



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

AUSTRALIAN
JOURNAL OF
LITURGY

Volume 3 Number 2 October 1991

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 1990-91

PRESIDENT:	The Revd Dr Russell H. Hardiman
PAST PRESIDENT:	The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood
SECRETARY/TREASURER:	The Revd Ronald L Dowling
EDITOR OF AJL	The Revd R. Wesley Hartley
STATE REPRESENTATIVES:	
NSW	Sister Judith Foster SGS
QLD	The Revd Dr Thomas W. Elich
SA	The Revd Dirk van Dissel
TAS	The Revd Dr Anthony M. Floyd
VIC	The Revd Joseph Doolan
WA	The Revd Dr Russell H. Hardiman

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMY

Admission to the Academy is open to persons of demonstrated competence in liturgical studies and to specialists in allied areas who contribute to the understanding of worship in a significant way.

The Academy consists of:

- a) **Members**, who have gained recognised qualifications or have otherwise demonstrated their competence in the field of liturgical studies and related areas, and
- b) **Associates**, who evidence a developing contribution to the field of liturgical studies and related areas.

Applications for membership are invited and should be made on an Application Form available from the Secretary,

The Revd R.L. Dowling
St. Mary's Rectory
9 Ridge Street
South Perth WA 6151

The annual membership fee (payable by members and associates) is \$30.00; or \$40.00 for married couples. The membership fee includes subscription to *AJL*.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 3 Number 2 October 1991

R. WESLEY HARTLEY
EDITOR

JOHN BAUMGARDNER
GRAHAM HUGHES
THOMAS KNOWLES SSS
ASSISTANT EDITORS

AJL is the journal of the Australian Academy of Liturgy and exists to further the study of liturgy at a scholarly level and to comment on and provide information concerning liturgical matters with special reference to Australia.

AJL is published each May and October.

ISSN 1030-617X

CONTENTS

A Eucharistic prayer for a church in time of decision-making <i>Elizabeth Smith</i>	53
Liturgy of Farewell <i>Russell Joyce</i>	63
Richard Hooker and the Eucharist <i>Elizabeth Smith</i>	67
News and Information	78
Communications	90
Contributors	92

EDITORIAL

Two examples of applied liturgics begin this issue of AJL. The Revd Elizabeth Smith writes from an academic context and Fr Joyce writes from a parish context, but both apply liturgical principles to particular situations. The articles give us both the finished product of their work and an accompanying rationale. It is good to have these reports and I would welcome further examples of applied liturgics for publication.

Liturgists need to be aware, of course, of the tradition of the church in order to be able to create good contemporary liturgy. The second article by Ms Smith, 'Richard Hooker on the Eucharist', is an example of the study of the tradition as an aid to understanding current issues.

The northern summer seems to be the season for international conferences. It is convenient for those in the northern hemisphere, while southerners welcome the chance to escape the rigours of winter. In welcoming participants to the Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Toronto (see my report) Archbishop Michael Peers, Primate of Canada, noted that many Anglicans today regret the replacement of the *Book of Common Prayer* by contemporary liturgies, in part because they perceive it to have been the 'glue' which held the Anglican Communion together. However, he quoted Archbishop Desmond Tutu's suggestion that the Anglican Communion has many 'glues', and the first of them is that Anglicans meet and are committed to meeting again and again.

But not only Anglicans do it. Methodists do it (see Mr Gribben's report on the World Methodist Council); liturgists do it (see Dr Elich's report on *Societas Liturgica*); and even liturgical linguists do it (Mr Gribben again, on the English Language Liturgical Consultation). The analogy of glue is not meant to suggest that these were 'sticky' meetings. Rather, it points to the importance of meetings for keeping us together in pursuing the liturgical task. And the liturgical task is one which, by its very nature, we must do together.

I am grateful to Elizabeth Smith for providing two articles for this issue. I would not normally include in one issue two articles by the same author, but I had nothing else available for this issue. Writing on liturgy *is* being done in Australia (see Mr Pidwell's report on studies at Melbourne College of Divinity for some examples) but not much of it is reaching AJL. To my much-repeated request that readers of AJL become writers for AJL I now add the request that those who know of people doing liturgical writing tell them about AJL and give them my address (see inside back cover).

A EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
FOR A CHURCH IN TIME OF DECISION-MAKING
Elizabeth J. Smith

The Pastoral Context

There are many times in the life of a Christian community when important decisions need to be made: discerning goals, choosing ministers, making and implementing ministry plans, determining mission priorities. All Christian decision-making should be enfolded in prayer. Sometimes it will be right for this prayer to take the form of the eucharist. It is for those times that I have written the prayer that is the subject of this paper.

The Liturgical Context

My primary liturgical loyalty is to the Australian Anglican church, and *An Australian Prayer Book* (approved in 1978) is therefore my point of departure in approaching this prayer. I aim to balance patterns that Australian Anglicans will recognise, with elaborations that will be acceptable to a reasonably broad range of sensibilities.

The Linguistic Context

It is in the linguistic context that I have allowed myself most latitude for personal idiosyncrasy. A first priority in writing this prayer has been that the language should be inclusive. In fact, 'gender-neutral' would be the more accurate term; while I use no masculine language either for God or for the people of God, neither does this prayer use distinctively feminine words or imagery. A second priority has been to avoid some of the more tired vocabulary and phraseology of some eucharistic prayers. The language here is still mainly biblical and mono- or bi-syllabic, but it has been chosen with an ear to rhythms of speech and patterns of alliteration and assonance, as well as theological accuracy and, I hope, some freshness of expression.

I am not aware of any consciously 'Australian' flavour to the language of the prayer. Perhaps some of the sentence-structure may reflect Australian speech patterns, but the prayer has a dearth of concrete imagery capable of evoking distinctively Australian landscape, habits or dreams. This probably makes the prayer relatively culture-neutral, as well as gender-neutral.

The Biblical Context

Choosing scripture on which to reflect for this prayer, I began with the assumption that God does in fact intend the church to be able to make decisions

that will be in conformity to God's will, however gloomy we may initially be about the prospect of success. I also assume that we will be held accountable for our decisions; that the process of discernment is likely to effect some transformation in our being, as well as determining our future actions; and that the tension involved in making decisions is better acknowledged than glossed over.

With these assumptions in mind, the portions of scripture with which I began were Isaiah 65, Psalm 81, Hebrews 12, and Luke 12.49-13.35. It would be possible, though not necessary, to include parts of some of these passages as the lections at a eucharist where this prayer was to be used. The next step is to become immersed for a time in the language and imagery of the chosen passages, and to identify forms of address for God, descriptions of the human condition, things to be thankful for, and things for which we might pray in the given context. Once these are listed, choices can be made about which of them can best be shaped into the prayer.

At this stage, other resources tend to insinuate themselves into the process as well, being suggested both by other parts of scripture and by life experience. These possibilities should be welcomed rather than suppressed. Perhaps there is a parallel here with the church's decision-making process: our discussions will undoubtedly unearth as many new questions, as answers to old ones, and our best decisions will be those which are informed by as broad a range of input as possible. So will our best prayers be those which are open to the contributions of many forms of wisdom.

The Wider Pool of Resources

The point at which my prayer diverges most in form from the mainstream of the tradition is in the manner of its expression of the trinitarian structure of a eucharistic prayer. The institution narrative and the epiclesis are addressed to 'you, our brother, Jesus' and 'Holy Spirit,' respectively, while the prayer as a whole is clearly offered to 'our faithful God,' understood as the first person of the Trinity.

In this diversion I have been influenced by the work of Janet Morley, in her book *All Desires Known*.¹ That collection includes four eucharistic prayers, which are notable for several reasons. They are remarkable for their brevity: they are set out on the page in short sense-lines, and the prayer for ordinary use is under 60 lines long, and that for Easter is just 50 lines long, excluding opening dialogue. They are unapologetic in their naming of women in the body of the prayer; for example, the Sanctus is characteristically introduced in this way:

Therefore, with the woman who gave you birth,
the women who befriended you and fed you,
who argued with you and touched you,
the woman who anointed you for death
the women who met you, risen from the dead,
and with all your lovers throughout the ages,
we praise you, saying:...²

Most significantly for my purposes, the epiclesis in Morley's prayers is consistently addressed directly to the Holy Spirit. Thus, in the prayer for ordinary use:

Come then, life-giving spirit of our God,
brood over these bodily things,
and make us one body with Christ...³

After having thus sketched consecratory and communion epicleses, Morley continues the prayer without shifting the address from the Spirit back to the person addressed at the outset of the prayer (in her case, 'Eternal Wisdom.')

What impresses me in Morley's work is how economically it is possible to invoke the Spirit when the prayer is bold enough to address her directly, rather than asking indirectly, by requesting the first person of the Trinity to send the Spirit along. Certainly, tradition — deriving from the days before Trinitarian formulations had been fully elaborated in the fourth century — has us normatively praying to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit; but there is also ancient precedent for addressing the Spirit directly. I found that I could include epiclesis material with a much better flow if I chose the direct address at this point. It was also natural to include in this paragraph of the prayer, still addressing the Spirit, the petitions for guidance in the decision-making process. Of the Persons of the Trinity, it is to the Spirit of Truth that Christians naturally turn when in need of gifts of discernment.

This decision had some unforeseen consequences for the Words of Institution. Again, Morley's style had an initial influence. She introduces the Institution Narrative in her prayers with what is close to a *berakah* form; for example, in the prayer for Pentecost:

Blessed is our brother Jesus,
who comes behind the doors we have closed,
and breathes on our fear his fearful peace;
who, on the night that he was betrayed...⁴

She continues with the Institution Narrative in traditional form.

It seemed to me that it might complement the direct address to the Spirit in the epiclesis, if Jesus were also to be addressed directly in this earlier part of the

prayer. It thus begins: Blessed are you, our brother, Jesus... It also has the effect of replacing the masculine pronouns applying to Jesus (he took... he broke... he gave...) with second-person, gender-neutral pronouns. It seems no more incongruous to be reminding Jesus himself of what he said in the upper room, than to be reminding the Father of the same words.

Historical precedent for an institution narrative addressed to Christ is not completely lacking. The Third Anaphora of the Apostle Peter, which is probably of similar parentage to the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, has an extensive portion of the prayer addressed to Christ. It should also be noted that many of the traditional acclamations of the people at various points in the celebration of the eucharist are addressed to Christ: 'Lord, have mercy, Christ have mercy....,' the Gospel acclamations, 'Jesus, Lamb of God, have mercy on us....,' and, in some Eastern prayers, the memorial acclamations within the eucharistic prayer. Some writers speak of a 'principle that has developed over the ages, of the congregation praying to Christ, while the presider prays to God the Father.'⁵ But I consider that a more important principle is the one which states that the whole eucharistic prayer belongs to the people; this would rule out applying one channel of prayer to the people while allowing the presider a more 'direct access' to the 'real' target of the prayer, 'God the Father.' It would therefore follow that if it is appropriate for the people to pray to Christ in the midst of the eucharistic prayer, by way of response or acclamation, it is at least possible for the priest to do so. This historical reasoning is offered as support for a decision initially made in this prayer for theological and aesthetic reasons.

At this point the prayer may speak for itself, and we may then resume a closer examination of its language and theology.

A Eucharistic Prayer for a Church in Time of Decision-Making

Lift up your hearts!

We lift them up to God.

Let us give thanks to our faithful God!

It is right to give God thanks and praise.

- 5 With expectancy and trust, we give you thanks, O God,
for you are unfolding pattern and purpose in all creation,
seducing chaos into beauty by your word,
and dissolving barren order into endless possibility.
In mystery, you invite us to question and explore,
- 10 to long for truth,
and to love the search for understanding.

You have given us freedom to choose our paths
and you bear with us in all our haste and hesitation.
Although we closed our hearts and would not listen,
15 you spoke a living, active word into our deepest need;
you have shaken our certainties and called us to account.
You sent your servant, Jesus,
to teach us to listen and live.
When we chose death, he died to overturn our wisdom;
20 you gave him back, alive, to be our hope.
And so, with the great cloud of witnesses,
with prophets and poets and all of your passionate friends,
we praise you, living God:

Holy, holy, holy,
25 **God of grace and truth,**
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is the one who comes in the name of our God.
Hosanna in the highest.

30 Blessed are you, our brother, Jesus,
for on the night before you died
you shared a meal with the friends you had chosen.
While they were eating, you took a loaf of bread,
and after blessing it you broke it,
35 gave it to them, and said,
Take; this is my body.
Then you took a cup, and after giving thanks you gave it to them,
and all of them drank from it.
You said to them,
40 This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.
Whenever you do this, do it in remembrance of me.
Christ has died,
Christ is risen,
Christ will come again.

45 And now, O God, we do remember Jesus,
who showed us love, who shared our death,
who lives for us a glorious life,
and gives us the Spirit of truth.

Come, Holy Spirit, with love and power;
50 breathe heavenly life into this bread and wine,
and make us one body as we share the gifts of Christ.
Bless your holy people with wisdom and courage,
so that we may be able to interpret the present time,
to judge what is right, and to do it.
55 In our uncertainty, guide your church;
when we fail to honour you, change us;
in our willingness to serve you, use us.

Hear and receive us, faithful God;
we look to your promises that cannot be shaken,
60 and we offer you this, our acceptable worship,
with reverence and awe,
a sacrifice of praise through Jesus Christ our Saviour,
in the communion of the Holy Spirit.

Blessing and honour and glory and power
65 **are yours for ever and ever. Amen.**

Notes for a closer reading of the prayer

The dialogue in lines 1-4 has been adapted from prayer book forms in two ways: masculine pronouns and the term 'Lord' have been replaced with the word 'God;' and a qualifier, 'faithful,' has been linked with the name of God. This follows Isaiah 65.16:

Whoever invokes a blessing in the land
shall bless by the God of faithfulness,
and whoever takes an oath in the land
shall swear by the God of faithfulness...

This is a unifying term for the prayer as a whole, and is recalled in line 58, leading into the final doxology.

Line 5 opens with an expression of the disposition of the community at prayer. 'Expectancy and trust' hint that there is something more we are hoping for, and that our faith encourages us to pray for, even as we begin to give thanks for what we have already received from God. The theology here is that God has a track record of benevolent creativity; the church remembers this thankfully, in order to begin making new requests for guidance. Lines 6 to 12 express various

aspects of God's creative work, with a particular emphasis on God's ordering of the world (a good basis upon which to request, later, God's new ordering of the life of the church at this time). Creativity as disordering (line 9) is also mentioned, because it will be important for people in a time of decision-making to recognise that God's activity may also be discerned in matters that are not arranged neatly and tidily. Our clinging to familiar patterns may be an impediment to God's helping us choose well, in a world where there is more variety than we often care to contemplate.

Human free will and responsibility are highlighted here both as God's gifts, and also as a source of sin. 'Our haste and hesitation,' through which God has borne with us in the past, is an encapsulation of much of the emotion that surfaces in times of decision-making; we both need and fear the choices that we face. That we may have confidence in God's patience with us at such times is also promised by Isaiah 65:

I said, 'Here I am, here I am,'
to a nation that did not call on my name.

I held out my hands all day long to a rebellious people...

Circumlocutions for the technical term, 'sin,' are found in lines 14 and 19: sin is the closing of human hearts, the refusal to listen, and the choice of death. In this context, descriptions of redemption will be the reopening of human living, the word which is heard, and the upsidedown wisdom of the cross as Jesus chose it. The language of the letter to Hebrews comes in here, with echoes of 4.12-13:

The word of God is living and active... all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account...

and 12.27:

the removal of what is shaken — that is, created things — so that what cannot be shaken may remain.

At the bridge to the *Sanctus* acclamation in lines 21-23, rather than joining with 'patriarchs, prophets and apostles,' here, I have chosen some less predictable but equally alliterative categories of participants in the heavenly chorus, describing the latter in terms of Hebrews 12.1-2. 'Living God' in line 23 is another epithet for God characteristic of the epistle to Hebrews.

The text of the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus qui venit* have been rendered more gender-inclusive and less hierarchical by the substitution of 'grace and truth' for 'power and might,' the use of 'God' for 'Lord,' and the now common 'the one who comes' in place of 'he who comes.'

Line 30 begins the bridge into the institution narrative with the *berakah* form, addressing Jesus, as explained above. The words of institution are from Mark's

account of the supper as translated in the New Revised Standard Version. Line 41, the command to 'do this,' is a simplified condensation of Luke's and Paul's tradition at this point. The acclamation, **Christ has died...** provides a break in the flow of the prayer, facilitating the return to addressing 'God' rather than Jesus at the next paragraph.

In this anamnesis, the emphatic 'we do remember...' is an attempt to do more briefly and less didactically what AAPB attempts with its studious avoidance of anamnestic language.⁶ What we have been commanded to do, we are doing! Jesus himself is the subject of each subsequent clause in this paragraph, and monosyllabic verb-noun combinations replace polysyllabic, technical nouns such as 'redemption,' 'sacrifice,' 'resurrection,' 'ascension.' The inclusion of the giving of the Spirit as part of the anamnesis in line 48 provides the bridge into the next paragraph, where epiclesis and intercession will be found.

The epiclesis finds us asking the Spirit to 'breathe' life 'into' bread and wine. Perhaps this is a slightly odd proposition, but the Johannine language is congruent with the 'spiritual' nature of the change being effected — nothing added, nothing removed, but bread and wine undergoing a heavenly change for us.

In line 51 the petition for the unity of the people is closed with 'the gifts of Christ,' a circumlocution for 'the body and blood of Christ.' *An Australian Prayer Book* never refers to the bread and cup as body and blood after the words of institution. My own feeling is that the use of 'body' and 'blood' in our rehearsal of Jesus' own words, and in the words of administration as people receive the communion, is sufficient witness to our understanding of the direction of God's action in the sacrament. We do not have to give God minutely detailed instructions as to what element is to become what aspect of the sacrament. The urge to say as much as possible about what is going on is, perhaps, the vestige of a didactic impulse towards the faithful, rather than a doxological impulse towards God.

Lines 53 and 54 contain key images from Luke 12.56-57: interpreting the times, and judging what is right. Together with an echo of John 13.17 ('if you know these things, you are blessed if you do them') this sentence constitutes the heart of the intercession. The next few lines (55-57) contain three symmetrically constructed petitions, each pairing an aspect of the church's situation with what the church is asking of God.

The next paragraph resumes the address to the 'faithful God' of the opening dialogue. God is asked to 'hear and receive us,' a grammatical inversion of traditional offering-language which tends to make God the indirect object of verbs whose subject is the worshippers.⁷ The language of this paragraph is taken

very directly from Hebrews 12.27-28 and 13.15. Its strong biblical flavour and relatively familiar terminology should have a reassuring effect as the prayer draws to a close. Full trinitarian honours are given in lines 62-63. The closing acclamation is based on Revelation 5.13, via *An Australian Prayer Book*.

Conclusion

A eucharistic prayer, however 'relevant,' is not on its own enough to help a congregation pray through its decision-making process. If a simple eucharist were scheduled, using this prayer, for, let us say, a vestry day conference where priorities for outreach were to be decided, considerable supplementary planning would be needed. The leader would ask two or three of the parishioners involved to choose some scripture readings, and perhaps one hymn, probably to the Holy Spirit. One of the conference planning team would be asked to take the day's agenda, and with the bible readings in mind, to tailor a set of prayers of the people to be used at the celebration. The eucharistic prayer itself is deliberately general in its thanks and petitions; the people in the group must articulate as specifically as they can the particular needs and choices facing the community, and the intercessions are the place for this to happen. The group might choose to celebrate the eucharist in the room where the discussion and decision-making were to take place. But, apart from the variant eucharistic prayer itself and the other elements that necessarily vary from eucharist to eucharist, I envisage such a celebration of the eucharist being very familiar to those participating. This is hardly an occasion for 'experimental' worship; people need the security of relatively familiar forms when they are planning to make decisions that will change their ways of living and working together.

It would also be extremely important to schedule time at the end of the day, when decisions have been finally made, a simple prayer time, in which the group could give thanks to the faithful God for persevering with them through this time of choosing and making commitments. It would then be appropriate to pray again to the Holy Spirit for strength and courage to carry out the decisions that have been made.

NOTES

1. Janet Morley, *All Desires Known* (Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1988) (originally published in Great Britain by the Movement for the Ordination of Women.)
2. *ibid.*, p. 36.

3. loc cit.

4. *ibid.*, pp. 44-45,

5. Dennis C. Smolarski SJ, *Eucharistia: A Study of the Eucharistic Prayer*, New York: Paulist Press, 1982, p.63.

6. 'Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded;
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us;
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice
made once for all upon the cross,
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.'
(*An Australian Prayer Book* p. 147)

7. In terms of sentence structure, this is the difference between 'We offer you these things' and '[you] receive these people.' My opinion is that the latter formulation, implying the self-offering of the people rather than any offering of bread or wine or body or blood, is the fullest, and least strained notion of eucharistic sacrifice still accessible to most contemporary worshippers. It is in the tradition of the post-communion prayer in *An Australian Prayer Book* with its line, 'we offer ourselves to you as a living sacrifice...' (*AAPB* p. 151.)

PATTERNS OF PARTICIPATION

an interdisciplinary study

Australian Academy of Liturgy Conference 1992

Redemptorist Retreat House, Perth, WA

Monday 3 to Friday 7 February, 1992.

PLAN TO BE THERE.

Enquiries:

The Reverend Dr Russell Hardiman

49 Hesse Street

Waroona WA 6215

LITURGY OF FAREWELL

Russell S. Joyce

There is within us all a need to celebrate the significant events of our lives, be it a birthday or anniversary, a marriage or a death. It is often useful to be able to express in more than words the importance of these events. It is the same within the church. Events are celebrated in both words and symbols by the worshipping community which express the importance of that event in their lives. Most of our traditions have a liturgical service or ceremony to celebrate the commencement of a new ministry. This is not just within the parish situation but many sector ministries also celebrate a new beginning of ministry.

Within the Anglican tradition the service of Induction and Institution of a priest into a new parish seems to be growing in importance, and many would welcome this as a significant liturgical occasion. The older style service of induction had within it the symbolic action of handing over the church keys to the new vicar, and the ringing of the church bell. There was even a tradition which said that the number of rings of the bell on that occasion would mark the number of years of ministry within that parish!

With all the celebrating of the beginning of a ministry, it seems that the issue of ending a pastoral relationship has not been well covered by our liturgical committees. Some recent services have been produced which liturgically mark the leaving of parishioners, but very little to mark the end of a priest's pastoral relationship.

I was faced with this issue when I came to leave a parish and move to my present position a few months ago. I consulted a number of books and journals but little was available, so why not create and adapt? There was, I believed, a need to mark my leaving of the parish in a liturgical way (as well as the traditional Anglican tea and biscuit and speech of well-done), to provide an opportunity for thanksgiving, for the acknowledgement of hurts, and for grieving (both priest and people). There also needed to be a symbolic statement which clearly said that this ministry had now ended, in the same manner in which a bishop on retirement lays his pastoral staff on the altar.

Recent services celebrating inductions and institutions are full of symbolic actions — handing over of bible for proclaiming the Word; prayer book to lead in worship and prayer; water to baptise; stole as a symbol of pastoral ministry; bread and wine to celebrate the eucharist with the people of God. As symbols have played such a part in the beginning of ministry so I believe they should also be part of a liturgy which concludes a pastoral relationship.

The Vicar hands the keys of the church, together with the Service Register, to the Churchwardens and says

I return to your care the Service Register and keys of this parish church.

A hymn may be sung

At the conclusion of the hymn all kneel. The Vicar standing before the altar blesses the people and parish for the final time.

May God, who has led us in the paths of justice and truth, lead us still and keep us in his ways.

May God, whose Son has loved us and given himself for us, love us still, and establish us in peace.

May God, whose Spirit unites us and fills our hearts with joy, illumine us still, and strengthen us for the years to come.

And the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be amongst you and remain with you always. **Amen.**

The people still kneeling, the Vicar kneels in silent prayer before the altar. He then removes his chasuble and stole, the symbols of his pastoral ministry, lays them on the altar, and says

Go in peace to love and serve the Lord.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

Note

The litany is based on the one by Henry L.M. Myers, in *The Wilderness of God's Mercy, Litanies to enlarge our prayer*, volume 1, Prayers for the Church, ed. Jeffrey W. Rowthorn, p 211 (Seabury Press).

RICHARD HOOKER AND THE EUCHARIST

Elizabeth J. Smith

In closing his Learned Discourse on Justification, preached as a sermon in 1585, Richard Hooker exhorts his hearers not to be too anxious when theologians differ in their judgments on 'doubtful cases.' He says, 'Be it that Cephas hath one interpretation and Apollos hath another, that Paul is of this mind and Barnabas of that; if this offend you, the fault is yours. Carry peaceable minds, and ye may have comfort by this variety.'¹ In the turbulent decades of Elizabethan England, Hooker stands out as one thinker and writer who did carry a peaceable mind, who sought to consider issues rather than to calumniate individuals, and whose reflections on controverted matters of theology have enabled many people since his time to find comfort, rather than scandal, in the variety of theological opinion.

In Book V of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Hooker adds his own expressions to the Reformation's considerable variety of thoughts on the matter of the eucharist. What are his distinctive contributions, and how does he arrive at his understandings? How is his thinking shaped by his inheritance from the English Reformation? Where could Anglican sacramental theology go on from Hooker's standpoint? These are the questions this paper will seek to examine.

Although the life of the English church in Hooker's time was still strongly marked by memories of martyrdom and exile, international politics and local social and political upheaval, Hooker's own path was relatively straightforward and his lifestyle stable. He did not travel to the continent, but grew familiar with the ideas of the continental reformers through extensive reading and correspondence. After the first few years of his childhood, contemporary with Mary's reign, all his experience of Christian worship was of the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer of 1559. We could almost say that he is the first 'cradle Anglican' of theological history, one who did not have to make in adult life the transition from Latin to the vernacular in prayer and practice.

Hooker's patron during much of his education and formation was Bishop John Jewel. On the matter of the presence of Christ in the eucharist, Jewel took his stand against the papists by tending to locate Christ's body in heaven, where alone it could be worshiped by the believer. Still, Jewel did want to affirm that there was more to the supper of the Lord than the eye perceived,² and to this the Puritans took exception. Hooker's role, in the last two decades of the 16th century, would be to clarify just where Puritan teaching failed to do justice to the truth of the sacraments.

Hooker's temperament as a writer and theologian was to be systematic, orderly and dignified. The sharp, rhetorical edges of polemic are rarely to be

encountered in his work, and in his treatment of the eucharist in the fifth book of his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* this decorum is particularly evident. He signals his methodological intentions early in his discussion of the sacraments. He will not attempt to discuss Christ's presence in the sacrament until he has spoken about Christ's person in the context of the Trinity, and established how the two natures of Christ are related to one another. It is his hope that 'it may thereby better appear how we are made partakers of Christ both otherwise and in the Sacraments themselves.'³ At this early stage the key term of *participation* enters the vocabulary of the discussion. *Presence* will be a term Hooker will reserve for the *whole* person of Christ, both human and divine, either in heaven or in the soul of the believer receiving communion.

Hooker multiplies vocabulary in order to deal with the way the Father and the Son are present to one another in the Trinity. He speaks of the 'coherence and communion' they enjoy, which are available, admittedly in a much-attenuated form, to those others of God's offspring who love and participate in the Son. Here, Hooker uses Wisdom-language of the Son, to highlight the way all creation is permeated by the Father's goodness.⁴ 'They which thus were in God... have by vocation or adoption God actually now in them,' explains Hooker. He elaborates this 'mystical conjunction' at some length, rejecting as 'too cold an interpretation' the notion that our being in Christ merely means that he and we share one human nature. He insists on the depth and fullness of 'the mystery of our coherence with Jesus Christ,' and explains, 'except we be truly partakers of Christ, and as really possessed of his Spirit, all we speak of eternal life is but a dream.'⁵ We can expect that this richness of participatory theology will also inform Hooker's understanding of the eucharist.

Once he has dealt with Christ in the Godhead, and ourselves in Christ, Hooker can go on and define his terms in the area of the sacraments themselves. The key term here will be that of *instrument*. The sacraments have a 'more excellent and heavenly use' than the teaching role attributed to them by the Puritans.⁶ They tell us *when* God's grace is imparted, and they are 'means conditional which God requireth in them unto whom he imparteth grace.'⁷ They mediate grace directly from God; they 'contain *in themselves* no vital force or efficacy, they are not physical but *moral instruments* of salvation'.⁸ They are not 'bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither... *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before'. Rather, the sacraments are 'means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify'.⁹ In his later discussion of the Eucharist, Hooker will return to the importance of the grace that this sacrament delivers into our hands.

When Hooker broaches the topic of the eucharist in chapter 67 of the fifth volume of the *Laws*, he begins by indicating the current state of the debate with all its passions and heavily loaded vocabulary. Even as he does so, however, he is announcing his intention not to join the fray on the same terms as his predecessors. He refers to some people's fear that for Zwingli and Oecolampadius the sacrament is only 'a shadow, destitute, empty and void of Christ', but immediately goes on to insist on 'that which alone is material, namely the *real participation* of Christ and of life in his body and blood *by means of this sacrament*'; and to lament that less central issues are still causing such distraction and disunity.

Everyone agrees, he says, about the end result of the sacrament, namely that 'the soul of man is the receptacle of Christ's presence'. The only question still causing trouble is whether Christ is present only in the soul who receives the sacrament – a 'receptionist' viewpoint held by those Hooker refers to as Sacramentaries; or whether he is *also* 'seated in the very consecrated elements themselves'. Although he does not at this point clearly affirm or endorse the former attitude, Hooker does go on to denigrate the consubstantialist and transubstantialist understandings which result from the latter viewpoint. The trinitarian theology he has already elaborated so painstakingly, and his understanding of the way Christ's human and divine natures embrace each other, make it impossible for him to locate the *whole* Christ anywhere as locally confining as the bread and wine of the sacrament.¹⁰

This leads some scholars to conclude that Hooker's own preference is for the receptionist attitude. Olivier Loyer is one such.¹¹ Others, like C.W. Dugmore,¹² want to attach a more distinctive, 'Anglican,' mystique to Hooker's formulations. Certainly, the evidence linking Hooker with the Sacramentaries mounts up as chapter 67 unfolds.

The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament... I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them.

Sacraments 'are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow.'¹³

Hooker does not speak of the real presence of Christ's body and blood until he has spent considerable time elaborating the importance of participation in Christ. The participation which the sacrament enables is life-giving in its effect and operation, and especially in its uniting of the believer with God in a 'divine and mystical kind of union.' When Hooker does introduce 'real presence', it is

located emphatically in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. 'Partaking' implies a much more dynamic reality than simply 'being present,' and points to the effects of God's grace in the believer rather than in the bread and wine. The fruit of the Eucharist is participation, not presence. Hooker reserves 'personal and true presence' for Christ assisting at the heavenly banquet.¹⁴ Presence-language about the sacramental elements entails Christological problems concerning the whereabouts of Christ's human and divine natures; participation-language avoids these difficulties and is thus much preferred by Hooker.

Perhaps Hooker's interpretation seems as 'cold' as the one concerning Christ's sharing of our human nature, rejected earlier in the discussion. Yet, when we look further, the way Hooker continues to speak of the effects of the sacrament is warm indeed. Loyer perhaps over-states the case by saying that for Hooker, receptionism can be given a fully realist interpretation, and by highlighting Hooker's fondness for the words 'real' and 'really' in connection with the presence of Christ.¹⁵

Hooker wants people to enjoy the presence of Christ instead of arguing about it. 'Shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how? ...this heavenly food is given for the satisfying of our empty souls, and not for the exercising of our curious and subtle wits'.¹⁶

This is an emphatic statement of Hooker's frustration with the people who, in their debates about objective presence, are effectively withholding themselves from Christ's gift of subjective presence, his 'real', if not his 'corporal', presence, that is available through sacramental participation in him. Later in the chapter, he warns that 'curiously sifting what it should adore, and disputing too boldly of that which the wit of man cannot search, chilleth for the most part all warmth of zeal, and bringeth soundness of belief many times into great hazard'.

Hooker's language about the eucharist constantly moves between these two poles: first, the 'cooler' pole of the theologian's careful formulation of terms and avoidance of problematic words or phrases; and secondly, the 'warmer' pole of the devout worshiper's enjoyment of God's grace through the sacrament. Around the first pole gather terms like 'those mysteries' – perhaps the safest formulation of all, and certainly frequent throughout the chapter; 'causes instrumental,' 'minister life... by effect or operation', 'the co-operation of his omnipotent power', 'a true and real participation of Christ... *as a mystical Head*', 'an unlikely instrument'. Finally, we hear that '*this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby I make myself wholly theirs....*' This last formulation, written as if Christ himself is speaking, is perhaps the fullest and most careful of the chapter.¹⁷

Around the second, more devotional pole, cluster phrases like these: 'the gift of Christ', 'a sea of comfort and joy to wade in', '*a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness', 'to rest ourselves altogether upon the strength of his glorious power', 'a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life'. The last and fullest statement is the one complementary to the words put into Christ's mouth and quoted above, and it runs thus: '*I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them my body*'.¹⁸

Many of these expressions are striking in the work of a writer like Hooker whose style is usually most restrained and rational; one commentator notes wryly that 'few passages in Hooker suggest any degree of mysticism,'¹⁹ but in this section of his work on the eucharist we do find him quite unable and unwilling to do theology in purely analytical terms. We see in Hooker a devout communicant. He is including in his theology his experience of receiving sacramental grace, an experience which has been powerful enough not only to make him impatient of other people's fruitless speculations on how that grace is 'packaged', but also to overcome to a significant degree his own natural bent towards measured, logical, systematic expression.

It is not, in the end, mere talk about the Lord's supper that persuades Hooker of anything. Rather, he says, 'Let it be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's table to know what I receive from him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth his promise....' Knowledge comes from the receiving, from the participation, from the personal encounter of the disciple with the master. That knowledge enables Hooker to speak of the act of communion with an eloquence that is impossible in the usual, more philosophical discourse of Reformation theology. So:

...Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to his very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of his gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb and made joyful in the strength of this new wine, this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this cup hallowed with solemn benediction availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body...²⁰

This much more poetic, less systematic language is the only place to look for support in Hooker for the 'non-popish Catholic' beloved of Dugmore.

Perhaps Hooker's dramatic use of transubstantiation as a metaphor for what happens when a Christian receives the sacrament of the eucharist is the most striking example of this component of his thinking. Our participation, our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ, is followed by 'a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of soul and body, an alteration from death to life'. Hooker has captured the word from the enemy's heartland and set it up triumphantly in his own citadel. This is both daring and effective. It is effective because it ensures the complete inversion of the medieval mindset, the complete change of focus from the eucharistic elements to the Christian receiving them, by means of the most evocative word in all the vocabulary of the sixteenth century. It is daring because, in its clearly metaphorical form ('a kind of transubstantiation...'), it signals the provisional, approximate nature of all we can say about the sacrament, and a healthy sense of relativism towards the agreed, philosophical terminology when we wish to speak about the workings of God's grace.

Those engaged in contemporary discussion of the sacraments might well regard this dimension of Hooker's language as a very positive development. Our generation prides itself on renewed insights into the power of metaphor and symbol, and into the place of spirituality in theology. We have a liking for the integration of the various theological disciplines. These factors might incline us to base our estimate of the quality of Hooker's eucharistic theology on these passages. *Lex orandi, lex credendi*, we may say, and applaud, as John Booty does, the fact that Hooker seems to be theologically closer to the Fathers when speaking of his own devotional stance, than when he is actually quoting the Fathers.²¹

It is interesting at this point to draw a comparison between Hooker and Anselm. St Anselm also lived in an era of considerable controversy over the eucharist, and was also a theologian of note. Yet his reticence in speaking on the question is even more marked than Hooker's would be centuries later.²² Anselm's only comment on the eucharist is contained in a single prayer, composed late in his life. It is a prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ, speaking of how Anselm loves and worships and desires to receive the Lord's body and blood. He prays to be purified by the sacrament, to be forgiven and strengthened by it, to receive the gifts in his mouth and in his heart (*ore et corde percipere*), and to be grafted and incorporated into Christ's body by them, that he may dwell in Christ and Christ in him.²³

It is striking to note how close Hooker is to Anselm in tone, emphasis and even imagery. Even though Hooker chose not to maintain a silence quite as resounding as Anselm's in the realm of the more formal theology of the sacrament, there is

a sense in which the most enduringly useful aspect of Hooker's sacramental theology is his use of silence. He simply will not be drawn beyond a certain point into the currently raging controversies. Neither does he wish to stir up the coals of the previous generation's conflagrations. What he cannot solve, he will at least refuse to exacerbate with 'curious and intricate speculations'. He invites his readers to carry peaceable minds through considerable diversity of opinion in matters concerning which 'we need not greatly to care nor inquire'. It is therefore regrettable that some modern commentators reproach Hooker for his silence on some matters where they would have preferred him to comment. The chief instance of this is in discussions about the eucharist as sacrifice. For example, Paget, writing at the end of the 19th century, says plaintively that Hooker 'cannot have meant to deny utterly all sacrificial aspect or character in the Eucharist.'²⁴ Loyer, more recently, expresses surprise that Hooker does not sound the war cry in the battle over the eucharist as sacrifice, and goes on to extrapolate quite a sophisticated sacrificial interpretation of Hooker's work. Indeed, Loyer asserts that in Hooker's 'eucharistic realism' we have the notion of propitiatory sacrifice even though it is never named as such.²⁵ Booty, too, regrets Hooker's silence, claiming that Hooker remained shackled by a medieval nominalism from which a suitable doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice might have freed him.²⁶

It is energy undoubtedly wasted that is spent trying to unearth a coherent account of sacrifice in Hooker's work. He is firm in asserting that it is believers who receive Christ's body and blood through the sacrament; he is adamant that it is believers who make their sacrifice of thanksgiving in celebrating the sacrament.²⁷ In the *Learned Discourse on Justification*, Hooker numbers the offering of the Eucharist to God 'as a sacrifice propitiatory' among the heresies of things which are practised as well as believed.²⁸

Chapter 78 of the *Laws* sees Hooker discussing the ordained ministry of the church, justifying the threefold order of ministry against Puritan criticisms. One of the Puritans' quarrels is with the use of the term 'priest', and Hooker goes quite a distance towards appeasing them. He personally prefers the word 'presbyter', as being more biblical and more evocative of a benevolent, fatherly aspect to ministry in the church's household. But he does not offer to eliminate 'priest' from Anglican vocabulary. Censoring certain words or phrases is not Hooker's way. He prefers to leave all the available words in play, and to choose from among them as a given occasion demands, expressing preferences, certainly, but not laying down hard and fast requirements. A Reformer who can use 'transubstantiation' metaphorically is not going to be afraid of the word 'priest' in analogy or metaphor. Hooker's own thoughts on the theological language game of his day are worth reporting:

...because words have so many artificers by whom they are made, and the things whereunto we apply them are fraught with so many varieties, it is not always apparent what the first inventors respected, much less what every man's inward conceit is which useth their words.²⁹

What, then, is Hooker's inward conceit, when he defends the continued use of the word 'priest' with its problematic, sacrificial resonances in Puritan ears? First, he states categorically that 'sacrifice is now no part of the church ministry'. Then he places the whole discussion clearly in the field of analogy – 'proportionable correspondence'. Christian presbyters may be called priests because the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ is 'proportionable' to ancient sacrifices. This is followed immediately by another categorical disclaimer, that the Gospel has 'properly now no sacrifice'.³⁰

Hooker is perfectly confident that the disproportion between the old and new kinds of service of God is quite obvious to the people. He is not worried that they will be led astray by the terminology. People do not expect an alderman necessarily to be old; people will not expect a priest necessarily to perform sacrifices. What the 'first inventors' of a word intended cannot restrict all subsequent use of the word; etymology is not everything, contrary to Puritan fears. Yet this hardly constitutes evidence for a leaning on Hooker's part towards a sacrificial understanding of the eucharist. On the contrary, he is saying that the metaphor is dead. He revives it only to justify retaining a traditional terminology for the ordained ministry, and not his own preferred terminology at that.

As a servant of the English Reformation, Hooker contributed structured thought, as well as an insight into personal piety, and some commendable reticence upon matters unlikely to be edifying if pursued at length. So we must ask, how far does Hooker advance the debate which spurred him to engage in these reflections in the first place? Perhaps some of his contemporaries were able to approach the sacrament with more peaceable minds after reading such learned and judicious reflections on the matter. Perhaps, four hundred years later, we too can be encouraged by Hooker's example to examine the points at which our academic theology gives way to our personal piety. Perhaps our efforts at creating eucharistic liturgies that will satisfy empty souls will be made more fruitful by our joining with Hooker's refusal to be distracted from the goal of the sacrament. Even so, the 'curious and subtle wits' that keep asking questions cannot be ruled completely out of order. Clearly, Hooker is within the tradition, perhaps most clearly of all when he is in his more devotional mode. But what has he added to the tradition?

In terms of new material, we must probably answer that not a great deal is added by Hooker. Hooker's gift is rather for timely recollections of helpful

scriptural and patristic themes. Neither the notion of mutual participation, nor the idea of sacrament as instrument of grace, was new in the late sixteenth century. What was new, was that Hooker was writing about them as a child of the English Reformation, writing in the English language, writing for English communicants, enabling them to recognise both their continuity with faithful Christians of previous generations, and their freedom to abandon medieval terminology for simpler, more biblical expressions. His is a contextual theology, a contingent expression that provides a prototype for later contextual theologies, rather than a springboard into higher or deeper explorations of the same territory.

Perhaps, then, it is important to see Hooker not as formulating immutable statements of orthodox Anglican eucharistic theology, but rather as offering a shining illustration of orthodox Anglican method. Hooker seems to have almost patristic authority for many twentieth century Anglicans, and this is probably not a helpful development. On one hand, his careful use of participation – rather than presence – language in his writing about the eucharist would seem to give joy to those contemporary evangelicals who are still worried about what qualities the ignorant among the faithful might be attributing to the eucharistic elements. On the other hand, his more lyrical, devotional passages and his confident use of metaphorical language would seem to encourage over-nostalgic catholics to go on and explore new territory, rather than merely reworking the same stock of old images.

But the most plausible claim to be spiritual descendants of Hooker will come from those who attend most carefully, not to Hooker's phrases, but to the language of their own day, and to the experiences of contemporary worshippers. They will be wise inheritors of Anselm and Hooker who know when to remain silent, and when to risk speaking in humility to their own people in their own language. Then, perhaps, more Christian people will be enabled to echo Hooker's words: 'Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, O my God thou art true, O my soul thou art happy!'³¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Stanley. *Richard Hooker*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1983.
- Booty, John. *Three Anglican Divines on Prayer: Jewel, Andrewes, and Hooker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of St John the Evangelist, 1978.
- Booty, John E. 'Hooker's understanding of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist', *The Divine Drama in History and Liturgy: Essays presented to Horton Davies on his Retirement from Princeton University* (edited by John E. Booty). Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1984.

THE WORLD METHODIST COUNCIL

When the Uniting Church was formed, it was agreed that we would keep our historic links with the two world bodies representing the traditions from which we came, namely, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the World Methodist Council. The Uniting Church's special contribution to the regular meetings of these bodies is the ecumenical dimension of our experience.

The world Methodists gathered – as many as the ecumenists at Canberra, some 3000+ – in Singapore in July. The central conference on denominational issues was preceded by a number of consultations, including one on liturgy. A major concern was to review the worship books and hymn books published in the five years since the conference last met. This brought a rich crop – delegates came home burdened with hymn books from the United Methodist Church (basically USA), the American Methodist Episcopal Church (largely a black church), the British Methodist, and two reflecting specific cultures: a collection of 'Asian American Hymns' called *Hymns from the Four Winds* (Supplemental Worship Resources 13, United Methodist Church, 1983) and the Christian Conference of Asia new hymnal, *Sound the Bamboo* (1990). Several singing groups were on hand to demonstrate the treasures.

We also filled our bags with liturgical resources, including a 'sampler' (liturgical show-bags!) of the new *Book of Worship* of the United Methodist Church, which goes before the General Conference in 1992 for authorisation. Liturgical resources for this church have usually been incorporated into their hymn book, so a separate liturgical book is new. It is designed for both ministers and music leaders (note!). It excludes services not needed regularly in a local congregation (e.g. ordination). It adopts most of the usages familiar to those of us who have been through the paper back revolution and find ourselves with hard covers (and Australia's *Uniting in Worship* was much admired). It has some distinctively American features, e.g. a Christmas Eve service of Las Posadas, involving Hispanic customs.

It was sad to note that no resources were offered from the African world, and few from the Asian. The publication and purchase of books costs money. But more seriously, it was clear that the 'mission churches' suffered from atrophied colonial christianity, caused by severe neglect of contemporary study of the liturgy. In this they are perhaps only marginally more deprived than, say, rural Uniting Churches or laity in general. And one might ask whether hard-back liturgy books are really what we need...

Robert Gribben.

INTERNATIONAL ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

The Anglican Communion is a fellowship of autonomous churches (each known as a 'Province') in communion with the See of Canterbury. Each Province has some form of lineal descent from the Church of England and has inherited the form of faith and worship as set out in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. The Communion is bound together and given expression in the Lambeth Conference of bishops, the Primates' Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC). None of these has legislative authority over the autonomous Provinces but each is a forum of consultation and an avenue for maintaining fellowship.

Although some Provinces had undertaken liturgical revision at various times, the BCP 1662 could, until quite recently, be seen as the glue which held the Communion together. The pace of liturgical change quickened during the 1960s and 1970s (the era of the little books of provisional and experimental liturgies) with the result that many Provinces have now issued new prayer books: Australia 1978, USA 1979, England 1980, Ireland 1984, Wales 1984, Canada 1985, New Zealand 1989, Southern Africa 1989. Some of these replace the BCP 1662 and others are for supplementary or alternative use. Other Provinces are at various stages of liturgical revision. The greatest growth in the Communion is at present in the Provinces in Africa and English is no longer the common language of all Anglicans.

With the glue coming unstuck would the Communion be able to stay together? Not only increasing liturgical diversity but other issues, especially the question of the ordination of women, were testing Anglican unity. In response to the liturgical diversity the international Anglican Liturgical Consultation (ALC) came into being and met first at Boston, USA in 1985. Other meetings followed at Brixen, Italy in 1987 and York, England in 1989. Beginning on the initiative of several Anglican liturgists ALC immediately began to foster connections with the ACC. At the request of the ACC, Guidelines for the operation of ALC were drawn up at the York meeting and subsequently approved by ACC. Biennial meetings of the Consultation are held in association with meetings of *Societas Liturgica*.

In the Guidelines the purpose of ALC is set out. "The primary task of the Consultations is to foster mutuality, scholarship and understanding, to respond when particular issues arise and to assist clear communication, but not to impose any programme on the Anglican Communion... Consultations should be planned to promote: (i) access to developments in liturgical scholarship and practice; (ii) adequate representation of Provinces and regional Churches; (iii) the contribution

of those with expertise in particular areas; (iv) mutual exchange, cross-fertilisation and encouragement.’

Although now officially recognised and with its relationship to the ACC defined, ALC has not become merely a committee of ACC or the Provinces. Those who may attend meetings of the Consultation are: ‘(i) those whom Provinces and regional Churches choose to nominate and send; (ii) Anglican members of *Societas Liturgica*; (iii) others whom the Steering Committee may invite.’ There is, thus, a degree of independence for ALC and it is a forum where representatives of Provinces and liturgical scholars (not necessarily mutually exclusive categories!) may meet.

With the Guidelines as its charter the Fourth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation met in Toronto, Canada in August 1991. The theme was ‘Christian Initiation’. Sixty-six participants (including nine bishops) gathered from twenty-one Provinces. Twenty-two papers for preparatory reading had been prepared. Work proceeded in four working groups: (1) The renewal of initiation theology; (2) Baptism, mission and ministry; (3) Confirmation and the renewal of baptismal faith; (4) Liturgical texts. An extensive document under these four headings was produced. The accompanying recommendations sum up the major issues covered and were ‘offered as basic principles for Christian initiation’. They are:

a. The renewal of baptismal practice is an integral part of mission and evangelism. Liturgical texts must point beyond the life of the church to God’s mission in the world.

b. Baptism is for people of all ages, both adults and infants. Baptism is administered after preparation and instruction of the candidates or, where they are unable to answer for themselves, their parents(s) or guardian(s).

c. Baptism is complete sacramental initiation and leads to participation in the eucharist. Confirmation and other rites of affirmation have a continuing pastoral role in the renewal of faith among the baptised but are in no way to be seen as a completion of baptism or as necessary for admission to communion.

d. The catechumenate is a model for preparation and formation for baptism. We recognise that its constituent liturgical rites may vary in different cultural contexts.

e. Whatever language is used in the rest of the baptismal rite, both the profession of faith and the baptismal formula should continue to name God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

f. Baptism once received is unrepeatable and any rites of renewal must avoid being misconstrued as rebaptism.

g. The pastoral rite of confirmation may be delegated by the bishop to a presbyter.

The main new development emerging from these recommendations is a new role for the rite of confirmation in Anglican practice. Following the disintegration of the rites of initiation (including baptism, the laying-on of hands and first communion) in the early centuries of the Church various practices had been adopted. Anglican practice from the sixteenth century maintained the early sequence (baptism, confirmation or the laying-on of hands and first communion) but the parts were separated in time. In recent years some Provinces have adopted the practice of admitting children to communion before confirmation. The Consultation's response to this was to affirm that 'baptism is complete sacramental initiation and leads to participation in the eucharist'. Confirmation was seen as a pastoral rite and not part of Christian initiation (Recommendation c).

The need for rites of personal commitment or affirmation of faith, to mark various stages in a person's Christian pilgrimage, was recognised. Such rites might include confirmation (by this or some other name), reception from other churches, reconciliation of the lapsed and restoration of the penitent. It was also recognised that some people who had experienced a renewal of faith looked for some liturgical expression of their experience. Provision for this was encouraged provided that 'any rites of renewal must avoid being misconstrued as rebaptism' (Recommendation f).

The role of the bishop was considered by the Consultation. It was affirmed that 'as the chief pastor of the diocese, the bishop expresses the unity of the community by presiding, personally or by delegation, at its liturgical rites' (from the Report). However, it was suggested that confirmation should be among those rites which a bishop could delegate to a presbyter (Recommendation g).

This is but a brief summary of some of the major points in a long report. It is up to the Provinces of the Anglican Communion to determine what, if anything, they do with the report. However, if the recommendations are followed there will ensue some significant changes in traditional Anglican practice in regard to Christian initiation.

To carry on the work of the Consultation and to prepare for the next meeting in 1993 a Steering Committee was appointed. It consists of Professor David Holeton (Canada), chairman, Ron Dowling (Australia), Bishop David Gitari (Kenya), Ruth Meyers (USA) and Bishop Colin James (England), appointed by the ACC to be a link with ACC and the Primates' Meeting. Paul Gibson (Canada), Co-ordinator for Liturgy in the Anglican Communion, will act as secretary.

R. Wesley Hartley

SOCIETAS LITURGICA: TORONTO CONGRESS 1991 BIBLE AND LITURGY

Toronto was host to the thirteenth biennial congress of *Societas Liturgica* held at Trinity College, University of Toronto from 12 August to 17 August 1991. Over two hundred liturgists from Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and oriental Churches took part, coming from every continent and from countries as diverse as Finland and India, Zaire and Japan. The bulk of participants were from North America and Europe, though Australia was well represented by seven people, including six members of the Australian Academy of Liturgy (D'Arcy Wood, Albert McPherson, Ray Hartley, Robert Gribben, Tom Elich, Ron Dowling).

The conference opened well on Monday evening with Paul De Clerck's presidential address. He first spoke of the liturgical setting in which the scriptures are read – minister, book, hearers – creating the liturgical act of proclaiming the Word. The arrangement of the place for reading and the use of a book distinguish this Word offered to the assembly from other words exchanged among the people themselves or words addressed by them to God. The proclamation of the word is an action of transformation by which the assembly is constituted as the people of God who receive, *today*, a living Word. Thus in the liturgical assembly, the read scriptures become the Word heard and received, fulfilling the first function of the Bible. This is no less than a sacramental sign since it is Christ who acts through the mediation of the Church. De Clerck went on to say that the Church, born of the Easter event, precedes the Christian Scriptures which are the product of Church Tradition. Liturgical practice has, therefore, a certain priority: the New Testament has been constituted by the liturgical and sacramental celebrations as much as the New Testament itself 'institutes' the sacraments. The liturgy – by its proclamation, song, and preaching – hands on and keeps alive the tradition which the scriptures represent. In doing so, the liturgy becomes the interpreter of scripture. Thus, reading the prologue of John's gospel at Easter (as in the Byzantine rite) or at Christmas (as in the Roman rite) represent different interpretations of the text. Likewise the washing of the feet has a baptismal meaning in the Ambrosian liturgy of Milan and a eucharistic meaning in the Roman liturgy. In fact, hermeneutics is already at work in the Bible itself when, for example, the Exodus is understood as a prefiguration of Christian Baptism. A multitude of hermeneutical questions are inevitably raised by the formation of a lectionary: which readings to choose, how to determine priorities, where to assign particular readings, etc. Paul De Clerck is a Catholic professor from Brussels and director of the Liturgy Institute in Paris.

The closely-argued paper of Klaus-Peter Jörns on Tuesday morning asked

whether the development of the Canon of scripture is connected with liturgical practice. There is evidence, though the New Testament is not interested in recording liturgical traditions, that the letters and the Apocalypse were read publicly in the worship assembly and thus became part of the Canon. When we identify prayer forms or hymns in the New Testament they provide connecting links between liturgical and scriptural development. Further, the Passion and Easter stories in the gospel, told as stories of sacrifice, show that the development of the gospels and of the eucharistic liturgy run parallel to one another. Therefore, the tradition of festal sacrificial worship is the cradle of the Scriptures *and* of the liturgy. Klaus-Peter Jörns is professor of practical theology in Berlin.

Paul Bradshaw focused on how the biblical texts have been used in Christian worship. He suggested that there are at least four different ways, not mutually exclusive, in which reading scripture can function in liturgical rites. First, the educational or pedagogical function both teaches and forms the people in the Christian life. Emphasised in Reformed and Lutheran worship, it was also important in cultures without widespread literacy where reading and preaching provided the only access to the contents of scripture. Second, the kerygmatic or anamnestic function operates when familiar texts are repeated frequently. This function is intimately related to the meaning of what is being celebrated, interpreting and stimulating the liturgical action itself. Third, the paracletic or pastoral function addresses not so much the need to expound the scriptures or to illuminate a liturgical rite as the need of the worshipping assembly. This is obvious at funerals, weddings, votive Masses, etc. Fourth, the doxological function operates when scripture is read primarily to give glory to God – when, for example, it is not understood by the assembled people. Next, Bradshaw suggested three ways in which biblical language has been used in liturgical texts: first, borrowing scriptural words or phrases; second, typological or allegorical use of biblical images; third, appropriating biblical texts for liturgical use (for example: the psalms). Finally Bradshaw showed how liturgical practices have emerged from scriptural texts (for example, the ephphatha). Sometimes, these rites become representational (a re-enactment of biblical events in liturgy, encouraged by the rise of allegory); sometimes they remain rememorative or anamnestic. Paul Bradshaw is an Anglican priest and liturgical historian who is professor of liturgy at Notre Dame University, Indiana.

Manfred Josuttis, basing himself firmly on the writings of Martin Luther, spoke of the authority of the Word in reforming, celebrating, and understanding worship. He is professor of practical theology in Göttingen.

Horace Allen, Presbyterian professor from Boston and co-chair of the English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC), outlined the principles and problems of the lectionary. (Four lectionary systems had been described

in *Studia Liturgica* 21:1, 1991.) He began by listing six roles a lectionary or pattern of readings plays in the life and worship of the Church. Firstly, by providing varied and extensive readings, the lectionary fulfils a catechetical intent. Secondly, the lectionary is for preaching which actualises the Word. Thirdly, the lectionary provides apt readings with which to celebrate feasts, festivals, and liturgical seasons. Fourthly, a lectionary may make provision for cultural, climatic, seasonal, and ethnic realities which do not always fit with liturgical feasts and seasons. Fifthly, the lectionary has a doxological function in the immediate context of the liturgical act, a function carried through in the Profession of Faith, General Intercessions, and sometimes the Eucharist itself. Sixthly, the lectionary maintains a witness to historical continuity and ecumenical fellowship. Allen then analysed how current lectionaries have chosen among and set priorities for these six roles he had outlined. For example, the ecumenical lectionary prepared in 1967 by the Joint Liturgical Group in England links the three readings thematically, thus emphasising the third and fourth roles, while the proposal to expand its two-year cycle to a four-year cycle would take more account of the first and second roles. The Roman lectionary with its large commitment to semi-continuous reading emphasises the first and second roles, though the third is well recognised by its linked readings for feasts and seasons. It is weak on cultural or ethnic realities but has maintained a strong historical continuity and has become important ecumenically through its relation to the Common lectionary. The Common lectionary is similar to the Roman but is taking more account of cultural and ethnic factors by acknowledging seriously the feminist and liberation agenda. The question is whether this will dilute its commitment to historical and ecumenical witness or compromise its sensitivity to the liturgical setting represented by the doxological function. Ultimately, the aim of a lectionary is pastoral, to lay the table of God's Word more lavishly for the liturgical assembly.

Marjorie Procter-Smith presented an alternative perspective on these lectionaries. Speaking primarily from a feminist perspective, though having in mind also the oppression of the poor, racism, and anti-semitism, she first identified some areas of dissatisfaction. Problems with the lack of inclusive language – met by revising the translations of lectionaries – lead to other problems of sexism in the text itself (*Wives, be subject to your husbands* argues for the divinely-ordered subordination of women to men). Solutions include offering substitute readings or omitting offending verses. This raises the question of the canon: what texts should be read publicly in worship? Who decides and by what criteria? The feminist critique challenges the inclusion of texts or the combinations of texts which assume women's subordination and the omission of texts which affirm women's leadership and authority. To respond

to this critique, some prefer to keep the set texts but to place them in the best light through preaching. Others have attempted to create new women's lectionaries whose principle of selection is the retrieval of women from the scriptures to place them at the heart of the lectionary rather than at the margins. The feminist hermeneutic of suspicion takes the bible as an androcentric text, the product of a patriarchal culture. The liturgical context in which the text is read often reinforces its patriarchal bias and, by giving it divine authority, places it beyond criticism. The primary commitment in preparing a lectionary should be to the worshipping community in which the texts are to be read. The hostility of patriarchal texts should not be softened or obscured since they are a formative part of our common heritage; but they should be lamented in the context of common worship and even amplified to draw attention to their 'evasions and lies and guilt'. Thus, for example, *Wives, be subject to your husbands* could be combined with Galatians 5, *Do not submit therefore to a yoke of slavery*. Procter-Smith's presentation gave new vigour to the discussions in the working groups which followed. She is associate professor of liturgy and worship at Perkins School of Theology in Dallas, Texas.

On Friday morning, Louis-Marie Chauvet, professor of sacramental theology in Paris, spoke on 'Biblical Liturgy: Liturgical Texts'. Otfried Jordahn, Lutheran liturgist from Hamburg, addressed the topic 'Biblical Liturgy: Liturgical Actions'. And Kevin Seasoltz, monk of St John's Abbey in Collegeville and editor of *Worship*, spoke on 'Biblical Liturgy: Liturgical Setting'. Of these three, Chauvet's presentation was the most significant. Liturgical texts, he said, are profoundly biblical, whether they involve biblical passages as such, direct quotations from scripture, explicit allusions, or simply the biblical image or turn of phrase. Even with readings, the biblical text is reprocessed by the fact of extracting it from the biblical book and from its historical and literary context and transposing it into the liturgical action. This raises the question of the status of the 'liturgical bible' in its relationship with the biblical canon. What happens to the meaning of the text, for example, when the centurion's words are taken up by the assembly before communion: 'Lord, I am not worthy...'? Next, taking the institution narratives as an example, the wording in the ancient anaphoras differs appreciably from our four New Testament versions and from one another. If these variations make the liturgical text less 'materially' biblical, do they make it less 'formally' biblical? This process had already begun in the New Testament itself. Jesus' last supper was not strictly paschal, yet this did not prevent the synoptics from presenting paschal versions of this meal. These may be 'material' infringements but are at the service of a 'formal' fidelity. Or again, Ambrose, Cyril of Jerusalem, and other Fathers apply psalm 23 typologically to the waters of baptism, the oil of anointing, the table of the eucharist with the cup overflowing.

For them, the scriptures are full of hidden meanings (*mysteria/sacramenta*) and the liturgy is biblical if it can reveal some of them. These processes of liturgical interpretation (isolating passages from their biblical context, giving them new links and contexts, perhaps adapting them to their new purpose) differ sharply from our modern scientific exegesis and its scrupulous respect for material fidelity. It may be that the technical interpretation of exegesis is the work of the specialist; but reading and hearing the text engages all believing people. To read a text is to 'mark' it (underlining one element, putting another in brackets). It is only then that we find a point of entry into a text from another time and culture. The gap between the meaning which scientific exegesis yields and the meaning encouraged by the Church in its liturgy need not be an obstacle to the truth since the truth of a text is not univocal. In fact, the text of the bible itself is the result of a constant entanglement between traditions, oral and written, and a re-reading of this corpus in the challenging political, social, and cultural conditions of history. Some traditions are eliminated, others created, others amalgamated until the community writes itself in the Book: it becomes so much a mirror of the community's identity, that it is adopted as a model. Fidelity to the bible is not only 'material' fidelity to the fixed written text but a 'formal' fidelity to the growing text. Thus when the biblical text is proclaimed in the liturgical assembly, when the written word is taken out of its 'death' of historical and cultural otherness and the voice of a reader makes the word live again today, this is being faithful to the essence of the biblical text itself. The great stories of the Passover and the covenant are not written as dry history but as the people remembered them in liturgy. What is canonical is what receives the authority of public reading. Never, therefore, does the bible come as much into its truth as when it is proclaimed in liturgy. What then is the relationship between scientific approaches to understanding the biblical text and the hermeneutic proposed by the Church in the liturgy?

The congress concluded on Saturday morning with John Baldovin's paper on 'Biblical Preaching in the Liturgy'. Preaching is interpreting the biblical text for people today. The Fathers of the Church recognised multiple meanings in the text – historical, moral, spiritual, and eschatological. This pluralism of readings gives the bible, like all classic texts, a certain timelessness, yet also demands that it be constantly interpreted for a particular place or time so that it evokes a response in the life-situation of individuals and communities. The task of the preacher is to enter the world of the text, study it, and translate it. It is an act of *critical submission*. The interpretive translation of the biblical text into the present is based upon experience, the experience of the community in which the word is proclaimed, an experience articulated not by the preacher alone but by many voices, especially the voices of the poor, disprivileged, and alienated. The

biblical text will be heard in different ways depending on the 'voice' of the preacher. Thus preaching favours a pastoral-theological paradigm of biblical interpretation rather than a doctrinal or historical one. How do the circumstances of worship affect preaching? Firstly, the primary focus of interpretation is not the biblical text or the liturgical event but the situation of the worship assembly here and now. It is interpreted in the light of faith, faith witnessed by the scriptures and the liturgy. Secondly, the liturgical setting of prayer and song provide a stable setting in which the homily offers some spontaneity. It is the hinge between the proclamation of the Word and the response to the Word in ritual prayer and action, between liturgy and life. Thirdly, the homily needs to transcend lectionary misinterpretation (the Corinthians reading for Holy Thursday, for example, omits the context of division and injustice which provoked Paul's text). John Baldovin is a liturgical historian and theologian who teaches at Berkeley, California.

It will be evident that there were common themes running through the major papers of this conference and some areas of overlap. The hermeneutical questions introduced by Paul De Clerck were taken up by Louis-Marie Chauvet and referred to by John Baldovin. Marjorie Procter-Smith's alternative perspectives found echoes in John Baldovins 'many voices' of the preacher. The liturgical origins of the scripture text studied by Klaus-Peter Jörens was presumed by other speakers. The functions of scripture reading in liturgy identified by Paul Bradshaw correspond to the roles of the lectionary in liturgy as proposed by Horace Allen. These convergences enable us to approach some of the key issues from different points of view. The papers not only asked some important questions but indicated possible avenues for finding answers. The papers from this thirteenth congress of *Societas Liturgica* will be published in a forthcoming issue of *Studia Liturgica*.

Tom Elich

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

This ecumenical body met in Toronto following the *Societas Liturgica* meeting there in August.

An historical note. ELLC consists of ICEL, the Roman Catholic world body on liturgy for English-speaking episcopal conferences, and several other bodies which are national and ecumenical associations: the Joint Liturgical Group from Great Britain, the Consultation on Common Texts (USA), the Australian Consultation on Liturgy (ACOL), and equivalents in Canada, South Africa, and

(until its recent demise) New Zealand. Its first round of work on common texts was published in 1970 (second edition 1975) as *Prayers we have in common* and the texts found their way into several liturgical books. The most recent discussions are now published as *Praying Together* (Canterbury Press, Norwich, and Abingdon Press, USA) containing its 1988 revised texts. The superb commentary on the texts was written by Evan Burge of Melbourne. These are used with one exception in *Uniting in Worship*, and bid fair to be accepted by other Australian churches in current liturgical proposals.

The Toronto agenda included two main items.

First, at its meeting in York two years ago, it decided to give consideration to a universal eucharistic prayer for English-speaking churches. Consequently, it asked its various member organisations to submit candidates for adoption/adaptation. Several did so; comments had been invited by all on 'Eucharistic Prayer A – for study and comment' issued by ICET (1988 revised text), a prayer notable for its lyrical and imaginative (and inclusive) language. In the end it was decided that this prayer was not an appropriate text for agreement because of its rejection by Rome. ACOL offered the prayer authorised in common by Anglican and Uniting Churches, whose original was composed by Dr H.F. Leatherland. After discussion at Toronto, it was decided to circulate four particular prayers to the liturgical associations around the world and invite further comment.

Secondly, the revision of the lectionary received major attention. We heard a report from CCT on its latest revision of the *Common Lectionary* which takes in critiques including the rejection of a 'typological' basis for choice of Old Testament texts, and the need to correct several perceived biases in selection from feminist, liberationist, and anti-Semitic perspectives. The result looks very good. It is due for final review in November 1991, and publication in 1992. One hopes that those Australian churches who may do so will adopt the revised form and take some steps towards an ecumenical lectionary once more.

ELLC is also examining several new scripture translations with a view to commending one or more for liturgical reading.

The body next meets in conjunction with Societas Liturgica at Fribourg (Switzerland) in 1993. The Australian members are D'Arcy Wood and Robert Gribben; the latter was appointed to the Steering Committee.

Robert Gribben.

STUDIES IN LITURGY: THE MELBOURNE COLLEGE OF DIVINITY

The Melbourne College of Divinity offers a number of courses and papers in liturgy. The Bachelor of Theology Degree, which is taught at the College's five associated teaching institutions, includes a wide variety of subjects in liturgy representing the variety of traditions which are represented in the MCD. For example, the Yarra Theological Union offers seven semester units from level one to level three, the Auckland Consortium for Theological Education offers four semester units, the Evangelical Theological Association offers one semester unit, Catholic Theological College offers two semester units, and the United Faculty of Theology offers one unit.

Within the College's BD and Diploma offerings are two papers on Early and Mediaeval, and Reformation and Modern Christian Liturgies.

A significant opportunity to study liturgy at some depth is offered by the College's postgraduate Diploma in Liturgical Studies which comprises seven papers in liturgical studies plus a 5,000 word essay chosen from a list of seven topics.

The new Master of Ministry Degree, which the College is offering for the first time in 1991, allows for candidates to study liturgical tradition and practice in relation to their own existential involvement in ministry. It is significant that a number of candidates have elected to focus their research project in this area.

Postgraduate students of the College have regularly made liturgy the focus of their research and current topics being pursued include, 'Sacramentality in an Australian context', 'The Eucharist as a symbol of hope', 'Symbols of faith in church life', 'Ecumenical convergence of the theology of eucharist in recent bi-lateral conversations on a world level', 'The relationship between the paschal mystery and the trinity', 'Developmental theory, symbol and eucharist participation', 'Sacraments in an interdisciplinary context', 'A child centred approach to the sacrament of penance', and 'Towards an understanding of ritual'.

A major contribution towards the furtherance of studies in liturgy is the H.F. Leatherland Exhibition which the College offers in association with the Australian Academy of Liturgy. The Exhibition is offered annually to candidates for the DipLS, the BD, and the BTheol, and requires an essay of between 3,000 and 5,000 words on an approved subject.

The MCD values the rich variety of liturgical traditions represented in its constituency which provides a rich pool of teaching staff and liturgical models.

Harold J. Pidwell

COMMUNICATIONS

The Editor, AJL

I hope I may be allowed to reply to some of the statements made by Mr Dowling in his review of *Circle of the South Land* (not *Southland* as he puts it) in the Journal last October (AJL 2/41 pp 222-3).

It and the previous volume do not contain revisions of 'most of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer', only of the Sunday and daily services, calendar, collects, and Communion readings — though *Circle* adds about 40 pages of appendices including original services for special days in the Church's year, extensive lists of Christian, Jewish, and general commemorations, and 18 new hymns written for our parish's family services (with 6 more recent ones added on a sheet now included with the book).

The reviewer considers such revision of the BCP of little use not least because 'around the Anglican Communion it would be hard to find a revised prayer book...as widely accepted into general use as AAPB'. It would be more correct to say 'widely used' since in the majority of parishes in Australia, I believe, the lay people have been given no voice regarding its use. In my own Diocese of Sydney, Synod refused to provide for any congregational vote. (By contrast, in England, approval at least by the Parochial Church Council is obligatory for use of the alternative book there.) In many Australian parishes and indeed sometimes at diocesan level, people have been told they have to have the new book. The original assurances that it was being introduced 'for use together with the *Book of Common Prayer* and not a replacement for it' (to quote from its Preface) I believe on the part of some were quite dishonest and certainly have often been ignored and dishonoured.

Mr Dowling comments that I have 'modestly revised, and in some cases, modestly updated' material from the BCP. The revision, I should have thought, is more radical than that as reference to notes on the theology of the work (pages 127-128) and examination of collects and readings should indicate. Unlike much 'modern' liturgy which is more influenced, for example, by the 'Biblical theology' of 30 years ago and which at times is still quite fundamentalist ('This is the Word of the Lord'), I have at least tried to take into some account modern Biblical and theological studies, and to comprehend and include something of the richness and diversity of the Biblical material and of Christian tradition. For instance, in addition to the fully 'orthodox' traditional Christmas collect, there is an alternative which omits any reference to virgin birth, and on Advent 4 one collect that speaks of what Jesus received from both his parents. Other collects (for example, for St Thomas or the Presentation) have been written so as neither to tie one to a literal interpretation of the stories nor to exclude a traditional understanding. Another

example showing that the work is more than a mild updating is found in the provision for Easter Day including a second collect based on 1 Peter 3.18b and John 12.20-32 as a possible Gospel, alternative to the various stories of an empty tomb. Throughout, of course, the attempt is made to preserve the richness and beauty of the Prayer Book language which *today* helps make possible a depth of understanding at various levels, in contrast to much modern and rather banal writing that can encourage literal interpretation, misunderstanding, and even unbelief. (There can be, of course, fine modern liturgical writing but it is not easily achieved.)

Mr Dowling again speaks of the retention of the 'gesima' Sundays as 'a confusion of the seasonal distinction'. I am not sure what he means but I find in practice that observing the 'gesima' Sundays (also described in the BCP and in my book as, respectively, the third, second, and first Sundays before Lent) — together with the use of blue as the liturgical colour — is a very helpful way of reminding people of the approach of Lent and of the need to prepare for it. There is no commonly agreed alternative. Some speak of 'Sundays before Easter', some of 'Sundays after Epiphany', some of 'Sundays of the year', some of 'Sundays in ordinary time', some of 'ordinary Sundays'. These three Sundays have long been strictly speaking '*Dominicae Cotidianae*' to use a very old term — ordinary Sundays, but neither that term nor the other modern terms made as much sense as the interesting 'gesima' names, themselves having a relation to Easter but with the additional designations making plain their relation to the approaching season of Lent.

Finally, there may be, as Mr Dowling says, no 'real rationale' provided with the Calendar. However, notes on the names of most entries are in an appendix as well as a table indicating from what centuries the names have been drawn. Examination of the Calendar would show that it has many more names of women than most calendars and there are a few innovations -- Abailard and Heloise and Thomas Traherne among them! The Introduction (page ii) makes clear that 'Sophocles and the Greek dramatists' etc. are not part of the Calendar itself but rather additional commemorations, appended in the same way that such commemorations were appended to the 1561 Calendar issued by Queen Elizabeth I (and there are more recent precedents). They include notable scientists, musicians, artists and writers, days of special interest to Australians, people such as Siddhartha Gautama, Muhammed, and Moses Maimonides, and not least the noble pagan woman philosopher, Hypatia, put to death in Alexandria in March 415 by a Christian mob. I commemorate her on June 27 in place of the man *An Australian Prayer Book* recalls on that day, the blood-thirsty St Cyril of Alexandria, the local bishop!

John Bunyan
(Rector of Chester Hill with Sefton)

CONTRIBUTORS AND REVIEWERS

The Revd Dr Thomas W. Elich is Director of the Liturgical Commission, Archdiocese of Brisbane and editor of *Liturgy News*.

The Revd Robert W. Gribben, a Past-President of the Academy, is General Secretary of the Victorian Council of Churches and teaches liturgy at the United Faculty of Theology, Melbourne.

The Revd R. Wesley Hartley, editor of AJL, is Vicar of the Parish of St Michael and All Angels, Beaumaris, in the Diocese of Melbourne.

The Revd Russell S. Joyce is Vicar of the Parish of St Thomas, Werribee, in the Diocese of Melbourne and has previously held appointments in the Dioceses of Dunedin and Wangaratta.

The Revd Harold J. Pidwell is Dean of Melbourne College of Divinity and was previously Principal of the Baptist Theological College in Auckland, NZ.

The Revd Elizabeth J. Smith, a deacon of the Diocese of Melbourne, is a doctoral candidate at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California.

The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood, a Past-President of the Academy, is Minister of City Uniting Church in Canberra and President of the Assembly of the Uniting Church in Australia.

Back issues of AJL
from Vol 1 No 1 to Vol 3 No 1
are available from
The Editor AJL
St Michael's Vicarage
32 Dalgetty Road
Beaumaris Vic 3193
for \$7.50 each (including postage).

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to:

The Revd R.W. Hartley
St Michael's Vicarage
32 Dalgetty Road
Beaumaris Vic 3193

Authors preparing manuscripts are requested to follow the style sheet jointly adopted by such publications as *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Harvard Theological Review*, *Hermeneia*, *Australian Biblical Review* and *Colloquium*, except that Australian spellings should be used following *The Macquarie Dictionary*. This style sheet is printed in JBL 95 (1976) 331-346 and CBQ 38/3 (1976) 437-454. *Australian Journal of Liturgy* should be abbreviated as *AJL*.

Articles generally should not exceed 3,000 words in length. Articles may be presented on five and a quarter inch IBM compatible disc in either WordPerfect or ASCII format. A hard copy should accompany the disc. *AJL* is indexed in *Australasian Religious Index*.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW to:

The Revd Dr G.R. Hughes
United Theological College
16 Masons Drive
North Parramatta NSW 2151

SUBSCRIPTION PAYMENTS to:

The Treasurer, AAL
Mrs Colleen Lark
5 Carrick Street
Woodlands WA 6018

Subscription Rates:
Annual Subscription — \$15.00

AJL is sent anywhere in the world for an annual subscription of AUSS\$15.00 if paid in Australian currency. If paid in any other currency the subscription is the equivalent of AUSS\$20.00.

For Members and Associates of the Academy subscription to *AJL* is included in the membership fee.

