

Whilst there may be difficulty in finding an authoritative English translation of this Reply, and the English text printed in the centenary volume in 1996 omitted this section, there has been available over the last two decades the entire 'authorized English translation (done by Hugh Fraser Stewart, the vice-principal at the time of Salisbury Theological College) in a CLA publication, entitled *Saepius Officio*, edited in 1976 by Douglas Carter, the erstwhile secretary of the Church Union. The last few lines of the extract above are rendered as follows:

'First we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice.'

I offer no evaluative comment at the moment (this is all ground-clearing). I merely point out that there are two questions:

1. What is a fair and accurate translation?
2. When we have that, is the theological statement it conveys true—let alone Anglican?

The matter is open for comment.

COB

#### Next month's publication . . .

. . . is Joint Liturgical Study no. 40, *The Liturgy of St. James: The Texts in Current Usage*, edited by Phillip Tovey. This liturgy is used in various forms today in differing Churches, and Phillip Tovey provides an English translation in parallel columns for comparison, along with Introduction and notes.

---

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ  
Phone 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949  
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 1998 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**  
RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU  
Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

---

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 281

May 1998

## Editorial

It has always been part of the philosophy of NOL that the participants are as much a component of liturgy as the text, the setting, or the music. That is the basis upon which I have thought it appropriate to reflect on indiscriminate baptism, or on issues about candidates for matrimony (or burial . . .). The Archbishop of Canterbury has recently called for an opening of the door of eucharistic hospitality by the Roman Catholic Church; the church press has been full of letters about it; so this is a good moment to comment upon the hypothesis of some form of inter-communion between Anglicans and Roman Catholics.

The immediate comment that comes to mind is that any such arrangement would hardly exist in a vacuum, or spring ready-made from nothing. The following background factors obtrude into the present:

Firstly, rightly or wrongly, Anglicans have never excommunicated Roman Catholics—though for most of the last four and a half centuries a Roman Catholic who received communion at an Anglican celebration would have been deemed to have lapsed by Rome itself, and (whether explicitly or implicitly) would have been excommunicated. It has been interesting, to say the least, to observe Roman Catholic reactions to the recent occasion when the newly elected President of Eire received communion in the Church of Ireland: for the argument was about whether this was tactful (or tactical), wise, or acceptable. The issues of lapsing or excommunication (or mortal sin) do not seem to have figured in the discussion—but it is only forty years ago, when I was a student before the days of Vatican II, when for a Roman Catholic *simply to have been present* at a non-Roman service would have been mortal sin. The first time I ever encountered such attendance was years after I was ordained, when I found myself beside Cuthbert Rand from Ushaw on a bus on an outing from the 1964 Faith and Order Conference at Nottingham, and I asked him whether, being an observer, he had been present that morning at the Conference eucharist—and he told me he had. When I asked him whether that was OK, he simply replied that he had been sent to observe the Conference and he imagined that included attending the worship. A year later Cardinal Heenan forbade some French visitors to attend the ordination in England of an Anglican student of mine (and they were much miffed), and that was the last time I can recall ever hearing of difficulties for Roman Catholics concerning attendance at non-Roman services.

Secondly, traditionally a large part of the Church of England would not have wanted to receive communion at a Roman rite. Indeed, evangelicals looked with such horror on the Roman mass as hardly to view it as the Lord's Supper at all, and certainly had little heart to be present at it. Again, the post-Vatican II changes (and an easing of evangelical attitudes so as actually to grapple with the character of the Roman uses) have made it a hundred times easier for most people this side of Ian Paisley to recognize it as Christian. Whilst I would not want Roman texts to be adopted uncritically into the Church of England's liturgy, and whilst I have put some energy into getting such texts marginally adapted when they were proposed, I would urge now that their rite is simply Christian but with some passing hiccups for visitors. I would have great problems still in having to preside at such a rite; but, other things being equal (to which I come below), I would see no problem *in the rite itself* in my being a communicant at a Roman celebration.

Thirdly, all kinds of informal inter-communion is now happening anyway. At intervals I find a fellow-Anglican who, with a light in the eye, breezily says; 'Guess what, I was in Brittany/Florence/Miami/Lima/blankety Abbey [or wherever], and they invited me to receive communion with them—and I did, and it was a great thrill.' I can applaud the deep Christian instinct for such sharing, and can appreciate the joy it has brought to the individuals, but I retain my hesitations. It reads like a kind of eucharistic situation ethics: 'If all the right ingredients are here, that is, right here this minute—namely, your desire and our willingness—then of course you can and should receive communion with us.' I have been present on such occasions, but I have never availed myself of the invitation. Why not? Well, there is a fourth consideration.

Lastly, the Roman Catholic Church has, *au fond*, always had to take account of itself as *the* church of Christ, whilst, Anglicans of whatever hue have had a concept of a plurality of particular or national churches, in which *some* open-ness to others' claims has been retained. The Roman view is wholly comprehensible—that denominations which are not Rome are excommunicate, and thus non-Roman individuals, however Christian, are likewise outside the ecclesiastical pale. On this view the eucharist is making an ecclesiological statement; and thus to defy the meaning is almost heresy, whilst to remove the significance is to turn it into something more trivial and essentially subjective. I have experience, indeed treasured memories, of being present at ecumenical occasions where Basil Hume or Derek Worlock presided over Roman rites, and non-Romans did *not* communicate. I can now experience the sheer pain of that—but, I quickly add, the pain represents the *reality*. And perhaps we have to change the realities before we can change the excommunication. I for one am ready to keep going down that path, and, given the Roman assumptions, am not quickly going to ask them to abandon their logic. If their practice is to change, then a changed ecclesiology ought to underlie the new hospitality.

One step forward there has been. The whole business of 'coming forward for a blessing' which was pioneered in Anglican circles with pre-confirmation kids, and

assemble this history piecemeal, as I can only call this a grossly neglected subject among the liturgical scholars of the world. Are you aware of any interesting literature on this subject? You have my permission to photocopy this letter . . .

Yours sincerely

Greg Crow  
PO Box 4456, St Paul, MN 55104, USA

[I have replied to this correspondent saying that there is certainly an Anglican history to this particular issue, and that I hope he will be hearing from a reader or two. It looks like being, a big book—even bigger than that Alcuin one about lighting candles during the 'triduum' . . . Ed.]

### SAEPIUS OFFICIO

We now play to our Latin-speaking gallery. The charge of inaccuracy of translation was brought against the editor in these columns three months ago by Jonathan Boardman (or whom the parish was wrongly reported through a misprint—he is Team Rector of the Catford and Downham Team Ministry in the Woolwich Area of Southwark diocese). On discovering that our correspondent had actually preached a Latin sermon at Oxford a few years ago, we were understandably hesitant to accuse him of mishandling the text. So we take the discussion forward more slowly by setting out the few relevant lines of Latin from *Saepius officio*, with part in translation following, but open to readers to render how they will—and drafts would be gladly received here. Here then is part of Section XI:

'Quoad locos autem a Papa citatos respondemus, nos de S.Eucharistiae consecratione maxima cum reverentia curare, et solis sacerdotibus rite ordinatis et nullis aliis Ecclesiae ministris permittere. Eucharistiae etiam sacrificium vere docemus, nec sacrificii crucis "nudam esse commemorationem" credimus, ut Concilio illo citato nobis videtur imputari, Satis tamen credimus in liturgia nostra qua in S.Eucharistia celebranda utimur—corda habentes ad Dominum, et munera, quae antea oblata sunt, iam consecrantes ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiant Domini nostri Jesu Christi, sacrificium quod ibidem fit ita significare. Memoriam scilicet perpetuan pretiosae mortis Christi qui ipse est Advocatus noster apud Patrem et propitiatio pro peccatis nostris, usque ad Adventum Eius secundum praeceptum Eius observamus. Primo enim sacrificium laudis et gratiarum offerimus; tun vero sacrificium Crucis Patri proponimus et repraesentamus, et per illud remissionem peccatorum et omnis alia Dominicae passionis beneficia pro tota et universa Ecclesia impetramus; sacrificium denique nostrum ipsorum Creatori omnium offerimus, quod per oblationes creaturarum Ipsius iam significavimus.' Quam actionem totam, in qua plebs cum sacerdote partem suam necessario sumit, sacrificium Eucharisticum solemus nominare.'

## REQUEST FOR HELP

We have a request from a research person, for help concerning what he calls 'a grossly neglected subject among the liturgical scholars of the world!' This is the substance of his letter:

### GENERAL SYNOD JULY 1998

General Synod meets in York over the first weekend in July. It looks as though the following liturgical business will be on the agenda:

Rites 1 and 2—second Revision Stage

Lord's Prayer—first Revision Stage

Extended Communion—first Revision Stage

Eucharistic Prayers—General Approval Stage

We will have an exact list next month.

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Editor,

For over a decade I have been doing extensive research work into the history of the mode of Communion reception (= 'Communion in/with the hand', tongue-communion, spooncommunion, intinction, etc.). My future book on this subject now looks like it will end up being around 600-800 pages in length, with perhaps about 1500-2000 footnotes. But I am still seeking to find more literature about this subject, especially little articles from obscure journals/sources. I'm already familiar with the English, German, Spanish, Italian and French sources.

The only literature I am aware of from the U.K. on this subject, is: [1] various anti-hand-communion writings of Michael Davies of London; [2] the CIEL U.K. English translation of an article by Martin Luginbuhl in the 1997 book *The Veneration and Administration of the Eucharist*; [3] A 1976 booklet titled *The Reception of Holy Communion in the Hand* (by the Rev. Anthony Boylan, Catholic Truth Society, London); [4] a few articles in *Christian Order*, one from early 1997 and a couple of others from the 1970s.

The above-cited sources are all Catholic. I have also researched—and quite extensively—the history of this subject, within Protestantism. That will be the subject of a chapter of my book. Aside from the Lutheran Church (and principally in Germany), the subject of what I call the mode of the reception of the Eucharist hasn't aroused much interest or controversy. The subject of the frequency of communion reception, or of the common cup versus little individual cups, seems to be of much more concern to Protestants. The Lutheran Church is the only Protestant body which has retained as the predominant custom the long-standing Catholic usage of having the minister place the eucharistic bread directly upon the tongues of the lay communicants, but a shift to hand-communion has been quite pronounced even among Lutherans during the last decade or two. I've never been able to locate any article devoted to this subject by any Anglican author. I've had to

then spread to unconfirmed adults, is now to be found when Anglicans and Romans are present together at a eucharist over which a bishop, priest or presbyter of one or other Church presides. Then the communicants of the other Church on that occasion 'come forward for a blessing'. Again the stark reality of being out of communion with each other registers strongly then.

Ah but, you may say, it is the Lord's table and not theirs. I think that statement, true though it is, precipitates the ecclesiological question rather than answers it.

Colin Buchanan

## THOSE DRAFT EXPERIMENTAL RITES

All this Winter the nominated parishes have been working hard at trial marriage and burial; and Sundays have been marked by the six draft eucharistic prayers we aired in November. For the sake of the record we publish below the form from the Liturgical Commission with which the parishes have been reporting to the Liturgical Commission office. It appears that the Commission has already sat on the results and changed the texts; and the planned programme now is that the eucharistic prayers (at least) will come to the House of Bishops at the beginning of June; and then, possibly after further amending at the behest of the bishops, will come to General Synod at the beginning of July for General Approval. After that we shall face the usual mincing-machine of a Revision Committee and two Revision Stages in General Synod. At some point they may merge with Rites 1 and 2—but that day is still far off.

### GENERAL SYNOD LITURGICAL COMMISSION DRAFT EUCHARISTIC PRAYER RESPONSE SHEET

Diocese:

Name of Church:

**Please return this sheet to the Secretary to the Liturgical Commission, Church House, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3NZ**

1. These responses are solely my own views/the result of discussion with a wider group including lay people.
2. (a) All/some have been used for Sunday and weekday eucharists during the experimental period.  
  
(b) Prayer A has been used.....times  
Prayer B has been used.....times  
Prayer C has been used.....times  
Prayer D has been used.....times

Prayer E has been used.....times

Prayer F has been used.....times

3. The general approach is acceptable/an improvement/presents the following problems:
4. Do any prayers give sufficient/too much variety for your needs? Are there contexts and situations for which none of these drafts seems appropriate?
5. Does a common institution narrative work or would different styles of narrative for each style of prayer be preferable?
6. Comments on Prayer A.
7. Comments on Prayer B.
8. Comments on Prayer C.
9. Comments on Prayer D.
10. Comments on Prayer E.
11. Comments on Prayer F.
12. Do you like the optional 'long preface' used with Prayer E?
13. Do you like the optional responses for Prayers E and F?
14. Comment on the question posed in Section 4 of the Introduction.
15. Would you see the need for these eucharistic prayers to be produced in a traditional language rite?

Probably a serious reviewer should head for 'scholar and teacher'. I inevitably went for the 'gadfly'. The metaphor (a brilliant one) came from his obituary in *The Times*, which said that the bishops of the Church of England had 'lost a salutary gadfly'. How he must have stung them! He was, says Bailey, 'naturally combative'— 'There was an ebullience of spirit, a zest, that loved a fight and knew more often than not he could win, or, at least, seem to win.' (p.90) He was, of course, fighting to win on almost the most indefensible ground a protagonist could choose to occupy—that of an Anglican papalist. The book starts with a six-year-old emerging from a nuns' chapel, heading for the kitchen and reappearing with a cook's apron about his shoulders, a large round metal fish slice held high above his head as a monstrosity, and three little girls forming the body of the procession he then led round the convent—and arguably the story goes on the same throughout; for Gregory is actor and showman, given to extravagance in every way (including advocacy and argument), contemptuous of the Church of England's conventions and rules, mocking of its bishops, and always with a vision of Catholic glory before his eyes. But, as Bailey perceptively points out, his real contribution to the Church of England came not through his politicking, his mocking of the kow-towing to Parliament (I share his sense of the absurd about the establishment), his catholicizing aims, but in fact through his scholarship in liturgy—for all that too hardly escapes from the charge of being propaganda. His praise as a liturgist is sung by Paul Bradshaw in the Alcuin Book I reviewed in the Editorial last month; it is fairly handled by Bailey; and it is perhaps unnecessary to repeat it here. But, oh, what would he have done not only for the Liturgical Commission but also for General Synod . . .

I apologize for being so long reviewing this book (I was unaware of it for some of the intervening period since it was written). I am very conscious of the growing gap of time, and the paucity of those now alive who knew Dom Gregory in his lifetime. It seems but yesterday I was agreeing with Kenneth Stevenson that he should write that (first-rate) *Liturgical Study, Gregory Dix—Twenty-five Years On—* but it is now getting on for 'Fifty Years on'.

Oh yes, and I learned here that he was born in Woolwich. Well, well—we must put up a blue plaque on the wall. And perhaps I can join the Orthodox.

COB, Bishop of Woolwich

#### EXCHANGE AND MART

We have received an offer from a reader of past numbers of NOL, (from 1978 to 1991—155 copies in all). He asks £10 plus postage—Requests will be forwarded from editorial address on page 12. Requests for individual missing numbers from your records can often be supplied from the sales office in Cambridge (or, for pre-1985 ones, from the editorial address).

confirmation to admission to communion. He calls for a more profound baptismal theology. And perhaps that raises (or begs) the great dilemma—for if, as seems true in much of my Area of South-East London, it is viewed as not a duty, but almost *de fide* and thus a privilege, to engage in indiscriminate infant baptism, then the very circumstances of its administration, and the lack of interest in its significance thereafter by the baptized, combine to make it very difficult to establish profound theology in practice.

COB

Simon Bailey, *A Tactful God: Gregory Dix, Priest, Monk, Scholar* (Gracewing, 1995) 268pp., £12.95

In Eric Kemp's life of Kenneth Kirk there occurs this poem:

How happy are the Oxford flock;  
how free of heretics.  
Their priests securely orthodox;  
their bishop orthodox.

Not only Kirk, but all post-War liturgists have had to keep their eye securely on the Dix ball-game. I myself was haunted in my early years on the Liturgical Commission with that extraordinary 'what if . . . ?'—i.e. what if Dix had still be alive, how would he have manipulated and directed that Commission. His influence was enormous through his writings, and the impact of the 'four-action shape' (to take a major instance) was arguably still growing in the early 1960s, rather than waning.

I confess, however, haunted or not, the only information I had about the person of Dix was that he had died at the age of 51 in 1952 (i.e. he was genuinely younger than several people who were members of the Liturgical Commission when I joined it in 1964)—and, in addition, what autobiographical *obiter dicta* one gleans from reading his books. I suppose also that reading on in the books gives an insight into the mind—and I think Dix more than any other author I have met (outside of Northern Ireland) reminded me of the maxim given me by 'Tom' Stevens, my Roman History tutor at Oxford, who used to coach his students (ruthlessly) thus: 'Make your sources work for you'. Never, I opine, did sources work so hard in and author's interests as Dix' sources were made to do for him.

The book was drawn from eight large boxes of his papers collected by his community. From these a slightly excerptive biography could, no doubt, be drawn; and the book does give us biographical material, though with a disclaimer ('this is not a full biography') at the beginning and a title to confuse anybody over it all. It has in fact been carefully researched, but is presented as a focusing on three 'aspects' of Dom Gregory. After 'the early years' the aspects are: (1) the monk and priest; (2) the church politician (entitled 'The Gadfly'); and (3) the scholar and teacher. Two last chapters deal with his travels and his death.

## LAST MONTH'S TRUE MISTAKE

PRAXIS, that ever-thrusting growth-point of the liturgical nineties, has produced a Pack on the new initiation rites—through the energies of Mark Earey, their field officer. He edits *PRAXIS News* (mentioned here earlier, and now in a first-rate second issue), which is relevant to the story. He sent us a flyer about the new Pack. We mislaid it (never trust the NOL editorial office). There was a rush on to get the April NOL into print. I asked my then secretary to 'get another copy of the flyer from Sarum College and pass it on to the printers.' She did. The printers set it up. I was doubtful about the proof—but Mark Earey was on post-Easter holiday. Life is short and so are deadlines. I let it go. It was in fact the blurb from last Autumn, exactly duplicating what we published then, advertising the coming of *PRAXIS News*—now old hat and not news at all. Well, we apologize, and here is the blurb about the Pack which should have been in our columns.

COB

## PRAXIS

**Help with the new Initiation Services—a new training resource from *Praxis***  
*Praxis* have published a second training resource to complement the *Praxis* Lectionary Training Pack. The new pack is based on the *Common Worship Initiation Services*, and is designed for busy people who not only have to understand and use these new services themselves, but also have to help others to understand them. The pack brings out the key background thinking reflected in the services themselves, including the way that the liturgical materials relate to evangelism, initiation, nurture and growth.

The pack will be of use to:

- clergy explaining the new services to PCC or congregation
- members of diocesan liturgical committees
- those involved in CME and other adult education and training
- parish baptism visitors
- those who help with confirmation classes, Alpha courses, enquirers' groups etc.

As well as the background thinking, the pack also considers the structure and flow of the new services and the details of the text, action and significant features, particularly in comparison with the ASB.

The pack comprises:

- 29 OHP master sheets for copying onto OHP acetate, each with an accompanying sheet of detailed notes, highlighting key points to explore in a presentation
- group work ideas for training events and presentations
- 7 samples handouts (which can be photocopied)
- materials for small groups (such as home groups or a confirmation class) to use, which explores the background ideas and makes links to significant texts and actions in the new services

All this for £10 (post-free). To order a copy send a cheque (payable to *Sarum College*) to: Praxis Resources, Sarum College, 19 The Close, Salisbury, Wilts SP1 2EE, or ring Mark Earey on 01722 424815 and give credit card details.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Martin Kitchen, Georgiana Heskins and Stephen Motyer, *Word of Life* (Canterbury Press, 1997) £9.99

This is the first of three volumes which aim to provide some basic homiletical commentary on the readings from the new lectionary. This volume deals with year C, which of course we are in at the moment and which mainly draws on Luke's Gospel.

All three contributors combine academic expertise in biblical studies and pastoral experience of preaching. The comments on each set of readings are a good way in to other texts and suggest ways of preaching on them. It would be tempting to use this book as sermon preparation on its own, which would probably not be the authors' intention. Their comments are based on good biblical scholarship and usefully sit alongside the work a preacher must do with commentaries and other tools in preparing a sermon.

Of course, many people will draw different themes from the readings other than those which are found in this handbook—for example, the Easter Day reading from Luke 24 seems to me to be important partly because it makes women the first witnesses of the resurrection in a culture when their testimony was not acceptable, yet this point is not mentioned here. This is not a particular problem because this book is meant to be a starting point and a help along the way. It will be very useful if preachers use it as a tool and do not make it do all their work for them.

There is a very brief introduction to Luke's Gospel at the beginning of the book and this might have benefited from some indication of where a more sustained overview of the Gospel and its theology may be found.

My copy contains an errata slip which indicates that the authors have not quite realised that the lectionary changes slightly in ordinary time depending on what year it is and so readers are asked to check that the readings for a given Sunday in February actually match the readings commented on in this book. Again, this is not a major problem.

I can recommend this book as a helpful companion to the year C readings and I await the other two volumes with interest.

Charles Read

Kenneth Stevenson, *The Mystery of Baptism in the Anglican Tradition* (Canterbury Press, 1997, viii/214pp. pb, £12.00)

Kenneth Stevenson's love of seventeenth century Anglicanism and Anglicans has been well established in previous publications, so perhaps one might guess that a collection of writers about baptism, writers who, according to the title of the book, bring us 'the Anglican Tradition', will in fact prove to be a book about seventeenth

century authors. I think it just worth a mild protest that one does have to have that prior knowledge about the author's predilections to be ready for the peculiar and narrow sense being given to the 'Anglican Tradition' in the title. In another's book that 'Tradition' might include the Reformers and the formulae of the Reformation period, whilst in yet another's book it might be the period from the Tracts to the present day which really yields the 'Tradition'. I gently urge that the 'The' is presumptuous. I looked in vain for the contents of Geoffrey Bromiley's book, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*, or Dean Goode's, *The Effects of Infant Baptism*.

However, it would be grudging and unfair to label this book simply that of another McAdoo. In particular, two Puritans get a fair opening each; and, in the persons of Perkins and Baxter, it is actually two giants of the Puritan hegemony who get the opening. And they were wrestling with real problems, and Kenneth Stevenson has encapsulated their driving themes as 'Inward or Outward?' (Perkins) and 'Disciples of Christ' (Baxter).

But, of course, it is Hooker and the Laudians who have pride of place. It is an interesting question as to whether they usefully submit to the single encapsulating title Kenneth Stevenson gives each. Some samples may stimulate the imagination:

Richard Hooker: 'Sharing in the life of God'

Lancelot Andrewes: 'Heaven Opened'

George Herbert: 'Providence'

John Bramhall: 'What about the Unbaptized?'

Jeremy Taylor: 'Holy Living'

Simon Patrick: 'Professing the Faith'

Herbert Thorndike: 'Covenant Begun and Continued'

The title betrays the author's interest in the whole theology of his chosen persons. In his handling of their baptismal theology, therefore, he is usually drawing upon a much wider knowledge of the whole theological position each took, and is laying that under contribution. His own enjoyment of his subject adds to the interest, but the ultimate test is, I suspect, whether we find the Laudians in principle attractive and in practice relevant to our pastoral dilemmas of today.

My own, perhaps quirky, preferences in the actual chapters are for George Herbert (a feast of poetry here), and for Thorndike (unpublished sermons here). Stevenson makes the intriguing suggestion (p.75) that a line in Herbert's prose work, *The Priest to the Temple*, affected the 1662 revision: and it made me wonder, when I came to the discussion by Bramhall of the necessity of baptism, whether a line of his had not also been adopted then. He wrote in an essay during the Commonwealth period about the 'wilful contempt of baptism when it may be had' (p.91). Did this condition father the words in the exhortation on the Gospel in the 1662 'Riper Years' rite 'the great necessity of this Sacrament, where it may be had.'? It does', we may note in passing, seem to express an Anglican reservation about the Roman insistence on hell (or limbo for infants) of those dying unbaptized.

There are final chapters entitled 'Retrospect' and 'Prospect'. Here he has forward-looking words to make about 'reaffirmation' concepts and about the relation of