

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Social Groups, Liturgy and Glossolalia

DOUGLAS DAVIES

THE INTEREST SHOWN by philosophers in the question of language in recent years has not been without parallel, both among theologians and social anthropologists, though each have carried on their discussions at rather different levels of analysis and with different concerns. This paper aims at developing one sociological approach which should prove of interest to theologians and sociologists, for while the phenomena chosen for analysis are those of liturgy and glossolalia, the theoretical questions which emerge concern the fundamental nature of church groups as social institutions involved in constructing and maintaining systems of communication.

Not all communication is alike, for as its form differs between non-verbal and written messages, so does the content. One important task in the analysis of communication of any sort is that of the contextualising of the communicative event. This involves asking not simply how a message, word or feature is used, but the more fundamental question of how the message came to be used. In other words, the mode of origin of a communication, if ascertainable, may illuminate the meaning intended. Further, our analysis does not focus upon any psychological 'intention' of a subject, but upon the social context within which a communication takes place, following some of the principles outlined in the work of Professors Mary Douglas and Basil Bernstein.¹ The latter's major thesis is that social groups possessing different modes of social organization, interaction and ethos, give rise to or generate different styles of language. Such differing forms he regards as operating on different principles or as constructed on types of codes which may be distinguished both by the form the language takes as well as by its content. Thus he denotes as a 'restricted code' that structure or model which underlies a language having to do with social solidarity, and in which meaning is logically implicit but crudely differentiated. Such a 'public' language he sees as reinforcing group loyalty as contrasted with a 'formal' language operating upon an

'elaborated code' and which serves to communicate more highly conceptualised statements. Both codes, he argues, are learned during the process of socialization and more particularly in the context of the mother-child relationship.

The severe criticism which Bernstein has aroused centres upon his assertion that children of lower socio-economic groups will tend to use restricted codes in most of their communication even in adult life, whereas children of higher social status groups, whilst able to use a form of restricted code, will tend to adopt the elaborated type in most adult social relationships. The aspect of Bernstein's theory which is adopted in the present analysis remains significant despite the criticisms levelled against his application of the theory of linguistic coding to social class and education. Harold Rosen has vigorously opposed the idea that 'working class language' is inferior or deprived, an idea which was regarded as the paramount conclusion of Bernstein especially by some American and British educationalists. Nevertheless Rosen fails to distinguish the general principle that specific types of social interaction generate particular types of language, from its application to the case of education and social class.¹ Indeed we would wish to criticise Bernstein's failure to clarify the idea that a variety of codes might be operating within a specific social class. Nevertheless, we can accept for the purpose of our present argument the fundamental hypothesis that the nature of social relations within a particular context will determine the type of language used by interacting personnel both with respect to its form and content.

Codes in Context

LET us consider 'baby-talk' as the polar type of restricted coding on the criteria that its logical or cognitive content is minimal and, for practical purposes irrelevant, while its emotive aspect is of prime importance. Its function is to express a warmth of relationship between persons involved in the exchange of gurgles and smiles, rather than to pass a verbal message. It might almost be said to be non-verbal communication involving sounds. Contrast such an event with a philosophical disputation in which each phrase is calculated to convey a specific message, a dialogue of mind addressing mind rather than heart calling to heart. The form of speech used will, of course, depend upon the situation of the conversants and it is of importance to our argument to remember that individuals use many kinds of speech based upon differing codes during the course of their lives. As an extension of Bernstein's thesis we assert that this variety of language used by an individual is influenced by a dominant code which will determine the relative significance of sub-codes, and the ability of the subject to perform in social contexts demanding one or other of such sub-codes.

The significance of Bernstein's findings lies in the way he has described the total involvement of the individual in the process of communication, both verbal and non-verbal. He has done this within a framework of socialization and with the relationship between language and emotion stressed quite heavily, and in a way not so comprehensively approached, theoretically at least, by social interactionists such as Goffman. Bernstein regards the whole individual as less involved in the act of communication in the case of elaborated coding, whereas the person using a restricted code remains less of a detached commentator and more of an actor in a living drama. Again, the restricted code user makes the form of what is said a vehicle for expressing his individuality whereas the elaborated user consigns this task to the explicit content of the speech act. Accordingly, the social groups in which individuals will be able to participate will depend to a certain extent upon the type of code in use. Perhaps one should say that the social interactions open to people will vary rather than social groups since individual, person to person contacts, depend upon mutual understanding based on the various codes. Indeed, it might be that an individual with a highly dominant elaborate code will be unable to communicate his feelings of a personal nature to another because he does not know how to 'bring himself to say' what he feels he must say. Similarly, someone might find it impossible to frame a logical argument without interposing his own emotional feelings into the debate.

Clearly a form of restricted code would be used by most people in speaking to a baby or small child, in small-talk about the weather, in personal crisis situations of bereavement, anguish or joy, and in love-making. Elaborated codes would obtain in intellectual discourse on most subjects where conceptual clarity is required and in conversation where the individual is concerned to assert and define his individuality over against the other actors. The ability to perform well in society would thus presuppose the ability to discriminate between the relevance of particular codes and their attendant speech forms in different situations. Bernstein asserts the necessity of seeing codes as involving different social structures and not as evaluative labels by which restricted codes are limited to the working classes who are then said to be linguistically deprived. Even so, codes are evaluative in the sense that some facilitate certain types of interaction but not others so that speakers possessing only a language based upon a restricted code will find it difficult to communicate with an individual thoroughly conversant with elaborated codes *in his terms*, over problems requiring a highly conceptualised and detached mode of argument. But the opposite is also true in that it is not necessarily the case that an elaborated user is able to switch, as Bernstein seems to suggest, to a restricted code which will place him in the same set of values and emotive meanings as the restricted user. In other words, the public and formal sub-codes of a Dominant Restricted Code are not the same and do not convey the

same meanings as the public and formal sub-codes of a Dominant Elaborated Code.

Religious Institutions

IN the light of this theory let us now turn to an examination of religious institutions and for the sake of simplicity postulate two basically different types of such groups as far as social organisation and the resultant codes are concerned. There is the long established group whose language of life and worship is relatively fixed and learned by successive generations of children and converts, and there is also the case of a newly developing movement or one in the process of rapid change or reformation. In both these general types it is postulated that the mode of interaction between personnel will influence the language and its underlying code generated by the specific social circumstances, and will also influence the type of theology possible in that institution, since the manner in which the theology is constructed and understood will depend on the mode of abstraction possible in that context. Variation will affect not only theological systems which stand within wider intellectual boundaries or which eschew such, but also other symbolic systems such as that of music. An extensive analysis of musical systems is not possible here, but the use of the chorus form of hymn in certain movements fits well the Dominant Restricted Code in that it reinforces group solidarity and does not involve logically complicated theological argumentation. If we contrast this with the liturgical settings of masses and anthems performed by trained choirs, and which develop theological themes in more logical ways, we begin to see the difference. Similarly one could contrast literalist modes of theological understanding with more philosophical ones, though it would be necessary to trace the development within movements with respect to both music and ideology since institutions change in their internal systems of interaction over time.

Our immediate concern is with certain aspects of Anglicanism as contrasted with aspects of sectarian religion. Because the Anglican Church is by no means a homogeneous institution, statements need to be specific. Criticisms made of Anglo-Catholicism might not hold with respect to Evangelicalism or in the cases of Neo-Pentecostal groups of each. A further problem concerns the social status of church members for the same church exists both at the Chapels Royal and in dock areas of industrial towns with the pew membership varying accordingly, not only in social class but also in intelligence. Yet until recently the liturgies have been identical in both contexts. While recent changes have indicated an awareness of the problem of communication it will be argued that the radical problem of the nature of social class, group, religious language and ritual has not been sufficiently

understood.

An emerging sect consists of people aware of problems, both material and spiritual, along with a set of answers usually formulated by a prophetic figure able to express the vague discontent of the people. The solution which thus emerges is closely related to the emerging community structure of social relationships, for the sectarians are not only, or perhaps not primarily, men possessing a satisfying world-view, but men who are brothers and part of a community in and through which truth is mediated and understood. Mary Douglas' work on the relationship of symbolism in relation to the body and to social life will be helpful in the following argument though it will require elaboration to apply to the 'social body' of emergent religious groups as well as to well developed religious institutions.³ The theoretical significance of Douglas' work lies in the way she shows how cosmologies are related to social structures, or, in other words, how human or social things can serve as models for understanding the world and life processes.

Bernstein does not discuss the nature of religious language or symbolism and the one reference he does make appears to be inaccurate on his own premises; for when referring to the restricted code he gives as an example the case of religious ritual on the basis that its structure is wholly predictable, that the words used are stylized and that individual expression can only be made through non-verbal components such as that of intonation. His stress on form rather than on content in this case has led to an overstatement since the content of much Anglican liturgy is elaborate in nature relating to doctrinal formulations in a highly abstract form. Indeed, Mary Douglas has commented on the abstract theorising of theologians to the effect that the elaborated code has influenced them too much.⁴ For such persons symbols often possess many levels of meaning some of which may not be accessible to those unable to conceptualise in complex ways, symbols may thus be said to be less 'multivocal' for restricted code users.⁵ The usefulness of a symbol may be said to depend upon the range of meaning it possesses for different groups of people, meanings both in terms of emotion and reason.

The restricted code complex operates in those social groups where interpersonal relationships are of a familial, rather informal type and which presuppose that all participants share in a commitment to the group. Individual differences and idiosyncratic expressions, whether in dress or speech, are avoided in the interest of group affectivity. Information passed tends not to be of a highly abstracted nature but relates to the immediate concerns of group life, often expressing internal solidarity vis-à-vis the outside world. Doctrines or articles of faith tend to be elaborated in nature as expressions of metaphysical conceptions but even so, they may be used by a group as a demarcator of membership, in which case the content of the doctrine is less significant than its symbolic value indicating the solidarity of the personnel. The

belief in the literal inspiration and truth of the Bible is a case in point. Many professing such a belief—the members of classical Pentecostal churches are a good example—do not understand what is involved in the belief or the many problems associated with the subject of Biblical interpretation and criticism. In fact the doctrine comes to serve a purpose other than that of referring to the nature of scripture: it becomes a symbol of group membership and also of that experience presupposed by membership but which is difficult to express verbally.

Of course, most religious groups do see the necessity of teaching their members, particularly in those movements possessing no professional ministry serving as guardian of the faith and in which the ongoing success and even the existence of the group depends upon the knowledge and missionary zeal of members. Even so the degree of sophistication of doctrinal systems as taught to the personnel varies a great deal, from the question and answer technique of the Jehovah's Witnesses, which requires but little thought, to the more involved class discussions held by Mormons. Perhaps mention should also be made of the extensive theological training which most of the larger denominations provide for their ministers. The Anglican Church is in a difficult position with respect to all this; for while its doctrinal position is legally fixed in the formularies of faith its clergy hold to widely differing positions, their training not often consisting of dogmatic indoctrination. Not only so, but the membership, drawn as it is from all social groups and intellectual abilities, varies in its interest in and commitment to doctrinal matters. It remains true that for the majority of the public the church caters for the rites of passage of baptism, confirmation, marriage and death but little else. Both the general attitude and language of the institution foster this approach while attempting to decry it. The formality of the occasional rites is not relevant or is at least inappropriate to the ordinariness of working life.

The Prayer Book, which we must take as the starting point in discussing such rites, is written in an elaborated code seeking to express religious truth in abstract and logically connected ways. Perhaps the Athanasian Creed is the perfect example of such an intricate formulation. 'As also there are not three incomprehensibles, not three uncreated: but one uncreated and one incomprehensible.' Similarly the services of Communion, Morning and Evening Prayer and the occasional offices are all couched in elaborated formulations and often relate more to inter-church controversy than to the needs of contemporary social groups. Whilst it cannot be doubted that prayers and phrases from these services may have profound significance for all types of people it is assumed here that they are less easily assimilated or rather appropriated by restricted code users. This may be seen by comparing utterances generated naturally within different kinds of groups.

The standardised and strictly formulated confessions, absolutions,

prayers and canticles of Anglican and some other liturgies express a precision not only of doctrinal content but also of the manner in which the divine is to be approached. Individual piety as a felt experience is not demanded, and in one sense there is no provision made for such. Thus the liturgy resembles elements of a public language in so far as it does not allow for individual expression of piety or devotional distinction among members of the worshipping group. Group participation in prayers and the versicles and responses, ideally at least, serves to consolidate the congregation. This situation is consonant with a church institution possessing both a clerical hierarchy in control of religious symbols and a laity subject to the clergy and not encouraged to seek positions of leadership other than through the professionalising agencies of clerical training.

It is impossible to say what state of mind is aroused or what message conveyed by the versicle and response, 'The Lord be with you—And with thy Spirit' (or in a modern version 'And also with you'). Again, 'Praise ye the Lord—The Lord's Name be praised' is difficult to evaluate sociologically other than as a statement of ideal relations between worshippers. They certainly appear rather stilted as expressions of zeal when compared with the unwritten yet often used phrase of Pentecostals and Evangelicals, 'Praise the Lord'. In these latter cases the exchanges may be regarded as examples of what Bernstein calls 'sympathetic circularity',⁶ but when used in a set liturgy they express truths held intellectually rather than give vent to personal piety. This is an important point; for Bernstein would argue that such acts of individuation are not common among restricted group users. Here, however, we see the elaborate code of the set liturgies serving to eliminate any individuation whereas individuation is very noticeable in the unwritten rites of groups which generally consist of restricted code users. Indeed it is in situations where the ritual interaction is relatively unstructured that the wind of the spirit may continue to blow as individuals feel constrained to utter their feelings to their god as well as to their worshipping neighbour; it is in that very act that all present realize that the spirit has not departed but remains in their midst. Rather than being an act of self-assertion it is an act of unifying significance. This may also be seen in the feedback of expletives which sometimes takes place between the preacher and congregation in Pentecostal churches. His message is their message and they are not lacking in assent. This contrasts with the detached composure with which the elaborated code user receives the lecture from the pulpit. Take as an example two prayers used before a sermon in two different churches. 'May the words of my lips and the thoughts of all our hearts be now and always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord our strength and our redeemer', a well known and commonly used prayer in Anglican circles, contrasts markedly with a prayer of a working-class lay preacher used in a nonconformist mission—'Bless this little man here O Lord

and this desk' (i.e. pulpit). This example of an idiolect, peculiar to this preacher, serves to assert individuality but only to the point where the desire for the spirit is expressed. This individuality-corporate distinction may be seen more clearly by reference to the service of the Lord's Supper which will serve as an example of the necessity for analyzing the phenomenon of communication in order to understand the particular features of religious movements, and in this instance of the Charismatic Movement.

One interesting feature of recent Anglican liturgies of the Eucharist has been the use of the statement 'We are the body of Christ. In the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body. Let us then pursue all that makes for peace and builds up our common life', which informs the congregation of their group involvement. We may presume this sentiment serves to counteract that dispersion of community solidarity which contemporary social mobility effects, since the number of congregational members who are kinsmen is now less than would have been the case in pre-industrial Britain, in the context of which the Prayer Book would have made more direct sense. The question must therefore be asked whether the assertion of a theological truth has any purpose in bonding persons together in any but a formal way during the ritual act. Similarly 'The Lord is here His Spirit is with us', is a formal assertion of a dogma far removed from the utterances 'Jesus, Praise His Name', often heard in Pentecostal circles and which presuppose His presence and the prompting of His Spirit. In the liturgy the symbolism of unity is developed by the statement 'We break this bread to share in the Body of Christ' and the response 'Though we are many we are one body because we all share in the one bread'. Exactly what message is conveyed by these exchanges is difficult to ascertain, yet such phrases would be redundant in communities of believers who need no reassurance of their unity. It is precisely in groups of elaborated code users who realize that they are not bound together in the reality of social life that statements concerning the unity of Christians are found. A mere assertion of unity clearly does not suffice to effect solidarity: yet the awareness of disunity may lead to other action such as the formation of house-groups which may serve that end. Lastly we may note the use of the term 'corporate communion' which has been used of late and which is indicative of the desire that the Eucharist should serve some unifying end among church members. Even so it cannot be assumed that mere statements will serve successful performatory functions if no other action is taken to enable personnel to interact in a face to face context. It is with this tension of the desire for unity and the knowledge of isolation that we turn to discuss the subject of the Charismatic Movement or Neo-Pentecostal movement as it has also been called. Two major factors characterize this movement, firstly that it has remained within the established church and denominational groups and secondly, that it has taken place amongst middle class people rather

than among the manual worker group which was so deeply affected by Pentecostalism at the beginning of the present century. A further point of interest lies in the fact that many Charismatics are of the ranks of both Anglo- and Roman Catholicism.

Code and Social Interaction

THE new experience of unity and community ethos which has characterised Charismatic groups and the new patterns of social interaction, have generated particular forms of linguistic usage which exemplify Bernstein's general thesis. For example the word 'praise' has taken on an entirely different meaning and is distinguished from 'prayer' which is viewed more as a petitionary phenomenon than as a movement of worship and adoration as it is in non-Charismatic circles. Groups meet for 'praise and prayer' and not simply for prayer, the distinction serving to describe the new place and emphasis given to singing and extempore prayer both in known languages and in tongues. The term 'sharing' and the phrase 'ministering to one another' have been adopted to refer to that intimate exchange of experiences of spiritual insights or the happenings of the day or week viewed from a perspective of God's guidance etc., which takes place in group meetings as well as in informal conversation.

Such sharing, praise and ministering to one another as takes place in Charismatic circles indicates the extent of affectivity and interpersonal involvement which takes place and which contrasts starkly with the aridly respectable religious life which many group members formerly experienced prior to their new encounter with the Spirit. That the Charismatic Movement has liberated many who had been prisoners of a barren sacramentalism cannot be doubted, what it has done is to introduce not only a new perception of the reality of God in a direct way not mediated by sacraments, but also a new style of social relationship between fellow believers. This new warmth of fellowship which does not admit of individual reserve and middle-class isolationism has led to a type of social organisation which has been mirrored in the language of caring and sharing and in which the terms brother and sister deepen in meaning. This immediacy of social relationship is paralleled by the immediacy of contact with the Spirit through visions and individual promptings over many aspects of life. For many there occurred for the first time the experience expressed by such statements as, 'The Lord has shown me . . . The Lord has pointed out to me . . . The Spirit has been teaching us'. Such expressions indicate the anticipation of the group with respect to God's activity in the here and now as he speaks through prophecy and not simply through the sacramental action of the priest and church.

The coding underlying Charismatic community speech is of a restricted type, but it is influenced by the abstract reasoning based on an

elaborated code. It partakes of the familial, integrative nature of the public language but with the reasoned elaborations of the formal language. Glossolalia is, essentially, a polar type of the restricted code, and indicates the breakthrough of the conservative, middle-class individual into the affectivity of religious community, into what Victor Turner has called 'communitas'.⁷

Glossolalia (speaking in 'tongues') is the polar type in that there is no explicit message contained within the utterance itself, another member of the community is required to translate; for the speaker himself is unaware of the meaning of what is said. At one level of analysis there is no possibility of the speaker using this language for the purpose of individuation, for distinguishing himself from his neighbour. The event is a sign of the Spirit's presence and of the individual's subservience, yet it has been observed that such speech may be used to reinforce a speaker's status if it is challenged by other members of the community. This observation which Calley made of low social class immigrant groups may have less application to middle-class groups, though a similar phenomenon is acknowledged by some members of the Charismatic Movement.⁸ Glossolalia is, indirectly, a statement that the individual is prepared to permit the Spirit to use him as a servant of and messenger for the group with personal dignity and isolationism being superseded in the process, a status of 'humilitas'.⁹

Glossolalia presents another problem in that it is not only a public language in the sense of being used in a social context but it is also used privately. There are times in public meetings when glossolalic utterances are made and remain untranslated as when they are produced as prayer-expletives while another is praying or singing, either in a 'tongue' or in his native-tongue. Such expletives may be regarded as units of sympathetic circularity reinforcing the soloist in his performance. The untranslated 'tongues' of private prayer are different. They appear to provide a basis for mental adoration and the rise of the heart to God apart from the use of words of known and thereby limited meaning. This failure of words which we may presume to be revealed in their abandonment as recognised units of speech is an interesting phenomenon and may be understood, it is suggested, in different ways for the Charismatic and for the Classical Pentecostal Movements on the basis of the theory of social organisation and linguistic coding.

Among the lower social class members of the Pentecostal Church are many who are unable to marshal sufficient technical prayer language to pray in public. For these, glossolalia enables the production of verbal utterances with zeal and sincerity which is meaningful to the fellow worshippers both as a sign of the speaker's devotion and also as a message concerning the faith since a more verbally competent speaker will provide a 'translation'. Among the middle-class Charismatics the case is different. Their problem is not usually one of verbal ability but of personal isolation and of the lack of ability to expose their selves to

the world. In glossolalia reserve departs and the Spirit manifests himself in a manner which leaves the speaker in a state in which he feels more free to share his feelings, hopes and aspirations with others. It is often the case that when a person first experiences such an event it is quite overwhelming, yet results in a sense of relief that the break has been made with personal reserve. The breakthrough is one into deeper personal relationships but is also symbolic of an acceptance of the supernatural by many who prior to the event were intellectually doubtful of some Christian assertions concerning the reality of God etc., or for whom a rational sacramentalism was not a sufficiently satisfying perspective for life.

This present analysis views glossolalia as a phenomenon natural to men in specific social contexts and which many could exemplify if the context fostered the speech form. Not all would be equally good speakers for variation would occur as in any other social art. This perspective makes the phenomenon intelligible in cases of mental illness and where it occurs in non-Christian religions,¹⁰ though it diverges markedly from the explanation of Charismatics and others who regard 'tongues' as a supernatural event motivated by the Holy Spirit or, in the case of other religions, by demons or the devil himself. Such a quantum view leads some who seek this particular gift to wait expectantly until God injects or confers the Spirit enabling speech in 'tongues'. Accordingly some leaders of the Charismatic movement often encourage individuals to try and begin with just a few words or sounds and then to speak regularly so as to improve the gift. This suggests the validity of the social context mode of analysis of glossolalia as a learned pattern of behaviour. The group expectations of spiritual status as associated with 'tongue' speaking encourages the beginner but the breakthrough of the Spirit in tongues is itself indicative of the final transition of the individual into the new nexus of social relationships in which he is accepted as a fully accredited member.

The adoption of this restricted code tongue transforms former social relationships based on an elaborated code associated with formal and rather impersonal relations. Formal language, then, inhibits affective relationships at depth and is a barrier. Similarly, the Charismatic feels that rational language is ill suited to the expression of love to God, an expression which comes to an outlet in tongues. The new found freedom of social intercourse is mirrored in the desired freedom from the constraints of language over the conceptualisation of God and the expression of that realisation. The God whose Spirit has been perceived through the emotions is now reacted to by the emotions, bypassing, as it were, the cognitive elements of religion. Dancing and jumping, the lifting of hands in prayer as well as mutual embracing are behavioural expressions of the new freedom. Consonant with the stress on the Spirit and freedom is the relative lack of emphasis on the doctrinal differences obtaining amongst the established churches

of which Charismatics are members, and indeed the lack of emphasis on doctrine and doctrinal precision has been a major criticism of the movement by other churchmen and theologians. Adopting Victor Turner's terms for the analysis of religious movements we may say that the transition from this state of enthusiasm or 'spontaneous *communitas*' to one of a more settled pattern of interaction or 'normative *communitas*' will certainly involve the development of a theological validation for the recent history and experience of group members.¹¹ We should not necessarily presume that this movement will soon become institutionalised and lose its characteristic ethos of affectivity within the wider context of the original church or denomination. Such a second generation theory may well apply to certain groups which have, historically, become independent and in need of organising their activities in an increasingly rational way, as was the case in the classical Pentecostal Church and in Methodism etc. For such institutions Turner's assertion that 'Spontaneous *communitas* can never be adequately expressed in a structural form' would be correct; but with respect to small movements within larger institutions this may not be the case since the groups expressing the new spirit may depend upon the extant church institution for their ongoing organisation in a formal sense, as a parish for example.¹² So it is that we can agree with Professor Douglas that 'It is possible . . . for effervescence to be sustained indefinitely as the normal form of worship . . . (if . . . the level of social organisation be sufficiently unstructured', in groups of a sect-like nature.¹³ This is even more likely, it may be conjectured, if the movement does not depend upon one charismatic leader whose demise could easily lead to marked changes in the remaining group of followers.

Both structure, in the form of sacramental liturgy, and relative spontaneity, in the private groups involving glossolalia, are experienced by many members of the Charismatic Movement, both these settings of religious expression cohere within the one broad institution of the Roman and Anglican Churches and some other denominations. They represent two modes of religious communication and are based upon elaborated and restricted Dominant codes, respectively. This contrasts with the classical Pentecostal Church which tended to operate only on a restricted code base in its social organisation, music and theology. The ability of Charismatics to 'switch' codes is indicative of their competence in social encounters though there remains the difficulty of containing the Spirit in the context of the liturgy; and in order to accommodate this spontaneity some congregations interpose periods of open or free worship within the liturgy itself. To a certain extent communication between middle-class Charismatics and members of the Pentecostal Church who are predominantly working-class, is possible since they both share in experiences which are accounted for in similar ways and expressed in like manner and based upon similar codes. Even so the fact that members of the Charismatic movement are prepared to remain

within their churches of origin, which are often regarded with suspicion by Pentecostals, indicates the sophistication of conceptualisation which allows them to accommodate to systems which do not totally accept the Charismatic perspective. This accommodation is possible because of the wider, inclusive attitude to life obtaining among middle-class persons even when they become members of small subgroups within a larger church body.

A problem which arises from this discussion is that of the nature of communication between people who tend to use one type of code complex at the expense of another. With respect to educational systems Bernstein asserts that 'between the school and community of working-class children there may exist a cultural discontinuity based on two radically different systems of communication'.¹⁴ A similar situation exists in some parts of all church institutions though it is more apparent in the Anglican Church than in others. The ministry is composed of largely middle-class persons who operate for the most part on an elaborated code, and even when they adopt a restricted coded type of speech it is not the same as the restricted code of working-class people. In response to the recognised distance existing between ordinands and the working-classes they are often encouraged to spend time working in factories and the like prior to ordination in the hope that they will come to see how the other half live. A theoretical question which must be asked of this procedure is to what extent the alien code is learned and language understood. Bernstein has suggested that restricted code hearers interpret or transpose elaborated messages into a restricted form and it may be suggested, at least, that elaborated users do the same of restricted codings alien to them. To learn the alien code does not mean only to understand a new vocabulary and grammar but also the social grammar or interpersonal relationships out of which a code is generated in the first instance. Insight into these areas of verbal and non-verbal communication is necessary for the liturgical reformer and the sociologist of religion to say nothing of ordinands and parish priests.

¹ Bernstein, Basil, *Class, Codes and Control*, Paladin (1971). Douglas, Mary, *Purity and Danger*, Penguin (1966); *Natural Symbols*, Crescent Press (1970).

² Rosen, Harold, *Language and Class*, Falling Wall Press (1972).

³ Douglas, Mary, *Natural Symbols*.

⁴ Douglas, Mary, *Purity and Danger*, p. 200.

⁵ Turner, Victor, *Forest of Symbols*, Cornell (1967; 50).

⁶ Bernstein, Basil, *ibid.*, p. 114.

⁷ Turner, Victor, *The Ritual Process*, Routledge (1969; 131ff.).

⁸ Calley, J., *God's People*, OUP (1965).

⁹ Turner, Victor, *ibid.*

¹⁰ Kelsey, M. T., *Speaking With Tongues*, Epworth (1964); Samarin, W., *Tongues of Men and of Angels*, McMillan, New York (1972).

¹¹ Turner, Victor, *ibid.*

¹² Turner, Victor, *ibid.*, p. 132.

¹³ Douglas, Mary, *Purity and Danger*, p. 103.

¹⁴ Bernstein, Basil, *ibid.*, p. 166. Some of Bernstein's ideas are developed in Volume 2 of *Class, Codes and Control*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London (1973).