Liturgy and Ecumenism

David Stancliffe[1]

1. Introduction: How Have Liturgists Come to Agree on So Much?

We were met at the west doors of the cathedral at Cefalu by the bishop, a Tuscan exile in Sicily, who embraced us warmly and said that his cathedral was ours for the morning. We had come from Palermo where the 21st congress of *Societas Liturgica* was taking place in August 2007, and had come to celebrate an ecumenical liturgy that was a form of Morning Prayer, including the renewal of baptismal vows and sprinkling, intercession before the great 12th-century mosaic of the Pantocrator in the eastern apse, and the kiss of peace.

That service was presided over jointly by Archbishop Piero Marini, then papal master of ceremonies, and myself, and what was expressed afterwards by those who participated in the liturgy was that they had felt entirely at ease in this act of worship and much moved by it. Why was this? One of the reasons was the way in which familiar elements from several traditions had been woven together in a structure that all present could recognize and own. Another was that it built on the recognition of each other's fundamental status as baptized Christians, a sacrament we share in common. And a third was that people could not distinguish any differences in the way Archbishop Marini and I presided in church. He and I had had a walk around the cathedral and agreed who would lead which texts, but there had been no rehearsal—no discussion about how we would gesture, reverence the altar, take mitres on and off. It just happened that—in spite of our different ecclesial formation and our very different roles in different churches—we turned out to behave almost exactly the same in church.

On one level this is a small and insignificant matter. On another, it is a powerful index of why it is that those from different traditions who have prayed the liturgy, celebrated the sacraments, and studied the development as well as the origins of the church's worship over the past fifty years or so together find themselves in substantial agreement not only on the broad outlines of what the contents of a given worship should be and what the texts should say, but also about the way in which it might be celebrated by the assembly.

Common study has been a major force for good. The academic work on the origins, development, and celebration of the liturgy has essentially been done together and gathered significant momentum since Vatican II. The international body *Societas Liturgica*, which gathers together those studying in this area, has been very influential in both forming and expressing that common search. Out of this common study has grown the respect and trust that make it possible to understand each other's theology as it is expressed in the different traditions, but also—and more importantly—to share in each other's tradition of worship. The

The Right Rev'd. Dr. David Stancliffe is bishop of Salisbury in the U.K.

Liturgical Ministry 17 (Summer 2008) 114–26

friendships formed in this process have enabled scholars and practitioners to get inside the dry bones of the inherited texts and see them as living acts of worship, and there have been few churches (at any rate, in the west) that have not substantially revised their liturgies in the past fifty years.

Nor is it simply a matter of texts. Living worship is about how the texts are celebrated by living communities. Books like Aidan Kavanagh's *Elements of Rite*[2]—describing the minimalist, unfussy Benedictine style of celebration that one might find in a French parish, a German abbey, an English (Anglican) cathedral, as well as in the United States—suggests a *lingua franca* of how to shape the liturgical space by the way the assembly inhabits it, how to form that assembly by song and movement and not just by text, how a president and a deacon might free the assembly to offer their gifts, so that the community as a whole celebrates.

What I hope to do in this essay is to sketch where the common ground lies, the obstacles we encounter in building on that, and how we have arrived at this position in the study of pastoral liturgy when so many other areas of ecumenical endeavor seem so snarled up.

2. Liturgical Development and the Longing for Renewal

The publication of the revised rites for Holy Week in the Roman Catholic Church by Pope Pius XII in 1951, and in particular the revisions made to the celebration of the Paschal Vigil so that it could regain its rightful place at the center of the liturgical year, marked the first tentative steps in the process of liturgical development that has characterized all the churches over the past sixty years. The project had a twofold origin: first, in the determination to recover the early tradition of worship in the undivided church; second, to give back to the whole Christian assembly the sense of participating in a pattern that was life-changing. Worship was not just about what went on in church; it was the key to a lively, life-enhancing pattern of engagement and transformation[3] into which new people were being drawn and which would have a profound effect on the communities in which the church was set.

The results have been greater than could have been imagined, thanks largely to the impetus given to the movement by the Second Vatican Council initiated by Pope John XXIII. There is substantial agreement (at any rate, among the churches of the west) in a number of different areas. First, about the way the liturgy should be celebrated as well as in the matter of texts written or revised and the theology they embody either explicitly or implicitly. Second, in harnessing these reforms in the service of the mission of the church, so that they result in changing the way in which the community of faith is built up (in the Eucharist), new disciples

Common study has been a major force for good.

made (in the rites of initiation), and people cared for at hinge points in their lives (in the pastoral rites). Third, in coming to understand the close relationship between liturgy and ecclesiology, so that it is acknowledged that how we worship shapes the conscious way in which we think of ourselves as the church. Consequently, a significant degree of ecumenical consensus has been achieved—at any rate, among those who recognize that what is fundamental to the life of the church is our worship of the Triune God, and that how we read Scripture, how we understand the nature of the church and the sacraments, how we develop a theology of the church and its ministry are (or should be) all consequent on our common life of worship.

Of course, there are those who do not think that this is what the church fundamentally is; they think of the church primarily in juridical or organizational terms. When you think like this, worship is just one of the "products" of the organization. On the other hand, there are those who think that the Christian faith is primarily a matter of personal response to what God has done in Christ, to which the key is the Bible, as a kind of stand-alone witness. We worship because the Bible tells us to; the uniting of our hearts by worshiping together encourages us and builds up our individual faith; and the church is simply the sum of those individuals.

The Anglican tradition has never had much in the way of confessional or ecclesial formularies. The Preface to the Declaration of Assent[4] (made by deacons, priests, and bishops of the Church of England when they are ordained and on each occasion when they take up a new appointment) states that

> The Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It 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.

If, as a fellow Christian in a different communion, someone wants to find out what the Church of England believes, the answer is "come and worship with us." It is the Church's worship that holds the Church of England's doctrine, and this is why any development of the "historic formularies" in terms of liturgical revision is such a major matter. The recent revisions, published in a series of volumes under the collective heading *Common Worship*,[5] though initiated by the House of Bishops and drafted by the Liturgical Commission, were all taken through a full scrutiny by the General Synod of the Church of England, requiring a number of stages including revision committees on which the "professional" liturgists were in a minority, before obtaining a two-thirds majority in each of the houses of the Synod (laity, clergy, and bishops) in order to be authorized. They are now the definitive statement of what the Church of England believes.

In the 16th and 17th centuries scholar-bishops in the Church of England had become aware of the wider history of the undivided church, and the rites of the Eastern churches were known to scholars like Bishop Launcelot Andrewes. Eastern emphases were visible in the liturgy and the early 18th-century companion to the *Book of Common Prayer* (known as Wheatly on the Liturgy[6]) extolled the virtues of the Eastern tradition and had a ground plan of an ancient Syrian Church as its frontispiece.

Interest in the development of worship as crucial to understanding the nature of the church became a cause of major concern to the Tractarians[7] from the 1840s onwards. Dissatisfied with a view that saw the origins of the Church of England in the Henrican split with Rome and codified in the Elizabethan settlement, they were convinced that the Church of England, though reformed, remained the Catholic Church in England. They explored the origins of Christian worship and doctrine in order to understand how worship and doctrine had evolved over the centuries, looking for the criteria by which to judge whether or not such developments were legitimate.

While the authority of the church to shape its worship independently of Parliamentary control was the presenting issue, the matter was crucial because to the Tractarians it was a test of the authenticity of the church. It was wrestling with issues like these that forced the future Cardinal Newman to leave the Church of England for Rome.

This is the background against which the distinctive contribution of the Anglican tradition to the search for ecumenical consensus can be made. The Anglican tradition, with its claim to be catholic but reformed, is confusing to many who are used to the simple polarities between catholic and protestant or western and eastern, but Anglicans are used to looking both towards their catholic origins and to their reformed inheritance, and to offering their long experience of interpreting these different traditions to one another, as we are well used to doing both within the Anglican family worldwide and also within the local church, the diocese.

3. *The Language of Unity—or Uniformity?*

Anglicans look at the ecumenical scene and recognize that from their perspective there are several ways of understanding the concept of the unity of the church. It is worth exploring these in order to set out the context in which the substantial ecumenical consensus among liturgists can be evaluated. I can illustrate these two ways best by reference to the encyclical *Ut unum sint* and the way it has been received.

Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ut unum sint*[8] was a renewed plea for Christian unity particularly directed toward the Orthodox Churches. The encyclical acknowledges that in baptism Christians become members of the Body of Christ and that many churches have some (or most) of the elements of truth, which, however, the encyclical claims exists in its fullness only in the Roman Catholic Church. The encyclical's positive and forward-looking tone is encouraging, but the model for unity remains essentially structural. There is a logical, linear sequence of mechanical links, each dependent on the previous one till they are validly rooted in Christ. After quoting the document *Unitatis redintegratio* (Decree on Ecumenism, 21 November 1964) from the Second Vatican Council, which speaks of the Roman See acting as "a moderator" and recognizing that the ministry of unity that is historically a particular responsibility of the Bishop of Rome is to be at the service of the church (no. 95), Pope John Paul II stated that "the communion of the particular churches with the Church of Rome, and of their bishops with the Bishop of Rome, is—in God's plan—an essential requisite of full and visible communion" (no. 96). And here this great and unbreakable chain becomes to outsiders apparently circular. For unity there must be communion, for communion there must be unity of ministry, since sharing in communion is the sign of being in communion, not a means to achieve it: "[I]t is not a substitute for unity, but the fruit of unity." For those outside the Roman Catholic Church it seems extremely difficult to break into this charmed circle. In the Church of England's relationships with other churches, especially the Scandinavian Lutheran Churches, the practice of intercommunion has played a considerable part in bringing the churches together. But the difficulty lies in the fact that acceptance of one another's sacraments implies acceptance of one another's orders as a logically prior link in the chain of authenticity, of expressing the mind of Christ.

One way forward might be to press the claims of a model of authenticity—of a truly apostolic ministry—which was less linear; not so much of a mechanical linkage to guaran-

tee the uninterrupted transmission of *potestas*, of priestly power to consecrate, as a raft or web. I think of it like this: we have a hammock that seems able to bear the weight of our heaviest friends, yet is made entirely of wool, some strands of which have been nibbled by mice. Its secret lies in the fact that it has an enormous number of strands, not one of which is bearing more than a fraction of the weight, and strand is woven to strand laterally as well as lengthwise; it has (if I recall the terms correctly) both warp and weft.

Such a web-like model of apostolic ministry might look more like this: Apostolicity belongs to the whole church living in continuity with the faith and mission of the Apostles. Succession in the episcopal ministry is a visible and personal way of focusing and of signifying the apostolicity of the whole church. The apostolicity and continuity of the whole church is inextricably bound up with the apostolicity and continuity of its ordained ministry, focused in episcopal ministry. Continuity in the episcopate signifies God's promise to be faithful to his church. At the same time, it signifies the church's intention to be faithful to its apostolic calling. It gives assurance to the faithful that the church today intends to do and to be what it has always intended to do and to be. The laying on of hands by bishops in succession is a sign—an effective sign—of that intention, but continuity is also manifested in ordered succession in the historic episcopal sees of the catholic church. Apostolic succession in the church should therefore be seen as a rope of several strands.[9]

That is certainly how the Porvoo Declaration (a statement of common understanding that lays a path open for the interchange of ministries between the churches of the Anglican Communion in Europe and the Lutheran churches of the Baltic and Scandinavia) understands the historical episcopal succession.[10]

But in the thinking of Pope John Paul II, it is the communion of the bishops of other churches with the Bishop of Rome that is an essential prerequisite of full and visible communion, and that communion of bishops implies both a recognition of authenticity and an acceptance of authority. Over the centuries the unity and authenticity of the church has come to center more on the guarantee of apostolic origin than on the presence of apostolic life. But the apostolic note remains crucial. The unity of the church is a particular concern for the bishop just because the tradition focuses the responsibility for handing on the faith together with keeping the church together in him: the unity of the church is sustained by a community of faith that stretches over the ages. This is made clear at an ordination, where the bishop does not act alone: his presbyters must be with him and the Eucharist celebrated. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (no. 3) the bishop is simultaneously the *alter Christus* and the *alter apostolus*. While the bishop alone can, like Christ, "give" the ministry, the presbyters accompany

There are several ways of understanding the concept of the unity of the church.

him in this giving as a visible sign of the new community where past, present, and future are imaged in the eucharistic foretaste of the Kingdom. The implication is that apostolic continuity is realized through the bishop, not as an individual but as the focus of a continuing community of faith. Apostolic succession through episcopacy is essentially a succession of church structure.

How else, after all, can the ordained ministry receive Christ's authority if not through the church? An apostolic succession that bypasses communion, the essential corporateness of the church as a body that is continuous in space and time, is vulnerable. It is rooted only in the single link of a massive chain that binds it clearly, but potentially disastrously (if one link snaps, the whole chain breaks) to the past. Communion, of which the Eucharist is the type and origin, is more like a web, a net, a hammock. In the Eucharist past and future, heaven and earth, God and humanity are bound together in Christ, the unique source of the Church's ministry.

> [Christ] is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in everything he might be pre-eminent. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things ... (Col 1:17–19)

This unity is the essence of God's nature, and whether we think of Christ as the one who reconciles us to God, or the one who inaugurates the new creation, or embodies the kingdom, the implication is clear in the high-priestly prayer in John's gospel:

> I do not pray for these only, but also for those who believe in me through their word, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

> The glory which thou hast given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me. (John 17:20–23)

At the heart of this model of unity is a repetitive, circular model of mutual indwelling, a pattern of communion. Our participation in the divine life, our communion with God, is by incorporation into Christ's one, perfect self-offering to the Father; and what exhibits, what reveals, the divine glory is this perfect union—with God, with one another, and (we might add, in a post-Freudian age) with ourselves and the natural order (though the latter might be foreign to St. John). It is this two-way relationship between Christ and the Father that we enter when we are baptized and that is at the heart of priestly ministry. Christ reveals the Father to us, and offers our worship to the Father. "In the Eucharist," declares the Moscow agreed statement of the Anglican-Orthodox dialogue[11] (1976), "the eternal priesthood of Christ is constantly manifested in time. The presiding celebrant in the liturgical action has a twofold ministry: as an icon of Christ, acting in the name of Christ, towards the community and also as a representative of the community expressing the priesthood of the faithful."

This analysis of these different understandings of unity may seem an over-heavy sledgehammer with which to crack a nut, but this contrast between the logical, linear, Latin-style chain of thinking in the Roman Church and the more circular, relational, web-like pattern of reflection that the Anglican (and Orthodox) tradition espouses illustrates the conceptual differences—shaped by the different language structure that provides the conceptual syntax in which each tradition has done its theology—between the ways in which the two churches have come to articulate their views. My point is this: we should not be surprised to find that we appear to conceptualize in different ways from one another, but we need to beware of assuming that this means we believe different (certainly exclusively different) things. If the argument over the nature of the unity of the church can only be conceived in linear terms, then of course a mechanical connection to the See of Rome that guarantees uniformity of belief and practice, and a crystal-clear line of authority, will be the only solution.

But is it possible to conceive that other models that derive from other linguistic thought patterns might be acceptable? Would it be possible to think that unity—like that experienced by the infant church on the day of Pentecost—might have more to do with the complementarity of different languages, patterns of expression, and thought-forms rather than in a historically derived or a universally imposed uniformity? The phenomenon of different languages was certainly understood in the Hebrew Testament (Gen 11:1–9) as a sign of disunity, even of chaos. But it is exactly the same phenomenon that in Acts 2:1–13 is seen to be a sign of the unity of the church in mission. True, neither the day of Pentecost nor the common life of the Christians of Corinth sound like tidy expressions of the apostolic church, but they—like the organic models of the church that figure in the earlier writings of the New Testament—are a good deal more vivacious than the later and more structural expressions of the life of the church in writings like the Letter to the Ephesians (2:19–22).

What concerns me here is that differences in understanding may be based less on our attempts to enter into the mind of Christ and more upon the ways of thinking that the use of one particular language structure encourages. Indeed, when people from different traditions gather, study, pray, and eat together remarkable things happen, as the worldwide gatherings of liturgists regularly experience. Intellectually, we know that this is an area worthy of exploration; practically and emotionally we find it hard to do, which is why that part of the bishop's ministry that is about engaging with the leaders and thinkers in other intellectual traditions and with Christians who do their theology in other languages is so vital for the church's pursuit of the truth and the unity of the local church with the church universal.

4. The Shape and Theology of the Eucharistic Action

This brief reflection on the essential distinction between the Anglican and Roman understandings of the nature of unity (and the implied difference between unity and uniformity) may be helpful in analyzing some of the worked examples where the different traditions may turn out to have what Anglicans would understand as being complementary, rather than opposing insights.

First, as far as the shaping of the eucharistic rite itself is concerned, there has been nothing but gain from our common study and close working. The structures of the major western eucharistic rites exhibit an astonishing similarity, and indeed it is quite difficult for lay people to distinguish between them.

The structure of eucharistic rites has become more nuanced since the simple division into a Liturgy of Word and a Liturgy of Sacrament, echoing the simple bipartite structure of The Acts of the Apostles 2:43: "… day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes." While that distinction remains, more attention has been given in recent years to the deep structure of the liturgy and the "soft" points—the parts where the focus shifts

and where the hinges between different sections of the rite alert us to the fact that it's at the points of intersection that significant liturgical development takes place. How does the assembly gather, and what enables a number of very different individuals to sit down together under Scripture? How do we move from attention to the word, proclaimed and expounded, through intercessory prayer, and into the offering of ourselves in eucharistic action? How does the transforming effect of the Eucharist, reshaping the rubble of human life into the coherence of the Body of Christ, result in a *missio*, a sending out, which might in turn transform the human community?

If the simple form of the structure derives from the welding of the breaking of the bread onto the worship of the Temple or synagogue as described in Acts 2, then the model that shapes the more developed form of the liturgy is derived from Luke 24:13–35, the account of the journey to Emmaus. Here, in compact form, is the narrative of engagement and transformation that shapes not only the eucharistic liturgy, but all other liturgies worth the name. The two disciples are drawn into telling their story of dashed hopes, and this welds them together: the *gathering rite* is there to gather a community, help the individuals who compose it to lose their sense of personal inadequacy and prepare them to attend to God's story, revealed in the Scriptures. When the disciples fail to recognize the stranger who walks with them and has such a knack of getting them to tell their story, they are upbraided by the challenge: "How slow you are to believe all that was spoken by the prophets," and they get several hours' worth of scriptural exposition. In the *Liturgy of the Word*, the assembly hears what God is doing and has the opportunity to set their story against the story of what God has done for his people. When they reach the village, they prevail on the stranger to come and stay. He takes bread, blesses it, and breaks it to give it to them. And suddenly the penny drops, and they recognize who it is. In the *Liturgy of the Sacrament*, the gap between God's story and ours is bridged by the liturgical action in which the broken and scattered fragments of the worshipers' lives are made whole, as the one bread—like the body on the cross—is broken for us, and death is discovered to be what gives life. But the two disciples do not stay rapt in adoration: they leap up and go straight back to Jerusalem to tell the others. The liturgy ends with a *dismissal rite* to energize the church and turn the renewed and transformed community outwards to live out what they have become.[12]

This is the essential liturgical shape, and gathering, encountering the Word, being transformed by Sacrament, and *missio* are the four structural elements that have shaped the church's sacramental celebrations in one form or another over the centuries and are now more visible than they have been for centuries in nearly every western eucharistic rite.

What enables a number of very different individuals to sit down together under Scripture?

5. Eucharistic Sharing: Different Theologies at Work

All this is common ground to those who work together to renew the liturgical life of the churches, and we have learned much from each other in the process. But there remains the difficult question of eucharistic hospitality, already touched on above. For the Roman Catholic Church, to participate in the sacrament and to receive Holy Communion is only possible if one is in communion with the See of Rome and a member of the true church. Communion is an expression of, and the fruit of, belonging. The Anglican tradition wonders whether this is a case where a juridical model of the church has (whether consciously or not) triumphed over a more theological one, and that behind it lies the only partially expressed (due to a generous ecumenical politeness) doubt as to whether Anglicans really are members of the church or simply of an "ecclesial body."

I have found it more difficult to accept the (frequently offered) invitation to receive the Sacrament in a Roman Catholic Church since I became a bishop for several reasons. Partly, it is that any act of mine as a bishop is no longer the act of an individual, but an ecclesial act with consequent structural implications. But more pressingly, it is that I do not believe that in participating in the Eucharist and receiving the Sacrament at a Roman Mass I am primarily placing myself in communion with the Bishop of Rome. My clear conviction that the one who invites the baptized to the Sacrament of his table is the Lord; he is the host, as the quintessentially Anglican poet George Herbert expresses so well

in his poem "Love Bade Me Welcome: Yet My Soul Drew Back."[13] If, indeed, it is the Almighty who invites me, then—however hesitantly I approach the table—I may not refuse.

In celebrating the Eucharist I believe that I am joining with the faithful of every age and community in "making the offering," of entering into the one perfect sacrifice of the Son to the Father which is the heart of our self-giving in worship. It is because of that one body broken on the cross that we, the scattered and divided members of the Body, are made one. My union with my fellow Christians is, therefore, a consequence of, not a pre-condition for, communion with God, and all my lateral relationships with my fellow human beings are the direct result of us all being made one in Christ in our baptism, and remade in that one Body each time we participate in the Eucharist.

So, if Henri de Lubac is right that the Eucharist makes the church,[14] then communion with one another is a fruit of our being drawn into unity with the Father in and through Christ's one, perfect sacrifice. It is this dynamic model (rather than a structural one) that lies behind the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's statement *Church as Communion* (1991) and that those who do their theology in relational terms using the verbs and adverbs of process, development, and change may be in a better position to engage with in terms of what is happening in the Eucharist than those who think more in engineering terms of what levers effect what movements and the consequent mechanics of change.

6. Patterns of Initiation: the Pilgrim Journey into Life

While different views on the way in which the Eucharist is related to communion remain between these two churches, a more immediately fruitful area for common understanding is the sacrament of initiation. Threefold immersion in water in the name of the Trinity is acknowledged by all the churches as a valid act of baptism. Around this central act a number of subsidiary rites, which have varied over the centuries, have grown. What is significant about baptism is that the rite can be administered in an emergency by someone other than an ordained priest; indeed, perhaps this is what has rescued the sacrament of baptism from the kind of questions that still hang around the celebration of the Eucharist. In baptism the question of validity of orders has never been held to raise questions about the validity of the sacrament.

If the heart of the rite of baptism remains a simple and universally acceptable act, the main theological questions about the nature of what happens in baptism have been the subject of continual exploration and development. First, there is the rediscovery of baptism as a process. Second, there has been a reevaluation of the subsidiary rites that accompany the different stages of the process and their theological significance. Third, baptism has been discovered to be fundamental to our Christian identity as those made in the image and likeness of God, and so to our calling to live out the faith we profess.[15]

The ecumenical agreement that baptism in water with the Trinitarian formula is valid and unrepeatable is foundational. But immersion in water in the name of the Trinity is only one part of the process. There is the calling of candidates, the proclamation of divine initiative of grace. There is the journey from welcome through a sense of belonging to believing. There is the formal renunciation of evil and the turning to Christ, the light of the world, with the sign of the cross inscribed on the forehead of each candidate, giving them in the badge of faith a defense against the powers of darkness and, as candidates, being claimed for the journey in Christ to the Father. There is the movement to the place of baptism, the prayer over the waters in the font (which is where much of the theology of the rite is stated), the corporate recitation of the Apostles' (or baptismal) Creed, and the scrutiny of each candidate before they are plunged below the waters or have water poured over them. When they emerge from the waters, they may be clothed in white and are then anointed with Chrism to show that they are God's viceroys—members of his royal, priestly people who have been given responsibility for the care of the world and its peoples. If the bishop is presiding, they may have hands laid on them and are confirmed before being given the kiss of peace and led to the altar for the Liturgy of the Eucharist at which they receive the consecrated elements, the bread of life and the cup of salvation. Finally, they are blessed and dismissed with a candle lit from the paschal candle as a sign of their being sent out as part of the church's apostolic *missio*. Like the first apostles on the day of Pentecost, they are to go out to challenge, change, and cherish the world.[16]

This progress through the different stages may be compressed into a period of preparation and a single liturgical celebration, but it may well be spread out over a number of months or even years. For example, candidates might be welcomed and made at home in the assembly at Michaelmas or All Saintstide. They might make the renunciations and receive the Sign of the Cross on the first Sunday in Lent and then come to the waters of baptism and be chrismated at Easter, receiving the sacrament of the Eucharist. Then they might be [confirmed and] sent out with an apostolic charge and a lighted candle at Pentecost.

These stages are laid out in the RCIA, the Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults, a program developed to help Roman Catholic churches to recover the corporate celebration of baptism in communities that acknowledge the transforming effect that accompanying adults on their journey

into faith has for the whole church.[17] Perhaps particularly important is the recovery of the church's responsibility for the post-baptismal catechesis—sitting down after the liturgical celebration with those baptized and confirmed to work out with them what difference this makes and what they should do about it, varying from the adoption of a rule of life to the proper evaluation of gifts and skills and the testing of vocation in its widest sense.

Again, there is considerable consensus among the liturgists in these matters and a growing awareness of how the wholehearted celebration of each stage in the process and its attendant rites can change not only the lives of individual candidates but of church communities. Most important, such celebrations refocus a church on two important aims: the making of new disciples and the church's mission—a mission that is less about "taking the gospel" to people, as if we were the sole custodians of God's grace, and more about discovering what it is that God is actually doing, and helping people to recognize it, celebrate it, and take part in making it happen.

In the theology of baptism two different strands are present. There is the *anamnetic* pattern where Christ's dying and rising is recalled by submerging the candidate in the watery tomb. Here the sense of being called out of darkness into the light of Christ rising fits well with a Pauline theology of dying to sin and rising to new life, and the implication is that baptism marks a sharp transition from the old life to the new. The imagery here is decisively paschal, and the key text is Romans 6:3–11, read as the epistle at the Paschal Vigil. This pattern is often assumed to be the norm, along with its accompanying expectation of instant conversion and immediate and total belonging aboard the ark of faith. It provides a model of church that is secure and essentially *contra mundum*.

The other or *epicletic* pattern is founded on a more Johannine theology of the new creation, and the experience of new disciples is less one of sudden conversion than of growing conviction. The new creation harks back to Genesis 1:2 and the narratives of Jesus' own baptism, where the Spirit descends on him as he emerges from the waters of the Jordan, declaring him to be both the anointed Son and the one who will suffer for the people. Emerging from the waters to be anointed with Chrism is the central theme in this tradition, and the key text is John 3:1–17—Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus about being born again by water and the Spirit. This model of baptism stresses continuing growth rather than instantaneous change, and plays into a theology of the church that is an emerging new Israel, a pilgrim people on the way rather than a fully fledged and radically different entity. The pattern is one of organic development rather than of radical change, and the church is seen less as the ark of faith and more as the leaven in the lump.

A more immediately fruitful area for common understanding is the sacrament of initiation.

If the first pattern is thought to be historically more characteristic of the western church and the second of the eastern, then it is salutary to remember that while those new to Christianity experience both patterns of coming to faith, St. Paul's Damascus road experience is not vouchsafed to many. An interesting sidelight on our assumptions that the paschal imagery must be the primitive and original strand is provided by Dominic Serra's research on the editorial process that took place on the prayer over the water at the blessing of the font in the 1951 revisions to the Easter Vigil. What Serra shows[18] is that the theology of rebirth and the new creation is older than some of the more obvious paschal material and that these two strands have at least an equal footing.

What is important for our purposes is that the two theologies of baptism each imply a different ecclesiology. A more paschal, decision-based theology (implying a clear division between darkness and light, the old order and the new) is accompanied by an ecclesiology that emphasizes sharp boundaries between the church and the world, between the saved and the rest of humanity. Such an ecclesiology leads to a citadel model of the church and a clear distinction between those who belong and those who don't. An ecclesiology based on a baptismal theology that emphasizes rebirth and subsequent growth where the womb rather than the tomb is the dominant image fosters an ecclesiology that emphasizes low thresholds and a strong center, an image of a people moving towards a goal rather than securely settled. Some ecclesial traditions are more comfortable with the black and white picture, just as some people are temperamentally inclined that way. For others a church that seems narrow or exclusive contradicts their image of a Christ who eats with tax-collectors and sinners; for some, a greater emphasis on the incarnational element of the faith (at any rate, as a first stage) seems more true to the gospel. Once again, there are dangers in an either/or approach, which is what is avoided by Cyril of Jerusalem, as he reflects in his post-baptismal catechesis:

When you went down into the water, it was like night, and you could see nothing. But when you came up again it was like finding yourself in the day. That one moment was your death and your birth; that saving water was both your grave and your mother.[19]

Again, in the ecumenical perspective, it may be possible to see that these different emphases are best understood as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. That is the great plus about working together over the different traditions.

7. The Rites of Ordination

The prime purpose of the ordination rites is to give shape and order to the life of the whole church of God. That community of faith is called to continue the work of Christ; it is into his Body that we are baptized. And the community of faith is not just called to reflect the nature and purpose of God; it is empowered by the Spirit to become God's agent and instrument in bringing about that new creation, which is his will for all. It is Christ's ministry that we share and as Christ is the Head of that Body (Eph 4:15–16), so the ordained ministry represents the ministry of Christ as Head of the Body. There is a distinctive responsibility within the whole people of God for its leaders (1 Pet 5:3).

In the Church of England a particular significance is given to the Ordinal in our historic formularies. The supposed deficiencies of the Ordinal in the *Book of Common Prayer* was the presenting reason behind the Leo XIII's bull of 1893 *Apostolicae Curae* declaring Anglican ordinations to be "absolutely null and utterly void." To the response made by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, *Saepius Officio*, no formal reply has ever been made.[20] The chief grounds for publishing this bull was probably the anxieties expressed to Rome by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England under Cardinal Vaughan about Lord Halifax's fraternal conversations with the Abbé Portal.

Even then *Apostolicae Curae* was clearly no match for *Saepius Officio* in terms of scholarship. Since then liturgists working on ordination rites have come to a common mind that the *porrectio instrumentorum*, the handing over of external signs such as the chalice and paten to priests or the pastoral staff to bishops, on which *Apostolicae Curae* placed such reliance, was never an essential part of the rite of ordinations that consist fundamentally in the laying on of hands with prayer.

The House of Bishops of the Church of England prefaced the revised ordinal with these words:

The ministry of the Church is the ministry of Christ, its chief shepherd and high priest. The ordained ministry is Christ's gift to his Church, and in their life and ministry, bishops, priests, and deacons are called to speak in Christ's name and build up the Church of which he is the head. In this way the whole body of the Church is ordered in faithful response to the Lord's summons to share his work.

This ordering of the Church's ministry has been shaped under the guidance of the Holy Spirit through the processes of human history, and the Church of England has maintained the threefold order of bishop, priest, and deacon. Within that threefold order, bishops are ordained in historic succession (that is, in intended continuity from the apostles themselves). This is a sign of the Church's care for continuity in the whole of its life and mission, and reinforces its determination to manifest the abiding characteristics of the Church of the apostles. This is not to deny that other Christian traditions have an authentic concern for apostolicity or that they intend to express apostolic continuity in other ways, but some such sign of apostolic continuity is required for the full, visible unity of the Church.

Holy Orders help shape the Church around Christ's incarnation and work of redemption, handed on in the apostolic charge. The ministry of deacons is focused in being heralds of the kingdom and in bringing before the servant Church the needs of the world. The ministry of priests (who continue to exercise diaconal ministry) is focussed in calling the church to enter into Christ's self-offering to the Father, drawing God's people into a life transformed and sanctified. The ministry of bishops (as they embody the ministry of both deacon and priest) is focused in the apostolic responsibility of proclaiming and guarding the faith, of presiding at the sacraments, of leading the Church's prayer and of handing on its ministry, as they share with their fellow bishops in their apostolic mission.

The Church's ordained ministry is apostolic; that is, it is sent to enable the Church to fulfill its vocation to mission, to witness to the resurrection, and to preach the good news of salvation in all the world. It keeps the Church faithful to the teaching of the apostles, and finds fresh ways to proclaim and express that apostolic faith as it has been handed on in each generation.

The Church's ordained ministry is catholic, that is, universal in time and space. The Church of England speaks of ordination to the office and work of bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of God. When an ordained priest presides at the Eucharist and at Baptism, pronounces God's absolution, and blesses God's people in his name, and when bishops confirm and ordain in a particular place, these are actions not only of a particular local Christian community, but of the whole Church.

The Church's ordained ministry is holy, set apart for its particular calling. The holiness of life that is required of the Church's ministers is "a wholesome example" of godly life to the flock of Christ. The Church is so ordered that the Holy Spirit may sanctify our sinful lives and direct our fal-

tering steps, as we are being made ready to come into God's presence.

> The Church's ordained ministry is one; one with the Church of the apostolic age; one in faith and doctrine; and one in continuous ministry wherever it has been established. In Christ, we are all baptised into one body, and the diversity of gifts of the many members of that body is recognised as essential both in building up the body and in ministering to God's people in his name. The Church's ordained ministry articulates and serves the Church's unity.
>
> In each of these aspects of the Church's ministry, Christ's mission is the fundamental and unifying reality. Christ's ministry and mission turn the Church outwards towards the world that God so loved that he sent his only Son. And they prepare the Church for that goal and end of all things, when Christ himself will present to the Father a world made perfect by his work, when all his people share in the joyful communion of love which binds the Father and the Son, in the unity of the Holy Spirit.[21]

What does the rite of ordination say about the church and its ministry? While the way in which an ordination is celebrated can make it look as if the bishop is setting some of the people of God apart from the community of faith and transmitting to them a distinct "power," ordination is the act of the whole community presided over by the bishop. The Anglican view is that ordination not only publicly authorizes a particular member of the community of the baptized to bear a representative responsibility, but also constitutes the church as the ordered expression of the divine life. Ordination is making a visible focus in a particular person of something that is (or should be) generally true of the call of all the baptized. While all disciples are called to minister, not all are called to be public, representative ministers.[22]

There is only one ministry, and that is Christ's. Ordination as a ministry makes visible in a particular person a distinctive call to the universal ministry of the church. Ordination makes clear that those ordained have a particular authority to minister in Christ's name within the baptismal vocation of the Body as a whole. The rehearsal of a series of stages in a candidate's development in response to the church's call is articulated by each rite: by the candidates' presentation, by their public examination and the assembly's assent to their ordination, by their visibly exercising the formal responsibilities of the ministry into which they have been ordained, by being equipped with the distinctive symbols of office, and by returning the candidates (authorized and acknowledged) to the communities in which they will exercise that universal ministry.

But ordination is more than articulating publicly what the church is doing. In an ordination it is God who empowers his people and orders his church. The sign of the candidates' incorporation into Christ's whole ministry that is

What does the rite of ordination say about the church and its ministry?

common to all ordinations is prayer with the laying on of hands. The ordained, of whatever order, hold before the church his entire representative and inclusive ministry.

Within this total ministry of the whole church each order highlights a particular aspect of Christ's work from which the more functional distinctions are derived. Just as the liturgy of the church celebrates the whole work of Christ each time it is celebrated—but yet we need Advent and Ash Wednesday, Christmas and Easter, Good Friday and Pentecost to sharpen our focus on different aspects of what God has done for us in Christ—so the different orders hold before the whole church different aspects of Christ's work to remind us and encourage us all to engage with continuing his work of salvation. The distinctive ministries of deacon, priest, and bishop focus what God has done for his people and give shape and direction to our longing to use our gifts in his service. The personal witness of each deacon, priest, or bishop holds before the whole church both an ecclesial and a social dimension of their witness.

The diaconate focuses God's direct and personal engagement with us, his sharing our nature in Christ's incarnation, his being rooted in the particularity of time and place. This rootedness opens the door to a ministry of attention, service, and the brokering that goes with the concept of Christ as the "agent" of God. If Christ is the "deacon of God,"[23] then the deacon is one who is commissioned to undertake a specific task. At the heart of this incarnational ministry is attention to people's needs, wherever they are.

The priesthood focuses what St. Paul describes as "the upward call of God in Christ," the reconciling, redemptive action of Christ's perfect self-offering on the cross. This sacrificial movement of response to a God who "calls us out of darkness into his marvelous light" sets redemptive change at the heart of the sacramental ministry of the priesthood. Movement and change are central to the paradigm of a missionary priesthood, but never at the expense of that unity with one another and with Christ and the one sacrifice offered at the one altar.[24]

Episcopal ministry embraces both diaconal and priestly ministry, but the distinctive focus of this ministry is pastoral oversight and apostolic challenge and mission. The mission

of the Twelve, and of the seventy, prefigures the distinctive Pentecostal mission of the church. The nature of the apostolic ministry is to engage God's people in this process of engagement and transformation and to make sure that this pattern is handed on. That is why episcopal ministry is focused liturgically in those occasions like baptism, ordination, and the ratifying of initiation in confirmation. Those are celebrations where baptized Christians who have recognized God's claim on their lives begin to take adult responsibility for sharing in the church's apostolic mission and ministry and its prophetic witness. It is here that the bishop's ministry as the focus of unity and the agent of communion with other parts of the church is given expression.

None of this implies that bishops are the only ministers engaged in the Pentecostal task: it is clearly shared with other ministers and with the priestly people of God. But it is the bishop's responsibility to see that the church is Pentecostal and apostolic, engaged in holding together the diversity of gifts in a way that builds up the Body in its witness to the world. Nor does it imply that this is all that the bishop does. The bishop is as much engaged as anyone else in the processes of engagement and transformation. But it is the bishop's responsibility to see that the whole church is engaged in that process, too, and to lead the church out from the safety of the sheepfold to engage in its mission to everyone.

This sense of overlap is true of the other orders too. The diaconate is not an inferior order where deacons never find themselves engaged in distinctively priestly or apostolic tasks; it is simply that the diaconate has a responsibility to remind the whole church to engage with reality first, before attempting to transform—or more properly, to let God have the opportunity to transform—our lives. Diaconal ministry undergirds everything else, which is why the church needs to have this held before it by ministers who have this distinctive responsibility. The diaconate cannot be merely a probationary period for the priesthood. It is a ministry in its own right and has an integrity of its own that needs to be respected, even for those whose ultimate vocation to the priesthood has been recognized.

Whatever may have been alleged about former ordinals, the recently revised ordination rites in the Church of England[25] (on which liturgists and theologians from other churches were invited to comment at every stage of their development) cannot be judged to lack doctrinal seriousness, liturgical scholarship, or ecclesial clarity.

8. Pastoral Rites

Those responsible for the revision and celebration of the pastoral rites of the churches have learned much from studies in social anthropology and psychology over the past century. A funeral rite, for example, may have only a bare hour in which to chronicle the stages of a person's life, to set that alongside the story of God's redemptive activity, to celebrate the real possibility of transformation in the resurrection (whether the Eucharist is celebrated or not) and to end with an appropriate leave-taking and commendation before the committal of the body to its resting place.

"Staged rites," a phrase that is common parlance in the ecumenical community of liturgists, are as much a part of the rites of burial as they are of the rites of initiation, marriage, childbearing, and sickness and recovery. In every case it is important to recognize the way the church's liturgy attends to moments of change, growth, and development—whether in the lives and deaths of individual people, families, or church communities.

Common to all is this recurrent sense of the church's presence in helping people face, grow through, and celebrate the processes of change. Change is, after all, the essential ingredient of being alive, and the Christian faith, in the face of a world almost obsessively interested in anti-aging creams, healthy eating, and gyms, ought not to be ashamed of a Gospel of death and resurrection. "Change your mind" (as the commonest imperative in the New Testament—μετανοιετε) would now be translated in preference to the old-established (and somewhat old-fashioned sounding) "repent" and could as well be translated as "get a life." At each of these moments of significant change there is a process to be gone through—of which people, however much they know they shouldn't be, are naturally afraid. Growth involves pain and the shedding of old and much loved skins or husks if the grain of wheat that is sown in the dark, damp earth is to spring into life.

At many of these points of change and decision (though not all) the church has sacraments to celebrate, and a large part of any priestly ministry is to stand with people and celebrate those sacraments of change with them. Where there are no traditional sacraments to celebrate, people are remarkably adept at finding sacramentals—para-liturgies that address their needs and offer an opportunity of marking such moments of transition. The churches could learn more from the Judaic tradition we abandoned when the Christian church professionalized the sacramental as well as the teaching ministry of the church and drew it away from its roots in Jewish household and family life. What is beginning to be recovered is a sense that in every moment—even in the face of human disaster, terrible inhumanity, and death itself—the Jewish tradition of finding something for which to bless God remains paramount.

9. Daily Prayer

True common prayer is even more fundamental to the well-being of the church and the phenomenon of groups of people—often without being dependent on an ordained minister to lead them—gathering to pray the Daily Office is one of the more remarkable growth points of our age. When an experimental Office Book (*Celebrating Common Prayer*) was produced in England in conjunction with the Franciscans in 1992, the publishers were amazed to sell more than 40,000 copies. That book paved the way to a pattern of praying the Daily Office that drew as much from the tradition of the "cathedral office" with a simple structure of praise, word (selective psalmody, seasonal canticle, and brief reading) culminating in a Gospel canticle, and then prayer, concluding with a collect and the Lord's Prayer as it did from the "monastic" pattern Cranmer developed with its recitation of the whole Psalter in a monthly cycle and a Lectionary designed to read the whole of the New Testament twice and the Old Testament (most of it) once in the year. This pattern, closer to the revised office in the Roman Rite, has now been embedded in the official provision for *Daily Prayer*[26] in the Common Worship set of volumes for the Church of England, and has also appeared in various pocket forms such as *Celebrating Daily Prayer*[27] which gives the worshiper all that is needed to celebrate the Office in a compact form.

Structurally, this volume preserves the layout of *Celebrating Common Prayer*, which means that the form for Morning and Evening Prayer for each day of the week in Ordinary Time over a seven-week cycle is also the form used each week during each of the seven principal special seasons of the church's year. This dovetailing of seasons with days of the week means that the book can be much more compact. The psalms chosen (more than two thirds of the Psalter) are printed in the place where they are recited, as are the canticles (one for Ordinary Time and one for the Season). The bulk of this book, therefore, contains the seven-fold pattern for Morning and Evening Prayer. In addition, there is the Angelic Salutation (traditionally used at midday) and Night Prayer (Compline) at the very end of the day.

These four points of prayer that shape the day each have a canticle from the early chapters of Luke's gospel as their invariable climax. In Morning Prayer it is *Benedictus*, the Song of Zechariah, who looks forward to the birth of John the Baptist, the herald of God's kingdom. As we pray the *Benedictus* we are tuned in to expecting God to act in the day that lies ahead. As we step into that day, we are to be alert to the angel tapping us on the shoulder inviting us to participate in bringing God's will into being. Reciting the *Angelic Salutation*, even if we only do it once a day, is a reminder to us to say yes to God, as Mary did when the

True common prayer is even more fundamental to the well-being of the church.

world's salvation hung on her response to Gabriel. And then, at the end of the working day, as we look back on its achievements and failures, we sing the *Magnificat*, the Song of Mary, at Evening Prayer. Praising God for turning the world upside down brings the challenge back to us personally: have I taken my part in casting down the mighty from their thrones or filling the hungry with good things? Only as we go to bed can we set aside the burdens of the day as, with old Simeon, we pray *Nunc Dimittis*: "Now, Lord, you let your servant go in peace." At Night Prayer we hail Christ as the light of the world and hand the world back to God, knowing that somewhere else the dawn is bringing on another day and that the voice of prayer is never silent.

Centering the day around these Lukan canticles is what, more than anything else, gives the person who prays the Office a sense of participating in the continuing work of God. At the heart of our life is a structured pattern that draws us into that daily celebration of the Incarnation, of a God who in Christ shares our life in order to change it. The pattern that is celebrated in the liturgical year between Advent and Candlemas is rehearsed daily, and that mindset of attending to what God is doing as well as to what he has done is reinforced by the constant repetition of that pattern.

These are patterns of prayer that help celebrate the rhythms of a life lived under God, and that is what many people are finding encouraging in praying these kinds of patterns. Across denominational boundaries Christians are discovering the value of being formed according to the mind of Christ together by praying the same psalms and canticles and reading the same passages of Scripture daily as well as weekly in the Sunday Lectionary.

10. Conclusion

In the end it is by sharing in this prayerful formation that the unity that Christ longs for his church will be realized. Theologians and bishops may continue to find their identity in the assurance that they are right and those who think

differently are mistaken, but in the end it is the people of God who are taking these matters into their own hands and finding their unity of heart and mind in Christ by being caught up into his one prayer to the Father. Where that happens across denominational boundaries (as in the ecumenical community of Bose in North Italy, for example) there is a glimpse of what God's future might be like.

1. For nineteen years Bishop Stancliffe was a member (and for twelve of them chairman) of the Church of England's Liturgical Commission and oversaw the revision of the current rites of the Church of England, published as *Common Worship*. He is a member of *Societas Liturgica*, was an Organ Scholar, and remains a practicing musician, conducting a number of concerts each year with period instruments including regular performances of the Bach Passions and the Monteverdi Vespers of the Blessed Virgin Mary (1610) in St. Mark's, Venice, to celebrate the millennium. He was formerly provost of Portsmouth where he supervised the completion and reordering of the cathedral, and is a teacher and author of a number of books including *God's Pattern* (2003), *The Pilgrim Prayer Book* (2nd edition, 2007) and the *Lion Companion to Christian Architecture* (due October 2008).
2. Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B., *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style* (New York: Pueblo, 1982; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990).
3. See David Stancliffe, *God's Pattern: Shaping our Worship, Ministry and Life* (London: SPCK, 2003).
4. The Preface to the Declaration of Assent is printed in full on page xi of *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (Church House Publishing, 2000, and available electronically).
5. *Common Worship* is published in the following seven volumes:
   Services and Prayers for the Church of England (2000): the basic volume, with what is required for Sunday worship: the Eucharist, Morning and Evening Prayer for Sundays, Baptism, the Calendar, Lectionary, Collects, Psalter, and some Canticles.

   Daily Prayer (2005): the Office Book, with orders for each major season as well as Sunday to Saturday in Ordinary Time.

   Christian Initiation (2006) including Rites on the Way, Baptism and Confirmation, Rites of Affirmation: Appropriating Baptism, Reconciliation and Restoration: Recovering Baptism.

   Pastoral Services (2000) including Wholeness and Healing, including Ministry to the Sick, Marriage, Emergency Baptism, Thanksgiving for the Birth of a Child, Funerals, including Ministry at the Time of Death.

   Ordination Services (2007) including the 1662 Ordinal and an introduction and commentary designed to set out the church's theology of ministry in the wider context.

   Times and Seasons (2006): the *Temporale*, or resources for the Christian Year.

   Festivals (2008): the *Sanctorale*, or resources for celebrating saints days and lesser festivals.
6. Wheatly has a remarkably full title: *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England wherein Liturgies in general are proved lawful and necessary, and an Historical Account is given of our own: The several Tables, Rules, and Kalendar are considered, and the seeming differences reconcil'd: All the Rubrics, Prayers, Rites, and Ceremonies are explained, and compared with the Liturgies of the Primitive Church: the exact Method and Harmony of every Office is shew'd, and all the material Alterations are observed, which at any time have been made since the first Common Prayer-Book of King Edward VI with the particular reasons that occasioned them* (Fourth Edition, Charles Wheatley, MDCCXXII).
7. Tractarians: a movement in the Church of England (also called the Oxford Movement) whose aim was to reintroduce a more catholic theology and practice to a church that was in danger of becoming Erastian. It was so-called after the series of "Tracts for the Times," the final of which, Tract 90, led its author John Henry Newman to leave the Church of England for the Roman Catholic Church.
8. *Ut unum sint*, the Papal Encyclical *On Commitment to Ecumenism*, 25 May 1995.
9. In his Bampton Lectures, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (Mowbray, 1954) Professor H.E.W. Turner ends his second lecture (examining Walter Bauer's thesis that Rome occupied a central role in determining and upholding orthodoxy) with these magisterial sentences: "For orthodoxy resembles not so much a stream as a sea, not a single melodic theme but a rich and varied harmony, not a single closed system but a rich manifold of thought and life. And that is after all what we should expect, for it is essentially the human expression from age to age of the truth of the One God, Father Son and Holy Spirit. ..." The theme is picked up by Rowan Williams in his essay "Does it Make Sense to Speak of a Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy?" in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed Rowan Williams (C.U.P., 1989).
10. The Porvoo Common Statement, Council for Christian Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England, London, 1993.
11. The Moscow Agreed Statement (Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussion) 1976.
12. See Stancliffe: *God's Pattern*, especially pp. 14-20.
13. George Herbert's poem "Love III" is the last in The Temple, and draws its imagery from the lovers' banquet in the Song of Songs (2:4) and Psalm 23:5 in the Old Testament, Luke 12:37 (the Lord serving those who sit at meal) and Revelation 3:2 ("I will come in to him and eat with him, and he with me") in the New Testament, and the Prayer of Humble Access in the Prayer Book.
14. *The Eucharist Makes the Church* is an insight by Henri de Lubac and is used as the title of a book by Paul McPartlan (T&T Clarke, 1993) on the relationship between de Lubac's key assertion that the church is most truly itself when it is celebrating the Eucharist and John Zizioulas' insight that the nature of the church is most fully defined as communion.
15. For the emergence of these patterns in the Church of England see *On the Way: Towards an Integrated Approach to Christian Initiation* (GS Misc 444) (Church House Publishing, 1995, 1998).
16. This description of a contemporary baptism and confirmation rite is based on *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (Church House Publishing, 2006). Common Worship is the collective title given to the volumes that make up the new liturgies and prayers of the Church of England from 2000 onwards.
17. *Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults*, study edition (Chicago: LTP, 1988).
18. Dominic E. Serra, "The Blessing of Baptismal Water at the Paschal Vigil: Ancient Texts and Modern Revisions," *Worship* 64/2 (March 1990).
19. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Mystagogical Catecheses* II.4; these words are inscribed round the rim of the substantial cruciform baptismal font in Portsmouth Cathedral.
20. *Saepius Officio* (February 1897) was drafted by the then Bishop of Salisbury, John Wordsworth, based on the work done before his death by Edward Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury when *Apostolicae Curae* was received. The text is available in an English translation electronically; the only comment that has ever been reported is that of a Curial cardinal who said that it was written in extraordinarily good Latin!
21. Introduction by the House of Bishops to *Common Worship: Ordination Services* (Church House Publishing, 2007) 4-5.
22. See John N. Collins, *Are all Christians ministers?* (Australia: E.J.Dyer, Pty. Ltd., 1992).
23. See Ignatius, Trall. 3:1 and Mark 10:45.
24. See Ignatius, Magn. 7.
25. *Common Worship: Ordination Services* (Church House Publishing, 2007).
26. *Common Worship: Daily Prayer* (Church House Publishing, 2005).
27. *Celebrating Daily Prayer*, compiled by David Stancliffe (the most recent version of the Pocket Version of Celebrating Common Prayer, originally published in 1994; Morehouse/Continuum, 2005).