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Introduction

The context which has provoked the interest in the question which forms the title of this study is parochial ministry in the Church of England. The ministry of a parish priest leads them into pastoral conversation with opportunities for teaching and learning. They meet with people seeking the ministry of the Church at times of ill-health, when considering baptism, and in many other contexts. Frequently in these conversations, and particularly in the context of baptismal preparation, the language of evil, and a discussion about the reality of that evil, arises. Sitting, as the author has, in dozens of living rooms and kitchens in three ministerial contexts, suburban, rural and now a cathedral context, whether chatting over a cup of tea with a mum and dad planning a christening, or sitting at the bedside of the dying and reflecting with them on their illness, it becomes apparent that the liturgy is not doing everything it could to make these questions navigable.

Not only are these questions profound and important in themselves, but they have, over the past 25 years or so, also been raised in the context of changing liturgical provision. The Alternative Service Book 1980 (ASB) reached the end of its period of authorisation in the year 2000 and, over the previous five years or so, the Church of England had been drafting and refining the texts which would end up being published as *Common Worship* (CW). The changes in the liturgical forms, and the wealth of new resources which had not existed in ASB, spawned a number of conversations about the reality and nature of evil, and the person and place of the devil. Whilst many of these conversations took place around the same kitchen tables as the baptism preparation visits, they took place also on the floor of General Synod and in Liturgical Commission and Revision Committee discussions.

The final contextual element in the formulation of the title question of this study is the author’s period of time serving as Bishop’s Adviser on the Ministry of Deliverance in the Diocese of Gloucester. This ministry brings the minister into close contact with those who consider themselves to be under specific and personal attack by the power of evil and, very often, by the devil himself.

In all these contexts the questions which recur are those around how, when and to what extent ‘evil’ acts upon either an individual, a family, or a place, and just what the reality and the power of that evil might be. Whilst these are of course fascinating theological
questions, in the pastoral contexts outlined above they are also personal, pressing and sometimes urgent questions in terms of the well-being of the people involved. It is out of this coincidence of liturgical, theological and pastoral contexts that this study asks its various questions.

The Church of England provides a number of statements in its liturgical formulae about things and persons from which one might need to turn away during the course of the Christian journey, as well as a number of statements about things and persons which one turns towards. The most obvious and explicit instances of this turning away from and towards are the Decision at baptism, and the renewal of baptismal vows at occasions like confirmation and the Easter Vigil. There are also a number of prayers and liturgical texts which name things which the Church prays for defence against. These prayers, known as apotropaic or prophylactic prayers, recognise the danger inherent in the powers of evil and pray that God will protect the Christian from these powers.

The Church also says a number of things about the nature of God himself, which include assertions of his authority and supremacy; monotheistic and Trinitarian statements; and statements about God’s attitude towards evil, and towards his people. The specifics of this study must therefore be held within a wider conversation about theodicy. Questions of how a Christian believer can make sense of the presence and power of evil in the world in its various forms: sickness and disease; the cruelties visited upon men, women and children by their fellow human beings; or the larger and less defined movements and powers which affect societies and cultures across the world; all of these are common in pastoral conversation as well as in the academy. Squaring belief in an all-powerful God of love with the lived reality of evil remains one of the ultimate questions for a monotheistic belief system at the centre of which is a God to which the faith system wishes to ascribe both omnipotence and benevolence.

Of necessity this study needs to be focused, and therefore many avenues of investigation will be omitted and some questions will remain unanswered. The enquiry here is into theology presented by the Church of England in its liturgical formulae in relation to the devil, the demonic, and evil. What this study sets out to answer is the question, ‘Does the Church of England present a coherent theology of the devil and the demonic in its liturgical formulae?’ What is of interest therefore are the liturgical texts themselves, together with
the surrounding supporting material. This study explores the way in which the participant in a liturgical rite encounters evil in word, action and symbol, and particularly those instances where that evil is encountered in personified form: the devil or other demonic forces. The liturgical formulae in question are those of CW, as the currently authorised and commended texts for use alongside The Book of Common Prayer (BCP). BCP remains authorised in perpetuity and therefore the appropriate texts from that volume will also be referred to. What will be revealed will be what the Church says about evil during its services and how much of that public language finds expression in theology of the devil, or in other demonological language.

It is worth saying something at the outset about terminology. At the points in the study where it is important that clear distinctions are made about the different titles and terms used for various supernatural malign beings, this will be made clear. Otherwise, the terms ‘devil’ and ‘Satan’ should be read as largely interchangeable in the narrative sections that follow. Both, in common parlance, refer to an evil and malevolent supernatural being whose evil is directed against God and his people. Similarly, when reference is made to other spiritual powers of evil, the term ‘demons’ and ‘evil spirits’ ought to be read interchangeably except where specific discussion is made of the differences historically and theologically between the two. In everyday pastoral conversation both of these terms refer to supernatural powers commonly believed to be part of the devil’s realm. Where the different terms used are important theologically, more will be said.

This study will mostly be concerned with the journey of an individual Christian through their life, and therefore will focus upon services of initiation, healing and deliverance where the Church ministers to an individual at points of transition, change or crisis. It is recognised from the outset that the language of evil is used of groups and communities as well as individuals, and indeed is also applied in relation to places. Where liturgical resources exist which discuss the impact of evil upon something other than the individual, these will also be discussed.

This study falls into three parts. Part A (chapters 1-4) contains historical reviews of the liturgical theologies and various liturgies of the Church of England, as well as the methodology for this study. Part B (chapters 5-7) contains the structural analysis which is
the heart of this study. Part C (chapter 8) comprises the theological, liturgical and methodological conclusions.

Chapter 1 is a discussion of liturgical theology in the Church of England. The historical relationship between what the Church of England prays publicly and what it purports to believe is an important one, and crucial for a discussion about whether a theology of the devil and the demonic is perceivable within BCP and CW. Beginning with the Preface to the Declaration of Assent, exploration will be made of the way in which the Church of England describes the relationship between its liturgy and its theology. The place of the “historic formularies” will be discussed, and two examples given of the way in which the liturgy has been appealed to over the course of the Church of England’s history in relation to its theology. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Fagerberg’s exploration of liturgical theology which has been of use to this study in illuminating how liturgy and theology relate.

The liturgical history of the Church of England begins with the first texts of the Reformation period, and the scope for exploration of the liturgical theology contained therein is immense. Constraints of space and a desire for focus mean that it is only the CW and BCP texts which will be studied in any depth here. Chapter 2 briefly accounts for the development of the liturgy of the Church of England, focusing specifically upon the texts concerned with initiation and healing, from The Book of Common Prayer of 1549 through the major reforms of the liturgy up to and including the period of liturgical experimentation of the second half of the 20th century resulting in the publication of ASB. This review will be of necessity brief and incomplete, but it will highlight the major theological and liturgical developments in the areas of the liturgy which concern the candidate’s interaction with the devil, the demonic and evil, and provide context to the more detailed exploration of the way in which CW was born.

Chapter 3 lays out the methodology for the study. A consistent and systematic method of examining the liturgical texts in question will be crucial if a fair appraisal of the Church of England’s ability to articulate theology through those liturgical forms is to be undertaken. The core method for this study is that of structural analysis. Structural analysis as a method

is most fully and clearly articulated by Taft.\textsuperscript{3} Chapter 3 will explore Taft’s methodology, and Day’s subsequent modification of the methodology which is also hugely influential for this present work.\textsuperscript{4} Modifications to their methodology have been made in order to reveal theology rather than the history of a rite. It will be demonstrated that this methodology is a new offering to the field, and has the potential to be of significant use to liturgical theologians in analysing other rites in the tradition. All scriptural references unless otherwise stated will be to the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible (NRSV).

Chapter 4 is brief. It is necessary at some point in this study to catalogue the terminology used for the devil, the demonic and evil in CW. This could have been done as a discrete section within each of chapters 5-7, but in order not to break the flow of those chapters the data have been presented separately. Of particular note will be those liturgies which are not otherwise treated by this study: the Office of Compline (Night Prayer) and the Collects in particular. As will become apparent in chapter 7, the use of names is theologically significant, and so this review of terminology at the outset will be beneficial to the reader when structural analysis is undertaken.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 form the heart of the study. Sequentially the principal initiation, healing, and deliverance rites will be subjected to structural analysis. For the initiation and healing rites the text used will be the authorised CW material, and the method for selecting the particular service to be analysed will be explained at the beginning of each chapter. Deliverance liturgies are more problematic. In the Church of England they do not enjoy the same status in terms of authorisation as the rest of CW. The reason and rationale for this will be discussed both in chapter 7 itself and in the conclusions, and this distinction in terms of authorisation will prove crucial in the attempt to argue for the coherence of the Church of England’s theology. In each of these three chapters scriptural and theological themes pertaining to the rites in question will be identified and the specific liturgical material to be subjected to structural analysis will be delineated. Structural analysis will then be undertaken and reflections upon the material studied will be gathered together and summary conclusions made.

Part C consists of the conclusions: theological, liturgical and methodological. As will be clear by this point, the theological and liturgical conclusions are intimately intertwined, so separating them is artificial. However the separation does allow the conclusions to make a number of specifically theological observations about the way in which the Church of England appears to be working, and then evidence the specific deficiencies in the way in which these theological assumptions are codified in the liturgical material. This study is concerned specifically with the way in which the Church of England handles its liturgical theology in relation to one specific area of doctrine: evil. The theological and liturgical conclusions hold the Church of England to account for the inconsistency and inadequacy of its liturgical theology in this regard. The final section of chapter 8 reflects upon how the methodology developed in this study could benefit the Church of England both in terms of broadening the remit of this examination of its liturgy, and also in terms of using the methodology to pursue different avenues of theological enquiry.
Part A  Chapter 1 – Liturgical Theology and the Church of England

1. Introduction

It is the intention of this study to examine the currently authorised liturgical formulae of the Church of England with the aim of discovering whether or not the Church is able to present a coherent and articulate theology of the devil, demons, and the “powers of darkness.” In order to accomplish this it will first be necessary to explore the Church of England’s understanding of the relationship between liturgical formulae and the official formulations of its beliefs or doctrines. How does the Church understand theology and liturgy to be related? The traditional assumption is that the Church of England’s doctrine is presented in its liturgy; that if one wishes to know what the Church of England believes about something, the liturgical resources are the source to which one would refer. This traditional belief stems from a particular interpretation of the formulation *lex orandi, lex credendi*: literally “the law of praying, the law of believing,”¹ which scholars have interpreted variously, some examples being “the rule of prayer determines the rule of faith,”² or “the law of prayer establishes the law of belief.”³ This study will consider the way in which the Church prays, and the way in which the Church expresses her doctrine, and hypothesise about the relationship between the two. If it is to be argued that liturgical texts are significant in the process by which a Christian community arrives at a set of statements of beliefs, then Prosper of Aquitaine’s formula requires anyone seeking to undertake this type of research to first ask important questions about the authority of the texts which are being studied.

Before this study attempts to define a methodology and to enter into a detailed examination of the CW texts which refer directly or otherwise to Satan, the Church of England’s understanding of the relationship between its liturgy and its doctrine will be explored. The traditional formularies will be identified and a number of the ways in which Anglicans have conceived of the relationship between these formulations and the doctrines of the faith will be presented. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate ways in which

¹ It is noted that *lex orandi, lex credendi* derives from Prosper of Aquitane’s fuller statement, which will be discussed later.
the Church of England has attempted to articulate the relationship between its liturgy and its theology over time, and not to catalogue the entire conversation. To this end two specific examples will be utilised: the Homilies, and the writings known as the Tracts. The intent is to give some account of the way in which the relationship between liturgy and doctrine has been discussed, hence the selection of the Homilies and the Tracts as evidence. It is acknowledged at the outset that these are only two of a range of available examples, and it is recognised also that the Homilies and the Tracts do not share equal authority, the Homilies being acknowledged in the Articles of Religion as having a particular status. Nonetheless, the two examples will serve to illustrate the way in which, in differing times, the Church of England has made its conversation between liturgy and theology.

Following this, available theologies of the liturgy will be examined in an attempt to provide a suitable theological framework in which to formulate a methodology and begin to examine the texts in more detail.

Schmemann, writing from the Orthodox perspective, is content to state that “the early Church firmly confessed the principle, lex orandi lex est credendi.” As stated above, it is largely assumed within the Church of England, though rarely explicitly stated, that this principle holds true for the Church of England also. What follows is a thematic examination of this assumption, which seeks to ask the question: what does the Church of England actually say about the lex orandi, lex credendi? These explorations fall into four thematic areas:

- The first asks the simple but crucial question: what are the historic formularies upon which the Church’s theology is based?

- The second theme explores the presumption of a relationship between these formularies and the doctrine of the Church.

- Thirdly, the warrant for such a relationship between liturgy and doctrine will be examined briefly, under the broad thematic headings of Scripture, Primitive Practice, the Fathers and the Monarch.

---

Finally a specific example of *lex orandi, lex credendi* ‘in action’ will be demonstrated, in the concept of liturgy as a protector of orthodoxy.

After this brief thematic study, the results will be examined through the lenses of some of the available liturgical theologies which might be of use to this study.

### 1.1 What are the historic formularies of the Church of England?

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.5

Upon taking up a new appointment all Church of England clergy affirm their assent to these historic formularies: the Thirty Nine Articles, BCP, and the Ordinal. The Preface to the Declaration of Assent states that the Church bears witness “to Christian truth” through these three texts, which are themselves in some way inspired by Scripture, the Creeds and the Holy Spirit. It ought to be noted that the Declaration of Assent does not afford the status of “historic formularies” to any alternative services which may be from time to time authorised “until further resolution of the General Synod.”6

Identifying and affirming the special status of certain formularies has always been part of the Church of England’s practice. The requirement to swear an oath before taking up public ministry has been in place since 1583, when Archbishop Whitgift’s three articles were first issued. The first of these concerned the status of the Sovereign, the second and third covered the same ground as the current Declaration of Assent in making absolutely clear the status of BCP, the Ordinal and the “book of Articles of Religion.”7 That these formularies’ status was made clear and then protected was important, considering that they were being introduced in a period of considerable upheaval. The Canons of 1604 remained in force until 1964 when they were replaced with a similar form of words.

---

5 Preface to the Declaration of Assent, CW, xi.
6 CW, ix.
7 C. Buchanan, *The Hampton Court Conference and the 1604 Book of Common Prayer* (Norwich: SCM Canterbury Press, 2009), 5 and 57. These directives of subscription subsequently became Canon 36, “Subscription required of such as are to be made Ministers”, in 1604.
BCP, the Articles and indeed the Ordinal have all been edited over the years by successive Convocations, which have sought to defend their alterations, additions and deletions in various ways, a process which will be discussed later when warrant for authority is explored.

Throughout the lifetime of these texts, the question of who has the authority to amend doctrinal texts constantly arises. Each successive monarch’s Act of Uniformity takes pains to establish the credentials for amending the “historic formularies”, and one of the key issues in the Tractarian discussions of the 19th century concerned who had the authority to alter texts which carried the weight of doctrine. The Tracts for the Times, a series of relatively affordable and widely distributed theological publications authored by leading members of the Oxford Movement, frequently argued points of doctrine. Tract 4, ‘Of Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course’ posed this question directly, referring to Canon 36 of the Canons of 1604, and to the section which affirms that “the Book of Common Prayer and of ordering of bishops, priests and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God.” The argument in this section of the Tract, defending BCP against proposed changes, is that if proposals are made to amend texts which carry doctrinal weight, the authority for that action needs to be made very clear. The Canons of 1604 which gave such status to the three “historic formularies” were still in force in the 19th century, and gave the Tractarians their ‘proof text’ for arguing that something which carried doctrinal weight required a special authority for its alteration. The Thirty-Nine Articles also afford status to a number of other documents, principally the Apocrypha and the Homilies. Having established that “the Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: And yet it is not lawful for the Church
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9 The precise details of which will be returned to later in the argument.
10 It is also worth noting here, as will be developed in later chapters, that the official position of the Church of England is that BCP remains, today, the “permanently authorised provision for public worship in the Church of England”, being licensed in perpetuity. CW, ix. All other liturgies are authorised (if they provide an alternative to BCP liturgy) or commended (if they form an addition to that provided in BCP), usually “until further resolution of the Synod”, but sometimes on a time-limited basis. What is the impact for doctrinal matters if seemingly divergent statements are made, for example, in CW and in BCP about interfaith issues, the salvation status of suicide victims, or indeed about Satan, to name a few possibilities? The model of liturgical theology adopted will be crucial, but if BCP remains permanently authorised, logically the status of any other theological formulation expressed liturgically must be deemed to have less authority. All of this will be examined later, but it needs to be stated at the outset.
to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s Word written,” it is then necessary to define
the scope of “God’s Word written”. Of the Apocrypha the Articles note that the Church
does “not apply them to establish any doctrine”. The Apocryphal books are therefore
firmly outside the boundary of what might be appealed to as a doctrinal standard. Of the
Homilies, Article 25 is clear that they are to be taken as doctrinal statements. The Homilies
must be considered also as at least semi-liturgical, because they are set formulations to be
delivered in public worship where no suitably qualified preacher may be found. The
Homilies, the 1547 book largely attributed to Cranmer himself, and the 1571 book
attributed to Bishop John Jewel, technically therefore retain their status as doctrinal
statements of the Church of England today, due to their warrant in the Thirty-nine Articles
of Religion, to which all clergy still affirm their “loyalty”. Throughout the history of the
Church these texts, almost unread by modern Anglican worshippers, have been appealed
to as guardians of doctrine.

1.2 The Presumption of a relationship between liturgy and theology

Having established what the “historic formularies” are in the Church of England, is it
possible to provide examples of Anglican writers attempting to make any statement about
the *lex orandi, lex credendi* in relation to these texts? There is little written which directly
addresses this point. It will be interesting to hypothesise about the reasons for this:
whether it was simply taken for granted that the “historic formularies” existed, and that
they held doctrinal weight, or whether it was just not part of the discussion for most of the
Church of England’s history. There are writings, however, which help to form an idea of the
approach to this subject, largely taken from the Tractarians, and so carrying the weight of
the controversies of that time. Tract 63 states explicitly that the liturgies of BCP are
“traditional depositories of ancient doctrine.” Here a theological point about the liturgy is
made which will characterise the Tractarian argument. An appeal is made to the doctrinal

---

11 BCP, Article 20.
12 BCP, Article 6.
15 Tract 63, *On the Antiquity of Existing Liturgies*. 
statements of the Prayer Book on the basis that they are “traditional”, in other words that they convey teaching which can be traced back into the primitive Church. The significance of this is clear when it is considered that one of the chief arguments of the Tractarians was for a rediscovery of the doctrine of apostolic succession, and an appeal for authority in Church matters to be identified as apostolic and not, primarily, as monarchical:

We are not thence to infer that [the Church] gave, or that she could give, to an earthly monarch, or to his temporal legislature, the right to interfere with things spiritual, with her Doctrines, with her Liturgy, with the ministration of her Sacraments, or with the positions, relative to each other, of her Bishops, Priests and Deacons.16

Whilst Tract 5, above, does not go as far as Tract 63 in identifying the liturgy as a depository of doctrine, it does hold the two together, along with the Ordinal and the Sacraments, as the “things spiritual.”

Conversely, the Homilies contain almost nothing about the lex orandi, lex credendi. The 1547 book makes no reference to such matters at all, and the Second Book, whilst it has things to say about attendance at Church, and the content of church services,17 contains nothing explicit about the relationship between belief and practice. Despite the relative dearth of primary sources, subsequent writers have noted how radical the Reformation period was in the way in which theological changes were delivered to local worshipping Christians through the medium of liturgical reform. MacCulloch comments on the 1548 Order of the Communion, most of which would pass virtually unaltered into the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, “it is worth pausing to scrutinize this first intimation of a revolution in England’s official Eucharistic theology.”18 A change in Eucharistic theology drives a change in liturgical texts, certainly at the level of those compiling them. It is likely, however, that the change operated in reverse at the level of those receiving this new service, on Easter Day 1548. For them the liturgical texts are the change, and the “official Eucharistic theology” is embodied in those changes. MacCulloch notes, “several clergy in Cranmer’s

17 The Second Tome of Homilees: of such matters as were promised, and intituled in the former part of homilees. Set out by the authouritie of the Queenes Maiestie: and to be read in euery parishe church agreeably (2nd ed. in which no. 21 was added) Imprinted at London: In Poules Churchyarde, by Richarde Iugge, and Iohn Cawood, printers to the Queenes Maiestie, 1571, accessed May 18, 2010, http://allsaintsgreenville.org/Faith/Homilies/.
18 MacCulloch, Thomas Cranmer, 385.
own diocese were certainly quite clear that the intention behind the alteration was to alter its theology.”^{19} Here the fluidity of lex orandi, lex credendi is highlighted. A liturgical text can be the issue, and the inspiration, of theological formulation. This important theme will be returned to at the end of this chapter.

The Tractarian period, with its preoccupation with authority and ecclesial identity, produces more attempts to define the relationship between liturgy and doctrine in the Church of England. In the Tracts can be found several specific examples of liturgy being treated as a source of doctrine. The anonymous author of this tract appeals directly to the words of the ordination service as proof of the doctrine of apostolic succession and the fact that the specific wording matters is clear in his statement that the doctrine of apostolic succession is undeniable unless “the words do not mean all that they say.”^{20} Liturgical language is crucial, he argues, “in order to hinder inconsiderate idle language.” In other words, formulations serve to make clear the truths of the faith, and if words become unclear or overly flexible, so does doctrine. Tract 3 is even more emphatic about the status of BCP, accusing those who wish to alter the texts of “unsettling...the mind” of those of faith, and especially of those worshippers in the parish churches who “have long regarded the Prayer Book with reverence as the stay of their faith and devotion.”^{21} Here is a statement which seems to imply that the author of the Tract saw the BCP text as one, and perhaps the most important, support or underpinning of both faith and devotion. It needs to be remembered that these Tracts were reactionary, in other words they were responses to what the authors saw as unstable times for the Church of England, and the defence of the 1662 texts was about Anglican identity. The Tracts go further still, and suggest that because the lex orandi is the depository of a lex credendi which they take to be apostolic, therefore the liturgical forms themselves have in some sense a divine authorship:

Will not the unstable learn from us the habit of criticizing what they should never think of but as a divine voice supplied by the Church for their need?^{22}

When the various models of liturgical theology are examined later in this study it will be seen that on the surface the relationship between liturgy and doctrine can seem to be a fluid one; that they can influence one another. A more thoroughly worked out liturgical
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19 Ibid., 386 emphasis author’s.
20 Tract 1, para 12, Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission.
21 Tract 3, para 7, On Alterations in the Liturgy, emphasis mine.
22 Tract 3, para 17, On Alterations in the Liturgy.
theology helps the student to move beyond the surface. Before this theme of the presumption of the *lex orandi, lex credendi* relationship is completed, more examples of the Tractarian period will be helpful to demonstrate how various are the ways, even within one time period and tradition, that the relationship has been conceived. In Tract 12, the extended metaphor of a conversation between the author and a friend is used to demonstrate a way of doing liturgical theology. The subject under discussion is the orders of ministry in the Church, and in the course of the Tract the doctrinal purity of the Church is ascertained by a study of the liturgy of the Prayer Book, tested against Scripture and tradition:

“You see then, Sir, the next thing I had to do was consult the Scriptures on the subject and, (if it be not too bold in such a one as I to say so) to try the Prayer Book by the Bible.”

“You method was the best possible,” I said.23

This is a fascinating example of theology being done by a clear method of starting with the liturgy as the presumed depository of sound doctrine, and then when concern arises as to the validity of doctrine, testing the liturgy’s soundness against scripture, and then the Fathers. In this instance, Clement, Polycarp and Ignatius are appealed to, and the liturgy is declared to be sound. Tract 27 presents a slightly different method, where Bishop John Cosin, investigating the Doctrine of the Sacrament, uses the liturgical texts in order to generate theology.24 Might it be said that here is an example, in the 19th century, of doing theology from liturgy?

1.3 Warrants for the authority of liturgical texts as statements of doctrine

Four sources are appealed to in order to lend authority to liturgical texts: the Scriptures, the “Primitive Practice” of the Church, the Fathers (the latter two are also referred to as ‘tradition’), and finally the authority of the Monarch, which was significant in the Reformation period and to which authority the Acts of Uniformity bear witness. Treating the authority of the Monarch first, it is useful to note that during the Hampton Court Conference King James “claimed authority to amend the text of the Book of Common Prayer by his own sole action”, appealing to the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth I which,


24 In this case, the Prayer of Humble Access, the Consecration Prayer, the words of Administration and the Thanksgiving Prayer, Tract 27.
bound into BCP, stated that “the Queen’s Majesty may...ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites as shall be needed.” Notwithstanding, when the accounts of the business of the Conference are studied, it becomes clear that the King himself repeatedly appealed to Scripture and the Primitive Practice of the Church over a number of the issues at stake, which included Confirmation, Emergency Baptism, Private Baptism, the use of the Sign of the Cross at Baptism, and the Absolution.

The use of Scripture as a warrant for doing theology is universal, but treated in different ways. Common Worship: Ordination Services (CW: OS) asks the ordinands, “Do you accept the Holy Scriptures as revealing all things necessary for Salvation though faith in Jesus Christ?” This is substantially the same as the questions, slightly different for deacons than for priests and bishops, that appear in the 1662 rite, which asks whether the candidate is “persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?” The Second Book of Homilies makes an appeal to the Scripture as the supreme source of doctrine because it shows most about Christ:

If one could show but the print of Christ’s foot, a great number I think would fall down and worship it. But to the holy Scriptures, where we may see daily (if we will) I will not say the print of his feet only but the whole shape and lively image of him, alas, we give little reverence or none at all.

Interestingly, the Tracts make almost the same appeal more than 300 years later during their argument for the preservation of such liturgical formulae as the Athanasian Creed, and the so called “imprecatory” (or cursing) psalms (psalms 7, 35, 55, 58, 59, 69, 79, 109, 137, 139). Their opponents argue that these, and various other statements contained within BCP provision, should be removed because they don’t witness to God’s love alone being supreme. The Tractarians counter with the argument that texts such as the imprecatory psalms need to remain in the liturgy because the Gospel speaks not only of God’s love, but also of his holiness, justice, zeal, hatred of sin, and such like. Here is a direct appeal for liturgical forms to be honest to the entire witness of the Scripture. The author of the Tract denies that their opponents’ argument is about liturgical forms alone:
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25 Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 12.
27 BCP.
28 Homilies 2. 10.
No;---they dislike the *doctrine* of the Liturgy. These men of the world do not like the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed, and other such peculiarities of our Services.²⁹

The Tractarian movement thus placed a high regard on Scripture, whilst recognising that there were other warrants available to them as well. Tract 8 noted that “there is no part, perhaps, of the ecclesiastical system which is not faintly traced in Scripture, and no part which is much more than faintly traced.”³⁰ Wainwright, a Methodist liturgical theologian whose work will be considered later, refers to this warrant as the test of “origin. Most weight will be given to ideas and practices that go back to Jesus.”³¹ The World Council of Churches introduced the concept of ‘ordo’, largely popularised by Orthodox theologian Schmemann,³² in its writings, claiming a Scriptural basis for the underlying structure of liturgy, and using Scriptural passages as ‘paradigmatic’ of various liturgical units, such as the Emmaus Road story in St Luke as an exemplar of the Liturgy of the Word.³³ Here a model is presented of liturgy as being an outworking of biblical paradigms, and where it seems the witness of scripture is driving liturgical theology in an interesting manner. The World Council of Churches presents a model of scripture as not only being a warrant for the underlying common ‘shape’ of the liturgy, but also that this relationship between scripture and liturgy can provide a way of discussing other types of theology including church order issues such as the appropriate age for baptism, and social justice issues. Here liturgical form, witnessing to fundamental scriptural themes, drives theology.³⁴

Third amongst the various authorities given for the use of *lex orandi, lex credendi* in the Anglican tradition is that of “Primitive Practice”, or the tradition of the Church. In King James’s *Proclamation for the Authorizing and uniformitie of the Booke of Common Prayer to be used throughout the Realm*, printed in the 1604 BCP immediately after the 1559 Act of Uniformity, it is confidently asserted that no fault can be found in:
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²⁹ Tract 3, *On Alterations to the Liturgy*, emphasis mine.
³¹ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 245.
³² Particularly *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* cited earlier, and which will be treated later.
³³ “Towards Koinonia in Worship: Report of the Consultation”, in *So We believe, So We Pray* ed. T.F. Best, and D. Heller (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1995), 6. The reference here is to paragraph 2 of the section which lays out the biblical foundations of the report.
³⁴ Ibid., 8. This is a recent and interesting ecumenical approach which merits more exploration than this chapter can afford.
The Booke of Common Prayer, containing the forme of the publike Service of God here established, neither in the doctrines which appeared to be sincere, nor in the Formes and Rites which were justified out of the practise of the Primitive Church.\footnote{Reproduced in Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 45, spelling author’s.}

Here doctrine is located in the text of BCP, and the form of the rites bears the authority of the tradition. A concrete example of this is found in the discussion about the use of the cross at baptism, which the Puritans were keen to see excised from the text, finding no authority in Scripture for its use. A warrant is sought and, when the Bishop of Winchester suggests to the King that its use goes back to Constantine, this is deemed authority enough for its continual use.\footnote{Barlow’s account of the Themes of The Hampton Court Conference, reproduced in Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 35.} The discussion becomes more interesting still, for then an objection is made that using the sign of the cross might confuse the congregation because a sign, the water baptism, has already been ordained by Christ. The King counters this by appealing to the position of the sign of the cross in the rite, arguing that “no sign or thing was added to the sacrament: which was fully and perfectly finished, before any mention of the crosse is made: for confirmation whereof he willed the place to be read.”\footnote{Ibid.} This is a good example of an appeal both to tradition – the use of Constantine, together with a concern for the liturgical units – the signing of the cross clearly seen here as a post-baptismal ceremony. The King’s argument is from the text to the doctrine, rather than vice versa. Because the signing appears after the water baptism it cannot, by his argument, be sacramental.

The Second Book of Homilies also has a concern for Primitive Practice, or tradition, in a number of the arguments put forth. Two examples will suffice here: the first, where in the discussion of fasting the homilist cites the Fathers to whom he appeals as his first authority as “grounding their determination in this matter upon the sacred scriptures and long continued usage or practice.”\footnote{Homilies 2.4 Usage or practice here refer both to Old and New Testament figures.} Secondly, and even more clearly, when searching for a warrant for the practice of praying to saints, the homilist reaches the conclusion that the liturgical practice cannot be deemed appropriate because “neither have we any commandment in all the scripture nor yet examples which we may safely follow.”\footnote{Homilies 2.7.}

A later example for the appeal to Tradition is by Newman in Tract 2 with reference to the Nicene Creed which provides the proof text for the Apostolic Succession argument of the

\footnote{\textsuperscript{35} Reproduced in Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 45, spelling author’s.}
Tract. The author comments that “this is a tenet so important as to have been in the Creed from the beginning. It is mentioned there as a fact, and as a fact to be believed in, and therefore practical.”40 The Nicene Creed, of course, bears a slightly different authority, being not one of the historic formularies, but the “setting forth” of the faith “revealed in the holy Scriptures.”41 Nonetheless here is another example of ancient and accepted practice being cited as sufficient grounds for authority.

Closely connected to the appeal to ancient practice is the appeal to the Fathers. The Canons of 1604 refer to a warrant of both the Fathers’ writings and the tradition when discussing ordination practice, finding their theology in a combination of “the judgement of the ancient Fathers and the practice of the primitive church.”42 The First and Second Book of Homilies refer throughout to the Fathers as ancient and authoritative sources of liturgical practice. Cyprian is the authority cited for the public celebration of Holy Communion according to the Prayer Book rite, as he gives guidance on how to conduct the rite. The homilist is keen to exhort the listeners to “cleave fast to the first beginning”: another example of early practice being considered best.43

1.4 A worked example of lex orandi, lex credendi in the Anglican tradition

One example of a worked out lex orandi, lex credendi in the tradition of the Anglican Church will be presented in order to demonstrate how part of the Church of England has interpreted its liturgical formulae. This is the concept of liturgy as the defence of doctrine, the “law of praying” strengthening, or undergirding, “the law of believing”. This will be significant later in this study when the introduction of new texts, especially in baptism, is considered. The Preface to BCP, dating from the period of the restoration of both the monarchy and the liturgy, after the Savoy Conference of 1661, makes a clear claim that a

---

40 Tract 2, The Catholic Church.
41 CW, ix. The relationship of the Creeds to the rest of the liturgy will not be treated adequately here. The reintroduction in CW of the ‘Eastern’ or ‘ecumenical’ Nicene Creed which omits the filioque (CW, 140) raises particular questions about how ecumenical concern may have driven theological discussion in the Liturgical Commission. Amongst many questions, one is what constitutes a “suitable ecumenical occasion” for the use of such a creed. Is it not the dream of the church that every Eucharist be the paradigmatic ‘ecumenical occasion’?
42 Canons of 1604, Canon 32 None to be made Deacon and Minister both in one day, cited in Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 57.
43 Homilies 2.15.
strike at the liturgy of the church can be a strike at its doctrine.\textsuperscript{44} It has already been highlighted that years before the compilation of the Preface, the text of BCP and its associated liturgical practices were seen as methods for defending theological precepts. The King’s Commission following the Hampton Court Conference stressed that the purpose of liturgy was to express doctrine clearly, and thus the alterations made to the liturgy were made because there were “certeyne things which might require some declaration and enlargement by way of explanation.”\textsuperscript{45} It is apparent from these texts that the liturgy was seen as having an authority drawn from long use, appeal to the Fathers and, above all, to Scripture. The liturgy could be appealed to in order to ‘shore up’ doctrine at moments when the teaching of the Church seemed to be under threat. Earlier than the Hampton Court Conference, in the Second Book of Homilies the practice of a Rogation-tide walk is cited as a method of demonstrating a theological principle. The homilist refers to the two merits of the practice of a Rogation: firstly to consider the ancient boundaries of the parish, but also as a prompt to worship and thank God for his bounty. Here it is directly suggested that a liturgical action serves to bring to mind a theological truth which is already revealed through the Scripture.\textsuperscript{46} There is no suggestion here that the liturgy is producing any theology, but rather that by the performance of the liturgy pre-existing theological truths are brought to mind and the congregation is led to reflect upon them. This would seem to fall under the umbrella of a theology of worship,\textsuperscript{47} as the theology drives the worship but the worship, none the less, prompts theological reflection in the minds of the participants.

A hundred years after the Homilies were composed, the Savoy Conference provides another clear example of this type of theology of worship in action. This time the issue at stake is extempore prayer, which the Presbyterians were keen to see given legal sanction in public worship. The bishops, in reply, suggest that extempore prayer risks “Idle, Impertinent, Ridiculous, sometimes Seditious, Impious and Blasphemous Expressions” being made in the course of public worship.\textsuperscript{48} The rationale for this is the same argument that the Tractarians will later use: words matter. The liturgy is seen as carrying theological truth which needs to be defended, and permitting extempore prayer risks the doctrine

\textsuperscript{44} The Preface, BCP, viii.
\textsuperscript{45} The King’s Commission, cited in Buchanan, The Hampton Court Settlement, 40. This itself is taken from E. Cardwell, A History of the Conferences and Other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1841).
\textsuperscript{46} Homilies 2.17.
\textsuperscript{47} See the discussion on liturgical theology pp28-9.
\textsuperscript{48} Bishops’ Reply to Exception 7, in Buchanan, The Savoy Conference, 22.
being watered down or, at worst, perverted into blasphemy. The Tractarians pick up on this theme of *lex orandi* as a defence of *lex credendi*, when in Tract 22 an extended metaphor likens the Athanasian Creed to a fence around a garden. Some are arguing that the Athanasian Creed is too problematic to continue to be printed in BCP, and the Tract replies that this Creed is “a fence or bulwark set up to protect the Truth against all innovations and encroachments.”  

Again, this concerns a Creed which carries a different authority to the “historic formularies” but the Tracts pick up on these too, and use the same argument of the liturgy as a defence of orthodoxy. In Tract 5 an even more overt stating of this argument occurs. It is suggested that the historic formularies are a reaction to corruption, as it were a shield or weapon with which to defend orthodoxy. The argument seems to be that we state our faith liturgically when we are required to do so in order to ensure that what we are saying is still the truth. When corruption requires “[The Church] to state the substance of her faith in articles (as was done in AD 1562) or when circumstances appear to require any change or variation either in the forms of her Liturgy or in her general internal government” then Convocation is called and new doctrinal forms, partly at least in the form of liturgical formulations, are produced.  

The Tractarians were quite clear that the argument for changing the texts of BCP were to do with changes in culture, and that the proper thing to do in such instances was not to alter the liturgy, which witnesses to doctrine, but rather to be more robust about preaching and living the doctrine. One example is the imprecatory psalms, which congregants were finding hard to cope with in worship. The Tractarian response to this argument is to suggest that if the psalms are problematic, then the issue is about interpretation of the Gospel, not altering the liturgy.  

Countering the argument that BCP does not permit the Burial Service to be read for a sinner, the argument is made that excommunication be more readily used, rather than the Prayer Book be altered.  

The argument here is for more confident ecclesiology and robust discipline rather than a yielding of the theological ground, which the Tractarians believed alteration of the liturgy would indicate. The liturgical formulae of the Church were the defence against heresy. The fervour of this particular argument, in this particular time
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49 Tract 22, *The Athanasian Creed*.  
50 Tract 5.  
51 Several provinces have, in the 20th century, removed some or all the imprecatory psalms from regular worship. CW does not set them as compulsory at any service in the year. The Church of New Zealand actually excised certain of them entirely from the printed psalter in their Prayer Book. *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1989).  
52 Tract 3, *On Alterations in the Liturgy*.  
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period is summed up in the words, “can you possibly imagine any better method of perpetuating doctrines, than by ordinances, which live on like monuments?”

What is it possible to say at this point? There are historic formularies in the Church of England: the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, BCP and the Ordinal, which bear witness in some special and authorised way to the faith which the Scriptures reveal and the Creeds set forth. There has been a long history of presumption that these formulae bear some close relationship to doctrine, and this has been argued on the basis of appeals to scripture, ancient authorities, long term practice and also to the peculiar and unique position of BCP in the Reformation process and the status of the Monarch. It has also been observed that one specific example of the use of liturgy in the Church of England has been as a defence of doctrine.

Before moving to consider the raft of new liturgical resources produced in the period following the 1960s, and asking what their status in this system of lex orandi, lex credendi might be, some of the available theologies of liturgy will be briefly examined, in an attempt to provide a framework in which to undertake the theological work of this study.

Fagerberg’s What is Liturgical Theology? explores a number of ways in which the relationship between worship and theology has been conceived. He is interested in the degree to which the worshipping community can be said to be producing theology, and the degree to which they are in some way recipients of a theology which already has an existence, independent of the liturgical theatre. He is from the outset clear that the popularising of the discussion of ‘liturgical theology’ has resulted in a diversification of definitions of the term to the extent that “we wonder if the theologians who use the term are moving it on the theological chessboard in the same way, by the same rules, for the same purpose.” It has already been demonstrated, by a brief exploration of the role of liturgical text and action in the post-Reformation Church, that there has been an understanding both of liturgy as a means of protecting, bolstering up or defending doctrine, and also as a source of doctrine. Clarifying this situation is important for the task ahead. Fagerberg wants to separate available models into three broad categories: theology
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53 Tract 32, Standing Ordinances.
54 He draws a clear distinction between ‘worship’ and ‘liturgy-proper’ which will be returned to below.
55 Fagerberg, What is Liturgical Theology?, 9.
of worship, theology from worship, and liturgical theology proper.\textsuperscript{56} These three divisions will be useful in reflecting upon the approaches to the text which have been revealed in the preceding pages.

Theology of worship differs from liturgical theology in two important ways in Fagerberg’s framework. Firstly, the primary locus of liturgical theology is the congregation, the assembly, and not the academic theologian,\textsuperscript{57} the latter being able to reflect upon and observe the theology which is occurring in the gathering of the faithful, but not actually generating the theology. The second important distinction is that, because this liturgical theology is happening in the context of worship, “the subject matter of liturgical theology is not liturgy, it is God, humanity and the world, and the vortex in which these three existentially entangle is liturgy.”\textsuperscript{58} Fagerberg draws a distinction between a system which assumes that liturgy, or worship to use the term he prefers, is something upon which theologians can reflect from some external position such that worship is the topic, and a system where worship is the medium in which theological reflection occurs initially. His argument is, of course, more nuanced than this, and some of the ways in which this is so will be explored.

It has been identified that one of the characteristic ways in which Church of England liturgy has been conceived, particularly by the Reformers, and then in the 19th century by the Tractarian movement, is as a defence of orthodoxy. The words matter because they elucidate, or even confirm, what it is that Anglicans believe. This model would seem to assume that a doctrine pre-exists, which is then given liturgical form. Tract 32’s reference to “standing ordinances which live on like monuments”\textsuperscript{59} seems to assume this type of relationship, where doctrines are “perpetuated” in the same way as Lewis Carroll’s monument in Poets’ Corner perpetuates his existence. The slab testifies to his life, work and the content of his thinking, but he himself pre-existed the slab and was the subject to which the slab later pointed. It is possible that this type of model is what Fagerberg would refer to as a theology of worship. Here theology, doctrine, is taken to pre-exist worship, and worship is reflected upon by theologians. This is not to say that there is not theology contained within liturgical forms, but that although “worship has a theology…it must be

\begin{footnotes}
\item[56] Ibid., 11.
\item[57] Ibid., 12. His term is “secondary theologian.”
\item[58] Ibid., 10.
\item[59] Tract 32 Of standing ordinances.
\end{footnotes}
identified by a theologian."\(^{60}\) Liturgy is deemed to possess a theology, "as one has a body,"\(^{61}\) rather than being theological in and of itself. This is an interesting model to reflect upon in the case of this study. It will be demonstrated that a theology of worship approach was certainly employed, perhaps even simply assumed, by the Liturgical Commission in their work preparing *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (CW: CI), a core text in this study.\(^{62}\)

Fagerberg also wants to identify a distinction between liturgical theology ‘proper’, and what he refers to as theology from worship. This is a subtly different model, where the experience of worship, as well as attention to text, can be deemed to produce theological insight. At first glance this might seem to come closer to Fagerberg’s definition of liturgical theology, because it acknowledges that experience of worshipping is crucial in the enterprise. Both Fagerberg and Kavanagh,\(^{63}\) writing from the Roman Catholic perspective, are convinced that the worshipping life of the community is fundamental to liturgical theology, but they would not describe their model as one of theology from worship because it still does not invest the liturgical act itself with the identity of being inherently theological. There is still a division between the act of worshipping and the act of being a theologian, or producing something that might properly be called theology. Fagerberg calls on the work of Methodist theologian Wainwright as one of his two examples of theology from worship.\(^{64}\) Wainwright attempts a systematic theology from the point of view of worship, and his fundamental thesis is that the theologian’s task, as one who is interested in doctrine, is to both learn from worship, and also exercise a correcting role upon worship.\(^{65}\) Here a model is outlined which sees the *lex orandi, lex credendi* as far more

---

\(^{60}\) Fagerberg, *What is Liturgical Theology?*, 11.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 73.

\(^{62}\) *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (London: Church House Press, 2006). In a private conversation with Bishop Standliffe, architect of the Initiation Services book, and Chairman of the Liturgical Commission during the period (1993-2005) in which a large part of the CW family was produced, his description of the composition process in the Commission was certainly not one of beginning with a set of doctrines and then crafting liturgy to meet those doctrinal truths, but something much more fluid where liturgy and doctrine influence each other. (Stancliffe per con. 18.4.10). This insight, though of course a personal one, is important because it identifies exactly what Fagerberg is trying to untangle – the connection between personal experience, text and doctrine.


\(^{64}\) Wainwright, *Doxology*. The other example is E. Brunner’s *Worship in the Name of Jesus* (St Louis: Concordia, 1968). He notes when considering this work that Brunner’s thesis is that the doctrine of worship, although identified from worship itself, has to be clarified before worship can achieve its proper end. Thus, again, worship is seen as ‘possessing’ a proper theology.

\(^{65}\) Wainwright, *Doxology*, 3.
reversible: one may and does influence the other. Worship is the place where the faith is at its most discernible and visible, and thus theology should properly start at the point of faith expressed in the liturgical context. He does, however, reserve a role for the academic theologian:

It is the Christian community that transmits the vision which the theologian, as an individual human being, has seen and believed. As a believer, the theologian is committed to serving the Christian community in the transmission and spread of the vision among humanity. Worship is the place in which that vision comes to a sharp focus, a concentrated expression, and it is here that the vision has often been found to be at its most appealing. The theologian’s thinking, therefore, properly draws on the worship of the Christian community and is duty bound to contribute to it.\textsuperscript{66}

Wainwright wants to afford a significant role to the community at worship, and he argues that the Reformers, in their desire to “establish doctrinal control over worship,”\textsuperscript{67} didn’t afford a significant enough place to the experience of worship - what he wants to label as doxology. Wainwright is unwilling to allow the \textit{lex orandi} to exercise ultimate control however, and in his model he sets up a number of criteria by which worship may be judged in order to ascertain whether it may be called upon as a source of doctrine. They appear very similar to those sources which the Reformers, and indeed the Tractarians, appealed to in the arguments outlined above. Briefly, when answering the question, “what gives to the Church’s worship any authority which it carries in matters of doctrine?”, Wainwright outlines three tests: the first is the test of origin – does it accord with the scriptures? Secondly, the test of “spread in both time and space”; in other words, does it have the mark of near-universality?\textsuperscript{68} Finally, does the practice seem to accord with the mark of holiness, or the presence of the Holy Spirit? Wainwright sees this holiness as a fairly practical holiness, noting that “Prosper considered that the holiness of a Church indwelt and led by the Holy Spirit gave authority to its liturgical practice as a source of doctrine”, but suggesting in addition that this indwelling would necessarily produce a holiness of life,

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., \textit{emphasis his}.
\textsuperscript{67}Ibid., 219.
\textsuperscript{68}Ibid., 243. He does note, with regard to “spread” a number of exceptions to this rule, of which infant baptism is the most obvious. We might wish to ally this concept of “spread” to that of authority. If something is used almost universally, might this accord it the authority of the Church? This is certainly one of the appeals the Tractarians have used, as well as the Reformers (consider the argument for the use of the sign of the cross at Baptism at Hampton Court, which was certainly an argument for authority and historical “spread”).
an ethical component, in the lives of the faithful. By setting these criteria Wainwright provides for doctrine to “prune” liturgy, recognising that without the lex orandi the theologian would have nothing to reflect upon, but none the less that that the lex credendi retains the role of playing “a proper part in the shaping and pruning of the continuing primary experience.”

Fagerberg takes issue with this theology from worship, and indeed the theology of worship discussed above, on the grounds that they are both based on a faulty definition of liturgy. Liturgy, he argues, is not something to which one can simply assign meaning: its meaning is evident if the structure of the rite is properly observed and respected. Here an important point is raised which will influence the methodology of this study: the importance of structure. In order to reach this discussion of structure Fagerberg draws a distinction between liturgy as a set of rules and directions, a “frilly, if sombre, expression of faith and doctrine”, and liturgy as leitourgia, the “community’s theological prima...liturgy treated as rite...with what gives the rubrics their meaning and value.” The distinction is important because it allows Fagerberg to dispense with the claims of the scholars of theologies of and from worship that an external theology is required to make sense of, or to correct and direct, worship. If the theology is inherent in the structure of the rites themselves, they do not need an external theology to explain them. The question for this study is whether it is possible to say that there is an inherent structure in the rites of the Church of England which carries theological meaning. From time to time some have attempted to make arguments based on a claim that the structure matters but it is not clear that this has been worked through fully in the Anglican context, and certainly no one has treated the CW texts in this way. The argument is that liturgy, or to use Fagerberg’s term leitourgia, is the primary ground for theology. He references Kavanagh’s description of the Mass as the place where the community continually adjusts to a life transformed by the encounter with God which is the liturgical rite:

This is how liturgies grow. Their growth is a function of adjustment to deep change caused in the assembly by its being brought regularly to the brink of chaos in the presence of the living God. It is the adjustment which is theological in all this.

---

69 Ibid., 245. This comes remarkably close to an appeal to “by their fruits shall ye know them” (Matthew 5:13).
70 Ibid., 21.
71 Fagerberg, What is Liturgical Theology?, 183-4.
72 For example, King James’ claim about the signing with the cross at baptism bore some resemblance to an argument from structure.
73 Kavanagh, On Liturgical Theology, 74, emphasis his.
If *leitourgia*, the liturgical act itself, is the condition for theology, then it can be stated that “the law of prayer (*lex orandi*) establishes (*statuat*) the law of belief (*lex credendi*) and not vice versa.”  

Mention needs to be made here again of the orthodox theologian Schmemann, not simply because he is an influence on Fagerberg, but also because his concept of ‘ordo’ may be crucial to this study once the liturgical texts begin to be analysed. Schmemann writes from the Orthodox tradition, where a physical “Ordo” or book of regulations and ritual exists. Schmemann’s claim is that whilst it is true that this physical Ordo is not a practical tool in modern orthodox worship an ‘ordo’ - a “shape or structure of worship”, the *lex orandi* behind any act of worship - exists, and it is this structure which can be fruitful to the liturgical theologian. His thesis is that the *lex credendi* is “expressed, inspired and nourished in worship”, and the ordo, the structure, is that which provides the “unchanging principle, the living norm, or the logos of worship as a whole, within what is accidental or temporary.” It is the task of the liturgical theologian to identify this ordo. This is intriguing for those who are interested in the liturgy of the Church of England, because at first examination its liturgical formulations have been so often adapted and developed that there is no single ‘ordo’. A comparison of BCP and CW orders of the Eucharist demonstrate this immediately. The question is then whether by careful analysis of the structural units of the rites as they are currently authorised and, crucially, for Fagerberg, Kavanagh and indeed Schmemann, as they are currently prayed by the faithful week by week, theology will emerge? This will be the task of this project, and the manner in which it will be undertaken is outlined in Chapter 3.  

74 Fagerberg, *What is Liturgical Theology?*, 17. Here Prosper’s full formula, *lex supplicandi legem statuat credendi*, is crucial in the argument. Fagerberg uses the image of a house (theology) and its foundation (liturgy). Of course each influences the other, he argues, but the foundation establishes the house, and not the other way around (198).  
75 Schmemman, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 34. He relates an amusing anecdote about the time that “an attempt was made at the beginning of this century (he is referring here to the 20th Century), in the Kiev Religious Academy, to conduct an “ideal” Great Vespers – i.e. one in which all the prescriptions of the Ordo would be observed in full – the preparations for this service took more than a year and involved a tremendous amount of historical and liturgical research”! His point is to highlight how even though it is ‘taken as read’ that all Orthodox services confirm to the Ordo, in fact they do not.  
76 Ibid., 39.
Fagerberg’s concept of liturgical theology is firmly grounded in concrete liturgical structures. It is this examination of the structures (‘Ordo’, in Schmemann’s model)77 which is the ground for the secondary liturgical theology, or “the study of liturgical theology” which is what he labels studies such as this one, and indeed all secondary reflection on the primary liturgical theology which occurs within the structure, movement and shape of the liturgy.78 He cites the example of his own teaching, where he encounters young people who have sat through the baptismal service dozens of times, but have no baptismal theology because, he claims, “they have not seen a baptismal theology epiphanized.”79 Given that this present piece of research emerges out of the experience of the author asking countless parents and godparents,80 “Do you reject the devil and all rebellion against God?”, and wondering whether any of those present (minister, godparents, congregation or invited guests) could articulate just exactly what was being asked of them, this insight from Fagerberg’s comprehensive survey of liturgical theology seems helpful indeed.

It would seem that the key to finding a model of liturgical theology such as this one lies in recognising the structures of the rite, whilst recognising that it is in the performance of the rite that meaning is transacted. To observe the rite as words on a page, distinct from the liturgical performance is to “stop the spinning top”, whereas, as Taft puts it, “the only way to understand a top is to spin it.”81

It will be the work of this study to keep the ‘top’ of CW spinning whilst examining its structures in order to attempt to make the meaning, the liturgical theology, evident. It is hypothesised that when this fails to be the process by which liturgical theology is done, and meaning ceases to be evident through worship, secondary theology, abhorring the vacuum, will ascribe alternative meanings to the texts.82

77 And, as has been seen, one that is re-emerging in Protestant and ecumenical circles as well, as the brief examination of the World Council of Churches document So we believe, so we pray demonstrated.
78 Fagerberg, What is Liturgical Theology?, 10.
79 Ibid., 188.
80 My curacy was served between 2005 and 2008 in a large suburban Anglican parish in Gloucester where baptisms occurred at least once a month, in the main act of Sunday worship.
81 Taft, Beyond East and West, 192.
82 Fagerberg, What is Liturgical Theology?, 180.
Chapter 2 – Liturgy in the Church of England: The Pre-Common Worship Position

Liturgical forms often arise out of debate and discussion over theological truths, but sometimes the reverse is true, and widely held theological beliefs are formed by texts which are used regularly. This chapter sets out the official position of the Church of England, as evidenced by its liturgy, in the century prior to the production of CW.¹ This chapter provides a brief commentary on the development of liturgical formulae in the Church of England which make reference to the demonic, from the time of the Reformation in England and the production of The Book of Common Prayer 1549 (1549) through until the publication of ASB. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to enter into detailed liturgical analysis of all the intermediate texts, and other authorities have already done so.² The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the liturgical units in the rites which made reference to the devil, demons, or evil in its various forms and titles. These texts will be discussed, and the theological traditions which inform them will be highlighted. The hope is that when CW is discussed in more detail later in this study, sufficient background will have been provided for the texts of CW to be considered as texts not created in a vacuum but as products of a Church which has, over the course of history, re-examined its liturgy in the light of the theological and liturgical challenges of each new generation.

The scope of this chapter must be delineated. No attempt will here be made to provide detailed commentary upon the Collects. These will be dealt with elsewhere. No para-liturgical material, for example, house blessings or deliverance liturgies which did not appear in the authorised service books of the Church of England, will be addressed; again, these will be treated elsewhere. Finally, as the focus of this study is CW, no detailed comprehensive theological analysis of the books preceding the publication of the CW library will be included, except where referring specifically to parts of the rite which address the devil or the diabolic in some way relevant to this study.

The Church of England’s official liturgy from the Reformation onwards took the form of successive editions of BCP, the first authorised for use from 1549, and the last authorised

¹ Here the term refers to the entire Common Worship library of liturgical resources, which began with the publication of the authorised edition of Common Worship: Initiation Services (CW: IS) in 1998.

² See the very helpful summaries in the texts referred to in this section, and especially the works of Kelly, Jasper & Bradshaw and the Liturgical Commission.
from 1662. The use of these texts was interrupted by political and devotional changes brought about by changes in the monarchy. Nevertheless, when the Church in England was not using the Roman Rite, as under Queen Mary (1553-1558),\(^3\) or the *Directory for the Public Worship of God* (Westminster Directory) (1645-1660)\(^4\), it was using one or other of the forms of BCP. In the 20th century, in an atmosphere of renewed desire to address the authorised liturgies and in the wake of the ultimately unsuccessful attempt to authorise a new version of the Prayer Book in 1927/8\(^5\) (1928), a variety of experimental or ‘alternative’ services were authorised for local use, or for limited periods, until ASB was published in 1980.

1549 drew heavily on the rites that had preceded it in English use, and was modelled particularly closely on the Use of Sarum. The initiation rites included *Of Baptisme, bothe publique and private* and *Of Confirmacion*, following the basic liturgical shape of the Sarum rite, itself a development of a pattern which originated much further back in the history of the Church. Kelly’s important work in this area\(^6\) provides a detailed liturgical analysis of the development of initiation liturgy from the early Church through until the 20th century reforms both in the Protestant Churches and in Rome, but predates the liturgical innovations of the 1970s and 1980s in the Church of England, which will be the main focus of this chapter. Phillips, in his much briefer treatment of the development of BCP initiation liturgies, makes the following important observation:

In its essence this initiation has always comprised four elements: (1) the renunciation of Satan; (2) the profession of faith – at first apparently a confession of Jesus as Lord, but later couched in a threefold form corresponding to the Persons of the Trinity; (3) the baptism with water “in (into) the Name of (i.e. into union with)” the Trinity (in the earliest days perhaps “into the Name of the Lord Jesus”); (4) the laying on of hands, conferring the gift of the Holy Spirit – the last an exclusively apostolic or (later) Episcopal function.”\(^7\)

These basic liturgical units are observable in the majority of initiation liturgies, and the concept of liturgical units will be important for this study, as will be outlined in Chapter 3. Within and between these four basic structural units other liturgical elements such as

---

\(^4\) Ibid., 34.
\(^7\) Phillips, *Background*, 122.
exorcisms, exsufflations, prayer, exhortation and catechism are added or developed, and in some cases the order of the units can be rearranged. The significant development which occurs before the period covered by this study is the separation of the fourth element, the laying on of apostolic hands and the invocation of the Holy Spirit. This division was partly born out of necessity - with bishops not being able to be present at each and every baptismal service - and is partly a logical way of ordering the initiation rites when infants began to be baptized. This is the pattern which BCP presents and which has obtained until the present day in the Church of England.

1549 makes almost no reference to the devil or the demonic outside of the initiation rites. Within those rites, however, there is significant language of the diabolic. The rite begins with the baptismal family at the church door, as in the Sarum rite,\(^8\) and the candidate is signed with the sign of the cross, and then exorcised:

\[
\text{N. Receyve the signe of the holy Crosse, both in thy forehead, and in thy breste, in token that thou shalt not be ashamed to confesse thy faith in Christe crucified, and manfully to fyght under his banner against synne, the worlde, and the deuill, and to continewhe his faythfull soldiour and seruaunt unto thy lyfes ende. Amen.}\(^9\)
\]

Of particular note is the retention of the reference to the devil, which continues throughout the reforms of the prayer book. The reformers sought to eliminate elements of the ritual and to simplify the ceremonial actions of the services, but it is clear that they were still driven by a theology of the devil which held him to be a serious threat to the Christian’s life of faith. Kelly notes of Luther, in his reforms in Europe, “[he] at first took over most of the demonological elements of the Latin, since he was firmly convinced of the need to combat the devil.”\(^10\) Whilst some elements of the Sarum rite were removed from this preparatory part of the service – the breathing into the candidate’s face (or exsufflation) being one, and the anointing of the mouth (the effeta) being the other - both exorcism and signing with the cross remain. It is also important to note the structure and elements of the formula in the signing with the cross in the 1549 text because it remains largely unchanged, though heavily debated and at times reworked, through Anglican liturgical reform: firstly, the signing is specifically with the sign of the cross as a significant Christian symbol; secondly, the cross is made in two locations upon the child’s body in the

---

\(^8\) Ibid., 124.
\(^10\) Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 254.
1549 text, as in the Sarum rite: the forehead and the breast; thirdly, that the signing is a “token” of the candidate’s unashamed confession of faith and desire to strive against three things: sin, the world and the devil. It is an apotropaic formula, a claiming of the power of the cross to assist the candidate in the fight against these three challenges to a Christian life. Following this signing with the cross came a Collect, and then an exorcism, drawn from the Sarum sources, with the rubric specifying that the priest “looks upon the Children”:

I COMMAUNDE thee, unclean spirite, in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy ghost, that thou come out, and departe from these infants, whom our Lord Jesus Christ hast vouchsaued, to call to his holy Baptisme, to be made members of his body, and of his holy congregacion. Therefore thou cursed spirite, remember thy sentence, remember thy judgemente, remember the daye to be at hand, wherein thou shalt burne in fyre everlasting, prepared for the and thy Angels. And presume not hereafter to excercise any tyrannye towards these infants, whom Christ hathe bought with his precious bloud, and by this his holy Baptisme calleth to be of his flocke.11

The priest addresses the “unclean spirit” directly, commands it to leave, and reminds it of the fate awaiting it. He also commands the spirit not to return to trouble the infant again, because the child is, by baptism, bought by the blood of Christ and made a member of his flock.

The next significant liturgical unit in the 1549 text is the renunciation, which follows a gospel reading and exhortation (a remnant of the old catechistic unit which would have preceded the baptism itself by at least a day), the Lord’s Prayer and the movement into the church building. Standing at the font, the priest speaks to the godparents and asks them to make the child’s promises of renunciation. The renunciations are, firstly, of “the deuill and all his works”, secondly, of “the vaine pompe, and glory of the worlde, with all the couetouse desires of the same” and, thirdly, a renunciation of “the carnall desires of the flesh.”12 The first English Prayer Book, then, set out clearly that amongst what needed to be renounced in order to proceed to baptism was the devil and his work, which, it is implied by the fact that the renunciations are made severally, is different from the vain pomp and glory of the world and the carnal desires of the flesh. These three are all important, but in the minds of the liturgists they are distinct. Then follows the (threefold) immersion or affusion, and the concluding rites which include the clothing with the white robe (Crisome) and the anointing. There are, however, no further antidemonic or renunciatory formulae

11 First and Second Prayer Books, 238.
12 Ibid., 240.
after the baptism proper, and only one brief mention of the devil in the exhortation to the
godparents to bring the child back for confirmation at the appropriate time.

For those whose experience of initiation rites began with the liturgies of ASB and CW it is at
first surprising to find no blessing of the water in the main body of the text of the 1549 rite.
The tradition in such times was, however, that the water in the font only be changed when
necessary. In some churches the tradition was to leave the water that was blessed at the
Easter Vigil in the font all year, freshening it with salt from time to time. 1549 provides, at
the end of the liturgy of Baptism, a form for the renewing of the water in the font. It
prescribes that this ought to be done at least once a month, and that before any child is
baptized prayers are to be said amounting to a blessing of the water, and prayers for those
who receive the water in baptism. The priest prays that God will “sanctifie this fountain of
baptism”, and that he would “graunt to all them which at this fountayne forsake the deuill
and all his works: that they may have power and strength to have victorie and to triumph
against hym, the worlde, and the fleshe.”13 This prayer of blessing over the waters of the
font Kelly traces to the Roman Rite, but notes an original English usage in the reference at
this point in the service, that is, immediately before Baptism itself, to the water effecting a
triump over both the devil and the flesh, the Roman Rite from which it is drawn only
having a reference here to triumph over the world.14 This, then, marks a significant English
development, right at the point of the Reformation, whereby the water in the font is
prayed over, not simply to effect a transformation in the child’s life at that moment, but
also for apotropaic action in the future life of the child, “thus making it a prayer for victory
over the devil in the future.”15

In the First Prayer Book of the English Church is found, then, an initiation service in which
the language of demons and the devil is prominent, and indeed 1549 introduces some
liturgical references to the devil where they had not previously been found. Where some
ceremonial aspects had been reduced or even eliminated, for the most part the language
remained. In the confirmation service, also, the rubric notes explicitly that confirmation is,
amongst other things, intended to give the candidate the strength to repel the devil’s
advances:

13 Ibid., 245-6.
14 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 256.
15 Ibid.
Secondly, forasmuch as confirmacion is ministred to them that be Baptised, that by imposition of hands, and prair they may receiue strength and defence against all temptacions to sin, and the assaults of the worlde, and the deuill:16

Also of note is an explicit acknowledgement in the catechism of 1549 that the Lord’s Prayer contains within it a prayer for exorcism: “that it will please [God] to saue and defend us in al daungers gostly and bodily”, and for further defence against the demonic powers: “and that he wil kepe us from al sinne and wickednes, and from our gostly enemye, and from euerlastyng death.”17 The authors of this catechism were acutely aware, therefore, of the dangers not only of the body, but also of “ghostly” dangers, and the enemy who coordinates those dangers. They were also aware of the possibility of “everlasting death.”

This treatment of 1549 gives enough background to the development of the Church of England’s liturgies at least to illustrate the world in which its authors felt themselves to be living. It is a world of dangers, some of them supernatural, from which the Christian needed to be delivered, of the lures which the Christian ought to avoid, and against which the Christian needed ongoing defence.

The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552), made significant changes to the liturgies, moving away from the shapes, as well as the rituals, of Rome. Concerning the devil and demons the compilers of 1552 removed the exorcism from the beginning of the baptism service and at the same time moved the entire service into the building so that all the liturgical action took place at the font. New formulae were added which changed the tone of the service from one of personal salvation from the devil’s power to a much more collegiate emphasis upon membership of the Church.18 Significant changes in the positioning of liturgical units were also introduced. The renunciations remained in their 1549 position, again addressed to godparents as the child’s “sureties”, and the wording was not changed although the three questions were conflated into a single question: “Dost thou forsake the deuyl and al his works, the vayne pompe and glorye of the worlde, with al couetouse desires of the same, the carnall desires of the fleshe, so that thou wylt not follow, nor be led by them?”, to which the godparents replied “I reject them all.” Thus the liturgy indicates that a theology of sin which included the work of the devil, the vanities of the world and the desires of the flesh still obtained. The text which had formed the

16 First and Second Prayer Books, 247.
17 Ibid., 250.
18 Ibid., 395.
monthly blessing of the water was significantly reworked and placed after the renunciations and profession of faith, with no rubric indicating that it should be directed specifically towards the water in the font. Indeed it became a prayer for the candidates and, although the petition concerning triumph over the devil, the world and the flesh was retained, the words “Grant to them who at this fountain forsake the devil and all his works” was removed, presumably to expunge ideas that it is the water which affects the defence against the devil, the framers of 1552 wanting to stress the faith of the candidate as distinct from the transforming power of any material species. Kelly argues that what occurred throughout Europe at this time was a removal of “purely dramatic aspects of ritual and a new emphasis on straightforward declaration.”19 There is no rubric specifying how many times the water ought to be administered. Possibly the most significant liturgical change is the translation of the signing with the cross from its position before the profession of faith to its position after the baptism. This is significant not only because it broke with the tradition which had obtained, largely, for the previous centuries, but also for its effect on later Anglican liturgies. As will be demonstrated, debates about the position of this liturgical action and its accompanying formulae will dominate discussions of the revision of liturgical texts through the entire CW process. By placing the signing with the cross after the baptism in 1552 it becomes a prophylactic device, rather than an exorcistic one, and Kelly notes that, although inserting an apotropaic formula after baptism is breaking with Western tradition, there is significant precedent from very early times, where such measures to combat the devil were made liturgically explicit after the water baptism itself.20 Significant changes were also made to the rite of confirmation. The rite was still explicitly stated as having power to repel the devil (the 1549 rubric being retained), but just as in the baptism rite the language was modified and the ritual actions reduced. The signing of the candidate was omitted in the 1552 rite and a new formula introduced, thus breaking the link with Sarum.21

The intermediate BCPs which were either issued or drafted between 1552 and 1662 made only minor changes to the liturgies, and none that are significant for this study. The Book of Common Prayer of 1662 (BCP), which is the ‘default’ Anglican liturgy in the Provinces of Canterbury and York to this day due to its authorisation in perpetuity,22 introduced slight

19 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 256.
20 Ibid., 259.
21Phillips, Background, 125.
22 See Canon B3.
developments to the 1552 liturgy. From the point at which BCP was authorised, any other services for use in the Church of England have been “alternative” services in the sense that they are produced for use alongside, rather than to supersede the Book of Common Prayer. This is an important point because it poses questions about how the Church’s theology is to be understood on occasions where it can be argued that the Book of Common Prayer and other authorised resources, are asserting different, or even contradictory, things about the devil, demons, or other issues of doctrine and faith. This will be discussed in some detail when CW is treated. BCP retained the 1552 Baptism service in almost all details. An additional rubric before the Ministration of Publick Baptism of Infants notes that “to take away all scruples concerning the use of the sign of the Cross in Baptism; the true explanation thereof, and the just reasons for the retaining of it, may be seen in the xxxth Canon, first published in the year MDCIV.” The necessity for including such a rubric in BCP speaks of the unease about ritual actions which had been epitomised in the Puritan period between 1645 and 1660. A small amount of ritual was restored in 1662 but, as the general rubric to the Baptism service illustrates, it needed to be carefully justified. To turn to the detail of the baptismal rite: the liturgy takes place at the font, and an exhortation, Collects and Gospel reading precede the address to the Godparents. At the renunciations the 1552 text is retained but a fourth question concerning Christian living is added. The remnant of that prayer which used to be the prayer of blessing over the water remains unchanged from 1552, but then a prayer of sanctification over the water is reintroduced, asking that God “sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.” Here is a return to the understanding that there is something significant about the material species and, although there is no suggestion of the water being exorcised as in earlier Roman rites, there is the implication that by God’s sanctification of the water it is set apart for some significant purpose. A later examination of the symbols associated with exorcistic, renunciatory and apotropaic formulae will discuss the importance of this in Anglican understandings of blessing, exorcism and other such ritual actions. The baptism follows, once again with no rubric specifying a threefold or a single administration, though the rubric does provide for both immersion and affusion. The signing with the cross remains in its 1552 position immediately after the baptism, and the text remains unchanged stating that the Cross is the token of the candidate’s confession of faith and commitment to

23 BCP. Note that this Canon still exists as Canon B25, “Of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism” where it states that the sign is not part of the Sacrament, but is for remembrance of the Cross of Christ.
24 Ibid., 385.
“manfully...fight...against sin, the world and the devil.”25 All the texts are repeated in the 
*Baptism of those of Riper Years* except, of course, that the candidates make their own 
declarations and renunciations. The 1662 confirmation service contains no explicit 
renunciation of the devil, but rather an assertion on behalf on the candidates that they 
“renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your Baptism; 
ratifying and confirming the same in your own persons.”26 This promise includes, therefore, 
an implicit threefold renunciation which includes the devil and his works. Interestingly the 
general rubric outlining the need for confirmation to be administered as a defence against 
“all temptations to sin and the assaults of the world and the Devil” which was present in 
1549 and 1552 is omitted from the 1662 rite. The confirmation prayer itself is accompanied 
by the laying on of hands, but no signing with the cross, and the formula which first 
appeared in 1552, “Defend O Lord..” is retained. The use of the word “Defend”, if read 
alongside the renunciations which include renunciations of the supernatural realm of evil, 
could be understood as, at least in part, apotropaic. The Catechism, with its assertion that 
the Lord’s Prayer is a prayer of exorcism and defence against the “ghostly enemy”, is also 
retained.27

Tracing the development of the Church of England’s official liturgy from the crucible of the 
Reformation through until the 1662 book, a pattern of a reduction in ritual action can be 
obscerved. Language about the devil is in some cases more muted, but it nevertheless 
remains. The assertion that there is a world of supernatural danger, over which presides 
the diabolic figure, remains to this day in the perpetually authorised Book of Common 
Prayer of 1662. Kelly describes this development as “rational demonology”:

The Anglican service, therefore, became a model of “rational demonology.” Gone is 
the fiction of diabolical possession in the unbaptised, the histrionic fulminations 
against the devil and the unclean spirits, the embarrassing addresses to water, oil 
and salt, and the anointing. There remains nothing but an address to the faithful, a 
subdued prayer or two, a Gospel reading, a simple dialogue involving a calm 
renunciation of the devil and the world, a confession of faith, and a desire to be 
baptised. Then, after the baptism, a discreet sign of the cross on the child’s 
forehead (the oil of the 1549 service has been dropped), and an indirect address: 
“We receive this child into the congregation of Christ’s flock, and do sign him with 
the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the

25 Ibid., 386. 
26 Ibid., 424. 
27 Ibid., 420.
faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner against sin, the world and the devil...”  

This ‘rational demonology’ is also evidenced in the other significant references to the devil in BCP which are found in the service for the Visitation of the Sick. Such services were included in 1549 and 1552, and remain largely unchanged throughout the reforms of BCP. Here sickness is related both to the action of the diabolic powers, and also to “God’s visitation.” The priest prays, upon entering the house, “let the enemy have no advantage over him”, which is clearly a reference to the diabolic, rather than worldly, enemy. The initial Collect in the service also contains the petition, “defend him from the danger of the enemy”, and after the sick person’s confession the Collect asks, “renew in him (most loving Father), whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil.”

1549 included an anointing of the sick person with oil, with prayer for the inward anointing of the Holy Ghost, with prayer for restoration, pardon of sins, and “gostely strength, by his holy spirite, to withstand and ouercome al temptations and assaults of thine aduersarye, that in no wise he preuaile against thee but that thou mayest haue perfit victory and triumph against the deuil, sinne and death.” Such anointing was omitted from the 1552 text, but the remaining texts were retained. In 1662 also is found an early Anglican example of a commendation prayer at the point of death, which petitioned God for forgiveness of sins committed specifically through “the lusts of the flesh or the wiles of satan,” and in the same order a prayer for persons of troubled mind refers to “deliverance from the fear of the enemy”, implying also that fear of the influence of demonic powers was an issue significant enough to require a set prayer at this point.

As the Book of Common Prayer as Proposed in 1928 was never authorised for use in its entirety, its treatment here will be brief. Its importance is in the fact that it paved the way for liturgical reform later in the 20th century, which reform resulted in ASB, the first full collection of Alternative Services in which authorised alternatives to almost everything contained within BCP were, although all authorised separately, offered in one volume.

---
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The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, set up in 1904, noted that the laws around public worship were unsatisfactory and so began a long process of liturgical renewal when the 1662 text was revised and updated with the intention of producing something which would please both those evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics who were dissatisfied with the 1662 provisions. The majority of the debate and discussion, which Jasper and Bradshaw note “dragged on tediously through the years”34, was around the Eucharistic Liturgy, and specifically about the Eucharistic Canon and the reservation of the Sacrament. However the draft book did include alternative versions of Baptism and Confirmation which, while not implying any significant doctrinal changes as regards the subject of this study, did rework the language on original sin in the preface to the baptism service (although interestingly the phrase “original sin” was retained in the Rite for Emergency Baptism).35 The Proposed order for Confirmation included the full renunciatory formulae from the Baptism service, which the candidate for confirmation was to make prior to the laying on of hands. It is interesting that the language of the devil was retained exactly as found in 1662 and that this language caused no concern at all in the revision process. Indeed in the Visitation of the Sick the 1928 text provides an additional suffrage in the litany which reads “from the assaults of the devil, Good Lord, deliver him.”36 Thus the Proposed Book of 1928 actually introduced more language of the demonic than it removed. The revisions were not to be authorised in their original form anyway as the Book failed to gain Parliamentary Assent. The texts were subsequently published privately and used widely, but illegally, for several decades.37 Discontent over the inability to effect any liturgical renewal continued and, after a number of Commissions set up by the Church Assembly (the predecessor to the General Synod) had reported upon options to free up the legislation around publishing and approving alternative texts, the Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure was passed in July 1964. This allowed alternative services to be published and authorised for periods of seven years, with a further seven-year renewal possible. The necessary two-thirds majority was secured in both Houses of Convocation, and the majority of the 1928 book was authorised in 1966 under the title Series 1 (an amended version of Holy Communion was authorised for use). The exact details of this process are laid out very clearly and helpfully by Jasper and Bradshaw in their Companion

34 Ibid., 21.
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36 Ibid., 457 emphasis original.
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to the ASB,\(^{38}\) and by the Liturgical Commission’s own commentary upon ASB,\(^{39}\) both of which documents the author has drawn upon. The import for this study is that for the first time since 1662, there was a new set of services authorised, which included an alternative rite of Baptism both of infants and adults.

Further development came with the Liturgical Commission’s *Alternative Services: Second Series* (Series 2) which also included rites for Baptism and Confirmation, authorised from 1968. There were a number of significant changes within these rites, prominent amongst which was the theological change in the renunciations. For the first time in the history of initiation in the Church of England, the parents of the infant candidate were required to answer the questions which had hereto been addressed to godparents alone. This change in the understanding of how exactly the renuncitory part of the service worked was further emphasised by the new rubric requiring the godparents and the parents to answer the questions on their own behalf *instead of* on behalf of the children.\(^{40}\) This was an unprecedented move as far as Church of England liturgy was concerned and was the result of a number of discussions and of committees meeting to, amongst other things, address the question of apparently unbelieving families requesting the Sacrament of Baptism. At the same time the renunciations themselves were reworded in such a way as to eliminate any direct reference to the devil. The formula which first appeared in Series 2 was to remain in Series 3 and through into ASB:

Those who bring children to be baptized must affirm their allegiance to Christ and their rejection of all that is evil. It is your duty to bring up these children to fight against evil and to follow Christ. Therefore I ask,

Do you turn to Christ?  
**I turn to Christ.**

Do you repent of your sins?  
**I repent of my sins.**

Do you renounce evil?  
**I renounce evil.**\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 20-29.  
\(^{41}\) AS 230, 162.
Two significant changes have therefore been introduced in one section of the Baptismal Liturgy at the point of renunciation: firstly the candidate no longer, even symbolically, renounces anything. The renunciation, in the case of an infant, is made by the parents and godparents alone. Secondly, “evil” is renounced, as well as personal sins, but the nature of this “evil” is not, in the renunciations anyway, specified. The 1928 formula for the Signing of the Cross after the water baptism is retained however, and so “Satan does not lurk under the global designation of “evil” throughout the whole service, since the old formula accompanying the signation is preserved with the admonition to fight against sin, the world, and the devil.”42 Series 2 Baptism was accompanied by an equivalent version of the Confirmation Service which used the same renunciatory formulae.

The use of modern English was also to play a deciding part in the revision of liturgical texts and the liturgical renewals happening in the Roman Catholic Church. The theological reflection coming out of the Parish Communion Movement, as well as constitutional change in Church government and the advent of the General Synod and its legislative system all meant that another group of services, Series 3 was produced, this time in modern (or contemporary) English, which again included a version of the Baptism Service and Confirmation bound into a single booklet with other Initiation services, together with new revisions of almost all the other services offered in BCP. Of these services, Initiation, produced in 1979, concerns this study the most as it continued the innovations of Series 2 which are arguably as groundbreaking as the developments in 1552. Of particular concern to this study are the debates around the renunciations, which have already been touched upon, as well as profession of faith, the use of oil, the signing with the cross, and the re-emergence of exorcistic formulae. Kelly, who is critical of many of the liturgical innovations at this period, ascribes to the liturgists of the time a degree of confusion as to the ceremonial devices being used. He notes that the translation into the vernacular of some of the Roman Rites at this time, under the reforms of Vatican 2, did reveal formulae which were, as he describes them, “embarrassing” when rendered into English.43 The problem of the vernacular had been met, of course, in the Church of England some 400 years earlier, but the Church was now engaging in a move towards contemporary English and there was a belief that ceremony and ritual had to be clearly understandable and accessible. Kelly suggests that the Roman Church was struggling to comprehend that formulas and rituals

42 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 260.
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surrounding exorcism were always intended to be dramatic rather than literal,\textsuperscript{44} and thus, his argument seems to imply, the answer was not, as was often the case, to remove such texts and ceremonies, but rather to present them in ways which would be understandable to the faithful. As this study will set out to demonstrate in the case of the Church of England, it was not clear, in the closing years of the 20th century, whether the liturgies of the Church were presenting ritual and ceremonial ways to understand confidently held doctrines. The change surrounding the way renunciation was handled in Series 2 is a case in point.

The 1979 \textit{Authorised Alternative Services: Initiation} (Series 3) were included in the ASB almost unaltered except for matters of pagination. It was the first time a collection of the Series 3 services were grouped together in a single volume, each service authorised individually for use for ten years, and then re-authorised for a further ten years, covering the period through until the publication of CW. The liturgical innovations in this period of thirty or so years between 1970 and 2000 in the field of initiation, and elsewhere, impact significantly upon the Church of England’s official doctrinal standpoint on the devil and the demonic. A brief review of the discussions around Series 3 and the ASB will illustrate the main issues.

The Liturgical Commission produced two reports, the first, GS 225 in 1975, and the second, which superseded the first, GS 343, in 1977. Both reports addressed the theological and liturgical issues around Infant Baptism, and the second report also treated the other ‘Initiation Services’, which included confirmation, various thanksgivings for children, prayers after stillbirth or when a child dies very young, and forms for the renewal of baptismal vows.\textsuperscript{45} The Liturgical Commission had been asked by Synod to create a new service for the baptism of infants. GS 225 was their report back to Synod at the end of that process, and it highlighted as its main theological concerns the following issues: provision for children who are old enough to be conscious of what is happening but too young to make rational decisions on their own behalf; ‘proxy’ renunciations and professions of faith; the ending of the ‘Decision’ part of the service (that part of the service containing the

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 264-5.

renunciations and the expression of desire to turn to Christ). This report was “overtaken by events,” namely theological discussion in other spheres, and specifically the publication of the *Ely Report* in 1971 which had been discussed in Synod during the time that GS 225 had been produced, and so essentially GS 343 replaced GS 225 as the official report on the Initiation Liturgies which were to end up being bound into the ASB. It is worth noting, however, a number of theological assertions which were present in GS 225 which either become more muted, or are reworked in GS 343. Firstly, concerning the issue of ‘proxy’ renunciation and profession of faith, in other words the liturgical device whereby adults, acting as ‘proxies’, or as “sureties” as BCP puts it, make promises on the infant’s behalf until such time as they can profess, or presumably, reject, those promises themselves. In GS 225, in 1975, the introduction stated:

> From very ancient times it has been the practice of the Church in the baptism of Infants to address questions to children who do not understand them and to credit the children with the answers given by their sponsors. This is the practice of the Book of Common Prayer.

It then goes on to describe the development of theological opinion that parents and godparents ought to be able to answer such questions for themselves in order to be “sureties” in the way that BCP envisaged them. It concludes that “both of these approaches contain elements of value, and...our proper course is not to exclude either of them.” The report does conclude, however, that it would be wrong to provide opportunity for clearly unprofessing sponsors to stand proxy for infant candidates, and asserts that “the proper solution of the difficulty lies in the field of pastoral ministration and not of liturgical reform.” Two things are worthy of note: the first that it is in the field of liturgical reform that this innovation of parents being involved at all in the answering of questions, and subsequently of all the sponsors answering for themselves, has arisen. Prior to the publication of Series 2, this had never occurred in the Church of England. Secondly, the report that superseded GS 225 retained the majority of the previous report’s wording on the issue of ‘proxy’ answering but, fascinatingly, expunged the appeal to BCP, thereby

---
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lessening the weight of argument for the validity of sponsors answering on behalf of the children alone.53

Concerning the actual renunciations, the Series 2 wording was retained, but the introductory words altered to read “Therefore I ask these questions. Parents and godparents must answer both for themselves and for these children.”54 No mention is made of Satan in the renunciation.

The next innovation came with the optional relocation of the signing with the cross on the forehead which could either take place immediately after the renunciations and before the Baptism, or immediately after the Baptism, although in GS 225 this option was not given, the signing being only permitted in its 1662 position after the water baptism. The form of words provided for the signing with the cross was “I sign you with the cross, the sign of Christ”, addressed to each candidate, and then the congregational response, drawn from the text which had been in use from before the 1549 rite:

*Do not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified.  
Fight valiantly as a disciple of Christ against sin, the world and the devil, and continue his faithful soldiers and servants to the end of your lives.*

The implication is that the entire formula - signing, ministerial text and congregational response - is used at the Signing of the Cross, wherever that may be located at the discretion of the minister. This assertion is complicated, however, by the re-emergence in Series 3 of what is to all intents an exorcism. Both GS 225 and GS 343 note that “experience has shown that in Series 2 the Decision comes to rather an abrupt end and needs to be completed with an appropriate prayer. We have accordingly provided a brief prayer.”55 GS 343 goes on to add, “[the appropriate prayer] answers to the questions in the Decision and brings this part of the rite to a suitable close.” The prayer in question is:

*May almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness, and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ. Amen.*56

---
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This is undeniably a prayer of exorcism and so it is worth noting that at this point in the liturgical renewal of the Church of England it was deemed “appropriate” and “suitable” to reintroduce a prayer of exorcism, asking for deliverance from the powers of darkness and to do so in a part of the service which includes a renunciation of evil and which may include the signing with the cross. It is implied by the notes in the Commission’s reports, and by the draft order of service in GS 225, that they conceived of this exorcism being the conclusion to the Decision, not to the signing with the cross, so that if the minister decides to relocate the signing to after the baptism, the exorcism remains where it is, immediately following the renunciation of evil. This is confirmed by the Order of Confirmation published in GS 343 which only permits signing with the cross after the baptism, and before confirmation. Were this not the provision, and the exorcism were to be transferred with the signing with the cross and the congregational response “Fight valiantly...” to after the baptism, then the exorcism would end up being after the baptism. This would make little sense as the Church of England has only ever employed prophylactic rites after the water baptism. If, however, the exorcism remains at the end of the Decision, divorced from the signing with the cross then this confirms that the liturgists at the time intended the signing to have no exorcistic overtones. It would be interesting to survey ministers who availed themselves of the option of positioning the signing with the cross after the baptism, to discover whether they left the exorcism to follow the renunciations or if they transferred that also, to follow the baptism.

The order of Baptism according to the Series 3 rite was, thus, as follows: an exhortation, readings, sermon and congregational prayers, including a prayer to God to “protect [the candidates] from evil” which, if “evil” includes supernatural forces, constitutes an apotropaic formula at the outset of the service. The Decision followed, with parents and godparents answering to the renunciations and affirmations for themselves and the children. The candidates were then signed with the cross and exhorted to “fight valiantly against...the devil”. An exorcism concluded that part of the rite. A prayer over the waters of the font followed, then a threefold profession of faith made by the parents and godparents [and candidates] alone, then an optional congregational creed. Water baptism followed, then the Signing with the Cross if it had not occurred earlier. Then the (optional) giving of a lighted candle, which had been introduced in Series 2, a welcome, prayers and the Grace. The orders were identical for adult candidates, and also for confirmation, where the adults
made the same renunciations and professions as did the infant candidates, but where the formula for confirmation replaced the “Defend” of BCP with “Confirm, O Lord.” 57

A Note on the Use of Chrism appears in GS 343, but not in GS 225. It referred back to the report Baptism and Confirmation of 1958 58 in which both “oil” for use before baptism and “chrism” for use afterwards were mentioned. That 1958 report had not ascertained any real desire for such ceremonies. The Ely Report 59 in 1971 had suggested the use of oil of chrism, and such was the influence of the Ely Report that the redrafted Liturgical Commission Report felt it necessary to acknowledge that the issue of oil had again been raised in Church of England circles. The note simply stated, “The Church of England has not declared its mind on this matter, and we therefore make no provision in this report for the use of chrism. We do not regard the matter as closed, but believe that it ought to be considered and a decision made in due course with a view to possible revision in the future.” 60

There is nothing else in Series 3 which constituted ASB to concern this study. References to the devil and his entourage remained restricted to the Initiation rites, and to the various Collects which will be discussed elsewhere.

ASB was authorised for a period of ten years from 1980. By the 1990s it became clear that ASB was unsatisfactory and that further liturgical revision was required. Notably, Initiation services were amongst the first rites to receive such treatment. While that work took place ASB was authorised for a further ten years. It was in the round of liturgical revision in the 1990s that the Church’s understanding of the devil and his diabolic host was once again debated, and the liturgy of the Church, both officially authorised and otherwise commended for use, entered its next stage of development.

57 Ibid., 25.
59 GS 30.
60 GS 343, 10.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 form the heart of this study and seek to identify the current theology of the devil and the demonic presented by the Church of England. The charge levelled by this study is that this theology is inconsistent and confused. The current chapter lays out the means by which the data required to support this charge will be identified, organised and examined.

The liturgical history of the Church of England has already been reviewed, and a discussion of some of the ways in which Anglican liturgical theologians have approached the relationship between liturgy and doctrine has been undertaken. What will follow is a detailed study of the relevant liturgical texts to test the hypothesis that the Church of England is unable to present a coherent theology of the devil and the demonic through its liturgical formulae.

Sources

This study is concerned with the theology of the devil and the demonic being presented to the worshipper in the Anglican parish church or cathedral in England in the present day. The operative questions are whether the liturgy is articulating a theology of the Christian’s encounter with evil which is coherent and consistent, and thus fitted to the formation of a believer in their discipleship journey and for the Church’s proclamation of the Gospel in the context of its liturgical worship. It is important to delineate at the outset the scope of the material to be treated. The primary source materials for this study are the CW texts, the currently authorised liturgical alternative to BCP. The CW texts will be subjected to structural analysis based upon the methodology developed by Taft and, subsequently, Day, and this methodology and the way in which it has been developed for this study, are outlined below. Before structural analysis of the material can proceed, the specific texts must be identified in what Taft refers to as the “gathering of initial data.”

3 Taft, Beyond East and West, 193.
identified for each section of structural analysis will be detailed within each chapter, under the heading Key Ritual Elements.

The vast majority of references to the devil, the demonic and more generalised ‘evil’ are found in the CW liturgies which concern the initiation of a Christian, and those which treat the subsequent spiritual, mental and physical “wholeness and healing”\(^4\) of the Christian and of the Church. It is in these liturgies that reference is found to the interrelationship between the Christian and the wider creation in which evil exists. These texts are found in the two volumes Common Worship: Christian Initiation (CW: CI)\(^5\) and Common Worship: Pastoral Services (CW: PS).\(^6\) There are, of course, references to the devil, the demonic and evil in other texts in the CW library, not least in the Collects, and these will be referred to where appropriate, but not subjected to detailed structural analysis. Chapter 4 reviews the more general references to the devil and the demonic in CW.

In order to identify, organise and then analyse the pertinent material, the CW texts will be treated in three broad areas: Initiation, Healing, and Deliverance. As will become clear, the Deliverance material contained within the authorised liturgies of the CW provision is minimal, being restricted to a set of notes in CW: PS,\(^7\) a note in CW: CI\(^8\) and in references in the introductions to both volumes and the theological commentary in CW: CI. Liturgies for the treatment of those presenting with some form of spiritual disturbance requiring a Ministry of Deliverance are authorised on a diocese by diocese basis by the Bishop. The author, having held the post of Bishop’s Adviser on the Ministry of Deliverance for the Diocese of Gloucester, has privileged access to the texts used in that diocese, and texts from other dioceses have been gathered to form a comparative sample. Whilst it is recognised that these texts do not hold identical status to the authorised and commended liturgies of the CW canon, they are all episcopally authorised as well as being referenced in the authorised texts, and structural analysis of them will be possible following the methodology laid out below after the model applied to the Initiation and Healing material. The specific caveats surrounding the Deliverance texts will be identified and discussed in Chapter 7.

---

\(^4\) This is the title of the first section of *Common Worship: Pastoral Services*, which contains the Healing services, Ministry to the Sick, and Prayers for Protection and Peace.
\(^7\) CW: PS, 94.
\(^8\) CW: CI, 290.
Under the heading of Initiation, the core text for this study will be Holy Baptism and Confirmation. Under the heading of Healing, the core text will be A Celebration of Wholeness and Healing. In both cases these are the ‘default’ texts from which the other rites in each volume are derived. The principal text under the heading of Deliverance will be the Diocese of Gloucester’s order of service for The Exorcism and Deliverance of a Person. The rationale for treating the texts in this order is that, at least in principle, initiation being the beginning of a person’s formal relationship with the Church, all subsequent engagement of a person with evil occurs in the context of that person’s initiated status. CW acknowledges this when it notes “Healing, reconciliation and restoration flow from baptism and are integral to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.” Deliverance, clearly identified by the Church of England as a specific and restricted instance of Healing, naturally follows last in this study. The fact that the candidate might not, in real life, encounter the ministry of the Church in this logical order needs to be noted at this point and will form a major element of the conversation as this study develops.

The material has been organised so that the study of its constituent parts, and the journey which the candidate or worshipper makes through the rite, can be identified and analysed. For this to happen the data must be approached structurally, so that the function of each liturgical movement, text or ritual action can be identified and the theological implications of it examined. A structural analysis of the texts identified above will be undertaken in order to provide this data.

**Structural Analysis**

Structural analysis, as a methodological tool, derives from the work of Baumstark and emerges from his theory that liturgies, like an organism, develop and evolve over time according to various influencing factors. Baumstark, focussing on the worshipping life of the Church in the Mediterranean basin, is interested in the direction or “course” of the
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evolution of a liturgy, and in the causes of such evolution. By examining liturgies in a structural manner, in other words by paying attention to the constituent parts of a liturgy, one can identify where developments and innovations occur, where older elements of a rite are moved or displaced by newer elements, and also where the reverse is true. West, examining Baumstark’s work, summarises his conclusions in the form of two laws. The first concerns “organic development” which states that there can be identified a movement from simplicity to richness in a liturgy, as older elements are added to, or displaced entirely by newer elements. The second law acts as a counter to the first: the law of “continuity” holds that at the more solemn or sacred times of the Liturgical Year there is more conservatism and older elements tend to be retained in these periods.

Baumstark’s work formed the basis for a revision of this theory by Taft, who describes his purpose as “rendering intelligible through systematising.” Taft’s methodology relies on the identification of “deep structure,” by which he refers to the common structures which are shared across liturgies. His purpose is to understand the liturgy, and structural analysis is a tool in that quest. He seeks to identify liturgical units which are far smaller than the structures identified by Baumstark - in Taft’s case individual prayers or litanies which can be analysed in order to discover the earliest or “pristine” form. He notes that “the initial and indeed sufficient purpose of such analysis is intelligibility”, but he also permits the possibility of other uses of this method of which the identification of a community’s theology appears to be one, though this is not developed in his methodology.

Referencing Taft’s essay on methodology as an influence, Day develops a methodology for a different purpose. She is interested not in discovering the primitive form of a rite, but in identifying the influences upon rites. She notes, “we have developed a methodology which attempts to find both what is common and what is distinct.” Day’s focus is the baptismal liturgy of Jerusalem and its influences, and she takes the Mystagogical Catechesis commonly attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem as her primary source. She holds that common
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15 Ibid., 15.
17 Taft, Beyond East and West, 188.
19 Taft, Beyond East and West, 197.
20 Ibid., 196.
21 Day, Baptismal Liturgy, 5.
to all initiation rites are three sections which she identifies as “primary structural units”, the equivalent of the “deep structure” of Taft:

The invariable presence of a water rite preceded and succeeded by other rituals would make it self-evident that the ‘deep structure’ of an initiation rite has three components, regardless of what takes place in each of these. The ‘deep structure’ consists of the ‘Pre-Immersion Rituals’, ‘The Immersion’ and ‘Post-Immersion Rituals’; these I refer to as primary structural units.22

Day goes on to identify subdivisions of these ‘primary structural units’ which she designates “secondary structural units”. These, in the case of the Pre-Immersion Rituals, would include the renunciation of evil, but this renunciation might not be common across sources in terms of the liturgical words spoken, the rubrics, the associated rituals or its position within that unit. It is by analysing the secondary structural units that Day identifies the “similarities and distinctions from which the relationship between the rites of different provinces may most profitably be discerned.”23 Her methodology goes on to identify the secondary structural units of the Mystagogical Catechesis.

The present study will take Day’s methodology, and aspects of Taft which influenced it, in identifying a primary text for each section of the structural analysis, but then develop a method of structural analysis of the texts specified above which seeks primarily neither to identify and understand the primitive liturgy, nor to compare liturgies but, by examining each individual unit with regard to its relation to the whole, to map out the theological journey upon which those involved in the rite are engaged. It is theology, rather than structure or origin, which is of interest to this study, and it is in this respect that the methodology offers something new to the field of liturgical studies. Taft notes that in the process of liturgical development “overloaded rites, like overloaded circuits, eventually blow a fuse,”24 and thus the resulting liturgy can often end up with the original form damaged or with liturgical elements no longer performing the function they were constructed to deliver. This study contends that this is evident in CW and that the coherence of the theology has in consequence been compromised.

This study follows Day in identifying three primary structural units for the Initiation rite: the Pre-Immersion and Post-Immersion Rituals, and what Day refers to as the Immersion but

22 Ibid., emphasis hers.
23 Ibid.
24 Taft, Beyond East and West, 200.
which this study, focussing not on fourth and fifth century Jerusalem but 21st century England, and noting that the vast majority of baptisms in the Church of England are not Immersions, will call the Water Baptism.

In the Wholeness and Healing rite, a similar division of the rite into three primary structural units can be identified. At the heart of the rite there is the Laying on of Hands with prayer for healing, and optional anointing. This unit we will call the Healing Rites. It is preceded by a unit we call the Preliminary Rites which includes secondary units such as confession. The third primary liturgical unit, which we entitle the Rites of Response, may optionally include the Eucharist, and certainly contains thanksgiving.

The Deliverance rite follows a similar structure to the Wholeness and Healing rite. The Exorcistic Rites themselves, focussed around the exorcism, forms the central primary unit, with the Pre-Exorcistic Rites, which include personal preparation of the ministers as well as scripture and an attempt to garner expressions of penitence on the part of the possessed person, as units within it. The Post-Exorcistic Rites comprise the third primary unit, within which anointing (with the oil of healing, rather than of exorcism), blessing and expressions of thanksgiving may occur. Elements of the Preparation may also occur within the Exorcistic unit instead, particularly if the candidate for exorcism is unable to express themselves prior to the exorcistic words being spoken.

The secondary structural units will be properly identified in each of the subsequent chapters when each rite is treated separately, but some guiding principles need to be laid down at this point.

Where CW liturgical headings exist for primary and secondary units these will be used, as far as possible, in recognition that the Liturgical Commission deliberately outlines a structure at the beginning of each rite which is meant to aid the minister in navigating the service. This structure must be respected and will prove illuminating for this study. There are several points, however, where the CW provision is either inadequate for the level of structural analysis required, or where options are given to reposition certain ritual actions or liturgical texts, at which point titles for secondary liturgical units will be assigned and noted. One example will suffice at this point.
The CW unit The Signing with the Cross, appears in the text thus:

**Signing with the Cross**

*The president or another minister makes the sign of the cross on the forehead of each candidate, saying*

Christ claims you for his own.
Receive the sign of his cross.

*The president may invite parents, godparents and sponsors to sign the candidates with the cross. When all the candidates have been signed, the president says*

Do not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified.

All **Fight valiantly as a disciple of Christ**
against sin, the world and the devil,
and remain faithful to Christ to the end of your life.

May almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness,
restore in you the image of his glory,
and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ.

All **Amen.**

Although all of this text, and the accompanying rubrics and actions, appear printed under a single section heading, the “Signing with the Cross”, within the pre-immersion primary unit, this apparently united set of texts will need to be divided into much smaller units and treated separately in accordance with the permissions given in the rubrics and notes. Other instances of this type will be discussed as the study progresses. Where CW titles will suffice they will be used. Where they prove inadequate this will be made explicit, and the separation of secondary units will be clearly identified.

**Liturgical and Theological Analysis**

The liturgical units will need to be analysed through both liturgical and theological lenses. Each unit will be examined liturgically to identify exactly what is happening to the participant (be it the possessed, the candidate, the sick person seeking healing or, indeed, the whole congregation) at each stage in the rite, and particular attention will be paid to a) what is *said*, and b) what is *done*, in other words what ritual actions occur. These two
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25 CW: Cl, 113.
liturgical criteria are designated as function. Attention will also be paid to c) who is the minister of the rite at that point – the congregation, the priest or the participant themselves? This final criterion is designated authority. In this way the coherence of the entire rite will be revealed, and the inconsistencies or confusions will be identified. The part that each unit plays in the whole will be made clear, and the connections with the immediately preceding and succeeding unit will be examined with particular care. At all times the liturgical units will be examined with attention to their references to evil, the devil, and the demonic. The rites which directly influence the CW forms will be appealed to for comparison at this stage as well. These rites are principally BCP and ASB, and their place in the Church of England’s developing liturgical canon have already been explored. Particular care will be taken to compare the CW rite with BCP because both of these rites are currently authorised for use, and close comparison will be crucial for formulation of a consistent English Anglican theology of the devil. Anglican rites from other provinces will also be used for comparison where available. The non-Anglican texts influencing CW, for example the Roman Catholic Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults, will also be appealed to where appropriate.

In examining the units through a theological lens another part of the methodological process will be required. The units will be examined by theological theme as well as liturgical text. For Day, the controlling story or narrative is the way in which “baptism permits the candidates to enter into and appropriate for themselves the history of salvation.”26 The concern for the present study is that same salvation process but, more narrowly, the way in which the candidate progressing through the rite, encounters, and is given the apparatus with which to negotiate, the presence and potency of evil and of the devil personified. It is this relationship between the Christian and the devil, or the evil and disorder which he represents, which will inform the theological analysis which will accompany each section of the structural analysis.
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26 Day, Baptismal Liturgy, 6.
Scriptural themes

The Preface to the Declaration of Assent reminds the congregation and minister that the Church of England professes the faith “revealed in the holy Scriptures.”27 Scripture holds an honoured and distinctive place in the liturgical theology of the Church of England and so one of the important steps in this methodology will be analysing the available texts for each stage of the Christian’s journey, and drawing together the themes revealed by this analysis. The specific texts for each section will be delineated at the outset of each chapter, but the principle will be that the main focus in each chapter will be the scriptural texts which the candidate and the congregation might be most likely to hear read aloud during the act of worship. It must always be remembered that liturgies are experienced, inhabited and participated in by the minister, the candidate and the congregation. In the Anglican tradition, in particular, the reading of Scripture passages is an essential and central part of that experience. What will follow in the Scriptural themes section of each chapter will be an identification of the types of text set by the Church of England for each occasion - which will be dependent upon the type of service; whether it takes place during Sunday service or not; and the context of the service in relation to the liturgical calendar. Recurring themes will be drawn out and identified, as well as any notable omissions. One example of the scriptural theme will suffice at this point, in this instance taken from the Initiation material. The baptismal ministry of John the Baptist is amongst one of a number of recurring scriptural themes set in both the Principal Service Lectionary and the lections provided for use outside the main Sunday service. As will be outlined fully in chapter 5, these scriptures are predominantly concerned with repentance and forgiveness, together with an emphasis on the way in which John the Baptist’s ministry points beyond itself to something else, with the associated eschatological themes.

Theological themes

This study follows Day in recognising that identifying dominant typologies or, as they will be referred to here, theological themes, will be of great help in analysing the liturgies for coherence and consistency. As explained above, the analysis of scriptural passages provides the first stage in this process. The second stage will be an analysis of the primary

27 CW, xi.
commentary upon the liturgical rites provided within the liturgical volumes themselves. The amount and style of such primary commentary varies from volume to volume, and when the Deliverance Rites are considered, there will need to be a conversation about what constitutes primary commentary. However, parameters will be delineated at the outset of each section. Recurring dominant theological themes will be sought which will help to frame the structural analysis’ subsequent reflections. What it is that the Church of England says that the services are doing and what emerges from the structural analysis itself may complement each other, contrast, or even reveal contradictions. Drawn again from the Initiation material, one example of the theological theme which emerges is that of the Journey. CW makes much of the concept of the Christian life as a journey within which baptism, confirmation and various other rites are staging points. As will be outlined in chapter 5, particular scriptural themes and liturgical motifs are drawn upon to illustrate this theme and to evidence its importance to those who compiled the liturgies.

**Analytical matrix**

Before each section of structural analysis is undertaken an analytical matrix will be drawn up as a visual aid to the process which will follow. The column headings will remain constant throughout the entire study, and these are sin, evil, and the devil. Sin is included within the analytical matrix because the relationship between sin and evil is so complex and intertwined that where structural analysis is taking place to identify the presence and activity of evil along the journey of the Christian, it will almost always be accompanied by references to sin. Much more will need to be said about the theological and liturgical relationship between evil and sin, some of which will take place in the process of structural analysis and some of which will be drawn together in the conclusions. The devil is included as a separate column heading for the precise reason that this study will want to identify the specific occasions where the devil (and other personified evil) occurs as a liturgical device, and where the more general term evil is used. The row headings for each analytical matrix will vary from chapter to chapter because these will consist of the theological themes garnered from the initial section of each chapter.
Thus the occurrence of the devil and evil in the liturgies will be isolated and identified, and analysed and reflected upon through theological lenses in order to draw conclusions about the coherence or otherwise of the journey being described by the liturgy.

It is recognised at this point that a number of selections have been made in terms of the primary sources to be analysed, and the methodological tools to be utilised in that analysis. A number of other avenues are therefore left largely unexplored. No examination of the systematic treatment of the concept of evil in the Anglican tradition is attempted in this thesis. Such an examination would certainly be possible, and would doubtless prove illuminating. This study opts not to proceed with that particular task due to the methodology outlined above which asks very specific questions of the texts themselves, and follows Day in identifying from the texts in question the theological themes which arise, and which therefore provide the lenses for structural analysis. A full systematic treatment of evil over the history of C of E would divert this study from its methodology, which is tightly focused upon the texts themselves as the place from which theology can be gleaned.

An examination of more systematic approaches to evil in C of E would be an interesting exercise for a study wanting to test the principle of *lex orandi, lex credendi*, and it would be crucial to determine from the outset what the principal sources would be. In the quest for a systematic treatment of evil over the history of C of E a starting point might be the various catechisms published prior to, and following, the Reformation to seek to identify whether any theological changes are codified into those documents as C of E establishes itself. Comparison with the developing catechism of Rome would also be important. Doctrinal statements issued by C of E, scarce though they are, would also be key sources. Aside from the catechisms which are easily sourced, the Doctrine Commission’s 1991 paper *We Believe in God* is amongst the most recent systematic treatments of evil, and of course predates most of the General Synod discussion which resulted in CW: PS and CW: CI. This paper
begins to expound a theology of evil built on Christological and Trinitarian doctrine as well as appeal to biblical texts, particularly Philippians chapter 3.\textsuperscript{28} This is the obvious starting point for such an exploration, together with some of the more systematic approaches to evil since 1991.\textsuperscript{29} The texts cited in the footnote are merely a beginning, but represent a sound initial bibliography for such an investigation, alongside the Doctrine Commission text and the catechisms.

The Methodology Summarised

To summarise, a new structural analysis methodology drawing on that of Baumstark, Taft and Day has been developed in order to analyse Initiation, Healing and Deliverance liturgies from the presently authorised Church of England provision. The purpose of this methodology is to discern the coherence or otherwise of the theology being presented to the candidate and the congregation in these liturgical acts of worship. The structural analysis will take place in chapters 5, 6 and 7, and in each case the methodology will follow the same structure. First of all, the available scriptures will be reviewed for the themes presented by them. Secondly, theological themes will be identified based on the scriptural readings as well as the available primary commentaries which describe the rites in question. From this process an analytical matrix will be formed to illustrate the way in which structural analysis will take place. For each liturgy theological themes will be the lenses through which sin, evil and the devil will be analysed as they occur in each secondary liturgical unit.


\textsuperscript{29} Amongst which of note are a number of the papers within the reader cited above (footnote 6) including all of the papers within section 3 of that work, which tackle theodicy. 56-78. Notable also are N. T. Wright, \textit{Evil and the Justice of God} (London: SPCK, 2006), particularly his assertion that a properly biblical and systematic theology of evil starts from the atonement and asks "what is God doing about evil", 16-17, 20, 29. Much recent work on evil in an Anglican context refers back to Austin Farrar's seminal \textit{Love Almighty and Ills Unlimited} (London: Collins, 1962), which is taken by many as a crucial text in 20th-century Anglican thinking about evil. Amongst those who cite Farrar more recently are Astley, Brown and Loades (62-64 in particular). Farrar includes a treatment of personified evil in the person of the devil which is significant in Anglican thinking (164). Joseph Kelly, treating the problem of evil in the West, also presents an interesting starting point for exploration, arguing for the importance of the retention of language of the devil in modern theological work, and then exploring a range of recent work from across the Protestant and Catholic spectrum. The \textit{Problem of Evil in the Western Tradition: from the Book of Job to Modern Genetics} (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 2, 214, 215 in particular.
The next stage of the methodology will be to identify the primary and secondary liturgical units within each rite to be analysed. This is described as ‘identifying the Key Ritual Elements.’ The secondary units which will not be subject to structural analysis will be identified and the reason for discounting them explained.

Finally, structural analysis will proceed unit by unit, making use of the analytical matrix as a framework for handling the data which will be produced. At every stage each unit will be analysed against the criteria of function and authority. The analytical matrix and the liturgical criteria of function and authority provide for reflections to be drawn together at the end of each chapter which will then inform the conclusions.
Chapter 4 - The Names

4. Introduction

CW contains a wealth of direct and indirect references to the powers of evil. As will be demonstrated in the ensuing three chapters, some of these constitute proper names whilst others are more general descriptive terms which permit themselves natural and supernatural interpretations. The purpose of this brief chapter is to note the fact that a variety of names and descriptions are used throughout the liturgy when things of the realm of evil and darkness are referred to and, where they will not be examined in detail within chapters 5, 6 and 7, to catalogue their occurrence so that the survey of the CW library is as complete as possible. Several terms highlighted here will be examined in more detail in chapter 7 where the Deliverance Rites are considered, but all the terms are noted here in the interests of presenting a comprehensive survey.

Within Scripture a number of different names are used to refer to things of evil, and Perry provides a comprehensive and useful survey of these.¹ The compilers of CW, drawing on the history and tradition of the Church’s liturgy, make a number of decisions as to which names and descriptive terms to include. Detailed analysis of the origin and development of these terms is outside the scope of this study, but where texts are new compositions for CW this will be highlighted, and where a text has been in use in the liturgy for a significant period of time that may also be important.

An important area of reflection later on in the study will be about the choice of terminology used for the devil and the demonic, because that will have a direct influence on drawing conclusions about the consistency or otherwise of the theology within the liturgy. Making a survey of the terminology at this point will make that task more straightforward.

4.1 Summary of names used in Common Worship

The rites of baptism, healing and deliverance will be treated in significant detail in the forthcoming chapters, and therefore names used in those liturgical texts will merely be noted here. The focus of the remainder of this chapter is upon the sections of the liturgy not otherwise covered, for example the Collects, where more detail will be provided.

The Collects and Post Communion prayers do not fit neatly into the structure of the remainder of this study but they are worthy of note because they contain a significant number of references to evil and its power. Nichols provides an overview of the Collects and Post Communion prayers which details their provenance, and it is that overview which provides the source material for this section. The other volumes which will be referred to here are CW itself, from which many of the Collects and Post Communion prayers are drawn, as well as the order for Night Prayer, and CW: PS, in particular the Funeral resources. Common Worship: Daily Prayer (CW: DP), Common Worship: Collects and Post Communions (CW: CPC) and Exciting Holiness (EH) will also be referenced, from which volumes Collects and Post Communion prayers for Lesser Festivals are drawn. Common Worship: Ordination Services (CW: OS) will also be referred to briefly.

4.1.1 The Devil

The term “the devil” is used in the Post Communion prayer of the Third Sunday of Lent, within the petition “grant your people grace to withstand the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.” The prayer is basically that of the Collect of Trinity 18 in BCP, which itself originates from the Gelasian Sacramentary, and Nichols notes that in 1662 the prayer was subtly altered from one which asked grace to “avoid” the temptations to a prayer for grace to “withstand”, which represents an interesting theological movement.
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3 EH is not an official CW publication but rather a private enterprise drawing together Collects and Post Communion prayers for Sundays, Feast Days and Lesser Festivals from CW: CPC and from the provinces of Wales, Scotland and Ireland. Because it usefully gathers together all of this material in a single volume it is used here for convenience.
4 Ibid., 188.
A reference to “the devil” appears in the Collect of the Second Sunday before Advent where the revelation of Christ is described as being “to destroy the works of the devil and to make us the children of God and heirs of eternal life.” This Collect is a lightly edited version of that of Epiphany 6 in BCP, and Nichols attributes its composition, in all likelihood, to John Cosin.5

CW: PS and CW: CI contain a number of references to “the devil”, all of which will be treated within the following chapters. These occur not only in the core liturgical texts such as the Decision, and the “Fight Valiantly” prayer after the signing with the cross, but also in additional provision such as the Christaraksha prayer. The Liturgical Commission’s Commentary to CW: CI also references on several occasions Ephesians 6:10-18, and whilst it does not directly quote this biblical passage, the passage itself concerns the “whole armour of God” affording the Christian the capacity to “stand against the wiles of the devil.”6

The order for Night Prayer in Traditional Language opens with a reading from 1 Peter 5:8-9, “be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about.” The author of the letter appeals to the reader to resist the devil through steadfast faith. The contemporary language version of Night Prayer retains this text as an optional reading rather than a compulsory ministerial text. In the contemporary service, therefore, mention of the devil by name becomes optional. Use of the 1 Peter text also retains the traditional term “adversary” as a descriptor of the devil.7

4.1.2 Satan

The proper name “Satan” occurs rarely in the CW provision. It appears in the Christaraksha prayer in CW: PS, and this occurrence will be treated in detail in chapter 7.8 There is also an oblique reference to Satan in the Liturgical Commission Commentary to CW: CI where the text cites the “proposed Ecumenical Baptismal Liturgy of Sri Lanka” with its question: “Do

5 Ibid., 196.
6 CW: CI, 320.
7 CW, 89, 85.
8 CW: PS, 96.
you renounce being ruled by the desires of this world, the flesh and Satan?” This example is provided as evidence of a growing awareness of the “social aspect of baptism” rather than a particularly realised demonology.

4.1.3 Our Enemy

In the Post Communion prayer of Easter Day (composed for CW) the resurrection is described as having “delivered us from the power of our enemy.” It is worth pointing out that the word “enemy” is not capitalised, therefore not explicitly a reference to the devil, but the phrase clearly denotes the resurrection as an act of deliverance, and reinforces that humanity possesses an enemy from which deliverance is required. Nichols’ commentary suggests that the enemy is sin rather than evil.10

“The enemy”, with the definite article, may also be found amongst the various references to evil in the Prayers for Protection and Peace in CW: PS. It appears in the modern language version of the Collect for Aid Against All Perils from Evensong, with its petition, “visit, Lord, we pray, this place and drive far from it all the snares of the enemy.” The “pain of the enemy’s attack” is referenced in the psalm prayer provided for optional use with Psalm 120 in the resources for funerals.11 It is worth noting that this psalm prayer, with its explicit plea for deliverance, is not the same as the psalm prayer provided for Psalm 120 in the daily round of psalmody in CW: DP. The latter prayer asks for preservation from “slander and deceit”, but makes no reference to the works of “the enemy”.12

4.1.4 Our Foe

The order for Night Prayer (Compline) in modern language retains the liturgical hymn “Before the ending of the day”, which contains the line “tread underfoot our deadly foe.” The traditional language version of the service includes the same hymn, but with the

9 CW: CI, 322.
11 CW: PS, 96, 382.
12 CW: DP, 842.
variant “tread underfoot our ghostly foe.” The traditional rendering thus contains a more explicitly spiritual or supernatural overtone. However, the word “foe” is used in both cases in the singular, indicating a personified opponent against which the Christian prays for defence during the night.

The Veni Creator, another liturgical hymn, this time included in the Ordination of Priests, contains a similar appeal for defence, “keep far our foes”, though this time the word is plural and there is no explicit indication elsewhere in the text that such foes are spiritual rather than corporeal.

4.1.5 The Evil One

The proper name “the evil one” (note lack of capitalisation) occurs within the Pastoral Introduction to CW: PS and will be treated in detail in chapter 8.

4.1.6 The Power of Darkness

The Collect of the Sixth Sunday of Easter describes God as having “delivered us from the power of darkness and brought us into the kingdom of [his] Son.” This Collect was included in the volume Lent, Holy Week and Easter (LHWE) produced to accompany ASB and is a revised version of a Mozarabic prayer. References to the “power of darkness” are not explicitly references to supernatural evil, or to the Devil personified, but are open to broader interpretation. A similar reference appears in the Collect for Janani Luwum, where it is reasonable to interpret the reference as explicitly one to worldly powers.

The Welsh Collect for James Hannington, bound into EH, describes Hannington and his fellow martyrs as having “in their deaths despised the powers of darkness”, and Christ who “overcame darkness by the power of the cross.” Whilst again not explicitly referring to
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13 CW, 82, 90.
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supernatural evil, this Collect comes closer than any Church of England Collect to linking that phrase to external evil, and in stronger language than the CW equivalent.

In the Collect for Alcuin of York there is a reference to “the darkness of our ignorance” which would seem to be a reference to a state of awareness of the Christian rather than to an external power. The word “darkness” is also used in the Collect for the First Sunday of Advent, and in the Irish Collect for Declan, but in neither case is the word linked explicitly to external supernatural evil, and in the latter case is likely a reference to paganism.

The “power of darkness” is referred to in the first of the Prayers with Dying People in CW: PS, in a version of the mediaeval prayer Anima Christi (Soul of Christ, sanctify me...). The appeal to Christ is: “from the power of darkness defend me.”17 There are references both in the singular and plural in the tradition, and where this last example seems to refer to a singular power, other references refer to a more diverse collection of powers.

“The dominion of darkness” is that from which the Christian is transferred in their baptism, according to one of the optional Prayers in Preparation for Baptism.18 This reference is almost identical to that in the address to the congregation and candidates at the presentation of the lighted candle at the end of the baptismal service.19 The “powers of darkness” are referenced in the exorcism which concludes the signing with the cross and which will be treated in detail in chapter 5.

4.1.7 Evil

The first Post Communion prayer of the Common of Martyrs, drawn from the Roman Missal, prays for “the courage to conquer evil.” There is no direct reference to the supernatural.20 The “powers of evil” are referred to in the Collect for Leo the Great, composed by a member of the Society of Saint Francis and drawn from the Franciscan volume Celebrating Common Prayer (CCP).21

17 CW: PS, 346.
18 CW: CI, 43.
19 Ibid., 77.
References to “evil” occur in several places within CW: PS, particularly in the prayer for the laying on of hands, which will be treated in chapter 6. Evil is also referred to in the prayer for anointing provided for ministry at the time of death which includes the petition “May he deliver you from all evil”, and in the provision of Psalm 23 in the funeral service itself with its assertion “though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil.”

4.1.8 Evil Spirits

The precise relationship between references to evil spirits and to demons is unclear in the liturgical provision of CW. As will be demonstrated in the ensuing chapters, the terms at times appear to be interchangeable. Both appear in the biblical provision for the various liturgies as well, and these will receive attention within each of the following chapters. Evil spirits are referenced directly in the Christaraksha prayer in CW: PS and in the Liturgical Commission Commentary to CW: CI, where the commentary notes that deliverance is the appropriate ministry for those who are “enslaved by habit, addiction or ‘evil spirits’.” The use of inverted commas within the commentary is noteworthy.

4.1.9 Demons

Demons are referred to in an indirect reference to 1 Corinthians 10 in the Theological Introduction to CW: PS, where again it is to be noted that the word is not capitalised and occurs within a list of other “forces beyond our powers to resist or break.”

---

22 CW: PS, 226, 263.
23 Ibid., 96, 97.
24 CW: CI, 324.
25 CW: PS, 10.
4.1.10 The Hordes of Hell

References to “the hordes of hell” stand out in the CW provision for being rare and distinct in their highly realised language. The only occurrences are in the provision of the traditional Indian prayer the Christaraksha, and will be treated in chapter 7.26

4.1.11 Things Under the Earth

The concluding ministerial invocation to the order for laying on of hands and anointing in CW: PS includes a reference to the Lord as the one “whom all things in heaven, on earth and under the earth obey.” This is a paraphrase of the early text included in Philippians 2, which asserts the authority of Christ over all others.27

4.1.12 Foes Invisible

The collective noun “foes invisible” appears just once in the CW provision, again in the Christaraksha prayer.28

4.1.13 Appeal to Ephesians 6

As has been noted above, there are several references to Ephesians 6:10-17 for some of the theological underpinning of CW’s approach to evil. This passage, which encourages its readers to be strong by utilising the “armour of God” contains some of the highest demonology of the New Testament texts.

Put on the whole armour of God, so that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our struggle is not against enemies of blood and flesh, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places.29

26 Ibid., 97.
27 CW:PS, 93; Philippians 2:10.
28 CW:PS, 96, 97.
29 Ephesians 6:11-12.
Verse 16 further refers to the shield of faith having the capacity to “quench all the flaming arrows of the evil one.” The Liturgical Commission’s Commentary to CW: CI appeals to this passage in a section concerning the way in which ‘separation’ and ‘reception’ constitute the Christian’s new relationship with God.\textsuperscript{30} The passage is also referenced in CW: PS in the Theological Introduction in a paragraph concerning the battle between the Christian and “forces of evil that are external to us.”\textsuperscript{31} The Theological Introduction will be treated in some detail in chapter 6 where it is noted that sections from 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 which refer both to idols and to demons are used to complement the Ephesians text.

4.1.14 References to angelic beings

Whilst not being properly included in the category of things referring to darkness and evil, it is worth pointing out that there are references to the, presumably, good angelic beings in the Collect of Michael and all Angels, where God is described as having constituted “the services of angels and mortals”, and his “holy angels” are also referred to as serving him in heaven. Established in this Collect is the assumption of a supernatural realm as part of God’s creation, although this particular Collect does not explicitly include within that realm the possibility of supernatural evil beings.

4.2 Reflections

4.2.1 Commentary and Liturgical Text

There are distinctions between the language used in the commentary material in both CW: PS and CW: CI, and the terminology utilised in the liturgical text itself. Given that the notes, rubrics and other supporting material within these volumes are commended or authorised in their entirety, they should properly be read as carrying the same status as liturgical texts, and so it would be unwise to try to draw too strong a conclusion about the inclusion in a commentary of a particular name which is not included in a public liturgy. It is, however, worth observing a general trend towards more realised language of the devil and the demonic appearing in the commentary material than in the liturgical texts themselves.

\textsuperscript{30} CW: CI, 320.
\textsuperscript{31} CW: PS, 10.
This could be evidence of a tendency towards conservatism in the composition of texts which will be spoken publicly in church, but a broader spectrum of theological tradition informing the commentaries and texts which are expected to be read only by the minister in preparation for the service. An exception to this general trend is the Christaraksha, as will be discussed in chapter 7.

4.2.2 Variety

It has been demonstrated from the brief survey above that there is a variety of terminology used to refer to things which could be interpreted as part of the realm of supernatural evil. Five terms would seem to refer to the devil himself: the devil, Satan, our foe, the evil one, our enemy. In addition to these five terms, a further six collective terms designate more general or collective supernatural evil powers: evil, the powers of darkness, evil spirits, demons, the hordes of hell, things under the earth and foes invisible. Depending on context and interpretation, this latter set of names may be interpreted more or less literally as referring to external supernatural evil. Ephesians 6:10-18 provides a further set of names which seem to inform commentary both on the Initiation and Healing texts. The manner and frequency of the use of these names is not uniform. The word “devil” occurs far more frequently, for example, than “Satan” and, whilst Satan is only used in one liturgical text, “devil” occurs relatively frequently in comparison. Several of the terms occur only in one part of the provision, the Christaraksha, which is itself drawn from an Indian rather than an English tradition.

4.2.3 Breadth of occurrence

The remainder of this study will concern itself with three specific areas of the liturgy: the rites of initiation, healing and deliverance. This chapter, however, demonstrates that mention of the devil, and of evil, is to be found across the breadth of the liturgical tradition which the Church of England inherits. Such language is to be found in the Collects and Post Communion prayers, in Night Prayer, the Ordination of Priests and in the Funeral provision. This is a helpful reflection to make at this point because it contextualises the liturgies upon which the study will now concentrate. Whatever conclusions are drawn after examination of the liturgies identified for particular study, they will need to be drawn against a
background of more general awareness of the presence of language concerning the devil and the demonic across the liturgical library. This important point will be returned to in the Conclusions, and a proposal made about the possibilities of further study in this area.
5. Introduction

The Church of England, in its liturgy, makes a number of statements about the relationship between a Christian and the powers of evil. The Initiation rites of the Church are one of the principal places where these liturgical formularies are found. As a candidate for baptism approaches their initiation they answer a number of questions and move through a number of verbal and symbolic stages on the route to the font and beyond. Contained within these rites since the earliest Church of England formularies in 1549 have been references to sin, evil, and the devil. These are what a candidate is required to turn away from in the process of turning towards Christ. An examination of the currently authorised liturgy of the Church will identify precisely the stages through which a candidate must pass, and seek to identify the order of those stages and how each adds to the process of the candidate’s movement away from the darkness and into the light. The theological and scriptural lenses through which CW examines this journey will first be identified, before structural analysis is undertaken. The chapter will conclude with some reflections on the structural analysis before drawing together some summary conclusions.

This chapter must begin by identifying the controlling themes present in the liturgical rites in question. These are identified from two main sources: the Scriptural passages available for use at Initiation services and the liturgical texts themselves. By identifying these themes it will be possible to construct an analytical matrix. In each of the following three chapters which treat Initiation, Healing, and Deliverance respectively, scriptural texts will be treated first, followed by the liturgical texts, and in each case a matrix will be developed.

5.1 Scriptural References to Initiation

The source of the scriptural texts which may be encountered by candidates and congregation at Initiation services must first be identified.

Canon B21 (of Holy Baptism) states that “It is desirable that every minister having a cure of souls shall normally administer the sacrament of Holy Baptism on Sundays at public
worship when the most number of people come together, that the congregation there present may witness the receiving of them that be newly baptized into Christ's Church, and be put in remembrance of their own profession made to God in their baptism."1 Central to every act of public worship in the Church of England is the reading of Holy Scripture, and it is important to this study to note the way in which the Church of England treats the selection of Scripture passages in its Initiation Rites. The assumption that Holy Baptism will take place in the course of public worship is reiterated at the beginning of the Notes to Holy Baptism2 where note 5 reminds the Minister that “the Collects and readings for the Sunday should normally be used.”3 The Minister has at their discretion the option of using one of several sets of Supplementary Texts during the periods of Ordinary Time on occasions “when baptism is the predominant element in the service” amongst which is some seasonal material which is “linked to occasions in the Christian year when its use might be particularly appropriate.”4 It seems therefore that a judgement needs to be made by the Minister as to whether baptism (and/or confirmation) constitutes the predominant element in the service. Although not explicitly stated in the note, it is implied that this would not usually be considered the case were the Initiation Rites being performed in the course of a normal Sunday service in which the congregation would have gathered to worship anyway. On such occasions the Principal Service Lectionary is to be preferred and is expected to speak to the pastoral situation of the initiate, as well as to the wider congregation.

Study and analysis of the readings for the CW Principal Service Lectionary5, which is the most commonly used of the three Sunday lectionaries, and of the table of selected readings in the Supplementary Texts, highlight a number of important issues. It must first be noted that the Principal Service Lectionary readings contain many and varied references to baptism, or to themes which the Church of England would describe as “baptismal”. Some of this material is drawn from the Old Testament in a set of optional “continuous” readings from the Scripture during Ordinary Time, where any link with the New Testament or the Gospel reading is largely coincidental, whereas if the “related”

---

2 CW: CI, 98.
3 It is difficult to know how many parochial clergy follow the directions of note 5 in favouring the Sunday readings. Anecdotally at least, it seems that many clergy choose their own readings based on pastoral circumstance.
4 CW: CI, 98.
5 CW, 537-578.
course of Old Testament readings is chosen during Ordinary Time, a link with initiation themes is more deliberate.

The readings prefer various themes, many of which are also reproduced in the seasonal and supplementary material. Firstly there are the narratives of the baptismal ministry of John the Baptist (Matthew 3:1-12 and the equivalent passages). These appear predominantly in Advent, and out of them a theme of forgiveness emerges as well as an expectation of a fuller baptismal ministry which the Messiah will bring. Accounts of the baptism of Christ himself (Mark 1:4-11 and parallels) occur principally in the season of Epiphany. Also set for Sunday use are narratives of the baptismal ministry of the apostles (e.g. Acts 10:44-48 on Easter 6 in Year B) and the conversion and subsequent baptism of St Paul (Acts 9:1-20 on the Third Sunday of Easter in Year C). The divisions in the early Church connected to the administration of baptism by various ministers are also included in the Principal Service lections (1 Corinthians 1:10-18 on Epiphany 3 in Year A) as well as accounts of baptismal ministry in the early Church (Lydia’s baptism in Acts 16:9-15 on Easter 6 in Year C; the account of the jailer and his household from later in that same chapter on Easter 7).

As well as the accounts of the baptisms or baptismal ministry of such figures, a number of themes emerge in the biblical texts which concern Initiation. The theme of forgiveness has already been mentioned. Distinct from that theme are the texts which refer to the passing through water of various types, whether the account of the Deluge (Genesis 6:9-22; 7:24; 8:14-19 Proper 4 in Year A; Genesis 9:8-17 on the First Sunday of Lent in Year B)\(^6\), the crossing of the Red Sea (Easter Vigil), or of the River Jordan (for example Deuteronomy 30:15-20 on Proper 2 in Year A, or the Elijah narrative from 2 Kings 2:1-12 on the Sunday Next Before Lent in Year B and again on Proper 8 in Year C). Prophetic passages such as Isaiah 43:16-21 on the Fifth Sunday of Lent in Year C refer to the Lord making “a way in the sea, a path in the mighty waters”. Gospel passages such as Matthew 24:36-44 set in Advent in Year A refer to “the days before the flood” and present the flood as a purifying experience for the world. Connected to the narratives of the passing through water are references to water as a representative of chaos and

\(^6\) Although many readings with overtly initiatory themes occur in Lent, many parishes will opt to follow traditional practice in not celebrating the sacraments of baptism or confirmation during this season.
disorder (Genesis 1:1-5 set for the Baptism of Christ in Year B; Psalm 42 on Proper 7 in Year C).

Another prominent theme is water as the route to rebirth and refreshment. These two themes are distinct but linked. The refreshment theme focuses largely on the Old Testament images of the river of God (Psalm 65:1-14 on Proper 25 in Year C) and the Deutero-Isaiah prophecy from Chapter 55:1-9 “Ho! Everyone who is thirsty, come to the waters of life.” The second Sunday before Lent in Year B sets Psalm 126 with its references to the “rivers of the Negev” alongside Hebrews 10:11-25 with references to “bodies being washed with pure water and hearts sprinkled clean”. Naaman’s own washing in water is set for Proper 2 in Year B (2 Kings 5:1-14).

The death and resurrection typology of baptism occurs frequently, particularly but not exclusively in the Easter season. An example of the non-Eastertide use of such a text is Colossians 3:1-11 on Proper 13 in Year C with its distinctive references to having been “buried with [Christ] in baptism” and subsequently being “raised with him” and the distinctive Pauline doctrine that “you have died, and your life is hid with Christ.” John 3:1-17 is set several times over the three-year cycle, presenting Nicodemus in conversation with Christ who asserts that he must be born of both “water and the Spirit”.

The theme of enlightenment connected to baptism emerges in the account of the conversion of St Paul (Acts 9:1-20). Here the acquisition by the initiate of new, or better, sight associated with baptism presents a subtly different initiation theme.

References which connect becoming a Christian to the action of the Holy Spirit will be important to note. This theme is of course present in the Nicodemus text but also in passages such as the Baptism of Christ (John 1:29-42 on Epiphany 2 in Year A), where the administration of baptism is explicitly linked with the pneumatic action of God, or 1 Corinthians 12:12-31a on Epiphany 3 in Year C, where Paul refers to the fact that “in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body.” The marking of a new stage in the apostles’ ministry by the administration of the breath of Christ further develops the pneumatalogical theme (John 20:19-31 on Easter 2).
Less frequent but nonetheless important are the passages which connect baptism, or developing Christian discipleship, with deliverance from evil. Passages such as Acts 16:16-37 (set for Easter 7 in Year C) connect the exorcism of spirits with the baptismal ministry of the apostles. Early Christians are referred to as being “delivered from the powers of darkness” (Colossians 1:1-14) by Christ’s ministry, and are referred to as the “children of light” to distinguish them from the darkness surrounding them in the same passage. Jesus himself refers to the “children of light” (Luke 16:1-13).

Finally it is important to note that references to anointing occur throughout the three-year Principal Service cycle. Candidates and worshippers at Initiation Services are likely to make connections with these readings at the points in the service where oil is administered (Psalm 133 on Proper 15 in Year A; Easter 2 in Year B and Proper 7 in Year B; Psalm 23 on Proper 23 Year A and Easter 4 in Year C; 1 Samuel 15:34-16:13 on Proper 6 in Year B; Psalm 89:20-37 on Proper 11 in Year B).

Most of these themes occur together in the readings set for the Easter Vigil at which the celebration of baptism is encouraged.

The seasonal provisions which are encouraged for use at services other than the Principal Sunday service are grouped into three sections: Epiphany/Baptism of Christ/Trinity; Easter/Pentecost; and All Saints, though the rubric indicates that “these texts may be used on any occasion to meet pastoral circumstances”. For each set of provisions three or four complete sets of lections are provided. Here the scriptures are selected for their thematic content and, although several passages occur in all three sets of provisions, the themes of enlightenment are most prevalent in the Epiphany provisions (for example Isaiah 9:2-3, 6-7; 2 Corinthians 3:12-4:6; Acts 9:1-20); references to passing through water, rebirth, new life and death and resurrection are most prevalent in the Eastertide resources (Romans 6:3-11; Ezekiel 36:24-28; John 20:19-23); and the All Saints-tide material gathers more eschatological themes and references to the nature of the community of faith (John 15:1-11; Matthew 28:16-20; Revelation 5:6-10).

---

7 CW: CI, 150.
5.2 Theological Themes

CW: CI is unashamed in presenting a vast selection of themes, both scriptural and theological. Indeed the Liturgical Commission’s commentary to the volume states that many themes have been incorporated into the liturgical texts and the lectionary provisions quite intentionally in an attempt to prevent one theme from being preferred above the others, and the imagery and theological insights of the other themes being lost.8

Alongside the scriptural themes, which either present themselves naturally in the Sunday Principal Service lectionary provision or thematically in the additional lections provided in CW: CI, a number of theological themes emerge. These are evidenced in the liturgical texts themselves, in the theological commentary within CW: CI, and also in the Synod debates and Revision Committee papers which contributed to the authorisation both of CW: CI and the 2015 Christian Initiation: Additional Baptism Texts in Accessible Language (CW: AT). The controlling texts for this analysis will be the Introduction to CW: CI9 and the Commentary by the Liturgical Commission in the same volume.10 In both of these texts the Liturgical Commission makes specific reference to a set of themes which it sought to privilege in the compilation of the new Initiation rites.11 The Liturgical Commission’s commentary references twelve predominant themes12 which overlap and share emphasis, and which this study, considering the biblical imagery and theological emphasis of each one, distils into five controlling themes. The five dominant theological themes against which the texts will be examined after structural analysis are those of Journey, Enlightenment, Death and Rebirth, Incorporation in Christ, and the Forgiveness of Sins, and are tabulated thus:

8 Ibid., 334.
9 Ibid., 3-12.
10 Ibid., 313-54.
12 Liberation, new creation, new birth, reconciliation, illumination, recognition, cleansing, stripping, clothing, dying, resurrection, building. CW: CI, 323.
5.2.1 Journey

The controlling text referenced by the Liturgical Commission for the theme of the Journey is the conversion of St Paul (Acts 9:1-31). Christian Initiation is almost unique in the CW family in containing an extended commentary which lays out in some detail the guiding principles the Commission believed to have been instrumental in shaping the new suite of rites. Acts 9, the Commission argues, sets a pattern for the journey of a candidate for Christian Initiation:

Paul’s conversion is not complete with the dramatic religious experience described in verses 3-9. It reaches its conclusion with verse 19, after the church in Damascus has played its part in the welcome and incorporation of the new believer... It is while Paul is on the road that he meets the risen Christ. Journey is a major image in the narrative of Scripture from the call of Abraham through to the itinerant ministry of Jesus and beyond.14

The extended commentary recognises that the rediscovery of Journey as a crucial element in the process of initiation is relatively recent, noting that only in the last century have Christians “been involved in the rediscovery of the meaning of baptism. Before this, baptism was generally treated as a sort of birthright within a Christian society.”15 The baptismal rite is the “beginning (Greek arche), which holds within itself its goal (Greek telos).”16 The way in which CW shapes the vast majority of its liturgies in the fourfold...

---

13 CW: CI, 314-355, the only other volume to contain such a commentary being CW: OS.
14 CW: CI, 318-9.
15 Ibid., 315.
16 Ibid., 321.
pattern of Gathering, Liturgy of the Word, Response to God, and Dismissal or Sending Out demonstrates the intent of the architects of the wave of liturgies published from 1998 onwards that liturgies should be dynamic and contain within them a palpable sense of movement, or journey, from one place to another. The Liturgical Commission is also clear that the Initiation Rite itself ought, in best pastoral practice, to be set within a period of catechesis and ongoing formation where the candidates and their community learn to walk with Jesus:

> Although this Way is open to all, it is not always easy; yet we do not journey alone. Jesus the fellow traveller, often unrecognised, makes himself known to us on our journey (Luke 24:13-35).\(^17\)

The Emmaus Road narrative is introduced as a second important influencing text, which is also cited as part of the Enlightenment theme. Many of the next themes to be discussed are shared with those identified by Day in her *Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem*, which has been an influential text for this present study, but the theme, or typology, of the journey is not amongst her “principal biblical typologies”.\(^18\) This is perhaps not surprising given the Liturgical Commission’s own admission that this is a relatively recently discovered theme.

### 5.2.2 Enlightenment

This study identifies the theme of Enlightenment as the second important theological theme revealed in the CW liturgies. The Emmaus road narrative referenced above begins with journey and ends with a moment of realisation as Christ is revealed in the breaking of the bread. The disciples have their eyes opened, they recognise Jesus, and as a result of this their “hearts burn within them”.\(^19\) Enlightenment has to do with the growing of a candidate into the fullness of their Christian discipleship, the third of four stages which the Liturgical Commission identifies as being vital to the baptismal process.\(^20\) Following Separation and Reception, which have more to do with the themes of Forgiveness and Incorporation, the candidate is then illumined by the light of Christ, and able to grow “into the fullness of the

---

\(^17\) Ibid., 325.


\(^20\) These are separation, reception, growth, and mission.
pattern of Christ”. Liturgical aspects of this theme are drawn out predominantly in the Giving of a Lighted Candle, as well as the Commission and indeed the Rite of Confirmation. Part, also, of Enlightenment is learning and inhabiting the patterns of worship, values, priorities and behaviours expected of members of the Christian community. Enlightenment is not simply a cognitive process, although learning and studying are central to the Christian life, but has more to do with the integrity of the candidate and their place within the Christian community. The Commission for use when the newly baptized are able to answer for themselves asks a number of questions of the baptized, and the entire community, about continued commitment to worship, repentance, proclamation of the good news, service of the community, and to a Christ-centred outlook upon the structures and powers of society. These are far more to do with the transformation of the whole person - body, mind and spirit - than with conforming to a narrow set of cognitive precepts. John 3, with its account of the interaction between Nicodemus and Christ, seems to be a strong influence on this theme with its drawing of distinctions between the things of the flesh and of the Spirit, and the nature of the process of coming to the light, thus sharing theological emphasis with the third of the study’s identified themes.

5.2.3 Death and Rebirth

The Liturgical Commission is clear that although the rites of initiation can be celebrated at any time during the Liturgical Year, with the caveat that their celebration in Lent is discouraged, Easter is nonetheless the principal moment when the Church initiates new disciples. Baptism is above all an Easter rite. Lent, Holy Week and Easter, in which the Church celebrates the mystery of Christ’s death and resurrection, are traditionally associated with Christian initiation.

...The ancient Church of the West has traditionally associated baptism with Easter. However, other traditions in the Church have associated baptism with other times of the church year, particularly the Epiphany and the Baptism of Christ, and All

---

21 CW: CI, 319.
22 Ibid., 325.
23 Ibid., 73.
24 Which Day identifies as the "Water and the Spirit" typology, Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem, 7.
26 CW: CI, 330.
Saints’ tide. There are practical difficulties with trying to hold all baptisms at Easter.  

The dominance of the theme of Death and Rebirth in baptism is balanced in passages such as those above with a healthy realism about the practicality of performing all baptisms over the Paschal celebration. It is clear, however, that the dying and rising symbolism of the water baptism, drawing as it does on biblical passages such as Colossians 3 and Romans 6 as well as the narratives, rituals and set lections for the Triduum, favours Easter as the liturgically ideal moment for the initiation rites to be performed. Easter bears not only internal significance to the candidate, but also an important missional aspect, for “Baptism is seen as acted evangelism, proclaiming in Christ’s death and resurrection God’s victory over the world powers of chaos and darkness to establish the new creation.” The Liturgical Commission’s twelve themes delineate dying and resurrection separately, but this study conflates them into one theme as they are inextricably linked. Just as Christ’s death makes no sense without the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:14), so the candidate must descend into the water in order to re-emerge. There is also something in this theme of dying and rising which speaks of the candidate, as well as the Christian community, preparing for their own mortal death and being reminded that bodily death in this world can be read as a completion of the act of “dying with Christ to ‘this world’”. Day notes in her study that under this typology the water baptism undergone by the candidate is not connected to Christ’s baptism at all, but explicitly to his death and resurrection.

Romans 6 establishes the most influential typology of baptism under this theme with its confident question, “do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life.” The font is established as a tomb as well as the place of

---

27 Ibid., 343.
28 Day uses the term "Death and Resurrection" to refer to this theme, Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem, 7.
29 CW: CI, 322.
30 For a recent examination of how closely the themes of death and rebirth are linked in the liturgical surroundings of baptism see Christopher Irvine’s The Cross and Creation in Christian Liturgy and Art (London: SPCK, 2013), especially Chapter 7 where he says, for example, "the deeply resonant symbols of death, rebirth and resurrection jostle for position in our theologies of baptism, but in the final analysis these three elements are indivisible.", 219.
31 Ibid., 324.
32 Day, Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem, 6.
rebirth, and so CW maintains the traditional assumption that baptism is by full immersion wherever possible, while recognising that, for practical reasons, this is unlikely to happen in many communities. It is important that the Liturgical Commission troubles itself to reassert the preference for “baptism by dipping”\(^\text{33}\) in order to maintain the solid link with the visual and biblical themes of burial and re-emergence from the tomb.

### 5.2.4 Incorporation in Christ

The fourth theme, that of Incorporation in Christ, shows close links with that of Enlightenment, but there are distinctions. The set of images which this theme references is those around the identification of the newly initiated candidate not only with the Christian community but also with Christ himself. “Paul repeatedly refers his hearers back to baptism not simply as a reminder of their conversion but as a way of bringing home to them what it is to be in Christ.”\(^\text{34}\)

The idea already mentioned of the catechetical process of establishing patterns of behaviour in, and forming the character of, the candidate is significant because those patterns of behaviour, in theory anyway, have something Christological about them. They are about the believer conforming more closely to the pattern of Christ’s own life. The relationship with the Christian community is incorporation in a family whose hearts and minds are set on God and so “entry into the new community is also entry into the life of the Trinity, putting on Christ who in his baptism was acknowledged as Son by the Father and indwelt by the Spirit”\(^\text{35}\). The traditional, though not widely practised, ritual of clothing the newly baptized with a white robe is one of the clearest liturgical symbols of this incorporation in not only the family of God, but of incorporation with God himself. There have been some attempts in recent liturgical reordering to establish a practice of the entire baptized assembly wearing white albs at acts of worship in recognition of this membership of a body which identifies with Christ, an identification made explicit at the point of baptism.\(^\text{36}\) The references in the liturgy to the fulfilment of Covenant promises are also

\(^{33}\) Ibid., 336.
\(^{34}\) Ibid., 315.
\(^{35}\) Ibid., 321.
\(^{36}\) Richard Giles suggests that "the alb is the basic liturgical garment of significance for the whole assembly. There is much to be said for vesting the whole community in albs", *Creating Uncommon Worship: Transforming the Liturgy of the Eucharist*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2004), 73. This study
linked closely to the idea of identifying with Christ, as is the marking of the candidate with the badge or sign of Christ, the Cross, whether that happens before or after the water baptism. The candidate, passing through the rite of baptism, becomes a “new creation”: something very real is moved away from and something very real is moved towards (Galatians 6:15, 2 Corinthians 5:17, Colossians 3:9).

5.2.5 Forgiveness of Sins

The fifth of the theological lenses through which the various elements of the baptismal rite will be analysed is that of the Forgiveness of Sins. Under this umbrella are gathered the three themes the Liturgical Commission identifies as Liberation, Reconciliation and Cleansing. As will be demonstrated, the majority, although not all, of the liturgical references to victory over the powers of sin and evil which the candidate is afforded by their encounter with Christ in the initiation rite, occur before the water baptism, and so the Decision and its attendant material will be a focus of study. The scriptural account of the ministry of John the Baptist with the “baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins”\(^\text{37}\) provides the clearest typology for this theme.

The necessity for the candidate to separate themself in some way from the world, to turn away from a number of things in order to turn to Christ, or as a result of turning towards him,\(^\text{38}\) has been central in baptismal liturgy over the centuries. The Liturgical Commission, in the fourfold theological framework for baptism already discussed above, identifies this “separation from this world - that is, the world alienated from God”\(^\text{39}\) as the first of the four stages of the CW initiatory framework. The threefold renunciation in BCP, that of the “devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world... and the carnal desires of the flesh” survive into CW in theological terms, although in three different liturgical forms. What is clear is that there needs to be an active turning away from the evil and sin of a guilty world.

---

\(^{37}\) Mark 1:4.

\(^{38}\) The order in which things are turned away from and towards becomes significant when the liturgical formulation of the Decision is considered, as will be demonstrated below.

\(^{39}\) CW: C1, 319.
The baptism administered by John, as well as the accounts of the “Jordan Event” as Day describes it\(^\text{40}\), provide a rich symbology of the water bath as a washing and cleansing ritual at least as much as a dying and rising one. Baptisms conducted in Advent and around the Baptism of Christ are likely therefore to prefer these theological themes, not least due to the lections set for these seasons.

It is within this theological theme of Forgiveness that the clearest encounter with the devil also appears. Whilst it is important to maintain a distinction between theological statements about sin, evil, and the devil they are clearly linked and the candidate encounters all three in their journey through the rite as their relationship with them is renegotiated. Within all of the redrafting of the initiation liturgies, what remains throughout is an explicit prayer for deliverance from evil (in effect an exorcism), highlighting that at least one of the duties of the minister of baptism is to pray for the deliverance of the candidate.\(^\text{41}\)

### 5.3 Identifying the Key Ritual Elements

CW: CI is the primary source of liturgical texts for this chapter of the study. The primary Church of England Rites of Initiation, those of Baptism and Confirmation, are found here, together with a compendium of liturgies entitled *Rites on the Way: Approaching Baptism* for use with candidates during their catechumenate, and two similar sets of services entitled *Appropriating Baptism* and *Recovering Baptism* which are explicitly for use with the initiated in their post-baptismal discipleship.

Just as Day notes in her synchronic study that it is important when comparing liturgies to identify a text which forms the “basis for the comparison,”\(^\text{42}\) so in this analysis of texts within the CW family it is no less important to identify a ‘default’ rite against which variations and optional alternatives can be scrutinised. For this study of the presence of references to evil, sin and the devil in the initiation rites, the ‘default’ rite for initiation is ‘Holy Baptism and Confirmation’ which takes place within the context of Holy

---

\(^{40}\) Day, *Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem*, 6. Day notes that rites drawing on the Jordan Event typology may also draw upon the narratives of John the Baptist’s ministry.  
\(^{41}\) CW: CI, 68.  
Communion. CW: CI also provides outline orders of service for when baptism or confirmation are administered individually; when they take place outside of the Eucharist; and when they take place as part of a Vigil service, but it is the first rite which is the ‘controlling’ service. The Revision Committee of the Liturgical Commission outlined that the ‘Composite rite’, consisting of “the Eucharist with Holy Baptism, Confirmation, Affirmation of Baptismal Faith and Reception into the Communion of the Church of England”, would form what they referred to as a “base text” from which the most appropriate set of formulae for each occasion could be derived. The liturgical principle of identifying a ‘controlling’ rite will be important to bear in mind later, when the Healing and Deliverance material is discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 respectively.

Initiation services appear elsewhere in the provision. The service of Holy Baptism, together with seasonal material and the Thanksgiving for the Gift of a Child, appear in CW. Still in use by many clergy is the now superseded CW: IS. The Baptism service also appears in Common Worship: President’s Edition (CW: PE). The liturgy of Initiation appears in Common Worship: Times and Seasons (CW: TS) as part of the Easter Liturgy.

Of particular significance to this study will be CW: AT, which was authorised by General Synod “until further resolution of the Synod” in 2015, and which provides a set of alternative texts to be used interchangeably with those found in CW: CI.

The key ritual elements to be examined in the structural analysis which follows will now be identified. This study follows Day in identifying the ‘deep structure’ of the baptismal rite as “consist[ing] of the ‘Pre-Immersion Rituals’, ‘The Immersion’, and ‘Post-Immersion Rituals’. Given the frequency of baptism being administered by sprinkling rather than full immersion, the second primary liturgical unit will be referred to as the ‘Water Baptism’.

---

44 GS 1152Y. Initiation Services: First Report of Revision Committee (October 1996), 5-6.
45 The principle of beginning with a ‘controlling rite’ would appear to be a key element of the Liturgical Commission’s methodology in the Common Worship project.
46 CW, 337-74.
50 Day, Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem, 5.
Like Day, this study labels these as primary structural units and, like Day, identifies the secondary structural units into which the primary units may be subdivided.

The Pre-Immersion Rituals in CW: CI include the entirety of the Preparation and Liturgy of the Word. Of the units contained within the Liturgy of Initiation, pre-immersion rituals include the Presentation of the Candidates and the Decision. The Signing with the Cross generates a set of questions because it can appear as either a Pre- or Post-Immersion Ritual, and this will be discussed below.

The Immersion Rituals themselves are the Prayer over the Water and the Baptism. This study follows Day in identifying the Prayer over the Water as an Immersion, rather than a Pre-Immersion Ritual.51

The Post-Immersion Rituals include the post-baptismal anointing and prayers, Confirmation and all that follows in the liturgy, which might include the Eucharist and the Giving of the Lighted Candle. An argument could be made that the (optional) anointing, traditionally with the oil of chrism, immediately following the water baptism is more properly classified as an Immersion Ritual itself, but this study follows Day in identifying it as a Post-Immersion Ritual not least because of the variety of options surrounding whether and how it is administered.

Several elements of the baptismal liturgy will not be treated in the structural analysis; namely the Preparation section; the Liturgy of the Word, except where references to specific scriptural provision concerns the study; and the Liturgy of the Eucharist.

The secondary liturgical units within the Pre-baptismal ceremonies to be analysed are identified thus:

---

51 Ibid. There is also a question around the status of the Profession of Faith, which is a congregational declaration occurring between the Prayer over the Water and the Water Baptism itself, and which invites of candidates old enough a profession of personal faith. It is the judgement of this study that, because this unit is located between the Prayer over the Water and the Baptism, both of which are Immersion rituals, the personal Profession of Faith in the Common Worship rite should also be considered an element of the Water Baptism. The positioning of the declaration of faith at this point has ancient pedigree.
The Presentation of the Candidates which will be treated briefly, due to the issues around assent.

The Decision.

The Signing with the Cross.

The Water Baptism itself forms its own primary liturgical unit, but can be subdivided into two (or three) secondary units:

- The Prayer over the Water.
- [The profession of faith where again assent is significant.]
- The Water Baptism.

The secondary units within the Post-Baptismal ceremonies to be analysed are:

- The post-baptismal prayer “may God, who has received you...”.
- Any post-baptismal signing with the cross or with oil.
- Clothing.
- The giving of the lighted candle.

All but the post-baptismal prayer are optional. On each occasion where an alternative text was authorised by General Synod in 2015 those alternative texts will be treated alongside those within the main volume.

As each of these units is examined, the methodology outlined in Chapter 3 will be applied so that the criteria of function and minister are put to it: What is the function of each unit within the greater liturgical movement? How does each unit in the Initiation Rites of the Church aid the Christian seeking initiation into the Church? In each case the question of who is doing the ministering will also be put to the unit: When is the candidate the active agent of Christ, when the priest, and when the congregation? Running alongside and informing these liturgical questions, the theological themes of Journey, Enlightenment, Death and Rebirth, Incorporation in Christ, and Forgiveness will challenge and inform the structural analysis.
5.4 Structural Analysis of the Units

5.4.1 The Presentation of the Candidates

The “Presentation of the Candidates” ascertains of an adult candidate their desire for baptism and of the congregation their willingness to “welcome” and “uphold” the newly baptized, and ensures that the parents and godparents of a candidate unable to answer for themselves are willing to undertake their roles:

**Presentation of the Candidates**

_The candidates may be presented to the congregation. Where appropriate, they may be presented by their godparents or sponsors. If there are infants for baptism, the direction in Note 1 (page 128) is followed._

_The Bishop asks those who are candidates for baptism_

_Do you wish to be baptized? 
I do._

The unit then goes on to ask questions of candidates for confirmation who have already been baptized, and of all candidates present. There is the option of testimony by any candidate. There is then an address to the whole congregation:

**The Bishop addresses the whole congregation**

_Faith is the gift of God to his people.
In baptism the Lord is adding to our number those whom he is calling.
People of God, will you welcome these candidates and uphold them in their life in Christ? 
With the help of God, we will._

_If children are to be baptized, the questions to parents and godparents in the service of Holy Baptism (page 66) are used._

This secondary liturgical unit is not entirely new in CW, having been present in a slightly different guise at the end of the section “The Duties of Parents and Godparents” in the ASB

---

52 The latter seems to be a purely liturgical device, rather than a way of gaining actual consent from the Community. There is no indication, for example, that if the congregation were to reply ”we will not”, the baptism would not proceed.

53 CW: Cl, 111.

54 Ibid.
rite for The Baptism of Children.\textsuperscript{55} In the ASB form, however, it does appear to be more of a prerequisite for baptism than a Presentation of the Candidates, and occurs at the very beginning of the rite.\textsuperscript{56} This accords with the ASB’s stronger theology of infant baptism requiring adult consent as well as personal confession of faith on the part of the parents and godparents.

The importance of this unit is that it establishes the requirement for, or at least a strong encouragement of, an expression of consent, or at least of support from the congregation, prior to baptism. Much of the unit is optional, including the physical presentation of the candidates to the congregation, but what is not optional is the question by the Bishop (or priest) to adult candidates, “do you wish to be baptized?”

There is an interaction between the officiating minister and the individual candidate at the outset of the unit which establishes the candidate’s desire to proceed with the rest of the rite. In the instance of candidates unable to answer for themselves consent is not required of the parents or godparents, although they are asked a set of other questions about their willingness to act as supporters and upholders of those whom they represent.

There is then an interaction between the officiating minister and the congregation gathered to witness the rite, which asks of the congregation whether they will act as welcomers and upholders of the candidates. The rite assumes therefore an indication of intent from the candidates, together with an indication of support from whatever wider congregation is present. Consent from the individual precedes that of the congregation.

CW: AT provides an alternative Presentation of the Candidates which includes two options, one for use with infant candidates and one for use with candidates able to answer for themselves. Both rites follow the same structure as the rite in the main text of CW: CI, providing first of all an address by the officiating minister to the candidate, or questions to the parents or godparents, followed by a presidential address to the congregation:

\textsuperscript{55} ASB, 243.

\textsuperscript{56} Jones highlights the theological distinction between godparents answering questions before and after the baptism of an infant, noting that a doctrine of “prevenient grace” is emphasised when God’s intervention in the life of the candidate, particularly in the signing with the cross, occurs before godparents (or parents) are required to answer anything. S. Jones, “Outward Ceremony and Honourable Badge: the Theological Significance of the Sign of the Cross in the Baptismal Liturgies of the Church of England and Scottish Episcopal Church”, in M. Ross and S. Jones, The Serious Business of Worship (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 144-158.
The president asks those candidates for baptism who are able to answer for themselves

Do you wish to be baptized?
I do.

Testimony by the candidate(s) may follow.

The president addresses the whole congregation

We thank God for N and N who have come to be baptized today. Christ loves them and welcomes them into his Church. Will you support them on their journey of faith?
We will.

Therefore of note to this study is that the 2015 revision of the initiation rites has not weakened the theology of the Presentation of the Candidates, nor its liturgical purpose of gaining an indication of consent or support, and neither has it rearranged the stages of the liturgical unit, maintaining first of all a request for consent from the candidate (or their representatives) followed by an indication of consent from the wider congregation.

5.4.2 The Decision

“The Decision” consists of a rubric, a brief exhortation to the candidates, either directly or through their parents and godparents, two groups of three questions to the candidates, and a final rubric:

A large candle may be lit. The president addresses the candidates directly, or through their parents, godparents and sponsors

In baptism, God calls us out of darkness and into his marvellous light. To follow Christ means dying to sin and rising to new life with him. Therefore I ask:

Do you reject the devil and all rebellion against God?
I reject them.
Do you renounce the deceit and corruption of evil?
I renounce them.
Do you repent of the sins that separate us from God and neighbour?
I repent of them.

57 CW: CI, 67. CW: CI, 112 provides the text without the reference to parents, godparents and sponsors. The text is otherwise identical.
Do you turn to Christ as Saviour?
I turn to Christ.

Do you submit to Christ as Lord?
I submit to Christ.

Do you come to Christ, the way, the truth and the life?
I come to Christ.

Where there are strong pastoral reasons, the alternative form of the Decision (page 168) may be used.

The rubric indicates that a large candle, probably the Paschal Candle (though this is specified only in a note) if not already burning, may be lit at this point at the place where the Decision will take place. Given that in many churches this will be at the chancel step rather than the font, it may be significant that CW anticipates the symbol of resurrection to be present at the place of renunciation rather than baptism. This may be a practical rather than theological decision, given the discussion over many years about the challenges of staging the modern baptismal rites in conventional churches. The rubric then indicates, “the president addresses the candidates”. President is the term used for the principal minister of the service, and where other clergy or lay people may lead particular liturgical units, the term “minister” is used to make that clear. President, in the case of baptism, may refer to a bishop, priest or deacon.

The threefold renunciations and statements of adherence are an attempt to regain something of BCP’s ‘strength’, and a conscious theological decision to reverse the Series 2 and ASB model of turning to Christ before turning away from sin and evil. This reversion raised significant objection in General Synod, and within the Revision Committee itself.  

---

58 CW: CI, 131, Note 4.  
59 For example, see C. Buchanan et al, Anglican Worship Today (London: Collins, 1980), 353, for a discussion about staging of the Pre-Baptismal and Baptismal rites, and also General Synod, Report of Proceedings 27.3 (1996), 1166 and elsewhere for the continuing discussion during the revision of the rites. S. Jones urges, where possible, that the Paschal candle move with the congregation from the East End to the font, and then back again. Celebrating Christian Initiation: Baptism, Confirmation, and Rites for the Christian Journey (London: SPCK, 2016), 43.  
60 Jones and Tovey note that it is the candidates, not the parents and godparents, who are being addressed, breaking with Series 2 and ASB, and Buchanan’s theology. See S. Jones and P. Tovey, “Initiation Services”, Companion to Common Worship: Volume 1, ed. P. Bradshaw (London: SPCK, 2001), 165 as compared to Buchanan, Anglican Worship, 157.  
61 CW: CI, 93, Note 1.  
63 For example, General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3 (1996). Compare the positions of the Revd John Guille (1155-6), Christina Rees (1156-7) and Bishop Stancliffe (1152) who, as the Chair of the Committee, is clear that the driving theological principle is a movement from darkness to light.
The default text consists of a rejection of “the devil and all rebellion against God”, followed by a renunciation of “the deceit and corruption of evil” and a repentance of “sins that separate us from God and neighbour.” That the devil is named personally as the first of a set of three renunciations is significant, signalling a theology similar to that of BCP and implying that the devil is not entirely the same thing as either evil or the motivator of sin, which must be turned away from separately. It is also a significant departure from ASB where the candidate repented of “sin” and renounced “evil” only, without any personification of that evil.

Owing to objections over the introduction both of the threefold renunciation and the naming of the devil, the last rubric in this unit was introduced at the final stage of revision, permitting the use of the Series 2 formula “where there are strong pastoral reasons.” The ASB form reverses the ‘movement’ of this unit, such that candidates turn to Christ before renouncing evil and sin:

The president addresses the candidates directly, or through their parents, godparents and sponsors

Therefore I ask:
Do you turn to Christ?
I turn to Christ.
Do you repent of your sins?
I repent of my sins.
Do you renounce evil?
I renounce evil.

This alternative form of the Decision therefore maintains the address to the candidates but crucially reverses the order in which the Decision is made, placing the turning to Christ prior to repentance of sin and renunciation of evil, and removes reference to the devil.

The third currently authorised form of the Decision is that in CW: AT and is structurally different from the two forms discussed above.

---

65 CW: Ci, 67.
66 Ibid., 168.
The president addresses the candidates directly, or through their parents, godparents and sponsors

We all wander far from God and lose our way: Christ comes to find us and welcomes us home. In baptism we respond to his call.

Therefore I ask:

Do you turn away from sin?
I do.

Do you reject evil?
I do.

The candidates, together with their parents, godparents and sponsors, may turn at this point.

Do you turn to Christ as Saviour?
I do.

Do you trust in him as Lord?
I do.  

The opening rubric remains as in the default text. There is then a newly composed presidential address followed by a set of four questions grouped into pairs. The first set addresses sin and evil. After the first two questions have been asked there is a rubric suggesting the option of a reorientation of the candidates and their supporters. This is the only rubric printed in the main body of the text which indicates a physical reorientation at this point in the rite. The second set of two questions follow, and these are the questions concerning allegiance to Christ. In this version of the Decision the questions concern “turning” to Christ, and “trusting” him as Lord. The question concerning trust replaces that about submission. There is no third question comparable to “do you come to Christ” in the main text.

5.4.3 The Signing with the Cross

CW presents the Signing with the Cross as a complete structural unit and so it will be treated as such here, though it must be noted that CW allows elements of this supposedly

67 CW: AT, 35.
coherent liturgical unit to be moved from their default positions to other places within the rite, a flexibility which introduces some significant liturgical confusion.

*The bishop or another minister makes the sign of the cross on the forehead of each candidate, saying*

Christ claims you as his own.
Receive the sign of his cross.

*The bishop may invite their sponsors to sign the candidates with the sign of the cross. When all the candidates have been signed, the president says*

Do not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified.
*Fight valiantly as a disciple of Christ against sin, the world and the devil, and remain faithful to Christ to the end of your life.*

May almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness, restore in you the image of his glory, and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ.
*Amen.*

The physical liturgical act of signing the candidates with the cross itself consists of two rubrics, enclosing a ministerial text. The Signing with the Cross may be conducted after the water baptism as in the 1662 position, although nowhere in the rubric does the option of moving the signing to a post-baptismal position appear. From this it might be inferred that to do so is less encouraged than the use of the “Alternative Decision” which is indicated by a rubric. The Note which permits the movement reads:

*The possibility of signing with the cross at the prayer after baptism is provided for, but if this is done it should be accompanied by the prayer provided at that point in the rite, not the text provided for the Signing with the Cross after the Decision. If signing takes place after the baptism, it must follow the administration of water as a separate action.*

The Signing of the Cross, in its default position, comes immediately after the Decision and thus seems associated with renunciation. No change of posture or position in the building is indicated. If, according to the rubric in CW: AT, the candidates and their supporters have reoriented themselves for the second two questions of the Decision, they remain in that

---

68 CW: CI, 113.
69 Ministerial, note, rather than Presidential.
70 CW: CI, 100, Note 11.
attitude for the Signing with the Cross. The rubrics make provision for a minister other than the president to conduct the initial signing and, after the formula “Christ claims you for his own. Receive the sign of the Cross”, for lay people also (parents, godparents and sponsors) to sign with the cross. This permission raises a number of questions about what is happening here, and complicates the use of oil at this point, as will be expanded upon below.

Then follows a rubric, a presidential exhortation to the candidates, and a congregational response. The “fight valiantly” text follows the signing and contains a congregational encouragement to the candidates to live out their discipleship to Christ by striving against “sin, the world and the devil”, and to maintain their faithfulness to Christ. It is important to note, however, that if the signing is moved to after the water baptism this entire liturgical unit, excluding the concluding prayer of exorcism, is also omitted. This means that, if all the permissions and notes are taken into account, the only mandatory section of this secondary liturgical unit is the concluding prayer:

May Almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness, restore in you the image of his glory, and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ.

Amen.

This presidential prayer for deliverance, or exorcism, is mandatory at baptism, even if much of the pre-baptismal material is omitted or moved. CW: AT provides an edited version of the “fight valiantly” exhortation to the candidates which eliminates reference to the devil and to sin, only addresses the “powers of evil” and removes much of the militaristic language. A shortened version of the prayer of exorcism concludes the provision which, it must be assumed, is mandatory just as it is in the default text:

When all the candidates have been signed, the president says

Do not be ashamed of Christ. You are his for ever. Stand bravely with him against all the powers of evil, and remain faithful to Christ to the end of your life.

71 As late as the second revision of the Initiation Services in 1996 the Signing with the Cross was framed in a more explicitly ministerial than imperative form: “We claim you for Christ our saviour. Receive the sign of the cross.” GS 1152A, 6. This form of words has a subtly different emphasis in terms of the theme of authority.

72 CW: CI, 113.

73 In fact, the version of this prayer initially composed for Series 3, GS 225, No 5.
May almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness, 
and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ. 

Amen.  

The prayer for deliverance, or exorcism, with its compulsory status serves as the final prayer of the Signing with the Cross unit, after which the rubric calls for a movement to the font, which may be accompanied by music and singing, followed by the Prayer over the Water.

The Signing with the Cross therefore at its fullest includes the imposition of the cross on the forehead of each candidate for baptism by the president or another minister, possibly including lay administration of the cross in addition to, but not instead of, the presidential administration thereof. It may include the use of oil. The “fight valiantly” formula is both presidential and congregational, encouraging the candidates in their Christian discipleship which will include encounter with the “powers of evil” or “sin, the world and the devil” depending upon which formula is selected. The unit ends with the only mandatory element within it, that is, a presidential prayer explicitly for the deliverance of the candidates for baptism from the “powers of darkness”.

5.4.4 Prayer Over the Water

The Prayer over the Water forms the first unit of the Water Baptism primary liturgical unit, and is preceded by rubrical encouragement for a physical movement to the baptismal font by “the ministers and candidates for baptism, together with candidates for confirmation, affirmation of baptismal Faith and reception into the Communion of the Church of England.” Provision is made in the rubric for “a canticle, psalm, hymn or litany” to be used. Movement is therefore expected, and the liturgical focus changes from the place of the Decision where the Paschal Candle has been burning to the place of baptism itself. This liturgical movement forms therefore a “hinge” moment.

A rubric and the presidential text for the Prayer over the Water form the remainder of this unit.

74 CW: AT, 36. 
75 CW: CI, 114.
Praise God who made heaven and earth, 
who keeps his promise for ever.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. 
It is right to give thanks and praise.

We thank you, almighty God, for the gift of water 
to sustain, refresh and cleanse all life.
Over water the Holy Spirit moved in the beginning of creation.
Through water you led the children of Israel 
from slavery in Egypt to freedom in the Promised Land.
In water your Son Jesus received the baptism of John 
and was anointed by the Holy Spirit as the Messiah, the Christ, 
to lead us from the death of sin to newness of life.

We thank you, Father, for the water of baptism.
In it we are buried with Christ in his death.
By it we share in his resurrection.
Through it we are reborn by the Holy Spirit.
Therefore, in joyful obedience to your Son, 
we baptize into his fellowship those who come to him in faith.

Now sanctify this water that, by the power of your Holy Spirit, 
they may be cleansed from sin and born again.
Renewed in your image, may they walk by the light of faith 
and continue for ever in the risen life of Jesus Christ our Lord; 
to whom with you and the Holy Spirit 
be all honour and glory, now and for ever.
Amen.

There is no indication in the text that manual acts are prescribed at any point during the prayer, although it will be common practice in certain communities for a gesture of epiclesis and/or the sign of the cross to be made either over or in the water of baptism at the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of the third paragraph.

The Liturgical Commission is very clear that the Prayer over the Water forms “the main theological statement about baptism” and the default prayer contains numerous scriptural and theological references to all five theological themes identified by this study. The default text contains significant Paschal imagery although it also references other themes. There are three optional prayers for use at different seasons of the liturgical year. The first, which is encouraged during Epiphany, at the Baptism of Christ and at Trinity,

76 CW: CI, 336.
contains more references to creation and the restoration of creation, and also contains an explicit reference to the “waters of judgement”\textsuperscript{77} in which sin is to be drowned. This reference, drawing heavily on the theme of Forgiveness of Sins, would seem to be referring to the Deluge, and also to the account of the crossing of the Red Sea. The second alternative prayer is set for use in the Easter season and, after a brief reference to the Jordan event, contains exclusively Paschal imagery, again including reference to the crossing of the Red Sea. In this prayer the waters are referenced as the waters of death rather than of judgement.\textsuperscript{78} The final prayer is intended for use during November in the period following All Saints’ Day and draws more on the themes of Incorporation in Christ, referencing the Communion of Saints throughout. It contains references also to Death and Rebirth but almost no Paschal imagery. The waters are described here as “the waters of destruction” and Noah is explicitly referenced.\textsuperscript{79}

All four Prayers over the Water have optional congregational responses, and all follow the same pattern of opening responses followed by a long prayer which includes at some point within it a more or less explicit epiclesis.

Two shorter Prayers over the Water are provided in CW: AT, both of which may optionally be preceded by the responses from the main text\textsuperscript{80}, and both of which contain at least an implied epiclesis. The first Alternative Text asks God to send the Spirit “that those who are washed in this water may die with Christ and rise with him”, whereas the second option contains a stronger epiclesis in which the Father is asked “to bless this water, that those who are baptized in it may be cleansed in the water of life...”\textsuperscript{81} The first prayer references Moses and the crossing of the Red Sea, and the death and resurrection of Christ. The second prayer references the Jordan Event, and also Matthew 28 and the commandment to the disciples to continue the ministry of baptism.\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{77} CW: CI, 152.
\textsuperscript{78} CW: CI, 158.
\textsuperscript{79} CW: CI, 163.
\textsuperscript{80} CW: AT, 6.
\textsuperscript{81} CW: AT, 37.
\textsuperscript{82} Interestingly the only reference to Matthew 28 in any of the Prayers over the Water.
5.4.5 Water Baptism

The Water Baptism itself comprises a presidential address to candidates old enough to answer for themselves, the rubric which concerns the administration of water, and the liturgical formula to accompany the administration:

*The bishop may address each candidate for baptism by name, saying*
*N, is this your faith?*

*And candidates answer in their own words, or*
*This is my faith.*

*The bishop or another minister dips each candidate in water, or pours water on them, saying*
*N, I baptize you in the name of the Father,*
*and of the Son,*
*and of the Holy Spirit.*
*Amen.*

This liturgical unit is preceded immediately by the congregational profession of faith which by default is a responsive version of the Apostles’ Creed, with a responsorial profession of faith supplied for alternative use. The presidential question to the candidates is therefore referencing the congregational profession of faith which presumably has included the candidates themselves. They are nonetheless asked to affirm that profession of faith as a group of candidates distinct from the rest of the congregation, although this presidential question and answer by the candidates is optional. It seems therefore that personal profession of faith at this point is encouraged but not required. BCP’s liturgy for adult candidates contains a personal affirmation of faith by the candidate followed by an affirmation of consent, providing an arguably more rigorous approach to the Water Baptism. Interestingly the Liturgical Commission’s commentary on the text does not treat the profession of faith or the presidential question to the candidates.

Of note in the rubric concerning the administration of water is the preference shown in the word order in the rubric to baptism by immersion. The Liturgical Commission’s commentary makes explicit the intent to preserve “traditional Anglican rubrical preference for administration of baptism by dipping”83 and also refers readers to Note 12 to the baptismal text, which reminds administrants of baptism that “the use of a substantial

83 CW:CI, 336.
amount of water is desirable; water must at least flow on the skin of the candidate.”84 It is important to note also that the president is not required to administer the Water Baptism itself. “Another minister” may do this, which may include an assisting priest, a deacon, or anyone else authorised to administer baptism.

The text provided for the administration of the water is unchanged from ASB and indeed from BCP, save for the change to modern language.

Whilst the post-baptismal ceremonies are gathered together in CW under the same liturgical heading of Baptism, this study, for the reasons outlined above, treats them as part of the third primary liturgical unit.

5.4.6 Post-Baptismal Rites

Revisions resulting in ASB removed cross-headings separating the Water Baptism from the following ceremonies and CW follows suit by making no distinction between the Water Baptism and the resulting actions and texts – all appear under the heading Baptism, just as four units appear together as The Signing with the Cross.85 This rather disparate unit, which would seem to contain some elements that are apotropaic in nature, consists of a rubric and optional ministerial text concerning clothing; a rubric which provides for signing with the cross at this point; a compulsory presidential text (a new composition for CW).86 The candidates and ministers may then move away from the font:

If the newly baptized are clothed with a white robe, a hymn or song may be used, and then the minister may say

You have been clothed with Christ.
As many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

If those who have been baptized were not signed with the cross immediately after the Decision, the president signs each one now.

---

84 Ibid., and CW: CI, 100.
85 CW: CI, 71.
86 Jones and Tovey, Initiation Services, 171.
The president says

May God, who has received you by baptism into his Church,
pour upon you the riches of his grace,
that within the company of Christ’s pilgrim people
you may daily be renewed by his anointing Spirit,
and come to the inheritance of the saints in glory.
Amen.

The clothing is a return to the Sarum and 1549 practice of the putting on of the Crisome, which was explicitly, in 1549, meant to symbolise the candidate’s duty to avoid sin, and as such is not an apotropaic symbol but a reminder to the congregation of the nature of the Christian life. CW reintroduces this as an optional ceremony, but without any accompanying formula, and it is not a presidential action. Presumably the clothing may in fact take place in private, especially in the case of adult candidates. The optional Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults (RCIA) does have an accompanying formula which is presidential and which, like 1549, has to do with the necessity of avoiding sin:

Receive this baptismal garment
and bring it unstained to the judgement seat
of our Lord Jesus Christ,
so that you may have everlasting life.

RCIA places the chrismation before the clothing (though both are optional and chrismation is only permitted at this point if confirmation does not follow), whereas CW has the clothing preceding both the optional Signing with the Cross and the newly composed prayer. It would seem clear that CW sees the clothing, much like the giving of the lighted candle, as what Day labels a “transitional” ritual, not adding anything to the status of the candidate but marking a movement into membership of the community. Moving on, CW’s reliance on a confusing combination of rubrics and notes does not make it clear what is permitted or encouraged. The rubric before the chrismation prayer, already quoted above, simply says:

If those who have been baptised were not signed with the cross immediately after the Decision, the president signs each one now.

---

87 1549, 241.
89 Day, Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem, 120.
Appeal to Note 1190 informs the reader that the formula which follows, which this study is referring to as the chrismation prayer, ought to be used rather than the formula from the Decision, and the rubric makes it clear that signing with the cross at this point is a presidential (though not priestly) action, and may not be delegated to another minister or shared with lay people as seemed possible at the Decision. This links the signing, use of oil and the prayer at this point much more closely to the water baptism, and perhaps also to Confirmation which is an Episcopal action in the Church of England, and an Episcopal or presbyteral, but importantly not diaconal, action in the Roman Catholic Church. This small detail in the rubric might provide some clue to what the Church of England believes is happening at this point in the liturgy.

The prayer, which is compulsory, calls for the riches of God’s grace to be poured upon the candidate in a direct allusion to the Holy Spirit and, perhaps, Confirmation. It also calls for the candidate’s daily renewal by the “anointing Spirit”. Jones and Tovey are clear that this is a prayer with a future orientation – it is not so much completing anything here and now as it is preparing the candidates for the rest of their Christian lives:

Presentation…, Decision, Prayer over the Water and Profession of Faith all lead the way to the font. Baptism follows and new life begins…What more is there to say? The baptismal bath marks the beginning of a new life in Christ; and the prayer which follows looks to the future…

Jones and Tovey are also keen to advocate the use of oil, whilst making it clear that they do not consider chrismation here to be denoting a specific moment of conferral of the Spirit, but rather stressing again the future orientation, “you may daily be renewed by his anointing Spirit.” This opens up the whole area of debate over complete sacramental initiation which is beyond the scope of this present project. What matters is to note that oil is encouraged in Note 1093 but not required, and that at this point it is a liturgical text which is compulsory, not an action. If oil is used, the note is slightly unclear and not entirely prescriptive. It suggests that at the Signing of the Cross pure olive oil, the oil of Catechumens, is used, but does not explicitly say that it should not be used if the Signing with the Cross comes after baptism. It also allows for chrism, which it explicitly names, to

---

90 CW: CI, 100.
91 RCIA 141 (Para 226).
92 Jones and Tovey, Initiation Services, 171.
93 CW: CI, 100.
“accompany the prayer after baptism”. The Note and rubrics might therefore literally be interpreted as permitting the signing with the cross in the oil of Catechumens, immediately followed by a further anointing in Chrism. They give no directions for the administration of such oil. Jones encourages the pouring of the oil over the crown. Jones and Tovey, *Initiation Services*, 171. Myers suggests a number of symbols to use at this point, including the Chi-Ro.95

### 5.4.7 Giving of Lighted Candle

The final post-baptismal unit, which in its default position comes at the very end of the rite, is the Giving of the Lighted Candle. This, too, can be transferred to “an earlier stage in the service, after the administration of baptism”96, and again the Note is ambiguous about where this unit might fit. Presumably it is up to the discretion of the president. The reason for mentioning it is that this concluding rite is positively clear about the status of the candidates:

> God has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and has given us a place with the saints in light.97

It therefore supposes that if the Giving of the Lighted Candle is transferred to after the water baptism, this statement confirms that the sacrament is complete and the “dominion of darkness”, alluding to but not naming the devil, has been put firmly behind the candidate. In CW there is no further encouragement to “fight valiantly”, as was possible in ASB and compulsory in BCP. It seems that the chrismation prayer, and perhaps its accompanying symbolic actions, are all that is required by way of prophylactic prayer at this point.

---

94 Jones and Tovey, *Initiation Services*, 171.
95 Myers, *Using Common Worship: Initiation*, 71. The Liturgical Commission’s commentary, as well as Jones and Tovey, also suggests the Chi-Ro, though Jones and Tovey consider that this might be “over-fussy” and suggest a simple anointing of the crown of the head. *Initiation Services*, 171. Jones, in his more recent work, reiterates the suggestion that simply pouring chrism over the crown of the head avoids the temptation to “overcomplicate the symbol unnecessarily”, as well as being more faithful to Old Testament patterns. *Celebrating Christian Initiation*, 61.
96 CW: CI, 101, Note 17.
97 Ibid., 77.
5.5 Reflections

Structural analysis of the Initiation texts raises a number of questions related to this study’s enquiry into the encounter between the Christian and the powers of evil and the devil. The main questions are outlined below.

5.5.1 The Minister at Baptism

There is confusion, or at least ambiguity, around the administration of certain elements of the baptismal rite, specifically the Signing with the Cross. This raises issues about authority. CW, whilst assuming the ‘default’ rite is Holy Communion with Holy Baptism and Confirmation with the Bishop presiding, allows for a deacon or other assisting minister to conduct the renunciations. This wording first appeared in the early drafts of Series 3. This permission becomes more problematic when liturgical actions such as the Signing with the Cross and the administration of oil are considered. As will be demonstrated below, there are points at which lay people are positively encouraged to act as administrants of signs and symbols which would seem previously to have been reserved to the ordained.

5.5.2 The Signing with the Cross, its symbolism, and the use of oil.

The ritual action of Signing with the Cross occurs at the very beginning of the 1549 service, before the exorcism of the candidates:

N, receyue the signe of the holy Crosse, both in thy forehead, and in thy breste, in token that thou shalt not be ashamed to confesse thy faith in Christe crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against synne, the worlde, and the deuill, and to continew[e] his faythfull soldiour and seruaunt unto thy lyfes ende. Amen.

This formula comes from the Missale Mixtum, but that source speaks only of the candidate’s fight against the world. Cranmer added the fight with sin and the devil and thus turned a prayer for strength into an apotropaic formula.

---

98 GS 225, Note 1.
99 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 256.
What is the principal theological truth that imposing the cross on a baptismal candidate is supposed to convey, and thus at what point in an initiation rite can a candidate legitimately “wear” the cross? Does the cross mean different things if it is used with the oil of Catechumens or the oil of Chrism and, if so, where is this made clear to the candidates or the faithful in the liturgy? There are questions about how often a candidate may, or should, be signed with the cross, and there are questions about whether or not the cross can be administered by a lay person. There are then a set of associated questions concerning the use, or not, of oil, and what that oil symbolises. There is a question about whether the imposition of the cross and of oil are one liturgical gesture or two. Again, there are questions about who may administer the oil. What is the position of the devil in all of this?

Irvine sums up the complexity of this most central Christian symbol when he says:

The cross is a condensed symbol. It is in one sense the signature of the God whose story is told in the Gospels. It is the universal sign of Christianity, and those who are made Christians are themselves signed with the cross at baptism to indicate their belonging to Christ.  

The position of the Signing with the Cross in ASB was one of the key issues raised in the revision process. Dalby noted after nine years of ASB’s authorisation, “the main body of ASB’s Initiation Services contains minor irritants as well as more glaring deficiencies.” Amongst the deficiencies he named the confusion over the positioning of the Signing with the Cross. The ASB printed the words for the Signing with the Cross, together with the unit Fight Valiantly under one paragraph number (14 in the main order of service), and the rubric at paragraph 21, the post-baptismal option for the signing of the cross, explicitly stated that the words to be used in the event of the signing taking place after baptism were precisely the same as those used if the unit was pre-baptismal. Thus ASB’s position seemed to be that the Signing with the Cross served exactly the same liturgical purpose before or after baptism, a position which is theologically and liturgically problematic. This was compounded by the permission given to use oil, which gave no indications as to whether more than one type of oil might be used and where.

---

100 Irvine, The Cross and Creation, 14.
102 ASB, 227-35.
103 Ibid., 226 Note 7.
Irvine, appealing to Ambrose of Milan, is confident that the badging of a catechumen with the cross defines them as a candidate for baptism, because the baptised are those who almost by definition are marked by the sign in which they believe. 104 Jones, in his detailed analysis of the position and theology of the Signing with the Cross in the Church of England, highlights the crucial theological difference between the cross being imposed before the candidate (or their parents and godparents) are required to make any affirmation of faith, and the cross being imposed afterwards. In the former model, he argues, “the theological emphasis... is on God’s prevenient grace.” 105 This he believes to be the prevailing theological position and welcomes its return from ASB onwards. He suggests that a post-baptismal signing, compulsory from 1552 and then optional from ASB and into CW denotes something rather different: “the ritual expression of the candidate’s reception into company of the baptised.” 106

The question, therefore, is what is happening with the Signing with the Cross when it occurs before the baptism? Is it predominantly an affirmation of prevenient grace? Is it at least partially exorcistic, as the tradition might claim 107, and linked to the renunciations that have just been made, or to the prayer for deliverance which immediately follows? If either or both of these are so, why is it optional at this point? The fact that it is moveable suggests that it is not of substantial importance in the pre-baptismal rites. 108 In order to attempt to bring some clarity to the situation, the theological confusion must be revealed.

In CW: Cl itself there is no mention of exorcism or deliverance in relation to the signing of the cross or the use of the oil of baptism. The relevant Note refers to “pure olive oil, reflecting the practice of athletes preparing for a contest” 109 being used when the signing occurs before baptism. The liturgical formula used implies a membership or claiming: “Christ claims you for his own.” 110 When the unit is moved to after the baptism, this

106 Ibid., 146. Syntax his.
107 Irvine appeals to the Mystagogical Catechesis, for example, as evidence of the combined process of the candidate’s being "anointed with the exorcised olive oil before being led to the water bath" being symbolic of their movement into belonging to Christ. The Cross and Creation, 211.
108 Jones notes that because there is no consignation in the Emergency Baptism service, the imposition of the cross is evidently non-essential for a valid baptism in extremis. "Outward Ceremony and Honourable Badge", 147.
109 CW: Cl, 100, Note 10.
110 In the original draft GS1152, this read, “We claim you for Christ our Saviour”, putting the authority rather more in the president’s hands than Christ’s, and this was picked up in the Synod
formula is not used, suggesting that as a post-baptismal unit the Signing with the Cross is not a claiming by Christ of the candidate, this having already been accomplished apparently without any marking of them with the cross. Instead, in this instance, the Chrismation formula is used, and the symbol becomes more about membership of the family of the Church. Myers, in her commentary on this rite, attempts to draw these issues out, noting, “we must make the sign of the cross at least once in the service...but take care: the accompanying words are not the same at both points. Signing before baptism has a different association, traditionally, from the signing after.” She goes on to link the pre-baptismal signing explicitly to “exorcism and protection from the powers of evil”, and at one point refers to the oil of Catechumens as the “oil of exorcism.” Thus she wants to see a direct link between the Signing with the Cross before baptism and both the Fight Valiantly and the Exorcism itself, and prints the three units together, as does CW. Stancliffe is clear that signing before baptism is “originally about protection and ownership and comes in the early rites after initial exorcisms and renunciations of evil.” It is one of the “step[s] over the threshold as candidates pass from darkness to light.” As such it is an integral part of the movement from not being baptized to being baptized. In his argument, the Signing with the Cross is part of the movement away from the power of the devil and towards incorporation in Christ. If, however, the sign of the cross is seen purely as a sign of membership, rather than also as an exorcistic stage as it was in 1549, then there is an argument that it makes sense to acknowledge that membership after, rather than before, the water bath.

Concerning the specific question of the relationship of oil to the consignation, although CW: CI actively encourages lay administration of the cross after the presidential administration, no rubric or note expands on whether lay people ought to be administering the cross if the oil of Catechumens is used or whether the minister alone uses the oil, the debate and subsequently altered. Here is an example of a theology of authority being modified during a Synod debate.
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111 CW: CI, 100, Note 11.
112 Jones also notes the pneumatalogical theology which would be associated with a post-baptismal consignation, given the accompanying text. "Outward Ceremony and Honourable Badge", 147.
113 Myers, Using Common Worship: Initiation, 45.
114 Ibid., 47.
116 Ibid.
laity using a ‘dry thumb.’ Indeed, it is unclear whether, if the signing is moved to after baptism, lay people may then administer it. It is not the common practice of the Church of England for lay people to anoint with oil, and indeed in the pastoral offices where the oil of Chrism or of the Sick is used, notes appear to specifically prohibit lay anointing. No such prohibition exists here, with the oil of Catechumens. RCIA, which has a great many more anointings in its pre-baptismal ceremonies, makes it clear that anointing must always be conducted by “a priest or a deacon.”

The problem is that the Signing with the Cross has accreted so many meanings since Cranmer transferred it from before the baptism where it accompanied the exorcism (1549) to afterwards (1552) that CW has fallen prey to the desire to allow all theological interpretations to be expressed. Added to this are the issues about staging and drama which were also raised during the revision process which allow theology to be sacrificed for the sake of convenience. What results is a complicated set of rubrics and Notes which do not make it clear precisely which texts and actions may be moved, and what happens to the rest of the pre-baptismal units if the signing is removed. The Signing with the Cross has “become detached from [its] original...place and purpose” and has, by being no longer fixed to the units around it, acquired new and multiple meanings.

5.5.3 The Devil and the Candidate

In 1552 the Signing with the Cross moved to after the water baptism and became a post-baptismal rite, still spoken by the priest alone. There it remained throughout the successive revisions and aborted revisions until Series 3, where the signing and the Fight Valiantly were returned to their pre-baptismal position.

117 Bishop Stancliffe did not expect many to take up the opportunity for lay people to sign with the cross in any case. General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3 (1996), 1164. Anecdotal evidence would suggest that this expectation was mistaken.
118 CW: PS, 24, Note 4, which refers the reader to Canon B37.
119 RCIA, 52 (Para 98), 114 (Para 90). RCIA's (optional) anointing before baptism is also clearly apotropaic rather than exorcistic: “May he strengthen you with his power”, 137 (Para 218).
120 One speaker at the November 1996 General Synod, for example, expounded his theology of the signing with the cross as the “most powerful of signs”, and that “the signing of the cross is not only to say that Jesus Christ died for that person; it is also, surely to mark this newest of recruits with the scar of Christ’s wounds.” General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3 (1996), 1096.
121 Taft, Beyond East and West, 189.
Two significant theological avenues of exploration present themselves. Firstly there is the issue of what the unit is saying about the action of the devil and the candidates in relation to him. The second is whether this unit, which has moved about all over the place in its history, serves any exorcistic or apotropaic function which is not served by other units.

Many of the letters and comments which were fed into the Common Worship revision process expressed concern about the re-emergence of language of the devil in the drafts presented in GS 1152 and at first glance the ‘default’ text does seem to be more interested in a personal devil than ASB. What this masks, however, is the permissiveness of the Notes and rubrics which, for the first time in the history of the Church of England, allow a candidate to pass through the initiation process without the devil being named personally at any point. Consider a parish which has opted for the “Alternative Decision” of CW: AT and also to use the Signing with the Cross as a post-baptismal unit. In this instance, the devil disappears from the renunciations. The Fight Valiantly, which has been a constant in the Church of England as regards its basic formula since 1549 is also omitted, while the signing formula, “Christ claims you for his own”, is replaced by the chrismation formula, “May God, who has received you...” This is a departure from ASB, which allowed for the transfer not only of the Signing with the Cross but also of the accompanying text of administration and the Fight Valiantly, effectively following BCP. This is a profound revolution because not only has the Fight Valiantly become an optional unit in CW, but also the naming of the devil, rather than increasing, has been made for the first time entirely optional.

If this is a conscious theological decision, rather than an unnoticed result of a set of complicated rubrics and notes, then the question has to be whether the Fight Valiantly contains anything within it which is lost from the rite entirely if it is omitted. In 1549, as a pre-baptismal unit, it is absolutely connected with the Signing with the Cross - in fact it is the liturgical words which accompany the liturgical action. It is presbyteral - the priest saying the words alone - and it is a statement of the efficacy of the sign of the cross, which is “a token” that in the future the candidate will be able to confess their faith, “manfully to

122 As well as the comments made in General Synod debates (see General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3, 1996), there are seven explicit references in the First and Second Reports of the Revision Committee (GS 1152Y and GS 1152X) to representations complaining about the use of the term “devil”, as well as many more referring to the form and language of the threefold renunciation. 123 CW: CI, 100, Note 11.
fight” against sin, the world and the devil, and to remain faithful. Thus it is an apotropaic statement made before exorcism and baptism, in a sense preparing the ground for those actions, just as it remains in the ‘default’ CW service. In BCP the import of the unit is the same but with the addition that it has now, by virtue of its translation to after baptism, become a statement also of belonging to the “the Congregation of Christ’s flock,”124 as has the sign of the cross, which now becomes the badge of the baptized rather than a preparation for exorcism and baptism. It is still a ministerial text and still clearly a text concerned with defence and protection.

The revisions of Series 2 and 3 result in the ASB formula which for the first time has an element of flexibility to it – it is up to the minister at which position to use it, although Jasper and Bradshaw note rather more strongly that “ASB clearly associates the signing with the Decision” and that “the Signing is accompanied by an appropriate text.”125 The text in question is the Fight Valiantly, now for the first time made a congregational text, shifting the authority from the baptising priest (or deacon) declaring what the cross symbolises, to the faithful encouraging a candidate (or newly baptized member). The Liturgical Commission’s own commentary on ASB is even more explicit about its preferred positioning noting that “it is suitable at this stage in the service that the candidate should be signed and enjoined to fight against sin, the world and the devil,”126 after which they appeal to Ambrose’s claim that the candidate is anointed to “wrestle in the fight of the world.” What needs to be understood is that, for all this theological rationale, they nonetheless provided for the unit to be used in alternate positions. With Taft in mind, the question needs to be what happens to the theology of the devil when a liturgy permits this kind of flexibility? 1549 clearly saw the cross, accompanied by the Fight Valiantly, as a necessary prerequisite to baptism and deliverance. 1552 saw it as a necessary culmination to baptism, having dispensed with the necessity for deliverance altogether in that rite. ASB chooses to permit both positions, with the same liturgical action and text. Is this a case of what Taft would call “universalisation,”127 where a unit is free to move around a rite and gain new meanings as a result, or of “conservatism”, where the unit has in fact lost its original meaning entirely? It is the argument of this study that ASB moves as far as

124 BCP, 269, 277, 286.
127 Taft, Beyond East and West, 189.
universalisation, but the fact that the same Fight Valiantly formula is present at either position of the Signing with the Cross means that the text is still linked to the action, regardless of how problematic that might be for gaining a linear understanding of a candidate’s movement through the rite. CW, by contrast, moves to conservatism because the text and the ritual action have become entirely disconnected, and the action can be used, with a brand new text, to symbolise something entirely different from the intention of the preceding liturgies. In the resulting confusion the devil is also written out of the baptism service entirely, despite the statement from the revision committee that “the committee has not been minded to remove references to the devil (preferring ‘devil’ to ‘Satan’)”!128

5.5.4 When has the candidate arrived? What will a candidate certainly have done to move from not being initiated to being initiated?

It is important to ask whether we can be clear about when a candidate has ‘arrived’. Unlike ASB, CW maintains a consistency that no formulae appear after the water baptism which could be interpreted as renunciatory or exorcistic. This keeps CW in line with the overwhelming majority of the tradition. Kelly, in his key work on baptismal rites, notes that from the earliest “mainstream developments”, by which he means the Apostolic Tradition, there is no mention of evil spirits after baptism and that all rites after the water bath are purely apotropaic.129

5.6.5 What is the nature of exorcism in the Church of England?

It is important to note that the word ‘exorcism’ does not appear at any point in CW: CI in relation to the baptismal rites. This study does use the word, however, because of the long association exorcism has had with baptismal rites and because it seems clear that, when its language and position in the rite is considered, this prayer is intended to have an exorcistic or, at the very least, an apotropaic function.

128 GS 1152Y, 27, Note 95.
129 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 92.
The prayer for deliverance (or prayer of exorcism) at the end of the Signing with the Cross was introduced for Series 3 in the report GS225 (which only dealt with infant baptism), and noted, “experience has shown that in Series 2 the Decision comes to rather an abrupt end and needs to be completed with an appropriate prayer. This we have provided.”

In this form it read:

*Then the priest says*
May Almighty God deliver you from the powers of darkness, and lead you in the light and obedience of Christ.

*Amen.*

In this form it followed the three questions of renunciation and adherence directly, the signing of the cross being located after baptism in its BCP position, and a Note confirmed that “priest” ought to be taken to mean “any other minster authorised to administer holy baptism.” Thus at its appearance we find a prayer with exorcistic elements immediately following a renunciation and adherence section, conducted by a priest or deacon. The same format appears in GS 343, which superseded GS 225, and eventually was authorised as ASB. The explanatory note in GS 343 was more specific, referring to the exorcism as “answering to the questions in the decision.” This is an interesting turn of phrase, and the question must be posed that, if this prayer is seen as answering to the questions in the CW renunciations as well, and these include reference to the devil, is this further evidence of a real exorcistic function in this prayer? The structural and substantial differences in CW are the insertion of the additional line, “restore in you the image of his glory”, which was itself the result of three revisions of the text, and the insertion, between this prayer and the renunciations, of the signing with the cross.

As regards the question of what is happening at this point in the rite, the candidate has probably renounced the devil, certainly sin and evil, adhered to Christ and may have been signed with the cross. The prayer in this position is a concluding of the pre-baptismal ceremonies before the movement to the font. A prayer with exorcistic themes at this point in the liturgy is an innovation for the Church of England, but having an exorcism in the rite
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133 GS 343, Section 10, 38.
134 GS 1152, GS 1152A and GS 1152B, in which the CW wording is finalised.
is of course not new. The last exorcism was that in the 1549 rite which took place earlier in the service, after the Signing with the Cross and Fight Valiantly but, significantly, before the renunciations and was absolutely explicit in its exorcistic function:

I Commaunde thee, unclean spirite, in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy ghost, that thou come out, and departe from these infants...135

What is significant about the placing of the units is that in 1549 the exorcism comes after the signing of the cross, just as it does in the ‘default’ CW rite, answering, at least historically, any argument that the Church of England does not need to exorcise its candidates once they have received the badge of Christ. In the default rite the (adult) candidate declares their desire for baptism, renounces the devil, adheres to Christ, and receives (perhaps in the ‘oil of exorcism’) the sign of the cross. Then follows a prayer over the candidate which has been interpreted as exorcistic or apotropaic136, but either way is about the candidate’s relationship to the “powers of darkness”, amongst which the devil is likely to be numbered and from which the president explicitly prays that the candidate might be “delivered”. The Greek word in Matthew 6:13 is ρῦσαι, translated by NRSV as “rescue” and by NIV as “deliver”. Less clear is whether the Matthean text or its parallels refer specifically to the devil. The presence of the article, τοῦ, prompts both NRSV and NIV to translate as “the evil one” but CW opts, in its Lord’s Prayers, to be more circumspect.

Whether or not the devil is referred to specifically, this is undoubtedly, then, a prayer of exorcism more than protection, as it asks for deliverance, not simply ongoing protection.137 It is referred to in the Revision Committee reports as “the prayer for deliverance”138, and in similar vein, in the 1996 Synod debate.139 Stancliffe, defending the new rites, was robustly in favour of reclaiming a theology of deliverance, which he maintains is deep in the tradition.140 The theological introduction to GS 1152, which in amended form found its way into CW, refers to themes of liberation. These included rescue from the “power of

135 1549, 238.
136 Buchanan refers to it as the “prayer for protection” in C. Buchanan, T. Lloyd, H. Miller (eds). Anglican Worship Today, 165.
137 It is worth noting that the word “deliver” occurs elsewhere in the baptism rite, in the optional seasonal blessing of the water for All Saintstide where the prayer asserts, “you delivered Noah from the waters of destruction”. This is the clearest occurrence of language of deliverance after the exorcistic prayer and the only occasion where “waters of destruction” are referred to in a Prayer over the Water. CW: CI, 163.
138 GS 1152X, 7 in which the wording of the prayer is being finalised.
139 General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3 (1996), 1165, in which the exact wording of the prayer is being discussed.
darkness”, for which it cites Colossians 1 as influence, and also of enslavement to “evil spirits” as a potential danger in Christian life to which baptismal theology ought to speak.\textsuperscript{141} Myers describes the prayer as one of “deliverance, protection and direction”, citing Ephesians 6 and Chrysostom’s Baptismal Homilies as influences.\textsuperscript{142}

This approach assumes a sequential progression through the Initiation Rites, with each action or rite happening only once however, which RCIA is less concerned with.\textsuperscript{143} Here, many “minor exorcisms”, and indeed many anointings, may happen over the period of the catechumenate, some of them administered by a “qualified catechist” rather than by a deacon or priest.\textsuperscript{144} Most of these minor exorcisms are, however, significantly less specific about what is being exorcised than is the CW text and, out of the eleven optional ‘minor exorcisms’, only six are phrased in such a way as to name spiritual evil, and only two mention anything which might be termed a prayer of deliverance.

The fact that a catechist may in RCIA administer ‘minor exorcisms’ raises the question of authority again. The issue of lay anointing has been discussed already. In the case of exorcism: is it a charism, or a priestly or diaconal ministry in the Church of England? The Notes concerning the ministry of deliverance, which will be treated in chapter seven, suggest that exorcism is not part of the routine ministry of all clergy, stating that special authorisation from the Bishop is required, but they do also suggest that it is definitely a clerical, rather than a lay, vocation. It may depend on how exorcistic the function of the prayer is: the minor exorcism in the Lord’s Prayer, for example, is prayed by all; the exorcism in the baptism service is prayed by the President: a deacon, priest or bishop, that is any deacon, priest or bishop seemingly by virtue of their authorisation to conduct baptism. More specific prayers of deliverance are reserved for those who, perhaps by demonstrating a charism, are selected by the bishop for the role.

\textsuperscript{141} GS 1152, 9-10.
\textsuperscript{142} Myers, Using Common Worship: Initiation, 47. She is referencing Ephesians 6:12, and Chrysostom’s Baptismal Homilies 2.24.
\textsuperscript{143} As indeed was pre-Reformation Sarum usage, with its multiple exorcisms.
\textsuperscript{144} RCIA, 42, Para 91.
5.5.6 What happens to a theology of the devil when there is such flexibility in the rites?

Significant divergence of theology was expressed in discussion over the reintroduction of the traditional Anglican practice of referring to the devil by name in the baptism rite. Vasey is clear that the devil represents the rebellion of the world rather more than “the seduction of the occult”\(^{145}\) whilst Stancliffe argued the need for a more “concrete” term than “evil” at the moment of renunciation\(^ {146}\). Bishop John Hind, presenting the first revision of the rites to Synod, however, refers to a “movement from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete” in each set of three questions,\(^{147}\) interestingly labelling the devil as both general and abstract.

The use of the “alternative Decision”, which may be chosen by many clergy due to its brevity rather than its theology,\(^ {148}\) and with no guidance provided as to what a “strong pastoral reason” might be,\(^ {149}\) means that since 1968 it has been the theological position of the Church of England that personal renunciation of the devil by name is not required for Christian baptism, contrasting with BCP and indeed RCIA, which has three optional forms of renunciation, all of which mention the devil by name.\(^ {150}\) Kelly identifies the personal renunciation of the devil by the candidate as the “only universal anti-demonic Christian initiation ritual.”\(^ {151}\) In his review of baptismal rituals in the Christian Church from the earliest times, this “dramatic confrontation with and defiance of the devil”\(^ {152}\) is the liturgical unit which he believes to be the single common element in all Christian initiation. That the Church of England has eliminated such language and theology, or at least made it optional, is therefore particularly significant and will be returned to in the conclusions.

\(^{146}\) Ibid., 1151.
\(^{147}\) Ibid., 1089.
\(^{148}\) See Myers, Using Common Worship: Initiation, 19; also appeals to the Revision Committee arguing for the importance of brevity for pastoral and evangelistic reasons: GS 1152X, 11-22 and GS 1152Y, 44-59.
\(^{149}\) Note that Jones and Tovey, in their otherwise excellent Commentary, make no comment at all, Initiation Services, 165.
\(^{150}\) RCIA, 136-7.
\(^{151}\) Kelly, Devil at Baptism, 94.
\(^{152}\) Ibid.
5.5.7 What happens after baptism?

There are a number of questions raised about the status of the candidate in relation to the devil and to evil more generally as they move on from their baptism. Initiated candidates will be invited to renew their baptismal promises regularly in some liturgical traditions, perhaps especially during Epiphany-tide and at the Easter Vigil. It has been demonstrated that CW does its best to eliminate any language of exorcism from Post-Baptismal Rites, but it is evident that the candidate’s struggle against evil, and perhaps evil in its personified form, does not end at the font. The next two chapters, which consider the healing rites of the Church and such rites of deliverance (or exorcism) as exist in the Church of England, will develop and explore these questions further, as they are the texts which address the Christian’s ongoing encounter with evil. The liturgical provision for Rites On the Way, together with confirmation when it is separate from baptism, also raises questions about the point at which Initiation is complete and precisely what the change of status of the candidate is at the point when they are initiated, both in relation to God and to the devil and evil.

5.6 Summary Conclusions

This survey of the Initiation material provided in CW sets up a number of key questions about the Church of England’s theology of evil and the devil and the relationship between a Christian and those powers. The structural analysis of the Baptism service has demonstrated the various points at which the candidate interacts liturgically with sin, evil, and the devil, and has also highlighted the points at which ambiguity, confusion or intentional flexibility introduce a lack of clarity in the candidate’s liturgical journey through the rite. It has been demonstrated that explicit language of the devil, whilst intentionally strengthened in the CW texts at the revision stage, has - by virtue of rubrical provision and subsequent authorisation of CW: AT - actually been weakened in practice. Questions have been raised about the nature of the minister of baptism and specifically around the role of lay people in the imposition of traditional symbols (the cross) and the use of traditional elements (oil). It has been demonstrated that again there is ambiguity and the potential for confusion.
What happens to the candidate after their baptism is important. How do they then engage with the powers of evil and the person of the devil? The healing and deliverance rites will be examined next, to identify what the Church of England wants to say about its membership in these contexts.
Chapter 6 - Healing

6. Introduction

The second set of liturgical texts which concerns this study is that in which the Christian’s journey is again described in relation to the powers of evil and to the reality of sin, and that is the rites of Healing. As discussed in chapter 2, the liturgies of the Church of England have from their beginning expressed a theological understanding that there is some sort of relationship between the Christian and the realm of things which beset them, things which include personal sin but also concepts of more or less directed and personified evil, which the Church instinctively wants to talk about during times of suffering. The order of service for the Visitation of the Sick in 1549 ¹ articulates a particular theological understanding of the relationship between illness and God’s will. More recent liturgies have similarly sought to provide a framework for understanding the nature of sickness and suffering for a Christian believer. The purpose of this chapter is to examine these later rites devised as part of the CW project and to identify how connections are made between sickness and suffering and the presence or operation of the devil and evil.

This chapter follows the same methodology as the preceding chapter in first of all identifying the dominant scriptural and theological themes available to the student of these liturgies, and devising a matrix to express those themes. Then the liturgy will be subjected to structural analysis through the lenses of the scriptural and theological themes, before some reflections are made and summary conclusions drawn.

The boundary between the remit of this chapter and the following one which concerns rites of deliverance will be demonstrated as being permeable, and reference will be made in both chapters to liturgies treated in the other.

6.1 Scriptural References to Healing

References to health and to healing occur in the Old and New Testaments, and other studies have undertaken analysis of these references in an attempt to discern the Bible’s

---

¹“The Order for the Visitacion of the Sicke, and the Communion of the Same”, in 1549.
fundamental message about health and healing in God’s plans for creation. Wilkinson’s analysis\(^2\) is particularly helpful for this present study in that it treats the Old and the New Testament in turn, suggesting a theology of health and healing for both before undertaking a very detailed treatment of each individual instance of what he refers to as a “supernatural” healing. The purpose of the present work is not to study healing in the Bible but to ask theological questions of the Church of England’s liturgical provision; where Wilkinson’s work treats the books of the Bible sequentially, this present study is concerned instead with the lectionary provision. As was noted in the last chapter, a distinctive feature of liturgical churches is the provision of a suite of readings for each liturgical occasion, and healing rites are no exception. ‘A Celebration of Wholeness and Healing’ (CWH)\(^3\) which constitutes the default rite in which healing ministry is offered liturgically in the Church of England today, provides a full scriptural diet of Old Testament, Psalm, New Testament and Gospel reading. Not every reading is compulsory at every service, but the rubrics are clear that at CWH the readings must be drawn from one of two prescribed sources:

*If this celebration takes place on a Sunday or Principal Festival the readings of the day are normally used. For other occasions a table of readings is provided on pages 44-45.*\(^4\)

As was the case in considering the Initiation liturgies, it may be assumed that the compilers of the lectionaries intend that their provision for any particular occasion deepens the congregation’s faith and perhaps also shapes it in the Anglican tradition.

Ministry to the sick in the Church of England, where pastors choose to avail themselves of the authorised or commended resources, will therefore draw upon one of two lectionary provisions. If the healing ministry occurs within the main Sunday celebration then the Revised Common Lectionary, a lectionary that is deliberately driven by a desire to treat scripture sequentially and with integrity rather than to draw themes to the fore\(^5\), will be the resource, whereas if CWH occurs at a time other than the main celebration, a table of


\(^3\) CW: PS, 13-25.

\(^4\) Ibid., 16.

readings “helpfully classified by season and by theme”\(^6\) is provided, demonstrating a different driving force is at work behind the scriptural selections.

The services of the Visitation of the Sick and the Communion of the Sick from BCP also remain available and authorised for use. In these cases one single set of lections (Hebrews 12:5 and John 5:24) is provided, constituting a very specific set of theological assertions about the corrective and chastening nature of suffering, which is not a theme which the recent revisions have sought to emphasise to the exclusion of others.

Study and analysis of the readings for the Common Worship Principal Service Lectionary, of the table of selected readings for use on “other occasions”, and of the Visitation of the Sick highlight a number of important issues.

Firstly it is noted that the Church’s ministry of healing finds its natural place as an element within the usual Sunday round. Although there are a battery of options for the rites being celebrated privately at home or semi-privately in a side chapel during worship, these other options are deviations from, or less ideal expressions of, the Church’s ministry of healing.

Secondly the editors of CW remain confident in asking questions about the relationship between sickness and sin. Although the uncompromising doctrinal language of the Visitation service has not found its way into CW, scriptural passages which make connections between sickness and sin remain set for use. Amongst the selection of seasonal lectionary provisions those for Epiphany and Lent stand out. In Epiphany the account of Paul and Ananias is set (Acts 9:10-19a) to be read alongside the Man Born Blind (John 9:1-7), setting up a conversation about whether or not there is a causal link between sickness and sin. In Lent the account of the healing of the paralytic (Mark 2:1-12) is set to be read, where at the least Christ appears to imply a connection between the forgiveness of sins and the recovery of physical health. CW clearly remains content that these issues be discussed.

The relationship between demonic possession and physical suffering is also referenced in the lectionary provisions. On several occasions a Gospel reading is set which presents

healing as treating both possession and other physical symptoms. Mark 6:1-13, which is set for Proper 9 in Year B, for example, describes Christ’s commission to the apostles to cast out demons and to anoint the sick with oil. Just as interesting are the sets of lectionary readings which provide a healing account in one reading and complement or contrast it with a reference to the ministry of exorcism in another. One example of this is the first Sunday of Lent in Year B which sets the Exodus account of the serpent on the pole, adopted as the symbol of healers, as the Old Testament reading (Numbers 21:4-9) alongside St Paul’s assertion that the Ephesians’ spiritual death was due to their enslavement to the Ruler of the Power of the Air (Eph 2:1-10). Another example is the second set of suggested readings for General Use which sets the proof text for Christian healing (James 5:13-16) alongside the account of the exorcism of the boy with the evil spirit (Mark 9:16-29). The theological intention of setting pairs of texts such as this is open to interpretation. It could be that there is an attempt to equate possession to sickness more closely than in previous times, or conversely to maintain a demonology alongside illness. Either way, the texts remain set for public worship. When sets of readings which highlight theological relationships between sickness and sin or evil occur in the Principal Service Lectionary there is no reason to doubt the intent of the compilers that these theological relationships should be the subject of reflection and teaching in the service. It ought of course to be noted that many of the sets of readings in the Sunday lectionary do not overtly treat any of the themes of wholeness and healing with which this chapter is concerned. It is nonetheless important to note the sets of readings which do, and note also the continued inclusion of such passages in the routine Bible reading of the Church of England.

Relationships between sickness and sin, and the presence of demons and sin have been identified above as important themes in the lectionary provision. There is one more: that of the relationship between evil and sin. The second set of Lenten provisions, entitled ‘Powerlessness and Grace’, places the Gethsemane episode (Mark 14:32-38) alongside Paul’s discussion of the “messenger of Satan” sent to him as a thorn in his side (2 Cor 12:7b-10). The final set of General use readings, entitled “Deliverance”, almost entirely concerns the overcoming of evil in its exploration of the evil spirit tormenting King Saul (1 Sam 16:14-2), Peter’s witness to the ministry of Jesus who “went about doing good and healing all who were possessed by the devil” (Acts 10:36-43) and Mark’s account of the healing of the man with the unclean spirit (Mark 1:21-28). The Dismissal Gospel, however, sets the healing of the woman suffering from haemorrhages, which is not concerned with
the presence of evil at all but with evidence of faith (Mark 5:25-34), and so maintains a link, or perhaps sets up an intentional tension, between physical healing and the activity and potency of evil.

6.2 Theological Themes

As has been demonstrated above, CW privileges a number of themes in its selection of biblical material for use in the rites of Healing. A set of theological themes also emerges from the surrounding interpretive and theological material as well as in the liturgical texts themselves. Taking the Theological Introduction to the rites of Wholeness and Healing7 as a controlling text, and drawing also on the four pastoral introductions to CWH, four dominant themes can be identified. These themes - of Recovery, Eschatology, New Creation and Deliverance - are outlined below. Following the methodology already applied to the Initiation Rites, each liturgical unit will be treated in analysis by means of the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>EVIL</th>
<th>DEVIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOVERY/RESTORATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESCHATOLOGY/KINGDOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW CREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELIVERANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 – Theological Themes Matrix - Healing

6.2.1 Recovery/Restoration

CW articulates, with a confidence lacking in previous liturgical revision, the fundamental influence of baptism upon the other authorised liturgies. Baptism is identified as the

7 CW: PS, 9-11.
‘controlling’ sacrament and thus the controlling liturgy.⁸ The CW project initially expected to revise the rites of initiation and healing together demonstrating an integrated theological approach and only later split the work into two separate items of business, and thus two volumes.⁹ The incarnation is the event by which Christ begins the renewal of the lives of all people, and the Romans 8 typology¹⁰ is referenced repeatedly to describe the way in which creation, though alienated from God, is yearning for restoration. It is instructive that the rites of confession (the reconciliation of a penitent) which are bound into the back of CW:CI, and which might reasonably have appeared in the rites of healing are in fact clearly identified as part of the initiation material and are subtitled “Recovering Baptism”. There is clear emphasising here of the ministry of the Church aiding individuals in recovering their full identity as baptized members of the household of God, a process demanding addressing and negotiating not only personal sin but also evil. Of the two forms of private confession offered in CW, the second strongly emphasises the recovery of baptismal purity and both are prefaced by notes which reference BCP’s first exhortation as providing the authority for private confession as a method of restoring a penitent’s position in the Christian family before receiving the Sacrament.¹¹ The theme highlights the promise that the “broken will be bound up in God’s healing love”¹², and the images are of individuals and the congregation returning, through corporate prayer and the healing rites, to something more like their state at their own baptism. Recollection of baptismal promises also appears in the Visitation of the Sick, though this is rather more a reference to the necessity for the sick person to recite the “Articles of our Faith” than to remember a state of grace imparted by the sacrament.¹³ It is nevertheless worth noting that baptism and recovery from sickness are clearly related to one another in the theology of the Prayer Book also.

The questions that arise from the emphasising of this theme of recovery and restoration, and which will reappear in the reflections at the end of the chapter, include:

1. How is it that evil, the devil, and sin act upon the baptized in such a way that further rites of the Church are required?

---

⁸ For example in CW:CI where it is stated that through the rites of initiation and healing “the Christian’s fundamental relationship with God...can be restored.”, 11.
⁹ GS 1152 presented both the Initiation and Wholeness and Healing material together under a single title “Initiation Services”. Subsequent treatment of the material was divided into separate projects.
¹⁰ The text itself is set as a suggested lection for healing services in Advent.
¹¹ BCP, the first exhortation at Holy Communion.
¹² CW:PS, 42, Pastoral introduction 2.
¹³ BCP, The Visitation of the Sick.
2. What is the position of Confirmation either in the process of initiation or as a rite which might fit between baptism and rites of healing?
3. Do the Deliverance Rites bear closer resemblance to rites of Initiation or Healing?
4. Can theological parallels be drawn between the progress of a candidate through the stages of initiation and through the ministry of healing?

6.2.2 Eschatology/Kingdom

The second major theological theme is that of the eschatological movement towards the Kingdom. CW asserts that “we are all on a journey through life.” The introductions to both CW:CI and CW:PS make clear that understanding the theme of journey is crucial in order to properly appreciate the liturgical and theological drivers of the CW rites, and furthermore that this is an innovation in approaching Initiation Rites in the Church of England. Movement is a significant theme within the rites, and the journey is not made alone: it is “an accompanied journey, with questions.” There is a very clear theme here of the candidate progressing through the various stages of any given rite, drawing theological and ecclesiological parallels with their journey through life, which journey clearly identifies itself with the life of Christ. The life of the baptized Christian “proclaims...our identification as human beings with the constraints and suffering borne by Christ” and the journey is one which therefore contains within it suffering and limitation. This second theme is also one of a movement through that limited life and into the Kingdom of God, and the promise that “all that is marred by weakness and sin will be transformed by God’s reconciling love.” All of life lived in this world is necessarily provisional because “we live towards the future.” Of the biblical typologies available Romans 8 is the most clearly drawn upon in this theme, with its images of suffering being not only built into the present order, but also a crucial part of the “birth pangs” which lead to a new order. Baptism, whilst introducing a candidate into a new life, nevertheless does not eradicate their need to navigate with care

14 CW: PS, 3.
15 CW: CI explicitly instructs the reader to “put...aside the approaches which conditioned thinking while the Alternative Service Book 1980 was in use”.
16 CW: PS, 3.
17 Ibid., 9.
18 Ibid., 42.
a world of temptation and danger, and so the candidate requires defence. Apotropaic material calling for God’s ongoing protection is provided in order to equip the Christian with an armoury to draw upon whilst journeying through this world towards the Kingdom of God.

Parallels are drawn between Christ’s life and the nature of the suffering of the Christian. Passages such as the Suffering Servant and the Crucifixion remind the worshipper that it is in weakness that Christ’s Messianic identity is most fully revealed, and that suffering is therefore not something to be ashamed of but something through which the Christian identifies with their redeemer. Found here also is the theological understanding that when the Christian suffers they in some real sense share in the sufferings of Christ. This is the theme which most influences the texts and supporting literature which seek to support the ill person in their state of weakness. ATTH points out clearly that illness is not to be equated with incompleteness or failure.

6.2.3 New Creation

The theme of New Creation shares a great deal with that of Eschatology, but there are differences. This theme gathers up all the questions which fall under the umbrella of ‘what does it mean to be complete?’ If being in Christ brings a “new creation” (2 Cor 5:17) through the salvific acts of Christ then what theological apparatus is available to the Church to explain and navigate experiences of ill health? If a person, regardless of the ministrations of the Church, remains in some sense incomplete, how is that possible?

It is under this theme of the New Creation that the discussion of physical healing is most prevalent. The Theological Introduction is clear that whilst physical healing is numbered amongst the signs of participation in “God’s new life”, it is necessarily a provisional one,

---

20 It is perhaps surprising that St Paul’s words to the Church in Corinth cautioning them for their over-realised eschatology are not drawn upon in this penitential material.
22 ATTH, for instance 129, 135. The report points out that Jesus’ own resurrection body is ‘disabled’ through damage to his limbs and side. This is a point made frequently in much disability theology.
23 Salvifici Doloris, section 5 as above.
waiting upon the “destruction of death” and the culmination of the Kingdom. The Church’s position on the significance/provisionality of restoration to physical health might be illustrated by the positioning of the Gospel readings of the healing of the man born blind and the raising of Lazarus in the period of catechumenate before baptism at Easter. Both the Holy Spirit and Jesus are explicitly identified as healers in the introductory material. That scripture witnesses some miraculous restorations of people to physical health by Christ, and that the Church continues to witness such healings, is balanced against the biblical evidence that Christ opted not to heal all the sick people he encountered or indeed to save himself from pain and death. Further, some of those who are recipients of the ministry of healing in Christ’s name today none the less experience deteriorating health or death. Given that the resurrection would imply that Christ cannot fail, what precisely does being a New Creation in a post-resurrection world mean?

CW favours the term ‘wholeness’ as a descriptor of that state of being which encompasses not just the individual’s physical condition but also their spiritual and emotional condition as well as other factors. This suggests that definitions of healing are not exclusively, or even primarily, about an individual’s physical survival, although ATTH stated that “the first principle [of Christian healing]...is that the human body matters.” Physical healing is numbered amongst the various ways in which “Christ meets human need” and any physical healing, still leading inevitably to physical death in the end, is a provisional sign of the presence of the New Creation. It is also possible to see in suffering borne patiently and gracefully, and in physical death experienced in the knowledge of Christ’s presence and

---

24 ATTH, 11.  
25 These Gospels are set on Lent 4 and Lent 5 in Year A in the Common Worship Lectionary. They may be opted for every year, and Rome instructs that they be used if there are catechumens participating in the Liturgy that year. RCIA, para 133.  
26 The Holy Spirit at CW: PS, 9, and Jesus at CW: PS, 42.  
27 ATTH cites the World Council of Churches definition of health as “a dynamic state of well-being of the individual and society, of physical, mental, spiritual, economic, political and social well-being – of being in harmony with each other, with the material environment and with God”, xv. It should be noted that some theologians have expressed reservations about ATTH’s rather wholesale adoption of the term ‘wholeness’ in relation to healing. See N. Messer, *Flourishing: Health, Disease, and Bioethics in Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), particularly xv, and 112-121 where he challenges ATTH, together with other theologians, and the WCC’s definition of health on a number of grounds including biblical ones.  
28 ATTH, 19.  
blessed by the ministry of the Church, “the fingerprints of a dying/rising God”. Christian healing ministry is above all things a ministry of hope.

Nevertheless, some liturgical elements in the Wholeness and Healing rites do stress the expectation of physical healing. The third and fourth Pastoral Introductions both describe the anticipation that when Christians obey the Dominical command to care for the sick, and to heal them, physical healing may, and does, occur. Such acts of healing are wrought so that, “all among us might know his saving power.”

6.2.4 Deliverance

The fourth theme presented in the liturgical and scriptural material which will concern this study is that of Deliverance. The death and resurrection of Christ bring judgement upon “all that is flawed” as well as bringing new life: one order of life is being “overthrown” in favour of another. The image is one of combat, of warfare. The liturgical resources make clear that, as a candidate navigates the Healing Rites, just as with the Initiation Rites, there is a recognition of and a deliverance from evil: “and this is the judgement: that light has come into the world, and the people loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil” (John 3).

There is a confident association of disorder with evil in the Theological Introduction. The various elements of disorder within the individual and wider creation can be identified with the biblical references to “the evil one”, “idols”, “demons” and the “array of forces beyond our powers to resist.” There are also references to the relationship of suffering, weakness and vulnerability with “the domination of sin and death”, and thus the need for absolution, and for recognition of the place of repentance as a proper part of healing, as well as of initiation.

30 ATTH, 153.
31 CW: PS, 42. Pastoral Introduction 2.
32 Matthew 10, Matthew 25, John 15 and James 5 are all alluded to or directly referenced in the Pastoral Introductions.
33 CW: PS, 42 Pastoral Introduction 3.
The questions presented for this study are what precisely the relationship is between deliverance and sin, deliverance and evil, and deliverance and the Devil personified.

Sin suggests a failure to adequately orient oneself in relation to God and the world. At one point ATTH comes very close to referring to sin as the ultimate cause of suffering.\textsuperscript{36} Sin and suffering are both expressions of the power of evil,\textsuperscript{37} and so repentance and prayer for deliverance are a proper part of the healing process. The Visitation of the Sick is commended for its emphasis on repentance, and the reader is reminded that “God’s forgiveness is an essential element in his healing grace”, although in the same passage ATTH rejects a simple causal connection between ill health and personal sin.\textsuperscript{38}

Evil is what Christ died to deliver his people from. Only he can “save to the uttermost”\textsuperscript{39} for evil is too strong a force for fallen humanity to escape or defeat alone.\textsuperscript{40} Evil personified in the form of the devil and his demons, or evil more generally referenced if held to be the source of sin and suffering, appear intricately linked with the disorders which beset creation and from which unhealthiness issues.

This theme will raise a number of questions about the relationships between initiation, healing and deliverance.

1. The most critical, on the face of it, is the question which arose initially in the discussion of the theme of Recovery/Restoration: Can an uninitiated person avail themselves of the Church’s Rites of Healing, if so much of the theology of healing and wholeness is dependent upon baptismal profession?
2. The secondary questions ask: What does deliverance ‘look like’ in a healing context? Will deliverance result in physical healing or ability to endure peacefully?
3. In anticipation of the final chapter, what are the distinctions and boundaries between deliverance in a healing context and exorcism proper?

\textsuperscript{36} ATTH, 22, presumably referencing Genesis 3 and the introduction into a previously perfect system of death, decay and personal disobedience. ATTH at this point does not differentiate between suffering caused by, for example, natural disasters, and that caused by human action, an omission which might seem incautious. The theology of sin and suffering is not entirely consistent in ATTH, and a simple Fall-based theology is certainly not endorsed throughout.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 245. The BCP theology of sickness being “God’s visitation” is rejected here and in the Theological Introduction to CW: PS. John 9 is cited as warning against this oversimplification.
\textsuperscript{39} CW: PS, 42, Pastoral Introduction 1.
\textsuperscript{40} ATTH, 21.
6.3 Key Ritual Elements

Liturgies containing what might be termed ‘healing elements’ abound in CW. Most of them are gathered in CW:PS but there are also several bound into CW:CI. The default rite is CWH, the rationale being that not only does this liturgy appear first in CW:PS, which as shall be demonstrated might be considered theologically significant in itself, but also because this is the Healing Rite designated for use in the most public manner, especially on “diocesan or deanery occasions”.41 It also appears amongst the rites titled ‘Recovering Baptism’ in CW: CI.42 It is this rite which will be analysed structurally and against the theological themes identified above.

A brief summary of the other CW rites of healing is required at this point as they will be referred to in the structural analysis which follows. CW: CI includes five rites which utilise secondary structural units from CWH. The first, ‘The Laying on of Hands with Prayer and Anointing at Holy Communion’ is a rite intended for use occasionally or regularly at the Sunday Eucharist. The rubrics provide for the Healing Rites to be either performed liturgically during the Liturgy of the Word or to be a semi-private ritual in a side chapel or other para-liturgical space during the distribution of Holy Communion. CW: PS’s section ‘Ministry to the Sick’ includes ‘A Celebration of Holy Communion at Home or in Hospital’ and a similar rite of distribution of Communion from the reserved Sacrament. Whilst both these rites are primarily concerned with the reception of the Eucharist by the housebound or sick, they include provision for both Laying on of Hands and Anointing. Finally, the section ‘Prayers for Protection and Peace’ contains a number of prayers to be said with “those suffering from a sense of disturbance or unrest”.43 These prayers include the most explicit references to the devil and the most realised theology of demons and of hell in the entire authorised provision. They will be returned to in the Deliverance chapter, but are noted here as belonging properly to the liturgies identified in CW for use when ministering to the sick.

As noted above, CWH is reprinted in CW: CI where it appears as the last of a collection of rites entitled ‘Reconciliation and Restoration: Recovering Baptism.’ Within this collection

---

41 CW: PS, 14.
42 CW: CI, 290-309.
43 CW: PS, 94.
are also included the rite for Laying on of Hands and Anointing in Public Worship; the short form for the blessing of the oil of the sick; some Eucharistic Propers; and two rites for the hearing of sacramental confession, which include the provision for the Laying on of Hands and for Anointing. In these latter rites only the text for Anointing is provided.

The key ritual elements of CWH will now be identified prior to structural analysis. This study, following Day’s methodology in relation to Initiation Rites, identifies that in the passage of a candidate seeking the healing ministry of the Church through a healing ritual there are ‘before’ and ‘after’ points and thus three primary structural units can be identified: ‘the ‘Preliminary Rites’, the ‘Healing Rites’, and the ‘Rites of Response’. The Preliminary Rites include the Gathering, the Liturgy of the Word and the Penitential section. The Healing Rites comprise the Presentation and Blessing of Oil, the Laying on of Hands, the Anointing with Oil and a concluding Collect. Rites of Response always include some act of thanksgiving, the Lord’s Prayer and the Sending Out and may include the Eucharist.

One of the challenges for this study is that several of the elements of this rite which include the clearest theological assertions about what is happening are optional. A case in point are the Introductions which would, were they normative, certainly form one of the key secondary structural units for analysis since they comprise theological statements delivered by the minister as to the purpose and anticipated effect of the ensuing rite. The challenge is that all four of the possible introductions are optional, the minister having the freedom to use “other suitable words”. In one sense this plasticity in theological definition of what is happening in the rites precisely addresses the confusion which this study identifies in the CW provision, but these texts are of sufficient interest, together with the Collect which is normative, to be treated as a pseudo-unit in what follows.

The Introductions acknowledged, the Penitential section forms the first of the secondary structural units proper, and the only normative Preliminary secondary unit. Penitence appears as a preliminary ritual in many of the rites from which CW draws as influences, identifying the link between personal repentance and the healing ministry of Christ.

---

45 CW: PS, 14.
In the Healing Unit itself this study identifies three secondary units. The CW liturgical structure collects all three of these units under a single heading, but they are properly treated separately. The first of these units is designated the Presentation and Blessing of Oil, which consists of responses and the prayer over the oil. There are several options available for this prayer. The second unit is the Laying on of Hands, which consists of a rubric and the words of administration. The third unit, the Anointing, again consists of a rubric and the words of administration. The second or the third of these units as appropriate is followed by an apotropaic Collect, concluding this Primary Unit in its entirety.

The third Primary Unit, the Rites of Response, will not detain this study long, but it always includes thanksgiving. The constants are the Lord’s Prayer, a Dismissal Gospel, and the Peace.

Having identified the key ritual elements for further analysis, it should be noted that this study will not cover Greeting, Collect or the Liturgy of the Word, except where scriptural texts available for use inform the thematic analysis of the units. The Litany likewise will not be treated.

As each of these units is examined, the methodology outlined in Chapter 3 will be employed, so that the criteria of function and of minister are applied to it: What is the function of each unit within the rite? In this chapter the key question is how does each unit in the Healing Rites of the Church aid the Christian seeking healing in their journey from a position of requiring healing to that of having received healing from the Church and from God? In each case the question of who is doing the ministering will again be put to the unit – when is the candidate the active agent of Christ, when the priest, and when the congregation? Addressing these liturgical questions, the theological themes of Recovery, New Creation, Eschatology and Deliverance will challenge and inform the structural analysis.
6.4. Structural Analysis

6.4.1 The Introductions

The two secondary units identified for study within the Preliminary Rites are very different in character from each other. The first, the Introductions, is unique in this study because it consists only of a rubric in the main text which references texts in the Supplementary Material section. It is unusual to treat a secondary unit which does not appear in the main body of the rite, but the very fact of its existence makes it important for this study.

The Introductions consist of four short paragraphs which set out a theological rationale for the ministry which is about to take place. Each has a different style and focus and each will be considered briefly below. Two significant curiosities present themselves: firstly that these Introductions are optional, and secondly that they can be used in two different places in the service.

There are three rubrics which refer to and guide the minister in the use of the Introductions. The first occurs within The Gathering, and reads:

*The president may introduce the service, using one of the forms on pages 42-43 or other suitable words.*

The second rubric appears at the beginning of the Penitential Section and reads:

*As an introduction to this section, a minister may use one of the forms on pages 42-43, if it has not already been used at the beginning of the service.*

The final rubric prefaces the Introductions themselves in the Supplementary Material section. This one reads:

*One of these may be used by the president, either at the Greeting, or to introduce the Prayers of Intercession before the Laying on of Hands and Anointing.*

---

46 CW: PS, 14.
47 Ibid., 17.
48 Ibid., 42.
Structural analysis of these texts and rubrics is difficult, not least because there are two major inconsistencies between the three rubrics. The third rubric implies that these texts, wherever they appear, are presidential, whereas the second rubric appears to permit another minister to read the Introduction if it is read before the Prayers. Further, the second rubric permits one of the texts to be read at the beginning of the service and another different selection to be used at the Prayers. The third rubric seems to rule that option out. With these caveats, structural analysis will be attempted.

Used in either position in the rite, the function of the texts is clearly didactic. The Introductions serve to provide an ecclesial mandate (Christ’s, or the Apostles’) to the liturgical actions which follow, and also to provide some theological background to the congregation which is about to participate in or observe these rites. They are presidential (or at least ministerial) texts, articulating the authority for the ministry to follow. This was the rationale for including them, fairly late in the revision process, when it was pointed out that the longer and far more complex Theological Introduction, whilst authorised by General Synod, would be accessible neither academically or in all likelihood physically to the congregation members, who were nonetheless in need of some theological interpretation of the services. The option to omit these Introductions exists, and there is no requirement for the president to introduce the service at all.

Each of the texts is delivered to the entire congregation, candidates and others, together. The first option draws heavily on Hebrews chapters 4 and 7, with a strong theme of recovery and restoration, stressing the incarnational life of Christ. It references Christ’s ability to “save to the uttermost”, drawing in a deliverance theme as well.

The second text is influenced by Romans 8 and has the strongest eschatological flavour of the four. It is concerned with hope and future, and looks to the time when the broken and suffering creation will be gathered up and made whole. It is also the text which references penitence the most and as such fits most naturally into the second, later, position in the rite, linking Penitence to the New Creation.

49 GS 1152V, paragraph 11 and Annex. Originally three of the Introductions were included (in GS 1152D), and then the existing Introduction from Ministry to the Sick was added as a fourth option (in GS 1152E and GS 1152W). There was also a plea in the Synod debate in July 1998 to introduce liturgical texts which would reduce somewhat the perceived need to “coach” candidates for the Healing Rites. General Synod. Report of Proceedings 29.2 (1998), 393.
The third text has a strong ecclesiological theme. It appeals to the account of the life of the early Christians in Acts 2 and applies it to the life of the Church today. It names Christ as “Jesus the healer” and makes the strongest claim of all four Introductions that the purpose of praying in his name is that “the sick may be restored to health” as well as that wider congregation may experience knowledge of salvation. It is probably the most confident Introduction in terms of the expectation of physical healing and as such has a strong restoration/recovery element as well.

The final option appeals to the dominical command of Christ to his disciples to lay hands on the sick, and then to James’s instruction concerning the gathering of the elders and the anointing with oil. Clear biblical warrant is provided for the liturgical actions, and so this Introduction is probably the most apologetic. It also clearly predicates different actions of God to the two liturgical rites. To the Laying on of Hands it attributes “healing and peace”, whereas the Anointing is described as giving “healing and restoration and forgiveness”. It is also the only text of the four which makes provision for the sick person to be named at this point in the service, providing continuity through the rite and linking the Preliminary Unit firmly to the Healing Unit.

6.4.2 Penitence

Following the Greeting and the (optional) Introductions the liturgy for Wholeness and Healing contains a full Liturgy of the Word and intercessions. At the very end of the Preliminary rites come the Prayers of Penitence, and it is this secondary unit which will now be considered.

The intercessions and the Prayers of Penitence are clearly designed to be two parts of the same liturgical unit as they fall within the one major heading Prayer and Penitence. The model is that of the BCP communion service where general intercession moves directly into confession and absolution. So in CW: PS the last thing that is done before the oil is blessed is that the people confess their sins. The preceding unit has consisted of a litany for healing which gathers up general concerns for the Church and the world as well as more specific

---

50 CW: PS, 43.
petitions for healing. The minister leading the prayers then addresses the congregation with a compulsory text which alludes to traditional words used at the imposition of ashes on Ash Wednesday. There is no indication that the president must lead this section, which might well be devolved to a deacon or assistant minister. Penitence and faith are identified as the offering of the people of God which renew confidence and grow trust.

Three responses follow which are biblical, drawn from Isaiah and the Psalms and, again, compulsory. Interestingly these biblical responses caused upset at the revision stage, with some Synod members feeling that they were too esoteric and confusing to be helpful to those who might seek the healing ministry of the Church in time of need, but not be familiar with its liturgical traditions. They were, in any case, retained, and they lead into a period of “silent reflection and self-examination”.

A rubric offers the minister two forms of corporate confession, whilst also allowing “another suitable form” to be used. The first text is a Kyrie confession and has strong associations with the paschal season as it speaks of the raising of the dead, the life of the Spirit and the light in the darkness. It does not mention healing specifically, unlike the Roman text in the equivalent rite which has a far more overt reference to confession in the context of healing. The second option is the text which first appeared in Church of England liturgy in *The Promise of his Glory* (PHG) in the order of service for Remembrance Sunday, and which has subsequently been adopted as a default alternative confession in CW. It draws on the language of the Collect for St Richard of Chichester and looks forward to a “humble walk” with God.

The president then declares the absolution. A set form is provided which clearly is intended to link the threads of the liturgical unit prior to the Healing Rites, but authorised

---

51 General Synod. *Report of Proceedings* 29.2 (1998), 392-3. Beatrice Brandon, currently Archbishop’s Adviser for Healing and Deliverance, suggested that these sections of the rite, “lack the clarity of thinking which suffering brings and do not convey well, in parts, the feelings and involvement of those in the congregation who are seeking healing...Where is the clarity of message here?”

52 CW: PS, 18.


alternatives are permitted. The default absolution draws heavily on the traditional text for absolution at private confession, perhaps reflecting the longstanding tradition in both the Church of England and in Rome that candidates for healing are encouraged to make a private or personal confession of sins first. The text references reconciliation, pardon, peace and strength. Originally composed for the 1981 Ministry to the Sick volume it failed then to gain the necessary approvals in Synod and was subsequently included in *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* and in the CW provision.

This brings to a conclusion the secondary liturgical unit under consideration and indeed the Preliminary Rites unit itself. A rubric suggests that it might be appropriate to sing at this point before the liturgy moves on to the Healing Rites themselves. In some contexts this singing might also cover the entrance of the oils into the assembly.

It ought to be noted that at no point in this Preliminary unit have the candidates for healing been singled out or identified or done anything ritually that has not been shared by the entire congregation (unless optional Introduction 4 has been used). Nonetheless, a theological rationale for the ministry has probably been presented either in Introduction or Sermon or both, and confession of sins, which has always been part of Anglican Healing Rites, has taken place in order that the candidates are ready for the second primary unit: the Healing Rites.

### 6.4.3 The Prayer over the Oil

At this point in the rite congregation, candidates and ministers have moved united through the Preparatory rites. They have gathered and there has been some articulation of the theological principles which underpin the journey of the candidates, either in an

---

55 The default absolution was authorised for use in New Patterns for Worship (NPW) as Confession B75. *New Patterns for Worship* (London: Church House Publishing, 2002). The collection also includes two absolutions (B79 and B80) explicitly identified as themes for “Relationships and Healing” and which are, presumably, therefore particularly appropriate. NPW, 96-7.

56 See BCP Visitation of the Sick where the penitent is “moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the Priest shall absolve him.” In Rome Penitence is expected during the Introductory Rites at *Anointing outside Mass*, and on a personal visit to a sick person an act of penance is expected. *Pastoral Care of the Sick*, 51, 76.

57 Headley and Nichols, “Wholeness and Healing”, 160.
Introduction, Sermon or both. There has been penitence and absolution, and reading of scripture. In all of this the candidates have not been distinguished from the rest of the congregation. In this second unit the candidates’ relationship with sin, evil and sickness is articulated more clearly. The whole of the second primary liturgical unit is contained within the CW: PS section, Laying on of Hands and Anointing. This unit can be further sub-divided into three secondary units: The Prayer over the Oil, the Laying on of Hands, and the Anointing.

The unit begins with the rubric: *Oil for anointing is brought before the president.*\(^{58}\) This is clear direction that oil be brought from some other place—whether within or without the worship space is not specified—and placed before the president of the rite. The implication is that liturgical movement is expected at this point, though the rubric could also be interpreted in a more utilitarian way. Either way, oil is introduced by another person, or people, into the assembly at this point, presumably in order to draw attention to the physical symbol. Note \(^{59}\) specifies that the oil to be used is pure olive oil, which by default is ‘unblessed’ at this stage in the proceedings, though the same note permits oil which has already been blessed to be presented, in which case a shorter version of the ensuing prayer is used.\(^{61}\)

The prayer over the oil begins after this liturgical movement and is prayed by the president:

\[\textit{Oil for anointing is brought before the president.}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{All} & \quad \text{Our help is in the name of the Lord} \\
\text{All} & \quad \text{who has made heaven and earth.} \\
\text{Blessed be the name of the Lord:} \\
\text{All} & \quad \text{now and for ever. Amen.} \\
\end{align*}

\(^{(or)}\)

\(^{58}\) CW: PS, 20.  
\(^{59}\) Ibid., 25.  
\(^{60}\) The Church of England specifies that the oil(s) used in its ceremonies be pure olive oil, following Canon B37(C).  
\(^{61}\) Certain other Churches permit other vegetable oils to be used. Rome permits the use of vegetable oil. See *Pastoral Care of the Sick*, 7. Tovey notes that Southern Africa “mentions ‘natural vegetable oil’, which may indicate a variety of different oils are used.” P. Tovey, “From Visitation to Ministry: Changing Approaches in Anglican Provinces to the Ministry to the Sick,” *Anaphora* 10.2 (2016): 74. Maddocks also asserts that the C of E, in the time of the ASB, permitted other types of oil to be used, though this study can find no evidence of this. See M. Maddocks, *The Christian Healing Ministry: 2nd edition* (London: SPCK, 1990), 118.
Praise God who made heaven and earth,
who keeps his promise for ever.

All

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God,
who is worthy of all thanksgiving and praise.

All

Blessed are you, sovereign God, gentle and merciful,
creator of heaven and earth.
Your Word brought light out of darkness,
and daily your Spirit renews the face of the earth.

When we turned away from you in sin,
your anointed Son took our nature and entered our suffering
to bring your healing to those in weakness and distress.
He broke the power of evil and set us free from sin and death
that we might become partakers of his glory.

His apostles anointed the sick in your name,
bringing wholeness and joy to a broken world.
By your grace renewed each day
you continue the gifts of healing in your Church
that your people may praise your name for ever.
By the power of your Spirit may your blessing rest
on those who are anointed with this oil in your name;
may they be made whole in body, mind and spirit.

Hear the prayer we offer for all your people.
Remember in your mercy those for whom we pray:
heal the sick, raise the fallen, strengthen the fainthearted
and enfold in your love the fearful and those who have no hope.

In the fullness of time complete your gracious work.
Reconcile all things in Christ and make them new,
that we may be restored in your image, renewed in your love,
and serve you as sons and daughters in your kingdom.
Through your anointed Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord,
to whom with you and the Holy Spirit
we lift our voices of thanks and praise:

All

Blessed be God, our strength and our salvation,
now and for ever. Amen.

Alternative prayers may be used (pages 46–47).

Use of oil fell out of use in the Church of England after the revisions which led to 1552 and,
although throughout the history of the Church of England there have been attempts to
reintroduce rites for the blessing of oil and its liturgical use in healing rituals,⁶² the

⁶² Documented comprehensively by, for example, Headley and Nichols, "Wholeness and Healing", 152-157; C.W. Gusmer, The Ministry of Healing in the Church of England: An Ecumenical-Liturgical
publication of CW: PS was the first time since 1549 that there had been an authorised Prayer over the Oil available for use in a healing context. The 2005 text is therefore significant in being the first authorised liturgical articulation since 1549 of what the Church believed the function of the oil to be in the rites of healing. That the purpose of this prayer is at least partly didactic is implied by the fact that there is no provision for the Prayer over the Oil to be omitted even though anointing itself is optional during this service. During the revision process it was made clear that “the prayer over the oil has been deliberately printed before the ministry of the laying on of hands, since the content of that prayer sets the general context for the whole ministry.”

Two opening dialogues are provided, the first the traditionally Episcopal set, and the second the pair familiar from the Prayers over the Water at baptism, designed to be spoken by a priest. In fact, according to the letter of the rubrics, either set may be spoken by the president, whether in episcopal orders or not. Both options for the opening dialogue have a strong emphasis of praise and thanksgiving.

The prayer which follows has at its heart the setting apart of the oil, with an epiclesis which is technically over the candidates for anointing rather than the oil itself. The function of the prayer is clearly to set the oil apart for the purpose of anointing candidates in order “that they may be made whole in body, mind and spirit.” The prayer has secondary didactic functions as discussed above. It sets the present-day ministry of healing in the apostolic context and it expresses theologically what the candidate might expect to be healed of or delivered from by virtue of this ministry about to be offered. The first paragraph of the prayer praises the Trinitarian God. The second paragraph articulates a Christology for healing which is firmly incarnational and in which the theological themes of deliverance and eschatology are present. The third paragraph expresses the apostolic origin of the healing ministry and then invokes the Holy Spirit upon “those who are anointed with oil in your name.” No presidential liturgical gesture is instructed here, though presumably a gesture over the candidates or over the oil might be appropriate at this point. Precedent

---

63 GS 1152V, 5, note 25.
64 Note 6 strongly discourages, but does not forbid, priestly use of option 1 when it states that “the introductory dialogue printed first has traditionally been a distinctively episcopal text.” CW: PS, 25.
would be for a gesture over the oil. The fourth paragraph sets before God the whole of the Church and prays that he might “heal the sick, raise the fallen, strengthen the fainthearted and enfold...the fearful.” The theological emphasis here is on restoration. The prayer concludes with an eschatological paragraph which looks forward to the new creation, and a Trinitarian doxology with a congregational response.

A rubric concludes this section, stating that Alternative prayers may be used. Three alternatives are provided. One is the same prayer as in the body of the text but with congregational responses, reflecting the perceived desire for the congregation to be more verbally involved in the liturgical rite. The second, permitted only when oil that has already been blessed elsewhere is presented, is a shortened version of that in the main text, omitting the reference to the apostolic origins of the ministry, and conflating and shortening several paragraphs. It retains the epiclesis over the candidates. The final option, an entirely different case, provides a shorter prayer. It is a single-paragraph prayer addressed to the Father which appeals to the tradition of the apostles and contains an explicit invocation of the Spirit over the oil:

Sanctify this oil, that those who are anointed with it may be freed from suffering and distress, find inward peace, and know the joy of your salvation.

This prayer is derived from the proposed form for the Blessing of the Oil of the Sick in GS 472, which failed to find authorisation in the ASB era. The theological themes are far more focused on deliverance and emphasise the freedom which Christ’s healing brings.

---

65 Headley and Nichols suggest that the epiclesis over the candidates at this point is less to do with a deliberate break with tradition and more to do with “the disagreement in General Synod over the blessing of inanimate objects.” Wholeness and Healing, 161.
66 Ibid., 164.
67 Tovey’s brief but useful survey of prayers of blessing of the oils in the Anglican Communion notes that England and Wales are alone in providing such a long default prayer, with most other provinces preferring briefer prayers. Tovey, “Visitation to Ministry”, 73.
68 CW: PS, 47.
6.4.4 The Laying on of Hands

*The laying on of hands is administered, using these or other suitable words*

In the name of God and trusting in his might alone, receive Christ’s healing touch to make you whole.

May Christ bring you wholeness of body, mind and spirit, deliver you from every evil, and give you his peace.

All Amen.

The Spirit having been invoked upon the oil, the candidates, or both, though the Prayer over the Oil, the rites of healing themselves are performed. The first, and normative, rite is that of the Laying on of Hands. In this unit the liturgical action is mandatory but the minister has flexibility in which words are spoken. There are no instructions about the position of president, ministers or candidates, but in this default rite the assumption is that the candidates present themselves before the ministers for healing. In some of the derivative rites which follow there is clear indication that a candidate may be in a sick bed at home or in hospital.

Hands are placed upon the candidate. This in itself is important. For the first time in the rite the candidate for healing is identified individually, and by touch. Maddocks stresses how important liturgically this is as an outward sign of the ministry of Christ via his Church, as well as simply being a natural act of love. There is no indication of how many hands are used, and neither is there instruction in the liturgical material about where the hands are placed. Canon B37 permits that hands may be laid on, but simply implies that such an action must be in accordance with “a form of service authorised by Canon B1”, which CW: PS is. What is interesting is that the rubric in the service appears to require that *some words* be spoken at this point. Hands, it seems, are not to be able to be imposed in silence, unlike in the Roman rite where silence is the normative accompaniment to the imposition of hands. The candidate is not required to respond other than to join in the

---

70 Unless Introduction 4 has been used.
72 Canon B37, paragraph 2. Alternatively, the Canon may be referring only to the anointing as needing to be performed according to authorised service.
73 *Pastoral Care of the Sick*, 76, though note that Rome does not envisage the Laying on of Hands occurring without anointing, so the two elements really form one continuous rite. Rome also remains clear that the Laying on of Hands, as much as the Anointing, is a priestly function, 12.
congregational Amen. There is explicit provision for proxy healing in the introductory note,74 recognising the longstanding Anglican tradition of a candidate receiving the laying on of hands on behalf of another which is also acknowledged in ATTH.75 Presumably some intention on the part of the recipient of the Laying on of Hands must be implied for proxy healing to function, though no expression of faith, or indeed of intention, is asked for in this rite.

The ministry of the Laying on of Hands may be devolved from the president to “others”.76 In practice these will usually be other clergy and laity trained in the ministry of healing, though there is no rubrical requirement for them to have training or authorisation.77 It is to be presumed that they ought at least to be baptized, given that the default words they speak to the candidate are spoken “in the name of Christ”.

The words provided, which presumably offer a theological and stylistic ‘norm’ for any extempore or local form, lay out what is happening to the candidate at this point in the rite. Firstly, Christ himself is ministering. The form states that in the imposition of the hands of the minister, Christ himself imposes his hands on the candidate. This imposition of hands with prayer is intended to effect wholeness of body, mind, and spirit, as well as to bring deliverance and to impart peace. Theological themes of restoration and deliverance are at the fore at this point. The candidate is being ‘put back together again’ in a sense, and this involves a rescuing of them from the influences of “evil” which, as was demonstrated in the Theological Introduction to this set of liturgies, are understood as personal, societal and spiritual.78 The Laying on of Hands has been read in a variety of ways by commentators of the Anglican tradition, but there is a degree of consensus that this ritual act, accompanied by prayer, represents the candidate’s being “adopted”79 by Christ or of grace being “transferred”.80 Maddocks, quoting Richards, suggests “the really important factor is that

74 CW: PS, 12. Until very late in the revision process there was confusion as to whether or not anointing could also be received by proxy. The texts provided in 1999 still included the note: “the Laying on of Hands and/or Anointing may be received on behalf of a third person who is not present.” GS 1152F, 2.
75 ATTH, 8.
76 CW: PS, 24 Note 4.
77 ATTH does stress the importance of training for those who exercise this ministry, and the Introductory Note (CW: PS, 12) identifies the need for those who “minister to others” to have adequate self-awareness of when specialist help might be required.
78 CW: PS, 10.
80 Headley and Nichols, “Wholeness and Healing”, 143.
“it is the hand of the Lord who heals, who blesses, who sends, who accepts, who equips and restores, and this cannot be overemphasised.”81 He also suggests two forms to be used at the Laying on of Hands, neither of which is the form suggested in Ministry to the Sick which was the authorised Church of England rite at the time. 82

6.4.5 The Anointing

The third secondary unit mirrors the shape of the second, consisting of a rubric and the words of administration of oil:

Anointing may be administered. The minister says

N, I anoint you in the name of God who gives you life. Receive Christ’s forgiveness, his healing and his love.

May the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ grant you the riches of his grace, his wholeness and his peace.

All Amen.

What is interesting structurally is that where in the Laying on of Hands the action was mandatory and the words optional, the reverse is true here. The rubric specifies which words are to be said, and by whom - in this case “the minister”. The entire unit, however, is optional. There is no requirement for anointing to take place.

If there is anointing, the candidate receives oil from “the minister”, who may be the president of the rite, or one of a number of “other ministers authorised for this ministry under Canon B37”.83 The Canon specifies that such ministers be priests and it also specifies that the oil be administered to the forehead.84 Most commentators recognise that there will be occasions on which oil might be administered to other parts of the body in addition to the forehead. No bodily location is specified in the rubrics of the service apart from the reference to the authority of the Canon. Unlike the Laying on of Hands prayer, which

81 Richards, J, in Maddocks, The Christian Healing Ministry, 122 emphasis Richards’.
82 Ibid., 122-3. Maddocks references the Burswood Community. The second prayer appears to be his own composition.
83 CW: PS, 24 note 4.
84 Canon B37 paragraph 3.
asserts “receive Christ’s healing touch”, the anointing is identified as being the ministry of the Church’s representative: “I anoint you in the name of Christ”, says the minister. There is a confident identification of the minister as the authorised conduit of the Church’s healing ministry in Christ’s name.

The fact that the Church of England requires oil to be administered by a priest is noted here for further discussion later. At other points in its history the Church has not seen the administration of oil as necessarily presbyteral. There are para-liturgical volumes available at present which appear to either misunderstand or consciously disobey the Canonical requirement for the priestly administration of oil. Gunstone’s *Healed, Restored, Forgiven* which provides additional liturgical material for the Ministry of Healing, offers an order for “Anointing with the Laying on of Hands” which permits lay anointing. Given the popularity of such para-liturgical volumes, this might indicate some lack of conformity regarding the minister of this rite.

Gunstone’s volume also permits “other suitable words” to be used in place of the CW formula. This is clearly not permitted by the rubrics. The formula for anointing is mandatory and an examination of the text is helpful in understanding what is happening to the candidate at this point in the rite. Hands (Christ’s hands) have already been laid on and prayer said for the wholeness and deliverance of the candidate. Now oil is imposed upon the candidate by the hands of an ordained presbyter. In terms of function the questions to be asked are ‘what is the oil adding? What is now being done which has not already been accomplished by the Laying on of Hands?’ The order of the rite is important. Laying on of Hands always comes first and Laying on of Hands is normative, though the words are optional and the minister may be lay or ordained. The oil is optional and comes second, but

---

85 Headley and Nichols, “Wholeness and Healing”, 147 notes that in the early Church lay people administered oil. M. Dudley and G. Rowell (eds). *The Oil of Gladness: Anointing in the Christian Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1993 reissued 2008) note that “auxiliary daily anointings” of a sick person were regularly performed by spouses or nurses following an initial priestly anointing. Maddocks, *The Christian Healing Ministry*, 228 commends the revival of the practice of lay anointing in the Church of England after first-century precedent. Tovey notes that in contemporary healing rites, there is a divergence of practice with some provinces permitting diaconal or even lay anointing. He does not specify which provinces, but does note that “in most of the services only the priest is expected to anoint the candidate” and recognises that “this issue seems to have had little consistent international discussion within Anglicanism.” “Visitation to Ministry”, 69-70. ATTH defends the reservation of this ministry to the presbyterate: “Traditionally oil is sacramental and reserved to priests”, 250.

it is administered by a priest and with set words. Oil is a symbol distinct from the imposition of hands, and the tradition associates it with the consecration or setting apart of a person or an object, and also with atonement, celebration and nourishment. Since the publication of CW: TS in 2006, the Church of England has re-articulated a theology of the use of three distinct oils, one of which is “for the anointing of the sick and dying,” consecrated using a version of the Prayer over the Oil considered above. What that prayer, and the liturgical action, imply is that the imposition of oil with prayer imparts God’s blessing upon the candidate for healing. Forgiveness of sins is mentioned also. This does not occur in the previous unit, which seems more concerned with deliverance from evil. Here another aspect of the Christian’s constant encounter with the threefold threat of sin, evil and the devil is treated. The imposition of oil appears to address the personal sin of the candidate in some way, even though confession and absolution have already taken place in the Preparatory Unit. Grace, wholeness and peace are imparted by the anointing, as well as forgiveness, healing and love. There is no suggestion of deliverance in the prayer, and the theological themes are very much those of recovery.

A final rubric introduces the presidential Collect which concludes this unit. It is recited whether or not Laying on of Hands alone, or both liturgical actions, have been administered. The Collect is apotropaic, a prayer for defence for the candidates, marking the reintroduction of the Eschatological theme. This is significant in terms of the passage of the candidate through this rite. The final element in the Healing Unit, delivered by the president to all the candidates collectively, is a prayer to the God who demands obedience from things “in heaven, on earth and under the earth”, for their ongoing defence. Having received deliverance, forgiveness and grace, there is now an acknowledgement that they will nonetheless continue to come under attack and that God’s defence, “now and evermore” is required for the ongoing journey.

---

87 Headley and Nichols, “Wholeness and Healing, 143.
88 CW: TS, 288.
89 This connection between anointing and confession is also evidenced in the contemporary Church of England rites of Reconciliation of Penitents where anointing is offered. CW: CI, 268, 271-2. ATTH also commends the “healing value of the assurance of forgiveness”, 247. In contrast Gusmer calls the Church to remember that “penance, not unction, is the sacrament instituted for the remission of post-baptismal sins” and suggests that unction is about liberation from evil, not forgiveness of personal sin. The Ministry of Healing, 124. Maddocks disagrees, noting that forgiveness will always be one of the “beneficial elements” of anointing, “for you cannot touch the fringe of Christ’s garment and go away empty.” The Christian Healing Ministry, 120.
6.4.6 Response

The Rites of Response as we have entitled them need not concern this study for long, but it is important to recognise the note of confidence and hope with which the service concludes. A rubric suggests that the Eucharist might be celebrated at this point, in which case the service would move directly into the Liturgy of the Sacrament for which five optional proper prefaces as well as an Extended Preface are provided. The first preface draws on imagery of being drawn into light from darkness (1 Peter) and describes the people of God as the first fruits of the new creation. The thematic imagery here, then, is of Deliverance and New Creation. A traditional language version of this preface is also provided. The second preface draws on incarnational imagery and also on the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52-3. Restoration is the strongest emphasis here. The third preface contains incarnational and atonement images. It refers directly to forgiveness and deliverance from evil. The fourth preface describes the types of healing Christ accomplishes and is an almost direct quotation from Isaiah 61. The fifth preface, which is preceded by a rubric suggesting that it is to be used in particular sickness and especially when the sick have been anointed draws on the Revelation images of the leaves of the tree of life being for healing. Again, the themes are those of the New Creation, and of Restoration. The extended preface draws heavily on the parable of the Good Samaritan. It shares many of its texts with the extended preface for the Chrism Mass\(^90\), linking the oil of anointing with the wine of the Holy Communion and framing both as signs of the “dawning light of his kingdom.”

If Holy Communion does not form part of the Celebration of Wholeness and Healing, the Lord’s Prayer, in traditional or contemporary form, follows immediately, with a mandatory introductory sentence inviting the people to pray “in confidence...for the coming of the kingdom among us”. Confidence is the word that Headley and Nichols use to sum up the entirety of this final Unit and it is an appropriate description of all that follows.\(^91\) A rubric suggests a *hymn or song of thanksgiving* be sung, and this is a clear liturgical indication of the tone which ought to permeate these closing rites. They are intended to be confident, thankful and joyful. There is nothing apotropaic or conditional about the words selected for

\(^{90}\) CW: TS, 290.
\(^{91}\) Headley and Nichols, "Wholeness and Healing", 161.
the closing responses, drawn from 2 Corinthians, though there is, in the final response, a recognition of the pervading mortality of all present. Perhaps just a hint of BCP approach to healing remains:

We have this treasure in earthen vessels
To show that power belongs to God.\textsuperscript{92}

A ‘Last’ or Dismissal Gospel follows. Gospel passages are suggested in the table of readings which has been discussed above. It is worth noting again that several of the suggested Dismissal Gospel passages are sections from Gospel stories which link Satan or sin with the physical experience of sickness and healing.

The Peace follows, replacing the blessing, perhaps in recognition that after the reception of healing ministry no further blessing is required, but more probably to stress the reconciliation of the community as the introduction to the Peace suggests. It is the same introduction that is used at Confirmation,\textsuperscript{93} and so again there is the same firm linking of the healing ministry of the Church with its identity as a community of the baptized, as evidenced in the Theological Introduction. Alongside the obvious theme of reconciliation in the liturgical action of the Peace are the eschatological themes connected to the “pledge of what is to come.”

The formal Dismissal, with its inclusion of the word “joy” to further stress the tone of thanksgiving, precedes the sharing of the Peace which ends the rite. Candidates, congregation and ministers mingle together in the family of the Church as they share the sign of peace. The themes of restoration and recovery are not difficult to discern.

\textsuperscript{92} CW: PS, 23.
\textsuperscript{93} Headley and Nichols, “Wholeness and Healing”, 162.
6.5 Reflections

At this point a number of reflections might usefully be made. The questions posed in the Theological Themes section will be returned to here and a number of other reflections also made. From these reflections some summary conclusions will be possible, whilst other questions will be carried forward.

6.5.1 The Ministry and Ministers of Healing

The biblical warrant of James 5:14-16 remains a fundamentally important influence in terms of identifying ministries and ministers of healing. The scriptural passage is set as a lection, and also referenced in the Theological Introduction and directly quoted in Pastoral Introduction 4. Rites of healing are characterised by the confession of sin (whether in a corporate or an individual context), the Laying on of Hands and the optional Anointing with Oil. The distinct practices thus remain distinct. It has been highlighted that the hands laid on are Christ’s hands, and that the words used appear to be less important that the physical act of touching. This is a lay ministry as well as an ordained one - it can be done with no words at all - but, if the suggested words are used, they address the candidate’s relationship with evil with an explicit minor exorcism: “deliver you from every evil”.

6.5.2 The Oil of Healing

The Anointing with Oil remains a priestly ministration according to Canon B37, although it has been demonstrated that history identifies a tradition of lay anointing as well, and that some contemporary liturgists seek to reintroduce a lay administration of oil into the Church of England. The hands used to anoint are the priest’s hands and the anointing is made in Christ’s name. Different healing properties are predicated of the hands and the oil. There is no reference to deliverance from evil here, but sin is addressed: “receive Christ’s forgiveness...” In terms of what the oil is and what it is doing, since the formal reintroduction of three oils into the life of the Church of England it is possible to identify

94 Since CW: TS.
which oil is intended to be used here, given the congruence between the Prayer over the Oil in CW: PS and the prayer for blessing “the oil for the anointing of the sick and dying” in the Chrism Eucharist. This oil is not the same as the oil used at exorcism (that of catechumens, or baptism) or at Chrismation.

6.5.3 Healing and Evil

A recognition of the reality and significance of evil acting upon societies and individuals is present throughout the healing material. Themes of deliverance and of protection are present. The various facets of evil are noted in the Theological Introduction and their power acknowledged, though little attempt is made to differentiate between them in the liturgical material itself. Evil is largely external to the individual and something from which the candidate, even though they may have been both baptized and confirmed, requires deliverance. There is a confident apotropaic strand running through the material which has been identified as belonging to the Eschatological group of themes. It seems clear from the liturgical provision that in the journey of discipleship Christians are expected to contend with, perhaps even regularly, sin, evil and the devil, from which they have turned in their initiation but which nonetheless act upon them. The thematic lectionary provision includes accounts of demonic possession alongside healing accounts. The Healing Rites are at least partly about defending the Christian from the host of evil forces which surround them on the journey. The material at the very end of the healing section of CW: PS, “Prayers for Protection and Peace”, includes traditional texts such as the Christaraksha95 and others which are the most explicit in their reference to the personified devil and his “hordes”. These will be addressed in depth in the next chapter.

6.5.4 Healing and Sin

The relationship between sin and health is less clearly defined. There is a moving away from BCP’s functional connection between personal sin and personal experience of ill health, though not a full severing of this link. Several of the lections provided support this theology whilst others do not. This could be interpreted as indicating mere confusion, or of

95 CW: PS, 96.
representing accurately the complexity and variety of the theology of healing represented in the New Testament and in subsequent tradition. Sin is evidently a factor contributing to lack of ‘wholeness’ broadly defined, which is consistent with the assertions that suffering finds sin to be its “ultimate cause.” Confession remains an integral part of the Healing Rites in CW, and is corporate by default, because CW envisages a congregation which recognises the contribution made by a fallen world to the suffering experienced within it. There is a wholesale rejection of the theology of God personally delivering illness upon his people as punishment or “visitation”, although the Visitation of the Sick remains not only authorised for use but, theoretically at least, also a normative doctrine of sickness in the Church of England.

6.5.5 Healing and Death

The physical survival of the individual is not the primary aim of the Church when it administers the Rites of Healing even though physical recovery might well be the aim of the individual candidate. Physical recovery is not the model that Christ sets; it is Christ’s dying and rising into a New Creation, articulated through the rites of Initiation, which set the pattern for the Healing Rites. Healing in the Church of England follows from Initiation, rather than the other way round, and all rites of healing are oriented to a recovery of the immediately post-baptismal status of the candidate. If a candidate does not experience physical healing, then that is indicative of Christ’s ‘Christ-ness’, rather than evidence of its failure.

6.5.6 Healing and Deliverance

The question was posed earlier in this chapter about whether there is a closer relationship between rites of Deliverance and the Initiation or Healing rites. A full answer to this question will be deferred until the end of the next chapter, but it is worth reflecting here upon the ‘family pattern’ of CW which seeks to provide a baptismal foundation for the other rites in the suite. The Healing liturgies contain within them signposts to the Deliverance liturgies proper and a collection of prayers which in some of the formulations

96 ATTH, 22.
get very close indeed to being prayers for deliverance. Furthermore, some of the material which would traditionally be viewed as being part of the healing ministry of the Church, particularly perhaps orders of service for the reconciliation of the penitent and indeed CWH, have been deliberately bound into the CW: CI volume in order to draw attention to their primary purpose of Recovering Baptism. Given the emphasis in CW on the ministry of healing as being primarily focused on a recovery of baptism, it would be interesting to put to the confirmation service the question of whether that could be considered, at least in part, to be itself a liturgy of healing. If a candidate who has previously been baptized repeats the words of the Decision, surely they are ‘recovering their baptism’ in a way not dissimilar to the way in which some of the healing liturgies work. If the drive towards ‘wholeness’ for all Christian people is essentially the recovery of baptismal status, then the corporate renewal of baptismal vows at the Easter liturgy could similarly be described as at least partially a rite of healing.

A number of issues remain to be carried forward into the conclusions of this study:

1. What does it mean to be a complete or ‘whole’ human being? What can make a person incomplete? How are sin, evil, and directed personal evil active in the diminishing of a baptized person?

2. There is still more to be said about what the relationship is between baptism and healing in the Church of England. Much has been said already about the concept of ‘recovering baptism’. If healing is to do with the recovery of a baptismal state of grace and protectedness, is it possible for an uninitiated person to receive the healing ministry of the Church at all? Presumably something different is happening if a candidate is not possessed of a baptismal state to recover, but what is that ‘something different’? How does this work in the routine parish ministry of the Church of England? Is this one of those occasions where the sacrament is deemed to “sort itself out”, such as when unbaptized persons present themselves to receive the Eucharist at, for example, Midnight Mass in a Cathedral?

97 CW: PS, 94 (notes 2 and 3 signpost the minister to the deliverance liturgies), 95-99 (Prayers for Protection and Peace).
98 CW: CI, 228-309.
3. What is the relationship between the evil which is acknowledged in the Healing Rites and in Initiation on the one hand, and the evil from which candidates will be delivered in the Deliverance Rites, which will be considered in the next chapter? Which oils will be used? Which words will be said? Which ministers are authorised to undertake this ministry? Where amongst all this are the figures of Satan and of Christ? At what point, precisely, does the Church of England become unable to authorise a national liturgical resource for this ministry of the restoration to wholeness of a baptized Christian, and why?

6.6 Summary Conclusions

The purpose of this study is to examine the way in which the Christian engages with evil and the devil in their pilgrimage through life. The examination of the Healing Rites has been instructive not least because it has demonstrated that the rites are informed by both the baptismal and eschatological theologies expressed in the texts themselves and in the notes and pastoral texts which surround them. There was a clear desire in the minds of the architects of the services to echo, recall and encourage recovery of that which is imparted in baptism. There is also a clear looking forward to the ‘wholeness’ which is the promise of God in the New Creation, and a clear understanding also that the principal aim of the Healing Rites is neither the recovery of physical or mental health nor the warding off of physical death.

The healing liturgies continue to affirm the real presence of evil in the world. This evil is distinguished in the services from sin, some, at least, of this evil is external to the individual Christian. This evil is personified in some of the language used, and it is made clear the Christian remains in a combative relationship with evil throughout their life. Baptism is the beginning of a life lived in faith but it is not, on its own, sufficient to protect the individual from the encroachments of evil, sin, and perhaps of the personified devil as well. The continuing emphasis on the distinction between evil and sin is important, and although the two often seem to operate together, CW, like BCP, strives to maintain their distinctiveness.

Regarding the operation and presence of the devil, it is interesting that if certain options in the initiation services have been chosen, a candidate may not have encountered the
concept of the personified devil at all in their catechumenate journey, and certainly will not have named and turned away from evil and the devil severally. It is possible therefore that their first liturgical encounter with the language of the devil could be in the Healing or Deliverance Rites. Certain of the optional prayers provided in CW: PS do make mention of the devil by name,\(^99\) as do the deliverance liturgies covered in the next chapter. It is possible therefore that the first time this type of personified language is used could be in a pastoral encounter around healing or deliverance, rather than in a more structured didactic environment such as a baptism or confirmation preparation course. Here again is evidence of the Church of England’s inconsistent approach to the presentation of its theology of evil, discussion of which will form a major part of the conclusions to this study. If the Baptismal Rites are intended to be the archetypal liturgy from which the others in the suite draw both their liturgical shape and core theological elements, did the architects of CW realise - when they codified into the baptismal service the option of omitting all reference to the devil - that they were making a decision to permit the omission of that element of the theology of evil, even though it would still be present in other rites that the Christian might encounter later on in their discipleship journey, or was this an oversight?

\(^{99}\) CW: PS, 96-97.
Chapter 7 - Deliverance

7. Introduction

The Diocese of Manchester’s 1994 Guidance for those Engaged in the Ministry of Deliverance opens with a preface from the then Diocesan Bishop which states: The Roman Catholic Church (RC) offers a useful definition:

Exorcism: When the Church asks publicly and authoritatively, in the name of Jesus Christ, that a person or object be protected against the influence of the Evil One and withdrawn from his dominion, it is called

This chapter is concerned with the liturgical texts, gestures and accompanying material which the Church of England utilises when engaging in the Ministry of Deliverance, particularly when undertaking exorcism. This chapter will follow the structure of the preceding two chapters in first of all identifying the theological and scriptural themes which are available to students of exorcism in the liturgy, then identifying the key ritual elements of the texts themselves before carrying out structural analysis and drawing together some reflections and summary conclusions. Attention needs to be given, however, to the fact that the status of the texts available is different from those in the preceding chapters. The Church of England offers no centrally authorised or commended liturgies for the Ministry of Deliverance and Exorcism, and so the majority of source material in this chapter is either local or otherwise unauthorised material, together with liturgy from other Churches, particularly the Church in Wales and RC. The nature of these texts will be outlined below.

A note at this point about permissions gained to use local, restricted and sensitive liturgies needs to be made. The author has gathered as many examples of deliverance liturgies as were available, and in all cases has received permission from the sources for them to be used for the specific purpose of writing this thesis. No permissions have been given, or indeed were sought, for these liturgies to be used in a public or liturgical context and they are all to be considered the property of the issuing diocese or province, as sensitive or restricted, and not to be reproduced for any other reason. Where requested the direct quotations will be excised from the published version of this thesis.

Numerous other definitions are available, including the usefully concise one offered by the Exeter Report: “Christian exorcism is the binding of evil powers by the triumph of Christ Jesus, through the application of the power demonstrated by that triumph, in and by his church.” R. Petipierre, ed. Exorcism: The Report of a Commission Convened by the Bishop of Exeter (London: SPCK, 1972), 16.
It is vital to note that CW: PS has almost nothing to say about the Ministry of Deliverance. Towards the end of the Wholeness and Healing section there is a set of notes which concerns the commended liturgical provision, ‘Prayers for Protection and Peace’, which are provided for the minister to use when praying with those who are “suffering from a sense of disturbance or unrest.” The second and third of the three notes go on to distinguish this ministry from “the ministry of exorcism and deliverance” which the text reminds the reader “may only be exercised by priests authorised by the Bishop, who normally requires that permission be obtained from him for each specific exercise of such a ministry.” The final note states clearly and explicitly that “it is for the Bishop to determine the nature of the [exorcistic] rite and what form of words should be used.” It is therefore the case that rites of exorcism in the Church of England are both episcopal and therefore also diocesan in the sense of being locally authorised or commended.

Key secondary texts for this section include authorised or commended notes and commentaries from CW: PS, ATTH, local Diocesan guidelines from bishops to the clergy, material produced by the Christian Deliverance Study Group (CDSG), and the Perry Deliverance text which comes as close as the Church of England has done to producing an

---

3 CW: PS, 94.

4 A note about liturgical terminology here may be useful. Authorised liturgies in the Church of England are those for which an alternative already exists in BCP: where there is no existing equivalent in BCP, liturgies are commended rather than authorised. Because BCP provides no liturgy of exorcism or deliverance, the Church of England could never authorise such a service, but it could commend one, though currently it does not. The status of local (diocesan) rites, produced by Diocesan Liturgical Committees or by the Diocesan Bishop, is presumably different to the status of services which have gone through the synodical process. Canon B4(3) provides that “The Ordinary may approve forms of service for use in any cathedral or church or elsewhere in the diocese on occasions for which no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer or by the General Synod under Canon B2 or by the Convocation or archbishops under this Canon, being forms of service which in the opinion of the Ordinary in both words and order are reverent and seemly and are neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter.” This study sought advice from eminent canon lawyer the Reverend Alex McGregor, whose opinion is that “Forms of service for deliverance prepared by bishops’ advisers ought to be authorised by the bishops, for their respective dioceses, under this provision. I would therefore agree with you that the rites in question are episcopally authorised rites for uses within the diocese concerned.” Reverend Alex McGregor, (per. con. email of 30 January 2017). The Exeter Report came close to claiming authority by designating its suggested forms of exorcism as “normal for the province.” How much authority or take-up the rites in the appendix to this report ever achieved in reality is unclear. Petipierre, ed., Exorcism, 27. It ought also to be noted that there are numerous anecdotal reports of ‘exorcism -like’ ministry being undertaken in Anglican churches, particularly those with a charismatic tradition, without any reference to the diocesan bishop or any locally authorised commended material, none of which, by definition, this study has been able to reference.
authorised set of guidelines for the Deliverance Ministry. The principal precursor to Deliverance is the 1972 report Exorcism, commonly referred to as the Exeter Report, which contains scriptural and theological material as well as a bank of liturgical resources. These were offered to the Church of England at the time, though none of the material was ever authorised or commended formally, and the report itself is now largely superseded by the work of CDSG. The Exeter Report will provide useful comparative material however, and also provide insight into the theological work around deliverance being undertaken at the time. A collection of liturgies from other sources is available for comparison where appropriate. Texts from RC, the Church in Wales, the Anglican Church of Canada and the Diocese of Chile will be of particular use.

7.1 Introduction to deliverance issues

This chapter begins by identifying the controlling themes present in the liturgical rites in question. These are identified from two main sources: the Scriptural passages available for use at deliverance services and the liturgical texts themselves.

7.2 Scriptural themes

Deliverance differs from both the Initiation services and those of Healing due to the expectation that the liturgies will take place privately or at least in a situation where the least possible publicity can be attracted. Where the previous two chapters therefore could look with some confidence to the Principal Service Lectionary of the Church of England to supply a starting point for the gathering together of Scriptural themes, it is less easy to do so where the rites of Deliverance are concerned. The lectionary will still be surveyed briefly, because to do so sets the Deliverance liturgy in the context the Church of England’s treatment of the devil and the demonic in its public worship, but alone the Principal Service Lectionary will not be sufficient. Certain of the available rites make scriptural suggestions and these will be treated first, followed by the broader context.

---

The Diocese of Gloucester’s Exorcism and Deliverance of a Person (Gloucester Major Exorcism) sets Psalm 57 to be used by the exorcist and congregation before the act of penitence.

Psalm 57 juxtaposes the “shadow of [God’s] wings” with the “storm of destruction”, and contains the confident assertion “he will send from heaven and save me and rebuke those that would trample upon me”. This psalm is also included in CDSG sample liturgy, upon which the author drew when compiling the modern Gloucester service.

The Diocese of Gloucester’s A Rite of Deliverance (Minor Exorcism) (Gloucester Minor Exorcism) includes provision for a reading from Scripture and suggests Mark 12:29-31, although it also notes that “some other appropriate passage” may be used.

The Markan passage is Jesus calling to Israel that “the Lord our God is Lord alone” and seeks to recall the person oppressed by evil to the remembrance of the Kingship of Christ.

The 2001 Church in Wales order for the Deliverance and Healing of a Person offers two suggested Scriptural passages. The first is Colossians 1:11-14, Saint Paul’s prayer for the Colossians to be strengthened by the God who “has rescued us from the powers of darkness”, and the second Luke 9:1-6; the sending out of the twelve disciples with “authority over all demons.” It is noteworthy that the reading of the passage of Scripture appears to be optional in , and the two options that are provided may be replaced by “some other” passage at the minister’s discretion. The Welsh rite provides eleven suggested sections of psalmody, fourteen suggested gospel readings, and nine other suggested New Testament readings in an appendix at the end of the order of service.

The most recently published Roman Catholic material contains within its preamble a review of Biblical literature concerning direct or indirect references to the devil and the powers of evil. The purpose of that review is to set the Ministry of Deliverance within an account of “the entire course of the history of salvation” within which “angelic creatures have been

---

7 The Diocese of Gloucester, The Exorcism and Deliverance of a Person (2009), 2.
8 The Christian Deliverance Study Group, The Deliverance and Healing of a Person (n.d.).
9 The Markan passage is Jesus calling to Israel that “the Lord our God is Lord alone” and seeks to recall the person oppressed by evil to the remembrance of the Kingship of Christ.
11 Ibid.
present, some serving the divine plan and continually bringing the Church hidden and powerful assistance, but others, the fallen ones, also called “diabolical,” who are opposed to God and his salvific will.”\textsuperscript{13} In the notes to the service the use of a psalm is encouraged and a reading from the Gospel compulsory. In the rubric within the body of the liturgy itself clear direction is given to the exorcist to use their own discretion “as circumstances suggest” as to how much psalmody, if any, is used.\textsuperscript{14} Psalm 91 is suggested, with its reference to God’s promise to “deliver you from the snare of the fowler and from the deadly pestilence.” A number of other psalms are suggested as optional alternatives (Psalms 3, 11, 13, 22, 23, 35, 54, 68 and 70). The rubric concerning the Gospel reading is slightly ambiguous. It appears to imply that the exorcist must read John 1:1-14 but that he may also choose “one of the pericopes provided in chapter II”. The appendix itself, however, suggests that these are in fact a selection of alternative gospel readings which may be read instead of the John reading. John 1 is of course the “prologue” which describes the light coming into the world. The five alternative gospel readings are Matthew 4:1-11 which describes Jesus’ encounter with the devil in the wilderness; Mark 16:15-18 which is the post-resurrection appearance of Christ to the disciples where he describes the driving out of demons as part of the mission of the disciples; Mark 1:21-28 which is the first encounter between Jesus and unclean spirits in Mark’s gospel; Luke 10:17-20 which is the account of the seventy returning to Jesus and informing him that even the demons submit to them; and finally Luke 11:14-23 in which Jesus challenges the crowd to justify how their own exorcists cast out demons and declares that he does so by “the finger of God”.

The Principal Service Lectionary contains a number of references to the devil, the demonic, and more general concepts of evil. They can be loosely gathered into thematic groups. The first set makes explicit reference to the devil. Some of these concern Jesus’, or indeed Judas’, direct contact or conversation with the devil. In several of these biblical texts Christ interacts with the personified devil, or his ministry is described as directly related, and in contradiction, to the devil’s work. The most obvious example is the temptation in the wilderness: Matthew 4:1-11 Lent 1 in Year A; Mark 1:9-11 Lent 1 in Year B (in which the names Devil, Tempter and Satan are all used in the same passage); Luke 4:1-13 Lent 1 in Year C. Here Jesus engages with the devil, who seeks to tempt him. In all three accounts the devil eventually withdraws and his presence is replaced by that of the angels. The devil
is described as entering into, or putting things into the mind of, Judas Iscariot in the events leading up to Christ’s crucifixion (John 13:21-32 Wednesday of Holy Week). The Acts of the Apostles describes Peter’s summary of Jesus ministry as that of “doing good and healing of all who were oppressed by the devil” (Acts 10:34-43 The Baptism of Christ in Year A; Easter Day in Year B). Paul refers to the full armour of God affording the wearer strength to “stand against the wiles of the devil”, though he then goes on to describe the struggle of the Christian as being against “the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places” in one of the most comprehensive lists of references to evil forces in the New Testament (Ephesians 6:10-20 Proper 16 in Year B). The Letter to the Hebrews refers to Jesus’ death as destroying “he who has the power of death, that is the devil” (Hebrews 2:14-18 Candlemas). The author of the first letter of Peter writes, “your adversary the devil [is] a roaring lion walking about” (1 Peter 4:12-14; 5:6-11 Easter 7 in Year A). The letter of James encourages the reader, “resist the devil and he will flee from you” (James 3:13-4:3, 7-8 Proper 20 in Year B).

As well as Jesus’ direct interactions with the character of the devil and the places in Scripture where the writers refer to the devil by name in relation to Christ’s ministry, there are also examples of Jesus himself referring to the devil by other names.

It is important to recognise that the use of the name Satan, the devil and various other names for personified evil in Scripture has changed both in text and in meaning over the many hundreds of years of the Bible’s composition. The Anglican Church of Canada, in its Guidelines from the House of Bishops Task Force on Exorcism, offers a brief review of the development of the figure of Satan through the Old and Intertestamental periods and into the New Testament. Though it has to be recognised that this review is offered for a particular reason, that is, in defence of an argument that the practice of exorcism developed in a “different symbolic worldview”, the brief review of names and references used is helpful. It notes, for example, the origin of the term Satan as a judicial figure (Zechariah 3:1) and the lack of any assertion in the Old Testament that Satan is “a demonic figure opposed to God.” Rather, Satan is presented as acting with God’s permission and consent in the book of Job. Hick notes helpfully the original depiction of the serpent in the Garden of Eden as simply an “amoral” creature, “and the urge which he embodies is

16 Ibid.
ethically neutral even though it leads to evil consequences.” It is only much later in the tradition that the serpent is identified as Satan.\textsuperscript{17} Canada goes on to chart the development of Satan as a demonic figure through the Intertestamental period (2 Enoch 29:4; Wisdom 2: 24 etc). Canada then notes “Satan appears in the New Testament under several titles, including diabalos (devil), and his role and that of the demons is largely taken over from late Judaism.”\textsuperscript{18} Perry offers a useful appendix on “the Demonic and Exorcism in the Bible” in which he relates largely the same account of the development of the character of Satan as does Canada, noting in addition that “the Satan” (adversary) appears as early as 1 Samuel 29:4 where it is used in reference to David, and Numbers 22:22 where it is used in reference to the angel set to turn back Balaam.\textsuperscript{19}

It is not the purpose of this study to explore in depth the biblical character of the devil, but it is important to highlight an awareness of the changing character and persona of the character called variously Satan, the devil, the Evil One and so on in Scripture, and to recognise that not all references to this character carry the same theological tradition and emphasis. However, it ought also to be pointed out that it is unlikely that the majority of worshippers in a Church of England congregation on a Sunday, or even those involved in such an unusual pastoral liturgy as Deliverance, will be aware of the nuances of the biblical tradition concerning the devil. It ought to be assumed therefore that these various references, when read out in isolated passages in church, may well be interpreted as referring to the fairly developed, clearly demonic and malevolent figure of the New Testament, “God’s archetypal enemy.”\textsuperscript{20}

With those caveats in mind, the Principal Service Lectionary will now be reviewed. The proper name Satan is used by Christ in the account popularly referred to as the Primacy of Peter, where of course the name is being attributed to Peter by Christ in a metaphorical sense (Matthew 16:21-26 Proper 17 in Year A; Mark 8:27-38 Proper 9 in Year B). Satan is also the term which Christ uses in Mark 3:20-35 (Proper 5 in Year B) together with the terms Beelzebub and “the Ruler of the Demons”; elsewhere he asserts “I watched Satan fall from heaven” (Luke 10:1-11, 16-20 Proper 9 in Year C). Satan is also the name used for the

\textsuperscript{17} J. Hick, \textit{Evil and the God of Love} (London: Macmillan, 1977), 283.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Perry, \textit{Deliverance}, 137-8.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 138. There will also be significant differences in interpretation of the figure of Satan and the demonic depending on varying cultural traditions.
spirit in Job who presents himself before the Lord at the beginning of that book (Job 1:1; 2:1-10 Proper 22 Year B).

The Evil One (‘ό πονηρός’) is another recurring title. In the Sermon on the Mount, for example, concerning the validity or otherwise of swearing oaths, Jesus describes anything more than the simple words “yes, yes or no, no” as coming “from the evil one” (Matthew 5:21-37 Proper 2 in Year A). The “Evil One” is referred to in the long prayer of Christ in Gethsemane (John 17:6-19 Easter 7 in Year B). Christ also uses the expression “the ruler of this world will be driven out” (John 12:20-36 Tuesday of Holy Week; also set for Lent 5 in Year B; see also John 15:26-27; 16:4-15 Pentecost in Year B). Delivering the parable of the weeds of the field Jesus does refer to the devil, but also to the Evil One (Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43 Proper 11 in Year A). John the Divine’s vision of the woman and the Dragon in Revelation also falls into this category (Revelation 12:1-5 Epiphany 4 in Year B), as do the references in Genesis 3 to the serpent in the Garden of Eden which have been taken up by the Church as a reference to the Devil (Proper 6 in Year B). Finally, Paul refers both to the “lawless one” and the “one destined for destruction” in the readings set for the Third Sunday before Advent in Year C, in which curiously the lectionary compilers omit the verses (6-12) which describe the “lawless one” as “apparent in the working of Satan”, suggesting that Paul here refers to the lawless one as a different evil presence to Satan (2 Thessalonians 2:1-5, 13-17).

The second set of biblical references is that which makes explicit reference to demons or spirits, though not to the devil. Examples of this kind concern the ministry of Christ and his disciples, for example where Jesus gives the disciples authority “over unclean spirits, to cast them out” (Matthew 9:35-10:8 Proper 6 in Year A). Unclean spirits are also referenced in, for example, Mark 1:21-28 (Epiphany 4 in Year B; also Mark 6:1-13 Proper 9 in Year B, Luke 6:17-26 Proper 2 in Year C, Luke 9:28-43 Next Before Lent in Year C). References to “evil” rather than unclean spirits include that which afflicted King Saul (1 Samuel 17:57-18:5, 10-16 Proper 7 in Year B). In the healing of Simon’s mother-in-law there is reference to those who are both sick and possessed where Christ addresses the demons, forbidding them to speak, in an example both of proclamation and exorcism (Mark 1:29-39 Proper 1 in Year B). The twelve Apostles are given power by Christ over “unclean spirits” and in that power they are seen to “cast out many demons”; here the two terms seem to be used interchangeably (Mark 6:1-13 Proper 9 in Year B). The Gerasene demoniac is referred to as “a man of the
city who had demons” and then later in the same account the term “unclean spirit” is used, again seemingly interchangeably (Luke 8:26-39 Proper 7 in Year C). An example of a healing account where the sickness is attributed to a demon by someone other than Christ, (but where Christ himself does not refer to the presence of a demon) is found in the healing of the Canaanite woman’s daughter (Matthew 15:10-28 Proper 15 in Year A). Curious within this second group of references are those which attribute the delivery of the evil into hell as the purview not of the devil or of demons, but of (apparently good) angels. In the parable of the net, which comes immediately after the parable of the weeds in Matthew’s Gospel, it is “the angels” who will “separate the evil from the righteous and throw them into the furnace of fire”, assigning to the angels at least the mechanical delivery of the evil people into hell, if not the decision-making itself (Matthew 13:31-33, 44-52 Proper 12 in Year A).

The third set of biblical references of interest to this study refers in more general terms to the presence or the influence of evil without mentioning the devil or demons explicitly. Paul’s references to the “works of darkness” are an example of this type of biblical reference (Romans 13:11-14 Advent 1 in Year A) as is his reference to the “rulers and authorities in the heavenly places” (Ephesians 3:1-12 Feast of the Epiphany). Similarly Paul refers to the “rulers of the power of the air” (Ephesians 2:1-10 Lent 4 in Year B), to the “powers of darkness” (Colossians 1:11-20 Christ the King in Year C), and to the “elemental spirits of the universe” (Colossians 2:6-19 Proper 12 in Year C). Isaiah makes reference to the transience of “princes and rulers” who could be interpreted as corporeal or spiritual (Isaiah 40:21-31 Proper 1 in Year B).

The word “deliverance” or “deliver” occurs in the Scripture passages set by the Principal Service Lectionary and is worth noting in light of the adoption of the word in preference to the more traditional “exorcism” or “exorcise” by the Church of England in recent decades. The Book of Psalms refers to the Lord hearing and delivering his people (Psalm 34 Mothering Sunday in Year A).

There are also manifold references to the “darkness”, many of which can be given a supernatural or demonic gloss but which may just as easily refer to physical darkness as a metaphor for a time period of waning faith in, or fidelity to, God’s promises. Amongst these references are Isaiah’s prophecy of the birth of a child (Isaiah 9:2-7 Christmas Day Set One,
Epiphany), the assertion of Saint Paul “once you were darkness but now you are light in the Lord” (Ephesians 5:8-14 Lent 4 Year A), the description of the prophetic word as being like “a lamp shining in the dark place” (2 Peter 1:16-21 Next Before Lent in Year A), and the assertion of the author of the first letter of Peter that the believers have been called “out of darkness into his marvellous light” (1 Peter 2, Easter 5 in Year A).

It can be gathered from the brief treatment of the primary lectionary provision above that the Church of England continues to offer to its worshippers a breadth of Scriptural references to evil - some of which is personified and some of which is not; some of which refers directly to scriptural accounts of the devil, demons and unclean spirits; and much of which refers more generally to the contrast, for example, between light and darkness or to powers which may or may not be spiritual. What is clear is that the regular Christian worshipper attending a church which uses the authorised lectionary in the triannual round of readings on a Sunday, will have been exposed to quite a considerable amount of biblical material, presenting a worldview in which evil, spirits, demons and the devil are anything but absent. It is not certain, of course, that those who seek the more specialist deliverance ministry of the Church will be regular worshippers.21

7.3 Theological Themes

The theological introduction to the services of Wholeness and Healing in CW: PS serves as the initial text for analysis. The four principal theological themes available for considering Deliverance liturgy are: Naming, Binding, Casting Out and Infilling. These themes are drawn both from the liturgical material available and the secondary literature commenting upon both the liturgy and practice of Deliverance in the Church of England. These four themes broadly fit the structure of the vast majority of deliverance rites, in which evil is sequentially addressed, bound, and cast out, after which the recipient of the Deliverance ministry is prayed for with invocation of the Holy Spirit’s power.  

21 The author’s empirical experience as Bishop's Adviser for the Ministry of Deliverance is that the majority of those who seek the deliverance ministry of the Church of England are not regular worshippers, but are nonetheless motivated to seek the ministry of their parish priest when confronted with unexplainable phenomena. This is, of course, simply an empirical observation based on deliverance ministry in a single diocese.
accepted Rite for the process of Exorcism”, but goes on to state that exorcistic rites include sections of preparation, the exorcism itself, penitence on the part of the “patient”, and blessings, and that:

- The actual exorcism must contain the following items:
  - a) A reminder to the demon of the absolute power of God
  - b) A statement to the demon that the Minister of exorcism speaks not for himself but as the mouthpiece of the Body of Christ, and with the voice of Christ.
  - c) A “binding” (not necessarily including that word) …
  - d) A Command that it shall go.

The theological matrix thus formed is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>EVIL</th>
<th>DEVIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTING OUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFILLING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 - Theological Themes Matrix - Deliverance

Throughout the consideration of theological themes, and also the ensuing structural analysis, it needs to be borne in mind that the Church of England recognises the traditional distinction between a Major (or Greater) and a Minor (or Lesser) exorcism (the terms seem to be used interchangeably). Due to the local authorisation of such texts it is not clear that every diocese or every diocesan bishop would make this distinction, but references ATTH:

Over the centuries the Church has traditionally distinguished between a greater and a lesser exorcism. In a greater exorcism the demonic is itself addressed in the name of Christ; in a lesser exorcism prayer is addressed to God to banish or protect someone from evil. Whilst it is true that the New Testament does not appear to make such distinctions... it has proved very useful in setting boundaries in pastoral practice.23

This important distinction between prayers addressed to God and liturgical formulae addressed to the devil, or an evil spirit, is significant theologically as well as liturgically.

---

22 D. Howell-Everson, Rites of Exorcism (The Christian Deliverance Study Group, 1990), emphasis original.

7.3.1 Naming

The theological theme of naming speaks of the relationship between Christ and the powers of evil which he encounters and with which he interacts. Christ, and the Church which carries out his Ministry of Exorcism today, makes it clear that identifying the nature of the oppressing or possessing spirit is a significant part of this ministry. The act of naming the evil presence concerned, either by a proper name or by its category and status, acknowledges both its reality and its presence. In some instances this means identifying a particular demon or demons by their name, for example, in the account of the casting out of Legion, in two of the three synoptic Gospels.24 On rather more occasions, what the theme of Naming identifies is a making clear of the difference between the power of God and the power of the spirit or demon concerned. Jesus’ conversation with the crowd about whether or not he is casting out demons through Beelzebul is an example of Christ drawing the distinction between the ‘kingdom of Satan’ and the power of the “finger” or “spirit of God” and his kingdom.25 CW: PS, after considering the human relationship with sin and death, goes on to identify that “the New Testament also presents us with a picture of Christians in a running battle with forces of evil that are external to us but bear heavily upon our lives.”26 This theme highlights the parallels, as well as the differences, between the use of naming and addressing in the baptismal service and in liturgies of Deliverance. The difference between the liturgical use of naming as identification of the candidate to be initiated and of an evil presence to be exorcised will be reflected upon further. The Theological Introduction refers largely to such forces in the plural but also makes reference to the evil one who “takes people captive.”27 In the Ministry of Exorcism it is considered essential by Perry to believe that “Christ knows the Demons… They know him and his power.”28 There are issues here of personality and identity which seem to matter greatly, and the naming of the evil presence, or the cause of the disturbing influences is crucial. Establishing the authority of Christ is paramount, because the Church follows the example of Jesus who “by his own authority drove out Satan and the other Demons, imposing on them his divine will.”29

---

26 CW: PS, 10.
27 Ibid.
28 Perry, Deliverance, 131.
29 Deliverance, 131.
The form of address also establishes the authority of the exorcist as the mouthpiece of Christ in most imperative exorcisms.

7.3.2 Binding

This second theme also concerns the authority and power of God over the ‘powers of darkness’. Perry notes that “exorcism is a specific act of binding and releasing, performed on a person who is believed to be possessed by a non-human malevolent spirit.” This simple definition of the word exorcism identifies both the theme of Binding and the subsequent theme of Casting Out as essential to the exorcistic rite. He then goes on to note that these crucial acts of binding and releasing are not essential elements of the broader range of Deliverance Ministry which Perry, and indeed the Church of England, see as a normative part of the Church’s pastoral care of its people. The binding of the presence of evil is a theological assertion of the power of God as compared to the relatively weaker power of evil. This theme establishes the subordinate nature of evil, whether personified or not, and defends the supreme authority of God from dualist charges.

7.3.3 Casting Out

Christ, and through him the Christian exorcist, has the power to eject the presence of evil from a person or place. This theme is the one which identifies Christ as the exorcist, by whose word or finger evil is cast out. The central act of any Deliverance liturgy is the prayer to God, or in the case of the Major Exorcism the direct command to the evil entity, that evil shall depart from that which it currently oppresses or possesses. CW: PS, whilst maintaining that the power of evil is “shadowy and interim”, asserts confidently that “we nonetheless need deliverance from that power,” placing the removal of the presence of evil firmly within the ministry of Wholeness and Healing of the Church of England. Perry, in the preface to the first edition of Deliverance, references John 3:8 in stating that “the Son of God appeared for the very purpose of undoing the devil’s work. We believe that the church

---

30 Ibid., 8.
31 Ibid., 2.
32 CW: PS, 10.
exists for the same reason.”33 The language of “release” is used by Perry in describing the work of exorcism and deliverance.34 Travis notes that “the normal word for the act of exorcism in the Gospels is ekballo, to ‘throw out’.35 The describes the ministry of exorcists in the Church as one of “commanding demons in the name of God to retreat.”36

7.3.4 Infilling

As has been noted several times in this study, CW claims for itself a fundamentally baptismal liturgical and theological foundation. The theme of Infilling shows parallels with the baptismal rite. The Casting Out in the Deliverance rite bears similarities to the Decision with its turning away from sin, evil and the devil, and the subsequent prayer of exorcism. Just as after baptism the candidate is prayed over so that the Holy Spirit might renew them, the oil of chrism in some traditions being administered as a sign or seal of the presence of God. The parallel in Deliverance Rites, after the presence of evil has been removed from a person or place, is the apotrapaic prayer that the recipient be filled with the Holy Spirit so that evil powers may not return.37 The Introduction to CW: PS reminds the reader that “salvation, wholeness, healing and peace with God are part of the same family of words, revealing the same essential theological themes [of] being put right, made whole, and restored.”38 CW: PS notes that “reconciliation and restoration are integral to the good news of Jesus Christ” and that therefore prayer for and over individuals, accompanied by manual actions and the use of oil are part of “an outworking of the presence of the Spirit.”39 Perry is clear that “the object of [an exorcism] is not only to remove the powers of evil, but to fill the place with the presence of Christ.” He then cites Matthew 12:45 as well.40 Ritual acts of sprinkling with holy water and blessing together with baptism and its associated rites are recommended. In exorcism, as in baptism and indeed the healing liturgies, the theological

33 Perry, Deliverance, ix.
34 Ibid., xi.
36 Matthew 12:45.
37 CW: PS, 4.
38 CW: PS, 10.
39 CW: PS, 132.
intention and the liturgical words and symbols at this point are about the ongoing life of grace that the Christian, filled with the Holy Spirit, ought to enjoy.

Repeated note might usefully be taken here of the theological and liturgical difference identified by the commentaries and the liturgical texts with regard to Major and Minor exorcisms. Much of this has been discussed above, but there remains an intriguing theological question about how often an exorcism might need to be repeated. This opens up a number of questions about evil’s power to endure despite all the theological statements about God’s authority and power, discussed above. The existence in the tradition of Major and Minor exorcisms suggests that various grades of diabolic or evil infestation in the life of a Christian can be identified. Perry notes that “Minor exorcisms are common and can be frequent. The Lord’s Prayer itself... is a minor exorcism... The major exorcism will be a very rare event.”

7.4 Prayers for Protection and Peace

Before proceeding in this chapter to identify the key ritual elements of the exorcistic liturgies available for study and subjecting them to structural analysis, note needs to be taken of the very small amount of centrally produced material which falls under the broad umbrella term of “Deliverance”. This provision might have been treated in the previous chapter as it falls at the very end of the CW: PS section Wholeness and Healing. The reason for treating it here, rather than in the Healing chapter, is principally because the majority of the notes preceeding the sparse liturgical provision concern the Church’s protocols and directions around the exercise of deliverance ministry. It should be noted, however, that until halfway through the revision process this section was entitled Prayers for Protection and Deliverance, a title which gives a fairly clear indication of the intention behind the
inclusion of this material. The material in question comprises CW: PS pages 94-99. The provision consists of three notes, eight prayers, and two ‘psalm responsories.’ The notes provide a degree of theological commentary and are worth reprinting in full:

Notes

1. The following material may be used where it would be pastorally helpful to pray with those suffering from a sense of disturbance or unrest.

2. These pastoral prayers may be used by any minister as appropriate. The ministry of exorcism and deliverance may only be exercised by priests authorized by the bishop, who normally requires that permission be obtained from him for each specific exercise of such a ministry.

3. On occasions when exorcism and deliverance are administered, it is for the bishop to determine the nature of the rite and what form of words should be used.

Important theological and liturgical principles are contained within these notes for a study seeking to discern the mind of the Church of England on the nature, and interaction with individuals, of evil. The notes firstly present an openness to the possibility that people will suffer from “a sense of disturbance or unrest”, such that it is worth producing a nationally commended liturgical resource. Secondly the notes make clear that the status of the material provided is that of “pastoral prayers”, hence “any minister” may use them. Within the same note (note 2) exorcism and deliverance are both explicitly mentioned, which at least implies that the boundary between “pastoral prayers” for those suffering from “disturbance or unrest” and the Ministry of Deliverance is not entirely clear, hence the need for a note. Thirdly the notes make clear that the ministry of deliverance and exorcism in the Church of England is reserved to those in priestly orders and that additionally they must be “authorised” by the Bishop; that each use of any exorcistic or deliverance formula requires Episcopal permission on each occasion; and that the Bishop alone is responsible for the composition of the rite. In terms of this study’s attention to the specific ministry being exercised, these notes are useful because they clarify that authority for the ministry of exorcism, in the Church of England at least, derives not only from priestly orders but also

---

43 In the version of the service presented to General Synod in GS 1152D in May 1998 the section was titled Prayers for Protection and Deliverance. This was altered by the time GS 1152E was presented to Synod, and justified in GS 1152W by a concern that "it is evident from the submissions that "deliverance" implies "exorcism" to many... The Committee has, however, changed the title and the Notes to distance this provision still further from a ministry of exorcism." GS 1152W, 8.

44 CW: PS, 94. Note also the reference on CW: PS, 12 to seeking the advice of the bishop’s “authorised adviser” if issues arise during a healing service which suggest exorcism is required.
from Episcopal authorisation. Episcopal permission is also required, and as such Deliverance is not covered by the authority to conduct worship usually contained within the average licence or mandate.

The second volume of *A Companion to Common Worship*, effectively the official commentary on the CW material, provides only a single paragraph of commentary on the Prayers for Protection and Peace, none of which comments in any detail on any of the selected material. It simply notes that “the prayers were a late addition at the revision stage, and responded to requests from those who might arguably have been seeking something closer to a rite of exorcism.”\(^{45}\) The entire paragraph lacks confidence and reads as gently critical of the provisions made but offers no history to any of the texts nor suggestions as to selections that might be made other than noting that the Christaraksha “is beautiful in its own right... but is not as obvious a resource for this sort of need as other more familiar prayers might have been.”\(^{46}\)

The prayer provision itself consists of eight prayers. The first four are bundled under the heading ‘For a person or persons’, and consist of a prayer version of the first four verses of Psalm 20, two verses from Saint Patrick’s Breastplate, and two more specific prayers. One is a prayer of invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the recipient, who is named in the prayer, but makes no specific reference to their being relieved of any disturbance or unrest. The other specific prayer asks for the relief of the suffering person explicitly, praying that the Lord Jesus Christ will “enter into your body and spirit, take from you all that harms or hinders you, and fill you with his healing and his peace.”\(^{47}\) Neither of these two prayers is attributed anywhere in CW: PS. A prayer follows ‘For a place’, which is a modern translation of the Compline collect “Visit, Lord, we pray, this place and drive far from it all the snares of the enemy.” Here, it should be noted, “the enemy” is named explicitly. This title is used for the devil elsewhere in CW, having been authorised in the Collect for Night Prayer (Compline) in modern language, in CW: DP in 2005.\(^{48}\)

The final prayer in the collection is the Christaraksha, an Indian prayer, which is offered in three different versions: the first to be used with a person before sleep, the second

\(^{45}\) Headley and Nichols, "Wholeness and Healing", 166.
\(^{46}\) Ibid.
\(^{47}\) CW: PS, 95.
\(^{48}\) CW: DP, 342.
rendered as a threefold blessing, and the third simply the first prayer repeated but rendered for an individual to say themselves without a minister. It is curious that this prayer was included, and included three times at that, because it contains probably the highest demonology and language of the devil of any of the authorised or commended CW material:

May the risen and ascended Christ, mightier than the hordes of hell, more glorious than the heavenly hosts, be with you in all your ways. Amen.

May the cross of the Son of God protect you by day and by night, at morning and at evening, at all times and in all places. Amen.

May Christ Jesus guard and deliver you from the snares of the devil, from the assaults of evil spirits, from the wrath of the wicked, from all base passions and from the fear of the known and unknown. Amen.

And the blessing...

The inclusion and commendation of this Indian prayer is fascinating and out of keeping with the otherwise fairly cautious tone of CW in terms of demonology and language of the devil. In a single prayer reference is made to the “hordes of hell”, “the devil”, “the assaults of evil spirits”, all of which are explicit references to supernatural evil, together with references to things which could be either earthly or spiritual opponents. The prayer is not mandatory, and the fact that it appears on the penultimate page of a final section of the Wholeness and Healing resources may well mean that its existence is not well known to clergy, but nonetheless here it is: a commended resource with explicit reference to the devil, his hordes and evil spirits. The fact that it is commended must indicate, at least technically, that its theology is consistent with that of the Church of England.

The section ends with two sets of Psalm verses, one based on Psalm 91, and one based on Psalm 121. The former is more explicit in its reference to the perils that beset the psalmist

---

49 CW: PS, 97. This is the first version of the three provided.
such as “the snare of the fowler”, “the deadly pestilence”, the “terror by night” and so on. The latter refers simply to the assurance that “the Lord shall keep you from all evil.”

7.5 Identifying the Key Ritual Elements

This chapter will take as its controlling rite the Diocese of Gloucester’s text. The rationale for choosing this rite is that it is the most up-to-date Church of England Deliverance liturgy available from those which have been secured for this study. The drawback in using this liturgy is that it was compiled by the author when he held the position of Bishop’s Adviser for the Ministry of Deliverance in the Diocese of Gloucester and is therefore not an entirely objective text to use for the purposes of this study. For this reason comparison throughout will be made with other Deliverance rites where they are available, both from the Church of England, RC and other sources. The main Anglican comparator will be the Church in Wales’s available to all clergy in the Church in Wales. The principal RC liturgy to be used in comparison is which has been made available to the author for the purposes of this study. Other rites have been secured from the Diocese of Manchester and from CDSG, and these will be referred to as appropriate. Texts are also available from the Diocese of Gloucester for again, the compilation of these liturgies was the responsibility of the author. As noted above, it is in the area of Deliverance liturgies that lack of authorisation or commendation becomes apparent, and it is to be assumed that provision varies from diocese to diocese. This inevitably means that this chapter’s approach to the material for study is less rigorous, although, as will be demonstrated sufficient similarities and parallels
exist between the available rites for a reasonable structural analysis to be undertaken and provisional conclusions drawn.

With the caveats above, the key ritual elements of [ ] will be outlined below in preparation for structural analysis of this liturgy and its parallels.

Following Day as before, the Primary Structural Units are first identified. These consist of:

- Pre-Exorcistic Units
- Exorcistic Units
- Post-Exorcistic Units.

The Pre-Exorcistic Units vary slightly from rite to rite but generally consist of personal preparation of the exorcist and their colleagues, what would be considered to be the Greeting or Preparatory sections of the liturgy, and the Liturgy of the Word. The Exorcistic rites consist of the addresses to the possessed person, the invitation to renunciation of sins and of confession of faith, the actual laying on of hands and exorcistic prayers themselves. Post-Exorcistic Units consist of prayers of thanksgiving, chrismation and blessings. Accompanying most Exorcistic liturgies are sets of rubrics which are vital to the interpretation and performance of the service.
It should be noted that unlike in the previous two chapters, every element of the liturgy will be treated in structural analysis, as there are no sections in [ ] which are not directly related to the main purpose of the service.

As each section is treated in structural analysis, comparison will be made to the appropriate parallel text in [ ].

7.6 Structural analysis of the Units

[...]

56 The Diocese of Chile.
Libro de Oración Común y Manual de la Iglesia Anglicana (n.d.).
I bind unto myself the Name,
The strong Name of the Trinity;
By invocation of the same,
The Three in One and One in Three.
Of whom all nature hath creation;
Eternal Father, Spirit, Word:
Praise to the God of our salvation,
Salvation is of Christ the Lord. Amen.
The minister begins
In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.
Our Father, who art in heaven…
Psalm 57
1 Be merciful to me, O God, be merciful to me,
for my soul takes refuge in you;
2 In the shadow of your wings will I take refuge
until the storm of destruction has passed by…
Penitence
may be used here, or after the exorcism as appropriate.
Do you reject the devil and all rebellion against God?
I reject them.
Do you renounce the deceit and corruption of evil?
I renounce them.
Do you repent of the sins that separate us from God and neighbour?
I repent of them.
[Do you renounce …
 specific practices which are to be renounced …]
I renounce them
Do you turn to Christ as Saviour?
I turn to Christ.
Do you submit to Christ as Lord?
I submit to Christ.
Do you come to Christ, the way, the truth and the life?
I come to Christ.
The president may say
May God who has given you the desire to follow Christ
give you strength to continue in the Way.
Amen.
Exorcism
Listen and fear, demonic powers, for I come in the Name of Christ our Lord and
master, and His commands do I convey:
I command you, every evil spirit, every power of the enemy, in the Name of the
Father Almighty + , in the Name of Jesus + Christ his Son, our Lord, in the name of
the Holy + Spirit of God, that, harming no person or thing present, you depart +
now and for ever from
the servant of God and return to your own place, there to
remain. In the Name of God, GO.
And/Or
183

I exorcise + and cast you out, most unclean spirit, every agent of the enemy, every spectre, every legion. In the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, be uprooted and put to flight from this child of God, his Lord and yours. In the Name of the Father +, and of the Son +, and of the Holy + Spirit, I command you, GO.

Then to the person:

I want you to repeat after me: Jesus is Lord

Jesus is Lord.

(repeated several times)

An act of Penitence follows, if it did not precede the exorcism

The person is anointed with the oil of healing

N, I anoint you in the name of God who gives you life.

Receive Christ's forgiveness, his healing and his love.

May the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ grant you the riches of his grace, his wholeness and his peace.

Blessing

God the Father who created you, preserve and keep you.

God the Son, who bought you with his blood, bind you to himself.

God the Holy Spirit, the giver of life, grant you new and eternal life.

May the holy angels and archangels guard, guide and protect you,

And the blessing of God almighty, The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit,

Be upon you and remain with you always.

Amen.

7.6.1 Personal Preparation of the Ministers

Whilst the rubric does not specify that most of the participants are priests, this is assumed. Certainly the principal minister will be in priests’ or bishops’ orders, as required by note 2 to the Prayers for Protection and Peace in CW: PS.57

The RC exorcism similarly expects that exorcists will be “a Priest endowed with piety, knowledge, prudence and integrity of life.” 58

Both the RC Exorcism and the House of Bishops Guidelines on the Ministry of Deliverance expect that Major Exorcism will not be carried out by a priest acting alone and that appropriate clerical and lay colleagues will assist, ideally including those versed in the resources of medicine.59

57 CW: PS, 94.
58 Ibid., 8.
59 The House of Bishops Guidelines, 2. Commentators note that recourse to the expertise of medicine has been included in notes to Deliverance liturgies from at least 1583, since “the synod of Reims in 1583 has stated that an exorcist must enquire into all aspects of a patient’s
There is no indication as to whether the ministers should prepare together or alone. The function of this unit being to ensure that the exorcists have taken every possible precaution to protect themselves from malign influence, the rubric seeks to do that by recalling the ministers to the need for personal preparation before the liturgy itself begins.

The unit then provides two possible prayers for the ministers to pray together, 

Other possible preparatory material is suggested in the available sources, all of which focuses on the protection and defence of those preparing to undertake this ministry. There is no indication as to whether this preparation should take place in the same location as the exorcism itself.

The Church of England makes no comment on location or liturgical furniture, other than that the exorcism should be in a place where publicity is minimal. In either case, presumably the decision about where the preparation will take place will depend upon whether the possessed person is present in the church or chapel. If so, it is to be assumed that the private preparation of the ministers would take place elsewhere. In terms of the theological lenses being used by this study, the majority of this section is prophylactic and therefore falls within the Infilling theme, in that it is asking in advance of the liturgy proper for the defence of the participating ministers. One of the options appeals directly to Saint Michael, demonstrating a high theology of the saints. The function of this unit is defence, transacted by the participating ministers.


The fear of adverse publicity is well-founded. During the discussions on the Wholeness and Healing draft liturgies in General Synod the chair noted, following the publication of GS 1152D, at least one commentator referred to “a holy hit squad of specially trained Church of England exorcists is waging a desperate war against a growing horde of evil spirits.” General Synod, *Report of Proceedings* 29.2 (1998), 319.
together. Given the repeated appeals for this ministry not to be undertaken alone, there should be no instance where these prayers are prayed by a single voice.

7.6.2 Trinitarian Invocation and Lord’s Prayer

The content of this secondary unit is self-explanatory. It consists of a ministerial text which commences the ‘public’ liturgy with the invocation of the Trinity, followed by the recitation by all present who are able to of the Lord’s Prayer, in its traditional language version.

Bearing in mind this study’s interest in authority as well as function, a comment here on the nature of the congregation is worthwhile. Text in bold here denotes that all the ministers, together with the possessed person, if they are able, and any other congregation present say the text together. Pastoral intuition is presumably to be relied upon in terms of judging who might be present during the rite, but the congregation will certainly be few in number and the vast majority of them will be ministers. In accompanying the liturgy there is a reference to vesture for the service, which suggests “traditional vesture for this service would be (surplice and) purple stole, but the circumstances would dictate what, if any, distinctive vesture is appropriate.” Again, attention is being drawn to the fact that this is not a public service in the way in which other occasional offices are.

---

65 Perry notes, "An exorcist should never work on his (sic) own". Deliverance, 129. The House of Bishops makes clear "This ministry should never be undertaken by one person ministering alone; the authorized person should always be accompanied by another priest or lay minister of mature pastoral experience who is similarly authorized." The House of Bishops Guidelines, 2.

66 On occasion the possessed are observed to be unable to recite Christian formulae. Perry suggests that "the amount of publicity should be commensurate with the publicity accorded the original defilement." Here he is speaking of the exorcism of a church rather than a person, and suggests that "if the whole congregation has been publicly aware of what has been done to the church, then the whole congregation should be involved in the remedial action." Deliverance, 129. Part of the desire to minimise publicity is of course to do with reducing the possibility of media coverage, but it is interesting to reflect upon how much of it may be indicative of the Church of England’s internal nervousness about the whole area of exorcism and deliverance. It is true that very few Anglican provinces have produced ‘national’ or centrally published orders for exorcism. This study is able to identify only...
In both instances the suggestion of purple or violet as a liturgical colour indicates the penitential nature of the service.

Following the invocation of the Trinity, the Lord’s Prayer is recited, containing, of course, the minor exorcism “deliver us from evil”. This liturgical unit is identical to

Following the Trinitarian Invocation there is dialogue between the Priest Exorcist and the congregation; the blessing of water; and asperging of the “afflicted member of the faithful and those present, and also the place.”

There are two options for the Collect, one of which is a simple prayer for the possessed person, described as “bound in chains by the power of the devil”. The second Collect contains a more explicitly exorcistic prayer: “we humbly entreat you for this our brother (sister) N., that you will drive the evil spirit away from him (her).”

Recitation of the Lord’s Prayer immediately before the exorcism itself, perhaps recognising the exorcistic nature of that most central of Christian prayers, the only variation being the provision of the Lord’s Prayer in both contemporary and traditional language. It then provides an additional section, prior to the Scripture readings, liturgical unit consists of a corporate confession, a priestly absolution, and an optional additional prayer of absolution for the possessed person:

This prayer is interesting in being partially a prayer of absolution of sin and partially a minor exorcism.
7.6.3 Scripture Readings

providing Psalm 57 as the Bible reading. There is no indication as to how the psalm shall be said, presumably leaving that decision to the exorcist, but it is printed in the version found in CW. The psalm is a recognition of the dangers and troubles which beset the believer, which include “the storm of destruction”, “lions, people whose teeth are spears and arrows”, and enemies who have “laid a net for my feet” and they have “dug a pit before me”. The psalm affirms that when God is invoked “he will send from heaven and save me” and cause the enemies to fall into their own snares. It is a psalm which recognises the dangers of the world and also God’s pre-eminent power.

Deliverance liturgies draw from a number of different scriptural texts for use during a brief Liturgy of the Word. In place of the psalm Delivers liturgies opt for a short passage from the Gospels (Mark 12:29-31), which is Jesus’ reiteration of the text from Deuteronomy 6, “hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is Lord alone.” The function of this unit is to speak the words of Scripture into the context of the exorcism, as well as fulfilling the basic expectation in Church of England liturgy that there will be “at least one reading from the Bible.”

The choice of text in the Major Exorcism reminds the possessed person and ministers both of the reality of the world’s dangers and of God’s superiority to them and willingness to act to save his people. in providing a confidently monotheistic text, challenges the authority of the devil. do suggest six biblical texts, all from the New Testament, mostly from the Gospels:

Matthew 10:1-13 [The disciples’ commission]
Mark 3:13-27 [Christ’s authority and power]
Mark 9:14-29 [Christ’s example]
Luke 10:17-22 [right priorities]
Ephesians 6:10-20 [the armour of God]

74 Gloucester Minor Exorcism, 3.
75 CW, 27 (and several other places where it is made clear that Scripture must always be read in acts of worship but that when circumstance requires, one reading is sufficient).
Revelation 12:7-12 [Satan thrown out].

The RC Exorcism provides a full set of scriptural provision for the Liturgy of the Word, including a psalm, with associated psalm prayers, and the liturgical recitation of the Gospel, of which the default is the Johannine prologue. The Church in Wales provides two optional suggested texts (from Colossians and Luke, as detailed in the Scriptural Themes section 7.2), the rubric implying that the reading of Scripture itself is optional: “A passage of Scripture (one of the following or some other) may be read.”

The use of Scripture brings to a close the Pre-Exorcistic Unit and prepares the way for the second Primary Unit. The exorcists, other ministers, the possessed person and any other congregation members have invoked the Holy Trinity, prayed together in words which include a minor exorcism and reminded themselves of the power and authority of God in the words of Scripture.

7.6.4 Renunciation of Sins and Affirmation of Faith

The liturgy of renunciation is placed before the exorcism, in the same liturgical sequence as appears in the baptismal rite, where the Decision precedes the Minor Exorcism in the Pre-Baptismal Unit.

The Gloucester Major Exorcism moves into the second Primary Unit with a heading and rubric which permit the act of penitence and the affirmation of faith to take place after the exorcism if appropriate. Again, this is a recognition that in some situations the possessed person may not be able to coherently repent of their sins or affirm their faith in Christ due to their physical, emotional and mental state. Something here should be noted therefore about both authority and function in relation to the candidate. In certain rites, including the Gloucester Major Exorcism, the candidate is not required to make any personal request for exorcism or any personal renunciation, prior to the prayer of exorcism itself.

---

76 The Diocese of Manchester, The Ministry of Deliverance, 6. Other biblical readings are suggested in the text at various points.
77 Church in Wales, Ministry of Deliverance, 12. Emphasis original. There is also a selection of suggested scriptural texts in the appendix, detailed here in the Scriptural Themes section.
The ministers are very much in control of the candidate’s progress through the liturgy at this point and it is their authority, together with God’s, which is the driving force. The candidate is required to engage personally in the liturgy but not necessarily until after the exorcism itself. This is a distinctive feature of the exorcistic rites and will be returned to the end of the chapter.

The Gloucester Major Exorcism provides the text from the Decision in CW and CW: PS, with the addition of a fourth question at the end of the sequence of interrogations:

[Do you renounce……
Specific practices which are to be renounced……
I renounce them]

This provides an opportunity for the possessed person to explicitly renounce any particular behaviour which the exorcist believes may have contributed to the oppression or possession from which they are now being delivered. The implication of the square brackets is that personal renunciation of specific practices is not essential for exorcism to be effective.

also includes a renunciation of evil but in a subtly different position, as it is included within the section entitled “The Deliverance” rather than in the section preceding the exorcistic prayer, and it does not appear to be removable to another position within the service. It also includes only renunciation at this point, and no profession of faith:

---

78 Gloucester Major Exorcism, 3.
79 The issue arises here about whether or not someone can be exorcised without manifesting any belief in the Christian God. This will be returned to in the reflections.
80 The Deliverance and Healing of a Person, 2.
The Gloucester Major Exorcism concludes the Penitence section with an optional presidential text, taken from the Initiation services for use after the Decision when the candidate is already baptized:

> May God who has given you the desire to follow Christ give you strength to continue in the Way. Amen.  

This text is optional, and serves to reinforce the tone of the service as one of recovery of baptism. The whole of this liturgical unit is taken from the Initiation material. The use of “May God who has given you…” implies that the person to be delivered is already baptized, an issue which will be returned to in the reflections.

---

Wales offers a very similar threefold renunciation of “the devil and all the spiritual forces of evil”, “the evil powers of this world which corrupt and destroy” and “all sinful desires that draw you away from the love of God”. It then adds a fourth question which is of adherence rather than renunciation, asking the candidate to commit themselves “to the service of Jesus Christ, assured of his protection.” A section of Saint Patrick’s Breastplate may then be prayed by all the ministers on behalf of the candidate. Again the optional nature of all this material is noteworthy.

---

RC, following the established pattern so far, provides a fuller liturgical provision at this equivalent point in the service. There is a Laying on of Hands, largely prophylactic in theology, followed by either the recitation of the Apostles’ Creed or the Nicene Creed or, alternatively, a set of interrogations and answers described as “the baptismal promises and renunciations”, of which there are also two sets, one simple and one more fully worked out:

---

---

81 CW: CI, 124, also 215.
Exorcist: And all his works?
All: I do.
Exorcist: And all his empty show?
All: I do.

RC concludes with the corporate recitation of the Lord’s Prayer which has two presidential introductions for the exorcist to choose from, the first of which explicitly references the minor exorcism in the ensuing prayer: “let us implore God to deliver us from evil, as our Lord Jesus Christ taught us to pray”

It is to be noted that in none of the exorcistic rites available to this study is there an option for a renunciation which does not include a direct and explicit reference to the devil personified. It would appear that regardless of the words used at baptism which, as has been demonstrated, can avoid direct reference to the devil, this avoidance is not possible in the service of deliverance. It must be remembered, however, that in most of the rites reviewed the renunciation is optional.

7.6.5 The Exorcism

There are occasions in the contemporary liturgy where formulae are addressed not to God but to someone else. The obvious examples of these are absolutions and blessings where the minister makes the pronouncement in the name of God or on his behalf. Similarly at baptism the water is administered by the baptizing minister in the name of the Trinity. Vital for this study at this point is to pay careful attention to who is and is not addressed in the exorcism. In the Gloucester Major Exorcism the unit begins with an address by the exorcist to the “demonic powers”, establishing in whose name he or she comes and in whose power. Here the powers are named, identifying them, after which the exorcist identifies themselves and states in whose name they come:

Listen and fear, demonic powers, for I come in the Name of Christ our Lord and master, and His commands do I convey.
Of note here is the description of the powers being contended against. They are “demonic powers”, a general term less specific than addressing the devil by name. These powers are addressed in the name of Christ who is described as both “Lord” and “master” of both the exorcist and the demonic powers, establishing Christ’s position as superior to the powers being addressed. It is also made clear that the exorcism which is about to take place is a command not from the exorcist but from Christ himself. This establishes the authority for the imperative formula which will follow. This will not be a prayer addressed to God, but rather the words of God himself to the demonic powers through the mouthpiece of the exorcist. As has been noted above, such imperative formulae are not unique but the exorcisms are striking in their directness.86

Two options are provided in the text, both of which are drawn from Howell-Everson’s 1990 set of resources for CDSG. The first is exorcism B in his text and is reproduced directly as presented in that document. The second option in Gloucester’s rite is Howell-Everson’s exorcism D, which is also reproduced faithfully, aside from being rendered into contemporary English.

The rubric between the two exorcisms suggests that both, or either, may be used at the discretion of the exorcist.

Both exorcisms contain a command to the power of evil to depart from the possessed person. In the case of the first, what is commanded to leave is “every evil spirit, every power of the enemy”, and they are commanded to “depart”. In the second option what is exorcised is “most unclean spirits, every agent of the enemy, every spectre, every legion” and they are described as being cast out, uprooted, and put to flight. In relation to the theological themes matrix, the pattern of naming, binding and casting out is demonstrably present, although the precise words used vary. The “infilling” element follows the exorcism, as will be demonstrated below.

The function of these exorcisms is clearly therefore to establish the authority of God (and thus the authority of the ministry of the exorcist) over the powers of evil - to bind, or cause

86 There are some examples in very early liturgy of the candidates for baptism addressing the devil directly in the renunciations. Kelly contains a useful review of such liturgies. Devil at Baptism, 99-101. These are examples of lay rather than priestly direct addresses to the devil and set a very early precedent.

87 Howell-Everson, Rites of Exorcism,
them to be under the control of the exorcist, and then to eject them from the possessed person through divine command. As regards ministry and function, it is of note that there is no agency attributed to the candidate for exorcism here. The exorcism itself is addressed to that which is being exorcised (or in the case of the Minor Exorcisms to God) by the exorcist. The candidate is supine at this stage.

The Gloucester Minor Exorcism follows broadly the same liturgical pattern in this unit, although the exorcism itself is deprecatory rather than imperative in form, and thus constitutes a prayer asking God to deliver and free the person from evil; it does not explicitly address, bind, or cast out anything:

\[
\text{Lord God of Hosts, before your presence the armies of hell are put to flight.}
\]
\[
\text{Deliver you from the assaults and temptations of the evil one.}
\]
\[
\text{Free you from every evil and unclean spirit that may be assailing you.}
\]
\[
\text{Strengthen and protect you by the power of your Holy Spirit;}
\]
\[
\text{Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.}
\]

Following that material, a simple prayer of deliverance is provided with a rubric noting that “some other” prayer may be used (although none is provided). The laying on of hands is optional at this point. The prayer provided is identical to Gloucester Minor Exorcism, 4.

Both deprecatory and imperative forms, preceded by the showing of a cross to the possessed person and an optional exsufflation. The rubric requires that a deprecatory form be used, but states that an imperative form may be used as well. Church in Wales, Ministry of Deliverance, 14. a clear theological statement that prayer to God for exorcism is a requirement even in the major exorcism, but that exorcism in the name of God remains optional.
Important questions for the reflection section below will be what the theological difference might be between deprecatory and imperative exorcisms, and why the Church of England has tended to continue to provide imperative exorcisms.

7.6.6 Affirmation of Faith in the Lordship of Christ

The exorcism is followed with an address to the exorcised person inviting them to affirm the Lordship of Jesus, which they do several times, repeating after the exorcist “Jesus is Lord”. The text is mandatory and so, even if the Penitential rites have not yet been used, the profession of the Lordship of Christ is still required immediately following the exorcism. This may be the first time during the liturgy when the delivered person speaks on their own, particularly if they were unable due to their symptoms to make the act of penitence earlier in the service. Their agency returns at this point.
7.6.7 Penitence

At the end of the Exorcistic Unit, regardless of which of the available rites has been followed, a number of liturgical acts have transpired, including an expression of penitence and renunciation of evil, an affirmation of faith in Christ on the part of the possessed person, and an exorcism led by the exorcist. The exorcism may have been deprecatory or imperative, and the imperative formulae will have included the three theological elements of Naming, Binding, and Casting Out.

7.6.8 Anointing and Accompanying Prayer

The Post-Exorcistic unit is the point at which the “infilling” identified in the theological themes is articulated in the liturgy. This is achieved by the use of the anointing with the oil of healing (infirmarium) together with the authorised CW words associated with that act. This prayer is discussed in length in Chapter 6 of this study; it is a prayer for forgiveness, healing, wholeness, peace and the reception of God’s love. The use of the oil of healing rather than of chrism or catechumens is perhaps significant, indicating that the Church recognises that, even after exorcism, there is the more general and essential work of ongoing prayer for healing still to be undertaken. Because the Church of England restricts the administration of oil for healing to those in presbyteral or episcopal
orders, it is to be assumed that the exorcist or perhaps assisting clergy will undertake this
anointing.

In their various ways the rites all make provision following the exorcism for prayer and/or
liturgical action which draw to mind, both to the delivered person and the rest of the
congregation, the necessity of continued prayer for wholeness and healing, for the
presence of the Holy Spirit, and for the ongoing protection afforded to the faithful by God.

7.6.9 Blessing

The final secondary liturgical unit in the Deliverance liturgy is a blessing.
7.7 Reflections

There are seven issues worth reflecting upon here, several of which reinforce or elaborate upon themes familiar from the Initiation and Healing chapters.

7.7.1 The Status and Importance of Names and Naming

The theme of naming is crucial in Deliverance ministry. The imperative exorcisms available to this study all name the power which is to be exorcised. It is interesting that services which offer more than one imperative exorcism to choose from are not consistent about the specific name used. This suggests that the particular name or names used are less important than the liturgical action of addressing the evil presence by a name, addressing it personally, an action which has the function of focusing the prayers of the exorcists on that which is to be bound and cast out and possibly, although this requires a high demonology, drawing the attention of the presence which is to be exorcised. The inconsistency in the naming of the devil, demons, unclean spirits, and the range of titles used for them seems to have ancient precedent, and the Church of England seems no more or less inconsistent than others.

Another name of vital importance in the rites is that of Jesus and in some of the rites also the name of the Trinity. All exorcism is conducted in the name of Jesus, and it is in his name, or in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that the devil is cast out. In terms of analysis of minister and function, exorcism in the name of Jesus (often Jesus of Nazareth) is in line with the language of the apostles in Acts.

Church in Wales, Ministry of Deliverance, 16. The biblical passages paraphrased are Romans 15:13 and 1 Thessalonians 5:23, 28.
The candidate is named at various points in the rites, and this naming also seems to be significant. Even if the candidate does not participate in any part of the rite verbally until after the deliverance prayer itself, their name is used to identify them personally and specifically. Some provinces have made theological comment upon the importance of the candidate’s name. The issues around the deliverance of unbaptized or nonbelieving candidates will be discussed below, but it is noted here that

**7.7.2 Status of the Rite and Role of the Candidate**

This study has already noted the unusual status of the rites of exorcism, particularly the Major Exorcism, which is clearly not a service which the Church expects to be used routinely. There is an argument that it counts as an occasional office, with the expectation that the occasions upon which it will be used are few. There is also an argument that exorcism is most usefully interpreted as having the same status as emergency baptism. In other words, it is a rite for use only *in extremis*. There are a number of convincing liturgical arguments for this view, not least the relative nonparticipation of the candidate. In emergency baptism the candidate takes no active role in the liturgy at all unless, having survived the crisis, they then come to church and make the renunciations and affirmations they would normally have made before receiving the sacrament. This is a very similar pattern to that of the candidate for exorcism. There is the expectation that they may not be able to participate verbally in the service until after the prayer of exorcism or deliverance has been administered but after that has occurred, they are expected, if able, to make both a renunciation of sin and evil and an act of adherence to Christ. This notion of making retrospective renunciations and adherence due to incapacity early on in the process is strikingly similar to the liturgical and theological rationale for the shape of emergency

---

100 The issues around the deliverance of unbaptized or nonbelieving candidates will be discussed below, but it is noted here that

101 CW: PS, 102-105. See especially note 4 which details the expectation that if the candidate survives they retrospectively participate in an act of renunciation and adherence.
baptism. It is an example of liturgical elasticity in response to pastoral necessity, and strengthens the argument that exorcistic rites in the Church of England should be labelled as rites *in extremis*. Reinforcing this argument is the inclusion in the Exeter Report of a suggested form of emergency exorcism which includes simply a “quick, deep act of Recollection” followed by “the Command... to the effect: *in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, I command you, evil spirit, to harm no one, but depart to the place appointed you.*”\(^{102}\)

The provision of a form of emergency exorcism is uncommon in the texts available for this study, and there is no hint of such provision being necessary in Perry’s *Deliverance*. The entire tone of that book, and the House of Bishops’ guidelines, rests on the fact that exorcism is a last resort after significant diagnosis and investigation, and should therefore never need to be performed in an emergency situation. A final argument in favour of exorcism as a rite *in extremis* is the Exeter Report’s conviction that exorcism is essentially a lay ministry, and it is only owing to the desirability of including a blessing in the rite, that it would normally be performed by a priest.\(^{103}\) This again has parallels with emergency baptism, where a lay person can be the minister of the sacrament although the normative minister is ordained. A counterargument would be that Rome makes provision for some of the minor exorcisms early on in the RCIA process to be performed by people other than those in priest’s orders, and so the appeal to lay exorcism is not unique to an “emergency” situation.\(^{104}\)

### 7.7.3 The status of Deliverance liturgies in the Church of England

The Exeter Report published in 1972 provided a suite of liturgies for Healing and Deliverance. The report recommended that “those appended here should be considered normal for the province, and be so used”, although it also recognised that “liturgical forms for exorcism vary from place to place and age to age.”\(^{105}\) The texts were not adopted nationally by the Church of England, and no move has been made since 1972 to centrally

---


\(^{103}\) Ibid., 21. The report appeals to historic accounts of the administration of exorcism by lay people, and notes that “exorcism can be and has been carried out by any Christian, and even by non-Christians, in the name of Christ.” Mark 9:38-40 is appealed to as evidence of non-Christians using the name of Christ in exorcism.

\(^{104}\) RCIA, 42, para 91. Rome would want to draw a clear distinction between the minor and major exorcisms, however, and is absolutely clear that major exorcism is restricted to specific priests in each diocese. *Exorcisms and other Supplications*, 8, para 13.

produce, commend or authorise liturgies for exorcism or deliverance. As has been noted, Rome does have a centrally authorised text.\textsuperscript{106} Other parts of the Anglican Communion vary considerably in their degree of provision.\textsuperscript{106} Given the caveats and apparent anxiety surrounding the Ministry of Deliverance in the Church of England, it is an interesting decision to devolve the liturgical (and therefore to a large extent the theological) decision-making in this highly sensitive area of ministry to the Diocesan bishops. Diocesan bishops of course are responsible for a number of local liturgies, particularly those for licensing and commissioning various ministers, but in the area of Deliverance it needs to be recognised that significant authority and trust is vested in the diocesan bishop not only to ensure that such liturgical resources are provided as required, but also to determine for themselves, or to seek out advice in the formation of, those resources. Doing so will require theological as well as liturgical decisions are made. One of the questions to be put to the Church of England in the concluding section of this study will be how the decision was reached not to adopt provincial liturgies, as recommended by the Exeter Report, but rather to request that such decision-making and liturgical composition take place at diocesan level, with the almost inevitable resulting disparity in practice across the dioceses. Is this deliberate, as a way of avoiding formulating official doctrine at the level of the national church?

It is now common practice for the diocesan bishop to identify more than one individual to advise them in the Ministry of Deliverance.\textsuperscript{109} There are questions around how such ministers are selected and whether exorcism is a charism or not.\textsuperscript{109} Given that the authority for

\textsuperscript{106} Exorcisms and other Supplications.


\textsuperscript{108} Church in Wales, Ministry of Deliverance. This text is not provided on the website on which the other Welsh liturgy is available.

\textsuperscript{109} Perry, Deliverance, 155.

\textsuperscript{110} The Church in Wales, A Memorandum on Exorcism, 4, and 7 where the Archbishop explicitly rejects the idea of appointing “diocesan exorcists” and makes it clear that he believes exorcism to be part of the “normal ministry of the local parish priest”, albeit with advice from “diocesan advisers.”
conducting Deliverance ministry, or advising the parochial clergy upon it, is essentially diocesan, and the adviser acts in the name of the diocesan bishop, it would be interesting to know whether there are any examples of the diocesan bishop themselves engaging in Deliverance ministry within their diocese.

A conclusion will need to be drawn in chapter 8 about whether the perceived concern of C of E over rites of Deliverance is theological, liturgical, pastoral, or a combination of these. Evident in the requirement for explicit episcopal permission from the diocesan bishop for the performance of an exorcism, and for the provision of the liturgy to be used, is a concern about authority. Why is it, given that C of E is so clear that episcopal permission and guidance is required for this ministry, that the Church is unable or unwilling to provide a provincially authorised form of service? Is this due to fear of, or embarrassment about, exorcism itself? Is it possible that there is a crisis of confidence here which General Synod and the Liturgical Commission would struggle to overcome? Is there a prevailing belief that no theological common ground could be achieved when seeking to authorise common texts which explicitly discuss highly realised doctrines of evil? Delegating authority for decision-making in such matters to the diocesan bishop certainly avoids such decisions being made in the public arena of General Synod, whilst ensuring that ministry exercised within each diocese is, in theory at least, appraised and overseen. The potential for there being as many ‘normative’ doctrines of exorcism as there are dioceses is, however, high, and the current system of episcopal authorisation therefore sets up a number of challenges in terms of establishing theological norms in this ministry. A related concern might be over reputational risk to the church, and associated danger of litigation. Ecclesiastical Insurance, which covers the vast majority of Church of England clergy and buildings notes that Deliverance ministry is not covered by the standard policy which insures parish clergy in their routine ministry. Particular and specific insurance is required for Deliverance ministry, which further suggests that this ministry is not to be considered routine or belonging to parochial clergy generally.\textsuperscript{111}

It is interesting to note that there would appear to be a divergence between the churches of the West and East. The Orthodox tradition would seem to treat exorcism as much more of a routine element of priestly ministry, and thus there seems to be less anxiety associated with it.\textsuperscript{112} Again, space does not permit further exploration of this interesting comparison here.

\textbf{7.7.4 Deliverance, Healing and Baptism}

At a number of points attention has been drawn to the links between the liturgies of Deliverance, and those of both the Initiation and Healing ministries. As was discussed in 7.6.4 there is a particular set of parallels between Deliverance and Baptism in terms of the progress of the candidate through the rite and their encounter with opportunities for the renunciation of sin and evil, expression of faith in Jesus Christ, and the sacramental or pseudo-sacramental moments of transformation. There is a particular parallel between exorcism and emergency baptism which has been elucidated above.

If, as it has been suggested in the previous two chapters, baptism is the controlling rite and controlling sacrament in the CW liturgy, then it is unsurprising that even restricted liturgies such as those of Deliverance should bear a family likeness. Given the historical precedent for exorcism to form a central part of the preparatory ceremonies in Baptism, the presence of baptismal imagery in Deliverance liturgy and vice versa makes perfect sense. In both liturgies the use of names is central, as indeed is the use of the sign of the cross. The sign of the cross as a pre-baptismal liturgical unit is imbued with exorcistic and apotropaic symbolism which, as was demonstrated in chapter 5, still exerts some influence upon the CW theology of baptism, though held in tension with a variety of other interpretations of the symbol.

The question about whether or not an uninitiated person can be the recipient of the rites of Deliverance, given the baptismal overtones of the service, is an interesting one and it will be further explored in the concluding chapter, not least because the same issues are operative when discussing the healing services more generally.\textsuperscript{112}

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
the Exeter Report warned against the presence of, in the words of the Church in Wales, “the unbelieving, sceptical, emotionally overwrought or merely curious.”

113 Perry seems more open to the presence and participation of those who are doubtful about the reality of personified external evil forces or even of those who are truly agnostic, noting that:

“it is Christ who casts Demons out; they know him and his power; the exorcist acts not on his own authority or by reason of his understanding but as the human agent of Christ. The agnostic can therefore act ‘as if’, offering up his own work and carrying out the work of Christ.”

114

The inclusion of Prayers for Protection and Peace in CW: PS makes it clear that the Ministry of Deliverance is closely connected to the Ministry of Healing more generally, but also distinct from it. The Exeter Report contained in its appendix a set of liturgies which included those for the laying on of hands and the anointing of the sick with oil, as well as a form for blessing holy water, and for the exorcism of a place and a person.116 It is instructive that commended forms of service for several of these scenarios were subsequently produced but that exorcism was excluded from that process. The notes to that section of CW: PS discussed above restrict the Ministry of Deliverance both in terms of liturgical provision and who may perform the liturgy. In terms of identifying what makes the difference between an act of healing and an act of deliverance, this would seem to get
to the question at the heart of this study: the Church of England’s capacity to articulate theology of evil, the devil, and the demonic. Whilst the membership of the Church of England pray daily “deliver us from evil”, it is clear that there comes a point where the specific nature of that evil, the effect it is producing in the life of the person seeking deliverance, and the remedy prescribed to effect that deliverance, moves the ministry and the liturgy out of the general realm of healing and into a more specific, demarcated and private form of ministry. Whilst the processes for making that judgement as to when the ministry moves from Healing to Deliverance will be specific to the diocese, what this study is interested in is the theological apparatus used to inform those decisions. This, again, will be returned to in the conclusions.

7.7.5 What, if anything, is the real difference between Deprecatory and Imperative Exorcisms?

There is a question to reflect upon about the liturgical, theological and functional differences between deprecatory and imperative exorcisms. As has been demonstrated from the structural analysis, both forms of exorcism are provided for use in Major Exorcism rites. Some sources provide both forms but prefer the deprecatory formulae, which are mandatory. In some liturgies there would appear to be no functional difference between the two forms, in that they both seek to address, bind, and expel the malevolent spiritual force. In terms of precisely what is happening liturgically, however, there is a significant difference. The deprecatory forms are prayers to God, and so what the exorcist is basically doing is praying, whereas the imperative forms are addresses to the evil presence in the name of God, but by the exorcist themselves. Here the exorcist is not saying a prayer but conversing in the power of God with the evil presence, uttering an imperative formula like an absolution or a blessing, addressing it not to a human congregation but to the evil presence. Perry provides a little assistance on this question in that he classes deprecatory prayers of exorcism as Lesser Exorcism and imperative prayers as Major Exorcism.¹¹⁷ He notes that Minor Exorcism, “that is a prayer to God in the name of Christ, directed against the power of evil, [in Christian tradition at least]

¹¹⁷ Perry, Deliverance, 127.
can be carried out by any baptised Christian (or even by an unbeliever)."¹¹⁸ That said, when discussing the Major Exorcism of a Place, he does instruct “exorcise immediately, using an imperative form of words.” Perry does seem to be attributing to deprecatory forms of exorcism, which he is restricting to the Ministry of Minor Exorcisms, a more general function of addressing non-specific evil presence. In contrast he ascribes to imperative formulae, which he expects to be used at all major exorcisms, a more focused and specific function in casting out an identifiable and specific evil presence.¹¹⁹

The status of Perry is slightly less formalised in the Church of England. The Exeter Report simply notes that “the form of exorcism may take the form either of a prayer to Almighty God, or of a command in the name of Christ to the powers of evil.” It hypothesises that the imperative formula is the earliest, referring to the record of a nun addressing a demon in the form “Exi! (Get out!)”, although the report offers no reference to support this claim.¹²⁰ As noted above, ATTH acknowledges both forms.¹²¹ ATTH seems to consider that the distinction between the two forms of exorcism might most usefully be considered a pastoral, not a theological, one. As well as having different liturgical structures, and therefore slightly different ministerial roles, there is a lack of clarity about the functional difference between the two forms and whether that functional difference, if there is one, has to do with the nature and type of evil presence that has been identified as oppressing, possessing or infesting the person or place.

7.7.6 What might success look like?

There are questions to be posed about what would count as success in an exorcism. This again has connections with the questions raised in the previous chapter about what healing more generally might look like. If the function of an exorcism is to name, bind and expel an evil presence and then to invite the Holy Spirit to renew the presence of God within the

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 150.
¹¹⁹ Exorcisms and other Supplications, 11 para 28.
¹²⁰ Petipierre, Exorcism, 20.
¹²¹ ATTH, 175.
candidate, there is a parallel with baptism to be drawn in which exorcism takes place prior to a sacramental act and a prayer for the presence of the Holy Spirit. In Baptism and in the liturgies of Healing there is an understanding that, although significant and real grace is imparted through those ministries, the candidate still retains the potential to encounter evil again in their life and therefore is in need of apotropaic prayer and blessing. So too, presumably, in exorcism the possibility of repossession exists. It would be interesting to gather accounts of those who have been the subject of an exorcism more than once where the diocesan deliverance team believed that each exorcism was genuinely required.

Success in exorcism is presumably contingent upon accurate diagnosis in the first place. The exorcism of a person who is not possessed by a demon, Perry notes, will not only be unsuccessful, but “may be positively harmful.”122 Liturgically there are questions here around how long the exorcism should continue on before the exorcists decide it is being unsuccessful, and how that judgement is arrived at. Many sets of guidance notes for exorcism make it clear that the service should not last too long because exorcism, if it works, does not need to be repeated over and over again due to the supremacy of Christ over the powers of darkness.123 Other commentators, however, have made links between mental exhaustion and success in exorcism:

---

122 Perry, Deliverance, 133.
123 Gloucester Major Exorcism notes: “no service of this nature should go on for more than one hour. If the client is not helped in this time, another diagnosis should be made.” The Christian Exorcism Study Group, Code of Practice: “After adequate preparation, no service of Exorcism should continue for more than two hours.”
124 Church in Wales, Memorandum on Exorcism, 3.
125 Anglican Church of Canada, Task Force on Exorcism, 3.
---
7.7.7 Towards a Theology of Evil for the Church of England

More needs to be said about the theologies of evil available to the Church of England in order to be able to draw conclusions about precisely what might be happening in the life of a person who presents requesting exorcism. It has been demonstrated above that there are divergent opinions across the various provinces and Churches whose guidelines and liturgies have been available to this study. The Anglican Church of Canada offers perhaps the most ‘rational demonology’ of those that have been reviewed, whereas the Exeter Report contains a very high demonology. These will need to be further explored. It has also become increasingly clear that the Church of England itself has, over time as well as more recently, struggled to articulate a coherent theology of evil to inform the variety of services in which that evil is encountered and discussed. Specific questions that arise from this present chapter are asking how theologically it makes sense that a person can journey through the rites of initiation, reject Satan, renounce evil, repent of their sins, be the recipient of a minor exorcism, be badged with the Cross of Christ and perhaps also be the recipient of the Church’s Ministry of Healing, and still end up in a situation of being oppressed, possessed or infested by the devil. The differences between the terms describing degrees of possession might offer some explanation. Recurring here are a number of the questions raised earlier in this study about whether it is possible to identify stages in a Christian’s journey where they have negotiated evil to the point where they are sufficiently defended from its power to no longer need exorcism. If such a point can be identified, then the questions that arise are to do with the relative power and authority of God and of evil, where free will fits into that, and how much of a person’s baptismal identity can be submerged or erased by the power of evil.

---

126 Ibid., and compare with the Exeter Report: “One cannot get away from the fact that the New Testament is teaching a personal origin for evil; it simply will not do to dismiss this language as metaphor.” Petipierre, Exorcism, 12.
Whilst this defends God's authority, it asks questions of his goodness.

7.8 Summary Conclusions

The scriptural and theological lenses available for the Church of England when discussing the specific Ministry of Deliverance and Exorcism have been identified, as have the available liturgical resources. Specific note has been made of the names by which personified evil is referred to in CW. Structural analysis has been undertaken to reveal the liturgical process by which a candidate undergoes Deliverance ministry, and commonalities and differences have been identified both within the Church of England's provision and between that provision and the texts of other provinces and Churches.

It has been noted that the Church of England does not centrally authorise or commend material for Deliverance ministry other than the Prayers for Protection and Peace and their associated Notes, and that all other material bears the authority of the Bishop of the diocese which has produced it. Some other provinces do centrally authorise material and make it available to their clergy.

The liturgical and theological parallels and connections with baptism and the Ministry of Healing have been discussed, and the status of the rites of exorcism in the Church of England as rites *in extremis* has been raised for discussion due to striking similarities in the examination of both minister and function.

In moving towards a conclusion to the question of whether the Church of England is able to present a coherent theology of the devil and of evil in its liturgical formulations, this chapter has noted the lack of a confidently articulated demonology in the published liturgical texts and the devolution to the diocesan bishop of the responsibility for formulating such theological and liturgical provisions. This exploration of the theology of evil will be the central focus of the final chapter of this study.
It is noted that theologies of personified external evil vary not only within the Church of England but also across the Churches and provinces which have been studied in the course of this chapter. The summary conclusion of this chapter has to be that this is at the least unhelpful and frustrating for those engaged in this ministry in the pastoral context. More positively, articulated through most of the rites available is a dominant theology of the supremacy of Christ which argues against a dualist approach to Deliverance ministry, or to evil more generally, as Perry confidently asserts:

[The exorcists] need at all times to bear in mind that they are fighting an actual battle against the powers of evil, but that they are protected by a far superior power because they are the vanguard of the irresistible army of Christ.128

---

128 Perry, Deliverance, 132.
8. Introduction

The conclusions which follow fall into three sections. The first section (8.1) draws together conclusions about the theology of evil and the diabolic which seem to be most at play within the CW material, and makes some comments about the consistency of this theology in the Church of England. The second section (8.2) goes on to draw some more specific conclusions about the liturgical provision of the Church of England today and to highlight some particular areas of concern. The final section (8.3) will propose extending this study’s structural analysis methodology to the rest of the CW library and make some suggestions about the areas which might most fruitfully be scrutinised by scholars in the future.

8.1 What theologies of evil is the Church of England presenting?

Theodicy and the nature and problem of evil will be central questions to any Church attempting to say anything either liturgically or otherwise about the relationship of God and humanity to evil, personified or otherwise, and sin. Any discussion of the person and nature of the devil in relation to the broader concepts of evil and sin will likewise have theodicy at its heart. Questions of the reality and problem of evil have of course been long-running in the history of the Church, and it must be stated clearly that in this study a comprehensive literature review of the theological and philosophical conversation and assertion in this area will not be possible. It is, however, crucial in concluding this piece of work to attempt to identify which resources from the tradition are most operative in the Church of England’s public liturgical discourse around evil and the relationship which a Christian has with evil as they make their journey of discipleship.

As has been pointed out earlier, authorised theological formulations about the nature of evil are sparse in the Church of England’s provision, with the ‘historic formularies’ of BCP and the authorised and commended alternative material in the CW collection forming the bulk of the evidence. The starting point for drawing conclusions about whether the Church of England successfully presents a theology of the devil and the demonic, and whether it is coherent, will be the Theological Introduction to the Wholeness and Healing material,
because it constitutes the most worked out of the Church of England’s authorised commentary on evil. The Introduction begins with an assertion of the primacy of baptism in the Christian’s journey of faith and as the foundation of the Church of England’s liturgical provision for the remainder of the pastoral services. Two paragraphs then treat issues to do with sickness and ill-health, and these are followed by a paragraph containing some significant assertions about the nature of evil:

Furthermore, the New Testament also presents us with a picture of Christians in a running battle with forces of evil that are external to us but bear heavily upon our lives. Although the principalities and powers (Ephesians 6.12) are not always forces of evil, they can have an impact on the social and political order; the evil one not only brings temptation but takes people captive (Gospels, passim); the power of idols enslaves consciences (1 Corinthians 8); and pagan sacrifices are offered to demons with whom we must not be participants (1 Corinthians 10). This series of pictures, while not absolving us from personal responsibility for our actions, also strongly implies that without the grace of God we are at risk of being in the grip of an array of forces beyond our powers to resist or break. Yet there is victory in Christ, and we also learn that, in the final analysis, ‘an idol is nothing in the world and there is no God but one’ (1 Corinthians 8.4); and that victorious discernment categorizes all forces of spiritual evil as provisional and counterfeit. Their ‘power’ lies in their impact on us, and their ‘reality’ therefore is shadowy and interim only. But we nonetheless need deliverance from that power, and the language of healing and wholeness is entirely appropriate to that process.

It is the assertion of this study that this paragraph is of vital importance in compiling a theology of evil and of the diabolic for the Church of England. As an authorised text, fully debated and approved by General Synod, it carries an authority greater than the secondary texts, for example, Perry or even ATTH. The Theological Introduction comes as close as any other CW material to taking its place amongst the ‘historic formularies’. It was received, in various versions, by General Synod and revised in light of written submissions from members of Synod and from elsewhere in the Church, as well as further Synod debates and revision committee discussions. As such it must be considered to carry significant authority.

---

1 CW: PS, 463 details that the entirety of the Wholeness and Healing section is authorised rather than commended. This may well be unique as a fully authorised theological statement. The Commentary by the Liturgical Commission in CW: CI has no similar authorisation, and indeed is printed in the volume after the authorisation statements, giving it the appearance of an appendix.  
3 CW: PS, 10.  
Analysis of this Theological Introduction identifies a number of key words by which the first section of these Conclusions will be structured. The key words in question may be grouped into categories thus:

1. Forces of evil; No God but one
2. External; Provisional; Counterfeit; Power; Reality; Shadowy; Interim
3. Evil One; Power of idols; Demons
4. Bear heavily
5. Temptation
6. Captive; Beyond our powers to resist; Deliverance

The first category concerns the existence of evil in a monotheistic schema. The second category concerns the status of the reality or otherwise of that evil. The third category concerns the personification of forces of evil. Category four concerns the way in which evil influences and acts upon humanity. Category five explores the connection between evil and sin. The sixth category treats issues around possession and deliverance itself. What seems to be articulated here is a theodicy which recognises a number of external powers acting upon the Christian, amongst which would seem to be classed spiritual forces which are evil in nature and have a number of potential powers. Amongst those powers are those of temptation, the influence of societal and community relationships, and enslavement and captivity. There is an assertion that without the assistance of God we are not strong enough to resist these powers, but through “victorious discernment” the Church is able to accurately identify both the status of the power and the reality of these evil forces, even though until the eschaton Christians will still require deliverance from them. The sort of deliverance that is offered has the nature of healing and wholeness about it.

Any delineating of the doctrine of evil for the Church community will first have to consider whether or not the community believes that evil exists. If a concept of evil is to be recognised, then something needs to be said about its nature and comparative relationship to God. Following that, successive statements will aim to define more narrowly the parameters of this thing called evil, its character and its operations. The six categories will aid this task.
8.1.1 Forces of evil; No God but one

The Church of England wants to retain language of evil in its liturgical forms. As noted above, the Theological Introduction is an authorised text. One of the outputs of the revision process was “a strengthening of the reference to the Christian life as a ‘running battle with the forces of evil’”. This comment comes in paragraph 23 of the Fourth Report of the Revision Committee on the bundle of liturgical resources that would eventually be published in CW: PS as Wholeness and Healing. Paragraph 23 specifically concerns the Theological Introduction and comments upon two changes made to the Introduction as a result of the revision process. The first is a strengthening of the baptismal theme at the beginning of the text, and the second is a “strengthening” of the language used about evil and its relation to the journey of the Christian through life. Thus at a moment of opportunity to redefine what the liturgy has to say about evil, Synod made the decision, guided by the Liturgical Commission, to “strengthen” such language, at least in one set of formularies. Bishop John Hind, chairing the Revision Committee, introduced the discussion on the Wholeness and Healing liturgies on 5 July 1998 by laying out the fundamental theological principles about evil which had guided the Revision Committee in their decision-making:

The first is that we pray for deliverance every time we say the Lord's Prayer, and we invoke the Spirit's power for deliverance every time the sacrament of baptism is administered. The prayers before us are offered as a pastoral application in particular circumstances of one of the most basic convictions of our faith.

The second is that Screwtape likes nothing better than to be ignored, if it is not that we should fear him excessively; those are the two things that he likes best of all. The plain facts are that evil is real enough and that its ultimate defeat is assured.

Framing the revision of the Initiation and Healing services, therefore, it can be demonstrated that there is an orthodox theology of the existence of evil within a monotheistic worldview where the victory of Christ over evil is guaranteed, but where it is clear that evil needs to be engaged with. Evil is a genuine threat to the Christian. ATTH asserts early on, “Christ came to fight for his people, for the power of evil is very strong.”

The origin and nature of this evil have not yet been delineated, but it can be identified that at least its existence can be taken as a given. Given the confidently monotheistic,

---

5 GS 1152W, 7.
7 ATTH, 21.
Trinitarian liturgical framework within which these liturgies sit, a dualist model of evil as
generated by “a majestic, dark God of Evil” can also be discounted.\textsuperscript{8} Having asserted that
evil exists, traditional theodicy would next need to say something about whence that evil comes, and whether it has a genuine existence of its own or whether it is more like the
privation of good which represents the Augustinian position.\textsuperscript{9} One classical solution to the
question of the origin of evil is the Fall, whether of the Angels from heaven (the pre-
mundane Fall) or of Adam and Eve in the garden (the mundane Fall).\textsuperscript{10} RC’s position is to
hold to the doctrine of the pre-mundane Fall, asserting that “God is infinitely good and all
his works are good” and that “the devil and the other demons were indeed created
naturally good by God, but they became evil by their own doing”. The fall of the angels
from heaven is ascribed to “their free choice” and so humanity, tempted by Satan,
therefore also falls, meaning that the devil has “acquired a certain domination over man,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[8] Perry, Deliverance, 8.
commentary on the problem of evil is vast, and is not the purpose of this study to review it, but
rather to note the terrain, and the broad thrust of CW’s theological influence, if such an influence

\item[10] Hick rejects entirely the concept of a pre-mundane Fall, noting “the basic problems of finite
personal life would not be altered by our transposing them into the heavens and speaking of angelic
instead of human beings. Further, whilst we know a good deal about man and his history, we know
nothing about angels, so that to derive a theodicy from a supposedly angelic prehistory would be to
build speculation upon speculation.”, Evil and the God of Love, 280-281. In contrast, Graham is
slower to reject the idea of the fall of the Angels (200), whilst stating “I do not believe in fact that
there can be a very logical demonstration of the necessity of supernatural spiritual entities”, Evil and
Christian Ethics, 159.
\end{footnotes}
even though man remains free."  

No such comprehensive statement on the origin of evil exists in authorised or commended Church of England liturgical material, although examination of the Decision in the Initiation Services does lend some weight to the argument that the Church of England aligns itself generally with a broadly Augustinian understanding of evil as the result of misuse of free will, whether on the part of the angels or of humans, and thus in some sense a privation or corruption of good rather than something with substantial existence of its own:

Do you renounce the deceit and corruption of evil?
I renounce them.\(^\text{12}\)

The ascription to evil of “deceit and corruption” shares much language with the traditional concept of evil as having the characteristics of a distorted and misdirected good. Candidates for baptism and confirmation recognise when they make the Decision that as they renounce evil what they are renouncing is something with the character of that distortion and misdirection, something that is dishonest and which is an abuse of something else. In the original draft of this renunciatory question, the word “deceit” was originally “glamour”\(^\text{13}\) but this was amended at the first revision stage after concerns about the word were expressed to the Revision Committee.\(^\text{14}\) Although “glamour” carries overtones of the seductive nature of evil, “deceit” is more explicit in its reference to the dishonest and false character of evil.

Mention ought to be made here of BCP catechism which, by virtue of its inclusion within BCP, is an ‘historic formulary’ and further enhances the Church of England’s doctrine of the reality of evil. In the answer to the question “What desirest thou of God in [the Lord’s] Prayer?” the candidates recite, “I pray unto God, that …it will please him to save and defend us in all dangers ghostly and bodily; and that he will keep us from all sin and wickedness, and from our ghostly enemy, and from everlasting death.”\(^\text{15}\) Of note is the ascription to the Lord’s Prayer of the capacity of defence and salvation from ghostly dangers as well as of those of the body, and of protection against the “ghostly enemy”.

\(^{12}\) CW: PS, 67.
\(^{13}\) GS 1152, 23.
\(^{14}\) GS 1152Y, 27.
\(^{15}\) BCP, A Catechism, That is to Say an Instruction to be Learned of Every Person Before he be Brought to be Confirmed by the Bishop.
Both phrases indicate a distinction between corporeal, perhaps worldly, dangers and those of a spiritual or non-corporeal nature, and that at least part of the latter category can be labelled as an “enemy”, in other words something that is in opposition to the Christian. The Revised Catechism lists renunciation of the devil and commitment to “fight against evil” as amongst the promises made by godparents at baptism, but, in the section where the Lord’s Prayer appears, no analysis is made of that prayer in the questioning and no reference made to the implicit exorcism within it.¹⁶ Intriguingly the New Revised Catechism presented to General Synod as GS Misc 354 in 1990, but never formally adopted, begins with a strikingly confident assertion of the place of evil within the world:

C Why then has God’s will been so often hindered?
A because all creation has been marred by evil; and men and women have chosen darkness rather than light.

This latter catechism, in answer to the question made about the promises of baptism, provides the reply:

A That I turn to Christ, repent of my sins, and renounce evil.
Turning from darkness to light, I promise to put my whole trust in Christ as Saviour and Lord, and I acknowledge my own sins and my share in the sin of the world, and I renounce the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil.¹⁷

The first conclusion that can reasonably be drawn therefore is that the Church of England in its liturgical formulae remains determined to recognise evil as something that is “real enough”¹⁸ and therefore needs to be included in the liturgical language which will accompany a Christian on their journey. It can be asserted that the theology of evil within the Decision is confidently anti-dualist, presenting evil as something which may be both turned towards and turned away from, and which has real power to harm.

The next set of keywords will enable further conclusions to be drawn about whether evil has an external reality of its own and exactly what its power might be.

---

¹⁷ A New Revised Catechism (GS Misc 354) (Church House Publishing: London, 1990), 1, 8.
8.1.2 External; Provisional; Counterfeit; Power; Reality; Shadowy; Interim

This set of seven words from the Theological Introduction, five of them adjectives, provides some useful information about the nature of the evil in which the Church of England believes. Questions posed are:

- Does evil exist? This question has been answered positively in 8.1.1

If the answer to the first question is ‘yes’ then the next questions are:

- Does evil come entirely from within the human heart, or is it external?
- If evil is external, is it supernatural? This and the preceding question will be addressed in 8.1.2.
- If evil is supernatural, is it personal? (Addressed in 8.1.3).

O’Grady, towards the end of his biography of the devil, *The Prince of Darkness*, identifies the question of whether evil is an external force or power which acts on human beings or whether it is a label or description for the sinful actions of human beings themselves, as of paramount importance: “The endless, mysterious question [is] - does the source of evil come from within human beings, or are they led into evil through some source independent of them?”19 The Church of England is absolutely clear: “the New Testament... presents us with a picture of Christians in a running battle with forces of evil *that are external to us* but bear heavily upon our lives.”20 This is enormously helpful in piecing together the theology of evil active in the liturgical texts. Whatever else the Church of England wants to say about the nature and the activity of evil, it is something which operates from a place external to the life of the individual Christian. In other words evil is not simply the sinful output of an individual person. Evil is something which, although closely related to sin (as shall be demonstrated below), is different from it, is external, and - as the keywords identified above demonstrate - has “power” and “reality”, even if that power and reality are then nuanced by other terms such as “provisional”, “counterfeit” and so on. This, at least in part, informs the retention of the renunciations of sin and evil (and the person of the devil) severally at baptism; the problems that arise when these renunciations become confused or interchangeable will be highlighted in section 8.3 below.

20 CW: PS, 10 *emphasis mine.*
The third question in the sequence concerns whether this evil, being identified as external, can also be ascribed, partially or entirely, to supernatural or spiritual forces. The Theological Introduction is itself open to interpretation, and all the references to the forces of evil could be read as referring to societal and institutional powers, invested with the symbolism of spiritual powers as an aid to better understanding and combating them. The text could equally be read more literally, and presumably this is intentional. As noted above, General Synod was clear that language of the reality of evil is important and, as will be discussed below, the retention of the renunciation of the devil further indicates a desire not to surrender the language of personification of evil. The inclusion within Prayers for Protection and Peace of material which explicitly refers to supernatural powers and beings argues against an entirely non-supernatural theology being at work. This will be further explored.

The question for the Church of England is whether it is able to conceive of an external power of evil which goes beyond that which is the result of the implicit or explicit collusion of communities, societies and other human agglomerations of power and influence. Walter Wink is amongst the theologians who argue that, whilst evil is real enough, maintaining a theology of the supernatural reality of “the powers”, as he refers to them, is unnecessary and largely irrelevant to the Church’s naming and confronting of the reality of those powers:

> These “Powers” do not, then, on this hypothesis, have a separate, spiritual existence. We encounter them primarily in reference to the material or “earthly” reality of which they are the innermost essence.21

Others identify in some of the horrors and atrocities of the world the indications of an evil which must have an identity which is both greater and more appalling in nature than individual human beings:

> When we think, for example, of Belsen... we are compelled to take seriously the idea of the demonic in the sense of evil which is utterly gratuitous - evil simply for evil’s sake.... When we meet evil in such senselessly malevolent and malicious acts and attitudes we seem to be face-to-face with that which has been called the devil or, less anthropomorphically, the demonic. In the demonic, evil as a necessary element in a soul-making universe seems to have got out of hand and to have

---

broken loose from God’s control. It seems to have developed its own evil potentialities far beyond anything that can have been intended in any divine plan.  

22

The challenge, if one follows Hick, is to articulate a theology of evil which guards against dualism and yet allows for an external, supernatural power of evil which acts against the purposes of God. Hick attempts this by concluding “we must insist both that evil is really evil and that God has really willed for a good purpose a world in which evil, with its demonic quality, arises.”

23

The Church of England tends towards this delicate balance of theology with its use of the descriptors “provisional”, “counterfeit”, “shadowy” and “interim” - the first two being used of “all forces of spiritual evil” and the latter two as ways of describing their “reality”. This theological language of evil being shadowy and interim permits it a reality which reflects the tone of the General Synod discussion, whilst firmly safeguarding the supremacy of God and the ultimate promise of the resurrection. The use, again, of the word “counterfeit” carries with it the overtones of deception and dishonesty traditionally ascribed to the powers of evil, and all four of these key words are very similar in tone to Hick’s own description of Augustine’s assertion that evil is “secondary and parasitic rather than primary and essential”. 24 Of note is the discussion that took place over the inclusion in the Theological Introduction of these direct references to forces of spiritual evil. In the second draft of the Wholeness and Healing texts there was no equivalent to those references. In GS 1152E, the third draft of the texts, the familiar language has been added but the “forces of spiritual evil” are described as “provision (sic) and spurious.”

25 The replacement of the word “spurious” with “counterfeit” occurs in the final draft of the text, where a note in the House of Bishops’ annex to GS 1152F simply notes the amendment without comment. Both words fundamentally mean inauthentic or not genuine, but the word “counterfeit” carries more implication that the inauthenticity is deliberate or intentional. This study can find no

---

23 Ibid., 363. Although Hick answers Wink neatly, his irenean theodicy brings other problems with it. Others who argue for an objective reality and identity to the forces of evil include Graham, *Evil and Christian Ethics*, 156, who argues “there is not only seduction, but a seducer.” Mathewes, *Evil and the Augustinian Tradition*, leaves the door open to the usefulness of the supernatural explanation for evil when he notes "perhaps the most apt image of what I have been explicitly concerned with... is the image of the fall of the rebel angels: they fall downward, to be sure, but more importantly fall away", 245.
25 GS 1152D is the second report. GS 1152E, 3 contains the phrase "provision and spurious". The error is in the original report.
commentary on the reason for the change of word but conceivably the intention was to harden slightly the theology that the actions of the forces of spiritual evil are intentional, rather than being an accidental result of a world order in which evil is capable of existing.

This section concludes, from reflection on this second set of key words, that the Church of England’s answer to the question of whether evil is external is emphatically “yes”. In answer to the further question as to whether that external evil is supernatural, permission seems to be given to supernatural evil being a reasonable explanation for the activity of evil in the world. The existence of supernatural evil is consistent with most of the tradition and is a legitimate position for the Church of England Christian to adopt. As will be demonstrated below, further evidence to back up this doctrinal position is supplied when the names used for elements of this evil are examined.

8.1.3 Evil One; Power of Idols; Demons

Of the four questions posed at the beginning of 8.1.2, one remains. If evil is supernatural, is it personal? In other words, if it is conceded that there is a spiritual element to the powers of evil, can they also be credited with some sort of personal identity or even personality? This goes to the heart of the subject of this study in terms of the Church of England’s use of the language of the devil and of demons when it discusses evil. O’Grady suggests, “in whatever way we think of the Devil, he can only be conceived in connection with humanity... The battlefield is within the human mind and heart. And it is at this point that the crucial question always arises: is the Devil purely a product of the human mind or has he an independent existence of his own?”26 The Theological Introduction refers to “the evil one” who has the power to tempt and bring people into captivity, to “idols”, and to “demons”. Scriptural references provide biblical background for the use of this terminology. It is notable that although the word “devil” is used in the liturgical provision itself, and indeed in Scripture, it is not used in the Theological Introduction. In addition to the three personalised titles listed above, the paragraph also makes reference to “forces of evil”, “principalities and powers”, “an array of forces”, and “forces of spiritual evil.”

26 O’Grady, The Prince of Darkness, 27.
As highlighted in Chapter 4, evil is given a personal identity and personality throughout the liturgical and scriptural provision in the Church of England, largely through the use of the title “devil”, though also in the use of the name Satan, in reference to demons, and in the more general terms mentioned above.

RC is explicit that “evil is not an abstraction, but refers to a person, Satan, the Evil One, the angel who opposes God. The devil (dia-bolos) is the one who ‘throws himself across’ God’s plan and his work of salvation accomplished in Christ.”27 The names are used interchangeably, and one clause refers to the devil by the titles which Scripture variously uses: “a murderer from the beginning,... A liar and the father of lies”, “the deceiver of the whole world”, “the enemy”, “the Prince of this world”.28

The Church of England provides nothing as explicit or confident as the RC catechism, but the Synod discussions over the language of the Initiation Rites reveal a certain degree of ad hoc theological reflection in the revision process which demonstrates a general strengthening of the use of personal language for evil. The renunciation of the devil by name in baptism as a requirement in the Church of England had disappeared in 1968 with the publication of the Series 2 baptism service. CW reintroduced a direct renunciation of the devil in the first draft of the proposed Initiation Services, brought to General Synod for the first time in 1995 (GS 1152), and until late in the revision process there was no option to use any alternative Decision which did not include reference to the devil by name. This in itself is an indicator of a significant theological decision to reintroduce into a rite explicit reference to personified evil in a way which - although BCP had remained authorised in the meantime - many practising Christians would not have encountered since the late 1960s. The amount of discussion in Synod, and the nature of the written submissions to the Revision Committee specifically on the issue of the sixfold Decision, indicate the profound theological debate which this move predicated.29 One of the specific points of confusion identified in the CW provision is identified here, however. There is a disparity between the theological rationale expressed in the Synod conversations and the actual liturgical

27 The Catechism of the Catholic Church, part four, section 2, article 3, VII (but deliver us from evil) clause 2851.
28 Ibid., clauses 2852 and 2853.
29 Over the course of the revision process there were six written responses to the Revision Committee objecting to the use of the phrase “the devil” from people outside the Committee.
provision which permits a *reduction* rather than a strengthening of personified language of evil. The specific liturgical concerns raised will be discussed in 8.2.2.

It is a reasonable conclusion to draw that, at the Revision Committee stage at least, the mind of the Church of England was that to reintroduce a rejection of the devil by name at the point of baptism and confirmation was a positive and healthy, as well as theologically coherent, development. The theological argument was made on two grounds: the first that references to the devil by name added to the candidates’ understanding of what the process was about; the second that their reintroduction was part of a broader reconfiguration of the Decision to put renunciation first, followed by affirmation.\(^{30}\) Stancliffe makes an explicitly theological statement: “we kept ‘devil’ because it is more vivid and concrete than abstracts like ‘evil’.”\(^{31}\) His argument is that “devil” is a concrete term, where more general references to evil are too “abstract”. Unfortunately this contrasts with the rationale given by the Bishop in Europe in his introduction to the discussion, which explicitly refers to the sequence of questions at the Decision as “a repeated pattern which may be described in each case as moving from the general to the particular, from the abstract to the concrete,” by which logic “devil” is more general or abstract than “evil”.\(^{32}\) There is thus confusion even amongst members of the Revision Committee presenting the liturgies to General Synod about whether the devil provides a more concrete or a more abstract image for baptismal candidates, but agreement nevertheless that mention of his name is liturgically helpful! The most clear and helpful piece of liturgical theology offered in that Synod debate comes from Michael Vasey, who argues that the rejection of the devil in the Decision provides an opportunity for the candidate to “not... reject their own rebellion but the world’s rebellion against God.” He refers to the BCP text and stresses that “baptism services have traditionally made a clear renunciation of the confidence and wealth of the fallen social order in which the Church is set, and it is important that this continues.” Without mention of the devil and rebellion against God there is a “risk that the reference to the devil in this text feels more as if it is the seduction of the occult, whereas baptismal liturgies have always made reference to the confrontation with the world and its pride.”\(^{33}\) Stressed clearly here is an association of the

---

\(^{30}\) General Synod. *Report of Proceedings* 27.3, 1151 and following. David Stancliffe is responding to David Bird’s motion to recommit the Decision to the revision committee.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 1089.

\(^{33}\) Ibid., 1158, 1159.
rejection of the devil by name with the rejection by the candidate of the rebellion of the
world against God’s plans and intentions, represented by the person of the devil. This
would seem to be a clear piece of liturgical theology, emerging through the process of
revising the liturgy, which has to do with the devil representing the rebellion of the world,
regardless of whether or not he is seen in this context as a concrete or an abstract symbol
of that rebellion. This is in line with ATTH’s assertion that evil is both societal and
personal.34 The Exeter Report, in defining evil, was clear that it “proceeds from created,
intelligent wills, either human or demonic. Both are possible sources of evil.”35 Thus at this
point in its reflections upon the nature of evil, the Church of England was ready to ascribe
evil to an intelligent will, but open to that being either human or demonic in nature.

As noted, it is interesting that CW: PS chooses to use the term “the evil one” in the
introduction to the Wholeness and Healing section, with its seemingly confident assertion
of personified evil. The discussion over whether or not evil, if it is deemed to have an
independent and objective existence, is personal or impersonal in nature has occupied the
church for centuries, and this study cannot contribute in more than a passing manner. The
most frequently prayed exorcism in Christian liturgy is the petition in the Lord’s Prayer:
“but deliver us from evil.” This petition itself highlights the tension between theologies of
personal and impersonal evil. The Lord’s Prayer has been variously translated through its
history, and although “deliver us from evil” has categorically held dominance in the Church
of England, it is not at all clear that this translation is the most accurate one possible. As a
useful way into this area of exploration, Colin Buchanan outlines the history of the Lord’s
Prayer as used in Church of England liturgy, and charts the various translations of the
prayer into English beginning with the text of John Myrc from around 1400 which contains
the line “but schelde vs alle from euil thynge”.36 Buchanan’s thesis is that the Greek text in
Saint Matthew’s Gospel which is variously rendered “but deliver us from the evil one” or
“but deliver us from evil” is ambiguous in the original.37 Buchanan’s review is helpful and
informative, but highlights that almost exclusively the Church of England has favoured a

34 ATTH, 167.
35 Petitpierre, Exorcism, 17.
37 He lays out this argument at some length, and then goes on to treat the Latin text, arguing that
whilst the exorcistic petition in the Lord’s Prayer in Latin is also ambiguous, an impersonal
understanding of evil is implied by the use of the text in the liturgical formula of the embolism, libera
nos ab omne malo and that this subsequently led to vernacular translations in English also favouring
the impersonal, rather than the personal, evil from which the petitioner prays to be delivered. 11-12.
petition, at this point, for the deliverance from impersonal (or at least more general) evil, which makes CW: PS’s allusion to Saint Matthew’s “evil one” the more striking. It is interesting that most commentary on the Lord’s Prayer occupies itself with discussion of “lead us not into temptation” but far less so with the exorcism which follows it. Most discussion of the exorcism admits the possibility of both personal and impersonal evil being indicated, without wanting to exclude either.

More than this about the objective reality of the person of the devil and his host is difficult to ascertain from the liturgical provisions. There is no discussion in the Synod reports and no commentary in the texts themselves beyond the Theological Introduction. Furthermore, there is little evidence of whether the Church of England formally differentiates between the devil and the realm of demons, evil spirits and other descriptions of personified evil which occur in various liturgical prayers as well as in the Theological Introduction. Perry, with a reasonably realised demonology, is happy to concede “if we believe in the existence of God and of Satan and of human beings... there is no reason in logic why this should not be a great chain of being which includes all sorts of creatures and spiritual beings like angels and demons, and why some of them should not owe allegiance to God and work for good, while others of them belong to Satan and influence us to do evil.” The evidence is not available from the liturgical texts themselves to make any further deduction about how symbolic and how real these figures are intended to be, or about whether the Church of

38 Buchanan notes several dissenting translations including that of the Bishop’s Book of 1537: “But deliver us from the evil.” and Becon’s Catechism of indeterminate date, but sometime during the reign of Edward VI which contains the same petition as the Bishop’s Book. 17-18. Every authorised text of the Lord’s Prayer since 1549 has, however, favoured the impersonal, though Buchanan notes the draft experimental texts which contained the line “but save us from the devil” which were presented by the Liturgical Commission in 1968 but which was never taken seriously in any formal setting. 23.

39 Space precludes a comprehensive survey. A brief sample of reasonably recent treatment would include the popular work of Rowan Williams and Sister Wendy Beckett in which Williams asserts "whether or not people these days believe in a personal devil, I think the idea of the principle or the power of evil coming in to make the most of our weakness and fear still makes sense.", Archbishop Rowan Williams and Sister Wendy Beckett, Living the Lord’s Prayer (Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2007), 70-71. Tom Wright’s devotional study warns against the dual danger of ignoring evil or conversely affording it too much power, before claiming that evil forces "gain power, collectively, that has, down the centuries of Christian experience, caused wise people to personify it, to give it the name of Satan, the Accuser." Tom Wright, The Lord and his Prayer (London: Triangle, 1996), 71. Timothy Bradshaw’s doctrinal study appeals to Austin Farrar in wanting to claim an objective reality of evil, and to Karl Barth to defend the identity of evil as inherently a negation, but avoids claiming for or against the objective reality of Satan, noting "it is as coherent to argue for an individual 'Satan' as against one", Timothy Bradshaw, Praying as Believing: the Lord’s Prayer and the Christian Doctrine of God (Oxford: Regents Park College, 1998), 184-185.

40 Perry, Deliverance, 143-144. In the same section he appeals to the biblical warrant for the existence of demons as well as Satan himself.
England believes that precision in the use of terms such as the devil, demons, evil spirits and so on matters anyway. What can be concluded at this point is that the presentation of evil in a personal sense, particularly in the use of the word “devil”, is intentional, deliberate, and meant to afford the Christian a way of negotiating the reality of “all rebellion against God” as the Decision has it, and that this is at least partially an appeal to the theology and liturgical practice of BCP. The rejection of the personal figure of the devil gives the Christian the opportunity to recognise the demons and the Satan of the world in what Wink refers to as their “concretions” - the only way that he, at least - believes the forces of evil can truly be seen by the Christian.41

8.1.4 Bear heavily

It has been demonstrated that the Church of England is capable of identifying evil as a reality, external as well as internal, and with supernatural elements, some of which the Church chooses to refer to in a personalised sense.

The next conclusion to draw is that this evil has the potential to influence and affect both the individual and society. Much of this has been alluded to above in the discussion about the devil as representative of the rebellion of the world against the purposes of God. The Church of England is clear from its provision in Initiation, and in Healing and in the more focused and specific Ministry of Deliverance, for which it provides guidelines and rubrics if not texts, that the Christian person will encounter evil at various points in their life, that this encounter has the potential to be repeated, and that it is part of the ministry of the Church to combat it.

What is less consistent is the Church’s understanding of the similarities and differences between the sorts of evil rejected and renounced in baptism, the sorts of evil encountered in healing ministries, and the sorts of evil which might “bear heavily” upon an individual, or indeed a location, which requires a Ministry of Deliverance. Held alongside this is another set of questions about the nature of the renunciations, exorcisms and apotropaic prayers in the various rites. Is there a difference between the exorcism or the renunciation of the devil at baptism and any later renunciation or indeed any later exorcism? What happens if

41 Wink, Naming the Powers, 139.
someone comes to the church seeking exorcism and they have never previously ‘encountered’ the devil in any earlier rites of passage? An example of this is the potential, as discussed in chapter 5, for a candidate for initiation in the Church of England to pass through the initiation rites without rejecting the devil or being exhorted to “fight valiantly... against sin, the world, and the devil” due to the rubrical permissions afforded the minister in the final version of CW: CI, but then to encounter language which is explicitly demonic at a later stage of their Christian journey, for example when they seek prayers for Protection and Peace or are judged to require exorcism. This sets up a number of theological questions about the point at which it may be important to talk about evil as personal. Whilst there is little conclusive evidence in the CW text, at times elements of the Church of England have felt more confident in identifying the objective reality of personal evil forces. The Exeter Report, for example, as was highlighted in chapter 7, is absolutely explicit about the personal, external nature of evil, appealing to the New Testament to support this claim. The Exeter Report is also happy to state that “disease can have a diabolical causation”, although it does not require one. The implication is that it is within the Devil’s power to cause sickness as well as other sorts of suffering.42

There is also a set of unresolved questions for the Church of England about whether or not there is a sequential progression through the various rites which the Church offers which are dependent upon the previous liturgical experience. For example, can an uninitiated person receive the Church’s rites of Healing? In practice, of course this happens all the time, particularly in places like cathedrals where the ministry of Healing is offered publicly and regularly. However, in terms of the theological rationale which the Church of England has presented - which describes both the ministry of Healing and of Deliverance in terms of the recovery of baptismal status - there are theological questions to be asked about what is happening when someone who is not baptized undergoes a rite whose intention is to recover baptism. Interestingly ATTH frames its theology of healing far more within an incarnational frame than a Paschal one.43

The Exeter Report identified four categories of recipients of exorcistic rites: candidates for initiation, things (such as salt, water etc.), places, and “persons other than candidates for

---

42 Petitpierre, Exorcism, 13.
43 ATTH, 17. Note in particular “God was in Jesus Christ and therefore in all of his actions and words, his healing miracles and his parables of the kingdom.”
The report does not make any comment, however, about whether this fourth category of people can be participants in an exorcistic rite if they have not already passed through the initiation rites. "initiation." 44

Chile is explicit about the fact that “if we are dealing with a person still not converted to God, it is necessary that person is strongly encouraged to accept Christ as Saviour and God; it depends on each case, this can be done before starting or immediately after. Otherwise this person must be told very clearly of the danger he/she may incur if he/she has not received Christ.” 45

It seems clear that the Church of England recognises the potential, and indeed accepts the likelihood, that evil is a power which will act upon and in the lives of human beings. Evil is something which has to be faced and challenged, and this is done, amongst a number of other ways, in liturgical ceremonies and actions. What is less clear, due to the inconsistency in the application of terminology and particularly in the permissive nature of the options around the Decision at baptism (see 8.2.2 below), is whether the Church is able to differentiate in any way between the various types of encounter with the evil and the devil which may occur during the Christian’s journey. Of particular interest to this study is the question of what sense can be made of recovering baptism in the liturgy in which the participant is unbaptized. An exploration of the incarnational as well as Paschal theological resources available for understanding of healing and deliverance liturgies might be of benefit to the Church in this regard.

8.1.5 Temptation

One of the operations ascribed to “the evil one” in the Theological Introduction is that he “brings temptation”. The relationship between evil and sin is a close one and, apart from a very brief period during the most recent period of experiment with the liturgical forms in the Church of England (see 8.2.2 below), Christians in the Church of England have always renounced, repented of, or otherwise turned away from, both evil and sin at their baptisms. ATTH and Perry provide useful theological material on the relationship between sin and evil. They both go further than the Theological Commentary, and comment on the relationship which is only implicit in the liturgical formulas being considered by this study.

44 Petitpierre, Exorcism, 19.
45 Libro de Oración Común, 77, paragraph 9.
In terms of the liturgical forms themselves, it has already been noted that in baptism the candidate turns away from both evil and sin. The formulae used for the laying on of hands and the anointing with oil of a sick person make reference to deliverance from evil in the laying on of hands prayer and, at the imposition of oil, include a prayer for the reception of “Christ’s forgiveness, his healing and his love.” Although it needs to be remembered that these are two separate prayers which do not have to be prayed together, nonetheless there would seem to be a clear indication in the liturgy here that forgiveness of sin is as much a part of the ministry of Healing as is deliverance from evil. Deliverance liturgies, including those from Church of England dioceses which have been studied here, provide for the compulsory or optional confession of sins and evil practices committed as an integral part of the service if the candidate is capable of making such a confession.

In terms of theological rationale, ATTH notes that sickness and sin are both expressions of evil. Perry, in the Church of England’s most recent semi-official theological text on the subject, identifies temptation as the initial stage of the encroachment of evil upon a human being. He notes: “every Christian knows that he is subject to temptation. Temptation may become so intense that it has to be described as demonic obsession... A further stage may be called oppression.” Perry is explicit that the infestation or possession of a person by the devil or by demons cannot happen without a human cause, in other words without some element of sin being involved. “People cannot catch demons as they catch the common cold. They have to put themselves at risk and be in a vulnerable position.” A little later in the same chapter, reproducing material by Howell-Everson, he lists the first background cause of demonic possession as “a blatant and unrepentant life of selfish sin” as amongst a possible six reasons for someone to become possessed, all of which have sinful overtones.

It seems clear therefore that the Church of England is able to draw a close relationship between the elements of evil which may be external and come to bear upon an individual,

---

46 CW: PS, 33-34.
47 ATTH, 19.
48 Perry, Deliverance, 118.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., 119. Sections from this chapter of Perry are reproduced from a now out-of-print document: Perry is also clear that the same precondition of human sinful action will be the case in the possession of a place, rather than a person, 129.
and sinful action as a result of temptation, which, according to Perry, is a prerequisite for the attack upon a person which may lead to possession.

As a side note, Kelly, in tracing the origins of renunciatory and exorcistic formulas in early initiation liturgies makes the case that the Jewish doctrine of “sin demons” which need to be cast out of a person is the most likely origin for the Christian doctrine connecting the presence of demons with both exorcisms at baptism and the requirement to repent of sin. He makes his case at some length both in the introduction and in chapter 3 of his work, supporting his thesis that even if exorcism has not always been an essential element in baptism, it is certainly a very early element indeed. The importance to this study of Kelly’s observations is the hypothesis that from the very early period of the Church developing rites of initiation, sin and other types of evil influence are held closely together. The Church of England implicitly reflects this theology in its liturgical provision and explicitly does so in a number of its semi-official theological statements including ATTH and Perry.

8.1.6 Captive; beyond our powers to resist; Deliverance

The final set of key words for consideration is that which concerns explicit reference to the way in which evil powers have the ability to dominate a person. The Theological Introduction is explicit that “the evil one... takes people captive”, that “we are at risk of being in the grip of an array of forces beyond our powers to resist or break”, and that therefore regardless of how “provisional and counterfeit... shadowy and interim” the powers of evil may be, “we nonetheless need deliverance from that power.”

There is vitally important theology here. What the Church of England is expressing is the sovereignty of God and the victory of the resurrected Christ - hence the provisional nature of evil’s dominance - but nonetheless that, even given God’s sovereignty and Christ’s victory, evil has the capacity to operate upon a Christian in a way which can render them defenceless before its power. It is at this point that the Church of England provides some theological rationale for its belief that possession can occur, and therefore rationale for the inclusion in CW: PS of the notes to Prayers for Protection and Peace. Although the ultimate

51 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 23, 55 (and throughout chapter 3).
52 CW: PS, 10.
victory is assured in Christ, even those who have been initiated in his name have the potential to be enslaved by the power of evil.

There is something quite important here about agency. What the Church of England seems to be saying is that it is possible for an initiated candidate to lose their own agency (though, crucially, not their status as a baptized Christian) to the point where a rite may need to be done to them, as opposed to by them, in order to effect release from that evil power. This gives weight to the question posed in chapter 7 as to whether the diocesan services of Deliverance and Exorcism ought properly to be counted as liturgies in extremis, in the same way as Emergency Baptism. In both cases, as has been discussed above, the candidate demonstrates no agency but is rather the passive recipient of the service, the minister or ministers taking upon themselves all authority within the service. In both services, however, the candidate is expected, after recovery, to participate in further liturgical rites where they express their own faith and claim for themselves the promises which have been previously claimed on their behalf. In a more ‘routine’ initiation service, and in the majority of services of healing, the candidate demonstrates rather more agency, although in the case of an infant baptism this agency is of course exercised by proxy through the participation of parents and godparents. It should also be noted that the laying on of hands with prayer for healing can be received by proxy also, presumably even without the knowledge of the person for whom someone else is acting as proxy. There is, then, an expectation that there are occasions in which liturgical rites will be performed with and for a participant who is unable to themselves coherently participate, and that this is common to Initiation and Healing rites, and to Deliverance also.53

Perry describes the demonic possession of a person in a very matter-of-fact manner, but he is also clear that there are various degrees of demonic infestation of a person’s life, beginning with “obsession”, moving to “oppression”, and finally “possession”.54 Perry therefore wants to draw a clear line between all the other ways in which evil can act upon a person - through temptation to sin, through the various evil behaviours and operations of societies and cultures as discussed above - and the final instance of a personified external evil identity taking up residence within a person and dominating them entirely:

---

53 Although there was no indication in any of the deliverance material that a candidate can be exorcised remotely. The candidate must be physically present for an exorcism to be affected.  
54 Perry, Deliverance, 118.
Possession is the most serious case. In this, the person’s will is taken over by an intruding alien entity. When this happens, the person is incapable of asking for deliverance on his own behalf. It may be a temporary state, however, so that the person when he is not possessed may know that he has been, and so will come to a counsellor expressing a wish to be released from this recurring condition. If a person is possessed by a demon, it can only be dislodged by exorcism.55

Given that the notes to Prayers for Protection and Peace refer the minister to their diocesan Bishop on occasions where they suspect demonic possession to be the diagnosis, and that Perry’s volume is the official text of CDSG, to whom the House of Bishops entrusted responsibility for “training people nominated by their diocesan bishops to exercise the deliverance ministry as one part of the whole ministry of Christian healing,”56 the quotation above is probably as close as can be found to an official definition of demonic possession in the Church of England. It is, however, contingent upon a highly realised theology of the external personal nature of evil which, as has been demonstrated above, the Church of England is far less confident about expressing in the rest of its liturgical provision.

If it is the case that deliverance from evil is basically a recovery of, or a return to, a state of baptismal grace, as the Theological Introduction asserts through its contextualising of all healing ministry within a baptismal framework, and if it is also the case that the Church of England, at least through CDSG, is accepting of the possibility of the complete possession of somebody by the devil or other demonic personality, perhaps it really does make quite a significant difference whether a candidate is afforded the possibility of rejecting “the devil and all rebellion against God” at their baptism. Deliverance from evil, when taken to its most extreme degree in the exorcism of a demon from a person, is the removal of an explicitly satanic and personal presence. If this is accepted doctrine and part of pastoral practice in the Church of England, it is peculiar that initiates are not required to reject that presence at the outset of their Christian journey.

There is a question remaining to be answered from chapter 6 about what it means to be ‘complete’, and what can bring incompleteness to a baptized person.57 It would seem that it is the directed activity of evil, within which is included sin but also external evil forces

---

55 Ibid., emphasis original.
56 Ibid., xi.
57 In terms of the relationship between Healing and Initiation there is also a connection here with the conversation about whether baptism constitutes complete sacramental initiation of a Christian.
operating upon individuals as well as groups of people, which has the power to divert a person from their journey towards “wholeness”, begun at their baptism, to the point, in the case of possession, where their entire personality can become dominated by a different, external personality. The implication, however, is that none of this action of evil has the power to expunge the baptismal identity of a person entirely, even when a person did not reject the devil explicitly by name at baptism. Perry, following CW and ATTH, is comfortable with the language of “wholeness and healing,” recognising that evil’s domination will rarely be restricted to one specific form, but that all forms of interference with the flourishing of creation are ultimately the devil’s work:

Nor is there any reason why some forms of dis-ease should not be open to treatment at the same time on the medical, the psychiatric and the spiritual level. Health and wholeness is the will of God for creation, and any interference with that is to be seen as the work of Satan.  

8.2 Coherence in the liturgy?

Structuring the first section of this Conclusions chapter around key words found in the Theological Introduction, it has been possible to draw some conclusions about the prevailing theology of evil and available demonologies at work in the Church of England. Structural analysis of the specific liturgies authorised, commended or locally authorised in the Church of England requires a second set of conclusions to be drawn which will highlight some specific deficiencies in the liturgical provision, and therefore highlight a disjunction between theology and liturgy, drawing into question whether lex orandi, lex credendi operates efficiently.

8.2.1 Nervousness about Deliverance and Exorcism.

The inability of the Church of England to centrally authorise or commend a service for deliverance and exorcism is conspicuous. As has been demonstrated, other denominations and Churches have found themselves able to agree upon a set of texts which carry some sort of central authority and which therefore have been the subject of rigorous theological

---

58 Perry, Deliverance, 144.
and liturgical analysis in the equivalent of a liturgical and/or revision committee stage. This study has noted particularly

The majority of churches restrict the circulation of such liturgies so they are not publicly available but are nonetheless nationally or centrally produced and authorised and available for use when required. Of the Church of England’s provision, only the House of Bishops Guidelines, the Theological Introduction and the Notes to the Prayers for Protection and Peace carry that kind of status, and all of these are in the public domain. The Perry Deliverance volume can be argued to have a semi-official status because it is the output of CDSG, itself a body which came into being following the Exeter Report’s work and is, in theory at least, the body to which diocesan bishops send their deliverance advisers for training. None of these resources provide liturgical material for a Greater Exorcism. The responsibility for constructing such a liturgy is vested in the individual diocesan bishop. The result of this is patchy provision from diocese to diocese, with theological as well as liturgical decisions about the Ministry of Deliverance being made at a local level. There is an interesting question here about authority. If the Church of England’s usual liturgical operating procedure is that for key texts the process for authorisation or commendation is via the Liturgical Commission and General Synod, is the devolving of Deliverance liturgy to the individual dioceses a statement about the weight of importance placed upon these liturgies? Are they considered to be relatively unimportant compared, for example, with a prayer of general confession, a Eucharistic prayer or a translation of the Lord’s Prayer, all of which require the full consultative process? Why is it that the removal of a demon from a person is less important than those? The answer must surely be that such liturgies are not less important and that the reason for the devolution is an inability on the part of the Church of England to formulate a doctrine of the demonic which would be acceptable to General Synod. This is a problematic and unsatisfactory state of affairs. ATTH recognised the complexity of the theological issues provoked by considering the Church’s liturgical Ministry of Deliverance when it noted “the issues surrounding the deliverance ministry are complex. They raise questions about epistemology, theodicy, cosmology, Christology, anthropology and sociology.”

The last Church of England report to have considered any of these issues in relation to exorcism was the Exeter Report, whose recommendations about authorising liturgical resources were not taken up. The Church of England is not alone in choosing not to authorise central resources for Deliverance. The Anglican Church of Canada

59 ATTH, 181.
60 Petitpierre, Exorcism.
has also made this decision, though Canada differs from the Church of England in presenting in their rationale a considerably ‘lower’ demonology than does the Church of England.61 Given that the Church of England - in ATTH, Perry, and during the revision process of the Initiation and Healing rites for CW - finds itself able to formulate a theology of evil which allows for it to be external, personal, and to bear heavily upon the individual, it is remarkable that an order of service to alleviate that spiritual danger is not nationally available.62 It is the judgement of this study that, given the sensitivity of Deliverance Ministry and the repeated observation that this ministry is to be undertaken with great care, with an eye to the danger of unwanted publicity and in conjunction with medical and psychological ministry, the Church of England is deficient in its failure to provide a set of texts and notes for its clergy.

8.2.2 The Decision

The most confusing section of the authorised Church of England liturgies which deals with evil is the Decision in baptism. There are a number of permissions given in the rubrics and notes, as well as options for alternative text to be used, which obscure rather than clarify the Church’s theology of evil and the devil.

The deficiencies in the Decision are several. There is first of all the question of the necessity of, or theological value of, the rejection of the devil by name. A second set of problems arises over the liturgical relationships between the renunciation and adherence, the signing with the cross (and administration of oil of baptism), the “fight valiantly” prayer, and the prayer of exorcism. Significantly divergent theologies of the movement of the candidate away from the powers of darkness and into the kingdom of light emerge when these liturgical units are separated and moved around the liturgy either for theological or pastoral reasons. A third set of related observations concerns the troubling history of the Church of England’s Initiation rites in the last century, where for two periods of time the Church of England has either intentionally or unwittingly diverted from the ancient tradition about what it is that the candidate needs to turn away from and turn towards in order for Christian initiation to be complete.

61 Anglican Church of Canada, Task Force on Exorcism, 3.
62 For example, ATTH, 181; GS 1152, 10; GS 1152Z, 7; GS 1152D, 4.
The first conclusion to be drawn around the Decision itself is that there remains confusion, which appears to be both theological and pastoral, about the liturgical inclusion of the person of the devil in the renunciations at baptism. It should be noted that some commentators are confident that the renunciation of the devil is the “only universal antidemonic Christian initiation ritual.”63 In the discussions leading up to the reintroduction of the rejection of the devil in baptism which led to the authorisation of the 1998 baptismal texts it has already been noted that, although the Liturgical Commission and revision committees argued strongly for the reintroduction of this particular liturgical device, there was discord even amongst the membership about the nature of the rejecting of the devil. Some argued that reference to the devil was concrete, while some argued that it was abstract. In the end the rejection of the devil was authorised, and so this liturgical device returned to the liturgy of the Church of England for the first time since 1968, but at the final revision stage permission was granted to use the ASB form of Decision “for strong pastoral reasons.”64 The arguments from pastoral necessity which occurred throughout the revision process had less to do with theological coherence than with the accessibility of the language, particularly to those who are unchurched. The importance for the argument of this study is that at the last stage of revision permission was introduced to use a form of Decision which does not include renunciation of the devil. The significance of this on its own has already been noted, and the significance of this late addition, in conjunction with the other rubrical permissions of the Decision, and the subsequent authorisation of CW: AT in 2015, will be outlined below and be shown to act directly against the prevailing theological desire of the Liturgical Commission to strengthen rather than weaken references to the diabolic in the Initiation services.

The liturgical deficiencies of the CW Decision are not easily noticeable until structural analysis is undertaken. As noted above, when the default text is encountered it appears to strengthen the language of the nature of the evil to be renounced when approaching Initiation. It has a threefold renunciation which includes a rejection of the devil, the renunciation of evil and a repentance of personal sin. It includes the “Fight Valiantly”, which names “the world, the flesh, and the devil” as those things to be striven against in

63 Kelly, The Devil at Baptism, 94. Kelly traces the renunciation of Satan back to both the Apostolic Tradition and also to the Church in North Africa of the same period, arguing that this evidence is a very early indication that renouncing the devil is both early and universal.
64 GS 1152Z.
the Christian life. It includes a minor exorcism following what might therefore be interpreted legitimately as the signing with the cross for the purpose of claiming the candidate for Christ as an exorcistic function, or at least indicating a change of allegiance, prior to water baptism. All of this would be consistent with the theological language of the Liturgical Commission and Revision Committee and of that presented in General Synod in 1996. The deficiency occurs where all of the permitted options are made use of by the local minister. If all of the permissions are taken into account, the Decision can be reduced to the alternative form of Decision (ASB form which includes a renunciation of evil but not a rejection of the devil) and the prayer of exorcism which remains before the water baptism compulsorily, but becomes disconnected from the Signing of the Cross, any administration of oil, and the “Fight Valiantly”. Because the permission and guidance notes for placing the Signing with the Cross after baptism are not directly indicated in the text itself, but rather annexed to a Note and a Commentary, it is unclear how many ministers realise that the liturgical symbol can be translated but not the text. The Note is also less clear than the harder-to-find Commentary about which of the texts under the headings of Decision and Signing with the Cross ought to remain before the baptism, and which are omitted if the Signing with the Cross is translated to the post-baptismal ceremonies. This leaves open the possibility that an exorcistic prayer might very well also be accidentally omitted before baptism because it appears under the heading of The Signing with the Cross.\textsuperscript{65} CW: AT does nothing to clarify the situation providing as it does alternative texts but relying upon the CW: CI rubrics and notes.\textsuperscript{66} The result of all of these permissions and potential misunderstandings is that, despite the mind of the Church of England during the revision process being that language of evil ought to be strengthened and that the traditional and historic place of the devil within that liturgical language ought to be reintroduced, the net result has the potential to eliminate all reference to the devil entirely because he does not appear in ASB Decision. If the Signing with the Cross moves to after baptism, the “Fight Valiantly”, which is the other place where he is named personally, also disappears. There is also a danger, as highlighted above, that language and symbol of exorcism might also be eradicated. Whilst the notes and rubrics are clear in terms of attempting to safeguard the post-baptismal ceremonies from any hint of exorcistic or renunciatory language and

\textsuperscript{65} CW: CI, 100, note 11. A fuller explanation with theological content is provided in the Commentary at the back of CW: CI (Signing with the Cross, 335), but this Commentary does not appear in the core CW volume, and it is unclear how many clergy delve far enough into CW: CI to discover it.

\textsuperscript{66} CW: AT, 1, 3. Jones also notes that in the ASB “regrettably, however, a note permitted the signing to take place in the Prayer Book position”, permitting this confusion which has persisted into CW: CI and CW: AT. Jones, “Outward Ceremony and Honourable Badge”, 149.
symbolism, the rather arcane and complicated system of notes and rubrics leaves open the possibility that some of that language might be mistakenly transferred to a post-baptismal position. Of course this would not in itself be a great divergence from the tradition of the Church of England, the Signing with the Cross accompanied by the “Fight Valiantly” being in this position in BCP, but it does work against the liturgical theology being advocated during the revision process leading to CW. The particular problems inherent in the perpetual authorisation of BCP will be addressed below.

The conclusion of this study is that a fairly clear dominant theology of the devil as a useful and clarifying symbol in pre-baptismal ceremonies can be discerned during the revision process, with the notes and rubrics requiring a minor exorcism to conclude the preparatory sections of the service. The subsequent permissiveness of the authorised texts, however, has the potential to negate that dominant theology, bringing either a return to BCP theology if certain options are selected in the construction of the liturgy or, more likely, confusion and contradiction within the service. Either way, the option to eliminate language of the devil from the pre-baptismal ceremonies may result in the Christian’s first liturgical encounter with the devil being far later in their journey than was the Liturgical Commission’s original intent.

The third set of concerns to be raised here relates to the two occasions in the last century on which the Church of England has diverged significantly from the ancient tradition of the Church in terms of how, from what, and to what a candidate for Initiation might turn prior to their baptism. It was noted in chapter 3 that between 1968 and 1998 (the period of Series 2, Series 3 and the ASB) there was no requirement for the candidate, if they were an infant, to, even symbolically, make the renunciations and adherences themselves. Not only that, but the Decision became a liturgical unit in which the people being ministered to were the parents and godparents and not the candidate themselves. For that liturgical unit, the faith journey of the candidate becomes irrelevant except to the extent that their baptismal status is contingent on someone else’s faith. The candidate cannot be initiated unless a third party makes a statement about that third party’s own faith. This is most peculiar, and its import for this study is that the statements about the relationship between the candidate and evil and sin are disconnected from the infant candidate and translated to the

---

67 BCP, The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses, the Ministration of Baptism for those of Riper Years.
parents and godparents. CW reverses this decision and restores to the candidate themselves, regardless of age, the requirement to turn away from evil, sin and, in the default text at least, the person of the devil before approaching the waters of baptism. There are, however, 30 years’ worth of Church of England Christians, including the author, whose baptismal status, at least liturgically, is contingent upon somebody else’s faith.

The last issue to note in this section is that during the experimental period leading to the authorisation of the Additional Baptism Texts in Accessible Language in 2015, one early version of the experimental liturgies required the candidates for Initiation to renounce evil, but not to repent of sin:

Do you reject evil?
I reject evil.

And all its many forms?
And all its many forms.

And all its empty promises?
And all its empty promises. 68

This was swiftly changed and the requirement to repent of personal sin was reinstated by the time the Additional Texts were presented to General Synod in June 2014,69 but again there will be a number of candidates who were baptized under the experimental liturgy between December 2013 and April 2014 who have been initiated without repenting of their sins, which must be considered at least irregular for the Church of England.70 It is worth noting that the report of the Revision Committee following the experimental period makes no reference to the irregularity identified above.71 The Accessible Language

70 It should be recognised that a lack of renunciation of personal sin is irregular in the Church of England as a prerequisite for baptism, but there is historical precedent in other Churches, for example RC, where one option for the pre-baptismal renunciations is almost identical to the experimental texts of 2013. RCIA, paragraph 217, B and C. It is worthy of note that the original Special Agenda item brought to General Synod by the Diocese of Liverpool (GS 1816A) requesting provision of Alternative Baptismal Texts itself noted that “the Church of England is a church whose doctrine and patterns of worship are intimately linked. The authorised liturgical texts of the church represent the mind of the broader church.” (2010), 2.
baptismal texts also revert to the earlier (ASB) prayer of exorcism (without the line “restore in you the image of his glory”) with no rationale being given for the reversion to this earlier text.

8.2.3 Confusions over Oil, Authority and Ministry

Liturgical deficiencies are easily identifiable when considering the administration of the sign of the cross and of oil. It is also possible to identify theological deficiencies, though whether these are intentional or accidental will be harder to ascertain.

Further evidence of confused liturgical presentation of the passage of a candidate through the Christian life is afforded by the same set of complicated notes and commentaries surrounding the Decision and Signing with the Cross. It has already been noted that some of the directions are enshrined in the rubrics themselves, while others are annexed to note 11 of the Notes to Holy Baptism. Additionally, the Commentary to CW: CI has to be consulted for a full explanation of the intended flexibility of the rites in terms of the administration of both the Cross and of oil. This is a remarkably complicated set of texts to navigate in order to discover not only what is permissible but also the underlying theological intent.

The import of this collection of documents appears to be that any signing with the cross before baptism is intended to be a symbol of the claiming or badging of the candidate for Christ. David Stancliffe, in the Synod debate in 1996, stated “signing is originally about protection and ownership and comes in the early rites after initial exorcisms and renunciations of evil, so it has all those forces about protection and ownership.”

The word exorcism is not used at any point in any of the CW texts, but the language used describes this pre-baptismal signing as being “the climax of a period of spiritual preparation, where the sign of the cross is the badge of Christian discipleship… The signing is followed by the prayer for deliverance.” Thus Deliverance is linked with the pre-baptismal signing of the cross fairly firmly in the Commentary. Any signing with the cross after baptism is accompanied with the post-baptismal prayer, and not with any of the text

73 CW: CI, 335.
provided at the Decision, and therefore ought not to carry any exorcistic/deliverance/transferring of allegiance symbolism. To complicate things further, the Commentary suggests that “it is possible to make the sign of the cross in both places.”

Alongside the instructions for the administration of the cross there is a set of notes concerning the administration of oil. Again, these instructions are annexed to the notes and commentaries. All use of oil is optional, with “pure olive oil” suggested for before baptism and “oil made fragrant with spices (often called chrism)” for accompanying the post-baptismal prayer and possible signing with the cross or other Christian symbol. Again, theological statements are being made by the suggested uses of oil, where administration of oil before baptism has an exorcistic or prophylactic character, “as part of the preparation of the Christian athlete for the struggle of faith”, and post-baptismal anointing is “a sign of participation in the community of the Anointed One.”

This already arcane set of notes is further complicated by the permission given for lay people to join with the minister in the administration of the sign of the cross. This permission is given in the main text of the service in a rubric, and in note 11. What is entirely unclear is whether or not CW: PS intended this administration of the sign of the cross to be in oil when administered by a lay person. Anecdotal evidence suggests that lay administration of the cross in oil is widespread. In a situation where the cross has been administered in oil, pre- or post-baptism, the child’s forehead will in any case be covered in oil, so any further lay administration of the cross will necessarily involve oil. The overwhelming view of the Church of England has always been, and Canon B37 continues to affirm, that the administration of oil is a priestly function, and yet here permission appears to be given for the oil of baptism, and possibly also the oil of chrism (if the permission, even if not the rubric, is able to be transferred to the post-baptismal position) to be administered by lay people. With effort, an argument could be made that there is some precedent for the visible ministry of lay people in pre-baptismal exorcisms, for example in RC use of lay catechists in the administration of minor exorcisms. This argument

74 Ibid., 336.
75 Ibid., 346.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid., 68, 100. Canon B37 refers to the administration of oil being by “the priest”, although it should be noted that this Canon refers specifically to ministry to the sick. This permission first appeared in GS 1152, 12, 23.
78 Although as noted in chapter 6 there are dissenting voices, for example Gunstone, Healed, Restored, Forgiven, 67.
is fairly spurious, however, as these earlier exorcisms are not of the same order as the liturgical exorcism in the baptism service; the catechists are trained and appointed, and oil is not used during the minor exorcisms. There would seem to be no comparable Anglican precedent for this apparent permissiveness on the part of the Church of England. It is interesting that David Stancliffe did not expect many people to take up the option of lay administration of the cross and his comments in Synod imply that the decision was made for pastoral and theatrical, rather than liturgical, reasons:

Other people signing is of course clearly optional, and I do not think many people would do it but some may. It actually gives people occasion when it is good to involve people in action and not just words. There may be cultures where that will be a helpful suggestion to make; it happens in some other churches.\(^79\)

It seems bizarre that this issue of lay anointing did not get discussed in any of the public forums to whose records this study has access. What can be concluded is that lay anointing does happen, that the decision was probably not deliberate, and that it introduces into the language of the battle against evil a liturgical practice for which no precedent can be found in the history of the Church of England. The inclusion of the laity in the application of the sign of the cross without oil before baptism would seem to be theologically coherent, if innovative, tying the parents and godparents, together with any sponsors present, closer into the ministry of the prayer for defence and the strengthening of the candidate prior to their water baptism. Extending the ministry of anointing to them seems unnecessary and ecclesiologically troubling.

**8.2.4 The Book of Common Prayer**

BCP’s historic and particular status creates problems for a consistent theology of the devil and the demonic in the Church of England. At various points in the revision process of the Initiation and Healing services, as well as in more recent theological commentaries such as ATTH, BCP is appealed to both as the gold standard of doctrine and as containing a set of doctrines to be moved away from. This creates confusion. To give an example, GS 1152Y explicitly states that the baptism services in BCP are “doctrinally normative for the Church
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\(^79\) General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3, 1164. Where Bishop Stancliffe says "it happens in other churches" it is to be assumed that he refers to the application of the sign of the cross, rather than to the use of oil.
of England." This is in the context of defending the return to the use of proxy promises on behalf of an infant candidate. On the other hand, in the Theological Introduction to the Wholeness and Healing services there is a rejection of BCP’s statements that sickness can be the action of God upon his people in response to sin. Compare:

Such prayer needs to be sensitive to a number of simplifications or misunderstandings. It should not imply a simple link between sickness and sin.

Whatsoever your sickness is, know you certainly, that it is God’s visitation.

There are both theological and liturgical deficiencies here which arise as a result of two parallel sets of liturgical provision being operative. ATTH, discussing the sacramental shape of Church of England liturgies seems to forget that BCP services have their own integral shape and rationale which does not conform to those of CW. The same report two pages later makes reference to BCP Visitation of the Sick service where theological warrant is claimed for the retention of the language of sin in the CW: PS services, but the theology of the Visitation Service is explicitly rejected:

These older rites remind us that there is a proper place for repentance in healing services: guilt and resentment can affect our emotional and spiritual health. Care should be taken, of course, not to give the impression that ill-health is caused by personal sin, still less that it is divine punishment.

The exhortation in BCP (which is optional) presents to the sick person a number of possible reasons why God may have visited upon them their ill-health, but it is clear that amongst those possible causes is divine response to sin. CW: CI also notes, almost in passing, that the prevailing theological models being used in the services are not necessarily those which influenced the compilers of BCP (or indeed those of ASB).
Anecdotal evidence might suggest that the use of BCP services, other than Holy Communion, has now diminished to the point where they are almost irrelevant pastorally (ATTH describes the Visitation service as “virtually obsolete”\(^{86}\)). However, whether it is used publicly in worship or not, BCP remains the perpetually authorised liturgy of the Church of England and, so long as the Preface to the Declaration of Assent points to it as one of the historic formularies in which the doctrine of the Church is enshrined, two parallel sets of liturgical theology appear to be in operation. The liturgical theology of CW, worked out through the decades of the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century, would appear to have the ascendance in terms of public articulation but liturgical theology of BCP retains its higher status in terms of being a historic formulary. This is a troubling and uncomfortable circumstance for the Church of England, and seemingly one which cannot be resolved without either a return to confident articulation of the theology of BCP or the ending of BCP’s privileged position in terms of liturgical authority.

8.2.5 Highly Realised Demonology: the Inclusion of the Christaraksha

The inclusion of the Christaraksha amongst the Prayers for Protection and Peace, discussed in chapter 7, introduces an element of highly realised demonology into the otherwise fairly disciplined vocabulary of CW. A small number of selected proper names for the forces of evil are utilised in the majority of the texts. The Christaraksha introduces some significantly more realised language, particularly in the second form provided, where the “hordes of hell” are referred to.\(^{87}\) This prayer is an import from the Indian tradition and, as mentioned in chapter 7, its inclusion was noted as unusual in the Common Worship commentary.\(^{88}\) The inclusion of this prayer without any interpretive material to support it does seem to be a bold and peculiar decision. It is difficult to know to what extent its inclusion was intended to signify a broad acceptance on the part of the Liturgical Commission of a highly realised demonology in which Satan and his hordes (or “hosts”, in versions one and three of the prayer) take their place with the “evil spirits” and the “foes… invisible” as part of an army of beings who assault God’s plans and his people.\(^{89}\) The lack of commentary on this issue is frustrating. More highly realised demonological language is found in some of the
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\(^{86}\) ATTH, 245.
\(^{87}\) CW: PS, 97.
\(^{88}\) Headley and Nichols, "Wholeness and Healing", 166.
\(^{89}\) CW: PS, 96, 97.
Deliverance liturgies, for example the Gloucester Major Exorcism, which refers to “the devil and his legion” in the prayer to Saint Michael provided for use before the liturgy begins, and to “demonic powers” and “spectres” in the prayers of exorcism themselves. The Christaraksha shares more family resemblance with the locally authorised rites of Exorcism than with the authorised or commended material of CW, further drawing attention to its inclusion within CW: PS as atypical. Demonology in general is lowest in the Initiation services (where either evil or the devil or both are renounced, but not demons), higher in the Healing services if the Christaraksha in particular is considered, and at its highest in the Exorcism and Deliverance services, which are not centrally authorised or commended. Demonology tends therefore to be higher as the liturgical provision diverges from the mainstream Church of England material.

A secondary issue raised by the inclusion of the Christaraksha is the question of hell. The perpetual authorisation of BCP keeps language of hell firmly within the tradition, but the use of the word “hell” in CW: PS is atypical for CW. The reality of the existence of a place called hell is not much discussed in relation to the liturgies which concern this study, and the Christaraksha prayer is the only place in which hell is referred to liturgically in the authorised or commended liturgies considered here. There is consistency amongst the locally sourced liturgical rites for Major Exorcisms, and in Perry, that when demons are expelled from a person or place they need to be directed to go somewhere. Even here, however, the language of hell tends not to be used. The relationship of hell to “the place assigned” to the devil or the demons is not discussed in the available literature. It does not seem to be an issue of interest to the commentators.

RC continues to teach of the existence of hell, describing it as “the abode of the dead, to which the dead Christ went down” and its occupants as those who are “deprived of the vision of God.” Even here, however, the teaching focuses on the human occupants of hell and stresses the doctrine that Christ’s death and resurrection led to victory over the devil who has the power of death, rather than describing any supernatural or paranormal occupants of hell. The inclusion of the Christaraksha is thus demonstrated to bring

90 Howell-Everson, _Rites of Exorcism_, 3.
91 Gloucester Major Exorcism, 4. Howell-Everson, _Rites of Exorcism_ (from which the two exorcistic prayers of the Gloucester Major Exorcism are drawn).
92 _Catechism of the Catholic Church_, part 1, section 2, chapter 2, article 5, paragraph 1 “Christ descended into hell”, Clause 633.
confusion on two levels – firstly, by introducing highly realised demonology into CW: PS with no rationale or commentary to support it, and, secondly, by similarly introducing confusing language of hell into a collection of liturgical resources which have studiously avoided such language elsewhere. It is undoubtedly a beautiful and finally turned prayer, but it does introduce realised demonology which sits awkwardly within the provision.

8.2.6 A Coherent theology?

This study returns, in concluding, to the work of Taft and Day. The various liturgies where a Christian encounters and negotiates the forces of evil have been studied through structural analysis. A number of deficiencies in the Church of England’s theology of the devil and the demonic as encountered in these liturgies have been outlined above. The deficiencies fall into several broad areas.

The Church of England is hampered from the offset by the fact that its Deliverance liturgies are of a different status to the majority of the rest of its liturgical material. That the Church of England has been unwilling or unable to authorise or commend through its Liturgical Commission and synodical process orders of service for the Major Exorcism and Deliverance of people and places is perhaps unsurprising, but it does mean that the liturgical material available to diocesan teams has not been discussed, revised and debated in the same way as most of the other liturgies. As has been demonstrated above, during the revision of the liturgy leading up to the publication of CW a considerable amount of liturgical theology was done ‘out in the open’ on the floor of Synod and during periods of experimentation in parishes. That the Church of England commits to this process for the majority of its liturgy is to be celebrated because it permits at least the potential that proper liturgical theology, in the sense that Fagerberg describes it, might happen.\textsuperscript{93} This, in itself, lends support to the contention that the Church of England still pays attention to the principle of \textit{lex orandi, lex credendi}. That orders of service for a ministry the Church of England considers important enough to hedge about with strict notes and House of Bishops Guidelines are not to be subject to the normal theological and liturgical processes is deeply troubling. It also means that the theological resources brought to bear on the construction of such rites are not monitored with the same rigour.

\textsuperscript{93} Fagerberg, \textit{What is Liturgical Theology?}
The Deliverance services which this study has been able to obtain demonstrate a striking consistency in their liturgical structure, some of which is because they appear to draw from each other and from common roots in RC. However, this tentative conclusion must be nuanced immediately by recognising that the resources available for making this claim are few. It is unclear to what extent the dioceses not referenced within this study have worked out liturgies ready for use and which ones have made no provision or would do so if required. From the evidence available then, the common structure of naming, binding, casting out and infilling appears to hold and, while there is a moderate degree of variation within the primary liturgical units, there is a coherence within liturgies consistent with the secondary literature which supports it.

When the commended and authorised services are considered, it is easy to discern a disconnect between these and the Deliverance rites. This disconnect operates at a liturgical and a theological level and has to do with demonology. As has been demonstrated, the Church of England is confident enough in labelling evil as extant, at least partially external and at least partially supernatural. Where the flexibility permitted in the Initiation services fails the later ministries of Healing and Deliverance is in the lack of confidence in labelling evil as personal in those Initiation rites. Despite the desire of the Liturgical Commission to heighten and strengthen the language of evil in the Initiation services, it has been demonstrated above that the reverse has happened in reality. All reference to personified evil can be obliterated from a person’s baptism if the appropriate permissions are taken, rubrics and notes having been consulted, with the result that later on in their Christian journey the language of the devil which they may encounter could be entirely unexpected and unfamiliar. Whilst this may not make a practical difference for individual candidates, particularly if they are baptized as infants, the theological presentation of the nature of evil is certainly inconsistent. The Healing Services permit more realised demonology, particularly in the inclusion of the Christaraksha, and hold confidently the relationship between evil and sin.

The cause of the disconnect between the baptism services and the other provision would seem to be both a structural and a pastoral one. As outlined above, the Decision and Signing with the Cross sections of the liturgy in particular are “overloaded”, to borrow
Taft’s phrase, and over-complicated. One speaker in the Synod debate in 1996, in reference to the permissiveness of the provision for signing, noted “it is another point where this seems to be a bit too much clutter... And maybe that could be confined to a note so that where churches want to follow that they can, but it just seems a bit too cluttered as it stands.” Ironically, it is the confinement to the Notes and Commentary of much of the rationale for options which contributes to the opacity and complexity of the service.

It is not hard to see elements of Taft’s conservatism, universalisation and arbitrariness at work in the Initiation services. Taft labels as conservatism what happens when “elements are preserved even when their meaning is lost”. Universalisation occurs when elements “become detached from the original limited place and purpose, acquiring new and broader meanings”, and arbitrariness happens when “elements are introduced which have no apparent relationship to others.” It could be argued that the inclusion of the Minor Exorcism in the Decision, when detached from the pre-baptismal Signing with the Cross and the “Fight Valiantly”, falls victim to conservatism because the exorcistic formula has become stranded; detached from the elements which historically belong in the same unit. Universalisation, similarly, could be occurring with the transference of the Signing with the Cross to other parts of the service, although if this argument were to be made it would need to be levelled at Cranmer in the first instance who introduced the post-baptismal signing, detached from any pre-baptismal exorcistic signing or other liturgical action.

The introduction of elements such as the parents and godparents marking the candidate with the sign of the cross is an example of arbitrariness, particularly when that sign is made (purposefully or accidentally) with an element, holy oil, historically reserved to the priesthood. A sign with a specific liturgical function has been adapted to serve a broader liturgical purpose, that of demonstrating symbolically the participation of the parents and godparents in the ongoing life of the candidate who is now ‘badged’ for Christ, and this broader purpose can be fulfilled regardless of whether the signing happens before baptism in its traditional exorcistic or apotropaic position or afterwards with the overtones of the life of the Spirit. Thus a new function has been created which obtains even when the original function of the unit is diluted or even dissolved.
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94 Taft, Beyond East and West, 200.
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As a result of the complication and confusion of these liturgical units, combined with the potential diminishment or even eradication of liturgical discussion of personal evil to be turned away from, any encounter with the devil later on in the Christian journey is made the more alarming.

Thus this study identifies the deficiencies of the Initiation services as setting up problems both with Healing and with Deliverance in terms of a coherent narrative of the nature of evil. These deficiencies are primarily structural, for pastoral and practical reasons, and not principally devised in order to dilute the theology of evil, but the outcome is the same. It is the assertion of this study, therefore, that the Initiation services in CW can be charged, in Taft’s words with being “overloaded rites”:

> Overloaded rites like overloaded circuits eventually blow a fuse. Something has to be unplugged, and in the liturgical load reducing the integrity of units is rarely respected, especially if their original form is no longer understood, or if they are no longer executed as they were originally intended to be.\(^{97}\)

The risk is not simply to the Initiation services and those involved in them. Kelly notes that the relationship between liturgies is as important as the relationship of one internal element to the other. He is interested in the presence and place of the devil specifically within baptismal rites, but his point obtains when considering the place of evil and the devil across CW. He notes that, “As time went on, the unity and impact of the services of the Good Friday to Easter triduum began to disintegrate. The scrutinies in baptism were removed from the Lenten liturgy, and the representational tropes and orders fell into disuse.”\(^{98}\) When the unity and impact of the Church of England’s liturgical provision for assisting the faithful through their encounters with evil is considered, it becomes apparent that the picture presented is not unified; therefore the impact must necessarily be diluted, and the coherence of the theological narrative also begins to disintegrate.

### 8.2.7 A Provisional Theology?

One final appeal will be made to counter the accusation that the Church of England is unable to present a coherent theology of the devil and the demonic, namely that a strain of

\(^{97}\) Ibid., 200.

\(^{98}\) Kelly, *The Devil at Baptism*, 274-275, *emphasis mine*.  
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theology of a provisional nature runs through all of the Church of England’s liturgy. If this appeal fails then it seems clear that the accusation must stand.

The Church of England, in its liturgical forms, has ever sought to “keep the mean between the two extremes.”99 When considering the issue of the articulation of a theology of personal and directed evil acting upon an individual in their Christian journey, an argument could be made that it is in the nature of the Church of England to retain a certain provisionality in its public utterances: to be confident about the existence and reality of evil and its potential effects, but to be more reticent about the precise form in which that evil might present itself.

That both baptism and the Healing Ministry of the Church are ultimately eschatological, in other words that they point towards the culmination of the establishment of the Kingdom of God, is reflected in the Theological Introduction to CW: PS, and the Commentary to CW: CI, and has been demonstrated as providing a framework for all those services. Eschatology was identified as a key theological lens in chapter 6. ATTH structures its entire argument on the basis that provisionality is built into any theology of healing because all human life lived in faith is a life lived in anticipation of the completion of God’s purposes such that “until the Son’s return with glory and judgement, all faith, all hope, all love are provisional. We live towards the future, towards eternity, not backwards towards the past.”100 In an attempt to avoid either giving too much authority and agency to the devil or, conversely, over-minimising his power, might the Church of England be wise to avoid saying overmuch about the personified devil until the point where, as a liturgy in extremis, the Deliverance rites are required? It was noted in General Synod at an early stage of the revision process of the baptismal rites that “the rites have an eye to the future. Baptism is seen as a stage on the journey of faith.”101 Whilst clearly an anecdotal observation, it is true that much of the liturgical worship of the Church of England deliberately keeps open some of the ultimate questions about the nature of the Kingdom of God, its inhabitants and the mechanism by which judgement and salvation occur. Church of England funerals have a lot to say about hope but little about the destiny of the particular individual at the centre of

---

100 ATTH, 18, emphasis original.
101 Reverend Clay Knowles, General Synod. Report of Proceedings 27.3, 1097. This is not a million miles away from what Aidan Kavanagh maintains when he says “Liturgy and Word lead us inexorably home.” Kavanagh, On Liturgical Theology, 12.
the service. Returning to the Theological Introduction, the key words to support this appeal to a provisional theology of the nature of evil are indeed those four: “provisional and counterfeit”, “shadowy and temporal.” CW is careful to also put the words ‘power’ and ‘reality’ in inverted commas. The Church of England is primarily interested here in ministering to those who find themselves moving through a particular stage of their Christian journey. That may be the stage of coming to faith, returning to faith, facing trial, illness or death, or one of a number of other moments where their life and faith are brought into sharp relief. While confident about the reality of evil and its apparent ability to thwart the ambitions of humans and of God, might the Church of England not be pastorally wise in choosing not to offer too many concrete images of something which ultimately is ‘shadowy and temporal’? The focus is on the future: Initiation and Healing and indeed Deliverance itself are all eschatological, pointing beyond a temporal recovery and towards the Kingdom of Heaven and “creation renewed and in perfect health.”

Ultimately the argument outlined above, whilst containing truth, is unconvincing. The promises and statements made in baptism are sacramental, speaking not only to the outward and visible but also to the inward and spiritual truths at the core of Christian identity. The weight of the tradition and the intent of the revisions in CW both point to a need to be clear and explicit about the ways in which evil bears upon the individual, or indeed the community, on the journey of life. Whilst broad, as has always been the case in the Church of England, there are theological principles which are discernibly confused, inconsistent and open to dilution, due to two fundamental mistakes. These mistakes are, firstly, the over-permissiveness of the Decision and Signing with the Cross sections in the Initiation services and, secondly, the inability to synodically approve services for the Exorcism and Deliverance of people and places. It might be argued that the first mistake is the result of pastoral desire for flexibility in the rites, the extent of the mistake being revealed only after structural analysis. The second mistake is undoubtedly theological, and it is hard to know whether General Synod will ever find the appetite for the theological conversation required for the Deliverance Rites to be brought out of the filing cabinets of the diocesan bishops and onto the debating floor.

---

102 CW: PS, 10.
103 ATTH, 260.
104 BCP, A Catechism.
8.3 A Method for further analysis of the Common Worship texts

The Church of England has been challenged here to answer the accusation that the theology of the devil and the demonic presented within CW liturgies is not coherent, and that this has two particular causes; over-permissiveness in the baptism services and a lack of appetite for synodical discussion on the nature of personal evil.

The methodology utilised by this study has been influenced positively by the liturgical theology of Fagerberg and Kavanagh. Both assert that proper liturgical theology can only be a result of an entire liturgical rite being examined as it is performed. Liturgical action itself is paramount, as is beginning with the structure of the service itself, because it is in the interrelatedness of one liturgical unit to another, and the procession of the participants through the rite, that liturgical theology can happen.\textsuperscript{105}

This study followed Fagerberg and Taft in ‘keeping the liturgical top spinning’\textsuperscript{106} and thus focused on the actual liturgies as provided for performance, including their rubrics, notes and commentaries. It has done so with a small number of rites for a particular analytical purpose, that of seeking a coherent theology of the devil and the demonic. The rites in question were chosen because they are the services in which this language is most prominent.

The detailed structural analysis of the CW services studied here is an innovation, and the methodology provides a new resource for the Church. This methodology could be employed in the service of liturgical theology in a number of ways. One useful project would be to subject the remainder of the CW library to the same structural analysis process to identify whether there are elements within the other liturgies currently in use which would reinforce the conclusion reached by this study. The Holy Communion, Funeral, Marriage and other services doubtless have less explicit language of evil, sin and the devil than those analysed here, but the process could stimulate fruitful discussion. A second useful piece of work would be to experiment with structural analysis of BCP for the same purpose. The distinctive structure and theology which BCP represents would benefit from

\textsuperscript{105} Fagerberg, \textit{What is Liturgical Theology?}, 15, 17.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 69, and Taft, \textit{Beyond East and West}, 317.
structural analysis. This would be further illuminated by a comparative structural analysis of the 1549, 1552 and BCP rites, and also the Use of Sarum.

The methodology could also be applied to other theological themes to test their consistency across CW. In a period when the Church of England is displaying anxiety and lack of confidence around its public declarations on a number of issues - not least human sexuality, equality and inclusivity, and the authority, conduct and role of its lay and ordained ministers - structural analysis of the public liturgical performance of the Church through selected theological lenses would be enormously beneficial. Such analysis could ascertain what the consistent theological themes are to which its liturgy bears witness and which therefore, if the Preface to the Declaration of Assent is to be taken seriously, indicate to the Church something important and significant about its faith. The selection of the theological lenses would be determined by the nature of the investigation, but an analysis of the liturgical rites through ecclesiological lenses might be profoundly revealing, as would an analysis of CW through the lens of the atonement.

One final proposal will be made. Fagerberg notes, when examining the example of a confirmation service, that “the theological meaning of the action escapes the laos if they can observe the rite but not know what happened.”107 This is undoubtedly true. It is the contention of this study, however - given the conclusion drawn about the inconsistency of the Church of England’s presentation of its demonology even within individual liturgies, and failure therefore to present the Christian with a consistent set of tools to navigate their relationship with the powers of evil - that ideally structural analysis should be done across the entire library of a congregation’s worship experience. The majority of active Christians live their lives in a ‘sea’ of liturgical experience, which will include regular Sunday worship, attendance at Occasional Offices, particular pastoral services and so on. What matters is whether the narrative presented is consistent across the experience of the believer. When divergent theologies, or only part of the theological story, are presented at different stages of the journey, Fagerberg’s accusation that the participant will not know what has happened seems likely to hold true. In that instance what is happening is less than true liturgy because it is not bearing witness consistently to the faith revealed in the holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds. Structural analysis of the entire CW library through a particular theological lens is likely to yield the most accurate picture of both the

107 Fagerberg, *What is Liturgical Theology?*, 293.
coherence of the Church’s theology and the experience of the worshipper. Given that what is being suggested here is an enormous academic task it should be borne in mind, by others utilising the structural analysis methodology to discover theology, that the ecclesiology of the Church of England is such that most worshippers will not encounter the Church in one set of liturgies; their experience will be broader than that, and by no means will all of their formation take place through liturgical worship.

8.4 The Devil, the Demonic, and the Church

A number of conclusions, both theological and liturgical, have been arrived at (8.1 and 8.2 above). Because of the way in which the Church of England claims its liturgy and theology are intrinsically linked, several deficiencies - two in particular - have been identified. As a result of highlighting these deficiencies, this study concludes that the Church of England is presently unable to present a coherent theology of the devil and the demonic in its liturgical formulae.

Nonetheless, there is much that can be acclaimed about the Church of England’s approach to evil. The relationship of Christians to evil, both individually and corporately, is discussed in all the liturgies which this study has analysed, for the Church of England recognises that evil is to be encountered in a wide variety of contexts:

[Demonic possession] is a minor sphere of the activity of Satan. His great work is to be seen in such obscenities as the nuclear arms race, in the embattled and trustless negotiations between power blocs either internationally or between sections of societies, in tribal and racial hatreds, in the million and one ways in which humankind behaves as though there were no God in heaven and no heaven for him to be in... Because there are great areas where Satan holds sway, we are not absolved from doing what we can in the smaller areas. Because he acts upon nations as well as upon individuals, we should not withhold our help, where it can be given, to single persons who need to be delivered from Satan’s usurped power.108

The Church is clear that evil is a reality which Christians encounter despite their belief in one omnipotent, benevolent God of love. This evil exists externally and is more than simply the collection of sinful thoughts and actions of the individual human heart and mind.

---

108 Perry, Deliverance, 134-135.
Moreover, although evil can be used to describe societal and political forces, it is also true that evil has a spiritual or supernatural and malevolent identity which acts purposefully and in a directed manner in opposition to the purposes of God and his Kingdom. Personification of this evil force as the devil and his demons safeguards this aspect of the Church’s theodicy and remains an honoured part of the Church of England’s liturgical theology.
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