

**Christian Initiation  
Additional Texts in Accessible  
Language**

**Report of the Revision Committee**

**January 2015**



**GENERAL SYNOD**

**ADDITIONAL EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS**

**REPORT OF THE REVISION COMMITTEE**

**Chairman:**

The Bishop of Truro

**Ex Officio Members (Steering Committee):**

The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Chair)

The Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (*Southwark*)

The Revd Philip North (*London*)

Susan Witts (*Blackburn*)

[Lorna Ashworth (*Chichester*)] appointed but unable to attend the meetings

**Appointed Members:**

Penny Allen (*Lichfield*)

Shayne Ardron (*Leicester*)

The Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (*Universities*)

Nick Harding (*Southwell & Nottingham*)

The Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (*Oxford*)

**In Attendance:**

Timothy Hone (Secretary)

Sue Moore (Assistant Secretary)

The Revd Dr Anders Bergquist (Consultant)

1. A report by the Liturgical Commission entitled 'Christian Initiation: Additional Texts in Accessible Language' received First Consideration from the General Synod in July 2014 and was committed to a Revision Committee.
2. Proposals for amendment were received from the following members of the Synod under Standing Order 53 (a):

Revd Canon Christopher Sugden*	Oxford
Revd Dr Dagmar Winter	Newcastle
Revd Mike Booker	Ely
Revd Jonathan Fraiss	Chichester
Revd Paul Hutchinson	York

Revd Canon Giles Goddard	Southwark
Revd Christopher Hobbs	London
Mr Adrian Vincent	Guildford
Revd Canon Gary Jenkins	Southwark
Mrs Mary Durlacher	Chelmsford
Revd Canon Tony Walker	Southwell & Notts
Ven Clive Mansell	Rochester
Revd Canon Karen Hutchinson	Guildford
Dr Peter Capon	Manchester
Mr Clive Scowen	London

*\* Member of Revision Committee*

In addition, some proposals for amendment were received from the following people:

Rt Revd Colin Buchanan (not a member of Synod)

Andrew Godsall, Exeter (submitted on behalf of a local church)

3. Standing Order 54 (b) requires the Committee to list in its report all the proposals for amendment received under Standing Order 53 (a), together with 'a summary of their reasons for accepting or rejecting such proposals, and for making such amendments'. Such a list and summary are provided in Appendix 1 to this report. In the main body of this report, all page and line references relate to GS1958A. In the Appendix, the references relate to GS1958.
4. The Committee agreed that it would also consider the proposals received from non-Synod correspondents.
5. The Committee met on two occasions in the autumn of 2014. Christopher Hobbs and Clive Scowen attended parts of the Committee meetings under Standing Order 53 (b) to speak to their submissions.
6. With the permission of the Chairman, the Revd Dr Anders Bergquist was in attendance as a consultant to the Steering Committee. The Committee is grateful to him for invaluable advice and assistance throughout the revision process.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

7. The texts presented in GS 1958 were drafted in response to concerns that the *Common Worship* Initiation texts in their present authorized form are not accessible to those who are unused to attending church. Clergy frequently find themselves conducting baptisms for ‘un-churched’ families, sometimes at services separate from the main Sunday morning act of worship. On these occasions, there may be few people present who have a developed understanding of the Church’s language and symbolism. For many of those attending, the existing provision can seem complex and inaccessible. The additional texts were prepared in response to this pastoral need and that provides a benchmark against which to assess any further revisions.
8. In referring these concerns to the Liturgical Commission, the House of Bishops made it clear that it did not desire a wholesale rewriting of the *Common Worship* provision for Holy Baptism. Specifically, the Commission was asked to focus on the Decision, the Prayer over the Water, and the Commission, and to review any other sections of the service which were felt to need revision.
9. Other key considerations of the revision process included:
  - revised texts for the Presentation of the Candidates, in order to make a clearer distinction between those making the promises on behalf of infants, and those candidates old enough to make the promises themselves;
  - concern to balance the clarity and flow of the liturgical language with imagery which is rooted in biblical texts and rich in symbolism;
  - a framework for the Commission, both in the main text and accompanying notes, which makes clear that the newly-baptized are members of the Church in both universal and local dimensions.
10. It was recognized that the texts presented to Synod in GS 1958 had already been carefully considered and revised, partly in response to concerns raised in the House of Bishops and, more thoroughly as a result of feedback from those involved in the trial of the texts in the early part of 2014. At each stage, the drafting group had taken as a starting point the principles already outlined, and sought to prepare texts which would provide an accessible alternative to the existing *Common Worship* provision.
11. The Synod debate in July 2014 was very positive about the approach taken by the Commission and felt that the proposed texts helped the underlying theology to be understood in a straightforward yet vivid way. The Revision Committee considered the submissions in this light and welcomed suggestions which helped to bring the texts into sharper focus, but were more robust about submissions which suggested more complex language or sought to define the underlying theology more narrowly.
12. Some of the submissions included points which referred to the *Guidance Notes* rather than texts or rubrics. Although the final texts of the *Guidance Notes* do not need Synodical approval, and therefore fall outside the Committee’s terms of reference, the Committee offers some suggested revisions which will be forwarded to the Liturgical Commission for its consideration.
13. During the revision process, a small number of textual anomalies were discovered. These have been clarified in the texts presented for authorization in GS 1958A.

- In **The Decision**, the initial rubric from *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* [hereafter, *CWCI*] p 67 had been inadvertently omitted. This has been reinstated. However, it no longer makes reference to the lighting of a large candle, for reasons which are explained later in this paper.
  - In the **Signing with the Cross**, the line from *CWCI* p 68 ‘Receive the sign of his cross’ had been incorrectly transcribed to read ‘Receive the sign of *the* cross’. This was unintentional, and the original *Common Worship* text has been reinstated.
  - In the first **Prayer over the Water**, the main text of GS 1958 presented the version which was agreed at the House of Bishops meeting in May. This resolved concerns about the appropriate liturgical expression of the operation of the Holy Spirit: ‘Now send your Spirit, that those who are washed in this water . . .’. In the sample service given in the Appendix to GS 1958, an earlier draft of this prayer was inadvertently retained. During the revision process, this prayer received more attention. The text presented for authorization retains the form of words suggested by the House of Bishops, but further revises following lines in order to strengthen and clarify the prayer.
14. The suggestion that all the rubrics should be adjusted so that the plural of parent(s) should consistently appear in brackets was resisted. The suggestion had been made for pastoral reasons to reflect that situation that not all candidates are presented for baptism by both parents. However, since the rubrics throughout the *Common Worship* Initiation services were written on the basis that there will be more than one candidate present, it follows that those making the promises will normally include more than one parent, even if both parents of all candidates are not present. The typography in *CWCI* has been kept as clear as possible by avoiding the use of unnecessary brackets, and we felt we should follow this precedent.
15. The suggestion that we should create an additional category for candidates old enough to answer for themselves but young enough to need parental support was resisted on the basis that this would over-complicate the provision. Pastoral common-sense would determine which of the options was most appropriate.

### **Presentation of the Candidates**

16. Throughout the review process, there were two strands of reaction to the use of the words of Jesus from Mark 10.14: ‘Let the children come to me. Do not stop them’. Many of those who had taken part in the trial of the texts warmly welcomed the inclusion of this text, and this was reflected in a number of comments made in the Synod debate. Others took the view that the use of this text was inappropriate because the biblical context does not refer to infant baptism. However, the Liturgical Commission had included the text in order to express the Church’s welcome to children, not as a justification of infant baptism, and the retention of this text was not challenged during the rest of the revision process.
17. The Revision Committee accepted the comment that the texts didn’t sufficiently express the love of God. Revised texts of welcome, both for infants and those who are able to answer for themselves, are offered which includes the words: ‘Christ loves them and welcomes them into his Church.’

18. A small number of typological inconsistencies about the adjustments that need to be made if there is only one candidate for baptism have been resolved.
19. In the remaining texts, the revision process benefitted from a number of suggestions about how the texts could be strengthened. These included the replacement of the provisional promise of the forms given in GS 1958, 'Will you promise to support them?' with the simpler and more direct, 'Will you support them?'. The Revision Committee also accepted the recommendation of the Steering Committee that the questions should be re-ordered, so that there is a more obvious progression from the reference to beginning the journey of faith, continuing a commitment to help the candidates 'to live and grow within God's family'. This form of words was felt to improve the texts originally presented in GS 1958.
20. However, the Committee resisted those submissions that sought to make these promises more wordy and specific, and to introduce technical doctrinal language. There was a clear view that such an approach would be at odds with the fundamental principles which were intended to underpin this piece of work.

### **The Decision**

21. Throughout the process, the drafting of the apparently straightforward texts of **The Decision** proved most challenging. In order to reach a place of consensus about the final forms of these texts, it may be helpful to be aware what the drafting group was aiming to achieve and what it was trying to avoid. Against this background, the final recommendations of the Revision Committee had to decide between a number of different views about these texts, not only expressed in the submissions received, but also in reflected in the different convictions of members of the Revision Committee. Throughout the revision process, the Committee tried to stay close to the fundamental principles of the process. Nevertheless, it proved challenging to find a form of words which allowed the doctrinal significance of **The Decision** to be made in words which those participating could understand, and to which they could respond with confidence.
22. In order to introduce this section, the drafting group were concerned to present a vivid yet straightforward statement which would convey to those making the promises a real sense of sin in terms of a separation from God. The text presented in GS 1958 carries references to the Good Shepherd and Prodigal Son (Luke 15), and was warmly welcomed by some who spoke in the Synod debate. During the revision process, this text was re-considered in the light of some misgivings that had been expressed. However, in the end, the Steering Committee felt that this was basically a resonant and strong text, but suggested two alternative forms, providing small refinements which expressed the ideas more clearly. One of these was accepted by the Revision Committee and appears in the texts offered for Authorization.
23. The drafting group aimed to produce groups of balanced questions separated by a symbolic action of turning. In the early stages of drafting, many different formulations were produced, including two groups of three questions.
24. The form offered in GS 1958 aimed to balance doctrinal clarity with language which avoided, as far as possible, the use of technical doctrinal language whose meaning would be obscure to those making the promises. A majority of the drafting group preferred this version, in which the answers echoed the questions (making them

accessible), but in a way which ensures that the answers are a real statement of intention ('I turn to Christ') rather than a more simple expression of agreement ('I do').

25. The symbolism of turning was strongly advocated by the drafting group and the rubric in GS 1958 ['The candidates, together with their parents, godparents and sponsors, may now turn to face the font, a cross, or the large candle.] was intended to suggest a number of ways in which this could be done, with more information given in the notes. It also assumed that the rite would be staged in a way that provided a suitable object (dependent on custom and tradition) towards which the candidates could turn to symbolized their new relationship with Christ. This idea that actions as well as words would convey meaning was not fully embraced during the revision process.
26. The drafting group worked on the basis that since *CWIS* provided a full six-fold formula [p 67], and continued to authorize an alternative three-fold formula [p 168], the alternative texts should be properly rethought, rather than making small revisions to the existing provision. The texts offered in GS 1958 were intentionally simpler than the full *CW* provision, in order to be more suitable in those situations for which these resources are intended. The drafting group also felt that this provision presented a clearer liturgical expression of repentance followed by turning to Christ than the text of the Decision in the Alternative Service Book, 1980, which was retained as an alternative in the *CW* provision.
27. The only clear message from the Synod debate was that the last of the challenges, 'Do you give your life to him?' was problematic for many people. In response to this, the Steering Committee originally proposed this revision:  
Do you put your trust in him?  
*I put my trust in him.*
28. The rest of the revision process tried to balance two possible directions for revision. The first sought greater simplicity, so that, for example, the final challenge became:  
Do you trust in him?  
*I trust in him.*  
  
Additionally, the suggestion that all the answers should simply be: '*I do*' was made on the basis that this was the simplest and most effective solution in situations where people were unfamiliar with liturgical language.
29. The opposite direction of travel was also strongly argued for in a number of the submissions. In particular, strong arguments were made for the reinstatement of the *CW* form 'Do you turn to Christ as Saviour? and adoption of the hybrid form 'Do you trust in him as Lord?'
30. By a majority, the Revision Committee accepted the compromise suggestion, presented in GS 1958A, that the questions could be made more doctrinally specific if the answers were simplified. This was a practical decision to balance the desire of some to include specific statements about the nature of Christ as Saviour and Lord by ensuring that the answers would be made in more accessible language. As a consequence of this, the candidates (or those answering on their behalf) would not make the complete statements of intention contained in the texts that came to Synod in GS 1958.
31. The rubric expressing the symbolic turning to Christ did not get universal support in its original form. The version offered here is greatly simplified, on the basis that the original intention of the drafting group is adequately conveyed in the supporting notes.



## **Signing with the Cross**

32. Although only one line of the text submitted for authorization differs from the suggestions contained in GS 1958, this text was rigorously discussed throughout the revision process.
33. The biblical framework for this section is Ephesians 6.10-17. The texts are intended to refer to a strong position of standing with Christ against the power of evil. This is seen as a posture of confident resistance rather than an aggressive act, and it deliberately stops short of the use of the word 'fight'. Early in the drafting process, we were asked to avoid language associated with fighting and bullying, which carry negative connotations for young people and which may translate in the adult world into violence or, at its most extreme, terrorism.
34. The Liturgical Commission has consistently resisted the idea that it is helpful to refer to a personification of evil in the form of the devil, in these alternative texts. Those who work with young people gave consistent advice that references to the devil are likely to be misunderstood in today's culture.
35. However, the Steering Group reconsidered the text of the *Alternative Service Book* at this point, which makes reference to 'sin, the world, and the devil'. In discussion, it was clear that this phrase was felt to be unhelpful, not only because of the reference to the devil, but in the identification of the world as a negative force.
36. Although representations were made, both in the written submissions and personal attendance during the revision process, to reinstate a specific reference to personified evil, a clear majority of the Revision Committee supported the consistent view of the drafting and revision process, to give a clear mandate to the text presented for authorization.

## **First Prayer over the Water**

37. There were a number of submissions arguing for the inclusion of other Old Testament references, particularly the story of Noah's Ark. The drafting group had explored these options at an early stage in the process and had not found it possible to develop this image in an adequate way. The drafting group had deliberately used a single image and those involved in the revision process supported this decision.
38. A number of revisions to the text were agreed by the Revision Committee in order to express the ideas presented in the prayer as clearly as possible. The proposed text makes a clearer reference to the choice between death and life, offered to God's people by Moses in Deuteronomy 30.19, as well as incorporation of Christians, through baptism, in the death and resurrection of Christ.

## **Second Prayer over the Water**

39. There was considerable discussion about the details of the biblical narrative that provides the roots of this prayer, in order to resolve how those ideas could best be presented in the condensed formulation of liturgical language.
40. First, we discussed the sequence of events of Jesus's baptism, in order to determine the point at which the baptism was accomplished. If we follow Matthew's account [3.13-17], Jesus comes to John for baptism but John resists, saying that it is he who needs to be baptized by Jesus. Jesus asks that the baptism go ahead in the proper way. 'And when Jesus had been baptized, just as he came up from the water, suddenly the heavens were opened to him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him. And a voice from heaven said, "This is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased"'. Without trying to resolve the issue of the exact relationship between the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan by John, the appearance of the Spirit in the form of a dove, and the affirming voice from heaven, the proposed text echoes the biblical narrative more fully than the version proposed in GS 1958. However, it broadens the frame of reference to baptism in general, so that it operates as a liturgical text rather than a simple recounting of a biblical event.
41. In the middle of the prayer, concerns had been raised about the blessing of the water. Careful checking revealed that the NIV, which had been used as the reference text to support an argument that suggested Jesus was not involved in blessing material objects, consistently avoids using the language of blessing to translate the Greek words which normally carry this meaning. Accordingly, the Revision Committee felt confident in retaining this element of the text, but supported a slight re-drafting of the end of the prayer which helps to present the underlying elements more clearly.

## **Commission**

42. Although the bullet points of the Commission are only intended as a framework, the Revision Committee was happy to accept the proposal that the texts be amended to include specific references to discipleship.

## **Guidance Notes**

43. The Guidance Notes do not need Synodical approval and therefore do not fall within the revision process. However, since they form an integral part of understanding how these texts relate to the rest of the *Common Worship* provision for Baptism, some small clarifications are offered here for subsequent consideration by the Liturgical Commission.
44. An initial paragraph has been drafted to explain that each section of text provides an alternate to the existing *Common Worship* provision. While it is possible to use all the options or only some of them, each section has an integrity that should be respected. There is no mandate to create further hybrid forms by combining the existing and alternative provision within a specific section of text.

45. Some revisions are proposed to the sample text which illustrates what might be said during **The Commission**. These strengthen the parts dealing with the journey of discipleship, and encourage regular exploration of the Bible in order to learn more of God's love.

## **CONCLUSION**

46. The Committee presents this account of the work it has done on the texts in the light of submissions received. It commends these revised texts for approval by the Synod and eventual authorization.

On behalf of the Committee

✠ TIMOTHY TRURO      7 January 2015

**General Comments:**

From	Submission	Committee response
GS/01	Refer to 'the devil' rather than 'evil'.	Resisted. See paras 34–36.
GS/03	Texts need to convey the continuum of age range for baptism between 2 and 11 years – particularly for children who can speak for themselves but where parental support will play a significant part.	Resisted. See para 15.
GS/03	Many baptisms involve one parent only. Change 'parents' to 'parent(s)' throughout.	Resisted. See para 14.
GS/03	Given that the marriage of the parents does not always precede the baptism of children, encourage ministers to affirm the value of marriage where appropriate.	Resisted. Outside the brief of this revision process.
GS/06	Welcome for the proposed texts, which will be as welcome in a highly articulate parish as those in less educated places as they effectively move attention from word to symbol.	Noted.
GS/06	Use existing responsive form of the Commission at the end of the service, perhaps with some light revision. Suggested version given.	Existing form can be used if required. The Committee resisted the opportunity to revise this text further.
GS/15	Purpose of these texts is to make provision which is accessible to those who know little of the Christian story, not to change the substance of baptismal liturgy or make it less demanding. Emphasis seems to be more on welcome of the child, rather than on repentance and discipline for the whole family.	Committee did not agree that the substance of baptismal liturgy is changed. The brief was to look again at some specific sections of text to make them more accessible in certain circumstances. See paras 7–9.

*NB. In the Appendix alone, page and line numbers refer to GS 1958. The shaded areas in the tables above indicate submissions received from non-Synod members, or received out of time.*

From	Submission	Committee response
GS/15	Baptismal liturgy should acknowledge the reality not just of abstract evil but of the personal evil lying behind it. ASB precedent for leaving out the devil should not be repeated.	In fact, the devil is referred to in the ASB after the Signing with the Cross. A number of options were discussed during the revision process, and the texts submitted for approval were strongly supported by a clear majority of the Revision Committee. See paras 33–36.
GS/15	Baptism preparation is key, and should be drawn out in the Sermon – which should be before the baptism takes place.	Point noted and the explanatory notes give helpful background which could be used for this.
GS/15	Opportunity has not been taken to refer more expressly to God’s love, or to God’s help (eg in the responses ‘We will, with God’s Help’).	<p>The first point has been accepted and the texts for the Presentation of the Candidates revised accordingly. See para 17.</p> <p>The second point has been resisted on the basis that this is already implicit and that the responses made by the candidates or their sponsors should be as simple as possible. See paras 20 and 30.</p>
NS/B	Baptism moved to near the beginning of the service to include children before they ‘go out to their groups’.	Outside remit of revision process. Parishes can choose to do this if they wish.
NS/B	Follow baptism by sharing the peace even if not a communion service.	Outside remit of revision process. Parishes can choose to do this if they wish.

**Specific comments:**

Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
NS/A	p.4 ln.12	Delete – generally agreed over the last 50 years to be inappropriate as an apologia for infant baptism.	This use of this text was not intended as a justification of infant baptism but to express the Church’s welcome to children. See para 16.
GS/02	p.4 ln.19	Theological problem about ‘helping children to become children of God’. Suggested rewording given.	Text amended. See para 19 and the revised texts for the Presentation of the Candidates.
GS/11	p.4 ln.19	Uneasy about first question of the Presentation. ‘Become’ implies a single event. Suggested alternative question.	Text amended. See para 19 and the revised texts for the Presentation of the Candidates.
GS/15	p.4 ln.19-23	Alternative text suggested.	Text amended. See para 19 and the revised texts for the Presentation of the Candidates.
GS/11	p.4 ln.22	Good case for this question being the same as ln.46.	Resisted. The small differences are intentional.
GS/05	p.4 ln.22-23	Question is ineffective in the form asked. Two alternatives suggested.	Agreed. Text amended. See para 19.
GS/15	p.4 ln.31	Alternative text suggested.	Resisted. It was felt that the responses made by the candidates or their sponsors should be as simple as possible. See paras 20 and 30.

Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
GS/15	p.4 ln.47	Alternative text suggested.	Resisted. It was felt that the responses made by the candidates or their sponsors should be as simple as possible. See paras 20 and 30.
Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
GS/05	p.5 ln.2	Preface section with appropriate rubric – eg CW:IS p.67, 85, 168	Typographical omission – corrected.
GS/11	p.5 ln.3-22	Shorter form of the Decision much appreciated.	Noted.
GS/15	p.5 ln.3-4	Alternative text suggested.	The text has been slightly amended. See para 22.
GS/10	p.5 ln.4	'Welcomes us home' is weak and inadequate. Three alternatives suggested.	Resisted. See para 22.
GS/12	p.5 ln.9-22	Accept the dramatisation which can be introduced in connection with turning, but apart from that the questions lack the 'punch' of words such as 'repent' and 'renounce'. ASB questions/answers were more robust.	Resisted. ASB text is already authorized for use with Common Worship. See paras 21–31.
GS/13	p.5 ln.9-22	Understand the desire for balanced questions but would prefer the ASB provision for simplicity and brevity. The different theological emphasis is not unhelpful either – it is when we turn to Christ that we recognise our sin and are enabled to put it away from us.	ASB text is already authorized for use with Common Worship. See paras 21–31.

Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
NS/B	p.5 ln.9-22	Alternative text suggested.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 21–31.
GS/15	p.5 ln.10-22	Alternative text suggested.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 21–31.
GS/07	p.5 ln.15-16	Remove ‘or the large candle’ and add ‘or’ between ‘font’ and ‘a cross’. Prefer to relegate to the Guidance notes, if it must be mentioned at all.	Rubric amended. See para 25.
GS/09	p.5 ln.21-22	Replace with Common Worship text.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 27–30.
GS/05	p.5 ln.21-22	‘Do you give your life to him’ carries difficult associations. Three alternatives suggested.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 27–30.
GS/11	p.5 ln.21-22	Reservations about question and answer in this form. Suggested alternative given.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 27–30.
GS/12	p.5 ln.21-22	‘Do you give your life to him’ is a potentially powerful question but lacks some of the reference points found in words such as ‘Saviour’ and ‘Lord’.	The text has been amended. See paras 27–30.
GS/02	p.5 ln.21ff	Clarify pairing of turn away/turn to and reject/?? and avoid ‘giving your life’ sounding like suicide. Suggested rewording given.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 27–30.



Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
GS/13	p.5 ln.22	Unease with 'I give my life to him' as an untested text. Turns the Decision into something that has a distinctive churchmanship. Giving one's life has plenty of negative connotations and needs considerable explanation, which these texts were supposed to avoid.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been amended. See paras 27–30.
GS/15	p.5 ln.32-39	Alternative text suggested.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been slightly amended. See paras 32–33.
GS/12	p.5 ln.35	Regret loss of 'crucified'.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been slightly amended. See paras 32–33.
GS/12	p.5 ln.37	'Stand bravely with him' is weak and more passive than traditional wording. Opening line needs to be more confident. If 'stand' is to be used, we need something that is, in part, about 'standing up for Jesus'.	The specific suggestions are resisted but the text has been slightly amended. See paras 32–33.
GS/02	p.6	Include the provision for Emergency Baptism here.	Resisted. The texts that have been provided respond closely to the brief given.
GS/04	p.6 ln.6	Insert new line 'we thank you that you saved Noah and his family in the ark from perishing in the flood'	Resisted. See para 37.

Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
GS/12	p.6 ln.6-8	Not convinced that reference to Moses is helpful for the unchurched. Better to use the image of water as a gift for living, cleansing and renewing.	Resisted. See paras 37–38.
GS/15	p.6 ln.6-10	Alternative text suggested.	Specific alternative not accepted but text has been amended. See paras 37–38.
GS/07	p.6 ln.10	Change ‘shown us the way of salvation’ to ‘won for us the way of salvation’	Specific alternative not accepted but text has been amended. See paras 37–38.
GS/12	p.6 ln.10	‘Deep waters’ are now ‘of sin’ rather than the ASB ‘of death’. In both cases they seem to be there to provide a reference to water – could not that reference just be in the baptism of Jesus himself? Suggested text given.	Specific suggestions not accepted but text has been amended. See paras 37–38.
GS/15	p.6 ln.11-15	Two alternative texts suggested.	Specific suggestions not accepted but text has been amended. See paras 37–38.
GS/04	p.6 ln.22	Insert new line ‘You saved Noah and his family in the ark from perishing in the flood’	Resisted. This is deliberately a prayer formed from a single New Testament reference. See also para 37.
GS/08	p.6 ln.23	Implies God imparted his Spirit on Jesus in the pouring of water on him. Suggested rewording given.	Text has been reworked. See paras 39–41.

Reference	Page/Line	Submission	Committee response
GS/10	p.6 ln.26	No biblical precedent for blessing water. Suggested rewording given.	Resisted. See para 41.
GS/12	p.6 ln.26	Personally, no problem with blessing the water, but there will be many who will find it difficult. Suggest 'set apart and sanctify' instead.	Resisted. See para 41.
GS/14	p.6 ln.26	No biblical precedent for the blessing of inanimate objects, only for living beings, people in particular. Change 'bless' to 'set apart'.	Resisted. See para 41.
GS/15	p.7	Add bullet point to both versions of the Commission: 'What it means to follow Christ in daily life'.	Bullet points changed. See paras 43–45 and the revised text of the Commission.
GS/11	p.9	Suggest that part or all of the Commission be said by a churchwarden or other lay person, eg by inserting 'a minister <i>or other suitable person</i> ' in the rubric.	Agreed. See paras 43–45 and the revised text of the Guidance Notes.
GS/12	p.9	Recognise that these are sample words not fixed texts, but 'helping you guide these children ...' is weak. Suggest 'guide these children to embrace and follow ...'	Resisted. See paras 43–45, and the revised texts for the Guidance Notes to for the revisions that have been made.
GS/10	p.10	Add 'and mercy' at the end of line 5.	Resisted. See paras 43–45, and the revised texts for the Guidance Notes to for the revisions that have been made.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Page/Line</b>	<b>Submission</b>	<b>Committee response</b>
GS/10	p.14	Double 'here' could be confusing to unchurched families. Suggested alternative given.	<i>This is existing Common Worship text and not part of the resources for authorization.</i>
GS/10	p.15	'In the water of baptism' is less clear than 'through ...'.	<i>This is existing Common Worship text and not part of the resources for authorization.</i>
GS/10	p.22	'Traditional' version of Lord's Prayer? Surely the newer version should be used.	<i>This is existing text and not part of the resources for authorization – either version can be used in the service.</i>