What does it mean that God is 'Father' and 'Lord'? A textual analysis of liturgical elements in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* and a feminist response

Naomi R Browell
MA, PG Cert

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Theology (Research)

School of Critical Studies
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

February 2022

41780 words

University of Glasgow | College of Arts

Declaration of Originality

This form **must** be completed and signed and submitted with your thesis.
Please complete the information below (using BLOCK CAPITALS).

Name: Naomi R Browell
Student: Number
Title of degree: Master of Theology (Research)
Title of thesis: What does it mean that God is 'Father' and 'Lord'?: a textual analysis of liturgical elements in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* and a feminist response

The University's degrees and other academic awards are given in recognition of a student's personal achievement. All work submitted for assessment is accepted on the understanding that it is the student's own effort. **Plagiarism** is defined as the submission or presentation of work, in any form, which is not one's own, without **acknowledgement of the sources.** For further information on what may be considered 'plagiarism', please read carefully the University's Statement on Plagiarism as contained in the University Calendar.

I confirm that this thesis is my own work and that I have:	
Read and understood the University of Glasgow Statement on Plagiarism	x
Clearly referenced, in both the text and the bibliography or references, **all sources** used in the work	x
Fully referenced (including page numbers) and used inverted commas for **all text quoted** from books, journals, web etc.	x
Provided the sources for all tables, figures, data etc. that are not my own work	x
Not made use of the work of any other student(s) past or present without acknowledgement. This includes any of my own work, that has been previously, or concurrently, submitted for assessment, either at this or any other educational institution.	x
Not sought or used the services of any professional agencies to produce this work	x
In addition, I understand that any false claim in respect of this work will result in disciplinary action in accordance with University regulations	x

DECLARATION:
I am aware of and understand the University's policy on plagiarism and I certify that this thesis is my own work, except where indicated by referencing, and that I have followed the good academic practices noted above

Signed: Naomi R Browell
20 October 2021

Abstract

The words 'Lord' and 'Father' punctuate most elements of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, the most recent eucharistic liturgy authorised by the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC). By undertaking a textual analysis of two aspects of the liturgy, the *Confession & Absolution* (*C&A*) and the *Sanctus & Benedictus* (*S&B*), this study explores the question: should the Scottish Episcopal Church consider abandoning these particular metaphors in their new eucharistic liturgy, or supplementing them with others (either neutral or female), or should the SEC remain steadfast in its use of the ancient metaphors which have for so long shaped the church's language and theology?

In seeking an answer to this question, research was conducted into the history of the use of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in the liturgy, with particular attention to their biblical roots. Following a grounding in the history of the terms, the work of feminist theology is reviewed with particular attention to the language used for God. Understandings of 'liturgy' and its purpose, as presented by liturgical theologians in the twenty-first century are then explored.

Part II of the study turns to textual analysis of the SEC 1982 liturgy more generally, and of these two liturgical elements more specifically. This is complemented by a feminist critical response to the findings of the textual analyses, which gives rise to four categories to assist in developing missional liturgy, liturgy which is attentive to the needs of the contemporary Scottish context and also coherent with the principles of feminist theology. The liturgical revisions of other English-speaking Anglican provinces is then considered, with particular attention to how they have altered the use of the words 'Lord' and 'Father' in their more recent liturgies. Finally, the four categories of feminist approach to the liturgy are used to propose potential new liturgical prayers which might replace the SEC's *C&A* and the *S&B*.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Charlotte and John for your support, questions, and patience!

A special thank you to Jethro for being willing to discuss liturgy and feminist theology far more than he ever imagined.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

ACA	Anglican Church of Australia
ACANZP	Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia
C&A	*Confession & Absolution*
CofE	Church of England
ELLC	English Language Liturgical Consultation
ICET	International Consultation on English Texts
S&B	*Sanctus & Benedictus*
SEC	Scottish Episcopal Church
TEC	The Episcopal Church (USA)

Introduction

The Scottish Episcopal Church's (SEC) most recently authorised eucharistic liturgy is *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. This liturgy has been in use in the SEC for nearly 40 years. Within the pages of the liturgical text, worshippers find God referred to as 'Father' and 'Lord' on many occasions; indeed, 'Lord' can be found in a vast majority of the prayers of the liturgy. Various elements of the 1982 liturgy have been updated or permissions for alterations granted, most of which introduce more inclusive language, but 'Father' and 'Lord' have remained in place, apparently consistently resistant to change. Is there something about 'Lord' or 'Father' and their use in the liturgical text which demands their apparently elevated status? This study undertakes a textual analysis of two liturgical elements of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* in search of an answer to these questions. Key to analysing the place of 'Lord' and 'Father' in the SEC liturgy is feminist theology. Feminist theologians including Elizabeth Johnson, Gail Ramshaw, and Marjorie Proctor-Smith – among others – produced invaluable work on the issue of male-gendered language for God. Their scholarship provides the basis from which this study constructively criticises the use of 'Lord' and 'Father'.

Part I, 'Groundwork', provides the building blocks from which to begin an investigation into these questions. The first chapter 'Historical Context' looks at the history of the use of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' to refer to the Christian God. Chapter 2, 'Feminist Theological Perspective', explores feminist thinking about language for God, with a focus on scholars who have worked specifically on liturgy and the use of 'Lord' and 'Father'. The final chapter of the 'Groundwork' section conducts a review of contemporary liturgical studies, developing a sense of the major issues being discussed in the field today.

Part II turns to the text of the liturgy, applying the textual analysis approach developed by Bethan Tovey-Walsh. After presenting this approach and an initial overview of the results of applying it to liturgical texts in general, the *Confession & Absolution* and

Sanctus & Benedictus used in *Scottish Liturgy 1982* will be analysed. These two elements have been selected as representative of a more modern liturgical text (*Confession & Absolution*) and a liturgical prayer with deep historical roots (*Sanctus & Benedictus*). Following the textual analyses, a feminist critical response is made, drawing the findings of Part I into conversation with the results of the textual analysis. This leads to the development of four possible categories of more inclusive prayers: 'neutral', 'female', 'simple' and 'radical'. The final part proposes 'solutions'. More recent forms of the *Confession & Absolution* and *Sanctus & Benedictus* developed by other English-speaking Anglican provinces with limited or no use of 'Lord' and 'Father' are presented. Following this some possible new versions of the prayers are introduced.

An important terminological note needs to be made regarding use of 'female'/'male' where in some cases it might seem appropriate to use 'feminine'/'masculine'. This distinction might particularly be noticed in reference to 'male' terms used for God. The words feminine/masculine do not always clearly indicate a specific meaning. These adjectives have been used to suggest stereotypes for people of different sexes as well as in the context of a term having a particular gender. Gail Ramshaw puts it thus: 'Concerning the categories "masculine" and "feminine": These adjectives are both too vague to mean much and too explosive to keep around.'[1] In order to avoid any implication of stereotyping as found in the use of feminine/masculine, I keep to the female/male distinction. The terms 'Lord' and 'Father' are referred to as male to be clear that it is the gender which is of importance.

The study considers the place of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' and draws attention to the difference in the contexts in which they have been and continue to be used. What does it mean that God is 'Lord' and 'Father'? Is this still appropriate language for today's church? The SEC has committed to drafting a new eucharistic liturgy over the next few years. It is hoped that this study will contribute to that process.

[1] Ramshaw, *Reviving Sacred Speech*, 62.

Chapter 1
Historical Context

In the Anglican tradition, liturgical texts tend to be explicitly biblically based.[2] When seeking to draw out the meaning of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' as they have been used in the church's liturgy it is therefore necessary to turn directly to the bible. Accordingly, this chapter focuses attention on the biblical and early Christian understanding of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' to lay the groundwork for a textual analysis of their use in *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. Following a brief exploration of translation issues, the development of 'Lord' is examined. The use of 'Father' for the Judeo-Christian God is then considered, including a critique of the influential work of Joachim Jeremias on the language of 'Father' for God. It will become clear that the biblical history of these terms cannot be disentangled from the patriarchal past in which they were chosen and developed for use in the church. It will be shown that establishing the historical precedent for the use of 'Lord' and 'Father' in the 1982 Liturgy is a relatively straightforward task even if the precedent itself is not unproblematic.

Despite the clear ecclesial practice, it is difficult to establish an undisputed point of origin or foundational meaning for either 'Lord' or 'Father'. This complex past is a good first indication that the terms' continued elevated use in the SEC's liturgy warrants review. Key to building an understanding of the use of these terms, with particular reference to 'Lord', is an appreciation of the complexity of translation. The reality of the male-controlled environment in which 'Lord' and 'Father' were established as central for an understanding of the Judeo-Christian God will be apparent.

Any English bible, including all its references to God as 'Lord' and 'Father', is a translated text. Though this might seem obvious, Ilona N. Rashkow submits that '[s]o securely has

[2] See, for example: Senn, 'The Bible and the Liturgy'. This observation is key to understanding the liturgical context of 'Lord' and 'Father'. The textual analyses in Part II will explore the biblical basis of the liturgical elements being analysed.

the English Bible established its place in the canon of English literature that to most of its readers the English Renaissance Bible *is* the Bible.' Rashkow explains that her use of 'English Renaissance Bible' refers not to any actual translation but to 'an archetype consisting of the Tyndale Pentateuch, the Coverdale Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Rheims-Douay Bible, and the King James Version.'[3] For most people who read, or listen to, the bible in English, an English translation is the only version accessible to them, and is accorded the status of a sacred text. Understanding the context of the development of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in the church is therefore directly tied to the work of translation. Francis Watson, in his *Text and Truth*, compares nine translations of a specific passage with each other, as well as the LXX and Vulgate renderings.[4] On the basis of this comparison, he describes the fundamental challenge facing any biblical translator:

> a stable text with a stable meaning is unattainable. Indeed, each of the translations might be seen as an act of bad faith. Each tacitly promises its readers that it faithfully renders the original text, without deviation, addition or subtraction, and that it is therefore an adequate substitute for the original. Each presents the façade of a stable text with a stable meaning; and yet this turns out to be an illusion when the various renderings are compared and contrasted with one another.[5]

Certainly most modern translators would argue against this accusation of 'bad faith' in their own work. Modern translators would also likely see the idea that any translation might '[render] the original text, without deviation, addition or subtraction', as problematic. Watson however is highlighting the nature of translation of a text which many of its readers will understand as sacred. Rashkow illustrates how particularly during the Reformation, when to be on the wrong side could be a death sentence, convincing biblical readers of a particular interpretation of theology or doctrine was as important as bringing into English the Hebrew or Greek text.[6] This was not a uniquely English-

[3] Rashkow, *Upon the Dark Places*, 9.
[4] The passage is presented in the various versions as 'Ps. 42.4 in the EVV [English versions], except for BCP and ASB [Ps. 42.4-5]; MT Ps. 42.5, LXX and Vg Ps. 41.5': Watson, *Text and Truth*, 109.
[5] Ibid., 110.
[6] Rashkow, *Upon the Dark Places*, 37–42.

language phenomenon, as Charlotte Methuen demonstrates in her discussion of Luther's translation of the Bible. Methuen affirms that Luther wrote his own theology into his translation.[7] A number of authors demonstrate, in Lynne Long's aptly titled *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?*, that translation is never a value-free activity.[8] As Rashkow and Methuen show, this was especially the case when vernacular translations of the bible started to appear during the Reformation. Richard Duerden reflects on the nature of translation at the time:

> Official discourse on translation in the early sixteenth century focused on the ways in which English scripture might affect the balance of power or, perhaps, how it might upset the desired imbalance of power among monarchy, church, and people.[9]

Translation itself was associated with power, as the translators were aware. Although it could be argued that the bible does not hold the same wider societal power today, the position of a sacred text in a community is central. As Peter Kirk emphasises, a great responsibility is therefore placed in the hands of biblical translators.[10]

Closely related to the issue of translation of the bible is that of interpretation. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza explains the complexity involved in understanding and participating in biblical studies:

> Studying the genealogy of biblical studies from the perspective of emancipatory movements helps one to realize that scriptural "meaning making" has been practiced for the most part not only by elite, Western, educated clergymen but also for the benefit of Western cultural and capitalist interests. A Western doctrinal, fundamentalist, or scientific

[7] Methuen, 'These Four Letters s o l a Are Not There', 162–63.
[8] K. Onur Toker, Adriana Serban, Peter Kirk, and David Jasper contribute chapters focused on translation in the Christian context: Long, *Translation and Religion*.
[9] Duerden, 'Authority or Power?', 13–14.
[10] Kirk, 'Holy Communicative?', 96.

> approach declares its own culturally particular readings as universal divine revelation or scientific data that may not be questioned.[11]

Historically, according to Schüssler Fiorenza, biblical studies has been undertaken by a specific, powerful, group of men whose interpretations of scripture have been used to benefit their own culture and interests. As Fiorenza explains, the way in which biblical studies and biblical interpretation are conducted profoundly influence the way in which scripture is allowed to function. If those conducting the work wish for scripture to be seen as the immutable word of God which must be given unquestioning authority, those who meet the bible through this scholarship are limited by what it teaches. The perspective of those conducting in the study influence the nature of the work. The issues of interpretation and translation are deeply intertwined. For both, context is key. There might be push back against any changes to the use of 'Lord' and/or 'Father' for God because both these terms for God are found in standard English translations of scripture and therefore, for some, not to be questioned. However, because the scriptures which contain these words are translations neither term appears exactly as it is in the original texts. The following explorations of the terms' foundations seek to show the importance of the context of the original choice of 'Lord' and 'Father' for God, as well as the context in which 'Lord' and 'Father' were translated into English. Does understanding this context impact the significance of the terms as translated terms?

Turning to 'Lord' and its use in scripture and liturgy, it is immediately clear that here the matter of translation is particularly complex. To establish a lineage for 'Lord' in the church, it is necessary to look first to the Torah. The name which Moses is said to receive for the God of the Israelites is 'YHWH' (Exod 3-4).[12] These four letters, the Tetragrammaton, Hillel Ben-Sasson proposes, represent the name given by God to Moses which 'is likely a permutation of YHWH: "Ehyeh asher ehyeh", often translated as "I AM THAT I AM".'[13] Ben-Sasson explains that the etymology of YHWH is not 'simple … nor [is

[11] Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Powerful Words', 262.
[12] More on YHWH can be found in Chapter 2.
[13] Ben-Sasson, *Understanding YHWH*, 3.

there] a clear-cut morphology.'[14] The lack of clarity around the Tetragrammaton can be traced, at least in part, to an instruction in Exodus 20.7 not to blaspheme the name of YHWH. It became part of post-exilic tradition for the Israelites not to utter the name YHWH outside the temple.[15] The special sacredness accorded to YHWH has made tracing its etymology more difficult, but the translation offered by Ben-Sasson, 'I AM THAT I AM', is the translation with the greatest theological impact[16] and will be accepted here. In addition to the declining practice of writing YHWH down, when the Hebrew Bible was read aloud, the readers began to speak 'Adonai' where the text presented YHWH.[17] 'Adonai' was used in the Hebrew Bible as a circumlocution of YHWH as well as in reference to people; it is generally translated into English as 'my Lords'.[18] Getting to the English term 'Lord' from YHWH is a revealing, if winding, road which is directly related not only to the language but also to the power structures of society.[19]

As Greek became the more prevalent language of Near Eastern society, the Septuagint (LXX) was composed – the earliest Jewish translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. The writers of the LXX chose to translate 'Adonai' with the Greek word 'kyrios'. Although 'Adonai' is a plural, the Greek translation 'kyrios' is a singular. A quick search of *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization* brings up 'kyrios' in three contexts: 'marriage law', 'household', 'women'.[20] Given the common English translation of 'kyrios' as 'Lord', it is telling to see its appearance in these three particular entries. The 'marriage law' entry reveals the English translation of 'kyrios' to be '"lord" or "controller"'.[21] The other two entries offer similar, authoritative, male descriptions of 'kyrios'. The 'household' entry

[14] Ibid.
[15] Bonfiglio, 'God and Gods'.
[16] See Johnson, 241-3 for a brief explanation: Johnson, *She Who Is*, 241–43.
[17] Mettinger, *In Search of God*, 15-6. As the tradition not to speak or write the Tetragrammaton grew, God was increasingly referred to by names other than YHWH in the text of the Hebrew Bible, particularly 'Elohim'.
[18] Eisenberg, *Dictionary of Jewish Terms*, 8.
[19] A full exploration of 'Adonai', both its development as a workaround for YHWH in the Ancient Israelite religion and its use in the Hellenistic society in which the Judeo-Christian religions and language matured is beyond the scope of this thesis.
[20] Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow, *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*.
[21] MacDowell et al., 'Marriage Law'.

offers 'kyrios' as the term for 'senior man in the household'/'head of household'.[22] The entry on 'women' describes the female situation in relation to her male counterparts:

> Because they were thought to be easily deceived and thus unable to make sensible judgements (Gai. *Inst.* 144, 190–1), women were supposed to have a guardian; in the absence of a father or husband a *kyrios* or *tutor* acted for them in economic transactions.[23]

'Kyrios' was 'used by the culture to denote respect for any male authority from a stranger to the emperor', as Gail Ramshaw describes it, and women were beneath this 'kyrios'.[24] The significance of the decision by the LXX translators to use 'kyrios' as the translation for 'Adonai' cannot be underestimated. Just as 'Adonai' served in the Hebrew Bible to signify both a name offered for God, YHWH, and respectable – according to the norms of society at the time – male humans, 'kyrios' was used for those purposes in the Old Testament translation into Greek. The LXX used 'kyrios' to refer to God and to men, as 'Adonai' had in the Hebrew. The term then took on further meaning in the New Testament of the Christian Bible. Given the use of 'kyrios' for certain men holding authority in society, including 'tutor', the title was accorded to Jesus as a term of respect. This then led to a useful duality: drawing on the LXX, in the New Testament 'kyrios' served not only as the circumlocution for YHWH but also as a term of respect for the God-man Jesus. This then enabled the two, YHWH and Jesus, to be drawn together and made of 'kyrios' a central term for the Christian faith. Before it reached modern English, the double-meaning term was rendered into Latin as 'Dominus' (most often translated into English as 'Master', also with the implication of both 'Teacher' and 'Lord'). In Old English it was translated by 'the term for male authority: *hlaford'*. [25] When the translators of the early modern English bibles opted for 'Lord' as the translation for 'Adonai'/'Kyrios'/'Dominus' it too became a central term for the Christian faith. Following (though misunderstanding) Luther's

[22] Foxhall and Bradley, 'Household'.
[23] King, 'Women'.
[24] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 49.
[25] Ibid., 50. Note that Gail Ramshaw has provided the most succinctly detailed account of the meaning and development of 'Lord' for Christianity.

guidance on typesetting, it became tradition in English bibles to use small capitals to differentiate between the rendering of 'YHWH' as 'LORD' and other uses of 'Lord'. [2627]

In this way, as Ramshaw has aptly and succinctly explained, the ability of 'Lord' – following 'Adonai' and 'Kyrios' – to present two ideas, that of YHWH and that of Jesus' human authority, made the term central to the expression of the Christian faith in English.[28] Its use as a translation of 'kyrios', in turn a translation of 'Adonai', appears to be a clear foundation for the long history of 'Lord' in the church. In their scriptural context, each of these words, at points, represents a circumlocution or translation of the word, or name, YHWH, which resists definitive translation. Here is a key moment to adopt a critical gaze at the development of 'Lord' into such an instrumental term for the Christian faith. At each juncture, the rendering of YHWH into a new language has been reflective of *male* authority. This central image for the establishment of the Christian faith reflected patriarchal culture where the male was at the top of a hierarchy of society, as 'Lord'. Whilst this no doubt seemed culturally appropriate at the time, this recognition raises the question as to whether it remains appropriate today. Does the circumlocution of YHWH into a noun describing a male authority figure, the tradition of setting 'Adonai'/'Kyrios'/'Lord' as equivalent, still represent the best practice for building a relationship with the Trinitarian God in the church today?

The term 'Father' has also played a significant role in the church's history and theological developments. Joachim Jeremias' work, *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* ('Abba: Studies in New Testament Theology and Contemporary History'), published in 1966, proved very influential in New Testament scholarship, and remains an important resource when assessing the significance of the term 'Father' used in reference to the Judaeo-Christian God.[29] In 1967, selected portions of Jeremias' work

[26] Ibid., 47–50.
[27] Methuen, 'HErr HERR', for a description of Luther's typesetting method, see 6.
[28] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 47–50.
[29] 'Preface: Prayers of Jesus', 7.

were published English under the title *The Prayers of Jesus*, a translation which Jeremias himself oversaw. Jeremias asserts: '[i]t is quite obvious that the Old Testament reflects the ancient oriental concept of divine fatherhood.'[30] That is, for Jeremias, the term 'Father' as a reference to a god in the time of the ancient Israelites was not uncommon. Although issue has been taken with some of Jeremias' analysis (and will be here also), his premise that 'Father' was a common term for gods in the ancient middle east remains widely accepted by scholars of the Ancient Near East and of the Hebrew Bible.[31] Having established the relative normativity of understanding the Divine through the lens of 'fatherhood', Jeremias then goes on to suggest that there are '*amazingly few*' (italics original) examples of reference to God as 'Father' in early Judaism.[32] In particular, he claims, although the Ancient Israelites appeared to have related to God as 'Father', post Second Temple Judaism had begun to relate to God differently, using the specific reference of 'heavenly Father' and understanding the notion of God's fatherhood specifically through a covenantal lens.[33] This notion that the Jewish community around the time of Jesus did not refer to God as 'Father' in any significant or personal way was foundational to Jeremias' understanding of the way Jesus expressed his relationship to God, and many scholars followed in his wake. Thus, Robert Hammerton-Kelly's study *God the Father* relies heavily on Jeremias' arguments. Reiterating some of this work in an article for the journal *Concilium*, Hamerton-Kelly presents Jeremias' reasoning:

> On the basis of Mark 14:36 where Jesus addresses God by means of the colloquial term of endearment, '*Abba*', and Romans 8:14-17 (and see Gal. 4:6-7), where Paul characterises the presence of the Holy Spirit by the cry of '*Abba*', Joachim Jeremias argues … that Jesus characteristically called God *Abba*.[34]

[30] Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 6:12.
[31] To name but a few: Geffré, 'Proper Name of God'; Hamerton-Kelly, 'God the Father in the Bible'; D'Angelo, 'Abba and "Father"'.
[32] Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus*, 6:15.
[33] Ibid., 6:16–17, 21.
[34] Hamerton-Kelly, 'God the Father in the Bible', 98.

Hamerton-Kelly – drawing once again on Jeremias' work – contends on the basis of these instances of 'Abba' in the New Testament that '"Father" was Jesus' special appellation for God.'[35] This theory seems first to follow a twisted interpretation to arrive at 'Father' from 'Abba' and then to elevate 'Father' as the preferential form of address when speaking to the Christian God. Both the logic of this argument and the claim that Jesus created a special use of 'Father' for God have been disputed, as will be seen below.

Jeremias' work produced a flurry of further scholarship defending his ideas, but it has also drawn significant critique. Scholars tend to agree with Jeremias that belief in a divine fatherhood was common in the time of the Ancient Israelites.[36] However, for some, that is about as far as the agreement goes. The assertion that there are few references in early Judaism to God as 'Father' has been challenged. Writing nearly 30 years after the publication of Jeremias' *Abba*, Mary Rose D'Angelo, in a paper which dismissed many of Jeremias' conclusions, finds rather that:

> the address to God as father was by no means absent from Judaism before Jesus; it was based on biblical imagery for God and was surrounded by use of this imagery in other contexts in the works of early Judaism. It may have been rooted in mythology of the ancient Near East.[37]

According to D'Angelo, there is evidence of the use of 'Father' as a personal reference to God in early Judaism – also referred to as the 'Second Temple Period', spanning approximately the years from 520 BCE to 70CE[38] – thus casting doubt on Jeremias' insistence that Jesus' Jewish contemporaries did not use this image.[39] Moreover D'Angelo warned that much of the scholarship on which Jeremias based his concepts had been produced by a distinctly anti-Semitic scholar, Gerhard Kittel, who was deeply influenced by National Socialist ideology and appears to have been intentionally seeking to

[35] Hamerton-Kelly, *God the Father*, 71.
[36] See for example: Geffré, 'Proper Name of God', 44.
[37] D'Angelo, 'Abba and "Father"', 622.
[38] Wandrey, 'Early Judaism'.
[39] D'Angelo references the Qumran texts addressing God in this manner and the need to re-examine existing arguments; see: D'Angelo, 'Abba and "Father"', 617–22.

distinguish the Christian understanding of God from the Jewish, and Jeremias followed his arguments. This claim puts the work of Jeremias into question. In particular, there is only one occasion where Jesus is referenced in the Gospels as explicitly calling out to God as 'Abba': in Mark 14:36. D'Angelo rightly questions whether this one appearance of 'Abba' from the mouth of Jesus – supported by just two further references to 'Abba' in the New Testament in the Pauline corpus: Romans 8:14-17 and Galatians 4:6-7 provides a sufficient basis to suggest that Jesus spoke to God as 'Abba' in a special, distinctive way. In addition, D'Angelo suggests that the one instance of 'Abba' in Mark could be understood as 'redactional'.[40] If this were indeed the case, Jeremias' entire proposal, whether anti-Semitic or not, would crumble. D'Angelo's critique of Jeremias highlights the absolute necessity of an awareness of the context in which ideas are developed. If D'Angelo is correct and the term 'Father' was not used uniquely by Jesus, what evidence is available that might help to explain its prominent use in Christian language for God? A look at the context of the development of the use of 'Father' in the early church can provide some insights.

As indicated by Jeremias, and supported by a range of scholars, the Hebrew Bible's use of the word 'Father' for the God of the Israelites arose in a social context that saw a number of ancient religions with faith in a divine fatherhood. This divine fatherhood was directly related to the belief in a G/god who was the originator of all that exists, both other gods and humanity.[41] Hamerton-Kelly suggests that the biological understanding at the time of the Ancient Israelites was that the male was solely responsible for the 'creation' of children. [42] His perception of the biological understanding of in the period of the ancient Israelites is supported by other scholars, including Elizabeth Johnson and Sarah J. Dille.[43] This being the case, it would not be surprising to see a god referred to as 'Father'. The god was the originator of the people, and therefore that god was necessarily understood in

[40] For D'Angelo's full discussion of 'Abba' in Mark see: D'Angelo, 'Mark and Q'.
[41] Hamerton-Kelly, 'God the Father in the Bible', 97.
[42] Hamerton-Kelly, *God the Father*, 27.
[43] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 35; Dille, *Mixing Metaphors*, 23.

male terms as the male was the creator. Hammerton-Kelly, drawing on Jeremias, has argued that in the time after Moses, the Israelites began to move away from the originator understanding for YHWH in opposition to the surrounding communities who maintained this belief in their father-gods.[44] If Hammerton-Kelly is correct, the development of the language for God among Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries may then have reverted to an earlier understanding, as the originator principle appears to have been a key theory in the development of Christology, as considered further below. It appears, therefore, that the first uses of 'Father' for the God of the Israelites were developed in a society that elevated the importance of the male in terms of (pro-)creation; therefore when they worshipped the originator of all, this was a distinctly male 'Father' God. The foundation of the use of 'Father' in relation to the Judaeo-Christian God was thus established in a distinctly male-oriented context in which women were subordinated to a passive role in the creation of life. Only the male actively created life and only male terms would therefore be appropriate for a creator god.

The first descriptions of God as 'Father' in the history of the church – reaching back to the time of Old Testament – are therefore found in a context in which many gods were referred to as 'Father'. The use of the term 'Father' to refer to God in the earliest Judeo-Christian context is thus unoriginal and highly contextual. How did this develop through the time of Jesus and the early church into an established term for the Christian God? The theory provided by Joachim Jeremias that 'Father' established itself due to Jesus' special use of the term for God has already been challenged. As opposed to 'Abba', on which Jeremias based his premise, 'Father' appears in the gospels far more frequently. Seeking to get a sense of the use of the term attributed to Jesus, and thus focusing exclusively on the gospels, my own calculations revealed the following uses of 'Father' for God in the four gospels:

Mark: 4

Luke: 17

[44] Hamerton-Kelly, *God the Father*, 31–32.

Matthew: 44

John: 121[45]

At first glance, it would appear from the number of references to God as 'Father', as many as 186, that it was a significant term for God in the time of Jesus. However, taking a closer look with Elizabeth Johnson and James Dunn, a more nuanced picture is revealed:

> God is referred to as father in the Gospels with increasing frequency: … As James Dunn concludes, it is scarcely possible to dispute that 'here we see straightforward evidence of a burgeoning tradition, of a manner of speaking about Jesus and his relation with God which became very popular in the last decades of the first century.' It is a matter of theological development in the early church rather than abundant use by the actual Jesus who lived.[46]

By this reading, it seems debatable whether Jesus referred to God as 'Father' as frequently as the gospels, particularly John, suggest. Was the increase in the use of this term across the gospels associated with a deepening desire in Christian circles to think of God's relationship to humanity in this way? If so, there may be some factors beyond the faith of the church which contributed to this development. It has already been acknowledged that in the time of the Ancient Israelites, other peoples referred to their gods as 'Father'. Jürgen Moltmann explains that during the earliest days of the Christians, the term 'F/father', both for biological fathers within individual homes and for gods and rulers, carried great weight. As the Christian community established itself and began to grow, society was in an apparently flourishing patriarchal order. According to Moltmann, fathers in the home owned everything, including his wives and children (not to mention the slaves); he was known as the *paterfamilias*, the father of the family. Similarly, the ruler of the land – the *patria*, 'the Fatherland' – was called '*paterpatriae*', that is, the 'father of his country'.[47] Although it is likely that the functioning of the male-led society differed across the Roman Empire, the hierarchy of society based on sex seems quite clear.

---

[45] These figures were established by counting every reference to God as 'Father' in the gospels.

[46] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 80–81; with reference to: Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 30.

[47] Moltmann, 'The Motherly Father', 52.

This underlying patriarchal perspective must have seeped into the church as more people from secular Greco-Roman society became Christians, whether or not it had been inherited in the original Christian teachings. It seems likely that Hellenistic culture will have had an influence on the terms used for the God of the Christians. Although it is impossible to assess the extent of this influence, the context of the community and development of language and ideas is important to bear in mind.

The increase in reference to God as 'Father' from Mark's Gospel to John's seems also to reflect a commitment to a particular Christology. Even as the 'Father' language may have entered the church language both from earlier Jewish understandings of God and through the ambient patriarchal culture, the church itself may have drawn increasingly on the 'Father' language as it sought to find a way of articulating its beliefs about the divinity of Christ. Calling God 'Father' may have been unoriginal and contextual, but it may well have become important for the Christians in order to establish a Christology. As already conveyed, the pagan religions referred to their originator, ruling god as 'Father'. Yves Congar, writing in 1981, suggests

> The monarchy of the Father is one of the most unanimously affirmed aspects of trinitarian theology in the writings of the Fathers. … Tertullian has the fine sentence … : "*Trinitas per consertas et connexas gradus a Patre decurrens et monarchiae nihil obstrepit*".[48]

Congar conjectures from Tertullian's thought: '[t]he Father alone is *archè*, [first-]principle, *aitia*, cause, *pèghè*, source.' Congar's finding in Tertullian is an echo of the wider pagan principle where the god who rules is also the god who is source of all. Although apparently working towards a trinitarian doctrine, Tertullian's focus on the place of the 'Father' at the head, as well reflecting the originator/ruler understanding, will have been key to constructing an understanding of Jesus' divinity within the Jewish belief in

[48] '[In like manner] the Trinity, flowing down from the Father through intertwined and connected steps, does not at all disturb the Monarchy, while it at the same time guards the state of the Economy.' Tertullian, 'Adversus Praxeam', 8.

monotheism. There can only be one God who is source of all: if Jesus Christ is divine, that divinity must come from the 'Father' as source.

On the same line as the father-god as source of all, the understanding that the male is the only active party in the conception of children seemed to become more widespread during the time of the early church. In the minds of the first Christians and particularly in those Greek Fathers most responsible for writing the doctrine of the church, the relationship between Jesus and God – and as a side-interest also Mary – was heavily influenced by the biological theories of the time.[49] The male was seen as the only active party in conception, and the woman merely a receiver, the material from which the child was grown. There was a deep-seated belief in this order of creation with the male solely responsible for new life. In order firmly to establish Jesus' divinity, therefore, the church heavily emphasised the 'Father' language for God. The language of 'Father' for the Christian God further rooted itself as the church grew and doctrinal arguments about Jesus Christ as the Son of God raged.[50] The language of 'Father' firmly established itself as central to Christian, 'doctrinally-sound', belief.[51] The context in which the creeds were written, and the gender and education of those who wrote them are crucial. In addition, later doctrinal movements which focused on Christology helped solidify the importance of 'Father' language.[52] Indeed, as Catherine Mowry LaCugna explains it:

> Gregory of Nazianus' idea [is] that the divine monarchy is not the sole possession of "God the Father" but is *shared equally* among the divine persons … But the *theological defeat* of [this] doctrine … by the preoccupation with the structure of God's inner life meant also its *political defeat*. A unitarian, patriarchal, monarchical, hierarchical theism gradually replaced trinitarian monotheism, with disastrous political results. Christian theologians justified every kind of hierarchy,

[49] Methuen, 'Mary in Context'.
[50] For more on the associated doctrinal issues, see, for example: Dam, 'Imperial Fathers'; Lyman, 'Arius and Arianism'.
[51] Sprinkle, 'Standing Together', 209.
[52] D'Angelo, 'Abba and "Father"', 622.

> exclusion and pattern of domination, whether religious, sexual, political, clerical, racial, as "natural" and divinely intended.[53]

LaCugna indicates that although some of the early church thinkers interpreted the nature of God in a less hierarchical way, the language through which the Christian God was understood – that of monarchy and fatherhood – ultimately maintained the status quo of the cultural context. When the church became an established institution with its fortunes now tied up tightly with that of the empire, these doctrines took on a more hierarchical leaning. It would seem obvious from the current perspective that the language of 'Father' and 'monarchy' will have made this shift quite simple. Congar, in 1981, suggested that in a balance to this, the church is returning to a more fully trinitarian understanding of God with Pneumatology receiving further attention. This shift may support a loosening of the grip of 'Father' language for God as the 'monarchy' of the 'Father' is abandoned in favour of a more relational concept of God.[54] Perhaps the time is ripe for the shift to continue and move yet further away from the 'Father' language which appears to stem from a sense of patriarchal monarchy and hierarchy.

This chapter has attempted to shed light on the origins of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in the English bible and provide a base from which to develop a textual analysis of the use of these two terms in *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. For the purposes of this thesis a few points should be held in mind. Firstly, the exploration of the history casts significant doubt on the originality of 'Father' for the Judeo-Christian God and shows the cultural and biological assumptions that underpinned its further development in the church. Secondly, context is of central importance, particularly when diving into the messy reality of translation in which 'Lord' is to be found. Translation is not neutral but reflects power dynamics, and the history of translation of the biblical texts cannot be separated from the long history of cultures ruled by men, in which the texts were written and their translations undertaken.

---

[53] LaCugna, *God for Us*, 17.
[54] Congar, 'Classical Political Monotheism', 35.

Chapter 2
Feminist Theology on Liturgical Language

> Whereas the old theology justified sexual oppression, the new theology for the most part simply ignores it and goes on in comfortable compatibility with it[55]

These words were written in 1971 by one of the earliest and most outspoken feminist theologians, Mary Daly, for her article, 'After the death of God the Father'. Although Daly herself eventually gave up on the possibility of reforming the Catholic religion, her insights furthered the development of the field of feminist theology. This chapter will consider whether Daly's accusation against 'the new theology' is still valid. Having delivered her indictment, Daly suggested that '[t]he work of fostering religious consciousness which is explicitly incompatible with sexism will require an extraordinary degree of creative rage, love, and hope.'[56] In the decades since Daly's work, there has been much 'creative rage, love, and hope' from feminist theologians as the following discussion will show. Yet, the Scottish Episcopal Church continues to use a liturgy authorised eleven years after Daly's criticism of theology which relies heavily on prayers to God as 'Father' and makes reference to 'Lord' in nearly every prayer. This prevalence of male imagery would seem to bear evidence to the ignoring of issues of sexual oppression and going on in 'comfortable compatibility', as Daly claimed. To conclude the Groundwork section, this chapter will look at general themes in feminist theology concerned with language for God and at what feminist scholars have said about the particular terms 'Father' and 'Lord'.

In the late twentieth century a flurry of work was produced as the feminist liturgical movement gained momentum. Key players contributed to the development of feminist theology which focused particularly on the language for God used in the formal worship of churches. Elizabeth Johnson, Gail Ramshaw, Teresa Berger, Janet Walton, Lesley

[55] Daly, 'After the Death of God the Father', 53–62, at 62.
[56] Ibid., 62.

Northrup, and Marjorie Proctor-Smith published some of the crucial work of the movement which remains fundamental to feminist liturgical theology today. As the secular feminist movement grew, exposing society's patriarchal structures, feminist theological scholars applied this critical eye to the church.[57] Elizabeth Johnson puts it succinctly: 'Religious patriarchy is one of the strongest forms of this [patriarchal] structure, for it understands itself to be divinely established. Consequently, the power of the ruling men is said by them to be delegated by God (invariably spoken about in male terms) and exercised by divine mandate.'[58] In their writing, feminist theologians such as Johnson sought to expose the reality of the church's place in the patriarchal configuration of society and the impact that misogynistic and androcentric beliefs had on the most common language used for God.[59] As well as revealing the context within which language for God developed, some feminist theologians have also wanted to show that the earliest years of Christianity resisted the misogynistic tendencies of the era. Drawing on historical writings, feminists have found that the way God was spoken about (and to) changed over the course of time as the church became recognised as a legal entity and therefore more integrated into the androcentric structures of the empire. Consequently the development of liturgical language solidified some images for God – which fit with the context of the established church – but lost many others, ridding Christianity of a plethora of images and metaphors for God that had originally shaped early Christian life. For example, imagery of God as 'root, the tree, and the fruit, or fountain, the river, and the stream' from Tertullian in the second century disappeared from mainstream theological thinking.[60]

[57] 'Patriarchy is the name commonly given to sexist social structures. Coined from the Greek pater/patros (father) and the arche (origin, ruling power, or authority), patriarchy is a form of social organization in which power is always in the hand of the dominant man or men': Johnson, *She Who Is*, 23.
[58] Ibid.
[59] androcentric: 'pattern of thinking and acting that takes the characteristics of ruling men to be normative' ibid., 23–24; misogynist: 'A person who hates, dislikes, or is prejudiced against women.': 'Misogynist, n. and Adj.'
[60] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 80; with reference to: Tertullian, 'Adversus Praxeam', 8.

In *Holy Misogyny*, her exploration of how ancient attitudes to gender have shaped contemporary Christianity, April DeConick exposes the shift in the place of women in the early Christian community as it moved towards the centre of society in the fourth and fifth centuries. Although there is evidence of women in positions of leadership and teaching in the very earliest incarnations of Christian communities, DeConick suggests that 'male leaders in emerging churches who had their own interests to front and authority to assert and maintain' took control of the texts and reshaped the stories to fit their own narrative and maintain their position of power.[61] As women were marginalised by a male-dominated society, they lost their opportunities and voice, and the men of power had complete control over the development of theology. DeConick submits this male-led theology was shaped specifically to keep women down. Making reference to the words of theologians such as Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Augustine – to name but a few – DeConick shows how early Christian, male, theologians laid sin at the feet of women. [62] The visceral words against women articulated by these revered theologians support DeConick's argument that the theology shaped by these men was done in such a way as to keep women in a subordinate position. Teresa Berger highlights how this marginalisation of women had particular impact on the church's liturgy through the centuries as women were consistently left out of the conversation. Berger describes how the central point of influence in the study of liturgy, and consequently the development of liturgy, increasingly became the university. Although women had been kept to marginal roles within the church's liturgical enquires for many years, if not since the very beginning, 'the academy in which liturgical studies ultimately found a home was established as a *specifically* gender-constrained terrain of scholarly inquiry.'[63] Women were prevented from contributing to the development of liturgical studies, kept on the other side of closed doors by universities, as well as from the development of liturgy, found guilty of bringing sin into the world and prohibited from taking leadership roles in the church. Although female mystics, such as Hildegard of Bingen, were present and

[61] DeConick, *Holy Misogyny*, 147.
[62] Ibid., 122–23.
[63] Berger, *Gender Differences*, 9; italics mine.

active in the church, Berger describes how these marginal sites of differing 'eucharistic reflections … were lost or devalued … with the emergence of the medieval universities.'[64]

With any dissenting female voices blocked out, it is no surprise that the position of male language for God solidified. Gail Ramshaw describes how Christian thinkers such as Augustine, followed by medieval theologians, pursued their personal interests in the nature of God. Ramshaw admits these pursuits may have been theologically interesting, but she asserts that the 'primary task [of] helping Christians pray' was lost. Instead, according to Ramshaw, the debates over the internal nature of God taking place within the closed walls of the academy 'evolved for fifteen hundred years into a masculinized Trinity.'[65] Ramshaw's accusation that theologians lost sight of the church's prayer life in favour of esoteric discussions is severe; however, it does not seem completely unfounded. Ancient authors, such as Tertullian – though, of course, not without his own misogynistic scruples[66] – provided a breadth of imagery for God, as shown above. This wider imagery seems to have all but disappeared as male theologians worked alongside each other in androcentric settings with little consideration for the impact of exclusively male language for God.

Despite the androcentric context in which Christian liturgy was developed feminist theologians have sought to retrieve something from the tradition. Claire Renkin supports Teresa Berger's argument 'that "tradition" is not a stable, monolithic, unproblematic category. It is in fact dynamic, fluid and open to new readings.'[67] Looking anew at the earliest sources to find fresh meanings in the tradition has enabled feminist theologians to free God from the constraints of a sexist classical tradition. Elizabeth Johnson's, *She Who Is*, has been key to this process.[68] After confronting the limited – and limiting – theology

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 81.
[66] See, for example, the infamous 'Devil's Gateway' passage: Tertullian, 'De Cultu Feminarum', 1.
[67] Renkin, 'Real Presence: Seeing, Touching, Tasting', 131; with reference to Berger, 'The Challenge of Gender'.
[68] For discussion of classical theism see Johnson, *She Who Is*, 19–22.

of classical theism and stressing that the Bible itself was 'written mostly by men and for men in a patriarchal cultural context and reflect[s] this fact', Johnson turns to Aquinas (who subscribed to the subordinate understanding of women's humanity of his time[69]) for support in her argument against the limited images used for God. Johnson shares Aquinas' own words: '"we see the necessity of giving to God many names."'[70] This leads to the classical theological theory of apophasis which teaches that one can only know what God is *not*. Apophatic theology is key to some feminist arguments against the restricted imagery in liturgical language. Apophasis may seem a negative, perhaps discouraging, way to approach the Divine. However, Susannah Cornwall, writing in *Trans/Formations* – edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood, two giants of feminist theology in the early years of the twenty-first century – suggests that 'apophatically influenced theologies, those which resist a finality of understanding and are grounded instead in a proactive *unknowing* about God' may lead to a more inclusive meeting with God and one another.[71] Although classical theology and the men who shaped it were in turn influenced by their patriarchal and distinctly androcentric context, feminist theologians in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have made novel readings of the tradition. While taking into account the culture in which traditional Christian writings emerged, feminist scholars breathe new life into them.

Two main strands in feminist theological arguments regarding the language used for God have developed: the first exposes the patriarchal context of the culture in which the traditional language was solidified, while the second turns the tradition on its head to reveal a more nuanced, flexible language. There has not been, and is unlikely ever to be, complete agreement on what this language should look like; however, there is a desire to reduce the use of male terms for God and increase the use of female and other forms of

[69] 'Only as regards nature in the individual is the female something defective and misbegotten': Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* I, q. 92, a. 1, ad. 1, from: Ibid., 24; Note that despite this androcentric thinking, Aquinas argued in favour of the equality of women's souls: 'in matters pertaining to the soul woman does not differ from man': Aquinas, *Summa Theologica Supplement*, 39.1.ad1.
[70] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 76, 117.
[71] Cornwall, 'Apophasis and Ambiguity', at 17.

language.[72] Whatever new imagery might look like, the task of changing the language of the church is a difficult one. Generations of Christians have developed a tendency to focus on a fixed image of God in order to feel a sense of security. Lisa Isherwood highlights, however, the words of John 1:14:

> [t]he author of John's Gospel tells us that God pitched a tent among us, that is to say a very flexible structure, one that moves with the winds of change, one that is mobile, one that can be pitched in many different locations and one that is permeable yet firm.[73]

Despite the useful analogy, it is worth keeping the idea of a tent which 'moves with the winds of change' in check. Paul's words in Ephesians 4.14 ('We must no longer be children, tossed to and fro and blown about by every wind of doctrine') question this idea of being moved by the winds. Perhaps it is within the bounds of holding onto something of the tradition that Isherwood's argument that the church, and the language used for God, should allow itself to be reshaped by the winds of change stands. The fixed way in which churches continue to reference God as 'Father' and 'Lord' with only limited introduction of more creative imagery, however, does not reflect this 'flexible' and 'mobile' experience of God in the world.

Before turning to look specifically at feminist theological engagement with the language of 'Lord' and 'Father' a few terms need to be clarified. Reference has already been made to apophatic theology, and it is from this perspective of 'proactive unknowing about God' that the discussion of specific language for God is considered. Gail Ramshaw and Elizabeth Johnson both employ a threefold method for engagement with language about God, but each uses different terminology to describe her method. Johnson builds on the theology of Thomas Aquinas, using 'analogy' to describe language referring to the nature

[72] Johnson argues for the balance of female and male terms to be redressed by use of mainly female terms for a period, though she 'theoretically' agrees in more equivalence and expansive language in the long term. Johnson, *She Who Is*, 56–56.

[73] Isherwood, 'Introduction', 2; with reference to John 1.14 'And the Word became flesh and lived among us', 'lived' here translated from the Greek term eskenosen, from the root skene which can be translated as 'tent'.

of God.[74] Her threefold method follows the work of 'early Christian theology [which] articulated … a threefold motion of affirmation, negation, and eminence', where terms used to speak of God both affirm the relation between the human reality as well as setting the language apart in its use to refer to God.[75] Johnson describes how it is only by following this method that language for God is kept in its appropriate analogous state.[76] This method suggests a term to be used, acknowledges that no human term can accurately describe God, then proposes that in God the term may find its perfection: 'affirmation, negation, excellence'.[77] In a similar vein, Gail Ramshaw uses a 'yes-no-yes' methodology. She applies this threefold method specifically to liturgical language which she calls 'sacred speech'. The language is first given a 'yes' as sacred, followed by a 'no' as being unable to capture the essence of God, before a renewed 'yes' completes the circle as the faithful accept that the speech is used in the story of salvation.[78]

Ramshaw suggests that all language about God is 'metaphor' rather than 'analogy', but her conclusions are very similar to Johnson's. Although relying on the Thomistic analogy theory for her language about God, Johnson includes a footnote with reference to the work of Frederick Ferre 'who holds that even though analogy may not be any longer metaphysically credible, it still remains linguistically useful for speech about God.'[79] In contrast, Ramshaw, writing four years later, rejects the Thomistic understanding of analogy which serves to 'relegate [metaphor] to secondary status'.[80] Ramshaw adopts Paul Ricoeur's understanding of all human communication as essentially metaphoric.[81] Nonetheless Johnson, although using different terminology, appears to reach the same conclusions as Ramshaw: 'Whether expressed by metaphorical, symbolic, or analogical theology, there is a basic agreement that the mystery of God is fundamentally unlike

[74] For Aquinas on analogy, see: Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 12–13.
[75] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 113.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ramshaw, *Reviving Sacred Speech*, 32.
[79] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 292.
[80] Ramshaw, *Liturgical Language*, 8.
[81] Ibid., 9.

anything else we know of, and so is beyond the grasp of all our naming.'[8283] Apophatic theology, where God is unknowable to the point that we might only be able to define what God is not, is the foundational method in this thesis for accepting that no language can clearly speak of the mystery of God. A plethora of metaphors, analogies, symbols are required to build a relationship with an unknowable God. It is important, however, not to take apophatism too far, for surely God has revealed something of Godself, at the very least, through the incarnation of Christ. Theories such as the 'theology of accommodation' look at Christ's incarnation and provide a starting point to speak of this unknowable God. According to Jon Balserak, a leading scholar on the theology of accommodation, 'Divine accommodation refers to God stooping down (so to speak) to communicate with human beings in ways that they can understand, like a mother cooing to her baby'.[84] Just as apophatism was developed by early Christian thinkers and embraced by feminist theologians, theologies such as divine accommodation, also to be found in the work of early theologians[85], keep apophatism in check and provide a platform from which Christians can speak about God.

A final terminology question to be addressed is that of 'names' for God. Gail Ramshaw defines her use of 'names' as 'those metaphors so basic to the tradition that they can refer, "while not univocally, at least more than usually," to the deity Christians worship.'[86] However, she also recognises 'that some Christians use the term "God's name" with a quite technical meaning, as if God "has" "a name," revealed in certain Bible passages, a name that is analogous to the name stipulated on our birth certificates.'[87] Against such 'borderline fundamentalism' Ramshaw suggests that 'metaphors do not stay untouched by time', and even these more frequently encountered metaphors for God which have

[82] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 117.
[83] For more on distinctions between metaphor and analogy, see, for example: McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 1–29; Soskice, *Metaphor*, 64–66.
[84] Balserak, *Calvinism*, 74; For more on the theology of accommodation, see also: Balserak, *Divinity Compromised*.
[85] For example, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Augustine: Balserak, *Divinity Compromised*, 13–19.
[86] Ramshaw, *Reviving Sacred Speech*, 60.
[87] Ibid.

become accepted as 'names' can be, and should be, scrutinised for what they convey today.[88] Johnson appears to make lighter use of the term 'names' for references to God, simply iterating that there are 'many names' for God'.[89] Using apophatic theology as a guide, this thesis will prefer to refer to language for God as metaphor, or image, avoiding the possibility of slipping into an attempt to speak directly to what God is.

The discussion of the 'names' of God leads into consideration of 'Lord' and 'Father'. These two terms used for God have historically been aligned with God's 'name' in the sense addressed by Ramshaw, as 'analogous to the name stipulated on our birth certificates'. It could be argued that if God were indeed to have a 'name' it would be that which was revealed to Moses in the burning bush: YHWH.[90] As discussed in Chapter 1, 'LORD' is used in most English translations of the Bible where YHWH would be found in the origin texts. If YHWH was considered God's name that could certainly elevate the term LORD above other terms for God. However, despite the fact that YHWH has been widely accepted as the name uniquely revealed to Moses, Ramshaw calls attention to:

> evidence of the invocation of this divine name [YHWH] among tribal peoples in the eastern Sinai prior to 1300 B.C.E. Thus, similar to other biblical divine names, also this privileged name was borrowed from another religious tradition and incorporated by the Israelite people into their own religious vision.[91]

Such a borrowing, also referred to as syncretism, in which elements of another religion are incorporated, does not appear to be widely acknowledged in churches. This has led to a special status in Christian language for LORD as a reference to God, in its role signifying YHWH in the Hebrew Bible. Given the syncretism involved in bringing YHWH into the Israelite religion, however, any argument for maintaining the status of LORD for Christians would need further grounds. [92] In fact, Carol Christ has used the reality of

[88] Ibid., 60, 44.
[89] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 117–20.
[90] See Exodus 3.1-15
[91] Ramshaw, *Reviving Sacred Speech*, 61–62.
[92] For more on the development of 'Lord'/' LORD' in Christian lexicon, see Chapter 1, 6–9.

Israel's syncretism to make a case for continued 're-imagining' of language for God. Christ suggests that 'feminist re-imagining is not a departure from the way symbols have always been created, but a continuation of it. What may be different is that feminists are conscious of our part in the process of symbol creation.'[93] More will be said in the final chapter on feminist re-imagining of symbols for God, but it is worth noting here that re-imagining could be seen as simply a continuation of the tradition around language for God.

'Translation is no innocent or gender-neutral enterprise.'[94] These words from Teresa Berger should remain central to any consideration of the language used for God. As discussed in Chapter 1, the Bible in almost all contexts is a translated text, and no translation is purely objective. The establishment of 'Lord' as a key image for God was done by men with power and emphasises an hierarchical relationship with God. Marjorie Proctor-Smith argues the use of hierarchical language for God was done 'to enforce the submission of persons with little or no power to persons with great power.'[95] The image of 'Lord' in general conjures up a relationship of 'power over'. Though traditional theology has encouraged this kind of submissive relationship between people and God, feminist theology asks questions of this interpretation. Instead, new readings of Scripture which emphasise instead a relationship of 'power with' are encouraged. An example of this 'power with' can be found in Luke 1.28 where Mary encounters Gabriel: 'And he came to her and said, 'Greetings, favoured one! The Lord is with you.' The Greek term 'kyrios', as discussed in Chapter 1, refers to a person of power. In which case, the Greek of the second sentence (*ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ*) might be translated as 'the power/the one with power is with you'. 'Lord' has been used through centuries of Christianity with an emphasises on 'power over'; however it might be reimaged as a representation of 'power with'. The term is trapped, particularly without a wider use of expansive imagery alongside it. Leaving aside its male connotations, referring to God as 'Lord' so

[93] Christ, *She Who Changes*, 228–29.
[94] Berger, *Gender Differences*, 174.
[95] Procter-Smith, *Praying with Our Eyes Open*, 78.

consistently, as the 1982 liturgy does, prevents the development of this liberating theology of God's 'power with'.[96]

The image of 'Father' does not escape these accusations. As Janet Martin Soskice puts it: the term 'Father' has been 'compromised by its consistent association with omnipotence, as in "almighty Father".'[97] The image of an 'almighty Father' draws the mind away from the immanence of God and upholds patriarchal values with the father at the head of a household and all others in submission to him. 'Father' also falls victim to the syncretism charge, as discussed above in reference to 'Lord'. There is evidence which suggests that any male deity in the Greco-Roman world was referred to as 'Father' which leaves those who would argue that 'Father' is a definitive 'name' for God with more questions to answer.[98]

Finally, and importantly, continued use of these obviously male terms emphasises the widespread understanding of God as male. Despite protestations from theologians and many in the church, consistent use of these terms, with little space for other metaphors, creates an image of a male God. Gail Ramshaw affirms this: '[t]he church cannot continue to repeat classical Christian language … of father, … claim the words do not mean what people think they mean, and ignore the resulting confusion. If historic terminology is easily misunderstood, Christians must find alternative speech to assist the proclamation of divine mercy.'[99] This confusion over the gender of God which is continually fostered by the excessive use of 'Father' and 'Lord' could be an indication that they are 'dead' metaphors. A metaphor is considered dead when it 'no longer surprises', as described by Ramshaw. She suggests that:

---

[96] See for example: Christ, *She Who Changes*; Hipsher, 'God Is Many Gendered Thing'; Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*; Walton, *Feminist Liturgy*; Northup, *Ritualizing Women*; Procter-Smith, *Praying with Our Eyes Open*.
[97] Soskice, *The Kindness of God*, 72.
[98] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 79; further discussion of this can be found in Chapter 1.
[99] Ibid., 87.

> too many metaphors in Christian speech are dead … They may be dead because the world of thought from which they are transferred is alien. … metaphors are killed because, especially to a literal-minded generation, they come to be believed. … All too often the church uses metaphor to conclude the religious quest rather than to spur it on in wonder.[100]

Ramshaw submits that the church, in seeking a sense of security, kills its metaphors by overdoing them, or holding on to them for too long, or losing sight of the metaphorical aspect of the term. Even though there have been continued discussions around the gender of God and repeated denials to the accusation that God is male, the male symbols are the ones still present in the church's liturgy. Is this presence giving life to the words which shape Christians' understanding of and relationship with God?[101]

With this, we return to Mary Daly's indictment laid out at the beginning of the chapter that new theology 'simply ignores ['sexual oppression'] and goes on in comfortable compatibility with it'. Daly was speaking into a theology of the 1970s, and since then feminist theologians in her wake have laboured to bring sexual oppression out of the shadows and into the consciousness not only of those in the academy, but also of those throughout the church. There is certainly evidence that progress has been made. In general there are fewer male images used for God in Anglican churches, for example, and the language for humanity in recent SEC liturgies has, for the most part, been altered to be more inclusive.[102] And yet, the prevalence of these two particular metaphors for God remains. 'Father' and 'Lord' are inarguably male-gendered words, and they dominate the liturgy to the detriment of a 'proactive unknowing' of God. Chosen originally by men in an androcentric society that created images of God elevating powerful men yet further above all others, do these metaphors still surprise and help twenty-first century

[100] Ibid., 99.
[101] Alongside feminist theology's concern to emancipate God and Christians from the limited terms provided in the litugy, there is also a recognition of the impact that language, particularly ritual language, has on the way people relate to God. The importance of the liturgical context is dealt with in Part II, and a discussion of alternatives to 'Lord' and 'Father is in Part III.
[102] See table in the Appendix for examples.

Christians relate to a God who is beyond gender? Moreover, does the current use of these metaphors not contribute to the 'comfortable compatibility' of theology with sexism and the upholding of patriarchal 'power over' beliefs, at the expense of alternate 'power with' possibilities?

Chapter 3
Liturgy Here & Now

This chapter sets out the context of the liturgical theology in which the terms 'Lord' and 'Father', as found in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, are to be examined. The discussion begins by investigating how the term 'liturgy' is understood, before reflecting on recent developments around the purpose of liturgy in the twenty-first century. The chapter then covers the idea of liturgy as mission and the significance of justice to that mission. In seeking out the current issues important to liturgical scholarship, the following categories have arisen: diversity and contextualisation, ritual and identity-formation, and the embodied nature of liturgy. These topics are discussed in the light of work by theologians who engage with liturgy in their research, such as Edward Foley, Michael Jagessar, Teresa Berger, Thomas O'Loughlin, and Judith Kubicki.[103]

The ideas presented in this chapter will be key to understanding the principles which might guide the SEC's approach to liturgical revisions. In particular, it will be argued that liturgy is a place where God's mission of justice can and should be enacted; this will draw into question the place of 'Lord' and 'Father' in the twenty-first century context. The other topics covered will similarly demand critical consideration of the suitability of these terms in contemporary SEC liturgy. The significance of identity formation in liturgy, the advantages of an openness to variety and diversity, and the importance of embodiment all contribute to the interrogation of 'Lord' and 'Father' as used in the SEC's 1982 liturgy.

What is liturgy?

What is liturgy? A definitive answer to this question has remained elusive despite a great deal of work by liturgical theologians. The starting point for many attempts at an answer is, understandably, the stem word for liturgy, *leitourgia*. In his chapter, 'Liturgy', from the Alcuin Guide, *The Study of Liturgy and Worship*, Benjamin Gordon-Taylor is no

[103] Because of the changing nature of the question, I have tended to limit the cited literature to work published since 2010.

exception to this general approach. Gordon-Taylor explains: 'the derivation of the English world "liturgy" [is] from the Greek *leitourgia*, literally "the work of the people", which in ancient usage has a secular sense of what would now be called public work for the benefit of the community'.[104] However, Edward Foley disagrees with this translation of *leitourgia* as 'the work of the people', offering instead 'work for the people'. Nonetheless, his conclusions based on this alternate translation appear to align with those of Gordon-Taylor. Foley interprets 'work for the people' as 'a public work accomplished – especially by the privileged and powerful – on behalf of ordinary folk.'[105] Despite a tinge of clericalism detectable in Foley's language, both scholars conclude that liturgy is 'a work' and not simply a text or the words used. So what is liturgy if it is more than a text, if it is understood as 'the work of (or for) the people'? According to Gordon Lathrop a definition of liturgy can be found 'first of all in the liturgy itself.'[106] Lathrop suggests '[i]f the gathering has a meaning for us, if it says an authentic thing about God and our world … then that becomes known while we are participating in the gathering.'[107] Here Lathrop is building on the influential work of Aidan Kavanagh who proposed that liturgy itself is 'primary theology'.[108] Taking this view, liturgy is undertaken as a theological endeavour by all who participate in it. It is therefore hardly surprising to find that there is no one clear answer to the question 'what is liturgy?'. As with most facets of theology, liturgy is open for interpretation.

Benjamin Gordon-Taylor, building on his translation of *leitourgia*, defines liturgy in the context of the term 'worship': 'To put the distinction at its simplest, *liturgy* is the means whereby *worship* is offered to God by the Church. Liturgy is consequent on the offering of worship and serves its needs.'[109] Although contemporary liturgical scholars take the term 'liturgy' in various directions, there appears to be a general consensus on this

[104] Gordon-Taylor, 'Liturgy', 13.
[105] Foley, 'Preaching in an Age of Disaffiliation', 151.
[106] Lathrop, *Holy Things*, 5.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 73.
[109] Gordon-Taylor, 'Liturgy', 14.

centrality of worship in liturgy. Therefore, this understanding of liturgy as serving the worship of the church will stand as a base. Whatever is meant by 'liturgy' each time the question is asked, it is certainly more than a passage of text and serves a distinct purpose in the life of the church. What that purpose might be, beyond the notion of worship, is where division begins. Any understanding of liturgy's broader purpose is surely influenced by wider societal concerns and therefore changes with the time, location, and other factors which define the society within which it is being studied. Contemporary liturgists and liturgical theologians find themselves grappling with the particularities of our society in relation to the understanding of liturgy and its purpose, as will be shown below. Current liturgical scholars – such as Juliette Day, Jenny Wright, Nicholas Wolterstoff, and Stephen Burns, to name but a few – continue to assert the priority of the worship of God in liturgy; however, they are also raising new questions around liturgical worship of God.[110] For these scholars, key issues for understanding liturgy in the twenty-first century include the role of mission and justice, embodiment, diversity and contextualisation, and identity-formation.

Liturgy as Mission

Within the Anglican Communion mission is described as something more than evangelism or catechesis. Instead, Anglicans refer to 'The Five Marks of Mission:'

The mission of the Church is the mission of Christ

1. To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom
2. To teach, baptise and nurture new believers
3. To respond to human need by loving service
4. To transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and pursue peace and reconciliation
5. To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation, and sustain and renew the life of the earth[111]

[110] See for example: Jasper, 'Politics of Post-Truth'; Wolterstoff, *The God We Worship*; Burns and Cones, *Liturgy with a Difference*.
[111] Office, 'Anglican Communion'.

The translations of *leitourgia* provided by Edward Foley and Benjamin Gordon-Taylor both bring mission to the fore. These two scholars find liturgy to be a work enacted. Gordon-Taylor describes this drawing together of worship and action through the idea of *leitourgia* as 'a reminder that liturgy and Christian service of neighbour are inseparable aspects of the baptismal life.'[112] For Foley, the mission of *leitourgia* is in fact God's mission: 'liturgy is something that God does in Christ through the Spirit.' He suggests that this mission is not just for the baptised and if the church exists to participate in God's mission to the world, the ritualising must also be missional.[113] Drawing on the work of Ruth Meyers, an American Episcopalian theologian, Bruce T. Morrill, SJ, reiterates Foley's argument:

> the church is not the primary subject of mission, rather, God is. The church does not receive faith and then go out on missions, rather, God is the one on a mission for the life of world. The church, in its members, shares in that mission through liturgical proclamation and ethical enactment, with these constituting the very way they encounter the God of Christ Jesus.[114]

If we accept that liturgy is a part of the work of mission, and in particular the mission of God into which we are drawn, then it is worth delving for a deeper understanding of that mission.

Mission of Justice

Liturgy must be missional. In turning to biblical sources, God's mission is revealed to focus heavily on justice, as reflected in the Anglican fourth mark of mission.[115] From the Hebrew Bible we can see a clear message that justice is of great concern to God. Proverbs 21.3 is just one of many expressions of the call to act justly: 'To do righteousness and

[112] Gordon-Taylor, 'Liturgy', 13.
[113] Foley, 'Preaching in an Age of Disaffiliation', 146.
[114] Morrill, 'Liturgy's Missional Character', 118. See also: Ruth A. Meyers, *Missional Worship, Worshipful Mission: Gathering as God's People, Going Out in God's Name* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014).
[115] Justice will be understood to mean morally correct, or fair.

justice is more acceptable to the LORD than sacrifice'.[116] The life and teachings of Jesus, the embodiment of God's mission in the world, carry on this message through the New Testament. In Matthew 23.23, Jesus states clearly, 'Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint, dill, and cumin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faith.' Moreover, *The Inclusive Bible: The First Egalitarian Translation* proposes a different interpretation of the Greek term (*δικαιοσύνη*) which has traditionally been translated as 'righteousness', so that Jesus is also heard calling for justice in his Sermon on the Mount: 'Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for justice: they will have their fill. … Blessed are those who are persecuted because of their struggle for justice: the kingdom of heaven is theirs' (Matthew 5.6, 10).[117] It seems clear that justice is and has always been a fundamental element of God's mission in the world. Proverbs 21.3 relates specifically to the ritual which the Israelites were performing as their worship of God and underlines the importance of justice over and above ritual. Micah 6.6-8 iterates this same hierarchy placing the doing of justice as a priority for God's mission in Creation. Although it cannot be expounded here, there is much to be said in favour of maintaining ritual for our embodied, human engagement with God, so no argument will be made for the complete abandonment of ritual. However, there appears to be a clear call to keep, or make, rituals aligned with the mission of justice. There is some evidence that the church has recognised this. The Church of England's Common Worship has composed a Confession of Sins around the words of Micah 6.8.[118] If justice is at the forefront of God's calling then it must be seen as key to God's mission. When Edward Foley calls for his tradition's ritual to be mission, he falls in line with the demands of a long line of prophets, including Jesus Christ. God's mission of justice is at

[116] See also, for example: Deuteronomy 32.4, Psalm 82.3, Isaiah 1.17. All biblical references are taken from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), unless otherwise stated.
[117] *Inclusive Bible*, 647.
[118] The concluding sentence of the Confession is: 'In your mercy forgive what we have been, help us to amend what we are, and direct what we shall be; that we may do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with you, our God. Amen.' In comparison with Micah 6.8: He has told you, O mortal, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?'

the fore, showing the emptiness of any ritual which does not recognise the importance of justice.

The significance of looking at issues of justice in liturgy can be traced through much of the work produced in liturgical studies since the turn of the twenty-first century. Making reference to Isaiah 1.11-17, Miguel A. de la Torre suggests that liturgy which is pleasing to God should be understood 'as love-based praxis that seeks justice for the hungry, the thirsty, the naked and the alien among us. If there is no love-based praxis, then our liturgy is nothing more than a sounding brass or a clanging cymbal.'[119] In order for the practice of liturgy to be considered true liturgy which serves to worship God, according to de la Torre, it must be concerned with justice. Mark Earey draws attention to the fact that 'well-intentioned and carefully led worship can nonetheless perpetuate oppressive or marginalizing patterns in church life and in Christian worship'.[120] If liturgy is to be a place for justice, a love-based praxis, as de la Torre suggests, then attention must be paid to any marginalizing patterns that do not serve a just liturgy. Earey indicates that much of the work which reveals these patterns of marginalization comes from perspectives such as the feminist one.[121] If women are marginalised by the liturgy, how can it be considered just?[122] As Chapter 1 has already begun to reveal, and as Chapter 4 will show further, the extensive use of terms such as 'Lord' and 'Father' must be examined in reference to a just liturgy.

Diversity and Contextualisation

Especially since the turn of the century, insights from feminism, LGBTQ+, and racial equality movements have gained traction in the world outside the church, and liturgical theologians have begun to grapple with these issues. Recent liturgical studies emphasise

[119] De la Torre, 'Liturgy's Missional Character', 156.
[120] Earey, *Worship That Cares*, 14.
[121] Ibid., 13–14.
[122] Seeking justice, and a just liturgy, addresses issues such as race, heteronormativity, and ablism are addressed alongside gender. While recognising the importance of these questions, this thesis looks specifically at feminist concerns.

the importance of diversity and contextualisation. After the publication of Dom Gregory Dix's *The Shape of the Liturgy* in 1945, there was a movement to develop liturgies around Dix's 'four-fold shape' theory. Churches were seeking to find common ground and converge their liturgies as much as felt theologically possible across the denominations. By the 1970s, however, questions were being raised around the validity of Dix's four-fold theory. As Roger T. Beckwith explains: 'the binding links which Dix attempted to establish between biblical teaching and patristic practice have proved faulty'.[123] With the questioning of Dix's theory, the emphasis on seeing diversity of liturgical practice as a positive has grown in recent decades. The Church of England (CoE) liturgical revisions are a prime example of this. The introduction of the Series 1 liturgy in the 1960s, followed by Series 2 and 3 and the *Alternative Service Book*, and finally *Common Worship* in 2000 provided liturgical text options for parishes. CoE churches are no longer expected to worship with the exact same text across the province, but rather are given a variety of authorised liturgies to use. Despite these movements, however, central texts developed by the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET) – and more recently the English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC) – continue to hold some sway over individual elements of the liturgy used across denominations.[124]

Thomas O'Loughlin's theological reflection on the Eucharist builds on the significance of diversity in liturgical experiences.[125] O'Loughlin stresses the inevitably human nature of liturgical celebrations. When seen as an embodied practice enacted by a particular group of people 'every manner of celebrating the Eucharist, and the theologies produced alongside those activities, needs to be identified as the product of a particular setting with a unique set of possibilities and limitations.'[126] Even in circumstances where the liturgical text is one provided by a centralised body, each performance of the liturgy is unique and produces a distinctive worship experience. There was once a desire amongst Anglicans to

[123] Beckwith, 'The Pan-Anglican Document', 56–57.
[124] This is examined more closely in the *Sanctus and Benedictus* textual analysis.
[125] O'Loughlin, *The Eucharist*.
[126] Ibid., 5.

create a uniform appearance to and experience of liturgy. The Preface of the 1549 BCP demonstrates this, seeking to rid the Church of diverse liturgical uses, it charges all parishes to follow only that provided in the new Prayer Book. However, some current scholarship recognises the impossibility of this dream. Indeed, the reality at the time was that each community developed its own way of using the Prayer Book. Diversity is increasingly seen as an apt inevitability when considering the worship of the earliest Christians. O'Loughlin's work recognises 'the awkward fact that Christian experience is multiform not just today, but it has always been so.'[127] Building on this, Stephen Burns and Michael Jagessar, looking at liturgical studies from a postcolonial perspective, point out that many of those working in the area of liturgical studies have been 'working with heavy and inflexible notions of tradition, and it certainly seems to be the case that some liturgists are quicker to acknowledge the fragmentariness of Christian liturgical origins than they are to bless and relish contemporary diversity in Christian worship.'[128] According to Jagessar and Burns, some liturgical scholars have been happy to recognise that Dix's four-fold shape is to some extent problematic, as Beckwith did, but appear to continue to desire some uniformity. Cross-confessional projects, such as the ICET are an example of this. Jagessar and Burns, however, see the irony in this position and long to have diversity acknowledged as an authentic element of liturgy. Contextualisation is both a necessary element of embracing the story of Christ for worshippers today, but also the reality of the history of liturgy. Liturgy was not created *ex nihilo*, but by humans in a particular time and place with particular theologies and desires.

Bryan Spinks suggests that the recognition of the localised element of much liturgical revision has led to a greater push towards inculturation and contextualisation of liturgies.[129] While this may be the case, an uncertainty remains regarding the critical awareness of the context from which the words of liturgy stem. Kristine Suna-Koro interrogates the distance to which the context has been attended to:

---

[127] Ibid., 9.
[128] Jagessar and Burns, *Postcolonial Perspectives*, 129.
[129] Spinks, *The Worship Mall*, 125.

> the questions of whose rites, whose bodies, whose language, whose traditions, whose cultural conventions, whose aesthetics, whose scriptural hermeneutics, whose moral values and whose political commitments take precedence, make meaning and exert authority in worship – and how – are no longer impossible to ignore.[130]

These questions were raised initially in the previous chapter exploring the feminist theological perspectives on liturgical language. They will continue to be important to bear in mind as the textual analyses are completed and the findings critiqued.

Ritual, Imagination, Identity

Contextualisation is key also for the next set of issues in current liturgical studies that will be discussed. Imagination, identity-formation, and ritual meet in liturgy and draw out questions as to liturgy's purpose. According to James K.A. Smith, 'the way to the heart is through the body, and the way into the body is through story. And this is how worship works.'[131] Smith sees story, and with it imagination, as central to liturgy. In this context, the purpose of liturgy is understood to be God's work within us: 'liturgical formation sanctifies our perception for Christian action'.[132] Here, then, liturgy is central to identity-formation as Christians. This is not a unique theory. The understanding of liturgy as providing a meta-narrative into which worshippers can write their own stories is central to the discussions of both Juliette Day and Cally Hammond about the way liturgy works as a text.[133] However, in 2006, Judith Kubicki questioned the continued understanding of liturgy as a metanarrative. Kubicki presents a widely-held evaluation of metanarratives from the post-modern age: 'Criticized for displaying absolute, universal, and cognitive pretensions, master narratives have been abandoned and exchanged for the radical particularity and contextuality of individual or local narratives.'[134] However, despite the apparent move against metanarratives, Kubicki builds on the work of Belgian theologian

[130] Suna-Koro, 'Liturgy, Language and Diaspora', 101.
[131] Smith, *Imagining the Kingdom*, 2:14.
[132] Ibid., 2:15.
[133] For more on Day and Hammond's discussions, see Chapter 4.i.
[134] Kubicki, *Christ in the Gathered Assembly*, 14.

Lieven Boeve who affirms the life of the metanarrative, but only when contextualised.[135] By contextualising not only our own narratives, but also the one in which we find Jesus' story, the possibility of joining the two together in the liturgical formation of worshippers is opened up again. The nature of liturgy as an overarching story into which Christians from all backgrounds should be able to integrate themselves is part of what sets liturgy apart. The work of God in the liturgy acts to draw the whole community together. It is this power of the liturgy which makes the choice of words so significant. The embodied, ritualised form of liturgical worship lays the groundwork for God's action in and through a diverse group of people whose imaginations and stories are shaped by the narrative with which they interact in liturgy. As suggested above, the role of ritual in allowing the imagination to be shaped towards God must also be recognised. As Smith submits, it is in the habitual ritualization of the narrative that our embodied imagination is shaped by the Spirit. More will be said in the textual analyses on the power of liturgy through ritual, imagination, and identity-formation.

Embodiedness of Liturgy

With the attention given to the concerns raised by feminist, LGBTQ+, and racial equality movements, and growing desire for liturgy to be a place of mission and justice, there has also been a greater recognition of the embodiedness of liturgy. Teresa Berger explores this in her liturgical historiography which seeks to uncover the gendered, embodiedness of liturgy. She highlights that '[l]iturgy's past is no longer understood as accessible primarily through the study of liturgical texts. Instead, there has been a deepened appreciation of liturgy as a multi-textured practice, in which not only words but also space, images, acoustics, material culture, bodies, voices, and instruments play a role.'[136] That no two bodies are the same and that this plays a role in liturgical celebrations is gaining traction. As Rachel Mann puts it, 'Liturgical assembly does not happen in imagined and imaginary space (or merely so); it is the business of bodies. Liturgical assembly is something done by

[135] Ibid., 14–15.
[136] Berger, *Gender Differences*, 15.

the people and the priest/minister together in a lived, gathered way.' However, as Mann also points out, 'it remains the case that, in different traditions, not all bodies are treated equally in the liturgical assembly.'[137] Mann is highlighting the marginalising of women's bodies in some traditions as well as the questions remaining around the acceptance of LGBTQ+ bodies.[138] The awareness of issues around justice for those who are differently bodied, through LGBTQ+ or mobility, gives rise to further awareness of the embodied nature of liturgy. The reality of this embodiedness is a growing concern in recent liturgical theology. The significance of this development must be noted and acknowledged. However, its use of textual analyses to build a critique of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father', this thesis will remain text-focused.

Key to liturgical concerns of the twenty-first century is an appreciation of contextualisation. Shaped by the increasing attention on embodiedness and the reality of the subjective nature of stories, liturgy has come to be seen through these lenses. If liturgy is to be a place where God's mission of justice is enacted, it must address concerns of marginalisation.

[137] Mann, 'Performance of Queerness', 36–37.
[138] Roman Catholic and some Anglo-Catholic traditions (not to mention Eastern churches) continue to prevent women's ordination, and the Church of England has not settled on a coherent policy regarding LGBTQ+ people and ordination.

Chapter 4.i
Textual Analysis Overview

In order to develop a good understanding of the role the words 'Lord' and 'Father' play in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* they must be looked at in their liturgical context. A useful method for setting the words in their context is a textual analysis. A textual analysis is a linguistic tool used to explore what lies behind the words on the page. By producing a textual analysis, it is possible to see the reflections from previous chapters 'in action'. Analysing the liturgical context of 'Lord' and 'Father' highlights the significance of their prominence in SEC liturgical worship.

The liturgical context of 'Lord' and 'Father' is wide and varied, both words occur throughout the 1982 liturgy; however, it is not possible to analyse the entire text here. Therefore, two elements that feature the terms have been selected for analysis. The two texts have been chosen due to their differing roles and backgrounds in the liturgy. The *Sanctus and Benedictus* is an element of liturgy which dates back to some of the earliest liturgy of the church and has only minimal alterations. The *Confession and Absolution* was introduced into the liturgical service at a later period, in the course of the Reformation, and has undergone more significant alterations since its inclusion in Anglican liturgy.[139]

Bethan Tovey-Walsh proposes approaching a text from four angles when conducting a textual analysis: Mode, Discourse, Lexis, Grammar.[140] These are distinct areas of linguistic

[139] The history of the liturgical elements will be discussed in the textual analyses found in Chapters 4.ii and 4.iii.

[140] The methodology for this textual analysis is drawn from the work of Bethan Tovey-Walsh, formerly a College Lecturer at Oxford University in English language and literature. Tovey-Walsh designed this framework to enable undergraduate and Master's level students with limited experience of linguistic analysis to approach texts from an analytic perspective. Her framework is informed by the work of Roger Fowler. In a personal communication, Tovey-Walsh explained that her framework 'encourag[es] a multi-theoretical linguistic approach to text.' In constructing this framework she drew from a range of theories and schools, including Register Analysis (Biber and Finegan, *Sociolinguistic Perspectives*; Halliday, *Spoken and Written Language*); Russian Formalism (Viktor, 'Art as Technique'); Stylistics (Widdowson, *Practical Stylistics*); and Systemic Functional Grammar (Halliday and Matthiessen, *Halliday's Functional Grammar*).

consideration that guide an investigation of what is embedded deep in the text. Tovey-Walsh describes the Mode and Discourse sections: Mode – 'covers the physical appearance and presentation of a text as well as the way in which it is produced'; Discourse – 'covers the sense-structure of a text, and its context.'[141] For the Discourse section, Tovey-Walsh suggests interrogating a number of contextual categorisations, such as public/private, fact/fiction, and prose/poetry which will prove useful in highlighting the unique nature of the liturgy. The Lexis and Grammar sections cover the lexical and grammatic choices and structures. When working through this textual analysis the terms 'audience', 'speaker', and 'author' are used in a literary sense. Audience, for example, does not refer simply to a gathered group of people who have come to watch a play, but to those to whom the text is understood to be addressing. Although the liturgy does not have a singular author, the term will be used to refer to the key players in shaping the text. Speaker also does not refer only to a person physically iterating the words, but to the voice behind the words which may sometimes be the author's voice, but also others. While Tovey-Walsh's method will be used to guide the following analyses, the result of a full textual analysis is a large product, not all of which will prove relevant for this thesis. An Overview analysis examining those aspects relevant to both liturgical elements will first be provided. Following this, two specific analyses of the two passages, the *Confession and Absolution* and *Sanctus and Benedictus*, will be presented.

****

Textual Analysis Overview of *Scottish Liturgy 1982*

Mode

An analysis of the mode of a text is concerned with its production and its appearance. Similar to texts written for staged performances, the text of the liturgy is produced to be spoken aloud. However, unlike the texts used in operas and plays, the liturgical text is created to be spoken aloud not only by a group who have studied it in advance. All those present at the liturgical performance who wish to do so are invited to actively participate

---

See: Fowler, *Linguistic Criticism*; Tovey-Walsh [personal communication], 'Framework', 8 February 2022; Details of Tovey-Walsh's methodology can be found on her website: Tovey-Walsh, 'Textual Analysis'.

[141] Tovey-Walsh, 'Textual Analysis'.

at various points. Analysing the appearance of the 1982 liturgy reveals the use of conventional tools to aid this particular type of engagement with the text.[142] Both of these key features of the mode of the liturgy are present throughout the text, and it will be shown that they have an influence on the liturgical context of the words 'Lord' and 'Father'.

The fact that there is a similarity between the production of a liturgical text and that used in dramatic performances is an indication of the type of event which takes place in churches. Cally Hammond describes the phenomenon of the liturgy:

> The whole of Scripture, like the fixed parts of the eucharistic liturgy, was composed or formed in a context of spoken 'performance', rather than silent reading. This matters here because, just as in the case of Scripture, so too in the case of liturgy, the meaning of the text subsists most clearly in its *performance* – and that not as a one-off event but as an anaphora, an event repeated, over and over, according to pattern and custom.[143]

The text of the liturgy exists in its proper place only within this context of a 'performance'. Most performances involve a traditional audience and in some ways the liturgical event is no different. A congregation forms to bear witness to the performance. Unlike most performances on the stage, however, the congregation at a liturgical event are given a more specific role to play. They are therefore not only an audience giving meaning to what is happening in front of them, but are actors themselves. The congregation are invited to actively participate in the liturgical performance, with lines to say and postures to move through, such as standing or kneeling. Focusing on the spoken participation, there will be some who are very familiar with the words of the liturgical text, some who have in fact rehearsed it many times, and others for whom the entirety of the performance will be completely new. Regardless of familiarity, all gathered are

[142] As outlined below, such conventions include, for instance, the use of bold for the sections spoken by the whole congregation.
[143] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 67.

encouraged to take part as they wish, with distinct roles given to particular members of the group.[144]

The liturgical text uses specific conventions which help the reader/participant determine their role in the performance of the liturgy. Bold-type text is used to indicate the words which all are invited to speak, while normal-type text is to be spoken by a designated actor. Italics are used to indicate rubrics, which are texts included to guide and are not spoken. Both elements of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* being analysed make use of bold-type, and the italic rubric is of particular interest in relation to the *Confession and Absolution*.

Discourse

This section of a textual analysis focuses on the relationship between, and attitudes of, the audience/speaker/author. It also considers the context of the text, including its genre, its historical and present context, and how it relates to other texts. These features of a discourse analysis highlight elements of the liturgy which emphasise its use and meaning within the wider Christian context; the liturgy is more than simply a piece of text read through each week. There is a complex system of relationships at play, including the relationship between the historical and present contexts of the text. These contextual points will be particularly important for understanding the role of 'Father' and 'Lord' in the liturgy.

The interaction between author/speaker/audience is key. For people of faith, the whole event of the liturgy is enacted with the understanding that God is present and listening. As such, God would be considered part of the audience. The words are for the people present as well, even those words directly addressed to God, and it is this feature which is of particular interest. Juliette Day describes the event of the liturgy as part of a metanarrative. According to Day, those present at a liturgical performance integrate their own sense of self with the metanarrative which is 'reinforced at every worship event

[144] Find more on the various roles in the Discourse section of the *Confession and Absolution* analysis, Chapter 4.ii.

through the telling of Christ's story and through our own immersion in that narrative through ritual and text.'[145] As well as being actors themselves in speaking some of the words, the gathered worshippers are also audience for the entire liturgy, even when actively participating the spoken word. They immerse themselves in the narrative and integrate it into their own individual stories. As the words of the liturgy find their way into people's understanding of themselves, the specific words used in reference to God will surely be reflected in these stories. In this telling and re-telling of Christ's story, the SEC liturgical text repetitively references the Divine as 'Lord' and 'Father'. What impact might this have on the metanarrative of the individual? Once the liturgical context of the terms has been established in the following analyses, the feminist critical analysis to follow will explore this question further.

Another significant feature of the liturgical discourse is authorship. In an interview for the YouTube Channel of Standing Commission of Liturgy and Music of The Episcopal Church (USA), Ian Paton, Convener of the SEC Liturgy Committee 2011-2014, now Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane, describes the process used by the Scottish Episcopal Church to produce and authorise new liturgical texts. The text is first drafted by the Liturgy Committee then circulated through the Faith & Order Board and College of Bishops before being authorised for experimental use. After this initial experimental authorisation, the text is used across the SEC for a defined period (usually three years), following which it goes through a consultation process with feedback given to the Liturgy Committee. The Faith and Order Board is given a final opportunity to review the text, and, if approved, the liturgy is finally given full authorisation by General Synod under Canon 22 after two readings.[146] This lengthy process takes on input, amendments, and feedback from a variety of boards and other groups before liturgy is authorised by a vote in the General Synod. This method of authorisation ensures a sense of obscurity about the authors of liturgical texts and is intended to give the whole SEC ownership of the

[145] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 65.
[146] Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music of the Episcopal Church (SCLM), *Interview with Rev. Canon Ian Paton*.

liturgies. It is worth noting, as well, that the use of biblical texts and allusions in the liturgy adds another level of complexity to the question of authorship. The question of the attitude of the author and how it is expressed in the text is difficult to answer. However, it is an important consideration towards gaining a better understanding of the use of 'Lord' and 'Father' in *Scottish Liturgy 1982*.

Although it is not possible to know the specific motivations of the liturgical authors, a textual analysis would be incomplete without considering authorial attitudes. There is one source which can provide a sense of the approach of the communal authors of the 1982 liturgy. Gian Tellini, a key member of the Liturgy Committee during the time of compilation of both the original *Scottish Liturgy 1982* and its latter *Alternative Eucharistic Prayers* (1996), wrote a commentary on the liturgical text. In the conclusion of his paper, Tellini expresses some general attitudes towards liturgy:

> Our worship should not be a matter of what we like, but of what must be done … our understanding of worship will never be completely adequate and that God will in any case make up for our failures … New liturgies must be devised and celebrated not because they are that much jollier or enjoyable, but because of the deeper and more realistic demands they make of our worship and ourselves … Our Liturgy has always been the meeting-point of God and his people. Only those structures, words, gestures, actions and postures that give concrete expression either to God's call to us or to our response to it (or may be to both of these) have a right to be part of an act of worship … the 1982 Scottish Liturgy demands of us … that, made one with Christ through God's grace, our whole lives should be transformed, through, in and with him, into '*a single, holy living sacrifice*' for the life of the whole world.[147]

[147] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:125–26.

It is possible to glean a guiding principle, or attitude, for the collective author from this quotation. The use of clear phrasing and a certain minimalism in the text was seen as important for the collective author in guiding people as they come to meet with God. This manifests itself through a thoughtful, intentional choice of words. Although the convoluted method for approving SEC liturgies does diminish the sound of any one particular voice, it is impossible to silence the liturgical compilers completely. It is their choices which immediately impact the building of the liturgy, including which terms are used for God. As well as this, the presence of 'paratextual elements', such as the rubrical interjections, reveal the author's voice. Juliette Day observes that although '[i]n the worship event, it is to be hoped that the "situation of communication" is between the worshippers and God … paratextual elements establish another "situation of communication" between the author and the worshippers.' According to Day, 'although not present in the event, the author's voice may well be the only one to be clearly heard.'[148] The voice of the liturgical compilers will always be present at the event of the liturgy even though those who put together the 1982 liturgy sought to remove their own voices as much as possible. They did so not only through consistent use of the complex authorisation process, but also by limiting the use of paratextual elements. The inevitable presence of the authorial voice, and therefore attitudes, at each event of the liturgy will be explored further in the feminist critical analysis.

Of course, the attitude the author brings to the text is just one among many. At any liturgical event the words of the liturgy will be spoken by all gathered, each with their own attitude towards the text. It would be impossible to try to determine the attitude of the speaker, as a discourse analysis might usually attempt. In the moments when the entire congregation make up the speaker, there would likely be as many attitudes towards the words as voices speaking them. The reality of these numerous attitudes to the texts brings up the first contextual categorisation to be considered: public or private. However, in the case of liturgy, there is a duality which prevents such simplistic categorisation. The

[148] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 143.

liturgical text is written to be said in public with the gathered community, but, as already seen in Chapter 3, also needs to be understood from the perspective of the individual engaging with it.[149]

Going though Tovey-Walsh's contextual categories, we are confronted again by the unique role played by a liturgical text. As opposed to other literary works, the liturgy is not easily situated in either the factual or fictional context. Looking at the liturgy's nature as a piece of text written to be spoken might provide some guidance as to the text's linguistic category. In his lectures (compiled posthumously into *How to Do Things with Words*), J. L. Austin opens up a different way of thinking about the spoken word which departs from the traditional understanding of utterances as being either true or false. Austin instead looks at what is happening in a 'speech act', providing three general 'families' into which these speech acts fall: 'the locutionary act … which has a *meaning*; the illocutionary act which has a certain *force* in saying something; the perlocutionary act which is *the achieving of* certain *effects* by saying something.' [150] In his analysis of what he calls 'illocutionary acts', Austin suggests that the conveyance of fact or fiction in particular is of little concern in relation to the 'force' which the act is conveying.[151] This way of approaching a text has been explored by Juliette Day in her research in which she explores the possibility of liturgical texts as those which would be seen as illocutionary acts. Day finds this method a more productive approach to the liturgy than an over-simplistic distinction between the categories of fact and fiction.[152] This approach opens up an interesting avenue to explore the use of 'Lord' and 'Father', and their liturgical context, as neither fact nor fiction, but as having 'force'.

We look now to the prose or poetry categorisation. Liturgical writing, however, once again stretches beyond the bounds of such classifying. Liturgy cannot strictly speaking be

[149] See Chapter 3, 39–41.
[150] Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, 121, 150.
[151] Ibid., 146.
[152] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 107–9.

understood as either prose or poetry. As Cally Hammond explains, not only are liturgical words written to be said 'easily, naturally, and together' but it is important also to remember that these are not just *words* to the worshipping community, but rather *prayers*. Therefore 'if [Christians] want those prayers to imprint themselves on the mind and become absorbed, appropriated, those prayers must work with, not against, the natural rhythms and cadences of English.'[153] The text is composed in such a way as to increase the likelihood of their integration into the individual worshipper's psyche. This is an important linguistic tool which supports the earlier consideration of the congregation as audience as well as speaker. The narrative of the liturgy is there to be absorbed into each worshipper's story and it is written – or should be written – to optimise the possibility of this. This is a suitable point at which to consider the commonly used adage of *lex orandi lex credendi* ('the law of praying is the law of believing') which stems from the work of Prosper of Aquitaine in the early fifth century.[154] However, the *lex orandi* appears to be losing its central role in Anglican liturgical theology as scholars such as Cally Hammond question its application.[155] Although the idea that the liturgical words are written in order to become a part of the Christian's faith may appear to reflect the *lex orandi*, Hammond gives this little consideration. Her only reference to the *lex orandi* simply explains how the phrase has been misinterpreted over time. She instead suggests a better understanding comes from Aidan Kavanagh who applies the *lex orandi* not to 'prayer or worship in general' but rather to 'supplicatory prayer' in particular.[156] Gian Tellini does not mention *lex orandi* once in his commentary on the 1982 liturgy. Rather, Tellini suggests that 'Christian liturgy must be *kerygma* (*i.e., "proclamation with power*") before it becomes *didache* (*i.e.,* a pious way of teaching the correct doctrine)'.[157] Tellini's idea may well be seen as an echo of Hammond's theory that the prayers of the liturgy are written to be absorbed. The liturgy is prayer with power. Returning to the

[153] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 95.
[154] Gordon-Taylor, 'Liturgy', 17.
[155] Paul Bradshaw also questions the use of the phrase in: Bradshaw, 'Difficulties in Doing Liturgical Theology'.
[156] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 20–21; with reference to; Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 92.
[157] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:102.

categorisation, the understanding of the words as prayers, and the way they are written to be ingrained, although perhaps poetic in nature, cannot be categorised definitively as either prose or poetry. The feminist critical analysis undertaken in Chapter 5 will draw this reality into conversation with the historically patriarchal nature of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father'. If it is desired that the words of the liturgy become a part of the worshipper's faith, how does the repetition of these terms shape the congregation's understanding of who God is?

Cally Hammond's description of the liturgy as an 'anaphora, an event repeated, over and over' provides an initial picture of the historical context of the liturgy.[158] The event of the liturgy has been taking place in churches for centuries, albeit with different forms, and the text of the 1982 liturgy finds a home in this wider anaphoral context. Each element of the liturgy, while existing as a part of the historical, spiritually repetitive context of liturgical texts as a whole, also has its own unique history. The following textual analyses will look closer at the specific historical contexts of the *Confession and Absolution* and *Sanctus and Benedictus* and how they play a role in the current use of the words 'Lord' and 'Father' in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. The linguistic register shows another side of the story. Anglican liturgy is written, on one level, in a formal register, with pre-composed language which stems from the deep historical roots of the church's writings. However, the liturgical text is also intended to be personal and present. Building on the words of Paul Bradshaw, Juliette Day explains: the liturgical text can be seen as "living literature": 'identified by "the fact that it circulate[s] within a community, forming a part of its heritage and tradition, but [undergoes] periodic revision and rewriting in response to changing historical and cultural circumstances.".'[159] The nature of liturgy as both an historical text with a deep connection to tradition as well as piece of 'living literature' is key to this study.

[158] Hammond, *The Sound of the Liturgy*, 67.
[159] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 6.

One final feature to be highlighted is the use of figurative language, that is, of symbolism and metaphors. This is a crucial area. The nature of 'Lord' and 'Father' as figures of speech used to speak about God has already been explored in detail in Chapter 2 so will not be reiterated here. It is simply noted, and the analysis of the two liturgical elements will open up the area of metaphorical language for further consideration in the feminist critical analysis.

Lexis & Grammar

Within this textual analysis overview, little can be said with regards to the lexis and grammar. These two features are text-specific and cannot be applied most effectively at this higher level. However, one aspect that crosses both liturgical elements – as well as for most the language of the liturgy – is the grammatical mood. Both the *Confession and Absolution* and *Sanctus and Benedictus* use the linguistic declarative mood. This mood implies a statement is being made, as opposed to either the imperative (a command) or interrogative (a question) moods. The other mood which features heavily in the liturgy is the precative (a supplication).[160] When people gather to hear and speak the words of the liturgy, they are generally doing so in the form of either a declaration or a request. The *Confession and Absolution* uses the declarative mood as well as the precative. Although a portion of the *Confession and Absolution* uses this specific grammatical mood which implies expressing a wish, it still applies a format similar to the declarative. It is not 'Please will you forgive us?', but rather 'Forgive us our sins'. As a whole, the liturgical text follows this declarative or precative mood. What is the impact of those liturgical words which are written and pronounced as a statement on the way the people relate to God? It would seem that to repeatedly *declare* God as 'Lord' and 'Father', as done in both the *Confession and Absolution* and *Sanctus and Benedictus* as well as across the liturgical text, leaves little space to imagine God in other ways.

The lexis of the liturgical elements include what might be considered subject-specific, or technical, lexical sets. There is language in liturgical texts that those unfamiliar with the

[160] 'Precative, adj. (and n.)'.

liturgy might find confusing or incomprehensible. This issue will be raised in the *Sanctus and Benedictus* analysis. Alongside the use of technical language is the use of personal plural pronouns. These pronouns, such as 'we' and 'us', are used to impact the congregation. The plurality and personal nature of the pronouns draws the people together into the same story. Day suggests: 'When "we" is used in liturgical text it brings into existence a community which did not exist before it was uttered.' [161] This analysis shows how linguistic features are clearly used to impact the congregation.

****

This Overview analysis of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* has sought to lay the groundwork for the analyses of the *Sanctus and Benedictus* and *Confession and Absolution*. We have looked initially at the text of the liturgy from a high-level before delving deeper into some of the specific places where 'Lord' and 'Father' feature. The intention has been to give a first indication of just how much lies behind the words of the text and the importance of examining the liturgical context as much as the words themselves. The two textual analyses follow the Tovey-Walsh format discussed here. Several of the paragraphs throughout the analyses conclude with questions about how the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' are impacted by the liturgical context. The issues raised are discussed in the feminist critical response found in Chapter 5.

[161] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 108.

Chapter 4.ii
Textual Analysis of the Confession & Absolution

The following textual analysis of the Mode and Discourse in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982 Confession and Absolution* shows the context of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in this traditional liturgical element. The 'Discourse' section gives a sense of the history of the *Confession and Absolution* (*C&A*) as used in the Scottish Episcopal Church as well as the interplay between author/speaker/audience.

****

Text of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982 Confession and Absolution* (with permitted changes):

Confession and Absolution
or at 15

God is love and we are God's children.
There is no room for fear in love.
We love because God first loved us.

Let us confess our sins in penitence and faith.

Silence

God our Father, we confess to you
and to our fellow members in the Body of Christ
that we have sinned in thought, word and deed,
and in what we have failed to do.
We are truly sorry.
Forgive us our sins,
and deliver us from the power of evil,
for the sake of your Son who died for us,
Jesus Christ, our Lord.

God, who is both power and love,
forgive *us* and free *us* from *our* sins,
heal and strengthen *us* by the Holy Spirit,
and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Lord.

Amen.[162]

****

Textual Analysis of the *Confession and Absolution* (with permitted changes):

Mode

As discussed in the Textual Analysis Overview, the key concern in the mode section of an analysis is the text's production and its appearance. The matter of production will not be reiterated here, as it was considered in the Overview and will be explored further in the *Sanctus and Benedictus* analysis. Of particular interest for the *C&A*, however, is the matter of appearance. As the overview revealed, the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* uses conventional liturgical tools to direct the involvement of the various actors at the liturgical performance. The use of bold-type text indicates that all present are invited to speak, whilst the normal-type text indicates words for the presiding-celebrant alone to speak, or so it would seem. In the case of the *C&A*, the first paragraph, which begins 'God is love', may in fact be spoken by the deacon, if one is present.[163] As discussed in the Overview, the compilers of the liturgy limited their rubrical interjections; the *C&A* is a prime example of how this method on the part of the liturgists ensures there is a need to be familiar with the event of the liturgy beyond the text in order to see the full picture.[164] The method of limited rubrics also plays a role in understanding the *Absolution*, seen here:

God, who is both power and love,
forgive *us* and free *us* from *our* sins,

[162] 'Confession and Absolution', SEC Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers 1996, 5-6; Permitted changes, 2017.
[163] See above.
[164] For further discussion on this, see the 'Discourse in Chapter 4.i.

heal and strengthen *us* by his Spirit,

and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Lord.[165]

The italics indicate words which might be altered by the person speaking them. This rubrical formatting found in the middle of a spoken passage is rather unusual. By contrast, The Episcopal Church of the USA (TEC) liturgy provides a separate rubrical note: '*A deacon or lay person using the preceding form substitutes "us" for "you" and "our" for "your".*'[166] The use of either 'us' or 'you' has a theological impact on the words of the *Absolution* which will be discussed in the Discourse section. In a document of permitted changes produced in 2017, the Liturgy Committee of the SEC include a possible alteration to the *Absolution*, exchanging the word '*us*' in the body of the text for the word '*you*'. They explain:

> a normative declarative *you* has been included, with a permissive *us*, in line with our own and wider Anglican tradition (see for example *Common Worship*, *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, *The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada*, the *American Book of Common Prayer*, *An Anglican Prayer Book* (South Africa), used by several Provinces in Africa).

While this allowance refers back to the formulation of the *Absolution* as found in the 1970 liturgy, the inclusion of reference to other Anglican liturgies, suggests that liturgists in Scotland are willing, and perhaps desirous, to learn from the experience of other provinces. Changes to the liturgical text appear because of what has happened elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. This will be of great importance when considering the use of 'Father' and 'Lord', as Chapter 6 will show.

Rubrics are key in the *C&A* in another way. This element contains the one location in the entire service where a period of silence is enjoined by the compilers of the liturgy, with

[165] 'Absolution', SEC Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers 1996, 6.
[166] TEC BCP 1979, 353.

no optional words provided.[167] Liturgical scholars have interpreted the use of silence in a service in different ways. Cally Hammond suggests that silence functions as form of punctuation, a written way of distinguishing between 'the separate sounds of the liturgy'.[168] W. Jardine Grisbrooke proposes that the enjoinder to silence is in itself a bidding to pray individually before joining in the 'formal prayer which follows'.[169] This latter reading might be understood to balance an intentional lack of specificity in the words of the *Confession*, as will be discussed below, providing worshippers with an opportunity to reflect on their individual need to confess. Either interpretation, or perhaps even a combination of the two, shows the importance of the rubric and the impact it has on the liturgical event.

Analysing the appearance of the text reveals a key reality about the changing nature of the language for God in the SEC liturgy. Although easily presented in the form shown above in local congregations, this is an altered version of the text found in the formal 'blue book' versions of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. In order to address concerns about inclusive language, the SEC approved changes to the *C&A* in 2010, as shown below. Although not affecting the changes to the *C&A*, a further document of permitted changes was produced in 2017. The 2017 document acknowledges that the original changes did not go far enough in introducing inclusive language. *Permitted changes to the text of the Scottish Liturgy 1982*, the document published in 2017, begins with a brief description of the nature of grammatical gender in Greek and Hebrew language as a justification for the further permissive changes to the references to God in the liturgy.[170] The 'rationale' states that a previous document produced allowing for changes to the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* 'was not comprehensive in its coverage of gendered language in relation to God.'[171] This document, reiterating those changes to the *C&A* permitted in 2010, allows for the use

[167] Both other locations which indicate a period of silence in the rubric, the Offering and the Breaking of the Bread, also provide optional words to be spoken.
[168] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 143.
[169] Jardine Grisbrooke, 'Silent Prayer', 442.
[170] SEC Liturgy Committee, 'Permitted Changes', 3–4.
[171] Ibid., 4.

'God' in place of 'he/his' in the introductory paragraph of the prayer. The original was as follows: 'God is love and we are his children. There is no room for fear in love. We love because he loved us first.' Whereas, as found above, the changes show: 'we are *God's* children' and 'We love because *God* first loved us' (italics mine).[172] The *Absolution* is also affected by these permitted changes, with the original having 'strengthen *us* by his Spirit' compared to the permitted change to 'strengthen *us* by the Holy Spirit' (italics original).[173] These changes can easily be seen to make the text more inclusive, and show a willingness from the SEC liturgists and wider authorising bodies to change the liturgical language as concern for inclusivity grows.[174] However, the imagery for God remains the same throughout the years of changing language for God in the *C&A*; God is still 'our Father' and Christ is consistently 'our Lord'. In terms of inclusivity, how is the male nature of these images different from the maleness of pronouns?[175]

Discourse

As indicated both in the Overview and in the Mode section above there is a lack of explicit rubric text in the *Confession and Absolution*, as is generally the case in the SEC 1982 liturgy. This sparsity makes seeing the full picture of the liturgy, and in particular the discourse, more difficult for those unfamiliar with the celebration. Coming into contact with the reality of a lack of rubric when analysing the *C&A* provides an opportunity to explore this further. Apart from wishing to remove their own voices as much as possible, the absence of rubric provided by the compilers is also founded on contextual reasons. The authors of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* limited the number of rubrical interjections 'out of a conviction that worship in a contemporary idiom must be adapted to suit particular times and places.'[176] This note exemplifies the 'living' nature of the liturgy, as expressed by Paul Bradshaw and discussed in the Overview. It also

[172] Ibid., 5.
[173] Ibid.
[174] These changes are due to be integrated into the authorised liturgy, as discussed in Chapter 5, 90–91.
[175] This issue, as well as corrective steps being taken by the Liturgy Committee and General Synod of the SEC, are discussed further in Chapter 5.
[176] SEC Liturgy 1982, 4.

confirms what one of the text's contributors, Gian Tellini, indicates in his background paper on the principles that guided the drafting of the Liturgy. Tellini said that 'in most cases … total uniformity imposed from above never works … [rather we] encourage local congregations to find their *own* ways'.[177] This intentional sparsity of rubric, endorsed for understandable reasons, makes the discourse of the *C&A* unclear, particularly for those unfamiliar with the liturgical event. In some respects, the lack of rubric in fact amplifies the attitude, if not the voice, of the authors. It is their interpretation of the purpose of liturgy and the best method for celebrating the liturgy which has led to a lack of instruction which might make the celebration easier to follow for newcomers. The perspective of the authors, though not given an explicit voice, plays a key role in determining the understanding of the liturgical dialogue.

The *Absolution* provides a perfect example to further the discussion from the Overview of the nature of 'performative' words and brings into question who is understood to be truly *speaking* – or, as an illocutionary act, *enacting* – the words.[178] It is possible to turn to the bible in search of a theological foundation for seeing liturgical words as performative. For the *Absolution*, Matthew 18.18 provides the source. Here Jesus Christ informs his disciples that 'whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven'. Matthew's words appear to show a direct connection between what is happening in the (liturgical) moment on earth with what correspondingly happens in heaven. According to Dale C. Allison Jr, in his chapter on Matthew in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, the implication of this passage is that the prayer, or forgiveness, of the community 'has the authority of heaven itself … for its prayer is in effect Jesus' prayer, and his prayer cannot but be answered.'[179] This biblical teaching can be interpreted to mean that though the one articulating the words of the *Absolution* is the celebrant, it is God who is speaking through them to absolve. There have been various readings of this passage and the subsequent use of 'you' or 'us' in the

[177] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:122.
[178] For more on performative language, see Chapter 4.i, 49.
[179] Allison, 'Matthew', 867.

Absolution. Arguments have been made for the 'precatory form', that is praying the words *to* God; the 'declaratory form', with the celebrant speaking the words on behalf of God; and the 'indicative form' with the celebrant understood as absolving in their own right.[180] Although there may be some that subscribe to the 'indicative form' of absolution, according to Robert D. Cornwall, this interpretation is least likely to be the one adopted by Anglicans.[181] The various possible readings of the passage from Matthew and subsequent understanding of the nature of absolution help to determine which word the celebrant uses, 'you' or 'us'. However the *Absolution* is interpreted it is a useful example of the complexity of the speaker/audience relationship.[182] The feminist analysis to follow will explore this complex relationship further in relation to the use of male terms for God at the point of confessional prayer and forgiveness.

The ambiguity about who is speaking during the various elements of the text of the *C&A* is reflected also in the audience – as understood in the technical sense described in the Overview – for the text. The bold-type element of the *Confession*, spoken by all the gathered people, seems to clearly define its intended audience: 'God our Father' and 'our fellow members in the Body of Christ'.[183] The first addressee of the prayer is of course of particular significance for this thesis. The specific use of 'our Father' to describe the God to which this prayer of confession is being addressed has a long historical trajectory. Gian Tellini, goes so far as to call it a 'rule' in his paragraph on the topic of intercessory prayers:

> As a rule, address the *Intercessions* to God the Father. This is because our prayer is always addressed to God *in, with,* and *through* the *Son* in the power of the *Spirit*. Only on very special occasions, and not too often,

[180] Dudley, 'Absolution' in *SCM Dictionary*, 1.
[181] Cornwall presents the theology of high church Anglican, George Hickes, who did not give absolute authority to priests, despite seeing them as having 'judicial' power in absolution. Cornwall, 'The Church and Salvation'.
[182] For more on understandings of absolution, see also: Pless, 'Confession and Absolution'; Dudley, 'Absolution'.
[183] SEC Liturgy 1982, 6.

> you may however address the *Intercessions* to the Son or the Holy Spirit.[184]

Although Tellini is discussing here the Intercessions, these principles appear to have been implemented in the prayer of confession as well. This reasoning likely stems from Jesus' words to his disciples instructing them to pray to the Father and to pray in Jesus' name (for example in Matthew 6.6 and John 16.23).[185] There are, however, a few theological questions that arise from this 'rule' regarding prayer. It is not clear how this principle of using a singular, specific name for all our prayers to God is compatible with an understanding of God as an incomprehensible Divine whose nature we cannot precisely distinguish.[186] Whether Tellini's rule is deemed inappropriate at this juncture or not, it has a significant impact on the discourse of the text of the *C&A* as presented in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. Worshippers are guided to speak their prayers to 'God our Father'.

A discourse analysis is also used to consider the relevant attitudes around a text, including that of the author. Gian Tellini once again provides the source for the author's attitude. Tellini does not include much discussion on the *C&A* beyond a brief explanation of the variability of its location in the service. He does, however, speak directly to the introductory paragraph which serves a purpose for the flexibility of liturgical location.

> God is love and we are God's children.
>
> There is no room for fear in love.
>
> We love because God first loved us.

Tellini indicates that these introductory words function to focus the worshippers' minds on the God to whom they are praying, regardless of where the *C&A* is said during the

[184] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:91–92.

[185] Matthew 6.6: 'But whenever you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father who is in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you.' & John 16.23: 'On that day you will ask nothing of me. Very truly, I tell you, if you ask anything of the Father in my name, he will give it to you.'

[186] This idea, based on an apophatic theological principle, is discussed more thoroughly in Chapters 2, 5, and 6.

service.[187] Tellini also suggests the words are based on 1 John 4:16-19[188], but a closer look at the passage reveals a more nuanced situation. In fact, the phrase of the liturgical prayer 'we are God's children' is imported from a different passage in 1 John.[189] An awareness of the way in which the liturgists have drawn images together from different biblical passages enables a more realistic critique of the overall use of various imagery throughout the liturgy. The combination of these two texts brings in the concept of childhood, and thus God's parenthood, to a passage originally speaking of God as love without such connotations. Is the use of 'God our Father' as the address in the *Confession* relevant to the lexical choices in the introductory paragraph? It is likely that the answers to these questions will go unanswered. This biblical perspective, however, shows a fuller picture of the liturgists' method of pulling together various images as seems to have suited their purpose. In terms of the *C&A* specifically, and the imagery presented here, if the worshippers have in mind a God who 'is love' and that 'there is no room for fear in love', how does this correlate with the images of 'Father' and 'Lord' which follow in the subsequent prayers? The collective liturgical author's decisions have an obvious impact here.

The texts of this *C&A* were written specifically for the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*; however, as with all liturgical elements, they have a wider historical context. The first formalised congregational *C&A* – that is, a rite of public confession as opposed to a rite of private confession – known to be used in Britain is found in the Church of England's 1549 Prayer Book.[190] According to Stephen Burns, Thomas Cranmer and his fellow English Reformation colleagues were unhappy with the 'sacerdotal' understanding of the

[187] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:82–83.

[188] 1 John 4.16-19 (NRSV) '*God is love*, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them. Love has been perfected among us in this: that we may have boldness on the day of judgement, because as he is, so are we in this world. *There is no fear in love*, but perfect love casts out fear; for fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love. *We love because he first loved us*.' (Italics mine.)

[189] 1 John 3.2 (NRSV): 'Beloved, *we are God's children* now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is.' (Italics mine.)

[190] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:82.

priesthood and considered the practice of sacramental penance and private confession as exemplifying this. The General *Confession and Absolution* were integrated into the eucharistic service and made congregational in order to diminish the apparently sacerdotal role of the priest in customs of individual penance.[191] It is from this particular theological tradition that the SEC's *C&A* stems. However, a look back through the liturgies of the SEC and their English precursors reveals that the 1982 liturgy's addressing of the *Confession* to 'God our Father' is something of an anomaly. The original 1549 *Confession* is addressed to 'Almighty God father of our Lord Jesus Christ'. A key difference is apparent here: 'father' is used as a reference to the relationship between God and Jesus Christ rather than as in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* when God is addressed as 'our Father'. In fact, the 1982 liturgy appears to be the first in which God is addressed directly as 'our Father' in the Confession, rather than as 'father' in relation to Christ or as a person in the Trinity. Although there is this difference in the confessional address, reference to God as 'our heavenly father' can be found in one location in the 1549 liturgy, the *Absolution*. The address of the 1549 *Absolution*, and all subsequent liturgies used in the SEC until the introduction of a new *C&A* in the *Scottish Liturgy 1970* – discussed below – is: 'ALMIGHTIE GOD, our heavenly father', compared to that of the 1982 *Absolution*: 'God, who is both power and love'. This historical contextualising has revealed where the 1982 Liturgy differs from its predecessors. What significance might this change bear for the understanding and use of 'Father' in the Confession?

As well as the historical liturgical context, there are at least two further levels of contextualisation for this text. The context of the liturgical composers themselves is one of these. We turn to Gian Tellini's work on the text once more. The lack of detail in the discussion on the *C&A* suggests that Tellini and his fellow liturgical writers found their alterations from the 1970 Liturgy to be relatively straightforward. In congruence with the general Anglican liturgical concerns of the era, Tellini's brief consideration of the *C&A* describes the historical context of the text and recommends flexibility for its placement

[191] Burns, *Studyguide to Liturgy*, 144.

depending on the circumstances.[192] This allowance for flexibility reflects the wider liturgical thinking indicated in a note added to an early page of the 1982 liturgical book in 1996. Bishop Richard Holloway, Bishop of Edinburgh from 1986 to 2000 and Primus from 1992 to 2000, wrote that the reduced number of rubrical interjections was done 'out of a conviction that worship in a contemporary idiom must be adapted to suit particular times and places.'[193] There is an understanding that the liturgy ought to be adaptable to fit best to the local context. According to J.C. Stewart, there also appears to have been a growing sense from liturgists at the time that many of the prayers of confession found in Anglican eucharistic services did not reflect the general understanding people had developed of themselves and sin. Stewart suggests that the prayers were using 'terms which, for most worshippers, are no longer real and living'.[194] Stewart also suggested that for many if a confession included words requiring too direct or specific an admission to sin, they would simply decide it did not apply to them personally. This led him to conclude that '[b]revity and the avoidance of a high degree of specificity may be suggested as the two most important features of a corporate prayer of confession for our times.'[195] It is in this context that the words of the 1982 *C&A*, building on similar changes in the *Scottish Liturgy 1970* came to look quite different from earlier equivalent prayers used in the SEC. Two forms of the *C&A* are offered in the *Scottish Liturgy 1970*:
The first is found at the opening of the liturgical text:

C - Celebrant. P - People.

C In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

P **Amen.**

[C I will go unto the altar of God.

P **Even unto the God of my joy and gladness**.

C Our help is in the Name of the Lord.

P **Who hath made heaven and earth**.]

[192] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:82–83.
[193] SEC Liturgy 1982, 4.
[194] Stewart, 'Vocal Parts of Worship', 39.
[195] Ibid., 40.

All **We confess to God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that we have sinned in thought, word, and deed, through our own grievous fault. Wherefore we pray God to have mercy upon us. Almighty God have mercy upon us, forgive us all our sins and deliver us from evil, confirm and strengthen us in all goodness, and bring us to life everlasting. Amen**.

C May the Almighty and merciful Lord grant unto you pardon and remission of all your sins, time for true repentance, amendment of life, and the grace and comfort of the Holy Spirit. **Amen.**

An alternative, more traditional, form was provided in an appendix:

'Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men: We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, Which we from time to time most grievously have committed, By thought, word, and deed, Against thy Divine Majesty, Provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, And are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; The remembrance of them is grievous unto us; The burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, Have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake, Forgive us all that is past; And grant that we may ever hereafter Serve and please thee In newness of life, To the honour and glory of thy Name; Through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them who with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him: Have mercy upon you; pardon and deliver you from all your sins; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness; and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'

The latter *C&A* mirrors the traditional forms as found in Anglican liturgies up to and including the *Scottish Liturgy 1929*. The former, however, appears to lay the groundwork for the *C&A* found in the 1982 liturgy. The decision to prepare a new form of the *C&A*, originally for the 1970 liturgy and then again for the 1982 liturgy, again shows a readiness from SEC liturgical authors to amend the text of the liturgy. These amendments reflect the sensibilities of congregations as well as changing theological and linguistic landscapes.[196]

The final level of contextualisation to be considered, of course, is the present one, twenty-first century Scotland. What impact does the current context have on these prayers and their use of 'Lord' and 'Father' as terms for God? This contextual question will provide the setting for the feminist critical analysis to follow.

The Overview included a brief discussion of the liturgical method of writing which makes use of short sentences and plentiful punctuation to enable a smoother transition from text to speech. By enabling ease of speech, the text is intended to work with the rhythms of speech to be absorbed effortlessly.[197] This sentence structure is especially evident in the *C&A*, where one long sentence is broken down into many short clauses. These sentences include a great deal of punctuation and may take as many as four lines to be articulated. This manner of writing also works alongside the expected physical engagement with the words, with ease of speech making more space for thought about movement. The direction before the period of silence is sometimes indicative of physical movement, into a kneeling position; however, the lack of rubric does not make this explicit.[198] The *Absolution* also is usually accompanied by an action from the celebrant as

[196] The *Confession and Absolution* included in the 1970 liturgy is modelled closely on the Roman Missal of 1965.
[197] For more on this see Chapter 4.i, 49–50.
[198] The *Scottish Liturgy 1929* includes a direct invitation from the Presbyter to the people to prepare themselves for the Eucharist with confession; the Presbyter then instructs them to kneel before doing so himself (necessarily himself in 1929). Presbyter and people then recite the *Confession* together: 'Confession and Absolution', *Scottish Liturgy 1929*, 10.

they speak, and often by the members of the congregation as well.[199] That there are physical actions alongside the speaking of the text emphasises the active nature of the *C&A*. The prayers of confession and absolution are not passive. Although the *Confession* may have originally been spoken by one person on behalf of or for others when prayer books were not so readily available nor literacy so widespread, the use of plural pronouns alongside active verbs will have drawn the whole community into the confessional moment. By the twentieth century, when it was expected that nearly all present at SEC services would be able to read and speak the words together, the *Confession* was written and presented so as to invite the participation of all gathered.

God our Father, we confess to you
and to our fellow members in the Body of Christ
that we have sinned in thought, word and deed,
and in what we have failed to do.
We are truly sorry.
Forgive us our sins,
and deliver us from the power of evil,
for the sake of your Son who died for us,
Jesus Christ, our Lord.

This participation, indicated by the printing of the text in bold, is supported once again by the use of plural pronouns in the text, and the words are spoken performatively, with illocutionary force[200], and again most of the verbs used are active. What might be the specific implications for the use of 'God our Father' as the direct addressee in a confessional prayer spoken by the entire congregation?

[199] For example, The Book of Common Prayer 1549 includes a rubric instructing '*Then shall the Prieste stande up, and turnyng himselfe to the people, say thus*'. In contemporary Anglo-Catholic congregations, the priest may also make the sign of the cross, and congregants might respond by making the sign of the cross on themselves, matching the movement of the celebrant's hand.
[200] For a description of 'illocutionary force' see Chapter 4.i, 49.

The final, key element of the Discourse analysis of the *C&A* is the consideration of the use of figurative language. As explored in Chapter 2, the understanding for this thesis is that the words 'Lord' and 'Father' are themselves figures of speech used to reference the Christian God. It is easy to see, therefore, that the text of the *C&A* is full of figurative language. Not only do we find 'Father' and 'Lord', but God is referenced as 'power and love', the people are members of 'the Body of Christ'. We see here 'Father' and 'Lord' in their liturgical setting, functioning to shape the relationship of worshippers to God at the point of confession. Each of the images bear the weight of its human meaning, and yet as language in reference to God and God's community seek to burst free from those bonds. In the context of the *C&A*, we confess to and seek forgiveness from God as 'Father' and 'Lord', alongside a few, more abstract, images. Despite the presence of these other symbols, it is directly to 'God our Father' that the *Confession* is addressed. The address of the prayer to 'God our Father', in a way that deviates from the formulation used in previous confessions, perhaps shows a desire to draw near to God in a relational way. The image of God as a relatable 'Father' presented in this way, however, is only one side of the equation. The use of this term for God has been discussed in detail in Chapter 1. What happens when its historical development, with all the androcentric, theological implications are brought to the fore? The feminist critical response will consider this question. The only image which is used more than once in the *C&A* is reference to Christ as 'Lord': in the final line of the *Confession*, 'Jesus Christ, our Lord', and the final line of the *Absolution*, 'and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Lord.' Analysing the use of 'Lord' in this particular context does not reveal much new information beyond its general use in the liturgy. The analysis of the *Sanctus and Benedictus*, however, will bring focus to 'Lord'. Despite the seemingly peripheral nature of the use of 'Lord' in this analysis, the question of why worshippers continually refer to Christ as 'Lord' in approaching God for forgiveness will need to be addressed in the feminist analysis. Alongside this looking at the figurative language shows the use of male and abstract imagery with no hint of female. Does this imbalance need to be redressed?

****

This textual analysis has revealed a few central aspects of the *Confession and Absolution* found in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* which require further exploration from the feminist perspective. Firstly, here is a need to be familiar with the wider event of the liturgy in order to appreciate fully the experience. The examination of the historical context then shows the changing nature of the text and the way in which the liturgists have been influenced, including from other Anglican provinces as well as the concerns of the worshippers. Looking at how the text has changed over time also reveals how the gendered language for God has been an issue for the liturgical composers, but they have stopped short of altering the male imagery. This analysis has also brought attention to the use of 'Father' as a significant linguistic feature. If the text is understood to act performatively in the liturgical event, addressing the confessional prayer to 'God our Father' would seem of particular consequence for the interaction between 'speaker' and 'audience'. Another aspect which cannot be ignored is the undeniable influence of the author on the entire performance of the liturgy. Finally, the obvious disparity of gendered imagery which features in the prayers is brought to the fore. The critical analysis to follow in Chapter 5 will explore these elements from a contemporary, feminist perspective.

Chapter 4.iii
Textual Analysis of the Sanctus & Benedictus

The following textual analysis of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982 Sanctus and Benedictus* shows the context of the term 'Lord' in this ancient element of the liturgy. As with the *Confession and Absolution* analysis, the 'Discourse' section reveals a sense of the history of the *Sanctus and Benedictus* (*S&B*). It also focuses on the prayer's traditional liturgical function. The 'Lexis' section then highlights the importance of repetition and how this serves the overall liturgical purpose.

****

Text of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers Sanctus and Benedictus*:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord,
God of power and might.
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.[201]

SANCTUS:
an anthem to God's glory

BENEDICTUS:
The greeting to him who comes in the flesh, comes in the sacrament and is still to come.

****

Textual Analysis of the 1982 *Sanctus and Benedictus*:

Mode

An examination of the mode of *Sanctus and Benedictus* (*S&B*) explores the matter of appearance and production of the text, as discussed in the Overview. The *S&B* is an

[201] SEC Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers 1996, 10; Permitted changes, 2017.

element of the Eucharistic Prayer. Although the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* as offered with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers includes five Eucharistic Prayer options, the *S&B* can be found at the same location in all of the prayers. Each Eucharistic Prayer begins with the Initial Dialogue, followed by an Opening Prayer, traditionally referred to as the 'Preface', which concludes with a sentence leading into the *Sanctus*. The *Sanctus* is then followed immediately by the *Benedictus* which comes prior to a variable Christological Prayer in each Eucharistic Prayer. The specific words of the paragraph which introduce the *S&B* will be of particular significance when considering the function and audience of the text in the Discourse analysis.

As in the *Confession and Absolution*, the text of the *S&B* as found in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* makes use of the conventional tool of bold-type text. As seen above, the entirety of the text is bold, indicating that all present, including both the ministers and congregation, join in saying the words. Again in a similar vein to the *Confession and Absolution*, the *S&B* lacks any rubric. The lack of rubric plays a particular role in performances of the *S&B*. In four of the five Eucharistic Prayers, the final line of the introductory sentence to the *S&B* text reads: 'singing the hymn of your unending glory'.[202] However, the text is not literally sung in every situation. In some congregations the text will be sung, but in others the text is simply spoken.[203] The lack of rubric here leaves the decision to sing or speak the words open to those who organise the gathering. This shows once again the need to be familiar with the liturgical event – not just generally, but locally – in order to know not only how to interpret it as a researcher, but also how to interact with it as a worshipper.

One final element of the appearance of the text is the unusual presence of textboxes alongside the body of the liturgical text. Although, of course, it is possible to print the

[202] SEC Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers 1996, 10, 12, 14, 16; Permitted changes, 2017. The introductory paragraph to the *S&B* in Eucharistic Prayer V: 'One day we will be with you in heaven, but already we laugh with the saints and angels, and sing their joyful song:', 18.
[203] Indeed, in some cases, if sung, the text may not exactly match the printed liturgy, for example, if the choir sings more repetitions.

liturgy without these text boxes, the version published by the SEC in 1982 included these explanations.[204] The more recent publication, in 1996, of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers* which is available on the SEC website also includes these boxes.[205] The Mode analysis usefully highlights this feature of the text which will have an impact on the discourse, as discussed below.

A Mode analysis also considers whether the text represents the written or spoken mode. As with all liturgy, the *S&B* was written to be performed, at least as found in its context in the 1982 liturgy. What impact might this have on the text's perceived function? This question will be addressed below.

Discourse

The consideration of audience and speaker of the *S&B* proves an important line of enquiry in the following discourse analysis. Key also is an understanding of the text's relationship to historical texts.[206] Although seemingly presented as two parts of a singular item in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, the histories of the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus* do not follow the same trajectory. The examination to follow of the ancient roots of the two texts alongside their development in the Scottish Episcopal liturgies will probe this disparity further. Before beginning the analysis, the use of 'anaphora' needs to be explained. For Paul Bradshaw, Maxwell Johnson, and Juliette Day, the term is used to refer to the text of the Eucharistic prayer. Cally Hammond, however, takes the linguistic definition of the term, using it to imply a repetition.

Although we are looking specifically at the *S&B*, as indicated in the Mode section the words which introduce the text into the service are significant for building a discourse

[204] SEC, 'Scottish Liturgy 1982, Original Printing', 7–9.

[205] See: https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/publications/liturgies/scottish-liturgy-1982-alternative-eucharistic-prayers/.

[206] The terms 'speaker' and 'audience' are used in the technical sense throughout this analysis. For a description of the various roles, see Chapter 4.i, 43.

analysis. Four of the five Eucharistic Prayers lead into the *S&B* with the words (spoken by the eucharistic president):

> we offer you our praise,
> with angels and archangels
> and with the whole company of heaven,
> singing the hymn of your unending glory:[207]

These words play a significant role in developing a sense of who should be considered the audience and speaker of the text, a central question in any discourse analysis. The introductory sentence suggests that 'we', presumably those bodily gathered at the service, sing a hymn of praise '*with* the whole company of heaven'. If these words are interpreted in a literal way, this call to 'join with' draws 'the whole company of heaven' into the discourse. This company then might be considered a part of the speaker of the text. In which case, they might also be included in the audience as participants in the hymn of praise and listeners to all those singing with them. It is possible to draw a connection here with the 'so great a cloud of witnesses' in Hebrews 12 which is said to surround the people of the church. Rowan Williams has suggested that the lives of the saints who make up the crowd of witnesses are intertwined with the lives of the worshipping community.[208] It would not be a stretch then, from such a position, to imagine that crowd, as the company of heaven, singing out the hymn of praise in harmony with the gathered people. According to Juliette Day, the invitation and action of singing with the angels places the gathered worshippers 'around the throne of God in heaven' and takes the setting of the liturgical performance from a localised place to 'beyond time'.[209] This latter suggestion might be seen as an argument in favour of maintaining the traditional language of the text which will be looked at more closely in the feminist analysis. Even if the setting of the liturgy and those who participate in it remains firmly rooted in twenty-first century Scotland there is a question about if the speaker is seen to include heavenly voices. If the angels and archangels are understood to be part of the speaker of the text,

---

[207] SEC, 'Scottish Liturgy 1982, with Alterations', 10.
[208] Williams, 'Cloud of Witnesses'.
[209] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 75.

what impact does this have on the language used for God? If all those who have gone before, as suggested by the introductory words as 'the whole company of heaven' are considered participants in the prayer, should their 'presence' influence the lexical choices? The discussion of the biblical context of the text will draw this out further.

We stay with the speaker a little longer. As shown in the Mode section above, the bold-type text indicates that all gathered who wish to are invited to join in speaking the words of the *S&B*. As suggested in the Overview, this then blurs any possibility of determining an attitude of the speaker, as there would likely be as many attitudes to the words as there are individuals iterating them. There is one attitude, however, which makes itself clear. The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* has a unique feature: the inclusion of paratextual elements which are not rubric.[210] As can be seen above, the *S&B* in this liturgy have alongside them textboxes which include explanations regarding the meaning of the texts according to the liturgical compilers. Of the *Sanctus* it is said: 'an anthem to God's glory', and of the *Benedictus* it is said: 'The greeting to him who came in the flesh, comes in the sacrament and is still to come.' This is a clear disruption of the line of communication between the gathered worshippers and God. As stated above, it is possible, of course, to print the liturgy without these textboxes, but they appear in the original authorised versions of the 1982 liturgy and therefore demand consideration. The interruption speaks plainly in the voice of the SEC liturgical authors. Despite the authors' best efforts to keep the disruption minimal with undoubtedly intentional side-lined placement of the explanations, it comes through loud and clear. At most other junctures, the liturgical compilers have chosen to keep their voice silent by diminishing the presence of rubric. The Eucharistic Prayer, however, appears to have been seen to require clarification for a contemporary congregation, and the *S&B* is no exception to this. The need to explain seems to reflect the complexity of the two texts and their juxtaposition which will be considered in the historical context discussion below.

[210] See Chapter 4.i 'Discourse' for explanation of 'paratextual elements', 48.

Before moving on to examine the authorship and contexts of the *S&B* we turn first to the question of audience. The most apparent audience is the gathered worshippers at an SEC service. It seems likely that it was for this audience that the liturgical composers deemed it necessary to include explanatory textboxes of the text. This reveals a sense of how the authors thought this audience would interact with the text, as something the meaning of which was not immediately obvious. The presence of these textboxes also suggest that the liturgical compilers felt it was important for congregations to have a sense of the meaning of the text. The question of audience, and their impact on the text, however, does not end there. As already suggested, for some, the speaker, and thus audience, includes the crowd of witnesses. If the heavenly hosts are to be considered a part of the audience as well, what impact does that have on the composition and lexical choices of the *S&B*? It goes without saying that the local, twenty-first-century SEC worshipper is coming from a very different place than the 'angels and archangels' with whom they join they voices. Does the understanding that the heavenly hosts join in saying the words of the hymn impact the text? Could it be this which draws liturgical compilers, generation after generation, to keep the text as close to the original as possible? The history of the texts will be described further below, but at this point, it is worth touching on the issue of tradition which then raises the question of mystagogy, the teaching of the mysteries of the faith. The Lexis analysis will raise the issue of mystagogy again, but it is worth noting at this point. Does mystagogy have a greater role to play in the future of liturgical worship? Or, can the explanatory textboxes in the liturgy be seen as an acceptable replacement for this ancient practice?

In comparison to the nature of the speaker and audience questions, at first glance the authorship appears straightforward. In terms of direct authorship of the English version of these texts, as found in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, one need look only as far as *Prayers We Have in Common*, a document put together by the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET) and published in 1970.[211] The ICET was an ecumenical group who

[211] International Consultation on English Texts, *Prayers in Common*.

worked to produce liturgical texts approved across a wide spectrum of Christian denominations. Their work epitomises the desire of the time to draw Christian communities closer together.[212] The text of the *S&B* as it appears in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* matches almost exactly with that produced by the ICET. The singular exception to this being the exchange of a comma after 'might' in the ICET version into a full stop in the 1982 liturgy ('Holy…God of power and might').[213] It would seem, therefore, that the authorship of the text as it appears in the 1982 Liturgy can be traced to just forty years ago. Of course, this is an oversimplification. The *S&B* each individually have a long history which has impacted the way the texts have come to be in the SEC 1982 liturgy.

We look first at the biblical origins of the texts. The *Sanctus* is linked to two separate, but related biblical passages. As can be seen, both these passages also set the precedent for the drawing of the whole company of heaven into the picture at the singing of the *Sanctus*. The first iteration of the *Sanctus* is found in Isaiah 6.1-3:

> In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lofty; and the hem of his robe filled the temple. Seraphs were in attendance above him; each had six wings: with two they covered their faces, and with two they covered their feet, and with two they flew. And one called to another and said: 'Holy, holy, holy is the LORD of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory.'

The second is in Revelation 4.8:

> And the four living creatures, each of them with six wings, are full of eyes all around and inside. Day and night without ceasing they sing, 'Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God the Almighty, who was and is and is to come.'

[212] A brief discussion of this can be found in Chapter 3, in reference to differing perspectives in the twenty-first century.
[213] International Consultation on English Texts, *Prayers in Common*, 15.

The biblical origins of the *Sanctus* appear to support the idea that both the speaker and the audience would include the heavenly host, as well as the members of the congregation, of course.

The *Benedictus* has its own, less straightforward, biblical heritage. In her article analysing the introduction of the *Benedictus* into Christian Eucharistic services, Juliette Day puts forward three possible biblical passages for the root of the text. Two of these are: Matthew 21.9:

> The crowds that went ahead of him and that followed were shouting,
> 'Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is the one who comes in the name
> of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest heaven!'

and Romans 1.25:

> because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshipped
> and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever!
> Amen.

Day also includes Revelation 4.8, as above for the *Sanctus*, as a possible biblical origin for the *Benedictus*. Despite this potential biblical meeting point for the two texts, Day suggests that Revelation 4.8 does not appear to be a direct forerunner for the *S&B* formula which becomes established. Instead, according to Day, despite the influence of these other biblical passages on some formulations of the *Benedictus* found in early liturgies, it is the Matthean verse which lays the groundwork for the *Benedictus* found in 'developed [*Sanctus & Benedictus*] units'.[214] The brief commentary provided in the ICET publication discussed above implicates yet a different biblical passage for the basis of the *Benedictus*, Mark 11.9-10:

> Then those who went ahead and those who followed were shouting,
> 'Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed

[214] Day, 'Anaphoral Benedictus', 195–96.

> is the coming kingdom of our ancestor David! Hosanna in the highest heaven!'[215]

Basing his understanding on the work of Joachim Jeremias, Gian Tellini offers instead Psalm 118, presumably vv. 25-26 which Day tells us is quoted in the Matthew verse:

> Save us, we beseech you, O LORD! O LORD, we beseech you, give us success! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the LORD. We bless you from the house of the LORD.[216]

From this plethora of choices, the verse on which the *Benedictus* is understood to be based will have implications not only for the interpretation of the function of the text in its liturgical context, but also for how a new version might be constructed.

Central to this is the use of 'Lord' or 'LORD', kyrios/adonai or YHWH as discussed in Chapter 1. Each of the New Testament passages which may underlie the *S&B* makes use of kyrios, whereas the Psalm and Isaiah passage feature YHWH. If one of the latter texts is taken as the root text of the *Benedictus*, 'Lord' here should be considered in the same light as in the *Sanctus*, where 'Lord' represents the circumlocution of YHWH. If, however, one of the New Testament passages is understood as the root text, 'Lord' in the *Benedictus* might be interpreted differently. Once Jesus is introduced, in the New Testament, another layer is added to meaning of 'Lord'. Jesus may well have been called Adonai (or 'Lord'), as teacher, but he was also called Adonai as Christ, one of the Trinity, who might be called YHWH. It is also worth drawing attention to the latter words of Romans 1.25: 'the Creator, who is blessed for ever! Amen.' If this passage were deemed the foundational text, it would certainly lay the groundwork for an argument to use 'Creator' in place of 'Lord' in the *Benedictus*. The significance of this will be critically considered in the feminist response.

[215] International Consultation on English Texts, *Prayers in Common*, 15.
[216] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:99–100; Day, 'Anaphoral Benedictus', 196.

It is possible now to consider how the *S&B* in the 1982 liturgy relates to other texts, specifically in the historical liturgical context. Even a brief look at liturgical scholarship on the *S&B* reveals a complicated story. Beginning with the *Sanctus*, in his paper on the development of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*, published in 1996, Gian Tellini gives a brief history of the *Sanctus* as understood by one of the leading scholars at the time. According to Tellini, who was drawing on research by Bryan Spinks, beyond the biblical origins of the *Sanctus*, its use within the church has its origins 'in the Qumrân literature, in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, in ancient Jewish mysticism and in the evolving prayers of the synagogue.'[217] More recent studies of the *Sanctus*, however, are diluting Spinks' influence. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson's research draws Spinks into conversation with other liturgical scholars who variously suggest that the *Sanctus* entered Christian worship specifically in Egyptian or Syrian communities.[218] Gabrielle Winkler in particular, using a different methodological approach, concludes that the *Sanctus* was originally found in baptismal liturgies at the point of consecration.[219] This provides a different theological foundation for considering the function of the *Sanctus* which will be explored below. After considering the diverse proposals, Bradshaw and Johnson conclude:

> it is only when the Eucharist itself becomes conceived of as *the* primary location and manifestation of the presence of Christ … that the *Sanctus* enters into eucharistic praying as the most "appropriate" christological hymn— with or without *Benedictus* —to acclaim and glorify that presence. And when it does, is the language used not so much that of synagogue *berakoth* or domestic worship— Christianized or not— but of the closest biblical parallel, God's self-revelation to Isaiah in the temple, the experience of which still can only be called *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*.[220]

[217] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:99.
[218] For a discussion of work on the Sanctus by liturgical scholars such as Robert Taft, Gregory Dix, and Gabrielle Winkler see: Bradshaw and Johnson, *Eucharistic Liturgies*, 100–107.
[219] Ibid., 103–5.
[220] Ibid., 105.

According to Bradshaw and Johnson the *Sanctus* in the Eucharistic service praises the awesome presence of God. The specific location and definitive reason for the first inclusion of the *Sanctus* in Christian eucharistic worship will remain a mystery. We can, however, trace its use in the SEC which is surprisingly straightforward. All liturgies that have been authorised in the SEC contain a *Sanctus*, though there is some variation in the specific words of the *Sanctus* presented in successive liturgies used by the SEC. Prior to the ICET agreement to make the second line 'God of power and might' each of the earlier versions included the line 'God of hosts' instead. Bishop Rattray's 1744 Office has 'Lord of Sabaoth', making use of the original Hebrew term as found in the Isaiah passage. However, Rattray's liturgy was never authorised. This slight change offered in more recent liturgies – from 'God of hosts' to 'God of power and might' – would seem to reflect the desire to present a language more comprehensible to contemporary congregations. The Lexis analysis will draw this issue out further.

The historical context of the *Benedictus* is an equally puzzling, if different, story and less work appears to have been produced on the history of the text. Juliette Day finds that the *Benedictus*, when added to the anaphora, did not borrow directly from synagogue worship. She does suggest though that there will undoubtedly have been an influencing Jewish factor. According to Day, '[o]ur sources for the East do show that the *idea* of B[enedictus] was more influential than a precise liturgical *form* of B[enedictus] and this is indicated by the variety exhibited.'[221] Day neatly summarises her own findings on the entrance of the *Benedictus* into the Eucharistic prayer:

> the idea is based on the Jewish *Quedushah*, in which the Sanctus was followed by a 'Blessed be' acclamation from Ezekiel 3.2, but … the whole was christianized by the insertion of a 'Blessed be' statement with clear Christological associations that was already in use for Palm Sunday processions.[222]

[221] Day, 'Anaphoral Benedictus', 210–11.
[222] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 96.

Although deciding to give the *Benedictus* due attention herself, Day usefully points out that the dearth of scholarship on the text may well be owed to the fact that a great number of Christian liturgies, both historical and contemporary, do not include the *Benedictus* at all. Looking through the liturgies that have been used by the SEC, this lack is reflected. The 1549 BCP does include the *Benedictus*, however the next iteration of the BCP which came quickly after in 1552 neglected to include the prayer. Although making a brief reappearance in the SEC Nonjurors' Office of 1718 and Bishop Rattray's Office in 1744, the *Benedictus* did not re-enter Scottish Episcopal worship on a more permanent basis until the publication of the *Scottish Liturgy 1929* when it was included as an option following the singing of the *Sanctus*. It is difficult to pin down exactly why the *Benedictus* has been variously included. One possibility does seem likely, in that both the 1718 and 1744 liturgies were heavily influenced by the *Liturgy of St James* which includes the *Benedictus*.[223] Later SEC liturgies emphasised the liturgical connection with the Eastern churches established in the eighteenth century by the Non-Jurors. According to Gian Tellini, Bishop Rattray's 1744 liturgy, which included the *Benedictus*, although Rattray could not have known this, 'corresponds in every respect to the structure, order and theology of the *ideal* Eucharist as proposed in 1983 by the World Council of Churches'.[224] The exploration of more recent authorised liturgies produced by other Anglican provinces, found in Chapter 6, provides further evidence the variability of the presence of the *Benedictus*.

The exact liturgical origins of both the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus* remain a mystery. Juliette Day helpfully brings this complexity into the present. She considers the juxtaposition of the texts of the *S&B*, two historical texts which appear to have entered the liturgy at different points in history and seem to stem from biblical passages which do not speak directly to each other. Day finds:

[223] German, 'Non-Jurors, Liturgy, and Jacobite Commitment, 1718–1746', 78.
[224] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:58.

> the scripturally literate worshipper is led on a false trail … If, however, the source material is not scripture but varied doctrinal writings and homiletic material of the period when these elements were introduced, then the contextualization expressed in the list of heavenly beings who share in this hymn is highly misleading. The juxtaposition of these two apparently unrelated …texts can only be understood in relation to orthodox Trinitarian and Christological statements of the fourth century.[225]

Day seems to be suggesting that if we would like to have more solid ground to stand on in understanding why the *S&B* have been brought into the liturgy together as they are, we are better served reflecting on the doctrinal issues in the 4th century, rather than on the biblical roots of the texts. Of course, this then raises the question of the significance of fourth-century doctrinal debates for contemporary worship. As discussed in Chapter 1 on the biblical and historical development of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in the church, should the way of speaking about God which solidified its place in church tradition on account of ancient doctrinal debates be included in such a direct manner in the worship of the church today?

The final aspect to consider in this discourse analysis is the function of the *S&B*. In order to do so, the two texts must again be looked at individually. We return first to the textboxes included in the liturgical book. According to the authors, the *Sanctus* is there as 'an anthem to God's glory'. The *Benedictus* then is said to be '[t]he greeting to him who came in the flesh, comes in the sacrament and is still to come.'[226] Despite this description of the *Benedictus*, Gian Tellini proposes that the text should be understood as '*messianic* and *eschatological*' rather than as a welcome to Christ at the Eucharist.[227] This is perhaps not a contradictory statement, but the explanatory textbox might be seen to leave this

[225] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 97.
[226] SEC Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers 1996, 10; Permitted changes, 2017.
[227] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:99.

interpretation slightly open. Juliette Day, although presumably having committed considerable research time to the text, says of the *Benedictus*:

> Unlike other major elements of the eucharistic prayer, its presence or absence adds very little to the eucharistic action, serving at best as a continuation of the contextualization of the earth-heaven axis of the worship or simply as a congregational refrain. Nevertheless its presence is curious given that there is no theological or liturgical necessity for it, as those traditions that managed perfectly well without testify.[228]

It would appear that, for Day, the *Benedictus* has no obvious function. This is perhaps unsurprising given the text's status in other liturgies as either optional or completely absent. The *Sanctus*, though apparently absent from the *Apostolic Tradition* which had great influence on liturgical compilers in the twentieth century, seems to have a better defined function. It reflects the hymn of worship from Isaiah and invites all those present to join with the heavenly hosts in praise. Heaven and earth are seen to draw together as their voices unite in worship. The function of both the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus* as used in contemporary worship will, of course, have implications for any new rendering of the text which might be offered.[229]

As well as their understood individual functions, the *S&B* naturally also takes up the function of liturgy in general, as discussed in Chapter 3, 'Liturgy Here & Now'. Liturgy as a whole exists for the purpose of worship, and the *S&B* explicitly claims this purpose, as opposed to the *Confession and Absolution*, for example. The words of the introduction discussed above illustrate this: 'we offer you our praise'. As the assembly joins together to speak these words of praise, to whom do they lift their voices? Does 'Lord' provide the appropriate image of God for the congregation to worship? As raised above, who indeed is meant by 'Lord'? Is it YHWH or Christ? The feminist analysis to follow will explore these questions further.

---

[228] Day, 'Anaphoral Benedictus', 193.
[229] See Chapter 6.

Lexis

Although not explored in the *Confession and Absolution* analysis, the lexis of the *S&B* provides some useful insights into the way liturgical text functions. One of Tovey-Walsh's guidance questions for an analysis of a text's lexis regards the repetition of words. In the *Sanctus*, we find 'holy' repeated thrice. In some textual contexts, it might seem that such repetition was unnecessary. However, Cally Hammond explains how any alteration of the repetition in the *Sanctus*:

> would feel wrong, and be wrong, because the words are not a vain repetition but rather a conscious imitation of the angels and archangels, who certainly repeat them in a form of anaphora which is unparalleled in the Old Testament. In other words, the *tersanctus* is not just conveying the information that God is holy – it is *realizing* God's holiness in the midst of the congregation, by attracting ("holy"), fixing ("holy"), and finally focusing ("holy") the congregation's attention on the object of all devotion – God.[230]

According to Hammond, we use and re-use the words written so long ago as an act of continuity and joining together with all the faithful. Could this desire for continuity be an effective argument against changes in the liturgy? That question will be explored in the next chapter.

Cally Hammond makes good use of the text of the *Sanctus* to demonstrate a wider function of repetition in the liturgical context, so we follow her example. For Hammond, '[r]epetition is of the essence of Christian worship … The Church depends on anaphora of words, phrases, actions, to make it the body of Christ – not just rationally but psychologically, spiritually, emotionally, bonded together by one confession of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism."[231] Hammond does not appear to make any reference to J.L. Austin's 'illocutionary force', but instead gives all the force of the liturgy to its repetitive

[230] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 80.
[231] Ibid., 85.

nature.[232] Hammond suggests that as the words of the liturgy become engrained in a worshipper's psyche, they are then able to "mind-slip" and allow the words to wash over them, and 'the divine presence pervade and transfigure the pray-er's self.'[233] The repetition involved in liturgy would seem to be of great significance to its power as a place to meet the Divine and become the Body of Christ; however, where is the space for transformation of the liturgy if all its power lies in repetition? Hammond does briefly address this, recommending a focus on rhythm as a guiding principle for making changes away from archaic language and towards more inclusivity.[234] The feminist analysis in the next chapter will consider the juxtaposition of the importance of repetition in liturgical texts and the need to meet congregations where they are.

The final consideration for this Lexis analysis looks at the technical, or subject-specific, nature of the language in the *Sanctus and Benedictus*. As discussed in Chapter 1, 'Lord' as a reference for God comes from a specific time and place. In its development as a significant term for Christian worship, 'Lord' in fact came to represent a complex set of ideas.[235] The way the term is used in the *S&B* exemplifies this ambiguousness. It is seen in the *Sanctus* as 'Holy Lord, God of power and might', and in the *Benedictus* as 'he who comes in the name of the Lord'. As presented above, looking at the historical contexts of the text does not present an obvious interpretation for the term as might be best understood by a worshipper today. This issue will be explored further in the feminist critical analysis, but it once again highlights the tension between tradition and contemporary comprehension. Would a formalised mystagogy, which once was central to the Christian community but appears to have fallen out of favour, close this gap effectively?

[232] More on Austin's theory of language can be found in Chapter 4.i, 49.
[233] Hammond, *Sound of the Liturgy*, 81–82.
[234] Ibid., 96.
[235] See Chapter 1, 6–9.

As this analysis of the *S&B* shows, there seems to be the possibility that even those who are familiar with the liturgy from regular attendance at church, myself included, may not be clear as to who is meant by 'Lord'. In addition, the use of terms such as 'heaven' and 'hosanna' might not be immediately understandable for a newcomer to the liturgy. This reality is emphasised by the presence of the paratextual notations which seek to explain the function of the words, as mentioned in the Discourse analysis. How does the lack of mystagogy, initiation into the knowledge of the faith, impact the role of the liturgy today?

****

A number of issues have been revealed through this textual analysis. In particular the critical feminist response will need to focus on the presence of the explanatory textboxes and how they represent not only a clear interruption by the authorial voice, but also a lack of clarity about the meaning of the liturgical text. As well, the question of tradition, raised by the potential to include the heavenly hosts in the speaker/audience of the text and the potential force of repetition, will require consideration. The historical contexts of the *S&B* and the way the relate to other texts has shown the lack of clarity about to whom it is the voices join together to praise. Is it 'Lord' of 'LORD'? In either case, is the term, surrounded by other words which may not be easily understood, too technical? Is there a need to reintroduce a formalised mystagogy to enable congregations to relate most effectively to the words of the liturgy? The *Sanctus and Benedictus* as appears in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* has drawn up some useful questions to explore in the following chapter.

Chapter 5
Feminist Critical Response

The textual analyses of the *Confession and Absolution* (*C&A*) and the *Sanctus and Benedictus* (*S&B*), as well as the Overview analysis, looked at the liturgical context of 'Lord' and 'Father'. This chapter draws the issues raised in the textual analyses into conversation with the material from the Groundwork section. It seems appropriate at this juncture to reiterate my commitment to constructive theology. Although deeply critical of some aspects of the liturgy of the SEC, this is done from a place of deep love. There is a sense of dedication which guides the criticism, pushing for the best possible rendering of the liturgy. In the process of reflecting on the liturgy with a constructively critical eye, we will meet again with some of the feminist theologians encountered in Chapter 2. A few new voices will also be introduced, including those of Sallie McFague, Janet Martin Soskice, and Nicola Slee. Given the constraints on space, it is necessary to focus on only a few topics. The importance of the audience/speaker relationship and the significance of context will be considered in relation to the *S&B* and *C&A*. The response to the Overview analysis will concentrate on the importance of ritual, the value of repetition, and the understanding of liturgical text as performative. Building on that discussion, perhaps most significantly, the implications of the traditional and yet 'living' nature of liturgy will be explored. The final element of this feminist critical response to the textual analyses will be a discussion of four categories of thinking about how new liturgical prayers might be developed, derived from the drawing together of the Groundwork section and the textual analyses.

Following the pattern of the liturgical performance, the *C&A* will be considered first. Although both analyses drew out the complexity of the relationship between 'audience' and 'speaker', the *C&A* will provide the prime example to explore this issue.[236] The words of the liturgical text are written with a multifaceted audience in mind. Given that at its

[236] As in the textual analysis, the terms 'audience' and 'speaker' will be used in the technical sense. See Chapter 4.i, 43.

heart liturgy functions as worship of God, God is clearly intended as part of the audience.[237] The gathered worshippers (including the service leaders) are also part of the audience. Even, or perhaps especially, in those moments when all present are invited to articulate the words of the liturgy, they remain part of the audience. Each line of text is written as much for the gathered worshippers as for God. This aspect of the text, as written for the worshippers, will be explored further with the theme of ritual and repetition below.

In the *Confession*, God is named explicitly as audience: the prayer is addressed to 'God our Father'. The congregation speak together the words of confession which are written in the declarative mood: 'God our Father, we confess to you'. God is spoken to and addressed as 'Father'. Chapter 1 laid out the history of the use of the term 'Father' for God, and the *C&A* analysis revealed how the address of the *Confession* has changed through time. The earliest English language liturgies used by the SEC did not address God as 'our Father', but rather as 'Almighty God father of our Lord Jesus Christ'. These confessions used language which reflected the specifically christological and trinitarian reasons that calling God 'Father' became central to the Christian lexicon. Earlier Anglican liturgies also addressed the *Absolution* to 'Father', though without the caveat of 'father *of* our Lord …'. However, they did not call God 'our Father', but rather 'God our *heavenly* father' (italics mine). This is perhaps a significant distinction when considering the power of imagery. It may be that this move to address God as 'our Father' was intentional by the liturgists behind the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. The liturgical writers may have been seeking to draw the people into a closer relationship with God by removing the term of 'heavenly' which may have been seen as distancing. We can never be certain as to the reasoning behind the change, but we might be critical of it. The language of 'Father' for God has been shown to have developed in an androcentric society. This provides the basis for an argument against its wide usage. The beginnings of such an argument have already

[237] For a discussion of the purpose of liturgy, see Chapter 3.

been developed in Chapter 2 and roundly made by many feminist scholars. In this case, however, we are looking at the *C&A* analysis in particular with the focus on '*our* Father'.

There is an obvious argument for calling God 'our Father' which has not yet been addressed: that is, Jesus' teaching in the 'Lord's Prayer'. In Matthew's version of the prayer, the same distinction just discussed is encountered. The Greek found in Matthew 6.9 might translate roughly to 'So then pray you, Father of us, the one in the heavens' (Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). Without going into a more extensive discussion of the translation, it is nevertheless possible to see, in Matthew, that the first line of Jesus' teaching on prayer might become 'Our heavenly father'. The first line of Luke's version of this same prayer (Luke 11.2), as it appears in the NSRV, reads simply 'Father, hallowed be your name', though it includes a note 'Other ancient authorities read *Our Father in heaven*'. It would seem that there is a lack of clarity over the words Jesus taught his disciples to use. This ambiguity encourages equally critical consideration of the use of 'Father' in the 'Lord's Prayer' as for all iterations of reference to God as such. Does 'Father' in this prayer, as spoken by Jesus in Aramaic and translated into Greek and beyond into English mean what worshippers interpret 'God our Father' to mean? God as 'Father' to the early Christians meant God who created us, God as 'Father' through the first century of Christianity developed to mean the One whose divinity Jesus Christ shared, God whose Spirit was upon believers.[238] We cannot say what God as 'Father' means to the broad spectrum of twenty-first century Christians. We can certainly say, however, that the social and technical realities of contemporary worshippers, and therefore the lens through which they meet the language of the liturgy, is radically different from those who met God in the first century, or the fourth century, or the sixteenth century. Given the new perspective of today's worshippers, does addressing the *C&A* to 'our Father' create for them the sense of what might be considered Jesus' intention when he taught his followers to meet God in prayer as 'Father'? As indicated in Chapter 1, on the historical context of the terms, the use of 'Father' for God was in part

[238] For a discussion of the meaning of 'Father' in the Church's past, see Chapter 1, 9–17.

due to biological understandings at the time – that the male was the sole active party in the creation of children.[239] Given this understanding, God described as 'Father' in the time of Jesus might slide with relative ease into God as, for example, 'Creator' in our times. Although this may remove the personal nature of the language, for the purposes of a confession of sin such, less gender-exclusive, language might serve better.

The *C&A*, although *per se* a part of the SEC's liturgy since the Reformation, together have proved relatively changeable elements of the service. The textual analysis revealed the flexibility of location for the *C&A* within contemporary liturgy. As well, the range of practices from previous liturgies was explored and the influence of shifting congregational sensibilities on the words of the *C&A* assessed. Building on this flexible nature, in 2010 the College of Bishops, on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, authorised a list of 'permitted changes' which enable clergy and church communities to make certain local decisions. These include the question of whether to continue using male pronouns for God in the *C&A* or to adopt changes which replace the use of 'he'/'his' with 'God'/'God's'. Initially these were permissive, in that celebrants and congregations could choose whether or not to use them. However, the 2021 General Synod passed the first reading of a measure which will make these changes mandatory: they will be the only option in future editions of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. That is, rather than allowing discretion, all new printings of the 1982 liturgy will replace male pronouns with apparently non-gendered language when referring to God.[240] While this reflects much contemporary understanding of best practice as evidenced in the liturgies of other English-speaking Anglican provinces, it leaves the feminist critic wanting.[241] The SEC's General Synod, under advice from the Faith and Order Board and the College of Bishops, was prepared to step away from the male pronouns towards the apparently gender-neutral term 'God', but has left the exclusively male imagery for God in the *C&A*

[239] Chapter 1, 12–13.
[240] This version of the *Scottish Liturgy 1982* is already available on the SEC website: https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/publications/liturgies/scottish-liturgy-1982-with-alternative-eucharistic-prayers-revised-2021/.
[241] See the examples provided in the table in the Appendix.

untouched. The combination of the male imagery with a lack of pronouns could in fact emphasise a maleness of God. Worshippers who have been attending SEC services for many years will now hear 'God'/'God's' where once they heard 'he'/'his'. However, that purportedly gender-neutral God is still addressed as 'Lord' and 'Father'. Instead of the male pronouns used to indicate a male God, the image of God will be shaped by the metaphors, those of 'Lord' and 'Father'. Although God is no longer 'he', God remains male through these images and, the word 'God' may itself then convey the maleness so familiar to worshippers over years of hearing God as 'he'. Taking these small steps, although in part commendable, rather than being prepared to risk more significant adjustment may simply accentuate the sense of God's maleness rather than mitigate it. The SEC Liturgy Committee have recognised the implications of this decision. Acknowledging the limitations of these small changes, the Liturgy Committee recommended wholesale revision of the liturgy and were subsequently commissioned by the Faith and Order Board to complete the task. The new liturgy is currently (in Autumn 2021) a work in progress.

Before moving on to respond to the *S&B* analysis, the very different histories of the two liturgical elements should be reiterated. The words of the *S&B*, and the *Sanctus* in particular, come almost directly from biblical passages, whereas the *C&A* is a more modern text, although reference to the bible is naturally present. When considering the feminist response to a piece of liturgy whose text is drawn so directly from ancient Christian tradition, it is necessary to first face an important question. Does feminist critique demand that the tradition be abandoned, or is there something in the tradition to be retrieved and reshaped? As already indicated in Chapter 2, responding to this question is a key component to feminist Christian thinking. Sallie McFague, writing in 1982, placed feminist theologians into two categories based on their answer to this question: 'revolutionary and reformist'.[242] The two categories distinguished between those who deem the Christian tradition irredeemable from a feminist perspective, the

[242] McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 152.

revolutionaries, and those who 'believe that Christianity contains untapped possibilities for revision of traditional theology', the reformers.[243] Revolutionary feminists tend to abandon Christianity, whereas a feminist who remains a Christian is more likely to identify with the reformists. In conversation with Daphne Hampson (herself subsequently a 'post-Christian', or revolutionary feminist theologian), feminist Christians Janet Martin Soskice and Nicola Slee, among others, present various reformist positions.[244]

Janet Martin Soskice situates herself with the reformists through the possibility of 'turning the symbols'.[245] Soskice has decided to remain committed to her Christian faith and to work to progress the imagery of the Church. While acknowledging problematic aspects of the institutional Church's history, Soskice suggests that if we are willing to accept our own subjectivity and the particular circumstances of our time, we should tolerate the same for different eras of church history. Accordingly, she concludes that although it is always particular, the historical nature of the religion does not demand an unchanging faith. For Soskice, 'Christianity is a historical religion: not by endorsing the values of one place and period for all time to come, but in being a teleological or eschatological faith, always renewing itself as it longs for and works for the "coming of the kingdom".'[246] In contrast, Nicola Slee, another reformist, develops a flexible framework for what it means to be a Christian and what it means to be a feminist. She suggests that the two 'traditions' are not static, and that she is able to count herself as both only in as much the two influence one another.[247] Slee adopts the reformist perspective by reading the 'Jesus-story' as a parable. By reading it in this way, Slee suggests that this story 'refuses every attempt at slavish imitation or mere repetition and compels contemporary hearers to shape and tell a new story of the rule of God active in their *own* lives and times.'[248] In line with the arguments of James K.A. Smith described in

[243] Ibid.
[244] Hampson, *Swallowing a Fishbone?*
[245] Soskice, 'Turning the Symbols'.
[246] Ibid., 29.
[247] Slee, 'Re-Member', 33–49, at 33.
[248] Ibid., 34.

Chapter 3, Slee sees that humans are shaped by stories and with each iteration of the liturgy the story of Jesus becomes a part of the stories of individual worshippers.[249] Slee then takes this a step further, suggesting that just as Jesus' story shapes Christian lives, so the faithful are able also to shape the story of Christ for contemporary times.

As these two approaches indicate, there are many reformist methods within the feminist Christian tradition. I use the term 'tradition' here intentionally, though it is only relatively recently that these questions have even begun to be asked. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, early Christian language about God was developed in an androcentric society; the Christian tradition well into the twentieth century was primarily shaped by continued androcentric assumptions. However, by the grace of God there is more to the faith than mainstream theology and the feminist Christian tradition has established itself to ask questions of ancient texts and terminology. It is within this young tradition, but with reference to the medieval practice of apophatic theology, that I am able to take the reformist, rather than revolutionary, position. Even if the knowledge of God and the saving work of Christ has come to Christians through androcentric language and often misogynistic institutions, the Love of God is greater than these. Though, one would hope, that most, if not all, SEC Christians would not wish think that the traditional language of their liturgy maintains any androcentric status quo, or, worse, draws them into collusion with misogyny, my findings suggest this implication needs to be taken seriously. Thankfully, our language to speak of God's Love need not be so limited. I believe that there is something in the Christian tradition of intrinsic value which might be recovered and reformed. This conviction informs my response to the *S&B* analysis.

The textual analysis of the *S&B* identified several aspects of the *Sanctus* which might lend themselves to arguments in favour of liturgical conservatism. Against making any changes, one might draw attention to the history of the *Sanctus*: the text has been a part of the church's worship since at least the fourth century. Its function in the eucharistic

[249] See Chapter 3, 39.

liturgy is to express the belief that the voices of the gathered worshippers are joining with those of the heavenly host. In addition to its long-standing place in the liturgy, the *Sanctus* is essentially a direct biblical quotation. These characteristics of the *Sanctus* place it in a particular category within the tradition. Anglican theology sets tradition alongside scripture and reason as the three central pillars of faith. In a Grosvenor Essay published in 2007, the SEC Doctrine Committee suggests faith is 'grounded on revelation and reason, on the Holy Scriptures and tradition.'[250] With tradition central to faith, it might be asked how making changes to a text with a centuries-long history would fit with the SEC's self-understanding. However, as has already been addressed, tradition need not be interpreted as fixed. The tradition of liturgical *C&A* has clearly included responding to the needs of congregations. Does tradition, in the case of the *S&B*, involve retaining the text as it is? The textual analysis revealed that the tradition of the *S&B* has never been static. To begin with, the *S&B* is now found and performed in English, certainly not the language used by the authors of the foundational biblical texts or in the first iterations of the liturgical *S&B*. As shown in the textual analysis, the *S&B* has also undergone changes through its life as an English text. The SEC versions of the prayer have featured various alterations including, 'God of power and might' as 'God of hosts' and even 'God of Saboath'. These changes, although in some ways subtle, reflect a similar awareness of congregational needs which has guided *C&A* adaptations. The language appears to have been modified for the purpose of understanding. There is clear precedent for the tradition of the *S&B* to be not unchanging, but rather to allow for adjustment.

Having established that the *S&B*, despite its ancient history, could reasonably be regarded as open for adaptation, it is possible to look at the use of 'Lord' in the *S&B*. Does 'Lord' qualify for modification in the same way that 'God of hosts' has, in the *Sanctus*? What does 'Lord' mean to worshippers today? Although clearly Christians in the twenty-first century understand that 'Lord' is used to refer to 'God' or 'Christ', the term has a not insignificant number of other meanings. The entry for 'Lord' in the Oxford English

[250] SEC Doctrine Committee, *Shape of Our Church*, 41.

Dictionary includes sixteen different definitions (though some are labelled 'obsolete').[251] The majority of those entries, refer to a male in some position of exercising power over others. In the UK, the most common use of 'Lord' (outside the church) is surely to refer to peers, and to members of the House of Lords. Without wishing to imply a complete lack of liturgical or theological formation on the part of worshippers, it is hard to deny how these others uses might influence the image conjured up when singing or speaking the *Sanctus*. This is not to suggest that worshippers in the SEC think first of the House of Lord's when worshipping through the *Sanctus*, but rather to highlight the associations of this term is used in other contemporary contexts.[252] These other definitions of 'Lord' surely play some role in the image conjured each time God or Christ are referred to as 'Lord'. Although there might be a theological basis for the use of 'Lord' in the *Sanctus*, the fact that 'Lord' is being used in the sense of the circumlocution of YHWH, as discussed in Chapter 1, may well not be clear to worshippers who instead will make use of their own experiences to understand the term. [253] The situation is similar, if more inconclusive in the *Benedictus*. As the textual analysis showed, it is not clear from which biblical passage the *Benedictus* stems.[254] If the *Benedictus* is rooted in Psalm 118, 'Lord' most likely refers to YHWH, as in the *Sanctus*. If, however, one of the New Testament passages is taken to be the basis – Mark 21.9, Romans 1.25, or Mark 11.9-10 – there is less clarity about the origins of the use of 'Lord' in the *Benedictus*. Overall, the image that is intended by the use of the 'Lord' metaphor is not altogether clear, and it is left to contemporary worshippers are required to do the work of creating that image themselves. Should we still be relying so heavily on a multi-layered metaphor that was instigated and maintained in more androcentric centuries and societies? It is not possible to know what each individual worshipper hears, or sees, when singing praise to 'Holy, Holy, Holy Lord' or 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord'; however, my own sense, having discovered more of the history of 'Lord' and the historical context of the *Sanctus* is that

[251] 'Lord, n. and int.'
[252] This idea is widely recognised and researched, referred to as 'intertexuality': 'Intertextuality, n.'
[253] The textual analysis showed the *Sanctus* to most likely be quoting Isaiah 6.1-3 which uses small caps to indicate this circumlocution.
[254] Chapter 4.iii, 77–78.

this language does not positively contribute to the worship of twenty-first century Scottish Episcopalians. Moreover, any argument for maintaining the text as it is on the basis of tradition implies a static nature of tradition which is in fact not reflected in the history of the *Sanctus & Benedictus*. The following chapter will suggest alternatives.

The tradition of the *Benedictus* appears to be even less fixed than that of the *Sanctus*. As the textual analysis has shown, the *Benedictus* has been completely absent from many liturgies. As discussed above, Juliette Day claims it was only included in early liturgies to strengthen Christological arguments in the fourth century.[255] She goes so far as to say that the *Benedictus* serves no purpose in liturgies today.[256] The function of the *Benedictus* certainly does not seem clear. According to Gian Tellini, many have misinterpreted its purpose. As described in the textual analysis, Tellini suggests that the widely accepted theory that the text is there as a welcome to Christ at the Eucharist is in fact incorrect. Instead Tellini interprets the *Benedictus* with a more eschatological flavour.[257] What does it say about the place of the *Benedictus* in contemporary Scottish liturgies if one of the key liturgists felt the need to dissipate what he sees as false but widespread ideas about why the *Benedictus* is sung in the service with the *Sanctus*? If congregations are unsure, or even 'wrong' according to Tellini, about the purpose of the *Benedictus*, perhaps this is a good argument for it to be adapted or dropped from SEC liturgies. It might be suggested that the various interpretations of the *Benedictus* give the text depth and that it need not fulfil one particular function in the liturgy. While this argument may not be completely without merit, it does not bear much weight in a discussion of the use of 'Lord' in the text. If a twenty-first century liturgy continues to include a term such as 'Lord' which has been exposed as an image with androcentric roots and marginalising qualities, the function should be clear. The fact that a number of Anglican provinces, both past and present, have left the *Benedictus* out of their liturgies seems to give good reason to reconsider its place.

[255] Day, *Reading the Liturgy*, 96–97.
[256] Day, 'Anaphoral Benedictus', 193.
[257] Tellini, *Living Sacrifice*, Part 2:97–98.

Responding to the Overview textual analysis requires consideration of the place of mystagogy and the purpose of liturgy.[258] Is the liturgy for the initiated, for those who believe and understand, or is it for anyone who might cross the threshold of a church, perhaps in simple curiosity? [259] It would seem to me that as church attendance dwindles, the liturgy plays a vital role in making the church a welcoming place for newcomers. The liturgy ought to be capable of speaking God's message in the clearest possible way without using exclusively male imagery which requires a great deal of explanation in the twenty-first century. This means that it needs to be amended. I do not mean by this that tradition should be abandoned altogether. Along with other feminist Christian reformists, I believe there is value in tradition. Ritual and tradition, when performed in an equitable and inclusive way, are part of what can make the SEC a welcoming place, part of what should support the mission of the church. Without the repetition and comfort of ritual, human life can fall into disarray (as twenty-first century life seems to be showing us). I do not mean either that the poetic sense of the liturgy should be left aside for the purpose of clear messaging. With James K. A. Smith and Nicola Slee, I believe that the imagination and beauty are also bound up tightly in knowing God's presence. It is through beauty that many come to see the loving hand of the Creator. So with beauty and respect for ritual, I argue that we should acknowledge the learning of the last decades where women have finally been heard. We should recognise that the language of 'Lord' and 'Father' appears no longer to serve the mission of God as well as it once did. If the liturgy is there to support the mission of God, to be a part of God's mission of justice – as described in Chapter 3 – 'Lord' and 'Father' need to be given, at least, a reduced role in the text, or perhaps abandoned altogether.

[258] Mystagogy: 'Initiation into mysteries, or instruction preparatory to this; the practices or teachings of a mystagogue.' 'Mystagogy, n.'

[259] Of course, I would also suggest that many who have faith and have been attending church for many years have also been left to make guesses as to what it means that God is 'Father' and 'Lord'. It seems likely that there is a real lack of mystagogical teaching in churches.

The Overview textual analysis brought out these themes of ritual and repetition. Part of the power of ritual and repetition, as shown in the Overview, comes from the illocutionary force of the words of the liturgical text.[260] With each performance of the liturgy, the words in themselves make a reality. What reality does the worship of God as 'Father' and 'Lord' create? I would wish to reiterate at this point my commitment to an apophatic theology, according to which we might always hesitate before claiming to speak any sense of 'truth' about God. Despite this, if we are participating in a real act of faith, what images of God are shaped, are made real in our minds, by the words we use? 'Father' almost certainly does not represent today what it did when it entered and solidified its place in the Christian lexicon. 'Lord' does not convey the same meaning to contemporary congregations as it did to people in times when androcentric, hierarchical thinking was the accepted norm. What image of God do these metaphors create, especially with the (almost) complete lack of female metaphors? As discussed above, in the SEC, just over ten years have passed since God was consistently, weekly, if not daily, referred to as 'he'. The use of male metaphors across the liturgical text, repeated over and over again surely impacts the image of God in worshippers' minds. Is this language and image of God consistent with the Christian faith in which all are created in the image of God? The power of repetition and ritual to shape Christians' image of God is profoundly influenced by the metaphors included in the liturgy.

One final topic from the Overview for consideration is the idea of the liturgical text as traditional and yet also a piece of 'living literature'. This has already been hinted at through the understanding of tradition as itself 'living'. The textual analyses, and the responses in this chapter represent this living nature of liturgy, and its tradition. There have been various changes, big and small, to both the *C&A* and the *S&B* through the years. These changes embody the growth which signifies life. According to Katherine Zappone, a revolutionary feminist who left the church, '[s]ymbols bind us … to the

[260] For a description of illocutionary acts see Chapter 4.i, 49.

history from which they arise.'[261] If the church is bound to stagnant symbols developed in the androcentric centuries of the past, it would be difficult to maintain both feminist and Christian commitments. Certainly the church wishes to be connected to its historical roots, and to the language of Jesus. However, that binding is not fixed. Jesus did not speak English, and he lived in a context far removed from the contemporary one. Theologians, liturgists, and worshippers through the years have embraced the living nature of liturgy, altering it here and there to meet the needs of Christians of the day while holding onto the core of the tradition. This seems to me to be another point to embrace the newness that comes with life, breathing fresh imagery into the liturgy before the faith becomes stale. I give the final word of this response to the Overview to the SEC Doctrine Committee:

> adaptation, if entered upon willingly and constructively, will entertain new possibilities of liturgical practice and theological reflection. It can enable a realistic notion of mission to move on with a proper sense of tradition but without nostalgic and unrealistic obsessions with the cultural past.[262]

The feminist critical response requires one step further than simply entertaining new possibilities; it requires the production of these new possibilities. Chapter 6 will delve into the creation of some new liturgical prayers. Here I want to introduce four categories which I suggest emerge from the drawing together of the work of the Groundwork section with the textual analyses completed in this chapter. The creation of new liturgical prayers which are committed to both the SEC and the feminist tradition might be taken on from a number of perspectives, but I want to suggest four options have arisen from the work of this thesis: 'neutral', 'female', 'simple', and 'radical'.

[261] Zappone, *Hope for Wholeness*, 94.
[262] SEC Doctrine Committee, *Shape of Our Church*, 41.

As next chapter shows, it is from the changes made to some Anglican liturgies in recent years that the first category to emerge as a possibility for producing more inclusive liturgies is 'neutral'. As opposed to the alterations employed by the SEC, as discussed above, this is not in reference to replacing the male pronouns used to refer to God with 'God', but rather to describe the nature of possible new imagery. For example, the Anglican Church of Australia has altered the first line of one of their *C&A*s to be 'Holy God', with no reference to 'Father'. This image has quite a neutral feel and does not include any female element. This approach takes away the maleness of references to God, and leaves God ungendered. However, this may not go far enough.

The second category to develop is that of 'female'. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, a number of feminist theologians, Elizabeth Johnson being a key example, argue that it is necessary to introduce female imagery for God to complement or replace the male imagery. According to Johnson,

> Language about God in female images not only challenges the literal mindedness that has clung to male images in inherited God-talk; it not only questions their dominance in discourse about holy mystery. But … such speech calls into question prevailing structures of patriarchy.[263]

In this case, it is necessary to introduce female imagery for God in any new liturgical prayers which remain committed to the feminist tradition. An example of such which will be described in the next chapter is Johnson's 'SHE WHO IS'.

Looking to the SEC liturgical tradition, the 'simple' category emerges. Prayers produced by Janet Morley and Steven Shakespeare (though the latter does not profess commitment to the feminist tradition, inclusivity is important to him[264]) provide an example. The 'simple' category refers to prayers which retain a very close commitment to the traditional prayers of the church, but which often (though not always) seek to remove the

[263] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 5–6.
[264] Shakespeare, *Inclusive Church*, ix–xi.

male imagery and the exclusive association of God with power. In the case of Morley and Shakespeare this is in reference to the Church of England (CoE), whereas the prayers found in this category in Chapter 6 will be following the SEC tradition. Shakespeare's commitment to the CoE is clear, as he is an ordained person in the church. The prayers he offers in his *Prayers for an Inclusive Church* show this commitment, following the style of CoE prayers closely. Although he avoids referring to God as 'Father', Shakespeare's *C&A* offerings include regular use of the image of 'Lord', a first indication that the 'simple' category may not be critical enough for the development of truly inclusive prayers.[265] Morley's prayers do appear to show her commitment to the feminist tradition while, for the most part, making simpler changes to the traditional prayers of the CoE. For example, Morley's alterations to the *S&B* make only three small changes: from 'God of power and might' to 'vulnerable [or resurrection] God' and 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord' to 'Blessed is the one who comes in the name of God'.[266]

The final category builds largely on the work of Nicola Slee, which will be discussed further in Chapter 6, and Gail Ramshaw, as found in Chapter 2. The 'radical' category of prayer takes seriously the need to use images for God which surprise the worshipper. Chapter 2 introduced Ramshaw's discussion of 'dead metaphors' within the church.[267] In order to deal with this problem new imagery should be introduced which may shock or amaze. The 'radical' category takes this idea a step further, moving away, to some extent, from not only the more traditional terms for God but also in part from the shape of the prayer as it has been used by the SEC for many years. This method takes into account in its radical approach not only the seriousness of encountering God in new ways through different imagery, but also the nature of liturgy as discussed above and in Chapter 3. The

[265] Shakespeare, *Inclusive Church*; for examples of Shakespeare's *C&A*s see, 131, 143, and 146.
[266] Morley, *All Desires Known*, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56. One of Morley's S&B versions retains 'God of power and might' (ibid., 56). Despite these examples of 'simple' changes to a traditional prayer, not all of Morley's liturgical work would fall into this category.
[267] Chapter 2, 28–29.

terms used for God exist in a particular context when used in the prayers analysed, and the 'radical' category seeks to shift the context as much as the images.

As the statement by the SEC Doctrine Committee above says, there may be 'a realistic notion of mission to move on with a proper sense of tradition but without nostalgic and unrealistic obsessions with the cultural past.' The categories I have introduced for developing new prayers seek to move in this direction, with a healthy commitment to tradition and a desire to let go of those elements of the past which no longer serve the mission of the church. The final chapter will look at how other Anglican provinces have approached more recent liturgical alterations and propose new options for an SEC *C&A* and *S&B*.

Chapter 6
Solutions

> [A]t all points along the way in the process of selection and development of texts the question has been asked: Is this text consistent with the Trinitarian and Christological formulations which we, as Anglicans, regard as normative and the ground of our common prayer?[268]

In his article for the *Anglican Theological Review* in 2016, Matthew S.C. Oliver argues that The Episcopal Church in the States does not follow the above stipulation in their *Enriching Our Worship 1* (1998). However, this thesis questions the validity of the suggestion in the first place. What does it mean for 'the Trinitarian and Christological formulations' to be 'normative'? What are the origins of the so-called normative formulations, and should they truly be maintained? Taking the apophatic perspective, it has been argued that no formulation should be normative. Any such restriction severely limits the relationship possible between humanity and God. Building on the work already presented, this chapter will first present formulations of the *Confession & Absolution* (*C&A*) and *Sanctus & Benedictus* (*S&B*) offered by other English-speaking Anglican provinces. Two more recent versions of the *C&A* produced by the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) will also be given. After considering these prayers alongside the work of feminist liturgists and theologians – such as Janet Morley and Marjorie Proctor-Smith – new liturgical material will be proposed. These liturgical pieces take into consideration the origins of the terms of 'Lord' and 'Father' – as found in Chapter 1 – and their context within the specific prayers of the *C&A* and *S&B* – as described in Part II. Moving away from the male terminology which has dominated the language of the church for centuries, the new prayers seek to express the meaning and purpose of the 'Lord' and 'Father' imagery for God in a way which might be more approachable for a twenty-first century community. Of course, many liturgists have been here before, creating expansive liturgy which might be used in

[268] TEC Standing Liturgical Commission, *EOW1*, 5–6.

various Anglican or other Christian contexts. This chapter will provide options which seek to address the specifically Scottish Episcopalian context and have been developed in relation to the equivalent liturgical elements in the *Scottish Liturgy 1982*. As introduced in Chapter 5, building on the work of feminist theologians such as Nicola Slee, Gail Ramshaw, and Elizabeth Johnson, the alternative versions of the *C&A* and *S&B* will fall into four different categories. Those categories are 'neutral' – using neutral language for God; 'female' – taking on female terms for reference to God; 'simple' – variations which reflect the 1982 prayers more closely; and 'radical' – stepping outside the comfort zone of the words provided in the 1982 liturgy to surprise with radically different prayers.

Appendix A presents the solutions offered by three English-speaking Anglican provinces which have made efforts to produce 'inclusive' liturgies. These provinces are the Anglican Church of Australia (ACA), The Episcopal Church in the United States (TEC), and Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (ACANZP). Each of these provinces have developed liturgies, mostly in the past twenty years, using more expansive language for God, though one *C&A* from TEC was authorised in 1997. The table shows that these provinces have moved away from the 'Father' imagery in their more recent *C&A*s. The image of 'Lord', however, remains prevalent.

It would seem that the *S&B* is more resistant to change than the *C&A*. Does the history of the *S&B* and its particular place in the liturgy – drawing together the contemporary worshippers with those who have gone before – make it more difficult, or even inappropriate to alter? The versions of the *S&B* provided in New Zealand's 2020 prayer book challenge the stasis of the English *S&B*, with two offerings that depart from the traditional formulation of the text. Although some might argue that the purpose of the *S&B* demands that the prayer go untouched, their argument may be shown to be wanting. Just as in the case of the English bible, the *S&B* as found in

its English form is a translation. The *S&B* as first sung, or said, would not have been in English. If the *S&B* serves to join the contemporary worshippers with the angels and archangels, does that demand the English version remain unchanged? Are the angels and archangels and all those who have gone before raising their voices in an androcentric English? The argument that the prayer must remain in its current form for the purpose of joining in the same song as Christians down the centuries does not hold water. The possibility of altering the *S&B* into a form with more readily understandable imagery becomes thinkable. We are not changing ancient words which are untouchable, but rather creating new translations for our time, just as Christians in the centuries before us did. The English versions of all ancient Christian texts have been translated. As well, the *S&B* textual analysis describes the changes made to this specific prayer by previous generations.[269]

Although little has changed in the lexicon of the ACA and TEC *S&B*, as shown in the appendix both the Australian and New Zealand Anglican liturgies either abandon the *Benedictus* or at least make it optional. These provinces are following a tradition of dropping the *Benedictus* as discussed in the *S&B* textual analysis. As well as this, the ACANZP has provided completely new versions of the *S&B*, both of which abandon the *Benedictus* altogether. It is noteworthy that the prayers also do not appear to make any attempt to include the 'Hosanna in the highest' line. According to Gail Ramshaw the phrase is 'nonsensical'.[270] 'Hosanna', translated to 'save us, we beseech you', cannot be 'in the highest'.[271] Despite finding the phrase 'nonsensical', Ramshaw, taking a liturgically more conservative stance on the line, determines that it ought to remain in the prayer.[272] The liturgists who developed the *New Zealand Prayer Book* appear to have found the phrase negligible for the purpose of the prayer in its liturgical context. Despite many provinces holding to the English translation of the

[269] Chapter 4.iii, 81.
[270] Ramshaw, 'Wording the Sanctus', 3.
[271] Ibid., 7–8.
[272] Ibid., 3, 18.

S&B as developed by the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET, now English Language Liturgical Consultation, ELLC), the ACANZP has shown that newer translations are possible at the provincial level. It seems to me that the versions authorised in the New Zealand prayer book convey the meaning of the text as described in the 1982 liturgy's explanatory textbox for the *Sanctus*, 'an anthem to God's glory', without any explanation needed.

The *Confession and Absolution* are presented in a variety of ways by these three provinces. There does not appear to be a similar commitment to specific lexicon attached to these prayers. As can be seen from the table, all three provinces have dropped the image of 'Father' in the *C&A*. Although several of the prayers use a variation on 'Merciful God', the images of 'Loving and all-seeing God', 'Holy God', and 'God our Shepherd' provide alternatives to 'Father' as used in the SEC's 1982 Liturgy. The ACA holds onto the image of Jesus as 'Lord' in their *C&A* prayers, however the other provinces opt instead to image Christ as 'Saviour' in place of the traditional 'Lord'. Although in their own right these newer prayers offer a potentially positive move away from the male imagery, none of them take the leap with female metaphors.

Before bringing feminist scholarship into the conversation, below are shown two *C&A* prayers developed by the SEC in recent years. These two prayers, following the example of several of the prayers in the table above, drop the reference to God as 'Father' in the address, but continue to refer to Christ as 'Lord'.[273]

Ash Wednesday, A Rite for the Beginning of Lent, 2017	*A Service of the Word, 2015*
Let us confess our sins in penitence and faith. *Silence* **Almighty God,** **Creator of heaven and earth,**	**God of mercy,** **we acknowledge that we are sinners.** **We turn from the wrong** **that we have thought and said and done,**

[273] Despite the positive move away from the male image of 'Father', I would like to note my hesitancy around the use of 'Almighty God' in a liturgy intending to be inclusive and just.

we confess that we have sinned in thought, word, and deed. We have not loved you with all our being, we have not loved our neighbours as ourselves: we have disfigured your image in which we are made. In your mercy, forgive what we have been and what we have done, guide us and help us to amend our lives, and bring us to fullness of life in you, for the sake of your Son who died for us, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.	**and are mindful of all that we have failed to do. For the sake of Jesus, who died for us, forgive us for all that is past, and help us to live each day in the light of Christ our Lord. Amen** *A short silence is kept before saying either* **May almighty God, who sent his Son into the world to save sinners, bring us pardon and peace, now and for ever. Amen.** *Or* **May the God of love bring us back to himself, forgive us our sins, and assure us of his eternal love in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.**

These prayers have made a small move away from the male imagery; however, it is in no way complete. The changes seem to fall short of providing a liturgy which is more fully inclusive and imaginatively expansive. There is one location in SEC liturgies where a move expansive image for God has been introduced. The new Season of Creation Daily Prayer material, authorised by the College of Bishops for experimental use in 2021, includes the line 'Glory to God, Source of all Being, Eternal Word and Holy Spirit.'[274] This image does not make it into the eucharistic material produced at the same time, but it shows some desire within the SEC to represent God with imagery beyond 'Lord' and 'Father'.

In preparing to offer new liturgical material, we turn now to the work of feminist liturgical scholars. Marjorie Proctor-Smith would argue that the lack of female imagery in the authorised liturgies shown above means they do not provide much needed emancipation of language. For Proctor-Smith,

> *God-language must include explicitly female referents.* This means that we need to discover new female names for God, including Goddess,

[274] SEC, 'Season of Creation', 3; This formulation may also be found in: Stancliffe, *Celebrating Common Prayer*.

> Mother, Sister, Lady, Queen, Grandmother. But it also means we need to use female pronouns freely to claim "neutral" names for God as female which can challenge androcentric assumptions.[275]

The lack of female imagery, alongside the continued use of 'Lord' in particular, holds the old male image of God in place despite the use of apparently genderless words. Elizabeth Johnson would certainly agree with this proposition. Johnson finds that there is a need to skew language for God in favour of female images for a period in order to balance the scales against the centuries of exclusively male metaphors. Johnson suggests building the imagery on the language of God as 'Sophia', Wisdom.[276] Johnson also turns to the work of Aquinas who argued that "this name HE WHO IS is the most appropriate name for God". In order to reach this conclusion, Johnson explains that Aquinas was interpreting 'the burning bush scene metaphysically.'[277] While agreeing with Aquinas' affirmation of the importance of the name given to Moses, Johnson acknowledges the 'androcentric character of the standard English translation.' However, she also suggests the Latin 'could be rendered differently … The name could be translated quite literally "who is" or "the one who is".'[278] Given Johnson's commitment to female imagery for God, it is a natural progression for her to then provide a 'feminist gloss' to the I AM and render it 'SHE WHO IS'.[279] Gail Ramshaw follows Johnson's line of thinking leading her to the I AM as well. Ramshaw, however, keeps the 'neutral' formulation of the name. Looking specifically at terms which might replace 'Lord', Ramshaw suggests alongside 'I AM', '*the Living One*' and '*the Name*'.[280] While scholars such as Ramshaw and Johnson have taken on in-depth theological work to produce suggested replacements for the male imagery that pervades the church's prayers, liturgists such as Nicola Slee and Janet Morley have chosen a more practical approach. Slee and Morley have published collections of

---

[275] Procter-Smith, *In Her Own Rite*, 112.
[276] Johnson, *She Who Is*, 122.
[277] Ibid., 242, for Aquinas see: *Summa Theologica* I, q. 13, a. 11; also *Summa Contra Gentiles* I.22, par. 10.
[278] Ibid.
[279] Ibid.
[280] Ramshaw, *God beyond Gender*, 54–58.

prayers with a wide variety of images. This method falls in line with an apophatic approach. For Slee,

> [n]o one image or model, however elusive or rich, can do more than offer glimpses and hints towards the divine. The best poems and prayers awaken as much as they satisfy curiosity, desire, the longing for we know not what – the beyond, the Other, the One towards whom we journey and quest in all our human searchings.[281]

Although some images may have stronger traditional theological bases from which to argue their appropriateness in an authorised liturgy, in the end, all language about God is only a glimpse. According to Slee, our prayers ought to surprise us as much as comfort us in our relationship with the Divine. This is not to say that the work of Slee and Morley has no solid theological grounding. In fact, Morley makes a point to signal the biblical basis from which she works. In the introduction to her *All Desires Known*, Morley communicates that '[t]heologically, it will be noted that I frequently refer to the Wisdom of God, who is personified in feminine terms in an important strand of Jewish thought. Strong and significant echoes of the Wisdom tradition in fact underlie many of the crucial Christological passages of the New Testament.'[282]

The prayers presented below seek to build on the work of these feminist liturgists and scholars while retaining a commitment to the general sense of the *C&A* and *S&B* as they have been used in the SEC through the years. Key to the work of this thesis is the imagery used for God, in particular, providing alternatives to 'Lord' and 'Father'. An attempt has been made to offer imagery that might equally surprise and comfort contemporary congregations using language that follows the trajectory of the meaning of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' as they may have been understood by the earliest Christians while leaving behind the androcentric thinking which solidified their place.

---

[281] Slee, *Like a Woman*, 128.
[282] Morley, *All Desires Known*, xiii.

Confession and Absolution

Neutral

God of all love and mercy, we turn to you.
We see those beside us, the Body of Christ,
We see you before us, open arms waiting.
Each day we could have turned to You,
yet followed our own way.
Forgive us our foolishness.
Help us to see your guiding hand
and to reach out to You,
day after day.
We pray in the name of Christ.

May the God of all strength and honesty,
forgive us and free *us* from the bonds of regret,
heal and strengthen *us* by the Spirit,
and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Saviour.
Amen.

Female

God our Amma and Abba,
who forgives and consoles.
We turn to You and each other,
knowing our faults and failings.
We are sorry.
Teach us to learn from our mistakes
and to live more fully together as the Body of Christ.

God-Sophia who gives purpose,
forgive *us* and free *us*,
heal and strengthen us by her Spirit
and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Saviour.
Amen.

Simple

God who is Love, Life, and Light,

we turn to you in knowledge of our responsibility.
In the presence of our community,
we express our sorrow for how we have let down,
You, each other, and ourselves.
We reach out to you for forgiveness,
that embraced by your Love,
we will seek again to live in Christ as You have called.

May the God of all strength and honesty,
forgive us and free *us* from the bounds of regret,
heal and strengthen *us* by the Spirit,
and raise *us* to new life in Christ our Saviour.
Amen.

Radical
You created us, Mother, you teach us, Father.
You are with us, Sister, you are beside us, Brother.
You are our foundation, Rock.
We are sorry for the ways we have faltered
and ask your forgiveness.

Origin of all forgiveness and love,
strengthen our spirit
and draw out our True Selves
that we might be forgiven and forgive.
We pray in all Your Holy Names.
Amen.

Sanctus and Benedictus

Neutral
Holy, Holy, Holy One,
God of wisdom and justice.
Who was, who is, who is to come.
Blessed is the One who comes,
the One who comes in the Holy Name of God.

Simple
Holy, Holy, Holy God,
Living One of love and strength.
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is the one who comes in Your Name.
Hosanna in the highest.

Female

Holy, Holy, God-Sophia,
She who was and is and is to come.
Blessed is the One,
She who comes in the name of Wisdom.

Radical

Holy Divinity, creation sings your Name.
Holy Energy, source of all that is.
Holy Water, in whom all worlds drown.
Blessed is the one who comes in Christ's name.

Conclusion

Christians have been addressing God in the liturgy as 'Father' and 'Lord' for centuries. This study therefore set out to analyse the worship of God in these terms and work a considered view of whether their current use in *Scottish Liturgy 1982* is most appropriate for worship in the present Scottish Episcopal context. As an experiment in methodology a textual analysis was conducted, focusing on two liturgical elements, the *Confession & Absolution* and *Sanctus & Benedictus*, and the use of two of the most prominent male terms for God, 'Father' and 'Lord'.

Together the three sections of this dissertation have explored the androcentric culture in which 'Lord' and 'Father' entered, and solidified their place in, the Christian lexicon. The focus of current liturgical theology on the nature of stories and the importance of missional justice has been emphasised. The textual analysis, as the central component of the study, put the terms in their liturgical context, and showed the changing, 'living' nature of liturgy. Liturgists – understood as those who celebrate the liturgy as much as those who are technical experts – have always responded to society around them and to congregational sensibilities, to the point of modifying traditional texts, such as the *Sanctus & Benedictus*. This mutability of the texts reflects an understanding that there can be development within a tradition, that commitment to a tradition does not entail an obligation that all aspects of it go untouched.

So what does it mean that God is called 'Father' and 'Lord', and should these terms continue to be used as they are in Scottish Episcopal liturgy? The Groundwork section established the history of the terms 'Lord' and 'Father' in the Church, showing not only the androcentric nature of their beginnings, but also emphasising the reality of their nature as translated terms. Alongside this the work of feminist theologians reiterated the reality that the terms were developed in a church which did not listen to the female voice, insisting on the normativity of the male perspective. Recent liturgical theology has shown there to be an emphasis on the Church's fundamental mission of justice, to which

the maleness of the images 'Lord' and 'Father' for God does not contribute. The work of Part I, in combination with the findings of the textual analysis iterated above and consideration of how other Anglican provinces have reduced, or removed, 'Lord' and 'Father' from their liturgies, led to the emergence of four categories within which new prayers might be composed. These categories, 'neutral', 'female', 'simple', 'radical', represent a variety of approaches that might be taken to develop new liturgical prayers that remain committed to both the SEC and the feminist traditions. With these guiding principles, new liturgical material, without the use of 'Lord' or 'Father' has been presented.

This study has argued that 'Father' and 'Lord' are not necessary metaphors for the *Confession & Absolution* and the *Sanctus & Benedictus* as found in SEC liturgies. Other English-speaking Anglican provinces have, at least to some extent, moved on from these images, and it is argued that the time is ripe for the SEC to follow suit. Our tradition in the SEC is not static and through the lens of the feminist tradition a variety of ways to approach the composition of new liturgical texts presents the opportunity to see more open, expansive imagery in the Scottish Episcopal liturgy. Whether the 'simple', or the 'female' route is taken, or even the 'neutral' or perhaps bravely the 'radical', or an altogether different option, it is time to reconsider what is meant each time God is turned to in the image of 'Lord' or 'Father' and find new, living ways to meet with God in the liturgy.

Appendix: Recent Prayers from English-speaking Anglican Provinces

	Anglican Church of Australia	**The Episcopal Church (USA)**	**Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia**
Confession & Absolution	*An Order for the Holy Communion (2009, revised)* *The deacon says* We remember that the Lord Jesus died to take away our sins. *silence* Let us confess our sins to the God who knows us through and through. **Holy God,** **we have disobeyed your commandments,** **we have resisted your call,** **we have failed to live by your generous love.** **We are sorry for all our sins, and ask you to forgive us,** **through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.** *The priest says* God who has called us is faithful, and will not remember our sins. Your sins are forgiven, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Live by the Spirit's transforming power, and forgive as you have been forgiven. **Amen.**	*The Holy Eucharist: Rite Two (Expansive Language), 2018* *One of the sentences from the Penitential Order or Enriching Our Worship 1 may be said.* *The Deacon or Celebrant says* Let us confess our sins against God and our neighbor. *Silence may be kept.* *Minister and People* **Most merciful God,** **we confess that we have sinned against you** **in thought, word, and deed,** **by what we have done,** **and by what we have left undone.** **We have not loved you with our whole heart;** **we have not loved our neighbors as ourselves.** **We are truly sorry and we humbly repent.** **For the sake of our Savior Jesus Christ,** **have mercy on us and forgive us;** **that we may delight in your will,** **and walk in your ways,** **to the glory of your Name. Amen.** *The Bishop when present, or the Priest, stands and says* Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you all your sins through the grace of Jesus Christ, strengthen you in all goodness, and by the power of the Holy Spirit keep you in eternal life. Amen.	All prayers from *A New Zealand Prayer Book / He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa 2020* *Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption* *The congregation then kneels.* Happy are those whose sins are forgiven, whose wrongs are pardoned. I will confess my sins to the Lord, I will not conceal my wrongdoings. *Silence* God forgives and heals us. **We need your healing, merciful God:** **give us true repentance.** **Some sins are plain to us;** **some escape us,** **some we cannot face.** **Forgive us;** **set us free to hear your word to us;** **set us free to serve you.** *The presiding priest says* God forgives you. Forgive others; Forgive yourself. *Silence* Through Christ, God has put away your sin: approach your God in peace.

Confession & Absolution	*THE HOLY COMMUNION,* *also called the LORD'S SUPPER or the EUCHARIST* *for situations when children are present* Jesus said: I came so that you may have life, and have it abundantly. Let us confess our sins in penitence and faith. *silence* Confident in God's forgiveness, we pray: **God our Shepherd,** **we are lost in the darkness and danger of sin.** **We are hungry and afraid,** **and we cannot find our own way home.** **We are sorry for our sins.** **Search for us,** **save us,** **forgive us,** **and bring us back to life, we pray,** **through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.** There is rejoicing in heaven when the lost are found, and there is hope on earth when sinners turn to God in faith. Through Jesus Christ the Good Shepherd, who died and rose again to save us, I declare to you: Your sins are forgiven. **Amen. Come, Holy Spirit,** **and keep us in the light of Christ,** **now and for ever. Amen.**	*Enriching Our Worship 1* *Supplemental Liturgical Materials, 1997* Confession of Sin *The Deacon or Celebrant says* Let us confess our sins to God. *Silence may be kept.* *Minister and People* **God of all mercy,** **we confess that we have sinned against you,** **opposing your will in our lives.** **We have denied your goodness in each other,** **in ourselves, and in the world you have created.** **We repent of the evil that enslaves us,** **the evil we have done,** **and the evil done on our behalf.** **Forgive, restore, and strengthen us** **through our Savior Jesus Christ,** **that we may abide in your love** **and serve only your will. Amen.** Absolution Almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you all your sins through the grace of Jesus Christ, strengthen you in all goodness, and by the power of the Holy Spirit keep you in eternal life. Amen.	*Thanksgiving and Praise (English)* Forgiveness *The congregation kneels.* *The minister then says* We come seeking forgiveness for all we have failed to be and do as members of Christ's body. *Silence* In God there is forgiveness. **Loving and all-seeing God,** **forgive us where we have failed to support one another** **and to be what we claim to be.** **Forgive us where we have failed to serve you;** **and where our thoughts and actions have been contrary to yours we ask your pardon.** *The presiding priest says* God forgives us; be at peace. *Silence* Rejoice and be glad, for Christ is resurrection, reconciliation for all the human race. *The minister and people say* **We shall all be one in Christ,** **one in our life together.** **Praise to God who has created us,** **praise to God who has accepted us,** **praise to God who sends us into the world.**

Confession & Absolution			*Thanksgiving of the People of God* *The congregation kneels. …* *The presiding priest or minister says* God has promised forgiveness to all who truly repent, turn to Christ in faith and are themselves forgiving. In silence we call to mind our sins. *Silence* Let us confess our sins. **Merciful God,** **we have sinned** **in what we have thought and said,** **in the wrong we have done** **and in the good we have not done.** **We have sinned in ignorance:** **we have sinned in weakness:** **we have sinned through our own deliberate fault.** **We are truly sorry.** **We repent and turn to you.** **Forgive us, for our Saviour Christ's sake,** **and renew our lives to the glory of your name.** **Amen.** ***The Absolution*** *is declared by the presiding priest.* Through the cross of Christ, God have mercy on you, pardon you and set you free. Know that you are forgiven and be at peace. God strengthen you in all goodness and keep you in life eternal. ***Amen.***
Sanctus & Benedictus	*An Order for the Holy Communion (2009, revised)*	*The Holy Eucharist: Rite Two (Expansive Language), 2018*	*Thanksgiving of the People of God*

	So we praise you, holy God, with angels and archangels and all your faithful people: **Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory.** **Hosanna in the highest.** **[Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.** **Hosanna in the highest.]**	*Celebrant and People* **Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory.** **Hosanna in the highest.** **Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.** **Hosanna in the highest.**	**Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory.** **Hosanna in the highest.** *And these words may be added* **Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.** **Hosanna in the highest.**
			Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption **Holy, holy, holy:** **God of mercy, giver of life;** **earth and sea and sky** **and all that lives,** **declare your presence and your glory.**
			Thanksgiving and Praise (English) **Holy God, holy and merciful, holy and just,** **glory and goodness come from you.** **Glory to you most high and gracious God.**
Use of 'Lord' and 'Father'	Father – No Lord – Yes, C&A and S&B	Father – No Lord – Yes, S&B only	Father – No Lord – Yes, S&B only

Bibliography

Allison, Dale C. Jr. 'Matthew'. In *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, edited by John Barton and John Muddiman, 844–86. Oxford: OUP, 2001.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. 4 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1957.

———. *Summa Theologica Supplement*. 4 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1957.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Balserak, Jon. *Calvinism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198753711.003.0005.

———, ed. *Divinity Compromised: A Study of Divine Accommodation in the Thought of John Calvin*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-5056-9_1.

Beckwith, Roger T. 'The Pan-Anglican Document'. *The Churchman* 88, no. 1 (March 1974): 54–57.

Ben-Sasson, Hillel. *Understanding YHWH: The Name of God in Biblical, Rabbinic, and Medieval Jewish Thought*. Translated by Michelle Bubis. Jewish Thought and Philosophy. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32312-7_1.

Berger, Teresa. *Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History: Lifting a Veil on Liturgy's Past*. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.

———. 'The Challenge of Gender for Liturgical Tradition'. *Worship* 82 (2008): 243–61.

Biber, Douglas, and Edward Finegan. *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*. Oxford: OUP, 1994.

Bonfiglio, Ryan P. 'God and Gods'. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Theology*. OUP, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/acref:obso/9780199858699.013.0089.

Bradshaw, Paul. 'Difficulties in Doing Liturgical Theology'. *PACIFICA* 11 (June 1998): 181–94.

Bradshaw, Paul F., and Maxwell E. Johnson. *The Eucharistic Liturgies : Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/detail.action?docID=4659051.

Burns, Stephen. *SCM Studyguide to Liturgy*. London: SCM Press, 2006.

Burns, Stephen, and Bryan Cones, eds. *Liturgy with a Difference*. London: SCM Press, 2019.

Christ, Carol P. *She Who Changes: Re-Imagining the Divine in the World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan, 2003.

Congar, Yves. 'Classical Political Monotheism and the Trinity'. Translated by Paul Burns. *Concilium*, God as Father?, 143, no. 3 (1981): 31–36.

Cornwall, Robert D. 'The Church and Salvation: An Early Eighteenth-Century High Church Anglican Perspective'. *Anglican and Episcopal History* 62, no. 2 (1993): 175–91.

Cornwall, Susannah. 'Apophasis and Ambiguity: The "unknowingness" of Transgender'. In *Trans/Formations*, edited by Lisa Isherwood and Marcella Althaus-Reid, 13–40. Controversies in Contextual Theology. London: SCM Press, 2009.

Daly, Mary. 'After the Death of God the Father: Women's Liberation and the Transformation of Christian Consciousness'. In *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion*, edited by Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow, 53–62. San Franscisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Dam, Raymond Van. 'Imperial Fathers and Their Sons: Licinius, Constantine, and the Council of Nicaea'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Council of Nicaea*, edited by Young Richard Kim, 19–42. Cambridge Companions to Religion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. doi:10.1017/9781108613200.002.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. 'Abba and "Father": Imperial Theology and the Jesus Tradition'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 611–30.

———. 'Theology in Mark and Q: Abba and "Father" in Context'. *The Harvard Theological Review* 85, no. 2 (April 1992): 149–74.

Day, Juliette. *Reading the Liturgy: An Exploration of Texts in Christian Worship*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

———. 'The Origins of the Anaphoral Benedictus'. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 60, no. 1 (2009): 193–211.

De la Torre, Miguel A. 'Worship Through Sanctuary'. In *Liturgy with a Difference*, edited by Stephen Burns and Bryan Cones, 154–64. London: SCM Press, 2019.

DeConick, April D. *Holy Misogyny: Why the Sex and Gender Conflicts in the Early Church Still Matter*. London: Continuum, 2011.

Dille, Sarah J. *Mixing Metaphors: God As Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Studies 398. London: T&T Clark International, 2004. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/detail.action?docID=436390.

Dudley, Martin. 'Absolution'. In *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, edited by Paul Bradshaw, 1. London: SCM Press, 2013.

Duerden, Richard. 'Authority or Power?: Authority and Reformation Bible Translation'. In *Reformation*, edited by Orlaith O'Sullivan, 9–23. London: British Library, 2000. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/detail.action?docID=3544002.

Dunn, James. *Christology in the Making*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster John Knox Press, 1980.

Earey, Mark. *Worship That Cares: An Introduction to Pastoral Liturgy*. London: SCM Press, 2012.

Eisenberg, Ronald L. *Dictionary of Jewish Terms: A Guide to the Language of Judaism*. Rockville, MD: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2011. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/detail.action?docID=843374.

Foley, Edward. 'Preaching in an Age of Disaffliation: Respecting Dissent While Keeping the Faith'. In *Liturgy with a Difference*, edited by Stephen Burns and Bryan Cones, 143–53. London: SCM Press, 2019.

Fowler, Roger. *Linguistic Criticism*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 1996.

Foxhall, Linn, and Keith R. Bradley. 'Household'. In *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. OUP, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780198706779.013.0400.

Geffré, Claude. '"Father" as the Proper Name of God'. Translated by Iain McGonagle. *Concilium*, God as Father?, 143, no. 3 (1981): 43–50.

German, Kieran. 'Non-Jurors, Liturgy, and Jacobite Commitment, 1718–1746'. Edited by JR Davies and Scott Spurlock. *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XLVII (2018): 74–99.

Gordon-Taylor, Benjamin. 'Liturgy'. In *The Study of Liturgy and Worship: An Alcuin Guide*, edited by Juliette Day and Benjamin Gordon-Taylor, 12–20. London: SPCK, 2013.

Halliday, M.A.K. *Spoken and Written Language*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 1989.

Halliday, M.A.K., and Christian Matthiessen. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2013.

Hamerton-Kelly, Robert. 'God the Father in the Bible and in the Experience of Jesus: The State of the Question'. *Concilium*, God as Father?, 143, no. 3 (1981): 95–102.

———. *God the Father: Theology and Patriarchy in the Teaching of Jesus*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979.

Hammond, Cally. *The Sound of the Liturgy: How Words Work in Worship*. London: SPCK, 2015.

Hampson, Daphne, ed. *Swallowing a Fishbone?: Feminist Theologians Debate Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1996.

Hipsher, B. K. 'God Is a Many Gendered Thing: An Apophatic Journey to Pastoral Diversity'. In *Trans/Formations*, edited by Lisa Isherwood and Marcella Althaus-Reid, 92–104. Controversies in Contextual Theology. London: SCM Press, 2009.

Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. OUP, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780198706779.001.0001.

Inclusive Bible: The First Egalitarian Translation. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2009.

International Consultation on English Texts. *Prayers We Have in Common: Agreed Liturgical Texts Prepared by the International Consultation on English Texts*. Second revised. London: SPCK, 1975.

'Intertextuality, n.' In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 20 October 2021. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/240987.

Isherwood, Lisa. 'Introduction'. In *Trans/Formations*, edited by Lisa Isherwood and Marcella Althaus-Reid, 1–12. Controversies in Contextual Theology. London: SCM Press, 2009.

Jagessar, Michael N., and Stephen Burns. *Christian Worship: Postcolonial Perspectives*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing, 2011.

Jardine Grisbrooke, W. 'Silent Prayer'. In *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, edited by Paul Bradshaw. London: SCM Press, 2005.

Jasper, Alison. 'Today's Church and the Politics of Post-Truth'. In *Truth and the Church in a Secular Age*, 177–89. London: SCM Press, 2019.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Prayers of Jesus*. Vol. 6. Studies in Biblical Theology 2. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.

Johnson, Elizabeth A. *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse*. New York: NY: Crossroad, 1992.

Kavanagh, Aidan. *On Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992.

King, Helen. 'Women'. In *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. OUP, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780198706779.013.0400.

Kirk, Peter. 'Holy Communicative? Current Approaches to Bible Translation Worldwide'. In *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?*, edited by Lynne Long, 89–101. Topics in Translation 28. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2005.

Kubicki, Judith M. *The Presence of Christ in the Gathered Assembly*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd, 2006.

LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Lathrop, Gordon W. *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1998.

Long, Lynne, ed. *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?* Topics in Translation 28. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2005.

'Lord, n. and Int.' In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 14 October 2021. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/110299.

Lyman, Rebecca. 'Arius and Arianism: The Origins of the Alexandrian Controversy'. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Council of Nicaea*, edited by Young Richard Kim, 43–62. Cambridge Companions to Religion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. doi:10.1017/9781108613200.003.

MacDowell, Douglas Maurice, Adolf Berger, Barry Nicholas, and Susan M. Treggiari. 'Marriage Law'. In *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. OUP, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780198706779.013.0400.

Mann, Rachel. ''The Performance of Queerness': Trans Priesthood as Gesture Towards a Queered Liturgical Assembly'. In *Liturgy with a Difference*, edited by Stephen Burns and Bryan Cones, 35–46. London: SCM Press, 2019.

McFague, Sallie. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1982.

Methuen, Charlotte. 'Herr Herr: Zum Umgang Mit Dem Gottesnamen in Der Lutherbibel'. In *Gott Heißt Nicht Nur Vater: Zur Rede Über Gott in Den Übersetzungen Der 'Bibel in Gerechter Sprache'*, edited by C. Gerber, B. Joswig, and S. Petersen, 130–44. Biblisch-Theologische Schwerpunkte 32. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008.

———. 'Mary in Context: A Historical Methodological Reflection'. *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ (ARCIC II)*, GS Misc, 872 (2008): 15–23.

———. '"These Four Letters s o l a Are Not There": Language and Theology in Luther's Translation of the New Testament'. *Studies in Church History* 53 (2017): 146–63. https://doi.org/10.1017/stc.2016.10.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *In Search of God: The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*. Translated by Frederick H. Cryer. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1988.

'Misogynist, n. and Adj.' In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 9 September 2021. https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/Entry/119828.

Moltmann, Jürgen. 'The Motherly Father. Is Trinitarian Patripassianism Replacing Theological Patriarchalism?' Translated by G. W. S. Knowles. *Concilium*, God as Father?, 143, no. 3 (1981): 51–55.

Morley, Janet. *All Desires Known*. Expanded Edition. London: SPCK, 1992.
Morrill, Bruce T. 'Liturgy's Missional Character: Trusting Truth in Real Bodies of Culture and Tradition'. In *Liturgy with a Difference*, edited by Stephen Burns and Bryan Cones, 115–25. London: SCM Press, 2019.
'Mystagogy, n.' In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 12 October 2021. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/124631.
Northup, Lesley A. *Ritualizing Women: Patterns of Spirituality*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press, 1997.
Office, Anglican Communion. 'Anglican Communion: Marks of Mission'. Anglican Communion Website. Accessed 12 October 2021. http://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/marks-of-mission.aspx.
O'Loughlin, Thomas. *The Eucharist: Origins and Contemporary Understandings*. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
Pless, John T. 'Confession and Absolution' 30, no. 1 (2016): 28–42. https://doi.org/doi:10.1353/lut.2016.0003.
'Precative, Adj. (and n.)'. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 12 October 2021. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/149558.
'Preface'. In *The Prayers of Jesus*, Vol. 6. Studies in Biblical Theology 2. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.
Procter-Smith, Marjorie. *In Her Own Rite: Constructing Feminist Liturgical Tradition*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
Procter-Smith, Marjorie. *Praying with Our Eyes Open: Engendering Feminist Liturgical Prayer*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1995.
Ramshaw, Gail. *God Beyond Gender: Feminist Christian God-Language*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995.
———. *Liturgical Language: Keeping It Metaphoric, Making It Inclusive*. American Essays in Liturgy. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
———. *Reviving Sacred Speech: The Meaning of Liturgical Language: Second Thoughts on Christ in Sacred Speech*. Akron, OH: OSL, 2000.
———. 'Wording the Sanctus: A Case Study in Liturgical Language'. *Worship* 77, no. Part 4 (2003): 325–40.
Rashkow, Ilona N. *Upon the Dark Places: Anti-Semitism and Sexism in English Renaissance Biblical Translation*. Bible and Literature 28. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1990.
Renkin, Claire. 'Real Presence: Seeing, Touching, Tasting: Visualizing the Eucharist in Late Medieval Art'. In *Reinterpreting the Eucharist: Explorations in Feminist Theology and Ethics*, edited by Carol Hogan, Kim Power, Anne F. Elvey, and Claire Renkin, 130–51. ProQuest Ebook Central: Taylor & Francis Group, 2014. online at https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/detail.action?docID=1815537.
Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 'Powerful Words: The Social-Intellectual Location of the International Signifying Scriptures Project'. In *Theorizing Scriptures: New Critical Orientations to a Cultural Phenomenon*, by Vinvent L. Wimbush, 256–67. Signifying (on) Scriptures. London: Rutgers University Press, 2008. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/gla/reader.action?docID=348826&ppg=277.

SEC. ‘Daily Prayer for the Season of Creation’. Edinburgh, 2021.
———. ‘Scottish Liturgy 1982’. Edinburgh, 1982.
———. ‘Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers’. Edinburgh, 1996.
SEC Doctrine Committee. *The Shape of Our Church: An Essay in Descriptive Ecclesiology*. Grosvenor Essay 4. Edinburgh: SEC, 2007.
SEC Liturgy Committee. ‘Permitted Changes to 1982 Liturgy: Rationale’, 2017. https://www.scotland.anglican.org/wp-content/uploads/Permitted-changes-to-1982-Liturgy-rationale.pdf.
Senn, Frank. ‘The Bible and the Liturgy’. *Liturgy* 19, no. 3 (1 June 2004): 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/04580630490459391.
Shakespeare, Steven. *Prayers for an Inclusive Church*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008.
Slee, Nicola. *Praying Like a Woman*. London: SPCK, 2004.
———. ‘The Power to Re-Member’. In *Swallowing a Fishbone?: Feminist Theologians Debate Christianity*, edited by Daphne Hampson, 33–49. London: SPCK, 1996.
Smith, James K. A. *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works*. Vol. 2. Cultural Liturgies. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.
Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. London: OUP, 1985.
———. *The Kindness of God: Metaphor, Gender, and Religious Language*. Oxford: OUP, 2008.
———. ‘Turning the Symbols’. In *Swallowing a Fishbone?: Feminist Theologians Debate Christianity*, edited by Daphne Hampson, 15–32. London: SPCK, 1996.
Spinks, Bryan D. *The Worship Mall: Contemporary Responses to Contemporary Culture*. Alcuin Club Collections 85. London: SPCK, 2010.
Sprinkle, Stephen V. ‘Standing Together: The Murder of Lesbians and the Martyrdom of Saints Perpetua and Felicity’. In *Text, Image, and Christians in the Graeco-Roman World: A Festschrift in Honor of David Lee Balch*, edited by Aliou Cissé Niang and Carolyn Osiek, 199–217. Princeton Theological Monograph 176. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012.
Stancliffe, David, ed. *Celebrating Common Prayer*. Second. London: Continuum, 2002.
Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music of the Episcopal Church (SCLM). *Interview with the Rev. Canon Ian Paton, the Scottish Episcopal Church - YouTube*. Accessed 5 November 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qsOrx3BUk0Q.
Stewart, J. C. ‘The Vocal Parts of Worship Including the Content and Style of Prayers’. In *Getting the Liturgy Right: Essays by the Joint Liturgical Group on Practical Liturgical Principles for Today*, edited by R. C. D. Jasper, 36–45. London: SPCK, 1982.
Suna-Koro, Kristine. ‘Liturgy, Language and Diaspora: Some Reflections on Inclusion as Integration by a Migratory Liturgical Magpie’. In *Liturgy with a Difference*, edited by Stephen Burns and Bryan Cones, 101–14. London: SCM Press, 2019.
TEC Standing Liturgical Commission. *Enriching Our Worship 1*. New York, NY: Church Publishing, 1997.
Tellini, Gianfranco. *A Single, Holy, Living Sacrifice*. Vol. Part 2. Dunblane: Scottish Episcopal Institute, 1998.

Tertullian. 'Adversus Praxeam'. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, translated by Peter Holmes, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885. https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0317.htm.

———. 'De Cultu Feminarum'. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, translated by Sydney Thelwall, IV:1.1.1-2. Accessed 8 October 2021. https://tertullian.org/anf/anf04/anf04-06.htm#P263_52051.

Tovey-Walsh, Bethan. 'Textual Analysis: Asking Questions about Texts'. Accessed 4 January 2020. http://www.bethtovey.com/language/text_analysis.html.

———. [personal communication], 'Tovey-Walsh Textual Analysis Framework', 8 February 2022.

Viktor, Shklovskij. 'Art as Technique'. In *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.

Walton, Janet R. *Feminist Liturgy: A Matter of Justice*. American Essays in Liturgy. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Wandrey, Irina. 'Early Judaism'. In *Religion Past and Present*, 4:238b. Brill, n.d. https://referenceworks.brillonline.com:443/entries/religion-past-and-present/early-judaism-SIM_08001.

Watson, Francis. *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1997.

Widdowson, H. G. *Practical Stylistics*. Oxford: OUP, 1992.

Williams, Rowan. 'A Great Cloud of Witnesses'. Church of the Holy Comforter, 2009. https://holycomfortermd.org/a-great-cloud-of-witnesses-2/.

Wolterstoff, Nicholas. *The God We Worship: An Exploration of Liturgical Theology*. The Kantzer Lectures in Revealed Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2015.

Zappone, Katherine. *The Hope for Wholeness: A Spirituality for Feminists*. Mystic, Connecticut: Twenty-Third Publications, 1991.