

DIOCESAN REPORTS

It appears that the two-year rota we have run for diocesan reports has now expired. At the meeting of diocesan representatives on 30 September it was agreed that a new two years could be initiated. Certainly NOL went up to twelve pages two years ago in order to ensure there was space for diocesan and other official or semi-official participation. In fact, this has not always worked out. Only half the dioceses have reported in the last two years, and the Liturgical Commission has been dilatory in using its allocated once-a-quarter space (with more if they want it).

So NOL now gives notice to diocesan committees (and I hope to be writing to separate chairpersons or secretaries soon). Can you yourselves identify a month in the next twenty-four when it would be especially appropriate for you to report? You may have a conference, or a motion before your diocesan synod, or some other above-ground activity planned—and thus you should know now when the best time would be. If you can so identify a month (and copy can be received at least up to halfway through a month in our office), then drop a postcard (or a FAX) and bid now for that month. Otherwise I'll be making suggestions soon to you. COB

BRADFORD AND CHILDREN IN COMMUNION

The Bradford Diocesan Synod recently passed the following motion:

That this Synod

1. endorses the conclusions of the report *Communion before Confirmation* (General Synod, 1985), and
2. requests its representatives on the General Synod to bring the following motion there:
"that the General Synod provide regulations under Canon B15A, whereby baptized children can be admitted to communion before confirmation."

The motion, which clearly takes the view that the supposed present activity of the House does not amount to very much, actually targets the place where a change can be made—that is to say, at the point of making regulations in the General Synod. Thus far the House of Bishops has declined to introduce regulations to the Synod, and it will be interesting to see whether a diocesan synod motion can have a better impact than the House of Bishops has so far secured.

Apparently an attempt was made during the debate in the diocesan synod to 'pass to next business' and this was only defeated by 54 votes to 50. However, when the substantive vote was taken, the voting was 62 to 40, with 12 abstentions.

This month's publication . . .

is Spirituality Series no. 47, *The Mystery of Folk Religion*, by Chris Sugden. There is also no. 20 in the Evangelism Series, *Getting Mission onto the Agenda of the Local Church*, by Alison White.

. . . and next month's

is Pastoral Series no. 52, *Joining Europe in 1992*, by Graham Dow, the Bishop of Willesden. There is no Worship Booklet or Liturgical Study in December, as the September Joint Liturgical Study was a double-sized one.

ISSN 0263-7170

30p

Postal Subscription for 1993 £6.00 (by air £8.50 or US\$17)

Editorial Address: St. Mark's Vicarage, 173 Canterbury Street,

Gillingham, Kent ME7 5UA (Tel. 0634-851818 or 855252; Fax 0634-573549)

GROVE BOOKS LIMITED BRAMCOTE NOTTS. NG9 3DS

(Tel: 0602 430786 Fax: 0602 220134)

Printed by Hassall & Lucking Ltd., Cross Street, Long Eaton Nottingham NG10 1HD Tel. (0602) 733292

News of Liturgy

Editor: Colin Buchanan

Issue no. 215

November 1992

Editorial

ORDINATION OF WOMEN AS PRESBYTERS APPROVED

On 11 November at around 4.30 p.m. the General Synod gave Final Approval by the required two-thirds majority in each House to the Measure to provide for the ordination of women as priests or presbyters. The voting was as follows:

	Ayes	Noes
Bishops	39	13
Clergy	176	74
Laity	169	82

What new can be written about this a fortnight after it has happened? It appears that a debate of high standard and considerable dignity, and even mutual concern between opposing groups, made a genuine impact on the world around—in my case this was evidenced by two separate taxi-drivers that evening, both of whom had listened on car radios, and had got more or less inside the debate and had followed it avidly. It is even possible that the debate itself had changed the minds of a handful of lay voters, thus, in effect, changing the result. Certainly the mind of the House of Laity had moved on from its 148-93 vote in July, and if, as is likely, the mind of the Church of England 'out there' has itself been moving by slow stages over all the years since 1975, then it is possible the Final vote this month came at the first point where support for the move was sufficient to make it credible. Of course minds have not moved independently of the decision-making process—it has been the necessity of addressing the question in deaneries and dioceses which has, alongside the burgeoning impact of women deacons, provided the stimulus for the change. But it does look as though that Final Approval came at the first moment in time where all three Houses could give it the two-thirds majorities simultaneously.

It has been basic to the debate throughout that even General Synods can err, and have erred. So, whilst I rejoice that women will now be ordained and enter very fully into the ordinary parochial and pastoral life of the Church of England, I cannot quite affirm that coping-stone of the argument—'it is God's will'. We prayed indeed; people have held out hands to each other across a divide quite wonderfully. I think it certain that opinions will go on changing in favour of the ordination of women: but my judgment is that we should remember that doctrines of orders must be subordinate to our doctrines of God, of salvation, and of the church, and that even mistakes about orders do not of themselves imperil the higher doctrines. There is, in any case, an elusive character to doctrines of ordination—and within the Anglican fold there is wide divergence not only as to the content of such doctrines, but also as to the importance to be assigned to them. On an ecumenical scene—and in the light of scripture—and *sub specie aeternitatis*—there must be an overwhelming provisionality to our beliefs about orders, and we are wise to keep them in proportion.

The press and the other media as I write are awakening to possible moves by those implacably opposed to the ordination of women. It may help to set them out:

- (1) to stay put, bite the bullet, and attempt to 'work the legislation' (which does include many safeguards);
- (2) to stay put and attempt by non-violent opposition to obstruct or even destroy the legislation;
- (3) to stay put and seek peaceably an 'alternative episcopal oversight';
- (4) to leave as individuals, and find refuge in any haven available;
- (5) to leave as a bloc and form a 'continuing Anglican Church';
- (6) to leave as a bloc and associate as a bloc, on some 'Uniate' terms, with the Church of Rome.

All these, of course, as remedies are a theoretical range of options for anglo-catholics. They do not all provide very helpfully for evangelicals who are opposed.

Just for once, Parliament may be a blessing (by ironic accident rather than by the outcome of any recognizable principle . . .). For we now have a space of time for people to consult and pray and consider the options carefully before the final decisions come. It is a time for the majority to stretch out every possible concern for the minority, to love them in Christ, and to seek every possible way that might keep a single Christian fellowship in being without simply shedding cynically the hurt minority. It sounds like squaring the circle, but scripture suggests that even that is well within God's capabilities.

Colin Buchanan

AND IN AUSTRALIA TOO—AND BY COMPARABLE MARGINS

The General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia met on Saturday 21 November in Sydney to debate and decide about 'The Law of the Church of England Clarification Canon 1992'—a Canon which, at the final reading the General Synod was then giving it, would destroy any onruling restraints to the ordination of women which might derive from the Australian Church's ancestry in the laws of the Church of England, and would permit diocesan Canons to inaugurate the ordination of women to the presbyterate. (I hope I've got that right . . .)

At any rate, there were needed in that General Synod also two-thirds majorities in each House of those present and voting, and *their* voting (done by secret ballot) came out as follows:

	<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>	
Bishops	16	4	(2 abstentions noted)
Clergy	67	32	
Laity	69	30	

So it was implemented by majorities very like the English. The major difference was that the opposition came primarily from Sydney evangelicals, not ultramontane anglo-catholics. And the ordinations themselves will follow in a matter of days, probably first in Adelaide.

LITURGICAL NEWCOMERS

We have been sent, what is not strictly liturgical, a brochure which we can hardly resist airing—the Movement against Bats in Churches (MABIC). The literature of this (presumably ecumenical) organization includes extracts from letters from all round the country, the general tenor of which is dissatisfaction with the protection given in law to the bats, as, e.g.:

'It is complete humbug to encourage bat colonies in churches, and a sure way to kill off the congregation . . .'

'One of the churches I am responsible for [the writer is a church architect] has severe death watch beetle in the roof, and every May it used to be fumigated to keep them in check. Then the bats moved in and fumigating was stopped. In the long term, unless a solution is found, the roof of this 15th century church will collapse and the bats will have to go elsewhere.'

The literature so took the eye of the NOL office, that we had to read it six times to be sure it *was* about bats, and not a brilliant allegory about having to tolerate those opposed to the ordination of women when wishing we could be rid of them (not NOL's own sentiments, we hastily add—see editorial above). But the sixth reading has convinced us (with only a modicum of remaining doubt) that the Movement is poker-faced genuine, and not a concealed attack on some other threatened but actually quite well defended species. So those who wish to join battle with bats can write to the secretary of MABIC, Mrs. Catherine Ward, the Rectory, Bale, Fakenham, Norfolk NR21 0QJ.

Michael Sadgrove, the vice-provost of Coventry cathedral, sends us a copy of 'We are all victims', the title of 'A service of prayer and remembrance for those affected by traffic accidents'. The event appears to have been very carefully constructed, from an introduction including road accident statistics and recent headlines on the theme, through a bringing up of baskets of names of victims written on 'autumn-leaves', a dance, the telling of road tragedy stories, prayers and songs (very deliberately crafted), to a final blessing of police and rescue vehicles in the street outside. Is this a first ever? It looks like a most powerful and moving handling of a scourge which outstrips AIDS and drugs tenfold or more . . .

RITE AMBIGUOUS

Anne Barton writes:

On a lighter note, for your amusement and for a small space in NOL should you wish:

'In a discussion of the possible introduction of Rite C, a junior member of our church choir was heard to refer to the 8.00 a.m. BCP Communion at Rite E. The choir had been practising Psalm 57 for Mattins:

"I myself will awake *Right Early*" (Ps. 57.9)'.

THE CHURCHES' COPYRIGHT DIRECTORY

At the end of October the Pratt Green Trust launched The Churches' Copyright Directory as part of the day in Golders Green on the ramifications of copyright law and practice.

Do you admit to being a vandal or a thief? Probably you would not think of defacing a painting, or by-passing your gas-meter; but are you so particular about changing the words of a hymn or photocopying worship songs? Each of the last two examples are offences against intellectual property and so protected by the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. This was the starting point of a most worthwhile day.

Speakers took us through the first five chapters of the Directory, giving us the background explanation and the ethical questions, of the different kinds of copyright (words, typography, music, graphics, literary work), what needs permission or doesn't, and how to set about obtaining it. We were given useful warnings about e.g. storage on disk, and recording on tape for the use of housebound people at home (sometimes allowed without specific permission, sometimes not). There was detailed information about the various denominational hymn books and service books (it pays to be Church of England) and the different liturgical texts and versions of the Bible.

The Directory gives a cursory look at various licensing schemes and publisher practices and introduces the new Stainer & Bell Ltd. licence; in some ways this seems to be an improvement on the Church Copyright Licence in that it has a flat fee, not dependent on the size of the church, and allows photocopying (within certain limitations) which the Church Copyright Licence excludes; C.C.L. covers overhead transparencies but the S&B Licence is available for travelling worship leaders or preachers. There is a useful chapter on weddings and baptisms, especially on making tapes and videos and on performing rights, as well as service sheets.

But five-sixths of the Directory (126pp. A4) consists of the indexes; a list of authorized changes to copyright hymn and song texts, an index of copyright administrators of every hymn and song in over 200 source books. These include *Carols for Today*, *Church Hymnary*, *Faith Folk and Clarity*, *Church Family Worship*, *Mission Praise*, *Anglican Hymn Book*, *New English Hymnal*, *Hymns and Psalms*, *Come and Praise Celebration Hymnal*, *Songs and Hymns of Fellowship*, and give the copyright holder of most items and the sort of terms one can expect; there are twelve categories such as one-time use allowed without application
or for one-time use apply beforehand or within seven days
or a fee payable for one-time use
or literal text is likely to be covered by a licence scheme
or local reproduction not allowed.

All the information given was checked at either July or October 1992, but there is a proviso that publishers and authors may change their practices, and not all sources had been completely cooperative. Assuming that all the information is correct this is a most helpful resource book—its cost is £15 but one copy per parish can be bought at £7.30.

For more information write to Stainer & Bell Ltd., PO Box 110, Victoria House, 23 Gruneisen Road, Finchley, London N3 1DZ or telephone 081 343 3303.

Sarah A. L. James, Rochester

GENERAL SYNOD NOVEMBER 1992

The big news, of course, was about the ordination of women (reported above in my editorial). But a little flurry about membership occurred on the first day. We had two successive diocesan motions which touched on this.

The first, from Birmingham, was designed to end an anomaly about the election of churchwardens. Currently they are chosen by a 'vestry' meeting, a relic of the days when the parishioners met to choose their wardens simply on the basis of residence in the parish, and the Birmingham diocesan synod wanted this changed to spell out that the wardens are appointed by a churchly process—i.e. election by the Annual Church Meeting of those on the Electoral Roll. Astonishing speeches were then made—urging that this access by the world and her husband to the affairs of the Church of England was that which gave *us* the right to have access into the affairs of society around. I sat in ever-widening amazement and finally protested that we were (as so often) invading the realm of fantasy and unreality. It made no difference—Synod rejected the Birmingham motion, and self-righteously told itself it was sustaining its 'establishment' inter-penetration of church and society.

The second flurry highlighted the absurdity of the first. Now we were debating a kindred issue—whether members of other Churches could also pronounce themselves members of the Church of England and sign the application to be on the Electoral Roll. There was fussiness about this—it was apparently harder to have ecumenical membership of the electoral roll than it was to have wordly wardens, or at least a world-shaped franchise for them. But the concept was approved.

We also had pulse-pounding stuff about cathedral fabric, and an electrifying debate (on the 'morning after' the big one) on the future of Theological Colleges, in which the Synod declined even to 'take note' of the report by the working party, which had been published at the wish of the House of Bishops, though the bishops themselves were not all in favour. Three Colleges had been recommended for closure: Oak Hill, Salisbury/Wells and Mirfield. It does not now appear that they will be closed.

SYNODICAL QUESTIONS

The Reverend Malcolm King asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops two questions:

- Q. When can the Synod expect to receive from the House of Bishops proposals for Eucharistic Prayers suitable for use at services with children present?
- Q. When can the Synod expect to receive the proposals from the Liturgical Commission concerning the authorization of some parts of *Patterns for Worship*, including the draft Eucharistic Prayers?

The Bishop of Winchester replied:

- A. Since I am Chairman of the Liturgical Commission I have been asked to reply on behalf of the House. With permission, Mr. Chairman, I will answer Mr. King's two questions together. As reported in the Minutes of its recent meeting, the House has agreed to commend the material in *Patterns for Worship* which does not require formal authorisation. This material is to be published in a second edition of *Patterns of Worship* which will be available next year.

The House also agreed to introduce to the General Synod in February 1993 drafts for a Service of the Word and Affirmations of Faith for consideration under the Liturgical authorization procedures. These drafts are drawn from *Patterns for Worship*. The Liturgical Commission plans to bring proposals for Eucharistic Prayers suitable for use at services where children are present before the House in the course of 1993.

It appears that the material from *Patterns for Worship* which is to gain its authorization by the synodical process (the first texts to do so for ten years) will form 'The Service of the Word', and will be introduced as 'alternative' to Morning or Evening Prayer. This could yet have implications for the requirement in the Canons for Morning and Evening Prayer to be said daily in parish churches, an issue with which the Revision Committee on the Liturgical Canons is wrestling. The text of the draft 'Service of the Word' will be published by Church House Publishing on 15 December.

NOVEMBER 5 WITHOUT FIREWORKS!

The PRAXIS consultation on the future of the Prayer Book tradition, held at St. Peter's Eaton Square, on 5 November was never intended to be secret (and therefore suspicious!), but it was by invitation only in order to ensure a wide and balanced representation of interested parties. As it was, the event was heralded in the press, with full coverage in the *Sunday Telegraph* and *The Times*, and a series of follow-up articles, inspired by it, in the *Independent*.

The meeting was originally to have been a more lowly affair, but PRAXIS allowed it to be hi-jacked by the Liturgical Commission as a setting for its members to meet with representatives of the Prayer Book Society, a dialogue that began when the PBS perceived in *The Worship of the Church* (GS Misc 364) a greater sense of reverence for that tradition and a desire to heal a rift. The Commission was strongly represented on 5 November, and the presence of Philip Mawer and David Silk gave an additional hint of synodical interest. Among the 'professional' liturgists, theological colleges were well represented, as well as those engaged in research, and practitioners in parishes. The Prayer Book Society fielded a strong team that included its chairman, Tony Kilmister, Lord Sudeley, who makes sure the House of Lords retains an interest in liturgical reform, Professor David Martin, who has been consistently articulate in his defence of 'Prayer Book people', and Professor Raymond Chapman, whose eirenic articles written for the Prayer Book Society have contributed to the better spirit now emerging. The House of Commons was represented by Frank Field and Andrew Rowe (apologies from some others), the world of literature by, among others, author Joanna Trollope and her playwright husband, Ian Curteis. And there were others too . . . it was a fascinating gathering. Penelope Lively should have been there, but at the last minute a funeral kept her away. And then there was Baroness (P. D.) James, who, uniquely, is a member of the Commission and of the Prayer Book Society, and, just by being who she is, is helping to facilitate this overdue meeting of minds.

The morning was taken up with four presentations—preceded by a plea for sensitivity from the chair. David Stancliffe looked at the process by which the Church has developed and is developing its liturgy. David Martin talked about the sense of hurt and loss felt by Prayer Book people. Phyllis James echoed this, from the viewpoint of the literary world. Colin

If appropriate, a representative from the candidate's previous post may come forward and commend him/her to the bishop and receiving congregation. Wardens and deanery representatives also stand before the Bishop.

The Bishop (or another) tells the congregation a little of the candidate's background and particular skills, and asks

- the candidate to commit him/herself to the new ministry
- the congregation for their assent
- all present for a promise of support

and invites all to pray for him/her in silence, ending with a collect (prayers in litany form may first be said or sung).

The Bishop invites him/her to take the Declaration and Oaths (unless the latter can be done before the service before suitable witnesses), The Bishop institutes the candidate, reading the Deed and handing it to him/her in the traditional manner, then adding a blessing. It may be appropriate to invite his/her family to come forward for this.

He invites the Archdeacon to Induct him/her (avoiding bogus legalese as much as possible!), either by going to the door or by handing over keys at the chancel step; the bell may be rung. He/she is then installed—led to the seat by the Archdeacon and some or all of the PCC, who stand around; applause may follow . . .

Hymn

Sermon

■CELEBRATION AND COMMITMENT TO SHARED MINISTRY (INCORPORATION)

Members of the parish and their new minister may determine the form this takes, to reflect their particular situation (and the nature of the building—processions around the 'furniture' do not work well in small churches). The emphasis is on (a) welcoming the new minister to 'be among us' (b) to enable all to take their proper part in the work and witness of the church. The people may present symbols of aspects of ministry, which are placed together before the people; for instance:

- a bible for preaching and study
- water and light for baptism
- oils for healing and anointing
- bread and wine for the eucharist (suitably worded for deacons)
- a white stole or a prayer book for marriage
- a wooden cross for funerals
- papers and documents for administration

It ends with the new minister inviting the people to share in the ministry of prayer for and with him, and leading them in the Lord's Prayer and other suitable prayers.

Notices and collection hymn

■COMING AND GOING IN PEACE . . .

The service ends with the Bishop and the new minister greeting each other, and representatives coming forward with their particular greetings (unscripted)—they may add further tokens or symbols of ministry. The new minister invites all to share the peace, and to continue the exchange of peace over refreshments. The Bishop blesses the congregation.

Recessional hymn

Having said this, the book has in its defence that it has restored prayer at noon and night to a more central position in the scheme of things. Morning and evening prayer do not reign supreme any longer. The scripture readings are considerably shortened compared with the ASB but there is still a theological problem, for on page 683 we are told that the readings etc. are 'the heart of the Office'. Not before the fourth century, they are not. What is so special about this period of time? (Similarly, the compilers have reintroduced the lamp-lighting custom of the fourth century, and this is no doubt a good thing in that it brings action and symbolism into the Office, but they will insist on linking it with Jewish lamp-lighting ceremonies as a custom which can be traced back to the first Jewish Christians). This is historical fantasy worthy of *Carry on, Columbus*.

If intercession were an integral part of the early daily office, you would never guess it from this book. There *may* be open prayer, but such a practice is relegated to a note on page 2. This is a regrettable omission, as I will indicate below.

From an historian's point of view, this book is very disappointing. You may well want to say 'so what?' However, I believe that the history of the Daily Office has much to teach us about how we may recover daily prayer in the contemporary church. This book will help some people to make that rediscovery, but I fear that its lack of a fuller historical awareness may be the very thing which stops it being helpful to other.

Charles Read

INSTITUTION SERVICES

[The proposals of Michael Ainsworth follow—the opening notes were published last month.]

•PREPARATION

Processional hymn

Words of welcome

A liturgical greeting, then the Bishop welcomes the congregation, mentioning particular groups; he explains that we are gathered to celebrate the ongoing life and ministry of the parish/team or a group/chaplaincy, and as part of that to install a new minister set apart for that purpose. All pray in silence for a time, and he says a collect for the whole church.

•THE SETTING OF THE NEW MINISTRY (SEPARATION)

One or two readings, which may be interspersed with a hymn or songs

Thanksgiving for the life of the parish

A brief presentation about the parish—its size and nature, activities, hopes and problems—may be given by members of the congregation or other ministers in the parish/team; this could be done in dialogue or interview form, but should be carefully prepared.

The Area Dean or another then offers prayers of thanksgiving for the parish, including for past ministers and those who have ministered during the vacancy. (This could include said or sung congregational responses.)

A hymn may follow.

•THE PRESENTATION OF THE NEW MINISTER (LIMINALITY)

The Bishop invites the patron (by name, explaining if necessary who is making the presentation and why) to present the candidate; he leads the candidate forward and says suitable words.

James looked to the possible future course of liturgical revision. All of them, unusually, had written down a good deal of what they wanted to say, and that has meant that it will not be too difficult to gather the contributions for publication, and I think a booklet will appear next year containing these four contributions.

After too short a time to reflect in smaller groups on what had been said, we moved into the church for a midday office, where Prayer Book, *Celebrating Common Prayer* and newer material still was mixed in together, and the BCP Jubilate was sung to Anglican chant, while the prayer had a Taizé chant, and nobody seemed to be unchurched! A good lunch then led into a final plenary session that was lively and marked by a genuine desire to build on the day. The Commission will have the matter on its agenda in December, so that the new opportunity is not lost.

It was very friendly day. What was said was not all bland, as if all we had to do was to smile at one another and the problems would evaporate. People did voice their deeply held convictions, but there was a genuine charity to the conversation that has sometimes seemed lacking. To my way of thinking, that made the day a success. There is a lot of tough talking to be done, and it can't be done in an atmosphere where everyone is bending over backwards to be polite and conciliatory, but I don't believe that stage can be tackled until there is less sense of threat and less mistrust. I think people came away understanding one another a little better, and with genuine mutual respect. I believe the Church can build on that. Although some in all camps will take time to discover that there has been a ceasefire, my hope is that very soon the sniping will stop.

Michael Perham

BCP BEYOND 2000?

In early November the press rumbled the news of an engagement between PRAXIS people and Prayer Book Society ones (I was not at the day, but Michael Perham reports it just above in this issue). In the course of the advance speculation, I was rung up by Ruth Gledhill of *The Times* and was asked my views. Amongst the other (typically very tentative) opinions I permitted myself to express, I did say something like 'Look round our Theological Colleges: you will need a microscope to spot one ordinand who seriously intends to use the Prayer Book beyond the year 2000.' I never saw *The Times'* column which quoted this remark, but some students at Wycliffe Hall did. They wrote to *The Times* (again I never saw whether they published the letter or not), and sent me a copy. It ran as follows:

Dear Sir,

We refer to your article 'Praying for Divine guidance' (*Times* 4 November). As ordinands training for ministry in the Church of England we should like to clarify our position in response to Bishop Colin Buchanan's reported statement:

'You would need a microscope to find one ordinand in the theological colleges who intends to use Prayer Book services after the year 2000.'

If Bishop Buchanan means that there are few ordinands who see the future of Anglican corporate worship in England solely in terms of the Book of Common Prayer, he is most probably right. However, we at least can envisage a balance of traditional and modern liturgies beyond 2000, with a proper emphasis on using language which is understandable to those outside the church.

In our future ministry we shall attempt to seek God's will concerning how best to lead His people, in any given locality, in worship which is 'in spirit and truth, for they are the kind of worshippers the Father seeks' (John 4.23). If the true, spiritual worship of a Christian community (or part of it) involves use of the Prayer Book, according to God's will and the wishes of His people, then it will be our role as their servants to say, with enthusiasm, 'Amen'—'so be it'.

Yours faithfully,
Richard Samuelson (and 18 other students
at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford)

I in turn replied to them to say that I had not denied that which they were asserting—for a courteous residual use of 1662 (especially in Old Folks' Homes etc.) may well be appropriate in the occasional place, and I would not want to forecast a blank refusal to be of help in such a case. I view that as a different matter from having a positive intention to put the BCP in the forefront of one's ministry. Anyway, I have undertaken to exclude 19 students of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, from any future such remarks I make—but closer examination suggests that we are but a hairsbreadth apart from each other in any case. *They* are not afraid of future changes—I am not insensitive to the past (I hope).

COB

Review Article

CELEBRATING COMMON PRAYER: A LITURGICAL HISTORIAN WRITES

There have been tremendous advances in the study of the development of the Daily Office in the past twenty years. The old view, propagated by Dugmore's important book *The Influence of the Synagogue on the Daily Office* was that first century Judaism had a fixed system of frequent and corporate daily prayer and that the textual content of such services were easily identifiable. The early church took over this pattern and developed it over the centuries into the seven monastic hours of prayer. The scheme of development was relatively simple, neat, straightforward and came to be the standard accepted view. New Testament text books still hold this view (because New Testament scholars are usually ignorant of developments in liturgical scholarship).

In 1981, Paul Bradshaw published *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* which blew apart Dugmore's neat and simple theory. First century Jewish prayer was seen to be a highly complex and diverse activity. The early Christians may not have taken over Jewish practice (whatever it was) quite so easily as Dugmore thought. The Anglican obsession with the idea that reciting Psalms is the backbone of the Office dating back to the apostles was shown to be an illusion. Psalmody only really made it into the Daily Office in the fourth century. The idea that all faithful Christians met together three times a day to say the Office was revealed as wishful thinking. Indeed common sense suggests that if the early church consisted of large numbers of slaves, then it would be very difficult for the Christian assembly to come together on such a regular basis.

Bradshaw's book is largely a piece of historical research, but he ends with some pointers for the future of the Daily Office in current practice.

1. No specific time of prayer can claim supreme authority or antiquity over all the others. Morning and evening prayer are not as ancient as

used to be thought. Night and noon have an equal claim for consideration in this respect. Above all else, the theological understanding of the early Christians was that unceasing prayer was more to do with unbroken communion with God rather than specific and frequent *times* of prayer. To quote Bradshaw: 'Set hours of prayer are not so much an obligation imposed on us as a guide and aid towards the practice of ceaseless prayer'.

2. Perhaps the major characteristic of early Christian daily devotion was that of prayer, especially intercession. Yet the classic Office has Psalmody as its major element. This is another example of originally secondary elements in a liturgy growing to the point where they displace what was originally the heart of the service.
3. Similarly, scripture readings are not a major and ancient part of the office. Like the Psalms, they came into use largely through monasticism. Bradshaw identifies three ways of using the Bible in the Daily Office:

Didactic—the orderly study of the Bible in some sort of sequence so that people become familiar with its content. (This is the use in the ASB Offices).

Kerymatic—used to express and interpret the significance of the occasion which is being celebrated and to elicit a response from the congregation.

Paracletic—texts chosen because they are appropriate to the individual spiritual needs of the congregation (as opposed to fitting for the occasion).

Changing circumstances mean that the didactic use of scripture in the Daily Office is probably inappropriate—we now have Bible study groups and so on for these purposes. Bradshaw's analysis would lead us to ask questions about what the function of Bible readings is in the Daily Office.

How does *Celebrating Common Prayer* match up with this historical research? At first sight this new book is another in the ASB mould, repeating all the misunderstandings of the classic Anglican approach to the office. The question arises as to which section of the history of the Daily Office is to be our model for redesigning the Office Today? On page 677, in the essay accompanying the texts in the book, we read: 'Daily prayer, offered by the whole Christian community, was an important feature of the early life of the Church. Such prayer consisted of only a relatively small number of Psalms and Canticles'. This is an improvement on suggesting that there should be lots of Psalms and Canticles in the Office, but it seems to focus on the fourth century as its historical model. Seen in the light of the first three centuries, almost every item in the quotation above can seriously be questioned. Thus the issue raised is how we use our knowledge of the development of liturgy which we create liturgies to help people to worship today.

What would a Daily Office look like which was based on the theological principles of the church before Constantine? *Celebrating Common Prayer* appears to adopt a 'lumpers' approach to liturgical history rather than the 'splitters' approach which the research of Bradshaw, and many others, would now indicate is appropriate.