



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

**AUSTRALIAN
JOURNAL OF
LITURGY**

Volume 5 Number 1 May 1995

CONTENTS

Towards Beatification

The preparation for the ceremony of the beatification of Mary MacKillop. A report on the process.

Carmel Pilcher and David Orr 4

Australian Anglican Church Dedications and the Calendar of Saints

Allan Cadwallader 15

Worshippers Today and How to Count Them

Elizabeth Smith 33

An Orthodox Easter

Joan Benson 45

News and Information

The 1938 Père Receveur Sesquicentenary at La Perouse

Frank Carleton 50

Book Review

The Problems with the Prayers of the Modern Mass

Denis Stanley 53

Contributors 54

Index to Volume 4 55

EDITORIAL

The beatification of Mary Mackillop in January this year was an event of national as well as ecclesiastical importance. Sister Carmel Pilcher and Fr David Orr, with others, were at the centre of the process which led to the liturgy for the ceremony of beatification. Their report on this process reveals how collaboration and consultation, together with the establishment of and adherence to clear liturgical principles, can result in good liturgical celebration. What we see in this report is clearly a model for those who might have the task of preparing major liturgical events. It is gratifying to note the acknowledgment given to the influence of the Academy in the process.

The Anglican Church of Australia has been going through another round of liturgical revision. The proposed *A Prayer Book for Australia* will be considered by the General Synod in July. The next issue of AJL will include an introduction to and reviews of APBA, subject to its being approved by General Synod. (If General Synod rejects the proposed book, AJL will attempt to bring you an explanation as to why this happened!) In the meantime, the article by Fr Allan Cadwallader in this issue is a response to the proposed calendar in APBA.

Dr Elizabeth Smith has returned to Australia and is now a parish priest in Melbourne, but she had sent a number of articles to AJL from California where she was studying. Her paper in this issue was a presentation to the Ecumenical Summer School in Melbourne in January. It is a timely reminder to those concerned with the performance of liturgy that people count.

Then finally, like some latter-day Egeria, Joan Benson transports us in mind and spirit to experience the liturgical joys of Easter in Jerusalem. What contrasts, and yet how much in common, between Jerusalem at Easter and the celebration at Randwick Racecourse last January – but it's all liturgy.

Strathmore Vicarage
St Philip's and St James' Day 1995

RWH

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 5 Number 1 May 1995

EDITOR

R. WESLEY HARTLEY

EDITORIAL PANEL

JOHN BAUMGARDNER (Assistant Editor)
CHARLES SHERLOCK (Book Review Editor)
ROBERT GRIBBEN
RUSSELL HARDIMAN
PAUL RENNER

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

AJL is published each May and October.

ISSN 1030-617X

TOWARDS BEATIFICATION

The preparation for the ceremony of the beatification of Mary MacKillop.

A report on the process.

Carmel Pilcher and David Orr

With the news that the Pope had chosen to come to Australia in January 1995 to celebrate the beatification of Mary MacKillop, there began the process of establishing a liturgy which could do honour to this great woman.

The Committee...

After an Australia-wide search to include both Josephites and women who could serve such a task, Tony Doherty called together a group of people working in liturgy throughout the Australian Catholic Church in April 1994 to prepare the liturgy for the Beatification. This group included: Carmel Pilcher, Clare Tobin, Paul Crowley and David Orr – all being members of AAL. Many friendships that have formed through the AAL were to be later used to contribute to and evaluate various elements of the proposed liturgy. This reflects one of the undeclared influences of the Academy.

There was some discussion regarding the possibility of a non-eucharistic liturgy for the occasion but because the ceremony of Beatification usually formed part of the introductory rite of Eucharist, there was little room for change.

The Venue...

The initial difficulty was to resolve the question of the venue for the ceremony. Enclosed areas were evaluated, but with the general consensus being that the venue must cater for all who would wish to attend, these had to be ruled out. Finally the decision was taken to return to the tracks of Randwick. The committee then set about the task of preparing for the occasion.

At the same time, attention was given to other possible liturgies which could be celebrated during the Papal visit. Morning Prayer with the Josephites in the Cathedral, some form of prayer at the tomb of Mary MacKillop, and the Beatification Mass at Randwick were the final suggestions.

Much of our early effort was given to learning the lessons of previous events and establishing the principles which would guide our work. (Paul was a fountain of information, particularly in the former area, having been responsible for the Papal liturgy in 1986. We ignored his persistent request to resign from the committee, claiming that one should only be sentenced once to such a task!) The nature of this event was different this time however: a Pontifical liturgy that was national, celebrating an Australian woman.

A Consultative Process...

The clear enunciation of principles was to provide a helpful tool in the resolution of the various problems which were to surface along the way. The process used to arrive at these principles was characteristic of the way the committee operated in all its decision making. Ideas were gathered from many individuals and groups. The Josephite Sisters were always key in these consultations. Distance was not an obstacle. Due to the technology at our disposal our contacts spread across Australia and New Zealand.

As an integral part of this wider consultation, a network of State and New Zealand contacts was set up. This group provided a necessary connection for diverse communities to receive information and to contribute to the development of the ceremony. In many ways the liturgy contacts became an extension of the committee, and enabled people beyond Sydney to feel some identity with the ceremony as it evolved. Monthly teleconferences initiated by Carmel provided the vehicle for this communication.

Guiding Principles...

After some time we arrived at the following principles:

- * That the ceremony be true to the spirit of Mary MacKillop and make her accessible to all.
- * That it be inclusive of all Australians, where all may feel accepted and able to participate.
- * That it be simple.
- * That it capture the spirit of reconciliation.
- * That it fire people and challenge them to be more accepting and respectful of others.
- * That it particularly highlight the ordinary and the marginalised.
- * That it be a celebration of an Australian woman.
- * That it be Australian, and international (including New Zealand.)

These provided a constant barometer in all our deliberations and decision making.

The Podium...

The design of the podium took up much of the early time of the committee. Our principles were of great assistance to the architect as he drew up his plans. Practical considerations also influenced decisions about the podium.

A decision was taken to use the occasion to highlight the national significance of the event by inviting the bishop of each Australian diocese to concelebrate

with the Pope. In this way it was hoped to give a clear statement of the national character of our Church in Australia. In fact, on the day of the beatification, each diocese of Australia was represented – along with bishops from New Zealand, Scotland and the Vatican. To symbolise further the significance of the occasion, that of honouring Mary MacKillop, we included the women who are currently leaders of the Josephite congregations on the podium.

Having taken these decisions, it was now possible to set the parameters of the podium. The final design was simple, characteristically Australian, and symbolic of the themes of Mary MacKillop. The roof was designed on the lines of the Woods-MacKillop Schoolhouse still existing in Penola SA and the monogram designed by Mary MacKillop. Imaged also in the design was the sense of the Australian shed.

An early decision was made by the committee to appoint Carmel as chair and by July Carmel had moved to Sydney to work full-time on this project. With the professional support of the MacKillop/Papal Visit Office, Carmel was able to give direction to the work. The central place of music and its preparation was given to Deirdre Browne and Colin Smith. These became members of the committee. The selection of music was thus integrated within the ceremony. At this time also, Catherine Carroll, a Josephite Sister from Sydney joined the committee, and was to provide an invaluable contribution on behalf of the local church.

Texts...

Slowly the ceremony began to take shape. Priority was given to tasks which had to be undertaken quickly. The initial work was filled with uncertainty: texts were not yet finalised. We decided to use the official prayers for the proposed feast of Mary MacKillop, that had been submitted to the Vatican Congregation for Divine Worship by the Australian Catholic Bishops Conference. At this time, and indeed all along the way, there were frequent phone conversations with various AAL members about technicalities and suggestions. However, no one in the country was able to find the text of the beatification rite! There are some drawbacks to history making!

There was need for additional texts: welcomes and introductions, prayers and scripture. Again we used our network across the two countries. The first draft of the prayer of intercession was prepared in Queensland, refined in New Zealand, translated in SA, Victoria and NSW, and given finishing touches by the liturgy committee!

Banners...

At Beatifications celebrated in Rome, it is customary to unfurl a banner depicting the person being honoured at the moment of the declaration by the Pope. We decided to include this custom in our ceremony, and had long discussions about a suitable image that would reflect Mary MacKillop in our Australian context. Artists from around Australia were consulted, and invited to submit images. The committee, along with the Josephite Sisters, spent time trying to determine the most suitable contribution. Eventually it was decided to combine the efforts of two artists into one image. Carmel conducted many intermediary phone calls between Dorothy Woodward from Newcastle NSW and Therese Quinn from Victoria. Eventually these two women sent to the office their individual contributions. These were put together to produce the official portrait that was later unveiled at the beatification. We then invited them to come to Sydney to meet each other for the first time, and to view their final work of art.

Significant Issues...

We grappled with other issues. How could women be included in the ceremony in a significant way? What would be the aboriginal contribution, and that of people from other cultures? How do we design a ceremony of this size that remains simple? What were the limits of creativity in a Roman liturgy? And perhaps the most challenging issue: How do we prepare a ceremony that enables full, active and prayerful participation of 150,000 plus people?

During all of this time of creativity we continued to call upon liturgists from around the country for their advice and suggestions. Tom Elich even made himself available when in Sydney on national matters! We are grateful that you so generously and enthusiastically shared your expertise and encouragement with us.

We spent much time deliberating about the inclusion of our aboriginal peoples. Involvement in past ceremonies has not always been acceptable to these people. Carmel had many meetings with leaders from aboriginal communities listening to their suggestions. It seemed obviously appropriate that the local carers of the land welcome us to the place, and welcome the Pope to the ceremony. We also wished to include them in the liturgy. At their suggestion we requested from Rome that a smoking ceremony replace the incensation at the beginning of the Eucharist. We were adamant that this be a replacement, and not an addition. To our great delight, this request was not only to be accepted but also actively encouraged. The Papal Master of Ceremonies was to say: "We do not expect a Roman ceremony to be performed outside of Rome." The design of their ceremonies and choice of their ministers was made by the aboriginal people.

Our inclusion of other cultures was another serious consideration. We decided that the liturgy of the Word would especially reflect our diversity. People dressed in national costume accompanied the Word to the Mary MacKillop table where it was proclaimed. Other people, representing a cross section of those with whom the Sisters of St Joseph work, read the prayers of intercession in their native tongue.

Pressure on the liturgy committee increased with the announcement of the need to have the ceremony in a completed form for presentation to the Vatican at the end of September.

From the outset we decided that the ceremonies we prepared would model and reflect current liturgical reform. When we had eventually completed them, the proposed liturgies were submitted to Cardinal Clancy before being taken to Rome. The ceremonies received his full support, including the implementing of the recently published permission for women to serve at the altar.

Off To Rome...

Carmel and David were given the task of taking the proposed ceremonies to Rome for approval. Arriving in Rome on the anniversary of Mary MacKillop's excommunication to receive the news of the cancellation of the Pope's visit to the United States, all seemed ominous.

The various proposed sermons and speeches of the Pope were presented to the Secretary of State and contact was made with the Papal Master of Ceremonies, Monsignor Piero Marini. His welcoming and hospitable manner offered a little hope to the daunting task of working at this level of church bureaucracy. In contrast to the total avoidance of Carmel by other Vatican officials, Piero was joyed in finding "that a woman at last is in the area of liturgy!"

Two days were then spent with the three other countries of this Papal Visit (Philippines, Papua New Guinea, and Sri Lanka), in discussing the details of each proposed liturgy to be celebrated by the Pope. Locked in a typical enclosed office in the middle of a Roman heat wave, gave some indication of the problem the Pope would face in the hottest part of our weather. While the bureaucracy of this meeting may have been frustrating, the clarity of liturgical understanding by Piero was most refreshing. Clearly he had been touched by the reform of Vatican II as he called for participation by all at the ceremonies, the inclusion of local custom, respect for local church and his request for clarity in the celebration of the Word. We may have come with some fear for our proposals, but we left affirmed that we were on the right track. In fact, some of our suggestions were to become standard for the beatification ceremony in Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka.

Implementing the Liturgy...

Returning to Australia, the task now was to implement the liturgy. This proved to be onerous due to the sheer numbers needed. We were faced with the prospect of organising 500 people to be ministers of Communion. The invitations needed to go to all dioceses of Australia, and to New Zealand. The large number was needed because of our decision to offer Communion to all who attended the celebration. We tried to use this opportunity to reflect the diversity of ministers in our Australian parishes by including priests, and lay ministers of Communion, both women and men. (It was at about this time that it became clear why Paul protested so quietly but firmly in the early preparations. We now felt the full import of his words!)

Other ministers needed to be chosen: those for the altar came from around Sydney, while most other ministers included representatives from each State. Three hundred and fifty children from three states took part in movement or running with banners during the proclamation of the beatification. It was at this time also that we faced a difficulty concerning the limits placed on concelebration due to the decisions we had made previously. Paul obtained the assistance of Paul Bird in writing a position paper about our decision, that was made available to the priests.

Furnishings...

Final decisions regarding the furnishings had to be made. This proved to be one of the most controversial aspects of the planning. Personal and practical preferences had to be weighed against liturgical considerations. Our principle of simplicity was a strong guide. Again we consulted with liturgists who were competent in this area. It was amazing in retrospect to discover the rich benefits of the consultative process we used in all our decision making. One learning for us however, in the area of space and environment, was the benefit it would have been to us to have appointed someone with this expertise to the committee from the beginning. The effect would have been a better integration of this significant aspect within the whole ceremony.

Other Considerations...

Another issue which had come up in discussion, but was never really faced, was the inclusion of other faith traditions in the preparation and celebration of the ceremony. We never came to any resolutions. The interfaith gathering of leaders to greet the Pope at the Domain was one appropriate recognition. However, we feel it important to include the consideration in this report. Perhaps

the next committee to organise a liturgy of this proportion may find creative ways of bringing about this possibility.

The Day Dawns...

Having lived for so long with the uncertainty of the Pope's health, the rain of the final days could quite easily be handled. However, Carmel did remark that Adelaide would have been a much better proposition weather wise in January! The late finishing of the podium and the rain prevented any possible practices of ministers or readers on the podium. Even as the covers were being removed late on the Thursday afternoon, there was still great uncertainty. Fortunately, the work load had been spread very widely – the early appointment of a manager for the site, John Moulton, proved to be one of the greatest blessings. We could all attend to the various needs for the liturgy, rather than have to chase every other detail – even though as the procession was being formed we had to answer an urgent need for a bucket of water for the papal toilet!

When Monsignor Marini and his assistant, Monsignor Enrico Viganò arrived at the podium, we knew that we were dealing with men who had done all this before. Attempts to rearrange the seating according to Roman tradition proved fruitless; Vatican fear of failure of the radio microphones was finally allayed; revelation of the appropriate level of authority for the event was clearly given by Piero to his attendants: “do whatever Carmel wants!”

The Ceremony Begins...

With the empowering words of welcome by the Aboriginal community to all present, the celebration began. What had been planned for months began to unfold and take on its own life of prayer. As the ceremony flowed, silence occasionally took over to recall the sacredness of what was happening. Humour was never far from the event – the Pope often took the opportunity to share his own humour. So the ceremony unfolded with the interplay of ministers and community.

The Aftermath...

After the event, many have spoken of their experience of being drawn into the celebration, of being affirmed in the action and included in the words. The final official word of the ceremony belonged to Boniface Perdjert, an aboriginal deacon: “go in peace to love and serve the Lord”. Then the community could stand united in our national anthem.

So our people proclaimed Mary MacKillop blessed. The power and place of liturgy was affirmed. For many, this liturgy was to bring new hope back into their

lives in the church. They discovered in the sharing of the experience new hope for themselves and their community. From the many expressions of feedback we experienced a sense that new possibilities had emerged. We knew our process had been effective when people continually named to us the principles we had continually adhered to. It was particularly gratifying to hear people feel included, and to have experienced a prayerful celebration.

Personal Reflections on the Process of the Beatification

What I have learnt from this process?

Constantly have I had to confront the pain of belonging to the Church – often not my own pain, but the pain of others: the Josephites who believed that they did not own the whole process, the many women who did not know a place of acceptance in the Church, the struggle of many priests to accept a servant role in the Beatification, the constant attraction of power, rather than prayer in many decisions, the difficulty in accepting the powerful political status of the Pope in our society, coming face to face with dehumanising effect of Church bureaucracy upon its members.

So why did I stay with the process?

Ultimately what did sustain me was my own dream that the Beatification of Mary MacKillop was of great significance to my country – therefore I wanted to share with my Australian Church this great moment. On Thursday, 19 January, I believe that it did happen – standing with the Deacon, Alan Gibson, at the table of Mary MacKillop, surrounded by the nations of our country, and affirmed by the presence of an immense assembly, the Word of God was proclaimed; then I knew that it was all worth while, and was possible. “All people shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken.” Isaiah 40.5.

A few lessons for liturgical preparation can be drawn from this experience:

1. Establish clear principles for the celebration. How often did we have to return to our principles to make decisions? Yet having established them at the beginning made it so significant to make future decisions.

2. Consult with others. It would have been easy to keep control of the agenda by making our own decisions, even within the small group of the liturgy committee. Yet the richness of any decision was the greater because we constantly reached out to the group involved to hear their opinion. Even many of the unsolicited suggestions found a home in final decisions.

3. Have the humility to acknowledge that we were only in the service of the community who came to pray and in the service of the God whom the community serves.

4. The need for a clear understanding of Liturgy. How easy it would have been to treat the Liturgy as mere theatre or entertainment! There was the constant need to return to the God question of liturgy – how can this celebration be the sacrament of our God in the lives of this community?

An interesting corollary of the whole event is the question of copyright. We have all become sensitive to the copyright for music, song and even dance. But is there also a copyright vested in those who establish the originality of the celebration? I believe this to be a unique question raised by liturgy – if it were a drama, the copyright of the producer would be respected; but because it was only liturgy, it belongs to no one! Usually the question would not arise, but with the inclusion of broadcasting of the event, it does require significant attention. How tempting it was for the broadcaster to invoke the principles of entertainment, and not of liturgy, to market the video of the event!

In conclusion, the experience has reinforced the unique opportunity offered by Liturgy. It does still enjoy the possibility of reaching out and speaking to the hearts of many people.

David Orr osb

From this distance of some months, memories of the process of last year fill me with a mixture of emotions. Many have said I must be glad it is all over. I'm not sure that is my reaction. Rather, as I recall the stories and events, I am on the one hand overjoyed at what was achieved, and on the other feel a deep sadness and loss at what is now only a memory.

The task of co-ordinating the ceremony is more daunting in retrospect than when I agreed to the request of the liturgy committee back in April of last year. The move to Sydney was exciting. Many of the areas of organisation were new and challenging. Working with competent liturgists was a privilege and a unique learning experience. Being the person responsible for the ceremony of Beatification of the foundress of my religious community was the realisation of a dream I had never even dared to imagine.

There were many struggles. Prominent among those for me was reconciling my task, which had been assumed by the Vatican as being filled by a priest, with the fact that I was a woman. The Australian church entrusted me with the task and the Vatican affirmed this decision on many occasions. However, there were times when I was subtly overlooked or simply left out of decisions. For some, liturgy is still the arena of the priest. While it was accepted I could prepare the

liturgy, there was no real place for me in its execution. There were tensions at times too, between the Church and the Josephite community. Some priests were not happy with decisions the committee put forward – particularly in regard to concelebration. There were also, at times, inferences of feminism at work.

There were also many joys. The group of people who prepared for the visit of the Pope to Australia were both highly skilled and zealous in their enthusiasm for the task at hand. Some were seasoned in these kinds of events. Others, like myself, were learning each day. I never ceased to be amazed at the generosity of everyone whom I met in connection with the visit. While some didn't know much about the finer details of liturgy, I knew nothing about the finer details of sound, lighting, podium designing and constructing, and a host of other items. It was always a reassuring thought to me that I had as resources the whole congregation of Josephites, and the many liturgists around the country.

My learnings ...

Prominent amongst my learnings concerned liturgy itself. I learnt about the precision and detail needed for the execution of a large scale ceremony. Many have commented on the simplicity and smooth flow of the Mass. This was due to the careful planning and thorough and lengthy rehearsals that happened in the many months of preparation.

I learnt that it is possible to prepare a national (and to some extent international) celebration. Through networking and regular consultation at all points of the preparation we were able to include many people from all over the country, both during the process and within the actual ceremony itself.

I was confirmed in my style of leadership that I have adopted from Adelaide: that of collaboration and consultation. This both gives ownership to many, and makes for a better ceremony because it enables the possibility of gleanng the richness and tapping the collective wisdom of liturgists from both Australia and New Zealand.

Like David, I am convinced that to begin with a set of principles is essential for the smooth organisation of any liturgy. It was no coincidence that people named back to us our principles when commenting after the ceremony. We spent much time deliberating on these principles, and used them as a constant referent throughout the time of preparation.

I learnt too, not to be daunted by bureaucracy. In my task I was often confronted by church bureaucracy, whether local or further afield in Rome. All the while we could back up our requests with a solid liturgical rationale, we had no difficulty in receiving a favourable response. Early we adopted the policy of seeking the possible rather than settling for the probable.

And so ...

At the end of the day we were able to prepare a liturgy that some have called a paradigm and many have called prayerful and inspiring. The ceremony was national and inclusive. We broke new boundaries and tested others. I feel very happy to have been given this unique opportunity to work so closely in this event and to come to know so many skilled and gifted people.

Carmel Pilcher rsj

AUSTRALIAN ANGLICAN CHURCH DEDICATIONS AND THE CALENDAR OF SAINTS

Alan H. Cadwallader

In Br Gilbert Sinden's handbook to *An Australian Prayer Book* published in 1978 (*When We Meet For Worship*), he wrote of the various principles guiding selection of names for inclusion in the three-tiered calendar of the then new Prayer Book. Principle five stated:

The attempt has been made to include the names of the most common dedications of parish churches, so that those parishes who wish to do so may the more easily celebrate their patronal festival.¹

In this regard Sinden was indicating that the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia was following a principle which had also guided other such commissions in the formulation of calendars for the revision of Anglican prayer books.² The principle has become important enough to qualify the operation of other principles avowed as guiding the construction of calendars. Thus the historical veracity principle demurs on instances where widespread particular church dedications exist. As Michael Perham comments 'St George is obscure, but in England the omission would be unthinkable.'³ Nevertheless no such sentiment could save St Christopher, St Faith or even St Catherine of Alexandria and St Margaret of Antioch.

On the other hand, certain tensions are set up by adopting this principle. The sixth principle given by Sinden was a disclaimer about the calendar canonising anyone, the title 'Saint' being reserved for those granted a Red Letter day (confined to New Testament entries).⁴ The proposed new calendar deletes the title 'Saint' altogether, though reinstating 'Holy' for the Innocents and retaining 'Blessed' for the Virgin Mary. However, local custom or the use of antiquity meant that most church dedications have 'Saint' and this whether such saints appear in the biblical record or not.

This suggests that the avowed principle of church dedication is very rubbery in application and appears to be influenced by other considerations which may have greater sway. Rather than have the stated principles either haphazardly applied or made a screen for other considerations which are known only to those constructing the calendar, the concern is that these other considerations be explicitly named and negotiated or repudiated, that is, if local authority is to be honoured.

To give but one example: writers about saints and the calendar often cannot resist proffering their particular favourites for inclusion, as well as those they would gladly remove. (As will be seen later, it is a temptation I could not resist.)

W.H. Hutton in 1903, for example, was fairly blatantly arguing for the inclusion of Queen Victoria.⁵ W.H. Frere has had far more success, arguing in 1914 for the inclusion of Nicholas Ferrar, John Coleridge Patteson and James Hannington. Frere became one of the key influences on the revision of the Prayer Book. His proposed calendar bears a striking similarity to that of the 1928 Prayer Book.⁶ Perhaps Frere was a discerning reader of holiness. Nevertheless it also appears that the standing of proponents is highly influential on the constituency of the calendar, more especially when they become members of commissions charged with liturgical and calendrical revision. Some Roman Catholic scholars have recognised that the canonisation of a saint occurs more by the willingness of the church hierarchy to take up popular veneration (for their own particular reasons) than by the force of that veneration.⁷ One wonders what weighting is in fact accorded to popular veneration and local custom in the Anglican church, at least insofar as church dedications are an indicator.

In part doubts about such weighting occur because there has not been, to my knowledge, a survey of church dedications across the Australian Anglican church. Occasional diocesan histories include reference to the dedication of churches,⁸ but an up-to-date quantitative list is absent. Much of W.H. Frere's work on the calendar early this century was informed by a thorough survey of English church dedications, but there is no indication that the compilers of AAPB followed the same procedure. Perhaps there was reliance on impressionistic evidence. However, the empirical data not only yields some interesting qualifications on the principles and details of calendar design, it also alerts those charged with such design to the weighting which has been given to various principles and even to other factors which may be unnamed or unrecognised.

Accordingly, I have sought to collate the church dedications of the Anglican Church of Australia and present them here in summary form. The material has been collected according to dioceses but only the provincial totals are included here for reasons of space. This obscures some interesting cross-trends in church dedications such as the efforts of one diocese to define itself *inter alia* through its church dedications over against another diocese,⁹ the influence of cathedral dedications on parish dedications, the influence of the bush brotherhoods, and, of course, the desire to promote and defend England on Australian shores (e.g. St Olave, St Linus¹⁰).

The basic resource for the gathering of data was the Diocesan Year or Information Books. However, some dioceses do not publish year books and I was reliant upon local parishes or diocesan staff for the information. The figures are as accurate as I could make them, but allowance needs to be made for churches which may have recently been sold or, conversely are not being used at present. Similarly, the third part of the table (No Dedication) contains only such

information as is recorded in diocesan publications; formal worship on stations or in house churches is irregular in appearance. Cross reference is also given to four calendars of particular influence in the Australian church – from the *Book of Common Prayer* (A), the 1928 Prayer Book (B), *An Australian Prayer Book* (C), and the proposed calendar for the new prayer book (D). This cross-reference has two parts, the first (•) registers an unequivocal correlation with a calendar entry, the second registers a correlation that could be inferred directly to an entry (α).¹¹

Dedications of Anglican Churches in Australia as at January 1995.¹²

Dedication – God and Salvation	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Total	A	B	C	D
Annunciation		2					2	•••••			
Ascension	2	5	1	3	3	1	15	•••••			
Christ Church ¹³	36†	18†	12	6	58 ¹⁴	6	136††	•••••			
Christ the Cornerstone	1						1				
Christ the King	2†	1			4†		7††				
Christ the Worker					1		1				
Emmanuel	3	1	2		4		10	α□□□			
Epiphany	2	1	1		4	1	9	•••••			
Good Shepherd	8	8	4	1		3	24				
Holy Advent					1		1	•••••			
Holy Covenant ¹⁵	1						1			□□	
Holy Cross	3	2	1	2	1	3†	12†	•••••			
Holy Faith	1						1				
Holy Family	2	1		1		1	5				
Holy Name	2	2			1		5	••••□			
(Holy) Nativity		1		1	2		4	•••••			
Holy Nativity & All Saints					1		1	□□□□			
(Holy) Redeemer	3	1	1		1	1	7	□□□□			
Holy Spirit	4	12			2		18	•••••			
Holy Trinity	39	14	7	8	54†	13	135†	•••••			
Incarnation		1					1	•••••			
Our Saviour		1					1	□□□□			
Prince of Peace	1		1				2				
Resurrection	3	3	2		2	5	15	•••••			
Risen Christ	1	1					2	•••••			
Sacred Advent	1						1	•••••			
St Saviour	9†	4	1	2	4	3	23	□□□□			
The Way						1	1				
Transfiguration	1	3	1		4		9	•••••			
Total	125	82	34	24	147	38	450	15	15	15	14
								5	5	6	7

Key: † includes Cathedral Church; A=BCP; B=1928; C=AAPB; D=New.

Dedication – Saints & Heroes	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Total	A	B	C	D
All Hallows			2			1	3		□	□	□
All Saints	58†	33	5	15	37 ¹⁶	20	168†	•	•	•	•
All Souls	5	3	1	1	3	2	15		•	•	•
All Souls & St Bartholomew		1†					1†		□	□	□
Catacombs			1				1				
Cranmer the Martyr					1		1		□	•	•
Holy Apostles	1					1	2	□	□	□	□
Holy Evangelists			1				1	□	□	□	□
Holy Innocents	2	1	1		1		5	•	•	•	•
John Oliver Feetham		1					1				•
King Charles the Martyr			1				1	•	•	•	•
Latimer the Martyr					1		1		□	•	•
Melanesian Martyrs		1					1				□
New Guinea Martyrs					1		1				•
Our Lady	1						1	□	□	□	□
St Agnes		2	1				3	•	•	•	•
St Aidan	14	5	3	2		1	25		•	•	•
St Alban	22†	10	8	7	13 ¹⁷	2	67†	•	•	•	•
St Alfred					1		1		•		
St Alphege			1				1	•	•		
St Ambrose	3	1					4	•	•	•	•
St Andrew	43†	20	5	11	18	12	109†	•	•	•	•
St Andrew's Christ Church					1		1	□	□	□	□
St Anne	8	10	1	1	1	3	24	•	•	•	•
St Anselm			1		2		3		•	•	•
St Anthony		1					1		•	•	•
St Augustine (of Canterbury) ¹⁸	9	8	7	2	10	7	43	•	•	•	•
St Augustine of Hippo			1				1	•	•	•	•
St Barbara			1				1				
St Barnabas (the Apostle) ¹⁹	23	9	6	6	4 ²⁰	5	53	•	•	•	•
St Bartholomew	5	3	2	2	1	1	14	•	•	•	•
St Basil						1	1		•	•	•
St Bede	3		1	1	1		6	•	•	•	•
St Benedict		1	2				3	•	•	•	•
St Boniface			1	1		3†	5†	•	•	•	•
St Catherine ²¹	1	3	1		4	1	10	•	•	•	•
St Catherine of Alexandria			1				1	•	•		
St Catherine of Sienna			1				1		•	•	•
St Cecilia		1					1	•	•		
Ss Cecilia and John					1		1	□	□		

Dedication – Saints & Heroes	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Total	A	B	C	D
St Cedd			1				1	.			
St Chad	4		1	1	1		7
St Charles (<i>cf</i> King Charles <i>supra</i>)		1					1	.	.	.	
St Christopher	3	1	3	1	1	4	13				
St Clare		2					2			.	.
St Clement	11	2	1	1	3		18
St Columba ²²	8	1	3		3	1	16
St Cuthbert	6		1		3	1	11
St Cyprian			1				1
St David	14	9	1	5†	7	3	39†
St Denys		1	1				2	.	.		
St Drontan	1						1				
St Dunstan	2		1		2		5
St Eanswythe					1		1				
St Edmund	2	1	3	1		1	8	.	.		
St Edward			1			1	2	.			
Ss Edward & Mary		1					1	□			
St Edward the Confessor			1		1		2	.	.		
St Egwin	1						1				
St Elizabeth of Hungary		1	1			4	6			.	.
St Etheldreda			1		1		2	.	.		
St Faith	3	4			2	1	10	.	.		
St Francis of Assisi	2	9	3		2	5	21
St Gabriel ²³	1	2		1	1		6				
St George	18	15	8	11	26	9†	87†
St Giles	2					1	3	.	.		
St Helen		1					1				
St Hilary of Poitiers			1		1		2
St Hilda	1	1	1		1	2	6
St Hugh		1	2				3
St James (The Great)	49	18†	8	10	31 ²⁴	5	12†
Ss James and Peter					1		1	□	□	□	□
St James' Holy Rood		1					1				
St James the Less			1	1	1		3	□	□	□	□
St John Chrysostom ²⁵					1		1
St John in the Wilderness ²⁶						1	1	□	□	□	□
St John the Baptist	11	5	6†	3	3	4	32†
St John the Divine	1	1	1		2	2	7				
St John (the Evangelist)	94	40†	14	16	12	9	185†
St John Mark	1						1	□	□	□	□

Dedication – Saints & Heroes	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Total	A	B	C	D
St Joseph			1				1			•	•
St Jude	4	2	2		4		12	□	□	□	□
St Lambert		1					1	•			
St Laurence	3	1			2	1	7	•	•	•	•
St Leonard			1			1	2	•	•		
St Linus					1		1				
St Luke	52	19	5	6	20	9	111	•	•	•	•
Ss Luke and Paul						1	1	□	□	□	□
St Margaret (Scotland/Antioch) ²⁷	6	8	7	1	3	3	28	•	•	•	•
St Mark	51	20	4	8	31 ²⁸	10	124	•	•	•	•
St Martin	13	3	4	5	9	4	38	•	•	•	•
St Mary (the Virgin)	31	23	10	8	27	12	111	•	•	•	•
Ss Mary and John					1		1	□	□	□	□
St Mary Magdalene		5	2	1	1	1	10	•	•	•	•
St Mary of Bethany			1				1			□	□
St Matthew	41	17	4	3	21	6	92	•	•	•	•
St Matthias	3	2	1	2	1		9	•	•	•	•
St Michael	6	1	2	1	3	1	14	□	□	□	□
St Michael and All Angels	4	8	6	5	8	6	37	•	•	•	•
St Mildred						1	1				
St Monica		1					1	•	•	•	•
St Neot			1				1				
St Nicholas	6		2		2	5	15	•	•	•	•
St Ninian			1				1	•	•	•	•
St Olave				1			1				
St Oswald	4	3	2	3	5	3	20	•	•	•	•
St Patrick						3	3	•	•	•	•
St Paul	82	22†	9 ²⁹	10	62 †††	14	199 †††	•	•	•	•
Ss Paul and Barnabas	1						1	□	□	□	□
St Peter (Apostle/fisherman) ³⁰	49	29	9	10	29	14	140	•	•	•	•
Ss Peter and Andrew					1		1	□	□	□	□
Ss Peter and Mark						1	1	□	□	□	□
Ss Peter and Paul	1		1				2	□	□	□	□
St Philip (the Apostle)	18	5	4		11	3	41	□	□	□	□
Ss Philip and James	1		1				2	•	•	•	•
St Raphael			1	1			2				
St Richard of Chichester			2				2	•	•	•	•
St Silas	1		1		4		6			□	□
St Simon	1				1		2	□	□	□	□

Dedication – Saints & Heroes	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas	Vic	WA	Total	A	B	C	D
Ss Simon and Jude	1		1	1		1	4	•	•	•	•
St Stephen	37	5	2	4	14	5	67	•	•	•	•
St Swithun	1		1			1	3	•	•		
St Theodore			1		1		2		•		
St Thomas	36	11	4	3	12	4	70	•	•	•	•
St Thomas of Canterbury	1					1	2			•	•
St Timothy			1		2		3			□	□
St Wilfrid			2	1			3				
St Werburgh						1	1				
Soldiers' Memorial	1						1			□	□
Soldiers and Miners Memorial	1						1				
Thomas Vicker	1						1				
Wentworth Memorial	1						1			□	□
TOTAL	891	419	220	174	484	226	2412	597	368	70	
								202	325	25	

Key: † includes Cathedral Church; A=BCP; B=1928; C=AAPB; D=New

No Dedication	NSW	Qld	SA	Tas ³¹	Vic	WA	Total
Chapel	1	1					2
'Community Church'	1	2	3		1	2	9
'... Congregation'			2		2		4
Fellowship					2		2
Hospital/Prison		3	1				4
House Ch/Homestead • locality	3						3
Locality	41	34	1		15	24 ³²	115
Memorial Church	1					1	2
'Mission Hall'/Hall/School etc.	15	15	7		3	12	52
Other denomination's church	9	4	1		1	3	18
Union Church	14	3	1		10		28
Worship Centre		1				1	2
TOTAL	85	63	16	na	34	43	241

An analysis of certain aspects of these tables reveals that the principle of Church dedications has been irregularly applied. A number of church dedications with minimal occurrence yet find their way onto the calendar, whereas others with the same number of dedications or more do not. Thus, of the pre-reformation saints, Ss Anthony, Basil, Cyprian, possibly Catherine of Sienna³³, John Chrysostom, Joseph, and Ninian are included in the AAPB calendar with but one instance of a church dedication in Australia; Ss Hilary of Poitiers, Philip and

James, and Richard of Chichester have two dedications apiece. Ss Alfred, Alphege, Barbara, Cecilia, Cedd, Denys, Drostan, Eanswythe, Edmund, Edward, Edward the Confessor, Egwin, Ethelreda, Faith, Gabriel, Helen, John the Divine³⁴, Lambert, Leonard, Linus, Mildred, Monica, Neot, Olave, Raphael, Swithun, Theodore, Wilfred and Werburgh are not included, even though in some instances the number of their respective dedications is greater than one; St Mary of Bethany shares a calendrical day with her sister who has no dedication. Some of course can be picked up by reference to the BCP or 1928 calendar e.g. Ss Alfred, Alphege, Cecilia, Cedd, Denys, Edmund, Edward, Edward the Confessor, Ethelreda, Lambert, Leonard, Monica, Swithun, and Theodore. Joint commemorations are much harder to cover, although there are some joint church dedications which make more sense and are more faithful to history and the biblical record, for example, Ss Luke and Paul, Ss Peter and Andrew. The most striking anomaly in this instance is St Philip with 41 churches dedicated to him who misses his own unique day, whereas Ss Philip and James with only 2 churches dedicated to them, have a Red Letter Day/ "festival". Even churches dedicated to St James the Less number more (3). If the number of church dedications were to influence the calendar more strongly, one would suggest that the traditional Eastern calendar be followed rather than the West – then separate days could be observed (14 November for St Philip which date is currently feria). Similar inconsistency applies to St Simon and St Jude. These observations are readily transferrable to dedications commemorating aspects of God and the work of salvation.

Calendar inclusions which find no mirror in church dedications are (A = BCP, B = 1928, C = AAPB, D = New):

Agatha A, Aldhelm B, Lancelot Andrewes CD, Anskar BCD, Antony of Padua C, Thomas Aquinas CD, Athanasius BCD, Frederic Barker D, Richard Baxter C, Bernard of Clairvaux BCD, Blasius A, Dietrich Bonhoeffer CD, Britius A, William Broughton CD, John Bunyan C, Josephine Butler CD, Clement of Alexandria B, Abbé Paul Couturier CD, Crispin AB, Crispinian B, Cyril and Methodius CD, Cyril of Jerusalem CD, Cyril of Alexandria CD, Eliza Darling D, Dominic CD, Elizabeth D, Evurtius A, Fabian AB, Nicholas Ferrar CD, John Fisher CD, Francis of Sales C, Charles de Foucauld C, Elizabeth Fry CD, Sr. Emma SSA D, Mother Esther CHN D, Gregory Nazianzus CD, Gregory of Rome ABCD, John Hannington C, Eliza Hassall D, George Herbert CD, Hippolytus C, Richard Hooker CD, Ignatius of Antioch BCD, Ignatius Loyola CD, Irenaeus BCD, James of Jerusalem CD, Jerome ABCD, John of God CD, John of the Cross CD,³⁵ John XXIII CD, Richard Johnson CD, Joseph of Arimathea CD, Julian of Norwich CD, Justin CD, John Keble CD, Thomas Ken CD, Martin Luther King D, Sydney James Kirkby D, Maximilien Kolbe CD,

Janani Luwum D, William Laud CD, William Law D, Leo the Great BCD, Lucian A, Lucy AD, Martin Luther CD, Machutus A, Martha of Bethany CD, Henry Martyn CD, the Martyrs of Japan C, Georgiana Molloy D, Thomas More CD, John Henry Newman CD, Nicomede A, Florence Nightingale C, James Noble D, John Patteson CD, Perpetua ABCD, Frances Perry D, Polycarp BCD, Prisca A, Remigius AB, Nicholas Ridley D, Oscar Romero D, Sava CD, George Augustus Selwyn CD, Seraphim of Sarov C, Sergius CD, Silvester A, Charles Simeon CD, Maria Skobtsova D, Mary Sumner D, Jeremy Taylor C, Teresa of Avila CD, Titus CD, William Tyndale CD, Evelyn Underhill D, Valentine A, John Vianney CD, Vincent ABCD, Vincent de Paul CD, Charles Wesley CD, John Wesley CD, William Wilberforce CD, John Ramsden Wollaston D, Wulfstan B, John Wycliff CD, Francis Xavier CD.

Even a number of holy days including Red Letter days, miss out on dedications: Holy Baptism, Circumcision, Lammas, Presentation of Christ in the Temple, Purification, Sapientia. The percentages of calendar entries without church dedications has by and large risen appreciably through the various prayer book revisions: BCP – 18 out of 94 (19%); 1928 – 18 out of 104 (17%); AAPB – 70 out of 164 (43%); the proposed new calendar – 81 out of 169 (48%)³⁶. The contrast between BCP-1928 and the Australian prayer book calendars is very great and signals that church dedications, whilst they may well have influenced the content of the 1928 calendar, are in fact having minimal influence on the Australian prayer books despite Sinden's avowal in 1978.

Once a name has appeared on a succession of calendars without eliciting church dedication, then *prima facie* the case must be made for the inclusion of the name on other grounds. But again those other grounds need to find some way of relating back to local support of the people of God. A good example is Anskar (others include Athanasius, Bernard of Clairvaux, Gregory the Great, Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, Leo the Great, Perpetua, Polycarp, Vincent).

Anskar, a ninth-century missionary bishop to Scandinavia, is hardly well-known in Anglican circles. The 1957 Report doubted whether his continued inclusion was warranted;³⁷ more recently Michael Perham concurred.³⁸ There is little doubt that the reason behind his inclusion was not merely the desire to recognise representative saints from other communions and places. In some ways, Anskar was one calendrical support for the movement towards unity, a movement which reflects higher Anglican aspirations and which began to be pursued actively earlier this century. The 1920 Lambeth Encyclical on Church Unity still stands as one of the high-points of the Anglican Church's practical steps towards union. It led to concrete demonstrations of unity with the Church in Sweden, but these movements were often not reflected at local levels.³⁹ Interestingly, there remains in Sweden particular academic and ecclesial interest

in the Church of England. Perhaps Anskar's inclusion in the calendar stands as a stark reminder of the failure of the Anglican church as a whole to live to its aspirations. This, of course, adds another dimension to the case for his (or an equivalent) inclusion in a calendar, but perhaps, like holiness, it yields reaction as well as emulation and thanksgiving. This particular instance however *has* yielded some results with the 1994 Poovoo Declaration, which restored full communion between the Scandinavian and English churches.⁴⁰ Reasons for calendrical inclusion, other than church dedications, have operated, and perhaps justifiably. But does this single instance transmute into a general warrant for continued inclusion of some names *against* the evidence of church dedications?

For example, what of Jerome? Great biblical scholar that he was, great provider of the Roman Catholic scriptures, he lies in history as one of the greatest misogynists that the church has produced. His deletion would not be an ecumenical loss provided some other saint of particular import to the Roman Church was substituted. Other adjustments in the calendar are called on notice. In the proposed new calendar, St Joseph, husband of the Blessed Virgin Mary is granted a "Festival" status whereas Transfiguration is demoted (from 1928 and AAPB) to a 'lesser Festival', with collects and readings. The translation of Transfiguration to the final Sunday in Epiphany season does not obviate the calendrical diminution. On the grounds of church dedications alone this is hard to justify. Mother Esther CHN, founder of the Community of the Holy Name gains an entry (11 September) but it is at the cost of the very charism to which she was responding, viz. the Holy Name (7 August). Five dedications are to the Holy Name. Whilst it may be possible to claim the 1 January as a sufficient entry, one wonders at her response, let alone the community's.

On the other hand the presence of church dedications of some number which are not included in the calendar does raise questions about what consideration was given to the saint's inclusion. For example, St Cyprian figured prominently as an exponent of principles which could be embraced by Anglicans of the weight of Bps Lightfoot and Ramsey. Cyprian's antiquity added stature. But what gives him a place ahead of St Gabriel or St Edmund? Or again, in spite of the false tradition that would see St John the Divine (7 Church dedications) as one with St John the Evangelist, why, given the developing commitment to attend to historical concerns, is not the Divine given a separate day? Monica has come and gone on calendars in the past. She now returns, no doubt as a result of the search for ancient women of some sanctity and with an identity that is not tied to monasticism and celibacy. Nevertheless, Michael Perham raises real questions about whether she is the model one would want.⁴⁰ St Faith, on the other hand, had difficulty finding any historical demonstration, and so, in spite of ten church dedications she has failed to receive an entry. Thus a number of other principles

seem to have governed selection, including some principles which are unacknowledged (e.g. saints favourable to Anglican interpretations, the desire for the inclusion of more women).

The extension of the number of days without a dedication is considerably expanded by entries of people from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But this indicates that calendars have begun to swing in their purpose. There is now a pedagogical intent, which implies that the initiative for inclusion of names is no longer solely or even primarily in the hands of the people. This may be the consequence of young Anglican provinces taking hold of their own identity but it is open to the dictates of a few not the spontaneous indications coming from local groups of the people of God.

One might see that sectional interests have had their influence also. Sinden tried to allay this concern with an emphasis on diversity and flexibility.⁴²

All this generates questions about how the principle of church dedications is applied, about what weight is given to it and whether it is time to extend or contract the principle. For all the rhetoric, how much are calendars, and saint-making/recognition generally, not primarily activated by the local people of God but by the hands of those who formulate and sanction the calendar? The sudden entrance of Hippolytus into the AAPB calendar, second tier (13 August), could well be seen as the sanctifying justification for the new form of the Holy Communion service contained within the revised prayer book. One wonders whether Hippolytus' political manoeuvrings also provided a model for those who desired the prayer book, with its calendar, to be ratified!

In the past, church dedication was an instance of the spreading nature of a cult of the saint. This variation on a shrine was one tangible means of accrediting the popular veneration which is held to be the beginning of the move to acknowledgement of a saint. The issue that Bishop Frere did not thoroughly anticipate, for all his critical acumen, was the impact of this calendrical principle upon calendars in the Anglican Communion outside England. Part of the use of traditional church dedications in Australia has been the desire to conform to the usage of the "home country". This meant not only replicating dedications of churches remembered in England but also yielded to the influence of the existing prayer book calendars, BCP and 1928. The 1928 calendar with its extension of the number and range of saints not only gave authority to adopt the new saints named in the calendar but also authority to take hold of the principle of adopting "new" saints, whether new meant very recent, of other communions, or saints not included in either calendar but of some antiquity. On the other hand it also gave credence to the possibility of "retiring" those who no longer held the interest of the people of God. Nevertheless, church dedications in Australia indicate how

loathe the people of God in Australia have been to cultivate their discernment of the breadth of holiness.

More recent feminist scholarship would take this further, advancing questions about the process of church dedication in the first instance. Dedication of churches to saints is dependant on those who have the authority and the means to promote that dedication, whether that authority be defined according to gender or official status within the church. It is highly unlikely that women as a group generally influenced a church's dedication, even if they had wanted. It is likely that local priests and perhaps bishops would have strong influence, the more so given Australia's colonial and missionary history. Indigenous Anglican veneration has hardly had time in this country to gather a head of steam. Aboriginal Australians may have something to teach Anglican new-comers in this regard.

It is somewhat similar to the battle for control of the church's traditions in the early church, a battle that sometimes appears to have been between certain women and certain men. Thus the *Acts of Thecla* records stories by women about their positive experience and liberating appropriation of the gospel proclaimed by Paul. The Pastoral Letters reflect the efforts of certain men to harness the Pauline material to, *inter alia*, silence (these?) women.⁴³ Women's stories were kept alive largely through non-written form, oral recounting (*cf.* 1 Tim 4.7, 5.13). One wonders how it is possible to discover who it was that Anglican women venerated – their diaries perhaps. Perhaps also a more extensive survey of dedications accounting for schools, chapels, memorial gifts even church halls would provide a greater clue to local veneration. In some ways, just as church dedications are a part of the evidence of local veneration so also in a country recently formed in Anglicanism, these other dedications are likely to deliver similar evidence. Survival past the immediate remembering generation or translation into other reaches of geography may not occur, but this is an issue that needs for the moment to be kept in abeyance given that official church authorities are more prone to attend to official church documentation (such as church dedications) than other sources.

The danger of course is in how to devise a calendar that reflects the belief that God has been at work through the Spirit in the last two centuries (or for that matter 40,000 years) as much as in the first century of the common era. The current Liturgical Commission wrote to each province seeking suggestions for the calendar, though how the provinces went about providing them is not generally known.

The Commission also sought the assistance of the Australian church historians Professor Ken Cable and Dr Janet West, particularly for the provision of names of women for consideration for calendrical inclusion. Accordingly, given the

newness of the church's presence in the country, the names for inclusion reflect a pioneering flavour. The question however needs to be asked as to whether this is now changing the nature of the calendar. What is the nature of "holiness" being commemorated? How is it discerned? But perhaps such a method indicates an effort to overcome the problem raised by the recognition that "spontaneous" or "local" veneration and devotion is itself constructed by the social and ecclesiastical realities of the time and place. These realities may well have precluded from consideration, for example, certain women. It may also illustrate that our eyes were not trained to focus on where or what to seek. Hence some compensatory (though not exclusive) input is to be welcomed and the test will be whether it "takes" not by way of imposition but rather by invitation.

The Anglican Consultative Council was authorised by the last Lambeth Conference to discuss the calendrical remembrance of saints with a view to advising "the provinces on the procedure to follow in recognition of such saints".⁴⁴ The language itself is striking – here is a conference whose resolutions have been constantly affirmed as not binding on Anglican provinces,⁴⁵ yet recommending that the ACC advise on the procedure, and this in an area where local practice is claimed to be primary. The ACC referred the matter to the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation for advice. Paul Gibson prepared in 1992 "the beginning of a draft" for the IALC.⁴⁶

No mention of the place of church dedications is contained in this paper though there is heavy accent on and protection of local "spontaneous devotion" as the primary factor in the commemoration by calendar entry. How this practice of cult is to be discerned is left largely to episcopal and diocesan review submitted then to a provincial body. Church dedications are not included in the Gibson Guidelines although emphasis is on local honouring as a foundation for eventual calendrical inclusion. The notion of church dedications might be read as an implicit sub-consideration in this guideline, but it is not explicit.

Significantly, both these aspects of the Gibson Guidelines appear to have operated in the latest formulation of an Australian Anglican calendar. Sinden's principle has vanished from the explanation accompanying the calendar, although there is the provision that "The anniversary of a church's dedication and the observance appropriate to the name of a church may be observed as a festival...". Church dedications therefore no longer are an important element in the formulation of a calendar for the church though they are recognised as important for local practice. The trajectory of influence has now turned full circle, and raises the question whether here is a reminder of the importance of local practice or the limiting of its sphere of influence.

The new calendar's efforts to include more Australians in its entries is trying to advance local veneration rather than simply respond to it. In part this is a

pedagogical aim. It is a shift from the avowed operation of calendars in the past, though doubt must exist about the reality. Certainly, Gilbert Sinden's concern to underscore the ecumenical intent of Anglican calendars because of the range of ethnic backgrounds in Australia had its own pedagogical element. The proposed new calendar, at least if it makes such purposes public, would be advancing the transparency of motivation.

And yet, the Gibson guidelines in fact repudiate pedagogical and sectional interests. This has positive points in that it provides a warning about partisan and pressure group dictates driving the church. But it also needs to be modified given that the rejection of sectional interests is often a screen for maintaining the power of the status quo. Moreover there is the danger that the calendar will not provide representative holiness (about which Frere was well aware). On the other hand the principle of wanting to acknowledge the ongoing sanctifying work of God might be seen as a pedagogical aim, if also fulfilling other concerns. The task is not easy and the efforts of the ACC may well prove highly valuable.

But it is clear that "church dedications" now play a minor role in guiding the inclusion of names on a calendar. There are good reasons for the promotion of more recent Australian names and more recent examples of holiness that retain the ecumenical dimension of Anglican calendars. This is particularly so given the number of "union" churches beginning to be identified in Diocesan Year Books, let alone the importance of recognising a saint as having no denomination. There can be a tendency when the Church feels itself under threat to begin thumping its breast more loudly, a sonorous pan-Anglicanism which collapses its ecumenical vision and with it, damages one of the key foundations of the identity of Anglicanism.

At the same time care needs to be taken that local veneration retains its importance. Otherwise the danger is that the calendar becomes another tool in the hands of a hierarchy trying to safeguard a church wherein that hierarchy is safeguarded. Further, one needs to be very careful that the calendar retains its primary commitment to bearing witness to the holiness of those in whom the Spirit of God has been visibly at work. Otherwise it becomes little more than an Honour Roll, far from the sentiments passionately expressed by Richard Hooker in his defence of the setting apart of days within the Church's year:

...well to celebrate these religious and sacred days is to spend the flower of our time happily. They are the splendour and outward dignity of our religion, forcible witnesses of ancient truth, provocations to the exercise of all piety, shadows of our endless felicity in heaven, on earth everlasting records and memorials. ⁴⁷

In sum it is time to augment the church dedication principle, making it subsidiary not only to other evidence of dedication but to other principles as well,

some of which have yet to be publicly recognised. Certainly, church dedications can still bear witness to a local cult developing a larger devotion (e.g. the New Guinea martyrs). Conversely, the absence of a church dedication can indicate that some saints have not captured popular veneration, even after 400 years+ resilience on Anglican calendars (e.g. Jerome). Wariness is also warranted in assessing the motives (formally perceived as well as literarily expressed) for entries in the calendar, along with commitment to seek additional means of assessing local custom and veneration. Above all it is time to ask anew questions about the role of saints in church and worshipping life and in what holiness consists in this time and place of God's grace.⁴⁸

NOTES

- 1 G. Sinden *When We Meet for Worship* Adelaide, self-published, 1978, 188.
- 2 In Australia, this was a principle enunciated by Bishop Felix Arnott in his proposal for a revised calendar given at the end of *Prayer Book Revision in Australia* Sydney, The Standing Committee of the General Synod, 1966, 117.
- 3 M. Perham *The Communion of Saints* London, Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1980, 154. No doubt the honour of being England's national patron saint assisted the case for his inclusion.
- 4 Sinden 189. The question of the ability of the Anglican Church to canonise is far from being as clear as Sinden's assertion would have it. Greater nuances of understanding are contained within the Commission Report for the Archbishop of Canterbury *The Commemoration of Saints and Heroes of the Faith in the Anglican Communion* London, SPCK, 1957.
- 5 W.H. Hutton *The English Saints* (The Hampton Lectures 1903) London, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. 1903, 353f.
- 6 W.H. Frere *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform* London, John Murray, 1914, 64-69. Frere later became a bishop, with, of course, the ability to formulate local calendars, with or without synodal input.
- 7 Hence the explanation why some succeed and others do not. See generally C. Duquoc and C. Floristçn eds "Models of Holiness" *Concilium* 129 (1979).
- 8 E.g. G. Stephens *The Anglican Church in Tasmania: A Diocesan History to Mark the Sesquicentenary*: 1992 Hobart, Trustees of the Diocese, 1991.
- 9 Compare, for example, the number of dedications to St John and St Paul in NSW and Queensland with those in Victoria.
- 10 St Olave was a Norwegian terrorist/freedom fighter who travelled to England to war upon the Danes; St Linus was the second bishop of Rome (according to the Roman canon) and reputedly came from Britain.
- 11 There is a certain amount of subjectivity that enters here.
- 12 The list and number of dedications are restricted to Anglican churches in Australia. Thus dedications of schools, colleges, chapels (apart from worshipping

congregations in a locality specified in Year Books as “chapels”), agencies and institutions are not included. No churches of New Guinea are included as these became a province separate from Australia in 1977. It should be noted that the Diocese of Tasmania’s Year Book notes that only churches which have been consecrated are included in the parochial list. By communication with the Diocesan Registrar, Mr. Peter Reynolds (2/2/1995), this in practice simply excludes listing of those congregations meeting in schools and the like. This does not apply in other Dioceses where Year Books often give the localities of people gathering as a worshipping congregation, whether halls, stations or the like. One house church was recorded which had taken as patron, St Alban. The Dioceses of Armidale, Carpentaria and Bathurst do not publish year books, and seek to publish information in various alternative presentations. The Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn gives parishes but not individual church centres (and therefore details of dedications). Accordingly, thanks are due to the priests and sometimes to their spouses in the Diocese of Armidale, to John Hansen, registrar of that diocese, to Louise Fell, secretary to the bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, to Peter Reynolds, registrar of the Diocese of Tasmania, and to Marilyn Robey, assistant registrar of the Diocese of Bathurst for information enabling these tables to be as complete as possible.

13 One church in the Diocese of Bunbury is listed as “Christ’s Church”.

14 One instance in the Diocese of Ballarat reflects a change of dedication. Christ Church Hamilton had previously been dedicated to St Botolf. How many such instances are in the Australian church are unknown. I am grateful to the Rev’d Philip Tolliday for this information.

15 It is not known what was the intention behind this dedication. AAPB and the new calendar with their provision for “Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Communion” might qualify as a calendrical inclusion of direct implication for this dedication. The Church is in the Diocese of Sydney.

16 This figure includes a Uniting and Anglican cooperating parish, which yet registers the Anglican congregation under a church’s dedication (cf. Table 3).

17 One dedication to St Alban is from a house church which is listed in the Year Book of the Diocese of Bendigo.

18 The dedication “St Augustine” is taken as St Augustine of Canterbury unless otherwise specified in the Year Books, or known personally to the writer. The figures for both St Augustines may therefore need revision. Similar considerations apply to St Margaret (of Scotland), St James (the Great), St John (the Evangelist), St Mary (the Virgin) and St Philip (the Apostle). St Catherine was left undesignated where such was the case in the Year Book dedications as a number of claimants were possible; so also St Michael.

19 Additions to the dedications are given in brackets, but excluding “on-the-Hill/in-the-valley/by-the-sea” etc (although it was tempting to give the full locality for one St Peter dedication – the township is called “The Rock”!). Usually the extended dedications are not given in the Year Books (which sometimes leads to confusion

about which saint is being designated). The addition here given is unique and particularly striking because it breaks ranks with the usual reservation of “apostle” to the Twelve. No doubt reliance upon Acts 14:4,14 and/or the BCP supports this designation but it marks a significant break from the norm and provides an invitation to add the designation (either explicitly or by the use of Red Letter Days or “commons” etc) for those subsumed in the development of the New Testament canon – thus Martha or Mary Magdalene etc.

20 See note 16 above.

21 The dedication “St Catherine” is left unidentified in this table unless specified in the Year Books or known personally to the writer. This affects the interpretation of the calendar columns. The BCP has an entry only for Catherine of Alexandria.

22 St Columba suffers from a distracting variety of spellings!

23 St Gabriel and St Raphael might have been included as a direct connection with the entry in AAPB and the proposed new calendar to “St Michael and All Angels” but this entry seems to accord with the references to the army of angels led by Michael rather than a synecdoche for the archangels. Furthermore Gabriel and Raphael are singularly mentioned in the Scripture and apocrypha.

24 See note 16.

25 This church (in the Diocese of Melbourne) is listed as St John the Baptist, but an investigation of the church records by the Rev'd Dr Charles Sherlock unearthed the dedication to “John the Golden-mouth”.

26 For space and interest this dedication is listed separately from John the Baptist. It indicates as do certain dedications accenting particular aspects of a Saint's holiness (e.g. Mary the Virgin) that the dedication wished for whatever reasons to focus attention on such aspects.

27 Whilst a number of dedications in the sources I consulted list “of Scotland” after the saint's name, many did not. It is suspected that many such dedications are directly influenced by the earlier prayer books and refers to St Margaret of Antioch. Hence the common listing of the prayer books in fact relates to two saints, AAPB and the proposed new calendar to Scotland, BCP and 1928 to Antioch.

28 See note 16 above.

29 The St Paul's Centre in Adelaide has not been included (by parallel with college dedications) even though it has a regular worshipping program and is derived from the now sold St Paul's Pulteney Street.

30 One church is listed under the dedication of St Peter the Fisherman.

31 See note 12 above.

32 Some instances after the statement of locality add a general reference to “stations”.

33 Because of the difficulty of distinguishing simple references to “St Catherine” there is some doubt here.

34 See further below.

35 It is clear that the composers of the calendar have resisted, in this instance, the ancient tradition of the Church equating this James with James the Less.

36 Totals treat as separate items those group commemorations which have a single representative as well (e.g. Michael and All Angels). They include fixed but not moveable holy days, and black letter days not given to a saint (e.g. Lammas day) simply for convenience.

37 1957 Report 34.

38 Perham *Communion* 85-86, 140.

39 For example, when Bishop Nutter Thomas returned to Adelaide, fired with enthusiasm for the Lambeth sentiments, he was quickly dowsed by local individuals and congregations. See D. Hilliard *Godliness and Good Order: A History of the Anglican Church of South Australia* Netley, Wakefield Press, 1986, 94-95.

40 I am indebted to the Revd Dr Charles Sherlock for this information.

41 Perham *Communion* 87, 140.

42 Sinden 187.

43 See D. MacDonald *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in History and Canon* Pennsylvania, Westminster Press, 1983.

44 Lambeth Conference Report §60.2.

45 But see Owen Chadwick's introduction to R. Coleman (Ed.) *Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867-1988* Toronto, Anglican Book Centre, 1992, x, where he writes of the expansionist nature of the authority emanating from such meetings regularly held.

46 "Towards Calendar Guidelines" 10/6/1992. I am grateful to the Rev'd Ron Dowling for alerting me to the existence of these guidelines.

47 *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: The Fifth Book* (ed. R. Bayne) London, MacMillan and Co., 1902, §lxxi.11 (433).

48 See my "The Local and the Universal: Anglican appreciations of the saints and Mary MacKillop" in a forthcoming book edited by John Chryssavgis and Antony Laurence, published by Collins Dove. See also the essay by Christina Fox in the same volume.

WORSHIPPERS TODAY, AND HOW TO COUNT THEM*

Elizabeth J. Smith

Scholarly discussions using seductive words like 'hermeneutics' and 'post-modernism' and 'deconstruction' are only part of the world of today's liturgical theologian. The important academic worlds they represent need to be linked by bridges into the other world, the world of the church, where the vocabulary is more along the lines of 'pastoral care' and 'christian education' and 'all-age worship.' Between academic world and church world, between scholars and pastors, between theorists and practitioners, however, the bridges are not always there, or are not always easily crossed. Sometimes no one has thought to build the bridge; sometimes it is there but shaky, haphazardly constructed or badly maintained; sometimes the bridge is carefully guarded at one end or the other by experts with vested interests, aiming to minimise traffic in the interests of efficiency, or purity, or some other high ideal.

Bridge builders and bridge crossers are therefore needed. Ecumenists are bridge people of a sort. Ecumenists know and love their own church world well enough to go exploring in another. They take the trouble to learn the new world as well as they can, and they take a long-term interest in its well-being. Such talents are needed to help connect not just Christian denominations but also different disciplines in the academic world, and to span the persistent gaps between academy and church.

Good bridges begin not so much with ideas as with contexts, not so much with theories as with the people on either side of a gap who produce or use theories and who create the contexts in which ideas and theories make more or less sense. The foreground, then, for these explorations in liturgical theology is *the people who pray*. Not the texts of the prayers, though they should be as eloquent as possible. Not the music of the liturgy, though it should be as heartfelt as possible. Not the building and not the furniture, though the furniture and the architecture should be as accessible and as hospitable as possible. Liturgical theology cares about texts and music and space and all the other artefacts of worship, but good liturgical theology cares most of all about the people who use the texts, the people who make the music, the people who move in the space, the people whose prayer is helped by the various artefacts of worship. The foreground of today's discussion is the people who pray.

**An address given to the Twenty-Second Ecumenical Summer School, Melbourne, February 3-5, 1995.*

And so to 'common prayer'. Those who are Anglicans have inherited this wonderful phrase from our tradition, and it is worth dusting off and polishing up in this context. In an ecumenical world there is no copyright on the phrase, and all are welcome to use it.

For most Australian Anglicans, 'common prayer' still conjures up the 1662 Prayer Book, with its incomparable language (and its interminable sentences), with its Protestant and Reformation intentions (and its persistent medieval and catholic penitential sensibilities). *The Book of Common Prayer* is a three-hundred-plus-year-old Anglican treasure whose words echo in our religious imaginations, so that we cannot bear to throw it out. Yet neither can most of us manage to nibble enough meat off its venerable bones to give us an adequate liturgical diet for late twentieth century life. 'Common prayer' as a phrase has thereby grown a little dusty by association with a particular book.

Yet here in Australia, and in Melbourne particularly, 'common prayer' has been given a new lease on life not by an Anglican liturgical commission but by a cartoonist: Michael Leunig. Over the past few years the occasional word-and-picture series that Leunig calls 'A Common Prayer' has touched huge numbers of people inside and outside organised religion in Australia.

When Leunig says 'common' prayer, his emphasis is, I think, on 'common' as 'ordinary' – 'common or garden' prayer, found everywhere, not suited only for the elite or the chosen few. This is a proper sentiment for Australians. When Thomas Cranmer and Anglican liturgical reformers since his time have talked about 'common' prayer, however, their emphasis has been more on 'common' as 'shared.' It is prayer together, worship, in fact, rather than private prayer or what is often called 'spirituality' today. This may not be quite as popular a concept for many a rugged Australian individualist, but shared prayer is still an enormously important part of many contemporary people's religious life. For ecumenical discussion today, then, it may be useful to borrow from both Cranmer and Leunig, and to think about ordinary prayer and how ordinary people pray together.

Such a hybrid use of 'common prayer' is useful because it moves us back towards the concrete behaviour and experience of actual people, and away from the relative abstractions of words like 'liturgy' and 'worship.' Liturgy and worship are perfectly fine terms in their proper place, but they can sometimes take on a theoretical life of their own at several removes from the people to whom they owe their existence. For this reason, before talking about liturgy or worship, it is helpful to sketch a few quick portraits of some of the people whose common prayer is at stake in discussions of worship.

Let us look at four people today, four worshippers who are not unlike some of the people in many churches Sunday by Sunday. Call them James, Chris, Rod, and Caroline. What are their gifts, and what are their needs, when it comes to common prayer? What kind of God do they meet in common prayer?

James is six months old and a fine bouncing lad. He was baptised at about six weeks of age, and a highlight of that service was the way all the other children in the congregation made him a huge supplementary baptismal certificate covered with gold stars and rubber stamps. It said: 'James, you are a member of the body of Christ.' He's been back in church each Sunday since the baptism, and of course he came to the Christmas Eve service with his parents, wailed a bit during the ministry of the word, and dozed off and snored comfortably right through the silence of communion, to the entertainment of all.

When James is in church, as he is most Sundays, he is a great gift to the rest of the Body. Whether he is asleep or awake, no one can look in his direction without smiling, and that has to be good for the soul. He clearly loves the singing and the organ playing. As far as James knows, he belongs with these people who gather for common prayer as much as he belongs with the family he was born to. Furthermore, even at six months of age, he does evangelism. A neighbouring family with a baby a couple of months older was invited to come to church for James' baptism, and they have been back most Sundays since. There may even be another baptism in the offing. James' capacity to generate love in the people around him is a gift to everyone's prayer of thankfulness. James embodies a message that every member of the Body is welcome at communion, and that is a gift of the proclamation of God's grace. James precipitates interactions between people in the course of worship, and that is a gift of connection that enhances the shared dimension of 'common prayer.'

James' needs in common prayer? He needs the congregation to live up to what they said about him at his baptism: that he is a member of the Body of Christ, already inheriting salvation equally with all the others. A big part of the truth of that belonging is his access to communion, to the bread and wine. James needs to feel and hear and taste common prayer, through bodies and touch and silences and music. He needs the other worshippers to exude the essence of common prayer as they gather, so that he can soak it up through his skin and ears and eyes.

James' God? It has to be the Incarnate One: the Christ into whose Body he was baptised, and on whose body and blood he feeds at the eucharist – at least when he is awake during communion. James' God is an unquestionably loving and enfolding and sustaining God. The time will come soon enough when questions of sin and judgement and forgiveness will require James' experience of God to be extended to deal with the dangerous and damaged world in which

today's children have to grow up. But the utterly loving God, in whom James is now immersed during common prayer, will be the same one who will see him through, and will be the foundation of all the learning, repenting, and witnessing still to come.

Now count Chris in. Chris has recently turned forty, she has an eighteen-year-old daughter, and she is going through a tough time in her marriage. She is also in the process of training and qualifying in a new vocation, as a family and child counsellor. Any of these – the birthday, the teenager, the relationship, the study, or the hurting people for whom she is asked to care – any and all of these can and do have their impact on the frequency and intensity of Chris' private prayer life. All of them likewise come with Chris to her experience of common prayer.

Chris has gifts for common prayer, and many of them are as connected with her head and her intellect as baby James' gifts are connected with his body. Chris' gifts include the way she listens to sermons fully expecting to hear good news proclaimed publicly, so that she can make direct connections with the dynamics of her personal life. To keep a preacher on his or her toes, there is nothing like a worshipper who constantly expects and frequently demands to be fed by the word of God. Another of Chris' gifts for worship is connected to her training and her gifts as a counsellor. She has highly developed listening skills, and the ability to add up what she hears and sees and to integrate the information she has gathered into a clear and accurate whole that she can reflect back to other people as a picture of their world. There is nothing like a worshipper with that capacity to keep worship leaders focused on the essentials, and careful of the overall drift and flavour and message of common prayer.

Chris has needs for common prayer, too. She is not at a time in her life when she is content to pick up second- or third-hand crumbs of consolation from under someone else's liturgical table. She needs direct access, not vicarious connection. She needs community, too, not so much to amplify her own spiritual experience as to ground it, to earth it, to spread the charge around. A high level of intensity in someone's personal life can be very tiring and quite dangerous to maintain, and praying with other people is a necessary way of gentling things down, of keeping perspective. Chris also needs to know that what she claims about her church's worship will be credible in the highly critical eyes of her husband and her teenager. Her family may not attend worship with her very often, but when they do, she needs for them to be able to recognise that there is something special going on here that is bigger than just Mum's group of weirdo friends, or the wife's religious tendencies. Yes, common prayer is a phenomenon, a time, an activity somewhat removed from ordinary city life. Yes, Chris and we who are like her are doing something when we gather that is rather arcane bycontemporary cultural standards. Still, we need it to commend itself as a genuine and viable

human activity, not just in theory but in practice. Chris does not want to find herself apologising for the experience of worship in her church.

Chris' God? The Holy Spirit, the connection-maker, is definitely at the heart of Chris' experience of worship these days. As Chris gets acquainted with her own power as a healer, as a woman, as a thinker, it is God the Spirit whom she thanks for her gifts, God the Spirit whom she thanks for the support of the faith community that contributes so much to her life, God the Spirit to whom she prays for grace to love in the hard places of her life, and grace to grow in wisdom for the sake of the people whom she is called to serve in her new vocation and ministry as a counsellor. Chris' God is the strength-supplier, the challenge-issuer, the powerful one who will do great things for us if only we don't get in the way.

Then Rod. Let's count Rod in. He attends worship each week with a nine-year-old daughter. Rod's wife stays home; she and organised religion don't see eye-to-eye. Rod's glad there are some up-front women in his church's common prayer, so that his daughter has some alternative spiritual role-models. Rod himself is quiet, an introvert. He is qualified as a lawyer, but he has also done quite a lot of theological reading over the years. He can and does preach from time to time, and his children's sermons are particularly good. There is nothing trivial or cute about the messages he gets across to the his daughter and the other children in the congregation, and he has various tricks for getting the children interacting with the older members of the congregation, to the delight of all.

Now, there are a couple of things implicit in that description of Rod that point to his special gifts for common prayer. He is a quiet but articulate presence who can make bridges between groups in the church that have often been seen as separated by great gulfs: adults and children; ordained people who do not have a monopoly on theological expertise, and lay people in the pews who do not simply sit there waiting to be filled up with knowledge from on high. When Rod sits in the congregation one week, and preaches or serves as an acolyte another week, it is a message to everyone that the gifts in the praying community are not automatically linked to lay or ordained status. When Rod leaves his spot in the sanctuary to help his nine-year-old find the right psalm in the prayer book, or to exchange the Peace with her, it is a message to everyone that worship roles and human relationships do not happen in different worlds, do not cancel each other out.

And Rod brings his distinct needs to common prayer. As an introvert, he needs quiet time as well as human interaction in the liturgy. Silence and Godward stillness in the company of others make a Sunday treat for him. When the liturgy does speak, he needs it to do so in well-chosen words and not too many of them.

He needs common prayer to do its share of the task of evangelising his daughter, and re-evangelising himself, not just through the up-front teaching sections of the time of worship, but also through the verbal texture of the prayers, the emotive capacity of the music, the palpable, hand-to-hand and heart-to-heart sacramental connections of the time of communion. These things also teach. These things also proclaim Christ and the Spirit, and Rod and his daughter need them to speak clearly and often in their worship.

Rod's God? There is a lot of the heavenly Father in Rod's God, tied up with his desire to love and teach and provide for his family. Yet Rod also welcomes a mothering God, both for his daughter's sake, and also because the old patriarchal language falls a long way short of describing the kind of father Rod wants to be and the kind of household he wants to help build. Rod is also a Word-person. He can spend hours pondering the connections between Word and sign, word and Wisdom, world and God, mystery and rationality. Maybe he is a kind of post-modern mystic, and it is eternal Wisdom, source and fount and origin of all things, first person of the Trinity, to whom Rod is closest these days.

Finally, let's count Caroline in among the worshippers. Caroline was 84 last birthday. She is new to her present congregation, though not to Christian faith or life in the church. She has done more than her share of committees, of social justice work, of outreach; she has done her share of making faith contagious for her children and her grandchildren. She still shows up for a little gentle weeding in the church garden at working bees, and she still brings a casserole for the parish party.

What gifts does she bring to worship? Eighty-four years' worth of experience in recognising integrity in common prayer, to start with. If there is no real depth to the worship, however much gloss and polish there is on the surface, Caroline will pick it up very quickly, and probably take herself elsewhere. She has lived long enough, and been part of enough differing congregations, to see the damage that can be done when people survive by putting on a good face for each other on Sunday morning. Another of her gifts is her rapport with the small children among the worshippers. Eighty-four years' worth of accumulated capacity for loving looks for an outlet, and common prayer time is a good time for Caroline to do the loving about which the liturgy speaks.

Caroline's needs include the opportunity to listen to good preaching. Even after all these years, she has not quite despaired of hearing genuine news from the pulpit, genuine, fresh-from-the-garden gospel in interesting and contemporary formats. She does not want to be overburdened in worship by constant novelty, but when it comes to the preaching, it had better be alive and kicking. She also needs to know that her value to the praying community does not depend on the

level of her pledge or the number of committees or work groups in which she participates. She needs to be valued for her solid and prayerful presence in the midst of the community.

Caroline's God? Jesus, I think; the one about whom she was taught long ago as a child, the one whom she still meets hand to hand and heart to heart as she receives holy communion. This not a naive faith, not a faith that's never matured. It is one from which all the accumulated abstractions of 84 years' worth of waves of theological fads and fancies have been stripped away, a faith in which deeply personal connections keep surfacing in surprising new relationships. Jesus is Caroline's doorway into God: Jesus making friends, Jesus feeding people, Jesus weeping over sinners, Jesus making laughter through tears in the recurring shock of resurrection.

This has been quite an extended series of character sketches, quite a gallery of worshippers. Is this way of doing theology too anecdotal, not scientific enough? Is it too pedestrian, not visionary enough? It is a good way of bridge-building between the scholarly and the pastoral worlds, and it is also a good way of making sure that liturgists are not merely making covert speeches about themselves, about their own needs and gifts, and about their own versions of God, when they talk about the church and the liturgy. James, Chris, Rod, Caroline, and worshippers like them are the bearers and the users and the owners of the praying tradition. James, Chris, Rod, Caroline, and people like them are the justification for the existence of liturgical scholars, not the other way around.

And so to the more scholarly side of the task we tackle here. We take it upon ourselves topiece together a picture of 'church' that extends beyond handfuls of individuals in praying communities hither and yon. We move from talking about particular worshippers today, into talking about the Church as people pray together today. It is a diagnostic task, a kind of finger on the pulse of the Body of Christ. The question is this: what kind of Church is made visible, as people like James, Chris, Rod, and Caroline do common prayer together?

The church of these people's common prayer is a hopeful church, a truth-telling church, and a hospitable church.

First, it is a hopeful church. It is a church that lives expectantly, and that expectancy is focused in common prayer. In the liturgy, we tell our shared history, and describe our particular present realities, and we also look for glimpses of the life of the world to come. We talk about Holy Communion as a foretaste of the heavenly banquet. God is ahead of us, not just behind us in our stories and beside us in our present crises. God has more to show us of truth and joy and extravagance, and while those visions may be quite terrifying to contemplate in the privacy of one individual's prayer life, in company we can

goggle at them and exclaim over them and complain about them and brace ourselves for them much more confidently. In company, Christians can believe that it is better to invest our energy in dealing with a radical future than to waste our energy trying to dodge that radical future. If the future is God's – and the future *is* God's – then attempting to avoid it is clearly a waste of time. If the future is God's, then hoping our way into it is a necessary part of our shared discipleship and our common prayer.

This liturgical hopefulness includes the expectation that the bible will speak in the context of worship, and that God's word will be heard as good news in the common language of the people who are gathered there. It includes the expectation that the Spirit will do something with the worshippers at the time of communion, so that there will be the experience of one Body, not just the rhetoric of unity. It includes the expectation that change will happen in the patterns and the words and the music of worship, and that such change is not something we simply have to grin and bear, but rather something intrinsic to common prayer. A church that has the habit of liturgical hopefulness will be predisposed to expect gifts to be given by God in and by and for worship, and to expect to enjoy discovering and using those gifts.

This hopefulness may not be an attitude easily cultivated by Australian Christians. We tend, culturally, perhaps, to expect disaster or at best mediocrity rather than gifts. If there is a drought, we are convinced that, when it rains, it will rain in all the wrong places. If we find something we like we tend to assume that it will be beyond our means, or that if we can afford it, it will break, or that if it is an ideal acquisition now, it will be out of date by the time we have paid for it. It is possible to pursue common prayer as a form of corporate excuse-making for not doing anything too dramatic, as a way of avoiding the 'new' part of the 'good news' altogether on the grounds that we would hardly want to put words into God's mouth. An excess of optimism is not exactly one of our besetting sins as a nation. Still, hope is one of the three greatest spiritual gifts, and if our churches are going to live into this godly virtue and superlative gift, expectancy is the attitude we need to be cultivating.

Common prayer can therefore help to build a hopeful church. The second claim being made here is that will also be a truth-telling church.

Worshippers offer each other an honest mirror in times of joy and stress. They do not invest time and energy in looking good, in image-production and image-maintenance. The church is a praying community where the members are in no doubt that they are sinners, but where they do not obsess about that fact. The reason they neither deny it nor obsess about it is that forgiveness is common coin in this church's common prayer. Forgiveness is ritually sought and ritually

offered and genuinely appropriated in the course of worship, and where forgiveness is genuinely happening, the truth of sinfulness is not terrifying. Secret-keeping ceases to be a valuable pastime.

The other side of truth-telling is the joyful one. The members of this church know how to play. They know how to party. They have the habit of thankfulness. They do not studiously strive for unspectacular but culturally normative mediocrity. The reason they are willing to shine, even when all around are rushing off in search of bushels under which to hide their lights, is that blessing, like forgiveness, is common coin in this church's common prayer. Blessing is part of the fabric of their worship: blessing spoken and blessing eaten and drunk, blessing in the touch of a hand and the smile of a baby and the moment in the hymn when the song truly becomes a prayer and the heart is lifted. Where blessing is endemic, the truth of giftedness is not terrifying. Hiding lights under bushels ceases to be a valuable pastime.

This, too, may not be an attitude easy for the Australian worshipper to cultivate. The national culture has its ways of dealing with tall poppies, and again we find it easy to believe that any blessing that comes our way is bound to have a sting in the tail. Perhaps Australian churches may have less of a problem facing the cost of discipleship, and more of a problem looking the benefits of discipleship in the eye. Still, Jesus promised that the Spirit would lead us into all truth, and not all truth is judgement against us. Jesus did provide some quite outrageously extravagant blessings during his time on the road 2000 years ago, and there is no evidence in scripture that people asked him to stop doing miracles with bread or wine or fish on the grounds that all the leftovers were too difficult to handle. Truth includes blessing recognised, blessing given thanks for, blessing gladly passed on as good as new and better, and truth-telling about the good as well as the bad is indeed a habit that the church needs to be cultivating as its members pray together.

A hopeful church, a truth-telling church, and a hospitable church. Common prayer and the people who pray it are to be passionately concerned about hospitality. Liturgy can offer protected, dedicated time and space for meeting with God who is present in every time and space, and it can offer protected, dedicated time, space and language for connecting human beings quite promiscuously with each other in a world marked mostly by disconnection or by highly controlled and selective encounters.

A hospitable church is the shared responsibility of everyone who prays, though the worship leaders, those who preside, whoever they may be in a given tradition, have a special care for it. A hospitable church rejoices in interactions between the members, especially during liturgy. Hospitality means awareness

of all present in common prayer – not just the up-front ministers, not just the communicants, not just the big donors in the stewardship drive, but also the newborn and the failing elderly, the wriggling five-year-olds and the sullen teenagers, the woman in the thirteenth pew who spends the whole service on the edge of tears, and the man at the very back who has neither shaved or showered for a week. A hospitable church assumes that God has sent all of them here for some reason, and that if we pray our prayers from the heart and with as much grace and style as we can muster on a given day, something of all the people's needs will be met.

A hospitable church does not say: this person's needs or that person's situation can better be addressed outside of worship, or in some other way than sharing the common prayer. Form a committee instead! Start a programme instead! Rather, a hospitable church says: here, in common prayer, everything makes a bit of sense. When we have grasped that sense, we will know what to do next, both inside and outside of worship. A hospitable church says simply: Welcome to the prayer; we will worry about the other details later.

And here is something that should come fairly easily to the Australian temperament, if we can just translate it from our national cultural behaviour into our Christian cultural behaviour. The transfer may be difficult, as historically it has been difficult for churches, hierarchically organised and status-conscious to get over the elitist tendencies they have inherited from cultures with strong class and caste systems. Yet there is a basic Australian conviction that no one really is better than anyone else, and that there is plenty of space for all. Common prayer can be shaped by that conviction.

Common prayer space is a big space, as big as the suburban back yard where the vegetable patch grows alongside the lemon tree and there is still space for the kids to set up a cricket wicket. Common prayer space is a hospitable space, as welcoming as the barbecue where the lamb chops sizzle alongside the chicken saté and the vegetarian shashliks. Common prayer space is a common heritage, like the multitude of parks and gardens that help our cities breathe, and like the wilderness that beckons patiently from the middle of the land.

To take these lifestyle metaphors a little further: someone has to keep the grass mowed if the kids are going to play cricket. Someone has to get the coals ready if the neighbours are coming in for a barbecue. Someone has to tend the parks and gardens, and someone has to watch over the wilderness, if Australians are going to be tempted out of their lounge rooms and away from their TVs and into the open spaces to meet each other. Likewise, in the church's worship, someone has to care about the details of hospitality. Many worshippers and worship leaders need to care about user-friendly books, about welcoming space,

about singable music, about texts that manage to be linguistically accessible and colourful at the same time – and about worshippers who are glad to share a pew with whoever happens to show up. The church may count, and must be able to count on, worshippers who will listen to the sermon with one ear for their own private and unique hunger for the word, and the other ear for the needs of someone else's situation: a family member back at home, a newcomer in the pew in front, a tragedy seen on the TV news last night. A hospitable church expects God to have something to say to everyone, and expects God to say it in the course of worship, as well as elsewhere.

Hopeful, truth-telling, hospitable – this has been a positive picture of the kind of church of which we all too often see only glimpses. But the glimpses matter, and they must be looked at very closely so that the more constant and dominating panorama of church distortions is not allowed to take up the whole of our consciousness. It is usually easier to list problems than to imagine solutions. It is probably necessary, if only to avoid accusations of being an incurable romantic, to list in addition to the positive vision a few of the roadblocks in the way. But the list will be brief. I would like the glimpses of faithful, fruitful common prayer to loom larger in our memories than the pitfalls, at this point in our churches' life.

On the down-side, then: spaces and furniture that conspire to prevent people interacting during worship. In the area of preaching and worship leadership, clergy incompetence or fatigue combined with lay despair or reluctance to insist on better. The exclusion of children and infants not only from the reception of communion, but often even from the worshipping assembly altogether. Liturgical language that perpetuates hierarchical understandings of human society and patriarchal understandings of the divine. A mentality of poverty: poverty of resources, poverty of ideas, poverty in the range of emotions allowable to people in the area of their religious life. Borrowing from the secular world the worst of its various forms of elitism: age-based, income-based, gender- or orientation-based, race-based, 'life-style'-based elitisms that we know have no place in the church, but that are more persistent in our common life than oxalis in a suburban garden bed. Local and institutional terror of change, and its natural corollary, hierarchically imposed change. Yes, we have problems.

But the gifts of God in and to the people of the church are always being given. There are congregations who know how to sing together, and others who know how to keep a holy silence. There are preachers with something to say and some skill in saying it. There are old worship spaces being used flexibly and new spaces being invented without reference to gothic cathedral design. There are people and even committees playing prayerfully with language to see how much more truthfully we can learn to speak and sing to God and about God in our

worship. There are worship leaders who nurture their gifts and skills for making prayer welcoming and reverent and holy without making it stuffy and pretentiously formal. There are congregations where people can walk in the door and sense that this is a place where they can pray in company, to the glory of God.

Above all, there are people like James, and Chris, and Rod, and Caroline: people of lively faith who have persevered with their church through hungry times without losing their trust that the final result will look more like extravagant abundance than like survival rations. Count those worshippers. Count yourselves in amongst them. And count, finally, on the God who sustains them and us and the whole church as we live in hope, tell the truth in love, and welcome all who come in the name of Christ.

ANORTHODOXEASTER

Joan Benson

Ascension Day came too soon for me this year (1994): after all, I had celebrated Easter only the week before. Also, in Easter Week, I found myself again in Lent. The occasion for this double experience was a four week visit to Jerusalem to do a course *The Bible and Worship* over Eastern Easter at St George's Anglican College. It proved to be an amazing and rich time of learning and worshipping.

Holy Week begins on Saturday for the Eastern Church which follows the chronology of the Gospel of John. So, early on 23 April, we joined the great crowds of pilgrims at Bethany, a couple of miles from Jerusalem, to celebrate St Lazarus' Day. In the Greek Orthodox Church of SS Mary and Martha the service was being sung while pilgrims processed through, many lighting candles; in the narthex older women pilgrims sat and a few knelt in prayer before life-size icons, oblivious to the crowd. Outside, our group joined pilgrims, mainly elderly women, from the Mediterranean lining the path from the church, hearing the service from an over loud public address system. Suddenly the bells pealed in delirious joy: Lazarus' resuscitation set the mood for Holy Week as clergy and worshippers processed from the church, banners held high, and led the crowds along the main road to the Tomb of Lazarus for the reading of the Gospel account of his raising.

Palm Sunday saw us in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre for the entry of the Greek Patriarch and later the Armenian Patriarch prior to their liturgies. At 9.00 we were on the roof to watch the Ethiopians process three times around the Dome of St Helena. Dressed in white, they waved palms while the young women sang Hosanna to the insistent note of a single bell and the wonderful accompaniment of a drum played by one of the singers. Singing and dancing, the young women led the clergy and other worshippers round the dome in the most exciting

Palm Sunday celebration we were to share. Then, in the shade lining the courtyard, a bishop led the liturgy, the thin, high chanting contrasting to the joyous singing of a few minutes earlier.

Holy Thursday is a great day, focussing on the Foot Washing rather than the Last Supper. In the course of eleven hours we attended four Foot Washing services, doing little else for the day. First we joined the vast crush of Greek pilgrims in the courtyard of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. To the stirring cantillation of a gorgeously-robed priest, we witnessed the Patriarch and twelve senior clergy leading the service from a central dais. For our group, the presence of eleven video camera operators on the dais was annoying until we realised that

our presence prevented forty other pilgrims attending. Indeed, the videos were played outside every tiny shop nearby that afternoon. We were privileged to see the Patriarch, divested of five layers of heavy vestments, kneel and wash the feet of his clergy and, in turn, have his feet washed.

Next we joined some of the Ethiopians in their chapel for a quiet meditative liturgy. Again there was the typical high nasal chanting, but most of the service consisted of readings, one taking twenty-five minutes! A second liturgy followed, this time in the huge marquee erected on the roof, the two chapels being far too small. The footwashing of the men was followed by washing of the right hand of the women, including some of our group.

After lunch the scene was St James' Armenian Cathedral where the story was again enacted, this time in very formal sung liturgy with many solos, all unaccompanied, men and boys singing in unison, at the same pitch. Their splendid voices, including that of the Patriarch, carried us to heavenly realms and helped dissipate the slight disappointment at the more 'ornate simplicity' of the Patriarch's change of vestment. The Gospel, from John, is traditionally read in English by the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem but as he was overseas, the Bishop of Honduras, one of our group, read, in Armenian vestments and mitre. At the appropriate time, the twelve assisting clergy disappeared behind a curtain and returned wearing a sandal on their right foot, the one to be washed, later disappearing and returning in shoes. Finally, it was the Syrians' turn. In the much smaller St Mark's Church, we were privileged to share a different type of service. This time all the clergy crowded the sanctuary dais and their somewhat unmusical chanting was matched antiphonally by the enthusiastic singing of a choir of girls and young women in a balcony at the opposite end of the church. There was none of the beauty of the Armenian singing but a hearty joyousness more nearly reminiscent of congregational singing that had its own validity. During the Gospel reading when the disciples were named, the scene was enacted as priests moved from the sanctuary to a hollow square in the middle of the church and the archbishop washed their feet and made a cross with oil on their insteps. In an amazing finale, the archbishop in his chair was hoisted shoulder-high and held there for the closing section of the liturgy. A most moving service concluded with worshippers being given a hot pita bread ('good') by elderly Syrian women to help us continue the service on our way home.

Good Friday morning saw three of us joining the vast crowd of white-robed Ethiopians as they processed along the Via Dolorosa. Their quiet devotion was not disturbed as they waited while Muslims on the way to pray at the mosques and Greeks praying the Stations of the Cross jammed the tiny Via through the market, causing one particularly nasty incident. On the roof, the Ethiopians quietly venerated the Cross then took turns to hold it high.

After lunch we joined the Armenians in their chapel in the Holy Sepulchre for the Liturgy of the Holy Crucifixion, readings from the prophets and the Gospels with very little chanting. At the Stone of Anointing, vast numbers of elderly women sprinkled rose water on the Stone and anointed their shrouds. In the Latin chapel, a Sister draped red ribbons around the Crucified One while we joined the crowds worshipping silently at the rock of Golgotha nearby. Later, in St James' Cathedral, we attended the Armenian liturgy of the Burial Service. It began in a darkened church, the sanctuary dominated by a bier, gloriously decorated with flowers and candles. The service was again largely readings from the Gospel, with some mournful chant. Later, clergy and choir moved into the nave and choir leaders chanted antiphonally with great beauty. The service concluded with veneration of the icons.

That evening we joined the crowds of Jerusalem Greek Orthodox for their burial service. Crowded into the Holy Sepulchre courtyard, we waited until they processed from the packed Church on its perimeter, circling the courtyard and singing triumphantly as the banners waved in the brilliant night air, the leading laymen taking turns to carry them. Men, women and children carried small posies of flowers and sang lustily. Borne shoulder-high was the bier, this time about a metre square and a third as high, timber-framed and glass-sided, full of flowers. Helping to carry the bier was clearly an honour.

Holy Saturday – Holy Fire! This was the most amazing day of my four weeks in Jerusalem. Guests of the Armenian Patriarch, our group of forty went early to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, unrecognisable now as pilgrims packed the courtyard and police and soldiers paraded between the barricades. A similar scene met us in the church where we had a wonderful position opposite the side of the Tomb where the Holy Fire emerges. Many pilgrims had slept in the church overnight; others had been there from before dawn. Crowds continued to pour in until noon, all going to the area traditionally designated for their church. About eleven the Tomb was searched for any sign of match or flint. and the doors were sealed with a huge lump of beeswax, a Franciscan, an Armenian and a Greek keeping watch outside the doors. The atmosphere in the church became more tense and passion-filled as Syrians, the leader held shoulder-high, kept up a chant for hours. Later we were to learn that. it meant 'Come Messiah, come!' The Greek Patriarch remained at prayer in the Greek chapel opposite the door of the Tomb. At ten to two he emerged and processed three times around the tomb, excitement mounting; our Armenian friends told us it would all happen in ten minutes. At two the Patriarch entered the Tomb and shortly a great cry went up as flames leapt out. the oval hole through the thick wall to be caught in a brazier by three runners, two of whom ran out of the church, their tapers going to Tel Aviv en route to Athens and Cyprus to light Paschal candles; the third circled the

Tomb, passing Holy Fire to the crowds as he ran. In no time the gloom had become brilliant light as we each waved our candle lit from the new fire, chanting 'Christ is risen!', the bells pealing madly. In a rare display of unity, the procession three times round the Tomb began, led by the Greek Patriarch, followed by the Armenians and other non-Chalcedonian churches, each with banners and choir. Police proffered tiny fire extinguishers and young Greeks with asbestos gloves assisted in putting out the candles while smoke darkened the great dome. In a few minutes it was over and all that remained was to get out - through the single entrance to the church and two small ones to the packed streets beyond the courtyard.

More meaningful though less exciting were the Easter Vigils that began that evening. Having chosen to 'follow' the Ethiopians and the Armenians, I went at nine to the Ethiopian roof where the Lighting of the Fire candlelit procession round the dome on the roof was witnessed by jostling visitors who left when this spectacular liturgy concluded. Crowds of pilgrims unable to fit in the special marquee sat round the roof or slept on the large carpets spread for them, to wake just before two when the final liturgy concluded. From midnight, the Easter Liturgies were celebrated in church or chapel by the Russians and Greeks, the Ethiopians following at 1.00, Copts at 2.00, Armenians and Syrians at 3.00. Chilled to the bone, I went home at 2.00, missing the Ethiopian Easter breakfast and the Armenian liturgies.

However, on Easter afternoon I attended the spectacular Armenian liturgy and procession at St James. In the 'blessing of the four corners of the earth' liturgy in the cathedral courtyard, stunning chant, colourful vestments and wonderful movement provided great excitement. Later, having processed into the cathedral, clergy and choir were divested of their festive robes and a gentle transition to Vespers took place. This proved to be a service where, though understanding only Alleluia and Amin, I was able to participate in this timeless liturgy.

For course members, Easter continued next day when we passed one and visited two of the four possible sites of Emmaus. Our final Eucharist was held in the Crusader church at Abu Gosh, Crusaders' Emmaus. Later we visited the Byzantine ruins including a baptistery at Imwas, another possible site. This was followed by a picnic lunch at nearby Latrun Monastery and winery.

But for me, Tuesday concluded Orthodox Easter as I went to the Armenian Cathedral to inspect an ancient Armenian hymnary as guest of the director of music. While there I saw the Lutheran clergy, the Apostolic Delegate, the Ethiopian, Latin, Syrian and Copt senior clergy coming at designated times to offer their congratulations on the Easter celebrations, the Melkites having been

earlier and the Greeks having an afternoon appointment. The Armenians had already paid their calls and had made similar visits after Western Easter.

It is difficult to come to definite conclusions about this amazing Easter. From the certainty of resurrection prefigured on St Lazarus' Day, through the ornate ritual of the Foot-Washing and Burial Services, the quiet passion of the elderly women anointing their shrouds and the Western pilgrims completing the Stations of the Cross while Eastern liturgies were taking place, to the spectacle of Holy Fire and the glorious triumph of the Resurrection mirrored in exotic chant, rich vestments, brilliantly colourful processions and the joyous pealing of each church's bells, it was a most. amazing experience which will clearly modify my understanding of these mysteries and over which I will ponder long.

St George's College, Jerusalem, runs ten courses each year on themes based on the Bible and its setting or the Bible and worship. Courses last from ten days to ten weeks and should be booked well in advance. The Revd Tom Brown SSM, St Michael's Priory, Box 180 Diggers' Rest, 3427, phone (03) 740 0006; fax (03) 740 0007 has further information.

NEWS AND INFORMATION

The 1938 Père Receveur Sesquicentenary at La Perouse

For the sesquicentenary of British settlement in Australia in 1938 the officially designated period of celebrations ran from Australia Day to Anzac Day, that is, from 26 January to 25 April.¹ Within this period occurred the sesquicentenary, on 17 February, of the death of Père Laurent Receveur, the Conventual Franciscan naturalist and chaplain of Laperouse's second ship, the 'Astrolabe'. This was solemnly commemorated, along with the presumed inception of the Mass in Australia by the two priests of the Laperouse Expedition during its early 1788 sojourn in Botany Bay, with a huge pilgrimage of some 9,000 people to Père Receveur's grave at La Perouse on Sunday 13 February, 1938.²

Before the event the rusted iron enclosure around the grave was renewed at the expense of the State Government following a request from the Franciscan friars at Waverley that this work be done.³ The 'Catholic Pilgrimage to La Perouse' was recommended beforehand by Archbishop Michael Kelly of Sydney in a circular letter in which he observed: 'It is almost certain that the first Mass would have been celebrated on Sunday, 27th February, 1788 – the Sunday after the arrival of the French expedition in Botany Bay.'⁴

On the day of the pilgrimage, which proved rainy, the solemnity of the occasion was enhanced by the presence and participation of ecclesiastical, naval, and civic dignitaries. The numerous Catholic clergy attending were led by N.T. Golroy, then coadjutor Archbishop of Sydney, and included two French missionary bishops, a French naval chaplain, and a group of Franciscan friars from Waverley among whom was Father Celsus Kelly who had organised a mass pilgrimage to the grave five years before. A representative of the Premier of New South Wales and K.R. Cramp, the President of the Royal Australian Historical Society, were present. France was represented by the Consul-General, Monsieur J. Tremoulet, and the Captains, officers and men of the two French warships anchored in Botany Bay for the occasion.⁵ These were the 6,500 ton training cruiser 'Jeanne d'Arc', which carried some 150 junior officers in addition to her complement,⁶ and the colonial sloop 'Bignault de Genouilly' which had visited in December 1936.⁷

To the music of their bands the French ships' companies marched from the Laperouse Monument to the allotted place below the verandah of the Old Cable Station, then a guest house, and Father Kelly gave an introductory address of the historic religious significance of the Laperouse Expedition's visit to Botany Bay

in early 1788. Following the arrival of the 88 year old Archbishop Kelly to popular acclaim, a decade of the Rosary was recited by the immense gathering. Then Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was administered by Archbishop Gilroy.

Although rain forced curtailment of the ceremonies by the omission of further addresses, these were printed in the March issue of the Australian Franciscan periodical, *The Crusader*. Included was the address of Captain (later Rear Admiral) Paul Auphan of the 'Jeanne d'Arc'. Concerning Père Receveur the Captain remarked:

He was, in a way, the advance guard in the Pacific Islands, of the French and Catholic missionaries who, in centuries past, as well as nowadays, in all the newly-discovered countries have preceded and allowed the progress of civilisation.⁸

The 1938 sesquicentenary ceremonies were the precedent for the 1992 Père Receveur Commemoration on Sunday 16 February which also took the form of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

The 1995 Père Receveur Commemoration, the eighth since the inception of annual commemorations which began with the bicentenary of Père Receveur's death in 1988, took place on Saturday 18 February at La Perouse. On the presumption that Père Receveur's death would have occasioned a Requiem Mass, said by the surviving priest of the Laperouse Expedition, the Abbé Jean André Mongez (1751-1788), the 1995 commemoration took the form of a Requiem Mass in the traditional Latin rite of the Catholic Church, the rite universally current in 1788. This was offered by a French priest, Father H. de la Tour, who preached the occasional sermon on the Holy Eucharist, at an altar with a black frontal that was erected in the newly refurbished Instrument Room of the Old Cable Station, which houses the Laperouse Museum.

The Mass was followed by the customary procession to Père Receveur's grave for the chanting of the final prayers for the dead, followed by the *Salve Regina*, within the grave enclosure.

In attendance as official guests were Captain G.R. Cole for the Royal Australian Navy and Mrs Cole, and Lieut. Commander Richard Kelly RN, representing Commodore B.J. Adams, the British Defence and Naval Adviser.

NOTES

This account has been drawn from the writer's *Terre de France à La Perouse?: A study of the historical foundations of a local myth 1788-1950*. (Author, 1995)

1 Bill Gammage and Peter Spearitt, eds, *Australians 1938*. (Fairfax, Syme & Weldon Associates, 1987) 14.

- 2 Celsus Kelly 'A friar who saw the First Fleet: Father Louis (sic) Receveur OFM, *The Crusader March*, 1938, 148; 'Pilgrimage to tomb of Fr. Receveur at La Perouse: impressive ceremonies despite rain' *The Crusader March*, 1938, 154.
- 3 Jim Fitzgerald 'Long, long ago, his grave was made' *Franciscan Newsletter* 137, 1985, 3.
- 4 Quoted in 'Pilgrimage to tomb...' 154.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 155.
- 6 Henri Le Masson *The French Navy I.* (Macdonald, 1969) (Navies of the Second World War), 98.
- 7 Plaque on southern side of the Laperouse Monument: 'A La Perouse et à ses Compagnons Le Rigault de Genouilly. December, 1936, Feb. 1938'.
- 8 Paul Auphan 'The La Perouse Pilgrimage: French Captain's address' *The Crusader March*, 1938, 3.

BOOKREVIEW

The Problems with the Prayers of the Modern Mass

Anthony Cekada (Tan Books and Publishers, Rockford, Ill. 1991)

x + 44 pp. ISBN: 0-89555-447-X. \$5.00

“Il traduttore e il traditore” – the translator is the traitor.

This is the thesis of Cekada as he studies the orations (Opening Prayers, Prayers of the gifts, after Communion, over the People) of the 1970 Missal of Paul VI. He compares these prayer texts with the 1570 Missal of Pius V to reveal how these new texts have been developed from the older. His target is the Latin translations, not the subsequent vernacular ones.

He says that the translators and editors of the new texts have eliminated language that he considers to be the bearers of essential Roman Catholic beliefs such the wickedness of sin and its punishment, detachment from the world, prayer for departed souls, conversion to the true faith, merits of the saints and any reference to miracles.

While he makes his point by careful comparison of the older and newer texts, the beliefs that he says are being betrayed by the new translations are not central in the hierarchy of truths. Moreover the style of language Cekada maintains these beliefs are best expressed in, (e.g. “God's fury”, “languor of soul”, “wicked thoughts”), is difficult for today's listeners. The truth of our relationship with God can be faithfully expressed in other language.

Because of the delicate bonds which join the *lex orandi* with the *lex credendi*, Cedaka is correct that the language of worship should be carefully and faithfully written. However his attack on the prayers of the Missal of Paul VI is far too broad and cannot justify a sentence such as :

The virtual elimination of these “doctrinal realities” from the orations of the new Missal is nothing less than an attack on the integrity of the Catholic faith. p. 29

Denis Stanley

CONTRIBUTORS

Joan Benson is a part-time theology student and is employed at the Victorian Council of Christian Education.

The Revd Allan H. Cadwallader is Lecturer in New Testament, St Barnabas' College, Adelaide.

Frank R.L. Carleton is an historical bibliographer who works freelance in the antiquarian book trade and is a frequent contributor to AJL.

The Revd David Orr, osb is a monk of St Benedict's Abbey, Arcadia and teaches liturgy for the Catholic Theological Union, Sydney. He was a member of the committee which prepared the liturgy for the beatification of Mary Mackillop.

Sister Carmel Pilcher, rsj chaired the committee which prepared the liturgy for the beatification of Mary Mackillop and teaches liturgy at St Francis Xavier Seminary, Adelaide.

The Revd Dr Elizabeth J. Smith has recently completed doctoral studies at the Church Divinity School, Berkeley California and is now Vicar of St John's Bentleigh in the Diocese of Melbourne.

The Revd Denis Stanley is Parish Priest of St Clare's Thomastown West in the Archdiocese of Melbourne.

Back issues of AJL
from Vol 1 No 2 to Vol 4 No 3
may be ordered from
Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282
Brisbane Qld 4001
for \$7.50 each (including postage)

INDEX TO VOLUME FOUR

[Part 1: pp 1-40. Part 2: pp 41-92. Part 3: pp 93-148.
Part 4: pp 149-196.]

ARTICLES

- Allen, Barbara: Yom HaShoah (Holocaust Memorial Day) liturgies: why the church should incorporate a Yom HaShoah liturgy within the Christian liturgical calendar. Part 1: 74. Part 2: 127
- Carleton, Frank: Cathedral ceremonies and pastoral practice: several partial record series 1858-1979. 25
- Carleton, Frank: Father Therry's Roman Missal. 134
- Cole, David R.: The prophetic chorus (Austin James Lecture 1993) 46
- Oberg, Delroy: Intercession – what's the use? 182
- Harrison, Helen: Re-reading Musicam Sacram: recommendations still relevant for Catholic liturgical music in Australia. 4
- Knowles, Tom: Worship for the common good. 153
- McKean, John C.: Liturgical conservatives: nineteenth century debates over the introduction of 'hymns of human composition' and 'instrumental music' in the Presbyterian Synod of Otago and Southland. 65
- McPherson, Albert: Art and liturgy. 177
- McRae-McMahon, Dorothy: How inclusive are our liturgies? 97
- Mendham, Peter M.: Liturgy and the future of evangelicals: a response to David Peterson. 102
- Renner, H. Paul V.: Christian ritual in pastoral care. 167
- Sherlock, Charles: Changing space, changing perspectives on symbol and openness: a case study of St Augustine's Moreland, Anglican Diocese of Melbourne. 114
- Smith, John H.: Liturgy and life: Liturgical reforms in the Roman Catholic Church 1832-1962, with special reference to the developments in post-war France. Part 2. 14
- van Dissel, Dirk: The liturgical welcome. 82

NEWS AND INFORMATION

- Basic religious library information sought. 36
- Conference 1994 (David Orr) 146
- Developments in Liturgy : 3. The revision of *An Australian Prayer Book*: a progress report (Charles Sherlock) 32

France en Australie: the 1994 Pere Receveur commemoration at La Perouse on Botany Bay (Frank Carleton) 194
International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (R. Wesley Hartley) 86
Letter on Koinonia in Worship (Robert Gribben) 191
National Liturgical Music Convention, Melbourne, April 1993 (Ian Brown) 29
Renovating St Stephen's Cathedral, Brisbane: applying liturgical principles (Tom Elich) 89
Societas Liturgica. Fribourg, Switzerland 16-21 August 1993 (David Rankin, SJ) 87

BOOKS REVIEWED

Ellwood, Robert S.: Islands of the dawn: the story of alternative spirituality in New Zealand (John Bayton) 139
Holden, Colin: Awful happenings on the Hill: E.S. Hughes and Melbourne Anglo-Catholicism before the War (R. Wesley Hartley) 144
Peterson, David: Engaging with God: a biblical theology of worship (Charles Sherlock) 141
Williams, Dick: Prayers for today's world (Charles Sherlock) 145

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to:

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

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

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

BOOKS FOR REVIEW to:

The Revd Dr C.H. Sherlock
1A South Terrace
Clifton Hill Vic 3068

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

Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282, Brisbane Qld 4001
Facsimile: (07) 221 1705

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 of the Academy subscription to *AJL* is included in the membership fee.

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 1994-95

PRESIDENT:	Tom Elich, BA, BD, DTh/DHistRel
PAST PRESIDENT:	Russell Hardiman, BTL, STL, DSLit
SECRETARY/TREASURER:	Inari Thiel, BA, MSc
EDITOR OF AJL	R. Wesley Hartley, BA, BD, MTh, DipLS
CHAPTER CONVENORS:	
QLD	David Pitman, BA, BD, DipEd
NSW	Doug Morrison-Cleary, BTh
ACT	H. D'Arcy Wood, MA, BD, PhD
VIC	Robert J. Brown, BA, MDiv, DTheol
TAS	Brian Nicholls, LSL
SA	Carmel Pilcher, RSJ, MA, DipT, GradDipRE
WA	Angela McCarthy, BA

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMY

Admission to the Academy is open to those who have recognised qualifications in liturgical studies and related disciplines. The Academy also admits those who have demonstrated in other ways their professional competence in these fields or who evidence a developing contribution in the area of worship.

The Academy hopes that the work of members will serve to animate the liturgical spirit of the traditions and congregations to which they belong.

Applications for membership are invited and should be made on an Application Form available from:

The Secretary
Australian Academy of Liturgy
GPO Box 282
Brisbane Qld 4001
Facsimile: (07) 221 1705

The annual membership fee is \$30.00; or \$40.00 for couples. The membership fee includes subscription to *AJL*.

