing PECUSA into a reformed episcopalianism. He did it—and in the process appealed to the 1785 draft BCP which had been brought to his attention as more accommodating of evangelicals (in fact it was Latitudinarian rather). The push and pull became too much. In November he resigned from his bishopric and advertised with a 'Call to Organize' that a meeting would be held on 2 December 'to organize an Episcopal Church on . . . a basis broad enough to embrace all who hold "the faith once delivered to the saints".'

The Reformed Episcopal Church was duly launched on that date with much press attention. Cheney was chosen as the second bishop and Cummins consecrated him eleven days later. The Cumminsite succession in turn consecrated bishops for the Free Church of England (which has its own complex history). But meanwhile the heart went out of evangelicalism in PECUSA itself, whilst it never established a strong nationwide identity in the Reformed Episcopal Church. The history (wonderfully told) stands as a warning not only against schism, but also against pushing people into schism. I must leave it there.

COB

When supper was ended, he took a cup of wine and gave thanks to you, God of all creation; he passed the cup among his disciples and said: Drink this, all of you, this is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins, Do this in remembrance of me.

[*Deacon:* Let us proclaim the mystery of faith]

**Dying you destroyed our death,
rising you restored our life.
Lord Jesus, come in glory.**

Therefore, O God,
we commemorate your Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ,
as we offer you our spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.
Death could not bind him,
for you raised him up in the Spirit of holiness
and exalted him as Lord of creation.
May his coming in glory find us
ever watchful in prayer, strong in love,
and faithful to the breaking of the bread.

By the overshadowing of your Spirit and your glory
let this thanksgiving meal be for us
the sacrament of the body and blood of your Son,
and nourish us at his table
with the bread of life and the cup of eternal salvation.

Rejoicing in the Holy Spirit,
your whole Church offers thanks and praise.
Gather us, with all who in life and death
are faithful and true to Christ,
to be one with the apostles and martyrs,
with Mary the Mother of the Lord
and with all the saints
in the whole company of the redeemed.

Then, at last, will all creation be one
and all divisions healed,
and we shall join in singing your praise
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Through him, with him, in him,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all glory and honour is yours,
for ever and ever. **Amen.**

Book Reviews

A Service of the Word and Affirmations of Faith (CHP, 1994, 32pp. £1.95)

The material in this Booklet was authorized for use last November by General Synod, and there have been questions asked about whether it would ever merit an official publication. The difficulty is that the text of *A Service* . . . is one page of the 32; it is wholly rubrics; and it hardly merits more than a 25p folding piece of paper in itself at all. Add in the *Affirmations* . . . material and it is worth a bit more. Then include the Introductions (officially part of what is authorized for the first time in the Church of England's history since 1662), and it grows. Put in opening Notes, information on copyright etc.—and add nine pages of confessions and two of absolutions (talk about Cranmer being preoccupied with sin)—and you are nearing the 32 pages.

It remains unimaginable that anyone will want to *worship* using this booklet as a basis. But as accurate information, along with some official coaching, one copy is proper equipment for every parish. What may not be so obvious, until the rules are consulted, is that, as an official 'alternative service', the use of the rite (and *Affirmations*) is technically subject to agreement of incumbent and PCC.

COB

How to make A Family Covenant: Child Welcoming Ceremonies (The Family Covenant Association, 66 High Street, Pershore, Worcestershire WR10 1DU, August 1994, 60pp., £4.95)

Twice in recent months I have been asked (probably because I am president of MORIB) to debate on the radio with compilers of *How to make A Family Covenant*. I think I have sometimes disappointed the organizers of the programme, as I have neither resented nor resisted the concept of a secular ceremony to welcome a child on earth—and that is what this book offers. Indeed my only quarrel would be with the blurb on the inside front cover which states 'It's for parents . . . who feel that a traditional baptism would be inappropriate.' Clearly the rites here are not exclusive of Christian ceremonies, and it is quite possible that in some homes a secular 'naming' ceremony might be followed later by a Christian baptism (which does not pretend to be a naming). It is even possible that a more-or-less Christian Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child could come between those two!

However, it is sheer secularism (and sometimes humanism) which lies behind the rites. The book sets out on pages 10-11 six purposes (and Christians will be interested to see the damp footprints of a baptismal rite left behind when Christianity went out through the door):

1. ' . . . an expression of *commitment*'—commitment, that is, to parenting the child.
2. ' . . . that *naming* itself'—an authoritative bit of liminality.
3. ' . . . the *welcome*'—with 'expressions of love and support'.
4. ' . . . appointment of *godparents*'—or, er, sponsors.
5. ' . . . generate *solidarity*'—a bonding of two families—perhaps for the first time if the parents of the child are not married!
6. ' . . . reflect the sense of a *miracle*'—even to secularists, birth elicits wonder and awe, and it should be expressed with, er, gratitude.

The centre section of the book includes four sample ceremonies. The first is a simple naming at home, with family undertakings of support, and a lighting of a candle: the second is the 'recording' of the names of a 12- and a 15-year-old: the third (for a nine-month-old) was devised with help from a specialist in theatre in the home, and includes each person present writing one of his or her own qualities which are specially to be wished for or upon the baby upon a square of fabric—and the fabric is then to be made up into a quilt—and there is also the signing of a book, and the planting of a tree: the fourth, interestingly, is a Christian event, including a reading from Mark 10 and the use of psalmody, but no prayer.

The next section of the book sets out other resources, mostly readings, which could be included in ceremonies; and a final part handles legal issues. I think *in toto* I found myself quite enthusiastic about the principle of providing resources for secular welcoming ceremonies, but an actual disappointment with the relative paucity of what is provided. Of course, if a miracle of birth has actually happened, you *might* want to express gratitude. But to whom?

COB

Allen Guelzo, *For the Union of Evangelical Christendom: The Irony of the Reformed Episcopalians* (The Pennsylvania State University Press, August 1994, xi/403pp. £13.95)

This is the story of the 'Cumminsite secession'. You've never heard of it? Well, I had—just. But I knew little of it until I read this book. And the book tells a story of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA in the nineteenth century which was an eye-opener to me. It is one which I have said elsewhere had me feeling like stout Cortez gazing on the Pacific.

For Guelzo tells us of strong evangelicalism in the Episcopal Church in the years from 1811 to 1873. The beginning is marked by the (Simeon-like) conversion of Alexander Grimwold when he was being consecrated as a bishop (I think the impact was more the gravity of the office and calling to which he was being consecrated rather than the text or power of the rite itself—but who knows?). But apparently the converted bishop was backed by 'tens of thousands' of lay people converted through Wilberforce's *Practical View* (first published in England in 1797). There was then a popular and swelling movement within PECUSA, from which Virginia Seminary lives on today as a surviving reminder (in its own contemporary way) of a once powerful force within that Church.

The beginning, however, is pre-history to the theme of the book—the secession. And it really came about (as it so nearly did in England) through the rise of anglo-catholicism. On both sides of the Atlantic, evangelicalism would have been distinguished in the period until around 1840 not by any distinctive doctrines, but by a *quality* of faith. Evangelicals *really* believed what everyone else *said* they believed—and staked their lives and their worldly goods and hopes upon it. But a party which began like that in the first half of the century looked very different by the 1860s—for now, as Guelzo tells the story (and as certainly was true in England by a little later)