



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

AUSTRALIAN
JOURNAL OF
LITURGY

Volume 3 Number 4 October 1992

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 1992

PRESIDENT:	The Revd Dr Russell H. Hardiman
PAST PRESIDENT:	The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood
SECRETARY/TREASURER:	The Revd Canon Thomas W. Sutton
EDITOR OF AJL	The Revd R. Wesley Hartley
STATE REPRESENTATIVES:	
NSW	Sister Judith Foster SGS
QLD	The Revd David D.A. Pitman
SA	The Revd Dirk van Dissel
TAS	The Revd Dr Anthony M. Floyd
VIC	The Revd Rodney B. Horsfield
WA	The Revd John H. Smith

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 Canon T.W. Sutton
PO Box 320
Subiaco WA 6008

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 4 October 1992

R. WESLEY HARTLEY
EDITOR

JOHN BAUMGARDNER
ASSISTANT EDITOR

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

EDITORIAL

Questions concerning the relation of the Bible and liturgy have been prominent in recent discussions among liturgists. The theme of the 1991 Congress of Societas Liturgica, for example, was 'Bible and Liturgy'. This area of concern has risen to prominence as part of the whole process of liturgical renewal over the last several decades and especially as questions of language and 'inclusiveness' have been considered.

Two articles which further the dialogue in this area arrived on my desk in the same week. Both are by Anglican women deacons of the Diocese of Melbourne who are currently involved in doctoral studies. The articles are complementary, providing different perspectives on the issues, and so go well together.

The other two articles reflect on different aspects of the western liturgical heritage. The survey of liturgical developments in the Roman Catholic Church by the Revd John Smith is Part I of a two-part article. Part II will appear in the next issue.

In order to have a more fixed address for business relating to this journal and membership of the Academy, the Academy is in the process of establishing a secretariat. It will be at Otira, the Centre for Continuing Education in Ministry of the Uniting Church Synod of Victoria. All business communications (including subscription payments, notice of change of address, purchase of back issues) should now go to this address: *Otira, 73 Walpole Street, Kew, Victoria 3101*. There is also a new address for the editor. Please address all editorial matter to:

24 Williamson Avenue, Strathmore, Victoria 3041.

RWH

Strathmore Vicarage
St Luke's Day 1992

CONTENTS

The Use of the Scriptures in the Three Year Lectionary <i>Peta Sherlock</i>	154
Lectionaries and their users: Conflict and co-operation in biblical interpretation <i>Elizabeth J. Smith</i>	176
Liturgy and Life Liturgical reforms in the Roman Catholic Church 1832-1962, with special reference to the developments in post-war France <i>John H. Smith</i>	187
An Exquisite Book – A Canon Missae of 1728 <i>F.R.L. Carleton</i>	195
News and Information	199
Contributors	204

THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THE THREE YEAR
LECTIONARY
Peta Sherlock

Christian feminists have found reason to be critical of the christian scriptures because they have been used in the church's history to make and keep women marginalised. On the other hand many women, the present author included, have had the experience of finding their liberation from those same scriptures. Letty Russell speaks of this dilemma of christian feminism in terms of 'liberating word' and 'liberating the word'.¹

Those christian feminists who continue to look to the scriptures for salvation, believing it to contain good news for women as well as men, have found it necessary to apply a hermeneutic of suspicion towards its words. This paper will not deal with such a hermeneutic, for, even if good news for women can be retrieved from the scriptures, another task is needed with regard to the hearing of the scriptures: the task of ensuring, in telling the truth and nothing but the truth, that the *whole* truth is told.²

If it is true that we need to be suspicious because a patriarchal society has collected and canonised these writings, it is also true that the church has been selective about which portions it chooses to read in public. The three-year lectionary as used by the Australian Anglican Church has made great advances on the amount of the whole truth that is heard by the average parishioner Sunday by Sunday. But the whole truth is still not being heard.

The impetus for this paper has come from feminist concerns.³ How dare the church not regularly read the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary Magdalene, generally regarded as the first resurrection appearance, let alone omit Ruth, Esther, and Song of Songs entirely, while continuing to include passages about wives submitting to husbands!⁴

On the other hand, as the lectionary has been studied, it becomes apparent that other assumptions are also operating, albeit hidden in the subconscious depths of history (or typology?). For example, it is assumed by many that the New Testament gives us, not only permission and encouragement to use the Old Testament scriptures, but also the lens or even the hermeneutic with which to approach them. We need to ask ourselves whether the Hebrew scriptures are now merely useful as

illustration or background material for the New Testament. Can, and should, they be read in their own right? In this, we are opening another can of worms!

There are other pressing feminist concerns about lectionaries that will not be dealt with at length here. For example, the particular version of the scriptures that is read. Poor translation can silence women even further - for example, does the New Testament term 'disciples' actually exclude women in the same way that 'the twelve apostles' does? If some texts are deemed unsuitable for use in public worship, as it seems most of the more gruesome Old Testament passages are, who makes such decisions, and by what criteria?

This paper does little to examine the way texts are placed together, although we note here the juxtaposition of Genesis 1.26-31, Psalm 128, and Colossians 3.12-21 on the first Sunday after Christmas which celebrates the theme of the christian family. This begins positively with male and female made in God's image, moves subtly into a wife being the fruitful vine of her husband, thence into wives being submissive to husbands. By the time we read of the Holy Family we could almost imagine them with two and a quarter kids in a station wagon on their way to Egypt! This shows something of the huge difficulties of working with a theme to which the text inevitably becomes subservient. A more creative juxtaposition might be to read 1 Timothy 2.11-15 alongside Galatians 3.26-29! But, of course, that is not in accord with the assumed 'proper' lectionary structure of Old Testament/Psalm/Epistle/Gospel which has ancient roots.

The way the scriptures are ceremonially handled also puts them above criticism - what do we really mean when we say, after scripture is read, 'This is the word of the Lord'? I have had criticism for daring to intersperse 'comment' within the liturgical act of reading the Gospel, as if any reading can be value-free and objective.

The following figures give an indication of which portions of the scriptures would be heard by a person who attends all Sunday services of Holy Communion and major feast days over a three year period. The lectionary readings do vary slightly from year to year, but this paper is based only on the readings included in An Australian Prayer Book. If some of the problems have already been taken into account and solved by those who produce our lectionary, well and good!⁵ Horace Allen shows how the CCT lectionary has attempted to deal with many of these problems, but admits that Marjorie Procter-Smith finds it wanting in terms of feminist ideals.⁶

It should be noted that, if some Sundays are replaced by saints' days, a slightly different pattern would emerge. This is indicated where it is obvious. For example, the most glaring omission from a feminist point of view, of the story of Mary Magdalen meeting the resurrected Christ in the garden, will appear if St Mary Magdalen's Day is observed, as does the Song of Songs, although in an extremely allegorical way.

There is no suggestion being made here that a patriarchal (or other) plot has been hatched as to which parts of the scriptures are used more often or not at all. It may well be due to unconscious personal preferences of compilers, or indeed of churches. However, suggestions will be made as to why some parts appear more regularly in the present three-year cycle and why others presently absent or under-represented ought to appear.

Note that on the Second Sunday after Christmas, Epiphany, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and Whitsunday, the readings are identical for all three years, hence those readings appear three times. Readings from the apocryphal writings have been ignored for the purpose of this study, and the alternative reading has always been chosen.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS 1.26-31(2), 2.7-9, 18-24, 3.8-15, 8-19, 9.8-15, 12.1-4, 15.5-18, 18.1-10, 20-32, 22.1-18

The feminist asks whether, according to the scriptures and according to particular readings of those scriptures, women are there at the constitutive events of salvation history. Here we find that the woman is included in both stories of creation, although the shortening of these stories tends to blur the development in the creation of the 'adam' that culminates in man and woman. Sadly, the naming of Eve as mother of all humans, seen by many as a sign of hope, is omitted.

Abraham's story is greatly abbreviated and only positive parts are related, e.g., 'Abram put his trust in the Lord.' (15.6) Omitted are his lack of trust while in Egypt, and the pitiful treatment of Hagar and Ishmael. The story at Mamre stops just short of including Sarah's very human response, which would only require a few more verses. Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, Leah, Rachel, and Joseph are non-existent. When Moses is later introduced to 'the God Of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob', he could well have said, 'Who?'

Procter-Smith argues that texts are often chosen because of their

relation to the story of a central male character. Thus salvation history is reduced to the stories of Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, Elijah, (carefully avoiding the more violent idiosyncrasies of the prophet), and the male followers of Jesus.⁷ The reply could well be that we do this because the scriptures tend this way! At once we are back to questions about the relevance and usefulness of the scriptures to women.

EXODUS 3.1-15, 12.12-22, 14.15-15.1, 15.1-12, 16.2-15, 17.3-7 8-13, 19.2-6, 20.1-17, 22.21-27, 32.7-14, 34.4-9(2)

The ingenuity of Moses' mother and sister in his birth saga is missing. Moses sings (twice in the lectionary) at the crossing of the Red Sea, but Miriam's song is forgotten, despite its great antiquity. However, Aaron's part in the making of the Golden Calf is also conveniently omitted, so it becomes 'the people's fault' rather than their leader's fault.

LEVITICUS 13.1-2, 45-46, 19.1-18

NUMBERS 11.25-29

DEUTERONOMY 4.1-8, 32-40, 5.12-15, 6.1-6, 10.12-22, 11.18-28, 18.15-20, 26.1-10, 30.10-14, 32.36-41

The portions chosen from these books show a lack of perceived relevance of most of the Torah, except perhaps as a background to customs in the time of Jesus, and further emphasising laws and obedience, the choice between blessing and curse. Deuteronomy 26 is one reading that emphasises grace rather than law, and happily it is chosen for the first Sunday in Lent!

JOSHUA 5.2-12, 24.1-18

JUDGES none

RUTH none

1 SAMUEL 3.2-19, 16.1-13, 26.2-23

2 SAMUEL 5.1-3, 7.1-12, 12.7-13

1 KINGS 3.3-14 (2), 5.10-17, 8.41-43, 17.10-16, 17-24, 19.4-8, 9-13, 15-21

2 KINGS 4.8-16, 42-44

1 CHRONICLES none

2 CHRONICLES 36.15-21

EZRA none

NEHEMIAH 8.2-10

ESTHER none

Joshua gives us the circumcision at Gilgal, which excludes women rather obviously from the covenant, while the telling of the history in chapter 24 leaves no role for women except to follow their husbands. This is reinforced by the reading of Ephesians 5.21-32 on the same occasion. Feminists have since found special meaning in the Gospel for the same day, John 6.60-69, when wondering whether there is any good news for them in christianity: 'Lord, to whom else would we go?'

Feminists argue that many of the significant women in Old Testament times are silenced by the choice to include or omit texts. However the choices could more likely indicate the lack of interest in the history generally. One might wonder whether the period between Exodus and Kingdom existed at all, and similarly the Exile and Restoration. 2 Chronicles and Ezra are the exceptions, but to unpack for a congregation everything about these two texts would take more than the average preacher is willing to give. The main problem is that salvation history, God's work in the world, seems to be in no great hurry!

The two books in which women make most of the running, Ruth and Esther, are omitted. Deborah, the judge, does not exist, but then neither do Samson and Gideon.

Other lesser-known texts from Judges have become significant to feminists, for example, the story of Jephthah's daughter, the victim of her father's foolishness. Feminists want to retrieve not only texts that speak well of women but also those in which women are seen as victims. It is only when abuse is recognised and given a voice that it can be dealt with and true freedom can be accomplished. Hagar's story is important in this respect, as is the gruesome rape and murder of the young woman from Bethlehem taken by the Levite in Judges 19.⁸ Again we see the inappropriateness of responding to all readings with 'This is the Word of the Lord.' It may be more helpful to have a range of responses, including 'Lord, forgive us.'

PSALMS

1, 4, 8, 15(2), 16(3), 17, 18(3), 19(3), 22(2), 23(5), 24, 25(4), 27(3), 29, 30(3), 31(4), 32(2), 33(5), 34(5), 40(3), 41, 47, 50, 51(6), 54, 62, 63(3), 65, 66(2), 67(2), 68, 69(2), 71, 72(4), 78, 80(3), 81, 85(3), 86, 89(2), 90(2), 91, 92(2), 93, 95(4), 96(3), 97(2), 98(4), 100(2), 103(6), 104(3), 107, 112, 113, 116(2), 117(2), 118(4), 119(2), 121, 122(2), 123, 126(3), 128(5), 130, 131, 137, 138(3), 145(6), 146(6), 147(3)

The most used psalms are (6 times) 51, 103, 145, 146,
followed by (5 times) 23, 33, 34, 128,
and (4 times) 25, 31, 72, 95, 98, 118.

David Brown notes that psalms have been chosen as a 'devotional response' to the first reading.⁹ It seems a pity that in over 180 possible uses of psalms, the following 81 psalms are not used at all: 2-7, 9-14, 20-21, 26, 28, 35-39, 42-46, 48-49, 52-53, 55-61, 64, 70, 73-77, 79, 82-84, 87-88, 94, 99, 101-102, 105-106, 108-111, 114-115, 120, 124-125, 127, 129, 132-136, 139-144, 148-150. On the other hand, of the 69 psalms used, 43 are used more than once. Even when the saints' days are included in calculations only two more psalms make it to the list. At least the musical director from my parish now knows why he has been waiting so long to use particularly nice versions of psalms 84 and 150!

The restriction on the use of psalms may be partly due to the failure to choose from the whole range of Old Testament texts, including stories of destruction and unfaithfulness as well as trust and obedience.

However my difficulties are not necessarily alleviated when Horace Allen tells me that in the Common Lectionary, with its longer Old Testament readings, 'the psalms virtually chose themselves.'¹⁰ The common preferences of a committee does not always amount to the mind of God!

Feminists ought to be concerned about the overuse of psalms such as 128 (5 times), which presume the subordination of women in a more subtle way than some New Testament texts. In addition Psalm 51, which tells us 'in sin my mother conceived me', is used 6 times in the cycle.

Numbers given for psalms do not indicate which verses were used, only that at least some of the psalm was used. It is to be hoped that people no longer leave out unsavoury parts of the psalms and thus take away their real power. Having used the psalms regularly with school girls at a daily office, I have noticed it is difficult to suitably remove offending parts anyway! It is not completely obvious which psalms are imprecatory and which are praise. Particularly unsavoury varieties like 58, 83, or 109 do not get a guernsey at all in the three-year lectionary, so I have my suspicions about the use of those left in the readings! For example, Psalm 63 stops with only two verses to go, even though the damage has already been done by the inclusion of verse 9. Walter Brueggemann sees the exclusion of lament psalms coupled with the overuse of the hymnic psalms as 'a monopoly of imagination' which serves the interest of the status quo and a theology of glory. 'The recovery of laments in pastoral care is a way to value the imagination of marginality, to serve the interest of social transformation, and to bear witness to a *theology of the cross*.'¹¹

However, in an ordinary parish congregation on a Sunday, the psalm, perhaps more than other reading, can easily be extended to include more verses than set down by the lectionary, if only ministers, wishing to remedy the situation, can trust their congregations with such inflammatory ideas.

JOB 7.1-7, 38.1-11

PROVERBS 2.1-15, 3.21-26, 8.22-31(4), 9.1-6, 31.10-31

ECCLESIASTES 2.18-23, 10.12-14

SONG OF SONGS none

Wisdom literature, apart from the psalms, is badly under-represented in the lectionary. Perhaps the question in compilers' minds is 'How can this be preached?' and it must be admitted that this is a mostly unanswered problem. However it is worth noting that for many scholars¹² wisdom is the basic mode of the scriptures, i.e., response to God rather than address by God. We need to come to terms with what wisdom is doing in the canon, not to mention what exactly we mean by preaching that it might include preaching wisdom literature.

The choice of only 2 texts from Job, one of Job's desolation and another of God's 'answer', or part thereof, indicates the difficulty of making any sense of Old Testament texts. The book of Job does not just consist of problem and answer, but of a whole way of working through the problem (42 chapters' worth!).

Similarly the optimism of Proverbs needs to be held in tension against the pessimism of Ecclesiastes, but two whole books cannot be used in one Sunday. Interesting that the capable wife of Proverbs 31 gets a mention, while the entire use of Ecclesiastes amounts to 9 verses. On the other hand it is probably easier to respond 'This is the Word of the Lord' after 'She deserves the respect of everyone', than after 'It is all useless, useless.'

The capable wife, with all her business dealings and initiative, is used in an interesting conjunction with Matthew's parable of the three servants. Here is a woman who uses her talents! However she is more or less put in her place before we see the connections with the gospel by the intervention of Psalm 128 appearing yet again! Why not 67 or 150?

The sad omission of Song of Songs must surely say something about the aversion of the church to talking openly about sexual matters! And yet, here we find permission. Even the use of the Song on Mary

Magdalen's Day stops before the more explicit verse, 'Promise me, women of Jerusalem...that you will not interrupt our love.'

ISAIAH 2.1-5, 5.1-7, 6.1-13, 7.10-14, 9.2-7(2), 11.1-10, 22.19-23, 25.6-9, 35.1-10(2), 40.1-11(2), 42.1-7, 43.16-21, 18-25, 45.1-6, 49.3-6, 14-18, 50.4-7(2), 52.7-10, 52.13-53.12 (3) (also 53.7-12), 55.1-3, 6-11(2), 56.1-7, 58.7-10, 60.1-6(3), 61.1-11, 62.1-5, 11-12, 63.15-64.12, 63.77-79, 66.10-14, 18-21

Undoubtedly the book(s) of Isaiah form part of the canon within the canon of the three-year lectionary! The 41 texts chosen are reasonably well distributed between the three Isaiahs. Isaiah is most obviously used in the Advent-Epiphany period, taking 14 out of 24 Old Testament choices. Two portions are read every year: the Servant Song from Isaiah 52-53 for Good Friday, and 60.1-6 for Epiphany. Both of these are used as direct prophecies of Christological significance. Little space is thus given for understanding the obvious meaning of the original writing. Prophecy is seen as pushing directly into the future which is Christ. Does this mean that it is now out-of-date as prophecy and is only useful as background document? Is there a 'fuller sense' in Scripture and is it now exhausted in Christ?

For an extended discussion of typology as used by both New and Old Testament writers, see John Goldingay *Approaches to OT Interpretation*, who argues that typology is of its essence historical, but we often use typology to remove texts from their historical setting. He cautions that the 'situation-centred approach to the text ('How does it relate to Christ?') has to be complemented by a text-centred approach ('What is the text saying in its own right, what is its own agenda?'). We need to understand Isaiah 7 or Genesis 44.53 for themselves; a typological approach does not necessarily help us to do this. Similarly, concern with the 'fuller sense' or 'spiritual meaning' becomes a lack of interest in the literal meaning.'¹³ Once we have thus exhausted the meaning of a text, we have removed the possibility of the text *continuing* to address us.

Generally we can say that this use of Isaiah highlights the way the Old Testament is used primarily to comment on the Gospel reading for the day. There is no possibility for a reading of the Old Testament on its own terms. (Indeed, Michael Vasey comments that preaching on this sort of lectionary is usually based on the Gospel and so the Epistle is also ignored.¹⁴ This brings a special problem for the prophets, who are thus presented by the lectionary as being on the side of the church, i.e., the bolsters of conservative opinion, whereas in their own day they were the radical element.

It is not surprising that Isaiah features so large in the lectionary, as it is one of the books most used by the New Testament writers. Furthermore we may be in no position to criticise the hermeneutic operating since, as C.F.D. Moule notes, in the New Testament, 'the choice of Old Testament passages is determined by the Christian events and their interpretation dictated by Christian tradition.'¹⁵ Even so, the use made of Isaiah far outstrips the use of Deuteronomy and Genesis. It may be due to the form in which these writings have come to us, already re-applied to a new situation by Second and Third Isaiah, that makes them so readily applicable to the Christian era.

A feminist lectionary such as those by Miriam Therese Winter¹⁶ refuses to limit scripture by correlating texts across the testaments. However it is unlikely that such resources, however good, will replace standard lectionaries based as they are on the christian year. This raises the further question of how androcentric the church year might be, and how far we are willing to allow the scriptures to be made subservient to the church calendar. In Isaiah's words, will God's word be freed to accomplish everything God sends it to do?

JEREMIAH 1:4-5, 17-19, 17.5-8, 20.7-9, 10-13, 23.1-6, 31.7-9, 31-34, 33.14-16

LAMENTATIONS none

EZEKIEL 2.2-5, 17.22-24, 18.25-28, 33.7-9, 34.11-16, 37.12-14, 38.2-10

DANIEL 7.13-14, 12.1-3

HOSEA 2.16-22, 4.1-6, 6.3-6, 14.1-7

JOEL 2.12-18 (3)

AMOS 6.1-7, 7.12-15, 8.4-10

OBADIAH none

JONAH 3.1-10

MICAH 5.2-5

NAHUM none

HABAKKUK 1.2-3, 2.2-4

ZEPHANIAH 3.11-13, 14-18

HAGGAI none

ZECHARIAH 9.9-10, 12.10-11

MALACHI 1.14-2.10, 3.16-18, 4.1-2

David Brown comments that 'With respect to the minor prophets and the 'wisdom' literature, passages were only chosen from these as they related to the Gospel readings.'¹⁷ Brown argues that Christ ought to be the focal point of any christian lectionary, however the way this fact relates to the reading of the Old Testament is by no means obvious. It does not necessarily follow that the Gospel reading ought to be the 'controlling lesson'¹⁸ any more than it is necessary always to mention Jesus in order to preach Christ.

The problem is highlighted by the brevity of the readings. If only five verses are read from the entire book of Habakkuk, or four from Micah, or Zephaniah and Zechariah are read in two and three-verse nibbles, it hardly seems worthwhile for the preacher or reader to unpack any of the historical background or themes of the minor prophets.

It may be that there is more to the relationship between the testaments as presented in the lectionary, as scholars have seen in the use that the New makes of the Old Testament. Thus when Matthew uses Hosea 11.1 to comment on the escape of Mary, Joseph, and Jesus to Egypt, it need not be as simplistic as it first appears. Rather, it may be calling up a whole way of thinking and speaking about God at work in the world. However the various disclaimers from those like Vasey, Brown, and Allen who have written about the lectionary, give little hope here.

NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES

The first set of texts, in brackets, are those used more randomly or on feast days. The second set of readings are used during Ordinary Sundays in a fairly systematic manner. However it must be noted that those wishing to follow this system find themselves 'rudely interrupted' by Lent and Easter!

MATTHEW (1.18-25, 2.1-12, 13-23, 3.1-12, 4.1-11, 6.1-21, 11.2-11, 17.1-9, 24.37-44, 26.14-27.66, 28.1-10, 16-20(2))

none repeated below

3.13-17, 4.12-23, 5.1-12, 13-16, 17-37, 6.24-34, 7.21-27, 9.9-13, 36-10.8, 10.26-33, 37-42, 11.25-30, 13.1-23, 24-43, 44-52, 14.13-21, 22-33, 15.21-28, 16.13-20, 21-27, 18.15-20, 21-35, 20.1-16, 21.28-32, 33-43, 22.1-14, 15-21, 34-40, 23.1-12, 25.1-13, 14-30, 31-46

Neither Matthew's nor Luke's genealogy is used, which probably says we don't know what their relevance is for our culture!

The Feeding of the 4000 has been omitted from both Matthew and Mark, thus it is lost from the lectionary, despite the fact that at least one commentator thinks it, rather than the feeding of 5000, was the original pericope.¹⁹ There seems to be an underlying assumption that one feeding is enough for any miracle-worker!

Also missing from all Synoptics is the healing of the Gerasene (Gadarene) demoniac(s), with its nasty ending for the pigs. The rejection of the Pharisees and others who wanted a miracle but would only be given the sign of Jonah is absent from all Synoptics, as is the death of John the Baptist, and the healing of the boy with an evil spirit.

Neither Matthew nor Mark are allowed to exhibit the large amount of apocalyptic teaching on Jesus' lips as his death approaches. It may be difficult for us to imagine so much preaching about the last days, and yet Jesus is presented as doing just that.

Such texts as these and the genealogies are strange to our culture, but they need to be heard lest we refuse to acknowledge the gap between our situation and that of the text. Some have argued that the hermeneutical gap is unbridgeable, but, even if they are mistaken, we need to retain some sense of the strangeness of the text and our distance from it, lest we domesticate it to merely suit our own concerns.²⁰

No one, not even John, is allowed to speak about the entry to Jerusalem! Although the Sunday next before Easter is commonly called Palm Sunday, there is actually no where these events are recounted. Nor is the strange cursing of the fig tree. Only John has the cleansing of the Temple, but that at the beginning of his Gospel.

MARK (1.1-8, 12-15, 9.2-10, 13.33-37, 14.1-15.47, 16.1-8, 15-20)

none repeated below

1.14-20, 21-28, 29-39, 40-45, 2.1-12, 18-22, 23-3.6, 20-35, 4.26-34, 35-41, 5.21-43, 6.1-6, 7-13, 30-44, 7.1-23, 31-37, 8.27-35, 9.30-37, 38-48, 10.2-16, 17-30, 35-45, 46-52, 12.28-34, 38-44, 13.24-32

The lectionary makes some use of the 'other endings' of Mark, but continues to ignore the resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene.

The oddest fact for the year of Mark is that the entire Gospel has not been included, despite its brevity. In particular, two key turning points in the Gospel are omitted: (1) the beginning, and the key, to the parabolic teaching of the Parable of the Sower, and (2) the need for a two-stage miracle/teaching/healing in chapter 8. Thus the story has lost its subtlety, especially as regards the obtuseness of the disciples!

At this point the compiling of a lectionary begins to look like an impossible task. One needs to be, at the very least, an expert in liturgy, hermeneutics, Old and New Testaments!

LUKE (1.1-4, 14-21, 26-38, 39-45, 2.1-14, 15-20, 22-40, 41-52, 3.1-6, 10-18, 4.1-13, 9.28-36, 13.1-9, 15.1-32, 21.25-36, 22.14-23.56, 24.1-12, 13-35, 35-48, 46-53)

none repeated below except 3.10-18, 15.1-32, 23.35-43

3.15-22, 4.21-30, 5.1-11, 6.17-26, 27-38, 39-45, 7.1-10, 11-17, 36-8.3, 9.18-24, 51-62, 10.1-20, 25-37, 38-42, 11.1-13, 12.13-21, 32-48, 49-53, 13.22-30, 14.7-14, 25-33, 15.1-32, 16.1-13, 19-31, 17.5-10, 11-19, 18.1-8, 9-14, 19.1-10, 20.27-38, 21.5-19, 23.35-43

Some of the more radical elements of Jesus' ministry have been edited out of Luke's story. Compare, for example, the more worldly Beatitudes of Luke with Matthew's more spiritual version. The so-called Nazareth Manifesto, a favourite text of liberation theologians with its emphasis on tangible salvation, is missing, as are the follow-up questions from John's followers about the physical signs of the kingdom. Should we look literally for prisoners set free, or blind and deaf healed?

A favourite text for feminists, the women bent for 18 years, is omitted. This omission and that of the sick man in 14.1-6 and the incident in the wheatfields (6.1ff), tends to play down Jesus' opposition to Sabbath regulations. The Magnificat is used, but it is taken not from scripture but from the prayer book. Thus it is taken from Mary's lips and put on the lips of others (men?) in church history. However it must be noted that Zechariah's song suffers a worse fate, and does not even appear from the Prayer Book pages. Jesus' love for Jerusalem, his weeping, and his use of feminine imagery of the mother hen is also gone.

JOHN

readings given in order used according to the year

A 1.1-18(2), 4.5-42, 9.1-41, 11.1-45, 18. 1-19.42 10.1-10, 14.1-12, 14.15-21, 17.1-11, 20.19-23(3), 3.16-20(1), 1.29-34

B 1.6-28, 2.13-25, 3.14-21, 12.20-33, 20.19-31(2-3 see above), 10.11-18, 15.1-8, 9-17, 17.11-19, 1.35-42, 6.1-15, 24-35, 41-51, 51-58, 60-69, 18.33-37

C 1.1-18, 8.1-11, 20.19-31(2-3), 21.1-19, 10.27-30, 13.31-35, 14.23-29, 17.20-26, 16.12-15, 2.1-12

It should be noted that John is considered too difficult a book for reading systematically in the manner of the Synoptics. The choices for Johannine readings are to be praised, however, for often including fairly large chunks of teaching and narrative. Such use needs to be consistent.

The story of Jesus appearing to the (male?) disciples is heard every year, thus highlighting the omission of his prior appearance to Mary Magdalen. It is not therefore surprising to have heard a well-known preacher assert that Mary Magdalen was actually wrong in wanting to hold onto the old Jesus, the rabbi, while John and Peter went home believing, and waited in the upper room for the Lord to manifest himself. The glaring omissions of narrative are the women at the tomb, as well as the anointing by Mary of Bethany, the story of Nicodemus, the teacher of the Law, coming by night, and the story of the footwashing with warnings of unbelief and betrayal. Some of this is rectified in the readings for Holy Week, but many congregations tend to 'do their own thing' at this time so it should not be assumed.

Such omissions could well be seen to leave women in a subservient position, while giving men reason for thinking they make few errors, need little teaching, and are being set by Jesus in positions of power.

ACTS (1.1-11(3) 1.12-14, 15-26, 2.1-11, 7.55-60, 10.34-38(2))

A 2.42-47, 2.22-28, 2.36-41, 6.1-7, 8.5-17,

B 4.32-35, 3.13-19, 4.8-12, 9.26-31, 10.25-48,

C 5.12-16, 27-41, 13.43-52, 14.21-27, 15.1-2, 22-29

The use of Acts as an alternative to the Old Testament during the weeks following Easter calls for comment. Michael Vasey simply notes that the use of John and Acts during the Easter season follows 'ancient tradition'.²¹ Horace Allen notes the reasoning that there is 'no Old Testament 'type' for resurrection, notwithstanding Jonah and Job'. Thus Acts, Revelation and John are combined to comment on the growth of the resurrection community. However the Common Lectionary does provide alternative Old Testament readings.²²

Some of our challenges to the use of the Old Testament also hold true for the use made of Acts. The lectionary seems more at ease with portions of scripture where salvation can be seen in its depth rather than its breadth, with New rather than Old, and with Jesus' short ministry rather than the apostles' more diverse doings.

Only the first half of the Acts of the Apostles is used, although within that a fair range of apostolic activities are mentioned, and there is an

attempt at chronological order. This means however that the missionary activities of Paul, seen by Luke as a vital stage in salvation history, are more or less ignored once the point about the Gentiles has been made by the story of Cornelius, and the Jerusalem Council has ruled on what is required of Gentiles. In fact, church-political squabbles are rarely overcome so easily. In fact the movement of Acts shows the shift that occurred in church politics from the Jews having priority to the Gentiles being the norm for Christianity. Such subtleties are lost by the lectionary's use of this book.

The main omissions in these first chapters are the story of Ananias and Sapphira (too hard!), and Stephen's speech (too long! depth rather than breadth), the conversion of Saul (which appears in the saints' days), the healing of Tabitha, and Peter's report to Jerusalem. Missing from the last half of the book is any sense of a background to Paul's letters.

From the feminist point of view what is lacking is the leadership of women such as Lydia in the church at Philippi. It could be argued that the places that caused Paul least problem were those where women were already prominent, such as Philippi and Thessalonica, and places like Berea with its 'many Greek women of high standing'.

Acts seems more at home being used as a source of readings for saints' days, but we need to ask why it is in the canon in the first place. Presumably not just to provide pen-portraits of first century Christians. The debate about why Luke saw it necessary to extend his story to a second volume seems not to have had an impact on the lectionary. If our present lectionaries are based on ancient usage, they probably have not come to terms with those parts of the scriptures that were not normally used as liturgical texts. Thus Acts is a puzzle to know how to read it within worship.

EPISTLES

Whereas the Old Testament readings seem to have been chosen on the basis of their perceived relevance to the Gospel or the general theme for the day, often there is an attempt to read systematically through the epistles. However entire books are rarely read, sometimes for the want of a few verses.

The first set of references, in brackets, for each epistle contains readings which appear in a more random manner throughout the year, especially on feast days. The second group are moves towards systematic reading.

ROMANS (1.1-7, 5.1-8 (2) 12-19, 6.1-11(3), 8.1-11, 14-17, 31-34, 10.5-13, 13.11-14, 15.4-13, 16.25-27)

3.21-31, 4.18-25, 5.6-11, 5.12-17, 6.3-11, 8.9-13, 18-23, 26-30, 28-30, 35-39, 9.1-5, 11.13-32, 33-36, 12.1-12, 13.8-14, 14.7-12

The omissions from Romans cover most of chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 16. In these chapters there is much discussion of the place of the Jews and the Law, uses of the story of Abraham, not to mention the personal greetings in chapter 16.

In Romans, Paul's argument about the Gospel for the Gentiles is worked out of his understanding of the place of Israel, and his own standing as a Jew. Is this, then, another rejection of the need for the Old Testament to help us fully understand the New Testament? Would we prefer the personal references, such as chapter 16, to be eliminated from the text, or does Paul live in a real world rather than as a spiritual giant above reproach?

1 CORINTHIANS (1.3-9, 22-25, 10.1-13, 12.1-13, 15.20-28)

1.1-3, 10-17, 26-31, 2.1-5, 6-10, 3.16-23, 4.1-5

and later 6.12-20, 7.29-31, 32-35, 9.16-23, 10.31-11.1

and later 12.4-11, 12-30, 31-13.13, 15.1-11, 12-20, 42-50, 54-58

2 CORINTHIANS (5.16-6.2(2), 13.11-14)

1.18-22, 3.1-6, 4.6-11, 13-5.5, 6-10, 14-21, 8.7-15, 12.7-10

Omissions in 1 Corinthians include the references to Apollos, immorality in the church at Corinth, lawsuits against fellow-christians, questions about marriage, food offered to idols, Paul's defence of his apostleship, gendered behaviour in worship, the gifts of the Spirit and church order, and personal plans and greetings. From 2 Corinthians we lose Paul's problems in relating to the church at all, numerous references to his previous letter, Titus and others, gifts for Judean christians, another defence of his ministry, false apostles, and Paul's suffering.

The conclusion is hard to avoid: that the letters of Paul are here being excised of any references that give historical grounding. This badly blurs the steps that need to be taken in order to move from the words of Paul to the word of God. In other words the working out of our faith is being delivered in bite-sized chunks that have been spiritualised at a distance from real life! No wonder Paul's painful letter to the Corinthians didn't make it into the canon. According to the liturgical canon, it didn't exist!

GALATIANS

1.1-10, 11-19, 2.16-21, 3.26-29, 5.13-18, 6.14-18

Our suspicions about the letters to Corinth, are supported further by the use of Galatians in which the more 'theological' parts have been extracted from their real-life setting. What does it mean for our understanding of Galatians 3.26-29 when we have not heard the prior arguments? Can we understand the circumcision heresy that Paul rails against, without ever mentioning circumcision?

In other words, is interpretation about eternal principles to be extracted from the scriptures, of either testament, which can be generalised and suitably applied to our lives?

Further, we should note the omission of Old Testament references to Abraham and Hagar. Difficult as we might find them to interpret, the use of the Old Testament in the New is a question that should be dealt with openly. In the meantime is the best course to leave it out and avoid any sense of alienation from the text?

EPHESIANS (1.3-8, 15-23(3), 2.4-10, 3.1-6, 5.8-14)

1.3-14, 2.13-18, 4.1-6, 17-24, 30-5.2, 15-20, 21-32

Feminists can have field day with the use of this book. Why do the instructions to husbands and wives continue to be read when those to children and parents, slaves and masters are not? Does Ephesians 5.21 carry any force, viz., that all christians are exhorted to submit to one another? An interesting omission is the metaphor of the armour of God.

PHILIPPIANS (1.3-11, 2.5-11, 3.2-14, 17-4.1, 4.4-7)

1.19-26, 2.1-11, 4.4-9, 12-20

Mostly missing from Philippians are the people: Timothy and Epaphroditus, Euodia and Syntyche.

COLOSSIANS (1.11-20, 3.12-21(3))

1.15-20, 24,28, 2.11-14, 3.1-11

Here, we could forgive the woman in my local congregation who thought there was plot against her because she was always being asked to read in church about wives being subject to their husbands. This passage is read three times (fortunately on a low Sunday, the Sunday after Christmas!), while the following words about masters and slaves, as well as Paul's refusal to obey man-made rules, and personal names like Timothy, Tychicus, and Nympha, and the church that meets in her house are omitted.

When personal details are omitted the whole tone of the letter becomes one of eternal principles, and it is easy to see where some interpretations of Paul's instructions to women find support. Generalise the matter, especially by reading most of the passages relating to women, wives, submission and silence, and a 'creation order' appears in which women are meant to be the weaker sex.

1 THESSALONIANS (3.12-4.2, 5.16-24)

1.5-10, 2.1-11, 7-13, 4.13-18, 5.1-11

2 THESSALONIANS

1.11-2.2, 16-3.5, 6-13

With such short letters, the question needs to be asked why not read the entire text?

1 TIMOTHY

1.12-17, 2.1-8, 6.11-16

2 TIMOTHY (1.8-10)

1.6-14, 2;8-13, 3.14-4.2, 4.6-18

(immediately following 1 Timothy readings)

We may be excused for crying 'Hallelujah!' at the omission of the reference to women being silent because Eve sinned first. It is probably omitted because such exegesis of the Hebrew scriptures defies logic let alone theo-logy! However omitted also is any reference to the widows, which contains the only New Testament reference to anyone being told to have charge (oikodespotein) over another. The widows seem to be an established grouping within the church with specific functions. They are mentioned in the same breath as the elders. But not in the lectionary.

The lectionary continues to have us read from 2 Timothy that '*all* scripture is inspired by God'. We just have trouble believing it.

We could be excused for thinking Timothy had some problems, as his personal adventures are again omitted. He is even missing from the letters which bear his name, along with Lois and Eunice! Basically it would seem to matter little whether or not these letters are written to Timothy, let alone whether they are Pauline.

TITUS (2.11-14, 3.4-7)

no systematic reading

PHILEMON

whole is read in one epistle

HEBREWS (1.1-16, 4.14-5.10, 5.7-9, 10.5-10)
2.9-11, 4.12-13, 4.14-16, 5.1-6, 7.23-28, 9.24-28, 10.11-18
and later 11.1-19, 12.1-4, 5-13, 18-24

Less than half of the book of Hebrews is read. Yet here we may have a greater chance to find the clues to interpreting the Old Testament. The passages relating to Jesus as High Priest and sacrifice are used extensively. Others relating to other Old Testament types such as the Sabbath rest, Melchizedek, and the Holy of Holies, are omitted. Marjorie Procter-Smith argues for a dialogical typology, in which the scriptures are engaged in dialogue with the community. Such a typology recognises the diversity of biblical witness and community interests.²³ In this use of Hebrews, the pattern or range of metaphors is made to appear much simpler than it actually is. It is the same problem we come up against when trying to understand the work of Christ with only one metaphor such as substitutionary atonement.

JAMES (5.7-10)

1.17-27, 2.1-5, 14-26, 3.16-4.3, 5.1-6

For texts that are waiting to be preached, it seems a special pity to omit James' words about the tongue!

1 PETER (3.18-22)

1.3-9, 17-21, 2.4-10, 20-25, 3.15-22, 4.13-16

2 PETER (3.8-13)

no systematic reading

Feminists may be glad at the omission of the submission passages for wives, but even this omission treats the text as if wives are somehow in a different category to slaves and citizens. The text also omits the admonition to church elders and younger men to 'put on the apron of humility' rather than rule over others. The question is still muddled as to whether women are indeed the weaker sex. In three cases, Ephesians, Colossians, and 1 Peter, the wives/husbands instructions have been separated from the slaves/masters, thus the similarity between them is no longer obvious.

1 JOHN

2.1-6, 3.1-2, 18-24, 4.7-10, 11-16, 5.1-6

2 JOHN none

3 JOHN none

JUDE none

REVELATION (1.4-8)

1.9-19, 5.11-14, 7.9-17, 21.1-5, 21.10-23, 22.12-20

Again the question arises why, with such short letters, we do not read substantial portions. The Revelation of St John is treated much as Job, with a mere beginning and end. Readings include obvious visions of Christ holding seven stars, the Lamb who will be the Shepherd, the new heavens and earth and Jerusalem, and the final coming of Jesus. It is as if the editors did not know what to do with all the material in between. Perhaps the only preaching we really know on such passages is highly inflammatory and misguided. That raises the question of the perspicuity of scripture. Are we willing to open the scriptures to everyone and thus to the possibility of misunderstanding? Are those who compile the lectionaries saying to congregation, 'Believe us, we know what is best for you'?

CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to raise questions about our choice of texts for use in worship. There are also many practicalities to be considered, not least the impossibility of publicly reading the entire scriptures in a three year cycle. But the theology behind our choices is vital, and it is important that it be brought into the open. For instance, given the diversity of the scriptural witness itself, would it not be more appropriate to have a diversity of lectionaries, despite the sacrifice of local ecumenism?

One final warning in living with the limits of any lectionary is to avoid the idea that what is read, used, preached, and sung on Sundays or major feast days within public worship is the only encounter we ought to have with our scriptures. Michael Vasey criticises the ASB lectionary for giving just this appearance: 'we've selected the *important* passages for you!'²⁴ He comments further that the use of a lectionary 'has the strange effect that it is not lawful to read large tracts of scripture at the church's main service.'²⁵

Perhaps the basic question is just who does own the scriptures?

APPENDIX

EXTRA READINGS PROVIDED BY INCLUSION OF 24 SAINTS DAYS AND HOLY WEEK

Note here the continued use of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the lack of imagination with Daniel, the continued lack of variation with Psalms, and the expansion of the number of readings from Acts. Holy Week

readings means that Song of Songs is included, as is Mary's anointing and the footwashing in John's Gospel, and the institution of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians.

Num 6.22-27

Deut 32.1-4

2 Chronicles 24.17-22

Prov 3.1-6

Job 29.11-16

Song of songs 3.1-4

Is 30. 18-21, 49.1-2, 62.6-12

Jer 8. 22-9.3, 31.15-20, 45

Daniel 7.9-12 (making 3 in all!)

Hab 2.1-4

Mal 3.1-4

Ps 124, 139

Matt 10.7-13, 17-22, 20.20-28

Luke 1.57-66, 80, 6.12-16

John 1.45-51, 20.1-18(2), 24-29 (4 times in all)

Acts 6.8-10, 9.1-22, 11. 19-26, 12.1-11, 13.1-3, 22-26, 22.3-16

Romans 10.14-18

Gal 4.4-7

Phil 3.13-21

Eph 2.19-22, 4.7-16

2 Timothy 4.9-17

Heb 2.14-18, 10.4-10

1 Peter 5.5-14

2 Peter 1.16-21

1 John 1.1-5, 5-10

Rev 7. 2-8, 12.7-12

NOTES

1. Cited by Marjorie Procter-Smith *In Her Own Rite. Constructing Feminist Liturgical Tradition*. Abingdon Nashville, 1990 117

2. Procter-Smith notes that liberation theologians raising issues from the margins are asking 'questions about ethics, over history, doctrine, or aesthetics.' Marjorie Procter-Smith 'Lectionaries - Principles and Problems: Alternative Perspectives', *Studia Liturgica* 22, 1992 Number 1, 84-99 84
3. As does the very valuable essay by Marie-Louise Uhr 'The Portrayal of Women in the Lectionary' *St Mark's Review* No. 135 Spring 1988 22-25. I would recommend this for readers who want a shorter treatment of the subject. However I attempt here to set out quite fully what is and is not read aloud in public worship, drawing my conclusions, and encouraging others to continue researching this data.
4. Marie-Louise Uhr concludes that the lectionary readings support 'the view that women are nothing but wives and mothers. At worst they are seen to picture women as irrelevant to salvation history'. art. cit., 24
5. Horace T. Allen Jr 'Common Lectionary: Origins, Assumptions, and Issues' *Studia Liturgica* Vol 21, 1991, 14-30
6. *ibid* 28
7. Procter-Smith, art. cit., 89 'In other words, contemporary christian lectionary systems, in their desire to be faithful to the major emphases of the biblical record, have intensified the androcentrism of the bible.'
8. Phyllis Trible *Texts of Terror. Literary-Feminist readings of Biblical Narratives* Fortress Philadelphia 1984
9. David Brown *Introducing the Three Year Lectionary* Uniting Church Press Melbourne 1982, 29
10. Allen, art. cit., 27
11. Walter Brueggemann 'Monopoly and Marginality in Imagination' pp 184-204 in *Interpretation and Obedience* Fortress Press Minneapolis 1994. Brueggemann agrees with Erhard Gerstenberger's conclusion that lament psalms 'are communal acts of rehabilitation...that they are not transacted in the temple but in the village, the house church, the base community... These psalms maintain a form of life and engage in a construction of social reality that is an alternative to the dominant social reality centred in king and priests.' 195-6 Thus he challenges the institutional church to struggle over and over again with its propensity to monopolise power.
12. e.g., John Barton *People of the Book? The Authority of the Bible in Christianity* SPCK London 1988 e.g., 45 46
13. John Goldingay *Approaches to Old Testament Interpretation* Updated edition, Apollon IVP Leicester 1990 111
14. Michael Vasey *Reading the Bible at the Eucharist* Grove Books Bramcote Notts 1986 14
15. C.F.D. Moule *The Birth of the New Testament* (3rd ed.), A & C Black London 1966, 106

16. e.g., *WomenWord: A Feminist Lectionary and Psalter: Women of the New Testament* New York, Cross road Publishing Co. 1990
17. Brown, op. cit., 10
18. ibid 42
19. Robert M. Fowler *Loaves and Fishes* SBL Dissertation Series 54, Scholars Press, Chico Calif., 1981
20. see George Steiner *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation* Oxford UP 1975 especially 296-303, who argues for a final step in translation/interpretation which comes after the merging of horizons, namely, that of stepping back from the text so that it can remain a classic text.
21. Vasey, op. cit., 14
22. Allen, art. cit., 23
23. Procter-Smith, op. cit., 121-122
24. Vasey, op. cit., 18. The effect is even greater since the readings have been reprinted in the prayer book. It is frustrating, but nevertheless healthy, to have to choose from a plethora of translations when preparing public worship, reminding us of the constant translation and interpretation that needs to happen in our dealings with these ancient texts.
25. ibid 19

LECTIONARIES AND THEIR USERS: CONFLICT AND CO-OPERATION IN BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

Elizabeth J. Smith

The churches are re-evaluating the eucharistic lectionaries which came into use with considerable excitement and optimism in the 1960s and 1970s. Underlying many of the practical problems and the unforeseen questions which have emerged with the use of these lectionaries is a lack of clarity about what the reading of the Bible in public worship may reasonably be expected to achieve. Liturgists must discern these expectations, and look behind them, to basic questions about the nature of Scripture and its relation to those who use it.

The Lectionaries: Their Claims.

Modern eucharistic lectionaries make various claims for themselves: claims for breadth of scriptural coverage, claims for depth of resources for preaching, claims for ecumenical convergence, claims for theological coherence, claims for pastoral orientation. Certainly, the Sunday assembly in many denominations is now exposed to more extensive scriptural offerings than perhaps it ever was before.

The Roman *Ordo Lectionum Missae* responded with a three-year Sunday cycle to the Second Vatican Council's call for a fuller and richer presentation of scripture to the faithful, as a necessary complement to the renewal of the sacramental aspects of the church's worship.¹ The claims of this lectionary centre on the Christocentric 'importance' of the chosen passages, and on the 'pastoral' concern underlying the project. The British Joint Liturgical Group's two-year Lectionary had an ecumenical thrust from its beginnings, and stressed the need for lectionary tradition to be under theological control.² It has also responded, in its recent, four-year-cycle revision, to calls for still greater breadth of scriptural material to be included.³ An ecumenical North American 'daughter' of OLM is the *Common Lectionary*, whose major concern, in addition to serving churches in which the proclamation of the word would not always be followed by the celebration of the Eucharist, is to treat the Hebrew Scriptures in a somewhat more sophisticated and extensive manner.⁴ A revised Lutheran lectionary in Germany has opted for a six-year series of preaching texts in addition to retaining the traditional, one-year cycle of historical pericopes.⁵

The Lectionaries: Their Critics.

There have been some pleasant surprises in the reception of these lectionaries, perhaps the greatest of these being the impact of *OLM's* three-year cycle outside the churches of the Roman rite.⁶ The lectionaries have many defenders, usually denouncing the perceived 'subjectivity' of other methods of selecting Sunday readings; and many advocates, usually touting the comprehensiveness of the biblical material covered; and many interpreters, usually selling homiletical and catechetical aids for preacher and people. The most recently-trained generation of pastors and preachers now takes one or other of the lectionaries as a Sunday and seasonal 'given'.

But the lectionaries have also had some critics. Earliest, and directed principally at *OLM*, was the critique of the way the highly Christocentric Roman lectionary handled the Hebrew Scriptures. Its *Introduction* quotes Augustine, and goes on: 'the New Testament lies hidden in the Old; the Old Testament comes fully to light in the New. Christ himself is the centre and fullness of all Scripture, as he is of the entire liturgy.'⁷ But, as Gerard Sloyan points out,

The world in which generalised type and anti-type were the common coin of religious interpretation is not one in which modern worshippers live. Nowadays, the comment on the biblical material comprised by the New Testament is bound to be heard as suggesting the sole meaning of the earlier texts.⁸

And, from the perspective of a Protestant biblical scholar, James Sanders argues for a more theocentric reading of the Bible as a whole, making it clear 'that the gospel begins in Genesis, and that God cannot be co-opted to serve Christian needs.'⁹ Neither the Hebrew Scriptures, nor historical Judaism, nor contemporary Christian-Jewish dialogue, is treated with critical respect when a simplistic promise-fulfilment schema is forced onto the scriptures chosen for public reading in worship. Sloyan, too, would have the Christian lectionary do justice to the 'many themes' of Judaism found in the Hebrew Scriptures,¹⁰ and would have lectionaries show less 'nervousness... that not every problem raised by the Hebrew Scriptures may be seen as solved by the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.'¹¹

Two main tacks have been taken in responding to this criticism. *Common Lectionary*, while keeping *OLM's* gospel pericopes almost unchanged, opted for more extended readings from the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomistic history, and the prophets on Sundays outside the Christmas-Epiphany and Easter seasons in years A, B, and C respectively.

It is defended against the charge of excessive Christocentrism by the reminder that the Eucharist, the setting for much, though not all, of lectionary use, is necessarily and unapologetically Christocentric.¹² The Joint Liturgical Group took the reading from the Hebrew Scriptures as the 'controlling lection' for part of each year, having it set the theological theme, and correlating to it the epistle and Gospel for the day. Even with these adjustments, however, questions remain about the amount and type of material from the Hebrew Scriptures that is under-represented or distorted in the lectionaries. This brings into focus the problem of doing justice to the sheer volume of material that presents itself for a single, first-testament 'slot' in Sunday worship.

The second, growing criticism of the lectionaries comes from feminist and other liberation theologies. Many users of the bible experience scripture as a mixed blessing, sometimes providing sustenance and transforming strength to the oppressed, sometimes being used by those who hold power to maintain relationships of violence and exploitation. Women, colonised peoples, children, slaves, and marginalised men, in the various liberation theologies now being articulated, locate the bible's authority firmly in the communities of the oppressed, and not in the biblical text or the tradition that dictates the reading of that text.¹³ When passages experienced by these groups as liberating are not read in worship, and when passages that perpetuate oppression are proclaimed with due liturgical solemnity, criticisms of omission and inclusion are naturally aimed at the lectionaries which determine the readings.¹⁴ These critics find the lectionaries' claims to include all the 'significant' biblical material both inflated (much that the critics consider significant is omitted), and offensive (much that the lectionary considers significant is oppressive.)

Liberation theology insists that all theology – and, since a lectionary is a theological artefact, every lectionary – is engaged, knowingly or unknowingly, for or against the poor and oppressed. In effect, feminist and other liberation critics deny the objectivity claimed for the lectionaries' selections of scripture. They point out that subjectivity still prevails: no longer, perhaps, embodied in the vagaries of a local preacher's choice of material, but located now, covertly, in the comfortable consensus of the denominational or ecumenical lectionary commission, whose membership is unlikely to include many women, racial and ethnic minorities, or even men outside the ordained, theologically-educated elite. Formed by this unacknowledged subjectivity of the powerful few, the selection of texts perpetuates the oppression of

the many. It is as if the undeclared bias of lectionaries adds insult to injury; if fewer claims to comprehensiveness of coverage were made for the lectionaries by the power-holders, the lectionaries' selectivity might rankle less in the estimation of those seeking liberation.

This liberation critique of lectionaries has led to some projects of retrieval, not tied to a particular church calendar. Such projects are unapologetically engaged with the experience of the oppressed. Miriam Therese Winter's three volume feminist lectionary is an example, as it recalls all the biblical women and explores some of the Bible's female imagery for God.¹⁵ Some 'official' lectionaries have moved into palliative care, omitting certain passages (Ephesians 5.22ff, for a notorious example) and inserting others (such as some of Paul's greetings of women leaders in the churches to which he was writing). *Common Lectionary* and its forthcoming revision, and the Joint Liturgical Group's four-year cycle, thus expand the references to biblical women, and prune some of the more blatantly patriarchal texts.

Behind the Critical Conversation: Some Hidden Assumptions.

It seems to me that both lectionary creators and lectionary critics make certain assumptions within the trends we have noted above; and that several of these assumptions are mutually incompatible, if not in direct conflict.

Who Reads, How Much, and When?

First, there is a liturgical-theological assumption: that a Christian's *normative* experience of bible reading will occur in Sunday worship. Second, a pastoral assumption: that most Christians' *sole* experience of bible reading will occur in Sunday worship.

Following from these two are canonical consequences: everything that is read to people in the course of Sunday worship matters (because the context dignifies the text); and everything that matters has to be read to the people in the course of that worship (or they will not hear it). But what if the churches are not willing or able to delineate their normative 'canon within the canon' of scripture, so that it may be hailed as such within the liturgy? What if liturgical theologians creating lectionaries are in fact being asked to do the under-cover, 'dirty work' of canon definition that is too hot for the other theologians to tackle openly?

A more narrowly-defined canon may still be possible for some churches. The German Lutherans who have retained the one-year cycle

of historic pericopes are closest to this, in that they thereby acknowledge the limits of their particular 'canon within the canon', and proceed to supplement it with large amounts of additional material. Such a historically-inherited 'canon within the canon', reinforced in this case by the treasury of church music that has grown up around it, is probably less of a theological minefield than a new creation that might be arrived at by contemporary denominational or ecumenical negotiation. It falls into the category of family heirlooms, like the historic creeds and conciliar statements, or the Reformation churches' Declarations, Theses, or Articles. It connects people to their shared past, without impossibly cluttering their present or limiting their future. For Australian Anglicans, the equivalent resource may be the traditional, one year cycle of Sunday lections associated with the Book of Common Prayer of 1662. Few congregations use BCP 1662, and probably fewer still use the one year cycle of readings, but it remains 'on the books' as manifestation of that denomination's historical 'canon within the canon'.

Dealing with the canonical consequences will, however, require other strategies as well. One option is to enforce a full, rigorous, course reading of the entire Bible with all its oddities, obscurities and repetitions. This would pay homage to the 'motherhood' statement that all scripture is inspired and profitable; it would silence all laments about contemporary biblical illiteracy - and it is not seriously suggested by anyone with a grain of realism about what is achievable or desirable in a late 20th century Sunday assembly. Some may counsel that the weekday or Daily Office lectionary is the natural repository for the remaindered scriptural texts after the needs of the Sunday eucharistic assembly have been met. But even these lectionaries, which may at first glance look like good, solid course readings of the entire Bible, have always strategically omitted some segments of scripture.¹⁶ And the Daily Office, or even daily Eucharist, context of these lectionaries is unlikely to be exploited by more than a very small percentage of those for whom scripture needs to be opened up.

Another option might seem to be for multiple lectionaries, specially tailored for the many constituencies of Christians who want to stake a claim to a distinctive interface with scripture. There would be one lectionary for white western feminists and one for people of colour, one for third world Christians, one for the affluent, one for the poor, and so on, *ad absurdum*; this hardly seems a workable option, either. It is no more helpful to regiment a diversity of perspectives than it is to impose a superficial uniformity. Most Christians do not identify themselves as

belonging to only one of these many constituencies. A white, middle-class woman would need not only to use a lectionary framed within her own feminist environment, but also to encounter the biblical interpretation of Black men, of the gay and lesbian community, or of the urban poor of her own city. The goal would be to have a single lectionary, but one that would be flexible enough to encompass, if not simultaneously, then at least eventually, the needs of many different constituencies of scripture users. A tall order, perhaps, but certainly a more reasonable undertaking than either the exhaustive course-reading or the bewildering multiplicity of lectionaries seems to provide.¹⁷

Who Interprets, and Where?

A third assumption behind the claims and criticisms of lectionaries is a biblical-critical one: that Sunday worship is not the optimal hermeneutical locus for scripture. And fourth, an ecclesiological assumption: that Sunday worship is the optimal catechetical and spiritual locus for bible reading. These, too, result in conflicting demands.

Contemporary biblical scholars rightly assert that their labours are a valuable element in the life of the churches. Most would understand themselves to be working within, and for, the community of faith. Some leave their desks and take to the pulpit regularly, and connect the methods and findings of their research to the specific needs of particular groups within the community of faith as they preach. But many others are averse to any overt engagement with the issues and controversies which are occupying the community of faith at a given moment. These scholars sometimes claim a kind of scholarly neutrality or purity of academic discipline that exempts them from making clear connections with the hurly-burly of the church's daily struggles.¹⁸ This has consequences in just such areas as the hermeneutical world of the lectionary, as Schüssler Fiorenza describes:

The questions explored by historical-literary biblical scholarship and those raised by believers and churches today are often so disparate that it is sometimes impossible to 'apply' a historical-critical interpretation addressing questions of scholarship to a pastoral situation. The proliferation of commentaries to the lectionary testifies to this predicament of biblical scholarship and biblical preaching. No wonder that readers of the Bible continue to adhere to a literalist reading promising 'instant' pietism and that ministers skip historical-critical exegesis for the sake of actualising rhetorics.¹⁹

Much biblical scholarship, then, shuns the highly emotional, tradition-beset world of the liturgy as an inappropriate place for sober biblical critical and interpretive work to take place. There is an immediate, disapproving response to what is seen as the betrayal of serious biblical scholarship by the trimming and distortion of biblical materials as they are tailored to the educational and pastoral needs of the liturgical assembly. The most credible hermeneutics, it is implied, will be done far from the liturgical scene.

On the other hand, preachers, teachers and pastors – and those liturgists who are concerned to help integrate all the elements of the community's prayer – find the ideal hermeneutical locus exactly where other scholars disdain to seek it. These interpreters tend to put the life and growth and mission of the faithful at the heart of their daily priorities. They constantly ask about the practical applications and implications of critical scholarship. The liturgy is where it is all supposed to come together. The liturgy is the place where these people's expectations are highest that God will speak a strengthening, challenging, visionary word to the church. Furthermore, within the liturgy itself, it is to biblical proclamation and preaching that the highest expectations of God's speaking are attached. The liturgical lectionary thus becomes, not the natural enemy of serious biblical study, but rather the natural candidate for the awesome responsibility of hosting truly credible hermeneutical investigation. Faced with such inflated expectations, it is hard to imagine a lectionary doing anything other than seriously disappointing those who put all their hermeneutical eggs into the one liturgical basket.

The moral of this story is, perhaps, that liturgists, at whose door the responsibility for lectionaries is usually placed, should be very circumspect about the claims they make for those lectionaries. Perhaps it is inevitable, given the emotions usually stirred up by changes in worship, that liturgists will feel a need to 'sell' a new 'product', such as a lectionary, by pointing out its benefits in areas of church life beyond the immediate requirements of the worship service. So liturgists may, for example, be tempted to rush in and 'rescue' Christian Educators from despair at a biblically illiterate community, by pointing to the scriptural coverage of the new lectionary. It might be more productive in the long term to allow the liturgy to take on only a small part of the responsibility for the biblical formation of the faithful, instead of trying to shoulder the whole burden.

To help sell a lectionary, liturgists might also be tempted to offer the academic biblical scholars a rare moment of glory as part of the cast of characters whose arcane skills turn out to be 'useful' after all, and whose authoritative mystique then adds to the lectionary's status as a serious theological document. It would probably be more fruitful – although more difficult – to ask the biblical scholars to reflect on what liturgical proclamation does to a biblical text, and to do this not only in reaction to current lectionaries, but from first principles. The biblical scholars, in turn, might require the liturgists to pay more serious attention to the complexities of contemporary hermeneutics and the limitations of the liturgical setting as a locus for biblical interpretation. This particular conversation, between two very different disciplines in the theological world, will not be an easy one.

Perhaps liturgists might be inclined to hail the ecumenical delights of having neighbouring churches of different denominations reading the same lections Sunday by Sunday, in order to sell a lectionary. Unity and convergence are strong, positive notions for the 'owners' of the mainstream churches in the late twentieth century, but often these dreams of future unity in fact represent nostalgia for a glorious, united, mostly mythical past. It would probably be more honest, both culturally and ecclesially, to acknowledge the great diversity of groups within the churches who must and will use different parts of scripture in different ways. Power structures are involved here, and the church's self-image; and this conversation, too, will have its heated moments. But imposing a lectionary on the basis of its ecumenical credentials may well be merely papering over the cracks that are appearing in monolithic denominational identities. It may mean that marginalised and oppressed groups, which are experiencing themselves as living and life-giving church, are unjustly being asked to subordinate their liberation to the greater good of what may be a moribund institution. The churches need ways to affirm and use the diversity within them, at least as much as they need ways to overcome those aspects of their divisions that are sinful.

Lectionaries: Their Users.

Much writing about lectionaries to date has included useful lists of what those lectionaries can do, the functions they fulfil in the life of the churches.²⁰ It may be that, in the next stage of lectionary development, the most useful list will not be of lectionary *uses* but rather of lectionary *users*. Such a list would include at least the following categories of persons.

First, and foremost, at least in the priorities of a liturgist, are the *hearers* of lectionary texts, the people present in the Sunday assembly whose prayer is shaped by the language and the message of scripture. The great diversity of experiences and needs of those praying hearers of lectionary texts needs to be acknowledged and honoured. It is dangerous to subsume their diversity into monolithic, verbal abstractions like ‘the faithful’; they are all faithful, but they are not all the same; still less are they clones of the committee members whose narrower range of needs and experiences inevitably shapes the choices of lectionary texts.

Second, there are the *proclaimers and preachers* of lectionary texts. Scripture, proclaimed and preached, has unique power to comfort and to convert. The liturgy provides distinctive opportunities – though not the only opportunities – for scripture to exercise this power, and the ministers through whom this is made possible are important, primary users of lectionary texts. Liturgists, narrowly defined as those who utilise space, ritual, music, and texts to enhance proclamation, are members of this group of lectionary users.

Third, there are the *scholarly interpreters* of lectionary texts. Without foundational biblical scholarship the church would forget why it bothers to read scripture in church, and would forget, also, what an astonishingly complex and slippery thing is the biblical witness to the living God. The scholarly interpreters may not necessarily begin their investigations with a text as a lectionary presents it, but must certainly wrestle with the liturgical stage of the text’s translation and interpretation.

Fourth, there are the *theologians*. As they seek to articulate dogmatic statements or denominational identity, to point paths towards liberation for oppressed groups or to describe the role of the Bible in the life of the communities they serve, they will necessarily use the lectionary as a *lex orandi, lex credendi* guide to what the church’s actual theology may be. They may then either criticise or affirm the theology implied by the document, but they will certainly be counted as a distinct constituency among the users of lectionary texts.

Fifth, there are the *poets* and the *prophets*. Such people see not only the riches of scripture, in order to flesh them out and communicate them vividly; but they also see the gaps in the biblical picture, and they hear the silences almost muffled by the chorus of biblical voices. Formed within the community of faith, praying within it, yet seeing beyond it to the world that also needs to hear the proclamation of the gospel, these people seek to fill gaps, and to speak with new voices. The prophets and

the reformers, the artists and the poets, use lectionary texts as models, as prototypes, for generating additional revelatory texts for today. Some of the varied *uses* of lectionaries may well be incompatible, or in competition. They remain in the realm of words and ideas, capable of causing but not of resolving controversy. But the different *users* of lectionaries are people, all of whom work with scripture according to their own special emphasis, and who pray together. None of them is in sole control of the way the biblical texts will be used in the context of corporate prayer. These lectionary users will need to talk with each other more openly, acknowledging each other's strengths more graciously, and their own limitations with more humility, in order for more useful lectionaries to evolve in the years ahead.

NOTES

1. Congregation for Divine Worship, *Ordo lectionum Missae*, Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969; see also *Lectionary for Mass: Introduction*, Liturgy Documentary Series 1, Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1982.
2. The Joint Liturgical Group, *The Calendar and Lectionary: A Reconsideration*, ed. Ronald C. D. Jasper (London: Oxford University Press, 1967). See also Donald Gray, 'The Contribution of the Joint Liturgical Group to the Search for an Ecumenical Lectionary', *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991) no. 1: 31-36.
3. Joint Liturgical Group, *A Four Year Lectionary*, JLG 2 (Norwich: The Canterbury Press, 1990).
4. Consultation on Common Texts, *Common Lectionary: The Lectionary Proposed by the Consultation on Common Texts* (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1983); see also Horace T. Allen, 'Common Lectionary: Origins, Assumptions and Issues' *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991) no. 1: 14-30.
5. Karl-Heinrich Bieritz, 'The Order of Readings and Sermon Texts for the German Lutheran Church', *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991) no. 1: 37-51.
6. Horace T. Allen, 'The Ecumenical Import of Lectionary Reform', in *Shaping English Liturgy: Studies in Honor of Archbishop Denis Hurley*, ed. Peter C. Finn and James M. Schellmann (Washington, D.C.: Pastoral Press, 1990): 361-384.
7. *Lectionary for Mass: Introduction*, no. 5.
8. Gerard S. Sloyan, 'The Lectionary as a Context for Interpretation', *Interpretation* 31 (1977) no. 2: 132.
9. James A. Sanders, 'Canon and Calendar: An Alternative Lectionary Proposal', in *Social Themes of the Christian Year: A Commentary on the Lectionary*, ed. Dieter T. Hessel (Philadelphia: The Geneva Press, 1983): 259.

10. Sloyan, 135.
11. *ibid.*, 137.
12. Horace T. Allen, 'Using the Consensus Lectionary: A Response', in *Social Themes of the Christian Year: A Commentary on the Lectionary*, ed. Dieter T. Hessel (Philadelphia: The Geneva Press, 1983): 267.
13. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984): 14.
14. Marjorie Procter-Smith, 'Lectionaries - Principles and Problems: Alternative Perspectives', *Studia Liturgica* 22 no. 1 (1992), 87-8.
15. Miriam Therese Winter, *WomanWord: A Feminist Lectionary and Psalter: Women of the New Testament* (New York: Crossroad, 1990); to be followed by *WomanWisdom* and *WomanWitness*, on the women of the Hebrew Scriptures.
16. Examples that come to mind are an Australian Anglican Sunday Evening Prayer pericope that covered the first chapter of Exodus with the notable excision of the Hebrew midwives' heroic defiance of Pharaoh's edict; and the omission, in the weekday Office, of a lone chapter in the midst of the succession narrative of 1 Samuel, namely the account of Abigail averting a serious conflict between David and her husband, Nabal. Apart from examples like these, where an omission is detected by feminist readers, much legal, genealogical and other material is routinely omitted by daily office lectionaries.
17. It is not the purpose of this paper to determine what such a flexible lectionary might look like. But it would probably include some clusters of texts chosen thematically by different 'constituencies' among the faithful; some groups of pericopes designated for non-eucharistic worship; some clusters which would highlight the contradictions and inconsistencies within scripture itself; and some selected not according to the content of the texts, but rather according to their forms. Allowing the existing calendar system to encompass this kind of diversity will be a major, but not, I think, insuperable problem. Regular 'excursions' from the normative cycle need not inevitably and permanently seize the liturgical limelight, and may even encourage more imaginative exploitation of the readings already available for feasts and seasons.
18. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread Not Stone*, especially the chapter 'Toward a Critical-Theological Self-Understanding of Biblical Scholarship', 117-149.
19. *ibid.*, 119.
20. for example, Lloyd R. Bailey, 'The Lectionary in Critical Perspective', *Interpretation* 31 (1977) no. 2: 140-42.

LITURGY AND LIFE

Liturgical Reforms in the Roman Catholic Church 1832-1962, with
Special Reference to the Developments in Post War France

John H. Smith

Introduction

This paper traces the history of liturgical reforms in the Roman Catholic Church from the refounding of the Solesmes Abbey in 1832 to the years immediately following the Second World War in Europe. These years reveal a steady humanisation of the Liturgy in that the Mass becomes more of a celebration of the gathered community and less of a mysterious spectacle witnessed by the congregation. Within the scope of this paper the most far reaching aspects of this process are to be seen in the mission efforts of the Roman Catholic Church towards the proletariat, particularly in France after the War.

A.C. Lichtenberger tells of a catechumen who asked a priest, 'What is the position of the layman in the Catholic Church?', to be given the reply, 'There are two positions... kneeling at mass and sitting when the priest is in the pulpit'. To this should be added, it was said, a third position, 'hand in pocket book'. A critical awareness of the attitude represented by these comments was allowed to impinge on the Church in the post-war years, together with the knowledge that the working class had been lost to Christianity. Various missionary endeavours resulted from this knowledge, and full use was made of the deepened understanding of the Liturgy that had developed in the previous decades. New life emerged in Church and society, and the second part of this paper will deal with these developments in more detail.

The two parts of the paper will cover the following periods: 1832-1915 and 1915-1962.

Part 1.

1832-1915

Since New Testament times there have been constant changes in the Church's understanding and practice of the Eucharist. The early Christians found Christ in the mysteries, and in the fellowship of the eucharistic feast. However, probably as a result of Aquinas' theology and the elaboration of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the thirteenth century, greater importance was given to the consecration and elevation of the host, so that the priest's performance in the sanctuary rather than

the people's participation became the chief concern.¹ The part of the laity became that of engaging in individual acts of piety while the priest, with his back to the congregation and careful attention to the rubrics, read the service at the altar. Three times during the service, at the consecration, offertory, and communion, a bell would sound to summon attention to the altar, but seldom were people required to take a more active part, or even make their own communion.²

The centuries following the Council of Trent were not without their reforming influences. However, the complicated interplay between the Reformation and Counter-Reformation in the sixteenth century, and then Jansenism, Gallicanism, and the Enlightenment in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries meant that despite some good work being done, the process of stultification which was evident in the Middle Ages was advanced rather than broken. The gap between the liturgy and the life of the people was not closed.³

Although many writers regard the Motu Proprio TRA LE SOLLECITUDINI of 22 November 1903 as the beginning of a modern liturgical reform, much work had actually been done before Pius X made this official pronouncement. The latter half of the nineteenth century, which might be termed a period of growth in 'liturgical science', in which the clergy became technologists of the sanctuary, saw a renewal of scholastic theology which went hand in hand with historical research into the early church, especially the writings of the Fathers.

Following the upheavals of the French Revolution, there was a romantic searching after the beauty and stability of the past. In this context, in 1832 Dom Prosper Guéranger refounded the Benedictine Abbey at Solesmes in France. Here Guéranger aimed to restore Benedictine practice in all its purity, including Gregorian chant, the scholarly study of which he inaugurated. Guéranger conducted much critical research into early manuscripts and reconstructed forms of liturgical ceremonial. He published several works, the most celebrated being *L'Anée Liturgique*, begun in 1840 and finally stretching to fifteen volumes. Guéranger was concerned to impart his love for the beauties and formularies of the Divine Office and, in contrast with the earlier trends in liturgical practice mentioned above, laid stress on the importance of official Church prayers over private prayer, which affected the attitude to private devotions during the Mass. Guéranger's work was aimed at arousing the liturgical awareness of French Catholics and restoring the uniform liturgies to the Church. Opinions regarding

his efforts vary from one extreme to the other. Liturgiologists in particular were incensed by the fact that in his drive to provide uniformity in the observance of the Roman ritual and calendar he was responsible for a 'wild slaughtering' of at least fifteen surviving forms of liturgy used in French dioceses. Guéranger's interest in uniformity was in part inspired by the fact that, up to the French Revolution, eighty of one hundred and thirty bishoprics in France had abandoned the Roman liturgy and were using pre-Tridentine national traditions.⁴ His interference in this state of affairs, together with an ultramontanist streak and the declaration that Jube's reforms (later applied by Pius X!) were heretical, did not serve to make him popular on French soil.⁵ Greater distance from his historical context has led others, such as the Catholic scholar Louis Bouyer, to say that 'there is no achievement whatever in the contemporary liturgical movement which did not originate in some way with Dom Guéranger. The very least we can say in his praise is that he brought liturgy back to life as something to be lived and loved for its own sake'.⁶ Equivocal responses, but indicative of the fact that good or bad, Guéranger's work had a seminal influence on the development and progress of liturgical reform.

The intensive work of Guéranger is generally understood as not having been aimed at creating greater participation in the Mass, as his resistance to the use of the vernacular would suggest. Furthermore, his work is thought of as scholarly and theoretical, reaching only the elite of the Church rather than the people.⁷ Despite these inadequacies, Guéranger's work was part of and contributed to a widespread preparation in scholarship and piety for the liturgical reforms made after the turn of the century.

In 1865 some of the fruit of the work at Solesmes was passed on to the German church in a book by the Abbot of Beuron, titled *Choral und Liturgie*. Guéranger's *L'Année Liturgique*, which had ceased publication in 1841 was resumed in 1875 and was translated into German, English and Italian. The first Eucharistic Congress was held in 1881 and the production of a French Missal in 1882, followed by a German counterpart in 1884, met with immediate success.⁸

The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnesses a rise of scholarly interest in the liturgy in England, Germany, France, Italy and Belgium.

Great interest was shown in Church Music, an aspect which was integral to Guéranger's work. Although it is said that liturgical teaching

in the seminaries continued at the level of initiation into the rubrics, it is obvious that there was a steady growth in the awareness of liturgical matters during this period. Little change may have occurred at the grass roots level, but the foundations for reform were taking shape in the mentality of many church people.

The period 1832 to 1903 was basically one of deepening research and slow restorative development in liturgical matters. One of the first acts of Pius X's pontificate was the promulgation of *TRA LE SOLLECITUDINI*, a *Motu Proprio* which was directly concerned with the restoration of Roman Church Music, a sure indication of the groundswell of opinion in the Church at large. The liturgy may not have been drastically reformed or given a very different social character in this period, but the concern with music and the celebration of the Mass was part of a process which eventually changed the face of Roman worship in the twentieth century.

Pius X's *Motu Proprio* of 1903 is often spoken of as the 'charger of the liturgical movement.'⁹ The reason for this is that Guéranger and others read one particular passage as giving encouragement to more than the restoration of music. After acknowledging the good work that had been done in many parts of the Church towards reviving music, the Pope said that many complaints regarding the celebration of the liturgy had reached his ears, and that -

It being Our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every aspect and be preserved by all faithful, We deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.¹⁰

While it may be true that papal decrees do not make movements, the pastoral tone of this decree, especially the provision for the 'active participation of the faithful in the mysteries' represents official sanction being given both to the impetus for the reform and a greater interest in the eucharist.

The Pope followed this decree with another, *SACRA TRIDENTINA*, of 20 December 1905 in which he declared that

at each Mass the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but sacramentally, by the actual reception of the Eucharist.¹¹

Compared with the practice of the medieval period, in which people rarely communicated directly, participating usually through private prayer, this decree represents what is a fundamental change in the Catholic attitude towards receiving the eucharist. With QUAM SINGULARI of 8 August 1910, which dealt with the question of children and communion, we find a new direction being taken by the papacy in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

Musical developments in this period centred on a commission which the Vatican authorised to prepare standard editions of Gregorian melodies. Problems over the question of whether to produce serviceable as against historically accurate music led to the Pope bypassing the commission and eventually, in 1911, establishing the Higher Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music under the Jesuit de Santi.

During the previous centuries there had been such a multiplication of festivals and votive celebration that the regular services of the Church had become obscured. Leo XIII had set up a commission in 1902 to begin the task of reforming the breviary, but had died before any real work was begun. His aim had been to restore Sunday to its primary place in the weekly cycle of the liturgy and recover the weekly recitation of the Psalter. As part of a broader approach being taken to liturgical reform in this period, Pius X tried to continue the process of clearing away the liturgical debris of the centuries. He encountered such resistance from the Congregation of Rites that he established an independent commission to work on the details.¹² The decree DIVINO AFFLATU of 11 November 1911 carefully announced that no feast would be suppressed, but almost always gave precedence to the Sunday celebration.

In addition, changes were made to the weekday office and the daily lectionary. This was complex work which demanded expert research and development. The Motu Proprio of 23 October, 1913, acknowledged these difficulties and put forward a more cautious agenda for reform, hoping for more far reaching changes in the future. Pius X died ten months after this decree was issued and although a slightly revised breviary appeared in 1914, the project virtually lay idle for the next twenty-five years, no doubt to the consternation of many priests.

Pope Pius X had his limitations as a liturgical reformer and his pontificate may not have seen all the changes that some were urging, but his decrees, whether they provoked or merely ratified changes already taking place, stand as significant landmarks in the development of liturgical practice for these years, and many to follow.

We have discussed the developments up to 1913 from the point of view of papal decrees and decisions. However, Bouyer makes the point that the lines of development opened up by the Vatican required the work of a priest if they were to be carried through to the church at large.¹³ The person who became highly significant at this point was Dom Lambert Beauduin, a Benedictine monk from Mont César. Beauduin participated in a decisive Catholic conference held at Malines, Belgium, in 1909, where he succeeded in proposing a programme which took liturgical reform beyond the Abbeys, where it had tended to stay up to this point. Under his direction it was decided that the Roman missal would be translated into the vernacular and its use as a devotional book promoted amongst the people. A plan for deepening private piety along more liturgical lines was developed and attention was given to the fostering of traditions for home use. Gregorian chant was encouraged, as were retreats to the centres of liturgical life for choir members.

The years following Malines saw Beauduin and the brethren at Mont César carry this programme through. The education of the faithful was a major aspect, for which purpose the distribution of a booklet containing a translation, with commentary, of the Mass for the day, was arranged. For the purpose of improving the liturgical knowledge of the clergy, Beauduin established the review *Les Questions Liturgiques*, and in 1914 published a pamphlet, *La Piété*, which was highly regarded for its solid doctrine, sound historical foundations, and pastoral orientation. Probably the most effective part of Beauduin's work was the organising of annual liturgical weeks which spread the ideas of this programme well beyond the boundaries of Belgium. Priests and laity were brought into a deeper awareness of the liturgy as central to the life of the Christian Church through this programme, which continued, after a break during the First World War.¹⁴

Bouyer is highly complimentary in his assessment of Beauduin's work. He considers that it had an element of realism which kept the human realities of the parishes well in view, with a mind to enriching their view of the existing Missal and Breviary. The Belgian movement, says Bouyer, 'never got lost in archeologism or antiquarianism, and it was never tempted to wander off into innovations of doubtful value'¹⁵. Whether or not we are prepared to accept such an effusive testimony fully, it is clear that there was a pastoral character to Beauduin's work which gave it a truly human touch.

The influence of the monasteries had a seminal influence on the development of liturgical renewal. In Germany it was the Beuron

congregation, particularly the monastery of Maria Laach which, together with that at Klosterneuberg in Austria, led the way. The work at Maria Laach at first developed along similar lines to that at Solesmes, but quickly developed a character of its own. The Abbot Herwegen and the monk Dom Odo Casel, noted for their thorough historical research, became the scholars of the German liturgical revival. Herwegen was especially noted for his clear perception of the deficiencies inspired by nineteenth century Romanticism and the shortcomings of the Medieval period.¹⁶ His book *Church and Soul*, which unfavourably compared the subjective piety of modern times with a more objective piety of Christian antiquity, drew much opposition and led the critics of Maria Laach to say that it was indifferent from 'true personal religion'¹⁷. Despite this, Maria Laach endured as a centre for liturgical scholarship and through teaching and publishing has been highly influential in the liturgical movement.

To the scholarly aspects of Maria Laach must be added another dimension. In 1914 the first liturgical week for laymen was held there and the dialogue Mass, in which the people shared responsively with the priest in the service, was introduced for the first time. Aimed to foster the participation of the faithful, this new move was greeted with enthusiasm, firstly in cultured circles and then amongst the working people. The intention was not simply to allow people to respond during the liturgy, but included the idea of linking the meaning of the mass to everyday tasks, thus extending its boundaries, integrating the worship of the people with daily living.¹⁸

The move for liturgical reform did not suddenly spring into being at Maria Laach, but the scholarship that developed there and the liturgical experience the Abbey provided for people were influential factors in the progress of the movement for many years to come.

Another feature of liturgical reform, developed by the popular school of Klosterneuberg under Pius Parsch, was the explicit promotion of the Bible as a source of inspiration for a deeper understanding of the liturgy. The method was to use publications, leaflets, and educational literature. The interplay between this emphasis and the emerging liturgical movement was important for biblical renewal and liturgical reform. The living liturgy and the living word began to be cultivated together in the Church. Later, Bible study circles, Bible weeks, and new translations into the vernacular were to be developments of Pius Parsch's work. The reading of the Bible and the singing of the Psalms

gradually became popular, once some initial anti-Protestant feelings were overcome.

The first fifteen years of the twentieth century was a time of much development in liturgical research and reform. A feature of the period was the way various countries proved successful in developing different aspects: Belgium and Germany, liturgical research; Austria popularised the Bible; Holland had the most success with music, especially singing. Liturgical reform in Europe was interrupted by the coming of the 1914-1918 War, but activities were to resume in the period that followed.

NOTES

1. Hebert, A.G. *Liturgy and Society: the function of the Church in the modern world* (Faber and Faber, London 1935) 81-2.
2. Klauser, T. *A Short History of the Western Liturgy* (O.U.P. Oxford 1979) 120.
3. Largo, G.A. *Community and Liturgy: An Historical Overview*, (Boston 1980)
4. Klauser, op. cit. 119
5. Bouyer, L. *Liturgical Piety* (Sheed and Ward, Notre Dame 1955) 53-55 and Koenker E.B. *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (Chicago 1954) 10 and 205 fn #7
6. Bouyer, op. cit. 57
7. Bishop, C.H. *France Alive* (New York 1947) 114 and Koenker op. cit 10-11
8. Aubert, R. *The Church is a Secularised Society* (Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1978) 125
9. *ibid* 126
10. Megivern, J.J. *Worship and Liturgy* (Official Catholic Teachings, Wilmington 1978) 16-17
11. *ibid* 27
12. Aubert, op. cit. 126-127
13. Bouyer, op. cit. 59
14. *ibid* 61 and Aubert, op. cit. 128
15. Bouyer, *ibid* 63
16. *ibid* 15-16
17. *ibid* 17
18. Koenker, op. cit. 13

AN EXQUISITE BOOK : A CANON MISSAE OF 1728

F.R.L. Carleton

Pre-1963 Latin liturgical books, which antedate the vigorous vernacularisation of the Western Rite in the Roman Catholic Church and the subsequent promulgation of the New Rite of Mass¹ in 1969, are many and various. So many and so various are they that in 1975 - as liturgical innovation raced universally apace - the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) published a 17 leaf list of uniform titles² for the liturgical books of the Latin Rites as an aid to library cataloguing.³ It contains fifty-six Latin titles with definitions, variants (including those of religious orders), and alternative titles for books used at the altar, like *Missale*, *Pontificale*, and in choir, like *Antiphonale Officii*, *Liber Usualis*.

Such books are the province, not only of the liturgical historian, but also of the historical bibliographer, who is concerned with the transmission of texts and the history of their printing, publication, and distribution - at official and popular levels. Hence Blom's 1982 bibliographical study, *The post-Tridentine primer*,⁴ which investigates the place of a popular book, that ran through over 40 editions between 1599 and 1800, in the history of English Catholic devotional literature, and its role in the individual histories of many of the most important printing houses working for the English Catholics in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Early printed, or pre-1801 books constitute a conventional rare book category for the books of the hand-press era from its inception by Gutenberg in the fifteenth century. Liturgical books, notably the Missal, are amongst the most frequently printed survivors of that era. Their marks of provenance, the evidence of past ownership, like book plates, labels, stamps, and inscriptions - even after their period - are frequently significant for particular historical associations with persons or events or as evocations of the routines of the past. For example, a small octavo Roman Missal, printed at Antwerp in 1657 by the famous Plantin house, and originally bound in full calf, has the following handwritten attribution of past use on the verso of its title page:

This was the missal used by the Very Rev J.J. Therry for many years after his arrival in the Colony.

The inscription was written and signed by Patrick Francis Cardinal Moran ('P.F. Card. Moran'), third Catholic Archbishop of Sydney

(1884-1911). The Revd John Joseph Therry (1790-1864) and the Revd Philip Conolly (1786-1839) arrived in Sydney as the first official Catholic chaplains in NSW in May, 1820. The missal, which is held in the Rare Book Collection of the Veech Library at St Patrick's College, Manly,⁵ is one of a number of early printed liturgical books in local libraries, including monastic books⁶ - quite apart from later ones in the Liturgical Collection in a bay of compactus shelving at Manly and a considerable accumulation of Roman Missals and episcopal books retired from active altar use to the crypt of St Mary's Cathedral many years ago⁷.

A once indispensable episcopal liturgical book is the *Canon Missae* which contains the text of the Canon of the Mass as used by bishops at Pontifical Mass. The most exquisite example ever encountered by this writer was an eighteenth century *Canon Missae* printed for a Prince Archbishop of Salzburg which is in the possession of the nuns of the Benedictine Abbey at Jamberoo on the south coast of NSW. A descriptive entry is given below.

The Archbishop was not the unmusical Hieronymus Colloredo (1772-1803) notorious for heaping indignities on Mozart and the last ecclesiastical prince of the archbishopric, but a predecessor. The Munich born Leopold Anton Eleutherius Firmian (1679-1744) became Dean of Salzburg in 1713 and successively Bishop of Lavant in 1718 and of Seckaw in 1724 (Salzburg's ancient 'private bishoprics') and finally Prince Archbishop of Salzburg in 1727⁸. Apart from the baronial lustre of his old South Tyrolean family name the title page of the *Canon Missae* enumerates the prelate's lofty titles: Prince Archbishop of Salzburg, Legate of the Holy See and Primate of Germany (a distinction held by the Archbishops of Salzburg from 1529)⁹.

As befitted the status of its egregious user this tall folio is munificently bound in morocco, extra gilt, with all edges gilt and is lined with silk doublures. Printed in 1728, that is within a year of Firmian's accession by Johann Josef Mayr, printer to the University of Salzburg, this book is characterised by half-title, title page with an engraved border and text in red and black, the typographic colour combination convention in liturgical printing.

This *Canon Missae* has no marks of its provenance but was very likely acquired by John Bede Polding OSB (1794-1877), the first Catholic Archbishop of Sydney (1842-1877) who founded the community of nuns possessing it in 1849¹⁰. Polding was an assiduous collector of books

for the liturgical and library use of his monastery in Sydney - especially from the numerous European religious houses he visited in the course of his *ad limina* visits to Rome¹¹. In 1847 he used the Scots Monastery in Vienna as his base for travels to establish a wide network of ecclesiastical and aristocratic contacts within the Habsburg Empire¹² into which Salzburg had been incorporated in 1816¹³. If obtained at this time the *Canon Missae* was presumably for Polding's own use in the first St Mary's Cathedral which succumbed to fire in 1865¹⁴.

While such liturgical books are artefacts of Christian culture they may not have outlived their liturgical utility as the Pontifical High Mass celebrated according to the editio typica of the Roman Missal of 1962 by Bishop George Pell in St Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne on Saturday 13 June 1992 and reported in the press clearly indicates. Preaching on the ancient Roman Rite of Mass then being celebrated in its most solemn form Bishop Pell observed

The Tridentine Mass has many virtues; it is part of a noble tradition of worship. Through prayer, ritual, and music it attempts very explicitly to convey the beauty of holiness, and especially through its decorum and dignity it helps to bring us to bow in worship before the invisible God, the All-Holy one.¹⁵

CANON MISSAE AD USUM EPISCOPORIUM. SALZBURG. 1728.

Canon Missae juxta formam editionis Romanae cum praefationibus, & aliis nonnullis, quae in ea fere communiter dicuntur, uti sunt Praeparatio ad Missam & orationes, quae ab episcopis, cum solemniter vel private celebrant; et ab aliis sacerdotibus dici solent, ne non gratiarum actiones Missae sacrificio peracto, recusus: jussu celsissimi, ac reverendissimi domini Domini Leopoldi, de gratia Archiepiscopi Principis Salisburgensis, S. Sedis Apostolicae Legati, Germaniae primatis: ex antiquissimis, et illustrissimis S.R.I. Liberis-Baronibus de Firmian &c. &c.

Salisburgi, typis Joannis Josephi Mayr, Aulico-Academici typographi p.m. haeredum. 1728

(4), 226 p. : ill., music : folio

With a half-title in red and black. Titlepage in red and black within an engraved border. Text in red and black within a double rule border.

NOTES

- 1 Though issued in Latin as the *Novus Ordo Missae* it is usually celebrated in the vernacular and is therefore cited in English.
- 2 'The particular title by which a work that has appeared under varying titles is to be identified for cataloguing purposes'. (AACR II)
- 3 International Federation of Library Associations *List of uniform titles for liturgical works of the Latin Rites of the Catholic Church*, recommended by the Working Group on Uniform Headings for Liturgical Works. IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, 1975.
- 4 J.M. Blom *The post-Tridentine English primer*, Catholic Record Society, 1982 (Catholic Record Society Publications (Monograph series); vol. 3).
- 5 Rare Book Collection 49980. For a full description see F. Carleton 'Memento and cultural artefact: a missal used by Father J.J. Therry' *Church Archivists' Society Newsletter* 85, May 1990 pp. 3-4.
- 6 For descriptions of early printed monastic liturgical books in Sydney Catholic libraries see F. Carleton 'The Rule and monastic liturgical books: pre 1801 editions in Sydney Catholic libraries' *Tjurunga* 26, 1984 pp. 44-51.
- 7 This large aggregation, an impressive reminder of the piety of the past, was encountered by the writer in 1987 while arranging and describing holdings of the Sydney Archdiocesan Archives in the Cathedral crypt for the NSW Bicentennial Archives Programme. A prime exhibit of the Archdiocesan Archives, as distinct from those indiscriminately stored books, is the sixteenth century Roman Missal (Salamanca 1588) of Bishop C.H. Davis OSB (1815-1854) for which see F. Carleton 'Bishop C.H. Davis OSB and two sixteenth century missals of a common provenance' *ANZTLA Newsletter* 13 May 1991 pp. 26-34.
- 8 *New Catholic encyclopedia* vol. 5 McGraw-Hill, 1967 p. 935.
- 9 *ibid.*, vol 12 p. 1005.
- 10 M.G. Foster 'Benedictine women in Australia' in *A man with an idea: Saint Benedict of Nursia*, ed by J.S. Martin, University of Melbourne, 1981 p. 102.
- 11 J. Fletcher 'The library of St Patrick's College, Manly' *The Book Collector*, Summer 1980 p 182.
- 12 T.J. Kavenagh 'Polding and XIXth century monasticism' *Tjurunga* 8, 1974 p. 169.
- 13 *New Catholic encyclopedia* vol. 12 *op cit* p. 1005.
- 14 H.N. Birt *Benedictine pioneers in Australia* vol. 2, Herbert and Daniel, 1911 p. 287.
- 15 'Historic Latin Mass at St Patrick's Cathedral, Melbourne' *AD20005* (7) Aug. 1992 p. 14.

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY: THE FIRST DECADE

The end of this year concludes the first decade of the Australian Academy of Liturgy. The Academy had its genesis in the minds of four people from Adelaide: Mary-Anne Duigan, Kevin O'Louplin, Michael Brennan and Anthony Kain. These were referred to in the first Chairperson's Report (December 1983) as the 'Gang of Four'. In mid-1981 a letter was sent to about a hundred people proposing 'a gathering of like minded people for mutual support and for the building up of the liturgical renewal of the Church community in Australia'.

Response to this letter led to the calling of a meeting in Adelaide from 30 November to 2 December 1982 and sixteen people attended (the 'Adelaide 16'). At this meeting the Academy was born and the following statement adopted.

Membership is open to men and women, from Australia and other countries, competent in liturgy, drawn from the various Christian traditions.

This Academy will enable members to exchange ideas concerning the various facets of liturgy at a scholarly level.

It will comment on liturgical matters and raise questions of importance for liturgy.

It will focus particularly on the understanding and development of liturgy relevant to Australia.

It will make its deliberations and findings available to the broader church.

The main focus of the Academy was the national conference held annually until 1988 and less frequently (due to the tyranny of distance and finance) since. To further the aims of the Academy it was decided at the 1986 conference to publish a journal and the first issue of *Australian Journal of Liturgy* appeared in May 1987. At the 1987 conference a constitution was adopted and set out more fully the goals and purposes of the Academy.

1. The Academy is an ecumenical association of specialists in Christian liturgy and related disciplines, with particular commitment to the understanding and development of liturgy in the Australian context.

2. It is the Academy's purpose:

a. To provide channels for mutual professional assistance and for the sharing of methods and resources.

b. To exchange information concerning recent developments in liturgical matters.

c. To communicate information concerning research projects and activities of its members.

d. To foster liturgical research, publication, and dialogue at a scholarly level.

e. To publish *Australian Journal of Liturgy*.

f. To encourage exchanges with individuals and communities of other religious traditions.

3. It is the intent of the Academy that the work detailed above will ultimately serve to animate the liturgical spirit of the traditions and congregations to which its members belong.

A list of conferences and office-bearers for the first decade follows.

NATIONAL CONFERENCES

First (5-8 December 1983) at Newman College, University of Melbourne. 'Liturgical Reform: twenty years after Vatican II'

Second (3-6 December 1984) at St John's College, University of Sydney. 'Ritual in the Australian Context'

Third (2-5 December 1985) at Newman College, University of Melbourne. 'How we Pray Liturgically'

Fourth (18-21 August 1986) at Sancta Sophia College, University of Sydney. 'Praying Liturgically'

Fifth (28 September- 1 October 1987) at St Paul's Retreat, Glen Osmond (Adelaide). 'Imagination and Liturgy'

Sixth (29 August- 1 September 1988) at Sacred Heart Monastery, Croydon (Melbourne). 'Reconciliation'

Seventh (30 April- 3 May 1990) at Mercy Conference Centre, Bardon (Brisbane). 'Celebrating Christian Marriage Together'

Eighth (3-7 February 1992) at Redemptorist Retreat House, North Perth. 'Patterns of Participation in Worship'

OFFICERS OF THE ACADEMY

Chairperson

The Revd Anthony F. Kain (December 1982-December 1983)

Dr H.V. Christian Harris (December 1983-December 1984)

The Revd Robert W. Gribben (December 1984-December 1985,
August 1986-September 1987)

The Revd David Rankin, SJ (December 1985-August 1986)

President

The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood (September 1987-May 1990)

The Revd Dr Russell H. Hardiman (from May 1990)

Secretary/Treasurer

Sister Mary-Anne Duigan, RSM (December 1982-December 1983)

The Revd H. Paul V. Renner (December 1983-December 1984)

The Revd Gordon Gebbie (December 1984-December 1985)

The Revd David Orr, OSB (December 1984-August 1986)

The Revd Thomas F. Knowles, SSS (August 1986-September 1987)

Dr Helen J. Harrison (September 1987-May 1990)

Secretary

The Revd Ronald L. Dowling (May 1990-February 1992)

The Revd Canon Thomas W. Sutton (from February 1992)

Treasurer

Mrs Colleen Lark (from May 1990)

NEW SONG IN AN ANCIENT LAND
National Liturgical Music Convention, April 18-23, 1993

From 18-23 April next year a National Liturgical Music Convention is being held at the World Congress Centre in Melbourne. This event is already attracting interest throughout Australia and overseas.

Planning for this convention began in 1989 in response to a review of liturgical developments over the last twenty five years. It was felt that musicians and liturgists in Australian parishes, schools, and communities had been striving, in often piecemeal ways and with varying degrees of success, to bring vitality to worship. Such attempts reflected the belief that '... good celebrations foster and nourish faith, while poor celebrations may weaken and destroy faith'. (*Music in Catholic Worship #6*)

Conscious of the need to encourage and foster these initiatives in a world rapidly moving towards the next century, the Catholic Archdiocese of Melbourne agreed to sponsor a liturgical music convention.

Since music and liturgy are so interwoven it will not be limited to musicians but open to all who are involved in liturgy and worship - ordained ministers, organists, instrumentalists, teachers, catechists, pastoral associates, composers, text writers, youth, choristers, cantors, leaders of song, conductors, lectors. The event is for all churches.

Twelve prominent international figures from North America, Europe, and Asia and over forty Australians have accepted invitations to offer presentations at this event.

Among the keynote speakers is Archbishop Rembert Weakand from Milwaukee. Bruce Murphy writing in the Milwaukee Magazine, July 1991, categorises him as follows: 'a mainstream intellectual, the most dangerous archbishop in America, a monkish introvert, a media-savvy star, the closest thing to an American Pope'. Formerly Abbot Primate of the Benedictines, he is a Doctor of Music from the Julliard School of Music and according to Bruce Murphy has a vision of the future that 'may turn out to be the message of the Catholic Church in the 21st century'.

Fr Joseph Gelineau from France will present a keynote address from 'Sound to Mystery'. His settings of the psalms are still of great significance around the world today and he is still remembered for his contributions prior to and during Vatican II.

St Deirdre Browne IBVM and the Revd Robert Gribben from the Uniting Church in Melbourne will give a two part presentation on 'The

Australian Song' entitled 'Taking the Pulse' and 'Sounds of Many Churches'.

From the Iona Community in Scotland, John Bell, a minister of the Church of Scotland, will provide music and ideas in the area of social justice and the liturgy as well as presenting insights into a community that is capturing the imagination of young people from around the world.

Composers and writers from the United Kingdom are Paul Inwood, Christopher Walker, and Bernadette Farrell, while from North America will be Marty Haugen, Bob Hurd, David Haas, and Jack Miffleton. Dr I-to Loh from the Asian Pastoral Institute for Liturgy will delve into the area of inculturation.

In addition to the keynote addresses and the fifty workshops being offered there will be a wide range of liturgical celebrations, choral performances, showcases, recitals, and a major exhibition.

Registration forms are now available and can be obtained from the National Liturgical Music Convention Office, Box 112, Ashburton Vic 3147 - phone (03) 885 7785, fax (03) 885 8063.

CONTRIBUTORS

Frank R.L. Carleton is an historical bibliographer and archivist who works freelance in the antiquarian book trade. He is preparing a catalogue of pre-1801 missals in Sydney Catholic libraries.

The Revd Peta R. Sherlock is Minister-in-charge of the Parish of St Andrew Clifton Hill in the Diocese of Melbourne. She is a doctoral candidate of the Australian College of Theology.

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 John H. Smith, who is pursuing post-graduate studies at the University of Western Australia, was formerly Co-ordinator of the Division of Mission and Nurture, Uniting Church Synod of WA.

Back issues of *AJL*
from Vol 1 No 2 to Vol 3 No 2
are available from
Australian Academy of Liturgy
Otira
73 Walpole Street
Kew Vic 3101
for \$7.50 each (including postage).

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to:

The Revd R.W. Hartley
St Aidan's Vicarage
24 Williamson Avenue
Strathmore Vic 3041

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 or three and a half 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 R.W. Hartley
St Aidan's Vicarage
24 Williamson Avenue
Strathmore Vic 3041

SUBSCRIPTION PAYMENTS and all business communications (including notice of change of address) to:

Australian Academy of Liturgy
Otira
73 Walpole Street
Kew Vic 3101

Subscription Rates:
Annual Subscription — \$15.00

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

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