



AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 1 Number 2 October 1987

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 1987-88

PRESIDENT:	The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood
PAST PRESIDENT:	The Revd Robert W. Gribben
SECRETARY/TREASURER:	Dr Helen J. Harrison
EDITOR OF AJL:	The Revd R. Wesley Hartley
STATE REPRESENTATIVES:	
NSW	The Revd Jennifer Farrell
QLD	The Revd Phillip Grace
SA	Dr Helen L. Northey, OP
TAS	The Very Revd Joseph V. Howe
VIC	The Revd Thomas F. Knowles, SSS
WA	The Revd Dr Russell Hardiman

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMY

Admission to the Academy is restricted 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 in 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, Dr H.J. Harrison,
35 Florence Street,
Goodwood, S. Aust., 5034

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 1

Number 2

October 1987

R. WESLEY HARTLEY
EDITOR

GRAHAM HUGHES
DAVID ORR, OSB
ASSISTANT EDITORS

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

CONTENTS

Truth, Language and Liturgy.....	38
<i>David Frost</i>	
'More Than Meets the Eye' Revisited.....	54
<i>Thomas Knowles</i>	
News and Information	
Sing Alleluia (D'Arcy Wood)	63
English Language Liturgical Consultation (D'Arcy Wood)	64
Conference 1987 (Thomas Knowles)	66
Constitution of the Australian Academy of Liturgy	69
Book Reviews	74
Contributors and Reviewers.....	82

EDITORIAL

Two particular themes emerge in this issue of AJL. The first theme has emerged from the 1986 and 1987 Conferences of the Academy. It has to do with issues surrounding 'liturgy as an art form' and 'liturgy and imagination'. A significant catalyst in the thinking of some members of the Academy has been Patrick Collins' book *More than meets the eye*. Fr Knowles 'revisits' this book in his article which was the opening paper at the 1987 Conference. Future issues of AJL will carry further papers from the Conference on this theme.

The second theme is that of liturgical language. This is an important question on which a lot more discussion and debate is needed before any sort of consensus can be reached. The theme has emerged for AJL in a number of ways. Dr Wood reports in this issue on the English Language Liturgical Consultation's revision of common texts in *Prayers we have in common*. The issue was a lively one at the 1987 Conference and is touched on in various ways in the papers to be published later.

The question is addressed directly by Professor Frost in 'Truth, language and liturgy'. This is the 1987 Oxford Movement Anniversary Lecture delivered in Adelaide on 20 October. I am grateful to the Union of Anglican Catholic Priests of S.A. (which sponsored the lecture) and to Professor Frost for the opportunity to publish this lecture. Not all readers of AJL will agree with Professor Frost's position — but that is just another way of saying that the question is still an open one.

The language of worship is one of the key places where doctrine and liturgy meet. Many emotive issues which strike at the heart of human identity and at the centre of Christian doctrine arise from the debate about language. Only continuing open discussion can avoid the danger of positions in the debate hardening into opposing ideologies. Stephen Sykes has remarked that 'it is essential to the health of the church that it learn how to conduct controversy constructively and openly'. It is my hope that AJL will contribute to this process and to that end contributions on the question of liturgical language, as on other questions, will be welcomed.

R.W.H.

St Barnabas' College
All Saints' Day 1987

TRUTH, LANGUAGE AND LITURGY*

David Frost

I've been recently in a former British territory in the South Seas, an island where Christianity was introduced some two hundred years ago, but where modern secularism is now somewhat eroding a faith that had been well-established. The whole range of Christian denominations are there; but they find themselves in an increasingly hostile environment, attacked both for destroying a traditional way of life, and for grousing at the new freedoms that western living brings. The island's economy, largely agrarian, is hit by the decline in world commodity prices and by the selfishness of the major economic powers. There are the usual horrendous social problems: the breakdown of stable family-life and the resultant spread of disease; a high suicide-rate among the young, partly because of youth unemployment; widespread gambling and drug dependence, to which political corruption contributes. But recently, the churches' difficulty in communicating their Christian witness has been compounded by the belief, introduced by American missionaries, that the dominant language of the island has been radically tainted by old, pagan attitudes: there is now a range of native words that Christians may not use, and grammatical constructions that they do their best to avoid. So the churches are expending enormous sums in revising their services and in re-translating the scriptures; and they have swept away many of their old prayerbooks and Bible translations. But unfortunately, the purified language is not quite that spoken by their fellow-islanders, and they find that they have put themselves yet further into a Christian ghetto.

That island is, of course, Australia. I have dressed our comparatively affluent society as a 'Third World' state to make a point: that even we have to decide what our priorities are and give account of our stewardship. Faced with demands from vociferous minority groups that we eliminate alleged masculine bias from the language of the faith, we have to ask 'Is it necessary?' (for it may be that so-called 'sexist language' does as little harm as do our pagan names for the days of the week — Wodensday, Thursday, Saturdays — names that well-meaning Christians also once tried to get rid of). We have to ask 'Is it possible to change the language?' We have to consider the extent of the task, its consequences, and its unexpected side-effects. Above all, we must ask if the venture is a proper use of our resources, given that Liturgical Commissions are expensive, that new Bible translations are far more costly to prepare, print and publish, that the version of the Psalms in *An Australian Prayer Book* (for instance) took nine men six years, on and off, to perfect, yet would be swept away after only a decade of use. How many children will die of malnutrition, how many souls (here and abroad) will

perish in pagan ignorance, because we are spending time, energy and money on purging from our services words like 'mankind', 'man' and 'men' when we speak of the human race, and the use of 'he', 'sons', 'fathers', 'forefathers', 'brothers', 'brethren', 'fellows', 'fellowmen', when we mean all human beings, male and female?

Yet all such usages have been proscribed by the Australian Consultation on Liturgy, and the ban has been endorsed by the Anglican General Synod, and sent to its Liturgical Commission as working instructions. When I resigned from the Liturgical Commission in May 1986, it was because I had failed to persuade my colleagues that, in pressing for 'non-sexist' (or to put a nicer face on it, 'inclusive') language, they were breaking a principle to which I had given seventeen years' work: the principle that the language of worship should be that of the present day, following majority-usage, and not the lingo of a faction, an elite, or a pressure-group.¹ The immediate causes of my resignation were first, the demand by the General Synod and the Liturgical Commission for alterations to my *Alternative Collects*;² and second and more crucial, attempts on the Liturgical Commission to revise the language of the historic creeds. It was proposed to say not that Christ 'became man', but that he became 'a human being'; and instead of coming 'for us men and our salvation', he was to come 'for us and our salvation' — a vagueness which seemed inappropriate in a statement of belief, since it was left unclear if Christ's sacrifice was for 'us *here*', for 'us Christians', 'us Australians', 'us in this Church' — or even 'us chickens'.

At that time, I believed (somewhat naively) that the real issue was that certain women misinterpreted the generic uses of 'man', 'men', and so felt excluded from the frequent general statements that scripture and liturgy make about 'mankind' and its relation to God. I advocated looking closely at every instance where what we wrote might be ambiguous, and revising where possible. Yet somehow this seemed not to appease the zealots; and since then I have come to realise that the demand for 'inclusive' language is not merely a dispute about a handful of words, but part of a larger demand that originates from outside Christianity and strikes at central doctrines of the Christian faith.

But before we embark on that wider issue, it is useful to rehearse just why the move to eliminate so-called 'sexist' expressions is unlikely to succeed, and should not at present be permitted to influence the language in which we worship. The odds are heavily against *any* attempt to change the forms of a language: the tide of linguistic change is unpredictable, and we have no adequate means of controlling which way it will flow. Over the years, there have been more than eighty suggestions for a singular pronoun in English to replace the generic use of 'he' to indicate both male and female³ — not least that of an Australian Royal Commission in 1977 which proposed the abolition of both 'he' and 'she', and their replacement with either 'id' or 'hei' or 'se'.⁴ Considering the charm of

'Blessed is he who walks in the ways of the Lord', it is hardly surprising that none of these suggestions have caught on.

Many of the substitute forms suggested offend against the principle of economy, which (given the laziness of human nature) usually wins out: 'God and Man' is a pithier and more forceful title than 'God and Humankind'; 'dustman' is easier to say than 'dustperson' — and 'hitperson' sounds ridiculous! The elimination of 'brethren' — which in modern usage has lost much connection with 'brothers', and in the popular mind means only a religious fellowship — would similarly offend against the principle of economy, since it would necessitate either the invention of a new term or the cumbersome use of 'brothers and sisters'. Another disadvantage of the proposed modifications is that expressive possibilities in the language are lost: the encounter between God and Man sounds more personal and direct than the encounter between God and Humankind; so that, if 'Man' is unacceptable, we need to invent a new generic term which has the same force. Again, human laziness is likely to incline us to preserve an effective usage rather than to invent a substitute.

A further reason why the attempted revolution is most unlikely to succeed is that the offending forms are too deeply entrenched in the language. 'Man' in its generic sense forms a variety of compounds and derivatives. Are we to contemplate distinguishing 'manslaughter' from 'womanslaughter' (or from 'childslaughter', if the children's rights movement has its way)? Can we contemplate an 'Ombudsperson', or 'alderpersons', 'person-hours', 'person-power', 'person-made' fibres, 'handypersons', 'bandspersons' and so on — and can we make all these changes by a 'gentlepersons' agreement? Will we 'man' a ship, or will it be 'personed' with 'seapersons'? And if those 'seapersons' prove inept, will we have to 'man, woman and child' the lifeboats? Will we promise to fight 'womanfully' as well as 'manfully' against evil? Will we have 'womanikins' as well as 'manikins'? Must we describe the higher apes as 'woman-like', when appropriate? And should the word 'woman' itself be eliminated as a term for the female, on the grounds that it clearly derives from the noun 'man', that it has been given a false etymology indicative of woman's secondary status as taken from the '*womb of man*', and that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it had the equally false etymology 'woe-of-man'? Such changes can trap us in embarrassing inconsistencies — as when the United States agency that issued lists of non-sexist terms for the various tradesmen woke up to the fact that it was still called 'the Division of Manpower Administration'!

The current language is the medium through which a verbal artist creates his effects; and like a painter who is forbidden certain tones and shapes, he (or she) must view with dismay any attempt to limit the possibilities at his (or her) disposal. To create effects of rhythm, emphasis, tone, sound patterns like assonance and alliteration, it may often be preferable to use, for example, 'all

men' rather than 'all people'. Slight changes in language can importantly affect the emotional colouring of what is said: 'Blessed is the man who fears God' directs our attention to the individual's relation with God; 'Blessed is the person who fears God' is less crisp and more abstract; while Evan Burge's preferred alternative, 'Blessed are those who fear the Lord', talks about a class. Those who are not sensitive to the variations in flavour and emphasis in three such alternatives should perhaps not be writing liturgy, which is akin to poetry in the demands it makes on the linguistic skills of its practitioners.

Even in cases where language could more easily be construed as exclusive, it is not always desirable to use the generally more satisfactory alternative. I myself normally prefer the expression 'children of God' to 'sons of God'. However, in a collect which speaks of our imitation of Christ's sonship, it seemed more effective to point the parallel by praying that we be brought 'to the glorious liberty of the sons of God' — and equally, it seemed necessary to avoid connotations of that libertarian sect calling itself 'the Children of God'. Since 'sons and daughters of God' was too much of a mouthful, I availed myself of the convention that the masculine forms may, on occasion, be taken as including both males and females.

At the time of my resignation, I suggested that 'non-sexist language' was a minority interest, largely the concern of a section of the literate bourgeoisie influenced by feminism. One way to start a fashion, of course, is to assert that everyone is already following it; and there have been a number of churchwomen and ecclesiastical Tootsies of late who have bravely asserted that they sense, they see, the tide of linguistic usage about to turn.⁵ Attempts through Education Departments and other government bureaucracies to direct a change might incline us to think a shift had been effected. So I thought it necessary to sample the current usages of four newspapers, *The Australian*, *The Financial Review*, *The Daily Mirror* and *The Newcastle Herald*,⁶ on the presumption that newspapers have a professional interest in responding to and reflecting popular usage.

These four newspapers showed up one instance of 'mankind' — *The Financial Review* writing of 'All mankind's yearning' — and 5 examples of the generic use of 'man', including a letter to *The Australian* commenting that 'a capitalist is man exploiting man — a socialist is vice-versa'. 'Men' in the generic sense cropped up in the phrase 'Yesterday's men, losers'. 'Man' meaning 'person' appeared in phrases like 'the three-man television crew' (4 instances), as against a single case of a 'three- or four- person operation'. The generic sense of 'man' was particularly alive in compounds: there were references to 'man-made gases', 'man-made ponds' and 'man-created genetic material'; though I doubt if the reference on *The Australian Woman's Page* to 'scantly clad man-killing harpies' was a generic usage! There was one amusing case of 'man' being used in the approbatory sense that the feminists complain fixes a masculine stereotype and unconsciously

elevates the male sex: Mrs Schroeder, a United States Presidential candidate, was quoted as saying 'I hope America is man enough to back a woman'.

The compounds that most abundantly showed the generic sense of 'man', 'men', referring to both sexes, were words like 'chairman', 'chairmen'. The four newspapers had 38 'chairmen', including 'Chairman Pam Allen' — and not one 'chairperson' in sight. There was also a 'chairmanship' and a 'deputy chairmanship'. 25 'spokesmen' of indeterminate sex included a 'U.S. State Department spokesman, Ms Phyllis Oakley'; though 5 'spokeswomen' had their sex clarified. There were 12 'aldermen' and 2 'congressmen', of either sex. Some of the 6 references to 'businessmen' clearly referred to business-people of both sexes; and there was only one use of 'businessmen and women'.

There lurked in the four newspapers instances (sex undefined) of a bandsman, a master craftsman, a handyman, tradesman, seaman, salesman, storeman, cameraman, jazz man, Rocket Man, clergyman, Soulman, a Working Class Man, a wingman, crewman, a right-hand man, some tin men, some hard men, some wise men, a Manhunter, 2 fishermen, 2 horsemen, a strong man, a gunman, a madman, 3 servicemen, 4 hitmen, but (mercifully) at least 5 policemen. There was one instance of a 'gentleman's agreement' — and against all that, only one sneering reference in a letter to *The Australian* to 'press persons'. From context, a fair number of these words were intended to include males and females. As evidence that popular usage applies these compounds to women, consider this comment on the Australia Card from a correspondent to *The Australian* (Tuesday, 15 September 1987): 'You should be thoroughly ashamed of yourself, Neil Blewett, putting Susan Ryan up as the front man to cop all the flak, knowing how naive she is'.

One surprise was to discover 5 instances of the generic use of 'he', 'him', 'his' to mean people of either sex. But sexist domination ran riot in outbreaks of 'masters', 'master-plans', 'master-races', 'master mariners', 'Mastercards', 'master craftsmen', 'political masters' and 'spymasters'. The forbidden word 'fellow' was used of a member of an institute, of indeterminate sex; and there was a report of an office party where staff (presumably of both sexes) were invited to come dressed as 'cowboys'!

Faced with this kind of evidence (and further sampling would only multiply it) we may ask if dear old Mother Church has quite 'flipped her lid', 'looped the loop' in setting out to reform the wicked English tongue. Does she know what she is getting into? For feminist demands to abandon generic uses of the word 'man' are only the thin end of a very large wedge. When the late Austin Farrar preached a sermon on John Keble, founder of the Oxford Movement, he pointed out that Keble did not see himself as a teacher of new doctrine: 'He was the defender of an established religion of true Anglicanism against dangerous innovation.'⁷ Giving this Oxford Movement Anniversary Lecture, I take opportunity to warn that the

current push against 'sexist language' and 'male-dominated, patriarchal imagery' in church is only one instance of a dangerous innovation that Christianity cannot come to terms with. Put simply, you cannot serve God and radical feminism.

Betty Friedan, one of the most respected leaders of the women's movement in the United States, recalls their dismay at being taken over, around 1969, by the 'anti-man, anti-family, bra burning image of "woman's lib"'.⁸ She points out (and I can confirm this from my experience as a don at Cambridge) that young radicals came over from the revolutionary student movement of the late 1960s. I recall my own pupils declaring, after the failure of attempts to forge a revolutionary axis with the workers, that western capitalism could only be destabilised by an assault on the family. Friedan accuses the radical feminists of preaching 'implacable sexual war against men', a 'rhetoric of sexual politics based on a serious ideological mistake'. That mistake was to see relations between the sexes (and, for a while, between parents and children) in Marxist terms of a necessary class war, in which men (husbands and fathers) were the oppressors, women exploited, and all married women prostitutes.

The rhetoric ranged from the ridiculous (the members of the consciousness-raising group deciding that if they go home and sleep with their husbands, from now on they must be "on top"; the belief that masturbation or sex with a woman was superior to any "submission" to man's penis) to the sublime (the high preaching of the new feminist theologians against every manifestation of "God, the father," or Mary Daly's image of man as vampire who feeds "on the bodies and minds of women ... like Dracula, the he-male has lived on woman's blood").⁹

The feminist movement developed a theory of some universal conspiracy by the men, extending over thousands of years and in every country of the globe, to oppress and subjugate women. (It was never adequately explained why women were silly enough to tolerate such tyranny, or how the conspiracy could be perpetuated, given that women had the moulding of children during their offsprings' most impressionable years.) But with a passion fuelled by paranoia and a consciously maintained 'rage', the feminists combed most areas of human activity for instances of 'oppression'. And, given the limitations of human beings, the capacity of all of us to be 'one-eyed', it was possible to show that predominantly male involvement in the study of history, art, literature, politics, economics, linguistics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, religion and so on had resulted in selection of evidence and in warped interpretations. Though the unmasking of masculine bias made a contribution to human understanding, the revisers laid no claim to balance or objectivity: as Rosemary Ruether put it:

women's studies do not pretend to an ethical neutrality. This stance is actually a ruling class ideology. Neutrality hides a commitment to the status quo. All liberation scholarship is advocacy scholarship.¹⁰

'Advocacy scholarship' meant that 'women's studies' developed at universities

in an embattled, ghetto-mentality, always vulnerable to the charge that truth, now stripped of its trousers, was being stifled under petticoats. 'Sexism' was discovered lurking in the commonest academic terms: at Goddard College, women's studies had to be taught not by seminar but by 'ovular'.

That example points to a primary obsession of the feminists: the fear that a tainted language both reflected and supported male tyranny, conveying to as-yet unformed minds that men were superior and that women should play the roles which males found acceptable. The notion that society influences language and that language limits the way we see ourselves was not new; and the eagerness of feminists to take charge of expression and turn it to promoting women's liberation might have been moderated, had they reflected that societies without the handicap of masculine generics, and even societies with the benefit of female deities, do not seem especially tender of women's rights.

Like much feminist scholarship, the language studies were built on a half-truth. Language, particularly in its insults, does reinforce ideals of what men and women should be, deprecating equally a 'girlish', 'effeminate' man and a 'mannish' female, and disliking the 'cocksure' of either sex. Historically, division of labour between men and women has meant that names for most workers outside the home have had a masculine connotation. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, it was felt that the titles of university degrees (Bachelor of Arts, Master of Science) were so obviously masculine that something else must be devised for the young women then graduating from American colleges: between 1873 and 1882 we hear of Maids of Arts, Maids of Science, Mistresses in Liberal Learning, and Vestals of Philosophy.¹¹ For at least two hundred years there have been those who worried that the generic 'he' in English and the use of 'man' both for a male and for the human race could be taken to indicate that males were the norm, and women a variation. Certainly, there has been no lack of male scholars down the centuries to insist that these and other linguistic oddities were to be explained by the derivative and subordinate status of women.¹²

Nevertheless, it remains debatable how much real harm these oddities of language do, in themselves. A favourite piece of research for Christian feminists, mis-reported by Vivienne Faull and Jane Sinclair, citing Sara Maitland, mis-citing 'Casey and Miller' in 1972 citing 'two sociologists', tells how 300 undergraduates were asked

to create collages on certain themes. Half were assigned their theme using the word 'man': 'Industrial Man', 'Political Man', 'Social Man'. Half were given the same theme using different phraseology: 'Industrial Life', 'Political Behaviour', 'Society'. The group working with titles including 'man' included far fewer pictures of women and children (up to 40%).¹³

This is a prime instance of the shoddiness of much feminist research, for the

experiment proves only what was obvious — that the word ‘man’ by itself is ambiguous, denoting either an adult male (as in ‘Man about the House’) or the human race. Without a clear defining context to indicate that a generic sense was intended, and given that males are said still to predominate in most professions, it is surprising that so many women and children made it into the collages after all. The experiment (contrary to what its designers concluded) suggests that the generic sense of ‘man’ is still very much alive.

I’ve cited the quasi-apostolic, uncritically received tradition of this piece of ‘evidence’ because it is not untypical of the highly dogmatic and indoctrinated assault now being launched on church language. The woman who perturbed my colleague on the Liturgical Commission by coming over ill in church at every instance of generic ‘man’ (her husband’s treatment, it was said, had made the word unbearable to her) was not an isolated case: her examples, her complaints, her remedies, her testimony as to an early sense of exclusion (however genuine her sufferings) could all be paralleled over and over in feminist writing since the 1960s — and not before. She had learned a repertoire of grievances.

It is important to realize that behind such women, motivating and coordinating their activities, lies an international programme of sexual revolution. Every rooting-out of an instance of generic ‘man’ is one victory in a continuing sex-war, and no gesture of appeasement will buy off the enemy. One sometimes hears clergymen, sensitized by feminist complaints, tacking-on somewhat nervously ‘and women’ to every instance of generic ‘men’. But the substitute is equally offensive, and the evidence from the mouth of sinful man already gathered to prove that phrases like ‘men and women’, ‘boys and girls’, debase women by according to males a priority. Thomas Wilson, writing his *Arte of Rhetorique* in 1553, has already been taken from his cupboard, dusted down and paraded for the discomfort of his successors. Wilson recommended an order of words where ‘the worthier is preferred and set before. As a man is sette before a woman’:

Some will set the carte before the horse, as thus. My mother and my father are both at home, even as though the good man of the house were no breaches, or that the graye Mare were the better Horse. And what though it often so happeneth (God wotte the more the pitye) yet in speakinge at the leaste, let vs kepe a natural order, and set the man before the woman for maners sake.¹⁴

Wilson’s argument is one indication of just why sensible churchmen and women have so easily acceded to the demand for ‘non-sexist’ language, without much regard to consequences. There has been no lack of men over the centuries to talk like Wilson and to act accordingly. I suspect that most males (whether our feelings are justified, or whether it is because we all became rebels at our mother’s knee) would share my suspicion that, in the exchange of injuries between the

sexes, men would prove on balance the greater wrongdoers. Language, whether English or Greek or Hebrew, does seem a bit unfair. And we have in the feminists a group, apparently hurt and aggressively angry, who insist that they are an oppressed minority, like the Aborigines, or the poor. Our pastoral instincts are aroused. Why should their demands not be met, since it means only tinkering with a few phrases and upsetting a handful of wordsmiths? To Christians weary of the battle to convert hearts and minds, verbal change seems to offer one painless victory: a chance by manipulating language to engineer an improvement in human attitudes, making it that much more difficult to think wrong things. And for once the Church would be with, not against, secular society; for the women's movement, with its proper demand that women should be able to fulfil their talents, is part of a larger social and economic change, whereby the labour of women has become essential to the maintenance of Western technological society at its present level. A recent report in *The Australian* makes clear that there will not be enough engineers to meet future demand, unless women are drawn into the profession. Similarly, Betty Friedan points to the simple necessity that persuaded the Pentagon to promote women's advancement in the American armed services: because of a sharp drop in the birthrate, leading to 25% less eligible men by 1992, women are needed in large numbers to maintain even the peace-time establishment of the United States' war-machine.¹⁵

I suggested at the outset several practical reasons why we should resist the demand for 'non-sexist' language in liturgy: that tinkering with words is a misdirection of our energies and resources; that we are unlikely to be able to effect a change in usage; that we would be limiting the power and precision of our language; and that we are in danger of being stuck with a church 'lingo' that is out of touch with current idiom. But there is one greater reason why we should not put our feet on a slippery slope where, once we have begun to move, there is no rational stopping-point. Objections to the language of liturgy lead inevitably to attacks on the language of the scriptures from which that liturgy largely derives; from there, to assaults on the basic metaphors and symbols by which the faith is taught; and finally, to demands that doctrine itself be changed.

To re-cast the Bible, as has been done of late, in 'inclusive language'¹⁶ is no more than to practise a well-intentioned deceit: it is slapping a little lipstick and powder on a face which remains (if that is how you choose to look at it) insistently masculine. Jesus Christ, despite his doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and his own Sonship, has been taken by Christian feminists as a prophet of 'non-sexism', an advocate of women's liberation — teachings unhappily obscured by the Christian society he founded. Seeing that both sides still tend to appeal to Christ as a standard by which to measure their own practice, I have submitted Christ's sayings as recorded in the Gospel according to Luke to analysis in 'sexist' terms.

First, a word about the method of calculation. Since decisions have to be taken

as to what are independent sayings, my figures are not hard-and-fast; for instance, I have chosen to treat the Beatitudes as one discourse rather than as many isolated sayings which have subsequently been collected together. However, despite some arbitrariness in my figures, they serve to indicate the extent of the problem.

Some allowance must be made for the social situation in which Christ taught. With malè playing most of the roles in public life, there will inevitably be masculine bias when speaking of judges, kings, scribes, and so forth. Nevertheless, where Christ could have made an effort to avoid 'sex-bias', there is no evidence of any such attempt. Of 12 full-blown parables recorded in Luke, 11 parables are about males, and only 1 (the Parable of the Widow and the Unjust Judge) is about a man and a woman.

When the contents of Christ's parables and sayings in Luke are analysed to determine their sexual orientation, 42.5 refer to male figures and their activities, 8.5 allude to female figures and activities, and 68 are neutral in content (though not in expression).

Turning to the language of the sayings, Christ conforms to the general rule that masculine forms, and references to 'man', 'men', 'sons', 'fathers', 'brothers', are taken to include both sexes. Commonly, he uses the Greek noun *anthropos*, which (despite the assertions of Christian feminists) resembles quite closely the English word 'man' in meaning both a male and a member of the human race. But on occasions Christ is reported as using the Greek word *andres* ('the males of Ninevah'), where context suggests that he did not mean to exclude women (Luke 11.31; 11.32; 14.24).

Analysing all the sayings and parables in Luke, 8.5 in their language make specific female reference, 65.5 make male reference, and a further 21 use masculine forms, but with likely intention to include both males and females. 24 sayings have a sexually indeterminate reference.

We must make some allowance for cultural filtration, since hearers may have remembered selectively, and scribes may have re-phrased. But even making the most generous allowance for errors in transmission, it is clear that the overwhelming and apparently unconscious 'sexism' of Christ's thought and expression makes him a prime candidate for feminist re-education (leaving aside his failure to promote according to the principles of Equal Opportunity).

We are not, therefore, dealing in Luke's gospel with a cultural veneer that can be peeled off to disclose an eternal truth, but with a bias (in feminist terms) that permeates Christ's thought, his parables and sayings, and the language in which they are expressed. Such alleged bias, however, does not exclude women from major roles as Mother, ministrant, subject of healing, recipient of teaching, and interlocutor. In Luke, women announce the Resurrection to the male apostles, and the apostles reject the news as 'an idle tale' (Luke 24.11).

This analysis presents the feminists and the proponents of 'inclusive language' with a problem. If drawing on predominantly male experience and examples for your teaching is so harmful, and if employing generic forms of 'man' and using the masculine when referring to both sexes is an injustice to women, why does Christ do it? Conversely, if he never gave a thought to the matter, why are we making such a pother about it? Was he wrong, sinful, in not perceiving the evils of 'sexist language'? Or has the Spirit, in a new age, made something wrong which previously was not wrong? And if Christ's practice is to be 'corrected' by the Spirit here, where (if anywhere) do we draw the line between what may, and may not, be 'corrected'? Does his moral teaching require as much revision as his shamelessly patriarchal imagery, with its talk of 'God the Father', and his invitation to us to imitate his own 'Sonship'? It cannot be said that Christ simply fell in with what his culture expected, for on other matters (such as Sabbath observance or ritual purity) he clearly defied their expectations: Did being fully man mean that Jesus shared not only the thought-forms of his day but also its wrong thinking?

A similar problem arises with the translation of Scripture. Once the principle that we translate honestly is abandoned, it becomes impossible to draw a line between what may, and may not, be changed. If we can 'correct' the unfortunate masculine bias of its language, why should we not 'correct' other details which are unpalatable to our age? In fact, the makers of 'inclusive language' translations seldom stop at a mere cosmetic job.

To follow the revisers in their hunting-down of masculine reference is to feel very soon that you are on the trail of a bunch of paranoid vandals. Take the 'Inclusive Language Version' of the Grail Psalter.¹⁷ Most noticeable, at first, is how much of what is individual and personal is lost, because 'man' and 'he' are to be avoided by putting everything into the plural. 'Here is a wretch who cried, and the Lord heard him' (Psalm 34.6) becomes 'When the poor cry out the Lord hears them'. It next becomes apparent that accuracy is less important than the elimination of 'sexist' terms: 'Help, Lord, for there is not one godly man left' (Psalm 12.1) becomes 'Help, O Lord, for the faithful have vanished'. The wicked of Psalm 50 seem to have got worse in the new version: once content with sitting and speaking against their brother, and slandering their own mother's son, now 'you sit and malign your *kinsfolk*,/ and slander your *brothers and sisters*' (v. 20). Pointed phrases lose their force: God is not 'the father of the fatherless' but 'Father of the orphan' (Psalm 68.5). The bride of Psalm 45, who on leaving her 'father's house' was promised that 'In place of your fathers, you shall have sons' (v. 16), is now told that 'Children shall be yours in place of your forebears'. No longer are we warned that 'Vain is the help of man' (Psalm 60.11), no more does wine 'make glad the heart of man' (Psalm 104.16). It may be 'better to take refuge in the Lord than to put your trust in man' (Psalm 118.8) — except that it is now

'mortals' that you must not trust. A general statement about the fate of the race, 'Man lives as a passing shadow' (Psalm 89.6) is watered-down to: 'a mere shadow, the one who passes by'.

Finally, one notices a pervasive de-sexing. The sun no longer 'rejoices as a strong man to run his course' (Psalm 19.5): now the sun 'rejoices like a *champion* to run *its* course'. King David loses masculinity: whereas God 'set a youth above a warrior ... exalted a young man out of the people' (Psalm 89.20), he has now 'set the crown on a warrior ... exalted one chosen from the people'. Adam, father of the race, has been phased-out: where God once turned 'man back into dust: / saying "Return to dust, you sons of Adam";' he now turns '*us* back into dust [saying] "Go back, children of the earth"' (Psalm 90.3). God is not immune to the general loss of gender, where it can be done discreetly: 27 references to God as 'he' in the original Grail version of Psalm 18 become 'you' in the Inclusive Language Version. The specific image of his Fatherhood is suppressed: 'As a father is tender towards his children: / so is the Lord tender to those that fear him' becomes 'As parents have compassion on their children, / the Lord has pity on those who fear him' (Psalm 103.13).

It is in the field of liturgy, with its somewhat greater freedom from the hedges and restraints of scripture, that you can see what I shall call the 'Great Sexist-Language Slide' at its fullest extent. At the top are the Liturgical Commissions of Australia and England, still clinging to the traditional formularies of Bible and Church tradition, but gingerly testing out if there is anywhere they could dig in their heels and stop short of falling into the arms of the Great Mother Goddess below. Frightened to let themselves slip, they are equally fearful of an army of strident nannies who exhort them to launch into the deep. Halfway down the slide, glad to be shot of the burdens of Resurrection and Virgin Birth, is the Bishop of Durham, zipping along all oblivious, and looking forward to embracing a God who 'reflects all that is female'. A little further down, we see the Anglican Church of New Zealand, whose members already have permission to refer to God in church as 'our Father and Mother'. At the bottom lie the liturgists of the Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the Language and Liturgy Task Group of the Commission on the Status of Women of the Australian Council of Churches — and beyond them is Mary Daly, grumbling that 'Christolatry is idolatry', re-interpreting the coming of the Anti-Christ as the Second Coming of Women, 'a new arrival of female presence',¹⁸ and tottering off from Christianity altogether in the direction of mother-goddess cults, witchcraft, and lesbian communes.

The end-result of supplementing or 'correcting' the symbols, metaphors and language of scripture is seen most clearly in *Out of the Darkness*,¹⁹ a publication of the Australian Council of Churches sub-titled 'Paths to inclusive worship'. From such a title, which implies a time of 'darkness' from which feminism

(rather than Christ) is only now delivering us, it is evident that the full feminist doctrine is there: its myth of the universal oppression and subordination of women by men, and its attack on Biblical language as one tool of that oppression, a 'male-centred language' driving women in 'hurt and frustration' to leave the Church (Preface, p. vii). In the Confession (p. 50), we ask forgiveness 'for participating in the oppression of women'. There is a pastoral service for victims of the sex-war, a 'Holy Communion for a Person Experiencing the Ending of a Marriage' (pp. 28-30) which begins 'Grace to you and peace from God our Mother and Father ...' We are offered a 'Baptismal/ Blessing Liturgy for a Girl-Child' (pp. 31-3), 'A Celebration of Womanhood' with a 'Women's Creed' (pp. 33-7), another service 'In Memory of Her' (pp. 43-4), which turns out to be a memorial to the woman who anointed Christ's feet, and concludes with a 'Final Blessing', 'Go in joy with your alabaster jar' (one wonders if that shouldn't be modernised to 'Go in peace with your pot of Nivea'!) The re-worded version of the Nicene Creed (p. 69) refers to Christ as 'the only *Child* of God' — as if (rather than being co-equal with the Father) Jesus remained eternally in infantile dependence. The compilers recommend de-personalised symbols and images for God: 'non-human and non-material images' (p. 5). Hence, God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is re-cast as 'Source of all Being, Eternal Word, and Holy Spirit' (p. 69). The general implication seems to be that it was one of God's gaffes to have Christ born a male, speaking of himself as 'Son of Man', 'Son of God', and of God as his 'Father' — better that the Christ had been some curious hermaphrodite. An expanded hit-list of unacceptable terms confirms that the publication has its roots in Marxist feminism as much as in Christianity. The compilers have tried to avoid the word 'Lord' where possible, since it has a 'hierarchical flavour' ('hierarchy' being a Marxist rather than a Christian sin): they insist that

Images of God as dominator, an all-powerful Lord, King and Ruler, a God of might and destruction — need to lose their privileged place in the Church. They have been used to justify domination, aggression and war in the world. (p. 7)

Biblical images of warfare are condemned as 'militaristic' (p. 91). We are discouraged from thinking of ourselves as 'Christian soldiers'; and (presumably) we ought no longer to 'put on the whole armour of God' or 'fight manfully against evil', or express our submission by acknowledging Jesus as 'Lord'.

And that is the real choice: between, on the one hand, the Jesus Christ born as a male Jew in Palestine, who claimed that 'he who has seen me has seen the Father', who taught us to pray to God as 'our Father', and invited us to imitate his own Sonship — and, on the other hand, the timeless, gnostic, human-created figure of 'Christa', symbol of worldly aspiration, exhibited on a cross of man's making, breasts bare, hips wide, womb protuberant, female and naked. (A

photograph of this devotional sculpture by Edwina Sandys can be found on the cover of William Oddie's book *What Will Happen to God?* In which King (or Queen) does Godhead lie? And which will we serve?

Traditional Christianity holds that God intervened in history to reveal his nature in Jesus Christ. It teaches that there is both equality *and* subordination within the Trinity itself, whereby Christ, though equal and co-eternal with the Father, is obedient to the Father's will, as we are required to be subordinate and obedient to Christ. The relationship within the Trinity is an archetypal pattern that serves as the model for human relationships, and destroys all worldly notions of hierarchy, status, domination and submission. The woman is to be subordinate to the man as the Church is subordinate to Christ; yet Christ, coming to us as one who serves, redeeming us to be his brothers and sisters before God, gives up his life and dies for us, as the husband must give up himself for his wife, and the Christ-like bishop and pastor must give up his life for his people. It is only the heathen who lord it over one another.

Christianity also regards the Biblical revelation as definitive, its symbols and images as God-given, rather than man-made. The 'Fatherhood of God' is not a metaphor we may supplement. Indicating as it does both his personal care and his directive rule, his exorbitant demand for our obedience and self-surrender, his tenderness towards us together with his potential for judgement, we tamper with it at our peril — for the God of the Jews cannot be domesticated, or re-fashioned after our own image.

In all its practices, traditional Christianity looks to the man Jesus and his teachings, as recorded in scripture. And here it must be observed that not only was his thought, imagery and language 'sexist', in feminist terms (as I have demonstrated): he is recorded as making no criticism of and advocating no adjustment to the time-honoured Jewish roles of women as wives, mothers, help-mates, nurturers, sustainers and comforters.

In contrast to that divinely revealed faith is a secular movement which regards all images of deity as man-made, expressing the aspirations of a culture, conditioned by it, and necessarily to be varied as that culture changes. To that new way of thinking, all human roles are artificial, there are no 'natural' characteristics belonging to either sex, and hence no appropriate sex-roles; human nature is treated as infinitely malleable, capable of being pushed into whatever mould you please. In radical feminist doctrine, the problem with human society is not our sinful rebellion against God, but the current oppression of women by men.

Perhaps I should let an oppressed woman have the last word. My Indian wife has lived with female as well as male images of deity; and after being the first woman to win the Nehru Memorial Scholarship, she studied for her doctorate at the University of Cambridge, and became a convert from Hinduism to

Christianity. She writes to the slightly adapted text 'And they made themselves a Golden Cow':

I present this as an appropriate text to describe the attempts by Christian feminists and their 'liberal' allies to reshape liturgy, language and traditional symbols. The Israelites grew weary of Yahweh and made themselves a golden calf. Intellectually stale and spiritually weary clergy and bishops join forces with a disgruntled social minority and make themselves an alluring 'golden cow' in the hope of surviving in today's anti-Christian, secular wilderness. This 'golden cow' is alluring because it apparently makes up for the alleged defects of Christianity. It is easily made by piecing together elements from the female personality supposedly lacking in 'Our Father', and by carefully discarding all that disturbs: power, majesty, Lordship — in short, all that communicates the 'other', the 'numinous', and requires submission. The feminist Godhead is intimate, comforting, dependable, rather like the domesticated cow. In my country, we have the notion of 'ishta-devata', or god of one's choice or liking, and there are many gods and goddesses to choose from. Among the many is the heavenly cow, Kamadhenu — granter of all desires!

In the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., Hinduism experienced an upsurge of feminist theology, and the Tantric cults developed an all-female, cosmic theogony to support their erotic rituals. I believe that modern feminists are mere novices in constructing a feminine theology. It has been done before — but I have to add that most Hindus are embarrassed by Tantrism, for it brought Hinduism into disrepute. Christian feminists, for all their talk of progress, are merely offering a regression into primitivism, an all-engulfing womb-love that dissolves personality; it is a far cry from the abundant and creative life offered by our 'patriarchal', 'sexist' Son of God.²⁰

What can a man say more?

NOTES

- * The 1987 Oxford Movement Anniversary Lecture sponsored by the Union of Anglican Catholic Priests of S.A. Inc.
- 1. My arguments then are published in 'The Language of Liturgy', *Overland* 104 (1986), 61-3. A fuller version is in *God, Sex and Language*, ed. Bruce Wilson (Canberra: St Mark's, 1987), pp. 37-43. The text of the resignation letter is reprinted in *News of Liturgy* (July, 1986), 7-8.
- 2. *Alternative Collects 1985* (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1986).
- 3. See Dennis Baron, *Grammar and Gender* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 198-216.
- 4. *Australian Royal Commission on Human Relationships: Final Report* (1977), Vol. I, p. ix, Vol. V, pp. 41-2.
- 5. See, for example, Jill Mendham and Ian George in *God, Sex and Language* ed. Bruce Wilson, pp. 44-7, 48-52.
- 6. *Australian*, 24 July; *Financial Review*, 1 September; *Daily Mirror*, 1 September; *Newcastle Herald*, 27 August 1987.
- 7. Austin Farrar, *The Brink of Mystery* (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 148-50.
- 8. Betty Friedan, *The Second Stage* (New York: Summit Books, 1981), p. 47.
- 9. Friedan, p. 48.
- 10. Rosemary Ruether, cited in William Oddie, *What Will Happen to God?* (London: SPCK, 1984), p. 40 — a work which is a most distinguished handling of the whole issue of feminist theology and its impact on the Church.
- 11. Baron, *Grammar and Gender*, pp. 7, 173-4.
- 12. Baron, *Grammar and Gender*, passim.
- 13. Vivienne Faulk and Jane Sinclair, *Count Us In — Inclusive Language in Liturgy* (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1986), pp. 5-6, citing Sara Maitland, *A Map of the New Country* (London, 1983), p. 164, mis-citing Casey Miller and Kate Swift, *Words and Women*

- (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), citing 'two sociologists'. The figures as originally reported showed 'in some instances ... magnitudes of 30 to 40%'.
14. Quoted in Baron, *Grammar and Gender*, p. 3.
 15. Friedan, p. 177.
 16. *The New Jerusalem Bible* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1985) is an 'inclusive language' version; and *The Revised Standard Version* is currently being re-done in 'inclusive language'.
 17. *The Grail Psalms: an Inclusive Language Version* (London: Collins Liturgical, 1986). Numbering of psalm and verse follows that of the version in *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978), which is used for comparison.
 18. See Oddie, *What Will Happen to God?*, pp. 12, 18, 106-11, who treats this whole matter comprehensively.
 19. *Out of the Darkness: Paths to Inclusive Worship*, ed. Frances Ford, Ruth Ford, Morag Logan, Cynthia Page, for the Language and Liturgy Task Group of the Commission on the Status of Women, Australian Council of Churches (Sydney: Australian Council of Churches, 1986).
 20. Christine Mangala Frost, 'And They Made Themselves a Golden Cow' (unpublished paper).

“MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE” REVISITED

Thomas Knowles, SSS

Imagine — with what other word could I possibly begin? — an old church, long and low, in traditional cruciform shape, painted in a pastel shade. Enter the church and get the feel of it. You find your eyes directed towards the apse as if through a tunnel, bounded above by the dark-stained coffered ceiling, below by the rich black and red of the carpet, and alongside by the wood-pannelled walls. Towards the pool of light bathing the ambo and eucharistic table, a solemn, silent procession of purple-robed choristers makes its way. They are led in by cross and candles and followed by ministers and violet-vested celebrant. Through the large expectant congregation they advance to the sanctuary area which is adorned not with the usual elaborate floral arrangements but with two vessels of prunus foliage. The setting is imbued with a spirit of restraint, simplicity, discipline.

Listen to the elemental story of the human predicament, the man and woman in the garden, the ambiguity of desire and choice, temptation, complicity, accusation, paradise lost. Hear the resounding conviction of the apostle, that where sin brought death through one person's transgression, grace has abounded all the more for life through another's obedience. Then enter into the *agonia*, the life-and-death struggle of Satan and the Son of Man; find yourself confessing a deeply rooted urge to claim autonomy for yourself, to exercise decisive power and self-determination, then choose with the man from Nazareth to entrust yourself to God's Word and to walk in the human way of dependence.

Let the Spirit of Jesus turn your heart in obedience to the true God, and find thanksgiving and praise arise out of the heart of your struggle to be human. Be caught up in the distinctively twentieth-century harmonies of Zoltan Kodaly's *Missa Brevis*, at once rich and restrained, forged in the crucible of Europe at war. And after you have communicated in the transfigured humanity of the Christ, go forth to the strains of an unaccompanied cello, evoking in Bach's robust and unsentimental tones the solitary arena within your heart where you wrestle with decision.

In this brief sketch I have sought to communicate something of *an* experience, an experience of liturgy celebrated imaginatively, prayerfully, feelingly, holistically, or, in Patrick Collins' word, aesthetically.¹ Let me hasten to satisfy the craving you have for mere factual knowledge. The liturgy I have just described was the solemn choral eucharist celebrated at St Francis' Church in the city of Melbourne on the First Sunday of Lent this year. I am not suggesting for a moment that this should be the sole paradigm of 'liturgy as art', but rather offering you one example of a liturgy which was experienced by many as *an* experience in Dewey's sense of the term, with a beginning and an end, an integrity

throughout, and a deeply felt emotional quality which had nothing to do with sentimentality. I trust that each of us could stand here and speak of very different but equally significant experiences.

Let me contrast that with a quite different eucharistic liturgy, one in which I regularly took part over a period of eighteen months or more while I was engrossed in all the academic study of liturgy which Patrick Collins now decries. It took place in the small front room of a suburban house. Crowded around the perimeter of the space were the fifteen or more worshippers; extras and latecomers had to make do out in the hallway. The furnishings were shabby, as were the liturgical appointments. A discordant array of religious objects was scattered around the room — a plaster saint here, an amateur icon there, one striking black African carving of the Christ, on the table a mass-produced crucifix. The altar linen and vestments were grubby and frayed.

The celebration began when most people had straggled in. They were men and women, blacks and whites, aged anywhere between twenty and seventy, but with one thing in common — all were mentally and physically handicapped residents in sheltered homes plus their associates. During the liturgy some joined in enthusiastically, others fell asleep, some squabbled and sulked; the cacophony of the singing could only have been unscrambled by archangels; the intercessions ranged from the needs of loved ones to the predicament of the pigs and chickens on the farm and the vagaries of the egg market; the eucharistic prayer was always punctuated by one of the men echoing the words of the celebrant, especially the words of the institution narrative — ‘... eat it ... *eat it*’, ‘... blood ... *blood*’; and after communion the celebrant would generally succumb to his exhaustion and doze off while a string of songs was debated, selected and tortured.

This was always an experience, but whether in Dewey’s or Collins’ sense I am not too sure! It did not have about it the kind of aesthetic qualities extolled in *More Than Meets the Eye*. And yet there *was* more than meets the eye — an earthiness, a fellowship, an ownership of that liturgy which expressed the mystery of a love which bound them together. This was a moment of deeply felt meaning for these *anawim*. It was a liturgy which, to steal from Hopkins, wore man’s smudge and shared man’s smell. Somehow our scheme of things must be able to encompass worship like this — homely, humble, disjointed, much more like a dog-eared holy card than the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.

The fact remains, however, that much of our liturgy (though I would be delighted to be contradicted on this point) does not qualify as *an* experience in the way that Patrick Collins would wish. I believe that his posing of the problem is as deadly accurate as ever. I hope that this Conference will allow us the opportunity to imagine new possibilities for liturgy in our communities of faith. What I propose to do for the present is simply to remind you of the drift of Collins’ argument, thank him in a major key and cavil in a minor, and finally to suggest some questions which may continue to interest and engage us.

First of all his thesis. Collins claims to offer a *revisionist* view of liturgy, viz. liturgy as a *form of art*.² Liturgical reforms promoted by historians, theologians and other scholars of liturgy have foundered on the reef of the conceptual, the verbal, the distinctly rational. Liturgy, however, far from being a discursive exercise, is a complex of *aesthetic expressive forms*, arising from and appealing to the imagination. Commonly liturgy fails to disclose the presence of mystery, being excessively preoccupied with clarity and with external participation instead of the interior participation which is what really matters. Only inward engagement can accomplish *transformation of vision and values* and allow us to envisage and act out of new *modes-of-being-in-the-world*. In Coleridge's phrase, alluded to repeatedly in the book, what the imagination does is to 'dissolve, diffuse, dissipate, in order to recreate'.³

In the light of this problematic Collins sets out to redeem the role of imagination in human knowing. Citing a variety of writers, he argues that imagination has a *synthetic* function in our knowing. It is 'not a faculty', he says, 'but the crossroads, the linking point, of all the faculties'.⁴ It enables us to *consciously participate in reality* rather than merely observe and manipulate it. Again to use a word of Hopkins, it lets us 'engage the inscape'.⁵ But because it relishes ambiguity and affectivity, imagination is rightly regarded with suspicion by established systems. And indeed it does run the risk of becoming demonic unless it is kept in touch with fullness of experience and critical reason, to mention a couple of Urban Holmes' criteria.

Imagination expresses itself in a variety of languages. Those which are most germane to liturgy are languages of religious imagination: *symbol*, 'a fundamentally non-verbal representation'⁶ whose peculiar character is to embody another reality and make it present in a way that is not identical with that reality; *myth*, which links symbols together in an *interpretative narrative*; and thirdly, *ritual*, which gathers symbol and myth together in a rhythmized, integrated whole in the form of *public dramatic action*. Ritual, in the writing of anthropologist Victor Turner, is a pattern of action shaped by a governing 'root metaphor' which serves to identify a culture, establish interpretative boundaries, bind the group together and affirm its present existence in relation to past and future. For Christian liturgy the pre-eminent root metaphor is the paschal mystery. In sum, then, religious imagination serves to 'represent, orient, communicate and transform existence in the world'.⁷

A major part of *More Than Meets the Eye* is Collins' attempt to translate John Dewey's philosophy of 'art as experience' into the matrix of liturgy. Art, far from being an optional extra, the pursuit of a leisured elite, is rather a *quality of all experience*. Art heightens and intensifies the experience of the ordinary. In this respect, religious experience is like aesthetic experience — both use matter to reveal spirit, both present concentrated experiences of reality, both share a way

of knowing which is immediate and self-authenticating, and both make it possible to envision a 'new world'. This is not to imply that aesthetic experience is identical with or a guarantee of the experience of God but is conducive to its occurrence.

How is a work of art created? It arises out of the artist's imaginative encounter with reality, his or her 'seeing with feeling', his or her merging in imagination with the inner reality of the object perceived. There is an interplay of energies between artist and environment which generates tension, tension between the artist's past and present experience, which is resolved in the working of some medium or other into a unified expression. What is created is not a *direct* expression of the artist's feeling, according to Susanne Langer, nor is it aimed at eliciting an identical emotional response from the perceiver. The art work is rather a form *symbolic* of human feeling. It expresses *ideas* of human feeling. This permits a sympathetic perceiver to participate affectively in the *meaning* of the experience, to have new horizons of experience open up, and to be receptive to personal transformation.

Collins' central contention is that the 'human processes ... energized to create and celebrate liturgy as an *expression* and *experience* of the mystery of Christ' are the same as those in art.⁸ Liturgy, like art, should be *an* experience, unified in its emotional quality, with a clear beginning and a definite conclusion. It is metaphoric activity, disclosing the potential of earthly realities to bear a spiritual presence; it is thus inextricably both this- and other- wordly. In creating liturgical forms, the ritual artist must be actively engaged in dialogue with two worlds — that of the *texts* and that of the *times*. The texts as given set *limits* which provoke imagination, while the times invite the artist to be immersed in them, to interpret them and to express their 'feel' in a symbolic whole. In this way energies from past experience (texts) intersect with present perception (times) and unveil in the present the promise of a future (Presence). In ritual art, 'impassioned' experience is embodied in a rhythmized whole whose proper intelligibility is open only to imagination. And in this imaginative knowing, energies for good are released. 'To be greatly good', Dewey said, 'one must imagine intensely and comprehensively'.⁹

Complementing his use of Dewey on art and experience, Collins returns to Susanne Langer for her exploration of the forms of art. Poetry, drama, dance, and music — four of the occurrent arts — may be seen as 'parables of liturgy'. In each one the same general principles of creativity are at work: a material form is first abstracted from its natural context, then, given that it is malleable enough, it is worked on to become 'transparent'. That is to say, it may be seen not simply as itself, as an ordinary object, but as an 'illusion', as a 'primary virtual object', as a form capable of suggesting deeper significance and provoking insight into what Langer calls the 'truth of human feelingfulness'.¹⁰

Poetry uses the medium of *words* to create *virtual memory* in which events are remembered not in the confusion of their undifferentiated occurrence in the past but as '*an*' identifiable experience in the present. Just so, liturgy uses words poetically in prayer and preaching to enable unconnected memories to become units of personal knowledge and to be linked with the active remembering of the pasch of Christ. *Drama* abstracts *actions* from their natural setting to create the illusion of *history* or *virtual future*. Dramatic action deals with *destiny*; it communicates a sense of a present full of import for the future. Liturgy, like drama, has its actors create an illusion of the future, our destiny of fullness of life in the Crucified and Risen One.

Movement is the primary abstraction of *dance*, which seeks to imaginatively suggest the *virtual realm of power* — 'not physically exerted power but appearances of influence and agency created by virtual gesture'.¹¹ Likewise liturgical ministers in their bodily presence and movement project a realm of power, viz. the presence of mystery. This is effected, for example, by the tensions and resolutions involved in processions for the entrance, the gospel, the gifts, and communion. Finally, *music* (the most ambivalent or 'imaginary' of these forms) creates a *semblance of time* from its primary abstraction, *sound*. This is not time as duration but as 'connected transience', time 'lived and experienced'. The illusion is created by the rhythms and resolutions of tension which are governed in a musical composition by a dominant motif. In the same way, religious ritual ought to be articulated out of the commanding motif of the paschal mystery and carefully rhythmized not only in terms of song, word and silence, but also in respect of movement and gesture. It is the minister's responsibility to respond to this inner rhythm and organic unity and communicate the experience of *progression* rather than mere *succession*.

Liturgy, then, being like poetry, drama, dance and music, ought ideally be fashioned by artists skilled in these forms working in complementarity with each other. Is this just a dream? In his final chapter Collins tries to suggest how the dream could be realized. In face of the 'starved imagination' of Western societies, he pleads for education in the aesthetic dimension of experience so that new generations will not be deprived of the human as it is embodied for us in the shapes, patterns and forms of the arts. Above all, those engaged in religious ritual ought to be directly involved with these forms of aesthetic expression so as to energize their imaginations and keep them in touch with the 'deep river of human feelingfulness'.¹²

Before going any further let us pay tribute to Patrick Collins for his timely attempt to usher in a new phase of liturgical life in the churches, one that is respectful of and inspired by the aesthetic nature of liturgy. *More Than Meets the Eye* has strong appeal because it is both a work of scholarship at the same time as being a 'cri de coeur'. In the alloy of both it has crystallized much of our

unease and the inarticulate discontent with liturgy which is abroad. Hopefully it will continue to stimulate the imaginations of those who are attempting to enhance the power of liturgy to engage believers and lead them to new 'modes-of-being-in-the-world'.

Let me, all the same, scatter a few grains of discord. I think it is a pity that Collins 'bites the hand that fed him', by which I mean the scholarly liturgical establishment; I would rather thank the academicians for bringing us to the possibility of a 'quantum' leap to an aesthetic appreciation of liturgy. After all, it is on the work of philosophers of art, not artists themselves, that Collins bases his case. That brings me to another limitation of the book, in my view — his almost exclusive and uncritical reliance on just two thinkers, Dewey and Langer. Not that I am competent to challenge them philosophically; I am just wary of edifices built on narrow foundations.

I am not sure, either, whether Collins has been entirely successful in marrying philosophy and liturgy. While there are plenty of references to liturgical practice and some excellent exemplifications of 'liturgy as art', I am left with a collection of disconnected fragments. Art and its philosophy, it seems, have occupied the higher ground. And I would have liked, paradoxical though it may seem, a little more rigour in his use of terms. At times, for example, 'imagination' is asserted to be a synthetic, integrating way of knowing, at others it is implicitly opposed to reason. In particular he uses a variety of expressions without elucidating their meaning adequately, such as 'reality', and the metaphor of 'depth' to reality. He might have given more careful account of the fundamental nature of 'word' to human existence and meaning. He appears to want to have his cake and eat it too, to decry the verbal in liturgy while appealing to the power of word in poetry and narrative. My last complaint is that Collins, like many of us, is better at delineating the problem than at offering strategies for bringing a new age to birth. I hope that we can do more than formulate an exhortation for comprehensive aesthetic formation. But enough of mean-mindedness! What might be some of the issues which arise from this book to challenge our antipodean imaginations?

In the foreword to his *Anthology of Australian Religious Poetry*, Les Murray says this: 'I have regarded as coming within the ambit of this book any verse dealing with material commonly regarded as religious — this is partly why the book opens with bells, bishops and church buildings ... as well as any verse that seemed to me to evince some real engagement with the numinous'.¹³ He goes on to assert that 'most decent religious poetry in Australia seemed ... to be contemporary, or nearly so'. This may appear surprising in the light of a general impression of the failure of religious imagination in contemporary Australia and the triumph of a secular, scientific mind. It may be useful for us to discern where the creative religious imagination is at work in Australia today. If not in church

life and worship, then where? What interaction is there between the imaginative energies of artists and the endeavours of liturgists?

Focussing more explicitly on the power of word, David Power writes: 'Simple words — jug, water, wine, bread — hold together earth and sky, times past and times future, humanity's boundedness to earth and its desire for a fulfilment that breaks this boundedness'.¹⁴ And reflecting on his ministry of preaching, Jesuit Walter Burghardt remarks: 'Two words, "Sieg Heil!", bloodied the face of Europe; three words, "Here I stand", divided the body of Christendom. Words have made slaves and freed slaves, have declared war and imposed peace. Words sentence to death ("You shall be hanged by the neck") and words restore life ("Your sins are forgiven you") ... A word is real, a word is sacred, a word is powerful, a word is ... I'.¹⁵ How can we rediscover the power of *word* in liturgical prayer and preaching today?

What about the role of the visual in religious imagination and liturgy today? In a recently published work, *A Theology of Aesthetic Sensibilities*, John Dillenberger sums up towards the end: 'The new interest in spirituality and the renewed interest in liturgy disclose a longing of the human spirit for experiences that are more than experiences in thought. It is surprising that these interests have had little association with the visual arts except for what has become the ever-present banner, an art form that seldom reaches the level of quality'.¹⁶ How can we promote an aesthetic sensibility for the visual in liturgy when we live in an age of the video screen? As Gregor Goethals notes, '... it may be that ironically, the sacramental power of images in American [read, Australian] society has been most effectively taken over by television'.¹⁷

A final question. To be alert and responsive to the aesthetic character of liturgy is deeply desirable, yet it casts a shadow of its own. There is the lure of aesthetic experience for its own sake, the appeal of romanticism. Quoting C.S. Lewis in his *Church Music and the Christian Faith*, Eric Routley describes romantic experience as an intense longing which is *in itself* prized as an object whose attainability is impossible, and as a sense of mystery in the thing longed for.¹⁸ Romantic music runs the risk of delusions of grandeur, nostalgia and sentiment (i.e. passion without responsibility). Christian liturgy is not romantic but eschatological; it generates energy to work for the coming of the kingdom in justice and peace. How can we foster aesthetic sensibility in such a way that the mystery experienced orients the worshipper to a more intense immersion than ever in the human enterprise?

I have not touched on other potential issues, such as how to respond imaginatively to limits imposed by church authority, how to incorporate the imaginative contribution of women, how to convert presiders at liturgy into artists of ritual, plus a host of other questions we may have hardly begun to formulate. May I conclude for the time being with a whimsical poem by John

Shea, entitled *The Prayer of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass?*

Those who do not believe in a Higher Harmony
will balk when told an accident crunched
in the parking lot at the very moment
the altar boy's nose began to bleed.
He bled on the surplice, the cassock,
the candle, the other altar boy,
and the priest's unlaced shoe
which bulgingly carried an Ace bandaged ankle.
The priest was stuffing a purificator up the boy's nose,
damning the blood into his eyeballs,
when the lector asked "how do you pronounce
E-l-i-s-h-a?" and the organist pounded
the entrance "Praise to the Lord".

They processed.
The bleeding, the halt, and the mute
unto the altar of God.

Saturday was late and liquored
and delivered God's people,
sunglassed and slumping, to the epilogue
of weekend life, the Gothic Church.
They were not the community of liberal theology
nor the scrubbed inhabitants of filmstrips.
They were one endless face
and that face was asleep.

"May the grace of our Lord ..."

A hungry pause for repentance.
A quick feast of sins.

The lector murdered the prophets once again
and bypassed the section where a certain E-l-i-s-h-a
was having prophetic truck with a widow.
The homily parlayed a fairly clear gospel
(you are either with me or against me)
into sentences of vacillation
and paragraphs of double-think.
The priest ran to the Creed for refuge
only to find a special creed was prepared
for this morning's liturgy by Mrs Zardek
"I believe in butterflies and the breath of ..."

The courage of the president
of the liturgical assembly
drained into the bolt holes
of communion rail days.

The offertory gifts never made it.
They were dropped by an elderly couple.
("We never liked the new Mass anyway.")
who collided with a small but speedy child
whose highheeled mother was in klicky-klack pursuit
and whose name was "Rodgercomeback."

The consecration was consistent.
The priest lifted the host
and said "This is my blood."
Instantly aware of his eucharistic goof
but also momentarily in the grip of a bizarre logic
he changed the wine into Jesus' body.
Then
with his whole mind, heart and soul
he genuflected — never to rise —
to a mystery which masks itself
as a mistake
and a power which perfects itself
in weakness.¹⁹

NOTES

1. P. Collins, *More Than Meets The Eye* (Paulist Press, 1983), p. 57.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 79.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
13. L.A. Murray (ed.), *Anthology of Australian Religious Poetry* (Collins Dove, 1986), p. xi.
14. D. Power, *Unsearchable Riches: The Symbolic Nature of the Liturgy* (Pueblo, 1983), p. 83.
15. W. Burghardt, 'The Word Made Flesh Today', in *Symbol: The Language of Liturgy* (Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, n.d.), p. 43.
16. J. Dillenberger, *A Theology of Aesthetic Sensibilities* (SCM, 1987) pp. 253-54.
17. G. Goethals, *The TV Ritual: Worship at the Video Altar* (Beacon Press, 1981), p. 37.
18. E. Routley, *Church Music and the Christian Faith* (Collins, 1980), p. 36.
19. J. Shea, 'The Prayer of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass', in *Symbol* (op. cit.), p. 29.

NEWS AND INFORMATION

SING ALLELUIA

Since *The Australian Hymn Book* (AHB) was published in 1977, more than 750,000 copies have been sold. The U.K. and N.Z. editions are known as *With One Voice*. That book filled a significant gap which existed in the 1970s, viz. the gap between the older, large hymnals many of which date back to the 1920s and 1930s, and the new crop of slight paper-backs which do not pretend to be comprehensive. The late Erik Routley, the greatest authority of this century on hymnody in English, regarded AHB as the best hymnal in English since the 1930s.

The AHB Committee has now produced a supplement called *Sing Alleluia*. Launched in September 1987, this book has 98 songs and several communion settings. The great majority of words and music were written after 1950, which is a contrast to AHB, only about ¼ of which is 20th century material, let alone post-1950.

Sing Alleluia is strong in Australian content. Thirty-five of the items have Australian words, or music, or both. Included are two aboriginal songs and two from the Torres Strait.

Because it is a supplement, *Sing Alleluia* does not cover all of the church year or all major subjects of Christian teaching, but the index shows that the coverage, for a small volume, is quite good. There is balance, too, between a style which is close to the traditional hymn and other styles which arise from the charismatic movement and from the folk genre.

There are two editions: (1) words and melody, which is the edition for congregation; the price of \$5.95 (discounts bring this to a lower figure) is in my opinion excellent; (2) harmony edition, for choirs and instrumentalists; at \$24.95 the price is perhaps a little high, but not as high as other recent song books and hymn books.

Reviews of the book are appearing. The most common criticism is of the harmony edition's layout: many tunes require the player to make an awkward turn of page. In other cases music is on one page and words on the next. The publishers have given reasons for this, but these are not likely to alleviate the frustration of musicians who will need to use two copies when playing some of the items.

Other criticisms are that the tunes are not lively enough, or too schmaltzy, or too difficult to sing. I feel that personal preference enters here, and I doubt that the critics have actually used the book with singers and verified these claims. Some church people, including musicians, have a rather narrow view of what a

hymn or song should be like. *Sing Alleluia* tries to break new ground, and I think it largely succeeds in this without including many songs which are inaccessible to a congregation which is willing to try new things in worship.

As to the words, the big advantage that *Sing Alleluia* has over most paper-backs is that the words have substance. There is very little that is trite or misleading. Worshippers are much more affected by what they sing than most people realise. So if *Sing Alleluia* succeeds in displacing some paper-backs that are musically and theologically second-rate (or worse) it will do the churches in Australia a great service.

The book was produced by representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic and Uniting Churches. It should be a significant aid to ecumenism. Some of its Australian songs suggest theological issues of our own time and place, and do so in an impressive way. They therefore constitute a major liturgical and artistic development in Australia's Christian story.

D'Arcy Wood

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

From 1975 to 1985, the translations of common liturgical material by I.C.E.T. (International Consultation on English Texts) were used widely in various English-speaking countries and by many denominations. I.C.E.T. was an ecumenical body. It worked on the texts of the eucharist which most churches use, as well as a few canticles, in an attempt to find common forms which would be generally acceptable.

A steady flow of criticism, positive and negative, followed. The text which attracted the most negative response was *Te Deum* "You are God, we praise you ..."). Mostly however the texts were well received. I.C.E.T. was dissolved in 1975. In 1985 the successor-body E.L.L.C. (English Language Liturgical Consultation) began its work of revision of the I.C.E.T. texts. Meeting in Boston in August of that year, it issued drafts of revised texts which were examined by liturgical bodies. Further revision was done in 1986, and then in August 1987, from Brixen in Northern Italy, E.L.L.C. issued its final versions — final in the sense that further revision in the near future is not envisaged.

E.L.L.C. has not changed I.C.E.T. versions where I.C.E.T. was clearly successful. Indeed one of its principles was to make no unnecessary changes. A second principle was to achieve accuracy of translation along with good contemporary English style. A third principle was to make the language more inclusive — in response to criticisms that I.C.E.T. is in places heavily masculine.

These three principles are to some extent incompatible, so E.L.L.C.'s self-chosen task was a difficult one. The new texts will be published, with commentary, in 1988. In the meantime they are available for scholarly perusal by application to A.J.L.

I can give only a few examples here. The Lord's Prayer has not been changed from the I.C.E.T. version. Of all the suggestions for line 9, none was considered better than I.C.E.T.'s "Save us from the time of trial".

An interesting approach to Magnificat and Benedictus was adopted: there are to be two versions of each, one which sticks closely to the biblical text and another which departs from it in pursuit of more inclusive language. The device used, mostly, is to put lines into the second person, e.g. "He has come to the aid of his servant Israel ..." becomes "You have come to the aid of your servant Israel ...".

There has been much discussion of the Nicene Creed's "and became man". E.L.L.C. now proposes "and truly human". Theologically, there is both gain and loss in this change, but the desire for inclusive language tipped the balance toward the new version.

E.L.L.C. has virtually no authority. Although it consists of representatives appointed by official ecumenical bodies (in Australia's case, The Australian Consultation on Liturgy) together with the Roman Catholic body I.C.E.L., the final decisions concerning texts to be published in liturgical books rest, naturally, with particular denominations. The churches will therefore be less than fully uniform in the versions they use. But E.L.L.C. will have an influence toward the elimination of at least some of the many differences in usage which presently exist.

D'Arcy Wood

CONFERENCE 1987

Avid readers of the first issue of *Australian Journal of Liturgy* will have devoured David Orr's pithy account of the 1986 Conference of the Australian Academy of Liturgy and its pre-history. A further chapter in the history of the Academy was written this year in Adelaide as the Academy-in-Conference adopted a Constitution to guide and shape its future. Thus Adelaide, which saw the birth of the Academy in 1982-83, also witnessed its coming-of-age.

The 1987 Conference evolved out of the previous one at which our reflections on liturgy as an art form and as a prayer experience had suggested this year's theme of *Imagination and Liturgy*. Prompted by Greg Manly's use of Paatrick Collins' little book *More Than Meets The Eye* in his paper last year, we used this as a springboard to launch into the subject. The backbone of the Conference took the form of a triad of major papers, beginning with a philosophical perspective on imagination as a human 'way of knowing', going on to a study of imagination and sacrament, and concluding with an account of a work of liturgical imagination, viz. a eucharistic prayer composed for the Uniting Church in Australia.

Firstly a word on the participants. We were twenty-five in number, not as numerous as hoped for (partly because of the appeal of the International Liturgy Assembly planned for late January 1988 in Hobart), but happily leavened with some welcome new faces. As one might have expected, Victoria and South Australia were the States most strongly represented.

The Conference formally got under way on the opening night with personal introductions, prayer and an introductory paper presented by Tom Knowles. Entitled '*More Than Meets The Eye*' Revisited, it served a kind of anamnestic function to bring to mind last year's exchanges and to project us into the possibilities of our 1987 gathering.

The first major paper was visiting speaker Dr Stan van Hooft's *Imagination as a Way of Human Knowing*. He led us through three ways of approaching the subject — 1) knowing as beholding, 2) knowing as understanding, and 3) knowing as belonging-in — drawing on Plato and the empiricists, Kant and Heidegger in turn. One important distinction he made along the way was between imagination and imaginativeness. He concluded: 'The question that remains is whether liturgy, of which ceremonial repetition seems to be an inherent aspect, can admit of the originality which would make it an authentic disclosure of Being'. And a little further on: 'Each ceremony must be made anew so that it can be experienced as a primordial disclosure of the One'.

We were led further along the main axis of the Conference by Frank O'Loughlin's paper, *The Function of Imagination in Sacramental Liturgy*. A brief survey of the terminology of sacrament in early times brought us to

Aquinas' treatment of sacraments and their effects in terms of signs. In our own time imagination has come to the fore again in a variety of spheres such as scientific discovery, personal relationships, and human action in the world. Imagination is 'fired, forged and nourished' in sacramental life. Sacraments enable us to encounter reality through images of Jesus, especially in his pasch. Attentive participation in sacraments allows us to recognize reality intuitively and thus be shaped, possessed and transformed by it.

All of this was exemplified in concrete form by the last paper in which Robert Gribben presented the genesis, rationale and final shape of a eucharistic prayer which he had been commissioned to write for the Uniting Church. He commented on its key features and phrases with explicit reference to *More Than Meets The Eye* and explained his attempt to compose an original anaphora which was evocative and inclusive in its language and flexible in its structure.

If these three addresses formed the backbone of the Conference, then flesh was added in the course of group discussions, table conversations and other exchanges. More particularly, D'Arcy Wood's 'International Update' and the Academy 'Show and Tell' session amplified the scope of the Conference. The former introduced us to the forthcoming supplement to the ten-year-old *The Australian Hymn Book*. Published as *Sing Alleluia*, it offers both a wider diversity of styles of Christian song and a greater proportion of contemporary compositions. We also heard of the work of the English Language Liturgy Consultation (ELLC), especially its revision of *Prayers We Have In Common*, due to appear in 1988, and of the eleventh biennial meeting of *Societas Liturgica*, held this year at Brixen on the theme 'A Worshipping Church: Penitent and Reconciling'.

The 'Show and Tell' session, while still awkwardly named, was nonetheless informative and stimulating. Members' reports on their activities and projects led to animated discussion on several issues, such as inclusive language and Christian celebrations of the seder meal.

Apart from receiving reports and electing a new team, the main item on the agenda for the Annual General Meeting was consideration of the proposed Constitution. Once it was scrutinized and amended, a thorough debate ensued as to whether it was appropriate for the Academy to be taking such a step at this stage in its evolution. The outcome was affirmative and the amended text was adopted in the form you will find elsewhere in this issue. Unfortunately Sr Mary-Anne Duigan was unable to be present with Fr Tony Kain to witness this historic step in the life of the Academy which they had nurtured together in its infancy.

The new Council of the Academy will be headed for the next two years by Dr H. D'Arcy Wood as President and Dr Helen Harrison as Secretary-Treasurer, assisted by the same State Representatives as before except for South Australia and Victoria which are now represented by Sr Helen Northey and Fr Tom

Knowles respectively. Fr Ray Hartley will continue his excellent work as editor of *Australian Journal of Liturgy*.

So much for bone and flesh. Spirit was breathed into the Conference by the several occasions of common worship. The opening and closing prayer as well as the daily morning prayer grew out of a variety of Taize chants, scripture texts, and intercessions, interwoven with silence. All this was in the hands of a local team led by Brian Phillips to whom we are indebted. The scheduled Liturgy of the Word was imaginatively devised and led thoughtfully by Graham Hughes in place of Jennifer Farrell who unfortunately was unable to be present. The one eucharistic service of the Conference was celebrated according to the Anglican rite under the presidency of Archdeacon Ian George.

The 1987 Conference ended with a great sense of satisfaction and accomplishment and with a buoyant optimism for the future of the Academy. In that spirit we hope to gather again in force around the same time next year, either in the Albury-Wodonga region or in Melbourne. In the meantime may the work of the Academy and its members flourish!

Thomas Knowles

CONSTITUTION OF THE AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

PREAMBLE

*In December 1982 a meeting of people who had an interest in fostering the cause of Liturgy in Australia took place in Adelaide. Convened by Fr Anthony Kain, with the support of Sr Mary-Anne Duigan, it included from the outset representatives of various Christian churches. Out of that meeting grew a national ecumenical body calling itself the **Australian Academy of Liturgy**. Its principal activity from 1983 has been an annual Conference. Operating under a brief statement of aims from its inception, it now defines itself in the terms of this Constitution.*

ARTICLE I — NAME

The name of this organization is the **Australian Academy of Liturgy**, hereafter referred to as the 'Academy'.

ARTICLE II — GOALS AND PURPOSES

1. The Academy is an ecumenical association of specialists in Christian liturgy and related disciplines, with a 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.

ARTICLE III — ADMISSION

1. Admission to the Academy is restricted 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.

2. The Academy consists of
 - a. **Members**, who have gained recognized qualifications or have otherwise demonstrated their competence in the field of liturgy and related areas, and
 - b. **Associates**, who evidence a developing contribution in the field of liturgical studies and related areas.
3. a. Members have permanent standing in the Academy contingent upon the payment of their annual dues.
- b. The move from Associate to Member status is by application to the Admissions Committee.
4. a. Candidates for the Academy must be recommended and supported by a Member.
- b. The Admissions Committee will examine the credentials of the prospective Members and Associates and recommend to the Council those who are qualified as either Members or Associates.
- c. New Members and Associates are approved by the Admissions Committee and accepted into the Academy by vote of the Council.

ARTICLE IV — COUNCIL AND OFFICERS

1. The officers of the Academy are the **President**, the **Secretary-Treasurer**, one **Representative** from each State, the **Editor of Australian Journal of Liturgy**, and the immediate **Past President** for the first twelve months after relinquishing office.
2. These officers together constitute the **Council** of the Academy and are elected by the Members and Associates at the Annual General Meeting. The **Executive** of the Council is comprised of the President, the Secretary-Treasurer, and the Representative of the State in which the President resides.
3. The President and Secretary-Treasurer are to be from the same State and are elected for a two-year term, while the State Representatives are elected for a one-year term. Officers may be re-elected as often as the membership desires. Only Members are eligible for office.
4. In the event of a vacancy occurring, the Council is empowered to make a suitable appointment until the Annual General Meeting. A replacement President or Secretary-Treasurer must be chosen from the elected officers of the Council, while a replacement for the immediate Past President must be chosen from the officers of the previous Council. A replacement State Representative may be any Member from the appropriate State.
5. If in any year there is no Annual General Meeting with a quorum, the Academy Council will remain in office until the next Annual Meeting.

ARTICLE V — COMMITTEES

1. The Academy shall have standing committees as provided in the

Constitution and By-Laws, and such committees as the President may establish.

2. The **Conference Committee** shall be responsible for the programme of the annual Conference. It will consist of the Executive of the Council plus the Representative of the State in which the Conference is being held, if this is not the State in which the President resides. This Committee will appoint a Conference Arrangements Committee to attend to the local organization for the Conference.
3. The **Admissions Committee** shall be a standing committee. It is comprised of the members of the Executive. It examines the credentials of those applying for admission; it recommends those qualified for membership as Members or Associates. On request it re-evaluates the status of those Associates who apply for acceptance as Members. The decision in every case rests with the Council.
4. The **Editorial Committee** shall be a standing committee. The **Editor** is appointed by the Council and will recommend other members for the Editorial Committee to the Executive. The Committee is responsible for **Australian Journal of Liturgy** and such other publications as the Council will determine.

ARTICLE VI — MEETINGS

The Annual General Meeting of the Members and Associates of the Academy is held during the annual Conference.

ARTICLE VII — AMENDMENTS

1. Proposed amendments to this Constitution shall be presented in writing to the Secretary-Treasurer at least sixty days before the next meeting of the Academy. The Secretary-Treasurer will circulate the petition to the members at least thirty days in advance of that same meeting.
2. A two-thirds majority of those financial Members and Associates who are voting in person at the Annual General Meeting is required for approval of amendments to this Constitution.

ARTICLE VIII — BY-LAWS

By-laws may be adopted by simple majority vote of those present and voting at the Annual General Meeting.

ARTICLE IX — QUORUM

A quorum for a Meeting of the Academy will be one-fifth of the total number of Members and Associates.

ARTICLE X — FINANCES

1. The Academy shall derive its revenue from membership dues, donations, and from such trusts as may support the goals and purposes of the Academy,

and from such fund-raising activities as the Council may approve from time to time.

2. The Academy may receive donations from those who do not seek membership but who wish to support the work of the Academy by their donations.
3. The Council is empowered to set a minimum figure for the annual membership dues required of Members and Associates.
4. Membership dues are to be paid in January and cover the period from January 1 to December 31. No member will be deemed unfinancial unless his or her dues remain unpaid by January 31 of the following year.
5. All monies are to be deposited in the Academy's bank account. Cheques drawn on this account are to be signed by any two of the three members of the Executive.

ARTICLE XI — TERMINATION

In the event of the dissolution of the Academy, any surplus funds after realizing on assets and discharging liabilities will be paid to an educational institute or institutions having goals or purposes similar at least in part to the goals and purposes of the Academy.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I — ELECTIONS

1. *All elections are to be conducted under the auspices of the Academy Council.*
2. *Nominations for an office may be made by Members or Associates of the Academy.*
3. *All financial Members and Associates of the Academy are eligible to vote in elections, but only Members are eligible for office.*
4.
 - a. *In the event one person on the first ballot receives more than one-half of the votes cast, he or she will be deemed elected.*
 - b. *If no one person receives one more than one-half of the votes cast there will be a run-off between the two persons with the highest number of votes (and any other person with the same number of votes as the second highest). The candidate receiving the majority shall be deemed elected. If this process results in two candidates with an equal number of votes, the choice between them shall be decided by lot.*

ARTICLE II — DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. *The **President** has the duty*
 - a. *To call, convene and preside at meetings of the Academy.*
 - b. *To appoint committees.*
 - c. *To preside at the meetings of the Academy Council and Executive.*

- d. To perform the duties applied to the President.
- 2. The **Secretary-Treasurer** has the duty
 - a. To perform the usual duties of the Secretary and the Treasurer.
 - b. To keep a permanent record of all meetings and all the minutes.
 - c. To organize the Annual General Meeting in consultation with the President.
 - d. To handle the monies of the Academy.
 - e. To maintain an accurate membership list.
- 3. The **State Representative** has the duty
 - a. To arrange, wherever possible, meetings of members in that State.
 - b. To act as a reference person for prospective members in that State.
 - c. To assure liaison with the Executive.

ARTICLE III — FINANCES

- 1. The annual membership fee for individuals and for married couples shall include the annual subscription to **Australian Journal of Liturgy**.
- 2. If a person is admitted as a Member or Associate after July 1, he or she will pay half the annual membership dues for that year.

ARTICLE IV — MEETINGS

- 1. Annual General Meetings shall be conducted according to Roberts' Rules of Order, unless otherwise determined by the Constitution or By-Laws.
- 2. At the Annual General Meeting the President of the Academy for the year past shall make a report on the work of the Academy.

ARTICLE V — PROCEEDINGS

- 1. Those delivering papers at the annual Conference shall be invited to submit them to the Editor for consideration for publication in **Australian Journal of Liturgy**.
- 2. A report of the annual Conference, including the Annual General Meeting, shall be published.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANTHOLOGY OF AUSTRALIAN RELIGIOUS VERSE

edited by Les A. Murray; Melbourne, Collins Dove, 1986. Pp. 302 + xvii.

The publication of this very substantial book is reason for both wonder and enthusiasm. Its advent is symbolic — that is, partaking of the reality to which it points — in a number of ways. In the first place it makes apparent to us all what only a very few perhaps knew or suspected, namely that this large, forbidding land, to whom its European inhabitants came bearing scepticism in their hearts and the marks of established religion on their bodies, has indeed borne in two centuries a genuine, if still seminal, spirituality. Secondly, it publicises what again only some among us will have known: that is, the length and depth and impressive maturity which Australian poetry has acquired in this period. Les Murray has collected well over three hundred poems, all from Australian poets and all finding their place, as he says in his Foreword, because they were 'first of all ... poetry'. One goes on from treasure to treasure and wonders: Did someone from among us say all these things?

I suppose there will be two questions which arise about a book of Australian religious poetry: what the word 'religious' denotes here, and what constitutes 'Australian' religious poetry. Then, because I am reviewing this book for a journal dedicated to liturgy in Australia, I find myself turning over some questions on the relationship between liturgy and poetry, and what the significance of this volume is for people who plan and lead liturgies in Australia.

I

Les Murray is one of Australia's best known contemporary poets. He happens also to be a practising Roman Catholic, having transferred from the 'deeply puritan Free Kirk Presbyterianism' of his childhood. One therefore assumes that he is as well-placed as anyone to compile an anthology of Australian religious poetry. The beauty and strength of the collection, however, is that it completely transcends any suggestion of sectarian division. It mirrors Murray's own broadly defined understanding of 'religion': 'a dimension of wonder, of quest, of value, of ultimate significance. ... (the) human response to the beauty, horror, mystery or incongruity of the world' (from 'Some Religious Stuff I Know About Australia' in *The Shape of Belief*, ed. D. Harris *et al* [Homebush, N.S.W., Lancer, 1982] p. 13). Thus, though the collection begins with poems on 'bells, bishops and church buildings, things that anyone might vaguely summon up when starting to think about the religious dimension' (p. xi), it ranges out from there to poems which express a disillusionment with institutional religion, to Aboriginal poems on the land and its mystery, on ordinary Australians celebrating the wonder of their

ordinary lives, to the beauty and the terror of the age in which we live, to modern reflection on biblical incidents, to life, to death, to poetry itself, to sensual and spiritual pleasures, to the uncanny, and so on. Strangely, and I think significantly, the more explicitly 'religious' / ones found less convincing (with the wonderful exception of Francis Webb's 'Bells of St Peter Mancroft' which stands at the head of the whole collection) than the more allusive, contemplative works. Of these it is impossible (and I suppose, in fact, invidious) to isolate one or two from such a rich collection; but I was deeply moved by David Martin's 'Death and Idea' (p. 92) which catches a moment of epiphany as the poet, travelling by train 'from Ballarat the other day', is enthused (in the most proper sense of that word) by the spring-time profusion of life —

How beautiful is the limited that creates the limitless

— but on reaching Melbourne is confronted again by his own mortality; or by Francis Webb's 'Wild Honey' (p. 157) which similarly ponders the proximity of life and death; or John Shaw Neilson's delicate approximation of Christ to a crane ('The Gentle Water Bird', p. 34). But having begun, I really would not know where to stop.

Doubtless there will be those for whom Les Murray's definitions are far too widely drawn, who wish to speak of 'religion' within much more recognisable and manageable confessional categories. I discovered, unexpectedly, that my own question ran in an opposite direction: if it is true that poetry is what happens when someone tries to express the inexpressible —

And after all, what's said is barely said

(Aileen Kelly, p. 179)

— then is not all poetry, which is worthy of the name, *religious*? Les Murray, in the essay referred to, seems to demurr from this when he says: 'There is impressive power in what we can imagine, but no transcendence' (op.cit., p. 21). Doubtless there is an artistic banality and an ideological cant of which the latter part of this sentence is manifestly true. But this is not what either of us is talking about. I believe in fact that it *is* through our human capacity to image the unimaginable that we achieve (or at very least, see the possibility of achieving) a kind of self-transcendence. And when the medium of that imagination is language then what we have will (usually, I think) be poetry. The strange thing is that of several poets in the volume who say this, Les Murray himself is one:

Art is what can't be summarised:
it has joined creation from our side,
entered Nature, become a fact
and acquired presence ...

Art's best is a standing miracle
at an uncrossable slight distance,

an anomaly, finite but inexhaustible,
unaltered after analysis
as an ancient face. ...

... a passage, a whole pattern
that has shifted the immeasurable
first step into Heaven.

(from 'Satis Passio', p. 187).

II

So much, then, for what makes verse 'religious' or not. But how shall one speak of 'Australian' religious verse? Is it all poetry written by Australians, with some semblance of religious subject-matter? Or is it verse which deals with 'religious themes from an Australian point of view'? Or are there certain recognisably 'Australian' religious subjects? As far as I can judge, Les Murray comes down somewhere near the first of these. And generally this works well enough, except for the few places in the book where I felt that the poems could have been written by any good practitioner, i.e. irrespective of their home-place ('Westminster Abbey' by Hall Colebatch; the same poet's 'On the Death of Ludwig Erhard'; Allen Afterman's 'The Light of Sinai' and 'Jerusalem'; and perhaps 'The Martyrdom of Saint Sebastian' by Rosemary Dobson, are some of these). The vast majority of the poems, however, really do have an Australian accent — not just in terms of language and idiom. One does begin to understand, in this book, what an Australian experience of religion is like.

In his essay to which I keep coming back, Les Murray speaks of the 'clown-iron'. 'The ability to laugh at venerated things, and at awesome and deadly things ... may, in time, prove to be one of Australia's great gifts to mankind' (op.cit., p. 17). In the collection of religious verse, the characteristically picaresque, sardonic, yet guileless drollery, which treats God and all things serious with a grin and a shrug, is unmistakable. Les Murray's own 'The Quality of Sprawl' (p. 52) says it perfectly:

Sprawl is the quality
of the man who cut down his Rolls Royce
into a farm utility truck, and sprawl
is what the company lacked when it made repeated efforts
to buy the vehicle back and repair its image.

As Murray hints, this refusal to take the 'serious' things seriously has an evangelical quality:

Sprawl is ...
driving a hitchiker that extra hundred miles home ...

It may have to leave the Earth.
Being roughly Christian, it scratches the other cheek
and thinks it unlikely. Though people have been shot for sprawl.

Yet, when it comes to personal relationships, the inadequacies of this impassivity are known and lamented; in Ray Matthew's 'Our Father', for example; or nowhere more poignantly than in James McAuley's 'Father, Mother, Son'; or Kenneth Slessor's 'Talbingo':

That's what we're like out here,
Beds of dried up passion

(p. 64).

Which brings us back to the perennial theme of the landscape. Perhaps no other feature has dominated Australian consciousness since white settlement more than the land. Some poems, it is true, rejoice in the hills and fertility of the countryside:

My heart rose when I looked on Samford
And the strong hills behind it,
Their breasts wine purple, their heads silver-violet.

(Paul Grano, 'Walking Samford Way', p. 43).

But most find the landscape daunting, haunting, enigmatic:

Eucalyptus too hard to cut, nothing sharper than a shell,
no animal of service, one edible fern,
one fungus.
Land without a fruit-bearing tree,
as though Truth were exiled and the Lie remained.

(Allen Afterman, 'Van Diemen's Land', p. 61).

Yet this harsh, unlikely place becomes a parable for the classic spiritual journey:

Voyage within you, on the fabled ocean,
And you will find that Southern Continent,
Quiros' vision — his hildago heart
And mythical Australia, where reside
All things in their imagined counterpart.

(James McAuley's 'Terra Australis', p. 55).

And in the end, with A.D. Hope, 'There are some like me who turn gladly home' ('Australia', p. 228). The wonder is that it is out of this sparse, dry soil that these particular fruits have come. As I said above, they are themselves a sign of that of which they speak.

III

I have already remarked upon the fact that the more overtly 'Christian' or 'religious' pieces in the book are for the most part the least convincing. It thus seems to me unlikely that those who plan worship services will often have occasion to 'use' passages from the book. Yet one somehow hopes and presumes that there is an affinity between poetry and liturgy; and on the other side, the importance of this volume for understanding Australian religious consciousness is simply monumental. So the questions recur: what is the relationship between

poetry and liturgy, and, what is the significance of this anthology for Australian liturgists?

The fact that the book may often not be 'used' in liturgies seems to me to be of as much consequence as the similar fact that no one now looks for poetic 'gems' with which to adorn sermons. I don't know that good liturgy ever does 'use' other art forms like this. The relationship between poetry and liturgy (as indeed of the relationship between art and liturgy, of which the present question is self evidently a refinement) is more organic and suffused. Certainly a poem may be present in liturgy — after all, hymns and songs are poems. But much more important is the consideration that the *whole liturgical event* should be or become a *poetic experience*.

It is from this point of view, I think, that Les Murray's anthology has its value for those of us engaged in liturgical reflection and practice. For it shows us, not how we may 'use' poetry, but rather how to be poetic. And since the context of our being is an Australian one, this deep, rich collection of Australian religious verse alerts us, sensitises us, to the deeply intuitive religious stirrings within us and presumably within those among whom we work. In other words, Les Murray's book can never be regarded as some sort of handy reference; the very idea seems to me to be a travesty of it. The process which it generates is more nearly a kind of osmosis. And, if it is allowed, the fruitfulness which follows will be a more authentic knowledge of ourselves and thus a more authentic expression in our worship of our most fundamental joys, fears, hopes and laughter. In the words of James McAuley:

... poems are prophecy
Of a new heaven and earth,
A rumour of resurrection.

(p. 180).

That's how I felt about this whole collection, a 'rumour of resurrection'.

Graham Hughes

ANNOINTING WITH THE SPIRIT: THE RITE OF CONFIRMATION:
THE USE OF OIL AND CHRISM

by Gerard Austin; New York, Pueblo Publishing Company, 1985. pp. xiii + 178
Paperb. \$A21.95.

When a new book appears on the market regarding Confirmation, there has to be something which will recommend the book. Gerard Austin seems to intimate a new approach towards his topic in the title he has chosen for his work: *Anointing with the Spirit*. He makes a point of this title in his introduction. He

also introduces the concept of 'baptismal consciousness' as a way of integrating and understanding Confirmation. He also sets his discussion on Confirmation within the wider discussion of the place of oil in the life of the Roman Church. With this approach it would be hoped that the author would remain consistent in his treatment of the topic. Unfortunately this hope is not realised in his book.

In his overview of the historical development of Confirmation, the author is selective in his presentation of evidence; he himself usually does not justify his evidence by personal research, but rather relies on the research of others. This approach makes it difficult for the reader to evaluate his presentation — especially when he treats of other ecclesial groups' various practices of Confirmation. His evidence is brief because of the limits of space. However his selection of evidence does not seem to group around any central theme — from his introduction, the concepts of 'anointing with the Spirit' or 'baptismal consciousness' could have provided such a centring; yet they are not employed until much later in the book. The author does however maintain consistently his plea for a return to the original unity of the sacrament of Initiation — a theme that will often surface in the book.

Having placed the ritual of Confirmation in the context of the Ritual of Christian Initiation (the norm for all rituals of initiation), the author discusses the resolution of the usual questions asked in the Catholic Church regarding Confirmation: its liturgical expression, the minister of the sacrament, age of candidates and the place of sponsors. Interestingly, the author, who has strongly argued in a previous work for the place of the imposition of hands in this ritual, can accept that the 'anointing so carried out sufficiently manifests the imposition of the hand' (p. 45) — in past writings he has referred to this ritual as the 'imposition of the thumb'! Basically his answers are those offered by the ritual. He does note, however, the danger of leaving Confirmation till after Communion as 'providing the potential for undoing that valiant attempt to restore the unity of the three sacraments of initiation' (p. 59).

The author then looks at the changes that have taken place in other Christian Churches — the Episcopal, the Lutheran, the United Methodist and the Presbyterian Churches. The author outlines the history of the reform of the ritual for Confirmation in each Church — a full chapter is given only to the Episcopal Church. This overview may be a helpful introduction to those of the Catholic Church seeking an understanding of Confirmation in other Christian Churches, but would only be a summary presentation for those of the Churches themselves. As noted previously, the author does not try to evaluate the stand by each Church regarding the place, the celebration and the significance of Confirmation.

Having failed to develop his theme of the 'anointing with the Spirit', the author's presentation of the Rites of the Blessing of Oils and of Consecrating Chrism seems an intrusion into the argument of his book — certainly his

concluding chapter will not include reference to these Rites. Again his treatment of the topic will be by way of quoting authors who have written on the area or by quoting the Rituals themselves. He is able to link chrism to the theme of Confirmation by introducing the reader to the 'confirmation bands' — 'a history of this interesting practice of confirmation bands still remains to be written' (p. 105).

In the concluding two chapters the author tries to look to the future, but only for the Roman Church. His judgement of the present state of initiatory practice in the Roman Church is that it is 'theologically chaotic and pastorally unmanageable' (p. 125). From this stand-point he then goes on to look at the issues of Infant Baptism, First Confession, First Communion and Confirmation. He freely admits the theological impoverishment of such a situation. Like all pastors he wants to offer his solution; unfortunately he has not provided in his book a firm foundation on which to place his suggestions. Throughout his work he has raised the issue of celebrating confirmation after first Communion. Now he states that Confirmation is intimately linked with Eucharist; for he sees Confirmation as 'the gift of the Spirit tied intimately to the water-bath that prepares one for the reception of the body and blood of Christ as a full member of the Church' (p. 146). If he had started from this discussion he may have been able to stay with a consistent line of presentation throughout his work.

In conclusion, this work serves its purpose in being Vol. III in the Pueblo series of 'Studies in the Reformed Rites of the Catholic Church' — as such it is aimed at the Catholic audience. For that audience, the author does address the issues raised by the celebration of Confirmation in that Church — in particular he continually restates the mind of Vatican II that Confirmation 'be revised in order that the intimate connection of this sacrament with the whole of Christian initiation may stand out more clearly' (SC n. 71). However the book does not serve as a work breaking new ground in the area of Confirmation, nor would it be a resource for material regarding the history of the sacrament. As it has been written, it is easy to read and would serve as a first text in the study of Confirmation and as an overview of the Rites of Blessing of Oils and Consecrating Chrism.

David Orr

WINTER HARVEST

by William W. Emilsen; Theological Explorations. Sydney. 1987 \$5.50

This little book gives us ten examples of what the 'Liturgical Sermon' should be. They use contemporary language, they are rich in images, yet they are also solid with information, and they are short.

Just as liturgical action forms visual and audible symbols in time and space, the sermon within that action needs to bring God's truth down into specific meanings for a people at just that time in their history. Emilson does this above all in his making of symbols. The church as an orange orchard, the church 'between the pub and the pictures', the ancients with their 'Supermarket of gods', 'God is a sea and we splash in his exhilarating waters' — all of these images are immediate to us, memorable, and they are given important meanings. Each sermon would take not much over ten minutes, I should think, yet these few words are made to do a lot of work.

It takes a certain daring and confidence to be true to the sacred text (and it is clear that this preacher has done his exegesis) and to move the meanings into our world. Partly he does it by accounts of his own experience with other people and in his parish, and partly by vivid symbols. He does know what he is talking about, whether it is the history of the area in which the church building is situated, or the situation in South Africa, or a touch of science related to the 'The Divine Mystery'; occasionally a little of the background reading peaks through. But part of the unspoken alchemy of the situation, sensed between the lines, is the relationship of this man to his congregation and to the world around him. This is the informed sensitivity that we all need.

Douglas Brown, SSM

CONTRIBUTORS AND REVIEWERS

The Revd Douglas A.S. Brown, SSM is Warden of the Society of the Sacred Mission Theological College, Adelaide and President of Adelaide College of Divinity. He teaches Biblical studies, theology and Church history for ACD and The Flinders University of South Australia.

Professor David L. Frost is Professor of English at the University of Newcastle. He has been a member of the Liturgical Commissions of both the Church of England and the Anglican Church of Australia. Professor Frost is responsible for the English rendering of the Psalms first published as *The Psalms: a new translation for worship* (Collins, 1977) and since then included in a number of service books, among them *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978).

The Revd Dr Graham R. Hughes, Assistant Editor of AJL, teaches liturgy and New Testament at United Theological College, Sydney.

The Revd Thomas F. Knowles, SSS is Parish Priest of St Francis' Church, Melbourne and Superior of the Blessed Sacrament Fathers in that parish. He teaches liturgy for Yarra Theological Union.

The Revd David Orr, OSB, Assistant Editor of AJL, is a monk of St Benedict's Monastery, Arcadia and teaches liturgy for the Catholic Institute of Sydney.

The Revd Dr H. D'Arcy Wood, President of the Academy, is Deputy Principal of Parkin-Wesley College, Adelaide. He teaches theology for Adelaide College of Divinity and The Flinders University of South Australia and liturgy for ACD. Dr Wood is President of the Australian Council of Churches and Chairman of the Uniting Church's Commission on Liturgy.

IN FUTURE ISSUES

'Heaven on earth "Down Under": experiencing heaven through earthly realities' by Miltiades Chryssavgis.

'Composing a Eucharistic Prayer for the Uniting Church' by Robert Gribben.

'Maundy Thursday and the Passover' by Gregory C. Jenks.

'Gendered language in corporate worship: or can we still pray "Our Father"?' by Charles Sherlock.

'Imagination as a way of human knowing' by Stan van Hoof.

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to

The Revd R.W. Hartley,
St Barnabas' College,
P.O. Box 217,
Belair, S.A. 5052.

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.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW to

The Revd Dr G.R. Hughes,
United Theological College,
16 Masons Drive,
North Paarramatta, N.S.W., 2151.

SUBSCRIPTION PAYMENTS to

Dr H.J. Harrison,
35 Florence Street,
Goodwood, S.Aust., 5034

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.

