



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

AUSTRALIAN
JOURNAL OF
LITURGY

Volume 5 Number 2 October 1995

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	Douglas 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*.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 5 Number 2 October 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

EDITORIAL

A Prayer Book for Australia was officially launched on 20 October 1995 as a new prayer book for the Anglican Church of Australia – but no-one writing in this issue had seen a copy at the time he was writing. They had the draft book which had been presented to the General Synod and a list of amendments which had been made. It is not quite the same thing as having the actual book in front of you, but our publishing schedule meant that we had to proceed without waiting.

Dr Burge describes the coming of APBA “a watershed for Australian Anglicans”. I am grateful to Dr Rayner, Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia, for his commendation of the book and to Dr Elich for a response to it by a non-Anglican. The review by Canon van Dissel arrived unsolicited and I have included it to illustrate some of the diversity within the Anglican Church and to prick some of the euphoria which might otherwise surround the arrival of APBA.

From across the Tasman comes the Leatherland Exhibitioner for 1994. Mr Dawson writes on confirmation in the Methodist Church of New Zealand. Part 2 of this article will appear in the next issue. Especially as there is no equivalent to the Academy or AJL in New Zealand we welcome contributions from New Zealanders.

In this issue the appearance of the names Leatherland and James perpetuates the memory of two respected liturgical scholars and teachers from Melbourne. Harold F. Leatherland was a Congregationalist and founder of the Ecumenical Liturgical Centre (which has now merged into the Victoria Chapter of the Academy). The “H.F. Leatherland Exhibition” is a prize offered to students of Melbourne College of Divinity or other tertiary institutions in Australia for an essay on a subject in the liturgical field. Details of the exhibition are available from the Dean, MCD, 21 Highbury Grove, Kew 3101.

Austin James was a Methodist whose work for ecumenical liturgical renewal is honoured in the Austin James Lecture. This lecture is presented about every two years under the auspices of the Victoria Chapter of the Academy (and previously of the Ecumenical Liturgical Centre). Dr Burge’s introduction to APBA is the Austin James Lecture 1995. It is the second occasion on which he has been the Austin James Lecturer – the previous occasion being 1975.

Some liturgists seem to be perpetually peripatetic. Others succumb to the condition around August in odd-numbered years. In August this year the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Congress of Societas Liturgica and the English Language Liturgical Consultation met in Ireland. Australia was well represented at each of these meetings and reports on the first two are included in the News and Information section.

Strathmore Vicarage
All Saints’ Day 1995

RWH

CONTENTS

A Prayer Book for Australia

Commendation by the Primate of the Anglican
Church of Australia
Keith Rayner 61

'A Prayer Book for Australia' – a Watershed for
Australian Anglicans. The Austin James Lecture
Evan Burge 63

Liturgical Resources Authorised
A Prayer Book for Australia (1995)
Tom Elich 87

A Prayer Book for Australia critically examined
Dirk Van Dissell 93

In Search of Meaning

Christian Initiation and the Rite of Confirmation
in the Methodist Church of New Zealand
Part I Reconsidering Confirmation
Brian Dawson 105

News and Information 118

Contributors 124

The Anglican Church of Australia



A Prayer Book for Australia

for use with
*The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and
An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*

**Liturgical Resources
authorised by the General Synod**

A PRAYER BOOK FOR AUSTRALIA

Commendation by the Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia

It is generous of the *Australian Journal of Liturgy* to feature *A Prayer Book for Australia* in this issue. Its adoption by the General Synod in July was a significant step for the Anglican Church of Australia. We look forward to its wide use around the Church.

Naturally, I am pleased to be able to commend *A Prayer Book for Australia* not only to Anglicans but to the wider Christian community.

We are, like other great historic Christian communions, a liturgical church. Our authorised liturgy expresses the character of Anglicanism, and it is essential that it be as good as we can make it. I have no doubt that there is a place for informal, non liturgical worship, particularly when we are trying to reach the unchurched; but there is a richness and depth about good liturgy which can marvellously nourish and train people in the deepening of their faith and worship.

Good liturgy is evocative in language, dramatic in form and sound in theology. It needs to become sufficiently familiar to enable the people to make it their own, yet sufficiently varied to express the tones and nuances of the church's seasons and holy days through which the central elements of our faith find expression.

Until 1977 when *An Australian Prayer Book* was adopted by the General Synod, Anglican liturgy in this country was tied to the *Book of Common Prayer*. For more than three hundred years it had remained unchanged, and it still remains according to our Constitution "the authorised standard of worship and doctrine in this Church". It was not only the vehicle of our common worship, but also the most significant means of transmitting our common faith. It was one of the strongest links that bound the Anglican Communion together.

By the middle of this century, however, most Anglicans found that it no longer adequately served these purposes. Beautiful in its language and wholesome in its theology, it was too redolent of the culture of another land and another age to speak with power to this generation of Australians.

An Australian Prayer Book was distinctive among Anglican liturgies in that it provided two versions of all major services. The first was the *Book of Common Prayer* version, but with its language brought more into line with that of today. The second followed the pattern of new liturgies influenced by the Liturgical Movement and found precedents in the ancient liturgies of the undivided church. This became widely used, and the whole book served to hold the Australian church in unity.

In the newest book there is evidence of a degree of understanding of each other by the differing theological strands within the church. More freedom has been

allowed and more variations to provide for differing emphases and differing circumstances.

I commend those who laboured to produce the book. It is a real achievement which moves us to another stage in our liturgical development. I trust that it will enable an enrichment of our Anglican worship and that it will make a worthwhile contribution to the liturgical movement ecumenically.

+ *Keith Rayner*
Primate

A PRAYER BOOK FOR AUSTRALIA
A Watershed for Australian Anglicans
The Austin James Lecture 21 September 1995
Evan Burge

Scope of the Book : Full and Shorter Editions

‘A big book’, said the ancient poet Callimachus, ‘is a big evil’. That is how many members of the Anglican General Synod must have felt when they first saw the draft of *A Prayer Book for Australia*,¹ on which they were to vote last July. On examining its contents they were generally impressed. The draft book was the fruit of years of labour and patient listening by the Liturgical Commission, whose mandate to prepare and present it came from General Synod itself. The Commission was a diverse group, which at the time of Synod consisted of 10 members and a consultant (Dr David Peterson) drawn from all States and Australian Capital Territory. Two members were women, a proportion that all agree is too low. Its cohesion and effectiveness owed much to the strong sense of Christian calling and commitment experienced by all members and to the unfailingly patient, just, caring and prudent leadership of its Chair, Canon Lawrence Bartlett, and his predecessor Bishop Owen Dowling. The standing ovation accorded by the Synod when the book was accepted was well deserved.

Containing 898 pages, the draft book weighed over a kilogram even with a thin cardboard cover. Compared with *An Australian Prayer Book* it has thicker paper, larger print, and a larger page size, and in its final published form is bound in a rich burgundy cover with gold lettering. Most parishioners, however, will become familiar only with the shorter edition – about half as thick. This provides Sunday congregations with a choice of three forms of *Morning and Evening Prayer*, services of *Thanksgiving for a Child*,² *Baptism and Confirmation* in the Holy Communion³ and *Baptism and Confirmation*⁴ alone, three orders for ‘*The Holy Communion also called the Eucharist and the Lord’s Supper*’⁵ and the complete Psalter. For weekday congregations or family prayers there are *Morning and Evening Prayer* for each day of the week (often called the Daily Offices), *A Service of the Light*, and *Prayer at the End of the Day*.⁶ In addition, the shorter book contains a range of *prayers, litanies and thanksgivings*, and the *Prayers (or Collects) for each week* and major holy day. At the end of both the full and shorter editions, reprinted without change from the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, are the *Athanasian Creed* and the *Thirty-nine Articles*. Both editions share the same page numbers (except for the Prayers of the Week). They are so laid out that, in spite of the numerous options, one moves steadily forward in following or conducting a service. Sections likely to be omitted are marked with shading along the margin.⁷

The full edition⁸ includes, in addition to the contents listed above, a revised *Calendar*⁹ followed by *Prayers and Readings (references only)*¹⁰ for Sundays –

one *lectionary-related Prayer or Collect for each Sunday* in each of the Years A, B, and C¹¹ – and for *Holy Days and Lesser Festivals*.¹² There are two forms for Marriage,¹³ resources for *Ministry to the Sick*¹⁴ and *the Reconciliation of a Penitent*, and *Funeral Services*¹⁵ offering a wide range of sentences, prayers, and readings. Services for the *Ordination*¹⁶ of Deacons, Priests or Presbyters,¹⁷ and Bishops follow. There is a final section entitled *Resources*, which includes a *Catechism*,¹⁸ an *Outline Order for the Holy Communion*,¹⁹ Notes relating to the book as a whole,²⁰ and a valuable *Index of prayers*.²¹

The contents of the full book are recognisably those of the Book of Common Prayer, with a greatly expanded range of choices for different needs and circumstances.²² Many necessary orders of service are found neither in this new book nor in the BCP: for instance, the installation of an incumbent, the dedication or consecration²³ of a church building, and, most noticeably, special provisions for Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Easter Vigil.²⁴ For the time being, these must all be covered by diocesan or local provision.

Reproduction of Services

As well as the full and shorter editions in book form, *A Prayer Book for Australia* is published on computer disk. Parishes may produce their own orders of service,²⁵ choosing between the many options available in the authorized printed book.²⁶ Copyright permission for this will be subject to the parishes buying a sufficient number of the printed books, paying a copyright fee and supplying a sample of their compilation to the publisher. The days when most faithful Anglicans followed the service from their own prayer books, small enough to fit in a pocket or handbag, appear to have gone for ever.

Relation to AAPB and BCP

A Prayer Book for Australia (APBA) is a successor to *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB), but does not officially supersede it. The title page states that it is for use 'together with the Book of Common Prayer 1662 and An Australian Prayer Book'. I wonder how many copies of these older volumes will be in use in three years' time.²⁷ In the years leading to the preparation of APBA, there were requests to have some services from BCP 1662 included in the new book.²⁸ Objections to this were based on the size and cost of the book.²⁹ To help worshippers who felt deprived of the worship in which they were nurtured, the Liturgical Commission recently arranged a separate printing of the main Sunday services and Collects from BCP 1662, lightly edited, under the title *In Living Use*.³⁰

Although they are not printed in APBA in their original form, these services, which have been for four and a half centuries the source and nourishment of

Anglican liturgical language and spirituality, are represented there by the first orders for Morning and Evening Prayer and The Holy Communion and, less closely, by The Great Litany. The best loved Prayer Book Collects are similarly represented in the Prayers for the Week,³¹ which stand alongside the newer prayers for each Sunday in Years A, B and C.³² The slightly modernised versions of these treasures from the BCP, using the pronoun *you* instead of *thou/thee*,³³ are closer to their originals than the corresponding forms in AAPB. Many familiar Cranmerian phrases have been restored. APBA is not then an iconoclastic book, rejecting or trampling on the riches of the past. It does, however, also recognise that those riches are inadequate as the Church faces the twenty-first century. Treasuring and retaining much from our Anglican past, APBA reaches out confidently to the future.

Inclusive Language

There are several ways in which APBA marks a considerable advance upon AAPB. First, it shows sensitivity to the need for inclusive language, as had been enjoined by General Synod as long ago as 1981. In language referring to human beings, the generic use of *man*, *men* and *he* to refer to women and men alike is everywhere avoided. The *Liturgical Psalter* found in AAPB has been thoroughly revised by Professor David Frost and his scholarly colleagues from this inclusive human perspective.³⁴ The 'sons of men' are now the 'children of Adam'. Psalm 1 now begins not with 'Blessed is the man' but 'Blessed are they'.³⁵ While regretting the loss of the New Testament treatment in Hebrews 2 of the phrase 'son of man' in Psalm 8:5, the revisers have noted the normal sense of the Hebrew *ben adam* as meaning a human being, and have rendered the verse:

What are we, that you should be mindful of us:
what are we, that you should care for us?

It cannot be said that this revision is unscholarly or inaccurate. Unlike some inclusive language versions, it is not the product of an unthinking reaction to certain words, which would have *man* excised even when, as in Psalm 128, it clearly refers to a male.

Surprisingly, the issue of inclusive language was not raised in the General Synod that approved the book. Several years earlier, the letters columns of *Church Scene* crackled with indignation against the very notion.³⁶ Objections were expected to a line in the Nicene Creed proposed by the international and ecumenical English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC).³⁷ To make it clear that the Creed asserts in its original form that at the incarnation the second Person of the Trinity became a human being (although it is, of course, true that Jesus was male), the word *enanthropesanta* (or, in Latin, *homo factus est*) was rendered by ELLC *and became truly human*. This translation can be defended.³⁸ In my view

it is inferior to one later recommended by ELLC as an alternative, *and became a human being*. For those versed in Aristotelian philosophy,³⁹ it is a question of substance (essential being) or attribute.

Language referring to God

Revision of the language in APBA referring to God has been less thorough. Scriptural terms such as *Lord, Father, King, and kingdom*, which seem to many to be clearly masculine in their orientation, have been retained throughout.⁴⁰ In the revised *Liturgical Psalter*, there are many occurrences of the pronoun *he/him/his* referring to God – more than the Liturgical Commission would have wished. Most can be justified on the grounds of accurate, or literal, translation.⁴¹ Outside *The Liturgical Psalter*, masculine pronouns referring to God are avoided whenever possible. The Psalms in the Daily Offices and Occasional Services are not always identical with those in the Psalter, and generally have fewer masculine references to God.⁴²

APBA does, however, introduce a wide range of images and approaches for speaking of God. Thus we find God addressed not only as *almighty* and *everlasting*, but also as *life-giving, righteous, bountiful, generous, loving, caring, gentle, forgiving* and many more. Prayers with feminine imagery for God are introduced as optional alternatives, notably about twenty Collects by Janet Morley from her book *All Desires Known*.⁴³ As an example of the sharpness, economy and sensitivity of these prayers,⁴⁴ here is an alternative Collect for Lent 5 in Year C:

Christ, whose feet were caressed with perfume and a woman's hair, you humbly took a basin and towel and washed the feet of your friends: wash us also in your tenderness, that, embracing your service freely, we may accept no other bondage. In your name. Amen.

Some will find that these prayers add greatly to the sensitivity and intimacy of the worship. Others, who find them alienating or unsuited to public worship, will not have to use them. Perhaps some men who feel discomfort may gain insight into how many women have felt when exposed only to the traditional male-dominated images of the past. The Bible itself is much richer in helpful ways of speaking about God than the largely regal, courtly and imperialistic images which have held sway in our worship for so long. APBA, then, marks a significant advance upon AAPB in its use of inclusive language⁴⁵ and its richer store of ways of speaking about God.

An Australian Book

Secondly, APBA is more clearly a distinctively Australian book than its predecessor. The need for 'inculturation of the liturgy' (an ugly phrase) is a

constant theme of recent liturgical discussion. It points to the need for worship to be grounded in the lives of the worshippers. The BCP, while containing much of timeless value, was also firmly rooted, as it was meant to be, in the culture of sixteenth and seventeenth century England—an officially Christian nation, largely rural, settled, governed by a strong monarchy and hierarchial system, and subject from time to time to the scourge of sudden death from disease, famine, or civil strife. Its beautiful forms often seem out of place when translated into other languages and set in non-British and post-Christian cultures. This has been increasingly realised by Anglicans in Africa, Latin America and the Pacific as well as in Australia. It means that we can no longer find our identity and unity as Anglicans in the use of a single Prayer Book.

Cultural diversity

In Australia, the appeal of traditional Anglican worship and the glories of its accompanying legacy of choral music is largely to people who by temperament and training belong to a highly literate culture.⁴⁶ They tend to listen to ABC-FM or another classical music station, to read serious books and newspapers, and to go to the theatre or the opera. The Church will neglect such people, or trample on their cultural sensitivities, at its peril. They find it difficult, or impossible, to worship within a transient popular culture with an emphasis upon entertainment and intense group feeling. The world of this culture is characterised by loud rock music, quiz shows, slapstick or bawdy comedy, and passionate TV serials. In church it is likely to be expressed in music with an obtrusive beat, chromatic harmonies with a sentimental effect, and banal words with many repetitions. There are dangers here—of cultural pride on the one hand and of a destructive rejection of beauty and depth in favour of instant appeal on the other. It is sad to hear of clerical vandals who, in the name of congregational worship advancing into the modern age, throw out the BCP and dismantle traditional choirs, often of high standard. At the same time, people belonging to the traditional literate culture have no right to insist that the gospel should be proclaimed only, or even primarily, to those with a refined, highly educated taste.

This question of cultural differences has not yet been squarely faced by our church. In my view, we have no option but to embrace a cultural pluralism—variety is the spice of life. This, however, means compromising or abandoning one of the BCP's clearest principles, that of uniformity of worship. Uniformity had more, however, to do with the Tudor monarchy and English nationalism than with the gospel or spiritual worship. Insistence upon this principle put great non-conforming Christians like John Bunyan into prison. While we acknowledge that after 1549, Hereford, York, Lincoln and Salisbury were required to have but one

liturgical Use, we must also recognize that, as a matter of fact, there has not, these many years past, been one Use common to, say Ballarat and Sydney, or, within one diocese, to Christ Church St Laurence and St Barnabas' Broadway.

Plain language and awareness of the land

APBA includes forms of service, especially the third orders for Morning and Evening Prayer and the Holy Communion, where the language is plain and unadorned, without being cheap or childish. These third orders are intended partly to help those with a low level of literacy or those whose first language is not English.⁴⁷ In my judgement, they would also be welcomed by many intelligent and literate congregations, including those in school and University College chapels. The words are only part of the communication. Much depends on the reverence and sincerity with which they are used, and on the liturgical atmosphere and setting, including the hymns, other music, movement and colour, and periods of silence.

The requirement that liturgy should be inculturated is closely related to another principle of the Book of Common Prayer, that public worship should be 'in a language understood of the people'. What was Australian about AAPB 1978? Apart from the green and gold cover, the line drawings of Australian flora, and a reference to flood, drought and bushfire, it is hard at a glance to see it as particularly Australian. The best answer is that AAPB was Australian because it was developed by Australians and was an Australian solution to the problem of providing acceptable worship for a diverse majority of Australian Anglicans in 1978. It was in no sense a self-consciously nationalistic book, and perhaps none the worse for that. The worship of the eternal God cannot be limited by geographical borders. One cannot, however, help comparing AAPB in this respect with *A New Zealand Prayer Book* 1989. The frequent use of the Maori language alongside English marks that book indelibly as coming from Aotearoa, New Zealand. There are also telling references to characteristic New Zealand landscapes, animals and plants, as in an evocative version for New Zealand of Psalm 65, which ends:

The tussock land becomes pasture and the brown hills turn green;
the paddocks are crowded with sheep and the plains thick with wheat:
the world itself a canticle of praise. (ANZPB, p.171)

and in a new canticle *Benedicite Aotearoa*, which includes the following:

All mountains and valleys, grassland and scree, glacier, avalanche, mist and snow: give to our God your thanks and praise. You kauri and pine, rata and kowhai, mosses and ferns: give to our God your thanks and praise. Dolphins and kahawai, sealion and crab, coral, anemone, pipi and shrimp: give

to our God your thanks and praise. Rabbits and cattle, moths and dogs, kiwi and sparrow and tui and hawk: give to our God your thanks and praise. You Maori and Pakeha, women and men, all who inhabit the long white cloud: give to our God your thanks and praise. (ANZPB, p.64)

It seems to be more difficult in Australia. For some reason, the mention of kangaroos, wombats and emus, unless handled by a skilled poet, strikes us as contrived and even humorous. There are so many Aboriginal languages, largely unknown outside their indigenous regions, that we cannot use any of them to give a uniquely Australian flavour to a prayer book for the whole continent.

Awareness of indigenous Australians

Nevertheless there has been real progress. APBA contains a moving thanksgiving prayer dictated at a time of inspiration by an Aboriginal woman, Lenore Parker. It begins:

God of holy dreaming, Great Creator Spirit, from the dawn of creation you have given your children the good things of Mother Earth. You spoke and the gum tree grew. In the vast desert and dense forest, and in cities at the water's edge, creation sings your praise. Your presence endures as the rock at the heart of our land....

and ends with this prayer for unity and reconciliation:

Lead us on, Great Spirit, as we gather from the four corners of the earth; enable us to walk together in trust, from the hurt and shame of the past, into the full day which has dawned in Jesus Christ.

A well-meaning attempt in the draft book to express parts of this prayer in traditional Anglican ways, and to avoid any suggestion of 'syncretism',⁴⁸ caused deep hurt. The General Synod wisely decided, with the encouragement of the Liturgical Commission, to adopt this prayer in its original form.⁴⁹ The Synod also rejoiced to see provision for celebrating on 1 July The Coming of the Light, a festival of great significance in the Torres Strait Islands, and for observing in late May and early June the Week of Prayer for Reconciliation, for which a prayer based on one by Bishop Arthur Malcolm (Occasional Prayer, 7) is most helpful, as is a Litany of Confession derived from the Koori Commission of the Diocese of Canberra and Goulburn.

An Australian voice

An authentic Australian voice is found also in the second Eucharistic Prayer drafted by the Dean of Adelaide, David Richardson – more in its overall colour and rhythm than in any particular phrase or reference:

At the dawn of time you wrought from nothing a universe of beauty and splendour, bringing light from darkness and order from chaos. You formed us, male and female, in your image, and endowed us with creative power.... When the fullness of time was come, you sent your Son, to be born of Mary. Bright image of your glory, he learnt obedience to you in all things, even to death on a cross, breaking the power of evil, freeing us from sin, and putting death to flight. You raised him from death, exalting him to glory, and the new day dawned.

Appropriate liturgical language

The quest for an appropriate liturgical language for modern times is being pursued in many parts of the Christian Church. The International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) a Roman Catholic body, has recently been responsible for some boldly original and effective compositions, including a new Eucharistic Prayer, a full set of lectionary-related opening prayers, and a new inclusive-language Psalter.⁵⁰ Its work will have a great influence on other denominations in the next ten years. Anglicans have long valued the timeless qualities of Archbishop Cranmer's rhythmical prose. Much of this language, which now resonates with the devotion of the centuries, is retained in APBA, not only, as I have mentioned, in the first orders for Morning and Evening Prayer and The Holy Communion, but also in many of the weekly Collects, and such greatly loved classical Anglican prayers as the Collect for Purity and the Prayer of Humble Access.⁵¹ Until about thirty years ago, this Cranmerian language was widely considered the only form of English fit for divine service. Anglican liturgists and non-conformist ministers praying *ex tempore* both strove to express themselves in the language of previous centuries, knowing no other models.

Our aim must now be, while retaining ancient gothic and renaissance glories, to evolve beautiful and evocative forms of language in a plain style. This does not mean jettisoning poetry and its power to evoke the transcendent and numinous. The examples I have already cited illustrate this, as do some of the most direct and loved passages of the Bible – God's revelation to Moses at the burning bush, the 23rd Psalm, the Sermon on the Mount (including 'Consider the lilies of the field ...'), and the Prodigal Son. A fine example, common to AAPB and APBA, is David Frost's Post-Communion Prayer, beginning

Father of all, we give you thanks and praise that when we are still far off you met us in your Son and brought us home.

So strong is the hold of the Latin-based rhythm and syntax of our tradition⁵² (which I love), that we find it hard to write so simply. It requires the art that conceals art or the result will be matter-of-fact and earth-bound.

The literary achievement of APBA is therefore uneven: it is the work-in-progress of learners (or disciples) not masters. Here, as an example, is part of the fifth Thanksgiving:

We thank you that when we turned away from you, you sent Jesus to live and work as one of us, and bring us back to you. He showed us how to love you and set us free to love and serve one another.

Like the passage from David Frost, apart from the last word, it is made up of words of one syllable.⁵³

In summary, then, APBA moves beyond AAPB in its sensitivity to inclusive language, in the increased richness and variety of its language about God, in its expression of an Australian ethos in some of its imagery, in its heightened awareness of the indigenous people of this land, and in the simplicity and directness of much of its language.

International and ecumenical influences

There are two further ways in which APBA marks an advance. The first is its drawing upon international ecumenical and Anglican scholarship. In 1978 AAPB was in many respects a pioneering work.⁵⁴ Since then virtually all provinces of the Anglican Communion have produced their own prayer books. Each successive book owes much to work in the other provinces. Within the past eight years, there has been established an International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, meeting every second year. It is currently chaired by the Revd Ron Dowling of Perth, who succeeded Dr David Holeton of Toronto. This consultation has revealed a growing Anglican consensus that the bitter controversies of the sixteenth century should be transcended by paying closer attention to biblical scholarship, Jewish elements in early Christian worship (in particular, the concepts of remembrance, by which the past is made present to the worshippers, and of thanksgiving, by which things are consecrated or set apart for a divinely-revealed purpose), and the liturgies of the early Church.

According to this general Anglican and ecumenical agreement it is desirable to return to ancient patterns for the Eucharist. Especially in Australia, however, there are also many who do not wish to lose the distinctive Cranmerian shape of the BCP Order for the Holy Communion.⁵⁵

Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer

It is from traditions going back at least to Justin Martyr in the mid-second century and Hippolytus in the third that we derive the pattern of eucharistic celebration now found in almost all churches, catholic and protestant alike. The note of thanksgiving which runs through the ancient eucharistic prayers (hence a

preference for 'Eucharist' as the title of this sacramental service) was partly obscured in the medieval and Tridentine Roman forms of the Mass. In these, the priest, after the ancient opening dialogue and preface leading into the Sanctus, turned at once from thanksgiving to supplication for the acceptance of the sacrifice being offered. In 1549, Cranmer removed all words that could be taken to refer to a material sacrifice of bread and wine, which might be thought to avail for salvation. Equally he removed anything which might suggest, in the words of Article 31, the 'sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt'. Many Roman Catholic scholars and virtually all others now agree that Cranmer was right to do so. Christ's sacrifice offered once for all upon the cross was indeed full, perfect and sufficient.

Cranmer removed any unscriptural understanding of sacrifices that we offer. He retained, however, the Roman pattern after the Sanctus of turning from praise and thanksgiving to supplication directly. This is evident equally in 1549, 1552 and 1662. It is still found to some extent in AAPB and APBA, both of which, however, also maintain a strong note of thanksgiving throughout the Eucharistic Prayer.

Through the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, an American scholar, Thomas Talley,⁵⁶ has had a great influence upon our understanding of the ancient eucharistic prayers, especially those of which follow the model of ancient Antioch. According to this model, the Eucharistic Prayer is essentially Trinitarian in its structure. The first two sections are of praise and thanksgiving for the Father's creation and the Son's work of redemption. The so-called institution narrative, recounting the Last Supper and the Lord's command to 'Do this in remembrance of him', is among the saving acts for which we give thanks. In all classical liturgies the Lord's command is followed by a 'Therefore' relating the command to what we are now doing. 'In remembrance of me' is spelled out with a specific recalling of the Lord's saving death and resurrection, to which his glorious ascension is usually added.⁵⁷ This *anamnesis* or remembrance is closely linked in this context to the bread and cup, which in all the ancient forms are said to be 'offered.'⁵⁸ It is a mistake, understandable in the light of the medieval developments, to see here the aberrations which the Reformers rightly rejected. The meaning is that the bread and wine are no longer for common use but are brought to God and surrendered for God to use for a divinely ordained purpose. According to Talley, the link between the institution narrative and the 'therefore' introducing the anamnesis should not be broken. The right place for an acclamation, on this view, is later, at the 'hinge' between thanksgiving and supplication; that is, before the invocation (or *epiclesis*) of the Spirit.

Epiclesis

At this point in the Antiochene pattern, as the Eucharistic Prayer moves from remembrance and offering with thanksgiving to the third section, which is concerned with the Holy Spirit, it also moves from praise to petition – that by the power of the Spirit the bread and wine may be the sacrament, or holy mysteries, of the Lord’s body and blood, and that the communicants may feed on him and receive all the benefits of his salvation.⁵⁹

Until Vatican II, the Roman Mass had had no epiclesis for well over a millenium. Neither did the English rites, including 1549, 1552 and 1662, that took their genesis from it. It was the Scottish Episcopalians and, of all people, the Puritans and Presbyterians, who introduced after the institution narrative an epiclesis of the Spirit upon the elements and the congregation, following Orthodox and ancient precedents.⁶⁰ From Scotland, it passed into the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church in the United States.⁶¹ It is curious that many adherents of a ‘catholic’ position wrote recently to the Liturgical Commission insisting that an epiclesis was an essential element of a valid eucharistic rite, thus condemning the historic Roman Canon. It is equally curious that many adherents of a ‘protestant’ position condemned an epiclesis as theologically improper, without consulting their Calvinistic friends or Puritan forebears.

After Vatican II, the Roman Mass introduced a novelty – a split epiclesis. The first part is before the institution narrative and relates to the consecration of the bread and wine. The second part, in the traditional place after the anamnesis, invokes the Spirit upon the communicants. There are enough Anglican precedents for most Anglicans to feel comfortable with this dual arrangement. From a historical and theological point of view, however, this is a structural confusion. The recent Roman approach has its counterpart, however, in many of the Eucharistic Prayers in APBA. The most important exception, the original short second alternative Thanksgiving, based on the most ancient model we have, the liturgy of Hippolytus, was unfortunately removed by the Synod in favour of a longer new prayer. The new one could simply have been added to the others. In the substituted Thanksgiving, and more briefly in the first Thanksgiving, the earlier epiclesis, before the institution narrative, corresponds to a petition introduced by Cranmer in the same place in 1549, which reads:

with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.

Bishop David Silk of Ballarat, whose suggestion⁶² lies behind the clause found in the first Thanksgiving:

we pray that by your Word and Holy Spirit we who eat and drink them may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood,

and the stronger form of it in the third Thanksgiving, has pointed to an ancient precedent for an invocation of the Logos or Word in Egypt in the Liturgy of Serapion.⁶³

Memorial Acclamation

A strong reason why Rome and many others wanted a consecratory epiclesis to come before the institution narrative instead of in the later classical position is a view of consecration shared equally by many Roman Catholics and the Book of Common Prayer 1662,⁶⁴ but otherwise not much in favour these days. This is that the consecration of the elements is effected when the appropriate words of institution are said. Those who believe this sometimes highlight ‘the consecration’ at this point by manual acts, a change of voice, elevation of the sacrament (forbidden in 1549 in order to ensure that the climax was not the consecration but the communion) and ringing a bell. Whatever one’s practice in these ceremonial aspects, a memorial acclamation such as

Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again.

(or any of the others in the Missal or APBA) is, on this view, a fitting response to the institution narrative seen as the central pivot of the prayer, rather than as what the Presbyterians have long termed ‘the warrant’ for what follows.

The Liturgical Commission, like most modern scholars, wanted consecration to be seen as effected through the whole act of praise, remembrance and petition and not through any one part of it. The Commission’s efforts to move the regular place of the acclamation to Talley’s ‘hinge’ position, while allowing it earlier as in AAPB, came unstuck in the Synod. Bishop Silk had earlier pointed out, both to some Commission members and to a Bishops Conference, that the traditional Eastern acclamation in the later place was linked to the coming supplication and not to the anamnesis. Its typical form in the later place was not a memorial acclamation but a link between thanksgiving and petition, such as:

We hymn you, we bless you, we give thanks to you, O Lord, and we pray to you, O Lord our God.

The Commission, he said, had taken Talley’s point about the hinge, but had neither adopted the Antiochene structure, nor provided the right kind of acclamation. The Bishops were convinced, and, like the Synod later, voted in favour of what they were used to, pointing out that it had the advantage of providing congregational participation at approximately equal spaces – in the opening dialogue, at the Sanctus, at the memorial acclamation, and in the final doxology.

Future Work

It will be clear from what I have said that although APBA makes a considerable advance from an ecumenical point of view⁶⁵ in its grappling with Eucharistic

structure and finding appropriate wording for difficult issues, there are still important loose ends to be secured by a future Commission. To succeed, it will need to enter into prolonged and open dialogue with different groups in the Church. The 1995 General Synod and the preparations for it do, however, encourage great hope for the future. That hope is based neither on uniformity of practice nor doctrinal unanimity on all points, but rather on the willingness of different groups to be more open to one another and to accord mutual respect.

General Synod 1995 – A Watershed

As well as the matters to which I have alluded - the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer, offering and epiclesis – concern was expressed in the Synod about realistic language identifying the sacramental bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ.⁶⁶ Some claimed that the anthem *Benedictus qui venit* (*Blessed is he who comes*) attached to the Sanctus (and excluded in 1552 and 1662) implied ‘transubstantiation’, and should not be permitted. It was also held improper for the sacrament to be given to the communicant, as was permitted in the draft book, with the words *The body* (or *blood*) *of Christ*. The latter point was resolved in a generous spirit by consensus that a verb *keep you in eternal life* should be added, thus replacing realistic identification by a prayer (as in BCP). The *Benedictus*, however, was allowed to stay, as an option in small type and square brackets.⁶⁷ Such was the spirit of mutual generosity and the Anglican *via media*.

The differing, indeed incompatible, views about offering and epiclesis could easily have ensured the failure of the book, which required a 75% majority to be authorised on the spot.⁶⁸ Aspects regarded as essential by one group were anathema to another. It is at this point that APBA, which was passed by a far greater majority than that,⁶⁹ marks not only an advance but a watershed – regrettable in the eyes of some and a wonderful step forward in the eyes of many more.

A change in approach from AAPB 1978

The Liturgical Commission which produced AAPB in 1978 was adamant that it should not contain anything that others would find doctrinally offensive. It resisted pressures to include any prayer in order to gratify a particular party. If a dispute arose, it was resolved by returning to the judiciously balanced words of 1662. AAPB was to be a book for the whole Church. After it was adopted with only one dissentient vote, it was an effective sign of unity. One could truly claim that it had a normative status.

For all this, AAPB in 1978 could not take full account of the growing Anglican or ecumenical consensus mentioned above. Few people, catholic or evangelical,

wanted in 1995 to be tied as strictly as AAPB was to the insights and limitations of 1662 and its English predecessors. When the 1995 General Synod of about 220 members assembled at the Melbourne Grammar School, the first time the General Synod had not been in Sydney, the general desire for the success of the new book and the atmosphere of goodwill were almost palpable. The Primate, Archbishop Keith Rayner, interpreted this feeling in his Presidential Address: 'We need a liturgy... which while sound in theology yet allows reasonable freedom for the different strands of Anglican tradition to be able to use the book with full integrity.' Later speeches were often passionate but they lacked courtesy never, and good humour seldom. On the Monday night was a helpfully low-key but significant presentation arranged by Dr Charles Sherlock on behalf of the Liturgical Commission. After an anthology of liturgical readings spanning the centuries from St Paul to AAPB, short unscripted interviews conducted by Mrs Margaret Collinson, a member of the Commission, with lay members of different Melbourne parishes, revealed how great was the diversity, even within one metropolis, of the needs we were trying to meet. Attention was thus focussed on the needs of parishioners, not on entrenched positions. The next day, the debate opened with two strong speeches from different ends of the spectrum, as Bishop Phillip Newell of Tasmania moved the adoption of the Canon to authorize the new book and Dean Boak Jobbins of Sydney seconded the motion. Significantly, Bishop Newell referred to the desire for 'a liturgical resource that would keep us in touch with Anglican liturgies round the world'.

Amendments in Synod

The Synod then moved into the Committee stage to consider over 400 proposed amendments received in response to the draft book. The Liturgical Committee helped by classifying these into five groups, ranging from (A) typographical and (B) other changes that could be accepted without discussion, through (C) changes it endorsed, (D) changes on which it was neutral and wanted Synod to decide, to (E) changes it did not commend. Synod readily endorsed most of the first two groups *en bloc* and settled down to three days – twice the allotted time – debating the points in groups C, D and E. Many proposals were withdrawn in order to expedite the business. An amendment required the consent of 70 members, estimated on a show of hands, before it could be discussed and put to the vote.

Some of the most substantial amendments proposed for the Second Order of the Eucharist were the result of a prior consultation initiated by Bishop Silk with the blessing of the Primate. Bishops Silk, Curnow and McCall met in Sydney with Dean Jobbins and Bishop Donald Robinson. Dr David Peterson called in for lunch. This informal but significant consultation was chaired by Archbishop Harry Goodhew of Sydney. Its proposals were forwarded by Bishop Silk and duly

considered by the Liturgical Commission. The Commission adopted a few points and recommended against most of them. The decision was left in the hands of the Synod.

As well as the long official lists of amendments, classified into categories A to E, the members of Synod received an unofficial four-page document from Bishops Silk, Curnow and McCall under the headline 'Give us a fair go'. It urged that because the Third Order for the Holy Communion (which originated in Sydney) met the needs of evangelicals, changes should be made in the Second Order to provide at least one Thanksgiving that Catholics could use with a clear conscience. Bishop Silk had drafted such a Thanksgiving in the light of the Sydney consultation. It contained the requisite epiclesis (divided in the modern Roman fashion) and expression of offering. In addition it affirmed the sufficiency of Christ's sacrificial death and our acceptance by grace alone.

The Liturgical Commission members were variously bemused or irritated by what followed. They felt sidelined. Discussions were going on outside the Synod until late at night as Bishop Silk and his supporters negotiated with an evangelical group in an attempt to achieve agreement on a modified version of the new Thanksgiving proposed in the 'Fair Go' paper. At one stage, Commission members were shown the developing new version and suggested further changes – removal of some masculine language (especially *Almighty Father*, which can be a terrifying phrase for victims of sexual abuse) and simplification of the style. By Thursday morning, agreement had been reached in private. Soon after, the newly revealed Thanksgiving was welcomed, with relief, by the Synod, despite reservations about including a prayer that had never been prayed⁷⁰ and was the result of back-room negotiations.

Dean Jobbins commended it to the Synod on the grounds of 'vibrational ambiguity', saying that phrases that ring one kind of bell in Sydney could be acceptable even if they ring another kind of bell in Ballarat. Hippolytus, as I have mentioned, went out in favour of the new Thanksgiving. Archbishop Goodhew at a later stage helped many evangelicals to accept the book as a whole by proposing that it be given an additional subtitle: *Liturgical Resources Approved by General Synod*.

Comprehensiveness: a unity of approach

This development and the new subtitle illustrate why *A Prayer Book for Australia* is a watershed. The old principle of uniformity has been replaced by another Anglican principle, that of comprehensiveness. Does this mean that, by adopting such a book, the Anglican Church of Australia has forfeited its theological and liturgical unity? Some think so. There is a greater risk now of going to an

Anglican church and finding a service that is altogether unfamiliar, and perhaps unacceptable. There is also the possibility of encountering worship which is alive, inspiring and involving, where the Holy Spirit and the love of Christ are clearly active in the congregation.

A Prayer Book for Australia will not ensure acceptable worship, but it does provide rich resources to make it possible. The orders of service offered in it are diverse, for diverse people in diverse circumstances. Yet all the services have demonstrable links with their BCP progenitors. The unity of Anglicans from now on, as it has long been in practice if not in theory, is a unity not of texts but of approach. Of that approach, fidelity to Christ and to the Scriptures, and awareness of the Church Catholic throughout the world are essential characteristics. As the new book is used for worship, I pray that it will be an instrument of the gospel, and will also promote harmony and respect among Anglicans for one another as members of the body of Christ.

NOTES

1. *A Prayer Book for Australia* is published under the imprint Broughton Books by E. J. Dwyer (Australia) Pty Ltd, October 1995. Its attractive appearance and usable format owe much to the publisher, but at least as much to the skill and dedication of its editor, The Revd Jill Mendham.

2. Thanksgiving for a Child may be used after an adoption as well as a birth. It is in part a replacement for the BCP Churching of Women. When appropriate, it enables both parents to join in thanksgiving with the congregation. In no sense does it replace baptism, though it may precede a baptism.

3. The full service of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion, drafted by The Revd Ron Dowling of Perth, corresponds to an early rite of Christian initiation, such as is still maintained even for infants in the Orthodox Churches. It is the basis of the modern Roman Catholic Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults. Anglicans generally agree that baptism alone is a sufficient and complete Christian initiation, but are less united on the significance of confirmation and whether it should precede admission to communion. In the baptismal service, the declaration of faith was moved by the Synod from its earlier BCP and AAPB position to its more ancient place – immediately before the actual baptism.

4. In addition to the complete service of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion, a service of Confirmation alone was included at the request of the Bishops. The Commission intended this to be included with Episcopal Services near the end of the full edition. It was moved to the earlier position, and so into the shorter edition, by the Synod. This arrangement allows both baptism and confirmation to be administered during Morning or Evening Prayer.

5. The ancient and ecumenical title 'Eucharist' is not found in the BCP from 1549 to 1662 but is supported and explained in the Book of Homilies of 1562 (XXVII

part II). Its authority is the thanksgiving offered by Jésus at the Last Supper (*eucharistias*, 1 Corinthians 11.24).

6. The Daily Offices, drafted by Bishop George Hearn of Rockhampton, are based on those in AAPB but drew inspiration also from *Celebrating Common Prayer – The Daily Office SSF* 1992. This was the main source for A Service of the Light, based on the Eastern Lucernarion, from which the hymn *Phos hilaron* (*Hail, gladdening Light*) comes. Prayer at the End of the Day is often called Compline.

7. Each major section of the book was originally provided with an explanatory introduction. These introductions, except for Concerning the Ordinal, were removed by the General Synod. The one example of allegedly contentious material cited there was a statement that the Holy Communion ‘is the central act of the Church’s worship’. These introductions will now be published as a separate collection. Perhaps they would not have been lost from APBA if its character as Authorised Resources had been recognised earlier in the Synod.

8. The original difference between the two editions was that the shorter was to contain only Sunday services. Fortunately, it was realised by the Synod that a book with the Daily Offices as well would be far more useful. The weekly Collects were wisely added after the Synod by the Prayer Book Production Committee. Unlike *Uniting in Worship*, there was to be no distinction between a book primarily for the people and one primarily for the clergy. An edition with larger pages and print, mainly for officiants, will depend upon the demand and economic considerations.

9. The revised Calendar has replaced Ordinary Sundays with Sundays after the Epiphany and Sundays after Pentecost. The proper readings and prayers are indicated by the date of each Sunday. To help those using lectionary books, the number of a Sunday in Ordinary Time is also indicated. The Easter season is understood to last fifty days and its Sundays are now called Sundays *of* (not *after*) Easter. Thus, the BCP First Sunday after Easter is now called the Second Sunday of Easter.

10. For the main services on Sundays, the Commission adopted the ecumenical Revised Common Lectionary (RCL) with minor amendments. This provides, for much of the year, two sets of Old Testament readings. In one, the OT readings form a series from one Sunday to the next. In the other, they are related to the Gospel of the day, as in the three-year Roman Lectionary (used in AAPB) on which RCL is based. APBA includes readings for a second service (such as Evening Prayer) on a Sunday. For the Eucharist on weekdays, the Roman two-year series used in AAPB continues.

11. A major source of the lectionary-based Collects was *The Book of Common Worship* (1993) of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, but many other sources were also drawn upon. The Roman Catholic International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL) has prepared a full set of lectionary-related Opening Prayers (Collects) as part of the current revision of the Sacramentary. This awaits authorisation and was therefore not yet available for Anglican use.

12. The lesser festivals include the Confession of Peter (18 January), the Conversion of Paul (25 January), Australia Day, Anzac Day, the Visitation (31 May), the Coming of the Light (1 July), the Transfiguration (6 August), the Martyrs of New Guinea (2 September) and Holy Cross (14 September).

13. The first Order for Marriage is based closely on the second form in AAPB and has the same structure as in BCP. The second with a commendable freshness of approach was drafted by The Revd William Lawton of Sydney. The two Orders for Marriage differ in structure and language but not in doctrine. In the draft book, both had equal vows for husband and wife but acknowledged in the officiant's Introduction that the man and woman have differing gifts and callings. At the Synod, the wife's vow in the First Order was altered to include a promise to honour her husband, even though the woman had previously agreed to give her husband 'the honour due to him as [her] husband' and in the Introduction the teaching of Ephesians 5 is affirmed 'that the husband must love his wife as Christ loved the church, and that the wife must give due honour to her husband'. St Paul, of course, enjoins *mutual* submission (Eph. 5.21). This unnecessary change to the wife's vow attracted much unfavourable attention in the secular press.

14. APBA includes provision for anointing the sick with prayer (James 5 .14 - 16) and the laying on of hands, which had not yet been authorised by General Synod in 1978.

15. The funeral services attempt to provide for a much wider range of circumstances than were considered in 1978. An important addition is a service for an infant who has died near the time of birth. The needs of parents at such a time of shock and grief have been recognised in several Churches. Pastoral ministry in such circumstances requires sensitivity and the conviction that God is intimately involved in and through the pain and grief.

16. In keeping with international ecumenical practice, the Commission does not recognise any important difference between 'making, ordaining, and consecrating' to the ordained ministry, but uses 'ordain' for admission to all three Orders. The ordination services were drafted by the Revd Charles Sherlock to take into account modern needs and international Anglican practice.

17. The word *priest* is derived from *presbyter*, the NT term for *elder* (1 Timothy 5.14). It should be distinguished from *hiereus*, the word for the sacrificing priesthood of the Old Testament. In the NT, *hiereus* and related words are reserved for the old priesthood, for Christ (Heb. 4.14, 7.24), and for the redeemed people of God (1 Peter 2.9).

18. The Catechism is a slightly modernised version of that in the BCP. It was prepared, like the first orders for Morning and Evening Prayer and the Holy Communion, by Canon Lawrence Bartlett. The Commission did not find any comparable statement of basic teaching that was short and could be regarded as having equal authority in the Anglican Church.

19. An Outline Order, following the example of ECUSA, was published by the Commission some years ago. It marks the Church's recent willingness to move from

fully prescribed forms of words towards the 17th century approach of the Puritans, who favoured the use of a Directory.

20. Some of the Notes refer to ecumenically agreed texts recommended by the English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC) and published with commentary in *Praying Together*, the Canterbury Press, Norwich 1988. Of special importance are the notes on line 9 of the Lord's Prayer, *Save us from the time of trial* and line 16 of the Nicene Creed *and became truly human*. Both were thought likely to attract attention in Synod, but neither was mentioned there.

21. The subjects of prayer with the most frequent references, apart from absolution, blessing, and confession, are discipleship, grace, light, love for God, love for others, new life, peace, service, unity, and witness.

22. Unlike BCP, APBA does not contain readings and psalms for Morning and Evening Prayer on weekdays. A daily lectionary was prepared by Dr Charles Sherlock, and authorised by the Synod for a three-year trial period. It was thought that printing it in the book was unnecessary and would make revision difficult. In practice, most Anglicans follow a printed almanac, produced annually. In 1996, Australian Anglicans will have a choice of two such lectionaries (based on AAPB and APBA respectively).

23. A previous Liturgical Commission prepared a service for the dedication or consecration of a church building, but did not accept any difference between the two terms. Many recent examples of the sale of churches call into question the concept of setting a building apart for ever.

24. Such services, especially for the period from Maundy Thursday to Easter, are included in the principal Prayer Books of many parts of the Anglican Communion

25. Printing special Orders of Service is permitted for occasions with large congregations, such as Christmas and Easter. Reproduction by overhead projection is also permitted. One may hope that in church the eyes of congregations will not be focused primarily on a screen.

26. Although adopted by the General Synod, the book must also be adopted by the diocesan synod, in which the Bishop has a right of veto, before it may be used locally, in whole or part.

27. Like AAPB in 1978, APBA is intended to last for about twelve years. It was recognised in 1978 that the work of revision was incomplete. The daily lectionary was adopted from England almost at the last minute without reference to the Eucharistic readings or the fact that the Australian Church had a different Calendar. It was also thought prudent, for legal reasons, to make minimal changes to the Ordinal. In fact, AAPB was seventeen years old by the time APBA was approved.

28. In 1977, the Commission rejected by only one vote a motion to include in AAPB the Holy Communion as in BCP 1662. Half the Commission felt that this would clash with the rest of the book and would undermine the concept of AAPB as a supplement to BCP rather than a replacement of it. The decisive vote was lost because one member insisted that the 1662 Holy Communion service must be

printed in AAPB exactly as in BCP and not be edited, as was later done in *In Living Use*.

29. The limited demand for the original BCP services would now hardly justify the cost of including them in the book. The 'first order' services appeal to those who value the BCP structure and approach but desire a slightly more modern style of language.

30. Two changes from BCP in the first edition of *In Living Use*, including the *Agnus Dei* as an anthem during the communion (as in AAPB) and omitting (with John Wesley) the line *duly provoking thy wrath and indignation against us* from the General Confession, were reversed by the General Synod. The 1662 Communion service is seldom, if ever, used exactly as it is printed.

31. As well as the BCP, a main source of the Prayers of the Week was the Australian *Alternative Collects* (1985).

32. The Sunday Collects for Years A, B and C, like the Revised Common Lectionary, are intended for use at the main Sunday services, whether these are the Eucharist or Morning or Evening Prayer.

33. The old pronoun *thou*, like French *tu*, signified intimacy rather than reverence and remoteness. Few clergy and lay people under fifty can now use *thou* and *thee* fluently (or grammatically).

34. Professor Frost began the revision of the Psalter with regret, but saw that *The Liturgical Psalter* would pass from use unless changes were made.

35. There is a loss in moving to the plural. It can be justified because Hebrew '*ish* (*man*) can have an indefinite use. Professor Frost rejected suggestions for other kinds of changes; for instance, to reduce the alliteration in *shatters the ships of Tarshish* (Ps.48.7). The Liturgical Commission respects the artist's rights over the work, and is glad that this Psalter with its traditional and Hebraic flavour will continue in use.

36. The Roman Catholic Church has been a leader in liturgical revision, for better and worse, since Vatican II, but it has recently had difficulties with inclusive language. Some of the Vatican's advisers appear to regard it as an American feminist aberration. An inclusive-language translation of the comprehensive Roman Catechism into English was set aside in 1993 in favour of one in older forms of language. The ICEL revision of *The Sacramentary*, currently being considered by national Episcopal Conferences, is generally inclusive and uses many ELLC texts, but this line of the Creed remains *and was made man*.

37. APBA uses almost all the ELLC texts, except for *Gloria Patri*, for which it keeps the Australian version introduced in AAPB:

Glory to God; Father, Son and Holy Spirit:
as in the beginning, so now, and for ever. Amen.

The General Synod rejected a proposal to offer an inclusive-language version, with a beginning taken from *Celebrating Common Prayer*:

Glory to God, Source of all being,
Eternal Word and Holy Spirit:

In the Apostles' Creed, *from the dead* has been substituted for *again* in the ELLC text: *On the third day he rose again*, in keeping with the original text.

38. *Truly human* has been attacked from two sides - that it obscures our Lord's divinity and that it obscures his human maleness. The original Greek does not include *truly*, which can be justified as making the meaning clear and as ruling out 'docetism' (that the incarnation was a mere appearance of God in human form).

39. Aristotelian philosophy has no place in the New Testament, but it is important in many of the Church Fathers and underlies several key terms of the Creed, especially *homoousios* 'of one Being'.

40. The Aramaic word '*Abba*' can hardly be rendered as other than *Father*. The Commission felt no temptation to substitute terms like *Parent* or *Mother/Father God*. It is hard to see how *Lord*, which has long represented the divine Name, can be replaced. *Kingdom*, however, would often be better replaced by *sovereign rule*.

41. The difference between a translation and a paraphrase is not as clear as many suppose. Literal translations are not necessarily more accurate. The colloquial French conversation *Ça va? — Ça va!* would be poorly rendered as *That goes? — That goes!* rather than in some way such as *How are things going? — Pretty well*. An aim of good translation is to produce, so far as possible, the same message and effect as the original. In Hebrew, God can be praised in both the second and the third person with little or no apparent difference in effect. There are many examples of alternation between the two in the Psalms; for instance, Ps. 104.6-15. Even Ps. 23 contains such a switch from *he* to *you* at verse 3. For purposes of worship in modern English, many psalms can be translated inclusively by replacing *he/him* by *you*.

Taking account of the cultural and emotional impact of words is important in translation, as is the purpose for which a translation is intended. In Ps. 51.7, an Aboriginal congregation is unlikely to receive the intended effect from *wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow*. It would be less misleading in a liturgical setting to say *brighter than snow* or to sacrifice the original comparison and say *wash me, and I shall be pure indeed*. This is not a question of sacrificing accuracy to avoid giving offence: it is a matter of conveying the message as faithfully as possible.

42. Having different versions of the same text may interfere with the familiarity necessary for worship. The Commission's reasons for having different texts included difficulties of copyright if the Occasional Services were to be reproduced for use on single occasions.

43. Prayers from Janet Morley *All Desires Known*, SPCK, 1992 have been used with generous permission of the author. Understandably, she was unwilling to accept the numerous 'improvements' that were proposed.

44. A prayer based on John 16.12-24 is offered as an alternative for Easter 6 in Year B:

O God, for whom we long as a woman in labour longs for her delivery: give us courage to wait, strength to push, and discernment to know the right time, that we may bring into the world your joyful peace; through Jesus Christ. Amen.

This prayer was mentioned in a Synod speech ('Thank goodness we will not have that labour ward prayer any more'), but was then left alone. Despite its long-standing link with the late Easter season, the passage from John 16 is unfortunately not included in RCL. It has been added as an option in APBA.

45. The response *It is right to give our thanks and praise* has been criticised. The context makes it clear that our thanks and praise are due to God. The traditional response said only *It is meet and right*, to which Cranmer added *so to do*.

46. I confess to being one of the people so described.

47. The Third Order for the Holy Communion is based on a service devised in the Diocese of Sydney. From a catholic perspective it lacks adequate reference to the sacramental bread and cup as a divinely appointed sacramental means of feeding on Christ. It could perhaps be claimed that this is clear from the liturgical context. Needless to say, the Third Order contains neither offering nor epiclesis. The Commission included this Order for its simplicity and doctrinal congruity with the BCP, but not to gratify one party.

48. The Christian tradition has always been syncretistic; for instance, in its 'baptising' of pagan festivals and of Greek philosophy, not to mention Roman Law.

49. In the circumstances it seemed insensitive, and probably unnecessary, to ask that *as the rock* be changed to *like the rock*.

50. The ICEL Psalter is written in a strikingly poetic and terse style that sometimes enables the subject pronoun *he* to be omitted, sometimes replaces it by *you*, and sometimes refashions the construction. Psalm 1, for instance, begins *If you would be happy: never walk with the wicked*. The beautiful ICEL Eucharistic Prayer A, with its sensitive use of feminine imagery and reference to the mystical tradition, is being increasingly adapted and used by other churches, but has not yet been authorised for Roman Catholic use. Because it is currently being revised by ICEL, the Commission thought it improper to use it, despite strong requests.

51. The Prayer of Humble Access was originally written in 1547 to be said immediately before Communion. In 1552 it was moved to follow the Sanctus, probably under the influence of Isaiah 6. This impedes the movement of thanksgiving. In recent years, this prayer has been moved to a still earlier place. In APBA it is attached to the Confession and Absolution, but does not fit comfortably there. It is, however, appropriate at that point if the Confession and Absolution have been used in the opening section. Suggestions that the prayer be removed altogether have been strongly resisted. It is an error to see it as 'grovelling'. It is an acceptance of God's graciousness and mercy.

52. The prose rhythms of the BCP, based on those of Latin, are more conducive to reverence and meditation than the hymn-like iambics favoured by many modern writers.

53. The gospel is memorably summarised in the Bible in twelve monosyllables: *The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost*: (Luke 19.10).

54. Important influences on AAPB in 1978 were the Liturgy of the Church of South India, A Liturgy for Africa, and the innovative home-grown A Modern

Liturgy (1964); and the English Series 2. The vernacular translation of the Roman Missal by ICEL in 1973 had a profound influence, especially in consolidating *you* as appropriate for address to God and in its departure from a sixteenth-century style.

55. In BCP 1552 the *anamnesis* or 'remembrance' commanded at the Last Supper was understood essentially as eating and drinking the sacramental elements with faith in Christ's saving death. The communion was therefore inserted *within* the Canon immediately after the words of institution. The addition of a congregational *Amen* at this point in 1662 was an error.

56. Thomas Talley, *Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future* in Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 27 (1994).

57. The reference in the anamnesis section of additional Thanksgiving 3 to *the outpouring of his Spirit and his presence with his people* is unusual, and a departure from the classical structure.

58. The sense of the ancient verbs for *we offer* (Latin *offerimus*, Greek *prospheromen*) may be expressed by *we draw near to you with this bread and cup* or *we bring before you this bread and cup*.

59. In Hippolytus, where we find the earliest and simplest expression of the sequence: remembrance, offering and supplication, we find:

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you. And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering her into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things to partake for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify you...

60. The Directory of Westminster, followed by the Scottish Presbyterians from 1645, directs the Minister *to pray to God... to vouchsafe... the effectual working of his Spirit in us; and so to sanctify these elements, both bread and wine, that we may receive, by faith, the body and blood of Jesus Christ...* Its descendant, the 1940 Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian) after a reference to *pleading His eternal sacrifice* includes this epiclesis: *...Send down Thy Holy Spirit to sanctify both us and these Thine own gifts of bread and wine which we set before Thee, that the bread which we break may be the Communion of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing which we bless the Communion of the blood of Christ; that we, receiving them, may by faith be made partakers of His body and blood, with all His benefits, to our spiritual nourishment and growth in grace....*

In the future a form such as this, in more modern language, may yet be acceptable in the Anglican Church in Australia.

61. The invocation in the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America 1790 reads:

...vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his Death and Passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. In 1793 'Word' was capitalised to refer to the divine Word (*Logos*).

62. Bishop Silk's suggestion, modified by the Commission to be closer to 1549, was *by the power of your word and Holy Spirit*, as in the new third Thanksgiving.
63. In *An Anglican Epiclesis*, the 1995 Barry Marshall Lecture given in Trinity College Melbourne (as yet unpublished), Bishop Silk traced Cranmer's conjunction in 1549 of the word and the Spirit in effecting the sanctification of the elements back to the fourth lesson for Mattins on the Sunday in the Octave of Corpus Christi in the Sarum Breviary, which in turn drew upon Gratian and Paschasius Radbertus. There is a parallel in the Gallican Missal. The Anaphora of Sarapion (Egypt 4th century) includes an epiclesis of the Word. Bishop Silk compares the Lima Text *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* 1982 (C 15), which no doubt owes much to the American *Book of Common Prayer* (hence to the Scottish Liturgy of 1764): *It is in virtue of the living word of Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become the sacramental signs of Christ's body and blood.*
64. This is shown by the rubric in 1662 providing for additional consecration by saying the words of institution if the bread and wine prove insufficient. APBA contains no such provision.
65. It may not be an advance from the point of view of those who see the Communion Service in BCP 1552 as an ideal structure.
66. Despite the realism of the Lord's own words, evangelicals strongly insist that liturgy should keep the outward sacramental sign distinct from the spiritual reality signified. This is the purport of the Declaration on Kneeling at the end of the Communion service BCP 1662, and Articles 28 and 29.
67. The *Benedictus* is not part of the *Sanctus* but an acclamation (originally introduced, and followed, by *Hosanna in the highest*) marking the transition from the praise of God the Creator to praise for salvation through the Son. It also has eschatological overtones, as in Psalm 118.26. It has nothing to do with the speculative philosophical theory known as 'transubstantiation'. Rather, it is analogous to *Come, Lord Jesus* in the Great Thanksgiving in the Third Order, which has an evangelical provenance.
68. With a majority between 50% and 74% in any of the three Houses, the Canon authorising APBA would have been regarded as a Special Bill. This would have meant that it had then to be endorsed by a majority of the diocesan synods, and by all the metropolitan synods, and then brought back to a future General Synod, where the whole process could start again. In other words, this would have meant the effective end of the book.
69. Much to the relief of the Liturgical Commission, the authorising Canon was passed by 22 out of 23 in the House of Bishops, by 87 out of 99 in the House of Clergy, and by 84 out of 99 in the House of Laity – an overwhelming endorsement by 193 out of 221, or 87.3%.
70. After the Synod, the prayer was used on two occasions in the Chapel at Trinity College, Melbourne, and, no doubt, in Ballarat and other places, before the publication of APBA.

LITURGICAL RESOURCES AUTHORISED

A Prayer Book for Australia (1995)

Tom Elich

Now, three months after its approval by the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, on the eve of its publication in definitive form, I am charged with reviewing the new Anglican *A Prayer Book for Australia* (APBA). I hope it may be possible to step aside somewhat from the few controversial questions which grabbed the headlines in July. In an attempt to avoid 'Anglican politics', I have chosen to approach APBA from an undisguised Roman Catholic perspective.

The book is a formidable achievement. I speak as one who is involved both in ICEL's work of revising the Roman Catholic *Sacramentary* and in Australia's task of preparing local texts and adaptations for our own edition. It is very hard and painstaking work. And the trouble is that no matter how well it is done, it is always easy to criticise. Everyone will have preferences about what should or should not have been included or about possible ways to rewrite certain texts.

Revision could of course go on forever, but there has to come a point when the work is regarded as complete and is approved for use. The Anglican Church has taken such a step with the 1995 General Synod. It is the decisive step in a hearteningly long process. A number of key rites were published in booklet form for trial use. This is an excellent idea because, whatever the expertise and consultation involved in drawing up the book, liturgy is an *event* and it is only in the actual celebration that the experience of liturgy is a reality.

A comparison, for example, between the 1990 *Holy Baptism with Laying On of Hands* and the sections of APBA on Holy Baptism and Confirmation shows how useful the 'time of trial' has been. Almost every prayer has been revised between 1990 and 1995 – sometimes the texts are tightened and simplified, sometimes enriched. As an example, these processes of revision are illustrated by this short text which is part of the welcome after baptism:

1990

Live as a disciple of Christ.

**Confess the faith of Christ crucified,
proclaim his resurrection,
and look for his coming again.**

1995

Live as a disciple of Christ:
fight the good fight,
finish the race,
keep the faith.

**Confess Christ crucified,
proclaim his resurrection,
look for his coming in glory.**

The 1995 text is richer scripturally, but offers a tighter, more memorable response for the people.

In reviewing the draft at this stage, one also needs to be aware of the changes introduced on the floor of the house by the General Synod. In the case of baptism and confirmation, the profession of faith was moved closer to the baptismal rite itself, the phrase “sanctify this water” was added to the blessing prayer over the water, and the rite of confirmation was moved from Episcopal Services to a position after the rite of baptism in the section Sunday Services.

This means that the section Sunday Services is comprised of:

- Services of the Word (*morning and evening prayer and a liturgy of the word with confession of sin and intercessions*)
- Thanksgiving for a child
- Holy Baptism (*rite in holy communion and rite in morning and evening prayer*)
- Confirmation
- Holy Communion/Eucharist/Lord’s Supper
- Prayers for Various Occasions

In general, the initiation section looks good to Catholic eyes because the layout establishes clearly the normative sequence baptism-confirmation-eucharist.

The APBA retains, of course, the traditional Anglican understanding of confirmation: it is the opportunity offered to those baptised in infancy to make a personal and public confession of faith. This baptismal faith is strengthened by the Holy Spirit through prayer and the laying on of the bishop’s hand. Such an understanding of confirmation is very familiar to Roman Catholics because it is the explanation adopted by us through much of the twentieth century to account for an isolated confirmation in early adolescence, celebrated well after admission to communion. The Second Vatican Council, however, called us back to a more authentic Roman tradition in demanding that the rite of confirmation be revised “in order that the intimate connection of this sacrament with the whole of Christian initiation may stand out more clearly”. So, especially in recent years, there has been a significant movement in the Australian Catholic Church towards celebrating confirmation at an early age before admission to holy communion, which is then seen as the climax of Christian initiation.

I did not find in APBA any note about admission to holy communion, and I am not sure whether it frequently takes place before confirmation. In fact there is a certain integration of the rites of initiation because the APBA rite of baptism itself

includes the options of confirming older candidates, or celebrating a reaffirmation or reception into communicant membership. The APBA's placement of the catechism with the thirty-nine articles in an appendix also seems to me to be a help to the ritual. It allows confirmation to be a rite of Christian initiation rather than a graduation rite from catechism class.

Another helpful aspect of the structure of the APBA is that it locates the celebration of Christian initiation unequivocally on Sunday. While this is no doubt the most frequent practice anyway, the arrangement of the book in this way establishes links between initiation and the Christian assembly on the one hand, and between initiation and the death and resurrection of the Lord on the other.

Quite a bit of work is done in the APBA through the notes which follow each rite. These look as though they will be expanded further now that the General Synod has removed the pastoral introductions from the book. Many of the elements allowed or explained in the notes are quite important – I hope they do not get lost. For example, notes encouraging the ample use of water and even immersion, the possibility of using oil in the post-baptismal signing of the cross, the suggestion that a lighted candle may be presented to the candidates – these are important not because they are the trappings of a 'Catholic' liturgy but because they expand the liturgical vocabulary in the direction of the non-verbal, gestural and symbolic.

Naturally a Catholic reviewer might also express some regrets about the rites of initiation. In the so-called post-Christian society of Australia, the Roman Catholic Church has found enormous vitality in the use of the catechumenate. Some of the insights gained from this process are being taken over into other liturgical books. The notion, for example, that conversion is a process and can be ritualised in stages is one valuable learning. The revision of children's initiation rites being begun by ICEL for the English-speaking world hopes to introduce some pre-baptismal rites directed at the parents and godparents, and a sequence of rites to take the infant up to confirmation, first communion and beyond.

This possibility is recognised in APBA in only a very limited way. There is an excellent rite of thanksgiving for a child after birth, with a series of additional prayers for special circumstances. This rite contains some beautiful and pastorally helpful texts for the assembly, the minister and the parents. It is a considerable enrichment of the 1978 version. There are, however, no further rites to carry the child through to confirmation. More significantly, there is no attempt to tackle anything like a catechumenate for adults. In fact, infants and those able to answer for themselves are baptised according to the same rite (with the option for the latter of continuing on to confirmation in the same ceremony). I would have preferred to see a separation maintained for 'Those of Riper Years' and, instead of reducing

the difference, elaborating it in the direction of a catechumenate. No doubt this suggestion also challenges the whole notion of a single, comprehensive prayer book. If that is sacrilege, remember that it comes from one accustomed to having a small library of ritual books available for liturgical celebrations rather than 'a' prayer book.

Let me make three other remarks about the first section containing Sunday Services: there is not enough space here to review the texts of the eucharistic prayers and their theology (or the politics of replacing the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus!). First of all, the Holy Communion. As might be expected, the orders of service for Holy Communion have been conservatively revised, for the texts are well known, even known by heart. It indicates clearly that APBA was intended as a replacement for *An Australian Prayer Book*. Despite the fact that it is officially now a liturgical resource for use together with the 1978 book, it seems that in the course of time the 1978 book will become obsolete. One other feature of these orders of service is their adoption of the ELLC common texts for the Profession of Faith, the Lord's Prayer, etc. This is a most significant ecumenical contribution. The Catholic Church intends to follow this lead in its revision of the *Sacramentary*.

Secondly, the Roman Catholic Church owes a debt of gratitude to the Anglican Church for maintaining morning and evening prayer as normative forms of Sunday Worship. While it is gratifying from a Catholic point of view that many Churches now celebrate the eucharist each Sunday, Roman Catholics need to be reminded that, when the eucharist cannot be celebrated, there may be better alternatives than a communion service drawing on the reserved sacrament.

Thirdly, I would like to commend the collection of prayers for various occasions. This is a section which will be expanded also in the revised Roman Catholic *Sacramentary* to take account of the more urban setting of our Church communities and the realities of contemporary society. APBA contains good texts – even if they are sometimes rather long and loose – for institutions such as the parliament, the judiciary, defence and police forces; for social needs such as unemployment, family breakdown or abuse; and for Church events and organisations. Most impressive is a new collection of specifically Australian prayers: a preface, prayer after communion and blessing for Australia, occasional prayers for Australia Day and Anzac Day, and a thanksgiving for Australia. Just a glimpse at the forms of address gives an idea of their richness:

Lord of every time and place;
God beyond our dreaming;
God of this ancient land;
Creator Spirit, God of holy dreaming.

Later in the book, at the end of a section of readings and collects for Sundays and Holy Days, there are further texts for Australia Day, Anzac Day and other regional commemorations. One wonders whether these texts would not be usefully grouped together in some way, or at least cross-referenced in their respective sections.

Both sets of texts are good. The Anzac Day texts steer a middle course between honouring the fallen and praying for peace; the Australia Day texts balance our present wealth and opportunity with our past struggle in adversity; the thanksgiving draws together the poetic (“you spoke and the gum tree grew”) and the prophetic (“one with your wounded ones: the convicts, the hunted, and the dispossessed”).

Another opportunity for Australian content is provided by the calendar. My only wish is to see short biographical notes on the Australian entries about whom I know very little, people such as Georgina Molloy (pioneer church leader and botanist), Eliza Darling (pioneer social reformer) or James Noble (first indigenous Australian ordained). The calendar also strengthens the ecumenical import of APBA. It contains Roman Catholic names (John XXIII, Paul Couturier, Oscar Romero, etc) and protestant names (Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Martin Luther King, etc.).

Again, APBA makes an ecumenical contribution when we come to the Sunday Readings and Collects. The cursus of readings follows the Revised Common Lectionary. This is an update of the cycle of readings used in *Uniting in Worship* and is based on the Roman *Lectionary*. Interestingly, APBA provides three Sunday collects designed to fit the readings of the three-year cycle. ICEL is undertaking a similar project for the Roman *Sacramentary*. I found it fascinating to compare the Catholic and Anglican sets. Occasionally APBA adopts or adapts the ICEL texts, borrowed via *The Book of Common Worship* (1993): ironically, the Anglican Church can use these prayers before the Catholic Church can! The difficulty in this project is to write a prayer which evokes the sentiments of the reading but which does not require the prior reading of the Scripture passage to be intelligible or does not simply ‘retell’ the gospel prior to its proclamation. In general, the APBA collects succeed well in fulfilling this brief though, as with the prayers for various occasions, I would like to see some of the texts crafted more tightly.

APBA is completed by two other major sections: firstly, Pastoral Services containing rites for marriage, the ministry with the sick and with the dying, funeral services and the reconciliation of a penitent; and secondly, Episcopal Services which will contain the ordinal.

The marriage rites have been revised and some beautiful texts have been added, notably, a text spoken by the couple after the marriage, and several prayers of the

people (giving thanks for the gift of sexual love, asking for the healing of memories, interceding for the couple and their families). Flexible rites for the ministry with the sick include an anointing and laying on of hands. The collection of resources for use with the dying includes not only prayers, commendations and blessings, but also an anointing with its own special texts. The funeral rites are more clearly structured and follow the standard pattern: gathering in God's name, the ministry of the word, the prayers, followed by the farewell, blessing and dismissal. The service may be preceded by a reception of the body and the placing of Christian symbols (candle, water, Scriptures, cross). APBA also adds full rites for the funerals of a child and an infant. The rite for the reconciliation of a penitent appears to be new. In each of these pastoral rites, there is a great enrichment in the provision of non-verbal symbolic rites and in the composition of new texts to address particular pastoral circumstances.

To revise an enormous corpus of liturgical texts and rites, to unify language and structure, to compose new texts and rites, and then to pull it all together into a single volume is indeed, as I said at the beginning, a formidable achievement. The book is inclusive in many senses: not only in avoiding masculine forms of language, but in incorporating aboriginal perspectives into the book, and in achieving acceptance from catholic and evangelical sections of the Anglican Church. One of its directing principles was fundamentally inclusive – everything must be able to be prayed by all. Prescinding from Church politics and media sensationalism, the publication of APBA is a milestone in the Christian history of Australia and deserves the admiration, the thanks and the congratulations of all the Christian Churches.

A PRAYER BOOK FOR AUSTRALIA

Critically Examined

Dirk Van Dissel

To comment on a book of 898 pages in a short article, is fraught with danger. Inevitably, one's comments must be brief, and there is little opportunity to go into detail or cite authorities. It is, however, essential that *A Prayer Book for Australia* be critically examined from the point of view of language, liturgical adequacy and theology.

In Anglicanism, the liturgy of the Church has a unique role. It is more than a collection of prayers and orders of service. Unlike, for example, Lutheranism, Anglicanism is not a "Confessional" church, with one or more confessional statements defining its theological position. The Book of Common Prayer has fulfilled that role in our Church. If you want to know what our Church believes about baptismal regeneration, or the presence of Christ in the eucharist, or the sacred ministry, you go to the Prayer Book. The Prayer Book defines our distinctive understanding of the Christian Faith. Theologians call this the *lex orandi, lex credendi* principle. It is, therefore, essential that any revised Prayer Book does full justice to the main theological positions historically held by Anglicans. It is my belief that *A Prayer Book for Australia* fails to do this.

At the outset, it must be acknowledged that there are some good things in *A Prayer Book for Australia*. The Service for Light (p.432) and Prayer at the End of the Day (p.439) will help make the Prayer book a resource for family prayer, and forge a link between public prayer and daily life. Both the 1662 BCP and the 1978 AAPB were weak in this respect. As long ago as 1917, Eric Milner-White, a Chaplain during World War I, and subsequently to become a distinguished liturgist and composer of famous prayers, such as the familiar bidding prayer for the service of Nine Lessons and Carols, wrote, "The comment of a Nonconformist has justice in it: 'Your Prayer Book smacks of the court, not of the home'".¹

It is good to see an attempt made here to address this. Similarly the "Service of Praise, Prayer and Proclamation" (p.36) will meet the need for informal and family services, where a more formal liturgical service is inappropriate; this is especially helpful in this Decade of Evangelism.

Without denying this and other obvious gains, it must be stated that on the whole, the book, in spite of the 400 odd amendments made to it in General Synod, leaves so much to be desired from a literary, liturgical and theological point of view, that its adoption by General Synod, was, I believe, premature and disastrous to Australian Anglicanism.

One is grateful that the General Synod added the sub-title "for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and *An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*",

although one would have preferred a stronger reference to The Book of Common Prayer. The Book of Common Prayer is the norm of doctrine and worship of the Anglican Church of Australia (see the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia, Sections 4-6). On the motion of the Archbishop of Sydney, the book was authorised by the Synod as a book of “Liturgical Resources”. Presumably, that means it can be drawn on by those who wish to do so, in the same way as a hymn book or a song book. As I understand it, the book is, therefore, less authoritative than *An Australian Prayer Book*. In view of some of its contents, we may be grateful for this.

Language

A Book of Common Prayer must have the ability to nurture and nourish people. It must have memorable phrases that etch themselves into the collective memory of the worshippers, so that they will come to mind to sustain them in times of trouble and distress, to console them, to strengthen them and to inspire them. There are few memorable phrases in this book, and little to inspire and excite us. One misses such magnificent and resonant expressions as “O God, the King of glory who hast exalted thine only Son Jesus Christ with great triumph unto thy kingdom in heaven....” (BCP, 1 Ascension); “O God, the protector of all that trust in thee, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy....” (BCP, 4 Trinity); “forgiving us those good things whereof our conscience is afraid, and giving us those good things which we are not worthy to ask....” (BCP, 12 Trinity); “From all blindness of heart, from pride, vain-glory and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness”, (BCP, Litany). “And here we give thee most high praise and hearty thanks for all thy Saints, who have been the chosen vessels of thy grace and lights of the world in their several generations....” (1928 BCP, Prayer for the Church). “Who after that he has ascended up far above all the heavens, and was set down at the right hand of thy Majesty: Did as at this time pour forth upon the Universal Church thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit: That through his glorious power the joy of the everlasting gospel might go forth into all the world: Whereby we have been brought out of darkness and error into the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ...” (1928 BCP, Preface of Whitsunday).

Even AAPB, the language of which is, on the whole, undistinguished, has some memorable prayers and phrases: i.e. the Post Communion Prayer by Prof. David Frost, “Father of all, we give you thanks and praise...” (AAPB p.173), the preface of Ascensiontide, “He has passed beyond our sight, not to abandon us but to be our hope” (AAPB p.168), the preface of Trinity Sunday, “You have revealed to us your glory and love in the glory and love of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; three persons, One God, ever to be worshipped and adored” (AAPB p.169), and the

Seasonal Blessings for Advent, Christmas, Lent, Ascension and Whitsun (AAPB pp.151,152).

In this new Prayer Book, there is very little to which the mind can go back on which it can reflect, and little to nourish our devotion. After an exhaustive examination, I would find only one example of evocative and memorable prose, the Easter Preface 1, p.147. In the “Thanksgiving” in the Eucharist, the syntax is all over the place. The continual change of pronoun in AAPB Eucharistic Prayer 1, p.146, i.e. “*he*” is your eternal Word.....,*you* gave him.....,*your* Son offered....., *he* is....., *you* have sent...” is repeated here in Thanksgiving 3 & 4, pp.129,131. This produces a restlessness and a resultant boredom as one theological statement is heaped upon another.

In Thanksgiving 2 (p.127), the splendid phrase “the new day dawned....” is tacked onto a sentence beginning “you raised...”, something that would not pass in a school boy’s essay.

Liturgical Scholarship

The Anglican Church of Australia has the right to expect a modest level of liturgical expertise from its Liturgical Commission. The structure of the Eucharist was uncovered and laid bare for us by Dom Gregory Dix, in his monumental and epoch making study, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945). Liturgical scholars have also revealed the shape of the Baptismal and Ordination rites. C.E.C. Whittaker in *The Proposed Services of Baptism and Confirmation Reconsidered* (SPCK, 1960), and E.C. Ratcliff in *The York Revised Service for the Public Baptism of Infants, an appraisalment* (SPCK 1960), and Paul F Bradshaw in *The Anglican Ordinal* (SPCK, 1971) made significant contributions in this area. In Baptism, the traditional order is Renunciation of Evil, Profession of Faith immediately followed by baptism into the faith that has just been professed. This is a dramatic and impressive sequence. In Ordination, the order is Examination of Candidates, Prayers of the People (including prayer for the candidates), Ordination Prayer, immediately followed by the laying on of hands. This also is a dramatic and impressive sequence.

A service with a logical structure will flow well. Even uninstructed people will appreciate this, although they may not be able to put their fingers on it. When a service “goes somewhere” and has a dramatic climax, the worshipper will be edified and will feel inspired by it. If the service stops and starts, the worshipper will be irritated and feel confused.

It is, therefore, cause for thanksgiving that although the book in its draft form adopted an idiosyncratic sequence in both the Baptismal and Ordination rites, the General Synod has altered this to the ancient and more logical order. One still wonders why the Liturgical Commission did not get it right in the first place.

Theology

The theology of *A Prayer Book for Australia* must give Anglicans great concern. Every effort seems to have been made to accommodate the extreme Protestant wing of the Church, the vocal feminist lobby group, and those addicted to the Social Gospel, but in the process, classical Anglicanism has been abandoned. Significant examples of the watering down of Catholic teaching concerning the sacraments taught by the Book of Common Prayer and the Anglican formularies, include the following:

Baptism

Baptismal regeneration, or the fact that Baptism is the new birth of water and the Holy Spirit (John 3:5), which was greatly watered down in the Baptismal rites in AAPB, has now disappeared completely. This on its own makes the services fatally flawed.

Confirmation

In Confirmation, the words from 1662 “...upon whom (after “the example of thy holy Apostles”) we have now laid our hands.....” which emphasise that Confirmation is an apostolic rite, and which were retained in AAPB, have now been deleted. At their recent meeting at Gilbulla, the bishops deplored that confirmation had largely fallen into disuse. This rite will hasten the demise of Confirmation in the life of our church by undermining its scriptural foundation.

Holy Communion

In contrast to BCP 1662 and AAPB p.147, there is no direction for the priest to take the bread and wine into his hands while he recites the Words of Institution. This destroys the connection between the elements and the prayer concerning them. (14,p.158 is quite inadequate).

Thanksgiving 5 & 6 (pp. 168-171) fall far below the teaching of 1662 BCP. These prayers seem to teach that the Eucharist is nothing more than eating bread and drinking wine in memory of Jesus. This is not the teaching of the Anglican Church. General Synod retained both these texts. The time has surely come for the Anglican Church of Australia to have at least one Eucharistic Prayer in harmony with those of the Primitive Church.

The minimum that such a prayer must contain, in addition to the Words of Institution, of course, is an *Epiclesis* and an *Anamnesis*. Every known Eucharistic Prayer in East and West includes these two elements, as do also the Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England, Church in Wales, Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Churches in South Africa, the West Indies and the USA. Such a Eucharistic

Prayer would be in harmony with the “teachings of the ancient fathers”, to which all Anglican reformers since Archbishop Cranmer have consistently appealed. It is high time that at least one such prayer be provided for the optional use of Australian Anglicans. Unfortunately, the much praised Eucharistic Prayer put together by the Bishop of Ballarat² which probably persuaded Catholic Anglicans to support the book, is defective at a number of points as a Catholic Eucharistic Prayer. The Prayer contains numerous points of conflict between Catholic and Evangelical Eucharistic Theology.

(i) The Offering Formula (p.3, para. 2b)

Fundamental to Catholic Eucharistic theology is the idea of oblation. The terms προσφερομεν and *offerimus* are of decisive importance. What is offered is the bread and cup, the body and blood of Christ, that worship, θυσια and *oblatio* to which the terms λογικος and *rationabilis* are applied.

In the proposed prayer, however, the sacrifice is nowhere defined in its terminology. The proposed offering formula is separated from the Christ event in the anamnesis. Its meaning has to be imposed into it by the person praying the prayer from his own resources, whatever these may be. He has to make it mean what he thinks it ought to mean.

(ii) The Epiclesis Paragraph (p.2, para. 1)

The Church’s offering is always accompanied by an appeal to God to approve and bless it, or to receive it on the heavenly altar. Here, however, the prayer falls short of asking that the bread and wine may become the body and blood of Christ. What we have instead is the virtualism that evades the objectivity of Catholic language.

(iii) The Tradition of the Institution (p.2, para. 2)

This tradition is perhaps the most constant and stable feature in the Eucharistic prayer, and is left to speak for itself as being objectively efficacious. The introduction to the tradition here is in its precise wording without parallel, and its purpose seems to be to draw a radical distinction between the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

These three paragraphs are of paramount importance. But there are a number of other details which detract from a Catholic understanding of the prayer.

(iv) The Post-Sanctus Paragraph (p.1, para. 5)

What is the origin of the clause “die as one of us”? Christ is not just another man, or just a man, but man. Perhaps it could be said that he is “one *with* us”.

(v) The Paragraph after ‘we offer’ (p.3, para. 3)

What is the force of the phrase “by your Holy Spirit”? Does it imply that

communion by means of “these holy gifts” is insufficient to give unity and make us “one body in Christ”?

There are too many shortcomings from the standpoint of Catholic doctrine and language, and too many ambiguities and tensions intended to accommodate Evangelicals, for this to be a satisfactory Eucharistic prayer. The meaning of what is said is constantly open to question.

The Anglican Church of Australia, has embarked upon liturgical revision, while harbouring very divergent theologies of the Eucharist. The aim has been to produce texts which can be read in more ways than one; but this has invariably meant that Catholic doctrine has been fatally weakened.

Catechism

In the Catechism (p.841), the two dominical sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, in contrast to 1662 BCP and AAPB, and every known Anglican Catechism, are no longer described as ‘generally necessary to salvation’. Is this yet another subtle attempt to push our church in a non-sacramental direction? There was no need in a book of services for the inclusion of a Catechism. AAPB or BCP could have been reproduced. I suppose it was too much to hope that the splendid Catechism in *An Anglican Prayer Book 1989* (the new South African Prayer Book) might be included. That would have really benefited our church as it enters the 21st century.

Ordination

One is grateful that the Preface to the Ordinal has been restored. This is an obvious improvement over AAPB. The Preface and Ordinal belong together, the one illuminating and explaining the other. They substantiate the Anglican claim to possess the historic three-fold Apostolic Ministry. The basic Anglican formularies as defined in Sections 4-6, The Ruling Principles, are the Book of Common Prayer, the 39 Articles and the Ordinal, which includes the Preface.

One is grateful that the questions in the Ordination rites have been improved by the General Synod, and also that the formulae at the Laying on of Hands from BCP and AAPB have been restored. However, the question concerning the bishop’s duty to drive away false doctrine from BCP and AAPB is still missing. Traditionally, this has been held to be one of the bishop’s most important duties, and its omission is a serious impoverishment. One would have liked to have seen the following lessons added to the Ordination rites: Numbers 3:5-10a (deacons) and Leviticus 8:4-12 (priests), these together with Numbers 11:16-17, 24-25 (priests) which is already included, provide the Old Testament types for the three-fold Ministry.

Smaller Matters

Intercessions in the Eucharist (pp. 164-165, 178-179)

The new order of subjects is idiosyncratic. The order of Church, World, Local Community, Suffering, Departed adopted in AAPB is logical and widely used ecumenically, and should not have been changed. The introduction of thanksgiving into the Intercession, is a mistake. The proper place for thanksgiving in the Eucharist is the Eucharistic Prayer. To introduce it here is devotionally confusing.

Marriage

It is regrettable that the Prefaces to both the first and second Order of Marriage (pp. 652, 661, 662) are so bland and lacking in weight and dignity. They also fail to set out coherently the three causes for which matrimony was ordained, and are in every way inferior to that of 1928 BCP.

Anointing the Sick

Although it is good to see this given liturgical recognition, the fact that there is no form of blessing of the oil is a grave blemish. As a result, the order is incomplete and inadequate.

Inclusive Language

While the subtle undermining of the Catholic substance of Anglican worship gives great concern, the not so subtle destruction of its biblical content fills one with dismay.

To appease the vocal feminist lobby, the use of masculine terms and pronouns for God has been greatly reduced. Versions of the canticles and common texts of the Eucharist prepared by the English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC) have been adopted in all orders of service. It has been claimed that the ELLC texts will be used by the Roman Catholics. There is no evidence for this; on the contrary, they have already been rejected in the USA. These translations are highly contentious as they have been deliberately devised to avoid as much as possible using the masculine pronoun in reference to God. We have elegant variation in the Magnificat and Benedictus (pp. 11, 12), clumsy repetition of the noun in the Gloria in excelsis – Glory to *God* in the highest, and peace to *God's* people on earth (p. 117) and ugly phrases such as “became fully human” in the Nicene Creed (p. 119).

However, the exercise has not been done consistently. Some masculine words remain. This illustrates the basic illogicality of the exercise. If it is wrong to use masculine words of God, then to do so even once is wrong. If the Liturgical

Commission in fact believes this, let it say so clearly and let it prove to the Church from Scripture and tradition that 2000 years of Christian usage, based as it is on our Lord's teaching (Matthew 7:9 etc), and that of St Paul (Romans 8:16; Gal 4:6), as well as on the Old Testament, is wrong.

The principle that God ought not properly to be addressed as "He" has never been established. It is a radical departure from orthodox Christianity. We call God "He" not because we believe he is male, rather than female, but because we cannot diminish him by calling him "It". The Judaeo-Christian revelation is of a God who is not like pagan gods, and goddesses of their neighbours. He is a God, who – in the words of the first of the Anglican 39 Articles – is "without body, parts and passions; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness" – in whose unity are three Persons, "of one substance, power, and eternity : the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost". It is we who are made in his image, not he in ours, and if in calling him "Father", some would make him an old man in the sky, that mistake is not rectified by compounding it in naming God "Mother". One heresy is not corrected by creating another more serious one. And heresy it is for it overturns the very scriptures which are meant to be our foundation. I am aware that the masculine pronouns for God are regarded by some as culturally conditioned. This is an outrageous claim to make concerning the founder of our religion, the second person of the blessed Trinity, and the Way, the Truth and the Life. It was he who taught us to call God, "Father". The biblical revelation is irredeemably masculine. Nothing less than our doctrine of God is at stake here.

Language about "the Father" and "the Son" is not metaphorical but analogical. There is a similarity and a difference when seen against the background of human generation. The similarity: the Father is the originator of the Son; the difference: the Father begets the Son in a non-sexual way for he is a spirit. The problem arises because many confuse metaphor and analogy: metaphor is fundamentally a comparison, "as if"; analogy is fundamentally a comparison, "yes, but". So too the "being" of God is in one sense comparable to our finite being, because both are not "non-being", but the difference is incomparably greater than the similarity, because God is infinite being, and we are finite beings.

The relationship within the Godhead is the pattern of the family: it is a relationship of an eternal cycle of self-giving love, which is not diminished by self-giving. This is also the pattern of the communion of the church. "Patriarchy" as a term of abuse in the feminist vocabulary must be resisted. One must first define what is meant by "fatherhood", which must be as respectable as "motherhood" when properly understood. "Patriarchy" is in fact a "given" in Trinitarian theology. The attempt to see in the concept of "sophia" an indication of a feminine element in the Godhead is as illogical as the argument that "Father" as applied to God is "patriarchal". Obviously, what is good in sexuality finds its origin in God,

but not in a physically sexual way. Male and female are created images of the love that exists a-sexually in God. Any attempt to change the language of “Father” and “Son” as applied to God and Christ must, therefore, be resisted in the name of truth and fidelity to the Biblical revelation.

In the matter of language referring to human beings, feminine susceptibilities may be accommodated where this can be done easily and with grace. Unfortunately, most of the examples in the new Prayer Book are clumsy, distort the meaning of the original, and draw attention to themselves, standing out like a sore thumb.

The feminist obsession with not calling God “Father” is taken into the heart of the Eucharist. Only one of the six Eucharistic Prayers (No. 4, p.131), addresses God as Father. Every Eucharistic Prayer in East and West is addressed to God as Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. A glance at R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cumming, eds *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* will bear out this fact. It is absolutely essential that the central prayer of the Eucharist exemplifies the basic and classical form of Christian prayer. Failure to do so suggests at its best an uncertain Trinitarian doctrine, and at its worst, gnosticism.

The appeasing of the feminist susceptibilities is presumably the reason for the inclusion of the canticles “A Song of Christ’s Goodness”, and “A Song of True Motherhood” (pp.426-428) although one is pleased that the latter was deleted by General Synod. These canticles are culled from the devotional writings of St Anselm and Dame Julian of Norwich. Both of these texts, without any warrant from Scripture, refer to our Lord and the Father as ‘mother’. However, appropriate and edifying these texts may be in the private devotional writings of these two great masters of spirituality, there is no place for such non-scriptural material in a book of Common Prayer. Inclusive language in reference to God takes us into the realm of touching the language of revelation itself. Our religion is a revealed religion. Changes in the fabric of the language of revelation raise questions of the church’s relationship to Scripture and must depend on a greater authority than that of any locality or generation.

The appeasing of feminists, no doubt also explains the presence of a series of collects by Dr Janet Morley. These include such extra-ordinary expressions as “when feeling is lost” (p.506), “touch his wounds when they bleed in others” (p.509), “help us to enter the cloud where you are hidden, and to surrender all our uncertainty to the darkness of faith” (p.521), reference to wisdom as female, coupled later with a reference to Jesus as “your Word and Wisdom made flesh” (p.542), “that in our wounds we may remember you” (p.570), “speak to the grief that makes us forget, and the terror that makes us cling, and give us back our name” (p.617), “so we may be pregnant with your Spirit” (p.632). The strangest prayer of all is that on p.518, which prays that God will “give us courage to wait, strength to push and discernment to know the right time”. Texts such as these are highly

divisive; what may be appropriate in private devotion is not necessarily Common Prayer. Common Prayer needs to be that with which a whole congregation can identify, and which collects 'the needs and experience of a diverse congregation'. Here attempts to be pictorial are made at the expense of unifying a congregation in common prayer. The General Synod did not touch this section. This is unfortunate for many reasons, because this whole section begs many additional questions.

The book contains a number of collects which were drawn up to match the readings. This was never the purpose of the collect, the purpose of which is to conclude the Entrance Liturgy, rather than to open the Liturgy of the Word. The collects in the ancient sacramentaries and in the modern Roman Missal are very broadly based, and not tied to any particular readings, although it is true that some of those in The Book of Common Prayer (i.e. 1 Advent, 2 Advent) do reflect the readings. There is no need to extend this further.

The various prayers have been carelessly thrown together and there is a lot of repetition, e.g. 2 Christmas: prayer of the week is virtually identical to 1 Christmas, Prayer of the Week; 13 Sunday C p.560 is the same as 3 Epiphany A p.565; 14 Sunday A, p.561 is similar to Maundy Thursday, second prayer, p.499; 19 Sunday, prayer of the week p.595 is similar to 16 Sunday A p.565, and there are a number of other examples. We may, however, be grateful for small mercies. The new book does not include the semi-gnostic paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer by Jim Cotter, beginning "Our Father and our Mother...." which disfigures the new New Zealand Prayer Book.

While there is a social imperative in the gospel, which may properly be given expression in liturgy as in hymnody, one objects strongly to the shallow reflection of contemporary preoccupations and fads of our time in the so-called confessions on pp.192-93. These texts are not prayers; they are politically correct statements dressed up as prayers. These texts are full of contentious statements which are unreal and untrue on the lips of most worshippers. They are didactic in the worst sense of the word – finger jabbing exercises to make us feel guilty and to make others feel smug and self contented. I cite the following as examples of trendy clichés.

"For living without concern..... We deprive others of hope..... our arrogance is closing our eyes to *all* peoples and cultures.....(*all?* is this possible? – General Synod has amended this to "other" – only a minor improvement).....not listening to the griefs of all who are oppressed in this land....we take your freedom from others....."

There are similar expressions on p.630, and also on p.211, a "Thanksgiving for Australia", which is addressed to the Creator Spirit, and describes Jesus as *your* Son. Has Our Lord become the Son of the Holy Spirit?

There is much more that could be said, however, the above summary gives an indication of the nature of the book.

A Prayer Book for Australia will delight Zwinglians and Calvinists, who have never really accepted what the The Book of Common Prayer teaches about the Eucharistic Presence, Baptismal Regeneration, Confirmation and Ordination. It will greatly encourage feminists, who will welcome the decrease in the use of the term 'Father', 'Son', and the masculine pronouns for God, and the resultant diluting of the biblical basis of Anglicanism and the undermining of classical Trinitarian theology. Its politically correct statements will please the adherents of the "Social Gospel". For these reasons, it is hard to see how this book can nurture Australian Anglicans in a biblical and catholic faith.

This book of 898 pages will have to retail at about \$40. How many parishes or individuals will be able to afford a copy? This is a book that is not needed or wanted by the church at large. There is no ground swell support for it. It embodies the views of powerful pressure groups within the church, and some current fashions of liturgical theory which are by no means unchallenged. It is difficult to see what it has in common with its predecessors of 1549-1662, and with AAPB. Those who love and believe in classical Anglicanism will receive *A Prayer Book for Australia* with considerable misgiving and not a little dismay.

Its authorisation by General Synod as a book of Liturgical Resources although it puts it in the same category as a hymn book or a song book, will, unfortunately, in the eyes of church people, bestow on it a greater authority than it actually possesses. In spite of the numerous small amendments proposed on the floor of the Synod, the book is still fatally flawed: some of the features of the original draft have, thankfully, been improved, but too many remain. Unfortunately, Bishop Silk's Eucharistic Prayer does little to redress the overall situation. It would have been better if the book had been authorised for experimental use for the next four years only. On the basis of the church's reactions to it, a new Liturgical Commission with greater expertise and more representative of classical Anglicanism could then have been in a position to draw up a new Prayer Book better able to serve our church in the next century.

NOTES:

I have benefited from discussing Bishop Silk's Eucharistic Prayer with Prebendary Michael Moreton, Lecturer in Theology at Exeter University. Moreton is the author of *Made Fully Perfect* (1974) and *Consecrating, Remembering and Offering* (1976), trenchant criticisms of the Eucharistic Prayer of Series 3. The Archdeacon of York, and the modern hymn writer Fr James Quinn, SJ, have drawn my attention to the pitfalls of "inclusive language" and I have drawn on their insights. See George

Austin, "Beware the Devil and all her Works" in *Faith and Heritage*, Summer 1994, Number 39; JQ to D van D: 16 June 1990.

1. E. Milner-White, "Worship and Services" in F.B. Macnutt *The Church in the Furnace* (Macmillan 1917).
2. [This prayer, not included in the draft book presented to General Synod, was substituted by General Synod for Thanksgiving 3 in the draft. Ed.]

IN SEARCH OF MEANING
Christian Initiation & the Rite of Confirmation in the Methodist Church of
New Zealand
Part I
Reconsidering Confirmation
Brian R. Dawson

Attitudes, policies, and practices concerning confirmation in modern New Zealand Methodism have emerged from a varied background. John Wesley himself held a sure and certain belief in the need for a “conscious embracing of the life of faith with the inward witness of the Spirit”¹ though an ongoing process of conversion led him to pay little attention to the rite of confirmation.

Within the New Zealand context, confirmation (when considered at all) has traditionally been utilised as a stepping stone in the process of church membership, despite a landmark decision in 1959 to adopt an extremely significant policy outlined in the document “Membership and the Place of Children in the Church” (MPCC)². Despite the truly startling changes the adoption of MPCC suggested, it has had little impact in practice.

Today we find confirmation in a much neglected state in New Zealand Methodism. Although still practised on occasion, there is nothing in the way of a coordinated strategy on a connexional scale and it is largely left to individual parishes and presbyters to decide what the rite means – to which the answer seems increasingly to be “nothing”. This then, in the proverbial nutshell, is the scenario from which we start. Having cast an exceedingly cursory glance over the question of “what has been” and “what is”, we can now move on to the more delicate question of “what could be”.

In approaching this question we must beware of being either too narrow or too wide in our outlook. It is indeed tempting to consider confirmation from merely one of a number of vantage points. What should our primary consideration be? Historical accuracy? Theological rightness? Pastoral concern? Sociological need? Liturgical appropriateness? The list could well prove endless, and any attempt to take every last consideration into account would ultimately be fruitless, if not impossible. The aim of what follows is to reconsider and redefine the rite of confirmation in an attempt to discover that quality which it has so often lacked: meaning.

What is Confirmation?

Officially, within New Zealand Methodism, confirmation is:

... that act of God in His Church whereby those who make personal confession

of faith in Jesus Christ have confirmed to them the promise of God given to them at Baptism.³

This somewhat vague statement is a condensed version of the definition offered by MPCC, which is primarily concerned with defining the nature and role of baptism.

Confirmation does not add to the organic relationship created by Baptism, but recognises and seals personal readiness to accept the privileges and responsibilities inherent in membership in the Methodist Church of New Zealand both as a part of the One, Holy, Catholic Church and as a legally constituted entity.⁴

MPCC goes on to define the “membership” conferred at confirmation as “responsible membership” as opposed to the “fundamental membership initiated by Baptism”.⁵

Within Methodism, therefore, confirmation is regarded as a three-fold action; of God in the “confirming” of the baptismal promise, of the individual in the personal confession and affirmation of faith, and of the church in the conferring of ‘responsible’ membership. The few instructional writings available, however, make it clear that the primary focus of confirmation within the Methodist Church rests on the latter two of these actions, particularly the third.

This emphasis on “membership” is perhaps the crux of the problems surrounding confirmation. On the one hand, MPCC clearly supports the view put forward by John Westerhoff that “baptism...is a complete act of initiation into the Christian community”.⁶ Yet by seeking to split membership into three different areas⁷, Methodism has confused the issue entirely.

James White describes this emphasis on membership in his discussion of the “dethroning of confirmation as a sacrament” in the Reformation. The result of the Reformers insistence on education as linked to confirmation, he writes, led to the rite becoming “... a didactic experience expressed as a graduation exercise.”⁸ The original idea may have been a good one. Responsible membership demands an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of the member. Unfortunately, as one author writing from the Protestant perspective has noted, this “graduation” from “fundamental membership” to “responsible membership” has all too often become “... something akin to ‘graduation’ from church”.⁹

A major problem with emphasising confirmation’s role in membership of the church is the inevitable impact it has on baptismal theology. Methodism (along with many others) has tried to avoid this clash by differentiating between membership of the “Church Universal” (conferred at baptism) and the “institutional church” (conferred at confirmation, or later). However, as the only truly visible extension of the “Church Universal” is the “institutional church” such distinctions are academic. As one person, who had enquired about baptism, said to me, “So what you mean is I can be a member of *the* church, but not *your* church?”

Faced with this apparent down-grading of baptism to some form of dedication ceremony, many people have chosen to define confirmation as "... simply a strengthening and ratification of what had already been given in baptism, if you like, a solemn 'renewal of baptismal vows' in which the person once baptised is now able to make a personal response."¹⁰ By terming the confirmation rite as merely a "reaffirmation" or "renewal" of the baptismal vows, proponents of this view succeed in maintaining the primacy of the initial sacrament.

There can be no doubt that the present approach to confirmation leads to confusion and misunderstandings. As one writer puts it, "... the present practice is a theological and pastoral anomaly. It separates the gift of the Spirit from entry into the body of the risen Lord, violates a sacramental continuum, and leads to a notion that there are degrees of membership in the church among the baptised."¹¹

Definitions of what confirmation is abound. They tend to differ widely depending on the denominational background of the author, the overall concern of their subject matter and whether they approach the argument from the point of view of confirmation forming part of a unified rite, a separate rite, or no rite at all. Some have attempted to bring these definitions together under a series of general headings,¹² while others have opted for a simpler approach. It has been described as "... a giving of the Holy Spirit to strengthen the recipient to courageously confess the name of Christ"¹³, as the "sacrament of Christian maturity"¹⁴ and a form of "ecclesiastical enculturization"¹⁵. In the face of such abundance, it may seem pointless to attempt yet another definition, but that is exactly what I propose.

Christian Initiation – Process & Event

Many understandings of confirmation, the Methodist one included, suffer from a static view of Christian initiation. This is hardly surprising. Our approaches to the sacraments in general have concentrated on the event rather than the process. Even where some degree of preparation is required this period has been identified with the ceremony as a specific point in time – become a candidate, go to classes, get confirmed.

Modern discussions, primarily in the realms of academia, have mostly moved to consider Christian initiation as a process rather than an event. Few who are intimately involved in these discussions would now claim that baptism, confirmation and eucharist are disjointed, unrelated ceremonies with little or no connection one to the other. The scene changes, however, when we move to the heart of the church's life – the parish or congregation.

For most lay people the "events oriented" view of Christian initiation remains the norm. Not that this should be seen as an indictment of the laity. Where, we should ask, are they supposed to find new information? Even our liturgies (which

I believe to be a vital source of Christian education) fail for the most part to reveal changes in understandings and attitudes, even though for the most part those who prepare them are well aware of these changes.¹⁶ Rather it is indicative of the lack of communication that exists between the pulpit and the pews, or (more accurately) between those who have been charged with increasing our knowledge of certain subjects and those who are in a position to put that knowledge to practical use.¹⁷ The result is an almost diametrically opposed set of understandings between the scholar and the layperson.

Terminology is one of the difficulties here. Undoubtedly, if we were to be entirely proper about things, we should talk of baptism as both process *and* event. But in the “real world” baptism is clearly identified as an event, a happening at a specific time and place. The same is true for both eucharist and confirmation. To speak of any or all as “events” at one point and “processes” at another is merely to confuse the issue. So if we are to communicate accurately the reality of the situation (and make life simpler at the same time) we would be wise to use distinct terms.

In this case I have chosen the term “Christian Initiation” when speaking of the “process”, and baptism, confirmation or eucharist when referring to the specific events that occur within that process. These “events” are primarily of a liturgical nature. They serve to celebrate and articulate various points on our Christian journey. They also serve as “stepping off points” – events that mark a new stage, a sense of progression and the beginning of a new thing.

Some would claim that these events are also the points of community involvement in the initiatory process. It is true that these times, when the faith community visibly comes together, *are* communal events. It is also true that none of the initiatory events is an individual activity; each involves the whole church as much as it does the individual who happens to be in the spotlight. But once more we must beware that what we *say* does not determine, or negate, what we *do*. Most, I believe, would not wish to limit the community’s involvement in Christian initiation solely to the events themselves, yet the above statements can easily suggest that. Rather it is important that we clearly claim that the entire initiatory process is one in which the whole community must be vitally, and visibly, involved.

It would be true to say that, among those who are in a position to study the subject, the arguments surrounding process and event have been largely resolved.¹⁸ The arguments that remain tend to centre on the question of timing. Proponents of Roberto’s “liturgical-initiation” school, for example, tend to argue for a unified rite, while others opt for an on-going initiatory process. These in turn are divided over how the separate rites within the process – baptism, confirmation and eucharist – should be ordered, and when.

This is not the place to attempt a detailed analysis of these ideas, of which volumes could be, and have been, written. What is important in terms of our topic is to make clear the difference between the *process* of Christian initiation and the *events* of baptism, confirmation and eucharist.

To set the scene for further discussions, I offer four definitions of my own, one looking at the “process” and the others the “events”. They are by no means complete definitions¹⁹, but they will suffice for the moment.

Christian initiation is the *process* whereby we are welcomed, nurtured and grown to a point where we can freely and personally understand and accept the rights, responsibilities and gifts of belonging to the Body of Christ that is the Church.

Baptism is the primary sacrament/event of Christian initiation whereby God *through* and *with* the Church, draws us into the Body.

Confirmation is the celebration/event whereby (i) we affirm the vows made by, or on behalf of, us at baptism. (ii) we signal our readiness and intention to move from a state where we have been primarily the recipients of ministry to being ministers ourselves. (iii) the faith community acknowledges our readiness and desire to move in this direction and welcomes and accepts the ministry that we have to offer. (iv) we are “ordained”, by God and the Church, to a life of ministry, with all that this implies.

Eucharist is the sacrament/event of the Christian community whereby we experience and acknowledge the presence of the Christ among us, celebrating as we do the sign/acts of God that transcend time and space to make what once was and what will be real for us today.

Given the emphases of our study here, it is appropriate that we look mainly at confirmation. But, before confining ourselves more to the matter at hand, it is important to first take a brief glance at a question that cannot be avoided.

Baptism – Confirmation – Eucharist

Of all the questions surrounding Christian initiation, none has caused more heated debate than that of the Unified Rite. The question here is not whether these three – baptism, confirmation and eucharist – are related, they most certainly are. Rather the question is, how *closely* related are they in terms of *timing*.

Many eminent scholars have argued for a return to a unified rite based around the paschal celebrations. A single ceremony, involving the baptism, confirmation

and first Communion of those who present themselves (after a suitable period of preparation). Indeed, many have thought their arguments so proven as to take such a rite as given when returning to any further questions.²⁰ Such confidence is not surprising when we consider that the Roman Catholic Church (undeniably responsible for the bulk of modern study into Christian initiation) has, in the post-Vatican II Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults, made the unified model the norm once more.²¹

While I confess to having some sympathy for the proponents of a single unified rite of Christian initiation, in terms of maximum effectiveness and meaning I believe it is lacking. Instead I believe we would be well advised to think in terms of a single process with separate events, spread over a significant period of time. To some this may appear to be the easy option, but in actuality I believe we will find it to be the greater challenge and opportunity.

A New Model For Confirmation

In approaching this task I am well aware of the dangers of reform. It is all too easy to suggest change merely for the sake of change. But, in this instance, I believe it is undeniable that confirmation, as it currently stands, represents a square peg not easily fitted within the round hole created by my definition of the rite. As a helpful vehicle on our journey, I propose that we follow through the four intertwined points contained within my definition of confirmation.

(i) Baptism – Confirmation

By stating that baptism, confirmation and eucharist all fall within the one process I do not mean, as some have claimed, that “Confirmation is ‘part two’ of the baptismal initiation, the ‘cap’ to the baptismal sacrament”²², nor even “the ‘consummation’ of baptism”.²³ As events/ rites, I want to state quite clearly that both baptism and confirmation are complete in and of themselves, with no “capping” or “consummation” necessary.

In stating this I obviously infer that confirmation, as a “follow-on” to baptism is not essential. Indeed if, as my definition states, baptism serves to “draw us into the Body”, then it also implies that we can choose merely to stay there.

The explanation offered by MPCC defines my meaning here quite well (and in so doing it shows that, despite appearances to the contrary, I have not drifted too far from the official Methodist stance).

The relationship to the Church of an adult who has been baptised in infancy, but who has not subsequently been confirmed, remains virtually that of an infant.²⁴

Such a statement may sound over harsh and judgmental, but I stand by it

nonetheless. Ultimately, in Tertullian's famous words, Christians are "made, not born". The intention of the baptismal event, whether in infancy or later, is to celebrate and proclaim the commencement of this "making". As Paul wrote to the church at Corinth, "When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways."²⁵ Baptism is the celebration/sacrament of the beginning of this childhood. As children we question, we make mistakes and we experience. And from those questions, mistakes and experiences, we learn and we grow and we become what we will be as adults. For most of us, childhood takes place within the family, and it is the influence of that family life, both positive and not so positive, that has the major influence on our own development.²⁶

The same is true for our lives as Christians and the church. In baptism, God, through and with the church, draws us into the Body. Within that Body we learn and grow. Age is not a major factor in this process. A human adult raised in isolation and brought into society would have as much learning and growing to do as any infant; so too for Christians, no matter what their physical age may be.

At our baptismal events certain vows and promises are made. If we are baptised as infants, these are made for us. If baptism takes place in later life, we make them ourselves. Although many modern debates hinge on this difference, I believe it to be of no major consequence. An adult making his or her baptismal vows is effectively making a commitment to the continuing initiatory process. The choice whether or not to live up to that commitment is ultimately his or her own. The infant brought to baptism has no choice in the matter at the time. The commitment, however, is still valid. If the parent or guardian chooses to follow that commitment, the child is forced to follow. This should not, however, be seen as a "faith-making by force" option. The word "forced" in this context is used in much the same way as a child is "forced" to learn to walk, talk and eat correctly. All are part of the natural life-cycle. In time, when the child learns to think for him or her self, the choice to follow the baptismal commitment can be rightly passed to them and, after an appropriate length of time, confirmation may follow.²⁷

But some children never grow up. Just as some parents grieve for children who have recently "left the nest", so others complain that they can't get rid of theirs. Any adult who has looked back fondly at the relatively simple and uncluttered world of childhood will understand that, for some, the temptation to stay within the safety of the home outweighs the natural tendency to leave.

As Christians we are (hopefully) nurtured and supported in our "childhood". It is easier and more comfortable to be "ministered to" than "to minister". In those early days our faith is "learnt" rather than "owned". With an occasional exception, we do as we are told and follow where others might lead us. But unlike a child in

the home, we may never be forced or pressured to move on, to grow up and take responsibility for our own faith and our own decisions. It is quite possible, and not uncommon, for people to spend their whole lives in this state of “Christian childhood”. For such people confirmation is inappropriate.

But for the “child” who has grown into an “adult”, confirmation, as we shall see below, is the celebration of that growth.

When we come to the confirmation celebration/event it is entirely appropriate that we affirm our baptismal vows. Although we are now ready to move on to a new stage in our journey, all true wisdom is tinged with the knowledge that there is always more to learn. And so we affirm our commitment to continue to grow and learn in our Christian life, also acknowledging that, although we have walked the road from baptism to confirmation once, there will be times when we must pass over the same territory again. Christian growth, like life itself, is often a process of “one step forward, two steps back”.

(ii) The Other Side Of Pentecost

Confirmation has often been referred to as the rite or sacrament of “Christian maturity”. Although we may refer to people as being “mature” by virtue of age, true maturity is earned rather than reached. To be “mature” is to have come to a point, through experience, learning and contemplation, where we can truly “own” our faith, beliefs and decisions and be ready to become “parents” ourselves, just as we have been “parented” to this point.

This is not to say that confirmation implies that we have learnt all there is to learn, or that our current beliefs are set in stone forever. Rather, confirmation acknowledges our “*readiness* and intention” to take on the mantle of maturity.

One author has described this action as representing “the intent to be on the other side of Pentecost, the point at which the transformation occurs from being a disciple to becoming an apostle.”²⁸

Looked at in this way, confirmation itself can be likened to the day of Pentecost. Although Acts portrays the events of that day in a dramatic fashion, the major transformation that occurred was within the community of disciples, and the disciples themselves. The “transformation” lies in the *intent* to be “on the *other* side of Pentecost”, the side where those who have been ministered to become the ministers.

The two key words in this process are *intent* and *readiness*. Without the intention to move forward, no movement can be possible. Equally, without adequate preparation and the reaching of a state of some degree of “readiness” it is less than likely that the intent to move will really be there.

(iii) Confirmation & Community

In today's church we are often loathe to disagree with another person's belief in him or her self. This in itself, I believe, is often a symptom of our own lack of assurance as to whether we are on the right track. If confirmation is to have any true meaning, however, we, as the church, must be prepared to acknowledge and own the readiness of the person in question to be confirmed, and accept the consequences of that acknowledgement.

When we confirm a person (within the model I am proposing) we are doing more than simply "graduating" that person to the next rung on the ladder. We are welcoming them into an *active* and *participatory* role among us. We are quite literally inviting that person to minister with and to us. If, for any reason, we are hesitant or unwilling to accept that ministry, then we must honestly consider whether confirmation is appropriate.

Acknowledging, welcoming and accepting. These are all concepts that demand active participation among the faith community throughout the entire initiatory process. As a community, we welcome a newcomer into our midst at baptism, acknowledging his or her presence among us and accepting the commitment to nurture this person in the days ahead. At confirmation we affirm this commitment and we take yet another step. To this point *we* have stood in the roles of teacher, guide and mentor, contributing to and encouraging the growth of the other. Within this process we too, hopefully, have experienced growth and change. No teacher can remain entirely unaffected by his or her student. But with confirmation we proclaim a shift in this relationship, to a point where the teacher, freely and eagerly, becomes the student, welcoming the insights and input of the confirmed.

Confirmation has often been seen as the consummation of a process of enculturation. Through the catechetical process we have attempted to mold the candidate into an "acceptable" version of ourselves. But this should not be the aim of confirmation. Here we find the immense challenge to the church. By welcoming the confirmed into our midst in a new way, by acknowledging and accepting his or her intent and readiness to minister among us, we are committing *ourselves* to a process of change. With new life and new ministry, the Body itself is renewed. As a community at confirmation we proclaim ourselves willing to become more than we currently are as the newly confirmed take their place among us.

(iv) A Royal Priesthood

W.K. Lowther Clark, in his examination of confirmation, has suggested that the Jewish antecedents of the rite are obvious.²⁹ Few would agree with him today. Lowther Clark goes on to describe confirmation as an "ordination to the priesthood of the laity".³⁰ While I do not subscribe to much that he writes,³¹ I do believe that

he has presented here a valuable tool to aid our understanding of confirmation in the modern world.

Having affirmed our baptismal vows, signalled our intention and readiness to move on and had this acknowledged, welcomed and accepted we must now share in the moment of commitment. John Chrysostom suggested that the initiation rite should include a solemn vow of allegiance; “I enter your service, O Christ”.³² For Chrysostom, and I suggest for us, confirmation is as much a point of commitment on the part of both those to be confirmed and the church as the ordination of a priest or presbyter.

Having been found ready and willing, it is our task to accept ordination. This must not be confused with the ordination to a particular ministry or service represented by the presbyterate or the diaconate. Rather this is the ordination that *all* Christians are called to, what the author of 1 Peter called “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people.” The same writer goes on to explain that we are called to this state of “ordination”; “in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.”³³ Gerard Austin believes that a view of confirmation in terms of an ordination rite will increase the already existing gap between clergy and laity.³⁴ On the contrary, in my opinion, to have one’s gifts and readiness to serve recognised and affirmed can only be seen as a positive step towards solving this dilemma. We speak boldly of the “ministry of all believers”, but so often only the ministry of those wearing the badge of ordination is acknowledged.

But to speak here of ordination merely in terms of a recognition of ministry would be to deny the other essential elements that the term implies. To be ordained in the Christian church is to both commit one’s self to a lifetime of service, and to receive the strength and gifts required to live up to that commitment. Here, once again, we come up against an area where Methodism has chosen for the most part to remain conspicuously silent.³⁵

Few contemporary commentators have much to say with regards to the role played by the Holy Spirit in confirmation.³⁶ Within Protestant circles in general, and Methodism in particular, this great silence can be attributed at least in part to what can only be called a seriously under-developed theology concerning the Spirit as a whole. But if we are to compare confirmation with the transforming power of Pentecost and ordination, we have no choice but at least to acknowledge the importance of the Holy Spirit in the process.

An essential element in the initiatory process is the dawning of recognition. It is only when we recognise the presence of the Holy Spirit within our own lives that we can begin to become ready for and intent on confirmation to a life of Christian service. This must be an integral part of the catechetical preparation for confirmation.

But this recognition is much more than merely a personal phenomenon. Indeed, it is the recognition of the Spirit's presence within the candidate by the gathered community of faith that truly signals one's readiness for confirmation.

One point that we must recognise is that we should not fall into the trap of seeing confirmation as the point where one *receives* the Spirit.³⁷ Many have attempted this over the centuries. While baptism is acknowledged as a point where this gift is given, it has been easy to claim that confirmation is the point of a "second gift". As one author has correctly stated; "The idea of two gifts of the Spirit in initiation is too neat a solution and has to be regarded as an unsatisfactory theology."³⁸ This is why I have chosen to emphasise the significance of recognition in this process. If we take for granted (as I believe we must) the already present gift of the Spirit, what becomes important is not so much whether the Spirit is there, but whether or not we recognise the potential for that Spirit to become manifest.

This, then, is the "ordination" that takes place at confirmation. Solemn commitments from candidate and community to manifest and receive the gifts of the Spirit, thereby adding to the "Royal Priesthood" that is the church. Such commitments cannot be given or taken lightly, for they impact upon the entire future of God's people.

Here we have concentrated on what confirmation "could be" in terms of definition and meaning. While it has been a most cursory examination, I hope that the basic foundations of my ideas are clear. In Part II we will move on once more – this time to the point where we attempt to build upon those foundations, putting theory into practice.

NOTES

1. O.E. Borgen *John Wesley On The Sacraments* (Abingdon 1972) p 170
2. *Membership and the Place of Children in the Church* (MPCC) Faith and Order statement, Methodist Church Conference Minutes, 1959.
3. R.H. Allen, *A Methodist Confirmation Manual*, (New Zealand Methodist Board of Publications 1967) p 2
4. MPCC Section 2
5. MPCC Section 2
6. Arthur J. Kubick, ed. *Confirming The Faith Of Adolescents; An Alternative Future for Confirmation* (Paulist Press 1991) p 160
7. MPCC Section 2
 - “(i) The fundamental membership initiated by Baptism.
 - (ii) The responsible membership which is recognised and sealed at Confirmation.
 - (iii) Membership in the institutional and legally constituted Church granted at Confirmation or later.”

8. James White, *Introduction to Christian Worship* (Abingdon 1971) p 160
9. Kubick p 109
10. John Greenhalgh & Elizabeth Russell, eds *Signs of Faith, Hope and Love* (St Mary's Bourne St 1987) p 65
11. The Murphy Centre, *Made, Not Born: New Perspectives on Christian Initiation and the Catechumenate* (University of Notre Dame 1976) p 141
12. See, for example, John Roberto's "liturgical-initiation" and "theological-maturity" models and Mark Searle's similar attempts in Kubick pp 2f.
13. Thomas Marsh in Kubick p 13
14. Gerard Fourez in Kubick p 48
15. Gary Davis in Kubick p 112
16. Ironically this cannot be said for Methodism within N.Z. as there has been no revision of the confirmation liturgy for nearly two decades.
17. This issue of communication is a dramatic and vast dilemma which rightly deserves further study. Unfortunately such a study does not fall within the parameters of this work, and it must therefore be left for another time.
18. This is not to say that the academics are without blemish. For instance, it is important to note that the majority of academic study regarding baptism in recent years has taken adult baptism as the theological norm. This, while perhaps making it easier to argue the points involved, ignores what is unquestionably the standard practice, and almost definitely well enough enshrined to be termed "tradition". Such a stance may serve well in the halls of academia, but I believe it will ultimately fail in the place where it matters most – the pews.
19. I am quite convinced that any act or action involving God can never be fully explained or known to us, but rather (like all true mysteries) we learn more of them as each day passes.
20. See, for example, Mark Searle *Alternative Futures for Worship Vol. 2 Baptism and Confirmation* (Liturgical Press 1987)
21. This is not to say that Catholicism has abandoned infant baptism, far from it. But the amount of attention placed on the RCIA, and the undeniably poor liturgical quality of the baptismal formula for infants in comparison to its adult equivalent, has left little doubt in most people's minds where the primary emphasis lies.
22. Davis in Kubick p 134
23. Davis in Kubick p 135
24. MPCC Section 2
25. 1 Corinthians 13:11. NRSV
26. See Andrew Thompson's essay in Searle, *Alternative Futures ... Vol 2* pp 55ff
27. Like John Westerhoff and others, I believe that the church needs to take seriously the emotional, physical and spiritual realities of the period in the life-cycle that we call "adolescence". In the past this time, around age 13-14, has been the point of confirmation. For a variety of reasons I think this entirely inappropriate. But still

some celebration/event is needed to recognise this vital point in both an individual's life process *and* the initiatory process.

28. Allen F. Bray III, *Baptism and Confirmation: A Relationship of Process*, Quoted in Kubick p 136

29. W.K. Lowther Clark, *Liturgy and Worship*, (SPCK 1933) p 444

30. Lowther Clark p 444

31. Given, as he is, to drawing concrete conclusions from less than self-explanatory passages and writings.

32. Quoted in Michael Dujarier, *The Rites Of Christian Initiation* (Sadlrer 1979) p170

33. 1 Peter 2:9 NRSV

34. Gerard Austin, *The Rite Of Confirmation; Anointing With The Spirit* (Pueblo 1985) p 154

35. This may have something to do with what often appears to be a stubborn determination to avoid any hint of "mystery" within our theology and worship. Who ordains, how and what does it really mean? These are important questions, which in general have remained unanswered.

36. Although most are quick to point to the overwhelming silence on the subject.

37. This altogether questionable idea was popular among certain pentecostal Anglican circles for a time. I am not sure if it still is, but I certainly hope not.

38. Thomas Marsh in Kubick, p 20

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY



NATIONAL CONFERENCE – CANBERRA

11-14 DECEMBER 1995

CHILDREN IN THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

BLACKFRIARS

127 PHILLIP AVENUE, WATSON

Enquiries and Registration to
The Revd Dr D'Arcy Wood

GPO Box 1526, Canberra ACT 2601

NEWS AND INFORMATION

International Anglican Liturgical Consultation

The International Anglican Liturgical Consultation is made up of Anglican members of *Societas Liturgica* together with representatives appointed by Provinces (national churches) of the Anglican Communion. Its purpose is to keep Anglicans talking to each other about matters liturgical and to make recommendations to the Provinces about liturgy. Most of the Provinces have now adopted modern liturgies (to replace or for use along with the Book of Common Prayer 1662), and inculturation of the liturgy is leading to greater diversity across the Communion. The work of IALC is, therefore, important in co-ordinating and monitoring the various developments.

The fifth full meeting of the Consultation (IALC-V) met in Dublin 6-12 August 1995 in the Church of Ireland College of Education. There were 80 participants from 18 Provinces. The largest numbers came from the British Isles, North America and Australasia, but there were people also from: Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Solomon Islands, Brazil, Cuba, Zimbabwe, Jamaica, Ghana, Sri Lanka, Rwanda, Germany, and Tanzania – the widest representation of any IALC. In the Provincial Reports we heard of such things as new prayer books and revisions in progress. But when Bishop Jonathan Ruhumuliza from Rwanda spoke of the recent devastation in his country, the emphasis was much more on liturgy as a source of stability and security for people whose lives were shattered.

IALC-V worked to produce a statement and recommendations to the Provinces concerning the future revision of eucharistic liturgies. Some preparatory work had been done in a conference at Untermarchtal in Germany in 1993 and further preparatory papers had been written. Professor Louis Weil delivered the keynote address on “Issues related to the Anglican eucharist in the twenty-first century”. The consultation then divided into five working groups to draft the report: 1. Ministry, Order and the Eucharist; 2. Ritual, Language and Symbolism; 3. Structure of the Eucharist; 4. Eucharistic Theology; and 5. Liturgical and Eucharistic Renewal. Finally, the Consultation committed to an editorial group the preparation of the statement and recommendations for publication.

No great surprises came from the Consultation (at least, not for those who have been reading recent eucharistic theology and other works on liturgy). There emerges from the statement an emphasis on celebration and community and on the incarnational nature of the eucharist. The statement is to be published before the end of the year and a further publication which will include papers prepared for the consultation will come out later. As a sort of summary and a way of seeing

quickly the standpoint adopted in the statement the Consultation adopted a set of “Principles”. These are appended to this report.

An enriching element of the consultation is the opportunity to pray together. The daily offices were in familiar form and the 80 gathered liturgists showed that they could produce good music. Celebrations of the eucharist used liturgies from various Provinces. There were liturgies from England, Ireland, and Australia (using the new APBA), a liturgy in Spanish from Cuba and a liturgy in use at St Gregory’s Church San Francisco. This last was a liturgy very much inculturated in San Francisco which seemed to combine elements of the Coptic tradition with leftovers from the hippies of 1960s. It all served to show the diversity of the Anglican Communion!

The work of IALC is guided by a steering committee which consists of a representative of the Primates (Archbishop Brian Davis, New Zealand), the Liturgical Officer of the Anglican Communion (Dr Paul Gibson, Canada), and four people elected by the Consultation: Dr Solomon Amusan (Nigeria), Bishop Colin Buchanan (England), Sister Jean Campbell (USA) and Fr Ron Dowling (Australia). Ron Dowling is the current Chairman.

R. Wesley Hartley

IALC-V Principles

1. In the celebration of the eucharist, all the baptised are called to participate in the great sign of our common identity as the people of God, the body of Christ, and the community of the Holy Spirit. No baptised person should be excluded from participating in the eucharistic assembly on such grounds as age, race, gender, economic circumstance or mental capacity.

2. In the future, Anglican unity will find its liturgical expression not so much in uniform texts as in a common approach to eucharistic celebration and a structure which will ensure a balance of word, prayer, and sacrament and which bears witness to the catholic calling of the Anglican communion.

3. The eucharist action models the way in which God as redeemer comes into the world in the word made flesh, to which the people of God respond by offering themselves – broken individuals – to be made one body in Christ’s risen life. This continual process of transformation is enacted in each celebration.

4. The sacrificial character of all Christian life and worship must be articulated in a way that does not blur the unique atoning work of Christ. Vivid language, symbol, and metaphor engage human memory and assist the eucharistic action in forming the life of the community.

5. In the eucharist, we encounter the mystery of the triune God in the proclamation of the word and celebration of the sacrament. The fundamental

character of the eucharistic prayer is thanksgiving and the whole eucharistic prayer should be seen as consecratory. The elements of memorial and invocation are caught up within the movement of thanksgiving.

6. In, through, and with Christ, the assembly is the celebrant of the eucharist. Among other tasks it is appropriate for lay persons to play their part in proclaiming the word, leading the prayers of the people, and distributing communion. The liturgical functions of the ordained arise out of pastoral responsibility. Separating liturgical function and pastoral oversight tends to reduce liturgical presidency to an isolated ritual function.

7. The embodied character of Christian worship must be honoured in proclamation, music, symbol, and ritual. If inculturation is to be taken seriously local culture and custom which are not in conflict with the gospel must be reflected in the liturgy, interacting with the accumulated inculturation of the tradition.

8. The church needs leaders who are themselves open to renewal and are able to facilitate and enable it in community. This should affect the liturgical formation of laity and clergy, especially bishops as leaders of the local community. Such continuing formation is a priority and adequate resources for it should be provided in every province.

9. Celebrating the eucharist involves both reaffirming the baptismal commitment to die to self and be raised to newness of life, and embodying that vision of the kingdom in searching for justice, reconciliation and peace in the community. The Spirit who calls us into one body in Christ equips and sends us out to live this divine life.

Societas Liturgica – Congress XV Dublin 1995

In 1945 Dom Gregory Dix's book *The Shape of the Liturgy* was published. This book has had a profound influence on liturgical scholarship and to mark the fiftieth anniversary of its publication the theme chosen for Congress XV was "The Future Shape of Liturgy".

Societas Liturgica is an international and ecumenical society for liturgical study and renewal, the professional association of liturgical scholars. Its fifteenth Congress was held at St Patrick's College, Drumcondra, Dublin, 14-19 August. [One has to be fairly precise in designating which "St Patrick's" is meant. There are nine cathedrals (not all still in use) and myriad churches, colleges and schools dedicated in the name of St Patrick in Ireland.] There were over 250 participants from 31 countries. English, French and German are the official languages of the Congress and all are used in worship. Simultaneous translation is provided for major addresses and symposia. To remind us of where we were there was also some

(mainly liturgical) use of the Irish language. The summer in Dublin had been unusually hot and dry. The maximum temperature each day of the Congress was 27 or 28 degrees Celsius and we soon learned how little provision is made in Irish buildings and buses for cooling.

Some indication of the approach of the Congress to “the future shape of liturgy” is given by the major papers presented.

Irmgard Pahl (Roman Catholic, Germany), “The centrality of the paschal mystery in the shape of the liturgy”.

Francois Kabasele Lumbola (Roman Catholic, Zaire), “The human imprint on Christian liturgy”.

Gordon W. Lathrop (Lutheran, USA), “Koinonia and the shape of liturgy”.

Paul F. Bradshaw (Anglican, England/USA), “The homogenisation of Christian liturgy – ancient and modern” (Presidential Address).

All these papers will be published in *Studia Liturgica*.

Two particular concerns were taken up in symposia. One of these is of fairly general application. It is the matter of “language and liturgy”. Perhaps most acute in English, the question arises, however, in all languages. The other symposium topic was of particular application to Roman Catholics. It was “Sunday worship without a priest”. Much scholarship was brought to bear on the question of how communities could worship without a priest, a situation brought about by the shortage of priests in the Roman Catholic Church. Should there be communion from the reserve sacrament? Should the worship be as much like the mass as possible, or not at all like the mass? Yet, the most obvious answer to the shortage of priests is to get more priests, but the issues of clerical celibacy and the ordination of women were studiously avoided by the speakers.

An important part of any Congress is the “case studies” and “short communications” presented by members. These range over a wide variety of topics and are often “work in progress” reports. Two contributions came from Australia. Ron Dowling and Jill Mendham reported on “A Prayer Book for Australia: the Eucharist”. Tom Elich gave a communication on “ICEL: expansion of the Roman Missal”.

Meeting in Ireland gave participants the opportunity to experience the warmth of Irish welcome (*Cead mile failte*, a hundred thousand welcomes), savour the Guinness (which is actually cheaper in Australia) and, for some, to trace their Irish roots (I found the house where my great-great-grandparents had lived!). More to the point, however, was the opportunity to hear about and share in the Celtic culture and spirituality. At the opening and closing liturgies and at the Congress Eucharist David Power gave a series of addresses on Celtic liturgy and spirituality. Celtic prayers and music were included in the daily worship. And then there was the excursion.

To provide a change of pace and a relief from the torrent of words, Thursday was excursion day. We visited first an interesting modern church, St Paul's Mullingar. The day was concluded with dinner, and a concert in the chapel, at St Patrick's College Maynooth. But the real highlight was the visit to Clonmacnoise, a monastic site whose Christian occupation dates from the mid-sixth century. Today it is mainly in ruins, but these ruins and their setting allow the visitor to feel part of the centuries of life and worship at this site. In a rural setting on the banks of the Shannon are a cathedral, several churches, two round towers, some high crosses and other remains. It is all interpreted well at the recently constructed visitors' centre. The fact that on the day of our visit the temperature was like that at Uluru in January did not really detract from our experience of Clonmacnoise.

The Congress Eucharist was celebrated in Christ Church Cathedral, on a site where there has been a church since 1038. The practice has been that the President of Societas presides at the eucharist, celebrated according to rites of his own tradition. As the President, Paul Bradshaw, is an Anglican, the Church of Ireland liturgy was used. Even though sharing in communion is a problem for some, the gathering of Christians from many traditions to celebrate the eucharist together is a special focus of the Congress. Maybe our own Academy could learn from the practice.

At the business session of Societas Liturgica Irmgard Pahl was elected President, the first woman and the first non-ordained person to hold this position. Robert Gribben was elected a member of the Council, the first Australian so elected. The next Congress (1997) is to be in Finland, continuing the invariable practice to date of holding congresses in Europe or North America. There might be a change, however. As a location for the 1999 Congress both India and Australia were considered. In the discussion about venues, issues such as air-fares and plumbing seemed to loom larger than indigenous culture and ecumenical encounter — but that is probably inevitable. The Council will make the final determination about venue, but if it comes to Australia we will have the hard work of doing all the local organising, but many more Australians will have the opportunity to attend a Congress of Societas Liturgica.

R. Wesley Hartley

1996 Père Receveur commemoration
at La Perouse on Botany Bay

The 1996 Père Receveur Commemoration has been scheduled with the NSW National Parks & Wildlife Service for Saturday 17 February, the actual anniversary of Père Receveur's death in 1788, at 3pm.

Père Claude François Joseph Laurent Receveur (1757-1788) was the Conventual Franciscan naturalist and chaplain of the "Astrolabe" on the Laperouse Expedition which sojourned on the north headland of Botany Bay between 26 January and 10 March 1788.

The Latin grave inscription, first left on a board fixed to a eucalypt and now incised on the mensa of the 1820's altar-style tomb, is the earliest public Latin inscription in the country.

The Commemoration will take the form of a Requiem Mass in the traditional Latin rite of the Catholic Church, after the use of Père Receveur and his confrere, the Abbé Jean André Mongaz in 1788, in the vicinity of the grave near the Laperouse Museum.

*Frank Carleton
Convener,*

Père Receveur Commemoration Committee.

The Grave Inscription

Hic jacet
L. Receveur
Ex F.F. Minoribus
Galliae Sacerdos
Physicus in Circumnavigatione Mundi

Duce D. de la Perouse
Obiit Die 17th Febr., Anno
1788

Here lies
L. Receveur
From the Friars Minor
Priest of France
Scientist in the Circumnavigation of
the World
Under the leadership of Laperouse
Died 17 February in the year
1788

CONTRIBUTORS

The Revd Dr Evan L. Burge is Warden of Trinity College, University of Melbourne. He is a member of the English Language Liturgical Consultation (representing Australian Consultation on Liturgy) and prepared the commentary on the ELLC texts published in *Praying Together* 1988. He was the Austin James Lecturer in 1975 and again in 1995.

Brian R. Dawson, a former presbyter of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, is the Leatherland Exhibitioner for 1994. He is currently employed as a talkback host for the radio station Newstalk ZB in Tauranga, New Zealand.

The Revd Dr Thomas W. Elich, President of the Academy, is Director of the Liturgical Commission, Archdiocese of Brisbane and editor of *Liturgy News*. He is also Executive Director of the National Liturgical Commission.

The Revd R. Wesley Hartley, editor of AJL, is Vicar of the Parish of St Aidan Strathmore in the Diocese of Melbourne.

The Most Revd Dr Keith Rayner, AO is Archbishop of Melbourne, Metropolitan of Victoria and Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia. A volume of his Advent Addresses delivered while he was Archbishop of Adelaide 1975-1989 was published in 1990 and a festschrift, *Episcopacy: views from the Antipodes. Essays on episcopal ministry presented to the Primate, Archbishop Keith Rayner, on the 25th anniversary of his consecration as bishop*, was published in 1994.

The Revd Canon Dirk van Dissell is Rector of the Parish of St Francis Christies Beach and Chairman of the Liturgical Committee, Diocese of The Murray.

**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)**

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.