

Worship, mission and the public square: a primer

Stephen Burns

Preamble: locating my perspective

In this presentation, I begin to sketch out some basic suggestions about relating 'worship', 'mission' and the 'public square'.¹ My modest aim – beginning a sketch - reflects the fact that finding two of my three keywords in creative juxtaposition is rare enough,² and that attempts to triangulate all three seem almost non-existent.³

I assume that precisely how the three ought best to be related is context-specific, hence wish to refrain from a headlong rush into prescription; rather, I am more concerned with what I take to be the beginnings of description⁴ and the search for some starting questions that might shape an agenda for vision and practice. So I aspire to present something like a primer: just first words able to be taken up in specific situations by others in their turn.

There are two main trajectories I want to try to open up: firstly, liturgy as public service, and secondly, the missionary dynamic of the deep structures of ecumenically-shaped liturgy. For what it is worth, I perceive my own thinking to be broadly in a stream of what the liturgical theologian Gordon Lathrop calls "critical classicism": that is,

marked by the willing reception of traditional patterns and archaic symbols, in the belief that these classics bear authority among us. . . [yet] at the same time. . . marked by the willing elaboration of a contemporary critique of received tradition.⁵

Lathrop's emphasis on both tradition and critique is helpful not least as an encouragement to my concern to encircle both old-line and emerging church practice.

In order to do this, throughout I use "worship" and "liturgy" more-or-less interchangeably,⁶ and assume that my suggestions are relevant in diverse ecclesial contexts, because alongside the Catholics and Lutherans and Anglicans and Methodists and all the other old-timers in the old-lines, worshippers who may at first think of themselves as "non-liturgical" (for instance, Quakers,⁷ the Brethren, and Pentecostals⁸) in fact do have liturgical forms, scripted or unscripted. The same is true of those who are variously labelled (by themselves or others) "mission-shaped"/ "liquid" church/ "post-evangelical"/ "emerging network"/ "fresh expression"/ "alternative worshippers".⁹

So I am sorry to have to say next that it does seem to me that too often in the literature, such as it exists, when links between liturgy and mission are made they tend to place too much emphasis on emerging church practices. One of the most high-profile culprits is the British Anglican endeavour (latterly taken up also by British Methodists, and now also making inroads into Australia), **Mission-Shaped Church**.¹⁰ The link between mission and emerging church practice is of course not wrong (and the missionary work of alternative worshippers should in my view be blessed and encouraged) but it does, I think, fail to tap the roots of other promising practices of Christian assembly. Hence, I find myself trying to think into two somewhat separate conversations: one way, I have found it to be common in certain church-styles¹¹ to come across disdain towards "emerging" church worship, which has been assumed to be jejunely "non-liturgical"; another way, among the "alternative", I have come across more than a little impatience towards liturgical practices which the Christian tradition mediates to us, which have been assumed to be un-missionary ephemera. So in relation to these different kinds of assumptions, I am appealing for more patience all round.

Public service

My first suggestion is that persons in whatever tradition, whatever their style, might try to retrieve from the Christian inheritance some meanings of the word "liturgy". It is a marvellously ambiguous word that conflates the Greek *ergon* and *laos*, people and work, and is most commonly rendered as "work of the

people". Hence it is oftentimes allied with the notion of participation, "full, conscious and active participation" being widely regarded as an "ecumenical treasure" and the principal key to the renewal of worship.¹² But liturgy might also (with good precedent, from the **Epistle of Diognesis**,¹³ if not the Epistle to the Hebrews,¹⁴ to recently deceased Benedictine Aidan Kavanagh¹⁵) be rendered as "work for the people", and as such some kind of public service.¹⁶

These are semantic associations here that really should not be missed. On the one hand, the notion of participation at the heart of contemporary liturgical theology is full of promising resonance for public theologians – ideals of participation are central in at least some ideals of public theology, in their visions of society, citizenship, and political processes.¹⁷ On the other hand, the longstanding idea of liturgy as public service challenges public theologians to make and keep connections with practices at the heart of the church which themselves purport to be public and at the very least are durable. My point here is of course not to argue for a kind of liturgical fossilization, as if to support the idea that "worship-is-already-public-service-so-everything-can-stay-as-it-is"; it is rather to share my critical-classical conviction that if we explore the tradition we will find resources to animate reflection and action in our particular struggles to unfold worship in public and missionary ways.

Just as the notion of public theology has attracted a range of specific understandings, so liturgical theologians have developed ideas about worship as public service in a range of ways. Among the most robust of them is Aidan Kavanagh, who writes makes the daring claim that worship aspires to "church doing world": the liturgy, he says, "steadily regards the world as abnormal by its own choice" and "play[s] extremely hard ball with the world by remaining constantly clearheaded about what the world cannot do for itself, and about its perennial need for grace and judgment".¹⁸ In a more positive vein, worship as Kavanagh envisages it may show something of how to "actively co-operat[e] with God in [our] own rehabilitation".¹⁹ The lines Kavanagh draws between church and world will no doubt be suspect to some of us, and intolerable to others – but they should give us pause enough to note that they are a line akin to lines drawn between church and society in at least some kinds of public theology.²⁰

For my own part, I find it helpful to blur the lines with the kind of nuance suggested in Christian Scharen's insistence that we remain always conscious of "the world in the church in the world".²¹ This is a natty phrase that points to considerable complexity in the interactions of church and world – and it can serve as the beginnings of a critique of any temptation on Christians' part to self-deception and superiority, as well as a constructive basis for missionary engagement: so it is notable that Scharen's wider argument is that a certain worldliness²² opens Christian assembly outwards in mission (a point he makes with force about the presence in Christian worship of what might be thought of "secular" song). And we might add, making a point that Scharen does not: an awareness of "the world in the church in the world" can readily be allied to celebration of the sacramentality of the world God loves.²³ In any case, the key point that I would ask that is remembered here is that the relationships between church and world, the cultures of Christian worship and other cultures, are overlapping, and most certainly include Christians' complicity and collusion with things that are wrong, apart from much potential for public goodness and personal beatitude.

Deep structures

My next suggestion is to encourage engagement with contemporary ecumenical consensus about the shape of eucharistic worship,²⁴ and in particular its deep structure. This deep structure begins with an intentional sense of gathering, and moves on to attend to the central things of word and sacrament,²⁵ and then on towards an intentional sense of sending out. This fourfold movement is now inscribed in the ritual books of countless traditions, so, as one example, the Church of England's **Common Worship** range begins with a description of "the journey through the liturgy" that reads:

The journey through the liturgy has a clear structure with signposts for those less familiar with the way. It moves from the gathering of the community through the Liturgy of the Word to an opportunity of transformation, sacramental or non-sacramental, after which those present are sent out to put their faith into practice.²⁶

Three initial points should be made about this deep structure. Firstly, this eucharistic shape is mirrored in much non-eucharistic worship, so that services of the word might also be shaped around the basic structure of gathering, word, table (so **Common Worship** speaks of an "opportunity of transformation, sacramental or non-sacramental") and sending.²⁷ The "eucharistic shape" can clearly be seen in the British **Methodist Worship Book** in which the third section of word services characteristically includes an emphatic stress on "thanksgiving" as a mirror, as it were, to eucharistic thanksgiving in the orders for holy communion. Secondly, contemporary ecumenical consensus is based on constructs of ancient Christian practice, and is especially indebted to Justin Martyr's testimony about Sunday mornings in second-century Rome.²⁸ But it may well also claim to be broadly based on the authority of scripture, fragments of biblical witness being taken together, with the risen Jesus' self-disclosure through open scripture (Luke 24.27) and table-companionship (Luke 24.35) in the Emmaus encounter usually regarded as the integrating key to the rest of the clues.²⁹

Thirdly, the most theologically loaded of the three, so I pose it as a question: if, as in the memory of Emmaus, word and table are in some sense means of gracious divine self-revelation - means of grace by which Christ makes himself known - then, surely, their significance is inestimable in terms of how worship is envisaged as both public and missionary? The implication of my question is contestable, of course, but the point to engage, whether by way of affirmation, rejection or whatever kind of nuance is that the tradition has long mediated the view that worship in word and sacrament is somehow a matter of God's giving of godself - word and sacrament "open[us] up to a richly personal divine presence, [] to be graced by that presence".³⁰ And of course relish in a sense of divine largesse and mercy in the central things of Christian worship is the ultimate reason that the deep structure of gathering-word-table-sending has met with affirmation, past and present, across any number of different church-styles, alt. worship included.

Sending

Much more might be said about aspects of the deep structure in relation to mission, so I limit myself here to just a few ideas. The most obvious is that the structure culminates with a sending out, a commissioning to a shared responsibility. It may involve liturgical features such as a "word of mission",³¹ and an assertion that all of life is worship - such as is nicely captured in the UK Baptists' line:

Our worship is ended.
Our service begins,³²

or some other kind of dismissal that is a summons to link liturgy and mission, "church" life and "public" life. So, for example, a beautiful and challenging old Huguenot dismissal has been incorporated in the recent revisions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: "Go in peace. Remember the poor".³³

It should be noted, however, that the sending section of the deep structure has been relatively poorly attended to in liturgical scholarship, and is the least well resourced with texts for prayer and ceremonial scenes in official ritual books. In light of the contemporary renaissance of mission in academic and ecclesial theology, this is strange and ought to change. But that being said, various imaginative attempts to strengthen the sending are now being sought and found,³⁴ and it may well be that emerging churches have been and are leading the way at reviving participation in the meaning of this part of the deep structure.

Apart from sending people, whose work liturgy is, the tradition (indebted to Justin's testimony) affirms at least two public, other-centred, practices as integral to the sending out. The first is the sending of communion to persons who are absent, and the second is the gathering of a collection for the poor - which the new North American Lutheran ending echoes nicely. Both are strong reminders that from the first Christian assembly has related to those who are not actually present. This is part of its public-ness.

The challenge of the ancient collection perhaps offers us a particular opportunity for fresh thought because we need to link it with the consistent finding that asking for money is the most off-putting aspect of church for many so-called "Generation X-ers" and "Generation Y-ers". In fact, the desire to do away with the practice of "passing the plate" in response to the finding was one of the key motivators for setting

up what became the archetypal "mega-church" at Willow Creek, Illinois,³⁵ which has been so lauded by some. Whatever, it seems obvious that finding ways to deal openly and creatively with our money in worship, whatever its style, is one of the most biting intersections of ritual and public action, and it should certainly be included in reflection on the church's mission, not least as we are seemingly evermore conscious of financial flows in a climate of globalization.³⁶

Gathering

But making something of the sending is not the only challenge in enacting the deep structure of Christian worship. The very idea of gathering can be regarded as potentially counter-cultural, at least if we follow the widespread line of thinking that western societies are now characterized by "consumer values" shaped by "an individualistic mentality" which cuts against "collective obligation"³⁷ – here citing Duncan MacLaren.

The value of gathering is certainly under question in some liquid church ideas: for instance, Pete Ward's massively influential **Liquid Church** suggests that "congregations" are inevitably identified with missiologically-inappropriate and dated modes of "solid church" which have "internalized some of the core values of modernity",³⁸ are fixated on Sunday morning attendance, and in which worship tends to be what he deftly calls 'a one-size-fits-all-environment'.³⁹ Conscious of the problems of this kind of "solid" institution in terms of evangelism to supposedly "fluid" post-modern individuals, Ward imagines what a church more expressive of liquid culture might look like, so as to begin to engage the situation that even when post-modern young people "might have met Jesus, [] they still don't want to meet the congregation!"⁴⁰ So Ward imagines (he says "dreams of") "worship in a liquid church" as a "decentred" activity which "does not rely on a congregational dynamic".⁴¹ He cites as inspirations the labyrinth – a "symbolic journey [] with a series of prayer stations",⁴² which several people can walk individually at the same time; the medieval spectacle of the elevation of the eucharistic host - perhaps in coterminous consecrations by priests at altars scattered throughout the same building: "a series of private prayers"; and the Orthodox expressing their devotion in "a variety of activities" – kissing icons, lighting candles, eating blessed bread, filling bottles with holy oil, and so on, all of which go on alongside the singing, chanting and ceremony conducted by the priest at or around the altar. For Ward, these three things – labyrinth, coterminous medieval masses, and Orthodox devotion - suggest the kind of "varied and individual. . . corporate [], but also decentred"⁴³ approach to worship he thinks there needs to be more of in contemporary western churches. He writes of the various modes of devotion he explores as shaping his own "attempt to get away from the congregational style of corporate worship that is characteristic of solid church" and of the emphasis of the western tradition on assembly for the communal enterprise of liturgy, which, it is often claimed by others, is "by its nature. . . more than shared celebration meeting private needs".⁴⁴ The heart of the dilemma here is perhaps that unless some concessions along the lines of Ward's proposals, or of some other kind, are allowed, there may be little hope of gaining or regaining a viable hope of what it means to congregate in Christ's name in at least some contemporary cultural contexts.

So gathering and sending are two parts of the deep structure of Christian worship that present huge challenges for the church's mission, and both have implications for what can be made of the claim that worship is public service.⁴⁵

Liturgy and life

There is a great deal more again in the various elements that constitute the fourfold movement of the deep structure. For instance, both "traditional" set pieces like the *Kyrie eleison*, *Gloria in excelsis* and *Sanctus* - so-called "prayers we have in common" – not to say creeds, can be seen as engaged in a public work of asserting "divine political authority" - "you alone are the Lord", "Lord, have mercy", "heaven and earth are full of your glory" - in that they help to "put the 'lords' of the world in their place"⁴⁶ by asserting the Christian people's primarily allegiances. And if we can believe that, I can see no reason not to say much the same thing about many contemporary praise songs' celebration of divine sovereignty. Then we might note that the prayers of the people at the pivot of word and sacrament are a key opportunity to link liturgy and life. So, hopefully, is preaching. And so are invitations to lament,

repent, renounce and affirm specific attitudes and practices in the likes of baptismal renewal, and the gesturing of selves in thanksgiving and oblation in eucharistic prayer. These are not the only possible examples, but texts from a couple of these cases make the point. From the Kenyan Anglican **Our Modern Services**, a contemporary lament that consciously echoes Habakkuk 3:

Though the mango tree does not blossom,
nor the fruit be on the vines,
the crop of the coconut fails,
and the fields yield no food,
the flock be cut off from the fold,
and there be no herd in the stall,
yet I will rejoice. . .⁴⁷

And from **Celebrate God's Presence**, the United Church of Canada's ritual book, the preface of a eucharistic prayer:

O Holy Wisdom of our God,
eternally offensive to our wisdom,
and compassionate towards our weakness,
we praise you and give you thanks,
because you emptied yourself of power
and entered our struggle,
taking upon you our unprotected flesh.
You opened wide your arms for us upon the cross,
becoming scandal for our sake,
that you might sanctify even the grave
to be a bed of hope to your people.
Therefore, with those who are made refugees in their own land,
abandoned or betrayed by friends,
whose bodies are violated or in pain;
with those who have died alone
without dignity, comfort or hope;
and with all the company of saints
who have carried you in their wounds,
we join to praise you. . .⁴⁸

Against the backdrop of events in Australia in February 2008, we note that the prayer in the Canadian book was originally intended for use in a service of official apology to First Nations peoples.

The public dimensions of such prayers take on edge if we believe that over time the deep structures of worship, and the various elements within them, shape dispositions that are ultimately the gift of mission. That is to say that worship is not simply expressive, but formative, and might even be regarded as nurturing abundant life⁴⁹ - a point that Kavanagh makes in his own way when he suggests that liturgy makes worshippers "normal" in the sense of resourced by God as God intends with the means of grace to become whole persons. Like my earlier question about divine self-giving in the central things, this conviction is also contestable, but it is one worth reflection because different possible feelings about it yield different kinds scope to possibilities of imagining worship and mission in the public square.

Further openings and ending

So this primer has begun to open out some starting thoughts towards aligning worship, mission and the public square. In my closing reflections, I want to point briefly to just two that I think are also of major importance.

If the deep structures of Sunday eucharistic worship might nurture full life, perhaps something similar might be said of the seven sacraments of Catholic tradition, or their variations in Protestant performance.

They suggest shapes of the life that matters, pathways to whole personhood in Christian perspective. And whatever we make of that idea, the most minimal that might be said about them is that in very many contexts they remain a major site of missionary opportunity. As James White insists, in terms of evangelization, such rites of passage may be much more important than eucharist, because they are oftentimes populated by "the alumni and alumnae" of Sunday morning worship.⁵⁰ That is they remain a crucible of engagement with a particular way in which the world is in the church in the world, through those who have been variously labelled as "vicariously religious" and "differentially religious", and whom Alan Billings calls "cultural Christians" - whilst he adroitly points out that they are probably not "believers without belonging" because beliefs are at best marginal to their self-confessed affection and affiliation to at least aspects of the Christian tradition.⁵¹ In any case, in terms of opportunities for engagement with such persons, the sacraments of the life-cycle are more significant than anything yet to surface in emerging church worship.

Although of course it is possible that it could be co-opted to galvanize excuses for failure to engage with the challenges of mission, I think in the end that we ought not fear the kind of engagement with cultural Christianity that Alan Billings invites, because the liturgical tradition is marked by intercultural engagement at every turn - as knowing anything about, for example, the origins of Christmas or Easter, or the hagiographies of many of a saint, makes evident. The same intercultural engagement is folded into the history of architecture for Christian assembly, where the world is in the church in the church in the world through the adoption of the public space of the basilica, and the assimilation and arguably transformation of certain of its stylistic features, from the first moves out from gatherings in private homes. So my next and last loose end for now is to point to the importance of investing thought (and money) towards imaginative buildings and space for worship. Buildings, correctly or incorrectly often called churches, are in many places still major centres for celebration of sacraments of the human life-cycle - as well as gathering places for communities in dreadful times of tragedy and lament⁵² - and as such involve a much wider "audience"⁵³ than any self-conscious church congregation. How these buildings might facilitate a sense of journey through the liturgy, engagement in the deep structures, is a question that seems to me to be of signal importance,⁵⁴ and it is part of their continuing capacity to be of public service.

These then are some opening reflections for a primer on aligning worship, mission and the public square. They all need further thought and testing in context-specific circumstances. What I have tried to begin to do is engage aspects of the liturgical tradition with possibilities for contemporary practice in old-line and alternative fresh expressions of worship. But I want to end on something in the challenge that Alan Billings makes central in his welcome of "cultural Christianity",⁵⁵ which is that in some western settings about 10 times as many people claim some sort of deep-enough connection with Christianity to identify themselves with it than those who identify themselves with the faith through participation in worship of either old-line or alt. kinds. This huge group of cultural Christians is a formidable reminder that lines between church and world, church and society, are much more opaque than in much public and liturgical theologies alike. I hope that at least some of my reflections are relevant to such persons.

Stephen Burns is Research Fellow in Public and Contextual Theology at Charles Sturt University, and is based at United Theological College, North Parramatta.

¹ A version of this paper was presented at the Australian Association for Mission Studies/Charles Sturt University Public and Contextual Theology Strategic Research Centre conference on "Mission and the Public Square" at the Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture, Canberra, October 05 08.

² DAVIES, Gordon, 1964, *Worship and Mission* (London: SCM Press, 1964) is still widely cited, which may reflect its 'classic' qualities, or simply a dearth of other work on its themes. For more recent efforts, see SCHATTUER, Thomas F, ed., *Inside Out: Worship in an Age of Mission* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000). For a contribution from Australia, see MCGOWAN, Andrew, 'Worship and the "Mission Shaped" Church', *St. Mark's Review* 200: 2006, 36-42.

³ FOLEY, Edward, Capuchin, 'Worship as Public Theology', *International Journal of Practical Theology* 8: 2004 1-13 makes an important, rare, attempt to bolster the alliance of worship and public theology. Intriguingly, for some reason this essay was not included in the published collection of papers from the

conference at which it was originally presented: GRAHAM, Elaine and ROWLANDS, Anna [eds], *Pathways to the Public Square: Practical Theology in an Age of Pluralism* (Munster: Lit Verlag, 2005). See also MOE-LOBEDA, Cynthia D, *Public Church: For the Life of the World* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2004) for a slightly wider perspective that very helpfully engages with sacramental practices.

⁴ On the importance of privileging description over prescription in liturgical studies, see WHITE, James F, *Christian Worship in North America 1955-1995: A Retrospective* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), p314.

⁵ LATHROP, Gordon W, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp4-5.

⁶ Whilst there are nuances about what might distinguish them, I wish more than to weight the nuances to unsettle any sense we might have - they are common enough - that some patterns of worship are 'liturgical', whilst others are not. For this reason, the conflation of liturgy and worship is commonplace in contemporary liturgical theology.

⁷ See DANDELION, Pink, *The Liturgies of Quakerism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004) and DANDELION, Pink, 'Quaker Spiritual Intimacy', in SLEE, Nicola, JAGESSAR, Michael and BURNS, Stephen [eds], *The Edge of God: New Liturgical Texts and Contexts in Conversation* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 2008), 214-224.

⁸ See, for example, ALBRECHT, Daniel, *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

⁹ Here I cluster a range of terms associated with what are supposed to be 'new' and/or 'experimental' forms of worship, echoing some book titles of key proponents: WARD, Pete, *Liquid Church* (Carlisle, Paternoster Press, 2002); WARD, Pete, *Participation and Mediation: A Practical Theology for the Liquid Church* (London: SCM Press, 2008); TOMLINSON, Dave, *The Post-evangelical* (London: Triangle, 1995); TOMLINSON, Dave, *Re-enchanting Christianity: Faith in an Emerging Culture* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008); KIMBALL, Dan, *Emerging Worship: Creating Worship Gatherings for New Generations*, (Colorado Springs: Zondervan, 2004); BAKER, Jonny, GAY, Doug and BROWN, Jenny, *Alternative Worship*, (London: SPCK, 2003), etc etc. This list is indicative only and far from exhaustive; obviously, namings differ, but concerns clearly overlap. See also McLAREN, Brian D, *A Generous Orthodoxy: Why I Am a Missional, Evangelical, Post/ Protestant, Liberal/ Conservative, Mystical/ Poetic, Biblical, Charismatic/ Contemplative, Fundamentalist/ Calvinist, ... Emergent, Unfinished Christian* (Colorado Springs: Zondervan, 2006). Much material about these related circles is available on the internet, good ways in being the websites by Jonny Baker and Ryan Bolger, in the UK and US respectively, who have both published in print in this area (the latter being a teacher at Fuller Seminary) and by Paul Roberts (a former teacher of liturgy in an English theological college, whose current research focuses on emerging church worship and whose own contribution includes critical assessment of the rhetoric of 'postmodernity' in emerging churches. See <http://jonnybaker.blogs.com/> and <http://thebolgblog.typepad.com/> and <http://alternativeworship.org/paulsblog/>

¹⁰ *Mission-Shaped Church* (London, CHP, 2004), p117. For critical engagement with this aspect of the report, see BURNS, Stephen, 'Mission-shaped worship', *Anvil: An Anglican Evangelical Journal of Theology and Mission*, 21: 2005, 185-201. For wider critique, see CROFT, Steven, [ed], *Mission-Shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church* (London: CHP, 2007), and especially HULL, John, *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response* (London: SCM Press, 2006). On the influence of *Mission-Shaped Church* in Australia, see NICHOLS, Alan, [ed], *Building the Mission-Shaped Church in Australia*, (Sydney: General Synod Office, 2007).

¹¹ I use the term 'church-styles' as an alternative to the older, gendered, 'churchmanship'.

¹² See, for example, BURNS, Stephen, *Liturgy* (SCM Studyguide) (London: SCM Press, 2006), pp1-12 and BURNS, Stephen, *Worship in Context: Liturgical Theology, Children and the City* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 2006), pp1-6.

¹³ See SEARLE, Mark, 'Private Religion, Individualistic Society and Common Worship', in KOESTER, Anne Y and SEARLE, Barbara [eds], *Vision: The Scholarly Contributions of Mark Searle to Liturgical Renewal*, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), 185-203, p195.

¹⁴ Hebrews 8.6 employs *leitourgia* to speak of Jesus' work for others.

¹⁵ See below.

¹⁶ Recently re-stated in, for example, BURNS, Stephen, 'Heaven or Las Vegas? Engaging Liturgical Theology', in WARD, Pete, *Mass Culture: The Interface of Eucharist and Mission* (Oxford: Bible Reading Fellowship, 2008), 95-112, pp108-9 and LOADES, Ann, 'Table', in BURNS, Stephen [ed], *Journey* (Renewing the Eucharist 1), Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008, 66-80, p80.

¹⁷ CARBINE, Rosemary P, 'Ekklesial Work: Toward a Feminist Public Theology', in *Harvard Theological Review*, 99: 2006, 433-455. Aspects of alliance between liturgical and feminist theologies are traced in BURNS, Stephen, 'Grace Dances: Liturgy and Embodiment', in WATSON, Natalie K and BURNS, Stephen [eds], *Exchanges of Grace: Essays in Honour of Ann Loades* (London: SCM Press, 2008), 225-235.

¹⁸ KAVANAGH, OSB, Aidan, *On Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1984), pp153, 168.

¹⁹ KAVANAGH, *On Liturgical Theology*, p176.

²⁰ Notions of public theology are sometimes predicated on understandings on David Tracey's writing in TRACEY, David *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981) which identifies three 'audiences' for theology: church, academy and society. The subtle interplay of these audiences is not always remembered.

²¹ SCHAREN, Christian, *Public Worship and Public Work: Character and Commitment in Local Congregational Life* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), pp203-227. Scharen appeals for a more ethnographic texture in the study of worship. His emphasis on 'the world in the church in the world' might also offer salient critique and contribution to characterizations of public theology.

²² WHITE, James F, *The Worldliness of Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967) remains insightful.

²³ For a wide view of the sacramental, see LOADES, Ann, 'Finding New Sense in the Sacramental', in ROWELL, Geoffrey and HALL, Christine [eds], *The Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality* (London: Continuum, 2004), 161-172

²⁴ See BEST, Thomas F and HELLER, Dagmar [eds], *Eucharistic Worship in Ecumenical Contexts: The Lima Liturgy – and Beyond* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1995).

²⁵ LATHROP, Gordon W, *Central Things: Worship in Word and Sacrament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2006) is a robust and accessible argument for the demonstrable significance of scripture and table in Christian assembly.

²⁶ *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (London: CHP, 2000), px (Roman numeral 10).

²⁷ Methodist Church of Great Britain, *Methodist Worship Book* (Peterborough: Methodist Publishing

House, 1999), pp26, 51, cf. 221-2.

²⁸ 1 *Apology*, 67, cited everywhere in liturgical studies. The document gives the earliest available fulsome description of worship in a Christian assembly, though it is not clear: [1] whether it describes regular or ideal practice; [2] whether it refers to one congregation, congregations across Rome, or what Justin took to be 'universal' practice.

²⁹ I sketch the contours of a cumulative argument for taking scriptural fragments together in BURNS, 'Heaven or Las Vegas?'

³⁰ LOADES, Ann, 'On Music's Grace: Trying to Think Theologically about Music', in LIPNER, Julius [ed], *Truth, Religious Dialogue and Dynamic Orthodoxy: Reflections on the Works of Brian Hebblethwaite* (London: SCM Press, 2005), 25-38, p26.

³¹ An attractive feature of the Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2* (Sydney: Uniting Church Press, 2005), interestingly mirrored in more recent editions of the Church of England's *Common Worship* range which have in a more obvious way retrieved the 'dismissal gospel' from the pre-conciliar Roman Catholic mass. See *Common Worship: Times and Seasons* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

³² Baptist Union of Great Britain, *Gathering for Worship: Patterns and Prayers for the Community of Disciples* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2005), p21 (bold case in original, indicating unison response).

³³ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2006), p115 (bold case in original, indicating unison response).

³⁴ IRELAND, Mark, 'Sending', in BURNS, [ed], *Journey*, 2008, 81-99, makes a range of practical suggestions.

³⁵ BYARS, Ronald P, *The Future of Protestant Worship: Beyond the Worship Wars* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), p17.

³⁶ See, for example, MOE-LOBEDA, Cynthia D, *Healing a Broken World: Globalization and God*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002) and READER, John, *Reconstructing Practical Theology: The Impact of Globalization* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

³⁷ See MACLAREN, Duncan, *Mission Implausible: Restoring Credibility to the Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), p132. My comments on the challenge of gathering draw on BURNS, 'Mission-shaped Worship'.

³⁸ WARD, *Liquid Church*, p17.

³⁹ WARD, *Liquid Church*, p19.

⁴⁰ WARD, *Liquid Church*, p14.

⁴¹ WARD, *Liquid Church*, p94.

⁴² Ward's 'dreams' of worship in a liquid church are found in *Liquid Church*, pp95-97.

⁴³ Ward is not alone in encouraging reflection on Orthodox worship in search of its potential contribution to worship in western Christian contexts: two notable examples are HOLETON, David, 'Welcome Children, Welcome Me', *Anglican Theological Review* 51: 1999, 92-111, in which Holeton draws on Orthodox practice to suggest means of including children in liturgy; and SENN, Frank, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997) in which Senn closes his

monumental study with reflection on how Orthodox worship can suggest means by which word-centred western worshippers can enrich the visual dimensions of liturgy for a post-modern context alienated by the lack of engagement of visual sense. Ward's willingness to contemplate the dissolution of congregational dynamic is, however, what is distinctive about his proposals.

⁴⁴ SEARLE, 2004, 'Private Religion', p195.

⁴⁵ See GILES, Richard, 'Gathering' and IRELAND, Mark, 'Sending', both in BURNS, *Journey* (Anglican), BYARS, Ronald P., *What Language Shall I Borrow? The Bible in Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) (Reformed) and QUIVIK, Melinda, 'Re-assembly: Participation as Faith Construction' and LANGE, Dirk G, 'Worship at the Edges: Redefining Evangelism', both in WENGERT, Timothy J [ed], *Centripetal Worship: The Evangelical Heart of Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2006), for further related ecumenical perspectives on gathering and sending dynamics in Christian assembly.

⁴⁶ LOADES, 'On Music's Grace', p36.

⁴⁷ Anglican Church of the Province of Kenya, *Our Modern Services* (Nairobi: Uzima Press, 2002), p5.

⁴⁸ United Church of Canada, *Celebrate God's Presence: A Book of Services* (Etobicoke: United Church Publishing House, 2000), p254; adapted from MORLEY, Janet, *All Desires Known* (London: SPCK, 1988), p52.

⁴⁹ See BURNS, Stephen, 'Liturgy and justice', ms submitted in 2008 to *International Journal for Public Theology*, pp10-16.

⁵⁰ WHITE, *Christian Worship in North America*, p313.

⁵¹ BILLINGS, Alan, *Secular Lives, Sacred Hearts: The Role of the Church in a Time of No Religion*, (London: SPCK, 2004), p17.

⁵² For a powerful, recent reassertion of this point, see CHERRY, Stephen, 'Representation', in WELLS, Samuel and COAKLEY, Sarah [eds], *Praying for England: Priestly Presence in Contemporary Culture* (London: Continuum, 2008), 21-41.

⁵³ David Tracey's word. See above note.

⁵⁴ See GILES, Richard, *Re-pitching the Tent: Reordering the Church Building for Worship and Mission*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, third edition 2004) and GILES, Richard, *Creating Uncommon Worship: Transforming the Liturgy of the Eucharist* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2004). See also various essays in BURNS, Stephen, [ed], *The Art of Tent-making: Essays in Honour of Richard Giles* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, forthcoming).

⁵⁵ Billings writes from the context of the UK, and in particular from Kendal, Cumbria, apparently in very way except ethnicity 'typical' of Britain according to the major study focused on the town by HEELAS, Paul, WOODHEAD, Linda et al, *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion is Giving Way to Spirituality* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004). See information on Lancaster University's (where Billings, Heelas and Woodhead teach) Kendal Project at <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fss/projects/ieppp/kendal/>