

'Prayer in the Evening'—simple, optional Offices which make possible a *Three-fold* daily pattern, or otherwise serve as a easy 'way in' to structured daily prayer.

All this will be tried out by the 50-or-so for a period of several months, with opportunity of feed-back, workshop, and revision. After that, Durham Liturgical Committee may have a clear idea of where to go with it next!

Tom Jamieson and Bruce Carlin

## NOTICE BOARD

### This Month's Publication...

...is Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 35, *Daily Prayer in the Reformed Tradition*, by Diane Karay Tripp.

---

**1997 Office Almanack** Hillfield Friary (Dorchester, Dorset DT2 7BE) have now available *Celebrating Common Prayer, 1997* (send them an SAE with 50p), the 'almanack' which relates the CCP calendar and lectionary to the particular year.

---

**Prices** After a three-year standstill on Grove Books' prices, there does now have to come a rise from the beginning of 1997. *NOL* and *NOH* (*News of Hymnody* quarterly) will carry a cover-price of 50p per copy—the price actually paid by those who take the journals on standing order with Grove Booklets. Annual subscriptions by post will look like this:

|                         | Inland | Overseas        |
|-------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| <i>NOL</i> (monthly)    | £7.50  | £10 (US\$20)    |
| <i>NOH</i> (quarterly)  | £3     | £3.75 (US\$7)   |
| <i>NOL/NOH</i> together | £9     | £12.50 (US\$24) |

Your advance renewal form will contain these prices. The new price of Booklets from January 1997 will be published next month.

---

**The January Conference on 'Evangelical Anglicans and Worship Beyond 2000'** (being held 6-8 January 1997 and hosted and resourced by GROW) is now receiving bookings daily, and the hope is that we shall have 200 participants (and there will be room for more by negotiation). Have you booked yet—the concession of £5 ends on 30 September (the benefit for *NOL* subscribers continues...)? A brochure was circulated with the July *NOL*, but, if you have mislaid yours, write to Grove Books, or to COB, or to the Conference Secretary, Mrs. Judith Read, St James' Rectory, Great Cheetham Street East, High Broughton, Salford M7 0UH.

---

ISSN 0263-7170

40p

Editorial address: 173 Canterbury Street, Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA

Telephone (01634) 851818 or 855252 Fax (01634) 573549

Postal subscription for 1997 £7.50 (by air £10.00, US\$20.00)

**GROVE BOOKS LIMITED**

RIDLEY HALL RD CAMBRIDGE CB3 9HU

Tel: 01223 464748 Fax: 01223 464849

# News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue No 261

September 1996

## EDITORIAL

Whilst *NOL* will not be losing sight of official C/E liturgical texts this side of the millennium, there is enough of an official breathing-space this month for a side-ways look at a rather different document. Churches Together in England, which celebrates its sixth birthday this month, published earlier in the year *Called To Be One*, an 84 page study of church unity and disunity and inter-church relationships in England. It costs £2.50 and is intended to promote a 'process' in each of the Christian denominations, in which all will between this Summer and next study how they understand 'church,' 'unity' and 'visible' and will provide denominational findings back to CTE by the end of July next year. I have found myself involved in this not only through my ecclesiological interests, but also because I am a member of the General Synod Council for Christian Unity (CCU) and (in the post I am relinquishing) one-day-a-week Ecumenical Officer of the diocese of Rochester. The studying of the main report is assisted by Helen Lidgett's *Called To Be One—The Workbook* (CTE, 40pp, £1.25), an extremely practical and cheap guide to help groups tackle in a down-to-earth way the apparently high-flown concepts about their understanding of which the Churches are being interrogated.

The problem the Churches face in the process is that they are more or less bound to go at the study involved in separation from each other. There are limited benefits in so doing—as there are some areas where the Church of England virtually only has itself to talk to; and there are more areas where the denominations would hardly know how to set up joint study, or where the disproportions of one or another denomination would either actually prejudice joint discussion—or would be sufficiently feared in advance for the discussion to be abortive. I write these things out of no pleasure—I simply report the fairly barren ecumenical landscape I encounter.

There are of course many areas of church life reviewed in the book which are hardly central to *NOL*'s purposes. There is discussion of common mission, and considerable space given to forms of ministry and church government. For the purposes of *NOL* it is in the ways of worship of the different Churches, and particularly in their understanding and practice of sacramental worship, where *Called To Be One* impinges most closely upon liturgy. There is a small section in chapter 4 'Visible Unity' entitled 'The Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist' (pp 29-30). In essence this section identifies three major divisions which need addressing is anything like agreement is to be registered:

(a) there is division between churchly bodies which have sacraments and those which have not. The Salvation Army and the Society of Friends ('The Quakers')

remain firmly outside of any 'sacramental fellowship' and see faith alone as necessary to discipleship.

- (b) where sacraments are used, there is a division between Baptists and pedobaptists as to whether it is appropriate (or allowable, or even possible) to give baptism to infants. The cry of Keith Jones, assistant secretary of the Baptist Union, at the CCBI Assembly in February was 'Do not assert a "common baptism"—we have no ground for such an assertion'—and I reviewed in these columns in June a report of a BU working party which made the point strongly.
- (c) there is a division between the churches over 'eucharistic communion.' *Called To Be One* does not enter into narrowly liturgical issues as to how the churches celebrate the sacrament, or what texts they use, or even how frequently they do so; but it does major on the question of how far they can welcome each other and share with each other in the eucharistic services of each.

Having raised the questions, the book reverts to them in two appendixes. Appendix B (pp 67-70) is entitled 'Christian Initiation and Church Membership,' and it is a highly realistic account of the difficulties in mutual recognition that the present denominational picture presents. These are not only the issue over pedobaptism, but also issues of common (or multi-) membership in Local Ecumenical Partnerships, and the significance given to chrismation and confirmation in relation to admission to communion or membership within the structures. The Salvation Army and the Quakers get a brief mention and then a series of 'challenges' is mounted, and some serious 'suggestions' added, suggestions intended to draw the churches nearer to each other.

Appendix C (pp 71-74) is entitled 'Eucharistic Communion,' and it wrestles with the relationship between visible unity and eucharistic sharing. It perhaps lacks a perspective as to the differing importance assigned to the eucharist in different bodies. But its 'challenges' include calling upon those who practise an 'open table' to consider whether they are taking visible unity sufficiently seriously—and that is a very fair question to incorporate.

The study concludes with an invocation of the 'Lund Principle'—that the churches should do nothing separately except those things which in conscience they cannot do together. The study does not apply that explicitly to worship. If an attempt were made to do so we might all be in difficulties—for it is in being separate in worship which constitutes us as a plurality of churches in the first place. It is merging our worship which blurs our constitutional separatenesses. Perhaps this point might find a place in the responses from the denominations.

---

The end of August saw two events in the Prince of Wales' life which were inevitably linked by observers. One was the becoming absolute of his divorce on 28 August; the other was a photo in a Sunday paper three days before showing him in the company of his mistress (who also got a divorce recently). The press

gle' daily office.

'Daily Prayer' is the simple and self-explanatory title.

'Daily Prayer' is designed to be used at any time of the day. Its balance of variety and continuity is achieved by the juxtaposition of three cycles:

The day of the week

The date in the month

The season of the Church's year.

Six separate booklets, each one covering a season, immediately allows considerable variety of context without complication in use. Our seasons are:

1 November to 16 December

17 December to 2 February

Lent

Holy Week to Low Sunday

Easter

'Through the Year'

Six canticles are designated 'The Cantic of the Season' for daily repetition for a period of weeks. This provides the heart of the continuity in Daily Prayer.

They are in relation to the seasons above:

The Song of Zechariah

The Song of Mary

Saviour of the World

The Song of the Church

The Song of Christ's Glory, or A Song of Praise

Four of these occur at other times of the year together with 29 further Canticles as 'The Cantic of the Day', each set for one day of the week during a Season. Thus, rich variety is introduced, but presented in a way which does not baffle.

Juxtaposition of 'Season' and 'date of the month' allows creative use of the entire psalter, by tables which are immediately accessible. The booklets have (inside front cover) a different Psalm Table running 1-31. (A double table in the case of the 'Through the Year' booklet, on account of the length of time from Monday after Pentecost to 31 October, and a different arrangement for Holy Week and Easter Week). Psalms were allocated to the tables according to two criteria:

- Ease (or otherwise) of use in Christian prayer
- Dominant theme (if any) in relation to the scheme of Seasons.

The first criterion determines the frequency of use of a psalm, so 148 most years will be recited 11 times, 58 appears once in the year and may then be omitted!

The second criterion, in the case of a psalm used less often, determines in which season or seasons it occurs.

There is much more, of course, to be said, about Holy Days, Responsories, semi-extempore Opening Prayer. Watch this space! What needs at least a mention is our supplements to Daily Prayer, namely 'Prayer in the Morning' and

gives a little more time for the distribution of the oils before Easter. A day in the previous week might, it seems to me, be even more practical. All this, of course, assumes that you are going to need oils at Easter!

Yours sincerely

Bill Jardine Grisbrooke

### IN MEMORIAM—MAX THURIAN

Max Thurian died on 15 August, the day before his 76th birthday. He was originally a French Reformed pastor, and joined Roger Schultz in 1942 within a short time of the founding of the Taizé ecumenical community. (He later became a Roman Catholic and was ordained in that Church in 1987.) He was far and away the best known member of Taizé, being famed through the world for his writings, many of them liturgical.

To Max Thurian is attributed both the major drafting task in the production of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (WCC, 1982), and also the compilation of the text known as the 'Lima Liturgy.' But we also owe to him various books on liturgy with a strong ecumenical flavour and intention, of which I note the following (with dates of their English translations): *The Eucharistic Memorial* (2 vols, Lutterworth, 1961), *The Mystery of the Eucharist: An Ecumenical Approach* (Mowbray, 1983), *Consecration of the Layman* (Helicon, 1963) (a study of confirmation!). Above all, I presume, the whole Christian world is in his debt for the offices and eucharist used at Taizé and adopted all over the globe. I never knew him personally, but find in him a far-ranging scholarship combined with a highly practical concern for the renewal of the church—not least in the drawing together of different traditions. He stood at a certain hinge of continental Christianity in the post-war years; and his contribution has been unique, far-pervasive, and with many years still (often unsuspected) to run. We honour his memory.

COB

### 'DAILY PRAYER'—THE DURHAM EXPERIMENT

Readers of *NOL* will be interested to know of a diocesan experiment in relation to the Daily Office.

Durham Liturgical Committee have sponsored the experimental use, by fifty or so people, of a form of Daily Office drawn up by two of its members, Tom Jamieson and Bruce Carlin. Bruce and Tom's work springs out of three essential convictions:

- The daily prayer of the Church needs to be more accessible to lay people.
- For most lay people and large numbers of clergy, a single time each day for a sustained period of prayer and Bible reading is what is realistically achievable.
- The riches of the entire Psalter, many canticles, and a wealth of fine prayers need to be made accessible to devout and busy people in the form of a 'sin-

has been speculating on whether she could ever become queen, and has also been wondering whether it is right or desirable that he should ever be 'supreme governor' of the Church of England; and there has been further discussion about how far 'Defender of the Faith' can be stretched (does it indeed have any specific C/E reference? And would 'Fidei defensor' translate as 'Defender of Faith'—a point I have not seen discussed?). These are large and non-liturgical questions, though my disestablishmentarian self would insist that the theological and moral objections to the present establishment are not based on, nor really related to, the merits or demerits of a particular occupant of the throne. There is, however, one more limited question which is arguably liturgical and also crops up around the present royal situation. It is simply this: could the C/E provide a church wedding for the Prince?

When I have been asked this I have found myself with the following considerations to weigh:

Firstly, the clergy of the Church of England are free in law to officiate at such weddings, subject to their own discretion not to officiate;

Secondly, it is contrary to policy for the Archbishop's Registrar to issue a Special Licence for the marriage of divorced persons;

Thirdly, in denominations which look more kindly upon such marriages it is usual to have some criteria to establish acceptable cases, just as the Church of England considered criteria in the early 1980s. As far as I know, such criteria have usually (if not invariably) included the provision that neither party should have in any sense participated in the break-up of the previous marriage of the other party. That criterion has its problems in relation to the present case.

It is, I suppose, an open question whose rites the hypothetical bridegroom would actually choose for a religious ceremony in any case. But it looks as though, if he wanted to take his chance with the Church of England, he would have to ask his local vicar (or the vicar of his bride's parish) which way he would expect to exercise his discretion. Royal Peculiars are not, of course, parish churches.

Colin Buchanan

### EUCCHARISTIC PRAYERS FOR RITE A REVISED?

Rites A and B Revised are now provisionally tucked into their Revision Committee, but, still have major problems (aired in previous months in these columns) in relation to eucharistic prayers and the Lord's Prayer. One feature of the eucharistic prayers which I did not mention last month was that I asked, as a supplementary question in synodical question time, whether if any of the six eucharistic prayers defeated in February were now submitted to the Rites A and B Revised Revision Committee, it would be in order for them to be incorporated into Rite A Revised. Off the cuff the Bishop of Salisbury answered 'no' to this supplementary, but leisured reflection has led me to question his off-the-

cuff response.

Here then are some reasons for thinking that if, on other grounds (i.e. liturgical and popular acclaim ones), there were reason to propose one or more of those six prayers, then procedurally the Committee should not rule out such proposals. I suggest instead the following approaches to an admittedly ticklish issue:

- (i) It is proper for the Revision Committee to *consider* all eucharistic prayers referred to it (and any others it cares to consider), and that none of the six defeated in February can be, or should be, viewed as off-limits for *consideration*.
- (ii) There may or may not then be need for the Revision Committee to consider whether or not the form of any prayers it *proposes* for authorization should vary to some degree from the text of the six defeated in February.
- (iii) However, when the Committee is considering how near to the February texts it may go with its proposals, the following factors favour going very near:
  - (a) to propose, say, two or three of the six is in no sense to bring back defeated proposals unchanged—it is rather to have listened to the February debate and to have brought a *very different* total package;
  - (b) the natural and only context for the prayers in February was Rite A of 1980; here it is distinctly and only a Revised Rite A—and that means the prayers are to be viewed as different on account of their context; (to illustrate this with an extreme example I would suggest that to propose a modern Lord's Prayer *for Rite B*, and have it defeated, is not of itself to view that text of the Lord's Prayer as out of court for Rite A—and the same argument applies here in a less extreme form, that a change of context is of itself a determinative departure from the previous proposal);
  - (c) even if the Committee is advised, or determines for itself, not to act in accordance with these points, there is yet a wholly unexplored ground as to what would make newly proposed prayers different from those defeated. It would, presumably, be improper and intolerable to assume that prayers that had a structure with an opening dialogue, preface, sanctus, post-sanctus (with or without epiclesis), narrative, acclamations, anamnesis, epiclesis, petition for fruitful reception, doxology, and amen were now beyond consideration; and it would be equally intolerable to assume that prayers that used vivid imagery were beyond consideration, or that to propose exactly six prayers is beyond consideration, or that propose that prayers should only have two and a half years life is beyond consideration—in short, in some respects (and those uncharted and uncontrolled) new prayers are *bound* to resemble defeated ones; and, lacking any clear picture as to what was being opposed in the existing prayers, we must judge that the degree and the way in which newly written prayers must differ from the six in order to *be* different

Lent 2) and reference is made to another Sunday, or comment is given on both passages.

This is not a technical commentary. Each Sunday has only two pages devoted to it (and half a page of that is the title!). It reads like the comments on the Sunday's readings in *Church Times* or *Church of England Newspaper*—which makes sense, as many of these comments first saw the light of day in the Australian equivalent, *Church Scene*.

Comparison is inevitable with the other major resource for the three-year lectinary, *Days of the Lord* (a Roman Catholic resource, volumes of which have been reviewed in various earlier editions of *NOL*). *Days of the Lord* is a much larger resource which is more technical and gives much more theological and historical background, with an average of seven pages of comment per Sunday.

*Inside the Sunday Gospels* is a much more modest affair, focussing on the Gospel reading alone. Peta Sherlock's style is fresh, straight-talking and honest. The blurb on the back tells me that Peta's first volume (on Year C) has proved popular with discussion groups as well as preachers, but I would have thought that it is most useful for the preacher, or for the individual who wants something thought-provoking to prepare them for Sunday worship.

This is not a book of ready made sermons, but is very helpful as a 'thought-starter' for anyone wanting to preach on the Gospel each week of the RCL. If she can complete the set with something on Year B, we shall all be in Peta's debt soon!

Mark Earey

## CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin,

James Steven hopes his letter will provoke further correspondence on the subject of the various additions to the Maundy Thursday liturgy.

Like Chris Walsh, to whom he refers, I am doubtful about the value of the liturgical renewal, as a matter of course, of ministerial—or for that matter any other—vows. But given that it is to be done, presumably Maundy Thursday was fixed on because common Roman Catholic theology sees the institution of priesthood—and of the ministerial priesthood—as taking place at the Last Supper, in the command 'Do this in remembrance of me'.

The blessing of oils on Maundy Thursday came about for purely practical reasons—new supplies of the oil of catechumens and of chrism were required for the Easter vigil baptisms (which of course included confirmation), and the Thursday was the last occasion on which this could be provided. There is surely something of value in preserving this link with the baptismal character of the Easter celebrations; but in modern conditions it might be well for the blessing of the oils to take place earlier—some Roman Catholic dioceses bless them on the Wednesday evening, which allows for both clergy and laity to get there, and

transubstantiation in its theological intention. It might be dressed up in the old forms, but its liturgical engineering was designed to present the eucharistic theology which we have seen Cranmer develop over the previous two or three years. This fact has been obscured by later disputes in the Church of England which would have surprised and probably distressed Cranmer; he would not have approved of Anglo-Catholic use of his 1549 rites as a safe haven from the implications of his 1552 rite...’ (p 412).

The 1552 rite was ‘clearly intended from the moment of the 1549 book’s introduction’ (p 504).

Also revealed is the *extent* to which Cranmer worked by being inspired by the work of others and then improving on it—and not only the great and well known, but also the little known (such as his chaplain Thomas Becon, p 416) and even those who opposed him (‘Cranmer’s extraordinarily omnivorous pursuit of a good phrase...’ p 417).

Two key turning points in Cranmer’s theology of eucharistic presence are stressed: first his move to a Lutheran consubstantiation in the 1530s and secondly (and more significantly) a change to receptionism and a belief in ‘spiritual presence’. This change is ‘frustratingly difficult to date’ (p 354). Although it seems to have been put in motion before Henry VIII’s death at the end of 1546, ‘only at the end of 1547 does the evidence for Cranmer’s change of heart become decisive’ (p 355). MacCulloch follows B A Gerrish in describing this as ‘symbolic parallelism... which points to a happening that occurs simultaneously in the present through the work of God alongside the sign itself’ (p 614)—a belief which Cranmer held in common with Heinrich Bullinger.

This is surely the definitive Cranmer biography for many years to come.

Mark Earey

Peta Sherlock, *Inside the Sunday Gospels—Year A* (E J Dwyer, Australia, distributed in UK by Columba, 1995, 135 pp, £5.99)

As the title suggests this is a book of brief commentaries on the Gospel readings for Year A of the *Revised Common Lectionary*, the lectionary which looks certain to become the Church of England’s main authorized provision in the post-2000 years.

Year A in the RCL is the ‘year of Matthew’, but this is a commentary on Year A itself, and so those looking for a preaching commentary on the whole of Matthew’s Gospel should look elsewhere.

This book proceeds Sunday by Sunday through the RCL giving comment on the Sunday Gospel. This is mostly from Matthew but also includes other Gospels (eg John 1.1-18 on Christmas 2, and a series of readings from John in the Easter season, which is the pattern in each year of RCL). The book would also be useful for churches following the Common Lectionary (ie the ‘un-revised’ three-year lectionary!)—where the readings differ from RCL this is noted (eg

for legal purposes is unknown and must be a matter of guesswork, entrail-inspection, or subjective judgment by the Committee.

(d) one of the unrepeatable features of the February defeat is the participation of the newly elected 50% of the Synod, who at that point had no opportunity for revision of the text; and as, by definition, everyone will now have opportunity for such participation, it is morally (and arguably legally) proper for the Committee to say to the Synod (in effect):

‘Here are the prayers which we know you defeated in February *because you could not revise them*: well, now you can revise them—and the Committee, when it re-considers after that, will be very sympathetic to requests from the whole Synod to revise; and that will lead to one of two results:

*Either the prayers will be changed, in which case it will be in line with even the strictest reading of Standing Orders to authorize them; Or the prayers will not be changed, in which case the Synod will sufficiently know it now wants the unchanged text for it to be worth suspending the relevant Standing Order to bring that text back for Final Approval.*

The Committee might still add extra assurance by recommending that the eucharistic prayers be subject to a separate vote at *Final Approval*, and be voted on separately one by one themselves. By such means all suggestion that the defeated package was being returned in blanket unchanged form would be rendered incredible.

Readers will not be surprised that I have duly picketed the Revision Committee to the above effect, and have added in some questions relating to actual texts: I have asked the Committee to consider whether:

- (a) it ought to let the rubric in the draft text stand, that permits eucharistic prayers from existing Rite A (but will not do after 31 December 2000, unless the specific texts are brought *verbatim* into the new framework, and that would properly open them to revision procedures);
- (b) there is a charter from the Synod for the ‘Trinitarian structure’ in at least some prayers;
- (c) there is a charter from the Synod for prayers for use when children are present;
- (d) there is a charter from the Synod for responsive material;
- (e) there is a charter from the Synod for prayers shorter than those in Rite A;
- (f) there is a charter from the Synod for a limit on numbers of prayers;
- (g) there is a charter from the Synod for some freedom in inserting home-made features (whether by Proper Prefaces, alternative acclamations, or longer items to be put into matrix-type texts);
- (h) there is a charter from the Synod for prayers to be unlike each other, or to be like each other;

- (j) there is a 'steer' from the Synod to reinforce the doctrine of the atonement in some or all of the prayers;
- (k) there is a view in the Synod about the kinds of imagery and boldness of imagery which are appropriate;
- (l) there is any weight to be attached to the views of those who, in effect, want no modern services anyway;
- (m) there is any substance in the extraordinary and unsubstantiated remark of the co-chairman of ARCIC that two of the prayers, if authorized, would in some unspecified way further prejudice Anglican/RC relationships;
- (n) there should be a responding to those who want 'the order following the pattern of the BCP.'

In the light of its conclusions about the above, the Committee ought to be ready to provide anywhere between two and six of the defeated prayers, perhaps marginally re-touched, but ought then to be gentle with Synod about further revising.

COB

#### BOOK REVIEWS

Robert Cotton and Kenneth Stevenson, *On the Receiving End: How people experience what we do in church* (Mowbray, 1996, vi/152 pp, £9.99)

Despite the title, the key word to the chapter headings is 'access'—'Access to the story,' 'Access to forgiveness,' 'Access to the meal,' 'Access to the Word,' 'Access to communion,' 'Access to the results.' One can see an outline shape of the eucharist in this order of 'accesses,' and each of them is treated by two short essays—the first by Robert Cotton, the second by Kenneth Stevenson—exploring the concept imaginatively and often anecdotally. It is devotional, colourful, often gently scholarly, pastoral, and delightful. Its overall impact is truly refreshing.

Naturally 'Access to the meal' (chapter 4) is a kind of centre-piece. But I was astonished to find that the Cotton half is largely devoted to a detailed attack on my own writing against the establishment of the Church of England. It does not much matter for the sake of this review that I think he comes up with the wrong answer—I am still more concerned to know why, to him, this was the dominant question. He comes to it by calling for the church to belong to and with those who do not attend it—and for it to be user-friendly for those who come occasionally. He cites a certain civic service to this end. He disposes of me in a couple of pages. He hardly even states the question as to whether non-communicants can sense themselves 'at home' in a communion service; and the moment he begins to address that matter he simply says that a common salvation is offered to all. But, as I understand the issue, the problem is not whether the fringe, the lapsed, the enquirers and the uncommitted will or will not be recipients of the

gospel if they are present at a communion service—the problem as it is usually discussed is whether they will be present at all when they know it is a communion service. And if there is any reason to think they *may* show up at intervals (and in many areas of England to-day there is not much such reason), then the strategic question is whether the provision of communion at that point will encourage or dampen the smoking flax.

I found myself more interested in the authors than their themes—perhaps because I know Kenneth Stevenson and do not know Robert Cotton, perhaps because over the years I have become intrigued by how two or more authors collaborate together to produce a joint work, so the dynamics of how these two join in each chapter caught me (and I tried opening at random to see if I could tell blind from the prose or the treatment which of the two I was with—but I did not always get it right). But I bumped up against what felt more and more like a basic snag—these two are professionals; they are surely located at the 'giving' end; they are at their most convincing for these purposes when they can persuade us that they can equally naturally inhabit the 'receiving' end (and Kenneth Stevenson in particular at interval allows us glimpses of his true need and his true relationship with God as a 'receiver'); but the dispenser and his presuppositions about what he is 'giving' and what is good for those who are 'receiving' are never completely banished from view—the Hoover salesman may run the machine up and down the floor and demonstrate its usefulness, but he cannot quite convince the housewife that he knows what it is really like at her end. Now hermeneutics depend upon the context of the reader as well as the writer, so I may be affecting the reading myself. But I never quite believed I was genuinely 'at the receiving end.'

COB

Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer—A Life* (Yale University Press, 1966, xii/692pp. Hardback, price £29.99)

This enormous new biography of Cranmer (632 pages of text, plus appendices and index) is heavy in every sense! As one might expect in a work so detailed, it can be a bit heavy-going at times, but it repays close study. The historical work is certainly detailed (several pages early on on the problematic Cranmer family heraldry!) but this is by no means at the expense of the theological and liturgical issues which run in parallel. The story of Cranmer from the political point of view is thoroughly integrated with Cranmer from a theological point of view. The overall stance is sympathetic but not uncritical.

On the liturgical front there is honourable (if brief) mention of COB's *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* (Liturgical Study No 7—mentioned in footnotes on p 413 and p 507). MacCulloch follows Buchanan and Geoffrey Cuming on the relation of 1549 to 1552,

'The rite of communion which emerged [i.e. 1549]...was in fact very far from