



AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

2003
Volume 9
Number 2

AUSTRALIAN ACADEMY OF LITURGY

COUNCIL 2003-4

PRESIDENT: Carmel Pilcher rsj, DipT, GradDipRE, MA, PhD
PAST PRESIDENT: Colleen O'Reilly, MTh, DMin
SECRETARY: David Orr osb, BSocSc, DSL
TREASURER: John de Lange, BA, BD, GradDipA
EDITOR OF AJL: Inari Thiel, MSc, MA, GradDipTheol
CHAPTER CONVENORS:
QLD Inari Thiel, MSc, MA, GradDipTheol
NSW Andrew Doohan, MTh
ACT Vicki Cullen, BA, BTh, MEd, DipMin
VIC Albert McPherson, MA, STM
TAS Cathy Murrowood, BA, DipEd, GradDipTheol, MA
SA Jenny O'Brien, BMus, MEd, DipTertEd
WA Angela McCarthy, BA, BEd

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 are invited and should be made on an application form available from:

The Secretary
Australian Academy of Liturgy
St Benedict's Monastery
121 Arcadia Road
Arcadia 2159

The annual membership fee is \$37.00 (GST incl.)
The membership fee includes subscription to *AJL*.

AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF LITURGY

Volume 9 Number 2 2003

EDITOR
INARI THIEL

EDITORIAL PANEL
CHARLES SHERLOCK (Book Review Editor)
ROBERT GRIBBEN
RUSSELL HARDIMAN
CARMEL PILCHER rsj
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 twice each year.

ISSN 1030-617X

Editorial

As the jacarandas remind Brisbane's students that end-of-year exams are upon them, *AJL* brings you the rather more pleasant prospect of engaging summer reading on a range of topics, including the second of the Archbishop of Canterbury's lectures on "Sacramental Living" which were presented as the Hughes-Cheong Lectures at Trinity College in Melbourne.

As with the first (*AJL* 9/1), this lecture has been transcribed from a recording of the event and not reworked for publication, so it retains its freshness and will, I hope, provide a sense of Rowan Williams' personality as well as the insights he conveys.

I'm also pleased to be able to publish Gerard Moore's paper, "ANZAC memorials: some reflections for Christian liturgy", from the United Theological College's 2002 Seminar Week dinner, making his work available to a wider audience than those able to be present on that occasion.

Robert Gribben (Uniting Church) and Charles Sherlock (Anglican) outline the principles informing liturgical aspects of the proposed covenant between their churches in Australia. Ecumenical cooperation is commonly the result of much dialogue and reflection, and often struggle, among people of faith from different perspectives, and it is encouraging to see a real prospect of practical application.

As always, I look forward to receiving your contributions for future issues of *AJL*; and I wish you a joyous Christmas.

Inari Thiel
Logan City

Contents

Hughes-Cheong Lecture, Trinity College, Melbourne	
Sacramental Living: living eucharistically	
<i>Rowan Williams</i>	43
Australian accent	
ANZAC memorials: some reflections for Christian liturgy	
<i>Gerard Moore sm</i>	58
Ecumenical update	
Anglican – Uniting Church covenant: liturgical aspects	
<i>Robert Gribben and Charles Sherlock</i>	71
Book Reviews	
<i>Praying Twice, The Music and Words of Congregational Song</i>	79
<i>Catholic Divorce: The Deception of Annulments</i>	81
Contributors	84

Sacramental Living: living eucharistically

Rowan Williams

I spoke before about Baptismal Living in connexion with the theme of 'being in the proximity of Jesus', and quite obviously that leads us into thinking about the Eucharist. Because if you read the Gospels carefully and openly, one theme comes over with enormous clarity and consistency I believe: what is salvation in the practice and in the language of Jesus? The answer is really remarkably simple: it is to accept the welcome that Jesus offers. Hence the fundamental and central quality in the Gospel narratives of table fellowship. It has been said so many times, it hardly needs saying again – but let's say it! Table fellowship is the concrete and specific form of "being with Jesus" which brings about healing and wholeness. From one point of view, this table fellowship is the concrete and specific expression of that "undefendedness" of Jesus which I spoke about *before* – that baptismal nakedness. Here is someone in whom the promise of God has no defences, has no fortified boundaries. Here is somebody whose identification with, and (as I suggested before) contamination by, the unrespectable and unclean, takes concrete form in sitting around one table.

In the ministry and teaching of Jesus, therefore, to be at peace with God and to belong with God's people is something which is determined not by religious ritual performance, not even by orthodoxy. It is determined by whether or not you believe Jesus when he tells you that God welcomes you. That is the 'test' of being at peace with God and belonging with God's people: do you believe Jesus when he tells you that God welcomes you? If you do, anything is possible; if you don't, nothing is possible.

Now that acceptance of the welcome, of course, that belief in welcome, can show itself in the practice of Jesus in two different interwoven ways – so deeply interwoven that the theme is like shot silk in the Gospel: you look at different angles and you see different colours. That two-foldness of the Good News is perhaps expressible in these terms: the gift Jesus offers is not simply his invitation to sit down with him, it is also your freedom to invite him to sit down with you. When Jesus says, in Luke 19, to Zachaeus “Salvation has come to your house” he says it because he has just invited Zachaeus to invite him. And to confer the dignity of being a host is part of what it is for Jesus to greet his guests. That is what I mean by “shot silk”, the interweaving of the invitation of Jesus and the freedom or dignity to be ourselves ‘inviters’. Just as in the most general terms possible, where the work of God is concerned, the essence of God’s gift is to give the dignity of being a giver. That is perhaps another story – but you see how it applies here.

So that is the first point I want to make about eucharistic living. Its roots are in practice: the words, the actions of Jesus in respect of the welcome that he offers on God’s behalf and the welcome he therefore enables and draws out from human beings. The freedom to respond to an invitation and the freedom to give an invitation. And to belong with God’s people, to be (so to speak) a paid-up member of God’s Israel depends, in the eyes of Jesus, only on that.

With that in mind we can, of course, understand far more fully why it is that so many of the Resurrection stories in the Gospels pivot around the experience of invitation. Jesus, we might very well say, invites himself into the locked upper room (he does not wait to be asked!) and then invites his disciples who have abandoned him to make him their guest. “Have you anything to eat?” he asks. (The ultimate social embarrassment when your guest finally has to ask you to give him something to eat!) And once again the alternation and interweaving of

themes in John 21: a miraculous draft of fish, the invitation to sit down to breakfast and, again, the invitation to invite which comes out of that, when Jesus says to Peter "Feed on my behalf". In other words, go and invite.

That the Resurrection stories give such stress to this theme suggests (I think) very strongly, both that the experience of the Resurrection of Jesus had a great deal to do with this theme, and that the table fellowship of the early church was seen as the context in which the Resurrection story could best and most fully be told. And we, I think, deeply misunderstand the resurrection if we fail to connect it continually with this experience of welcome given and repeated. The Resurrection is the continuation of Jesus' encounter with those he invited.

Jesus' freedom to invite on behalf of God is not extinguished by any degree of human refusal – even that ultimate slamming of the door which is the death on the cross. Nothing can stop God in Jesus issuing an invitation, and therefore nothing can finally quench the liberty in human beings to be themselves hosts, inviters. And in the context of that, it is very hard indeed, isn't it, not to see the Eucharist of the Christian Church as centrally, focally, *the* Resurrection Encounter. These are the people who have eaten and drunk with him after his resurrection from the dead. We read in the Acts of the Apostles that that is how Jesus' followers are recognized: eating and drinking with him after his resurrection from the dead, because it is after his resurrection from the dead we see that this invitation is more powerful than anything that human beings can do. This invitation is of God, but it takes the cross to show us that. Only on the other side of the cross does the utter freedom of God to invite become real and definitive. Only *there* do we see what this invitation is capable of overcoming. Only when we see what the depth of the negation is – that says no to God's invitation – do we see the depth of the negation of that negation: the 'no' to our 'no' that God utters on and by the cross.

And that, I think, is why also we have often been at sea in thinking of the Eucharist as first and foremost the representation of Christ's passion. You can see why: "Do this in remembrance of me" says the Lord as He breaks the bread, which is His body and pours out the blood. That clearly brings the Passion to mind. But the more we focus on the Eucharist as the representation of the Passion in and of itself, the more I believe we lose that sense of the Eucharist as the act of encounter with the Risen Christ. There is a sermon by the great sixteenth century Anglican divine, Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury, where he asks what it is that is represented in the Lord's Supper. And, like a good Protestant, he replies that, of course, it is the Lord's death that is set forth there to our minds and affections. "But," he says, "not the Lord's death as an event on its own. But," he goes on, "it is the effects of the Lord's Passion. Here we see the darkness over the earth, here we see the cost of sin; here we see the graves to open and the dead to rise and the earth to shake." It is quite strong really for what is going on in the Eucharist, but he is talking about the effect of the death of Christ. The no to our no. The graves open and the rocks are split.

So the Eucharist re-presents, commemorates, makes active, allows to *be* active, the passion of Jesus as it is oriented to the renewal of Resurrection. Not as an event transacted at a distance, but as, specifically, that event which shows us how God's invitation overcomes our refusal, which pushes forward irresistibly towards resurrection. From all this, then, we can see that Eucharistic Living is, centrally, living in the presence of the living Christ; and a little more specifically, it is hearing the invitation of God in Jesus Christ and exploring our own freedom to invite.

So in the rest of what I want to say this evening, I want to explore those two things further and also tentatively to suggest some of the ways in which the

implications of that go on beyond and outside the human world alone. So let us think for a moment about the Eucharist as a place where we are invited.

The Eucharist is, if all I have been saying is right, a place where the call of God in Jesus Christ is heard and renewed, the call to be a guest. Eucharistic living, then, is living as a guest, which means living, in and with the sense, in the awareness, that my company is desired. One gets into trouble (I speak from experience), using the language of desire too freely where God is concerned. I was able to read recently a very severe judgement on my use of this language by an American theologian who didn't like it at all and thought that I meant somehow God was after us for God's own sake: that God wished to improve the quality of His life by searching out relationships with us. That is not quite what I mean. That is not at all what I mean. (As T.S. Eliot puts it, 'That is not what I meant at all!'). I think we need, for talking about the love of God in the light of Jesus, language strong enough to cope with the passion and intensity and relentlessness of the divine outreach towards our aloneness and lostness. And I am not quite sure that we have got any language other than "desire" for that. We can make all the analogical qualifications we want, and I am quite prepared to say that I do not, for a moment, believe that God needs us to be happy. But God behaves as if He did! And that sense that our company is desired, longed for, is surely one of the things that we ought to be saying as part of Eucharistic living. If we are God's guest then God actually desires with all his heart that we be present there. And our presence to God is the effect, the creation, of God's longing.

So it is not only, as I said last time, that we are, by God's grace, called into being out of chaos. It is also that we are called, very specifically, into company – into accompaniment with God in Jesus Christ, called into the intimacy that Jesus has with the one He calls Father. Called therefore into a movement of

love so strong that we can only speak of it in something like the language of desire. After all if God is, in some sense, hungry and thirsty for God's own being, if God is hungry and thirsty for God's own fullness, then God's love for Jesus, the Word, the Offspring of the Eternal Source - that love reaching out to us can only be seen as God's hunger and thirst for God's own reality. We are treated as if we were God. And I always quote here that marvellous Eucharistic hymn "Look Father! look on His anointed face and only look on us as found in Him." And so He does!

Out of all that emerges the very obvious point that living eucharistically is living gratefully, and I touched on this last time, when speaking of how, if we understood the baptismal calling, we would understand why the Eucharist is at the centre of our Christian practice. Because what response could there be to being desired in such a way but our thankfulness? And I said then and would say it again - that the centrality of gratitude in Christian language and practice is something that cannot be underlined too strongly or repeated too often. Because it does not seem to feature all that largely in some accounts of what it is like to live as a Christian. And you would not always deduce from the way we carry on that gratefulness is something that gave us our distinctive flavour as human beings who are Christians.

But living thankfully - *there* is actually quite a challenge. I can be thankful, from time to time, when I think that I have got something to be thankful for, and depending on my temperament and my circumstances I may or may not do that regularly. But *living* thankfully - that is a bigger challenge, because that suggests that somehow I have to learn a way of connecting every corner of my experience with God as giver. And because so much of our experience is not felt or sensed as a gift, that is an immensely challenging thing. And with some trepidation, I refer here to the experience of a friend who died some six or seven

years ago after a very painful and humiliating illness; and who wrote to me about how she found it possible to pray in hospital. How she felt herself obliged to move from “if I live until morning I will give God thanks” to “I will give God thanks and perhaps I will live until morning”. That is, I suppose, putting it as starkly as could be, and it is not everyone for whom that comes naturally – to put it mildly. But you see what I mean about living thankfully. “I will give God thanks and perhaps I will live until morning” is different and frightening, and I do not want to make that bland or pious because thankful living is not the kind of cheerful acknowledgement that God is the giver of good things. It is the willingness, as I said, to make the connection between our experience, wherever and whatever it is, and God as giver. And the referral of every moment of our experience to God, the sense that every moment is a door that God has opened for us into the divine life, that is thankful living. And it is in that sense of course, that gratitude is so closely bound up with what I spoke about last time in terms of the priestly calling, of the baptised, of the making of connexions – the making of sense. You might say the distinctive Christian way of making sense is to refer moment by moment to God as giver in this way.

I suppose it is something of this which lies behind the language, the quite bold and extravagant language, used by the great Gregory Dix in his book on the Eucharist, about what he called “Homo Eucharisticus” – that species of humanity that Christians are supposed to be, Eucharistic humanity. Because certainly what is being defined and outlined here is a distinctive style of being human, and it is certainly the very opposite of a depersonalised, functionalised humanity. It presupposes that human beings are capable of thanksgiving at that level. “I will give God thanks and perhaps I will live until morning.” Gregory Dix, you will remember, in many of the pages of his work on the shape of the liturgy, writes about how Homo Eucharisticus, eucharistic humanity, stands over against corporatist humanity, collectivist humanity; humanity understood

in terms of what it can achieve as a lump. Against that, the eucharistic person is the one who is able to identify the movement of her or his life moment by moment, with the movement of Jesus towards the Father in time and eternity. The eucharistic person is the one who is able to be taken up into that movement, so that sense is made of the movement of her or his life.

So Eucharistic living seeks a connection between our finite experience – moment by moment – and God, by way of gratitude. By way, that is, of acknowledging that what comes to us comes to us as gift, and that that means that every moment contains an openness of possibility of growth towards God. How do we discern, how do we uncover, that gift and invitation in every moment? Well nobody, least of all myself, is going to give you a generalised answer to that. But I think that that challenge takes us on to a further aspect of Eucharistic living which I have begun to hint at already. If my task as a eucharistic person is to recognise the open door in each moment and experience into the life of God, then how I view other persons, and how I view my whole environment, and how I view the very passage of time itself is altered. If these things are the carriers of gift, if they have in them an open door, then my task, in response to time and matter and people, is the task of incorporating my awareness of those realities into Christ's act of thanksgiving to God, Christ's act of motion towards and into the heart of God. And that, of course, has very radical effects on how I look at time and things and people.

What if time were a gift? What if time is not just a large empty space waiting to be filled up with useful and productive activity? What if time is an open door to God? "I will give God thanks and perhaps I will live until morning" changes the way you spend the night. What if the material stuff of this world is God's gift? Then there are things that I must not do with it. I must not subordinate it wholly and uncritically to my agenda and my personal drives. What, above all,

if other people are God's gift to me? How very hard to believe, when thinking about that in the last lecture, in respect of the people we would least like to spend eternity with. But what if people are God's gift? If all of these things – with time, with things, with people – what thanksgiving imposes on me is the need for, what that great French philosopher Simone Weil called "hesitation". Pause, draw breath before you work out how to fill your time. Pause and draw breath before you plan what to do with your material environment. And, above all, pause and draw breath on the threshold of that infinity which is the person next to you, and the person before you and even the person you are.

That hesitation, that reverent caution before the reality before me is, again, a hard aspect of Christian discipleship, but without that we will end up in that frame of mind which is not, I guess, unfamiliar to you (as it is certainly not unfamiliar to me) which regards the environment as the raw material for my ego. And that is the one thing, of course, which stifles thanksgiving once and for all. Because the material which is before me is not a gift whose hinterland is the mysterious giver, the material before me is just raw material. And with raw material, of course, I can do what I damn well please! And it is in *that* sense that I suspect Eucharistic living has something very deeply to do with something I can only call the contemplative attitude to time and things and persons. Contemplation which, as St Augustine said, is "The enjoyment of something in itself and for its own sake," is very deeply bound up with thanksgiving. It refers what is before me not to *me*, but to something beyond, and to break through the compulsion that so distorts our lives in referring things to our ego, that requires very, very deep practices of stillness and (in the right sense) detachment in our inner lives. First see what is there. "What seest thou else?" Well, that seeing which is required of the ordained minister, required of all the baptised, *that* is part of what is required of living eucharistically. That

seeing of our environment as related first to God before it is related to me. First related to the Giver, even before I experience it as a gift.

Eucharistic living then, living in the presence of the living Christ – yes, living with a sense of invitation and the dignity of being able to invite, living in gratitude, living contemplatively. But here of course we need to put in the necessary qualifications – lest anybody should suppose that living contemplatively is the same as living passively! As if the point of Eucharistic living were just to sit back and cultivate our experiences and think how wonderful they were! We do not respond and interact creatively with our environment if we are passive. And one thing that Eucharistic practice and language says to us is that this is a mystery to do with *transformation*. That is, with how in our seeing and our interacting things change, how our perception of what is possible changes. At the heart of the Eucharistic action is a prayer and a ritual which says that what you see is no longer what is the full reality. Something has been broken and opened up and in that withdrawal, that hesitation and caution, that context that is seeing, that thankful patience is all connected with, rooted in, the action of Christ – the Passion and resurrection – in all that, what is possible for the world changes. So no, not a passive attitude: Eucharistic living is the opposite of that. And it changes (I have already hinted at this) our sense of what the material world is about, and therefore the ways in which we concretely use it. Eucharistic living ought to make us see the environment differently certainly, but also then use the environment differently. And to live gratefully in a material environment is very clearly, I would say, part of living eucharistically and is something which we clearly have not learnt to do after two thousand years of celebrating the Eucharist.

But I think it takes us back also to a theme which I touched on last time: the sense of what the other person is. To be invited and to have the freedom to

invite establishes both self and community as being free to exercise hospitality. So, on top of all the other words I have used, I would say Eucharistic living is hospitable living: undefended, risky, but creative, because hospitality changes possible relations. But not a hospitality which simply depends on my initiative and my vision. I may or may not feel like inviting somebody, I may or may not feel like having somebody sharing space with me. But the Eucharist is about how God's hospitality has already anticipated and overtaken ours. God's action of invitation has gone beyond my will and my decision. Because of the Eucharist, God says to me this or that person, this or that situation, is already invited – and your job is to catch up! And when we see one another as already called, as already guests summoned by God, I realise, we realise, that the value of the other, just like the presence of the other, does not depend on what I decide or what I think is suitable. Eucharistic living is aligning ourselves with and reiterating the call or the welcome of God, and that means that eucharistic living is bound up with the recognition of others as already summoned.

God has been there ahead of us. If we approach the other person – at any level, in any context – as someone we may or may not want to invite, we miss the point. We encounter others first as people that God has already invited, and, as I said earlier, that is a deeply unpleasant and embarrassing reality most of the time. It is unpleasant and embarrassing when we look around the church, it is unpleasant and embarrassing when we think of the people we would like to see in the church and the people we would not like to see in the church. Unpleasant and embarrassing in any number of ways. It was said to me – and I do not exaggerate – that one of the complaints about a new parish priest in our diocese was that he spent all his time bringing new people into the church, which is no doubt regarded as a very terrible failure. I think it arose from the conviction on the priest's part that those who worshiped regularly at the Eucharist in this church had some notion that they were invited by God but that possibly people

around didn't have that notion and might need to be woken up for the recognition of that already existing invitation. So living in and with invitation, and having the freedom to issue invitation – but not to issue an invitation simply on the grounds of *my* decision, but on the much more authoritative and world-transforming grounds that *God* has decided to invite them already. Hospitable living in addition to thankful living and contemplative living.

Now I suppose that it is in the light of all this that Christians have so regularly seen the Eucharist itself as a sort of anticipation of the end of all things. And if you will pardon the jargon, the final thing I want to address is the Eucharist as eschatological living. (“Eschatological” is one of those words, as you know, that theologians use when the going gets tough!) In Eucharistic living, something is anticipated, something is realised in advance, and as you think through some of these themes, you can see, perhaps, how very many aspects of our world are caught up in this understanding – in such a way that you can see where they are going in the longest of long runs in God's purpose.

God invites us into being by creation, and therefore God's purpose for every human person is that they be drawn into a definitive, unsurpassable, unique intimacy with God's own life. At the Eucharist, and in Eucharistic living, that final intimacy is already anticipated. It is anticipated and shouted forth in some very, very crude and simplistic images of assimilation and unity: eating and drinking. But that intimacy, that mutual in-dwelling and absorption represented by eating and drinking, that is there to tell us we are made for intimacy and here we taste it. So that distinctive and unique creative word which God speaks to call each person into being, that is the word that we are to listen for in the Eucharist because in the Eucharist we begin to hear our true name, our distinctive name as uttered by God before the foundation of the world, and we know what we are for. And at the same time, in knowing that, we know that all

those unique, distinctive words are the reflections or the sparks from the fire of the one Word. So that in that Word, in God's eternal self-communicating, we all meet, and something else is anticipated: the fact that the good of every human person is convergent with the good of every other human person. (Something which we again find habitually very hard to believe, because we are innately deeply competitive and we find it almost impossible to credit that what is good for us has something to do with what is good for the person next to us, let alone the person next to them, the person in the other room or the person on the other side of the globe.) But if the words of the invitation come from the one Word of God's self-communicating, then what is spoken to me is spoken to you and spoken to a great many people that I have never met and shall never meet, and what is anticipated in the Eucharist – where that Word is uttered, that call is heard – what is anticipated is that convergent gathering-in of human beings drawn to their joy, drawn to their eternal good. And because the creative Word of God is not something which applies only to human beings, because there are other things in creation apart from human flesh and bone, then the purpose and the good, the fulfilment of every aspect of our environment, is also anticipated and foreshown in the Eucharist.

As has often been said, especially in the Eastern Christian tradition, there is a sense in which the Eucharist is about the material world itself finding its place. Its place is to speak of the self-giving of God. So that the natural processes and the material stuff of bread and wine stand for a creation which has been soaked through with the loving self-communication of God. What we do with things at the Eucharist is the anticipation again of that final, that "horizon state" of things, in which everything speaks of God because everything lives in mutual gift, dependant on God's initiating act. "Alpha and Omega, to whom shall bow all nations at the doom, is present now," says another great Eucharistic hymn. So Eucharistic living is living hopefully – let us say that, rather than

“eschatologically”; it is a lot easier and actually a lot more positive. Living hopefully. The universe in all its complexity, human and non-human, is rooted in the self-giving of God. And that means that the universe in all its complexity, human and non-human, is destined to reflect God – to absorb God’s radiance, God’s action and realise it in its own inner relationships. The Eucharist anticipates that, and therefore living eucharistically is living in the confidence that as we go into our daily business from a celebration of the Eucharist, it is possible to make a difference in the name of God and possible to identify and to create anticipations of the last day, and begin gathering things and persons in God’s love.

So then, time to draw this together a little bit. Perhaps, again in good Anglican style, three things to round up where we are.

1. Eucharistic living is first of all living at the centre of the world because at the centre of the world is Christ’s gift of self to the Father. That Trinitarian relationship out of which flows everything else.
2. Secondly, it is living in a transforming contemplation of the world, because it is a process of finding and re-finding meaning in all things and all people in relation to God: reading the world and reading persons in terms of gift as I suggested. A transforming contemplation, which, like all contemplation, makes on us demands that we frequently want to shrink from. We would be easier with a scheme which allowed us to absorb reality into ourselves, our projects, our agenda. We would be easier with a scheme that allowed us more room and more right to defend ourselves. But we are asked first to stand back, to be still, to look and, in that looking, to discover something of what God’s purpose is for a situation, a person or a material object.

3. Living at the centre of the world, living in transforming contemplation of the world and living, finally at the end of the world. Living with our vision informed from that sense that in God's purpose and by God's providence reality converges, it doesn't fall apart into eternally, endlessly incompatible goods and destinies. Eucharistic living is about a proleptic – another technical word, sorry – a realising in advance, a proleptic realising of the calling of the holy creation.

In all of this, with all of those three things in mind, we have to go back to the simplicities with which we began. This exists because of who Jesus was, and what he said, and what he did, and what he suffered. It exists because at that pivotal moment in the history of the human universe the act and work of God was made specific in acts of invitation. And health and salvation was understood once and for all as the belief that the world is welcome.

If we are in the business as Christians of eucharistic living – living out our baptismal calling in the neighbourhood of Christ – then, in short, our task is to learn what it is to believe that the world is welcome. Welcome to God and therefore welcome to us. Once again Christian history does not always suggest that this has been the first thing associated with Eucharistic practice in many people's minds. But if it has anything at all to do with Jesus' own redefinition of salvation in terms of welcome, then that is our task. If the world is welcome to God, if my neighbour is welcome to God, if this moment is a door into God through which I may be welcomed, if this experience is open to God in that way, if this material reality and environment is welcome to God, then my calling should be clear.

ANZAC memorials: some reflections for Christian liturgy¹

Gerard Moore *sm*

While reading Ken Inglis' fascinating work on Australian war memorials² I was struck by the number of theological and, more specifically, liturgical references. The language of the book continually threw up interpretations of *sacred, shrine, pilgrimage, stations of the Cross, order of service, holiness, sacrifice, memory and remembrance*. There are others. My initial question is quite simple. What does the work have to say to liturgists about Christian worship in an Australian context? In that sense I am avoiding the field of the relationship between civil religion and Christian liturgy. Unsure how helpful or insightful such a discussion is, my thoughts have turned rather to seeing whether an analysis of the memorial movement offers insights for our own memorial traditions. This paper, a small attempt to open up the area, falls more into field of liturgical theology than practical liturgy. Hopefully its inadequacies will stimulate better reflection!

Amongst the vast range of ideas that Inglis throws up I would like to concentrate on three points in particular. First we will look at how the memorial movement takes up the issue of the value of the non-utilitarian, of 'useless' objects. The main part of the essay seeks to identify and examine the various levels of consciousness in the gathered assembly, their *grand narratives*, local

¹ This paper is a modified version of a talk given at the Seminar Week Dinner (Wednesday, 14 August) during the 2002 Seminar Week at the United Theological College, North Parramatta. The Week was centred around a series of lectures by noted North American liturgist Don Saliers. Also celebrated was Graham Hughes' the final semester of teaching and ministry at UTC.

² K.S. Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*, assisted by Jan Brazier (Melbourne: The Miegunyah Press, 1998). The numerous references to this magisterial work are included in brackets in the text itself.

narratives, and individual personal stories. Finally we will turn to the application of Christian symbols to the needs of society at large.

A second word of warning! All liturgy has one constant – change. As Inglis passes from the Boer War, through the First and Second World Wars, to the present, he uncovers how significant symbols and events have been and continue to be reinterpreted and reappropriated. At their origins ANZAC memorials never meant only one thing. More importantly, over time the memorials have come to signify different things again. There is a caution here for liturgists, who tend to be more at home with Parmenides than Heraclitus. The same river is ever in flux. Consequently our focus will fall mainly on the dynamics behind the building and dedication of the ANZAC memorials following World War I.

The importance of the ‘useless’

Since much in liturgy is pretty ‘useless’, or more adequately described as non-utilitarian, then this seems an appropriate place to begin. A central question in the choice of a monument was whether the memorial should be a utilitarian form or not. Some were, in all practical reckoning, useless forms: obelisks, statues, urns, crosses, archways. Others valued function: halls, drinking fountains, clocks, gates. The debate was interesting. Why should a functional object, one that the municipal council ought provide anyway, be used as a memorial? Could a hall, used typically for dances, be suitably sacred? What message would be given if such a building fell into disrepair? Those churches built as memorial buildings came to be seen as belonging more to the denomination than as expression of the sentiment of the local community. Centres that chose functional objects after WWI often elected to build something symbolic after WWII (413, 440). Most Vietnam War Memorials are monumental in character (385).

The value of the useless became apparent. Purely monumental forms served as places of reference in the town, and as rallying points for the ceremonies. Likewise they acted as places for pilgrimage, reflection and quiet. Their very absence of utility enabled them to take up a sacred duty as ground dedicated to the 'burial' of the fallen. Within just four years of the erection of the pillar in Ulmara (NSW) a citizen is reported as saying: *Religious services had always been held around the memorial ... and in his opinion that piece of ground was sacred* (250). So much so did they carry this message that they became almost impossible to translate to a different spot when the increase in motor traffic necessitated a rethinking of their location. At the proposed 1926 relocation of the Hurstville memorial the president of the RSL sub-branch said the following: *It's the grave of their fallen comrades – the only grave that mothers, wives, and sisters have to visit. Shift the monument, and all its glory fades* (250, 419-420).

Much that is part and parcel of Christian worship is for all intents and purposes 'useless'. What does it matter to sing a hymn, to have a beautiful lectionary, to construct a building solely for worship rather than multipurpose? Does everything have to be immediately explainable, so clear in its meaning, too purpose oriented? In the ANZAC story it does not appear to matter so strongly whether the monument be a pillar, an obelisk, an arch, or a cross. What did matter was that communities that once had memorial halls and the like recognized that ultimately such forms did not serve all that well. Perhaps the key is that a more effective memorial was one that allowed for more open interpretation. In the long run memorial halls, churches, drinking fountains, clocks and later swimming pools could not quite do this. So to what did these 'useless' objects give space and permission?

The levels of consciousness in the assembly gathered around the ANZAC memorial
 What is in the mind of the gathered assembly? What is in the minds of the absent? Reflections on the post WWI memorial movements allow for some intriguing insights into this most difficult liturgical and ecclesial question. Writ large, in what could be termed the *grand narrative*, or the *BIG words*, appears to be a two fold national consciousness. The public speech of statesman, politicians, officials and the like was dominated by an ideology of nation building. ANZAC remembrance was set forth in terms of the growing up into nationhood of Australia, consequent with blood, sacrifice, duty, a warrior tradition, and a colony taking its place in the empire (222). It is the logic of King, Country and God, a trinity that were to be reckoned with. This consciousness mainly had currency by being talked about. Its three terms were essentially abstract and somewhat nebulous. The King was far distant and impersonal. God, too, was at least distant and mysterious, and not necessarily Christian. Country had some immediate claim on the Australians. Yet while everyone could think of their homeland, 'Country' could mean England, Australia, Empire or all three together. Ultimately this powerful threesome represented a high language devoid of deep experiential roots. Yet, as the language used to bring comfort and solace to unknown mourners across the oceans (99), it had significance and valency. It is important not to underestimate the power of the national narrative consciousness. Those who challenged it came up against its raw emotion. Professor John Anderson, the controversial philosopher at the University of Sydney felt its wrath first hand (230). Recent work on the prevalence and size of secret Depression era civilian militias reveals that the *grand narratives* had impact.

The returned soldiers carried a different national consciousness. Their ideology was built around free enlisting men, a voluntary corps (221), renowned for their mateship and achievement. Underlying this were events that no words could

adequately speak, experiences devoid of language, high or low. They will remain without voice for almost fifty years³.

The memorial movement, then, bespoke a complex national consciousness. It contained at least two *grand narratives*, one often spoken (God, King, Country), another so deeply experienced that it could only be given expression through limited terms under the rubric of 'the volunteer corps'. Yet there were other narratives at play. Local communities were the catalyst of remembrance celebrations and monuments. Towns, small and large, wished to remember their dead and their returned volunteers. They felt the need to do this publicly, where no one would be forgotten, and where those who did not volunteer would be silently marked by their absence from the roll. It is a logic of community, of civic contribution, of home. It opens onto the experience of whole districts coming to terms with the loss of their young men, the quiet grieving of mothers and widows in their midst (399), the young women left with no one to court them. The local narrative is a shared experience, held by individual communities, but common across all of them. It too held a dreadful secret, only able to be told generations later (225); the young of the district had often died in vain, from folly, blunder and incompetence.

At a deeper level, the entire memorial movement seems driven by a consciousness more familial and personal. It is the answer to the pressing question: *How do we mourn when we do not have a body?* Only one soldier (and his horse) was repatriated to Australia for burial. What was too expensive for any family would be forbidden to all families. Rich and poor mourned alike. The memorials acted as burial plots, places of rest on home soil for men and women killed so far away (97, 128). Clearly the town memorial was pertinent

³ Inglis (439) points especially to the seminal work of Bill Gammage *The Broken Years. Australian Soldiers in the Great War (1974)*.

to the bereaved families. It was also highly significant for those soldiers who returned. According to Inglis, the withdrawal from Gallipoli meant the abandonment of their mates: *no theme recurs so powerfully in their published and private memories as the anguish of leaving dead comrades* (89). The plaque, statue, obelisk offered a site for personal grief and mourning. Further it allowed secrets and silences a location, ensuring that they too would not be forgotten. Here it is worth considering the spiritualist ideas that were part of the religious imagination in the pre and post WWI (62, 104, 275-279). They enabled attendees at ceremonies to imagine that spirits of the departed were present, hovering around gathering.

Also in the minds of those who gather is a consciousness of who were absent. In general Labor politicians, catholic clergy, and anti-war activists were rarely welcome in any official capacity, and often wisely chose to stay away or at a distance. Yet there were also returned soldiers who would not come. The horrors of war were enough for them (225-6, 244). Those repatriated into mental institutions could not attend. Some built their own memorials in the grounds of their hospitals (244-45). Another casualty from WWI, as yet unwritten about but mentioned in a radio interview with Ken Inglis, are the chaplains who returned with their faith shattered (for a hint see 87). The final absent one was the 'unknown soldier', someone's brother, son, husband, lost, never found, never identified, never properly buried. To generations schooled in the Iliad and the Odyssey this was a great sadness. Where did those spirits rest?

Perhaps there is another category to be considered: those who gathered in diversion, disruption or disrepute. The memorial service could simply act as a prelude for the main events of drinking, story telling, gambling. These smaller narratives, non-official but essential rituals, are telling. They reveal that there

are other truths. Further they remind that official rites have only a limited capacity to heal. Attendance at the formal side of things was simply a convenient way of getting down to the real business. Yet disruption and disrepute were also present. Let me quote here directly from Inglis:

No paper at all reported a sight observed by the six-year-old Russel Ward during an unveiling by Governor Newdegate at South Perth on Armistice Day 1923 and remembered sixty years later: "a drunken old digger having a pee in full view of the official party and lots of grown-up ladies" (224).

Much post modern thought has been occupied with the displacement of the *grand narratives*, and the emergence of discontinuous *small narratives*. The multilayered sense of the memorial assembly allows for a more careful differentiation. There are different forms of narrative, working at different levels, in the same people at the one time. Some narratives have their power in principles and ideology. More enduring are those that are grounded in actual experience, whether named or unnamed. Yet these smaller narratives are able to be carried, given a place, and ultimately find expression, through the public environment created by the broader consciousness. The recognized frameworks of King, Country, God, or the 'volunteer corps', along with the spiritualist currents, allowed for many other memories and understandings, ultimately subversive to the dominant rhetoric, to be carried and await their time. Eventually the horror of war, the incredible sadness borne by those left at home⁴, the violence against women in war (389), the treatment of Aboriginal soldiers during war and afterwards (216, 245), the fate of people of German birth or descent interned during the war (187), and reconciliation with former enemies will find a public voice. The dominance of *grand narratives* and their 'monumental' incarnation may have forestalled this far too long, but it may also

have enabled these *small narratives* to be given a hearing at all. It is also possible that these smaller narratives have the capacity to re-name and re-make the dominant story.

The levels of consciousness in the Christian liturgical assembly

This gives pause to think about the levels in Christian memorial. Do those who gather for worship have any less complicated a collective 'mind'? Do we not have a multiplicity of Christian *grand narratives*: the Word, the holy sacrifice of the Mass, justification by faith not by works, the divine liturgy? Yet where is their experiential hold? What is their relationship to our lives as we actually live them, to our hopes as we cling to them, our loves, our laments? How do they fit with the other large narratives common to our communities?

Significant here is the recognition that a range of *grand narratives* may be operative in the same assembly. Their interconnection and disconnection is part and parcel of a living community. In light of this it is worth asking whether there are, in general, *grand narratives* held dear by the clergy that are not so warmly or enthusiastically shared by the laity, and *vice versa*. If so, then it means that presider and participants, preacher and hearers, leader and prayers, may be interpreting the same rites, prayers and symbols quite differently within the one assembly. As with the memorial movement, what we need to investigate is the local and experiential basis underpinning any *grand narratives*. This is perhaps more important than determining whether there is necessarily conflict when different *grand narratives* are operating in the same ceremony.

⁴ Two more recent studies are Margaret Reeson, *A Very Long War: the Families Who Waited* (Melbourne University Press, 2000) and Joy Damousi, *Living with the Aftermath: Trauma, Nostalgia and Grief in Post-war Australia* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).

What are the local narratives? Anyone who has tried to rearrange the interior of a church building, perhaps by removing the altar rails, will soon be confronted by the power of the local. Each assembly has something of a shared history. This has an effect on the way any and every member gathers, participates and absents herself or himself. Ultimately the local narratives are most strongly held in the memory of the laity. Nor are they confined to the church building or Sunday assembly. They work to place this particular Christian community into context with the people, issues and customs of the locality. Also in the consciousness of the assembly are the questions Who is absent? Who cannot come in? Who only brings trouble when they turn up? Who is here just to use us for something else? The absent and the ambivalent are part of our worship picture. They offer a constant critique of our current practices and ideas. They challenge the breadth of our inclusivity, and stretch the capacity of our forgiveness and embrace. In a sense they unmask the 'smallness' of some of our BIG words, and proclaim the existence of experiences and categories yet to be touched on by the gospel. They can 'worry' our faith because they threaten to exist beyond the reach of Christ, while belonging in the midst of his people. As in the ANZAC memorial movement, these local expressions exist in and under the *grand narratives*. While it is *grand narratives* that call the people together in the first place, the faithful will only assemble if those BIG words serve to meet the needs of the local, smaller narratives.

At the individual level we can ask what are the personal narratives of sin, shame, lament, redemption and thanksgiving. Liturgy seeks to give communal voice to these intimate experiences. Its favoured method is to subsume their religious expression into rite and symbol so as to unlock them, enrich them and allow their ongoing transformation. Our worship rites and symbols must have enough of the quality of the 'useless' to enable this to take place. As with the soldier memorials, unless the rituals and symbols have tapped into the levels of

local and individual ownership and participation, they can become ineffective and for all intents and purposes actually useless, if not counter productive.

All these levels and layers are in our collective 'mind' at the same time! Here we can get a glimpse of why preaching on the *grand narratives* is often so soulless and redundant when it is not attached to the many smaller narratives that co-exist along side them, if not give them experiential underpinning. Perhaps we could also speculate that every true Christian *grand narrative* contains the seeds of its own undoing, its own *kenosis*, along with the germ of its rebirth into deeper truth – somewhat like the saviour himself! And the place for this transformation is worship!

Symbol and Rite

There is much to notice on how the ANZAC traditions of remembrance have adopted symbols and created rites. The monuments took their inspiration from a range of sources. Classical thought gave us urns, obelisks, pillars. The scriptures offered words of inspiration, especially John *greater love has no man* (Jn 15:13) and Ecclesiasticus *their name liveth for evermore* (Eccles 46:12 or 46:15)⁵. The citation references were not supplied on the monument. For a written text, the context almost demanded the language be in archaic idiom. The Christian story brought forward the symbol of a cross. Conventional imperial poets and wordsmiths supplied other comforting words; *They shall not grow old as we grow old* (93), *lest we forget* (see 190-196). Scales of economy and local aesthetics gave rise to the figure of the solitary standing digger, a young district man inside a military uniform. Few of these are the same, local variants being part of the commissions (176). Tomb customs were taken over in cenotaphs. The trophies of war also played a part; captured weapons distributed to any district that wanted them for display. As children we played on the

cannons and machine guns that were used against our grandfathers! The eclectic nature of this incomplete list is a reminder of the diversity within communities and across a then quite homogeneous nation. It is also quite secular in intent. Importantly, there is little that bespeaks the glory of war or the might of victory. The 'secular' offers the community values and morals that shock Christians into realizing that we are not the sole heirs of grace nor the only arbiters of authentic goodness!

What is being done to the Christian symbols as they are taken up? The Cross has not been utilized as a sign of the resurrection, the victory of Christ over death, the beginning of a new creation, or martyrdom for the faith. It appears to be reappropriated as a symbol of sacrifice unto death. It takes up the inspirational story of the death of that outstanding man Jesus devoid of theological significance or interpretation. Some churches built crucifixion tableaux, and the town of Berridale (NSW) erected a calvary. How was this interpreted? The Anglican rector took the view that such scenes were common in English and French villages, representing a 'little bit of France transported'. The Catholic priest from Cooma contributed that at the foot of the Cross all are equal (158-9). The monument points not to Christ but to the memory of the returned soldier, and the comfort of the bereaved.

Biblical inscriptions suffered a similar fate. They were handy texts, fitting sayings, archaic truths, mined from classic works lodged deep in the Western mind. In no way did they seek to encourage passers-by to reach for their bibles! In a sense Christianity has been so successful that its texts have now been easily called into service even against their meaning and intent. This was not without the collusion of the churches. Inglis reports one such occasion: *when men*

⁵ Also Is 6:8: "Whom shall I send? Here I am send me" (Inglis, 193) and Is 60:22: "A little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation" (Inglis 193).

invalided out of the war heard a sermon in their honour at Melbourne's Wesley Church on ANZAC Day 1916 by a preacher with three sons in the AIF, they could see the word ANZAC in gold letters on a crown over the pulpit (84). At another level, the story of Simpson and his donkey was associated with that of the Good Samaritan, connecting two sacred narratives (3).

Liturgically we are reminded how difficult it can be for us to bring critical gospel scrutiny to bear on a *grand narrative* that both has about it the air of authentic religiosity (God, King, Country) and also touches into our deepest humanity (the fate of sons on the frontline). As well, we are offered a poignant reminder that our worship symbols are evocative of more meanings than we generally allow. Their polyvalence stretches beyond what theology and popular religious imagination usually supplies. Taken up into the society at large, there is no complete check on the interpretative matrix that believers themselves bring to them. Most monuments, built by committees full of Christian believers, eschewed Christian forms. The Christian symbols used were acceptable for their secular strengths and insights. It would seem that the Australian Christian imagination has long had the ability to wrestle with traditional religious themes such as death, sacrifice, and protection of country, deliberately outside the confines of theology and religious practice!

Conclusion

Working closely with Inglis' text we have been able to look into three areas that are of considerable interest to liturgical practice and theology. The ANZAC war memorial movement arising out of World War I has afforded us a glimpse at how 'useless' things can be potent symbols. Further, and perhaps more importantly, it gives us some insight into the way *grand narratives*, local narratives and personal stories interact in the one assembly at the one time. We have concluded with some overview of how society appropriates Christian

symbols, remembering that even as their direct Christian intentionality was washed out, this was being done by Christians of that society. In particular this leaves us to reflect on the way the Christian religious imagination works with traditional religious symbols even beyond their intended theological breadth.



QUARTERLY

— *Catholic Pastoral Liturgy Journal* —
ALL-AUSTRALIAN

The Liturgical Commission

GPO Box 282, Brisbane AUSTRALIA 4001

E-mail litcom@bnc.catholic.net.au

Telephone (07) 3224 3329

Facsimile (07) 3221 1705

Subscription: \$22 p.a. (Overseas \$30). Use your credit card.

Anglican – Uniting Church covenant: liturgical aspects

Robert Gribben and Charles Sherlock

The following agreement sets out a framework for the liturgical practice of co-operating congregations within the proposed Anglican – Uniting Church covenant.

It is recognised that such a statement cannot cover the full range of congregational practice within both churches, not least because (especially for the Uniting Church) authorised liturgical forms do not necessarily represent such practice. The agreement therefore speaks in terms of the principles, substance and shape of the corporate worship life of both churches.

Christian Initiation

- a) Both our churches recognise Baptism as administered in both churches, and welcome people of any age to this sacrament.
- b) We agree that, subject to particular notes made below, use of the forms in *An Australian Prayer Book*, *Uniting in Worship* or *A Prayer Book for Australia* constitutes valid Christian Baptism. We agree that the Apostles' Creed is a sufficient affirmation of the faith into which each person is baptised.
- c) We agree that each Christian is baptised into the Church of God. Where the question is raised locally as to whether this takes visible shape in either the Anglican or Uniting Church communion, our response would be that he or she is baptised into a visible body which anticipates the Church that is coming as Christ's will and gift 'from the future', embracing both Anglican and Uniting traditions.

- d) There is some difference of emphasis as to the 'warrant' for the baptism of an infant. The Anglican Church requires of each candidate for baptism that they repent of sins and confess Christ, whether of themselves (supported by sponsors) or through their sponsors. The Uniting Church requires that the parents of an infant make public affirmation of their own faith, and the intention to raise the child as a Christian, but does not ask the infant to confess sins or faith. We recommend that, in any baptism of an infant conducted in a joint congregation, both disciplines are followed, so that the parents state their own faith, and also that sponsors act on behalf of the child. In the case of *A Prayer Book for Australia*, this would be achieved by including the parents in The Presentation and The Decision (pages 55-6 // 74-75).
- e) Both churches take the admission of baptised persons to the Holy Communion with considerable seriousness. We both practise a form of commissioning through prayer and the laying on of hands – in Anglican practice, confirmation, normatively by a bishop. The Anglican Church 'receives' communicant members of a Church holding the apostolic faith who wish to become Anglicans. We believe that in any joint congregation, confirmation must continue. Where this is conducted by a bishop, the candidate should be received by the Uniting Church as a member accepted at the Lord's Table; where this is conducted by the Uniting Church minister, the candidate should be received by the Anglican Church as a communicant member.

The pattern of worship

Along with western churches generally, both the Anglican Church of Australia and the Uniting Church in Australia have shared in the renewal of public worship through the liturgical movement. One institutional outcome is the

formation of the *Australian Consultation on Liturgy*, in which both churches have been active since its inception. In particular,

a) We note that both our churches are committed to the systematic public reading of the holy scriptures, and delight in corporate singing. As one outcome of liturgical renewal, we note gladly that we use closely similar versions of the *Revised Common Lectionary* for Sundays. Further, we share a substantial body of hymnody: in particular, that many congregations from both churches use *The Australian Hymn Book* and *Together in Song*.

b) We agree that the Lord's Prayer, preferably in the modern translation prepared by the *English Language Liturgical Consultation* which is common to both our churches, is normally to be used on every occasion of corporate worship.

We note that the use of an affirmation of faith is a normal part of Sunday worship in both traditions, and also that this is always an authorised form. For both churches, the Apostles' Creed is normative for baptisms. For Anglicans, it is also typically used at Morning and Evening Prayer, with the Nicene Creed used for the Holy Communion. We agree that, in co-operating congregations, the use of such affirmations of faith should be a regular aspect of corporate Sunday worship

We agree that the omission of the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed is not a communion-dividing issue between us. We recommend that the congregation uses the form which belongs to the church of the presiding minister.

c) Another outcome of this common heritage – of immediate relevance to the current task – is agreement on the basic structure of the worship in a Christian assembly:

Gathering (typically including greeting, hymnody, scripture sentences and prayers, and – if not employed elsewhere – confession and absolution/assurance of forgiveness)

Ministry of the Word (both our churches employ similar patterns of readings, make use of the Psalter, assign a critical importance to preaching, and confess the faith of the Church)

The Prayers of the People (commonly using responses from the congregation), and allowing for both liturgical prayer and the disciplined use of *ex tempore* prayers)

The Holy Communion, preceded by appropriate preparation, the Greeting of Peace, the Great Thanksgiving (giving thanks for God's work in creation and redemption, commemorating the atoning death of Jesus Christ, and invoking the Holy Spirit to enable all present to feed on Christ by faith with thanksgiving, and so offer the praise due to God our heavenly Father), followed by administration in both kinds.

Sending out (including blessings and dismissal).

Where the Holy Communion is not celebrated, fuller use of hymnody, prayers and preaching commonly takes place in both our churches.

- d) On the basis of the above considerations, we believe that the regular Sunday services of both our churches, conducted according to our respective formularies, may in general terms (subject in particular to the comments below about the Thanksgiving Prayer) be used in good conscience in a co-operating congregation.

The Holy Communion

- a) Both our churches celebrate regularly the sacrament of the Holy Communion, Lord's Supper or Eucharist, and receive those who are accepted at the Lord's Table by their own Church (in Anglican terms, 'communicant members'). We therefore agree that all members of a co-

operating congregation, and visitors who meet the above conditions, may receive the sacrament whether the service is shaped by the Anglican or Uniting traditions.

- b) Both our churches welcome all persons who have been baptised, and are in communion with a church which holds the apostolic faith, to receive the Holy Communion, while respecting the disciplines of churches who differ from this position.
- c) The Uniting Church authorizes a variety of Great Prayers of Thanksgiving in *Uniting in Worship*, but it also allows ministers to choose to use a prayer from another source as long as it conforms to Uniting Church doctrine. Ministers are asked to exercise an important discretion at this point. As regards the Great Thanksgiving, the Uniting Church accepts that each of those in *An Australian Prayer Book* and *A Prayer Book for Australia* are sufficiently congruent with Uniting Church understandings as to be able to be used in a co-operating congregation.

We note that the prayer described as 'Alternative Prayer of Thanksgiving A' in *Uniting in Worship* is almost identical to the Second Prayer of Thanksgiving in *An Australian Prayer Book*, and Alternative Thanksgiving 4 in *A Prayer Book for Australia*. This commonality is due to the prayer having been originally drafted by the (Congregationalist) Harold Leather-land, making it particularly appropriate for use in services which join the Anglican and Uniting traditions of worship.

We note that some Thanksgiving Prayers authorised in the Uniting Church allow the narrative of institution to be read prior to the opening dialogue, as the 'warrant' for what follows. Since the Anglican Church uniformly prays this narrative as part of the Great Thanksgiving, it is unable to authorise its omission from the prayer.

We also note that some Uniting Church Ministers of the Word pray this Prayer *ex tempore* – perhaps using the authorized prayers as a model. Where this takes place in a co-operating congregation, we agree that the prayer must offer thanks for God's work in creation and redemption, commemorate the atoning death of Jesus Christ, and invoke the Holy Spirit to enable all present to feed on Christ by faith with thanksgiving.

We note that in some Anglican congregations a considerable amount of symbolic action is made by the president during the Thanksgiving Prayer. While not wishing to make a judgement about this, we suggest that an elegant simplicity will enable both Uniting and Anglican members to participate more fully in the prayer.

We note that the Uniting Church's practice is that those ordained as Ministers of the Word and as Deacons may preside at the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. There are protocols (passed by the 8th Assembly) governing when it is appropriate for each so to preside in a local congregation. It is also the practice for a presbytery to authorize a lay person (usually after some theological and practical study) to preside at the sacraments, but this is largely in the case of serious pastoral need, and is, in any case, limited both in time and place, reviewed annually. Such presidency by deacons or lay people at the Holy Communion is not in accordance with Anglican norms. We also note that in some dioceses of the Anglican Church of Australia, women are not ordained as priests. However, the issue of who may or may not be the appropriate minister to preside at the Holy Communion (or other services) is related to, but distinct from, the liturgical substance of worship.

The resolution of these matters will be guided by the discussion and covenants following the report *For the Sake of the Gospel*, and will be the

concern of those charged with the responsibility of appointing ministerial leadership to cooperating parishes/congregation.

Pastoral services

Pastoral ministry, including the ministries of healing and reconciliation, form substantial aspects of the worship life of both our churches. We rejoice in the many occasions of personal and community care, nurture, advocacy and encouragement which take place without regard for our particular ecclesial allegiances, for the sake of the kingdom of Christ.

The following notes take up particular ministries in which liturgical forms play a significant part.

- a) As regards *weddings*, we note that both our churches are committed to the preparation of each couple for marriage, including preparation of the wedding service itself.

We also note that Commonwealth law requires the use only of rites authorised by the church concerned. We agree that there is nothing in our formularies which ought to trouble the good conscience of either Anglican or Uniting Church 'authorised celebrants'. We also agree that the use of any of our authorised rites for weddings would issue in a valid marriage in Christ.

In the case of an inter-church marriage, we would encourage the couple to be viewed ecumenically rather than regarded as a problem: they should be seen as a couple who embody the church growing into that unity which is Christ's gift and will.

- b) As regards *ministry to the sick and dying*, we acknowledge with gratefulness that our authorised rites have benefited from mutual borrowing: what matters here is more the quality of pastoral ministry and relationships, which is a communion-bonding issue.

We note that the practice of deacons and authorised lay ministers distributing the sacrament to sick communicants from the congregational celebration of the Holy Communion is acknowledged in both our churches. We agree that where such ministry is part of a co-operating congregation it may be offered by either Anglican or Uniting Church persons.

- c) As regards *the ministry of reconciliation*, we agree that the opportunity for personal confession and absolution of sin is a significant aspect of every 'minister of God's holy Word'. We note that both churches have authorised liturgical forms which may be used for this ministry, and commend these.

Where members of a co-operating congregation ask for the ministry of reconciliation to be offered by either an Anglican priest or a Uniting Church minister of the Word, such wishes are to be respected.

- d) As regards *funerals*, we again acknowledge that mutual borrowing has taken place in our liturgical provisions, and we encourage mutual co-operation in funeral ministry.

We recognise that while there are some differences of emphasis in practice (though not in our formularies) touching the faithful departed, both churches affirm the reality of the communion of saints.

We offer this agreement in the hope that it may offer encouragement to all Christians in our worship of the Triune God - in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Book Reviews

Brian Wren, *Praying Twice, The Music and Words of Congregational Song* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000) 0 664 25670-8, Limp, pp ix + 422

When Brian Wren speaks about hymns, one sits up and listens. As a hymn writer, he is and has been at the cutting edge of English-speaking hymnody since his early days with the Dunblane group forty years ago.

Dr Wren argues that congregational song is indispensable, but he is not unaware of threats to it both from the secular world of entertainment and the restless hunger within the church for attractive novelty. He offers practical suggestions as to how congregational song can be encouraged and repertoire enlarged.

When it comes to “contemporary worship music”, Wren is neither gullible nor snobbish. He urges that it deserves “a critical welcome” with both words being equally weighted. He provides an incisive set of criteria for “assessing the lyrics of congregational song”. Those carry the weight of one who submits to the same discipline he prescribes for others. His comments on choruses etc are charitable, but one is not convinced that he is entirely at home in this field. He does however offer useful suggestions as to how these pieces may be used.

Wren’s comments on issues of gender in language help explain why many editors and hymn writers today are sensitive about this issue. As part of this, he explores the effect of Kingship metaphors in the language of worship and suggests viable alternatives.

His technical analysis of hymn poetry as a form is impressive. In the midst of this, one finds delightful throw-away lines, such as “singers of hymns need poetry that will express their faith and enable them to be truthfully themselves in the presence of God”. The man has a way with words!

When he tackles the question “why do they keep changing the good old hymns”, Wren is at his best. His expertise and wide reading provide compelling answers. For example, he catalogues and analyses the editorial changes made to the favourite known today as “Hark, the herald angels sing”. This is most informative. However, whilst accepting that editorial modifications may be needed as language usage and culture change, he is far from uncritical of clumsy editorial work following what he labels “the Ugly Truth Theory”.

In all, this book is a source of significant comment and analysis concerning congregational song. However, without in any way denigrating the views expressed in this book, there will be those who will think it over wordy. To them, it may read like a PhD thesis before it has been pruned for publication. Arguments are sometimes over-extended: the reader is already convinced but the lecturer goes on. This is surprising for one who is such a fine ‘wordsmith’ when it comes to writing hymns in which there is never a superfluous word. Or again, one never becomes restless or impatient when attending a workshop conducted by Dr Wren. He has a wonderful ability to engage his audience. There is the danger that an author writing a book about a topic close to his heart may sometimes become lost in his own thoughts in the privacy of his study.

Having said that, nothing would reduce the value of what this book says. If some readers find it a little lengthy, they could skip and still find the gems it undoubtedly contains. Dr Wren is a man who cares about congregational song and does all he can to nourish it, and for that we are truly thankful.

— *Lawrence Bartlett*

Pierre Hegy and Joseph Martos (Editors), *Catholic Divorce: The Deception of Annulments* (New York: Continuum, 2000) 0-8264-1228-9 h/b pp1+230 RRP \$42.95

The book is composed of ten chapters, being contributions of the editors, and Catholic theologians Edward Schillebeeckx and Joseph Martos, Archbishop Peter d'Huillier of the Eastern or Orthodox tradition, William H. Swatos Jr of the Anglican communion, Adair T. Lummis from a Protestant position, and sixteen testimonies of the pain and confusion of divorced people who have remarried or considered remarriage, with or without an annulment.

The editors address the possibility that "in prohibiting remarriage after divorce and creating an annulment process to find a way to circumvent the prohibition, the Catholic Church is engaged in deception" (201). Addressing the Christian teaching on marriage, Hegy, Schillebeeckx and L'Huillier dispute the interpretation of biblical passages about marriage and divorce which underpin theology today. So much of what is defined as being authentically the teaching of Jesus is in fact the interpretation of a developing Church, as we are today. So much of canonical law regarding marriage is political, as it has been throughout Western history.

Joseph Martos demonstrates vastly different assumptions about what is meant by the word "marriage" in different ages and by different cultures. The Catholic Church has the philosophical assumption that the moral law is uniform for all humankind. Martos sees the complexity of divorce/annulment/remarriage arising from the rigid definition of marriage as sacrament. "Never since the Middle Ages has Catholicism taken a fresh look at the notion of sacrament, neither at Trent nor at Vatican II: the old formulas are endlessly repeated" (140, 208).

Edward Schillebeeckx's two chapters in *Catholic Divorce* are available for the first time in English. He claims that "indissolubility...does not seem to be a property that comes from an institution; rather it is dependent on the personal conviction and decision that one wants to have a certain type of relationship with one's marriage partner" (90). For me, indissolubility happens when the partners themselves can say they want never to walk away from their relationship. I agree with Schillebeeckx's proposal that "only a successful married life has a right to be called consummated" (96). Further, I would contend that sacramentality is a state into which some married people grow in time.

In his second article, Schillebeeckx claims that nowhere is there a discrepancy so great as that between official Church teaching and those who live the reality of sexuality and marriage (180). Official teachings about most types of human behaviour cannot be seen as professions of faith, but rather as either a "conviction" or an "opinion" of the Church, since human behaviour develops culturally (196).

Archbishop Peter L'Huillier states that the doctrine of indissolubility cannot be found in Byzantine law. The concept of annulment is also foreign in the Eastern patristic tradition, because one does not find the idea that the marriage bond persists after divorce (115) as opposed to the sacramental theology of Catholicism.

Adair T. Lummis writes of a slowly-increasing acceptance, even compassionate support, of divorce among men and women clergy of Protestant communities in the USA. Where divorce of clergy may not be an issue in Catholicism, there are today more prominent married lay leaders in parishes, schools and hospitals

than there are priests. Catholic acceptance of divorced remarried couples would greater enhance the Church's support of families.

I found *Catholic Divorce* a scholarly book in its treatment of the Scriptural and historical background to sacramental marriage. Its appeal would be more in the area of marriage theology than of liturgical interest, although Schillebeeckx does raise the possibility of a separate positive wedding liturgy for second marriages. There was some disappointment for me that the authors proposed the "most healthy" healing of deception as the acceptance of the institution of the Church as both human and divine, both a means and an obstacle to salvation, rather than a transformation of Catholic marriage theology.

— Pat Mullins

Contributors

Lawrence Bartlett served on the staff of The Kings School, Parramatta, and as Tutor in Church Music in Ridley College, where he experimented with congregational liturgical music. From 1968, he has served on The Australian Hymn Book Committee. As a composer, he has hymn tunes published in Canada, the UK, USA, the Philippines and Australia.

Robert Gribben is Professor of Worship and Mission in the Uniting Church Theological Hall in Melbourne. A Methodist preacher from the age of 18, and a Uniting Church pastor of rural, suburban and city congregations for more than three decades, he now teaches an ecumenical course in 'Word and Mission - Preaching Today' at the United Faculty of Theology.

Gerard Moore is co-ordinator of liturgy at the Catholic Institute of Sydney. Alongside work for the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) he is currently engaged in a study of the theological themes underlying the third edition of the Roman Missal.

Pat Mullins having lived 45 years in a Roman Catholic marriage, gained a doctorate for her now-published work, *Becoming married: Towards a Theology of Marriage from a Woman's Perspective*.

Charles Sherlock is Senior Lecturer in Theology at the Melbourne College of Divinity. He has been involved in a number of Australian and international ecumenical dialogues, and served on the Liturgical Commission that prepared *A Prayer Book for Australia*. He is the author of *A Pastoral Handbook for Anglicans* (Acorn, 2001).

Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury, is a Fellow of the British Academy. He has written a number of books on the history of theology and spirituality, and published two books of poetry. His most recent work is *Writing in the Dust: reflections on 11th September and its aftermath* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2002).

AJL ADDRESSES

MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION to:

The Editor, *AJL*
PO Box 6339, Upper Mt Gravatt 4122
Phone: (07) 3801 2740
E-Mail: editor.ajl@optusnet.com.au

Authors preparing manuscripts are requested to follow the AGPS *Style Manual*. The author-date system of citation is preferred. *Australian Journal of Liturgy* should be abbreviated as *AJL*.

Articles should not normally exceed 5,000 words in length. Articles may be presented on PC disc in rich text format (.rtf). A hard copy should accompany the disc. Copy may be sent to the editor by e-mail.

Only articles not previously published and not under consideration for publication elsewhere will be accepted. All articles submitted will be reviewed by the *AJL* editorial panel or other reviewers with appropriate expertise.

AJL is indexed in *Australasian Religious Index*.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW to:

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

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

The Secretary
Australian Academy of Liturgy
St Benedict's Monastery
121 Arcadia Road
Arcadia 2159

AJL is sent anywhere in the world for an annual subscription of \$AUD20.00 if paid in Australian currency. If paid in any other currency the subscription is the equivalent of \$AUD30.00. For members of the Academy, subscription to *AJL* is included in the membership fee.

Advertising is accepted: \$20 per half page.