

EARTHING COMMON WORSHIP:
AN ECOTHEOLOGICAL CRITIQUE OF THE
COMMON WORSHIP TEXTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

by

Jeremy Mark Sebastian Clines

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology and Religion
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
The University of Birmingham
2011

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis undertakes an interdisciplinary analysis of new Church of England liturgies (*Common Worship*) from an ecotheological point of view: making use of reader response theory, literary analysis, a social scientific survey, liberation theology, environmental and political ethics and liturgical theology. Chapter 1 considers the theological, political and sociological influences on liturgical reform, which include, inculturation, the expression of ethics in the prayer of the Church, liberation theologies, technology, and agrarianism.

Chapter 2 considers methods of liturgical change and the scope for making creation visible in liturgy. Chapter 3 finds justification in reader response theory for determining ecotheological priorities for critiquing liturgy. Analysis of *Common Worship* texts occurs: in Chapter 4, using literary analysis; in Chapter 5 via social scientific survey of clergy using *Common Worship*; Chapter 6 looks in details at Collects and Post Communions and undertakes an ecotheological rewriting of 9 sample texts. Chapter 7 identifies lessons for liturgical revision in general and for eco-liturgical reform in particular, paying particular attention to the dissonant creation theologies unearthed in *Common Worship*, the necessity for future revisions, and the importance and implication of technological change for liturgical writers and commentators.

DEDICATION

In Memorium Michael Vasey

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes to the people who have supported me at the higher education institutions I've been connected to, both before and during the writing of this thesis: Whitelands College, Roehampton; St John's College, Durham; the Irish School of Ecumenics, Milltown Institute, Dublin; The Church of Ireland Theological College, Braemor Park, Dublin; the University of Birmingham; York St John University; and the University of Sheffield.

My appreciation goes to those who know me well and who have remained interested in my studies over many years and succeeded in keeping patient with my progress. My appreciation also goes to those who were impatient with me too, since they helped me keep going.

My admiration goes to all members of my family who have shown confidence in my abilities and demonstrated love towards me by encouraging me to finish my studies. It has been a joy to spend such cheerful, love-filled holidays with Louise and latterly with Esther too even with the thesis in tow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

Introduction: What Influences the Visibility of Creation in Liturgy?	2
1. <i>Reasons for this Thesis</i>	3
a. <i>The intersection between poetry and faith</i>	4
b. <i>The work and testimony of Sean McDonagh</i>	4
c. <i>The ecotheological imperative</i>	5
d. <i>The intrigue of Andrew Linzey's animal rites</i>	5
e. <i>Theology arrives with the people via liturgy</i>	5
f. <i>The new resources of Common Worship</i>	6
g. <i>Being my father's son</i>	7
2. <i>The Context for this Thesis and the Terminology Used in It</i>	7
a. <i>Liberationist liturgical theologies, ecotheology, eco-justice, and eco-liturgy</i>	8
b. <i>The Creation, creation themes, earthing and greening</i>	9
c. <i>Panentheism, pantheism, transcendence and immanence</i>	10
d. <i>Liturgical reform, the Liturgical Movement and inculturation</i>	13
e. <i>Trinitarian and eschatological cosmologies</i>	14
3. <i>Choosing between General and Particular Examples of Eco-liturgy</i>	15
4. <i>Church of England Motivations for Eco-liturgical Innovation</i>	17
5. <i>Inculturation, Cultural Change and Technology</i>	21
a. <i>Understanding the language of inculturation and using its methods</i>	22
b. <i>Issues of catholicity and inclusivity for liturgical inculturation</i>	23
c. <i>Recent examples of liturgical inculturation in urban and Anglican settings</i>	24
d. <i>The influence of cultural change on liturgical reform</i>	27
e. <i>The influence of an agrarian legacy and a technological society on liturgy</i>	29
6. <i>Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, (Lex Agendi / Lex Vivendi)</i>	31
7. <i>How Theologies of Liberation Have Been Expressed Liturgically</i>	33
a. <i>Feminist liturgies</i>	34
b. <i>Political and urban liturgies</i>	38
c. <i>Disability and children and liturgy</i>	43
d. <i>Liberationist liturgies and their implications for eco-liturgical reform</i>	46
8. <i>The Content of this Thesis</i>	48

Chapter Two	
Church of England Liturgical Reform in Ecotheological Context	50
1. <i>Liturgical Developments in the Church of England; 1965 to the Present</i>	51
2. <i>Alien Rites: An Introduction to Peter Nicholas Davies's Work</i>	56
a. <i>Introduction to Alien Rites</i>	59
b. <i>The success of revision</i>	60
c. <i>Liturgy as a reforming journey</i>	61
d. <i>The comprehensibility argument</i>	64
e. <i>Arguments against revision</i>	66
f. <i>An escape from the impasse</i>	67
g. <i>The limited success of liturgical modernization</i>	68
h. <i>The shift in authority in new rites</i>	72
i. <i>Alien Rites: points of synthesis and departure for this study</i>	73
3. <i>Making God in Creation Visible in Common Worship</i>	74
Chapter Three	
Approaches to Analysing Earthed Liturgy	78
1. <i>Reading Liturgy from a Committed Position</i>	79
2. <i>Cosmologies and Eco-liturgy</i>	86
3. <i>The Trinity and Eco-liturgy</i>	87
a. <i>God as Creator in the liturgy</i>	88
b. <i>Christ as rescuer of creation in the liturgy</i>	95
c. <i>The Spirit of God as sustainer of creation in the liturgy</i>	99
4. <i>The Presence and Absence of Earthed Eschatology in Liturgical Writing</i>	106
5. <i>Hope and Promise in Earthed Liturgical Texts</i>	113
6. <i>Conclusion</i>	118
Chapter Four	
An Analysis of Selected <i>Common Worship</i> Resources	119
1. <i>An Analysis of Ecotheological Themes in Common Worship Texts</i>	120
a. <i>Purpose of analysis</i>	120
b. <i>Process of analysis</i>	120
c. <i>Identifying and including relevant texts</i>	121
d. <i>Supplementary criteria for the gradation of relevant texts</i>	131
2. <i>The Quantity of Texts with a Creation Theme in Common Worship</i>	133
3. <i>Remarkable Texts</i>	135
a. <i>Intercession and Praise</i>	136
b. <i>Exceptional texts</i>	140

4.	<i>God in Creation</i>	151
	<i>a. The nature of God as Creator</i>	151
	<i>b. The Trinity and the Creation</i>	154
	<i>c. The physical involvement of God in the Creation</i>	163
	<i>d. God's love for and the redemption of creation</i>	173
5.	<i>The Nature of the Creation</i>	179
6.	<i>Suffering in the Creation</i>	182
7.	<i>Stewardship, Dominion and the Cherishing of the Earth</i>	192
8.	<i>Animals</i>	195
9.	<i>Eschatology and the Creation, Realized and Unrealized</i>	200
	<i>a. Realized eschatology</i>	200
	<i>b. Unrealized (and realized) eschatology</i>	204
10.	<i>Conclusion</i>	210

Chapter Five

	<i>A Survey and Analysis of the Use of Earthed Common Worship Texts</i>	211
1.	<i>Survey Process</i>	212
2.	<i>Survey Texts</i>	213
	<i>a. Invitation to Confession</i>	219
	<i>b. Confession</i>	220
	<i>c. Collect</i>	220
	<i>d. Preface: for Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E</i>	221
	<i>e. Post Communion</i>	223
	<i>f. Blessing</i>	223
3.	<i>Survey Questions</i>	225
4.	<i>Survey Results</i>	226
	<i>a. Awareness of the theme 'God in Creation'</i>	227
	<i>b. Familiarity with the six CW texts</i>	227
	<i>c. Use of the six CW texts</i>	229
	<i>d. The usefulness of the six CW texts</i>	230
	<i>e. Influence of survey on respondents</i>	231
5.	<i>A Dialogue with the Respondents' Additional Comments</i>	231
	<i>a. Invitation to Confession</i>	232
	<i>b. Kyrie Confession</i>	233
	<i>c. Collect</i>	235
	<i>d. Thanksgiving Preface</i>	236
	<i>e. Post Communion</i>	242
	<i>f. Blessing</i>	243
6.	<i>Conclusion</i>	244

Chapter Six	
<i>Common Worship Collects and Post Communions: A Detailed Study</i>	246
1. <i>An Ecotheological Liturgical Critique in the Context of Liturgical Revision</i>	246
2. <i>Revisions of the CWPC</i>	249
3. <i>The Collects and Post Communions in Ecotheological Perspective</i>	252
a. <i>God the Creator in the CWPC</i>	252
b. <i>How earthed are the CWPC?</i>	253
c. <i>What happens when the prayers are earthed?</i>	254
d. <i>Eco-eschatology and CWPC</i>	255
4. <i>A Process for Suggesting Revisions</i>	256
a. <i>Adjustments to the architecture: not rebuilding</i>	256
b. <i>Inclusiveness in earthed revisions</i>	257
5. <i>The Critique, Revision and Analysis of Nine Collects and Post Communions</i>	259
a. <i>Encountering God's works</i>	259
b. <i>Joining creation in celebrating God's love</i>	262
c. <i>Trinity, ecclesiology and cosmology</i>	264
d. <i>Humanity expresses God's communion with the cosmos</i>	266
e. <i>Reliance of all creation on God's grace</i>	268
f. <i>Grace, works and stewardship in God's kingdom</i>	270
g. <i>Heavenly and earthly nourishment of the faithful</i>	272
h. <i>Speaking the names of the Trinity within creation</i>	274
i. <i>The relationship between Creator and the fallen creation</i>	275
6. <i>Conclusion</i>	280
 Chapter Seven	
<i>Routes for Revision</i>	282
1. <i>Charting the Routes of Revision</i>	283
2. <i>Will Liberationist Routes be Absorbed in the Mainstream?</i>	284
3. <i>A New Perspective on the Contents and Use of Common Worship</i>	285
4. <i>Creation Theologies in Common Worship Made Visible</i>	287
5. <i>The Liturgical Ethics and Cosmology of Common Worship</i>	290
6. <i>Evidence of How Church of England Theology Develops through its Worship</i>	293
7. <i>Future Routes for Revision in a Technological Age</i>	295
 Notes to the Appendices (On CD ROM)	299
 Bibliography	301

ABBREVIATIONS

- ANZPB/HKMOA *A New Zealand prayer book—He Karakia mihinare o Aotearoa* (The Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia 1989)
- ASB *The Alternative Service Book* (The Church of England 1980)
- BCP *The Book of Common Prayer, 1662 Version: Including Appendices from the 1549 Version and other Commemorations* (The Church of England 1999)
- CW The full collection of *Common Worship* texts: i.e. the full series of resources entitled *Common Worship—Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (Church of England 2000–2008)
- CWAC *Common Worship: Additional Collects* (Church of England 2004)
- CWCI *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (Church of England 2006a)
- CWCPC Collects and Post Communion prayers for Sundays and Principal Holy Days in *Common Worship* (CWME: 376-426) and the Additional Collects (CWAC)
- CWME The Main Edition of the series, *Common Worship—Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (Church of England 2000a)
- LHWE *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* (Church of England 1984)
- NPW *New Patterns for Worship* (Church of England 2002)
- PHG *The Promise of His Glory* (Church of England 1991)
- PW *Patterns for Worship* (Church of England 1995)
- TSAY 'Seasons and Festivals of the Agricultural Year' in *Common Worship: Times and Seasons* (Church of England 2006c: 593-643)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: WHAT INFLUENCES THE VISIBILITY OF CREATION IN LITURGY?

When training for ministry I found the dynamics of compulsory chapel worship frustrating even though the liturgy was, at times, creative, varied and liberating. I was relieved to escape from this, for the spring term of 1997, to Dublin, where, among other things, exploring environmental issues turned from being a topic of doom and gloom into one of hope and purpose.

I returned to my theological college in Durham, for a final summer term. I shared my newfound eco-enthusiasms with my personal tutor Michael Vasey, but bemoaned the fact that Chapel worship would continue to frustrate me, since we would travel through three weeks of Rogationtide without much more than one nod in the direction of caring for the Creation. Michael invited me to structure prayers of intercession for those leading worship across those weeks and I did. When Michael

died the following year, on the weekend of my priesting, I began to think about what I would like to do to honour his memory. From that reflection this thesis arose.

Before embarking, in subsequent chapters, on a consideration of selected liturgies from *Common Worship* (C of E 2000–2008) and a look at some more widely collated resources, in this introductory chapter the broader reasons for the focus of this study are given. The benefit of paying attention to creation themed *Common Worship* texts is then explained. Following this a fuller examination is made of potential reasons for the development of both older and newer creation themed prayer.

Arising from these topics come suggestions on how this particular study connects with broader questions of liturgical reform, inculturation, cultural change, agrarianism and technology. This leads into a reflection on the interrelatedness of liturgy, doctrine and ethical praxis. The remainder of the chapter is given over to looking at the relative successes of liberationist movements to reform the liturgy. Finally an outline of the contents of the thesis is made in the concluding section of this introduction.

1. *Reasons for this Thesis*

There are seven external influences apart from Michael Vasey that have led me to the writing of this thesis.

a. The intersection between poetry and faith

I attended an extra-curricular course in 1989–90 entitled 'Poetry and Faith' at Whitelands College in south west London (led by Nicola Slee and Robert Titley). This awoke a desire in me to participate in speaking about the things of faith in a language that was less to do with the doctrinaire and more to do with art of language. It was clear to me that using a rainbow full palette of colours, timbres and metres to explore the moods, sentiments and mysteries of Christian faith in a written format could offer a much more fruitful expression of belief and theology. That liturgy could be part of such literary forms was, for me, a given.

b. The work and testimony of Sean McDonagh

I had barely noticed the name Sean McDonagh SSC on the list of speakers at a study day on environmental issues in Dublin organized by John Bartlett (at the Church of Ireland Theological College in Braemor Park). I was unaware of McDonagh, a missionary priest who had been working in the Philippines and among rainforest communities. Neither did I know of his first three books (McDonagh 1986, 1990 and 1994), which formed the basis of his input. I was inspired by his mission not just to talk of God's kingdom for people, but also of God's passionate desire to sustain and rescue the earth. I was profoundly struck by his impassioned testimony about species extinction. This served as an inspiration to me to 'consider creation, consider it now' (Web of Creation 2010).

c. *The ecotheological imperative*

We now see a shift from a fear that global warming may be a possibility to a conviction that it has already begun, is continuing and needs to be curtailed. Some within the world of environmental campaigning now greet arguments against the realities of environmental destruction in a way that is akin to the response to voices that would want to deny or question the reality of the Holocaust.

Studying holocaust issues, the problems in Jewish-Christian relations, and the legacy of British colonialism on the indigenous aboriginals of Australia, whilst in Dublin, helped me to develop a frame of reference in which to understand the need for the Church to be attentive to contemporary issues. I began to see that the matter of environmental destruction is an important subject for the Church not just to be speaking about but praying about too.

d. *The intrigue of Andrew Linzey's animal rites*

Animal Rites (1999) by Andrew Linzey was an intriguing and perplexing set of liturgies that were full of polemic, wisdom and unexpected biblical theology. It was as a consequence of me writing a letter to Andrew that I began my research under his supervision. His approach to animal rites and animal theology had much to teach me about methodologies in eco-liturgical studies.

e. *Theology arrives with the people via liturgy*

As the work for this thesis began, a slowly dawning comprehension emerged that it is one thing for new theological thinking to arrive in the hands of the people in

printed form but it is another for such thinking to become rapidly embedded by words being owned and uttered by the people of the Church. Liturgy, like nothing else in theology, gets new thinking into the hands of the people faster than learned articles and books. I realized that investigating liturgy was a chance to start thinking about theology in a way that could influence what ordinary people think about God and the Creation.

f. *The new resources of Common Worship*

To begin with, I assumed that *Common Worship* (hereafter *CW*) was an immediate and easy target for proving that there was an absence of ecotheological and eco-liturgical matters in worship in contrast to more radical liturgies being developed all over the world. It came as a real surprise to me that there were a significant number of texts in *CW* that contained creation themes. There was no immediate desire to be soft hearted towards liturgy written by committee and agreed by General Synod.

Two questions motivated the deeper exploration of *CW* resources that discussed the Creation:

- had the C of E genuinely sought to reform itself, in relation to concerns about the environment, in its own worship texts?
- was there any chance that if/when *CW* was superseded by a second edition that a thesis such as this could help to ensure environmental concerns would feature more substantially?

The political influences on C of E liturgical reform that were involved in the development of CW will be considered in more detail during an exploration of Peter Nicholas Davies' *Alien Rites* (2005) in Chapter 2.

g. *Being my father's son*

The new literary criticism was of interest to me in my undergraduate English studies in London. The new literary criticism was of even greater interest in my undergraduate theology and biblical studies in Durham. For me such theories were part and parcel of my intellectual life but also, my life, because of my father (see for example David J. A. Clines 1993, 1998). I did not see what struggle there was to be had with both the freedoms and responsibilities that come from understanding that meaning and authority reside in interpretative communities (see Chapter 3, Section 1).

2. *The Context for this Thesis and the Terminology Used in It*

The analysis of creation themed liturgies is unploughed ground in liturgical studies because there is only a brief history of interest in prayer related to the recent concerns about global environmental crises. The amount of creation themed liturgy being produced is substantial. Because there are a wide variety of texts for different aspects of the liturgy and liturgical year with a creation theme in CW alone, this warrants giving the focus of this study to CW as a way into exploring and analysing

creation theology and the liturgy. The analysis of texts with a concern for the Creation in the prayed theology of CW rites is the main question this thesis is devoted to. It is important, first of all, to define the terms that will be used.

a. *Liberationist liturgical theologies, ecotheology, eco-justice, and eco-liturgy*

Over the last four decades theologies of liberation have been influencing liturgical reform. Not just the theologies that first arose in South America, but feminist, indigenous, womanist and black theologies have begun to influence how liturgy is thought about and written, some examples of which are discussed later in this chapter.

One of the newer types of liberationist theologies is an ecological liberationist theology, sometimes referred to as eco-liberationist theology but more typically known as ecotheology. It is not just scholarship that is raising ecotheological concerns, leading church people are also assessing and developing Christian ecotheological perspectives. For example, Rowan Williams in a speech to the Methodist Conference in 2004 offered this tight summary:

We live in a world of colossally organised selfishness in which the environmental crisis that we all face is again and again deferred, postponed for our thinking and our praying, let alone our action. And when we are addressed as a royal priesthood, we are among other things being called to challenge the world we're in in this respect. Do we make peace with and in our material environment, is our use of material things something which creates peace and justice. Are we acting in a priestly way, expressing gift and thanksgiving in our use of the things of this world. If we are, and very occasionally we may be when we worship particularly. If we are, then there is indeed a kind of restoration of what human beings are most deeply about. If we're not, we are barely existing as church at all. The body of Christ is the place where peace is made, where thanksgiving is sacrificially offered. What sort of body of Christ are we if we can't make that a practical, an economic, a social reality.

Williams speaks in a way that brings questions of ecotheology to the fore. He argues that 'praying' about ecological matters goes alongside 'thinking' and 'action'. Perhaps he makes this a little clearer himself when he says that this is 'a matter of justice for the human as well as the non-human world' (Rowan Williams 2004).

Some examples of ecotheologies are explored in Chapter 3 and in the same chapter ecotheological liturgical texts—or to abbreviate, eco-liturgies—are critiqued. What this study is careful to reserve judgement on is whether all liturgical texts with a creation theme are eco-liturgies, which is discussed later on in this chapter.

b. *The Creation, creation themes, earthing and greening*

Because this study reserves judgement on whether prayers with a creation theme are eco-liberationist, other language is used to describe the flavour or style of the text. 'A creation theme' is one obvious way of describing such texts, or 'prayers that make reference to the Creation' is another way (note only when creation is preceded by a 'the' does creation become a proper noun). This study also allows a definition for creation themed prayers that exhibit a coherence that relates to ecotheological concerns without determining that the text is ecotheologically motivated or judging that it is an example of eco-liturgy: the verb is 'earthed'.

The verb 'earthing' relates to liturgy in three ways. First, theology expressed in liturgical worship is part of the holistic expression of the process of faith that is given shape by the community of believers through both word (including liturgy) and action (that may include liturgy). The words and actions of worship are a corporate

expression in a particular place and at a particular time. Worship happens in a context: hence the verb 'earthing', which can be used in a similar way to 'grounding'.

The second reason is that in words and action of worship God is 're-membered' (see Slee 1996), God is acknowledged as being the central part of all life's substance. There is an intention on behalf of those at Christian worship to celebrate God's incarnated presence on earth, hence, 'earthing'. The third and most important reason for this study is that, when at worship, it is both helpful and contextualized to comprehend not just the divine but also the physicality of one's context. To engage with context, one must be mindful of it and in prayer for it. In this current time the Creation itself is part of the context that the Church is becoming particularly mindful of, hence the verb 'earthing' and also the motivation for this study.

Earthing has many positive advantages, as just explained, but also is more effective a word than 'greening'. 'Green' and 'greening' are both heavily used—noun and verb—to describe political movements and concerns covering a broader range of issues than creation themes and their resonances with ecotheology. The noun 'earth' and the verb 'earthed' do not have the same dynamic relationship and the verb is not over-used, and so, the verb can serve well here—without too many other associations—to speak of the context in which God has placed us.

c. Panentheism, pantheism, transcendence and immanence

The exploration of how God interacts with the Creation as expressed in the CW texts under consideration is central to the analysis. There have been misapprehensions that when God and the Creation are discussed in the same breath that this

amounts to pantheism, God being the very creation itself (or to put in another way, 'that nature and God are identical', Shaw 1983: 423). This has led to anxiety about some of the proposed *CW* texts for the eucharist, as discussed later in this chapter. Panentheism is God's presence and 'indwelling' of the Creation (Moltmann 1985: 14) so that 'all is in God' (Cobb 1983: 423), but not God being the Creation or the Creation being God.

God's presence in the cosmos, defined as panentheism, goes well beyond questions of transcendence and immanence though these terms are useful for unpacking the popularity of panentheism in contemporary Christian theology. Explicitly pantheistic conclusions have arisen from the work of those who have emphasized an immanentist aspect to God's transcendence (for example, Moltmann 1981: 108-11 and 1985: 13-19). These conclusions inform and underpin ecotheology and many creation themed texts in *CW* and in other liturgies written with an ecotheological emphasis. It is important, however, not to create an exaggerated separation between the two concepts. In certain respects immanence is a clarification of the nature of God's transcendence.

A brief discussion, at this point, will hopefully suffice in seeing both transcendence and immanence as terms that relate to the theology of God's role, action and presence in the cosmos. In the brevity of the writing of prayers for liturgy, the false dichotomy between the concepts can be exaggerated. Hymn writing is perhaps the quickest way of clarifying the problem. These three stanzas from two different sources make the point most effectively:

Immortal, invisible, God only wise,
 In light inaccessible hid from our eyes,
 Most blessèd, most glorious, the Ancient of Days,
 Almighty, victorious, Thy great Name we praise
 ('Immortal, Invisible', Walter C Smith 1867).

Not throned afar, remotely high,
 Untouched, unmoved by human pains,
 But daily in the midst of life,
 Our Saviour in the Godhead reigns.

In every insult, rift and war,
 Where colour, scorn or wealth divide,
 Christ suffers still, yet loves the more,
 And lives, where even hope has died
 ('Not Throned Afar', Hymn 20, Brian Wren 1988).

At first sight Walter C Smith's stanza is bound up in a God far removed from earthly matters whereas the second stanza—written over a century later by Brian Wren—in discussing the second person of the Trinity, evokes the immanent sense of God's transcendence. It is not though simply that Wren succeeds where Smith fails: rather it is that Wren, in a post-World War Two context, puts an emphasis on Christ's solidarity with those who suffer. Walter C Smith has a different focus for 'Immortal Invisible', but still explores the immanence of God in the context of transcendence, by going on to observe in third stanza of the hymn that:

To all, life Thou givest, to both great and small;
 In all life Thou livest, the true life of all;
 We blossom and flourish as leaves on the tree,
 And wither and perish—but naught changeth Thee.

God is both in the life of the cosmos, but God's immutability is where the difference lies, Smith observes. This is not ecotheology but an 'earthed' theology, which is achieved by both writers. It shows how a transcendent God is also immanent, and how that immanence is part and parcel of God's transcendence.

This is certainly a tension for theologian and liturgist alike.

Theologians in every era are confronted with the challenge of articulating the Christian understanding of the nature of God in a manner that balances, affirms and holds in creative tension the twin truths of the divine transcendence and the divine immanence. A balanced affirmation of both truths facilitates a proper relation between theology and reason or culture. Where such balance is lacking, serious theological problems readily emerge. Hence an overemphasis on transcendence can lead to a theology that is irrelevant to the cultural context in which it seeks to speak, whereas an overemphasis on immanence can produce a theology held captive to a specific culture (Grenz and Olson 1992: 11-12).

The additional challenge for the liturgist is that striking this balance constructs an ecclesiology (See Chapter 1, Section 6).

d. *Liturgical reform, the Liturgical Movement and inculturation*

Liturgical reform has been going on for as long as the Church as existed. The 'Liturgical Movement' is both a definition of Roman Catholic liturgical reform that had its roots in the nineteenth century (Chandlee 1986: 308) and also a definition that 'has not be confined to the Roman communion' (Chandlee 1986: 312) but includes broader range of activities that has happened across denominations (Chandlee 1986: 312-313). It is not just about one group or activity with a singular focus or purpose, but does cover reforming activity especially since Vatican II. One aspect of the Liturgical Movement is discussed in Section 5 of this chapter, that of the inculturation of the liturgy, a topic that includes: 'cultural issues to do with worship; processes of liturgical change; [and] issues of cultural alienation in worship' (Tovey 2004: 3).

e. *Trinitarian and eschatological cosmologies*

What is of particular interest here is how—through the liturgy—a transcendent God’s immanence is expressed, both in the second and third person as well as the first person of the Trinity. This is because in exploring ecotheological themes in the liturgy it is important to consider the three-fold approach of the tri-une Godhead to the Creation and the three-way dynamic between God, humanity and the Creation.

The way that the three persons of the Godhead are rooted in, not only transcendent above the Creation, is important in its own right. This contributes to the concept of ‘inaugurated eschatology’ (see, for example, Meyers 1993: 170) or ‘realized eschatology’ (see C. H. Dodd 1953: 447), theology that runs counter to certain contemporary Church obsessions with an anticipated eschaton being entirely wrapped up within apocalyptic theology. Realized (or inaugurated) eschatology, pays attention to what has already come to be as a result of the first Advent of Christ. Moltmann, whose eschatological creation theology is discussed in Chapter 3, has explored unrealized and realized eschatology in fuller detail.

The theological framework that underpins God’s interaction not just with humanity and the earth, but also with the whole cosmos can be referred to as a theological cosmology (and in a theological setting ‘cosmology’ can be understood as always referring to a theological cosmology). Theological cosmologies will be considered in more detail as this study develops, and especially in Chapter 3. The work of Gordon Lathrop (1993, 2003) is drawn upon to help shape fuller understandings of what a liturgical cosmology might be.

. *Choosing between General and Particular Examples of Eco-liturgy*

Considering creation themed liturgy, that comes from 'above' or 'below' is central to the research process for this thesis. Both texts agreed and delivered from 'above' to local congregations by synodical law, and rites created from 'below', by communities wanting to express themselves, more freely, at particular times and in specific settings, have provided the scope for this study. Ultimately, though, among the thousands of ecotheological liturgical texts that have appeared in the last few decades and the thousands of liturgical resources published by the Church of England in the last decade, it is just 316 texts that sit within the *CW* materials—and give some emphasis to the Creation—that receive the fullest consideration here.

The decision to focus substantially on texts from one ecclesial source, all agreed by the same authorities, was guided by four main factors. First, the plethora of materials available (an estimated 3,000 different liturgical texts and prayers with a word count of over a million words were easily traced in the early part of this research) and the speed with which new texts are being published means the sheer weight of material to grapple with disallows any opportunity for substantive analysis within a wider corpus of texts.

The second reason is because the sources from which the wider collections of liturgies come are many, varied and at times unclear and fragmentary. This means any analysis of text and context would have to be highly selective and because many texts were to be found in collated volumes (for example, Geoffrey Duncan 2002) or

secondary locations¹ each text came with a different level of knowledge about its context or embodiment.

Two more reasons for the selection of *CW* texts arise from the reasons above (how a liturgical text is embodied and what number of texts it is possible to meaningfully consider). Thus, the third factor is that in wanting to examine the significance of how a church community's worship can develop its doctrine, concentrating on one context makes it more possible to examine how the doctrinal journey is being shaped by the liturgical innovations that are taking place (and vice versa). Not only can doctrinal development through liturgical innovation be more clearly scoped but also the transverse is far more incomprehensible, in that, if texts were to be selected from multiple contexts—where the dynamic between liturgy and doctrine are vastly different from each other—this would mean it would become impossible to undertake a coherent comparative analysis of texts.

The fourth and final reason for selecting liturgy from a single source is to make a particular assessment of how much the development of creation themed liturgy in one setting has to do with any of the following three factors: a) the influence of theologies of liberation; b) the need for worship texts fashioned in post-Agrarian industrialised settings to enhance or replace rites that were developed by Agrarian societies that were closer in outlook to the Agrarian contexts within which the Hebrew and Christian scriptures arose, and out of which the early rites of the Church immediately developed; and c) what deconstructive and reconstructive force is contained

¹ Many of the liturgies I first gathered came from a resource file (or to be precise a wooden box) cared for by two founding members of Christian Ecology Link.

within the technological (post)industrial context in which creation liturgies are being produced and disseminated.

Although the focus of this study is precise, the earlier broader efforts, to collate creation themed prayers from a wide range of sources, has proved useful in giving a context to the specific texts that are given closer consideration here. Looking widely also allows for some conclusions to be drawn on general trends in this particular strand of liturgical development (see Chapter 3). The broader collection of rites also indicates the breadth of theologies being deployed and this also serves as a comparative tool to be used when fathoming the theological and doctrinal shifts present in the smaller setting of selected CW texts.

4. Church of England Motivations for Eco-liturgical Innovation

As mentioned in the previous section, there are many liturgical texts that are demonstrably about environmental justice. These texts arise from a clearly expressed ecotheology that draws on the development of theologies of liberation in general but in the particular matter of the liberation of the created order rather than a particular human group: an eco-liberationism. Although the C of E has within it those who would advocate an approach that takes cognisance of theologies of liberation, the decision by the C of E General Synod for new liturgical texts with a creation theme to be written and developed by the Liturgical Commission cannot be described as

simply being an expression of a theology of liberation in general or as a consequence of ecotheology in particular.

Some new CW texts with a creation emphasis have appeared as a result of the liturgy being adapted so as to be inclusive of a range of contemporary circumstances and occasions. This does not mean that just because some texts have arisen out of a commitment to include prayers for many different kinds of occasions that all such texts are serving an eco-liberationist purpose. For example, including new canticles, from scripture, that celebrate creation may depend, in part, on the biases of those selecting biblical sources, but mainly the primary control is the biblical material itself, not the level of commitment to eco-justice among liturgists tasked with broadening the range of worship resources available.

There has been, however, a developing sensitivity to questions of eco-justice within the C of E, as commented on by Michael Vasey in his Preface to Andrew Pearson's *Making Creation Visible* (Vasey 1996).

There are various signs in recent work that the Liturgical Commission is sensitive to these concerns, and, in March 1995, an official update identified a need for the new Commission to 'address various issues linked with creation and the liturgy' (Vasey 1996: 3, citing *News of Liturgy*, May 1995: 3).

These additional resources have appeared at a similar time to the establishment of ecotheology as a discipline but in parallel to, not as a consequence of, ecotheology. The more attributable influence on the new liturgical writing comes from the C of E reports *Faith in the City* (Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas 1984) and *Faith in the Countryside* (Archbishops' Commission on Rural Areas 1991), which both identified the need for clearer and more relevant worship resources for a variety of contexts and moments within the rhythm of the liturgical

year (see Sections 5 and 7 of this chapter for further discussion of urban poverty and the liturgy and Chapter 2 for responses to recommendations in *Faith in the Countryside*).

The increased recognition of the need for a Christian concern for the environment, since these reports first appeared, has added to the clamour for new materials. What this does not mean, however, is that a single or coherent set of theologies is at work, but rather a coordinated desire for prayers that are relevant to contemporary mores. The making of such a distinction is important when considering the question of how theologies of liberation *have* and *have not* developed their liturgical contributions within and beyond the authorized texts of established churches, which is discussed below in the subsequent section of this chapter.

Although there was an acceptance, from certain quarters, of the need for an increase in materials on the Creation in *CW*, Andrew Pearson (1996) observes that a number of the proposed new eucharistic prayers that had an environmental emphasis failed to gain approval (by the Synod's House of Laity, Pearson 1996: 15). The eucharistic prayers finally approved and published in the *CW Main Edition* (hereafter *CWME*, C of E 2000a) did not include some of the more obviously panentheistic motifs for fear of pantheism or a misunderstanding of the difference between the two.

The situation more than a decade later is much improved with *New Patterns for Worship* (hereafter *NPW*, C of E 2002). The precursor of *NPW* is *Patterns for Worship* (hereafter *PW*, C of E 1989 and 1995), which does include a modicum of creation

themed material, 25 items in total: a Confession,² an Absolution,³ three Responsive Intercessions,⁴ six 'Prayers after Communion and Service of the Word endings',⁵ two 'Acclamations and Responses',⁶ two 'Longer Acclamations and Responsive Scriptures',⁷ two Proper Prefaces,⁸ five Thanksgivings,⁹ two Scriptural Songs,¹⁰ and one Blessing and Ending.¹¹ *NPW* contains more than three times as many creation themed materials as *PW* (82 texts compared with 25) including: invitations to confession, confessions, responsive forms of intercession, praise responses, thanksgivings (that can be used independently or at a eucharist), short eucharistic prefaces, words of dedication, closing prayers, blessings, and a final acclamation (all of which appear in Appendix 1). The more recently published *Times and Seasons*, including the section 'Seasons and Festivals of the Agricultural Year' (hereafter *TSAY*, C of E 2006c: 593-643), contains a further 64 creation themed texts including: confession materials, gospel acclamations and other eucharistic material. There are also texts for the blessing of the Plough, the seed and the Lammas loaf.

² 'Creation, Harvest' confession, *PW*: 42, 10C6, also appears in *CWME*: 126.

³ *PW*: 51, OD13, also in *NPW*: 95.

⁴ Of the three Responsive Intercessions, *PW*: 75-79, 8H11, 9H14 and 10H15, the first two also appear in *NPW*: 204-05, 206. Some, but not all of the text of the third intercession is also replicated in *NPW*: 191.

⁵ 'Incarnation, Christmas, Annunciation, Mary', *PW*: 93, 2J8, appears in *NPW*: 297; and 'Resurrection, Heaven, Glory, Transfiguration', *PW*: 95, 6J18, appears in *CWME*: 387; 'Creation, Harvest, Bread, Vine', *PW*: 97, 10J27, appears in *NPW*: 292; 'Saints', *PW*: 100, 15J39, appears in *CWME*: 441; 'Love, Peace', *NPW*: 100, 17J40, appears in *NPW*: 296; 'Morning' *PW*: 102, 0J47, appears—with a slight amendment—in *NPW*: 290.

⁶ 'Creation' *PW*: 111, 10L19, appears in *TSAY*: 605; 'Saints', *PW*: 112, 15L20, appears in *NPW*: 225.

⁷ 'Resurrection, Heaven, Glory, Transfiguration, Death, Funerals', *PW*: 119-20, 6M8; 'Creation', *PW*: 121-22, 10M9.

⁸ 'Creation, Harvest', *PW*: 128, 10N19, appears in *NPW*: 258 and *TSAY*: 603; 'Kingdom, Ascension', *PW*: 130, 16N28, appears in *NPW*: 262.

⁹ 'Creation', *PW*: 142-44, 10P15, appears in *NP*: 241-43; 'City, World and Society', *PW*: 144-45, 13P17, appears in *NPW*: 255; 'Saints', *PW*: 146, 15P19, appears in *NPW*: 257; 'Reconciliation' *PW*: 146-47, 16P20, appears in *NPW*: 252-53; 'General' *PW*: 147-49, 0P21, appears in *NPW*: 234-35.

¹⁰ 'A Song of the Wilderness', *PW*: 150, 1Q1, appears in *CWME*: 57 and 786; 'A Canticle of the Sun' (*PW*: 160-61).

The quantity of material that references the Creation does not prove ecotheologies have served as catalysts for the material or that such theologies are expressed within any particular text. Determining so occupies much of chapters 3 and 4. It is also important to identify the biblical sources that have been included or contribute to themes in the collection of earthed liturgical resources in *CW*. This is examined in Chapter 4.

5. *Inculturation, Cultural Change and Technology*

There have been more immediate influences upon liturgical change than either theologies of liberation (which is discussed in Section 7), or different preferences for the use of biblical material (see Chapter 7, Section 4). The most significant pressures are the challenges of rapid changes to global culture, which in turn changes worshipping communities, who in turn seek for new forms of expression in worship. There is a potential disjunction between the sustained liturgical language that has survived across many centuries and new attempts to write prayers for multi-layered and multi-faceted contexts. Comprehending these changes is discussed in this section. The relationship between inculturation, technology and agrarianism will also be returned to in Chapter 7.

¹¹ 'Mothering Sunday, Mary' (*PW*: 179, 2T8); 'Harvest, Creation' (*PW*: 184, 10T27), appears in *NPW* (*NPW*: 304).

a. *Understanding the language of inculturation and using its methods*

The work of Anscar J. Chupungco (for example, Chupungco 1989, 1992) has progressed the reflections contained in paragraphs 37-40 of the Second Vatican Council in relation to the cultural adaptation of the liturgy (Burns 2006: 16-17). The appreciation of issues relating to liturgy, culture, cultural alienation and change (Tovey 2004: 3), has developed across the Liturgical Movement during the twentieth century. The term 'inculturation' of liturgy is used interchangeably (and differently) in a 'fog of incomprehensible terms' (Tovey 1988: 5) alongside 'indigenization' and 'assimilation' (White 1997: 186), Tovey in his more comprehensive definition adds 'adaptation' and 'contextualization' (Tovey 2004: 1).

Chupungco considers an even longer list of options (Chupungco 1992: 13-30), but he stresses that these are simply 'jargons', which 'to the uninitiated [...] are outlandish if not linguistically barbarous' (1992: 13). These linguistic gymnastics can cloud the genuine attempts to speak of the 'relationship between liturgy and culture' (1992: 13). The process of inculturation is the effort of 'inserting the texts and rites of the liturgy into the framework of the local culture' (1992: 30). For Chupungco the result is an 'adaptation' of existing liturgy, though, not free expression or 'creativity' (1992: 32).

The interpretation of unwieldy terms by both Chupungco and Tovey provides a framework in which to describe the task of liturgical inculturation in relation to eco-liberation, a topic that occupies this thesis. In mapping the terrain, Tovey is clear that liberation is an aspect of inculturation (Tovey 2004: 4). This thesis pays substantial attention to such a definition by using a methodology that considers the adaptation

of existing rites (see Chapter 4) and by offering further adaptations, rather than alternatives, as a route for revision (see Chapters 6 and 7).

Methods of 'dynamic equivalence' (Chupungco 1992: 37-44) and 'creative assimilation' (1992: 44-47) are used, but of most interest here (not just for its etymology!) is 'the method of organic progression' (1992: 47-51). This method seeks only to take the role of 'filling in what [earlier texts] lack' (1992: 47). In this thesis the benefits of such a method are considered (in Chapter 2), interpreted (in Chapter 4), and applied (in Chapter 6). The value of such a method is judged upon in Chapter 7.

b. Issues of catholicity and inclusivity for liturgical inculturation

A more general challenge for proponents of inculturation is that in localizing the liturgy—connecting it to 'local culture'—the question of the catholicity of worship arises. In the history of the reforming movement this has been overcome in part since the liturgy has repeatedly, throughout Christian history, been localized. Two immediate examples that evidence this are, first, that the centralization of worship at Rome in the seventh century was not always effective or enforced (Susan White 1997: 187), second, in more recent missionary endeavour, even where free rein was not given it was regularly taken (Susan White 1997: 188).

Attentiveness to local identity has become more essential (in parallel with the change in approach within aid agencies moving from benevolence to empowerment). Probably the best known example of this sea-change in local engagement comes in Vincent Donovan's 1978 work *Christianity Rediscovered: An Epistle from the Masai*,

which considered how far the development of Christian faith and local culture is a symbiotic relationship which transforms existing orthodoxies.

This approach also respects the fact that the forces of cultural change have consequences globally. What is additional to the 'global spread' of Christianity and its worship—which has happened across two millennia—is the more recent change brought about through globalization (Stringer 2005: 203).

Peoples, cultures and discourses meet and interact with each other continuously [...] In terms of Christian worship, the main context for this kind of globalisation has been the debates over inculturation and the realisation that the worship developed and moulded for the Western churches is no longer relevant or applicable to many different parts of the world. The mainstream churches are being forced to take local cultures much more seriously and to see how their worship can be adapted to, or even transformed by them (Stringer 2005: 210).

Local communities are taking existing texts and developing new materials in a process of liturgical and cultural change. There is a meta-narrative to liturgical, cultural and social change, which is about globalization, where innovation is arriving and travelling in many different and alternating directions, very fast. In the context of this thesis, the intention, rather than localizing the liturgy within an ecotheological context, is to see how ecotheology can assist in the construction of liturgy that relates to this globalized context. The circle is completed by considering how new eco-liturgy can relate to the environmental implications of globalization at the macro and micro levels.

c. Recent examples of liturgical inculturation in urban and Anglican settings

It is the notion of inculturation that has informed not just the missionary movement across the world, but those concerned with the urban context too. New immi-

grants to unfamiliar urban settings have felt the need for worship that relates both to their first identity and their new identity, since the balance between assimilation and indigenous identity is an important one to keep (Susan J. White 1997: 189). Beyond the indigenization of worship at a local level, especially in urban contexts there are those, who in leading worship, seek to include liturgies from other places within the world church to show solidarity with the catholicity of the Church (Susan J. White 1997: 189-90).

Although the term 'inculturation' was never used, this concept was a primary driver that led to the *Faith in the City* report (Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas 1985) to argue for patterns of worship more suited to poor urban settings (see Chapter 1, Section 7b). It is important to note the distinction, when speaking of urban liturgy, between poor and deprived Urban Priority Areas (UPAs) in particular and the notion of the 'urban' in general (Stratford 2002: 4).

'Urban' is a very misused word. It conjures up images of grey tower blocks, broken streets, crime, violence, low educational standards, poor health, unemployment and angry youths (Stratford 2002: 4).

The 'middle class English' that 'dominates the Church of England's central structures, and, consequently, its official liturgies' (Stratford 2002: 10) is an urban class, but not one that tends to fully inhabit the Urban Priority Areas in the same way as the urban poor do. This has meant that well intentioned efforts in liturgical reform, have struggled, not just because of the agrarian history of the liturgy, but because of some unhelpful presuppositions about both urbanism itself and urban poverty in particular. What happened, in an implicit way with *Faith in the City* was that the

principle of inculturating the liturgy to a local context was put in place, even if the results did not match the intentions (see Section 7b for further discussion of urban liturgy).

More widely, three years after *Faith in the City*, the Lambeth Conference of 1988 made a specifically Anglican response to the need for local creativity and for the catholicity of worship that related to culturally specific concerns not just in C of E Anglicanism but also across the world communion (see Tovey 2004: 132-34). The conference's 'Magna Carta for Anglican liturgical inculturation' (Tovey 2004: 139) affirmed, in two resolutions, the need to 'encourage a multicultural expression of Anglicanism' (Tovey 2004: 134).

The challenges facing C of E Anglicanism in reforming its liturgy relate directly to the 'common shared concern' (Tovey 2004: 149) facing global Anglicanism, which include: the process of 'becom[ing] more aware of being a global church', 'culture coming to the centre of the discussion of liturgy', 'language complexities (some Provinces work with more than 10 languages)', and the technological challenges of 'printing problems' (Tovey 2004: 139).

The principle challenge for C of E liturgical reform, in particular, was to seek development of both the agrarianism of a Prayer Book theology from four and five centuries ago *and* the multicultural experiences of urban society. These polarities provoked the creation of new structures for the production of worship texts (in *PW* and subsequently in *CW*). These structures have allowed enough room to be inclusive of the breadth of English identities, new and old, while keeping hold of that which is familiar through tradition and that which is familiar through lived reality.

d. *The influence of cultural change on liturgical reform*

Ruth Meyers in her assessment of reasons for the development of the liturgy in the last hundred years looks at the cultural influences on reform. She acknowledges the 'factors' internal to the Church as:

- 'the twentieth-century Liturgical Movement';
- 'liturgical scholarship';
- Gregory Dix's *The Shape of the Liturgy* in establishing 'the pattern for many eucharistic rites';
- the Ecumenical Movement';
- and 'in this ecumenical climate, many Roman Catholic reforms initiated by Vatican II have been adopted in Protestant traditions (Meyers 1993: 155).

Meyers is keen to point out other factors too, since churches

exist in the wider framework of culture and society [...] hence when revision occurs in a number of different worshipping traditions during the same period of time, it is likely that socio-cultural factors have been a crucial stimulus for change (Meyers 1993: 155).

Meyers regards such change as a consequence not only of the most visible factors of 'mass communication' and transport (Meyers 1993: 157), the consequence of global wars and the upheaval of the 1960s (Meyers 1993: 157-59), but also from the rise of a 'secular age' (Meyers 1993: 160-69). The development of access to higher education in the 1960s meant that the educated young 'welcomed innovation in worship' (Meyers 1993: 166), while others, in the over 50s age group, expressed a resistance to change (Meyers 1993: 168, Stark and Glock 1968).

Underlying all of this were changing world-views that led to a shift in Christian thought that emphasized 'a more existential theological perspective and the recovery of a biblical understanding of inaugurated eschatology' (Meyers 1993: 170). This, consequently, led to many 'unofficial' texts that were focussed on the here and now, even to the point that liturgies 'reflected the contemporary jargon of that decade and were highly introspective and verbose' (Meyers 1993: 170). The churches, however, committed to a more substantial process of reform that in many denominations followed parallel pathways of trials, review and further reform, reflecting a new 'underlying assumption of such a process [being] that texts are not fixed entities expressing static truths, but a means of communication with God and an expression of a community worshipping at a particular time and space' (Meyers 1993: 172).

This pattern of change reflects a more consultative and democratic shift, which is clearly argued as being in synthesis with the socio-cultural changes, especially following World War Two. Meyers is keen to point out that although the shift has been substantial and connected to the current realities of the social milieu: 'liturgy that remains truly Christian cannot be totally bound to current perceptions of reality' (Meyers 1993: 175). Consequently it cannot be presumed that the seismic shifts that are occurring in liturgical reform are as a consequence of theological reform *per se* but that all reforms relate to the upheavals in wider social structures that inform and influence the plethora of changes occurring within the Church simultaneously. Neither does it mean such changes are unrelated to one another. It is also worth noting that the connection between 'worship and justice' (James F. White 1990: 37) predates contemporary ecclesial liberationist movements:

ever since indeed the Quaker movement in the seventeenth century, there has been a strong awareness among the Friends that worship must not marginalize anyone because of sex, color, or even servitude. Indeed the Quaker insistence on human equality derives directly from their understanding of what happens in the worshipping community. That means, of course, that women and slaves were expected to speak in worship, hitherto an exclusively white male prerogative. (James F. White: 37)

In considering ecotheological reforms, therefore, the power of cultural change must be regarded as a likely primary driver for change.

e. *The influence of an agrarian legacy and a technological society on liturgy*

Susan J. White in her commitment to relate worship to technology is concerned about where there is no inculturation, since:

our worship tends to rely exclusively on images from an idealized, rural past, where green fields, grazing sheep, and starry skies were commonplace experiences. Should we not think about the ways in which we might inculturate our worship to the technological culture of which we are a part? (Susan White 1997: 190-91)

Her call for a technological inculturation of worship shows quite how far the influence of liturgical assimilation has reached in the development of new rites. It is within this setting that new earthed or creation themed materials are also being devised. They make use of the same palate of methods that are used for other types of liturgical inculturation. It is societal, political and technological change that has a shared responsibility for the transformation of the liturgy.

Earlier in this introduction (Section 3), liturgy produced by a liturgical commission was said to come to the people 'from above'. In White's analysis in *Christian Worship and Technological Change* (Susan White 1994), she argues this is a product not simply of an ancient patriarchal methodology, but of a technological environment that

embeds the process of manufacture into the construction of the liturgy itself, in what she labels the 'bureaucratization of the liturgy' (Susan White 1994: 50ff). Such bureaucratization has not just affected the liturgy commissions of the various denominations, but also, 'by a sort of ecclesiastical "trickle-down" process [...] congregations and individual worshippers as well' (Susan White 1994: 51).

The erosion of agrarian society is one that White notes has resulted in some anthropological researchers of ritualism deliberately looking at non-industrial settings to assess the influence of technology on ritual (Susan White 1993: 185). She also notes that within modernity, technology serves not just as a 'primary shaper' of context, but also contributes to the process of 'faith seeking understanding' (Susan White 1994: 27). This contrasts with the more typical liturgical theological view of technology as something to be 'battled' with via the use of effective liturgy since such forces are 'unalterably opposed to the nature of the religious quest' (Susan White 1994: 31).

As much as the liberationist movements may prove, in the course of this study, to have provided a substantial basis for the new earthed materials in *CW* alongside the agrarian contexts from which the existing rites arose, it will also be vital to ask, in conclusion, how the technology itself—which at times appears as a malign 'power and principality' at work against the liberation of creation—is a third primary force that shapes even the most earthed of liturgies within the *CW* corpus.

6. *Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, (Lex Agendi / Lex Vivendi)*

Before looking in the subsequent section at how liturgical reform is part of the expression of liberationist or contextualized worship, ethics and the liturgy are considered in what follows here. There is a partly spoken understanding that the words of worship shape the theology of the people and vice versa. The term *lex orandi, lex credendi*—an abbreviation or even ‘misappropriation’ of the fifth century motto ‘*lex supplicandi statuat, lex credendi*’ (Anderson 2003: 25)—is widely used to describe this dynamic, and as Stephen Burns comments, it means somewhat ‘distinctive’ things to different liturgical theologians (Burns 2006: 13).

Some, such as Schmemmann, understand that ‘doctrine is derived from the liturgy’ (Burns 2006: 13):

[f]or others, the Church’s theological traditions possess a greater power of critique in relation to liturgical experience, and are considered to have a more explicit role in the adjustment and evolution of liturgical practice. Typically, an awareness and sympathy with scripturally-grounded Reformation arguments about aspects of medieval liturgical celebration or familiarity with forms of contemporary liberation theologies shape this latter position. (Burns 2006: 13)

Burns observes that liberationist liturgical theologies may ‘in prioritiz[ing] the perspectives of particular oppressed groups’ use those in place of older ‘received tradition[s]’ as the primary tool for developing a critique of the liturgy. This thesis deliberately and explicitly will deploy a methodology that does give precedence to eco-liberationist concerns in its critique. What will also be argued, especially in conclusion, is that by applying one specific critique to CW not only are particular concerns

explored, but that a fulsome analysis is developed about aspects of the process of liturgical reform that have occurred in the creation of new C of E liturgy.

A further justification for introducing a deliberate bias or agenda into a study of liturgy has little novelty to it, since it is common amongst twentieth century liturgical theologians to add the third qualifier '*lex agendi*' the 'rule of "living"' or 'belief enacted' to the motto *lex orandi, lex credendi* (Burns 2006: 14). *Lex vivendi* and *lex agendi*—are used almost interchangeably, both also being defined as expressed practice, though *lex vivendi* emphasises the *outliving* of the law, whereas *lex agendi* 'the law of ethical action' emphasizes the ethical *underpinning* of expressed action (Anderson 2003: 27). Whichever term is used, it is commonly understood that this part joins together with worship and theology in a three-way symbiosis where all shape the other and together make up the meaning of worship, theology and communal Christian life. To say that one of the three has precedence is not the point; rather 'it is pointless to try to rank their importance as if one could some how supersede the others' (Phillips 1993: 97-98).

This three-fold way of shaping the communal life of the Church is precisely what informs the motivation to look, in this thesis, at one particular matter of ethical life and practice in relation to the worship of the Church and the formation of the Church's theology. It would be fair to judge that the motivating factor for the study arises from a question of ethical living, but is also directly connected into both the way ecotheology is explored as an area of theology and how worship is expressing new movements in theology and ethical practice, and how theology and liturgy can influence the adoption of ethical ways of living by its members. The remarkable

power the liturgy has is in being able to provide meaning not just within worship, but to make meaning between justice and prayer by serving as 'one primary and essential connection between worship and ethics, liturgy and daily life' (Lathrop 2003: 51).

7. How Theologies of Liberation Have Been Expressed Liturgically

Within and beyond the rites of established Churches ethically and politically motivated theologies of liberation have been expressed in liturgies. Some argue that the urgent need for new liturgical rites in a post-industrial, post-modern period of shifting ideologies arises because older symbols based in redundant cosmologies need not just to be improved upon but replaced. This is a theme picked up by Gordon Lathrop in *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (2003):

... We need the scientific testing of hypotheses, the experimental vulnerability to actual evidence. But we also need the breaking of symbols, the breaking of myths (Lathrop 2003: 37).

There have been a variety of approaches that different liberationist ecclesial and theological movements have taken towards 'breaking' the old symbols and constructing new liturgy to express a new cosmology. It is important to identify some examples across a range of approaches so as to be able to compare these with the new eco-liturgical materials appearing within the CW corpus in particular. The options, which have been taken by different reforming movements in the last five

decades is discussed below, within: feminist theology, political and urban theologies, theologies of disability and children, as well as liberationist theologies.

It is within the scope of this study to consider the efficacy, to date, of different approaches in relation to their influence within *CW* resources, but it is beyond this study's focus to determine which of the routes are *better* ways of influencing liturgical change and effecting theological shifts to the widest number of communities. That is something that can be judged by looking backwards and so much of what is happening, in terms of reform, is very much in the present.

a. *Feminist liturgies*

Liturgical innovation within mainstream denominations is not something that automatically occurs. As I have said, liturgical reform typically comes by a process of ecclesial democracy or through episcopally appointed liturgical commissions, as is the case with *CW*. Feminist liturgical theology would question such an approach, firstly because 'in the mainstream churches today those who feel most keenly the isolating barriers of language, gender and law are the women' (Primavesi and Henderson 1989: 73). Second, since 'feminist ritualizing eliminates the impression that there is an elite group on whom divine power and presence depends' (Walton 2000: 46). It is also, however, Walton's assertion that the construction of feminist liturgy is an 'accountable' and '*collective*' one (her italics, Walton, 2000: 46). This is also the case, in certain ways, in the C of E where, the work of the Liturgical Commission is authorized by a collective vote of the elected houses of Clergy and Laity as well as the appointed House of Bishops.

Although the Commission is subject to the democratic process, it still works as a reforming force by degrees, returning with suggestions for modernizing certain texts, typically offering supplementary resources and occasionally removing the older material altogether and instating new liturgies in their place—all then to be put, at least one more time, to the vote. This is quite different to Walton's definition of liturgical collaboration as one that ensures 'empowered relationships' (Walton, 2000: 46). This has not been the case with *CW*, a route to revision that is fair to understand, therefore, as modern but culturally orthodox: a process of seeking to effect change from within hierarchical constructs, where feminist liturgical development has, by necessity, confronted the *status quo*.

It could be argued that feminist theology has won a modicum of change in *CW* too, though whether there is much significance in making a relatively small number of texts gender-inclusive will be discussed in Chapter 2 where questions of C of E liturgical reform are explored more directly. What is more critical for feminist liturgical theology is whether the full set of metaphors for God, as deployed in *CW* and its precursors, are so confused and patriarchal as to be fundamentally unhelpful ways of expressing God's identity to women and men. Brian Wren puts it this way:

Our knowledge of the Trinity as love-in-relationship is limited by the male metaphor of Father and Son, its patriarchal formation, and by the difficulty of naming the Holy Spirit as a fully coequal center of divine personhood. In worship, the traditional doxology pictures God as an all-male one-parent family with a whoosh of vapour (Brian Wren 1989: 200).

In the instance of feminist theology the methodologies deployed for liturgical change have been in stark contrast with *CW* by being both radical and counter-cultural, seeking to change even the most basic of metaphors, whether about the Church

or God. In the new rites that have been and are being developed, there is a repeated and deliberate rejection of existing rites in preference for entirely new patterns of worship—a remarkably different route from the reform of CW.

Anderson, in drawing some conclusions about feminist liturgical developments—through a discussion of Janet Walton, Mary Collins and Marjorie Proctor Smith—judges that on the one hand feminist liturgical praxis has an objective to be reached by accommodating itself ‘to the present age while remaining both faithful to and critical of Christian tradition’ (Anderson 2003: 55) and yet ‘on the other hand, the critical claims of feminist practice point to a retrieval of the radically egalitarian and inclusive grammar and narratives of Christianity’s originating sources’ (Anderson 2003: 56). It is this tension that forms a continuum upon which feminist liturgical expressions are made, at times falling at one end of the balance or the other, or at a mid-point between the two.

The degree to which liturgical change occurs is, in part, due to the level of confidence in choosing change, it is also though—as the continuum described by Anderson indicates—because there are different approaches to how transformation is made. This is because, as Lathrop observes, ‘liturgy orients its participants in the world’ (Lathrop 2003: 51). Some feminists have shifted their orientation away from the *status quo* more than others.

Barbara Reid identifies a second, more subtle continuum to also be aware of in relation to this, between a) those whose feminism has shifted their worldview enough that they now gladly embrace new liturgy and want to reject that which

came before and b) those for whom grappling with a new outlook let alone new rites is profoundly unsettling:

For many Christian feminists, there is a distressing gap between their theology and their experience in the assembly. For those who are new to the feminist perspective changes in traditional language, symbols, and roles can be confusing and upsetting. A movement to feminist consciousness is actually a conversion process that demands a shift in one's worldview. The translation of feminist insights into liturgical expression must be preceded by education and explanation with sensitivity to the position of people at all points of the continuum (Reid 1991: 133-34).

It is not just the world view that catalyses liturgical innovation but comfortableness with the new world view that overcomes the inertia of discomfort with the unfamiliar. With feminist theology the ideological shift and the requirement for change are symbiotic and imperative, but at the same time the sociological experience of changing a culture and more specifically a rite is not peculiar to the feminist movement.

The feminist liturgical movement is self-consciously aware of the social change that it is making among women, but also seeks to bring social change and justice for many who are marginalized by patriarchy, not women alone. Janet R Walton in considering the words used in feminist liturgy speaks of the need to choose language that rejects:

- 'deception and distortion and violence';
- not 'naming females' since the naming of women as women 'is critical to reversing dishonesty';
- 'color coded language' [is 'another example of inaccuracy that leads to discrimination'];

- 'language that connects able-bodied people to goodness and disabled people to sin;'
- 'words that categorize people dehumanize them as well';
- 'age [as] a stereotypical cause of discrimination' (Walton 2000: 34-35).

What other liberationists may add here would be the rejection of language that marginalizes those from the majority world or of language that is so human-centred it ignores the groaning of creation for liberation.

There is in liturgical reform the power to bring about social change through a change in the words that are used, which models a different cosmology. The act of rejecting existing texts in itself requires, social change too. The social demands of ritual change are explored in Davies' *Alien Rites* (2005, see Chapter 2). Beyond these more obvious sociological challenges to the implementation of ritual change, is the matter of cognitive dissonance between cosmology and liturgy that will be discussed in Section 6 of Chapter 7.

b. *Political and urban liturgies*

'Any discussion presuming a link between liturgy and social justice, suggests, for many, a most unlikely marriage of topics' begins Edward Foley's introductory comments to his chapter 'Liturgy and Economic Justice for All' (Foley 1991: 116-17). Developing an underpinning liturgical theology for rites that engage with justice issues is work that has become particularly well developed in North America. As to steps being taken by the Church to change established liturgy, from a justice point of view, there has been little progress.

Foley's title is a direct reference to the 1986 pastoral letter from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) in the United States, which recognizes the relationship between social action and the worshipping life of a community.

331. The liturgy ... turns our hearts from self-seeking to a spirituality that sees the signs of true Discipleship in our sharing of goods and working for justice. By uniting us in prayer with all the people of God, with the rich and the poor, with those near and dear, and with those in distant lands, liturgy challenges our way of living and refines our values. Together in the community of worship, we are encouraged to use the goods of this earth for the benefit of all. In worship and in deeds for justice, the Church becomes a "sacrament," a visible sign of that unity in justice and peace that God wills for the whole of humanity (National Conference of Catholic Bishops 1986: 59).

The statement is unequivocal in understanding worship to be capable of challenging and changing the worshipping community, but on the practicalities of liturgical reform there is a suitable vagueness here, considering the gap between the liturgical resources that were in use and the ideological understanding of how transformation can occur through worship. Although Foley sees merit in the Bishops' letter being committed to a deeper connection being made, through liturgy, between the world of work and worship (Foley 1991: 119), there is little of substance that arises from the letter.

It was the previous year (1985) that the C of E report *Faith in the City* was published. Some of the concerns about liturgy and social action expressed in it are very similar to those of the U.S. Bishops. The report was wide reaching, critical of government policy on urban poverty, critical of Church engagement with the urban poor and critical of the liturgy's suitability.

6.110 [...] to give people a 1300 page Alternative Service Book is a symptom of the gulf between the Church and ordinary people in the UPAs. We have heard calls for short functional service booklets or cards, prepared by people who always ask 'if all the words are really necessary'. The work of re-forming

the liturgy has really only just begun for the UPA Church, and *we recommend* that the Liturgical Commission pays close attention to the needs of Churches in the UPAs (C of E 1986: 136-37).

Not only was there an understanding that the *Alternative Service Book* was not in an appropriate *format* for liturgy, rather this was a minimum concern but a greater and more visionary desire was also expressed in the report:

6.111 There has also been a clear plea that the form of liturgies so beloved of the wider Church must be complemented in UPAs by more informal and spontaneous acts of worship and witness (C of E 1986: 136).

The consequence of all this was a new type of liturgical resource *Patterns for Worship* (see above, Section 4) that broke the mould of how liturgical resources could be presented. *PW*, Stephen Burns observes,

remains unusual—if not unique—among the range of liturgical resources published by churches in Britain, consisting as it does of rubrics, resources, commentary and sample services (Burns 2006: 25).

The more recent *NPW* (also discussed above in Section 4) continues in the same vein.

Although there is, to date, a lack of assessment of the reforming influence of *PW* (and consequently *NPW*), Bryan Spinks (1993) takes a closer, albeit, brief look at the intersection between modern Western culture and liturgical reform—in relation to *PW* as well as to *The Promise of His Glory* (hereafter *PHG*, C of E 1991)—in his essay Spinks notes the provisions made for family services and in poorer economic settings. He also sees that the efforts made in *PW* are both to relate the liturgy to real life and also to take ancient language and ‘press it into new use’ (Spinks 1993: 44-46). He applauds the attention to the Creation, and social justice and the book’s attempts to engage with class difference in British society (Spinks 1993: 46-47). His reflections on both the inclusivity but also the challenge that *PW* offered to the *status quo* of the

Church's worship inform the attempt here to assess the inclusivisation of CW in relation to the Creation and the theological shifts and challenges CW offers to the Church by using a fresh way of thinking about the prominence the Creation may have in Christian thought.

What neither the C of E report or the NCCB pastoral letter succeeded in doing was to consider the theological underpinning for liturgical innovation: the best that is managed, in *Faith in the City*, is a call to speak in less esoteric ways and relate worship to personal circumstances. The incarnational nature of worship is mentioned, but simply as that, incarnationality as 'an indispensable characteristic of a worshipping community' (C of E 1986: 135), this is not unpacked any further.

The vision for worship expressed in *Faith in the City* leans heavily on the need for liturgy that can work with different cultures and a different class of person living in an Urban Priority Area.

6.102 To understand worship in this way means that certain aspects of UPA life will necessarily greatly affect the formation of the worshipping life of the UPA Church. The main contribution of the Church to our cities is to be itself, and true to its vocation. It will gather up and inform local life. It must 'accept the positive aspects and validity of working class culture, particularly to build on the strong sense of family and community which is often found, and be prepared to communicate through feeling rather than the mind, through non-verbal communication rather than verbal'. It will be more informal and flexible in its use of urban language, vocabulary, style and content. It will therefore reflect a universality of form with local variations, allowing significant space for worship which is genuinely local, expressed in and through local cultures, and reflecting the local context. (C of E 1986: 135)

The call for a 'universality of form with local variations' does not exactly constitute a liturgical theology or even express a model of liturgical inculturation although it does hint towards a reforming methodology, which goes slightly further than the NCCB letter. What this proposal does not suggest is introducing a new pattern of

worship that cries out for justice in intelligible ways for people regardless of their poverty or wealth, in both urban and rural settings. Instead it looks to make the liturgy accessible in places of poverty and urban contexts.

It is as though both of these senior church panels were not able to see beyond their own existing world-view and so, although they could see a practical need for new liturgy, they could not spot the accompanying cosmological shift that reworking the liturgy implied. It was treated, at least by the authors of *Faith in the City* as making something esoteric more intelligible and immediate. Foley does get a little further than this by arguing that liturgy is radical by its very nature by following the lived liturgical example of Christ, which guarantees that liturgy will serve as an 'impetus for justice' because liturgy is 'in itself a just act' (Foley 1991: 116-17).

There is a rather startling comment in *Faith in the City* that reveals some flaws in judging what worship was or was not suitable in a poor urban setting compared with elsewhere. The report suggests the need to create liturgy that related 'to UPA Christians ... [who] feel they must hide from the clergy and the local Church their debts, their court cases, their sufferings at the hands of their husbands' (C of E 1985: 136; 6.107). This suggests a range of stereotypes swallowed by the panel not just about working class circumstances, but also about the distinctions between what working class and other people might hide from the Church. The Archbishop's Commission had formed an opinion on why C of E worship was not making connections in impoverished contexts, founded on some misapprehensions. This marks out some of the hazards in attempting to construct political or urban liturgies with-

out the right quality of foresight, or without enough time to establish wisdom that comes with hindsight.

c. Disability and children and liturgy

The inclusiveness of the liturgy for people with disabilities and for children has been given too little attention within new liturgical prayers and in liturgical studies. Deaf churches and the L'Arche communities *are* two exceptional living examples of where fuller expression of a worshipping person's identity is enabled where people are disabled. The general lack of attention resonates, up to a point, with a similar lack in eco-liturgical prayers and studies.

John Hull is one scholar who has done a little work in the area of disability and liturgy, and who 'studied some of the many references to blindness in hymns [and] concluded that when the blind condition is treated as a symbol of sin and unbelief, a largely unconscious prejudice against blind people is reinforced' (Hull 2008: 117; quoting his earlier article "'Sight to the Inly Blind"? Attitudes to Blindness in the Hymn-books', Hull 2002: 333-41).

In his follow-up article "'Lord, I was Deaf": Images of Disability in the Hymn Books' (Hull 2008: 117-33) he establishes criteria for what constitutes unhelpful metaphors relating to disability, defining them as those that are pejorative (2008: 122) or disparaging (2008: 127). He concludes that 'sensitivity towards the negative images of disabled people has hardly begun, but it is not impossible that this will be the next wave of reform' (2008: 131). Evidently practically all of the work for reform in this area remains to be done.

Similarly, Stephen Burns identifies a vacuum and yet a great need for liturgical reform in regard to children. He comments that compared with the abundance of theological reflection on identity, 'children are a neglected topic' in his important work on worship and children: *Worship in Context: Liturgical Theology, Children and the City* (Burns 2006). He notes the omission of sustained discussion of children from all quarters of the theological world, 'biblical studies, systematics, ethics, pastoral theology, or liturgy' (Burns 2006: 99). He also notes that 'children are rarely referred to in liturgical theology except in the briefest of ways in relation to infant baptism' (Burns 2006: 101). The overlooking of children in the liturgy is evident in English churches, even when they do report on children and the church. Just one chapter is given over to children and worship in *The Child in the Church* (British Council of Churches 1984: 125-44) and three pages in *Children in the Way* (General Synod Board of Education 1988: 49-52).

In response to this dearth of discussion, Burns attempts to summarize some significant discussions of children in theology that have taken place. Although Burns notes that there is an absence, within the Gospels, of reference to much of Jesus' childhood (Burns 2006: 102-04), he believes that the portrayal of 'Jesus' understanding of children [is] distinctive from the Jewish and Gentile cultures of the early Mediterranean world' (Burns 2006: 104). Burns discusses Jesus' recognition, blessing and affirming of children in relation to, Matthew 14.21, Mark 10.13-16, Luke 2.28 and Luke 15.20 (Burns 2006: 104-05).

He also considers how Jesus speaks in his teaching of 'children becom[ing] teachers of how the divine reign is to be received ("Truly, I tell you, whoever does not

receive the kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it")' (Burns 2006: 105). He discusses interpretations offered by both Chilton and Gundry-Volf of this text. From Chilton, the suggested sense is that the grasping of the kingdom is just as a child would grab hold of something. Gundry-Volf's perspective is that Jesus responds as one liberated from the Law, just as a child was free from the Law's obligations (Burns 2006: 105-06, Chilton 1996: 85, Gundry-Volf 2000: 473-74).

He continues to discuss Gundry-Volf's theology of children in relation to the welcoming of children by Jesus and his command to the disciples to do the same (Mark 9.33-37 and Matthew 18.1-6) and finally in Jesus' passion and death, that the vulnerability of Jesus relates directly to the vulnerability of children in that ancient near eastern setting (Burns 2006: 106-07, Gundry-Volf 476, 477). Burns also notes fragmentary work done within feminist theology on the identity of children (2006: 107-08) but seeks not to develop an 'expanded theology of children and childhood [although] such a theology is most certainly reckoned to be needed' (2006: 108). Rather, he turns to consider the place of children in worship.

First, Burns considers the admission of children to communion within Anglican practice, discussing how 'sacramental belonging' (2006: 108) is for all the baptized not just for adults or the confirmed (2006: 108-11). He then moves on to look at Roman Catholic perspectives on children and the Mass. Drawing heavily on Searle's work 'Children in the Assembly of the Church', theological views of children as having a 'diminished humanity' compared with adults are discussed (Burns 2006: 114, Searle 1992: 35-38). Although this sounds derogatory, in part, this conceptualization of the child went hand in hand with an understanding of the child

as, therefore, 'standing closer to the veil that divides the visible from the invisible, the temporal order from the eternal' (Burns 2006: 114). This more ancient understanding of the place of the child in worship is compared by Burns, quoting Searle, with the sound-proof 'cry rooms' made available in some places of worship and other examples of children being removed from the liturgy so the adults can get on with their worship (Burns 2006: 114-15, Searle 1992: 41-42).

On the question of whether the need is for separate children's liturgies or a change in the liturgy so that the whole people of God may worship in communion with one another, Burns does not tender an opinion of his own, but rather in concluding his chapter 'Children in the Church' (Burns 2006: 99-126) considers David Holeton's evaluation in 'Welcome Children, Welcome Me' (Burns 2006: 117-20, Holeton 1999: 93-111). Holeton's call is for a pattern of Anglican worship that is 'more holistic, truly inclusive, and less cerebral' and therefore accessible to children, in a way that is more akin to the spaciousness afforded to children as sacramental participants within the Orthodox liturgy (Burns 2006: 117-20, Holeton 1999: 107, 111). It is not that *Patterns for Worship* did not recognize such concerns, but neither the introductory sections on 'Family Service' and on the term 'Family' (*PW*: 3-5) or in the prayers themselves is a successful and coherent approach to what includes children in worship. Whether such calls will continue to be ignored and why this differs from the relative successes for eco-liturgical texts in being included in *CW* shall be returned to in the final chapter.

d. *Liberationist liturgies and their implications for eco-liturgical reform*

The three groups of reform discussed immediately above provide insights relevant to eco-liturgical reform. Liberationist liturgies may focus on one particular aspect of the 'cry of the poor', or sit within the broader genre of theologies of liberation. In the United Kingdom many contemporary independent liturgies have been published in recent years, with a notable set of examples coming from the Iona Community (Wild Goose Resource Group, 1999; Philip J. Newell 1994, 1996) and the anthologies made for Christian Aid by Geoffrey Duncan 2002a, 2002b, 2004). Politically radical liturgies such as these reflect an approach that is not present in the core liturgies of mainstream UK churches.

The theological underpinning for such moves comes more directly from theologies of liberation than from well-developed liturgical theologies of liberation. There is a fundamental reason for this, expressed early on in the liberation movement by the approach taken in Solentiname and initiated by Ernesto Cardenal, where even the sermon is replaced by dialogue since, he explains, these dialogues are 'usually of greater profundity than that of many theologians ... This is not surprising: The *Gospel* or "Good News" (to the poor) was written for them, and by people like them' (Cardenal 1977).

Liberationist liturgies are arising as quickly as theologies of liberation develop. This growing is not something that even the fast-paced liturgical reform movement can currently keep pace with. This is a similar situation to eco-liturgy, the difference is that theologies of liberation are better developed than ecotheology is. Still, though, liturgy is often written without reference to specific liberationist theology.

In all these examples of liberationist liturgies discussed above, there is a consistent commitment not just to pay different social groups or issues greater attention, but also to shift the theological language used about people and God.

If a God-metaphor has serious limitations, we can try to mitigate them by explaining that it doesn't mean exactly what it says. Yet if it is a basic metaphor, a metaphor we live by, it will continue to shape the way we think and will limit what can be said and known. In worship the qualifications and explanations of theologians have little effect, since what counts is the metaphor's impact on the imagination (Brian Wren 1989: 200).

Wren's insight here, which is most pertinent for this study, is that the power of imagination has limits that are determined by the discourse used within a metaphor. Changing the discourse changes the imagination about the world we live in, about the cosmos we inhabit.

8. *The Content of this Thesis*

The main purpose of this thesis is to assess CW resources with a creation emphasis (Chapter 4), provide an analysis and critique of such texts (Chapter 4), assess how accessible such resources are (Chapter 5) and begin to explore what ecotheological adaptation of CW would look like (Chapter 6). Chapters 2 and 3 build the foundations for this work.

First, space is given to considering the history and impact of liturgical reform in the C of E in Chapter 2, so that the reformed materials of CW can be understood in a clearer light and to clarify what likely opportunities there would be for future ecotheological reforms. Reasons for what is already included in CW having a creation

focus or emphasis are explored in Chapter 2, to assist with interpretation, use and modification of those texts in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Second, developing an ecotheological set of priorities and interests to be used in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 occupies the whole of Chapter 3. In doing so, reader-response theory and meaning in the liturgy are explored and eco-liturgies are examined.

For this study 316 texts from *CW* have been selected for detailed consideration (Chapter 4). In Chapter 5 a survey of the clergy's use of creation themed *CW* is made. Of particular interest, is whether optional materials in *CW* are known about and being used. This is important for judging the significance of the creation themed materials that *have* been included in *CW*.

In Chapter 6 a detailed consideration is made of the developments that have occurred in Collects and Post Communion in relation to the theme of the Creation. The detailed look at *CW* Collects and Post Communion (hereafter *CWCPC*) also experiments with how adaptations of current prayers could help make the texts more earthed.

The main focus of the Conclusion (Chapter 7) is on how this thesis enhances an understanding of *CW* in general, and particularly the creation theologies of *CW*. How such liturgical reform shapes the theology of the C of E is touched upon too. Time is also given over to questioning what the future likelihood is of liberationist theologies reforming mainstream churches' liturgies. The ethical imperatives for liturgical change and the technological influences on liturgical writing occupy the latter part of the final chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

CHURCH OF ENGLAND LITURGICAL REFORM IN ECOTHEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

In this study closest attention is paid to *Common Worship* texts. However, being in the best position to understand ecotheological themes, and to assess the significance of such liturgies comes, in part, from understanding the background to the process of liturgical revision. This chapter begins, in Section 1, with a brief examination of the recent history of C of E liturgical reform: looking in detail at how reform itself was being shaped. Second, in Section 2, comes a deeper examination of these reforms and a consideration of the effect liturgical change has had on the reconstruction of both ecclesial identity and theological thought. Particular reference is made to the Anglican Church in both England and Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia via a discussion of the work of Peter Nicholas Davies in *Alien Rites* (2005).

Section 3 puts *CW* in the appropriate context for this study by considering the ecotheological attention already given to it, particularly by Andrew Pearson (1996).

This leads into the task of Chapter 3 where criteria are developed for defining the type and quality of ecotheology present within liturgical texts. Davies' work also informs the survey of clergy that is the focus of Chapter 5.

1. *Liturgical Developments in the Church of England: 1965 to the present*

The C of E liturgy has developed radically between 1965 and the present. As radical as these changes have been, the radicalism has been to do with reform of the liturgy taking place rather than particular theological innovations in the content. Certainly there have been theological shifts and developments, but these are a more subtle part of the change. It is in this context that this study's interest in the theology of creation themed texts takes place, where theological radicalism is unlikely to be striking or readily noticed. Rather, the radicalism has been the sudden increase in the variety of texts available to be used that make reference to the topic of creation.

Liberationist perspectives have not made explicit or significant direct contributions to the work of the Liturgical Commission during this period. There have been, however, two publicly owned C of E attempts to explore liberationist themes in the liturgy. First in providing resources for Urban Priority Areas in *PW* (as recommended in the *Faith in the City* report, C of E 1985, and discussed in the previous chapter) and second in terms of inclusive language as explored in the report *Making Women Visible* (Liturgical Commission 1988), discussed below.

Apart from these two direct attempts to make the liturgy more inclusive there has been further lobbying to bring a greater sense of inclusion into C of E resources. *Making Creation Visible* (Pearson 1996) and *Children in the Way* (General Synod Board of Education 1988) are the two most obvious and immediate examples. None of these amounts to evidence that a liberationist agenda has pushed or been formative in the shaping of new liturgy, though these reports indicate that consensus where stronger views will have been expressed in debate about liturgical revision.

In addition to these influences on creation themed innovation and the contextual influences discussed in the previous chapter, it is also worth noting the influence of Franciscan spirituality and practice too. The 1989 revision of the Anglican Franciscan office book—widely known and used in the version entitled *Celebrating Common Prayer* (Society of St Francis, 1992)—made a very direct contribution to the resulting CW volume *Daily Prayer* (C of E 2005).

CW provides us with the result of revisions to the 1662 Prayer Book that began in 1955. This chronological period of C of E liturgical reform sits in parallel to the most creation and development of liberation theologies and environmentalism. That the liturgical revisions and theological shifts have occurred to the principle acts of public worship at the same time as ecological anxieties have grown makes this particular period important. Just as we can chart the beginning of liturgical reform with the establishment of the C of E's Liturgical Commission and the presentation of reports from the Scottish, Indian and English churches at Lambeth in 1958 (Jasper 1989: 213-14), we can also mark out how environmentalism became a significant concern

within society beginning with Rachel Carson (1962), and for Christian theology, with Lynn White (1967).

Although it is both impossible and meaningless to quantify the relative impact of White, Carson or creation themed rites in the C of E, it is the case that each of these has generated a shift in thinking, whether it is among those planning and participating in worship, amongst scientists and ecologists, or among those concerned with the role religion plays in human and global crises. Understanding the shifts in thought among scientists, ecologists and those studying the role of religion in human society are beyond the scope of this study. It is, however, pertinent to examine how the change to what is expressed in the C of E liturgy in relation to creation developed and now shapes contemporary thought for those leading and participating in worship.

Recent C of E liturgical reform was primed by the attempted revisions to the *Book of Common Prayer* (hereafter *BCP*). These efforts, begun in 1908, led to the proposals in 1927 of *The Deposited Book*, which—with amendments—became commonly known in the form of *The 1928 Prayer Book*. Davies (2005) argues that this is part of a continuous movement of reform since the beginnings of Anglicanism, and this opinion will be discussed in Section 2. What is certain is that since the reforming efforts between 1908 and 1928, a new journey of liturgical reform began in the 1950s and has continued up to the present.

The beginnings of the most recent episode in the reforming journey of the C of E began when the Archbishops' Liturgical Commission of the Church of England first met in 1955 (Jasper 1989: 211). The commission was not given scope to develop any-

thing much more radical than a repeat try of the revision process of the *1928 Prayer Book*. The Commission was given four objectives by Archbishop Fisher: 'simple non-controversial' amendments including 'variations which were already widely used'; 'more radical' and 'experimental variations' drawing heavily on the *1928 Prayer Book* to be trialled over 'a period of seven years'; new initiation rites; and a survey of contemporary liturgical revision in the C of E (Jasper 1989: 212).

The commission presented *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* (Archbishops' Liturgical Commission 1957) to the Archbishops in 1957. This report outlined the commission's projected purpose (and the 1957 report was brought to the 1958 Lambeth Conference). Six 'guiding principles for revision' were to be: 'conservative'; not 'repugnant' to scripture; expressive of 'theological and liturgical insights of the time'; 'related to current life and thought'; 'a co-operative enterprise of all the main schools of thought of the Church'; and an enriching resource for the Church, not for 'disciplinary ends' (Jasper 1989: 213).

Although the intention for revision remained conservative and more innovative proposals met with initial resistance, the agreement in 1963 by Archbishop Donald Coggan to involve the C of E in an ecumenically constituted Joint Liturgical Group (through the leadership of R. C. D. Jasper), created a looser and less binding structure within which creative liturgical opportunities could be explored in a more neutral space (Jasper 1989: 227-29). Two further powerful influencing factors arrived from the world Church in 1963: the Report of the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order (Jasper 1989: 237), and *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* from the Second Vatican Council (Jasper 1989: 239).

Subsequently and critically for the C of E, new legislation—that became law as the ‘Prayer Book (Alternative and other Services) Measure’—permitted liturgical proposals to be considered and adopted for use. Key dates for the passage of this into state and Church statute lay between 1964 and 1966 (Jasper 1989: 232).

Throughout the Anglican Communion ‘new eucharistic liturgies’ were appearing. First ‘in Japan and the West Indies in 1959’, and then ‘between 1964 and 1967 sixteen other new rites appeared elsewhere’ (Jasper 1989: 237), which even included an experimental united African liturgy (Jasper 1989: 235-37). These developments proved that the *BCP* ‘could no longer be regarded as a bond of unity’ (Jasper 1989: 235). It was this loosening of the Church’s sense of being bound to the *BCP*, which was so essential for allowing the philosophical as well as the practical explorations of new rites.

It was these movements that set so much in motion for the new liturgies, which were presented and ratified by the C of E. *Series One* published in 1966 was mainly a reiteration of the 1928 Prayer Book (that had failed to be approved for use by Parliament). *Series One* meant that ‘for the first time in just over three hundred years, the Church of England had a solid core, if not a complete range, of services available for public use, alternative to those of 1662 and possessing lawful authority’ (Jasper 1989: 247).

Series Two published in 1967 and 1968—covering all main areas except ‘Matrimony and Burial’ (Jasper 1989: 264)—marked the beginning of an exploration of new structures for worship and new texts (rather than just amendments to the *BCP* as was the case with *Series One*) but still continued to use traditional language. The popular-

ity of *Series Two* booklets (Jasper 1989: 264-65), which were a tentative rather than a radical departure from the *BCP* was evidence of the need for further revision work to be done. *Series One* and *Series Two* were only temporary alternative forms that would ultimately be amalgamated and refined for inclusion in the *Alternative Service Book* (hereafter *ASB*).

One principal innovation for the C of E with the *Series Three* texts was the introduction of the use of more contemporary language and idiom. When the first sections of *Series Three* were approved for use from

1 February 1973 ... this ... was a milestone in Anglican liturgical revision. It was the first authorized service in contemporary language and much of its content was the product of ecumenical co-operation. In structure it remained identical with *Series 2*, but in content it was considerably enriched and improved (Jasper 1989: 317).

The complete set of *Alternative Services* was finally published in 1980 as the *ASB*. These included the *Series Three* texts (in the vast majority of cases without amendment) and, to summarize, the refined *Series One* texts placed within a *Series Two* structure (Jasper 1989: 321).

Consequently, when the *ASB* (C of E 1980) was published, perhaps not many imagined that it would date as rapidly as it did, in fact 'many wondered what a new' Liturgical Commission (1981-86) would do (Bradshaw 2001: 22). R. C. D. Jasper, though, for one, foresaw what longevity the *ASB* was likely to have, regarding it as a 'catalyst, a necessary step towards the creation of something even better' (Jasper, 1989: 362). It turned out to be less than another twenty years after this, though, that a total, complete revision, *Common Worship*, would begin to be published.

The impetus for such a full-scale revision came from several directions. In part it was the determination to publish additional resources that first appeared in *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* (hereafter *LHWE*, C of E 1984), which gave rise, later, to *The Promise of His Glory* (*PHG* C of E 1991). In part it was the level of interest in these supplementary materials that even 'surprised' commission members (Bradshaw 2001: 24). In part it was that the arguments for the use of inclusive language in society and the Church were slowly growing in strength. Such concerns had previously been raised in the decade before by one of those working on the *ASB*, Jean Maylan, but this concern was burgeoning at that point, not established (Bradshaw 2001: 26).

The liturgical success of *LHWE* combined with the questions raised in *Faith in the City* (C of E 1985), led to an even more radical proposal for a set of new liturgical resources, as Tovey recalls:

The idea of a 'directory' of material came in 1985. This was further developed both as a response to the *Faith in the City* report being critical of the culture of the liturgical provision of the church, and also as a resource for the growing 'Family Service' movement (Tovey 2008: 12).

When the following Commission sat (1986-91) they began work in the light of the previous Commission's

"end-of-term" report [...] drafted by Colin Buchanan and entitled *The Worship of the Church* (GS 698) [...] Its message was clear. It was too early to revise the *ASB* after ten years, but it would be necessary to do it after a further ten (Bradshaw 2001: 26).

The new commission recognized that *LHWE*'s success meant it was timely to push ahead with a new publication *PHG*, but also, 'in parallel', work began on *Patterns for Worship*. *PW*, rather than just providing supplementary orders of service for particular occasions (as with both *LHWE* and *PHG*), set out a new approach of providing a

range of liturgical resources for different types of worshipping contexts as well as a breadth of occasions (Bradshaw 2001: 28). The result of this thinking took ten years from suggestion to publication, but when it did appear *Patterns for Worship* (1995), marked the most radical shift in C of E reform since the original Prayer Books of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This commission also produced a report addressing a specific detail of post-*ASB* reform: *Making Women Visible* (Liturgical Commission, 1988) outlined how to make *ASB* texts more inclusive of both genders (Bradshaw 2001: 26-27). The Report admits that 'at certain well-known points in the *ASB* its language is felt by many to be insensitive to the presence of women' (Liturgical Commission 1988: 1, 1.4). During the preparation of the *ASB* it was not understood how essential this matter was going to become. It was only a matter of a few years after the *ASB* was published that legislative and ideological shifts indicated that, far from being faddish, these linguistic developments would mark a permanent change in the use of English language. The follow-on report to *Making Women Visible* (Liturgical Commission 1988) was *Language and the Worship of Church* (Liturgical Commission 1994), which defined the policy approach in regard to new liturgy.

Just as the *ASB* compilers and authors missed, by only a matter of years, the obvious need for linguistic changes that would be more inclusive of gender, so those working on the principal edition of *Common Worship* missed the pressing need to address environmental issues. In each case it is possible to read the slowness to respond to new movements (that were present in each instance) as a difficulty in judging a trend as something different to a permanent concern of prime importance.

2. Alien Rites: A Commentary and Analysis of Peter Nicholas Davies' Work

a. *Introduction to Alien Rites*

The amount of sustained and detailed theological liturgical analysis of *CW*, to date, is very limited. Paul Bradshaw, Ronald Jasper and Michael Perham have served as editors for a series of running commentaries on liturgical developments (see for example: Perham 2000 and Perham ed., 1989, 1993a, 1993b; Ronald Jasper 1989, Jasper and Bradshaw 1986; and Bradshaw 2001). Hence, *Alien Rites*, by Peter Nicholas Davies (2005), makes an early and original contribution to the analysis of these new liturgical resources by approaching the rite from a separated perspective.

More important than the fact that Davies got there first—which in itself is intrinsically useful—is that his approach looks in detail at attitudes, held by those who use the liturgy, towards linguistic change (and beauty in liturgical text). His careful analysis and critique of the history of liturgical reform within C of E and Anglican liturgy that includes *CW* provides a more accurately assessed context on which this study's work can be built.

In relation to this study, Davies lacks an engagement with the political or liberationist content of the text. This means that there are not many points of political overlap between his work and this thesis. Because, however, Davies' concerns with the politics of linguistic reform are so significant and thorough, they merit a substantial commentary and analysis in this chapter. He considers contemporary liturgical forms in the Anglican liturgies in two nations: texts from *A New Zealand*

prayer book—He Karakia mihinare o Aotearoa (The Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia 1989, hereafter *ANZPB/HKMOA*); as well as *CW* (from England).

A key attentiveness in *Alien Rites* is to the reaction new liturgies cause in those who also are familiar with the text of the *BCP*. *Alien Rites* uses two principle methodologies, first, a linguistic analysis of the new texts (Davies 2005: 3-144) and secondly a social-scientific survey of users of the texts (Davies 2005: 147-96). Davies, through both methods, seeks to weigh the relative merits of the new material in relation to the *BCP* both in linguistic terms and in terms of the users' experience of the materials. What does not take place in the book is a comparison between *ANZPB/HKMOA* and *CW*; rather, patterns of reaction to new liturgies replacing the *BCP* in two different contexts are paralleled.

b. *The success of revision*

An over-riding argument of Davies is that Anglican liturgy has been, from the inception of Anglicanism, one of liturgical revision. The question for him is not whether revision is appropriate but how successful the revision is. He asserts that both the intention of continuous liturgical reform is a stated aspiration at the heart of Anglicanism, especially around 'the issue of comprehensibility' (Davies 2005: 29-30) and also that for much of the time this aspiration has not been realized. He emphasizes the Church's valuing of reform for the sake of making meaning clear, ahead of 'theological considerations' (2005: 30-32), 'social change' (2005: 32-34), and cultural change (2005: 34-36).

Davies argues that theological considerations are not as 'relevant' (2005: 30) as other arguments. He recognizes that even in contemporary liturgies the appreciation of social inclusion of both the young and women in the liturgy is something that is beyond a feminist desire for liturgical change (2005: 34). Cultural change in his opinion (as also expressed here in Chapter 1), is something that is complex (2005: 34) and has 'accelerated in recent decades' (2005: 36), thus giving greater impetus for liturgical reform. However, these third and fourth arguments for reform reside, for Davies, under the larger heading of 'comprehensibility', which is discussed below in Section 3d.

c. Liturgy as a reforming journey

Understanding the C of E contribution to the modern movement for liturgical reform within a much longer running C of E desire for liturgical change, which began with the prayer books themselves, is highlighted by Davies (2005: 49-55). He notes how this continued as soon after 1662 as 1690 and that 'arguments in favour of change have been current for the whole period' since then (2005: 49). Debate around reform was much more to do with elements that were and were not included, for example, prayers for the dead (2005: 50).

Although Davies is at pains to point out a continuous desire for reform, there was a very long pause in the successful seeking of specific change, up until the Lambeth Conference of 1908 when there was a desire to make the liturgy 'more contemporary' (2005: 51). The Lambeth conference 50 years later in 1958—following on from

guidance from the Church of England Liturgical Commission's report of 1957—marked the beginning of worldwide liturgical reform in Anglicanism (2005: 51).

The development of *Series 3* is of particular linguistic interest to Davies because it is:

the first official liturgy of the Church of England to be written in contemporary English. The writers have attempted to give the liturgy the flavour of modern English by replacing archaisms of vocabulary and syntax, while at the same time ensuring that much of the content is still recognizably that of the *BCP* (2005: 54).

This partial amendment of existing language is intriguing, since it straddles the space between seventeenth and twentieth century English language as Davies's analysis demonstrates:

In its syntax, the language of *Series 3* shows many of the characteristics of the language of the *BCP* ... they are: premodification of the noun when addressing God ('almighty and eternal God'); long sentences (the whole passage of 19 lines consists of one sentence); and the repetition of grammatical patterns ('through him you have ... through him you have ... through him you have'). Similarly echoing the *BCP*, the services of *Series 3* contain many examples of lexical collocation: two or more words, either synonyms or closely associated in sense used in combination. Examples are: 'our duty and our joy'; 'celebrate and proclaim'; 'thanks and praise'; 'praise and glory'; 'hearts and minds'; 'praise and thanksgiving'; 'pardon and deliver'; 'confirm and strengthen'; and 'guide and strengthen'. The Prayer of Humble Access in *Series 3* contains a grammatical construction typical of the *BCP*. The final petition is: 'Grant us therefore ... so ... and ... that ...', thus linking two co-ordinating clauses within a subordinate clause, a construction which is extremely rare in modern English (2005: 51-52).

This analysis shows how the language that was developed for *ASB* texts is anomalous: proving an inherent weakness in the *ASB*'s quality and longevity. A more intriguing but underdeveloped observation Davies's makes is that 'before the second half of the last century, the focus in liturgical reform was rarely upon

language' (2005: 57). Typically, the content, especially the theological intention, was of greater interest, as is the case with this study. What is mystifying is the deployment of a quasi-traditional language. Davies defines the traditional elements that the *ASB* uses, systematically.

1. realization (phonology and graphology):

- i) the substantial use of alliteration and complex rhythm;
- ii) the archaic use of punctuation and, for example sentences beginning with 'And' (2005: 77-78).

2. form (grammar: accidence and syntax lexis):

- i) additional words, such as 'thou' in the phrase 'restore thou';
- ii) use of 'eth' at the end of words (2005: 78);
- iii) 'the distinction between clause and sentence is not as sharp as in modern English' (2005: 79);
- iv) 'two or more near synonyms' (2005: 80), for example, 'humble, lowly, penitent and obedient' (2005: 80), which shows less of a desire to clarify and define, Davies argues these show a 'fascination with the rhythmic cadences of spoken prayer' (2005: 80-81);
- v) the difficulty for those speaking modern English in understanding the denotative and connotative meanings (2005: 74) are evident, for example the use of 'bretheren', 'chiefly', 'sober', 'godly', 'health'. Davies argues that the meanings developed are peculiar to a religious mode of speech and therefore 'extra-ordinary' (2005: 81-82).

It is critical, for this study, to understand that the language deployed in the *ASB* and in a significant number of *CW* texts is atypical compared to its contemporary setting, since this provides a basic explanation when grappling with form and syntax separate from other questions that focus on theological content.

d. *The comprehensibility argument*

In considering the case for liturgical reform based on the need for comprehensibility, Davies draws on the *BCP* itself, quoting from three places. First in considering the preface for the *BCP* included in the 1549 edition that cites the Pauline concern that there is 'suche language spoken to the people in the churche, as they mighte understane and haue profit by hearyng the same' (Davies 2005: 29, *BCP*: 3). Second, Davies highlights the concern expressed in the Preface of the 1662 edition of the *BCP* that discusses the importance of 'the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times' (Davies 2005: 29, *BCP*: 7). Finally, the strength of this argument is underpinned, Davies explains (2005: 171), by the concept of comprehensibility being established in the twenty-fourth of the thirty-nine articles of the Church.

XXIV

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people (*BCP*).

Although Davies considers that these foundational arguments for comprehensibility constitute the clearest rationale for reform, he does not believe it has been a sufficient force for change for two main reasons. The first is the most obvious, very little in the way of reform did take place, this being evident in the fact

that although the 1662 Preface spoke of updating the 1549 the changes were 'relatively minor' (Davies 2005: 30).

The second issue that Davies has with the comprehensibility argument is that he does not see an automatic need to replace 'figurative language'. This is because he does not agree (2005: 30) with either Tillich or Crystal (Davies 2005: 30, Tillich 1963, Crystal 1995) that because such texts are ancient and 'outdated'—to the point that meaning may be obscured or altered—that this justifies revision. Rather, Davies understands that 'comprehensibility is affected not only by the denotative meanings of words by themselves, but also by their connotations or associations in the minds of hearers and speakers' (2005: 30). The inference that can be made here is that Davies hopes that beauty—as well as a substantial and yet partial grasp of the meaning of a text—can be 'good enough' for a liturgy's comprehensibility.

Davies does explore the partial comprehensibility of the liturgy, further, by surveying those using the contemporary and traditional texts. He asks three complementary questions on the topic with the following results:

- 55% of those from England found that the 'beauty and dignity of [liturgical] language [was] more important than whether [they] can understand it all' (2005: 171);
- 85%, however, said it was 'important to [them] to understand most of the language of the service' (2005: 171);
- 73% believe that 'the richness and beauty of the language of worship is more important than whether it is modern or old-fashioned (2005: 174).

Questions of richness and beauty 'do not override considerations of understanding' Davies concludes (2005: 174). As to the connotative meaning of a text, he sees in the responses to the *CW Collects* evidence that it is not just the age of the text that determines its comprehensibility. Of the 85 who commented on *CW Collects* 15 found them 'too long', 12 found the sentence structure 'too complex' and 10 found the language 'archaic' (2005: 176).

For Davies, therefore, no conclusive case can be made to justify revision on the basis of the need for comprehensibility, since contemporary texts may or may not be incomprehensible too. He does highlight survey feedback that suggests that training and education to understand liturgy is more important than how archaic or not the material is (2005: 172). It is clear from Davies's analysis that, neither comprehensibility nor the traditional nature of language is the guiding factor for judging the appropriateness and accessibility of texts. Rather, he maintains some neutrality on both these matters, preferring to consider what is appreciated and/or valued by the users of liturgy as a primary indicator of a text's merit.

e. Arguments against revision

In *Alien Rites* Davies gives some consideration to more contemporary arguments against revision, the most attention being devoted to the emotive and pastoral critique of liturgical reform given by David Martin (Davies 2005: 37-38, Martin 1993: 24-25). For Martin the modernization of the liturgy has the severest of consequences: people undergo a violation 'when the house of consolation and reprieve is taken over by alien rites' (2005: 38), hence the titling of his book.

Additionally, Davies reasons that

to a great extent, the arguments against modernization arise from an apprehension that a much-loved prayer book would lose its official status and authority and its usage would diminish. Among those who have been accustomed to the *BCP*, there is a sense of loss. To some, this is a loss not only of a great liturgical (and therefore theological) tradition but also of a treasure of English literature (2005: 45).

This serves as an 'impasse' (2005: 45) in arguments between those for and against revision. Here is the middle ground that Davies seeks to inhabit for the whole of his book: attempting, by adopting a position of relative neutrality, to offer either a solution to the 'deadlock', (2005: 45) or if not achieving that, at least providing a meta-commentary on it.

f. *An escape from the impasse*

Although the arguments are entrenched, Davies offers three ways of escape from this into a more considered analysis of perspectives on revisions:

- 1) the matter of quality of a liturgical text is not entirely dependant on the age of it (2005: 45);
- 2) he suggests that, because the quality of the new prayer books are inconsistent, worshippers have complex and varying, rather than equivocal views (which could eliminate an assumption that the debate is polarized);
- 3) Davies points out that there has been a misapprehension that there is some desire by the 'authorities' to do away with 'all that is loved and revered in the Anglican tradition in the vain pursuit of modernization' (2005: 45).

Davies reiterates a key motivation for modernization—that it is a long-standing Anglican principle (see the extensive discussion above and 2005: 45)—this gives a

reasonable justification for change (see also a longer discussion on the processes and motivations for C of E liturgical modernization 2005: 49-55).

Davies defines 'traditional' language as that of the *BCP* since this is the format of the arguments (2005: 73-86, Chapter 3). Davies's study carefully demarcates his definition of what counts as liturgy as that which is 'artefact' (2005: 10) and which Dix defines as being texts 'officially organized by the Church' (Davies 2005: 10, Dix 1945: 1). This means, for Davies, that other liturgical possibilities become classed as other options in worship: 'such as "light", "visuals", "place" and "movement" refer to non-linguistic phenomenon' (2005: 11). In attempting to restrict the area of his study, but wanting to claim a comprehensiveness of attention, there is an incentive for Davies to limit the definition of liturgy, but not one that is automatically going to hold sway.

g. *The limited success of liturgical modernization*

Davies asks three challenging questions of liturgical modernization and the first of the three comes with four sub-questions.

Question 1. To prove that the revisions are consistent with the stated principles for change (2005: 131), he outlines the four sub-questions that, by answering affirmatively proves consistency.

Qu. 1: sub-question i. 'Do these texts reflect the culture of the worshipping community?' Davies answers in the affirmative because the texts:

- have used gender inclusive language;

- contain greater 'active participation' for worship participants;
- provide a 'wide range of alternative forms' for use;
- offer 'greater lexical range' both in reference to God, theology and human identity (2005: 131).

Qu. 1, sub-question ii. 'Do these texts reflect the changing nature of the current understanding of God?' Again, Davies answers this in the affirmative because the texts:

- do not exclusively refer to God in masculine forms (more so in *ANZPB/HKMOA* than *CW*);
- God is referred to as a 'loving parent', 'source of love, care and 'compassion';
- references in *ANZPB/HKMOA* of God as 'vindictive destroyer' have been removed from the Psalms (though *CW* has retained these);
- there is less emphasis on God as an 'agent of punishment' and more on 'God's love expressed through Jesus'. For example, 'we thank you for counting us worthy' in *CW* Eucharistic Prayer 'C' versus references to the worship participants as 'unworthy' in *BCP* Eucharistic rite.
- there is a new emphasis on the worshipping community as a 'holy people' (2005: 132).

Qu. 1, sub-question iii. 'Are these texts written in contemporary language?' Here the answer is far more complex for Davies, partly because this is a less straightforward question to answer, but also because this is a primary focus of his research. He

concludes that it is fair to conclude that the language is contemporary with the following caveats:

- phonologically and graphologically, the form corresponds to contemporary styles;
- grammatically, in some cases entirely (2005: 132-33).

Davies follows on directly from this point by observing that:

CW frequently and characteristically shows a preference for the archaic syntactical forms of the *BCP* whereas *ANZPB/HKMOA* is, on the whole, more likely to avoid syntactical archaisms. The syntax of the *ASB* lies between these two extremes. Both the *ASB* and *CW*, in retaining the syntagma of the *BCP* collect, replicate many of the syntactic structures of traditional language. The shorter collects of *ANZPB/HKMOA* are grammatically more consistent with contemporary English (2005: 132-33).

Davies' view is one shared with and—in relation to the *CW* Collects—responded to, by the General Synod of the C of E, in the publication of the *Common Worship: Additional Collects* (hereafter *CWAC*, C of E 2004). These new texts follow in the pattern of the shorter Collects in *ANZPB/HKMOA*. The response is only partial since *CWAC* is simply Additional Collects and does not provide any additional Post Communion prayers, of which many (but not all) follow 'traditional' forms of syntax.

Qu. 1: sub-question iv. 'Do these texts reflect the changing nature of the current understanding of authority?' Davies concludes two things: first that no 'one particular form of liturgical language has precedence over any other' (Davies 2005: 133) and second, that a 'multiplicity of choice [...] changes the location of authority' because 'choices need to be made at a local level' (2005: 134).

More briefly Davies considers a second and third set of questions:

Question 2. 'Do the contemporary language texts deserve the adverse criticism which they have received?' There is a confidence from Davies that the criticisms are reasonable since the new liturgies:

- induce 'a sense of loss of traditional language';
- which in turn betrays 'a valuable heritage';
- the contemporary texts do alter the nature or doctrinal exposition of faith;
- the 'numinous' is lost from the liturgy (2005: 134-35).

His third and final question is:

Question 3. 'Are the contemporary language texts likely to fulfil the proposed criteria for worship?' Here the answer is ambivalent: the modern texts, Davies believes 'facilitate a reappraisal of our human experience ... while at the same time closing down access to "mystery"' (2005: 135).

This assessment of the value of 'contemporary' texts—whether or not the language can be classed, idiomatically, as contemporary—is one that Davies does not make a final judgement on, rather he offers tools for esteeming the texts. The reasons in this study for esteeming texts are different in emphasis from Davies's, but a similarity occurs in stance. New attempts at liturgical expression also benefit from new attempts at critique and analysis.

h. The shift in authority in new rites

The shift, that Davies maps, away from there being a 'single authority' or a single textual structure (2005: 65), is important for this thesis because of the fluidity around authority (2005: 65) and much greater level of choice and variety (2005: 66). This state of flux means that there is scope for the creation of more specifically themed texts, and the adaptation and improvement of existing materials becomes easier to propose (without anticipating a further 350 year wait).

Davies discusses the factors that both influenced and inhibited liturgical change in both the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia and the C of E. A principle anxiety was 'a reluctance to introduce into the liturgy any changes which might be seen to concede ground to Romanism' (2005: 66). Davies makes reference to Terry Eagleton's argument that a 'multiplicity of choices' is to do with the 'commodification of culture' (2005: 66-67, Eagleton 1986: 21), but Davies holds back, just, from agreeing that the new liturgies are a consequence of the 'culture of the supermarket' (2005: 67). He offers, instead a softer and more accurate argument that new liturgies are, rather, a reflection of developments that leads to a 'different understanding of how to address God' and a 'willingness to include original compositions' (2005: 67). This is the framework within which new liturgical rites appear, including creation themed texts. It is not the case that a whole new theology or cosmology is created, but a difference of emphasis or orientation is palpable and so the theology and the rites and the language used begins to shift.

i. *Alien Rites: points of synthesis and departure for this study*

Alien Rites gives most attention to the quality of language of the rite, not to its theology, its politics nor its inclusivity. This study gives time to scoping out how a creation theology relates to the formation of liturgy and finding texts that relate to the topic, where Davies gives attention to the motivations for reform, the debate around meaning and mystery in the rite and the merits of modernization. The main theological concern of Davies is one of the maintaining of the theological quality and depth in the rite during a process of modernization where this study is concerned the importance of theological shifts to respond to contemporary concerns (in relation to environmental crises).

In Davies and this study surveys are used to gain fuller soundings of the views of people using the liturgy. Davies predominantly asks qualitative questions in his survey, whereas Chapter 5 of this study gives greater attention to the quantitative concern of how and when new texts are used. The objective measuring of the quality of the modern and existing rite is something that Davies seeks to achieve. In Chapters 4 and 6 of this study a deliberate attempt to make subjective readings of the liturgical texts and, in Chapter 6, to propose changes based upon a theological premise where the priority is not quality but a changed theology. The motivations for a biased approach are discussed in Chapter 3 of this study.

3. *Making God in Creation Visible in Common Worship*

As discussed above, when the *ASB* was published in 1980 there was barely any additional mentions of 'God in Creation' compared to the *BCP*. By the 1990s some movement had begun to be made. There were sections in *PW* on 'Creation' and 'Harvest' (see Chapter 1) as well as texts in *Enriching the Christian Year* (Perham 1993). The public discussion about enhancing the C of E's creation themed liturgy first appeared in the C of E's report *Faith in the Countryside* (1990). There were two subsequent Grove Booklets. The first was *Worship in the Countryside* by David Cutts (1990). This was a rapid response and supplementary set of remarks reflecting the report's concern that there was a lack of specific resources for countryside settings. The second input was by Andrew Pearson in his Grove booklet *Making Creation Visible—God's Earth in Christian Worship* (1996).

The research for this project began from a premise in agreement with Pearson's: that God in creation in the rites of the C of E is 'Hid From Our Eyes' (Walter C Smith 1876). Just as the *ASB* ignored women, the earth has similarly been 'hidden'. Pearson's suggestions, taken up in this thesis, are to see how further revision could re-contextualize the Church in relation to the Creation and engage with society's and theology's concerns about ecological crises.

The effort Pearson was making here was to get the C of E to include the earthing of the liturgy as priority in reform. Michael Vasey, in the introduction to Pearson's

booklet, argues that there is an inappropriate apathy to correct towards the Creation within Protestantism in general and Anglicanism in particular.

An important chapter in Oliver O'Donovan's *On the Thirty-Nine Articles* helps to explain the instinctive apathy to creation in later Western Protestantism. He finds in the near silence of the Articles on creation 'the roots of modernity' (Michael Vasey 1996: 4).

Pearson explores the possibility that agrarianistic perspectives will suffice:

With the Anglican Church, some will argue that creation does get a mention at certain key festivals. Harvest is the most notable of these (pp 980-901 in the *ASB*), and there are other examples such as Rogation and even Plough Sunday. These however, are not good examples of trying to integrate the cosmos into Christian worship. They have several limitations. They are rural festivals, although harvest is celebrated in many urban areas (but some inner-city churches use this as a celebration of resources). However, these festivals limit inclusion of the creation into the liturgy to just two or three occasions per year (Pearson 1996: 12).

This study, in later chapters, will also consider on how many more occasions *CW* texts, which make creation visible, are likely to be used in a year. For Pearson, he is certain that the agrarianistic themes that are contained by default within the liturgy will not suffice in making creation visible:

the pattern of the Christian Year has its origin in the agricultural rhythm of the Mediterranean region. The neat Christological packaging of the church year hides its grounding in the human dependence on the vitality and order of creation. Adopting an ecclesiastical package is not enough. We need to learn again how to pray out of an explicit awareness of our creatureliness, and to respect neglected traditions of prayer such as public intercession at Rogationtide. The Scriptures must be allowed to teach us how, in our culture, to pray for and celebrate our life in creation. This needs to include all life in its scope: animals and the environment; urban as well as rural life; the expression of human creativity in art, science, and work; the ordering of corporate life through money and politics (Pearson 1996: 9).

Pearson's theological liturgical opinion of this is critical, though he sees it, moderately, not as a deliberate fault, but as

a 'sin of omission' on the part of the Church of England—at least—that our planet and the species dependent upon it (apart from *homo sapiens*) has hardly ever been included in our liturgy (Pearson 1996: 9).

The delicacy in winning the argument without alienating potential sympathizers within the C of E is perhaps what moderates Pearson's commentary on the texts that were not approved by General Synod. He observes that there was a significant attentiveness to the Creation in the experimental alternative prayers that were being tested.

six alternative eucharistic prayers were brought before Synod for final approval in February 1996 and were rejected at this last stage by the House of Laity

[...]

Prayer 1 begins:

God our Father, giver of light and life, maker of all things,
We praise for earth and sea, for wind and fire ...
For all the wonder of creation we praise you:
Hosanna in the highest!

[...]

Eucharistic Prayer 3 begins:

Blessed are you, Lord God of the universe,
you bring forth bread from the earth.
Blessed be God for ever!
Blessed are you, Lord, God of the universe, you create the fruit of the
vine.
Blessed be God for ever!
The whole universe praises you, its creator,
Sun and rain, hills and rivers praise you.
Blessed be God for ever!
The fruit of the earth praises you:
Wheat and grape, this bread and wine,
are part of the riches of your earth (Pearson 1996: 15).

Pearson concludes though, gently, that 'the rejection of these prayers, even as experimental texts, may indicate that the General Synod has some way to go in sensitivity to the creation' (Pearson 1996: 15). What Pearson could not predict is that the changes that have appeared between 1996 and the publication of *TSAY* (Church

of England: 2006c) have placed equally inclusive texts into the *CW* corpus, but not as centrally or prominently as in the eucharistic rites that were thrown out in 1996.

The efforts of this study will seek to discover whether, despite progress being made in 'making Creation [more] visible' in *Common Worship* than it was previously. What difference there is in a smaller proportion of the published rites being principle texts (i.e. texts for a eucharist/communion at Sunday worship in the C of E, which would be useful week-by-week) is returned to in Chapter 7. What is also presented in Chapters 6 and 7 is continued evidence, in the same vein as Pearson, of the need for further enhancements and an increasing visibility in *CW* of the Creation.

CHAPTER THREE

APPROACHES TO ANALYSING EARTHED LITURGY

Providing a justification for reading liturgical texts from a committed position occupies the first section of this chapter. The attention in Section 2 is on how to begin to undertake an ecotheological reading of texts. Then in the final three sections:

- details of how the Trinity's relationship with the Creation can be addressed in liturgies are considered (Section 3);
- the expression, in liturgy, of both realized and unrealized eschatology is explored (Section 4);
- as a subset of eschatology, how theologies of hope may be contained within the liturgy is discussed (Section 5).

Some more radical prayers will be discussed in this chapter for the purpose of comparison with *CW* and also as a way to explore the parameters of creation themed liturgy and its intersections with theology.

1. *Reading Liturgy from a Committed Position*

To make a reading of texts from a committed position is essential for this thesis, but it is one that would have been unwelcome back in the period when *Series One*, *Series Two*, *Series Three* and, ultimately, the *ASB* were being prepared. But in the same year that the *ASB* concluded the work of that sequence of Liturgical Commissions (1965-1980), a book was published from the West Coast of the United States by a literary scholar, Stanley Fish who had been known till then for his work on Milton. The title *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Fish 1980) marked a new departure for ways of reading and critiquing literature that gave a new importance to the view of the reader.

'Reader Response Theory' led to debates about meaning, identity and a multiplicity of truths. Such debates, related to post-modernity, still continue, and uncertainty remains as to what it may signify for contemporary scholarly activity. The theory 'has enormous implications for interpretation of liturgical texts' (Zimmerman 1999: 79). Zimmerman like others interested in meaning in liturgy (see also: Catherine Pickstock 1993, 1998; Paul Janowiak 2000; Graham Hughes 2003) seeks some absolute authority and ultimately meaning for liturgical texts.

In Zimmerman's exploring of Derrida's *Writing and Difference* (Zimmerman 1999: 72, Derrida 1987), she sees Derrida's theory of deconstruction as having 'attractive features for a liturgical hermeneut, namely, its insistence on the possibility of innovation in interpretation and its emphasis on inter-textual relationships' (Zimmerman

1999: 72), but pulls back from embracing such a theory, because it poses too many 'problems' including 'ontology, no authority to a text and no concept of embedded meaning' (Zimmerman 1999: 72).

Like Paul Janowiak (2000), Zimmerman believes that something special, holy and theological happens with liturgical text as it is read, differently to other literary material. Zimmerman believes 'liturgy is mystery, it is necessarily open ended' (Zimmerman 1999: 72) so liturgical hermeneutics resonates with liturgy's sacred purpose. Paul Janowiak focuses on the 'ritual dynamics' that occur in the 'preaching of the word' (Janowiak 2000: 85) as an aspect of the liturgical act. He argues for a deepening of Roman Catholic liturgical theology by combining it with reader response theory. He understands the result of this combining of theology and post-modern theory creates a particular and new holy action by providing an 'integrating hermeneutic' (Janowiak 2000: 173).

Sacramental theology needs the open-endedness of such theoretical creativity because confusion around liturgical proclamation as a sacramental act rests largely in a passive, one-dimensional understanding about the nature of the ritual act taking place and the sacredness of the dialogue that nurtures it (Janowiak 2000: 150-51).

Both Zimmerman's and Janowiak's claims, made exceptionally for liturgy, go beyond what would be either helpful or necessary to claim for the methodology being established here for this thesis. Zimmerman draws on Paul Ricoeur's textual theory (Ricoeur 1976), to develop a theory of solidity of meaning in liturgy (Zimmerman 1999: 17). She achieves this by using Ricoeur's theory that human action can be fixed in a text (Zimmerman 1999: 17, Ricoeur 1974).

Ritual is a good example of the fixation of human action. Rituals are rule-governed; they are executed according to a written or unwritten set of rules.

This is fixed meaning enabling the ritual to be repeated—so the encoded meaning is recoverable. With respect to liturgical texts, the residue of meaning recoverable by its fixation remains constant throughout liturgical tradition, even though the specific ceremonial that concretely shapes it changes from time to time (Zimmerman 1999: 17).

It is not that Zimmerman believes there is no place for reader-response theory in liturgical hermeneutics, rather it is that Zimmerman is expressing the belief that the liturgy itself has been ring-fenced by a divine authority that overrides the fluidity of meaning. There is meaning in the liturgical text, which is solid and then there is a further meaning created in the reading of the text, which is fluid:

The liturgical text has an integrity (truth) of its own at the same time that it interacts with the context of those who are celebrating to produce the meaning of the text in the here-and-now (Zimmerman 1999: 79).

The reinforcement of this view comes for Zimmerman from the use of Ricoeur's mimetic theory (Zimmerman 2000: 308-10, Ricoeur 1984, 1985, 1988). She applies the 'threefold mimesis' to the liturgical act by describing *prefiguration* as 'none other than the events of Jesus' life' (mimesis₁), *configuration* as 'those events in the actual liturgical celebration' (mimesis₂), and "'receiving" the events' as a *refiguration* 'of our lives in greater conformity to the mystery of Christ' (mimesis₃, Zimmerman 2000: 309).

Delving back into Peircean scholarship, Graham Hughes' analysis (Hughes 2003: 201-15) is that Umberto Eco's critique of deconstructionism as 'hermetic drift' (Hughes 2003: 202, Eco 1994: 26-27) is substantiated by T. L. Short who shows that Peirce jettisoned any move towards indeterminacy of meaning because he saw 'that "indefinite deferral of meaning is the negation of meaning"' (Hughes 2002: 203, Short 1998: 8). For Hughes this is important in proving that liturgy has determined mean-

ing. Hughes seeks to engage, substantially with Martin Stringer's approach to enquiring after meaning in liturgy (Hughes 2003: 209-12, Stringer 1999: 3, 7, 63-64, 76, 85, 87, 95ff., 97, 105, 120, 122, 125, 167, 176-77, 199, 205-06, 211, 212, 218). Stringer uses the tools of ethnography (Stringer 2004) to develop his theory of meaning in liturgy:

worship is an action ... without cause and without inherent meaning. It is an action that cannot be interpreted or explained (explained away?) in any easy fashion and cannot therefore be reduced to the functions or meanings of explanation or interpretation (Stringer 1999: 58).

Hughes declares 'indebted'[ness] to Stringer (Hughes 2003: 212) but disagrees, fundamentally on 'meaning' since Hughes wants to claim that because there is 'something to respond to' in worship (Hughes 2003: 212) that this proves meaning cannot sit entirely with the worshipper. Stringer's reply sits on a page not addressed by Hughes:

We actually find it very difficult to accept worship as it is, without cause or effect, open to the meanings that people wish to impose upon it. Increasingly, however, analysts are beginning to talk about worship in this way (Stringer 1999: 56).

My purpose in this thesis is to deliberately and honestly 'impose' meaning upon liturgy and open it up to meanings that matter to me. In declaring eight major influences in Chapter 1 I have sought to make my bias explicit. Although I am interested in the sociological approach of Stringer, I work as someone more interested in post-modern literary theory. What is *most* relevant to this study therefore is reader-response theory.

The question of authority of meaning does not go away with this theory; rather the power base shifts from text to community, and is neatly summarized by the subtitle of Fish's book (1980), 'The Authority of Interpretative Communities'. CW itself is

the act of an interpretative community, the C of E, as it seeks to express the life of faith, develop its understanding of Scripture, and grow its tradition. The vast difference between the *ASB* and *CW* reflects a shift in understanding of whether power over texts needs to reside with the authors of texts or with those selecting texts that they wish to choose.

There is also the action of various other interpretative communities upon the *CW* texts, including those concerned with theologies of liberation, and in the instance of this study, ecotheology. To undertake a deliberate and explicit act of subjective reading from a clearly argued and theologically tested basis—as is done in this thesis—addresses the question of bias head on. To be openly biased is as an act of academic honesty and yet to be engaged by a variety of biases is even more sophisticated. What shows a mature honesty is to also deploy a self-critique on the usefulness of the biased results. Beyond that, to analyze, to commentate on the perspectives of different interpretative communities offers a more sophisticated approach that can be classed as metacommentary:

Metacommentary, what is that? Let me try this formulation: When we write commentary, we read what commentators say. When we write metacommentary, we notice what commentators do.

This plain and symmetrical account of metacommentary seems to begin to immediately collapse, however, the moment it has been formulated. For what do commentators *do* apart from what they *say*? [...]

Well the main thing they do but do not say is not say what they don't say. Not many say, Of course, I am failing to ask this question of the text, or I am hiding from you, dear reader, my own opinion on the matter, or, I come to this text with a prejudice about what it ought to mean (David J. A. Clines 1993: 142).

To develop a critique based at the level of metacommentary in the context of this thesis is to treat those writing liturgy and liturgical hermeneuts like biblical commenta-

tors. Metacommentary on such activity involves noticing what is said and what is not said.

Admitting my own bias even in the comprehending of different ways in which theologies of creation are and are not being expressed by others contributes to my metacommentary here. Clashing with existing texts and commenting on my own adaptations (Chapter 6) is part of the process. To arrive at a position requires a journey, which many begin but not all complete, according to Stephen Breck Reid's categorization of readers of biblical texts (1995: 210-24) that I will apply to the context of liturgical theology and composition. (Reid speaks of those who 'read', but for liturgy, we need to include 'write' as well).

It is perhaps enough for many liturgical theologians and writers of new liturgical texts simply to become *Procedural Knowers* (Reid 1995: 216)—readers (and writers) who comprehend text through method. This style of reading (and writing) predominated in the twentieth century as a way of achieving an apparent objectivity in interpretation. Reid develops the theory as presented in Belenkey (Reid 1995: 214-16, Belenkey et. al. 1986: 3, 37-109) that being procedural is a stronger place to be in than to be subjective. However, the journey to a more complex approach to reading (and writing) text is to move beyond the procedural to those who know separately.

Separate Knowers readily use a hermeneutic of suspicion (Reid 1995: 216). There are two more steps that can be taken, first to become a *Connected Knower*, who can empathize with the text, and finally be a *Constructed Knower*. To be constructed in one's reading (and writing) is to use empathy, not just with the text, but also with the context and with oneself to develop a more honest and substantial critique (Reid

1995: 218-20). This constructed reading can be used to greatest effect when it is developed in the reading (and writing) of multiple texts, as a way of producing metacommentary.

This relates directly to the reading and writing liturgical texts (and reading liturgical commentators) from an ecotheological point of view. If we look at a collection of liturgical texts, seeking to discover in each text what is said or is not said about the Creation and environmental crises, then this is the first part of metacommentary. If we then complete a constructed reading of these texts it develops a metacommentary. If, in addition to this, further prayers or enhancements are offered by response this continues the process and makes explicit the constructed knowledge acquired, through the act of liturgical development (see Chapter 6).

A useful analysis is only one that relates to a wider interpretative community:

validity in interpretation has to lie in “interpretative communities”—groups that authorize certain meanings and disallow others. Validity in interpretation is then recognized as relative to the group that authorizes it (David J.A. Clines and J. Cheryl Exum 1993: 19).

A critique developed outside of an interpretative community is likely to be irrelevant. This is the check and balance to all bias in reading and writing texts, if no one else subscribes to the same interpretative community as the interpreter, the reading and writing still has a truth, but a truth which is unendorsed by others, and so of much less significance. Therefore, in developing a basis to read the texts of *CW* and write new ones, this study has sought not to make a new theology but to take key themes from a current in theology, an ecotheological one.

In the analysis of the liturgies, consideration is given to the theologies of creation that are present in the texts. This interest in ecotheology and the reading and writing

of text from an eco-liberationist standpoint is relatively new position but not a solitary one. There are a burgeoning number of academic publications in the area of ecotheology, proving that there are interested parties, and collectively speaking an interpretative community. The 'earthed' lens through which the liturgies will be viewed is one that will be made explicit. Then the established critique will look at the strengths and weaknesses of the existing theologies by considering their coherences and dissonances and examining specific texts. The circle is completed in the critique, adaptation and analysis of texts in Chapter 6.

2. *Cosmologies and Eco-liturgy*

Some cosmological perspective must be deployed to even explore and analyse liturgy. Approaching liturgy with a deliberately eco-liturgical set of interests generates a favouring of some cosmological biases over others that are not prioritized. Fixing a framework to serve as the lens through which *CW* can be analysed does not constitute a cosmological perspective. It would not be possible to create a neutral framework, but deliberately creating a lens through which to encounter cosmology does not create a particular cosmological position. What it does do is to enable the examination of cosmological dynamics rather than being a cosmology in its own right. Thus, the analysis is taking place from the position of a *Constructed Knower*, a stance that eschews the desire to establish a cosmology, but rather sets parameters—

as broad as the dynamics discussed below—as a way of examining the underpinning cosmologies of the liturgies being considered.

Seeking to discover the cosmology of liturgy has significance because, as Lathrop reminds us, there are many constructs, many cosmologies, and many risks involved in constructing such perspectives:

Cosmologies have been constructed that consign whole groups of people, whole parts of the world, whole ranges of species to evil or even to non being [...] Cosmologies are not all innocent, all of equal value, all beautiful (Lathrop 2003: 37).

One question that will be borne in mind in what follows is whether it proves to be possible—by exploring what cosmologies appear in *CW*—to determine what the cosmology of *CW* is in totality. This is a difficult and yet possible question to ask. Precisely quantifying exactly what a singular cosmology of *CW* is may not be achieved, but at least it may be appropriate to judge how conflicted the cosmologies are and what the main emphases appear to be within creation themed texts. This thread runs through all the chapters and will be re-interpreted in Section 5 of Chapter 7.

3. *The Trinity and Eco-liturgy*

Drawing on texts that are not restrained by the votes of those wary of major cosmological shifts allows a blunt consideration of the palette of possibilities available for those shaping new liturgy with an earthed emphasis. The benefit of offering an

analysis of texts not only allows a consideration of some possible approaches to writing earthed liturgy but reveals the pitfalls too.

a. *God as Creator in the liturgy*

In Section 5 of Chapter 2, samples of eucharistic texts not approved for *CW* were cited from Pearson (1996) here though is a text that did get authorized.

You fashioned us in your image
and placed us in the garden of your delight.
Though we chose the path of rebellion
you would not abandon your own.
Again and again you drew us into your covenant of grace.
You gave your people the law and taught us by your prophets
to look for your reign of justice, mercy and peace.
As we watch for the signs of your kingdom on earth,
we echo the song of the angels in heaven,
(Eucharistic Prayer F, *CWME*: 198).

This new material from *CW*, offers an eschatological journey through God's creation that sees the point of departure, rather than arrival, as the Elysian paradise of Eden ('the garden of delight'). We also see here a seeking after signs of God's reign in the present, a 'kingdom on earth'. The prayer is clear that our praise towards the God the Creator is a collaboration between creation, heaven and ourselves. Another prayer, leading into the Sanctus, continues similarly:

Therefore all creation yearns with eager longing
as angels and archangels sing the endless hymn of praise
(Extract from Extended Preface on the days between Ascension Day and Pentecost, *CWME*: 321).

These two texts, above, are exemplars of earthed prayer from *CW* that see God's work of creation as something we are participants in rather than disconnected from. That God's work of creation is spoken of at all is of interest to the earthed reader of

the liturgy. What is more significant for the eco-liturgist is how and when God is spoken of as Creator of the Creation. How the relationship between creator, humanity and the Creation is schematized in the prayers sifts many poorer texts from those that succeed in maintaining an ecologically relevant theological coherence.

We can take Moltmann's mapping of creation theology, within the context of his eschatological vision, as a guide to the type of theologies that are expressed in the liturgical texts. Moltmann introduces the Church's initial model of God in creation as one of 'religious cosmology' (Moltmann 1985: 33).

The theological idea of the transcendence of the Creator in relation to his creation evoked the cosmological notion of a temporally and spatially limited, contingent and immanent world (Moltmann 1985: 33).

He observes that it was as the natural sciences developed their own cosmology that the doctrine of creation became detached 'from cosmology altogether' (Moltmann 1985: 33). This left a reduced theology that focussed on 'a personal belief in creation' where the main emphasis was that the believer's faith was always in the creator and never the created (Moltmann 1985: 33). Moltmann continues,

In order to protect it from scientific attack, the Protestant theology of modern times liked to explain faith in creation as an expression of the feeling of absolute dependence.

[...]

Now though, science and theology have recognized a greater scope for interdependency accepting the scope of collaboration in exploring the 'sphere of cosmology and in the realm of social practice' (Moltmann 1985: 34).

The damage that the second stage of creation theology caused to the understood relationship between humanity and the creation is only now beginning to be repaired. A more developed creation theology is able, in Moltmann's view, to enable

the believer to realize that their existence in the created world matters as much, as if not more than, the fact that 'God created *me*' (Moltmann's emphasis, 1985: 33).

The fall-out from a separation of a consciousness about the Creation from a developed cosmology has been at the root of a false dichotomy created in prayers about environmental problems exaggerating the divide between God's creativity and humanity's destructiveness of the Creation. Such a binary opposition leaves little scope for the possibility that in creative endeavour, excess and non-intentional damage is likely to occur *as part* of the creative process. A theology of destruction and wastefulness needs to be part of a coherent ecotheology if this false set of oppositions is to be overcome in liturgical writing. The danger though is the following kind of result:

Lord isn't your creation wasteful?
 Fruits never equal
 the seedlings' abundance.
 Springs scatter water.
 The sun gives out
 enormous light.
 May your bounty teach me
 greatness of heart.
 May your magnificence
 stop me being mean.
 Seeing you a prodigal
 and open-handed giver,
 let me give unstintingly ...
 like God's own
 (By Dom Helder Camara, of Brazil, in SPCK 1998: 78).

This less than scientific analysis of the dynamics of the biosphere, which insinuates for example that the sun could easily manage to cool down and still maintain life on earth, is more than problematic! What would be more helpful is a theology of

wastefulness and destruction that comprehends them both as part of the creative process without legitimizing wantonness.

Further, what is needed is an understanding of the nature of goodness in the Creation. God's blessing or approval of humanity cannot be determined by whether the ecological equilibrium is being maintained or not, as the following prayer concludes:

Impartial God, you cause the rain to fall
On the good and the bad,
The just and the unjust,
The righteous and the unrighteous
(*'Active Power'*, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 114-15).

Effective liturgical writing not only needs to demonstrate a strong level of understanding of the work of the creator. It also must separate the natural processes of wastefulness, calamity, success and failure in the biosphere from those of sin.

In relation to the Creator, there is value in an acknowledgement being made of the boundaries of science and theology. This is particularly the case when the work of creation is described:

God of the whirlwind,
We realize we were not there.
You made it all without us,
From the earth's foundations
To the highest heavens.
You alone shut the doors of the sea
And made, from the clouds,
A coat for the earth
(By Janet Lees, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 27).

There are three principles that are noteworthy that occur in this prayer. First, the drawing on Job 38 means that the language, rhythm and metaphor are automatically familiar, even if the prayer is not. Second, by naming YHWH as 'God of the

whirlwind', the text does not seek inappropriate parity for humanity with the Creator in the work of creation. Third, in exploring the three-way dynamic—between God, humanity and the Creation—it avoids the danger of giving the Creation authority over humanity, which is in fact held by the Creator not the created.

Such a hazard becomes apparent in the following prayer that speaks of a 'Mother Earth' who 'creates' and performs miracles 'of renewal' that humanity can participate in as its cooperative 'citizens' and as the 'midwives' to this pregnant environment that is the gift of God.

CONSIDER CREATION

All people of the earth, each and every nation
 Arise and rejoice at the continued creation
 Of beauty, of springtime, the yearly rebirth
 of our protector, our home, our own Mother Earth!

Who despite man's apparent lack of care
 Creates bountiful splendour for all to share
 From mountain tops to the deepest sea
 All wonderful earthly miracles bursting free!

Yet this miracle of renewal acquires the helping hand
 Of the people to replenish and renew the land
 From the largest of cities to the most remote farms
 To unite in spirit and with the strongest arms.

Become a midwife to the birth of each flower
 A guardian of our resources hour by hour
 Man must learn to take time to appreciate
 The miracles of which he did not create.

For God has given this wonderful treasure
 And its preservation will be the measure
 Of people who recognise and will celebrate
 The birth of each season before it's too late.

In citizenship, in willingness to toil
 We must bend our backs and tend to the soil
 In stewardship, arise and applaud the worth
 Of the wondrous marvel of our Living Earth!

Consider creation. Consider it now
 (Web of Creation 2010).

The prayer suggests that it is the 'preservation' of the earth (stanza 5), as mother, which will be the 'measure' of those who are the earth's do-gooders. The people who serve the earth well are those who 'recognize' and 'celebrate' (stanza 5), this is the measure of those who are 'righteous'. The indication is that there are two types of people: those who are worthy 'celebrants' of the earth, and those who will not celebrate the Creation before it is 'too late' (stanza 5). In the call (in the title and on the last line) to 'consider creation' and to 'consider it now', the need for action by humanity is limited to considering. Meanwhile God appears a passive observer to the crisis. The nature of the dynamic between God and God's work of creation has been lost altogether.

This final text with its provocative set of contrasts, in many ways, summarizes what can be strong and weak in exploring the three-fold set of relationships between God the Creator, humanity and the Creation.

[People] In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters.

[Reader] In the beginning of the technological age, man recreated the heavens and the earth. To the earth he gave new form with dynamite and bulldozer and the void of the heavens he filled with smog.

[People] And God said "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. Let the waters under heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear".

[Reader] Then man took oil from beneath the ground and spread it over the waters, until it coated the beaches with slime. He washed the topsoil from the fertile prairies and sank it in the ocean depths. He took waste from his mines and filled in the valleys, while real estate developers levelled the hills. And man said, "Well, business is business".

[People] Then God said, "Let the earth put forth vegetation, plants yielding seed and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind, upon the earth...Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds". And it is so. And God saw that it was good.

[Reader] But man was not so sure. He found that mosquitoes annoyed him, so he killed them with DDT. And the Robins died, too, and man said, "What a pity". Man defoliated forests in the name of modern warfare. He filled the streams with industrial waste - and his children read about fishing...in the history books.

[People] So God created man in his own image; in the image of God he created him. And God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over every living thing".

[Leader] So man multiplied - and multiplied - and spread his works across the land until the last green blade was black with asphalt, until the skies were ashen and the waters reeked, 'til neither bird sang nor child ran laughing through cool grass. So man subdued the earth and made it over in his image, and in the name of progress he drained it of its life ... Until the earth was without form and void, and darkness was once again upon the face of the deep

(Richard H. Schwartz 2002: 37-39 in jewishveg.com 2010).

From this, three matters merit attention:

- i. God's continued Sabbath rest.* The text places God in a passive role (after the sixth day of creation), as if in a permanent Sabbath rest. God made, and since then humanity has been unmaking all that had been made.
- ii. Creation as humanity's victim.* The human act of engagement with the creation is at best one of 'manslaughterer' and at worst of rapist.
- iii. Humanity's contradiction of the Creator.* Humanity's actions are entirely contradictory to those of the Creator, and do not in any way contain within them the *imago dei*.

The success that could possibly come in identifying a trajectory towards an Armageddon is that it opens up space for introducing notions of rescue and redemption by God. That, however, is an inadequate theological and liturgical position because it simply throws the blame for the earth's destruction onto a sinful humanity and the responsibility for rescue back onto an apparently inactive creator.

b. *Christ as rescuer of creation in the liturgy*

We will now consider how liturgical prayers can explore the role of Christ as rescuer of creation. Earlier notions of creation theology emphasized personal salvation ahead of the redemption of the whole creation and separated science and theology from one another, whereas the combination of the disciplines of science and theology can serve the imperative to 'cure' the ills that are being inflicted on a suffering world.

Vincent Rossi speculates that:

If we are able to face this crisis for what it is, beyond denial or avoidance, is it possible to use the perspective we have gained by the raising of the existential stakes to realize a deeper insight into ourselves, our world and our actual situation in a way that will allow an understanding of the cause, and hence the possibility of a cure, of a problem in which the conflict of religion and science is undoubtedly one of the symptoms? (Rossi 1997: 69).

The weakness in Rossi's vision is that it may only lead to a re-merging of the ways between disciplines rather than a cure emerging from it. It also pins the blame for the crisis on an inter-disciplinary rift, perhaps excusing theology for lacking its own sense of how God's rescue speaks to the whole of creation.

An alternative approach to the talking of a cure for the Creation comes from Sallie McFague who argues that the fashioning of an 'ecological Christology' could be redemptive (McFague 2000). She is quick to point out that Christianity has 'from the earliest days' been occupied with how 'the renewal of creation, the salvation of the individual, and the liberation of the people' have all been 'necessary components of the work of God in Christ' (McFague 2000: 29). Having explored the types of Christologies that have emerged she takes from these signs of 'ecological potential' (McFague 2000: 33). She itemizes the following as 'needed dimensions' (McFague 2000: 33):

The insistence on justice to the oppressed, including nature, and the realization that solidarity with the oppressed will result in cruciform living for the affluent; the need to turn to the earth, respecting it and caring for it in local, ordinary, mundane ways; the recognition that God is with us, embodied not only in Jesus of Nazareth but in all of nature, thus uniting all creation and sanctifying bodily life; the promise of a renewed creation through the hope of the resurrection, a promise that includes the entire cosmos and speaks to our ecological despair; the appreciation of the intrinsic worth of all life-forms, not just of human beings; and, finally, acknowledgement that human salvation or well-being and nature's health are intrinsically connected (McFague 2000: 33).

This can be summarized. McFague has five requirements for a coherent ecological Christology. It must be one that speaks of:

- Justice, liberation and transformation of society and the whole creation;
- An attentive listening to and practical care for ecological matters;
- Encountering and listening to the living Christ in the sacrament of creation;
- The appropriate valuing and honouring of all life;
- The journey towards wholeness, healing and rescue is shared with creation.

Applying this to earthed liturgical texts needs some adjustment. Important as it is to consider what a prayer's Christology looks like, it will be easier to find use of the language of rescue, and harder to uncover direct discussions on the nature of Christ (original affirmations of faith being the obvious exception).

This first text, below, relates to McFague's requirements. All of this is achieved in 34 words of instruction for an activity.

People to add stones to a spiral of growth at the foot of a cross committing themselves to growing in God's way of love for creation and grieving the crucifixion of life on earth (Iona Community 1991: 82).

A commitment to grow in God's way in the context of love for the Creation and the suffering of creation certainly meets the criterion of addressing justice, liberation and

transformation. That time is devoted to 'grieving the crucifixion of life on earth' is making space for 'attentive listening', and the 'committing' ties in with the need for the other part of the second criterion of 'practical care'. The cruciform shape of the sculpture and the language of crucifixion mean that the Christ is the very way the theme of creation is explored as sacrament (criterion 3). Life is honoured in it being grieved for (criterion 4), and the 'journey towards wholeness' (criterion 5) is appropriately earth-centred.

The next two texts are harder to grade according to McFague's five requirements, and yet they both offer useful insights into how Christological themes are explored.

The earth is at the same time mother,
 she is mother of all that is natural,
 mother of all that is human.
 She is mother of all,
 for contained in her are the seeds of all.
 The earth of humankind contains all moistness,
 all verdency,
 all germinating power.
 It is in so many ways fruitful.
 All creation comes from it
 yet it forms not only the basic raw material for humankind,
 but also the substance of the incarnation of God's Son
 (Iona Community 1991: 80, Uhlein 1983: 58).

O Christ, there is no plant in the ground
 but is full of your virtue.
 There is no form in the strand
 but it is full of your blessing.
 There is no life in the sea,
 there is no creature in the ocean,
 there is nothing in the heavens
 but proclaims your goodness.
 There is no bird on the wing,
 there is no star in the sky,
 there is nothing beneath the sun
 but proclaims your goodness
 (Iona Community 1991: 62).

Both these prayers seek to explore the incarnation in the Creation. The first speaks of the Creation not as 'mother earth' but both 'earth' and 'at the same time, mother', that which contains the seeds for the creation of life, of humankind, and the source or root-stock for the incarnation. The sacramental nature of the earth is not exaggerated and neither is it glossed over, its place is firmly defined and yet its role remains as a nurturing one, without it ever becoming *the* incarnation itself.

Hildegard's ancient prayer is in several respects replicated in the second of the two prayers, again, from the Iona Community. Here, once more, the things of the earth are seen as containing aspects of the incarnation, without being the incarnation itself. Here it is Christ's 'virtue' and 'blessing' which is in life on earth that proclaims the 'goodness' of Christ. These prayers meet further requirements that McFague desires for an ecological Christology, those of inclusivity and embodiment.

1. 'Inclusivity' (McFague 2000: 36)

... nature, not just Jesus, is the sacrament of God; the entire creation is *imago dei*, as Thomas Aquinas suggests when he claims that the whole panorama of creation is needed to reflect the divine glory (McFague 2000: 37).

2. 'Embodiment' (McFague 2000: 37)

In addition to inclusivity, incarnational Christology underscores embodiment. The tradition has expressed this in John's phrase "the Word became flesh." But often, Logos Christologies are narrow, validating only Jesus' flesh. Recent Spirit and Wisdom Christologies widen the range: both can include other life-forms--the Spirit of God can dwell in spirits other than human ones, and Wisdom makes her home in creation (McFague 2000: 37).

This earthed comprehension of Christology merges and fuses with understandings of the work of the Spirit in creation and so loses some focus and definition. In moving from Aquinas's claim of the need of the cosmos to reflect God's glory, to sweeping up all of creation into the *imago dei* leaves many unanswered questions

both about suffering and predation in creation. McFague's vision will be returned to, in Chapter 7, to consider what *CW* liturgical texts, if any, fit within such a fulsome understanding of Christ's present action in the world.

c. The Spirit of God as sustainer of creation in the liturgy

Liturgical prayer that contains a pneumatology—which expresses God's role in the world as living and active—secures an understanding of God as one that sustains the Creation.

At a basic level it is God's creation, not 'our environment' ... that is anti-theological, and does not awaken us to a sensitivity to God's world and to thank God for it, and seek God's wisdom on how to look after it. The environment isn't a political programme, it is God's (Chryssavgis 2000: 87-88).

Such a theology of the Holy Spirit has little regard for talk of the environment, but, rather, speaks of what is God's rather than what is ours.

If texts make reference to the Holy Spirit and allow scope for the Spirit as that which brings order to the Creation and upholds God's purposes for the cosmos, then it is likely that an ecotheological pneumatology is being expressed. If however the Holy Spirit is seen as the presence of God brushing across the surface of the cosmos like an afternoon breeze, then God's breath will have been substantially diminished in scale and stature.

To develop this notion of breath a little further, it is worth considering the strength and weakness of Mark I. Wallace's supposition that the Spirit is part of the 'wounded' manifestation of God that comes in 'cruciform' shape (Mark I Wallace 2000: 62):

Could it be, then that an adequate basis for hope in a restored earth lies in a recovery of the Holy Spirit as God's power of life-giving breath (*rūah*) who indwells and sustains all life forms? Perhaps. But a Spirit-centered and earth-centered basis for such a theological hope is difficult to sustain when one's bioregion is under daily assault by ravenous demonic forces that labor to destroy hope through the politics of despair (Mark I Wallace 2000: 62).

It would seem that Wallace is losing track of what God's breath may signify, so much so that his explanation for the apparent lack of God's power in the face of eco-catastrophe can be explained by understanding that the Spirit is wounded and requires 'recovery'. Wallace suggests this is unlikely during a 'daily assault by ravenous demonic forces': an image that sounds more akin to a stricken ship than the force that winds and sea obey.

The following text offers us a fascinating insight into how a prayer can similarly misunderstand the significance of the Spirit as *rūah*:

O Spirit, grant us a calm lake, little wind, little rain, so that the canoes may proceed well, so that they may proceed speedily (SPCK 1998: 79).

At first glance there is little evidence in this text that 'Spirit' is being used as anything but a different name for God, rather than being chosen to denote the activity of God in the world. Choosing 'Spirit' as a name for God to reflect primal traditions and indigenous spiritualities—which could be the case here—may sound inclusive, but can, rather, simply lead to an over-writing of the name of God with the title 'Spirit'. A stronger approach would be one that expresses a pneumatological perspective that regards the sustaining work of the Spirit as an essential part of understanding the role of the Trinity in the Creation.

To ask the Spirit to 'grant' something in this instance asks that the Spirit deny something else (for example, 'little rain' disallows the watering of crops by more

rain). Far from this being an exceptional text, it is an all too common example of how prayers get prayed with little regard for the dynamics of God in creation and the kind of power that they are asking to be unleashed to fulfil personal desire. To ask for waters to be stilled, winds to abate and rains to subside is to ask for a change in weather systems, not just the activity of the weather in one location.

It could be countered that there is biblical precedent for requesting command and control over waters, winds and rains from both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. This brings some justification for how the prayer has been written. The prayer is concerned with the human's safe passage across the face of the waters, rather than a concern for the Creation itself. Herein lies a stronger answer to why the name selected is that of 'Spirit'- perhaps the allusion is quite deliberate. It may well be the prayer is likening the person paddling the canoe to the Holy Spirit of God hovering over the face of the waters. In that way what appears at first glance as a superficial prayer has the undercurrent of showing the relationship between humanity and the work of the Spirit.

Such imagery expresses the desire for God's assistance in maintaining dominion over the forces of the cosmos for the sake of humanity. What is lacking here is an understanding that God's Spirit brought form and order to the cosmic chaos to complete the work of creation rather than to pass across the cosmos *en route* from Alpha to Omega. The Spirit of God does more than pass across the face of the deep: the Spirit sustains the order that is wrought out of nothing, and out of chaos. This prayer does not reflect such purposes of the Spirit of God.

There is a different kind of vagueness in the following prayer in relation to understanding the role of the Spirit in the creation:

<i>leader</i>	O God, who called all life into being,
<i>all</i>	The earth, sea and sky are yours.
<i>leader</i>	Your presence is all around us,
<i>all</i>	every atom is full of your energy.
<i>leader</i>	Your Spirit enlivens all who walk the earth,
<i>all</i>	with her we yearn for justice to be done,
<i>leader</i>	for creation to be free from bondage,
<i>all</i>	for the hungry to be fed,
<i>leader</i>	for captives to be released,
<i>all</i>	for your kingdom of peace to come on earth. Amen

(Iona Community 1991: 34).

The Spirit has the role of 'enlivening'. It is not clear from the first four lines whether it is the Spirit that is the 'energy' in 'every atom', nor does the fifth line make it clear if 'those who walk' means to specify all creatures with legs (and not to include, for instance cetaceans, snakes or fish)! The Spirit is given the feminine form (line six) though, oddly creation's own longing and groaning for liberation (Romans 8.19 and 8.22) is transferred onto the Holy Spirit and those praying. It seems that the Spirit's role is somewhat lessened in relation to that of the God of line one. The Spirit makes things a little livelier. The energy in all things, though, comes from God's creative power, not from the Spirit. The female denotation of the Spirit appears to reinforce a more stereotypically passive role that serves in a responsive reaction to the work of first person of the Godhead.

The difference with the following text is that it gives the whole focus of the prayer to the Spirit's action, some of it refers to the Spirit's action in the Creation, in the bulk of the prayer, however, the Creation is used as a vivid metaphor.

Lord, Holy Spirit,
you blow like the wind in a thousand paddocks.
Inside and outside the fences,
you blow where you wish to blow.

Lord, Holy Spirit,
you are the sun who shines on the little plant.
You warm him gently, you give him life,
you raise him up to become a tree with many leaves.

Lord, Holy Spirit,
you are the mother eagle with her young,
holding them in peace under your feathers.
On the highest mountain you have built your nest,
above the valley, above the storms of the world,
where no hunter ever comes.

Lord Holy Spirit,
you are the bright cloud in whom we hide,
in whom we know already that the battle has been won.
You bring us back to our Brother Jesus,
to rest our heads upon his shoulder.

Lord, Holy Spirit,
in the love of friends you are building a new house.
Heaven is with us when you are with us.
You are singing your song in the hearts of the poor.
Guide us, wound us, heal us. Bring us to God
(James K. Baxter, in SPCK 1999: 8).

Most if not all of the prayer is making use of creation imagery as metaphor to construct a fuller notion of the Spirit, rather than defining the Spirit's action in the Creation. To be precise, the first stanza is a simile 'like the wind in a thousand paddocks'. The second stanza is either metaphor or pantheistic, 'you are the sun': I think the former conclusion is more likely than the latter, considering all other content is either metaphor or simile. The third stanza uses the metaphor of a 'mother eagle' leaving the reader in no doubt by referring to the 'storms of the world' showing that this is not any regular eagles nest.

The fourth stanza continues, partially, with a creation flavour, but the 'bright cloud' refers to the mystery of transfiguration, and the ascension, as well as the mystical work *The Cloud of Unknowing* in which 'we hide'. The Spirit's role, as with the previous text, is one that is contained within the created order, rather than beyond it or directing it. The final stanza describes the action of the Spirit as 'building a new house' and 'singing a song in the hearts of the poor'. When the work of the Spirit is related more directly to human life the creation imagery is dropped. This text does not explore the three-way dynamic between the Spirit, humanity and the creation even though it references all three.

The next prayer combines creation themed imagery and a fuller narrative of the Spirit's work, but does not manage to make much of an exploration of the Spirit's action in creation or the three-way dynamic between Spirit, humanity and the Creation.

Spirit of God, active in creation:
 Spirit of love,
 Spirit of Jesus, one with our Saviour:
 Spirit of love,
 Spirit of life, present in the church:
 Spirit of love.

We rejoice in your presence
 around us and in us,
 through the precious Gospel of Christ,
 like wind on our faces
 and breath in our lungs:
 Presence of joy.

We rejoice in your power
 to give new birth and new life,
 like fire, warmth and radiance,
 like life in dormant daffodils
 bursting forth in spring:
 Presence of hope.

We rejoice in your accepting us,
 ceaselessly seeking us,
 freely treasuring us,
 with love older than mountains
 or distant stars,
 new every morning:
 Presence of grace.

Creator Spirit:
 Spirit of love,
 Life-giving Spirit:
 Spirit of love,
 Nurturing Spirit,
 Spirit of love,
 We bless you for your mercy,
 love you and adore you.
 Blessed be your name
 of love for ever and ever (Bruce D. Prewer, in SPCK 1999: 64-65).

What the prayer is clear on (in the fifth and final stanza) is that the Spirit has a role in the work of creation, 'Creator Spirit [...] Life-giving Spirit'. The Spirit is carefully likened to and yet distinguished from the Creation, 'with love older than mountains or distant stars' (stanza four) marks out a panentheistic approach. This is also the case with the likening of the Spirit's work to that of 'the wind on our faces' (stanza two) and to 'fire' or 'daffodils bursting forth in the spring' (stanza three). It will be of particular interest, in the following chapters, to observe how the Spirit's work in creation is articulated in *CW* and how the three persons of the Trinity have been given distinctive roles within the 316 *CW* texts that are paid particular attention.

4. *The Presence and Absence of Earthed Eschatology in Liturgical Writing*

Just as Bonhoeffer in *Nachfolge* (1937) speaks of the nonsense of 'cheap grace' (Bonhoeffer 1959: 42-44), so it is possible to also critique 'cheap eschatology': a mode of thought which ignores hope this side of death by imagining that faith is a fast-track to a heavenly paradise. Liturgical eschatology that avoids such cheapness veers in the direction of 'ecological eschatology' (Keller 1997: 86), or to repeat the refrain of this study, in an earthed eschatology. Earthed eschatology develops a notion of the kingdom of God coming in the present context. This directly relates to the request from the Lord's Prayer 'your kingdom come'—praying for the kingdom of God and seeking, in prayer, to serve the purposes of the kingdom of God—for the present and all the futures that will be arrived in.

If eschatology only reaches back to Eden and forward beyond time then the value of thinking, eschatologically, is lost. 'Unless it can meaningfully and effectively address the green apocalypse, Christian theology becomes a trivial pursuit at the end of the second millennium' (Keller 1997: 86). Finding an eschatological vision that speaks to the apocalyptic sensibilities of our time and also manages to transform those fears is a way of succeeding in developing a theology of both the *now* and the *not yet*, the realized and unrealized aspects of eschatology.

Climate change and species extinction are not new or unproven topics. What level of apocalypse the earth is facing is hotly debated. No matter what changes do or do not take place, an inculturated expression of Christian hope is timely. If we can re-

image and re-imagine the theological shape of the kingdom, that can lead us in our worship to pray with a different knowing when we ask that God's kingdom would come here on earth.

There are many examples of 'unearthly' eschatologies that encourage us 'to live in orientation toward a many-mansioned heavenly home' (Keller 1997: 87). Gaining a sense of the *basileia tou Theou* located in the time and space we occupy is going to come from becoming more aware of what it is to be at home in our earthly context, than anticipating a heavenly dwelling place. Keller suggests that the reconstruction of relationship with the earth will 'mean nothing less than understanding the earth as our true home' (Keller 1997: 96).

The reasonable weakness of Keller's article is that she calls for an eco-eschatology that will radically reshape theology without constructing it (this is just an article after all). She does suggest four methods, two for the process of reconstruction and two for the philosophy of building. The reconstructive method must use, 'recycle' and 'compost' the former theologies of creation (Keller 1997: 92), and explore a new eco-eschatology in the light of a '*metanoia*' in the human relationship with the earth (Keller 1997: 96).

Two central philosophies that intertwine with each other are those of apocalypse and home. The language of green apocalypse (Keller 1997: 96) must not fall into the same trap of thinking about the 'end of the world' (Keller 1997: 96). What is needed is a better understanding not of the *end* of our earthly home, but of home (*'oikos'*), which will be shaped in an 'ecumenacy' that commits to a fuller meaning of the word '*oikonomos*': being 'house-stewards' (Keller 1997: 97). Keller believes this will enable

us to develop hope as a 'language of desire' (Keller 1997: 98). This directly relates to opportunities liturgical writing. It also serves as an interpretative tool for interpreting texts that speak in apocalyptic terms about the state of the Creation. In all probability such texts await a new home, rather than fostering a desire to become effective 'house-stewards' in the existing one.

When the theology expressed in a prayer lacks a sense of what it means that the kingdom has already been inaugurated, then a strong eschatological grip slips away from the life of faith leaving a lesser sense of direction. Such a loss is something Moltmann charts in his *Theology of Hope* (1999) as a significant and long-standing issue for Christian theology:

Christianity in its social form took over the heritage of the ancient state religion. It installed itself as the 'crown of society' and its 'saving centre', and lost the disquieting, critical power of its eschatological hope (Moltmann 1999: 27).

This accusation is not so generalized as to argue that the Church abandoned eschatological hope from the moment that it received the power of the state. Rather, the disquieting and critical edge was lost, which is part and parcel of that hope. This analysis comes both from Moltmann speaking from his own historical moment in Christian history and also into a moment of Christian history long in the past.

The context is one where the flaws of earthly empire are all too apparent, and which Moltmann regards as containing little hope. Moltmann's socio-political context, after all, is witness to conflicting utopianisms dominated by tensions between capitalism, socialism and communism. In such a post-war milieu it is unsurprising that Moltmann senses Christian ideology is more drowned out than it is shaping and fusing with the culture of the time. Perhaps this is where Moltmann's analysis is eas-

ily built upon, to anticipate that as Christianity loses its place at the centre of culture it can begin to refashion its image of the kingdom in a counter-cultural mode.

The Church's participation and integration within a society does not, automatically, disempower it. The Church may choose to conform itself to the interests of the state, and that is a choice it does make on occasion. It is also possible that the Church has been able to use the legacy of the era of Constantinian state-sponsored religion for good. For instance, such positioning can help in strengthening the Church's role in creating new utopian visions for the society it is serving. At times though the Church has used this position for ill, endorsing and enriching state injustice too.

The counter-intuitive and counter-cultural expression of faith can only come from confidently exploring the relationship between political heritage and the Christian faith. It has been this alternative positioning that has led to the noticing of connections, gaps, and points of tension in the dynamic between polis and faith. This new perspective has been central to the development of indigenized eschatological visions, as we can see in the development of liberation theologies from around the world.

The weakness of eschatological vision within academic and ecclesiastical theology, combined with the loss of a distinctive utopian voice within society, and plunging further and further into ecological crisis, makes it easier to understand why it is that when the Church comes together in prayer and worship that it finds it difficult to know how to pray with confidence as its Saviour has taught it for the kingdom to come. What will reawaken a hopeful vision in face of such calamity? Moltmann calls us back to the very foundation of hope, the notion of God's promises to humanity:

In order to attain to a real understanding of the eschatological message, it is accordingly necessary to acquire an openness and understanding vis-à-vis what 'promise' means in the Old and New Testaments, and how in the wider sense a form of speech and thought and hope that is determined by promise experiences God, truth, history and human nature (Moltmann 1999: 27).

This summary of how eschatology needs to work will be useful to us as we look at the theology of hope and the vision of the kingdom expressed in the liturgical work of the Church. We will discover where there is strength and weakness of eschatological insight.

Rather than start in a place of liturgical strength, we will begin by considering the common weaknesses that appear in eco-liturgical texts. The following prayer is a typical example of how it is possible to miss the eschatological imperative in the attempt to earth theology:

Father God,
just as children spoil their presents,
so we abuse your good gifts to us.

We dump rubbish in the rivers.
We leave litter on the streets.
Our beaches are contaminated with oil.
The air is filled with fumes and smells.
Noisy machines and radios destroy our peace.
And so many of these things we allow in the name of progress.

Give us a greater respect for the world you entrust to us,
so that by our greed and selfishness,
we do not destroy or spoil,
that which we could never have created for ourselves.
(William N Richards and James Richardson, Kenya, in SPCK 1999: 20)

There are numerous prayers, confessions and litanies that follow this similar pattern.

There is a clear environmental agenda here but without much sense of God's place in creation that is compounded by no clear vision of how things will become different.

Because God is addressed as 'Father', immediately the place of God in relation to the Creation is made explicit: a parent handing out the gift of creation to humanity. 'God you have given' is a refrain that occurs in many texts (see, for example, Low 2003: 90). What is concerning about this is the limited sense that is offered of what it might be for humanity to be given a planet, without a sense of the symbiotic relationship that is present, or the ongoing engagement of God with the creation. John Johanson-Berg's demonstrates the hazard:

Creator God,
 you gave us paradise,
 an earth producing fruit in abundance
 in fields and orchards, lakes and oceans.
 We have not been good stewards
 of such precious gifts.
 We have polluted the seas with impurities;
 we have desecrated the earth with poisons;
 we have ruined the air with radiation.
 Forgive us for our betrayal of mother earth;
 help us to take better care
 of the planet which is our inheritance
 (John Johanson-Berg in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 39-40).

Again the image given is of a beautiful 'paradise' handed over to human care that is now polluted, desecrated, ruined and betrayed. God is the parent who hands out the goodies, and then leaves the room, only for the children left with the presents to suddenly realize they have damaged their gifts.

This kind of summary of the relationship between humanity and creator looks backwards to the beginning of things to conjure up an idyllic, pastoral and Edenesque interpretation of the creation so as to capture a utopian vision. The real weakness in this backward looking approach is that the eschatological framework that is then established becomes an attempt to recapture and reclaim that golden age. The

reason for the loss of the better place is put down to the reckless and petulant behaviour of a childish humanity. Expressing remorse for humanity's misuse of the planet is an unsatisfactory but quick route to 'greening' up a confession. It may provide a convenient handle on which to hang the ecological crises we are currently experiencing but what it disallows is a clear picture of how confession and the accompanying repentance can make a difference the fallen human misuse of creation. If it is human fallenness that is destroying the planet then nothing will change that except for a recovery from that fallen state.

The evidence that the construction of an Eden-centred ideology inhibits the construction of a positive utopian vision arrives in the conclusions of both Johanson-Berg and Richard and Richardson's prayers:

Forgive us for our betrayal of mother earth;
 help us to take better care
 of the planet which is our inheritance.
 (John Johanson-Berg in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 39-40)

Give us a greater respect for the world you entrust to us,
 so that by our greed and selfishness,
 we do not destroy or spoil,
 that which we could never have created for ourselves.
 (William N Richards and James Richardson, Kenya cited in SPCK 1999: 20)

These are unsuccessful in their concluding, since they only offer a sin-reduction criteria rather than a way of building a new kingdom. Johanson-Berg suggests that humanity needs further assistance from God in caring about things, hardly a vision of a new heaven and a new earth. Richards and Richardson ask God to give humanity a 'greater respect' for the earth, in the hope that 'respect' will counter-balance human greed and selfishness. This model does not remove greed or selfishness but

cancel out the effects these sins have on the environment—a rather limited hope for change.

Neither prayer offers a sense of God's involvement with humanity and creation, or a realistic narrative of how humanity's relationship with the planet could change. The pattern of each prayer has a three-fold structure: first, God the Creator is benevolent to humanity; second, Humanity abuses the gifts it has received; finally, help is requested to behave differently.

Such prayers repeat a pattern of covenant relationship offered by God, and humanity's breaking of those promises. What is also required, to effectively complete the confessional process, is a renewal of covenant that has a new vision of what is possible. What we find here (and all too often in ecological texts) is requests for help. So the prayers are incomplete in the way they understand the nature of 'promise'. Moltmann's request is for a 'speech and thought and hope' (Moltmann 1999: 27) that understands 'promise' through the experience of four things 'God, truth, history and human nature' (Moltmann 1999: 27).

5. *Hope and Promise in Earthed Liturgical Texts*

We will now look at some further liturgical texts and prayers bearing in mind these fourfold concerns (Moltmann 1999: 27) and concentrating on hope. Prayers with an earthed eschatology will be those that, after identifying a broken covenant, will effectively express a 'hope' or 'promise' of reconciliation. Since many con-

fessional prayers, including some from *CW*, are very ready to identify the brokenness of the human nature as a primary reason for the destruction of the environment, it is important that we identify whether the promise of reparation takes a realistic view of what is possible within the constraints of human nature as understood within the text, otherwise the text lacks an internal integrity, and deconstructs itself. Here is a typical and telling example:

Forgiving Creator, awaken us to the roaring of creation, the cries
for ecojustice, that we may open our minds and hearts to respond.

(Diann Neu, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 84)

Here God's gift of creation is one given by its creator, whose nature it is to forgive. The request is an awakening to the cry of the earth so that humanity becomes open to the possibility of responding. The text certainly manages to deal with 'truth' and 'human nature' a little more effectively than the nature of 'God' and the context given by 'history'. The level of response offered is openness, nothing more than that, so the level of reparation for the size of the covenant broken is mismatched since an openness to 'respond' offers some hope but not very much and without specificity.

The confessional prayer by Marlene Phillips also begins with a litany that portrays an experience of a contaminated environment:

From the stench of organo-phosphates
on summer evenings
From pesticides on our food
O God deliver us.

God here delivers and forgives, and is asked that 'we may see in our time' without any clarification of what the human participation would be in such a hope. The prayer continues:

O God, forgive us.
 O God, may we see in our time pigs in coppiced woodlands,
 cows in wildflower meadows,
 curlews and skylarks in lowland pastures,
 hens in orchards
 and teeming fish in clean waters.
 May we leave for our children a safe, clean and free environment,
 a world where health and beauty count for more than financial gain
 Marlene Phillips, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 83-84).

The voice of the text is separate from those who are causing the damage, so it is not clear who is responsible for the broken covenant. It is apparent though that the speaker only suggests that those confessing only have to tolerate the smell of organophosphates rather than being involved in the use of the fertilizers.

The text does succeed in identifying what reparation might need to be made, what positive animal welfare may consist of and what sort of biodiversity will be present in grazed meadows. How that will be achieved and what allowance will be made for human nature is not addressed. Hence the dream (or hope) by those praying for what they 'may see in our time' is lacking any eco-eschatological significance.

Another example of a very weak view of what needs to happen in the face of environmental calamity comes from Heather Pencavel, who having identified the world's ecological woes requests that God would,

Teach us to build a community and world
 where everyone is valued justly
 and loved freely ...
 (Heather Pencavel, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 80).

Perhaps if the request was to be 'taught again', then she would have recognized the place in the covenant relationship that had been reached. Even with that insertion though, the aspiration to 'just valuing' and 'free loving' lacks the same specificity with which she had itemized the eco-calamities such as 'people driven off their land'

and 'woman abused and exploited' earlier in the prayer (Heather Pencavel, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 79).

The Uniting Church of Australia manages to get a little further, by beginning to count the penitential price of environmental destruction:

Help us to do what we know we must
even at the cost of reducing our lifestyle
so that others may live.

Please help us, O God.

(The Uniting Church in Australia, in Geoffrey Duncan 2002: 77)

Even so, the cost is loosely measured as somewhere between optionality and necessity: 'even at the cost' (line 2) is not an exacting demand on the penitent.

Non-penitential confession fails to satisfy the Church or those listening to the talk of the Church. It could rather be argued that it will leave those bearing witness, and the witnesses more horrified by the passive hand wringing in the face of impending disaster.

God of creation, forgive us.
May we no longer abuse your trust,
but care gently and with justice for your earth.
(Jan Berry, in Janet Morley 1992: 174)

Here there is balance between the request for pardon and commitment to action, although Jan Berry's use of the phrase 'may we' is a far softer option for those praying than declaring a commitment to a new way of being.

The acknowledgement of the need for, and the power of eschatology is much harder to find. Here is one brief example.

In all of us is a longing
for a life that has not yet come,
for a world that is free and just,
a dream of hope for all people.
(Dorothy McMahon, in Janet Morley 1992: 175)

At least this desire is mentioned, what is discussed though is what shape that longing will take. This acknowledgement, of the need to dream, coupled with the admission of the cost of penitence shown in the previous prayer, does lead—when provided in combination—towards a textual coherence, which can be used as testimony to a Church committed to costly eschatology.

This next prayer provides us with some further signs of what the costliness is of praying the kingdom in:

Sustainer and Lord of all creatures,
 Make us faithful members of the company of your creation.
 Liberate us from our sins against our neighbours, the plants, the animals, the air, the rivers and the watery deeps of this earth.
 Liberate us from our sins against the future.
 Forgive our chronological snobbery whereby we forget our human neighbours whom we shall never see.
 Lead our minds to the discovery of a larger science that will correct our misuses of science.
 Set our hands to the making of a new technology that will fulfil the promise and undo the damage of the old.
 Stir our imaginations to the vision of a new society, wherein we shall learn to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with you (Carothers 2010).

The acceptance that doing justice is a 'learning' process is a sign of hope. As is the talk of imagination and the recognition that there needs to be changes to the way we explore science and use technology. Even so there is still a call upon God to commit God's self to transform us, no call on the people praying to effect any change themselves.

It is only when confession ends with a definite promissory note that there is some completion of the circle of confession, penitence and absolution.

Bless us now, O Lord, and make us a blessing to those around you. May our stated commitment to you be expressed through our faithful stewardship of the earth. We would make a covenant with you [...] to so act that the whole

human family might yet learn to live in harmony with your creation (Carothers 2010).

Perhaps there are too few signs in any of these prayers to inspire hope that the Church is expressing an eschatology that is earthed. To 'earth' eschatology would be to understand the mandatory call upon the community of faith to use the power of dreaming and longing in the context of God's creation. A consciousness of the relationship humanity has with the Creation can only be grown as the Church demonstrates its understanding of God, promise, history and human nature in relation to the Creation too.

6. *Conclusion*

In drawing on examples from texts outside of the *CW* corpus, it has been possible in the latter sections of this chapter to identify strengths and weaknesses associated with exploring ecotheological themes within the liturgy. This combined with an assessment of key components of an earthed liturgical theology and, from earlier in the chapter, the reasons that liturgical reform has arrived where it has for the C of E, now gives a clear basis upon which to begin to explore some of the material in *CW* in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMMON WORSHIP RESOURCES

This chapter provides a commentary on the research analysis of *CW* that has been undertaken for this study. The research begins with the development of twelve ecotheological criteria for examining *CW* texts (Section 1). In the light of the principles established, a search was made of nearly all the *CW* resources, to find texts that scored against two or more criteria. 316 texts were selected for closer study, and the results analyzed for high, low and average scores (Section 2).

In the second half of this chapter an in depth analysis of some of the 316 texts is made, first by looking at exceptional texts (Section 3). Sections 4–9 discuss texts that relate substantially to the following themes: the work of the persons of the Trinity in the Creation; God's love for and redemption of the Creation; the nature and suffering of the Creation; concepts of stewardship and dominion; the representation of animals; and finally, eschatology and hope.

1. *An Analysis of Ecotheological Themes in Common Worship Texts*

a. *Purpose of analysis*

As a central part of the research activity as many of the texts as possible were analysed to discover ecotheological themes. A complete reading was undertaken of *CWME* (2000a), *Pastoral Services* (2000c), *NPW* (2002), *CWAC* (2004), and *Christian Initiation* (2006c). In the instance of *Times and Seasons* (2006c) all sections were read, but only texts from 'Times and Seasons of the Agricultural Year' (*TSAY*) have been included because of the quantity and quality of the creation themed materials in this section compared with the lack of reference to creation elsewhere in the volume. Texts that were not considered were *Daily Prayer* (2005) because it is not intended for principle acts of worship and the *Ordination Services* (2006b) for the same reason. *Festivals* (2008) is omitted because the analysis had been completed by then.

Such a detailed analysis was undertaken because it was essential to discover what the corpus contained in regard to ecotheological concerns, which approach it adopted and how effective it was. In terms of the distribution of creation themed materials in different parts of the *CW* volumes, this is discussed later, in Chapter 7 *after* the results of the survey of the use by clergy of creation themed resources from different *CW* locations is presented in Chapter 5.

b. *Process of analysis*

The process of the analysis had three main tasks:

- to identify the texts that contained ecotheological themes;

- to consider the quality of the texts;
- to discover common themes, concerns and theologies in the texts.

The process by which these steps were taken is now explained.

c. Identifying and including relevant texts

A short-list of those texts with ecotheological themes was established. This was done by, first, undertaking a close reading of every text from the whole corpus of *CW* (bar the exceptions mentioned above). Those texts that did contain anything of relevance to ecotheology were re-read and considered for inclusion in a list of *CW* texts with content that related directly to ecotheological themes. To assist in judging whether a text had enough merit to be included and to assess its quality, 12 main indicators were established.

Six of the indicators form three contrary pairs, designed to make a distinction between direct and indirect references to ecotheological concerns. The maximum score for each text against the 12 criteria is, therefore, 9 rather than 12. Each criterion requires a simple 'yes' or 'no' judgement as to whether a text contained a particular ecotheological theme. For a text to be included it must usually have scored 'yes' on more than two of the criteria related to creation (rather than humanity).

The 12 main criteria were used to make a quantitative analysis of the material and also assist in making a qualitative assessment of each text too. The criteria were set as those tests that could accurately assess whether a text was: referring to the Creation; exploring aspects of the relationship between God, humanity and the Creation;

giving voice to the physicality of the created order; and expressing an understanding of both realized and unrealized eschatology.

The twelve criteria are now discussed (i–xii).

i. *A direct reference to the Creation.* ‘Direct’ means that there is specific mention of any of the following: earth, land, world, cosmos, universe or an aspect of one of these. For example,

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation,
 you bring forth bread from the earth.
 Blessed be God for ever.
 (Preparation of the Table: Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 630)

This makes two direct references to the creation, ‘creation’ and ‘earth’. ‘Bread’, in this instance, serves only as an allusion to the creation, but in itself is not a specific mention of the creation.

ii. *An indirect reference to the Creation.* ‘Indirect’ means an allusion to earth, land, world, cosmos, universe or an aspect of one of these, without a direct naming of the creation. For example:

God of compassion,
 whose Son Jesus Christ, the child of Mary,
 shared the life of a home in Nazareth [...]
 (Collect for Mothering Sunday *CWME*: 395)

By mentioning a specific locality on earth, this prayer alludes to the physicality of home-life, but does not name the land, earth, world, cosmos or universe in which Jesus the Christ lived.

iii. *Realized eschatology for the Creation.* A theme that is eschatologically realized is one that indicates that an aspect of the kingdom of God has already come, has been partially fulfilled (or inaugurated), or in some way has been confirmed at some time already past or in the present moment. A realized eschatological theme for creation is one where the eschatological fulfilment refers directly to all or some of the earth, land, world, cosmos or universe. For example:

The earth has yielded its harvest;
God, our God, has blessed us.

You visit the earth and water it;
you make it very plenteous.
You soften the ground with showers;
and bless the increase of it.
You crown the year with your goodness;
and your paths overflow with plenty.
The meadows are clothed with sheep;
the valleys stand so thick with corn,
they shout for joy and sing.

The earth has yielded its harvest.
God, our God, has blessed us.
cf Psalm 65.8, 10, 11, 13; Psalm 67.7
(Acclamation: Harvest Thanksgiving TSAY: 632)

What is celebrated here, spelled out in explicit detail, is the fulfilment of the land. This fulfilment is parenthesized by the celebration of the harvest as a blessing of humanity by God. God's blessing of humanity, however, is something that comes about as a result of the realization of eschatology in creation, which then provides an eschatological benefit for humanity.

iv. *Realized eschatology for humanity.* Here the aspect of the kingdom of God that is declared as having already come relates to humanity (or a sub-section of humanity such as the Church in the world, or those praying the prayer). For example:

May God who loved the world so much
 that he sent his Son to be our Saviour
 forgive us our sins
 and make us holy to serve him in the world,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 Amen.
 (Absolution, B81 *Living in the World NPW*: 97)

The text is clear (using John 3.16) that God's love is for the whole world, but what this text names as realized by God, in eschatological terms—by the sending of his son—is the salvation of humanity not the salvation of the world.

If a text identifies a realized eschatology for both humanity and the Creation, then it is marked as referring to criterion 3 and 4. For example:

Yours, Lord, is the greatness, the power;
 the glory, the splendour, and the majesty;
 for everything in heaven and on earth is yours.
 All things come from you,
 and of your own do we give you.
 (Prayers at the Preparation of the Table, *CWME*: 291)

God is described as being present and having ownership of all things (realized eschatology for creation). Also, humanity is described as belonging to God (realized eschatology for humanity). Those praying are, by giving God's 'own' back to God, bringing about an eschatological fulfilment by completing the circle that contains both the givenness of all that is made and the human ability to gift what is given to its original source.

v. *Unrealized eschatology for the Creation*. The mention of unfulfilled eschatological hope for the Creation is apparent where a mention is made of the Creation, and also a hope, prayer, desire or confidence is expressed that some difference, transforma-

tion, rescue, redemption or replacement of the Creation will occur at some point in the future or at the end of time. For example,

Lord of all life,
 help us to work together for that day
 when your kingdom comes
 and justice and mercy will be seen in all the earth.
 (Eucharistic Prayer E, *CWME*: 197)

This text suggests that 'justice and mercy' are what *will* 'be seen' when God's 'kingdom comes' 'in all the earth'. Thus, an unfulfilled eschatological hope for the Creation is named. The text gives an indication of how the coming of the kingdom occurs: it is based on God helping 'us to work together for that day when you kingdom comes'. The 'us' could be understood as those who are praying, although the 'us' could include God too, since God is being addressed.

vi. *Unrealized eschatology for humanity*. Similarly to the criterion immediately above, this refers to any text that identifies an unfulfilled eschatological hope for humanity (or a sub-section of humanity such as the Church in the world, or those praying the prayer). This is apparent where a hope, prayer, desire or confidence is expressed that some difference, transformation, rescue, redemption or restoration of humanity (or a sub-section of humanity) will occur at some point in the future or at the end of time. For example,

Heavenly Father,
 whose blessed Son shared at Nazareth the life of an earthly home:
 help your Church to live as one family,
 united in love and obedience,
 and bring us all at last to our home in heaven;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Post Communion: The First Sunday of Christmas, *CWME*: 382)

Here there is a hope for all to be brought 'at last to our home in heaven'. The 'all' could be understood as referring to any or all of the following: a) those praying the prayer, b) the 'Church' that has previously been mentioned in line 3, or c) any who have, like Christ, 'shared [...] the life of an earthly home' and who, like Christ could also arrive 'at last to [their] home in heaven' (line 5).

vii. *Physicality: either personal or natural.* An example of a text that mentions personal physicality is the Collect for the Fifth Sunday before Lent:

God of truth,
we have seen with our eyes
and touched with our hands the bread of life:
strengthen our faith
that we may grow in love for you and for each other;
through Jesus Christ our Lord (CWME: 387).

A second example has three strong physical elements to it, human form, the womb and death:

And now we give you thanks
because he shared our life in human form
from the warmth of Mary's womb
to the stillness of the grave (Short Prefaces: G99 Incarnation, NPW: 259).

Natural physicality may include references to the land as well:

A sower went forth to sow, and some seed fell into good soil.
cf Mark 4.3,8
(Short Passage of Scripture, S3 Plough Sunday, TSAY: 608)

viii. *Relationship between humanity and the Creation.* This criterion seeks to judge whether a text refers to the interaction between humanity and the Creation. Two examples will serve as explanation:

Creator God,
 you made us all in your image:
 may we discern you in all that we see,
 and serve you in all that we do;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Collect, The Sixth Sunday after Trinity, *CWAC*: 20)

By asking that we will 'discern' God in the world around, means part of the prayer is specifically about the relationship between 'us' and the Creation. The second text speaks of the relationship again, but in this case refers to the strength of the connection between humanity and the Creation:

And now we give you thanks
 because all things are of your making,
 all times and seasons obey your laws,
 but you have chosen to create us in your own image,
 setting us over the whole world in all its wonder.
 You have made us stewards of your creation,
 to praise you day by day
 for the marvels of your wisdom and power:
 so earth unites with heaven
 to sing the new song of creation:
 (Short Prefaces, G89 God in Creation, *NPW*: 286)

First, the text discusses God's relationship with the Creation, then humanity's place within the Creation ('setting us over the whole world'). Second, it clarifies what the relationship is for humanity as 'stewards of [God's] creation'. Some of the action of such stewardship is mentioned, i.e. praising 'day by day for the marvels of your wisdom and power'. There is an inferred consequence of the relationship, which is then named, 'so earth unites with heaven to sing the new song of creation'.

A clever and confusing twist occurs here, which is that the reader may conclude that the praise offered by humanity to God for the Creation is what leads to earth uniting with heaven in praise. This, in effect, suggests the Creation has no purpose or function to praise, but exists as 'marvels of God's wisdom and power'. Humanity

then transforms it from marvel, in to a praising entity. Many texts do identify the Creation as offering praise though and four more sub-categories were included in the analysis in addition to the main twelve and are discussed below.

ix. *Direct reference to the Creation's salvation.* There are two primary avenues where the salvation of the Creation is explored in the texts. There are those prayers that draw on the concept of the salvation of the whole world, typically using John 3.16. A second avenue is to explore the restoration or fulfilment of the Creation through it being made new, typically borrowing from Romans 8.19-23:

Father in heaven,
 who sent your Son to redeem the world
 and will send him again to be our judge:
 give us grace so to imitate him in the humility and purity of his first coming
 that, when he comes again,
 we may be ready to greet him
 with joyful love and firm faith;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Post Communion, The Second Sunday of Advent, *CWME*: 377)

Almighty God,
 you have broken the tyranny of sin
 and have sent the Spirit of your Son into our hearts
 whereby we call you Father:
 give us grace to dedicate our freedom to your service,
 that all creation and we may be brought
 to the glorious liberty of the children of God;
 through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you,
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and forever.
 (Collect, The Third Sunday after Trinity, *CWME*: 409)

The first of these two texts uses John 3.16 and in common with similar prayers tends to leave more ambiguity than the second text, which draws on Romans 8.19-23.

This is partly because the use of 'world' (rather than earth, land or the Creation)

leads to a vagueness in definition and overlaps with negative uses of 'world' found in some texts (see Section 6, below, and also discussion of Collects using 'world' in Chapter 6: Sections 3a; 3d; 5f; 5i; and 6).

There are routes off these main avenues of salvation (or rescue) and liberation (from the bondage to decay). One example is asking for God's mercy or compassion:

Let us ask God to have mercy on our tired land,
and to prosper the work of our soiled hands.
Let us ask God to forgive our delusion of self-sufficiency
so that we may praise him for his provision and goodness.
(Invitation to Confession, A1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 609)

Other texts speak of the new Creation fulfilling God's purposes for the cosmos both in the here and now and beyond the end of time. For example:

It is indeed right and good
to give you thanks and praise,
almighty God and Father,
through Jesus Christ your Son.
Through him you have created us in your own image,
and made us stewards of your good creation.
Through him you teach us to exult in the birds of the air,
the lilies of the field, the precious and life-giving crops of the earth.
Through him you free us from the slavery of sin,
giving him to die upon the cross,
and to rise again for our salvation.
Through him, you begin your work of new creation,
as we look for a new heaven and a new earth
in which your righteousness dwells.
Therefore, we join with angels and archangels,
and give voice to every creature under heaven,
for ever praising you and saying.
(Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 612)

x. *Indirect reference to the Creation's salvation.* When there is a hope expressed for the Creation's salvation without it being directly spelled out as such then it has been scored as providing an indirect reference to the Creation's salvation. For example:

Almighty God, good Father to us all,
your face is turned towards your world.
In love you gave us Jesus your Son
to rescue us from sin and death.
Your Word goes out to call us home
to the city where angels sing your praise.
We join with them in heaven's song:
(Preface, Eucharist Prayer D, CWME: 194)

This text does include a compassionate viewing of the 'world' by God, one aspect of redemption, but the 'call[ing] home' only appears to relate to 'us' not the 'world', hence the judgement here that this as an indirect reference to the Creation's full redemption.

xi. *Direct reference to God as Creator.* Where God is named as creator, this is marked as a direct reference. For instance:

It is right to praise you, Father, Lord of all creation;
in your love you made us for yourself.
(Preface, Eucharistic Prayer H, CWME: 204)

Additionally where the Creation is referred to as being God's then this also is graded as a direct reference:

Pour out your Holy Spirit as we bring before you
these gifts of your creation;
may they be for us the body and blood of your dear Son.
(Epicicles, Eucharistic Prayer G, CWME: 203)

Where God is referred to as Lord of the Creation, although this does not specifically identify God as the maker, this is still counted as a direct reference to God as creator. This is because it would be more complex to argue that God was Lord of the creation without being its creator, than it would be to argue that the two things could be

viewed separately. So for example the Prayer at the Preparation of the Table for Harvest Thanksgiving (TSAY: 630), is included as identifying God as Creator:

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation,
you bring forth bread from the earth.
Blessed be God for ever.

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation,
you create the fruit of the vine.
Blessed be God for ever (TSAY: 630).

xii. *Indirect reference to God as Creator.* Differently from the previous quotation, where God is referred to as Lord of all creation, which is on the border-line between being a direct or indirect quote, the following text provides an indirect reference to God as Creator, since it does refer to God as being the creator of humanity but not, directly, of the whole creation.

This provision is not used on weekdays after 5 January.
Almighty God,
who wonderfully created us in your own image
and yet more wonderfully restored us
through your Son Jesus Christ:
grant that, as he came to share in our humanity,
so we may share the life of his divinity;
who is alive and reigns with you,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and forever.
(Collect, The First Sunday of Christmas, CWME: 381)

d. *Supplementary criteria for the gradation of relevant texts*

Once texts were selected according to the twelve main criteria, four further criteria were applied to each text. The four criteria are as follows:

- creation gives praise to God;
- creation and humanity praise to God;

- creation makes intercession to God;
- creation and humanity make intercession to God.

That a text either recognizes creation's praise or intercession is valuable in itself. It is also significant when a text recognises the mutuality of prayer or praise by both creation and humanity.

These questions are important principles since: a) humanity's praise to God is an exercise of human freewill to join in with creation's natural praise; and b) that creation joins with humanity in groaning or making intercession to God for liberation since the Creation and humanity are equally subject to futility and are in mutual need of release. Therefore, these four questions seek references to the praise offered to God by the Creation and the intercession offered by humanity that creation joins in with by way of 'groaning'.

It is not so much that the four additional questions are less important than the twelve main ones rather, they allow a distinction between significant and exceptional texts. Also they occur less frequently than the 12 main criteria and demonstrate a gap in the current liturgical material. These extra questions help set up a theological framework for the prayer and praise of the Church to be more directly related to the praise, longing and groaning of the Creation.

2. The Quantity of Texts with a Creation Theme in Common Worship

In total 316 texts were found that scored on at least two of the twelve criteria as listed above. The total any text could score is 13 (9 out of 12 main criteria, plus the 4 additional criteria). Of the 316 texts, here are the spread of scores.

Table 4.1

Score total	No. of texts with this score	% of texts with this score
2	58	18%
3	48	15%
4	46	15%
5	46	15%
6	34	11%
7	29	9%
8	31	10%
9	19	6%
10	5	2%
11	3	1%
<i>totals</i>	<i>316</i>	<i>100%</i>

Just less than half the texts picked up a score of four or less (48%). The small majority scored five or more (52%). The mean and the median average were both five points. Texts in the 25th percentile all scored seven or more. Of the creation themed texts identified by the research, the evidence is that half of the texts are *moderately* apt in content and that half are *significantly* apt in terms of depth and breadth of ecotheological material.

As the table below outlines (4.2) an affirmative answer against each of the criteria was scored on between 5 and 250 occasions.

Table 4.2

Qu. No.	Criteria	No. of texts with this score	% of texts with this score
4	Realized eschatology for humanity	250	79%
1	Direct reference to the Creation	229	72%
6	Unrealized eschatology for humanity	211	67%
3	Realized eschatology for the Creation	159	50%
7	Physicality: either personal or natural	146	46%
11	Direct reference to God as Creator	125	39%
5	Unrealized eschatology for the Creation	118	37%
8	Relationship between humanity and the Creation	116	37%
9	Direct reference to the Creation's salvation	76	24%
12	Indirect reference to God as Creator	62	20%
2	Indirect reference to the Creation	40	13%
10	Indirect reference to the Creation's salvation	32	10%
13(+4)	creation gives praise to God	28	9%
14(+4)	creation and humanity give praise to God	28	9%
15(+4)	creation makes intercession to God	6	2%
16(+4)	creation and humanity make intercession to God	5	2%

Of the 12 main categories, 8 appear in at least 37% of the texts. Or to put it another way—ignoring the additional (+4) questions—two-thirds of the criteria have an occurrence rate greater than 37%, with the average frequency of occurrence among the top eight criteria being 56% compared to an overall frequency of occurrence for all 12 main criteria being 41%.

Among all the texts the highest scoring category is 'realized eschatology for humanity'. When viewed with the next highest scoring category 'direct reference to the Creation' the most common trend becomes apparent: that, typically, when CW texts make reference to the Creation they will also make reference to a realized

eschatology for humanity. The overlap where texts include these two categories is 178 texts (56%). The next most common occurrence is texts that not only make a direct reference to the Creation and a realized eschatology for humanity, but unrealized eschatology too. 130 texts include all three categories (41%).

Because most texts do address more than four of the criteria it is important to look at the trends and repeated themes across the material. This will be done best, not by revisiting each of the twelve main criteria one at a time (especially considering the large number of texts all matching the same criterion), but by considering the strong theological themes that run across the 316 texts. This is done in Sections 4 to 9. In this examination of the material, by theme rather than by score, the relative strengths and merits of each text will be borne in mind, in part, through reference back to the quality of the work according to the criteria explored above. Outstanding texts are discussed in Section 3.

3. Remarkable Texts

18 remarkable texts are considered in this section. First, we will look at the results for texts that scored against the four supplementary criteria for the reasons outlined below. Second, we will consider some of the highest scoring prayers that have exceptional features.

a. *Intercession and praise*

The four additional questions have relevance to the theological underpinning of this thesis, but references to them are fewest in number. Of the six texts that do refer to the Creation's intercession only one, the extended preface for days between Ascension and Pentecost (*CWME*: 321), mentions humanity and the Creation in relation to prayer at the same time. This exceptional text and its use of Romans 8.19-23 is given further attention in the following sub-section. It is worth noting at this point, though, that even though the theme in the second half of this text is Christ's call to unity in prayer among the disciples and the longing of creation is coupled to it, there remains a distinct disconnection between the two.

Of the remaining five texts, the first four of them also make direct use of Romans 8.19-23:

God's whole creation groans.
 The land produces thorns and thistles and longs to be set free.
 Our sin affects all around us.
 We confess our sins in penitence and faith.
 (Invitation to Confession, A1 Creation, *TSAY*: 599)

A Song of God's Children
 [...]

5 These sufferings that we now endure*
 are not worth comparing to the glory that shall be revealed.
 6 For the creation waits with eager longing*
 for the revealing of the children of God.
Romans 8.2, 14, 15b-19
 (Extract, Cantic, A Song of God's Children, Pentecost, *CWME*: 796)

Father, while all your creation groans with pain
 like the pain of childbirth,
 and longs to share the freedom of the children of God,
 your Spirit pleads for us
 in groans words cannot express.
 (Extract, Thanksgiving, G80 Holy Spirit, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 252)

Human sin disfigures the whole creation,
 which groans with eager longing for God's redemption.
 We confess our sin in penitence and faith.

cf Romans 8.22,23

(Invitation to Confession, B6 God in creation, Lament, Penitence, *NPW*: 77)

To be said facing the open doors

To a troubled world
 peace from Christ.

To a searching world
 love from Christ.

To a waiting world
 hope from Christ.

(Closing Prayers, J33 Living in the world / Conclusion, *NPW*: 296)

This final text does allude to images from Romans 8.19-23 too, though it does not make the intercession of the Creation explicit, so its inclusion is more tenuous than the previous four. It is significant that so little space within *CW* has been devoted to this all-encompassing notion of intercession stretching beyond the communion of saints, since the liturgy is by its very nature an intercessory act. Even within the smaller corpus that this research has analysed, six texts constitute only 2% of the material.

The Creation's praise is a much more common theme. It occurs in 9% (28) of the texts. In each of these cases, the Creation's praise is mentioned alongside humanity's praise; creation is never left to offer praise by itself. Once more the exceptional example of this is in the Extended Preface from the day after Ascension Day until the Day of Pentecost (*CWME*: 321), cited above (and discussed more fully in the next sub-section). The prayer creates a different nuance to the Romans 8 text. It begins with thanks being offered by humanity: 'It is indeed right, our duty and our joy, always and everywhere to give you thanks' (*CWME*: 321). The Preface concludes

'[t]herefore all creation yearns with eager longing as angels and archangels sing the endless hymn of praise' (CWME: 321). In the context of this prayer of thanksgiving an interpretation of the Romans 8.19-23 is given that the Creation's eager longing is one that resonates both with human thanks being offered to God (for Christ's resurrection, ascension, presence in heaven and call for unity in prayer) and with the angels and archangels with whom Christ is present.

As with this first example, among the 27 other references to the Creation sometimes the praise of humanity and the Creation are addressed as separate actions. At other times the praise of humanity and the Creation are seen either as one and the same action, or they occur simultaneously, as these two examples demonstrate:

And so, in the joy of this Passover,
 earth and heaven resound with gladness,
 while angels and archangels and the powers of all creation
 sing forever the hymn of your glory:
 (Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From Easter Day until the
 Eve of the Ascension, CWME: 316)

Therefore the universe resounds with Easter joy
 and with choirs of angels we sing forever to your praise:
 (Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, Ascension Day, CWME: 319)

Sometimes the suggestion is that all will praise and creation and humanity are referred to, explicitly at the same time, such as in the following conclusion to an intercessory prayer:

God of grace,
 as you are ever at work in your creation,
 so fulfil your wise and loving purpose in us
 and in all for whom we pray,
 that with them and in all that you have made,
 your glory may be revealed
 and the whole earth give praise to you,

through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

(Extract, Intercession: H2 Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 628)

A more unusual and perhaps ambiguous reference to united praise comes in the Extended Preface at the end of Lent:

For as the time of his passion and resurrection draws near
the whole world is called to acknowledge his hidden majesty.

The power of the life-giving cross
reveals the judgement that has come upon the world
and the triumph of Christ crucified.

(Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions: From the Fifth Sunday of
Lent until the Wednesday of Holy Week, *CWME*: 313)

The acknowledgement of Christ's majesty here includes praise but is not exclusively about praise. This text also makes reference to the anticipated time when Christ's rule and judgement over all things will be universally acknowledged (Philippians 2.10-11) and all things will be put in subjection under his feet (Ephesians 1.22). The development of a theology of the kenotic secret (or 'hidden majesty') comes, in part from 1 Corinthians 2.7 ('hidden wisdom'), but is developed, first of all in an early use of the phrase in Cyprian of Carthage's sixth treatise (Cyprian 1868: 447). This same phrase is echoed by many Christian thinkers included Calvin in his commentary on Hebrews (Calvin 1853: 35, Hebrews 1.3) and Karl Barth in his *Church Dogmatics: IV* (1954: 180).

Probably the most intriguing of all these texts speaks of a 'silent music':

Blessed are you, Lord God,
our light and our salvation;

to you be glory and praise forever.

From the beginning you have created all things
and all your works echo the silent music of your praise.

In the fullness of time you made us in your image,
the crown of all creation.

You give us breath and speech, that with angels and archangels

and all the powers of heaven
 we may find a voice to sing your praise:
 (Preface, Eucharistic Prayer G, Order One, CWME: 201)

There is an obvious source for this prayer: Psalm 19, where the 'day to day and night to night' worship of God by both heavens and firmament is speechless, wordless and unheard:

The heavens are telling the glory of God; and the firmament proclaims his handiwork. Day to day pours forth speech, and night to night declares knowledge. There is no speech, nor are there words; their voice is not heard; yet their voice goes out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. (Psalm 19:1-4, NRSV).

The Preface to Prayer G makes a clear distinction between the certainty that the universe will worship God and that humanity may use its capacity to do the same (line 10). In this prayer the separate placing of humanity not only serves to contextualize *homo sapiens* within God's work of creation as its 'crown' but also to show that the process of praise is something that must be 'found' rather than assumed.

b. *Exceptional texts*

In this section we will consider six exceptional texts, three Extended Prefaces, two forms of intercession, and a canticle. The first text has already been mentioned, twice in the preceding subsection. Here, it is quoted in full:

*Extended Preface for use with Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E
 on days between Ascension Day and Pentecost*
 It is indeed right, our duty and our joy,
 always and everywhere to give you thanks,
 holy Father, almighty and eternal God,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 For he is our great high priest
 who has entered once for all

into the heavenly sanctuary,
 evermore to pour upon your Church
 the grace and comfort of your Holy Spirit.
 He is the one who has gone before us,
 who calls us to be united in prayer
 as were his disciples in the upper room
 while they awaited his promised gift,
 the life-giving Spirit of Pentecost.
 Therefore all creation yearns with eager longing
 as angels and archangels sing the endless hymn of praise:
 (Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From the day after Ascension Day
 until the Day of Pentecost, *CWME*: 321)

This Extended Preface succeeds in scoring on 7 main criteria and all 4 of the supplementary criteria. It does this, not by addressing all the criteria at length, but rather through a deftness of touch in expanding the context of human worship by placing it within the context of the prayer and praise of both the Creation and the heavenly host.

The text provides a fuller dimensionality by speaking of both realized and unrealized eschatology as one and the same thing, especially through speaking of the Spirit's 'grace and comfort' being continually poured upon the Church and through the 'eager longing' of creation being swept up seamlessly into the never-ending angelic hymn. This is achieved by the mirroring of the eternal love bestowed upon the Church with the eternal cry of heaven and creation to God. It is that humanity's journey is embraced by the wonders of the universe as well as by the wonder of God's love.

More than any other single word, the 'therefore' is the one upon which so much of the success of this prayer depends, because it ties the essence of these themes together. It does not simply move the prayer forward into the Sanctus, but in this

instance completes a sense of connectivity between the work of Christ for the Church and all that lies within and beyond the universe.

Two further Extended Prefaces score nearly as highly and operate in a similar vein.

Extended Preface

[...]

Through him you have created us in your own image,
and made us stewards of your good creation.

Through him you teach us to exult in the birds of the air,
the lilies of the field, the precious and life-giving crops of the earth.

Through him you free us from the slavery of sin,
giving him to die upon the cross,
and to rise again for our salvation.

Through him, you begin your work of new creation,
as we look for a new heaven and a new earth
in which your righteousness dwells.

Therefore, we join with angels and archangels,
and give voice to every creature under heaven,
for ever praising you and saying.

(Extract, Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 612)

This prayer is effusive in its celebration of the Creation. However, the Creation is rendered passive within it, since the celebration is an activity of humanity and the 'new creation' is a work of God. This passivity is emphasized at the conclusion of the Preface as it identifies who joins in with the Sanctus. Again it is the human voice that 'give[s] voice to every creature under heaven'.

This is by way of contrast with the Extended Preface for The Annunciation of Our Lord.

Extended Preface for use with Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E

[...]

We give you thanks and praise
that the Virgin Mary heard with faith the message of the angel,
and by the power of your Holy Spirit
conceived and bore the Word made flesh.

From the warmth of her womb
 to the stillness of the grave
 he shared our life in human form.
 In him new light has dawned upon the world
 and you have become one with us
 that we might become one with you
 in your glorious kingdom.
 Therefore earth unites with heaven
 to sing a new song of praise;
 we too join with angels and archangels
 as they proclaim your glory without end:
 (Extract, Extended Preface, The Annunciation of Our Lord, *CWME*: 311)

Here the whole world is clearly joining in the song of praise. If there was any doubt in what is included within that definition, the linking phrase 'therefore earth unites with heaven' confirms that it is the Creation. So although this prayer is less focussed on the Creation than the preface for Rogationtide (above), it offers a fuller coherence between humanity and the Creation and indicates the hope of salvation (through the verb 'dawned') as something both realized and yet to be. (It also shares the same physical language of the Short Preface, i.e.: 'womb'; 'stillness of the grave'; and 'human form', G99 Incarnation, *NPW*: 259, discussed in Section 1 vii.)

It is not just these three Extended Prefaces that are noteworthy, one form of intercession and one canticle also achieve similarly earthed results. In the intercession for Harvest Thanksgiving (*TSAY*: 628), seven of the nine sections of the prayer refer to the Creation directly and helpfully. Although the context is Harvest, on each occasion that the Creation is mentioned the prayer goes beyond the confines of celebrating the gathering in of produce, to make a deeper ecotheological point. Due to its length it is considered here a few sections at a time:

Let us offer our prayers to God for the life of the world
 and for all God's people in their daily life and work.

[stanza 1]

God, the beginning and end of all things,
in your providence and care
you watch unceasingly over all creation;
we offer our prayers
that in us and in all your people your will may be done,
according to your wise and loving purpose in Christ our Lord.
Lord of all life:
hear our prayer.

The opening offers thanks for 'the life of the world' and 'for God's people'. This introduces the prayer as being as much about the world as it is about the labours or 'work' of human hands. The first stanza clarifies the active and continuous love of God towards all that is created. Although the focus of the second stanza is human relationships, God's ordering of them is explicitly placed within a wider context by the closing of the following section with 'Lord of all creation, hear our prayer'.

[stanza 2]

We pray for all through whom we receive sustenance and life;
for farmers and agricultural workers,
for packers, distributors and company boards;
as you have so ordered our life that we depend upon each other,
enable us by your grace to seek the well-being of others before our own.
Lord of all creation:
hear our prayer.

[stanza 3]

We pray for all engaged in research to safeguard crops against disease,
and to produce abundant life among those who hunger
and whose lives are at risk.
Prosper the work of their hands
and the searching of their minds,
that their labour may be for the welfare of all.
Lord of all wisdom:
hear our prayer.

[stanza 4]

We pray for governments and aid agencies,
and those areas of the world where there is disaster, drought and starvation.
By the grace of your Spirit,
touch our hearts

and the hearts of all who live in comfortable plenty,
and make us wise stewards of your gifts.
Lord of all justice:
hear our prayer.

In the praying for those who research into the ‘safeguarding of crops’—in the third stanza—we see a level of detail about the science of responsibility humanity has in caring for creation, as well as the more usual attention to the effort involved in the labour with the harvest. This stanza also addresses contemporary concerns about crop research and technological development, relating the theme of ‘wisdom’ to this work. The notion of ‘safeguarding’ serves as an exposition on stewardship and wisdom too: a theme that is developed in the fourth stanza where the request is that we would be ‘wise stewards of your gifts’. In the inclusion of ‘wise’ there is a synthesis of themes of dominion from Genesis 1.26-28 with that of the stewards of the vineyard in Luke 12.42.

We pray for those who are ill,
[...]
Lord of all compassion:
hear our prayer.

We remember those who have died,
[...]
Lord of all peace:
hear our prayer.

We offer ourselves to your service,
asking that by the Spirit at work in us
others may receive a rich harvest of love and joy and peace.
Lord of all faithfulness:
hear our prayer.

God of grace,
as you are ever at work in your creation,
so fulfil your wise and loving purpose in us
and in all for whom we pray,
that with them and in all that you have made,

your glory may be revealed
 and the whole earth give praise to you,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 Amen.
 (Intercession, H2 Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 628)

In this remaining part of the prayer the last two stanzas develop a theology of both harvest and God's glory in the world, which leads to glory being given back to God by 'the whole earth'. The 'rich harvest of love and joy and peace' is one that is experienced by humans offering themselves in the service of God. The reference to the harvest of the fruit of the Spirit and the physical harvest of food links the two concepts more closely together. The final stanza picks up on the first stanza's attention to God's perpetual involvement in the Creation. It is in the final stanza that God's nature develops beyond that of the 'watching' of God of stanza one into a God who is 'ever at work in [...] creation'. The last stanza moves on to speak of God's 'loving purpose' being fulfilled for 'all that [God has] made', and the praise that is returned to God is offered by 'the whole earth'. Thus, this prayer proves to be rooted and grounded within an earthed framework that merits emulation.

A second form of intercession that is significant and yet not so effective as the first is that for the *TSAY* theme 'Creation' (*TSAY*: 601-02). It is, however, particularly long too—500 words—but it does cover, partially, a wider range of ecotheological points than the previous set of prayers. It has eight sections (plus an introductory sentence), which we will look at in turn.

Let us pray to God the Almighty, the King of creation.

God said, 'Let there be light'.
 Eternal God, we thank you for your light and your truth.
 We praise you for your fatherly care
 in creating a universe which proclaims your glory.

Inspire us to worship you, the creator of all,
and let your light shine upon our world.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

The need for humanity to participate in the praise that the universe proclaims towards God is an important feature of the prayer's opening. The request for God's light to shine is a hope for transformation upon the whole earth.

God said, 'Let there be a firmament in the midst of the heavens'.
We thank you for the vastness of the universe
and the mysteries of space.
We pray for all scientists and astronomers
who extend the boundaries of our knowledge.
As we contemplate the wonder of the heavens,
confirm us in the truth
that every human being is known and loved by you.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

The endeavour of science is here identified as serving the purpose of exploring the wonders of the created universe. There is, oddly, an underlying human-centredness to this prayer—'that every human being is known and loved by you'—considering the subject matter is the 'firmament in the midst of the heavens'!

God said, 'Let the waters be gathered together,
and let dry land appear'.
We thank you for the beauty of the earth,
for the diversity of land and sea,
for the resources of the earth.
Give us the will to cherish this planet
and to use its riches for the good and welfare of all.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

The earth is identified as being a beautiful place, then it is valued as being a 'rich' and precious gift that is to be cherished, and the riches of the earth are to be used for the common good of humanity. The topic of energy is addressed, but in a fashion

akin to switching off light-bulbs rather than considering the relationship between energy use and global warming:

God said, 'Let there be lights in the sky
to separate the day and the night'.
We thank you for the warmth of the sun,
the light of the moon, the glory of the stars.
We praise you for the formations of clouds,
the radiance of dawn and sunset.
Save us from wasting or abusing the energy
on which all life depends.
Open our eyes to behold your beauty,
and our lips to praise your name.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

The economic contextualization of the earth that had begun in the previous stanza is continued here.

God said, 'Let the waters bring forth living creatures,
and let birds fly across the sky'.
We thank you for the teeming life of the seas,
and the flight of the birds.
Help us to protect the environment
so that all life may flourish.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

No prayer offered is for the environment itself, but each has been for human action upon the environment. The language of protectionism avoids the matter of considering *from what* the environment needs protecting.

God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures of every kind'.
We rejoice in the variety of animal life.
Grant us grace to treat all animals with respect and care;
to protect endangered species,
to preserve the variety of habitats,
and to honour the delicate balance of nature.
God of life:
hear our prayer.

The theme of protection is continued in this, the sixth stanza, where it is linked to the preservation of the natural order and the honouring by humanity of the delicate balance of nature. This line of reasoning begins to project that the earth is a precious, valuable and fragile commodity: an apt and accurate ecological commentary.

In what follows, though, the narrative diverts away from these concerns into a human realm that is presented as being quite separate from what has gone before.

God said, 'Let us create human beings in our own image'.
 We pray for the human family.
 We exult in its diversity and giftedness,
 we repent of its sins, divisions, and violence.
 By the power of your Spirit, restore your image within us,
 through Christ who came to re-make us
 by his death and resurrection.
 God of life:
 hear our prayer.

In arriving at the sixth day of creation, puzzlingly for a prayer with a theme of 'Creation', there is no attempt to connect humankind with the rest of God's works. It is as if this moment in the prayer separates humanity from the rest of God's work.

Heavenly Father, you have filled the world with beauty:
 open our eyes to behold your gracious hand in all your works;
 that, rejoicing in your whole creation,
 we may learn to serve you with gladness;
 for the sake of him through whom all things were made,
 your Son Jesus Christ our Lord.
 Amen.
 (Intercession: H1 Creation, TSAY: 601-02)

The missed opportunity here—that is taken at several other points in CW—is that the text speaks of rejoicing *in* rather than *with* the Creation. It appears that the narrative of this prayer perpetuates a disconnection between humanity and the Creation at the same time as celebrating the work of God in creation.

There is one further text that is worthy of note for being exceptional: this is a scriptural canticle, sourced from Isaiah 35.

A Song of the Wilderness

1 The wilderness and the dry land shall rejoice,*
the desert shall blossom and burst into song.
2 They shall see the glory of the Lord,*
the majesty of our God.
3 Strengthen the weary hands,*
and make firm the feeble knees.
4 Say to the anxious, 'Be strong, fear not,
your God is coming with judgement,*
coming with judgement to save you.'
5 Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened,*
and the ears of the deaf unstopped;
6 Then shall the lame leap like a hart,*
and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy.
7 For waters shall break forth in the wilderness,*
and streams in the desert;
8 The ransomed of the Lord shall return with singing,*
with everlasting joy upon their heads.
9 Joy and gladness shall be theirs,*
and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.
Isaiah 35.1, 2b-4a, 4c-6, 10

The song goes beyond the metaphorical or symbolic to a point where the well being of the earth is synonymous with the vitality of human life. The fulfilment of one is more than predicated by the other, it is that the hoped for transformation of desert and broken humanity are one and the same thing. They occur at the same time. The rejoicing will happen for land and people as God's glory is made manifest. This transformation is quite literally a physical one and the predicted celebration of the longed for restoration arises from within all parties.

4. God in Creation

a. The nature of God as Creator

In the 316 texts, God is named as the Creator directly on 125 occasions and indirectly on a further 62 occasions (a text could only score for one or the other criterion, not both). This amounts to 59% of the texts. God is named in a wide range of ways. In the following two tables a number of examples are given of ways that God is named being Creator either as repeated phrases or as unique occurrences. (The references numbers relate to the number given to each of the 316 texts in Appendix 1).

Table 4.3

Unique phrases referring to God as Creator in CW texts	Ref.
'commanded the light to shine'	72
'created the heavens and the earth'	77
'creating and saving God'	287
'creator of heaven and earth and sea'	219
'creator of the heavens'	146
'faithful creator'	161
'God of creation'	280
'God said "Let there be light"'	259
'God the Father who created the world'	309
'Lord of heaven and earth'	165
'made the world'	24
'maker of all'	208
'Maker of heaven and earth'	16
'maker of heaven and earth'	16
'mighty creator'	41
'on the first day of creation you made	242
'you made the [rhythm / riches / goodness] of the [sea/land]	170

Table 4.4

Repeated phrases referring to God as Creator in CW texts	occurrence	Ref.
'creator [...] of all'	2	2, 33
'may God who clothes the lilies and feeds the birds'	2	250, 308
'you [have] created all things in heaven and on earth'	2	200, 213
'Lord of all creation'	3	31, 213, 265, 303
'creator God'	4	164, 170, 241, 247
'creator of heaven and earth'	4	4, 55, 223, 229
'Lord of creation'	4	166, 191, 287, 302
'Lord God of all creation'	5	37, 271, 272, 293, 306
'praise God who made heaven and earth'	5	54, 59, 60, 61, 62
'God our creator'	7	51, 52, 72, 181, 192, 281, 308

Within the repeated phrases listed, the most common way of directly referring to God as creator is the use of the very word 'creator'. The most unusual is the reference to God that makes use of Luke 12.24-27 'who clothes the lilies of the field and feeds the birds of the air'. There are also the slightly ambiguous references to God as 'Lord' of creation (or 'heaven and earth'). Within the context of the Christian theological tradition, this can be assumed to mean not just Lord but also creator even though the reference is indirect. For example,

Lord of creation,
 whose glory is around and within us:
 open our eyes to your wonders,
 that we may serve you with reverence
 and know your peace at our lives' end,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Additional *Collect*, The Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, CWAC: 23)

The text speaks, in line three, of God's 'wonders', which it is reasonable to assume are both works of creation and humanity in general (what is 'around' us) and God's

glory that inhabits our lives ('within us'). God is named as 'Lord' his place in creation specified by a proper noun.

More rarely God's relationship to creation is expressed through a verb rather than a noun. Of the five instances that directly relate to God's action in the Creation four involve seeing:

Almighty God, good Father to us all,
your face is turned towards your world [...]
(Extract, Preface, Eucharistic Prayer D, Order One, *CWME*: 194)

God, the beginning and end of all things,
in your providence and care
you watch unceasingly over all creation;
(Extract, Intercession, H2 Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 628)

God our saviour,
look on this wounded world
in pity and in power;
(Extract, Collect, The Third Sunday after Trinity, *CWAC*: 19)

God of peace,
whose Son Jesus Christ proclaimed the kingdom
and restored the broken to wholeness of life:
look with compassion on the anguish of the world,
and by your healing power
make whole both people and nations;
through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
(Post Communion: The Third Sunday before Advent, *CWME*: 424)

grant favourable weather,
temperate rains, and fruitful seasons,
that there may be food and drink for all creatures
(Extract, Rogationtide addition to *CW* Litany A, Procession, *TSAY*: 614)

Other verbs such as God 'providing' are not linked to the Creation but rather linked to an object from the earth. For example, 'you provide seed for sowing' (The Blessing of the Plough, *TSAY*: 607).

b. *The Trinity and the Creation*

The way the Trinity is represented in relation to the creation is a matter of importance (as discussed in Chapter 3). A number of texts from the selection consider the action in creation of Christ and the Spirit as well as the Creator and specific examples are discussed below. However, there are only two full invocations of the Trinity that bear an explicit connection to the Creation:

Blessed are you, Holy God,
creator, redeemer and life-giver;
you have spoken the world into being
and filled it with wonder and beauty.

For every blessing we have received
we give you thanks and praise.

(Extract, Opening, Thanksgiving, G61 General / God in creation, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 238-39)

Generous God,
creator, redeemer, sustainer,
at your table we present this money,
symbol of the work you have given us to do;
use it, use us,
in the service of your world
to the glory of your name.

Amen.

(Words of Dedication I9, Action and Movement, *NPW*: 286)

In both of these instances the invocation is integral to the prayer, the G61 Thanksgiving uses the invocation to introduce the concept of 'speaking the world into being' and 'fill[ing] it with wonder and beauty': the speaking, representing the Creator; the word, representing the Son; and the filling of it, representing the Holy Spirit.

The invoking of creator, redeemer and sustainer in the Words of Dedication are effective, because 'service' relates to the servanthood of Christ, the work that God has 'given' for humanity to do refers back to the completion of creation in Genesis

(1.26-30), and the request that God would use both us and our gifts, relates to the sustaining work of the Holy Spirit.

We have seen above how God is named as creator and Lord of the Creation. Christ's role in the Creation overlaps with this by Christ also being named as 'Lord of creation' (Extract, Opening, Thanksgiving, G56 General, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 234-35). This Lordship is made more explicit in the Praise Response for Ascension (*NPW*: 229, G39), 'God put all things in subjection beneath his feet'.

Christ's role in the determining of the world's existence is cited on seven occasions and in all instances it is a direct quote from a biblical or other sources. For example, John 1.3 'he was in the world that had its being through him' (Thanksgiving, G68 Incarnation, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 244) and quoting the Nicene Creed 'God the Son, through whom all things were made' (Litany B, Rogationtide, Procession, *TSAY*: 615-17).

Christ's pre-existence and role in creation is most fully expressed in a *NPW* Thanksgiving for Ascension (that can also be used as a Eucharistic Preface):

Father, we are in your Spirit and hear your voice:
 'I am the first and the last,
 who is, who was, and who is to come.'
 Before the worlds were made,
 Jesus Christ the living one was reigning with you and the Holy Spirit.
 Through Christ you created everything in heaven and earth,
 the whole universe created through him and for him.
 Lord of glory
All: we worship and adore you.

You sent him,
 the visible likeness of the invisible God,
 to reflect the brightness of your glory,
 to sustain the universe with his word of power,
 to achieve forgiveness for the sins of all.

Lord of glory
All: we worship and adore you.

And now he rules in heaven, mighty risen Lord ...
cf. Colossians 1.15-20; Hebrews 1.3; Revelation 1.14-18
 (Extract, Thanksgiving, G65 Father, Son and Spirit / Ascension, Praise and
 Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 241)

This text is also significant for identifying tripartite roles for the Godhead and dramatizing the praying community's relationship to the Trinity, through the use of the three biblical sources as quoted at the end of the text. First, it is through the Spirit that the voice of God is heard, those praying immediately do hear the words heard by the apostle John who 'was in the Spirit on the Lord's day' (Revelation 1.10). Second, the permanence of the Godhead is spelt out: 'Before the worlds were made, Jesus Christ [...] was reigning with [God] and the Holy Spirit'. Then the work of Christ, which is the focus of this text, is spelt out in full detail: 'everything in heaven and earth' was created by Christ, and the 'whole universe created through him and for him'. Christ also is the one who sustains the universe 'with the word of his power'. This is the most fulsome text about the part that Christ plays in the Creation.

The Spirit's role in the Creation is referred to in a greater variety of ways and with a greater dynamism than when the liturgical texts speak of the work of the second person of the Trinity. The work of the Spirit appears in overlap with the second person of the Trinity, in Eucharistic Prayer F:

You are worthy of our thanks and praise,
 Lord God of truth,
 for by the breath of your mouth
 you have spoken your word,
 and all things have come into being.
 You fashioned us in your image
 and placed us in the garden of your delight [...]
 (Extract, Preface, Eucharistic Prayer F, Order One, *CWME*: 198)

The 'breath of [God's] mouth' uses an image from the Hebrew Bible to develop a notion of the creative work of the Holy Spirit (Psalm 33.6). The 'word' is what is spoken by the 'breath'. We have an overlapping image here between the second and third person, the Spirit being what speaks Christ's creative power into the cosmos. This is fascinating, colourful and shows how poetry can reflect dynamic aspects of the Trinity in a phrase.

More explicit and specific than that are the five texts that use Psalm 104.30 as a source. The repeated use of the same source does not limit the creativity of the texts:

Daily your Spirit renews the face of the earth,
bringing life and health, wholeness and peace.
(Prayer of Thanksgiving, Thanksgiving for the Healing Ministry of the
Church, Thanksgivings for Use at Morning and Evening Prayer on Sunday,
CWME: 50)

The prayer offers an explanation of what the result of the daily renewal of the face of the earth is: the bringing of life, health, wholeness and peace. More substantial and perhaps most significant of all for interpreting the role of the Spirit in creation is the first prayer offered as a Prayer over the Water at Baptism from *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (hereafter *CWCI*, Church of England 2006a), when used in its optional responsive form:

Praise God who made heaven and earth,
[...]
We thank you, almighty God, for the gift of water
to sustain, refresh and cleanse all life.
Over water the Holy Spirit moved in the beginning of creation.
Through water you led the children of Israel
from slavery in Egypt to freedom in the Promised Land.
In water your Son Jesus received the baptism of John
and was anointed by the Holy Spirit as the Messiah, the Christ,
to lead us from the death of sin to newness of life.

Lord of life,
All: renew your creation.

We thank you, Father, for the water of baptism.
 In it we are buried with Christ in his death.
 By it we share in his resurrection.
 Through it we are reborn by the Holy Spirit.
 [...]
 Lord of life,
All: renew your creation.

Now sanctify this water that, by the power of your Holy Spirit,
 Renewed in your image, may they walk by the light of faith
 and continue forever in the risen life of Jesus Christ our Lord;
 to whom with you and the Holy Spirit
 be all honour and glory, now and forever. Amen.
 Lord of life,
All: renew your creation.
 (Extract, Responsive form of the Prayer Over the Water, Holy Baptism,
 CWCI: 364)

The prayer references back to Psalm 104.30 in the response 'Lord of life, renew your creation' without making it explicit in the response that this renewal can be understood as being the activity of the Spirit. However, there is a strong and clear allusion to this being the case since the Spirit is discussed in four ways:

- moving over the face of the water 'at the beginning of creation';
- anointing God's 'Son Jesus' as 'the Messiah, the Christ';
- humanity is 'reborn' by the Spirit 'through' the water of baptism;
- the Spirit, working via sanctified water, renews the baptised in God's image so their walk in the life of faith is possible and so the baptised may 'continue forever in the risen life of Christ'.

In conclusion, a traditional Trinitarian invocation is made because the prayer has so ably introduced different aspects of the Godhead—and especially the Holy Spirit.

This means that this reference to all three persons has a greater depth to it than in a more typical setting.

Another prayer that succeeds in invoking the Trinity while referring to the action of the Spirit in the Creation is the Additional Collect for Pentecost:

Holy Spirit, sent by the Father,
ignite in us your holy fire;
strengthen your children with the gift of faith,
revive your Church with the breath of love,
and renew the face of the earth,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Collect, Day of Pentecost, CWAC: 18)

The Spirit's actions are fourfold: igniting the holy fire in 'us'; strengthening God's children with faith; reviving the Church with love; renewing the face of the earth.

The prayer creates a sense of equivalence among all parties mentioned. It achieves this through listing the Spirit's actions in four directions. That is, towards the 'us' who are praying, God's 'children', the 'Church', and 'the earth'. Additionally, the connectivity within the Trinity is explored: the Spirit is sent by the Father and the listed works of the Spirit are effected through the Son.

The power the Spirit has to renew the face of the earth is also referenced in the responsive form of intercessions, themed 'Holy Spirit', from *NPW*:

[We pray to God the Holy Spirit.
Holy Spirit, come upon us.]

Come, Holy Spirit, creator,
and renew the earth.

Holy Spirit, come upon us [...]

(Extract, Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies: F62 Holy Spirit, Prayers, *NPW*: 204-05)

Again the action of the Holy Spirit towards 'us' and the Creation is referred to in tandem, which gives added significance to both relationships.

The next prayer, a Blessing—unlike the previous two texts—does not select the renewal of the earth as one of the actions of the Spirit, or at least not at first glance. However, the third section asks the Spirit to 'bring the world alive', which is a close reference back to Psalm 104.30. The prayer also refers to the Spirit's hovering 'over the waters when the world was created', and relates that directly to the Spirit's transformation of the self:

May the Spirit,
 who hovered over the waters when the world was created,
 breathe into you the life he gives.
 Amen.

May the Spirit,
 who overshadowed the Virgin when the eternal Son came among us,
 make you joyful in the service of the Lord.
 Amen.

May the Spirit,
 who set the Church on
 fire upon the day of Pentecost,
 bring the world alive with the love of the risen Christ.
 Amen.

And the blessing ...
 (Blessing, J91 Holy Spirit, Conclusion, *NPW*: 309)

This prayer of blessing is successful in narrating both how the Spirit has been active, previously, and at the same time in expressing hope for how God may work in the lives of those prayed for, in the now.

The Extended Preface for the Creation takes a different tack. The work of creation and the new creation is left to the first person of the Trinity, the Son is only referred to in relation to 'our' salvation. As to the Spirit, it follows the detail of Psalm 104.30

quite closely on two out of three counts. The prayer refers to the Spirit as being sent by God and renewing the face of the earth. However the Spirit is also given the responsibility for giving 'life to our mortal bodies' too.

It is indeed right, it is our duty and our joy,
 always and everywhere to give you thanks,
 holy Father, almighty and eternal God.
 For you have created the heavens and the earth,
 and formed us in your own image.
 In the fulness of time you sent forth your Son, your eternal Word,
 who laid down his life for our salvation
 and rose from the grave, the first fruits of your new creation.
 You send forth your holy and life-giving Spirit
 to give life to our mortal bodies
 and to renew the face of the earth.
 Therefore with all the heavenly hosts,
 we give voice to everything that you have made,
 and sing the eternal hymn of praise.
 (Extended Preface, M1 Creation, *TSAY*: 604)

This penultimate line picks up on the inclusivity of the Spirit's work in renewing 'the face of the earth', by giving continued prominence to all things created and yet silences them at the same time. There is a difficulty here, though, that deserves noting, it partly relates to the Spirit's work. The problem in the text is in a collective 'we' that 'give[s] voice to everything' that God has created. This is particularly strange since it has already been stated that it is the Spirit who renews the earth. If anything or anyone was to be charged with giving voice to the Creation it would, surely, be the Spirit, not a subset of humanity, the Church at worship. The perplexity of this line is presented in a similar way on only one other occasion (in a text previously mentioned):

Therefore, we join with angels and archangels,
 and give voice to every creature under heaven,
 for ever praising you and saying.
 (Extract, Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 612)

In the latter case, voice is given to every creature rather than to all things that have been made. This sets a tone that is in contrast to an earlier Extended Preface from the main volume:

[...]
therefore with all who can give voice in your creation
we glorify your name,
for ever praising you and saying:
(Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From the day after All
Saints' Day until the day before the First Sunday of Advent, except Christ the
King, *CWME*: 327)

Although there is more clarity here, in this third text, that humanity is joining in *with* other voices in the Creation, the prayer still creates confusion by allowing only for those things 'who can give voice', which immediately disables all silent parts of the cosmos (which takes us back to Eucharistic Prayer G discussed above). This prayer does succeed in avoiding the mistake of the previous two texts, which remove the full dynamic that lies between the Godhead and the Creation (mistakenly investing in humanity the action of giving voice to part or all of the Creation that arguably can only come from the breath of God, not the breath of human utterance).

Despite these difficulties and weaknesses, overall, there is a breadth to the discussion of the role of the Spirit's work in the Creation. This when combined with the more limited palette of ideas but often repeated assertion of Christ as the 'Word' and 'Lord' of the Creation means the selected texts present a Trinitarian presence as that which sustains the Creation.

c. *The physical involvement of God in the Creation*

When a prayer provides either a metaphor of God's engagement with the earth or relates a physical action or object to the nature of God then such a prayer succeeds in moving the conceptualization of God into the realms of immanence. A simple reference to 'earth', 'universe' and 'land' do also achieve this, up to a point. There are some texts that provide a fuller sense of physical connection between God and the earth. God's physical holding of the earth is the most potent novel metaphor in the texts:

[...] embrace the earth with your glory [...]
(Extract, Collect, Christmas Eve, *CWAC*: 5)

The physical involvement of God in the Creation is expressed, most thoughtfully, in the Post Communion for the commemoration of the martyrdom of Stephen:

Merciful Lord,
we thank you for the signs of your mercy
revealed in birth and death:
(Post Communion, Stephen, 26 December, *CWME*: 444)

There is a double surprise as this prayer gives even weight to both birth and death as signs of God's mercy. It interprets the mercy present from God unsurprisingly in a person's martyrdom, but more than that, indicates the two guaranteed experiences of all humans *and* all creatures, is a space where God's love and care are expressed (see Section 8 for a fuller consideration of the place of 'all creatures' in *CW*). An alternative reading would be that the focus of the prayer is much tighter: the celebration of Christ's 'birth' on the previous two days (Christmas Eve and Christmas Day) and immediately following that the commemoration of Stephen's 'death'.

A much more popular and well used text succeeds, by the deft use of a complex simile, in combining images of land, labour, food, Church, God, and the kingdom, and sets them within a length of time that spans across the past, present and future:

As the grain once scattered in the fields
and the grapes once dispersed on the hillside
are now reunited on this table in bread and wine,
so, Lord, may your whole Church soon be gathered together
from the corners of the earth
into your kingdom.

Amen.

(Prayers at the Preparation of the Table, 6, Supplementary Texts, *CWME*:
292)

The 'fields' and (a singular) 'hillside' are made present on the table through the inferred human labour that did the 'scatter[ing]', 'dispers[ing]' and 'reunit[ing]'. This principle image is, in its entirety, serving as a simile rather than a metaphor since the text begins with an 'as'. It is most effective in making present the effort involved in bread and wine arriving at table.

The prayer requests that the Church be similarly gathered ('so [...] may your whole Church soon be gathered') in order to represent the Church as scattered and dispersed across many 'fields' and 'hillside[s]'. The image of 'land' is sustained through the phrase 'corners of the earth'. The text sustains, through this, the need for the Church's unification with itself and God. The timing for such a re-gathering, though, is also made clear, it will not be as prompt as the time span from seed sowing to bread delivery, rather it is that the 'gathering together' occurs on arrival 'into [God's] kingdom'.

If there is a weakness in the physicality of the prayer, it is that if the Church is represented by grapes and grain gathered from the earth, then it appears that there is

a physical disconnection between the Church and the earth. The Church, the prayer suggests, will leave the earth behind. This, however, is a fairly literalist reading of what, after all, is only a simile. What is successful in the prayer is the linking of the earth's physicality and human labour in the earth to the activity of God in the Church.

The experience of Christ's suffering is something that is repeated within CW, though the stark physicality is less frequently explored, the follow text being exceptional:

Almighty God,
 who in the passion of your blessed Son
 made an instrument of painful death
 to be for us the means of life and peace [...]
 (Extract, Collect, Holy Cross Day, 14 September, CWME: 440)

A concern for well-being and the human condition is also referred to, though also with infrequency. There is one occurrence where a holistic sense of health and healing is presented:

Almighty God,
 whose Son restored Mary Magdalene
 to health of mind and body [...]
 (Collect, Mary Magdalene, 22 July, CWME: 436)

On a far larger scale there are many more occurrences in which God's immanence within the Creation is considered. This is the case, particularly in the more recent TSAY material.

Let us bring forward symbols of the harvest,
 gifts that God has created and his sun and rain have nurtured.
All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of the cornfields,
 the oats and the wheat, the rye and the barley.
All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of roots,
the swedes and marigolds, turnips and sugar beet.

All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of seeds for next year's crops,
for clover, for hay and for corn.

All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of vegetables,
peas, potatoes, beans and hops.

All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of pears and apples, berries and herbs.

All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the harvest of flowers,
the finest blooms from our gardens and our fields.

All: Thanks be to God.

Bring forward the grain and the grape,
for our Saviour took bread and wine
to feed us with his body and his blood,
given and shed for the life of the world.
Let us feed on him by faith with thanksgiving.

All: Thanks be to God.

All: Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,
praise him, all creatures here below,
praise him above, ye heavenly host,
praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.
Amen.

(The Bringing Forward of Symbols of the Harvest, Harvest Thanksgiving,
TSAY: 629)

The offertory is made into an explicit celebration of produce, the work of the producer and of the Creator too. That the 'Bringing Forward of Symbols' concludes with bread and wine ('the grain and the grape'), the only manufactured symbols included in the list, this introduces Christ as being life-giver to the world with the power to transform. The role of God, prior to the doxology, is couched, in the past tense, unlike the following more immediate prayer of blessing:

May God the Father,
who clothes the lilies of the field
and feeds the birds of the air,
provide us with all we need for life in its fulness.
All: Amen.

May God the Son,
who fed the five thousand and turned water into wine,
feed us with his life and transform us in his love.
All: Amen.

May God the Holy Spirit,
who hovered over the waters of creation
and formed the world from chaos,
form us in the likeness of Christ and renew the face of the earth.
All: Amen.

And the blessing ...
(Blessing, P2 Creation, *TSAY*: 604)

The importance of this text lies in God the Creator's present action within the Creation ('who clothes') and the request for God's ongoing sustaining power to 'provide', 'feed' and 'form'. God being present and active in the world is a less common topic within *TSAY* than the easier switch of agricultural item into metaphor:

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation:
in your goodness you have given us this seed to sow.
In it we perceive the promise of life,
the wonders of your creative love.
By your blessing,
let this seed be for us a sign of your creative power,
that in sowing and watering,
tending and watching,
we may see the miracle of growth,
and in due course reap a rich harvest.
As this seed must die to give life,
reveal to us the saving power of your Son,
who died that we might live,
and plant in us the good seed of your word.
Blessed be God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
Blessed be God for ever.

By itself the earth produces:
 first the stalk, then the ear, then the full grain shall appear [...]
 (The Blessing of the Seed, *TSAY*: 607)

Of course the metaphor is one sourced from the gospels. All the same the activity of the seed relates to the *kairos* moment of Jesus the Christ's life, death and resurrection. The request that the seed be a 'sign of [God's] creative power' gives scope to infer that such power is present and active, but that is clouded by the notion that 'by itself the earth produces: first the stalk [... etc.]'. God's action by the end of the prayer has become a transcendent one: 'plant in us the seed of your good word'.

It is not just the *TSAY* material that has varied successes in construing God as tangibly engaged in the life of the world. *CWAC*, also, in places suggests that the immanence of God can be recalled as being a moment from the past rather than in the present. One clear example relates to the Christmas season:

Lord Jesus Christ,
 your birth at Bethlehem
 draws us to kneel in wonder at heaven touching earth:
 accept our heartfelt praise
 as we worship you,
 our Saviour and our eternal God.
 (Collect, Christmas Day, *CWAC*: 6)

The following Lenten Collect achieves the same result.

Eternal God,
 whose Son went among the crowds
 and brought healing with his touch:
 (Collect, The Third Sunday before Lent, *CWAC*: 10)

Evidence that such an approach need not be the only one, comes from the connecting of Pentecostal fire into the month when 'the Kingdom' is emphasized:

God of glory,
 touch our lips with the fire of your Spirit,
 that we with all creation

may rejoice to sing your praise;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Collect, The Fourth Sunday before Advent, *CWAC*: 25)

The eucharistic texts, first tested before 2000, face the same challenge—of expressing God’s engagement with the Creation—and achieve varying degrees of success.

Lord of all life,
 help us to work together for that day
 when your kingdom comes
 and justice and mercy will be seen in all the earth.
 Look with favour on your people,
 gather us in your loving arms
 and bring us with [N and] all the saints
 to feast at your table in heaven [...]
 (Extract, Eucharistic Prayer E, Order One, *CWME*: 197)

God’s help is requested for those praying to work together, but the ‘us’ is unhelpfully ambiguous. It may be the case that the prayer can be understood as suggesting that the ‘us’ is indicating that it is those praying ‘together, with God’ but it does not spell that out, so it is just as possible to conclude that God is depending on the action of the Church to bring in the kingdom of God.

Such an engagement with God’s just rule on earth though is at an advantage over the weaker material from the *BCP* that is retained in the following Collect:

O God, the protector of all who trust in you,
 without whom anything is strong, nothing is holy:
 increase and multiply upon us your mercy;
 that with you as our ruler and guide
 we may so pass through things temporal
 that we lose not our hold on things eternal [...]
 (Extract, Collect, The Fourth Sunday after Trinity, *CWME*: 410)

The journey through the ‘temporal’ existence being something that is in contrast with all that is eternal, suggests a troubling theological framework, which is not often

repeated. The newer collects and some material from *NPW*, although more prone to emphasizing Jesus' historical immanence, do at least give substance to God's eternal sustaining presence in the world.

The next five texts all share the same emphasis of spelling out the earthly family existence of Jesus.

Almighty and ever-living God,
 clothed in majesty,
 whose beloved Son was this day presented in the Temple,
 in substance of our flesh [...]
 (Extract, Collect, The Presentation of Christ in the Temple, *CWME*: 386)

And now we give you thanks
 because in his earthly childhood
 you entrusted him to the care of a human family.
 (Extract, Short Prefaces, G129 Relationships and healing / Incarnation, Praise
 and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 264)

Heavenly Father,
 whose blessed Son shared at Nazareth the life of an earthly home [...]
 (Post Communion, The First Sunday of Christmas, *CWME*: 382)

Heavenly Father,
 whose Son grew in wisdom and stature
 in the home of Joseph the carpenter of Nazareth
 and on the wood of the cross
 perfected the work of the world's salvation [...]
 (Extract, Collect, Joseph of Nazareth, *CWME*: 428)

God of compassion,
 whose Son Jesus Christ, the child of Mary,
 shared the life of a home in Nazareth,
 and on the cross drew the whole human family to himself:
 strengthen us in our daily living
 that in joy and in sorrow
 we may know the power of your presence
 to bind together and to heal;
 (Collect, Mothering Sunday, *CWME*: 395)

This fifth of the group of five, above, speaks of the physicality of Jesus Christ's life more than that of his death.

There is, though, an assortment of prayers where the physicality of Christ's death is included in the narration of the Passion:

Almighty God,
 whose most dear Son went not up to joy but first he suffered pain,
 and entered not into glory before he was crucified:
 (Extract, Collect, The Third Sunday of Lent, *CWME*: 393)

Lord God,
 whose blessed Son our Saviour
 gave his back to the smiters
 and did not hide his face from shame:
 give us grace to endure the sufferings of this present time
 with sure confidence in the glory that shall be revealed;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Collect, The Fourth Sunday of Lent, *CWME*: 394)

Faithful God,
 whose Son bore our sins in his body on the tree [...]
 (Post Communion: Holy Cross Day, 14 September, *CWME*: 440)

Almighty and everlasting God,
 who in your tender love towards the human race
 sent your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ
 to take upon him our flesh
 and to suffer death upon the cross:
 (Collect, Palm Sunday, *CWME*: 397)

The concept of Christ taking 'upon him our flesh' borrows the phrase from the *BCP* Collect 'Sunday next before Easter' and also similarly from the *BCP* Collect for the 'Presentation of Christ in the Temple' where Jesus is 'presented [...] in substance of our flesh'. What is helpful across this small group of nine prayers is an attention to physicality that does not come across so clearly in the full corpus of *CW* material.

There are other prayers that, quite exceptionally, explore our own physicality:

We give thanks to God for all his gifts to us.

Father, we give you thanks and praise
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

For birth and life and strength of body,
for safety and shelter and food,
we give you thanks:
we praise your holy name.

For sight and hearing and the beauty of nature,
for words and music and the power of thought,
we give you thanks:
we praise your holy name.

For work and leisure and the joy of achieving,
for conscience and will and depth of feeling,
we give you thanks:
we praise your holy name [...]
(Extract, Thanksgiving: G63 General / God in creation, Praise and
Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 240)

This list of the meeting of human needs by God sits closely to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow 1943: 370-96).

Just as noteworthy for being unique is the use of breastfeeding as a simile:

Loving God,
as a mother feeds her children at the breast
you feed us in this sacrament with the food and drink of eternal life:
help us who have tasted your goodness
to grow in grace within the household of faith;
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Post Communion: Mothering Sunday, *CWME*: 396)

There is more substance to this simile than if it had become a metaphor, though a metaphor of God in a maternal role would, perhaps, have been less palatable to certain members of both General Synod and on the Liturgical Commission since to make the action of breastfeeding a metaphorical expression of the nature of God would be seen by some as an inappropriate feminization of a God who is referred to, in *CW*, in exclusively male or non-gendered terms.

d. *God's love for and the redemption of creation*

All three persons of the Trinity are understood by some of the collected texts as demonstrating love for the Creation and participating in its redemption. There are forty texts that directly address these themes, eight of which speak of God's love in or for the Creation.

Father, you made the world and love your creation [...]
(Extract, Preface, Eucharistic Prayer E, Order One, *CWME*: 196)

This is the most straightforward example. The following is more profound:

Almighty and everlasting God,
you hate nothing that you have made [...]
(Extract, Collect, Ash Wednesday, *CWME*: 392)

Cranmer's text—originally, 'thou hatest nothing that thou hast made' (from the *BCP* Ash Wednesday and Lenten Collect)¹—although it throws up the unanswerable questions about theodicy and predation in the Creation—has a continuing merit in asking that the power of God's love may fall upon 'all things created'. A newer and equally helpful notion comes from the Harvest Thanksgiving Post Communion prayer:

Lord of the harvest,
with joy we have offered thanksgiving for your love in creation [...]
(Post Communion, Harvest Thanksgiving, *CWME*: 447)

'Love *in* creation [my italics]' has a potency that 'love *for* creation' would not achieve. It indicates an active presence within the created order and is, therefore, of more substance than those texts that emphasize God looking upon the world. Love

¹ This phrase also appears in the *BCP* in 'A Communion, or Denouncing of God's Anger and Judgements against Sinners, With certain Prayers, to be used on the first Day of Lent, and at other times, as the Ordinary shall appoint'.

with the preposition *in* is used more customarily, for instance, in a Kyrie confession from *NPW*:

[...] Christ came in love to a world of suffering [...]
(Extract, Kyrie Confessions, B57 Incarnation, Penitence, *NPW*: 91)

This concept of Christ's presence being transformative of the Creation is taken to a well-known theological conclusion—penal substitution—in the following Collect:

Gracious Father,
you gave up your Son
out of love for the world [...]
(Extract, Collect, The Fifth Sunday of Lent, *CWAC*: 13)

Whereas the Collect for seven weeks later speaks of Christ's suffering not as an atoning work, but rather as a statement of intent, of love and of triumph.

Risen Christ,
your wounds declare your love for the world
and the wonder of your risen life [...]
(Extract, Collect, The Fifth Sunday of Easter, *CWAC*: 17)

A less focussed text comes from *NPW*, where God's love is only indirectly mentioned, although the ownership of the world is clearly God's.

[...] Father, we know that your world needs love and harmony [...]
Father, we know that our world is starved of love and care [...]
(Extract, Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies: F64 Holy Spirit /
Living in the world, Prayers, *NPW*: 206)

A much stronger and systematic text also comes from the *NPW* collection, where the covenant of marriage serves as a mirror of God's will for all the Creation:

And now we give you thanks
because in the covenant of marriage
you show us your divine love,
a mirror of your will for all creation
made new and united to you forever.
(Short Prefaces, G133 Relationships and healing, Praise and Thanksgiving,
NPW: 264)

An ambiguity is left hanging by the text, about what is ‘the mirror of [God’s] will for all creation’. For the first-time reader it is not easy to judge whether it is the ‘divine love’ of God in its own right, or the divine love of God shown to those who are married, or ‘marriage’ itself. It is however reasonable to assume the third option to be the case, since ‘made new and united to you’ indicates both the covenant established in marriage and the work of God in the new creation.

God’s blessing on the earth or land is given particular attention by six texts: ‘bless the earth’ is the most succinct and direct (Intercession, Eucharistic Prayer F, Order One, *CWME*: 200), and is closely followed by ‘bless this good earth’ (Litany B, Rogationtide, Procession, *TSAY*: 615-17).

More substantially, in the following text, God’s blessing is prefixed by an explanation of God’s connectivity with the Creation:

May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
who is the source of all goodness and growth,
pour his blessing upon all things created [...]
(Blessing, J69 God in creation, Conclusion, *NPW*: 304)

The requests for blessing are more specific in the following intercession:

[...]Upon the rich earth send a blessing, O Lord [...]
Upon the produce of the earth send a blessing, O Lord [...]
Upon the seas and waters send a blessing, O Lord. [...]
(Intercession: H1 Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 610)

The Litany covers a similar breadth with more brevity:

[...] That it may please thee to bless the lands and waters [...]
(Extract, Rogationtide addition to *BCP* Litany A, Procession, *TSAY*: 614)

God’s redemption of the Creation—through its healing—features in six texts. Typically the healing of the earth is coupled to the healing of humankind, as with the intercessions for Holy Baptism and a pre-Advent Post Communion:

[...] Deliver the oppressed, strengthen the weak,
 heal and restore your creation [...]
 (Prayers of Intercession, Holy Baptism, *CWCI*: 360)

God of peace,
 whose Son Jesus Christ proclaimed the kingdom
 and restored the broken to wholeness of life:
 look with compassion on the anguish of the world,
 and by your healing power
 make whole both people and nations;
 through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
 (Post Communion, The Third Sunday before Advent, *CWME*: 424)

A slightly different trajectory occurs in a Short Preface from *NPW*, where the focus is God's attentiveness, in Christ, to the human condition:

And now we give you thanks
 that you have shown the greatness of your love for us
 by sending him to share our human nature
 and accomplish our forgiveness.
 He embraces us in our weakness,
 he suffers with the sick and the rejected,
 and, bringing your healing to the world,
 he rescues us from every evil.
 (Short Prefaces, G136 Relationships and healing / Lament, Praise and
 Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 265)

It can be inferred from this that the purpose of God bringing 'healing to the world' is for the rescuing of God's people 'from every evil'. The text could also be interpreted as being explicitly human-centred since the theme is God sharing 'our human nature', so 'world' in this instance could have little or nothing to do with creation.

There is a similar ambiguity in the following prayer about what is included in the reference to the 'world':

God of all mercy,
 in this eucharist you have set aside our sins
 and given us your healing:
 grant that we who are made whole in Christ
 may bring that healing to this broken world,

in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Post Communion, The Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, *CWME*: 415)

Although it is not clear how this prayer understands God's healing extending, there is a certainty that such healing can be brought, particularly, by those who are made whole in Christ.

Far more open ended, to the point of ambiguity, is the Additional Collect that invokes the power of God's 'look' to enable healing:

God our saviour,
look on this wounded world
in pity and in power;
hold us fast to your promises of peace
won for us by your Son,
our Saviour Jesus Christ.
(Collect, The Third Sunday after Trinity, *CWAC*: 19)

This gaze is different from that described above in the Collect for the Third Sunday before Advent where the request is that God looks upon the 'anguish of the world with compassion' and 'by [his] healing power make[s] whole both people and nations'. It appears that although the whole world merits compassion that healing is only noteworthy among human societies. These two prayers do not succeed in introducing the 'look' of God so as to make clear that the looking leads to or is part of the healing of the Creation. The following prayer from *TSAY* does succeed:

God of compassion,
we rejoice in the unity which is at the heart of your creation;
look upon our land and heal it [...]
(Extract, A Prayer in Times of Crisis, Harvest, *TSAY*: 633)

There are other actions beyond the power of God's healing in the earth that signify ways in which the Creation is being redeemed. A prayer for use on Christmas night asks for God's peace to fill the earth so as to bring transformation:

Eternal God,
 in the stillness of this night
 you sent your almighty Word
 to pierce the world's darkness with the light of salvation:
 give to the earth the peace that we long for
 and fill our hearts with the joy of heaven
 through our Saviour, Jesus Christ.
 (Collect, Christmas Night, CWAC: 6)

This theme is repeated in a 'Heaven/General' responsive form of intercession from

NPW:

Give to the world and its peoples
 the peace that comes from above,
 that they may find Christ's way of freedom and life.
 (Extract, Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F75 Heaven /
 General, *NPW*: 216-17)

It is not clear whether the 'they' are the 'world and its peoples' or just the 'peoples'. It would not have been difficult to create a greater clarity that 'Christ's way of freedom and life' was for the whole of the Creation. A similar lack of clarity also appears in the Additional Collect for the Fourth Sunday of Epiphany (CWAC: 9), which asks that God would send 'the gospel to the ends of the earth'.

Far clearer is the following Invitation to Confession (also mentioned above as an example of a direct reference to Creation's salvation, Section 1, sub-section ix):

Let us ask God to have mercy on our tired land,
 and to prosper the work of our soiled hands.
 Let us ask God to forgive our delusion of self-sufficiency
 so that we may praise him for his provision and goodness.
 (Invitation to Confession, A1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 609)

Here the three way dynamic between God, humanity and earth are fully explored and succinctly. The desire for redemption and the actions that mitigate against such a rescue are both expressed in these two sentences. This call for God's mercy has two edges to it. Mercy is requested for the 'tired land' and mercy is a suggested need for

humanity because of the 'delusion[ary]' way they are interacting with their environment.

This contrast is spelt out in fuller detail in the first part of the Kyrie Confession in the 'Creation' section of *TSAY*:

You delight in creation, its colour and diversity;
yet we have misused the earth,
and plundered its resources for our own selfish ends.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy (*TSAY*: 600).

5. *The Nature of the Creation*

The exploration in the texts of the nature of the Creation is an important topic for an ecotheological reading of the *CW* material. The unity of the created order within Godhead is expressed in a well-known and standard *CW* text (originally from the *ASB*, 'The Preparation of the Gifts', 34, *ASB*: 129).

Yours, Lord, is the greatness, the power;
the glory, the splendour, and the majesty;
for everything in heaven and on earth is yours.
All things come from you,
and of your own do we give you.
(Prayers at the Preparation of the Table, 1, Supplementary Texts, *CWME*:
291)

This is a declaration of ownership more than an expression of the unity of the Creation.

This next prayer, in referring to God holding 'all things together' (Colossians 1.17), indicates the unity of the created order within God.

Loving God,
 you hold all things in life
 and call us into your kingdom of peace;
 help us to walk the path of your truth
 and fill our lives with gratitude and faith,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

All: Amen.

(Introduction, Prayer, Thanksgiving for the Gift of a Child, *CWCI*: 339)

The text demonstrates the power and authority of God in the Creation. What it does not offer is a new understanding of human identity in the Creation.

The Collect for Christ the King (*CWME*: 426) and Thanksgiving (General, G59, *NPW*: 237) also speak of God's 'rule over all things'. This 'reign on earth' (Post Communion, The Second Sunday of Christmas, *CWME*: 382) is more fully expressed in the following Post Communion, which is an exact borrowing from the *BCP* Collect for the fifth Sunday after Trinity (except for 'thy' and 'thee'):

Grant, O Lord, we beseech you,
 that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered
 by your governance,
 that your Church may joyfully serve you in all godly quietness;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Post Communion, The Fourth Sunday after Trinity, *CWME*: 411)

A second prayer explores this peaceable rule:

Lord God,
 you hold both heaven and earth in a single peace.
 Let the design of your great love
 shine on the waste of our anger and sorrow,
 and give peace to your Church,
 peace among nations,
 peace in our homes,
 and peace in our hearts,
 in Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Closing Prayers, J31 Living in the world, Conclusion, *NPW*: 296)

The holding of 'heaven and earth in a single peace' develops the notion of the unity of all things within God. The 'peace' through which God's love is expressed is in

contrast to the 'waste of [...] anger and sorrow'. This is an intriguing juxtaposition, from an ecotheological point of view, since a theology of waste is a peculiar and uncommon theme (see Chapter 3 and 7). How waste relates to an understanding of issues of environmental waste is something that would merit further attention.

The following four texts all concur that God has formed or made humanity in God's image: The Preface to Eucharistic Prayer A (CWME: 184); The Collect for the First Sunday of Christmas (CWME: 381); The Collect for the Second Sunday before Lent (CWME: 390); and the Additional Collect for the Sixth Sunday after Trinity (CWAC: 20). The set Prefaces for both Eucharistic Prayers A and B (CWME: 184-85, 188) expand on God's responsibility for creating 'all things' (Colossians 1.16). Eucharistic Prayer F repeats the same theme:

by the breath of your mouth
you have spoken your word,
and all things have come into being (CWME: 198).

It is not only that God creates and rules all things but that all things worship according to two texts (the first previously discussed):

[...] From the beginning you have created all things
and all your works echo the silent music of your praise. [...]
(Extract, Preface, Eucharistic Prayer G, Order One, CWME: 201)

so earth unites with heaven
to sing the new song of creation:
(Short Prefaces: G89 God in creation, NPW: 286)

Additionally the nature of the Creation is explored, in one place, as being created out of nothing (*ex nihilo*), in the Confession, B47, 'Christian Beginnings' (NPW: 86-87). More common themes are those of the Creation containing goodness and beauty. For example:

God, our light and our salvation:
illuminate our lives,
that we may see your goodness in the land of the living,
and looking on your beauty
may be changed into the likeness of Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Additional Collect for the Twentieth Sunday after Trinity, CWAC: 24)

There is substance to these descriptions of the Creation, but there is much more attention in the prayers on God's work in creation (see Section 4) than about the Creation itself. It also becomes apparent in the following section of this chapter that greater depth of attention is given over to suffering and struggle in creation.

6. *Suffering in the Creation*

The number of texts where the suffering of the Creation is explored is significant. In the following section 25 texts will be considered, which makes up nearly 8% of all the texts selected for this study. The Creation's suffering is explored in a wide range of ways, with a variety of themes being deployed, both metaphorical and literal, to express the challenges of environmental destruction. However some of the texts couch the nature of the Creation in an unfavourable light. One that is central to the initiation of Christians and so of particular importance associates the world with sin and the devil:

Do not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified.
Fight valiantly as a disciple of Christ
against sin, the world and the devil,
and remain faithful to Christ to the end of your life.
(Signing of the Cross, Holy Baptism, CWCI: 354)

To be encouraged, by the people of God (who all say the text) to ‘fight valiantly [...] against [...] the world’ runs counter to much of theology that is explored in the more recent material collected for this research. A text from the same rite that attempts to interpret this battle suggests that it is ‘the trials of this world’ that we are to be guided through by Christ rather than the world being a place we must do battle with, strengthened by Christ.

*The authorized Post Communion of the Day,
or a seasonal form, or the following is used*
Eternal God, our beginning and our end,
preserve in your people the new life of baptism;
as Christ receives us on earth,
so may he guide us through the trials of this world
and enfold us in the joy of heaven,
where you live and reign,
one God forever and ever.
Amen.
(Post Communion, Holy Baptism, *CWCI*: 362)

The world as a disturbed, suffering or dark place is a motif that is regularly repeated throughout the Christian year:

Eternal God,
in the stillness of this night
you sent your almighty Word
to pierce the world’s darkness with the light of salvation:
give to the earth the peace that we long for
and fill our hearts with the joy of heaven
through our Saviour, Jesus Christ.
(Collect, Christmas Night, *CWAC*: 6)

In a dark and disfigured world
we have not held out the light of life:

Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

In a hungry and despairing world
we have failed to share our bread:

Christ, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.

In a cold and loveless world
we have kept the love of God to ourselves:
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.
(Kyrie Confessions, B64 Church and mission / Living in the world,
Penitence, *NPW*: 93)

Christ came in love to a world of suffering:
forgive our self-centredness.
Lord, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.
(Kyrie Confessions, B57 Incarnation, Penitence, *NPW*: 91)

Merciful God,
whose holy apostle Saint James,
leaving his father and all that he had,
was obedient to the calling of your Son Jesus Christ
and followed him even to death:
help us, forsaking the false attractions of the world,
to be ready at all times to answer your call without delay;
through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
who is alive and reigns with you,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and forever.
(Collect, James, 25 July, Festivals, *CWME*: 437)

[...] For letting ourselves be drawn away from you
by temptations in the world about us;
Father, forgive us:
save us and help us [...]
(Confession, B49 Lament, Penitence, *NPW*: 87)

That the world is 'dark', 'disfigured', 'hungry', despairing', 'cold', loveless', 'suffering', 'false' and containing 'temptations' provides an unequivocal reading of the nature of the Creation across these five texts above. These texts speak of a dystopian or fallen world (see Section 6 and Chapters 6 and 7 for further discussion of this theme).

There are, however, many prayers that provide a more generous reading of the Creation, and speak with hope for transformation of a suffering creation.

God of peace,
 whose Son Jesus Christ proclaimed the kingdom
 and restored the broken to wholeness of life:
 look with compassion on the anguish of the world,
 and by your healing power
 make whole both people and nations;
 through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
 (Post Communion, The Third Sunday before Advent, *CWME*: 424)

Gracious Father,
 by the obedience of Jesus
 you brought salvation to our wayward world:
 draw us into harmony with your will,
 that we may find all things restored in him,
 our Saviour Jesus Christ.
 (Collect, The Fourth Sunday after Trinity, *CWAC*: 20)

Human sin disfigures the whole creation,
 which groans with eager longing for God's redemption.
 We confess our sin in penitence and faith.
cf Romans 8.22,23
 (Invitation to Confession, B6 God in creation, Lament, Penitence, *NPW*: 77)

[...] To a troubled world
 peace from Christ [...]
 (Closing Prayers, J33 Living in the world, Conclusion, *NPW*: 296)

Let us ask God to have mercy on our tired land,
 and to prosper the work of our soiled hands.
 Let us ask God to forgive our delusion of self-sufficiency
 so that we may praise him for his provision and goodness.
 (Invitation to Confession, A1 Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 609)

[...] Jesus died for a dying world [...]
 (Extract, Thanksgiving, G56 General, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 234-35)

Although the world is 'anguish[ed]', 'wayward', 'disfigured', 'troubled', 'tired' and 'dying', the world's restoration is the focus of the prayers. This negative depiction of the creation is problematic though and will be returned to in Section 6, below, and

also in Chapters 6 and 7. At this point though, the positive elements of the petitions are of particular interest: that the world is made 'whole'; that 'all things are restored'; that God's redemption, God's mercy and Christ's peace would overcome the world's suffering. The liberation comes from God and the world is preternaturally capable of being a broken and fallen place.

In the following Invitation to Confession from *TSAY* there is a coupling of the world's brokenness with the world's own built-in internal desire for liberation:

God's whole creation groans.
 The land produces thorns and thistles and longs to be set free.
 Our sin affects all around us.
 We confess our sins in penitence and faith ...
 (Invitation to Confession, A1 Creation, *TSAY*: 599)

This steps beyond the limited confines of the six prayers immediately above, to a space where the impetus and direction is utopian and Godwards, rather than a passive waiting by the world for rescue from itself.

The above prayers are more dynamic than the more resigned text that comes under the theme of 'Heaven', which uses Job 14.1 and Isaiah 40.8 to develop a metaphor of the Creation's impermanence as being symbolic of human mortality:

Man born of woman has but a short time to live.*

We have our
 fill of sorrow.
 We blossom like a flower and wither away.
 We slip away like a shadow and do not stay.
All: Holy God,
 holy and strong,
 holy and immortal,
 have mercy upon us.

In the midst of life we are in death;
 where can we turn for help?
 Only to you, Lord,

who are justly angered by our sins.
All: Holy God,
holy and strong,
holy and immortal,
have mercy upon us [...]
(Confession, B54 Heaven, Penitence, *NPW*: 89-90)

A more mature reading of our place in the world comes from those texts that see, the imperfections of the Creation, recognize the human contribution to the world's 'suffering and sorrow', and also acknowledge the human ability to help contribute towards 'the life of wholeness'.

[...] You have given the human race a rich land,
a land of streams and springs,
wheat and barley,
vines and oil and honey.
We have made by sin a world of suffering and sorrow.
We pray for those who bear the weight of affliction,
that they may come to share the life of wholeness
and plenty.
Father, Lord of creation,
in your mercy, hear us [...]
(Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F47, God in creation, Prayers, *NPW*: 191)

Even more positive than the format for intercessions above is the purpose, below, of being sent out into the world, not just to 'live and work to [God's] praise and glory' (as with the first of two standard prayers for after Communion, *CWME*: 182), but to bring 'healing and reconciliation to this wounded world':

Father, in baptism we die to sin,
rise again to new life
and find our true place in your living body.
Send us out sealed in Christ's blood of the new covenant,
to bring healing and reconciliation to this wounded world,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Post Communion prayers, J43 Holy Spirit, Conclusion, *NPW*: 298)

Rather than the responsibility for the world's healing resting with God, here the prayer places that task firmly in the hands of the Church as Christ's 'living body'. The prayer powerfully affirms the capacity of those praying to make a difference through their actions. What is lacking is a suggestion that the world's healing is required, in part, as a consequence of human action.

A number of confessions do address the matter of the destructive human impact on the Creation. Where these are most successful is when there is a process of repentance built into the confession, that moves from confessing the damage done to committing to act differently in future (as discussed in Chapter 3, Sections 4 and 5).

Lord God, our maker and our redeemer,
 this is your world and we are your people:
 come among us and save us.
 We have wilfully misused your gifts of creation;
 Lord, be merciful:
All: forgive us our sin.
 (Confession, City, World and Society, Authorized Forms of Confession and
 Absolution, *CWME*: 127)

In this first prayer there is a brief but fulsome confession but no suggestion of repentance.

The verb 'misuse' is developed much further in *CWME* in a neighbouring text:

We confess our sin, and the sins of our society,
 in the misuse of God's creation.
 God our Father, we are sorry
 for the times when we have used your gifts carelessly,
 and acted ungratefully.
 Hear our prayer, and in your mercy:
All: forgive us and help us.

We enjoy the fruits of the harvest,
 but sometimes forget that you have given them to us.
 Father, in your mercy:
All: forgive us and help us.

We belong to a people who are full and satisfied,
but ignore the cry of the hungry.

Father, in your mercy:

All: forgive us and help us.

We are thoughtless,
and do not care enough for the world you have made.

Father, in your mercy:

All: forgive us and help us.

We store up goods for ourselves alone,
as if there were no God and no heaven.

Father, in your mercy:

All: forgive us and help us.

(Confession, Creation, Harvest, Authorized Forms of Confession and Absolution, *CWME*: 126)

Again there is confession without repentance. The process of misuse is extrapolated by seven definitions, 'careless[ness]', 'ungrateful[ness]', 'forgetfulness', 'ignor[ance]', 'thoughtless[ness]', 'not car[ing] enough', and acting 'as if there were no God and no heaven'. A cursory reading could suggest no ambiguity remains about human responsibility for the Creation's suffering, though in fact the misuse is, according to this prayer semi-accidental; carelessness, ignorance, thoughtlessness and acting as if there were no God are sins of omission. This type of naivety is convenient but lacks accuracy.

It is a relief, therefore, to find two confessions where there is a more honest facing up to the consequences of human interaction with the Creation.

We confess to you
our lack of care for the world you have given us.

Lord, have mercy.

All: Lord, have mercy.

We confess to you
our selfishness in not sharing the earth's bounty fairly.

Christ, have mercy.

All: Christ, have mercy.

We confess to you
our failure to protect resources for others.

Lord, have mercy.

All: Lord, have mercy.

(Kyrie Confessions, B56 God in creation, Penitence, *NPW*: 91)

Although brief, there is an increase to the seriousness of human fault compared with the 'Creation / Harvest' confession from *CWME* above. Here the 'lack of care for the world' is much more stark than 'do not care enough for this world'. 'Not sharing fairly' is more active than the passivity of 'ignoring the cry of the hungry'. 'Failure to protect' improves, substantially on 'used your gifts carelessly'. The philosophical shift between the two prayers is subtle but significant. The prayer still lacks a full cycle from confession into repentance.

TSAY goes further in self-judgement, turning humankind into 'plunderers':

You delight in creation, its colour and diversity;
yet we have misused the earth,
and plundered its resources for our own selfish ends.

Lord, have mercy.

All: Lord, have mercy [...]

(Kyrie Confession, B3 Creation, *TSAY*: 600)

A few pages on in *TSAY* another confession text once again sets the tone from the outset, with the following invitation:

Let us confess our forgetfulness of the needs of the poor,
and repent of the ways in which we waste
the resources of the world.

(Invitation to Confession, A1 Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 623)

All of the above confessions are, thankfully, better than the worryingly dismissive account of the human interaction with the Creation that comes from a confession, focused on 'Resurrection / Heaven, Penitence':

[...]
 We have lived for this world alone,
 and doubted our home in heaven.
 In your mercy, forgive us.
 Lord, hear us and help us [...]
 (Confession, B46 Resurrection / Heaven, Penitence, NPW: 86)

There is nothing here to suggest an interaction with the Creation that is unhelpful except that the 'world' has been detrimental to the well-being of the person praying.

What is most concerning about the CW confessions is the lack of prayers that have even made an attempt to make confession for the sins of environmental damage or destruction. In the whole collection of texts, there are only four Kyrie Confessions, two regular Confessions and five Invitations to Confession that directly address these issues. The remaining two Kyrie Confessions, not already discussed above, repeat the same themes; though humanity as 'plunder[er]' is swapped for 'squander[er]' in the *TSAY* confession for Rogationtide:

Lord, you give us this good earth,
 yet we take your generous gifts for granted.
 Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.

Lord, you give us this good earth,
 but we squander its rich resources.
 Christ, have mercy.
All: Christ, have mercy.

Lord, you give us this good earth,
 but we fail to share your bounty with all of your children.
 Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.
 (Kyrie Confession, B1 Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 609)

Taking God's gifts for granted and failing to share are identical themes to those explored above.

The TSAY Kyrie for Harvest Thanksgiving is less specific and more passive about the topics of hunger, poverty and injustice.

God has blessed us:
but still God's children go hungry.
Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.

God has blessed us:
but still the poor cry out for justice.
Christ, have mercy.
All: Christ, have mercy.

God has blessed us,
but still we see inequality and oppression in the earth.
Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.
(Kyrie Confession, B2 Harvest Thanksgiving, TSAY: 623)

Whether 'inequality and oppression in the earth' does or does not include unjust human actions in the environment is as vague as the tone created in the whole prayer and merits no further discussion.

7. Stewardship, Dominion and the Cherishing of the Earth

The theme of God's gifting humanity with a responsibility to care for, or be stewards of, or to have dominion over the earth (Genesis 1.26-28) is one that is given some attention. Only one text uses the word 'dominion' to describe humanity's responsibility in the Creation:

You have created the universe by your eternal Word,
and have blessed humankind in giving us dominion over the earth:
we pray for the world,
that we may honour and share its resources,

and live in reverence for the creation
and in harmony with one another.

Lord of the harvest,

All: in your mercy hear us.

(Extract, Intercession, H1 Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 626-27)

The text does not shy away from the word 'dominion' but it interprets the term by adding 'honour', 'share' and 'reverence' as approaches to be taken towards the Creation. This attention to reverence is repeated in 'Almighty God, give us reverence for all creation' (Collect, The Second Sunday before Lent, *CWAC*: 11).

More typically, texts use 'stewards', or speak of God making 'us' stewards. (Three examples of this being: Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F47 God in creation, Prayers, *NPW*: 191; Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 612; Preface, Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 630.) There is an expansion on the term 'stewards' in the petition, 'make us generous and wise stewards' in the Post Communion for Harvest Thanksgiving (Festivals, *CWME*: 447). Another blessing asks for wisdom from God: 'God give you grace to be wise stewards' (Blessing, P2, Harvest Thanksgiving, *TSAY*: 631).

Three further texts explore the theme of stewardship and dominion without using either word, opting instead to use the verb 'care' to identify human responsibility for the Creation:

- 'O God, whose good earth is entrusted to our care and delight and tenderness' (Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F48 God in creation / Living in the world, Prayers, *NPW*: 192);
- 'Tend the earth, care for God's good creation' (Dismissal, P3 Creation, *TSAY*: 604);

- 'Prosper all who care for the earth, the water, and the air, that the riches of your creation may abound from age to age.' (Litany A, Rogationtide addition to CW Litany, Procession, *TSAY*: 614).

The first of these three swaps notions of stewardship or dominion for that of God entrusting the earth to humanity. The next two texts speak of what is assumed to be a Christian or morally positive attitude towards the earth without stating if it is a God given responsibility. The Litany states the hope that God will prosper (not make prosperous) those endeavouring to care for 'the earth, the water, and the air', since, the prayer claims that such generic efforts will enable the abounding of creation 'from age to age'. A weakness in this Litany comes by not weighing up whether those caring may be counterbalanced by those destroying or being wanton with earth, air and water. The prayer also places responsibility for the earth's abundance on those who care, when in fact the environmental factors that affect abundance are many and various.

The notion of caring for the earth is developed in two more texts that feature the verb 'cherish':

- 'may we cherish and respect this planet and its peoples' (Collect, Harvest Thanksgiving, *CWAC*: 27);
- similarly, 'give us the will to cherish' features in *TSAY* (Intercession: H1 Creation, *TSAY*: 601-02).

The concept of cherishing brings a stronger relational emphasis than the verb 'care'.

Valuing Creation because of the human work undertaken in it and for the produce that comes from the land also features in the collection of texts. The following exam-

ple is particularly strong, since it portrays the unity of Creator, the Creation and human labour at the eucharist:

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation:
through your goodness we have this bread to set before you,
which earth has given and human hands have made.
It will become for us the bread of life.

All: Blessed be God for ever.

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation:
through your goodness we have this wine to set before you,
fruit of the vine and work of human hands.
It will become for us the cup of salvation.

All: Blessed be God for ever.

(Prayers at the Preparation of the Table, Supplementary Texts, *CWME*: 291)

The following prayer, for either rain or better weather, sees the need for God to help humans in their dominion of the earth. It is designed for times when a dependency upon the power of the elements makes all the difference to the success or failure in agriculture.

O God, heavenly Father,
who by your Son Jesus Christ
have promised to all those who seek your kingdom and its righteousness
all things necessary to sustain their life:
send us, we entreat you, in this time of need,
* such moderate rain and showers
* such favourable weather
that we may receive the fruits of the earth,
to our comfort, and to your honour;
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

(For Favourable Weather in Time of Need, Harvest, Prayer in Times of Agricultural Crisis, *TSAY*: 633)

The prayer does not consider if the weather events have anything to do with human action, rather it only assumes that more useful weather patterns are something that may be granted by God.

8. *Animals*

There are very few direct references to animals in *CW* texts. Five texts that are explicit (in relation to the agricultural year or creation themes) are discussed later in this section. First, the approach in eucharistic prayers is considered, especially where the Prefaces lead into the Sanctus. It is here that animals are often included, though typically without being named. This first text is an exception in being explicit about animals:

Therefore, we join with angels and archangels,
and give voice to every creature under heaven,
for ever praising you and saying.
(Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 612)

This Rogationtide text makes it clear though that it is humans who serve as the voices of other creatures (see Sections 3b, 4b for further discussion of this text). A similar division between humans and the rest of the animal kingdom is made in this Preface that is exclusive in focussing on human praise:

You give us breath and speech, that with angels and archangels
and all the powers of heaven
we may find a voice to sing your praise:
(Preface, Eucharistic Prayer G, Order One, *CWME*: 201)

It is not possible to *prove* that the text means to make an exclusive claim for humans over and against other animals. It is reasonable, though, to *infer* that a traditional natural law argument is being made—that humans do have reason and that other creatures do not. Inference is possible since it is ‘speech’ (*CWME*: 201) that serves as a traditional basis for making the distinction between the rational creature and the

creature with instinct 'since he lacks a language, he cannot give a reason; and only those being who can give reasons can act for reasons' (Kenny 1993: 82).

This traditional and common reading of Aquinas does not accurately describe the boundaries between rationalism and instinct he made: 'the difference between humans and animals is not one that we can see or hear or touch [...] it can only be established by exercise of the quality which is itself its essence, rational thinking' (Yamamoto 1998: 85). Yamamoto goes onto explain how rationalism was not something understood as always belonging to all humans or even exclusively *only* to humans (Yamamoto 1998: 85-89). Yamamoto's fairer interpretation does not deny speech as an important element of the distinction, just not the only one. In considering the eucharistic text above (CWME: 201), the more common understanding of speech and rationalism is fair to bear in mind when interpreting the philosophy of the text in relation to animals.

Perhaps it is for this reason that there is, more typically, in eucharistic Prefaces, an attempt to give no layers of sentiency or primacy to different aspects of creation other than humans. Animals are usually included obliquely, when there is reference to the whole creation generally and not to animals specifically:

so earth unites with heaven
to sing the new song of creation:
(Extract, Short Prefaces: G89 God in creation, NPW: 286)

Therefore earth unites with heaven
to sing a new song of praise;
(Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, The Annunciation of our Lord, CWME: 311)

Therefore all creation yearns with eager longing
as angels and archangels sing the endless hymn of praise:

(Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From the day after Ascension Day until the Day of Pentecost, *CWME*: 321)

earth and heaven resound with gladness,
 while angels and archangels and the powers of all creation
 sing forever the hymn of your glory:
 (Extract; Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions; From Easter Day until the
 Eve of the Ascension, *CWME*: 316)

There is one exception to the above approaches of either oblique inclusion or deliberate exclusion of animals:

therefore with all who can give voice in your creation
 we glorify your name,
 for ever praising you and saying:
 (Extract, Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From the day after All
 Saints' Day until the day before the First Sunday of Advent, except Christ the
 King, *CWME*: 327)

The more traditional distinction of language or speech is bypassed through the use of 'voice'. Where the Extended Preface for Rogationtide (*TSAY*: 612) spoke of humanity giving voice to other creatures, here humanity is a subset of all those being that 'can give voice in [God's] creation' (*CWME*: 327). This proves to be a more respectful observer of the subtle borders between human and other creaturely life.

There is an intriguing accidental inclusion of animals, it is reasonable to guess, in the following:

Heavenly Father,
 whose blessed Son shared at Nazareth the life of an earthly home:
 help your Church to live as one family,
 united in love and obedience,
 and bring us all at last to our home in heaven;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Post Communion, The First Sunday of Christmas, *CWME*: 382)

The 'home' in first century Palestine would include species other than humans: 'typically a house had two to four rooms, often with a pillared wall that could help sup-

port a second floor and also partition off a side room where any animals could be quartered' (Knight 1990: 294). An implication of the prayer is that a heavenly home awaits 'households' of faith (see Acts 11.14; 16.31 and 1 Corinthians 7.14 for a consideration of salvation for the household, and see for example, Matson 1996).

The five texts that follow are in stark contrast to some of the texts above that discuss animals only by inference or accident.

Through our love of the countryside,
 through our care for animals,
 through our respect for property and tools:
 Father, hallowed be your name.
 (Extract, Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F49, God in creation, Prayers, *NPW*: 193)

For the flowers and the animals,
 Father in heaven
 we give you thanks and praise.
 (Extract, Thanksgiving, G62 General / God in creation, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 239)

For the care and welfare of animals
 and for the veterinary profession we pray.
 (Extract, Litany: B, Rogationtide, Procession, *TSAY*: 615-17)

God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures of every kind'.
 We rejoice in the variety of animal life.
 Grant us grace to treat all animals with respect and care;
 to protect endangered species,
 to preserve the variety of habitats,
 and to honour the delicate balance of nature.
 God of life:
All: hear our prayer.
 (Intercession, H1 Creation, *TSAY*: 601-02)

That it may please thee to grant favourable weather,
 temperate rain, and fruitful seasons,
 that there may be food and drink for all thy creatures,
 We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.
 (Extract, Litany, A, Rogationtide addition to BCP Litany, Procession, *TSAY*: 614)

Four of these five prayers include 'all thy creatures' (TSAY: 614). One prayer gives focus to human 'care' of creatures (TSAY: 615-17). There is an unpleasant juxtaposition of 'animals' and 'property and tools' in the responsive intercession (NPW: 193). The third prayer does partially address the treatment of livestock, 'for the care and welfare of animals and the veterinary profession' (TSAY: 615-17). None of the five get anywhere close to the topic of animal rights, but the matter of 'welfare' or 'care' features in the first, third and fourth of these five.

9. *Eschatology and the Creation, Realized and Unrealized*

a. *Realized eschatology*

There are 157 texts that explore realized eschatology in the Creation, a small proportion of these do so in an explicit and sustained way and are discussed here. Just over half of these (84) also discuss the theme of unrealized eschatology for the Creation. Noteworthy prayers that do discuss realized eschatology for the Creation (in addition to those texts not already discussed above) are those that speak positively and specifically about the realization of the kingdom of God in the here and now.

Christ, who by his incarnation gathered into one
things earthly and heavenly,
fill you with peace and goodwill
and make you partakers of the divine nature;
and the blessing ...

(Blessing, Seasonal Provisions, From Christmas Day until the Eve of the Epiphany, CWME: 303)

There is a looseness in the text here that means it can be read two ways. Maybe it means, simply that the incarnation gathers the heavenly and earthly nature of God's identity into one place and one being (the looseness in this being the reference to 'things earthly' that could be read as creation itself).

It is possible to read it in a second way, that the gathering together of *all* things in heaven and earth has already occurred as a consequence of the incarnation itself, which is in contradiction to familiar biblical passages that speak of the gathering of 'things earthly and heavenly' (Eph 1.9-10 and Philippians 2.10), as a future event. The second possible reading of this text is both made more legitimate and also moderated by the following six texts that carry on exploring a similar theme but from the perspective of what has already begun.

Extended Preface for use with Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E

All honour and praise be yours always and everywhere,

mighty creator, ever-living God,

through Jesus Christ your only Son our Lord:

for at this time we celebrate your glory

made present in our midst.

In the coming of the Magi

the King of all the world was revealed to the nations.

In the waters of baptism

Jesus was revealed as the Christ,

the Saviour sent to redeem us.

In the water made wine

the new creation was revealed at the wedding feast.

Poverty was turned to riches, sorrow into joy.

Therefore with all the angels of heaven

we lift our voices to proclaim the glory of your name

and sing our joyful hymn of praise:

(Extended Preface, Seasonal Provisions, From the Epiphany until the Eve of the Presentation, CWME: 305)

'Things' are not completed or gathered in this passage, but three things are 'revealed' as the result of Christ's incarnation. The third revelation comes through

the miracle at the wedding in Cana, when the new creation is 'revealed'. More than that, 'rich[ness]' and 'joy' were also made manifest in the same miracle. So these two texts indicate that both the incarnation and the life of Jesus present the arrival of the new creation.

Less surprising in content are the following texts that espouse a realized eschatology but name it as a consequence of the resurrected Christ. First is on the more minor detail of joy. The kind of joy that fills the cosmos is suggested in a *NPW* Short Preface:

The joy of resurrection fills the universe,
and so we join with angels and archangels,
with [N and] all your faithful people,
evermore praising you and saying:
(Extract, Short Preface, G145 Heaven, Praise and Thanksgiving, *NPW*: 266-67)

The Short Preface relates 'joy', not to the miracle during the wedding at Cana (cited above), but to the resurrection.

The Easter Day Collect speaks, not just of the joy, but also of the power of the resurrection:

Lord of all life and power,
who through the mighty resurrection of your Son
overcame the old order of sin and death
to make all things new in him:
grant that we, being dead to sin
and alive to you in Jesus Christ,
may reign with him in glory;
to whom with you and the Holy Spirit
be praise and honour, glory and might,
now and in all eternity.
(Collect, Easter Day, *CWME*: 400)

This Collect, when read in conjunction with the Christmas blessing (above) would suggest that the incarnation was the moment when 'all things' were gathered together and that the resurrection was the moment when 'all things' were made new. These three texts sit well with each other to express a substantial understanding of how aspects of God's kingdom break in through the person of Christ.

A more subtle understanding of Christ's resurrected presence in the world is given in this Additional Collect, where signs of the kingdom are muted in tone and come in the guise of the poor and marginalized.

This provision is not used on weekdays after 5 January.
 God our Father,
 in love you sent your Son
 that the world may have life:
 lead us to seek him among the outcast
 and to find him in those in need,
 for Jesus Christ's sake.
 (Collect, The Second Sunday of Christmas, CWAC: 7)

Returning, though, to a more systematic approach to the process of the bringing about of new creation, two more texts add to overall impression of how CW understands the sequence of this work of God.

Through [Christ], you begin your work of new creation,
 as we look for a new heaven and a new earth
 in which your righteousness dwells.
 Therefore, we join with angels and archangels,
 and give voice to every creature under heaven,
 for ever praising you and saying:
 (Extract, Extended Preface, M1 Rogationtide, TSAY: 612)

And now we give you thanks
 because in him, our risen Lord,
 the new creation is being brought to perfection,
 a broken world is being renewed,
 and creation itself will share
 in the glorious liberty of the children of God.
 (Preface, L1 Creation, TSAY: 603)

The present moment of the prayer being in proximity to the very beginnings of the new creation is noted in the Extended Preface (*TSAY*: 612), whereas the Preface (*TSAY*: 603) emphasizes how close at hand the completion of the same work is. All of these seven texts above make direct reference to Christ (NB the extract from the Short Preface, *NPW*: 266-67, omits an earlier stanza from the prayer that speaks of Christ's work).

The very large majority of the 159 texts (from the 316) that give emphasis to a realized eschatology make more than a mention Christ. Usually, it is the work, power or presence of Christ that brings about a realized eschatology. Texts from the 159 that do not mention Christ are either prayers of intercession addressed to the first person of the Trinity, or they are very short texts, such as this:

Blessed be God,
by whose grace creation is renewed,
by whose love heaven is opened,
by whose mercy we offer our sacrifice of praise.

All: Blessed be God for ever.

(Prayers at the Preparation of the Table, Supplementary Texts, *CWME*: 293, and also *TSAY*: 603, 612)

b. *Unrealized (and realized) eschatology*

In addition to the 84 texts that explore the Creation in relation to both realized and unrealized eschatology there are a further 33 texts that focus solely on unrealized eschatology and Creation. Several texts that are noteworthy in the way they discuss unrealized eschatology cover both themes. Two details that prove to be particularly important are, first, the tense adopted in relation to the hope for something unrealized, and second, the certainty and uncertainty expressed about what will happen.

One text in which both the realized and unrealized aspects of eschatology are explored, where an unfulfilled hope is named for both the Creation and humanity—and where grammatical tense and the certainty about the new creation are also expressed—is the eucharistic Preface for the *TSAY* theme of ‘Creation’:

And now we give you thanks
because in him, our risen Lord,
the new creation is being brought to perfection,
a broken world is being renewed,
and creation itself will share
in the glorious liberty of the children of God.
(Preface, L1 Creation, *TSAY*: 603)

The drawing on Romans 8.21, in the latter half, is obvious. The understanding that the ‘new creation is being brought to perfection’ echoes the words used in a prayer by Oscar Romero at the Mass he presided at in 1980 when he was assassinated (and quoted in a posthumous work):

God’s reign is already present on our earth in mystery. When the Lord comes, it will be brought to perfection. That is the hope that inspires Christians. We know that every effort to better society, especially when injustice and sin are so ingrained, is an effort that God blesses, that God wants, that God demands of us (Romero 1988: 206).

What the Preface achieves is that it replaces the ‘will be’ of Romero’s second sentence with the ‘is’ of the first sentence (i.e. ‘is being brought to perfection’). The phrase is not as common as it may sound. It only appears in two different bible translations (cf. 1 Kings 7.1, Douay-Rheims: ‘And Solomon built his own house in thirteen years, and brought it to perfection’; John 17.23, New American: ‘I in them and you in me, that they may be brought to perfection as one, that the world may know that you sent me, and that you loved them even as you loved me’ (cf the contrasting text Hebrews 7.19, Douay-Rheims: ‘For the law brought nothing to perfection’).

The phrase 'brought to perfection' does appear, almost identically, in a eucharistic intercession from the *CWME*:

Gather your people from the ends of the earth
to feast with [N and] all your saints
at the table in your kingdom,
where the new creation is brought to perfection
in Jesus Christ our Lord;
(Extract, Eucharistic Prayer F, Order One, *CWME*: 200)

A difference between the two prayers, which makes the 'Creation' Preface (*TSAY*: 603) more remarkable than the eucharistic intercession for Prayer F (*CWME*: 200), is the use of the present continuous (passive) tense about God's fulfilment of the Creation in the first prayer. This gives a very clear and tight definition of the new creation as being both realized and unrealized in the present reality. The eucharistic intercession in using the present simple tense leaves a greater ambiguity about how much, if at all, the new creation impinges on the present moment of the prayer.

There is less success in exploring the unrealized aspect of eschatology by calling on God to 'renew' of the earth.

Lord of life,
All renew your creation.
(Extract, Responsive form of the Prayer Over the Water, Holy Baptism, *CWME*: 364)

Come, Holy Spirit, creator,
and renew the earth.
Holy Spirit, come upon us.
(Responsive forms of intercessions and litanies, F62, Holy Spirit, Prayers, *NPW*: 204-05)

In the fullness of time you sent forth your Son, your eternal Word,
who laid down his life for our salvation
and rose from the grave, the first fruits of your new creation.
You send forth your holy and life-giving Spirit
to give life to our mortal bodies
and to renew the face of the earth.

(Extract, Extended Preface, M1 Creation, TSAY: 604)

The theme of renewing the earth (cf. Psalm 104.30), expresses something of both realized and unrealized eschatology. The third prayer refers both to how Christ's resurrection brings about the 'first fruits' of the new creation, and also to the power of the Spirit's work in renewing the earth. This gives a sense of what has begun but has not been fully realized (first fruits / new creation), and it also scopes out what can be sustained in the here and now, until the new creation is fulfilled (our mortal bodies and 'the face of the earth'). What is different here from the 'Creation' Preface (TSAY: 603) is that there is no suggestion that there is any movement along the continuum from here towards the new creation, only that the direction has been set.

The following prayer also adopts the same perspective that a different version of creation is something beyond the temporal realm. It includes an intriguing nuance: the certainty of creation's eternal existence, in contrast to only the *possibility* of eternal existence for those praying.

God, the giver of life,
 whose Holy Spirit wells up within your Church:
 by the Spirit's gifts equip us to live the gospel of Christ
 and make us eager to do your will,
 that we may share with the whole creation
 the joys of eternal life;
 through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you,
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and forever.
 (Collect, The Twentieth Sunday after Trinity, CWME: 420)

The implied 'if' of eternal life for those praying, comes from the clause 'that we' (the requirements being to 'live the gospel' and be 'eager to do [God's] will'). Although

'new creation' is not named, the 'joys of eternal life', is what awaits the Creation beyond the end of time.

The relationship between the present moment and the new creation is given more structure in this Post Communion prayer:

Father of light,
 in whom is no change or shadow of turning,
 you give us every good and perfect gift
 and have brought us to birth by your word of truth:
 may we be a living sign of that kingdom
 where your whole creation will be made perfect
 in Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Post Communion, The Twenty First Sunday after Trinity, *CWME*: 421)

Those who pray the prayer bring the 'sign' of the place (where creation is made perfect) into the present moment, but only the sign of it. The implication is that what is present of the new creation in the here and now is only present in those persons who have already been 'brought [...] to birth by [God's] word of truth' (present perfect tense).

The Post Communion for the Baptism of Christ develops a similar idea but with a different sense of timing, producing contrasting results:

Lord of all time and eternity,
 you opened the heavens and revealed yourself as Father
 in the baptism of Jesus your beloved Son:
 by the power of your Spirit
 complete the heavenly work of our rebirth
 through the waters of the new creation;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Post Communion, Baptism of Christ, *CWME*: 384)

The imperative 'complete' makes clear that the work of rebirth has been realized in part, but not entirely. The understanding expressed is that some of God's work is still to be completed (cf Philippians 1.6). Birthing consists of a passage 'through the

waters of the new creation' (CWME: 384). This particular prayer does not spell out that the new creation is yet to be completed or when it began, the implication is, first, that the waters of the new creation came about in the waters of baptism of Jesus (the moment, the prayer describes when God 'opened the heavens' with a new revelation of God's self). Second, that those same waters serve as the conduit from here into eternity (when God's 'heavenly work' will be made 'complete').

A baptism prayer that also addresses unrealized eschatology but avoids exploring eschatology for the Creation, focussing solely on that for humanity is worth noting for its stark contrast with the Post Communion (CWME: 384) above:

*The authorized Post Communion of the Day,
or a seasonal form, or the following is used*
Eternal God, our beginning and our end,
preserve in your people the new life of baptism;
as Christ receives us on earth,
so may he guide us through the trials of this world
and enfold us in the joy of heaven,
where you live and reign,
one God forever and ever.
All: Amen.
(Post Communion, Holy Baptism, CWME: 362)

There are also, within the collection of prayers, those texts that approach the theme of unrealized eschatology not by discussing it directly, but by indicating how far the present circumstances are from perfection.

God's whole creation groans.
The land produces thorns and thistles and longs to be set free.
Our sin affects all around us.
We confess our sins in penitence and faith.
(Invitation to Confession, A1, Creation, TSAY: 599)

Where texts do not name the time or place for change to come about this heightens the sense of desire for God's unrealized eschatology to break through. The weakness

is that there is the risk of bewailing current circumstances without suggesting what hope or promise there is of movement towards a new heaven and a new earth (for further discussion of such texts see Section 6, above).

10. *Conclusion*

What is contained within this chapter simply looks at the noteworthy resources in *CW* as they stand. The original expectation at the outset of this research was that there would be very little, or that what was of note would only be so for negative reasons. The substantial number of texts has been a surprise. The complexity of at times clear, and at other times tangled and confused theology has been fascinating to analyze. What this chapter does not offer is proposals for improvements to the existing resource by re-presenting and enhancing the materials that are currently available. In Chapter 6 such an approach is developed in relation to Collects and Post Communion. First of all, in Chapter 5, the question of how much any of these materials are being used is tested via a survey of clergy.

CHAPTER FIVE

A SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF EARTHED

COMMON WORSHIP TEXTS

The main purpose for the survey was to test out whether *CW* texts, which have been assessed in this research as having ecotheological significance, were currently being put to use in worship contexts. Another purpose was to see if worship planners regard such texts positively. The interest lies especially with those texts that are within the *CW* materials but are not the main or default sources most readily to hand for those planning and leading worship.

This chapter reports on and provides an analysis of the results of a survey conducted, as part of this research, on the use of some of the *CW* resources by clergy working in the C of E. Where respondents provided comments, this serves as a catalyst for further analysis and discussion of the texts selected for the survey within the wider context of *CW* resources.

1. Survey Process

Choosing to use a survey was determined in part to deliberately continue in the same vein as Davies' in *Alien Rites* (2005). Designing a brief survey was to do with the time constraints on the research process considering this was a final research task for the thesis. Brevity in the survey was also important so that there was not too much data to comprehend. A third reason for the survey being brief (but with space for optional additional comments) was to encourage the completion of the survey by respondents who had begun it (a challenge for online surveys).

Although time did not allow, there was scope for following up survey responses with further interviews and one of the questions asks if respondents want sight of the survey results, which will be duly shared (within the ethics of confidentiality that were promised and kept to). Once results *have* been shared, then any data stored about individual respondents will be destroyed. The only ethical oversight I can see, was that in titling the survey as being to do with *Common Worship*, I may have attracted people to undertake the survey because they wanted to comment on *CW* but found themselves in a much smaller area of focus, which could have been disappointing or irritating.

The survey of people using *CW* texts sought to find out how much use was being made of supplementary and optional material with a creation theme.

When deciding how to survey clergy I considered three options:

- surveying clergy in different types of parish;

- surveying clergy in different types of deanery;
- surveying a random selection of clergy.

I determined that it would be easier for the survey to, by accident, omit different types of clergy through the first two options than via the third route. The third route was made readily available through the listing of email addresses in the *Crockfords Clerical Directory 2008/2009*. This ensured that I was surveying all types of clergy, including those in parish, chaplaincy, retreat houses, cathedrals and even those retired, with permission to officiate or those in academic life.

Clergy are not the only people involved in the design and leading of worship in a parish setting. Clergy, though, are a likely group to know of liturgical change and they are likely to encounter the range of available materials and have some responsibility for deciding what materials to include. I also wanted to include those in ministry for many years who were ordained at a similar time to the decisions of the C of E Liturgical Commission of 1957 and the Lambeth Conference of 1958. If time had allowed it would have been useful to have interviewed some clergy of this period to ask for their consideration on the progress of liturgical revision to date.

Clergy were selected at random by selecting the fourth person from the top of each odd-numbered page in the left-hand of the two columns per page. That level of frequency gave a total survey group of 447. If the fourth person from the top was without an email then the next name down, with an email, was used instead.

Of the 447 emails sent out, between 76 and 84 could be identified as undeliverable due to return email alerts indicating that the message had failed or may have failed or was waiting to be tried again. That means a maximum of 371 surveys were suc-

cessfully delivered and of the maximum 371 who received the survey, 128 responded, giving a response rate of just over a one-third (34.5%).

In the statistical results from survey there were more responses from those who had been in ministry for more than 15 years than from those who had been ordained less than fifteen years.

Table 5.1

Length of time ordained		
0 - 15 years	49	38%
16 - 30 years	48	38%
31 - 45 years	17	13%
46 - 60 years	5	4%
No answer	9	7%
Total	128	100%

This reflects the stipendiary and non-stipendiary numbers as published by the C of E (Church of England Facts & Stats *Licensed Ministry* 2009). For example, 4162 stipendiary clergy were ordained in the 15-year period from 1993 to 2007 (inclusive) and the total number of stipendiary clergy for 2007 was 8423, so 51% of those in stipendiary ministry had been ordained for more than 15 years, 49% for less than 15 years.

There is a weakness though in undertaking an email survey when considering all clergy since only 31% of all ordained clergy, including chaplains and those in other ministries, have been ordained for less than 15 years. When active retired clergy are also numbered (a further 4600) then the proportion of those ordained less than 15 years drops to 23%. It is reasonable to assume that clergy with published email addresses in *Crockfords* are those more active both in submitting their details and in wanting their contact information shared with others (and most likely to be in sti-

pendiary ministry), it may or may not be the case that those who share an email address are younger, older, in stipendiary ministry or not.

The selected survey group were those not just who were ordained but those who had an active email address that they had chosen to share in the public domain. Any system of selecting a survey group would have created different biases (alternative selection criteria considered included surveys in contrasting deaneries and dioceses or by political interest in the environment). Creating a group that were web literate was necessary for this form of survey, the advantages of using an online survey included the benefits of the survey software for the collation of data (see also Lloyd, Steven and Tovey 2010: 21). This was an imperfect but satisfactory solution (and probably more neutral than selecting via more specific criteria, which introduces further presuppositions).

The information on the role of the respondents in relation to public worship is another important factor in determining what the respondent group is representative of (table 5.2). Of 127 respondents 117 led worship in a parish setting, 17 in a chaplaincy context and 38 elsewhere. 82 identified themselves as responsible for planning parish worship. 120 of the 128 were participating in worship at least once a week.

Table 5.2

3. role in relation to public worship	I participate in public worship	I'm a leader of public worship	I'm involved in planning public worship	I'm responsible for planning public worship	I delegate the planning of public worship
Parish	93	117	84	82	48
Chaplaincy	14	17	13	14	4
Cathedral	10	7	3	0	0
Centres or 'Houses'	5	8	5	4	0
Pilgrimages	4	3	3	3	1
Other places	16	20	10	7	1
Total Respondents	127				
(skipped this question)	1				

Table 5.3

Participation in worship: frequency		
	<i>Response</i>	%
Monthly or less	3	2%
weekly or less	5	4%
once a week	10	8%
2 to 6 times a week	81	63%
7 to 17 times a week	28	22%
more than 17 times a week	1	1%
Other	0	0%
(skipped this question)	0	0%

2. Survey Texts

The range of texts that were selected as example texts for use in the survey were planned as a sequence that would make up many of the constituent parts of a eucharistic service. The reason for selecting texts that serve within a eucharistic setting is, first, that it gave coherence to the survey for participants as they were introduced to optional elements that could be included in the same act of worship.

Second, the eucharist is a service that all those leading worship are the most likely to include as a main act of weekly worship, at least several times a year, if not weekly. Other forms of worship have more variants to them and it is less likely that all survey participants would definitely be leading such services as a principal act of worship.

A third reason for the choice of texts was to use resources not immediately obvious for those using *CWME* in printed format (the physical place where the main eucharist appears). One of the six texts does come from *CWME*, the Post Communion for Harvest Thanksgiving, which appears at the very end of all the Collects and Post Communions that are provided. This means it comes after the seasonal Collects and also after all those for Saints' Day and finally for a church's Dedication Festival. It does, therefore, sit as something of an anomalous text on its own, thus making it more obscure than other *CWME* texts.

In total six texts were chosen with the following headings:

- a. Invitation to Confession
- b. Confession
- c. Collect
- d. Preface: for Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E
- e. Post Communion
- f. Blessing

A common theme was also selected where appropriate, 'God in Creation': a titling that is used in *NPW*. This served as the first choice in selecting materials for the survey. Four of the six texts come under that heading and are from *NPW*, which was

first published in 2002. The survey took place six years later, which gave substantial time for those surveyed to have become familiar with the resources. This does not mean the four texts appear in a sequence in *NPW* (in fact, they appear in the following locations *NPW*: 77, 91, 241-43 and 304). There was no guarantee that because one text had been seen or used that another would have been to, though it could make it more likely. For this reason a question was included in the survey to ascertain whether those responding were familiar with the title 'God in Creation'.

In planning the survey an option that was considered was including texts for use at the Eucharist that first appear in *Times and Seasons*, from the 'Creation' section (C of E 2006c: 599-606) of *TSAY* (C of E 2006: 593-643). Two reasons determined the decision not to include such materials. First, texts were chosen for use in the survey that participants had, as a minimum, already had chance to see during the course of a full lectionary cycle and to then have the opportunity to make use of during at least one subsequent year, which discounted *Times and Seasons* materials since it was less than two years old at the time of the survey. Two of the six texts, however, *also* appear in *TSAY* (Invitation to Confession *NPW*: 77, *TSAY* 599, and the Blessing *NPW*: 304, *TSAY*: 604).

Second, 'The Agricultural Year' is one of eleven sections, and 'Creation' is one of six sub-sections. It is reasonable to assume that considering its more recent publication and the relative obscurity of the texts compared with the more established *CW* volumes, that less people would have both found and used this material to date. This presupposition determined, in part, the selection of materials.

That being said, *TSAY* materials are a significant part of the collection of texts considered in this thesis: 23% of the 316 texts appear in *TSAY* (i.e. 73 texts). Eight of the texts from *TSAY* have previously appeared in *NPW* and 65 texts out of the 316 appear solely in *TSAY*. Having no inclusion of texts from this volume in the survey has some disadvantages. If there had been scope for a more extended survey, or some follow-up research, then asking the same respondents what they thought of the newer material would be of interest.

The quality of the ecotheological concepts explored in the texts was a factor that assisted in determining what materials to choose, but was not the only one. The inconsistent quality of *CW* materials was something that it was also important to reflect in the texts that were chosen, whilst at the same time showing resources that were constructive contributions to this study's points of interest.

a. *Invitation to Confession*

Human sin disfigures the whole creation,
which groans with eager longing for God's redemption.
We confess our sin in penitence and faith.
cf Romans 8.22, 23
(B6 God in Creation / Lament, *NPW*: 77)

This Invitation is among the highest scoring texts, according to the criteria as laid down in the previous chapter. It scored 10 along with five others, from all of the 316 selected from the *CW* material. Although the narrative speaks in the negative of creation's disfigurement, the responsibility for this is named as a consequence of human sin. Creation, however, rather than being passive in its suffering is actively

seeking God's transformation. (This text and the confession that follows have already been discussed in Chapter 3, Section 6, 'Suffering in the Creation'.)

b. *Confession*

We confess to you
our lack of care for the world you have given us.
Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.

We confess to you
our selfishness in not sharing the earth's bounty fairly.
Christ, have mercy.
All: Christ, have mercy.

We confess to you
our failure to protect resources for others.
Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy.
(Kyrie Confessions, B56 God in Creation, *NPW*: 91)

This prayer does not score as highly as the Invitation, though again the text is explicit in identifying humanity as being the cause of the suffering of humankind and the earth. The text speaks of a world to be cared for, which provides bounty and offers up resources that need to be protected. The earth is cast in a more passive mode than in the Invitation to Confession. It is contradictory that this text comes from the category 'God in Creation' and yet there is no reference to God's involvement in the Creation beyond providing 'mercy' as a counter-weight for sinful human action.

c. *Collect*

Almighty God,
as we prepare with joy
to celebrate the gift of the Christ-child,
embrace the earth with your glory
and be for us a living hope

in Jesus Christ our Lord.
(24 December, Christmas Eve, CWAC: 5)

The selected Collect comes from the *Additional Collects* (CWAC), published four years after the main volume, and not so readily 'to-hand' as CWME. However, these extra Collects have been included in the popular *Canterbury Church Book and Desk Diary* and in the online versions of CW so they are accessible enough.

The text scores six, which could suggest that it is not remarkable. Several aspects of the text are though. The prayer identifies the incarnation as being relevant to humanity and the earth. It provides both eschatological realization and an unrealized hope, at least for humanity, all in the pithiness of thirty-three words!

d. *Preface: for Eucharistic Prayers A, B and E*

If this Thanksgiving is used as an extended preface to a eucharistic prayer it should be in this form

Father, we give you thanks and praise
for your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.
He is the image of the unseen God,
the firstborn of all creation.
He created all things in heaven and on earth:
everything visible and everything invisible,
thrones, dominions, sovereignties, powers,
all things were created through him and for him.
Lord of all creation

All: we worship and adore you.

He is the radiant light of your glory:
he holds all creation together by his word of power.
Lord of all creation

All: we worship and adore you.

He is first to be born from the dead.
All perfection is found in him,
and all things were reconciled through him and for him,
everything in heaven and everything on earth,
when he made peace by his death on the cross.

Lord of all creation
All: we worship and adore you.

The Church is his body,
 he is its head.
 He takes his place in heaven
 at your right hand,
 where we worship you with all of your creation, singing:

All: 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.
cf Colossians 1.15-18
 (Thanksgivings, Extended form for Eucharist, G66 God in Creation, NPW:
 241-43)

This is a strong text from an ecotheological point of view (scoring nine marks along with 19 other texts). It explores the work of Christ in creation in detail (citing Colossians 1) and the congregational refrain reinforces the point of God's lordship over all creation. It skilfully builds a rhythm of emphasis about the Creation that leads neatly and clearly into the Sanctus where the reference to 'heaven and earth' being full of God's glory creates a refreshing resonance that emphasizes the glory of God *in* the earth.

As substantial as this text is, there are others, although not selected, that are even stronger than this one. There are four other prefaces that score more highly (all within the eight highest scoring texts out of the 316), however they all come from sources deemed ineligible for the survey. Three come from *CWME* (The Annunciation of our Lord, *CWME*: 311; From the Fifth Sunday of Lent until the Wednesday of Holy Week, *CWME*: 313; on days between Ascension Day and

Pentecost, *CWME*: 321), the fourth comes from *TSAY* (Rogationtide, *TSAY*: 612). These four did not meet the criteria for suitable survey texts.

e. *Post Communion*

Lord of the harvest,
 with joy we have offered thanksgiving for your love in creation
 and have shared in the bread and the wine of the kingdom:
 by your grace plant within us a reverence for all that you give us
 and make us generous and wise stewards
 of the good things we enjoy;
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.
 (Harvest Thanksgiving, *CWME*: 447)

This text scores a healthy eight. It sits with the complementary Collect for Harvest Thanksgiving (tucked away on their own at the very end of all the Collects and Post Communions in *CWME*). It celebrates a realized eschatology evidenced in the Harvest, which identifies God's involvement in and love for the Creation. The request for God, by his grace, to 'plant within us a reverence for all that you give us', shows a desire in the prayer for an improved relationship between humanity and the Creation. Human enjoyment of the good things of creation is balanced in the prayer with a need for stewardship that is both generous and wise. It is one of 136 texts identified by this study from *CWME* though probably one of the most obscure. (This and the following Blessing are also discussed in Chapter 4, Section 4d: 'God's love for and the redemption of creation').

f. Blessing

May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
 who is the source of all goodness and growth,
 pour his blessing upon all things created,

and upon you his children,
that you may use his gifts to his glory and the welfare of all peoples;
and the blessing ...

(Conclusions: Blessings, J69 God in Creation, NPW: 304)

There is a problem, as indicated previously, with a request for God to pour an indiscriminate blessing on 'all things created'. This is most clear in relation to questions of theodicy. The prayer could, inadvertently, be expressing a hope for both the blessing and the stewarding of such destructive forces as Satan and all his works, viruses, volcanic eruptions and hurricanes!

The prayer does make a certain sense in asking God to bless 'all things [...] and [...] you his children, that you may use his gifts to his glory'. This constructs a world where 'all things' become blessed 'gifts' and human use of these 'gifts' brings glory to God, who made the 'gifts'. This may appear straightforward in logic but less straightforward in theological terms, since there are many things—although blessed by God—that it may not be possible for humanity to make use of to glorify God. One way to find a theological logic to the prayer would be to interpret it as a request for a cover-all blessing of anything that *may* get used in an act of stewardship.

Other possible texts in addition to the six above could have included an introductory sentence to the Peace (but brevity was a priority as explained above). Also, introductions to the Peace are typically a direct quotation from scripture so less significant in terms of not being newly developed material (although newly selected biblical texts are still significant and can demonstrate a theological perspective). Another possibility for inclusion would have been a prayer for the 'Presentation of the Gifts', but this is a moment that is an optional part of the Eucharist in a way that the first six texts are types of prayers that do need to be included.

3. Survey Questions

The full survey text as respondents viewed it is in Appendix 5. The email encouraging people to take the survey is in Appendix 6. Three questions were asked about each text. They were:

1 'Have you seen this text?'

Available answers: yes / no / maybe / don't know / other.

2 'Have you ever used this text for public worship?'

Available answers: yes / no / maybe / don't know / other.

3 'How useful do you think this text is for public worship?'

Available answers: very useful / useful / neutral / somewhat useless / useless / other.

An optional open-ended comment box followed each question.

There were four supplementary questions that followed the questions about the six texts:

1 'Before this survey were you familiar with the phrase "God in Creation" as a heading for some Common Worship texts? (Equivalent headings include phrases such as: "Church and Mission"; "Incarnation"; "Holy Spirit"; and "General".)'

Available answers: yes / no / don't know / other.

2 'Will your approach to selecting texts for public worship change as result of this questionnaire?'

Available answers: very likely / likely / neutral / unlikely / very unlikely / other.

- 3 'Would you like to be contacted again, via your email address, with results of this survey and my research on *Common Worship* texts?'

Available answers: yes / no.

- 4 'Do you have any further comments you want to make?'

Available answers: a text box was provided for comments.

The question about the 'God in Creation' heading was included in the survey for several reasons. First, it appears in *NPW*. Admittedly, in *Times and Seasons* the short section that includes much of the same material is simply entitled 'Creation'. Since this survey excluded *Times and Seasons* for reasons explained above, 'God in Creation' was used as a title to clarify whether those surveyed were aware of this as one of the multiplicity of mini-collections of materials gathered around one theme (an approach first developed in *PW* where the title 'God in Creation' was not used).

4. Survey Results

The complete survey results are in Appendix 7, 8 and 9 (minus name and email details).

a. Awareness of the theme 'God in Creation'

Just over three quarters of respondents were familiar with the title 'God in Creation' that is used in *NPW*, 17% were not familiar with it or did not know whether or not they were familiar with the titling (table 5.4). This does suggest that the concept of themed texts is one that is not just familiar but now inhabits the consciousness of those preparing and leading services of public worship with *CW*.

Table 5.4

Familiarity with 'God in Creation' title	Response	%
Yes	99	77%
No	16	13%
Don't know	5	4%
Other	0	0%
Total Respondents	120	94%
(skipped this question)	8	6%

b. Familiarity with the six CW texts

Table 5.5

Have you seen the text?	Yes	No	Maybe	Don't know	Other	Total Respondents	(skipped question)
Invitation to Confession	39 30%	54 42%	32 25%	2 2%	0 0%	127 99%	1 1%
Kyrie Confession	84 66%	23 18%	16 13%	0 0%	0 0%	123 96%	5 4%
Collect	75 59%	19 15%	21 16%	7 5%	0 0%	122 95%	6 5%
Thanksgiving Preface	49 38%	50 39%	19 15%	2 2%	0 0%	120 94%	8 6%
Post Communion	75 59%	26 20%	17 13%	3 2%	0 0%	121 95%	7 5%
Blessing	52 41%	54 42%	15 12%	0 0%	0 0%	121 95%	7 5%

The presupposition that the hidden-away location of the Post Communion results in a diminished usage is proved, to some extent, by 59% being as sure they had seen it as had seen the Alternative Collect for Christmas Eve (the Post Communion being published in December 2000 and the Alternative Collect three-and-a-half years later in May 2004). 66% of respondents knew the Kyrie Confession from *NPW* compared to the 59% who recognized the Post Communion.

The greatest uncertainty among respondents about any text lay with the briefest one, the Invitation to Confession, with 25% of respondents undecided as to whether they had seen it before (the next highest level of uncertainty was 16% for the Collect). Three of the texts were known by more than half of the respondents (Kyrie Confession, Collect and Post Communion). Three texts were familiar to less than half of the respondents (the Invitation to Confession, the Thanksgiving Preface and the Blessing).

The mean average of certain knowledge of a text was 49%. The certainty of no knowledge of a text was significantly lower at 29%. On average 16% of respondents answered 'maybe' as to whether they had seen a text before and 2% did not know. The 'maybes' and 'don't knows' could suggest people who are faced with such a large scale of texts that identifying single items is too challenging. There will also be differences due to personality or textual memory that determines the likelihood of someone confidently asserting that they knew a text or were less certain of it. That about half of the respondents had a confident working knowledge of the material is a useful measure of the success with which less prominent material in *CW* is being noticed.

c. Use of the six CW texts

Table 5.6

Have you used the text?	Yes	No	Maybe	Don't know	Other	Total Respondents	(skipped question)
Invitation to Confession	12 9%	104 81%	7 5%	1 1%	1 1%	125 98%	3 2%
Kyrie Confession	51 40%	58 45%	12 9%	0 0%	2 2%	123 96%	5 4%
Collect	41 32%	60 47%	18 14%	4 3%	0 0%	123 96%	5 4%
Thanksgiving Preface	9 7%	103 80%	4 3%	1 1%	2 2%	119 93%	9 7%
Post Communion	56 44%	44 34%	17 13%	4 3%	1 1%	121 95%	7 5%
Blessing	27 21%	80 63%	10 8%	2 2%	1 1%	120 94%	8 6%

The biggest variation between what was known and what was used is for the Thanksgiving Preface. 49 respondents had seen the text and further 19 said 'Maybe' they had seen it (table 5.6). Only nine had used it, with a further five considering that they may have or did not know. The closest differential between having seen the text and using it came for the Kyrie Confession, Collect and the Post Communion: seen by 84, 75 and 75 respectively and used by 51, 41 and 56 respectively. The Post Communion had the largest proportion of respondents using the text and the smallest differential between knowledge of the text and use. The Kyrie and Collect are alternative options, whereas the Post Communion is the set text if or when a Harvest Thanksgiving communion takes place.

d. *The usefulness of the six CW texts*

The third question on each of the six texts shifted the emphasis from the quantitative to the qualitative, providing some intriguing results.

Table 5.7

How useful is the text?	Very Useful	Useful	Neutral	Somewhat useless	Useless	Other	Total Respondents	(skipped question)
Invitation to Confession	9 7%	48 38%	41 32%	12 9%	10 8%	7 5%	125 98%	3 2%
Kyrie Confession	31 24%	63 49%	20 16%	4 3%	2 2%	4 3%	122 95%	6 5%
Collect	25 20%	64 50%	23 18%	6 5%	0 0%	6 5%	123 96%	5 4%
Thanksgiving Preface	13 10%	60 47%	35 27%	7 5%	0 0%	6 5%	121 95%	7 5%
Post Communion	29 23%	67 52%	20 16%	3 2%	0 0%	1 1%	120 94%	8 6%
Blessing	23 18%	71 55%	20 16%	3 2%	0 0%	4 3%	121 95%	7 5%

The Kyrie Confession, Collect, and Post Communion and Blessing were considered to be useful or very useful by 73%, 70%, 75% and 73% respectively with neutrality on the same texts at a very similar 16%, 18%, 16% and 16%. This is in contrast with the other two texts, which achieved much lower favour, though still around half of respondents classed them as useful or very useful—Invitation to Confession (45%) and Thanksgiving Preface (57%)—the number who were neutral nearly doubled (Invitation to Confession 32% and Thanksgiving Preface 27%). 17% deemed the Invitation to Confession as somewhat useless or useless whereas all the others only had 5% or less judging the material that negatively.

e. *Influence of survey on respondents*

The influence of the questionnaire on respondents, although not a central purpose of the survey, was worth gauging since there was a possibility that providing those taking the survey with an even closer look at six texts—in totality offering a sustained outworking of ecotheological concerns—could have the possible result of a making a change to clergy's familiarization with earthed CW materials.

Table 5.8

24. Questionnaire influence on selecting texts for worship?		
	Response	Percent
Very Likely	2	2%
Likely	26	20%
Neutral	33	26%
Unlikely	35	27%
Very Unlikely	17	13%
Other	7	5%
Total Respondents	119	93%
(skipped this question)	9	7%

Of those who provided a comment as part of this answer, most remarks were 'where appropriate'. Only one suggested a reason for not using the material that was beyond their control: 'When I have opportunity. I usually have to do what is "set"'.

5. *A Dialogue with the Respondents' Additional Comments*

Opportunity was given for respondents to make a final comment. In the remainder of this chapter the responses are discussed and by way of dialogue some reaction and further analysis is developed in the light of topics raised by those who

commented. Twelve people (11%) took the opportunity to do so making 28 comments between them. Of the 28 comments made, 75% (21) were directly critical of the material either in a detail or of the whole text.

a. *Invitation to Confession*

Table 5.9: *Comments on the usefulness of the Invitation to Confession*

Comment no.	Invitation to Confession Human sin disfigures the whole creation, which groans with eager longing for God's redemption. We confess our sin in penitence and faith. <i>cf Romans 8.22, 23</i>
1	I can see it might resonate with some congregations. However, the intro (lines 1 and 2) doesn't seem to hold out much hope to move people into line 3.
2	Very Useless; non-user friendly language and theologically difficult for a congregation to understand in that context. I also believe that people are aware of their failings without the church piling it on, when they actually come to a service.
3	I use Church in Wales Liturgy but this is useful
4	I'm inclined to think it would not be very useful in my current context (rural parishes - too emotional/dramatic) though in a particular context I might find it useful
5	A bit obscure - we don't talk like that here
6	OK in the right context
7	in a theological college maybe

The first comment on the Invitation to Confession observes a noticeable discontinuity between the first two lines and the third. Comment two's expressed dislike for 'non-user friendly [...] theologically difficult' language is unsurprising considering the accessibility of a prayer for a congregation where, firstly, sin is described as a 'disfigur[ing]' force and second the prayer speaks of creation's 'groan[ing] with eager longing for God's redemption' and relates to the concept of the injury of sin. The

fourth comment suggests it is too 'emotional / dramatic' and the sixth and seventh suggest it is suitable for use in a limited range of contexts. The fifth comment is more direct 'we don't talk like that here'.

b. *Kyrie Confession*

Table 5.10: *Comments on the usefulness of the Kyrie Confession*

Comment no.	
1	Useless; I think farced [sic] kyries are properly used only when they are farced [sic] with positive statements about God. The Kyries are acclamations of praise affirming the nature of God as much as they are acknowledgements of human need (viz. sinfulness). They aren't really confessions!
2	I use Church in Wales Liturgy but this is useful
3	Useless; Unhelpful. It conflates corporate sin as a derived concept with personal sin; it may be seen to position the church in relation to current, ephemeral concerns about global housekeeping instead of doing the business of addressing actual, culpable sin in need of confession.
4	limited - maybe for Harvest or special Creation Service - Too Green for normal Sundays.

The first comment makes two points about explicating the Kyrie with prefixed sentences ('parsing' may be the word the respondent was looking for). The first is the assertion that these texts should be both positive statements about God and simultaneously acknowledgements of human need. The second is a critique of whether the format of Kyrie prayers constitutes a confession. The text as it stands is attempting to serve the purpose of confession and the comment does, by inference, acknowledge that is the case but disagrees with such a use of a Kyrie.

This Kyrie Confession is exceptional among the thirteen identified for this study, in only lamenting named sins rather than offering praise or thanks to God. Of the 13 Kyrie Confessions (among the 316 texts) 11 of them make the nature of God the first

topic. Two do not, the one in the survey and B64 'Church and Mission / Living in the World' (NPW: 93), which speaks of the earth and human action in the negative. These two Confessions are a minority, not achieving a celebration of God's nature in the way the other 11 do.

To be precise the survey Kyrie Confession does refer to *something* of the nature of God by speaking of the earth as 'the world you have given to us', even though it begins with the topic of human sin. A lack of consistency with a purpose is not problematic, but these are the reasons the two texts are vulnerable to the critique that they have unhelpfully strayed outside the format of a Kyrie Confession by forgetting to celebrate the forgiver, concentrating, rather, on the sinner. The first comment from the survey does pick up an important point about the purpose of a Kyrie and of the use of it as a confession.

Returning to the respondent comments on the survey (table 5.10, above), the third comment, by contrast with the first, objects to the text doing two things at once 'conflat[ing] corporate sin as a derived concept with personal sin'. The respondent wants to prioritize the necessity of 'doing the business of addressing actual culpable sin' as if a collective conceptualized matter of 'global housekeeping' does not get to the heart of the matter of sin but is ephemeral because a derived concept is a notional matter (especially compared with an individual carefully and deliberately confessing their own nominated sins that they have identified and chosen to confess).

This challenge to the effectiveness of defining corporate sin for corporate confession brings up the problem of specificity. This is a definite flaw for any collective prayer of confession, because liturgical text needs to accurately determine the collec-

tive crime in a way that is beyond question and also to make the named fault fit the misdeeds of all possible worshippers who may use the prayer.

Comment 4, in its brevity, naming the text 'too Green' makes the necessary point, that the text conveys a political message that is targeted at an imagined audience in need of hearing that message. Liturgy is unquestionably political, but when the point made is based not on the nature of God but on a judged human misdeed the text has become less secure in its positioning as material for collective worship across the political spectrum. The advantage of CW is that with such a variety of optional texts, each one need not be suitable for all places and occasions.

c. Collect

Table 5.11: *Comments on the usefulness of the Collect*

Comment no.	
1	Not bad, really, if a bit subtle in its tying eschatology and incarnation together. But it'd work, long-term.
2	Useful; I use Church in Wales Liturgy but this is useful
3	'Christ-child' is potentially unhelpful to our understanding of the incarnation
4	May catch the mood but says little.
5	Would modify - the 4th line would elude many of my parishioners.
6	OK in the right context

The critiques 'a bit subtle', 'says little', and 'would elude many of my parishioners', show that brevity does not guarantee clarity, especially when new concepts are introduced. '[T]he gift of the Christ-child' conflates the concept of 'Christ-child' and the 'indescribable gift' of the second person of the Trinity. To glue these two concepts together does produce something singular and puzzlingly particular: how the

Church or those celebrating Christmas can celebrate the Christ-child as their gift would require an imaginative leap. A leap into experiencing one earthly moment in the eternal life of Christ as an entity in its own right, which is gifted to the Church. Similarly, requesting God's embrace of the earth with glory could be conjured in the imagination as an orbiting anthropomorphized deity giving the globe a hug. It is no wonder that one respondent thought the idea 'would be lost' on their worshippers. Innovation is required to keep liturgy fresh, relevant and contemporary but ideas that are too novel are prone to distract or confuse.

d. *Thanksgiving Preface*

Table 5.12: *Comments on the usefulness of the Thanksgiving Preface*

Comment no.	
1	A bit 'Fatherless,' isn't it? Therefore 'all things were reconciled' with whom? With each other, apparently - well, okay, but secondarily so, surely? Also - 'You (Christ) created' everything, AND 'everything was created through you and for you.' Trinitas abscondita [sic]! The eucharistic prayer ought really to be addressed to the Father.
2	I use Church in Wales Liturgy but this is useful
3	Probably useful. I'd not avoid it [sic] for theological or linguistic reasons but because I'd not think to insert it in the EP [Eucharistic Prayer] when preparing a special order. Now I've seen it I might think to use it if we do something on Col 1.15-18.
4	I am not at all sure about the wording of the opening of the third para. 'You are the first to be born from the dead'. Surely (a) Christ was raised not born from the dead. And what about Lazarus, the widow of Nain's son etc, and OT 'raisings'.
5	OK in the right context
6	Not words I would choose to use

Leaning as heavily as this prayer does on Colossians 1 means there is a risk that those using this text will misunderstand the emphasis of Christ's work in the

Creation (see comment 1), however, the prayer is addressed to God as 'Father' and the repeated refrain begins 'Lord of all Creation' and Christ is referred to in the third person. The criticism that it is 'a bit fatherless' and that the prayer should 'really be addressed to the Father' are evidence of an understandable but inaccurate reading of the material.

More problematic is the phrase 'all things were reconciled by him and for him'. For those conversant with Paul's theology it is a simple enough step to understand that this reconciliation means a reconnection with God and also a new harmony in the Creation, but this prayer does not make that clear. Neither does it explain the work of the Trinity in the Creation, hence the allegation of 'trinitas absco[n]dita' (comment 1). In fairness though, the text is focussing in the work of Christ in the Creation, not on all the activity of the Trinity.

Although there may be reasons to focus on the work of just one person of the Trinity, it is possible to go further than that. There are two successful attempts at exploring the work of all three persons of the Trinity in the Creation out of the 19 Thanksgiving Prayers selected for this study. Three more texts are partially successful in doing the same thing.

The first text is the one that succeeds in discussing all three persons in relation to the Creation.

Thanksgiving: G59 General

Let us give thanks to God.

For the love of our Father, the maker of all,
the giver of all good things,
let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God

For Jesus Christ our Saviour,
 who lived and worked among us,
 let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God.

For his suffering and death on the cross
 and his resurrection to new life,
 let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God.

For his rule over all things
 and his presence in the world,
 let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God.

For the Holy Spirit, the giver of life,
 who teaches and guides us,
 let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God.

For the grace of the Spirit
 in the work of the Church
 and the life of the world,
 let us bless the Lord.

All: Thanks be to God.

Amen.

(*NPW:* 237)

The prayer lists the three persons of the Godhead in sequence: the Father, the subject of the first stanza, is 'maker of all'; stanzas two to five discuss Christ the ruler 'over all things' present 'in the world'; the sixth and seventh stanzas introduce the Holy Spirit as the 'giver of life' whose 'grace' is present in the 'life of the world'.

The next two prayers do distinguish the work of the different parts of the Trinity but not with the same evenness of application to each person's role in the Creation. The next Thanksgiving begins well by naming the Trinity at the outset as 'creator, redeemer and life-giver'.

Thanksgiving: G61 General
 Blessed are you, Holy God,
 creator, redeemer and life-giver;
 you have spoken the world into being

and filled it with wonder and beauty.
 For every blessing we have received
All: we give you thanks and praise.

Blessed are you, Holy God,
 for people of every language and culture
 and for the rich variety you give to life.
 For every blessing we have received
All: we give you thanks and praise.

Blessed are you, Holy God,
 for Jesus Christ our Saviour,
 truly divine and truly human,
 living and dying for us,
 and going before us into heaven.
 For every blessing we have received
All: we give you thanks and praise.

Blessed are you, Holy God,
 for your Spirit,
 the fire of love burning in our hearts,
 bringing us to faith,
 and calling us to holiness
 in the Church and in the world.
 For every blessing we have received
All: we give you thanks and praise.

*Other thanksgivings, appropriate to the season or the situation,
 may be added here. Prefaces for eucharistic prayers, suitably
 adapted, may provide appropriate material.*

Therefore, we worship you
 with all the company of heaven.
All: Holy, holy, holy Lord,
 God of power and might,
 heaven and earth are full of your glory.
 Hosanna in the highest (NPW: 238-39).

God's speaking 'the world into being' references both the Father (who speaks) and the Son (the Word that is spoken). The separate discussion of Christ in the third stanza only refers to the historical presence of Christ in the world and his ascension. The Spirit's role in the world is oddly mediated via the Church 'bringing us to faith

and calling us to holiness in the Church and in the world'. The earlier naming of the Spirit as 'life-giver' is the only direct relation that person is given to the Creation.

The next Thanksgiving does discuss the work of the Spirit in the Creation far more clearly: pleading for the 'freedom of the children of God'. It is reasonable to infer that the Spirit's 'groans' are in unison with the 'groans' of 'all your creation', especially since 'groans' is the only repeated word in the text. The Spirit's 'law' is life-bringing and is that which 'sets us free from the law of sin and death'.

Thanksgiving: G80 Holy Spirit

Father, while all your creation groans with pain
like the pain of childbirth,
and longs to share the freedom of the children of God,
your Spirit pleads for us
in groans words cannot express.
Father in heaven
All: we give you thanks and praise.

The law of the Spirit brings us life in Christ,
and sets us free from the law of sin and death.
Father in heaven
All: we give you thanks and praise.

Like all who are led by your Spirit,
we are your children.
By your Spirit's power we cry, 'Abba, Father.'
Father in heaven
All: we give you thanks and praise.

[The Spirit confirms that we are your children,
fellow-heirs with Christ,
sharing his suffering now,
that we may share his glory.
Father in heaven
All: we give you thanks and praise.]

So by your Spirit we praise you forever
and proclaim your glory with all the company of heaven,
saying:

All: Holy, holy, holy Lord,
God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
cf Romans 8.2, 14-25

This effective discussion of the Spirit's work is more fulsome than that for the Son or Father. All persons of the Trinity are discussed. Christ is the one with whom those praying have life and whom we share heir-ship, suffering and glory. The Creation is referred to, in the first sentence, as being the Father's. These three texts and the analysis above, of all the Thanksgivings, demonstrate the challenges in praising all persons of the Trinity for their work in the Creation. Doing so is possible but when it does not happen the text is more vulnerable to critique.

The Thanksgiving used in the survey is particularly vulnerable to being seen as uneven in its emphasis because it only narrates Colossians 1. This causes other problems too, for example, respondent four makes a query about 'first to be born from the dead', I guess either the person is seeing a difference between 'firstborn from the dead' (Colossians 1.18 and Revelation 1.5) and 'first to be born', or considering the rest of the respondent's quote, perhaps she or he has simply forgotten the biblical source for this. What is certain is that when there are exceptional concepts in a prayer—that contain coherence internal to one biblical text—this will look quite perplexing to those using the prayer if the bible text has a dissonance with theology or other biblical themes.

e. Post Communion

Table 5.14: Comments on the usefulness of the Post Communion

Comment no.	<p>Harvest Thanksgiving (CWME: 447)</p> <p>Lord of the harvest, with joy we have offered thanksgiving for your love in creation and have shared in the bread and the wine of the kingdom: by your grace plant within us a reverence for all that you give us and make us generous and wise stewards of the good things we enjoy; through Jesus Christ our Lord.</p>
1	<p>I changed it - I said 'tend' instead of 'by your grace nourish [sic],' because I reckon participation in the eucharist DOES plant the requisite stuff within us. In fact, I reckon this prayer, as do many things in Common Worship, carefully peels away the divine presence and work from the sacraments and instead erects a comfortably abstract God.</p>

The same survey respondent offered the first written comment on each of the six texts. Here is someone who is especially engaged by the liturgical material and keen to grapple with it. In this instance the respondent would prefer 'tend' to 'plant' (not the mistakenly remembered 'nourish', which isn't used) since it makes God's engagement more definite and given. This appears as a frustration towards a particular direction in the CW new materials, evidence by the analysis of a careful peeling away of 'the divine presence and work from the sacraments' replacing it with a 'comfortably abstract God'. The dislike for 'plant' is not because it is an environmental image, rather the critic sees a better ecological one, 'tend'.

f. Blessing

Table 5.15: Comments on the usefulness of the Blessing

Comment no.	<p>Conclusions, Blessings, J69 God in Creation, (NPW: 304).</p> <p>May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the source of all goodness and growth, pour his blessing upon all things created, and upon you his children, that you may use his gifts to his glory and the welfare of all peoples; and the blessing ...</p>
1	Function of liturgical blessing - authoritative bestowal of God's increase upon assembly. This, however, blesses all creation (a bit <i>ultra vires</i>) and it's also unclear who's doing the blessing - the Father? Or the Trinity? Unfocused!
2	This prayer shares with other CW prayers a sense of being overstuffed. For example, I would prefer God in this instance to be EITHER the source of all goodness OR the source of all growth. Both are huge concepts and it's enough to get one's praying heart around one of them. Similarly, the prayer is over-egged in the next two lines. Why do we need to include all of creation at this point? 'Upon you his children' would suffice. A blessing doesn't need to be a jarful of oil poured over our heads. It can be effective in the form of a few drops trickling down our foreheads.
3	Confusion is possible with spiritual gifts. Uncertain of the theology of the church's stewardship of the earth being expressed.
4	I'm not happy about mixing the blessing of a generality with blessing the people present.

The accusation of *ultra vires* is fair only if it is accepted that the defined function of the prayer is as an 'authoritative bestowal of God's increase upon [sic] assembly'. The evidence is that this is the case; such a pattern is typically and nearly always followed. The next challenge is the repetition of a blessing from the Father, followed by the blessing of the Trinity. This is a particularly confusing structure and the scale of the blessing being on 'all things' means it is unsurprising that another challenge from respondent 2 is that the text is 'overstuffed'.

There is also the difficulty spotted by respondent 3 over the reference to the worshipping community using God's gifts 'for his glory and the welfare of all peoples'. The confusion created here is whether the gifts of creation are well stewarded solely when used for peoples' welfare. There may be many other reasons to be wise stewards apart from it being for this particular functional purpose. Ultimately blessing everything and the people assembled is an example of covering all matters in one go. The counter-argument may well be that it demonstrates that all that is made is blessed simply by it being a gift of God in creation, however, as discussed above, this does not explore the thorny areas of theodicy and evil in the Creation or for what purpose we are recipients of these gifts.

6. Conclusion

Knowledge of creation themed resources is reasonably strong, based on the *CW* sample of material included in the survey and with the sample of respondents who replied. It is not only known, but used too, not by all but the average level of use of the examples presented to respondents sits at 23%, which considering the very wide range of materials available to them (across numerous themes) is encouraging. Further comment is made on these levels of awareness about *CW* creation themed texts in Chapter 7.

Some survey respondents were provoked by the texts into a range of remarks that are telling because they demonstrate that there is a readiness to challenge and question the material as it stands and that the people who do use such prayers under-

stand when there is a coherence to a piece and also when it is lacking. Testing of materials is, therefore, very important and although not all CW resources have gone through the same levels of draft testing, this does not prevent texts being assessed in the field after a period of time to discover how vital and engaging the materials are.

As explored in the previous chapter CW has provided some significant and positive additions to the liturgy that respect the relational dynamic between Creator, the Creation and humanity. An initial level of analysis of the material has been made. Now a fuller critique will be made of one section of the *CWCPC*. The data discussed in previous chapter will inform a fuller textual analysis in the following chapter. Finally, proposals for ways in which CW texts could be more fully earthed will be explored by a detailed examination of the Collects and Post Communions.

CHAPTER SIX

COMMON WORSHIP COLLECTS AND POST COMMUNIONS: A DETAILED STUDY

1. An Ecotheological Liturgical Critique in the Context of Liturgical Revision

This chapter is a case study that looks at the layers creation theology the prayers contain, with the final section given over to a very detailed look at nine prayers. A consequence of analysing the nine texts is to attempt a commentary in response by drafting nine amended prayers with accompanying self-critique. The adaptations of the current prayers will show what an eco-liberationist reconstruction of the existing texts looks like. A main reason for choosing Collects is for their importance within the C of E: 'for generations, Anglicans have learned the essential truths of the faith through their regular repetition' (Davies 2005: 111, Dudley 1994: 43).

The new revisions of the prayers do not look radically different in form. The intention is to include aspects of the Trinity, creation, humanity and eschatology in

the prayers as developed in Chapter 3. This follows a similar pattern of approach to the way the *ASB* Church of England liturgy was amended to make more of its texts more inclusive in relation to gender identity as discussed earlier (also see Michael Perham's chapter 'Affirming the Feminine', Perham 1989: 75-83).

The material this chapter works with is from within the *CW* Collects and Post Communion prayers (*CWCPC*). By *CWCPC*, this does not just mean those that are included in the selection of 316 texts in the analysis of Chapter 4. In this instance it includes any Collects or Post Communions that are designed for use at prayers for Sundays and Principal Holy Days, plus Harvest Thanksgiving (*CWME*: 376-426, 521) and *CWAC* (which covers the same days, *CWAC*: 4-27). That is 210 Collects and Post Communions in total. The chapter will show how these prayers contain theological modes that relate to contemporary environmental concerns. *How* they relate to such concerns and the weaknesses and strengths evident in the prayers is of particular interest.

As I have prepared to offer an earthing of current liturgical text, I have considered the variety of approaches taken within feminist liturgical writing (as discussed in Chapter 1). An especially subtle approach has come from the English Language Liturgical Consultation, which called for 'sensitivity to the need for inclusive language' (English Language Liturgical Consultation 1988: xi). Their proposals serve only as a minimum requirement for revisions, since their efforts have not looked to change anything in terms of substance, rather they have sought to make changes to non-gender specific language wherever it is simple to do so and where it does not

interfere with the meaning of the text. There are many more contrasting approaches to revision as discussed in the first three chapters.

Two examples that provide a contrast with such piecemeal and modest revisions of Collects and Post Communions, as offered here, come from Janet Morley and the St Hilda Community. In both Morley's feminist reworking of the notion of weekly Collects offered in *All Desires Known* (Morley 1992) and the prayers of the St Hilda community (St Hilda 1996), existing rites are discarded and a new corpus of liturgy created.

Adopting a revisionist approach, as is done later here is a deliberate choice, but not out of disagreement with those who seek to overturn the *status quo*. There are several motivations for offering revisions rather than entirely new submissions:

- to adopt a 'start again' approach in writing eco-liturgical texts would be more likely to leave the material within the networks of the signed up members of Christian Ecology Link and equivalent groups;
- entirely new texts would succeed in perpetuating an unhealthy marginalization of eco-concerns to the fringe;
- it serves as a way of speaking from the margin to the centre in direct fashion;
- re-drafting seeks to clarify what stands between the current *CW* texts and rites that are more earthed.

A reasonable critique of revisions—which take existing texts and make them inclusive—is that the poetic or harmonic quality of the existing prayer may be diminished. In defence of creating this potential weakness of redrafting is the

certainty that revision is a useful form of theological exercise even if it is not judged to improve the quality of the poetry or prose. Also the benefit of such an approach is to show a demonstrable gap between more or less earthed texts.

A second criticism of this approach is that it is arguably not communal theology since it is solo work. Because this thesis engages with communal work, however, and also because this thesis is a contribution to an ongoing and communal debate, then it is reasonable to argue that this study is not being made in isolation from others.

2. *Revisions of the CWPC*

In this section details are given of the process of revision of the Collects and Post Communions, which occurred between 1955 and the present day. The first steps towards transformation of Collects and Post Communions included three generic steps discussed in Chapter 2. The first was the formation, in 1955, of the C of E's Liturgical Commission (Bradshaw 2001: 17ff) whose closest pre-cursor was the 'Committee of Experts' which had met from for three years up until 1915 (Donald Gray 1989: 3). The second driver for revision sat beyond C of E governance, it was the formation of the ecumenical Joint Liturgical Group (JLG) in 1963 (Jasper 1989: 227). The third step, in 1965, was when the C of E Church Assembly passed its 'Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure' that was to make liturgical revision much simpler than before (Jasper 1989: 227).

Soon after, work on Collects and Post Communions began to surface. JLG published a set of new collects in 1968 (Jasper 1989: 303). Meanwhile in 1968 the Anglican Lambeth conference was looking at draft texts for the eucharist published with *Series Two* (although at this stage new Collects and Post Communions were not provided). The change in C of E governance from Assembly to General Synod in 1970 helped speed the process of revision so that in 1975 the Liturgical Commission published a full set of Collects for *Series 3*. Seventy Collects from the Book of Common Prayer were used, in part or whole, to provide Collects for the liturgical year (Jasper 1989: 305). This mixture of existing, amended and new Collects were authorized by the General Synod for use from February 1977 (Jasper 1989: 304).

An introduction to the use, quality, form and structure of Anglican Collects is offered in Davies' *Alien Rites* (2005: 111-19). A summary of Dudley's analysis of the Collects' 'five-fold' structure is offered (Davies 2005: 111, Dudley 1994: 4): 'an address to God; a relative or participle clause referring to some attribute of God or to one of his saving acts; a petition; the reason for which we ask; and the conclusion' (Davies 2005: 111).

In 1984 *LHWE* and then in 1991 *PHG* offered potential further additions (although not authorized by Synod) and most importantly more Post Communion prayers than the *ASB*, which had only provided four. Historically the Collects related to lectionary readings, but the introduction of a three-year lectionary cycle from 1997 meant new Collects were attached to themes not readings (Davies 2005: 111). Finally the *CW* texts, prepared by the Liturgical Commission were authorized from 2000. With these came a full set of accompanying Post Communions. Synod, whilst approving the

new work requested a full set of alternative or 'short' Collects, which would follow a simplified form of syntax. These were approved and then published in 2004. There was little debate of the need for a simpler form of prayer, though more discussion about tying each additional Collect to a Sunday rather than a theme (see Buchanan et al 2002).

At each moment of new revision, there has been an opportunity to transform the structure and theology of the material. Jasper claims a higher importance for the first stage of work up to 1977.

The whole collect operation had taken a long time, almost longer than any other pieces of liturgical revision: but the expenditure of time and trouble was justified. Experience might well prove them to have been one of the really significant pieces of revision (Jasper 1989: 305).

What Jasper does not offer here is a rationale for the purpose of revision and the most obvious reason for this is that the work of change has been piecemeal. This has led to a tendency for new work to make scattered and at times oblique references to the currents in contemporary theology during the same period. All the same there have been some very significant theological influences, as discussed in Chapter 1, which include 'the family', faith in an urban context (especially after the *Faith in the City* report of 1985), gender inclusivity, and strands from liberation theology (especially poverty and social justice) and a concern for prayers requesting God's healing. Latterly, further Collects and Post Communion texts provided by TSAY have also considered countryside matters and reflect the influence of, for example, the *Faith in the Countryside* report (Archbishops' Commission on Rural Areas: 1990).

3. *The Collects and Post Communions in Ecotheological Perspective*

Two immediate eco-liberationist criticisms of the 210 *CWCPC* texts being considered are, first, the Collects could have been less human-centred and less de-contextualized. There could have been a much more developed eschatological substance to them, which was inclusive of the Creation. The second 'miss' was that the Post Communion prayers could have presented a re-imagined framing of the eucharist as a place where heaven, humanity and earth meet.

a. *God the Creator in the CWCPC*

God is only referred to in the *CWCPC* as creator on eight occasions. God is named: as 'Lord' of creation once¹ and as saving, reconciling or delivering the world three times;² as light of the world once;³ reference to God having love for the world occurs twice;⁴ and mention of Christ being sent into the world occurs once;⁵ one collect speaks of God as 'heavenly Lord' longing for the world's salvation.⁶ Apart from direct reference to Christ's incarnation the prayers privilege images of God as a transcendent figure who remains passive in relation to the earth, awaiting its worship and the Church's obedience.

¹ Additional Collect for the 16th Sunday after Trinity (*CWAC*: 23).

² 'Forgiving': Additional Collect for the 2nd Sunday of Advent (*CWAC*: 4); 'reconciling': the Collect for the 13th Sunday after Trinity (*CWME*: 416); and 'delivering' the Collect for the 20th Sunday after Trinity (*CWME*: 420).

³ Post Communion for the 3rd Sunday of Epiphany (*CWME*: 385).

⁴ Additional Collect for the 5th Sunday of Lent (*CWAC*: 13) and the Additional Collect for the 5th Sunday of Easter (*CWAC*: 17).

⁵ Post Communion for the 7th Sunday of Easter (*CWME*: 405).

God is presented in the texts as the authority over creation and yet is seemingly excluded from participating in the ongoing work of creation. The new texts presented in this chapter include God within the framework of the cosmos rather than allowing God's immanence only to be referred to in connection with the incarnation of Christ. The new texts also give more space to exploring the activity of God in the world beyond the realm of the Church. The existing prayers, in the main, limit God's activity within the cosmos to actions performed upon the Church of Christ.

b. *How earthed are the CWPC?*

Using the same 12 main criteria as used in Chapter 4 for *CWPC* reveals interesting results (Appendix 4). The Creation is referenced on just over one quarter of occasions. There are 33 prayers out of a possible 210 that make a direct reference to creation and 21 that do so indirectly (54 in total, or 26%). References to realized eschatology for creation total 32. 17 of these *CWPC* prayers also reference unrealized eschatology for creation and a further four speak only of the unrealized, not the realized (36 in total, or 18%). Humanity's relationship with the cosmos gains 37 mentions (18%) and creation's salvation receives 24 direct and 12 indirect mentions (17%). God's identity as creator is referred to on 8 occasions and alluded to in a further 23 instances (31%).

This data gives an indication of a small but significant amount of attention to creation themes. Just because a prayer mentions these topics does not mean it is earthed. That so few prayers discuss unrealized eschatology without mentioning

⁶ Additional Collect for the 2nd Sunday before Advent (*CWAC*: 26).

what is realized, however, is promising. In Chapter 4 an analysis was offered on 13 *CWME* Collects,⁷ 14 *CWAC* Collects⁸ and 8 *CWME* Post Communions,⁹ which make up 17% of 210 prayers being considered in this chapter. Again, that they are discussed does not give a conclusion on how earthed each prayer is, but shows a promising level of significance.

c. *What happens when the prayers are earthed?*

In the collection of *CWCPC* some attempts are made to locate the Church within the context of the Creation. There are three significant examples. First, the pre-Lenten Collect on the second Sunday before Lent speaks of a desire to discern God's hand in all God's works (*CWME*: 390). This is a departure from the more typical approach of never referring to creation as context.

There are two further prayers that offer a shift away from a Church-centred and human centred perspective. The first prayer is the Collect for Ash Wednesday (*CWME*: 392) that says 'you hate nothing that you have made' (indirectly referring to creation), the second is for the twentieth Sunday after Trinity (*CWME*: 420) when the hope is expressed that 'we may share with the whole Creation the joys of eternal life'.

These three prayers anticipate humanity sharing the joys of eternal life with creation. What is disconcerting is that there is no reference to what happens in the meantime. This means that there is nothing within the prayers that explores the active dynamic between people and earth in the new creation.

⁷ *CWME* Collects: 381, 386, 387, 392, 393, 394, 395, 397, 400, 409, 410, 420, 426.

⁸ *CWAC* 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25.

⁹ *CWME* Post Communions: 382, 384, 396, 411, 415, 421, 424, 447.

In the prayer for the fourth Sunday after Trinity (CWME: 410) we find one of the most contextualized of the whole set. In this prayer the significance of the Creation to the servants of God is explored. The prayer does suggest that in the Creation there is nothing that is strong or holy without God. This prayer acknowledges God's all pervading power throughout creation.

What the prayer does not do is to speak of the residence of a mortal people. Rather, it slips into a reflection on the everlasting residence for those who have passed beyond this mortal life into 'things eternal'. This side steps the question of context and so humanity's current relationship with the created order is diminished to the point of not even being named, let alone explained or understood. Instead the emphasis is on our relationship with God that includes a unity with creation in the *not yet* rather than the *now*.

d. *Eco-eschatology and CWPC*

To satisfy an ecotheological set of priorities the *CWPC* would need to express aspects of unrealized and realized eschatology within a non-humano-centric and contextualized framework. On occasions when the Creation is mentioned in the 316 texts analyzed in Chapter 4 (included some *CWPC*) both realized and unrealized eschatology for creation is addressed with varying success. This means that some prayers do offer an expression of the tension the Church finds itself in by being on an eschatological continuum which seeks to offer some sense of being in the present reality and yet also longing for a new creation (see Romans 8.18-23).

When it comes to the *CWCPC* texts (for Sundays and Principal Days) in totality, the picture is less promising. In addition to the three Collects (out of four) discussed above (Section 3c), creation is *named* directly in four further Collects,¹⁰ five Additional Collects¹¹ and two Post Communions.¹² That is 14 references out of a possible 210 (just over 7%). Admittedly there are further direct references that do not *name* creation, which bumps the total up to 16% (see Section 3b above). There are 13 *CWCPCs* that name creation and explore realized and unrealized eschatological hope. Where these three prayers remain vague about humanity's relationship with its own context, new prayers, or revisions are needed, which articulate what it is to be God's people on God's planet. I will seek to show that there is scope, to introduce a more thorough eschatological vision, through revisions that follow.

4. *A Process for Suggesting Revisions*

a. *Adjustments to the architecture: not rebuilding*

Examples from *CWCPC* and rewritten versions of the same prayers will be offered with accompanying critique and analysis. Each consideration of Collects, Post Communions and Additional Collects (from *CWME* and *CWAC*), consists of the proposing of an alternative version of the same prayer which includes God, creation and humanity according to the framework and scope developed in this thesis.

¹⁰ 'Created': Collects: 2nd before Lent (*CWME*: 390); 'Creation': 20th Sunday after Trinity (*CWME*: 420); 'Creation': 3rd Sunday after Trinity (*CWME*: 409); 'created': Christ the King, (*CWME*: 426).

¹¹ 'Creation' in Additional Collects: 4th before Advent (*CWAC*: 25); 2nd before Advent (*CWAC*: 26); 2nd of Epiphany (*CWAC*: 8); 2nd before Lent (*CWAC*: 11); and 16th after Trinity (*CWAC*: 23).

Just as an access audit of a built environment will suggest reasonable adjustments that can be made to the existing architecture, the work of revisions offers reasonable adjustments to the prayers so as to earth them. These alterations are to be seen as an experimental exploration of what may constitute a reasonable change of an existing text to satisfy contemporary ecotheological concerns. What stands out in the following process is, firstly, a critical commentary of what exists and, secondly, a self-critique of any adjustments offered.

This process seeks not to produce something intrinsically better, and there is scope within the critique to acknowledge that the existing text may ultimately be more successful than the revision. To continue the metaphor, just as a set of ramps, lifts and alterations to existing architecture may devalue or obscure certain aspects of the original design, so these revisions may aim to succeed on some fronts but not all. To stretch the metaphor, within reason, the alternative of demolishing the existing architecture is one that is beyond the chosen remit of this activity, even though various liberationist movements have made a case for such an approach (as discussed in Chapter 1). And to complete the parallel, the aspiration of this provision of critique and revision is to provoke and inspire a more earthed approach to constructing new prayers at the point of inception.

b. *Inclusiveness in earthed revisions*

Although the emphasis is on the connection with the Creation (and all its creatures), it is also necessary in the revision process to consider the inclusion of

¹² 'Creation' in Post Communions: 1st of Epiphany (CWME: 384); and 21st after Trinity (CWME: 421).

people too. It is not only the faithful who pray, and since the worship of the church is a public, not a private act, therefore, I have referred to 'people' rather than the Church as often as possible when our humanness is a subject in the prayers. I see being as inclusive as possible as a primary task for a liberation theologian whether one's perspective is Marxist, feminist or ecological. This thesis focuses on the last of these three. My work, however, is founded on the same premise that people—whether women, children, the disabled, indigenous and black communities, those marginalized by their identity in any way—and in this case the earth, are all *included* not *excluded* from God's purposes.

When humanity's relationship with the earth is referred to in my new prayers I will attempt to include all of humanity wherever possible. Sometimes it may be appropriate since it may be that a prayer is focussed on one particular group's function or activity the obvious example being the Church. To clarify my aspiration for each prayer, I have ranked levels of inclusivity of humanity in a descending order below. There are occasions where prayer is clearly for the purpose of addressing specific groups, but wherever possible the highest-ranking level is preferred:

1. whole of humanity;
2. the faithful;
3. members of the church;
4. all who are praying the prayer;
5. those who have received communion who are praying the prayer.

It is important to make a distinction between 2 and 3 since members of the Church are a subset of the faithful people of God; it is not possible to assert the same in reverse.

5. *The Critique, Revision and Analysis of Nine Collects and Post Communions*

The nine prayers, below, that are critiqued, were selected by starting from Pentecost and working forward looking for existing prayers that touched on ecotheological issues either obliquely or directly. The selection was in certain ways arbitrary, although the analysis took place at about the time of year when they were being prayed in churches. It was begun with a view to offering as many critiques throughout the whole year as was possible. After nine, however, it was clear that the examples were a sufficient introduction to the process within the broader context of this overall study of *CW* texts. The selecting depended, partly, on identifying theological ideas that lacked an internal coherence or deconstructed themselves since this enabled the work of critique and revision to be more defined and contrasting to the original texts.

a. *Encountering God's works*

The significant issue which is encountered in this first Collect is the question of what is 'good' that 'come[s]' from God, and whether it is appropriate to identify the Creation as one of those 'things'.

The Weekdays after the Day of Pentecost

Collect (CWME: 406)

O Lord, from whom all good things come:
grant to us your humble servants,
that by your holy inspiration
we may think on those things that are good,
and by your merciful guiding may perform the same;
through our Lord Jesus Christ,
who is alive and reigns with you,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and for ever.

Critique. The prayer's basis is a request for the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to enable those praying to operate within God's goodness. What the prayer leaves unclear is how the 'good things' that come from God may affect the relationship of the people praying with those same things. It offers two responses that the servants of God may have to good things: first to 'think on those things', and second to perform good things themselves. That the prayer speaks about 'all' of God's works suggests an earthed stance.

What is lacking here is a stronger expression of the dynamic that exists between humanity and the Creation. Here, the 'servants' of God ask simply to 'see' and 'think' about God's good works, there is at no point a suggestion that God's servants might enter into an engaging and fulfilling relationship with these 'things'. The circle could also be completed between the discovery of God in our lives and the discovery of God's presence in the cosmos.

Revised Collect

O Creator, from whom all good things come,
grant to us your humble servants,
that we may see you in all your works,
be inspired to think on your goodness,
and be guided to become holy stewards
in the kingdom of Jesus Christ our Lord
who is alive and reigns with you,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and forever.

Analysis. The naming of God as 'Creator' brings a new emphasis to the original prayer's reference to God as 'Lord'. The expressed desire for those praying to see the goodness of God in God's works is not without its challenges since, for instance, earthquakes, suffering and predation are present alongside goodness. All the same the request provides a clearer presentation of the three-way relationship between God, worshipper and creation.

The original dynamic between thinking and performing is replaced by thinking, seeing and stewarding, which contextualizes the place for performance of good works. The original prayer leaves the question hanging of what 'performing the same' goodness may involve, whereas specifying the believer's role as a wise steward in the kingdom develops the concept of being a 'humble servant' of God in relation to both God and the Creation.

b. *Joining creation in celebrating God's love*

The connection between the communion of the faithful and God's love for all is explored in the analysis, revision and critique. A more contextualized ecclesiology in relation to creation is developed in the revision.

The Weekdays after the Day of Pentecost
 Post Communion (CWME: 406)
 Gracious God, lover of all,
 in this sacrament
 we are one family in Christ your Son,
 one in the sharing of his body and blood
 and one in the communion of his Spirit:
 help us to grow in love for one another
 and come to the full maturity of the Body of Christ.
 We make our prayer through your Son our Saviour.

Critique. In anticipation of Trinity Sunday this prayer references all three persons of the Trinity, but focuses on the Holy Spirit because it follows immediately on from Pentecost Sunday. It explains that through communion we show our oneness with Christ, communing with the Spirit by bread and wine. The request is for God to help our growth in love, leading us to become the 'mature' body of Christ. Because the prayer speaks of being in God's family and that the family must become mature, there is a weakness in how the prayer understands the people of God since this metaphor does not fully represent the nature or the realities of the body of Christ. First the use of the metaphor of 'family', nowadays, is problematic. It may signify many negative things for those living outside of standard family arrangements or those who have suffered within a family setting. Second, the lack of full communion in the Church means that only a partial oneness can be expressed in communion. A

third and fourth gap in the prayer is that it excludes both the Creation from this unity, and humanity as a whole.

Revised Post Communion

Gracious God, lover of all that is yours,
 in this sacrament we join the whole Creation
 in celebrating your Son's rescue:
 help us to grow in love for what you have made,
 and to join the community that Son and Spirit indwell;
 that your church may be the Body of Christ here on earth.
 We make our prayer through your Son, our Saviour.

Analysis. This new prayer for Trinity Sunday speaks of all that we can become in relation to one another and creation. Line two speaks of 'joining' in with creation's praise of God. When God's salvific work in Jesus Christ is referred to here (line 3), it is spoken of as 'rescue'. (See also, the use of 'rescue', below, in the Revised Additional Collect, Section 5i).

Here it is not just the worshipping community that gives praise back to God, rather, it *joins* creation in worship of the tri-une God. Only if creation was locked into a pre-Christian form of monotheism, which does not acknowledge God's rescue in Christ, could the Church refuse to acknowledge creation's worship of the revealed Messiah. Naming creation as being involved in Trinitarian worship is something that is unprecedented within the existing prayers. The 'family' of the original prayer, is here replaced with 'community'. This offers a broader and stronger frame of reference for the 'Body of Christ' and alludes to the perfect Trinitarian community indwelling the Church.

c. *Trinity, ecclesiology and cosmology*

The Collect for Trinity speaks of the Church's steadfastness in faith, set within a Trinitarian declaration. The possibility that the prayer could benefit from a connection being made between the doctrine of Godhead and Church to develop its cosmology is considered in the revised prayer.

Trinity Sunday

Collect (CWME: 406)

Almighty and everlasting God,
 you have given us your servants grace,
 by the confession of a true faith,
 to acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity
 and in the power of the divine majesty to worship the Unity:
 keep us steadfast in this faith,
 that we may evermore be defended from all adversities;
 through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you,
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and for ever.

Critique. This prayer's theology of grace, is that God gives the Church of Christ a tri-une faith to confess, a tri-une glory to celebrate, and in that power, to worship the 'Unity', so enabling the worshipping faithful to remain steadfast and secure in God. The prayer creates a false separation between those worshipping a Trinitarian God and the rest of the cosmos by neglecting the praise offered by the non-human creation. Of course the Hebrew Bible contains many reference to the Creation's offering of praise to the Creator (and see discussion and analysis of Creation giving praise in Chapter 4, Section 3a). The new prayer continues with the theme of the previous six

days (the weekdays after Pentecost) by arguing that Christian faith is a way of joining in with the rest of creation in praise of God not *vice versa*.

Revised Collect

God within and beyond all worlds,
 by your grace you have given us a true faith
 to confess and acknowledge the nature and glory of the Trinity;
 may we join with all creation, in the power of the divine majesty,
 to worship the Unity.
 Keep us steadfast in the faith;
 So we may be sure that your eternal liberation
 will overthrow all adversities;
 through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you,
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and forever.

Analysis. Here, in line one, ‘Within’ refers to God’s immanence and ‘beyond’ to God’s transcendence. In line two there is a change to how faith is explained. Faith here is labelled as a gift of grace—in the original text the syntax says that we have been given a single gift, grace, for a single purpose, to acknowledge God’s tri-une glory. The new version demonstrates that God’s gift of grace enables and inspires faith, acknowledgement and worship. In so doing the prayer contextualizes the particular need of humanity for God’s gift of faith so as to be able to join creation in acknowledgement and worship of the creator.

Faith in, and comprehension of the tri-une nature of God is for those of Christian faith. The Creation’s worship of God does not include an act of faith or creedal basis, hence the insertion of creation after faith is spoken of, not before. The prayer develops the original’s talk of ‘adversities’ to God’s delivery from adversity by the eternal liberation of the children of God that the Creation longs for too (Romans 8.22-

23). Naming God's nature as 'everlasting' has been lost from the original, but eternal liberation provides a substitute reference to eternity. The prayer retains the direction of the original prayer, that is, the worship by the faithful of the Trinity. At the same time the new prayer places all that is true for the Church in particular immediately alongside all that is true for both Church and creation, in relation to worship of the tri-une God.

d. *Humanity expresses God's communion with the cosmos*

The sharing of bread and wine symbolizes God's unity not just with the believer, but also with the fruit of creation and the work of human hands. The experience of the believer being in communion is one not just of connection with God, but also with God's cosmos.

The Day of Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Communion

Post Communion (CWME: 407)

All praise to you, our God and Father,
for you have fed us with the bread of heaven
and quenched our thirst from the true vine:
hear our prayer that, being grafted into Christ,
we may grow together in unity
and feast with him in his kingdom;
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Critique. The Church's unity (as discussed in the previous prayer) is of less significance when placed within the bigger picture of the unity of God's creation with humanity, and with God. Great Christian thinkers such as Maximus and Gregory before him have grappled with the unique role humanity has within creation in terms of obtaining unity with God on behalf of the whole created order. This matter

takes us back to Romans 8.18-23 where Paul speaks about the Creation longing for the liberation of the children of God, as if there is a primacy of human relationship with God that has an impact on all creation:

in Maximus' own terms, one might say that part of the problem was the Origenists allowed no space for the person to develop in distinction to the created nature, left no gap between creation and salvation ... Garrigues's analysis of Maximus' soteriology has led him to suggest that the Confessor himself grew into this appreciation ... There is [in Maximus' work] a growing appreciation of the eschatological nature of this personal salvation: that the Incarnation of Christ enacts a radical innovation upon creation (Janet Williams 2004: 197).

And not only does this line of thinking suggest no separation between our own and the created order's communion with God it also indicates what role the Church has in incarnating Christ:

in the practice of the Christian life human persons actualize the Incarnation: Maximus regards the Incarnation as an event not limited by the historical career of Jesus Christ, but enacted also in creation (the 'natural law') and in Scripture (the 'written law' – *Difficulty* 10, Louth p. 109). Once again, the human person as microcosm has a particularly pivotal role in this: as created being and bearers of the scriptural tradition, we realize the Incarnation of Christ not merely by making Christ human, but also by divinizing him (Janet Williams 2004: 198, Louth 1996: 109-10).

This human incarnating of Christ, both iconifies the image of God and the 'created universe', so that humanity serves as a cosmological sign of God and God's universe at a microcosmic level.

The human person, too, is an icon. Created in the image of God, humanity is also a living image of the created universe. The church fathers see humanity as existing on two levels simultaneously—on the level of the spiritual and on the level of material Creation [...] A human being, says Gregory the Theologian (fourth century), is like 'another universe', standing at the center of Creation, midway between strength and frailty, greatness and lowliness. Humanity is the meeting point of all the created order. The idea of the human person as a bridge, a point of contact and union, is developed as early

as the seventh century by the lay monk Maximus Confessor. As an image of the world, the human person constitutes a microcosm (Chryssavgis 2000: 87).

Revised Post Communion

All praise to you, our loving Creator,
for your body is bread for the world,
and your blood, wine for all who thirst,¹³
hear our prayer, that with the whole Creation,
we may be grafted into Christ,
and so be unified and prepared for the eternal kingdom,
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Analysis. Line one in the context of the whole prayer identifies that God creates cosmos, communion and salvation. Lines two and three indicate what the nature of the eucharist is, indicating that it is God's tangible offering of God's self within the fallen order. Lines four to six express our communion with God and creation through being grafted, together with the cosmos into God. The revised prayer serves to show how those praying can be an icon of God's unity with all that is created.

e. *Reliance of all creation on God's grace*

God's sustaining of the universe, as well as the believer, by the power of grace and love is considered here.

The First Sunday after Trinity

Collect (CWME: 408)

O God,
the strength of all those who put their trust in you,
mercifully accept our prayers
and, because through the weakness of our mortal nature
we can do no good thing without you,

¹³ This comes from a the sheet music by Bernadette Farrell ('Bread for the World' 1990): 'Bread for the world, a world of hunger: wine for all peoples, people who thirst. May we who eat, be bread to others, may we who drink, pour out our love.'

grant us your grace,
 that in the keeping of your commandments
 we may please you both in will and deed;
 through Jesus Christ your Son our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you,
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and for ever.

Critique. This powerfully encapsulates the doctrine of grace. It argues that those who trust in God find their strength by grace. It couches the doctrine of grace in the negative, about the human condition, and so emphasizes human dependency upon God. The focus on human weakness (rather than 'strength') and an inability to be good or to please God is not untypical of Christian thought, but there are different modes within the Christian tradition that a revision can draw on, while considering the doctrine of grace and dependency on God.

Revised Collect
 God of all good things,
 it is your strength that sustains us
 and your love which spins the globe,
 we long to serve your purposes here on earth
 and pray that by your mercy you would enable us
 to put our wills in the orbit of your love
 so we may live as you have commanded us,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord,
 who is alive and reigns with you
 in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
 one God, now and for ever.

Analysis. The new prayer, unlike the former does not conclude that we are without strength in ourselves to do good, rather it suggests that it is good that we are mindful of the need for God's grace to enable us to please God in the way we live. The objective of the new version is to clarify that the goodness of God is present in the tempo-

ral nature of our lives and also in the Creation. The prayer hopes that God's grace will enable the Church to be earthed within the goodness of creation and that his grace will be established in those created in God's image.

Reference to the power of God is provided in lines two and three, they speak of strength and love, showing that it is the same force which enables the life of faith as that which continues and sustains the work of creation ('It's your love that spins the globe ... It's your love that will sustain me', Susan Wallace 2003). Line four explains what God's purpose for our mortal lives is—locating the life of faith within the Creation. In speaking of the orbit of God's love in line six, the theme of God's power and love is developed—likening those praying to planets orbiting around the eternal sun. This alludes to the admission of the need for full reliance on God in the original prayer.

f. *Grace, works and stewardship in God's kingdom*

Faith as a journey is a popular theme both in the book of Psalms and in contemporary spirituality and theology. The relationship between the 'works' of such a journey, the grace of God regardless of the merits of the journey and the purpose of the journeyers is considered here.

The First Sunday after Trinity
Additional Collect (CWAC: 19)
God of truth,
help us to keep your law of love
and to walk in ways of wisdom,
that we may find true life
in Jesus Christ your Son.

Critique. God's wisdom, love, law and truth embodied in Jesus Christ are explained in this prayer. The prayer associates truth with God's wisdom, asking that God would enable those praying to walk in wisdom's way so that true life will be found in Jesus Christ. True life, the prayer explains, is life in Jesus and wisdom comes from love's law. The prayer borrows language from Psalm 119 that asks repeatedly for the keeping of the law, walking in God's truth, and the avoiding of false ways. It also introduces the notion of 'true life' that sounds like a reference to the contemporary language of being 'fully human' or 'fully alive' (cf John 10.10).

The original prayer succeeds in segregating people into those who find true life and those who do not. It does this by implying that life can be lived untruthfully, unwisely and unlovingly, but also indicates that a person's life itself can be untrue. If the prayer is alluding to eternal life as being 'true' life, then that means it also is suggesting that eternal life is something to be found through being wise, loving, and obedient to God's law. Such a theology is one of works not of grace. What mitigates against the prayer emphasizing 'works' is that the law that must be kept is one of 'love' suggesting a new covenant of grace, not works.

Revised Additional Collect

God of wisdom,
help us to be stewards in your Creation,
no longer aliens in the land¹⁴
for the earth is full of your steadfast love,¹⁵
and we long to find messiah, here, among us.

¹⁴ Psalm 119.19

¹⁵ Psalm 119:64

Analysis. The intention of the new prayer continues the spirit of the original prayer rather than adhering to the same phraseology. It speaks of the location where life in abundance (John 10.10) is to be lived, by using images present in Psalm 119. The new prayer takes language appropriate to the Hebrew Bible to invoke God as Trinity and as Unity. Notions of walking God's way, in the context of the land—through experiencing wisdom, truth, love, and law—are all explored. Here, though, 'law' is referred to in relation to stewardship, and the image of walking is replaced with that of meeting (or 'finding').

Introducing the term 'stewards' (line two) continues the topic of the original prayer (the keeping of God's law). It clarifies that keeping the law means being stewards of God's love towards one another and God's love for the Creation. Line three does not separate the person praying and 'the world', rather it seeks a connection with the world in contrast to the original prayer's development of a sense of alienation from the world.

The new prayer uses the words 'wisdom' and 'messiah' that are Hebrew Bible notions of the presence and promise of God. By using these two words to invoke the Trinity, the prayer pays due respect to the source of the prayer's language (Psalm 119).

g. Heavenly and earthly nourishment of the faithful

Sustenance by God for the faithful is considered as being both a physical and spiritual process.

The First Sunday after Trinity
 Post Communion (CWME: 408)
 Eternal Father,
 we thank you for nourishing us
 with these heavenly gifts:
 may our communion strengthen us in faith,
 build us up in hope,
 and make us grow in love;
 for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Critique. The prayer gives thanks for heavenly nourishment. The world is made invisible in the prayer. The request is made that the communion would strengthen the faithful, 'building hope' and 'growing love' in those who have received the sacrament. By asking that the heavenly sustenance would ennoble the recipients all others are excluded. The prayer makes no direct reference to the mortal nature of our lives.

Revised Post Communion
 Eternal Father
 we thank you for the nourishment we find
 when heaven and earth meet in broken bread, in outpoured wine:
 may this strengthen faith, build hope, and grow love in us
 that will bring heaven to earth
 for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Analysis. In writing a new Post Communion the attempt is to offer thanks for the sacramental that brings heaven's sustenance to earth and to the faithful. Unlike the original prayer which speaks of the gifting of God as something which is 'heavenly' this new prayer makes clear that nourishment is not heavenly alone, but that it comes when heaven and earth meet in the sacrament of bread and wine broken and poured. In the new prayer the suggested purpose of the sacrament in our lives moves

from the fulfilment of the communicants—the concern of the original—to the communicants joining with God in fulfilling God’s purposes in the world.

h. *Speaking the names of the Trinity within creation*

To name the persons of the Trinity in the context of creation is to earth Trinitarian doctrine and make those praying aware of God’s threefold presence in the world.

The Second Sunday after Trinity
 Additional Collect (CWAC: 19)
 Faithful Creator,
 whose mercy never fails:
 deepen our faithfulness to you
 and to your living Word,
 Jesus Christ our Lord.

Critique. Here God is the ‘Faithful Creator’ who is unfailingly merciful. The request from those praying is for a deeper level of faithfulness in the ‘Creator’ and in Jesus Christ who is ‘Lord’ and ‘living Word’. It asks that the person praying will reciprocate God’s faithfulness by being faithful in return to both God (as ‘Creator’) and to Christ (as ‘Lord’). It speaks of our faithfulness being ‘deepened’, which is an obvious and yet odd verb to choose since neither quality or quantity of faith matter so much as the simple gift of faith itself.

Revised Additional Collect
 Faithful Creator, whose mercy never fails,
 our Lord and our God,
 gift us faith in Jesus Christ;
 the Word you have breathed into all Creation.

Analysis. In this new prayer all three persons of the Trinity are referred to (apt for the liturgical moment in the year), unlike the original. The prayer demonstrates how Spirit and Word operate in the whole cosmos, not just in the human sphere. Line one refers to the first person of the Trinity. Line two makes reference to the second person, the embodied and resurrected Christ, God's physical and wounded presence with us shown to the face of our doubt—as is expressed in Thomas witnessing the resurrected and wounded Christ (John 20.28). That faith is gifted to us is much more important than that it is deepened, since only a mustard seed of faith is required in any case (Matt 17.28). This 'breathing' of the Word, in line four, introduces the third person of the Trinity into the prayer (and imitates other *CWME* texts, e.g. Preface, Eucharistic Prayer F, *CWME*: 198).

Work on this was, initially, with an alternative order of syntax, 'Faithful Creator, whose mercy never fails, gift us with faith in the Word you have breathed into all Creation, Jesus Christ our Lord.' Adding a sub-clause, however, to explain the nature of the Word prior to using the name of Christ, was bringing complexity to the Additional Collect, which was going against the purpose of having a briefer text, so this was abandoned. The words 'our Lord' did not fit neatly with the repositioned 'Jesus Christ' so it was then that I decided to speak of God as our Lord in the first half of the prayer rather than at the end.

i. The relationship between Creator and the Fallen Creation

The gaze of God upon the fallen creation is considered and God's peaceful purposes for both humanity and the cosmos are teased out.

The Third Sunday After Trinity
Additional Collect (CWAC: 19)
God our saviour,
look on this wounded world
in pity and in power;
hold us fast to your promises of peace
won for us by your Son,
our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Critique. The prayer asks for God, who is saviour, to look in pity and power on the world, which is described as being 'wounded'. The request relates the saving nature of God to peace, asking that 'we' may be held 'fast' to God's 'promises of peace', which have been 'won' by Jesus who is our saviour.

The prayer is poorly written. It uses the word 'saviour' twice, by separately naming God and Jesus with the same title, this is repetitious rather than expansive. In the first and second instances of the use of the word 'saviour' there is a difference of emphasis. The first speaks of God's nature, the second of Christ's title. It makes little headway though in making sense of the significance of the word 'saviour'. The world is named as 'wounded' as if the world is an entity. Perhaps the prayer subscribes to the Gaia hypothesis that thinks of the earth as a being or entity in its own right. This is an interesting shift in Judeo-Christian understanding. The 'land' or the 'earth' is often referred to as entities within the Hebrew Bible (for example, in the Psalms; Psalms 69.34, 76.8, 96.11, 97.4, 98.4, 100.1, 114.7). Speaking of the 'world' in this way constructs not just a new but untried metaphor.

The prayer declares that the world is wounded and yet offers no explanation for what kind of wounds they are or who has inflicted them. I can see three options for interpretation of this word 'wounded': first the scars of battle on the face of the earth

from human warfare; then the environmental damage caused to the earth by human activity; and finally a reference to the fallen state of humanity and creation. Taking each of these in turn I will show how the use of the verb wounded is unhelpful to the prayer.

Warfare certainly damages both people and environment. The level of wounding this causes to people is quite different to that caused to the planet. It is confusing to mix the imagery of human death and wounds as a result of warfare with the injuries caused to other species, or the damage inflicted on the planet itself by humanity.

Second, if this is the language of disfigurement then there is an ambiguity about where the responsibility for the action of disfiguring lies: is it with God, a fallen creation or humankind? The prayer is not forthcoming with an answer. Human action in the world as that of wounding uses the language of disfigurement, just as the *CW* confession (Confession, B47, *Christian Beginnings*, *NPW*: 86-87) which talks of us having 'marred' God's image in us: this also is ambiguous, confusing and unhelpful. If the world's wounds are a human responsibility then to ask for God's 'pity' adds further confusion, since it would be for humanity to repent and to seek after God's mercy not just pity.

There is another problem with the notion of pity. The only time God's pity is involved in the bible is as an alternate response to God's anger being shown. There is no biblical precedent for God's pity being shown, except as an alternative to angry destruction. Asking for God's pity is to plead with God to stay the hand of destruction, and be merciful instead. So the prayer is asking that God would pity the planet rather than join in with the human destruction of the planet by destroying it further.

This is as confusing as the first option. One could infer, from the prayer, that it is God who is capable of wounding the world: the prayer serving as a plea to God to hold back from a further wounding made in anger.

The metaphor is ambiguous and is without a biblical or liturgical precedent and therefore striking in its unfamiliarity and at the same time unclear. Also because this prayer sits within a relatively non eco-centric framework of the *CWCPC* it serves to give emphasis to its own obscurity in understanding of the purpose of creation and God's relationship with it.

The third possibility, that the prayer is a reference to the result of the human Fall upon the Creation, is something which is not only applicable to the world, but to the cosmos too. To understand the Fall as the wounding of the world is to misunderstand what the Fall symbolizes. The Fall is to do with knowing and separating: a by-product of it may be woundedness. Woundedness is a consequence of sin rather than part of the intrinsic nature of things. To refer to the world as 'wounded' is less helpful even than calling it 'sinful', 'fallen' or 'in bondage to decay' since it introduces a new cosmological construct that has little theological or biblical precedent, and at the same time constructs a negative view of the planet on which we live.

There are other difficulties in naming planet earth 'this wounded world' when combined with the request that God looks on it—there is no evidence of whose world it is, and God is spoken of as being beyond it, looking on. To turn God into an onlooker is also puzzling, since it removes the presence of God from the earth and from society.

Finally, there is a fourth possibility, that 'our world' is a reference to human society more than it is to the Creation, which reinforces the difficulty with the use of the 'world' in a period of human history where popular astronomical science means those praying are conscious of the planet's place within the solar system and cosmos.

Revised Additional Collect
 God our rescuer, come stand among us
 in your love and power:
 heal the earth, save the people,
 and speak words of peace over us,
 through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Analysis. The nature of God's rescue (line one) is developed during the prayer by speaking of God saving and healing, promising, breathing and bringing peace. Reference is made to the Holy Spirit in the invocation for God to 'come'. The end of line one speaks of the coming of the risen Christ too by referring to him standing among the disciples to give them the promises of peace (John 20.20-22).

The combination of 'love' and 'power' (line two) repeats the notion of 'power' from the original prayer, reframing it, though, in the context of God's love and Christ's resurrection. In line three healing the earth and saving the people are specific 'pitying' actions and they replace the word 'pity'. Rather than speaking of the world's wounds, instead the prayer asks for the earth's wholeness—which makes much more eschatological sense—since it refers both to what is unrealized and what is hoped for.

Line four lacks the ambiguity present in the original request that we would 'hold fast' to promises, rather, here, these promises are breathed over us, like a parent

speaks words of comfort to a child, like the breath of the Spirit, and as Jesus breathed peace over the disciples. This continues the motif from John 20.20-22 that is begun with the phrase 'stand among us'. The result is that the prayer has a far stronger Trinitarian feel than the original since God's rescue, coming, breathing, healing, saving, speaking power and lordship are all invoked and Jesus Christ is named.

6. *Conclusion*

The small selection of the original *CWCPC* and my revisions show how creation can be either included or excluded from written Collects and Post Communions. Continued use of texts that do not make explicit either humanity's connection with creation or God's, provide evidence of the Church's continuing struggle to enter into a powerful dynamic with creator and created.

The new prayers demonstrate how it is possible to show that earth, people and heaven meet in public worship and the life of faith. Lathrop describes the intersections of these three in his liturgical cosmology *Holy Ground* (Lathrop 2003). He speaks of the Markan understanding of the relationship between the earthly and heavenly spheres (Lathrop 2003: 34-35), where the Spirit makes a 'tear in the perfect fabric of the universe' (Lathrop 2003: 34-35) at the baptism of Christ. It is this torn location that the revised prayers seek to be situated in.

Lathrop also speaks of Christ's death as further evidence of a new connection between heaven and earth, Christ being in 'the sphere of the sky' and also 'among us sharing our death (Mk 1.1; 15.39), becoming our life' (Lathrop 2003: 34-35). Lathrop sees this Markan pattern as one of 'broken cosmological symbols' (Lathrop 2003: 34-

35). The revisions suggested above wield these broken symbols with careful consideration (see especially the extensive discussion around the 'woundedness' of God's world in Section 5i, immediately above).

To this broken cosmological interpretation of the Markan narrative offered by Lathrop, I would add the broken religious sphere. Mark 15 offers another tear in the fabric of theological order, as the temple curtain is ripped at the moment of Christ's death. If it is beyond the sanctuary that the sanctification of life is occurring, then the Church finds its own sanctification not by seeking God in the privacy of the *ekklesia*, rather it is by God sanctifying both *ekklesia* and the Creation, bringing them back into full union with God.

Celebrating God's sanctification of the cosmos can be central to the prayers of the Church as they seek to locate the people praying at the place where the fabric of the universe has been torn open to reveal heaven. It is possible for the prayers to reveal the tear that has opened between the sanctuary of both ecclesial and human society, as well as speaking of the tear that has been opened by Christ's combined rescue of the Creation and its human stewards.

Whether the alternative prayers that are offered fail—by continuing to pour new wine into old wineskins—is a question that remains to be proved. Many would argue that a completely new start is essential, however the references and citation from other liturgical texts outside of *CW*, in Chapter 3, shows that a new wealth of context specific prayer can lack theological integrity and, also, may have less impact than that of a revised core of texts that are used most of the time.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ROUTES FOR REVISION

This is a period in Church history of major liturgical innovation, and in the Church of England a transition for its liturgy 'more dramatic ... than in any other century, apart from the sixteenth' (Stringer 2005: 215). Included in this is change to the form and function, style and content of the liturgy. There has been a substantial increase in the content of creation themed materials, even—as this study has discovered—in the mainstream liturgical corpus of *CW*. There is new and un-chartered territory being explored as the commonality of worship is being stretched and transformed, through connectedness being found more in 'juxtaposition, bricolage and collage' (Phan 2003: 66) than in a confining or prescriptive formula. Even *CW* in its structure reflects this new shaping of worship resources.

By way of conclusion some indication of whether the subset of resources, examined here from *CW*, are evidence of a post-modernist approach to liturgical inculturation, will be judged. Whether *CW* is 'succumbing to ephemeral fads and passing trends' (Phan 2003: 66) or whether in this new set of freedoms the cry of the poor and

for that matter the earth can be much better seen and heard, in the worship, beliefs, and actions of the Church, will be decided.

1. *Charting the Routes of Revision*

The route the C of E has taken in its revision in the last 50 years has been remarkable and has proved it to be a church born out of the Reformation, that has reform at its heart. The lack of radical theology in its new liturgies will disappoint many interest groups, including those of an ecotheological persuasion. What *CW* does contain, is an engagement with creation themes, taking a variety of approaches.

Those clergy who have been using the new resources are reasonably informed of the materials available and are making use of them. Those who do use the Creation themed texts are flexible in their use of them and take what is useful, whilst discarding texts that are unhelpful for being 'too Green' or irrelevant to the social or cultural context where worship happens.

The *CWCPC* prayers that have been studied in depth show that there is plenty of scope to revise existing texts in the light of contemporary concerns and it is reasonable to assume that the next fifty years will see more rather than less opportunity for revision, refreshing and renewing of liturgical resources, even if the talk from the Liturgical Commission is all about 'Liturgical Formation' (Earey and Tovey 2009), it is unlikely to stay that way for long, the cosmological shifts are likely to be too great.

Even if it is not in the very immediate future, there will be plenty of chance in the processes ahead to make the Creation even more visible than it is now.

2. Will Liberationist Routes be Absorbed in the Mainstream?

In CW there is little evidence of an eco-liberationist stance towards the Creation. What though is apparent is that CW by its very structure naturally allows space for more radical and liberationist perspectives within it. If revision continues, more texts that give voice to the cry of the poor, the marginalized and the earth will be possible. A purpose in studying CW texts is that the Church's internal dialogue and engagement with the eco-political issues of the day provides documentary evidence of how Christians are shaped by and contribute to social attitudes.

It is in the texts of worship maybe more than in any other theological activity that the Church is communal in thought and practice. This is not to over-blow the strength of the C of E's unity, it is rather to point to the clearest evidence of commonality, the prayers that are prayed, and this ties back to the connectedness of the prayer, theology and action of the Church—*lex orandi, lex credendi (lex vivendi / lex agendi)*.

Theological commonality has a value that is quite different to that of theological radicalism—the latter has theo-political influence rather than *de facto* influence, the former has both. Although CW has not got there in terms of its theological radicalism, it has demonstrated radicalism in liturgical development. CW shows how litur-

gical theology has shifted what is understood as communal in a direction from the prescriptive to the dynamic and with the potential to be inclusive.

3. *A New Perspective on the Contents and Use of Common Worship*

The 316 texts considered demonstrate that within the *CW* corpus there are prayers that do, by their content, make creation more visible. This study has given consideration to 10% of the word count of *CW* resources, selected because of the relevance of these texts to ecotheological concerns. (These 316 texts total 25,000 words and there are approximately 250,000 words of liturgy in total in the *CW* corpus, excluding the Psalter and Traditional language texts).

What is also important is to measure the visibility of the resources. Assessing how many of these are key or core texts is complex since *CW* allows for such a variety of options. The levels of use or usefulness among the 316 are broken down into 11 categories (in table 7.1), the first category being the texts that are for use most frequently, and then in descending order to the eleventh category for those materials that are useful on the least number of occasions.

Table 7.1

	<i>Frequency of use</i>	<i>No. of texts</i>
1	texts where frequency of use could be weekly on Sundays;	21
2	texts where use could be weekly at a weekday service;	2
3	texts that could be used for the duration of a season;	12
4	texts designed for use during a week or major festival;	48
5	Additional Collects for use during a week or major festival;	31
6	Canticles that could be used at any time;	8
7	optional texts suitable for general use depending on service theme;	102
8	optional texts are suitable for use during a specific period or season;	43
9	optional texts suitable for a specific occasion in the liturgical year;	16
10	texts for use during Baptism or Thanksgiving for the birth of a child;	13
11	Collects and Post Communions for lesser days in the liturgical year.	20

This shows the wide spread in how the 316 resources are positioned in *CW*. The proportion of optional or supplementary texts compared to core texts, reflects the nature of the design of *CW*, which has built in a remarkable level of flexibility.

The survey of clergy does show that more than half of the respondents had seen more than half of the six texts presented to them. More people were familiar with the *NPW* Invitation to Confession than with the *CWME* Harvest Thanksgiving Post Communion. This is interesting in the light of Tovey's concern about *how* the *CWME* has been titled: 'people have mistakenly viewed this volume as the definitive book, with other books as supplementary. This missed the point of there being a series of volumes rather than one main book' (Tovey 2008: 4). This particular result, though, does not disprove the concern, rather it suggests that some users of the liturgy are

not finding multiple volumes as problematic as might have been foreseen. Many users, however, may well find more than one volume burdensome and feel less adventurous.

An endeavour of this study was to discover what the effect is of having a smaller proportion of the published rites being principle texts and a much larger number as options for, one-off services, particular themes, or seasons of the year. This interest was not just to judge the usefulness of the *CW* structure, but also to assess how hidden away the texts are that speak of the Creation in substantive ways. For the C of E to explore in its worship the Church's and humanity's relationship with the earth, depends not just on the presence but also on the use of relevant materials.

The six texts had each been used by between 9% and 44% of respondents, the mean average use being 23%. This means that if this sample bears any relation to the 316 texts, perhaps one quarter of them have been used at some point per respondent. This is a cautious estimate considering the table, above (7.1) shows that from the 316 there are a reasonable number of texts that are available for use every week, or for a whole season (two of survey texts came from category 4 of Table 7.1, the Collect and Post Communion, the four 'God in Creation' texts are from category 7).

4. *Creation Theologies in Common Worship Made Visible*

There is substantial evidence of theologies of creation in *CW*. It is not eco-liberationist, but some is earthed, and draws on the same sources as ecotheology and

at times with particularly pleasing results. It is not possible to say there is a single coherent theology of creation. That is part of the consequence of the radicalism that is present in the liturgical reform movement, which allows a very post-modern milieu of conflicting ideas to sit in honest juxtaposition with each other.

There is dissonance too within the 316 texts considered, with some profoundly negative constructions of the nature of the 'world' that run counter to texts that are energetic in the inclusion of concerns for contemporary environmental crises. Well known examples from the Book of Common Prayer that remain in the *CWCPC* such as 'the changes of this world' (*CWME*: 389), 'the world, the flesh and the devil' (*CWME*: 395), 'put on the armour of light, now in the time of this mortal life' (*CWME*: 376), and 'that we may so pass through things temporal' (*CWME*: 410) are relatively tame compared with some of the new images deployed.

The attention given to the three persons of the Trinity and to eschatology in the prayers has led to some positive results. There is less clarity about the work of the Spirit than that of God as Creator or Christ as Lord of all creation, but there has been a reasonable engagement in this area. There is nothing quite so radical as McFague proposes (see Chapter 3 and McFague 2000: 29-37), but a new exploration has begun that does include a noticeable level of 'embodiment' and 'inclusivity' (McFague 2000: 36-37), which recognizes the *imago dei* in creation and the Spirit of God not only present in Jesus or praying Christians (see Chapter 3, Section 3b and the discussion of McFague 2000: 36-37).

The breadth of biblical material that is drawn upon (Appendix 3) is impressive. This list of 1289 references was constructed by looking for key phrases in each of the

316 prayers (Appendix 2) that had likely biblical origins. Online bible search tools helped with finding references. 49 biblical books are drawn upon, the eleven most frequently referenced being: Psalms (174, 13%), Isaiah (147, 11%), Genesis (106, 8%), Matthew (77, 6%), Colossians (75, 6%), John (72, 6%), Romans (62, 5%), Revelation (51, 4%), Luke (50, 4%), Ephesians (41, 3%), and Job (38, 3%).

The texts show balance in exploring both realized and unrealized eschatology for the Creation and clearly Dodd's and Moltmann's influence in English eschatological theology has seeped into the shaping of a theology of hope that is expressed in the liturgy. What is missing is an expression of this hope in the approach the *CW* resources take to confession and repentance in relation to the Creation. This has yet to get beyond self-conscious hand wringing and calling on God for mercy.

This could be helped by using prayers of confession and repentance more as acts of commitment than for bemoaning failure to care for creation. Liturgy needs to 'carefully balance past, present and future dimensions of human experience ... the future also needs to be named, the better to enable transformation' (Henderson 1994: 9). A deeper exploration of human stewardship of the Creation would be particularly useful in this regard. A prayed commitment, where there is brokenness in the Creation, to rebuilding things into something more akin to the new creation could help.

5. *The Liturgical Ethics and Cosmology of Common Worship*

In finding the ethical value of the Creation themed texts in *CW* it is necessary to consider the intersection between liturgy and ethics described by L Edwards Phillips, who warns using liturgy as a 'source for theology and ethics' has problems because 'liturgy is by nature ambiguous' (Phillips 1993: 91). Rather, it is only possible to use liturgy 'as an object of ethics. As such, liturgy may be approached in two ways: (a) as the object of ethical critique, or (b) as a tool for expressing ethical ideas' (Phillips 1993: 91).

Liturgy, Phillips observes, can serve as an ethical object. This is proved through the substantial critique of liturgy made by feminists and liberation theologians. Phillips joins the particular debate over how possible it is to amend existing texts or whether succeeding in removing oppressive and patriarchal notions means new rites must be created (Phillips 1993: 92-93). This means, for Phillips, that there is a necessity for liturgy, as an object, to reflect the ethics of the people. Phillips argues that this not only 'demonstrates the need for ethical evaluation of Christian liturgy', but also leads to a recognition 'that liturgy can be a tool in the development of ethical concepts and behaviour' (Phillips 1993: 93).

Ethics and liturgy can at times appear to be synonymous as expressions of Christian life (Phillips 1993: 95-96) but are not automatically so since 'the actual worship of the Church is not always consistent with Christian ethics' (Phillips 1993: 97). The solution for explaining the dynamic between liturgy and ethics is, for Phillips, a

circular one (drawing on both Yoder and Hauerwas). How to judge the ethical authenticity of liturgical community is predicated on underlying 'ethical assumptions' (Phillips 1993: 96). Due to the inherent weaknesses in this circular argument Phillips forms a decisive conclusion that, ultimately, ethics and liturgy are part of the activity of the Church and believer but are 'not related' (Phillips 1993: 99). Neither is a connection between the two guaranteed to be effective without 'catechesis' since,

despite the insistence of some liturgical theologians and ritologists that liturgy 'forms' ethical behaviour, without proper catechesis liturgy will not be sufficient as an agent of ethical formation, as the overwhelming testimony of church history bears witness. Wealthy Christians all too easily can participate in the eucharist with poor Christians and not understand the justice issues inherent in this act. Christians can pray, 'give us this day our daily bread', and not understand the limits this places on the consumption of food resources. As noted above, ritual is inherently ambiguous to those who participate in it regularly. Therefore, today, as in the fourth century, the ethical relevance of liturgy must be periodically explained in order for worshipping Christians to make the connection (Phillips 1993: 97).

It is not possible, then, to separate the ethical elements of the liturgical materials considered in this study from their use and the actions of those who use them. In retrospect the survey of those using the resources considered in Chapter 5 would have usefully also included the question as to whether the choosing of these texts was either as the consequence of some ethical choices or that the use in itself had led to making new ethical choices among the worshipping community (or whether the process had been symbiotic).

It would have also been helpful, if time had allowed (the constraint being in part the time any respondent would remain patient enough to complete the whole survey), to examine whether, where there was more or less use of the creation themed

texts by a respondent, if this related directly to settings where there was more or less concern about environmental issues among a particular worshipping community.

Returning to the question of the justice present within the *CW* texts, Phillips, again, helps to clarify the parameters within which it is reasonable to judge the significance of the rites this study has considered:

the most important relationship between liturgy and ethics is not direct or causal, but is to be found on a higher level in their common goal, the faithful service of God. Because they have a common goal, a critical principle may be formulated: sound liturgical practice will never subvert Christian ethics, nor will proper Christian ethics denigrate liturgy, because each is necessary for God to be well served (Phillips 1993: 98-99).

Common Worship's cosmology is not clear or singular. It is, though, travelling in directions that allow for new ways of thinking about God's interaction with the cosmos. This development of cosmology in *CW* matches Lathrop's test of Church worship. He suggests this question of the liturgy: 'whether or not our conception of God and of Cosmos are undergoing a transformation by the encounter with the surprising grace and truth of the Trinity' (Lathrop 2003: 48). There is, unquestionably the intention of encounter and a shift in conception of God and cosmos in the material that has developed in *CW*.

Something further still needs to be found for C of E worship, Pickstock suggests, which is a liturgical cosmology that relates to the possibility of a catastrophic moment in our world's existence:

The cosmos is poised on the edge of the abyss. In order that there be an enclave at a remove from the vast and undefined space of the chaotic quotidian where events are caught up in the cataract of paratactic time, an enclave where words are continuous with their referents and where the violence of time is suspended, a sacred polis must perpetually reaffirm creation. (Pickstock 1993: 115)

Although there is something overblown, verging on the apocalyptic in her assessment, this throws into stark relief the need to articulate in the liturgy what kind of cosmos we currently inhabit, with God at our side.

Where Pickstock overstates, Guiver, helpfully understates.

The world in the end sends us looking for God; worship on the other hand wants to open us to attend to the world. 'World' and 'Church' are in a continual conversation, a game of divine ping-pong. When we engage in the liturgy with desire, and also engage in the world out of the same desire, there we gain a unique glimpse of the nature of things, and a unique participation in them. If we find God by transcending ourselves through the physical events of everyday life, the same thing happens in religious rites, with the same God and by the same means." (Guiver 1996: 50)

One detail of our engagement that still requires a far more realistic exploration is a liturgical theology of the wastefulness and plenty, the suffering and the predation present in the Creation. When our world is comprehended for what it is, our home, rather than what we would like it to be like, what we believed it was like, or what we hope it will be like, then we will find the earthing of our worship coheres in a way it has not before (see Chapter 3, Section 4 and Keller 1997: 86-98).

6. Evidence of How Church of England Theology Develops through its Worship

Prayer Book (*BCP*) theology is visionary enough to give it a power well beyond its own setting within an agrarian society. Over time dissonances have begun to occur between the prayers and more contemporary contexts due to socio-political changes and new trends in theology. The small number of *BCP* references to God sustaining

the Creation (as well as the Church) is problematic now, in a way it was not when the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI (1548, 1552) and the *BCP* were first in use.

The cognitive dissonances that Prayer Book theology now generates with the contemporary milieu, in relation to the Creation, have become loud enough to be a catalyst for continuing reform. Post-modern Western society is far more disengaged from its environment than an agrarian society would have been. Creation emphases were, perhaps, so deeply understood and implicit in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that the difficulties now observed lie first and foremost in the context we now inhabit rather than in the quality of Prayer Book theology.

None of this gives an excuse for *CW* to continue to offer a creation theology of the reformation period alone. To continue to leave a separation of all that is in creation from the believer is to leave the Church with texts that are dissonant with present and future ecological and ecotheological concerns.

The present-day liturgical revolution can become a conflicted space. Davies' study (2005) is, in a subtle way, devoted to the conflicts that are part and parcel of revision and reform. George Guiver summarizes the context with startling clarity.

The revolution demanded of us is so great, at least akin to that which gripped the sixteenth century, that individuals may find it impossible to take seriously both the voice of the Church's tradition and the voice of the world — they will feel a need to take sides. Unless, that is, we can find a language which enables real dialogue rather than shouting past each other in mutually incomprehensible double-Dutch (Guiver 1996: 215).

There needs to be an attention to the dialogue, and in the construction of new liturgical texts, a conscientization about the hermeneutical cycle that constitutes the

process of interpretation, deconstruction, and new contributions. It will make a difference if it is done with a desire to take the approach of a 'constructed knower' seeking to make a meta-commentary of existing texts, in the drafting of new resources.

7. Future Routes for Revision in a Technological Age

It is evident from the materials considered that there is a mixture of the forces of liberation theology, agrarianism and technology that contribute to the formation of the creation themed CW texts examined. The intersection between these three forces is territory that has been long raked over among industrialized socialists: epitomized by the antithetical utopian fictions by Edward Bellamy and William Morris in *Looking Backwards* (1888) and *News from Nowhere* (1890).

William Morris wrote *News from Nowhere* in response to Bellamy's utopian fiction that imagined the possibilities for a more humane society based upon technological innovation. Morris sought to visualize a humanity whose achievement came from reaching beyond 'dark satanic mills' to a sustainable world of smallholdings, local skills and an emphasis on 'Arts and Crafts'. Neither prophet succeeded in holding sway within the socialist movement. Rather, the dynamic tension has remained between the two competing perspectives. Both have maintained their influence and that has been the case in society, in questions of sustainability and the care of the earth, and in the life and worship of the church.

These utopianisms inform and re-shape the eschatological visions that the Church constructs too. Where there are many who long for a restored earth to resemble an Edenesque garden, others are at pains to point out that although the Christian story began in a garden it ends in a city (see, for example, Gorringer 2002: 117, 249). The fusion of the two concepts is not a new vision either, encapsulated in the 'garden-city' movement that seeks a model of urbanization that remains connected to the earth (Gorringer 2002: 132, 173).

It is these tensions that are played out in the construction of the creation themed *CW* texts that are the subject of detailed examination here, and the same tensions that inform the 'manufacture' of liturgy in a technological age. The relationship is inextricable between technology and the social (and liturgical) structures. Technology in itself cannot destroy anything, rather it will be the socially acceptable uses of technology that may lead to an implosion of existing models of existence (and worship).

These are dangerous times, but times where it will be wiser to seek the sacramental in the tools of technology rather than dismiss the tool as unable to aid our social and liturgical transformation:

The practice of Christian worship in an age dominated by technology and technological thinking is in grave danger: in danger of becoming irrelevant and banal, in danger of becoming just another "technological fix", in danger of succumbing to the destructive values of technology, in danger of being locked into a religious or cultural ghetto, and yes, in danger of disappearing altogether. What is at stake here is not only the sanctification and redemption of individuals, but the sanctification and redemption of the world as a whole, including world of technology. Technology can become sacramental, it can become a bearer of the self-giving love of God to a broken world. But in order for this to happen, Christian faith and practice must establish a genuine and ongoing discourse with technologized modernity (Susan J. White 1994: 128-29).

The earth that is inhabited by worshippers in the Church of England is one that is full of technology. Even for those committed to environmentalism, it is technology itself that has enabled such a concept to develop. Without a scientifically constructed comprehension of the earth there would never have been a movement away from understanding the planet as a mysterious force to be conquered or defended against. Now it is possible to be environmentalist, because science and technology have proved that the planet is being shaped by human intervention and have also discerned the potentiality to manage human interaction with the earth in a sustainable way.

John Habgood identifies a 'paradox' in this move away from nature as a mystery beyond the wit or control of humankind, to something that can be controlled since, 'the more we subject the environment to our management skills, the more we are likely to destroy the very qualities which make [nature] so interesting—its residual otherness from us, its ability to be itself, its naturalness' (Habgood 2002: 70). For worship there is a paradox that runs parallel to this. There can both be a disconnection from creation by believing it can be tamed for ill or good (in domination or stewardship) or in believing the Creation is 'other' or 'alternative' to the technologically creative social world that we inhabit.

The challenge of losing wonder for the otherness of nature is certainly a risk for liturgists and worshippers seeking to explore their identity in relation to the Creation from a technological social setting. It is also apparent that there is much ground that remains to be covered if worship within the Church of England is to become more fully earthed. This is made evident both by the texts of *CW* that ignore or slight

industrial endeavour and also from the limited supply of prayers within CW that engage with urban, technological and industrialized contexts in positive and accessible ways.

Perhaps in becoming better connected to the ground on which the Church stands the worship that is constructed will become more 'recognizable from within the prevailing cultural matrix' (Graham Hughes 2003: 255) This would develop the 'recognizability' of worship and the 'difference' of being at worship (Graham Hughes 2003: 295). This would mean, in turn, that the words of the people and the creed of the people will be expressed in lives lived with a compassion for the earth and with a yearning that leads to sowing the seeds of justice for humanity and the whole creation.

This is likely to only become increasingly more difficult when we consider the projections and models that indicate what our world may look like in ten, twenty and fifty years time: unless a robust eschatological vision can be established which speaks into the crises and prays with vision, even if from a place of weakness. In this time of uncertainty about the future it is not just a new understanding of God's earth that will enable the liturgy of the Church of England to become more earthed, it will also come through a stronger theological understanding of how earthed God is.

NOTES TO THE APPENDICES (ON CD ROM)

Appendix 1: Locations and Scores for the 316 CW texts

The spreadsheet gives access to the 316 CW texts discussed in Chapter 4. Texts are numbered from 1-318 because two texts were noticed, later on to be exact repetitions, so they were removed from the analysis, but their places kept. The scores each text made against each of the criteria are shown. Using the 'sort' tool it is possible, for instance, to see high scoring texts, or all Collects, or materials from *TSAY* grouped together.

Appendix 2: Finding Biblical Sources for the 316 CW Texts

Up to six phrases were identified from each of the 316 texts that looked to be of biblical relevance or interest. Searches were then done using online bible tools to find related phrases or direct quotations. In some instances only one text is relevant, because, for instance, it is a full straight quote and the source is shown at the foot of the prayer itself.

Appendix 3: Index of Biblical Sources to 316 CW Texts

This spreadsheet sorts the results of Appendix 2 into a searchable list of 1289 bible references. Number codes were created that made it possible to list in order of book, chapter and verse.

Appendix 4: Scores for 120 Collects and Post Communions

The *CWCPC* prayers that are discussed in Chapter 6 were also scored according to the same criteria as in Chapter 4.

Appendix 5: A Survey on the Use of *Common Worship*

This is a replication of the original online survey, but in word processed, rather than html layout.

Appendix 6: An Email Invitation to Clergy to take a survey on *Common Worship*

This contains the text of the email that was sent out to clergy inviting them to take part in a survey on *Common Worship* use.

Appendix 7: Results from the *Common Worship* Survey on Use

Appendix 8: Respondent Comments on Texts from the *Common Worship* Survey

Appendix 9: Respondent Comments at the Conclusion of the Survey

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Principal Worship Books*

The Church of England

1548 and 1552 (1999)

The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI (The Prayer Book Society, Everyman's Library: London).

1662 (1999) *The Book of Common Prayer, 1662 Version (includes Appendices from the 1549 Version and other Commemorations)* (Everyman's Library, 241, David Campbell Publishers: London).

1927 *The Deposited Book*

1928 *The Book of Common Prayer, with the Additions and Deviations Proposed in 1928* (Oxford University Press: Oxford).

1946 *The Shorter Prayer Book* (Oxford University Press: Oxford).

1966 *Series One: Alternative Services* (SPCK: London).

1967 and 1968

Alternative Services: Second Series (SPCK: London).

1974a *Alternative Services Series 3: An Order for Holy Communion* (SPCK: London).

1974b *Alternative Services Series 3: An Order for Holy Communion* (SPCK: London).

1980 *The Alternative Service Book* (SPCK: London).

1984 *Lent, Holy Week and Easter* (Church House Publishing and Mowbray: London).

1989 *Patterns for Worship* (Preliminary edn., Church House Publishing: London).

1991 *The Promise of His Glory*, (Church House Publishing and Mowbray: London).

1995 *Patterns for Worship* (commended edn, Church House Publishing: London).

2000a *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (Church House Publishing: London).

2000a *Common Worship: Main Edition* (see above, Church of England 2000a, *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England*).

- 2000b *Common Worship: President's Edition* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2000c *Common Worship: Pastoral Services* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2002 *New Patterns for Worship* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2004 *Common Worship: Additional Collects* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2005 *Common Worship: Daily Prayer* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2006a *Common Worship: Christian Initiation* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2006b *Common Worship: Ordination Services* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2006c *Common Worship: Times and Seasons* (Church House Publishing: London).
- 2008 *Common Worship: Festivals* (Church House Publishing: London).

2. Other Liturgy Books

The Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia

- 1989 *A New Zealand prayer book—He Karakia mihinare o Aotearoa* (William Collins: Auckland).

Adam, David

- 1985 *The Edge of Glory: Prayers in the Celtic Tradition* (SPCK: London).

Ashwin, Angela (ed.)

- 1996 *The Book of a Thousand Prayers* (Marshall Pickering: London).

Carmichael, Alexander

- 1900 *Carmina Gadelica* Vol 1 (<http://www.sacred-texts.com/neu/celt/cg1/cg1002.htm>: sacredtexts.com).

Colebrook, Erna and Michael Colebrook (compilers)

- 1990 *Earthsong: A Green Anthology of Poetry, Readings and Prayers* (Churchman: Worthing).

Duncan, Geoffrey (compiler)

- 2002a *Harvest for the World* (Canterbury Press: Norwich).
- 2002b *Shine On, Star of Bethlehem: A worship resource for Advent, Christmas and Epiphany* (Canterbury Press: Norwich, 2nd edn).
- 2003 *Let Justice Roll Down: A Christian Aid / CAFOD Anthology for Lent, Holy Week and Easter* (Canterbury Press: Norwich).

Iona Community

- 1991 *Iona Community Worship Book* (Wild Goose Publications: Glasgow).
- 2001 *Iona Abbey: Worship Book* (Wild Goose Publications: Glasgow).

Kwaterna OSB, Michael

2000 *Praise God with all Creation: A Book of Prayer for Morning and Evening* (Resource Publications: San Jose, CA).

Low, Mary

2003 *Cherish the Earth: Reflection on a Living Planet* (Wild Goose Publications: Glasgow).

Linzey, Andrew

1999 *Animal Rites: Liturgies of Animal Care* (SCM Press: London).

Millar, Peter

1988 *An Iona Prayer Book* (Canterbury Press: Norwich).

Morley, Janet

1992 *All Desires Known*, (SPCK: London, 2nd edn).

1992 *Bread of Tomorrow* (SPCK, London).

Newell, J. Philip

1994 *Each Day and Each Night: A Weekly Cycle of Prayers from Iona in the Celtic Tradition* (Wild Goose Publications: Glasgow).

1996 *An Earthful of Glory: Biblical prayers, liturgies and meditations* (SPCK: London).

Perham, Michael (et. al.)

1993 *Enriching the Christian Year* (SPCK / Alcuin: London).

Society of St Francis

1992 *Celebrating Common Prayer* (A Cassell imprint, Mowbray: London).

SPCK

1999 *Prayers Encircling the World* (SPCK: London).

St Hilda Community

1996 *The New Women Included* (SPCK: London, 2nd edn).

Staffordshire Seven

2003 *Seasonal Worship from the Countryside* (SPCK: London).

Wallace, Martin

1994 *City Prayers* (Canterbury Press: Norwich).

Wild Goose Worship Group

1999 *Wee Worship Book: Fourth Incarnation* (Wild Goose Publications: Glasgow).

Wyles, Kate

2003 *From Shore to Shore: Liturgies, Litanies and Prayer from around the World* (SPCK: London).

3. General Bibliography

- Anderson OSB, E. Byron
 2003 *Worship and Christian Identity: Practicing Ourselves* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas
 1985 *Faith in the City: A Call for Action by Church and Nation* (Church House Publishing: London).
- Archbishops' Commission on Rural Areas
 1990 *Faith in the Countryside: A Report Presented to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York* (Churchman Publishing: London).
- The Archbishops' Liturgical Commission
 1957 *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* (SPCK: London).
- Atherton, John (ed.)
 1994 *Social Christianity: A Reader* (SPCK, London).
- Bangalore Theological Forum
 1986 'Eco-theology ecumenism: reviews on M.M. Thomas' (Vol. 18, no. 4 [Oct.-Dec. 1986] WCC publications, Bangalore, India).
- Barns, Ian
 1998, 1999 'Eschatological Hope and Ecological Justice', *Ecotheology* 5, 6: 173-184.
- Barth, Karl
 1954 *Church Dogmatics: IV* (T&T Clark: London).
- Bauckham, Richard
 1987 *Moltmann: Messianic Theology in the Making* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott: Basingstoke).
- Begbie, Jeremy
 2002 *Sounding the Depths: Theology Through the Arts* (SCM Press: London).
- Belenkey, M.F. et al.
 1986) *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (Basic Books: New York).
- Bellamy, Edward
 1888 *Looking Backwards* (William Ticknor: Boston, Massachusetts).
- Bernstein, Eleanor and John Brooks-Leonard (eds)
 1992 *Children in the Assembly of the Church* (Liturgy Training Publications: Chicago, Illinois).
- Berry, R.J.
 2003 *God's Book of Works: Nature and Theology of Nature* (T&T Clark: London).
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich
 1937 *Nachfolge* (Chr. Kaiser Verlag: Munich)
 1948 *The Cost of Discipleship* (abridged, trans. R.H Fuller, SCM Press: London).
 1954 *Life Together* (SCM Press: London).
 1959 *The Cost of Discipleship* (trans. R.H Fuller, SCM Press: London).

- Boucher-Colbert, Marc
 1994 'Eating the Body of the Lord: Eucharist and Community-Supported Farming', in LaChance and Carroll 1994: 115-28.
- Bradshaw, Paul
 2001 'Services and Service Books' in Bradshaw (ed.) 2001: 1-21.
 2004 *Eucharistic Origins* (Alcuin Club Collections, 80; SPCK: London).
- Bradshaw, Paul (ed.)
 2001 *Companion to Common Worship*, I, (Alcuin Club Collections, 78; SPCK: London).
- Bradshaw, Paul and Bryan Spinks (eds)
 1993 *Liturgy and Dialogue: Essays in Memory of Ronald Jasper* (SPCK: London).
- Brown, David and Ann Loades (eds)
 1995 *The Sense of the Sacramental: Movement and Measure in Art and Music, Place and Time* (SPCK: London).
- British Council of Churches Consultative Group on Ministry among Children
 1984 *The Child in the Church and Understanding Christian Nurture* (Reports of the Working Parties, British Council of Churches: London).
- Buchanan, Colin and Trevor Lloyd
 1996 *Six Eucharistic Prayers as Proposed in 1996: The Official Texts for Final Approval with Introduction and Commentary* (Grove Worship Series, 136; Grove Books: Cambridge).
- Buchanan, Colin, Michael Vasey
 1998 *New Initiation Rites: A Commentary on Services Authorized from Easter 1998* (Grove Worship Series, 145; Grove Books: Cambridge).
- Buchanan, Colin, Mark Earey, Gilly Myers and Tim Stratford
 2002 *Collects: An Alternative View* (Grove Worship Series, 171; Grove Booklets: Cambridge).
- Burns, Stephen
 2006 *Worship in Context: Liturgical Theology, Children and the City* (Epworth: Peterborough).
- Burns, Stephen, Nicola Slee and Michael N. Jagessar
 2008 *The Edge of God: New Liturgical Texts and Contexts in Conversation* (Epworth: London)
- Calvin, John
 1853 *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews* (trans. and edited by John Owen; Calvin Translation Society: Edinburgh)
- Cardenal, Ernesto
 1977 *Love in Practice: The Gospel in Solentiname* (trans. Donald D. Walsh; Search Press: London).
- Carson, Rachel
 1962 *Silent Spring* (Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, MA).
- Cavanaugh: William T.
 2002 *Theopolitical Imagination: Discovering the Liturgy as Political Act in an Age of Global Consumerism* (T&T Clark imprint; Continuum: London).

- Chandlee, H. Ellsworth
1986 'Liturgical Movement' in J. G. Davies (1986: 307-14).
- Charley, Julian
1971 *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist* (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship, 1; Grove Books: Bramcote, Nottingham).
- Chilton, Bruce
1996 *Pure Kingdom: Jesus' Vision of God* (SPCK: London).
- Chilton, Bruce and J.I.H. McDonald
1987 *Jesus and the Ethics of the Kingdom* (SPCK: London).
- Chupungco OSB, Anscar J.
1989 *Liturgies of the Future: The Process and Methods of Inculturation* (Paulist Press: New York, NY).
1992 *Liturgical Inculturation: Sacramentals, Religiosity, and Catechesis* (A Pueblo Book, The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minnesota).
- Chryssavgis, John
2000 'The World of the Icon and Creation: An Orthodox Perspective on Ecology and Pneumatology', in Hessel and Ruether 2000: 83-96.
- Clines, David J. A.
1993 'Metacommentating Amos' in Clines and McKay (1993: 142-60).
1998 'The Postmodern Adventure in Biblical Studies' in David J. A. Clines and Stephen D. Moore (1998: 276-93).
- Clines, David J. A. and J. Cheryl Exum
1993 'The New Literary Criticism' in Exum and Clines (1993: 11-25).
- Clines, David J. A. and Heather A. McKay
1993 *Of Prophets' Visions and the Wisdom of Sages: Essays in Honour of R. Norman Whybray on his Seventieth Birthday* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- Clines, David J. A. and Stephen D. Moore
1998 *Auguries: The Jubilee Volume of the Sheffield Department of Biblical Studies* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- Cobb, John
1983 'Panentheism' in Alan Richardson and John Bowden (1983: 423).
- Congar, Yves
1984 *Diversity and Communion* (trans. John Bowden; SCM Press: London).
- Crystal, D
1995 *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Cutts, David
1990 *Worship in the Countryside* (Grove Worship Series, 114; Grove Books: Bramcote, Nottingham).
- Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage
1868 *The Writings of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage* (trans. Robert Ernest Wallis; T&T Clark: Edinburgh).

- Davies, J.G.
1986 *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (SCM Press: London).
- Davies, Peter Nicholas
2005 *Alien Rites: A Critical Examination of Contemporary English in Anglican Liturgies* (Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot, Hants).
- Dawtry, Anne and Christopher Irvine
2002 *Art and Worship* (Alcuin Liturgy Guides 2, SPCK: London).
- Dearmer, Percy D.
1912 *Everyman's History of the Prayer Book* (Mowbray: London).
- Delap, Dana and Gareth Lloyd
2000 *A Simple Guide to Common Worship* (Canterbury Press: Norwich).
- Derrida, Jacques
1978 *Writing and Difference* (trans. from the 1967 original, Routledge and Keegan Paul: London).
- Dillenberger, John
1987 *A Theology of Artistic Sensibilities: The Visual Arts and the Church* (SCM Press: London).
- Dix, Gregory
1945 *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Dacre Press: Westminster, London).
- Dodd, C. H.
1953 *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Donald, Gray
1989 'Preparing the Way' in Michael Perham (ed.) 1989: 1-6.
- Donovan, Vincent J.
1978 *Christianity Rediscovered: An Epistle from the Masai* (SCM Press: London).
- Dudley, M
1994 *The Collect in Anglican Liturgy—Texts and Sources, 1549-1989* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Eagleton, Terry
1986 *The Illusions of Postmodernism* (Blackwell: Oxford).
- Earey, Mark and Phillip Tovey
2009 *Liturgical Formation and Common Worship* (Grove Worship Series, 200; Grove Booklets: Cambridge).
- Echlin, Edward P.
1997 'Jesus and the Earth Community', *Ecotheology* 2: 31-47.
- Eco, Umberto
1994 *The Limits of Interpretation* (University of Indiana Press: Bloomington, Indiana).
- Ellul, Jacques
1965 *The Technological Society* (trans. John Wilkinson; Jonathan Cape: London).
- English Language Liturgical Consultation
1988 *Praying Together* (The Canterbury Press: Norwich).

- Exum, J. Cheryl and David J. A. Clines
1993 *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- Fergusson, David A. S.
1998 *The Cosmos and the Creation: An Introduction to the Theology of Creation* (SPCK: London).
- Foley, Edward Capuchin
1991 'Liturgy and Economic Justice for All' in Hughes and Francis (1991: 116-123).
- Ford, David F.
1997 *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Blackwell: Oxford).
- General Synod Board of Education
1988 *Children in the Way: New Directions for the Church's Children* (National Society / Church House Publishing: London).
- Gill, Robin
2002 *Changing Worlds: Can the Church respond?* (T&T Clark imprint; Continuum: London).
- Gnanakan, Ken
1999 *God's World: A Theology of the Environment* (SPCK: London).
- Gorringe, Timothy
2002 *A Theology of the Built Environment: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Gosling, David
1992 *A New Earth: Covenanting for Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation* (CCBI: London).
- Granberg-Michaelson, Wesley
1987 *Tending the Garden: Essays on the Gospel and the Earth* (William B. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, MI).
- Green, Elizabeth E.
1996 'The Travail of Creation and the Daughters of God: Ecofeminism and Eschatology', *Ecotheology* 1: 61-70.
- Grenz, Stanley J and Roger E Olson
1992 *Twentieth Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age* (Paternoster Press: Carlisle).
- Gregorios, Paulos Mar
1987 *The Human Presence: Ecological Spirituality and the Age of the Spirit* (A Wellspring Book; Amity House: Warwick, NY; 2nd English edition).
- Gundry-Volf, Judith
2000 "'To Such as These Belongs the Reign of God": Jesus and Children', in *Theology Today* 56, 4 (2000: 469-80).
- Guiver, George CR
1996 *Pursuing the Mystery: Worship and Daily Life as Presences of God* (SPCK: London).

- Habel, Norman
 1998, 1999 'Key Ecojustice Principles: A *Theologia Crucis* Perspective', *Ecotheology* 5, 6: 114-25.
- Habgood, John
 2002 *The Concept of Nature* (Darton, Longman & Todd: London).
- Halkes, Catharia J. M.
 1991 *New Creation: Christian Feminism and the Renewal of the Earth* (SPCK: London).
- Hallman, David G. (ed.)
 1994 *Ecotheology: Voices from North and South* (Orbis Books: Maryknoll, NY).
- Hampson, Daphne (ed.)
 1996 *Swallowing a Fishbone: Feminist Theologians Debate Christianity* (SPCK: London).
- Hart, John
 2004 *What Are They Saying About Environmental Theology?* (Paulist Press: New York, NY).
- Henderson, J. Frank
 1994 *Liturgies of Lament* (Liturgy Training Publications: Chicago, Illinois).
- Hessel, Dieter T. and Rosemary Radford Ruether
 2000 *Christianity and Ecology: Seeking the Well-being of Earth and Humans* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA).
- Holeton, David
 1999 'Welcome Children, Welcome Me', *Anglican Theological Review* 51: 93-111,
- Hopewell, James F.
 1987 *Congregation: Stories and Structures* (SCM Press: London).
- Hughes, Graham
 2003 *Worship as Meaning: A Liturgical Theology for Late Modernity* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Hughes RSCJ, Kathleen and Mark R Francis CSV
 1991 *Living No Longer for Ourselves: Liturgy and Justice in the Nineties* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Hull, John M.
 2002 "'Sight to the Inly Blind"? Attitudes to Blindness in the Hymn-books', *Theology* CV.827: 331-41.
 2008 "'Lord, I was Deaf": Images of Disability in the Hymn Books' in Stephen Burns, Nicola Slee and Michael N. Jagessar 2008: 117-33.
- Janowiak, Paul
 2000 *The Holy Preaching: The Sacramentality of the Word in the Liturgical Assembly* (A Pueblo Book; Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Jasper, David, and Ronald C. D. Jasper
 1990 *Language and the Worship of the Church* (Macmillan: London).
- Jasper, Ronald C. D.
 1989 *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662–1980* (SPCK: London).

- Jasper, Ronald C. D. and Paul F. Bradshaw
1986 *A Companion to the Alternative Service Book* (SPCK: London).
- Jasper, Ronald C. D. and G. J. Cumming
1990 *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Johnston, Elizabeth A.
2000 'Losing and Finding Creation in the Christian Tradition', in Hessel and Radford Ruether 2000: 3-22.
- Jones, Cheslyn, *et al.*
1992 *The Study of the Liturgy* (SPCK: London, Revised edn).
- Jones, James
2003 *Jesus and the Earth* (SPCK: London).
- Kallistos, Bishop of Diokleia
1997 'Through the Creation to the Creator', *Ecotheology* 2: 8-30.
- Keller, Catherine
1997 'Eschatology, Ecology and a Green Ecumenacy', *Ecotheology* 2: 84-99.
- Kenny, Anthony
1993 *Aquinas on Mind* (Routledge: London).
- Kerr, Fergus
1997 'Reconceiving Roman Catholic Theology', in David F Ford 1997: 105-107.
- Knight, Douglas A.
1990 'The Family' in (Mills 1990: 294-96)
- LaChance, Albert J. and John E Carroll (eds)
1994 *Embracing Earth: Catholic Approaches to Ecology* (Orbis Books: Maryknoll, NY).
- Lands, David
1983 *Revolution in Time* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge MA).
- Lang, Bernhard
1997 *Sacred Games: A History of Christian Worship* (Yale University Press: London).
- Lathrop, Gordon W
1993 *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, MN).
2003 *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, MN).
- Leach, John
1989 *Liturgy and Liberty: Combining the best of the old with the best of the new in worship* (MARC: Eastbourne, Sussex).
- Linzey, Andrew
1998a 'Unfinished Creation: The Moral and Theological Significance of the Fall', *Ecotheology* 4: 20-26.
1998b *Animal Gospel: Christian Faith as Though Animals Mattered* (Hodder & Stoughton: London).

- Linzey, Andrew and Dorothy Yamamoto (eds)
 1998 *Animals on the Agenda: Questions about Animals for Theology and Ethics* (SCM Press: London).
- Liturgical Commission of the General Synod
 1988 *Making Women Visible: The use of inclusive language within the ASB* (General Synod Misc., 859; Church House Publishing: London).
 1994 *Language and the Worship of the Church* (General Synod Misc., 1115: London).
- Lloyd, Trevor
 1999 *A Service of the Word* (Grove Worship Series, 151; Grove Books: Cambridge).
- Lloyd, Trevor, James Steven and Phillip Tovey
 2010 *Social Science Research Methods in Contemporary Liturgical Research: An Introduction* (Joint Liturgical Studies 69; Alcuin Club and The Group For Renewal of Worship; Hymns Ancient and Modern: Norwich).
- Louth, Andrew
 1996 *Maximus the Confessor* (Routledge: London).
- Low, Mary
 2003 *Cherish the Earth* (Iona Community, Wild Goose Resource Group: Glasgow).
- John Macquarrie
 1983 'Immanentism' in Alan Richardson and John Bowden (1983: 287).
- McDonagh, Sean
 1986 *To Care for the Earth: A Call to a New Theology* (Geoffrey Chapman: London).
 1990 *The Greening of the Church* (Geoffrey Chapman: London).
 1994 *Passion for the Earth: The Christian Vocation to Promote Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation* (Geoffrey Chapman: London).
- McFague, Sallie
 1993 *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* (SCM Press: London).
 2000 'An Ecological Christology: Does Christianity Have It?', in Hessel and Radford Ruether 2000: 29-45.
- Martin, David and P. Mullen (eds)
 1981 *No Alternative: The Prayer Book Controversy* (Blackwell: Oxford).
- Maslow, Abraham
 1943 'A Theory of Human Motivation', *Psychological Review* 50(4), 1943: 370-96.
- Matson, David Lertis
 1996 *Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation* (JSNTS 123, Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- Metz, Johann-Baptist and Jürgen Moltmann
 1995 *Faith and the Future: Essays on Theology, Solidarity, and Modernity* (Orbis: Maryknoll, NY).

- Meyers, Ruth
 1993 'Liturgy and Society: Cultural Influences on Contemporary Liturgical Revision', in Bradshaw and Spinks (eds) 1993: 154-75.
- Mills, Watson E. (ed.)
 1990 *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible* (Mercer University Press: Macon, Georgia).
- Min, Anselm Kyongsuk
 2004 *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology After Postmodernism* (Continuum International Publishing: London).
- Moltmann, Jurgen,
 1981 *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The doctrine of God* (trans. Margaret Kohl; SCM Press: London).
 1985 *God in Creation: An ecological doctrine of creation* (trans. Margaret Kohl; SCM Press: London).
 1991 *History and the Tri-une God* (trans. John Bowden; SCM Press: London).
 1992 *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (trans. Margaret Kohl; SCM Press: London).
 1995 *The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology* (trans. Margaret Kohl; SCM Press: London).
 2002 *Theology of Hope* (trans. James W. Leitch [1965]; SCM Press: London, new 'Classics' edn).
- Morrill, Bruce T.
 2000 *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue* (A Pueblo Book; Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Morris, William
 1890 *News from Nowhere* (Commonweal Journal: London).
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops
 1986 *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (USCCB: Washington D.C.).
- Northcott, Michael
 2000 'From Environmental U-topianism to Parochial Ecology: Communities of Place and the Politics of Sustainability', *Ecotheology* 8: 71-85.
- Oliphant Old, Hughes
 2002 *Worship: Reformed according to Scripture* (Westminster John Knox Press: London).
- Pearson, Andrew
 1996 *Making Creation Visible: God's Earth in Christian Worship* (Grove Worship Series, 137; Grove Books: Cambridge).
- Pearson, Clive
 2001, 2002 'On Being Public about Ecotheology', *Ecotheology* 6: 42-59.

- Pecklers SJ, Keith F.
2003 *Worship* (Continuum: London).
- Pecklers SJ, Keith F. (ed.)
2003 *Liturgy in a Postmodern World* (Continuum: London).
- Perham, Michael
1989 'Affirming the Feminine', in Michael Perham (ed.) 1989: 75-83.
2000 *New Handbook of Pastoral Liturgy* (Alcuin Club Collections, 69; SPCK: London).
2001 'Liturgical Revision 1981–2000', in Bradshaw (ed.) 2001: 22-37.
- Perham, Michael (ed.)
1989 *Towards Liturgy 2000: Preparing for the revision of the Alternative Service Book* (SPCK: London).
1993a *Model and Inspiration: The Prayer Book Tradition Today* (SPCK: London).
1993b *The Renewal of Common Prayer: Uniformity and Diversity in Church of England Worship* (Essays by members of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England) (General Synod Misc., 412; SPCK: London).
- Pfatteicher, Philip H.
1997 *Liturgical Spirituality* (Trinity Press: Harrisburg, PA).
- Phan, Peter C.
2003 'Liturgical Inculturation: Unity in Diversity in the Postmodern Age' in Keith F. Pecklers SJ (ed.) 2003: 55-86.
- Phillips, L. Edward
1993 'Liturgy and Ethics', in Bradshaw and Spinks (eds) 1993: 86-99.
- Pickstock, Catherine
1993 'Liturgy and Language: The Sacred Polis', in Bradshaw and Spinks (eds) 1993: 115-37.
1998 *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Blackwell: Oxford).
- Primavesi, Anne and Jennifer Henderson
1989 *Our God Has No Favorites: A Liberation Theology of the Eucharist* (Burns & Oates: Tunbridge Wells, Kent).
- Proctor Smith, Marjorie
1990 *In Her Own Rite: Constructing Feminist Liturgical Tradition* (Abingdon Press: Nashville, TN).
- Reader, John
1994 *Local Theology: Church and Community in Dialogue* (SPCK: London).
- Reid, Barbara
1991 'Liturgy, Scripture and the Challenge of Feminism', in Hughes and Francis (1991: 124-37).
- Reid, Stephen Breck
1995 'The Role of Reading in Multicultural Exegesis', in Smith-Christopher (ed.) 1995: 210-24.
- Richardson, Alan and John Bowden
1983 *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology* (SCM: London).

- Ricoeur, Paul
1971 'The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text', *Social Research*, 38.3 (529-62).
1976 *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Texas Christian University Press: Texas).
1984 *Time and Narrative* (Volume 1; trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois).
1985 *Time and Narrative* (Volume 2; trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois).
1988 *Time and Narrative* (Volume 3; trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois).
- Robinson, Edward
1987 *The Language of Mystery* (SCM Press: London).
- Romero, Oscar
1988 *The Violence of Love: The Wisdom of Oscar Romero* (Compiled and translated by James R. Brockman; Orbis Books: Maryknoll, NY).
- Rose, Aubrey
1992 *Judaism and Ecology* (Cassell: London).
- Rossi, Vincent
1997 'Liturgizing the World: Religion, Science and the Environmental Crisis in Light of the Sacrificial Ethic of Sacred Cosmology', *Ecotheology* 3: 61-84.
- Russell, D.S.
1992 *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic* (SCM Press: London).
- Schreier, Robert J. C.P.P.S. (ed.)
1991 *Faces of Jesus in Africa* (SCM Press: London).
- Schumacher, E. F.
1973 *Small Is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered* (Blond and Briggs: London).
- Schwartz, Richard H.
2002 *Judaism and Global Survival* (Revised edn, Lantern Books: New York)
- Schwarz, Hans
2000 *Eschatology* (William B. Eerdmans Publishing: Grand Rapids, MI).
- Scott, Peter
1998 'Types of Ecotheology' *Ecotheology* 4: 8-19.
- Searle, Mark
1992 'Children in the Assembly of the Church', in Bernstein and Brooks-Leonard (1992: 30-50).
- Searle, Mark (ed.)
1980 *Liturgy and Social Justice* (Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Senn, Frank C.
2000 *New Creation: A Liturgical Worldview* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, MN).

- Shaw, D.W.D.
1983 'Pantheism' in Alan Richardson and John Bowden (1983: 423-24).
- Short, T. L.
1998 'What's the Use?', *Semiotica* 122, 1&2: 1-68.
- Skolimowski, Henryk
1985 *Eco-theology: toward a religion for our times* (Ann Arbor: Michigan).
- Slee, Nicola
1996 'The Power to Re-member' in Daphne Hampson (1996: 33ff).
- Smith, Walter C
1867 *Hymns of Christ and the Christian Life* (MacMillan & Co: London).
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel (ed.)
1995 *Text and Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- Spinks, Bryan
1993 'Liturgy and Culture: Is Modern Western Liturgical Revision a Case of Not Seeing the Wood for the Trees?', in Bradshaw and Spinks (eds) 1993: 28-49.
- Stark, Rodney and Charles Y. Glock
1968 *American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment* (University of California Press: Los Angeles, CA).
- Stevenson, J (ed.)
1966 *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents illustrative of the history of the Church A.D. 337-461* (SPCK, London).
- Stevenson, Kenneth
1989 *The First Rites: Worship in the Early Church* (Marshall Pickering: London).
- Stibbe, Mark
2005 *Drawing Near to God: The Temple Model of Prayer* (Darton, Longman & Todd: London).
- Stratford, Tim
2002 *Liturgy and Urban Mission* (Grove Worship Series, 173; Grove Booklets: Cambridge).
- Stringer, Martin
1999 *On the Perception of Worship: The Ethnography of Worship in Four Christian Congregations in Manchester* (University of Birmingham Press: Birmingham).
2005 *A Sociological History of Christian Worship* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
- Sugirtharajah, R.S. (ed.)
1993 *Asian Faces of Jesus* (SCM Press: London).
1995 *Voices from the Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World* (SPCK: London, 2nd edn).
- Tillich, P
1963 *The Eternal Now* (SCM Press: London).

- Tovey, Phillip
 1988 *Inculturation: The Eucharist in Africa* (Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study, 7, Grove Booklets: Bramcote, Nottingham).
 2004 *Inculturation of Christian Worship: Exploring the Eucharist* (Ashgate: Aldershot, Hants).
 2008 *Mapping Common Worship: Mind Maps to Find Your Way Round All the Volumes of Common Worship* (Grove Worship Series, 195; Grove Booklets: Cambridge).
- Trigo, Pedro
 1991 *Creation and History* (trans. Robert R. Barr; Burns & Oates: Tunbridge Wells, Kent).
- Uhlein, Gabriel
 1983 *Meditations with Hildegard of Bingen: A Centering Book* (Bear & Company, Inner Traditions International: Rochester, Vermont).
- Van Olst, E. H.
 1991 *The Bible and Liturgy* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids Michigan).
- Vanin, Cristina
 2001, 2002 'The Significance of the Incarnation for Ecological Theology: A Challenging Approach', *Ecotheology* 6: 108-22.
- Vasey, Michael
 1996 'Preface' in Andrew Pearson (1996: 1-3).
- Victorin-Vangerud, Nancy
 2001, 2002 'The Sacred Edge: Seascape as Spiritual Resource for an Australian Eco-eschatology', *Ecotheology* 6: 167-15.
- Vogel, Dwight W.
 2000 *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Liturgical Press: Collegeville MN).
- Wainwright, Geoffrey
 2003 *Eucharist and Eschatology* (Epworth Press: Peterborough, 3rd edn).
- Wakefield, Gordon S
 1998 *An Outline of Christian Worship* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh).
- Wallace, Mark I
 2000 'The Wounded Spirit as the Basis for Hope in an Age of Radical Ecology', in Hessel and Radford Ruether (eds) 2000: 51-72.
- Walton, Janet R.
 2000 *Feminist Liturgy: A Matter of Justice* (Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN).
- Ward, Hannah and Jennifer Wild
 1995 *Human Rites: Worship Resources for an Age of Change* (Mowbray: London).

- Pete Ward
2002 *Liquid Church* (Paternoster Press: Carlisle).
2005 *Selling Worship: How what we sing has changed the church* (Paternoster: Milton Keynes).
- Pete Ward (ed.)
2004 *The Rite Stuff: Ritual in Contemporary Christian Worship and Mission* (Bible Reading Fellowship: Oxford).
- Webb, Stephen H
1998 *On God and Dogs: A Christian Theology of Compassion for Animals* (Oxford University Press: Oxford).
- Wegman, Hermann
1985 *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History* (trans. Gordon W. Lathrop; Pueblo Publishing: New York NY; English edn).
- Welcker, Michael
2000 *What Happens in Holy Communion* (trans. John F. Hoffmeyer; SPCK: London).
- White, James F.
1990 *Introduction to Christian Worship* (Abingdon Press: Nashville TN; 1990 edn).
1992 *Documents of Christian Worship: Descriptive and Interpretive Sources* (T&T Clark: London).
1993 *A Brief History of Christian Worship* (Abingdon Press: Nashville TN).
- White, Lynn
1967 'Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis', *Science* 155: 1203-07.
- White, Susan J.
1993 'Liturgy and Technology', in Bradshaw and Spinks (eds) 1993: 176-201.
1994 *Christian Worship and Technological Change* (Abingdon: Nashville, TN).
1997 *Groundwork of Christian Worship* (Epworth: Peterborough).
- Williams, Janet P.
2004 'Pseudo-Dionysius and Maximus the Confessor', in Evans, *The First Christian Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Church* (Blackwell: Oxford): 186-200.
- Witherup, Ronald D.
1996 *A Liturgist's Guide to Inclusive Language* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minnesota).
- Wooton, Janet H.
2000 *Introducing a Practical Feminist Theology of Worship* (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield).
- World Council of Churches
1982 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Faith and Order Paper, 111; World Council of Churches: Geneva).

- Wren, Brian
 1988 *Faith Looking Forward: the Hymns and Songs of Brian Wren* (Carol Stream, Hope Publishing: Illinois).
 1989 *What Language Shall I Borrow? God-Talk in Worship: A Male Response to Feminist Theology* (SCM Press: London).
- Yamamoto, Dorothy
 1998 'Aquinas and Animals: Patrolling the Boundary?' in Andrew Linzey and Dorothy Yamamoto (1998: 80-89).
- Zimmerman, Joyce Ann
 1999 *Liturgy and Hermeneutics* (The Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minnesota).
 2000 'Paschal Mystery—Whose Mystery? A Post-Critical Methodological Reinterpretation' in Vogel (2000: 302-12).

4. Hymns

- Farrell, Bernadette
 1990 'Bread for the World' (OCP / St Thomas More Centre, London).
- Smith, Walter C
 1867 'Immortal, invisible God only Wise' in Walter C Smith (1867).
- Wallace, Susan
 2003 'Sunrise', date located, 4 January 2011, url:
http://www.soundclick.com/bands/page_songInfo.cfm?bandID=105712&songID=715908
- Wren, Brian
 1988 'Not throned afar' Hymn 20 in Brian Wren (1988).

5. Internet Sources

- Carmichael, Alexander
 1900 *Carmina Gadelica* Vol 1 (date located 7 August 2010) url:
<http://www.sacred-texts.com/neu/celt/cg1/cg1002.htm>:
 sacredtexts.com
- Carothers, J. Edward
 2010 'Task Force on Christian Life Style and Ecology: Life Style—Ecology' (Worship Resources [3rd edn]), date located 21 November 2010) url:
<http://www.webofcreation.org/archive-of-resources/510-denominational-resources>
- Church of England Facts & Stats
 2009 *Licensed Ministry* (date located February 2011) url:
<http://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/facts-stats/research-statistics/licensed-ministry.aspx>

jewishveg.com

- 2010 'In the beginning God created' by Richard H. Schwartz (2002)
(adapted for liturgical recitation, date located 1 December 2010) url:
<http://www.jewishveg.com/JudaismAndGlobalSurvival/Ecology.html>

Wallace, Susan

- 2003 'Sunrise' (date located, 4 January 2011) url:
http://www.soundclick.com/bands/page_songInfo.cfm?bandID=105712&songID=715908

Web of Creation

- 2010 'Consider Creation' (date located, 1 December 2010) url:
<http://www.webofcreation.org/Worship/liturgy/prayers.htm>

Williams, Rowan

- 2004 "Environment Lecture: Changing" The Dr Rowan Williams, keynote
address at the Methodist Conference, Monday 28 June, 2004 (date
located 1 December 2010) url:
<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/1065>