

I am grateful for the assistance of both Brother Tristram and Simon Kershaw, but any errors that remain in it are entirely mine. Suggestions for corrections and improvements to it would be most welcome.

I hope that this may be useful to those who use *Celebrating Common Prayer* but also wish to follow the new calendar.

Simon Sarmiento  
simon@fayrfax.demon.co.uk

[As in previous years, I have Bro Tristram's own blue *Ordo* for 1999 for CCP available to anyone sending an SAE to my address—COB]

### TAILPIECE—INSTITUTIONS

Southwark is not alone in again re-thinking services of institution. However, along with text, there are also occasions which vary, and have recently had two interesting experiences.

Firstly, I instituted a new vicar in a 'Forward in Faith' parish. The service began with the institution and induction, after which, with a liturgical text, I handed over the parish and vicar to the extended episcopal care of the Bishop of Fulham, who then presided at the inaugural eucharist.

Secondly, on Advent Sunday, in the afternoon, I instituted *four* incumbents at the same service. They belonged to neighbouring parishes which had all gone vacant at the same time and had all had presentation suspended. Priests-in-charge were appointed, suspension was lifted, and all four were to be instituted. Readers may like to speculate on how we did it!

---

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 1999 £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 289

January 1999

### EDITORIAL

I held this space till the last minute, as we had been promised the full works of *New Start Worship* before Christmas, and then in early January, but it still did not come. What is *New Start Worship*? Well 'New Start' itself is in the Millennium Resolution, and the Churches Millennium Office has picked this up and is running a triple Christian thrust with that theme:

A New Start for the World's poor

A New Start at Home

A New Start with God

So the books we were promised are sub-titled 'Worship Resources for the Millennium'. There are in fact two books—one entitled *1999 Preparing* and the other *November 1999-January 2001*. The 1999 material includes Mothering Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Pentecost, Transfiguration, Annunciation (their order looks a bit odd here) and Harvest. There will also be introductory articles on services of repentance, on marking time and on the Lord's Prayer, with suggested hymnody.

The millennium office is well aware that deadlines cannot be delayed as we go down to 300 days (or whatever) to the millennium. However, it does not appear that their printers or suppliers have quite got the message. If the books do come into their office on 18 January (the latest date given) and reach the parishes in the weeks after that, most places which plan matters at all will already know what they are doing for Mothering Sunday, Holy Week etc.

---

When the Group for Renewal Of Worship (GROW) ran a conference at Swanwick in January 1997, we had many asking us to do it again. We had a hard look at doing so in the year 2000, but the pressures upon the first few days of the millennial year daunted us; and the revising programme of General Synod will still be incomplete then also. We have now, however, booked Swanwick for 250 people (or more) from 8 to 12 January 2001. (That actually covers five days, but we shall be reducing it to four and will keep you posted.) As in 1997, we shall do our utmost to keep the cost low, and to offer financial incentives for early booking. Please note it in your diaries now.

COB

No, not the liturgy of the Church of South India—trail-blazing though it was, and very near to its golden jubilee though it now is. No, the liturgists of the world are due to meet in Kottayam in Kerala this August. The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC-6) meets from 13 to 18 August, and the interdenominational *Societas Liturgica* from 19 to 24 August. Kottayam itself is well worth a visit—at the heart of almost the most Christian part of India. IALC will be taking issues of ministry and ordination rites further (see Joint Liturgical Study no. 39 from December 1997); *SL* will be tackling liturgical theology.

### WHAT IS 'IMPAIRED COMMUNION'?

On 3 December in Southwark Cathedral the Archbishop of Canterbury (assisted as always by many other bishops) consecrated two new suffragans, one (Andrew Radford) for Taunton in the diocese of Bath and Wells, the other (Michael Houghton) to be the second Bishop of Ebbsfleet, a 'Provincial Episcopal Visitor' who is legally a suffragan of Canterbury. There is nothing too extraordinary about the consecration of a 'Flying Bishop' (the last being Edward Barnes, Bishop of Richborough, in Summer 1995), and certainly nothing at all extraordinary about the consecration of a bishop of the 'other integrity', opposed to the ordination of women (of whom John Broadhurst, Bishop of Fulham in the diocese of London, was arguably the most recent in September 1996, though a case might be made for Wallace Benn, Bishop of Lewes in the Chichester diocese, who is an evangelical opponent of women's ordination, and was consecrated in 1997).

It has always seemed to me, at least in theory, that the Achilles heel of 'impaired communion' comes when the present Archbishop of Canterbury consecrates a new bishop, and, immediately and as an integral part of the consecration service, presides at communion, and gives communion to the newly consecrated bishop. At that moment, in that brief but highly significant liturgical context, the Archbishop and the newly consecrated bishop are in visible, open and unimpaired communion with each other—and, unless all such consecrations were referred to York (or some other carefully selected Southern bishop were mandated by the Crown to be chief consecrator), it is difficult to see how it could be otherwise. I think I have always assumed (though I have certainly not watched or counted) that such bishops continue to receive communion from the Archbishop of Canterbury when they attend the House of Bishops and on other similar occasions. Perhaps I have been innocent in thinking that communion between bishops was not so impaired as the relationship is asserted to be between bishops and other sorts of ministers in the Church of England.

Well, let me return to the Southwark cathedral event of 3 December. I was away myself, so have only second-hand reports; but the Provost of Southwark wrote to *Church Times* a letter (published on 11 December) which complained that hundreds

Dear Colin,

At the end of a presentation at the recent 'Faith in the City' conference, I closed with the alternative third collect from *ASB Morning Prayer*: 'Eternal God and Father . . .'

Afterwards, a certain Bishop explained to me that, although he liked the prayer, it was actually heretical because it separated God's power and love into his work of creation and redemption respectively. I confessed that I had never read it (or prayed it) that way, as I had always assumed that it meant 'create *and* redeem' by 'power *and* love'.

When I asked your opinion, you could see both interpretations but would also prefer the past tense (another thing that had not struck me before!).

So, my questions are:

- (1) Where has the Church of England got to with regard to Morning and Evening Prayer being included in *Common Worship*, and in what form? And,
- (2) Will the above mentioned collect be included?

Perhaps I could make a suggestion for its wording, which may keep all parties happy, by use of the word '*and*' and the past tense (for which I favour the perfect, as it denotes an action in the past which still has effect now).

**Eternal God and Father,  
you have created and redeemed us  
by your power and love:  
guide and strengthen us by your Spirit,  
that we may give ourselves in love and service  
to one another and to you;  
through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.**

Yours sincerely

Simon Law

Becontree

Dear Colin,

Some of you readers may remember that last year I posted a note here concerning the electronic availability of a revised version of the 1998 *Ordo* published on paper by Brother Tristram SSF for *Celebrating Common Prayer*. This revision made adjustments to conform CCP to the then new Church of England Calendar (published in 1997 with the new lectionary and the new collects as the first component of *Common Worship*).

I have prepared a further revision for 1999. This one is available at:  
<http://justus.anglican.org/~ss/ccp/>

Steering Committee, introduced the meeting by saying that he and the Bishop of Gloucester, Chairman of the Revision Committee, together with the members of the Revision Committee, were there to listen rather than to make speeches. There were two introductory speeches. Colin Buchanan began with 'I am here as a kind of Rip Van Winkle' and helpfully painted a picture of what had happened in the discussions on Prayer and the Departed in 1964-68, when the House of Laity insisted on unitive liturgy and were determined to throw out anything which was not usable by the whole church. Michael Ainsworth spoke of the two seminars on this subject held at recent York Synods. Some said 'Well, it's natural to pray for those whom we love. Why should their death make any difference? All prayer is an expression of love,' 'Ah, yes' said the others, 'But it's unnecessary to pray for the Christian dead and improper to pray for others. You have to make a choice in life. When you have made that choice, it is too late to change. To pray for the departed undermines the doctrine of assurance.' 'But', said the former, 'we often pray for things whose outcome is already assured. No prayer is an attempt to manipulate God or to get him to change his mind.' He drew attention to the work of Christopher Cocksworth on looking at the biblical material in relation to the concept of time. This also led to a recognition that the language we would use at the time of death and the language we would use subsequently may not be quite the same.

There were some notable personal comments. Mark Santer, Bishop of Birmingham, spoke about his discoveries in prayer after the experience of losing his wife four years ago. 'There is the necessity to pray for people who die because they are all bound up in one bundle of life, but as you get further from the loss, you get more and more of a sense that they are praying for you than you for them.' He went on to speak on reading recently some early seventeenth century material by Richard Field, a friend of Hooker's, on the importance of distinguishing prayer for the departed from a much later doctrine of purgatory. David Stancliffe, Bishop of Salisbury had, just returned from the funeral of Bishop Daniel Zindo in the Sudan, which lasted for four days; the first day focused on the body as people came to make their association with the person who had died, round the open coffin. The second day was the interment, largely with local customs, putting the seal on the human life. The third day was the reading of scriptures and sharing the memories as they rehearsed the whole salvation history. The fourth day was the celebration of Holy Communion because that is where the unity of all Christ's people, the living and the departed, is maintained and celebrated. The problem, the Bishop added, is how to do all that in twenty minutes at the Crematorium.

Other contributors in what was a very irenic meeting explained why any form of prayer for the departed was a problem, if not illegal, and also discussed how to make the service more user-friendly to those who had no or little faith, without falling into the trap of making assertions about the departed which could be seen as universalist.

Trevor Lloyd

of those present (including one of the bishops presenting Michael Houghton) had declined to receive communion that day. He asked the pointed question as to whether, if the Archbishop was deemed acceptable for the purpose of consecrating bishops, he should not similarly and by the same logic be deemed acceptable for the purpose of consecrating eucharistic elements. *Church Times* on 18 December and 1 January has teemed with all sorts of answers. I attempt to give some shape to these.

Firstly, there was Allan Buik (chairman of Forward in Faith in Lichfield diocese). He said that within his own ministerial lifetime he had attended the consecration of bishops where the congregation was told they were not to receive, and that, in any case, if he preferred not to receive at any particular eucharistic event (a long-standing and respectable custom), no-one was to read anything into such preference. In effect he said that the 1975 prohibition on receiving had given way to permission to all to receive, but no-one should transmute that into a command to receive!

Secondly, there were Margaret and Quintin Greatorex of Hall Green, Birmingham, and members of FiF. They simply denied the Provost's premise, saying that they had received communion themselves and 'most, if not all, the people sitting round us'—who were FiF people—had also received, and 'the Provost has markedly overstated the point'. If they are followed, then it sounds remarkably like unimpaired communion. That is fine, but then why do we need PEVs anyway? Or is there such a discipline as 'occasional conformity'?

Thirdly, there was the Bishop of Ludlow, John Saxbee, who is President of the Modern Churchpeople's Union. He is far from being a member of FiF, but is a friend of Andrew Radford, so was there on the day, and took the view that refraining from receiving communion was showing 'lack of courtesy and concern for Andrew Radford' and that this 'is something which Michael Houghton will join me in finding regrettable' (in view of this assertion, it would be interesting to have the Ebbsfleet view from the bishop's own mouth). He is wanting to put an end to the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod, and his MCU has suggested 11 November 2002, ten years from the General Synod approval of the Measure. He (surely disingenuously?) points out that 'Geoffrey Kirk is not happy with it [the Act of Synod]', and adds that as a makeweight in the case for its abolition!

Fourthly, there was Oswald Clark, superannuated Chair of the House of Laity of General Synod. He holds the bishops responsible for the Measure, the Act and the actual ordinations, and on those grounds, and so 'Since 11 November 1992, I have not myself received communion at any eucharist celebrated by a bishop who on that day voted for the final approval [of the Measure], or who, subsequent to that date, has to my knowledge ordained a woman as a priest.' He does not doubt the sacramental reality of such eucharists, but such withdrawal 'is personal . . . making plain in the most intimate, painful and dramatic way possible our continuing opposition to the Church of England's unilateral decision . . . and our consequential and sustained inability to be in other than impaired communion with those bishops . . .' He might just possibly expose an Achilles heel when he says 'Bishop Houghton's

action in receiving communion does not affect the point at issue. The rite of consecration as a bishop requires the bishop to receive.' In point of fact the ASB rite does not so require, though the BCP rite does; but the more interesting question is whether anyone becoming a bishop should accept what he views as improper conditions as the price of being consecrated—and the point would be most firmly made if a prospective Ebbsfleet or wherever were to stick his toes in and say 'Archbishop, I am ready to be a PEV, and I am ready to receive consecration at your hands, but in conscience I cannot receive communion from you.' The Archbishop would then be faced with three options:

- (a) treating the candidate as having withdrawn (and presumably notifying HMQ so);
- (b) consecrating him, and not minding that he asked for a verbal blessing rather than communion;
- (c) mandating some other bishop (perhaps London?) to preside at the consecration.

I believe that the famous occasion in 1784 when the Scottish Jacobite bishops gave episcopal consecration to Seabury involved no communion at all, and certainly the ordination must be viewed as complete once the ordination prayer and laying on of hands are over.

But does the Oswald Clark point mean something different—that impaired communion can be varied according to different occasions, and may be less impaired at some events than at others? His own position would not seem to allow this.

Fifthly (though first in point of time), there is Geoffrey Kirk himself, National Secretary of FiF, and fully equipped controversialist. He makes several points, one of which is to say in effect that the Measure was actually self-contradictory, because it provided for a class of presbyters (i.e. women presbyters) who, unlike others (i.e. men), could not be made bishops. He says that such a separation is 'unprecedented historically, indefensible theologically, and repugnant on the grounds of simple fairness and equality'. This looks a bit like crocodile tears, though one has to allow for a highly scholastic mind; and I would want to answer that (a) the Measure does not forbid the making of women bishops; it merely says that it does not itself provide for that; and that (b) on the point of separation, the Eastern Churches have for many many centuries provided that married men can be made presbyters, but they are disqualified by marriage from being bishops—is this not providing for 'two classes of presbyters'? So is there perhaps precedent?

But the main Kirk point, the one which is intended to be the key to the whole Southwark cathedral conundrum, is that bishops are OK whilst they are being bishops, but they are not OK when they are doing what other presbyters can do, for it is the presbyterate which they have muddled. Thus, he says, we need to withdraw when a bishop who ordains women (or would be ready to) presides at communion. this appears to be a fairly recondite argument, but I think it is saying that so long as male presbyters are presiding at communion, then all can receive communion—the only exception being bishops who have connived at the ordination

certain other booklets we could name). There is a booklet for each season or group of seasons (as I write this, we are using *The Season of the Word made Flesh* which covers 17 December to 2 February). In all, there are five seasonal booklets, plus one for Saints and Holy Days. There is a general one for the other times of the year and other booklets for those extra Offices I mentioned earlier (including one for the Vigil of the Resurrection—Saturday night to you and me).

Two final booklets complete the set; a book of supplementary Psalms and readings to take on holiday (so you don't need a Bible or Psalter) so you can continue daily prayer while you are away, and an introductory booklet.

This latter booklet sets out the mechanics of using the Daily Office and assumes nothing—not even how to decode Bible references. There is also here some helpful advice on the Daily Office as a 'spiritual tool'. There is, thankfully, less emphasis on historical continuity ('We're praying just like the apostles did')—an unsustainable piece of romanticism still found in many introductions to the Daily Office. (Though actually the Durham Office does look somewhat more like a patristic office than some others).

The Office is straightforward to use; you only need one booklet each time and the guides through which seasonal material to use are very clear. There is a common beginning to the Office each day and a common ending. The daily variants are set out a page at a time and everything is in the place you would expect it to be. You will need a hymn book, Bible (and maybe a Psalter) as well. There is an encouragement to say or sing a hymn each day as part of the Office. A good idea and certainly echoing the current scholarly consensus that the early Office majored on praise and prayer. My only hesitation here is that the suggested choices are rather limited (you do get a different hymn each day), though there is nothing to stop you using other hymns and songs than the ones suggested. There is only one Bible reading each time and the lectionary follows pretty much a *lectio continua* pattern which I think is good for evangelicals and others who want to see the way a Biblical book develops. You can, of course, substitute your own Bible reading scheme instead.

This is an admirable attempt at revising the Daily Office and I hope it will be tried out extensively. It seems to work as well for individuals as for groups and is sufficiently adaptable to cater for a wide range of needs.

Charles Read

## PRAYER AND THE DEPARTED

Because of the inadequate time available for the debate on the Pastoral Rites in the July Synod, an informal (but minuted) meeting on the Funeral Services was held in the Convocation Hall on the Wednesday during the November General Synod, attended by 69 members of Synod. Trevor Lloyd, Chairman of the Pastoral Rites

Christian life that should arise from the teachings of the Prayer Book. 1662 and Canadian 1962 are the Books chiefly in view—and no modern liturgical formulation is even mentioned, though there are passing pejorative references to ‘experimentation’, ‘licence’, ‘ambiguity’, ‘temptation to do whatever is right in our own eyes’, and so on; and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that it is modern liturgical forms which are being covertly attacked. Decline of Christianity in the Western world is easily attributable to this liturgical vagueness, though a critical inspection of recent decades would suggest not only that ‘Post hoc ergo . . .’ is appalling logic in itself, but that in this case the decline was not ‘Post hoc’ at all, but had at least a hundred years of Anglican history behind it before anyone thought of modern liturgies . . .

There are occasional communities round the world that believe all our problems would be solved if we could pallisade ourselves off from contemporary culture and mores and return to horse-and-buggy transport, oil lamps, and home cheese-making from goat’s milk. Perhaps PEI symbolizes something similar in liturgy. It is a different question as to whether the great bulk of contemporary persons will want to join them.

COB

Compiled by Bruce Carlin and Tom Jamieson, *Daily Prayer: A daily office for laity and clergy commended for use in the Diocese of Durham* (Durham DLC, 1998, £12)

There has long been dissatisfaction with Daily Offices in the BCP and ASB, both as vehicles for daily prayer and also (for purists) because we now think that the early office had less emphasis on Bible readings and psalmody and more emphasis on praise and prayer than Anglicans (and their devotional primers) cared to admit.

*Celebrating Common Prayer* was an attempt to try a new form of Office, but, although it has proved very popular, it is essentially still wedded to a rather rosy view of what an Office was and ought to be. (Even though I savaged it in these columns when it was published, I do use it—in all sorts of contexts—and I think it is a useful tool for devotion. I even own three copies of it—but I still think it has drawbacks).

The Durham Office addresses one of these drawbacks in that it provides only one Office and you decide when you are going to use it. If you want more than one Office a day, then there is provision for extra (shorter) Offices. Up to now, people have had to go for Morning or Evening Prayer of some sort if they only wanted one prayer time a day and that rather spoiled the sense of continuity if you prayed at different times each day. Durham thus offers flexibility with continuity and is to be commended for this alone.

There is plenty of seasonal material too. The way in which this Office is presented is by way of a set of separate booklets (each one somewhat less substantial than

of women to the presbyterate. These erring folk, while they preside at fully valid and spiritually acceptable eucharists, have so damaged the ecclesial structure of the church that we have to withdraw from them in protest. It is a very fine point as to whether that is the appropriate protest against the particular bishops; and, paradoxically, I suppose, if Geoffrey Kirk and I meet as communicants, we shall find we are in communion with each other; or, if I preach in his parish (which I have done recently) and he, duly presiding, asks me to administer the cup, we shall find we are in communion with each other. It even sounds as though I could minister confirmation in his parish, so long as he presided at communion. But if I should preside at communion, then I am back in the category of having muddled presbyteral clarity and communion is impaired. I think I must be in a kind of asymmetrical lay communion with him.

Anyone reading the *Church Times* correspondence, let alone this arrangement and interpretation of it, must wonder whether we are not rather in a world of impaired communication. But perhaps (as one or two correspondents hinted) we are into a world of unprecedented ideas which do not well yield to clarity of thought, word or deed.

COB

#### **This Month’s Publication . . .**

. . . is Worship Series no. 150, *The Daily Office*, by Anne Barton. We are still waiting, of course, to hear what the Liturgical Commission may propose (by the Franciscan offices out of *A Service of the Word*, perhaps?).

#### **. . . and Next Month’s**

is Worship Series no.151, *Using A Service of the Word*, by Trevor Lloyd.

#### **MORE THAT THE SPELLCHECK MISSED**

I was at a conference in early December, where, in following duplicated booklets of CCP Morning Prayer, we were treated to these two hapaxes:

The Song of the Ring’s Glory (*by Tolkien, perhaps?*)

and

Blessed be the Lord, the Cod of Israel (*the origin of ichthus, no doubt*)

There has also now been noted that, in the text of the eucharistic prayer which went to Synod in July, Prayer E included:

Let us give thanks to the Lord *or* God.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Kevin Roy, *Baptism Reconciliation and Unity* (Paternoster, 1997, x/204 pp., £XXX pb)

This book, written by a South African, has a Foreword by George Beasley-Murray, and it is in fact a mirroring (or expanding) of Beasley-Murray's work in the 1960s, both in being by a Baptist and yet not so much denouncing everyone else as trying to open doors towards them. And Kevin Roy has strong claims to be heard, because, if you name it, he has quite probably been there in his own person—Roman Catholic, evangelical Protestant, Brethren, Baptist, and now, after 'another conversion', ecumenical. He basically reckons there are three main positions on baptism—two pedobaptist ones (Roman Catholic and Reformed) and one 'credobaptist'. It is possible he has never quite held the Reformed position, and Anglicanism does not figger strongly in his assessment—and there is no index, so it is hard to trace and collate passing references. But that hardly matters, as he is striving to identify and hold on to the strengths of each of the three positions. His ecumenical fervour (rooted not in liberalism but in a profound grasp of the scriptural nature of the church) is leading him all the time to a true 'reconciliation' of differences on 'baptism' to provide true 'unity'.

His chapter 9 provides his own 'model for reconciliation'. Here he begins with two principles and ends with three precepts thus:

Principle 1: we must respect freedom of conscience, even if different from our own.

Principle 2: baptism is 'diaconal'—i.e. baptism serves the church: it is not that the church serves baptism.

Precept 1: 'The baptism of infants ought not to be forbidden nor enforced.'

Precept 2: 'The "rebaptism" of those baptized in infancy ought not to be forbidden nor enforced.'

Precept 3: 'Mutual respect for differing baptismal convictions must be maintained and promoted.'

At one level, this looks like a much-trumpeted grand delivery of the merely trivial—parturiunt montes et... On second inspection it strikes me as impractically naive. It is not that we cannot contain variety of practice within different churches (though that is initially easier for pedobaptists than for credobaptists who, to be themselves at all, virtually have to begin by saying that infant baptism is no baptism). It is more that it is impossible to abandon all value-systems and still teach credibly and coherently about a sacrament. I simply do not see how to baptize an infant one Sunday, and in that rite state that that infant is truly thoroughly and once-for-all-for-life baptized, and then the following Sunday baptize an adult who was previously done as an infant but now disavows that and wants me (and a whole ecclesial system) to connive at it and accept him for baptism as an unbaptized

person. Not only shall I be wholly unprincipled, but the nature of baptism will disappear from sight, its objectivity will be ruined, and I shall be as St. Werburgh's in Derby was once reputed in my time in Nottingham to be—offering you a plunge every week if you want one, and, by thus multiplying the experience, depriving it of all initiatory significance.

There are less naive, more principled, approaches to the problem. George Beasley-Murray himself propounded one such over thirty years ago—admittedly a non-starter, as it was in principle credobaptist, but allowing exceptions under carefully stated conditions. On the other hand, in the Church of North India, which included Baptists in its original union, and in the United Reformed Church in England, which has taken the (credobaptist) Churches of Christ into union with it since it was formed, there are practical provisions which are much more heavily weighted than the apparent mere indifference of Kevin Roy. In effect they state the Churches concerned to be pedobaptist and thus at an ecclesial level to have to resist 'rebaptism'—but, after a process of counselling, to allow an exception for an individual whose conscience cannot be quieted.

I, who am a convinced pedobaptist and believe the Churches ought to seek union on a pedobaptist basis, do not want the Church of England to go as far as even meeting an individual's conscience in the way these two Churches have allowed (though I would not want to pre-judge exactly what the limits should be in a context of reunion). On the other hand, I do believe that, if an adolescent or adult can be brought to acknowledge that his or her baptism, received years before in infancy, was baptism, then, with that foundation, that person can quite properly be submerged to add the experience of conscious swamping (and the totality of surrender to Christ it implies) to be added to the original baptism. This should no more imperil the standing of the original baptism than does the profession of faith, articulated personally for the first time at confirmation ('with your own mouth and from your own heart'), then detract from the baptism which had preceded it. I have written this up in Grove Worship Series no.124 . . .

COB

*'Two Presbyters of the Anglican Way', The Way, The Truth and The Life: The Anglican Walk with Jesus Christ* (St. Peter Publications, Charlottetown, P.E.I., Canada, 1998, x/116pp. pb, n.p.)

This book ranks as a curio. Its 'two presbyters' are one British and one American, and they write for the Prayer Book Societies of the Anglican world. They have found a publisher in Ann of Green Gables country, Prince Edward Island—and the Maritimes are famous as the place of conservative reaction in Canada.

The book is not specifically liturgical, but is rather an attempt to set out the