

WAS QUEEN ELIZABETH CONFIRMED AT THREE DAYS OLD?

Daft question? Everyone knows she was—it is mentioned everywhere. J. D. C. Fisher relates it, and refers to H. Holloway, who wrote in 1901, and to S. L. Ollard in his essay in the SPCK volume of 1924. But Behrens (see the review on page 6 above) quotes the first-hand source (or nearly first-hand perhaps). Carolly Erickson in *The First Elizabeth* gives an actual account of the event. The part quoted by Behrens (acknowledging the help he had had from a David Baldwin, sergeant of the Chapel Royal) includes the following:

‘... [the baby Elizabeth] was undressed behind a curtain, then handed to the Bishop of London who immersed the back of her head and heels in the holy water. Before the purple mantle was put on again she was anointed on back and breast with the holy oil sacred to royalty and given her name . . .’

That seems to have been the whole rite as far as the candidate herself was concerned (apart from the giving of a candle). There is no mention of confirmation, name or thing. Yet the story has been (and Diarmaid McCullough gives references for it) that Cranmer, who stood as godfather to Elizabeth, then confirmed her. Certainly Behrens himself, by italicizing the anointing part of the account quoted above, thinks that *was* the confirmation. Who will burrow at sources and tell us what happened? Was it that someone somewhere decided that the post-baptismal anointing (itself ordered in the Sarum Manual) was to be treated as confirmation, and the word has spread that is what happened? Or is the account above itself inadequate and there is indeed a separate record of the Archbishop confirming her?

Of course, Greenwich royal palace was where the RNC Chapel is now, and is within my own Episcopal Area. I must ask the archdeacon to look for the confirmation register . . .

ISSN 0263-7170

50p

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ
Phone 0208-699-7771 Fax: 0208-699-7949
E-mail: bishop.colin@dswark.org.uk

Postal subscription for 2000 £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 305

May 2000

EDITORIAL

This month is the lull before the monsoon, one with few breezes but every promise of a gale soon. My guess is that clergy readers in this country will find themselves soon with acres of print arriving through the front door, or out of the FAX machine, or embedded in the E-mail, all offering further help, guidance, and indispensable wisdom in relation to the new rites of Common Worship. NOL has pitched into the battles over the new texts (and remains astonished at one major eucharistic area where no fighting of any substance has been recorded—details in a later month!), but inevitably has to repeat that the event of worship, and not least the central event of Sunday worship, has only a minimal amount of official text in it (say, ten minutes in an event of 70, 80 or more minutes). If those ten minutes are being altered by, say, 10%-20%, then the net impact on the total event would appear to be not much greater than the inclusivizing of a hymn, or the addition of a new verse or two to a golden oldie. So the hype could well be out of all proportion to the hyped . . .

But, to return to my non-theme, this month seems light on new publicity, and the hype is in the sphere of confident prophecy rather than contemporary actuality. I do have one weighty letter on the subject, and a couple of passing points of my own, and I print those out below. But for the main part I take leave (probably the only time this year) to look in this editorial at other issues.

A recurrent theme which owes little (though by no means nothing) to the new initiation texts is the limits set upon the administration of infant baptism. Readers may recall that, although I genuinely do not placard it too often, I am president of the Movement for the Reform of Infant Baptism (MORIB). I found myself in Easter week pondering how my hat bears upon the situation in Cheadle parish church in Cheshire (and the suburbs of Manchester) where I was once curate myself, where the rector was getting publicity for (apparently) declining to baptize the child of unmarried parents. In the event he was interviewed on the Sunday programme on Low Sunday, and indicated that he had receded from the position he had taken up, had withdrawn the leaflet he had issued which warned that such baptisms would not happen, and was now ready to accommodate the couple and their infant. He sounded as though he both acknowledged that Canon Law required him to give baptism to the infant, and that that requirement did not allow him to do other than baptize—which he would now do. The turnaround seemed as quick and easy as the previous stance had sound harsh and unyielding.

I responded all the more to this account not only because of my MORIB responsibility, but also because I was once assistant curate in that very parish (er, nearly 39 years ago . . .). I had previously written about my baptizing experiences in Cheadle in published works, in the following terms:

‘. . . in a strongly evangelical parish, the curates officiated (I think it was every other Sunday) at a 4 p.m. 1662 rite, to which people came from any old parish around, with no advance preparation or education. We had a service (sometimes with over one hundred people present) quite unlike any other service of the day. I have written about this as follows: “[If we were to ask not what the Church is doing, but what in baptism the individual gains]...the answer to this latter question was clearly: ‘The individual gains nothing and loses nothing, so the Church can give it without any awkwardness, and *without the issue touching at all upon upon our (wholly different) task of preaching the gospel.*’” (The main quotation here is from my 1993 DLT book, *Infant Baptism and the Gospel*, footnote on p.9; and the quotation within it (in which the italics are original) comes from an essay of mine in the book by COB, Clifford Owen and Alan Wright, *Reforming Infant Baptism* (Hodder, 1990), p.60)

I should add that my interest in a principled approach to infant baptism does not (as far as I can judge) arise from an emotional over-reaction against participation in this unwelcome practice; but rather from years of working at a proper theological basis for infant baptism. But I am not writing a theological autobiography here; I am simply noting that at some point—perhaps at the single change of rector which has occurred in those 39 years—the practice of Cheadle changed. There has clearly been some rigorous theological thinking—thinking which perhaps did connect baptism to both the gospel and the church—which has occurred in the parish, and led to this swingabout.

There has been another change also, which is built into the difference between the two glimpses of Cheadle we get—there are now co-habiting couples, and not only in Cheadle, who both want their offspring baptized and see no reason to marry each other. In the 1960s they would undoubtedly have been living in sin, and, irrespective of any much-to-be-desired state of penitence, would have been pressed towards matrimony or separation. (If the question had ever been asked, that is, for it clearly might not—but in my day all couples had the same surname as each other . . .). To-day they have probably not heard much about sin, believe the coupled but unmarried state to be as acceptable as the coupled-in-matrimony one, and are affronted to be told their child cannot be baptized.

My own later experience (from 1991 to 1996) as an incumbent in the Medway area would confirm this appraisal. I used sometimes to think that few, if any, of the parishioners of whose souls I had, with the bishop, a half-cure, were interested in marrying just once in their lives. They seemed more intent on either not marrying at all, or on hastening through a first marriage in order to contract a second or third. Cohabiting couples might be free to marry (if the idea were to seize them),

REPORT FROM LIVERPOOL DLC

It will come as no surprise to learn that Liverpool DLC has spent the past twelve months trying to keep up with the twists and turns of Common Worship material. It’s members have also spent a great deal of time visiting deaneries to keep Synod and Chapter members up to date. It would have been much simpler if everybody subscribed to Praxis News (or NoL).

Soon after their publication a diocesan conference on the Initiation rites was run as it became evident local parishes were uncomfortable with the Baptism service. Good ideas shared from various local experiences including ways to manage the Presentation, use of Testimonies, and introduce movement helped. There are still grumbles about the wordiness of the service but there seems to be a general sense of willingness to explore what new creative possibilities it introduces.

A great conference is planned in Liverpool on 1 November (when everybody else is celebrating All Saints) to help clergy and other worship leaders get to grips with all the new material. Michael Perham will be speaking about Liturgy and Change, Colin Buchanan about Liturgy and Mission. The other work done at the conference will be modelled on the York Conference in September.

An arm of Praxis in the North West is also now up and running, helping to co-ordinate some work between the Blackburn, Chester, Liverpool and Manchester DLCs. It ran a successful Funerals conference last year as a launch event and has planned for this year’s conferences on the Common Worship Wedding Services (27 June) and on CW Eucharistic material (26 September). St Helens Parish Church has become the home of these events, being geographically central with motorways and trains nearby. It is hoped that a long series of Praxis events are going to continue there.

Tim Stratford

WILL THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES BE IN COMMON WORSHIP?

It appears that a report here a month or two ago suggested that the whole text of the Articles would appear at the beginning of the new Book. Not so, and we hasten to clarify. What will appear is the Preface to the Declaration of Assent, a thoroughly contemporary document, somewhat briefer in compass than the Articles. The point about its being printed is in part that it includes reference to the Articles:

‘It [the Church of England] professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.’

- (c) Non-Sacramental—126: Anne Barton, *All-Age Worship*
 —150: Anne Barton, *The Daily Office*
 —151: Trevor Lloyd, *A Service of the Word*
 —155: Paul Roberts, *Alternative Worship in the Church of England*
- (d) Initiation—118: Toronto Statement, *Christian Initiation in the Anglican Communion*
 —124: COB, *The Renewal of Baptismal Promises*
 —134: Christopher Byworth, Charles Read and John Waller,
Joining God's Church (re On the Way)
 —145: COB and Michael Vasey, *The New Initiation Services*
 —149: Peter Reiss, *Children in Communion*
- (NB: Nos. 145 and 149 are both due for reprinting and may not be available)
- (e) Eucharist—121: COB, *The Heart of Sunday Worship*
 —135: Dublin Statement, *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*
 —136: COB and Trevor Lloyd, *Six Eucharistic Prayers as Proposed in 1996*
 —148: COB, *Eucharistic Consecration*
 —157: Carolyn Headley, *Home Communion—A Practical Guide*
- (f) Preaching—139: John Leach, *Responding to Preaching*
 —141: Michael Vasey, Trevor Lloyd, Jane Sinclair and Peter Moger,
Introducing the New Lectionary
 —144: Tim Stratford, *Interactive Preaching*
- (g) Music and Hymnody—127: Peter Moger, *Music and Worship: Principles to Practice*
 —132: John Leach, *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*
 —156: Chris Idle, *Real Hymns, Real Hymnody*

So what conferences are planned? Please let us know (with booking details) and we will advertise free of charge.

WHEN THE SPELLCHECK SAW SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT THERE

Gerald Davis, erstwhile editor of the erstwhile Australian church weekly *Church Scene*, reminisces thus:

'In the early 1980s, *Church Scene* had profound difficulties with hyphenation. Our state-of-the-art software repeatedly had people like Primates *pre-aching* in high and public places . . .'

but often they were not, as one (or even both) had previously wed someone else and had abandoned that spouse and had not gone through a divorce. The puzzle then was that, other things being equal, the case for baptizing an infant of a woman abandoned by her lover appeared as marginally stronger than that of baptizing a child of a couple in even stable adultery—yet, if the baptism of the child of the single mother went ahead, the boy-friend might well return and re-co-habit after it. Would we not be in a simpler and more honest set of problems if we asked no questions about the standing of the parents?

My own answer—or half-answer—has always been that in principle infant baptism could only be defended in the context of a believing 'household', and all my writings have run in that direction. I have also been ready to say that it is better under pressure to act in fully acknowledged breach of a principle than to reverse the principle and make a virtue of doing so. So I hope we can hold onto the concept of infant baptism being only justifiable as for the children of believers (when it should lead on to child communion etc. etc.). If we are forced to blur the edges or even breach the principle, then let us confess we are doing just that, not changing the principles. (And, I should add, that as a bishop, whilst I hear so much about an 'open' or an 'inclusive' policy as being virtuous, I only drop hints that there might be theological questions to be asked, and a consistent gospel apologia for infant baptism (rooted not in Augustine, but in the scriptures) to offer to Baptists and Pentecostals.)

But I am trying to write about the Cheadle conundrum. I wondered whether the rector conformed a bit quickly. The Canons do allow delay in baptism for 'preparation' of parents; and is it not arguable that marriage is part of that preparation? I recall the fuss we had in Synod in November 1995 about the *Something to Celebrate* report which appeared to treat cohabitation as marriage; and I am also aware of the trouble we took on the House of Bishops more recently not to repeat that equation (however gentle middle-aged parents—such as bishops—have to be about the coupling habits of their own youngsters nowadays). But there remains a nagging question about whether the Church of England should abandon any distinction between the two coupling states, should diminish the importance of actual vows of lifelong faithfulness to vanishing point, and also should be heard to say to homosexuals that anything goes in the heterosexual field—but not in theirs.

Bishops find themselves preaching regularly at the baptism of adult converts, occasionally even of Jewish or Muslim converts. Baptism then has the most enormous significance, which I hardly need spell out here. Is this consistent with the baptism of infants from homes that are not only unbelieving (I pass no judgment about that in relation to the Cheadle request), but also at best irregular in matrimonial terms?

And there remains then a question about baptismal texts. Should our common baptismal text beef up the tremendous import of passing 'from darkness to light', or should it play all that down so as to meet the actualities of indiscriminate baptismal policies? I have picked up ripples of alarm about statements that baptism

makes a candidate a 'new Christian' (as in the draft text of the 'Pastoral Introduction' we published in March), and about whether the 1998 text is consistent with a 'covenant theology'. I hope that the former ripple can be addressed within the synodical procedures (how? well, I can tell you), and I hope to address the latter with a major insert into the August NOL this year.

Colin Buchanan

PS: A liturgical oddity—I found myself editing this issue of NOL on 3 May, St. Mark's Day. Is this the latest he can ever fall? A tiny prize for an accurate demonstration he can come later . . .

TWO SMALL ISSUES ABOUT COMMON WORSHIP TEXTS

Firstly, I have received a query about that 'Amending Canon 22' which gives powers to bishops to approve continued use of ASB rites for up to five years from 1 January 2001. This is not the query that I placed against the Canon, as to whether it went beyond the provisions of the 1974 Church of England (Worship and Doctrine) Measure; no, it is a query as to whether it was needed at all, as the House of Bishops decided many years ago (when exactly?) that continuing discontinued uses would rank as making a change 'of no substantial importance' under the terms of Canon B5. This would certainly justify the suggestion we aired recently that Rite A is Order One with changes of no substantial importance; and, presumably, 1662 is 'Order Two with changes of no substantial importance'!

Secondly, I draw attention again to the 'Prayers at the Preparation of the Table' (ppp.145-7 in the 'Sample' booklet of Orders One and Two). The two prayers at no.4 carry forward the Roman 'offertory' prayers, prayers which were allowed, but not printed or publicized in the ASB (and I could tell you the story of these in 1978-79 . . .). The new Order One, at its first entry into Synod (when it had no eucharistic prayers), had a jumbled set of 'Prayers at the Preparation of the Table', and included these two prayers, re-touched from their Roman form, and with exactly the same 'set before you' text as has now been authorized. I protested and wrote in to the Revision Committee, but was stumbled by the clumsy procedures. Initially, the eucharistic prayers were being handled by a totally separate procedure from the eucharistic rite; yet not only the 'Table Preparation' prayers, but also the one of the eucharistic prayers, had 'set before' as a main verb, and that had to be handled and revised in its own right before pressure could be brought upon the Revision Committee treating the rest of the rite. By the time the eucharistic prayers committee had indeed expunged 'set before', the other committee had affirmed 'set before' in the Table Preparation Prayers. I appealed to the Bishop of St. Albans who, as chairman of both Revision Committees, was in a unique position to correlate the text of the two—but I did not prevail. At the House of Bishops in January this year), I made a very small inroad in getting the House to rearrange the jumbled order of those Preparation Prayers, but they were not rewriting them. Yet I have a

and on the floor of Synod, and made constant submissions to the recent Revision Committee and appeared before them on three occasions. Charles Read (now tutor in liturgy at Cranmer Hall, Durham, succeeding Michael Vasey) was a member of the Steering Committee of this latter Revision Committee and was therefore closely involved in all the re-writing a Revision Committee does.

. . . and, secondly, Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study no.46, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Later Nonjurors: A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth Century Usages Controversy*, by James Smith of Ottawa. The division between the 'Usagers' and the 'Non-Usagers' is fairly well known, though it would be interesting to see if the 'Usages' could be named off the cuff by Anglican scholars (in, say, a TV quiz show).¹

. . . and forthcoming titles beyond June

to mark the Common Worship year are:

August: 159 Jeremy Fletcher, *The New Eucharistic Rite: Order One*

October: 160 Trevor Lloyd, *Common Worship Funerals*

December: 161 COB, *Common Worship Wholeness and Healing*

To top it up, in the late Autumn the same team are providing *Common Worship Today*, the delightful (and beautiful) successor to *Anglican Worship Today*—and in January are hosting the Swanwick Conference 'Common Worship and Beyond' (8-11 January 2001, cheap rates till end of August).

. . . and a Recouping of Past Titles

If you are equipping a local conference with the right literature, do keep the above titles in view and have them in stock. But you will also find help as follows from other recent titles:

(a) General—130: David Kennedy, *Understanding Anglican Worship*.

—133: Mark Earey, *Worship Audit*

—140: Mark Earey, *Worship as Drama*

—143: Carolyn Headley, *Liturgy and Spiritual Formation*

—146: Christopher Cocksworth and Jeremy Fletcher, *The Spirit and Liturgy*

—152: Mark Earey, *Leading Worship*

—154: Tim Stratford, *Liturgy and Technology*

(b) Lord's Prayer—131: COB, *The Lord's Prayer in the Church of England*;

¹ The four 'Usages' were: The mixed cup, the epiclesis, the prayer of oblation (as necessary and integral to the sacrament, as in 1549) and petitions for the dead. The underlying principles in the dispute were (a) whether the Bible had supreme authority, or whether early Church practices were to be determinative; and (b) whether the Nonjurors wished to appear as the legitimate succession to the Church of England of 1688, or whether they were floating free to initiate whatever liturgical forms they saw fit.

However, in my own life, one very interesting bit of light did dawn, arising from a long quotation from an obscure source in relation to something I have often seen quoted, but never previously read at first-hand. I outline that on page 12 below.

COB

IN MEMORIAM—PHILIP HAYNES

Philip Haynes died earlier this year, and *Church Times* published a brief obituary on 7 April. I have to say that, although I must have known his name in the years 1976-80, I had not noticed the obituary nor, when I was told of it, did I quickly connect his name with the ASB. But Robin Brookes (erstwhile of first SPCK and then Church House Publishing, now retired) has written in to put the record straight.

The *Church Times* obituary by Christopher Campling included the following:

‘... But his outstanding service to the Church was the work he did in editing the Alternative Service Book, at the request of Dr. Ronald Jasper. There are many opinions of this book, affirming and critical; but I have never heard a word said against its layout, or the clarity and accuracy of its printing. Dr. Jasper was awarded the CBE, but he wrote to say that this should have been shared by those who prepared the book for publication...’

Sure enough, he gets one mention in the index of Ronald Jasper’s (semi-autobiographical) *The Development of Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980*. Robin Brookes, who was at SPCK when the ASB venture occurred, adds the following himself:

‘Philip’s ASB work was undertaken on an entirely honorary basis, though characteristically he took no credit for that. He came to think he should not have despised the very inadequate offer made to him. He brought to the work skills required as a proof-reader for OUP.

‘He made a big contribution on the Readings, where he brought consistency to a very unsatisfactory typescript, often transcribed and randomly adopted from American editions. In the services he was responsible for establishing the stylistic conventions...’

‘... Philip’s involvement continued through the separates to *Ministry to the Sick*.

‘Somewhere at Church House there is an interleaved two-volume set of ASB, marked with marvellous economy in his well-formed hand to show every change made (and some detected) in the six or so stages of correction between the first printing and 1985. I hope this is cherished—it deserves to be.’

This latter part of Robin Brookes’ letter takes NOL back to its prizes for true errors, to which we referred last month.

Next month’s publications...

... are, firstly, Worship Series no. 158, *The Eucharistic Prayers of Order One*, by COB and Charles Read. After a substantial introductory essay, the text of the eight prayers is displayed on successive left-hand pages, and a commentary on each accompanies it on the right (though the three prayers—A, B, and C—which are carried forward from Rite A get somewhat shorter treatment). COB was, of course, on the 1995-96 Revision Committee, scrutinized the new prayers closely in the House of Bishops

funny suspicion that those who use the Roman text will use it in its Roman form (‘... this bread to offer...’ etc.), and the others will not use it at all. But the existence of the text leaves us to make some sense of it. What meaning can *you* attach to ‘... this bread to set before you’? The ‘set before’ terminology has previously surfaced in the reply of the two English Archbishops to *Apostolicae Curae*, in 1897 in the anamnesis of the 1927-28 communion rite, in the text submitted to the Revision Committee on Rite A by Brian Brindley (but not in the text then authorized), and in early drafts of the present round of eucharistic prayers. Have any other sightings been reported?

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin

The following is the text of a letter I have sent to the Liturgical Publishing Group:

Dear Members of the Group

Re: Layout of the Common Worship Material

I have been eagerly awaiting the arrival of the new Common Worship material, excited by many of the liturgical developments. However, I am very disappointed by a number of decisions about the printing of the text, and I highlight the main ones below. I hope it is not too late to change what I believe are some significant mistakes. I am not expert in layout, but I believe the following items need addressing:

1. Placement of the Eucharistic Prayers: these need to be placed in the correct place in the service, so that we do not have to roam backwards and forwards in the book to find them. Perhaps you believe that people should not be following them in the book, but then why are you bothering to print them at all?

2. The use of Red Ink: Red ink has the effect of highlighting that which is printed in it. Using red ink for headings and rubrics subordinates the content of the worship to instructions about how it is to be performed, surely the opposite of what is required. Moreover, red is a psychological warning (dangerous things are red in nature), and so the combination of red and black printed texts not only looks bad, but leads to a sense of dis-ease whilst using the text. The use of blue in the ASB was one of its outstanding successful innovations.

3. Using Black Covers: do you really want to make people think the church is dead?

The above are my major concerns, that I believe must be addressed as a matter of urgency. The following are more on the level of personal preference, but are still a considerable concern.

4. The Font: the lightweight font does not capture the depth and profundity of our worship. (It makes it feel as if the words do not matter.) It is particularly feeble in its italicized form (and the italicized ‘*All*’ throughout the text looks silly).

5. The use of Right-Justified Headings: this is un-natural for a language which runs from left to right. (If it is trying to remind us of the Jewish roots of some of our worship, then I suggest that the words are also printed from right to left!)

6. The use of ¶: this looks silly (but the idea of linking the structural diagram to the beginning of a service with the text of the service is a good one).

Yours sincerely

The Revd Dr Geoffrey Burn

BOOK REVIEWS

Alan Griffiths, *We Give You Thanks and Praise* (Canterbury Press, 1999, 342pp. £12.99)

I am a little puzzled by this book. It contains a translation of the 311 eucharistic prefaces of the Ambrosian Rite into modern English. Some are the same as the Roman rite, but the introduction helpfully points out those that are not and so gives some of the defining features of this independent western tradition. These are put into felicitous modern English; however, my puzzlement is with how to use them. I have taken the suggestion of the book and used them in daily prayers for a thanksgiving. Churches (Roman Catholic or Church of England) have not, however, given permission for them to be used in the eucharist, the place of their *raison d'être*. Thus they form an interesting curiosity. Had, of course, Common Worship allowed freedom to use any preface then this collection might have come into its own.

Phillip Tovey

Mike Riddell, Mark Pierson, Cathy Kirkpatrick, *The Prodigal Project* (SPCK, 2000, 156pp, £12.99).

If the medium is the message, then this book got to me. Well it was not the book, but the CD for this book also includes a CD with all the content on that, plus it sings to you while you are reading. Resources take you to hyperlinks and before you know where you are you have moved onto the web and are at Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, finding out about labyrinths. So the CD turns into an exploration of Cyberspace. There is even a web page for add-ons to the book. All of this kept me very happy on a bank holiday.

What is the book about? Alternative worship, 'the emerging church', a critique of much of our western church life, worship in a post-modern context. This is a very helpful introduction to this movement and has lots of places to follow up. If you want to know more get this book.

This was my first book with a CD on worship. More please publishers; this is definitely the way to go. SPCK are to be commended for being bold enough to do this.

Phillip Tovey

James Behrens, *Confirmation, Sacrament of Grace: The theology, practice and law of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England* (Gracewing, Fowler Wright Books, Leominster, 1995)

I confess I have been slow to review this book, though it is also true that the publishers kept it fairly secret for some time after publication. James Behrens is an Anglican layman, a barrister with a special interest in Canon Law.

He approaches the comparison he wishes to make of the two sets of practice (and perhaps theology) by asking himself and his sources certain precise questions and then reading off the answers from the sources. There is then a chapter of 'Summary and Conclusions' but it is simply putting the previous answers together in a more systematized way.

Of course a modern Anglican reader turns to the first proffered source—scripture. Chapter Two ('The theology of confirmation') has a first section in it on 'Confirmation in Scripture' before it moves to its neatly divided two-denominational treatment. And, as I suppose one might have guessed once the methodology was clear, we get four pages of chasing through a concordance looking up the word 'confirm'. (The answers have their own interest, quite a few uses being to 'confirm' oaths, promises, covenants or contracts. Not entirely helpful samples are included in the cause of thoroughness, such as 'So Queen Esther, daughter of Abihail, along with Mordecai the Jew, wrote with full authority to confirm this second letter concerning Purim.' (Esther 9.29)—and to think of the years I lectured on confirmation without giving Queen Esther a second thought . . .). At the end of the four pages he quotes Acts 8.14:17, Acts 19.1-7 and Heb. 6.1-3, and tells us that the laying on of hands and the receiving of the Holy Spirit 'takes place at the same time as or after baptism, is part of Christian initiation . . .' (p.11). And that's it. He is wholly unembarrassed by contrary argument or exegesis. He has asked the Scriptures his question, and answered it in seven lines. *C'est tout simple*.

It is possible thereafter that the Roman Catholic Church will yield clearer answers to his narrow-focus questions than will the Church of England. He does acknowledge that different theologies of confirmation are around, and even ventures the evaluative comment that Lampe is 'more orthodox' than Mason and Dix (I raised half a cheer there). He cites the (unacceptable) preface from 1928, without noticing that the House of Laity defeated this when it came up as Series 1 in 1966. He comments on the form 'Confirm, O Lord, your servant N with your Holy Spirit' that it 'appears very much a sacramental form of words. . . and not merely precatory'. (But the test is really whether it could be used on other occasions, and it could, whilst sacramental words of administration could not. . .).

After that the lawyer is in his own field for a while. We have Chapter Three, 'The legal effects of confirmation', and then a chapter on proofs and records, one on the minimum age for confirmation, then on preparation (i.e. in respect of 'legal requirements'), on the minister of confirmation, and on 'after-care'. Chapter Nine is about changing one's name at confirmation and Chapter Ten about the relationship to church membership (on which he naturally finds it difficult to discover a relationship). The next chapter handles ecumenical relations, and is more about recognizing Roman Catholic confirmation than about joint confirmations, though they do appear.

The new rites were of course still over the horizon when Behrens wrote, and even the ASB rite gets but half a page of mention. The index is infuriating, because various notable reports are cited in footnotes in the text, but appear in no dress at all in the index.