

Quite seriously, I am putting to the Revision Committee, as I did to the House of Bishops, that the use of the Interim Rite should be viewed as swallowed up by existing Rite B, and perhaps allowed for (but carefully in respect of the prayer of oblation) under the Revised Rite B—but should in no way reappear as a variant on 'Rite B following the pattern of the BCP'—for it clearly does *not* follow that pattern. Whence came this odd proposal? Will the Revision Committee not ditch it?

Other points about the projected text pale a bit beside this one: the full ten commandments must be used on Advent Sunday and through Lent (is that how the BCP is 'customarily used?'); Gloria in Excelsis may be used at the beginning (surely not BCP pattern?), and has the oddest of all rubrics introducing it at the end; places for hymns are provided (one of them being after the blessing, a formal error that needs rectifying, though it is perhaps partly induced by the provision of the Gloria in Excelsis in its BCP place before the blessing); a proper muddle has been made at 'The Offertory', as there is first a collection of money ('*taken and presented*'), then a placing of the bread and wine on the table, then a hortatory sentence about giving money (in the BCP, of course, the sentence comes first, then the collection, and then—if there is to be a communion—the bread and wine are placed on the table, and that order makes sense); the fraction may be lifted out of the narrative of institution and used after it with 'The peace of the Lord' wording—and, consonant with the Interim Rite intrusion, the Lord's Prayer may also be said after the consecration rather than after the communion. There is no provision for supplementary consecration—an interesting mirror-image of the main text of Rites A and B Revised which provide (at Rite A) for supplementary consecration without a text for original consecration—but, for completeness' sake, there needs to be such provision, for BCP supplementary consecration is bound to be unlike the provision for modern rites which will be alongside it.

I suppose we should not complain about the Revision Committee following the Legal Adviser's advice (though there is much re-touching to be done)—but the determined way in which the Commission and the Revision Committee are trying to get an ancient rite into a modern 'alternative services' book is, I guess, the *fons et origo* of most of the problems. It is not helping give legality to variants on the BCP so much as giving a cosmetic place to it in a (partly) modern book.

COB

Editorial address: 37 South Road, Forest Hill, London SE23 2UJ

Phone 0181-699-7771 Fax: 0181-699-7949

E-mail: bishopcolin@dswark.org.uk

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 268

April 1997

EDITORIAL

COMMUNION BEFORE CONFIRMATION

The Guidelines of the House of Bishops are now published, and are printed here and may be photo-copied at will. It looks as though the next move will come from individual bishops, as they let it be known whether or not they wish to avail themselves of the 'discretion' the Guidelines accord to each diocesan.

The following practical questions are already surfacing in my experience:

1. Is there (or should there be) a minimum age for admission to communion? If so, what sanction or self-justification has it? If not, how can patterns of 'preparation' be built in and/or monitored?
2. On what basis are 'the next-door neighbour's kids' to be admitted to communion? Is there a need of adult 'sponsorship', or does merely appearing at church or Sunday School qualify a child quite apart from his or her family?
3. What is to be done about the unbaptized children? This is not only the children considered in paragraph 2 above, but also (and quite widely) the children of crypto-Baptists in our congregations. The more the age of admission to communion creeps down, the more of a stalemate will begin to emerge on this front...
4. Will it be possible to preserve the old discipline in parishes (or dioceses) that desire to do so? It is clear from the Guidelines that children who are communicant anywhere must be permitted to be communicant everywhere, and this means that one 'new discipline' family with young communicant children moving into an 'old discipline' parish can provide a wedge driven deeply, even destructively, into the pattern in that parish. It is perhaps inevitable that there should be a continuous slow move in the one direction, as parish after parish changes its ways.
5. What will be the future of confirmation? I have already found myself in Southwark parishes which admit to communion before confirmation, but still have confirmation at 12 or 13. My understanding is that confirmation should properly come on the true eve of adulthood, and the age should not need to be forced down from now on by the desire to admit to communion early. This may, of course, start to throw our uncertainties about the meaning of confirmation into relief.

I am hoping this year to re-write my own Grove Booklet, *Children in Communion*, which has recently run out of print, and clearly needs re-writing as events have moved on. There will be a large amount of new coaching and nurturing materials coming off the presses too. And the communicant status of youngish children gives a new validity and urgency to the production of a 'Eucharistic Prayer for Use when Children are Present'—not, one hastens to add, in order to provide kiddies' eucharists, but to take seriously the 'all-age' participation.

I very much hope that NOL can signal the coming on stream (or, at a pinch, not) of each diocese, and would ask alert readers to drop me a line with a summary of how your diocese is tackling it. In the process we shall probably unearth more resources readily available.

Meanwhile, a student's reading-list could well include the following:

The Ely (1971) and Knaresborough (1985) reports

The 'Boston Statement' of the first International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (1985) - 'Children and Communion' (This has been re-printed with a new set of essays entitled *Children at the Table*, (ed. Ruth Meyers, Church Hymnal Corporation, 1995))

The 'Toronto Statement' of the fourth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, 'Walk in Newness of Life'. (This is published as Grove Worship Series no. 118, David Holeton (ed.), *Christian Initiation in the Anglican Communion* (1991), and has been reprinted with a set of essays from the Toronto Consultation as David Holeton (ed.) *Growing in Newness of Life* (ABC, Toronto, 1993))

The Culham Report, *Communion before Confirmation* (Culham College, 1993), a review of the pastoral usefulness of existing 'wrong-side-of-the-blanket' parishes.

Southwell Diocesan Liturgical Committee have produced a pack.

I look forward to news from round the country.

I have now moved to my more permanent home, and the new details (including a slight change to the postcode) are on the back of this issue. These details should last a bit - and there's E-mail too.

Colin Buchanan

ADMISSION OF BAPTIZED PERSONS TO HOLY COMMUNION BEFORE CONFIRMATION

GUIDELINES AGREED BY THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

- a. Since 'communion before confirmation' is a departure from our inherited norm, it requires special permission. After consultation, every diocesan bishop will have the discretion to make a general policy whether or not to entertain new applications for 'communion before confirmation' to take place in his

description of a parish as 'Prayer Book Catholic'), but the oddity of it comes through well in the horns of Dix's dilemma.

At any rate, the provision of Series 1 communion in 1966 took up the Interim Rite and included as alternatives a longer and a shorter last paragraph after the narrative of institution, and the longer had the whole prayer of oblation in it. Evangelicals objected (as Dix had) to this position for self-oblation and very nearly defeated the rite in the House of Laity. Series 1 ran on, and was renewed for another seven years in 1973. But it was replaced by 'Series 1 and 2 Revised', which became Rite B in the ASB. By now the Cranmer-based 'First Thanksgiving' in Rite B had only one post-narrative text; and this, whilst containing most of the prayer of oblation, excludes self-offering (which in both Rites A and B come properly in the post-communion, as in 1552). Rite B also provides, through the opening notes, for the shape and text of 1662 itself to be used as a particular variant of Rite B—though, obviously, nearer to how it is used in practice (as e.g. with the Summary of the Law) than an exact following of the BCP text would provide.

In 1984 the House of Bishops yielded to somewhat one-eyed appeals and asked the Synod whether it would like Series 1 re-introduced. The Synod was divided and the Bishops went no further. I wrote in NOL in March 1984 'We undertake to lay on a demonstration antique Rite B, fully lawful, which the lover of the Interim Rite could only distinguish from the text of his heart by a microscope . . . 'I could also have laid on an antique Rite B which the lovers of the BCP could only distinguish from the love of their hearts by a microscope.

So much for the background. The foreground is this remarkable proposal to put a full text of the BCP rite ('as customarily used') before the Revision Committee on Rites A and B Revised, and look for it to come out in the wash as a single coherent unaltered whole, which can then be used as an 'alternative service' (with the consent of the PCC), though it feel and look in most cases just like the 1662 rite itself did when it was used the previous Sunday (with the minister using the discretion of Canon B5 to make the odd change of no substantial importance). Apparently the 'Liturgical Publishing Group', following the muddle-headed resolution of Synod in 1994 to provide a 'core book' in both ancient and modern language, wants this BCP-type rite included in that book, cannot adapt the BCP itself for that purpose, and has asked legal advice, and this is the answer.

Thus far, the story is how the BCP got turned into Interim Rite, which phased into Rite B, and is now to be re-shaped back into the BCP. But the story becomes odder than that, for, straight after the narrative in institution, there is here a rubric which says:

'The people answer Amen unless the Prayer of Oblation (p.12) is said immediately.'

So now we have the BCP, first adapted as Interim Rite, legitimized as Series 1, carefully re-touched to become Series 1 and 2 Revised, turned in turn into Rite B, now adapted back again to being BCP, which is then adapted as Interim Rite . . . Are we, one might ask, on an infinitely spinning merry-go-round?

Dear Colin
MITRES

St. Augustine, Kilburn possesses a mitre adorned with amethysts, and having an adjustable lining to help fit different heads. The parish tradition, which may actually be written down, if my memory serves me, on the fly leaves of the baptism registers, is that it was the first to be worn by a bishop of London after the Reformation. The Bishop of London concerned was John Jackson, who consecrated the church, or at least the first part of it. Could this be true, or wishful thinking?

Graham Palmer

St. Alban's Vicarage, 4 Margravine Road, London W6

RITE B ACCORDING TO THE PATTERN OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

No, your eyes are not deceiving you with this heading, for it is an exact reprint of the heading of a liturgical text circulated (on the instructions of the House of Bishops) to members of General Synod as 'GS Misc 487'. How did it come about? Well, here is the COB account.

Once upon a time there was a 1662 Communion. It was much loved in the Church of England and even characterized as 'incomparable'. There existed, however, in odd quarters a memory that there had once been 1549 rite, which had a long canon including the 'prayer of oblation' as its concluding paragraph. This notion re-surfaced in the 1637 rite, in Cosin's ideals for the 1662 rite itself, and in eighteenth century rites of the non-jurors, the Scottish episcopalians and (ultimately) the Protestant Episcopal Church of the (newly independent) USA. It hung about thereafter, and the nineteenth century anglo-catholics tended to view 1549 as the peak of Cranmer's achievements, from which 1552 had been a sorry (and perhaps enforced) descent—though, it would be hastily added, the descent had not been so serious as to uncatholicize the Church of England.

In the wake of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline along came Walter Howard Frere with his *Some Principles of Liturgical Revision* (1911). Why not, he argued, be content (in an 'interim' sort of way) with an unshuffling of the parts Cranmer had so improperly shuffled in 1552? This could be done by what he called a 'codicil' to the 1662 order, and would involve no alteration of Cranmer's words save the addition of 'Wherefore' to introduce the prayer of oblation. This passed into regular use as the 'Interim Rite', and even survived the frontal attack of Gregory Dix who said 'He [Cranmer] was an admirable liturgist. If you share his theology you had much better use his liturgy as he left it, for a better expression of that theology will not be achieved by tinkering with his rite. If you do *not* share his theology, you will not achieve the expression of a different doctrine merely by shuffling the parts of his rite . . . (*The Shape*, footnote p.692), I suppose the Interim Rite felt more lawful than Roman uses (and could more or less justify the

diocese. If he decides to do so, individual parishes must seek his agreement before introducing it. The bishop should satisfy himself that both the incumbent and the Parochial Church Council support any application, and that where appropriate ecumenical partners have been consulted. If the parties cannot agree, the bishop's direction shall be followed.

- b. The incumbent must ensure that the policy adopted for his/her parish is clearly and widely understood. The policy should be considered within the general context of the ministry that is carried out in the parish through initiation, and also of the continuing nurture of people in the Christian faith. The bishop should be satisfied that the programme of continuing Christian nurture is in place leading to confirmation in due course.
- c. Before admitting a person to communion, the priest must seek evidence of baptism. Baptism always precedes admission to Holy Communion.
- d. There is a question regarding the age at which children may be admitted to Holy Communion. In general the times of the first receiving should be determined not so much by the child's chronological age as by his or her appreciation of the significance of the sacrament. Subject to the bishop's direction, it is appropriate for the decision to be made by the parish priest after consultation with the parents or those who are responsible for the child's formation, with the parents' goodwill. An appropriate and serious pattern of preparation should be followed. The priest and parents share in continuing to educate the child in the significance of Holy Communion so that (s)he gains in understanding with increasing maturity.
- e. The Church needs to encourage awareness of many different levels of understanding, and support the inclusion of those with learning difficulties in the Christian community. Particular care needs to be taken with the preparation of any who have learning difficulties, including children. The incumbent should consult with those concerned in their care, education and support regarding questions of their discernment of the sacrament, their admission to Holy Communion, and their preparation for confirmation.
- f. Before a person is first brought to Holy Communion, the significance of the occasion should be explained to him/her and to his/her parents, and marked in some suitable way before the whole congregation. Wherever possible, the person's family should be involved in the service.
- g. A register should be kept of every person admitted to Holy Communion before confirmation, and each should be given a certificate (or, better, the baptismal certificate should be endorsed).
- h. Whether or not a parish practises 'communion before confirmation', the incumbent should take care regarding the quality of teaching material, especially that used with children and young people. The material should be reviewed regularly and the advice of diocesan officers and other professional advisers taken into account.

- i. The priest must decide exactly how much of the liturgy communicant children will attend. Even if there is a separate 'Ministry of the Word' for children, anyone who is to receive Holy Communion should be present in the main assembly at least for the eucharistic prayer.
- j. No baptized person, child or adult, who has once been admitted to Holy Communion and remains in good standing with the Church, should be anywhere deprived of it. When, for example, a family moves to another area, the incumbent of the parish they are leaving should contact their new incumbent to ensure that there is no confusion regarding the communicant status of children. It is the responsibility of the new incumbent to discuss with the children and parents concerned when the children should be presented for confirmation. Such children should normally be presented at least by the age of 18.
- k. Since baptism is at the heart of initiation, it is important for the bishop regularly to be the minister of holy baptism, and particularly at services where candidates will be both baptized and confirmed. It is generally inappropriate for candidates who are preparing for initiation into the Christian life in baptism and confirmation to receive baptism at a service other than the one in which they are to be confirmed.
- l. In using rites of public re-affirmation of faith other than baptism and confirmation, care should be taken to avoid the impression that they are identical with confirmation. In the case of people who have not been confirmed, it will be more appropriate for the incumbent to propose that they be confirmed.

TWO WELCOME APPOINTMENTS

Mark Earey, Anglican minister at the ecumenical church of Christ the King in the parish of Luton in Chatham (and author of recent Grove Booklets in the Worship series - nos. 133 *Worship Audit* and 140 *Worship as Drama*) has been appointed to Sarum College to keep Christopher Walsh (the Roman Catholic Director) company and provide a truly Anglican resource there. He is to take up his appointment in June, and some information about it is on page 5 opposite.

Harold Miller, a joint-editor of *Anglican Worship Today: Collins Illustrated Guide to the Alternative Service Book 1980*, is an Irishman who was in 1980 Director of Extension Studies at St. John's College, Nottingham, but is currently Rector of Carrigrohane outside Cork (it includes Blarney within its cluster of parishes). He is a prominent member of the Liturgical Committee of the Church of Ireland. He has been unexpectedly but wonderfully nominated by the House of Bishops in the Church of Ireland as the Bishop of Down and Dromore, the most heavily populated diocese of that Church. He is to be consecrated on St. Mark's Day in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, with Dr. Christina Baxter, the chair of the House of Laity of the Church of England's General Synod, as the preacher. Despite all I have written in the past, have we here a man who is being made bishop primarily because he is a liturgist? The answer may still be 'no', but the question is real.

I conclude with a sample of Perry craftsmanship:
 '19.8 ACCLAIMING THE SAVIOUR *from Hebrews 5*
 Jesus is God's Son; God is his Father; he is a priest after the order of Melchisedek;
he is able to deal gently with us when we go astray,
he is the source of eternal salvation.
 Hallelujah! Amen.'

COB

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Colin,

In 1979 I spent a sabbatical in India studying the development of worship there in both north and south—what we now regularly call 'indigenisation'. The effects of using the culture of the people was to increase attendance and to enable Indians to become Christians without the adoption of western music, ritual and traditions. It seems to me that this is precisely what is being done in services like NOS for those who are already unable to comprehend the classical culture of western Europe. There are some who can inhabit the worlds of Mozart and Garage simultaneously, (leaving Strauss's *Arabella* at Covent Garden I overheard a group of young people debating which club to go to for the night) but I suspect they are not the majority.

I regularly attended NOS once a month for the Planetary Mass and found it very different from the description given in Dr. Runcie's comments. It precisely attempted to lift people into a more serious attitude to life through their own cultural expressions. Serious thought and the presentation of the demands of God to counteract the pleasure-seeking effects of night-clubbing were very much part of the ethos. A simple liturgy with rich ceremonial appropriate to the occasion and hard hitting preaching reached many people who would be unable to make it on their own if dressed in the conventional guise of the C. of E. After Chris's departure, the president was regularly one of the local clergy from Sheffield Cathedral or neighbouring parishes—the only change I noticed was a slight decline in the application of the sermon to the life of those attending!

One of the causes of a decline in church attendance which doesn't seem to have been noticed is that shops now open on Sundays! Here in a UPA where many women and young people find employment in shops and supermarkets it is evident that they are now choosing or having to choose week-end work which obviates their Sunday worship attendance. They still worship—but at mid-week services, which are not counted in the figures. This has been true of other jobs for years—nursing and medicine, public services for example—without anyone commenting, but the latest changes have probably made up a fair proportion of the 36,000 alongside the dead and nursing-home residents you mentioned in your analysis.

It would be good to know if Lord Runcie in his time as Archbishop or since ever attended NOS or a similar act of worship before commenting. If not, how can he comment?

Leonard Childs

St. Mark's Vicarage, 119 Francis Street, Derby

Richard Deadman, Jeremy Fletcher, Janet Hudson and Stephen Oliver (eds.), *Pastoral Prayers: A Resource for Pastoral Occasions* (Mowbray, 1996, 144pp. hardback, £12.99, but Mowbrays have a special offer)

Alan Wilkinson and Christopher Cocksworth, *An Anglican Companion* (CHP/SPCK, 1996, viii/123pp., hardback, £7.99)

These two books are like each other in their slim A5 hardback format, and their overall wide scope of themes for prayers and readings; and they are almost certainly of comparable pastoral usefulness in parochial ministry. They are unlike each other in that the material in *Pastoral Prayers* is specifically 'targeted' and that in *An Anglican Companion* is as deliberately untargeted. The former is a resource for pastors to use on particular occasions, whereas the latter is a resource for the worshipper to have (perhaps to have as an adult confirmation present, a use for which I am recommending it) in order to provide a broad-based spirituality to undergird the whole of life.

Pastoral Prayers provides its resources under ten headings: the pastor's own ministry, house and home (including the longest section in the whole book, on 'deliverance' - but with proper health warning), 'new life' (peri-natal occasions), relationships, endings and new beginnings, preparation for sacraments, healing and wholeness (including prayers for those suffering from addictions or AIDS), death and bereavement, 'life situations' (including grace at meals - and 'in court'!), and additional resources. This last is the nearest to a rag-bag but interestingly includes 'a simple form of confession and absolution', which in turn has an 'I absolve you' form within it, though an alternative is offered. Some of the interest, at least to this reviewer, derives from the Bishop of Salisbury writing a Foreword to a book containing a totally unauthorized form for confession and absolution (not called, it appears, 'the Reconciliation of a Penitent'), which, when he is being the official liturgist of the Church of England, he knows the lawyers forbid...

COB

Michael Perry, *Bible Prayers for Worship* (Marshall Pickering, 1997, xvi/239pp, pb, £9.99)

This is the book to which I referred in my obituary to Michael Perry in January, quoting there the Foreword I had written earlier (which referred to his being at the cross-roads between life and death). In the event he died before the book went through the press. So I quote here from the Foreword that actually appeared, laying more emphasis upon the contents, and less upon the author:

'There is nothing here which is not the direct text of scripture. It might be argued that there is nothing here that any Christian could not discover for themselves. But when you begin to work through the book I believe you will be struck by three things:

- the enormous range and variety of biblical text used
- the author's instinct for identifying the "grain" of a sentence or passage which enables him to make an accurate division between the call and the response, so enhancing our understanding of the text and our ability to make it our own
- the appropriateness of the passages to the themes they represent—the text make sense both in their original context and to us in our own daily lives. They allow us to acknowledge our own sin, and so reveal to us God's grace.'

PRAXIS GETS FULL-TIME EDUCATION OFFICER

For some years now PRAXIS (a partnership between the Liturgical Commission, the Group for Renewal of Worship and the Alcuin Club) has been providing a programme of training events, day conferences and residential events for leaders of worship, lay and ordained. Now PRAXIS has taken a major step forward in its work, in partnership with the *Institute for Liturgy and Mission (ILM)*, based at *Sarum College, Salisbury*.

Sarum College

Sarum College is an innovative ecumenical centre based in the buildings formerly occupied by Salisbury and Wells Theological College. It provides a variety of different forms of learning at all academic levels. Among the groups using Sarum as a base are the *Institute for Christian Spirituality*, the *Southern Theological Education and Training Scheme (STETS)* and the *Institute for Liturgy and Mission*. Further ecumenical institutes and educational projects are planned.

The Institute for Liturgy and Mission

The aims of the Institute are

- to raise awareness of the central place of pastoral liturgy for the life and mission of the church
- to promote good practice in worship
- to assist and service the various churches in the work of liturgical formation
- to foster ecumenical exchange and co-operation in a way that promotes common understanding while recognising denominational priorities and perspectives

The intention is eventually to have four full-time staff: the Director (a Roman Catholic pastoral liturgist); an Anglican pastoral liturgist; a music specialist; and a specialist in the setting and environment of worship. The Institute is functioning with two members of the team already in post: Fr. Christopher Walsh (the Director), and Robert Fielding, the musical specialist. The Institute aims to provide:

- academic courses (post-graduate level) and opportunities for sabbatical study
- training, research facilities and opportunities for private study
- practical courses and workshops on aspects of worship (eg. making the most of Advent, using the new baptism rites etc.)
- an ecumenical 'basic liturgy' course that can be taught locally
- distance learning materials (including the possibility of liturgical learning on the internet)
- a consultancy service to churches who wish to improve their worship (including the use of Worship Audit).

The Anglican member of staff will also be National Education Officer PRAXIS, with a particular brief to serve the needs of worship education and communion

in the Church of England—a strategically important task given the amount of new worship material expected in the next few years.

PRAXIS National Education Officer

The main problem with the PRAXIS post has been securing the funding. However, enough money has now been found (from various sources) to offer an initial three year contract to Mark Earey, who has been appointed to this post, starting in July 1997. More funding is urgently needed, both to extend the contract to the intended five years, and to cover secondary expenses. If you have suggestions about sources of funding, please contact Sarum College (01722 424800) and ask for the fundraising brochure which gives further details. In the meantime, watch this space for news of how the post develops.

BOOK REVIEWS

Donald C. Gray, *Ronald Jasper: His Life, His Work and the ASB* (SPCK, 1997, x/154pp., hb, £30)

Ronald Jasper chaired the Liturgical Commission from 1964 to 1980, and arguably had a greater formative influence upon the modern liturgical programme of the Church of England than any other person. I sat through virtually every minute of his chairmanship, and can bear testimony to his enormous labours, his happy mixing of patience with impatience in the chair, his own uncompetitive scholarship and his sheer befriending of the members of the Commission in all the informal relationships which were built up.

Well, Ronald passed all his documents to his son, David Jasper, as his literary executor. But the family then entrusted Donald Gray (a member of the Commission himself from 1968 to 1986) with the task of writing Ronald's biography. Ronald was himself a biographer by choice, and often spoke as though he would rather have continued in that trade (to which he contributed notable biographies of Arthur Headlam and George Bell; so I guess that Donald Gray must have had a sense of having to pass a stiff exam—perhaps even with a tinge of *viva* about it!—to satisfy the subject of his venture in biography. The task was also made the odder in that Ronald had already gone brilliantly autobiographical in *The Development of Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980*, and Donald, who had little reason to doubt Ronald's modest veracity, must therefore have wondered how he could render the same story in different words and possibly at greater depth, when the man who had lived inside Ronald's skin all those years obviously knew it all intimately. What Donald does say (and this I don't think an outsider would have guessed) is that Ronald bequeathed to him seventy boxes of materials—'correspondence, memoranda and other significant documents'. I find myself not too surprised, partly because I sent quite a bit of that voluminous correspondence myself, but especially because I knew of Ronald's own desire to get the history of this remarkable liturgical transition properly documented. And the oddities are poetically compounded by Donald's residence at Westminster Abbey being the same house than Ronald occupied in the sixties and early 'seventies, and the thousands of papers returned to be processed in the very room in which so many were originally written.

The story is well told by the author, and might even have been fuller without causing us boredom. Ronald was born in 1917, played the piano for school worship in Plymouth in his teens, helped run a church Scout T roop at much the same time, and took off for Mirfield (actually for the CR hostel in Leeds) at the age of eighteen. The inner life which led to his vocation was apparently not easy to trace sixty years later, though I *think* I have a memory of Kenneth Thompson, Bishop of Sherwood till 1974, saying he had known Ronald first as a server in Plymouth, a stage in the teenager's progress which is not mentioned here.

From Leeds Ronald went to Mirfield itself (and Donald links this with the consecration of the Community Church there—and the tombs of Gore and Frere). Then he went on to Durham for ordination in 1940, known as a promising scholar but not as one with any particular liturgical predilections. He then had six jobs in eight years around the city and county of Durham, married and found an awakening interest in liturgical scholarship. The sixth appointment was to be as incumbent of Stillington, and there he stayed for seven years, and researched the nineteenth century movements and pressures for liturgical change, gained a Leeds B.D. for it, and got it published—and this led on to his editing and publishing Frere's liturgical correspondence. He was thus ready not only for appointment as successor of Exeter cathedral in 1955, but also to be a founder-member of the Liturgical Commission, which convened in December that year.

I am tempted then to add, in Alistair Cook's famous phrase, 'and the rest you know'. Ronald soon became a national and international figure on the liturgical scene, and his public activities are well attested, and (at least by the elderly) easily remembered; and his work towards the ASB is accurately documented in his own account of those years. But no biographer can omit material on those grounds, and the years are faithfully recorded—not only in his early years on the Commission, but the taking over the chairmanship in 1964—and not only his years as Dean of York, but the extraordinary flaming valediction of the South transept being burnt in his last days in office (and I well recall his being up all night, then coming the following evening to the farewell party's members of the Commission (many of them in York for the General Synod) were throwing for him and managing equably to say 'Don't fret—this fire will give the modern craftsman the opportunity to show he is a good match for the medieval one'.

This is a review, but it is a review of Ronald more than of Donald. Of Donald, I must say that I think Ronald would have congratulated him. Of Ronald, I am tempted into telling a Commission story which Donald has suppressed. For many years a certain Dean of a Southern Irish cathedral was the Church of Ireland observer on the Commission; and for all those years he thought he was a voting member and raised his hand for or against when voting or straw-voting was happening; and for all those years Ronald never told him that he had no vote, but simply deducted one from the voting figures according to which way our over-participatory observer had voted. And my own final word would be that Ronald threw a long benign shadow over my own life for upwards of fifteen years, and, without totally losing my independence, I recall with pride and gratitude what it was to walk in that shadow. So thank you, Donald, for Gray's Jasper.

COB