

A Conversation with Julian of Norwich about Liturgical Language

Gail Ramshaw

It was on May 8th that Richard Rutherford telephoned to announce to me the Berakah. May 8th is the day on which many Christians commemorate Julian of Norwich, since it was on that day in 1373 that she experienced her visions. Not only am I adamant about the use of the Sunday lectionary, but also I try to attend to the writings of the saints on their commemoration day, and so I did not have to wonder what my text for this address would be. (By the way, there is a disputation among the doctors about whether the manuscripts note the date of Julian's visions as v-iii, thus May 8th, or x-iii, thus the 13th.¹ My church's calendar holds with the 8th and, as a sometimes compliant daughter of the church, so do I.) Fortuitously, some months prior my husband had given me the latest scholarly edition of Julian's text, and so reviving my 1970 study of Middle English, I took up Julian's *A Revelation of Love* to converse with her about my current liturgical project. Despite the great gulf fixed between Julian and me, I discover that she has words for me about my current work on the language of Eucharistic prayers. I am hoping that it will be interesting for you to eavesdrop. I do recall a professor greeting the third volume of Jaroslav Pelikan's monumental history of Christian doctrine with the remark that Pelikan's ideas were really good when he conceived them thirty years before. A scholar my age dreads hearing someone in the back of the room chanting "Same song, sixty-second verse": I hope to meet this morning's challenge to say something new to this assembly about liturgical language.

Let me first review for you the facts of Julian. Born probably in 1342 and residing near Norwich, England, Julian nearly died of some ailment in 1373, when in extremis on a day in May she experienced a series of visions. Sometime afterward she wrote an account of the visions

entitled *A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman*. Although Benedicta Ward argues, to me persuasively, that Julian was not a vowed religious,² at some point she moved with a maid into an anchorhold affixed to St. Julian's church, which was located in a busy commercial area of Norwich, one of England's largest cities, and by which name we know her. She contemplated her original and several later visions for over twenty years, and perhaps by 1400 had completed *A Revelation of Love*, a much expanded exposition of the meanings of her visions. This extraordinary text, the oldest extant use of the English language written by a woman, is now recognized as a piece of rare theological genius. In 1413, when Julian was 70, the rambunctious pilgrim Margery Kempe visited her for spiritual direction.³ Several fifteenth-century wills include bequests made for her maintenance. She died sometime after 1416. The two earliest complete, although not identical, manuscripts of *A Revelation*, both seventeenth century, are now kept in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris and at the British Library in London.

I begin by mentioning a few surprises. Her text *A Revelation of Love* was completed perhaps two full decades into her life walled up in St. Julian's anchorhold. I expected that being captive to parish worship would have had some effect on her text. Yet except for two sentences about being fed with the eucharist, there is no mention, none at all, of the liturgy, its ordinary text, its propers, its seasons and festivals, its presiding clergy, the spiritual meaning of the liturgy, liturgical music or the art on the walls of Norwich churches.⁴ This ought to humble those of us in this room. Perhaps the contemporary reconstruction of her cell is inaccurate, and there was no window that opened from her cell to the nave. Perhaps, since there is no indication that Julian knew Latin, the liturgy was inaccessible even to her. Although she repeatedly claims that her writing corresponds to what holy church preaches and teaches, she mentions the seven sacraments only once (57:30), in a passage that first discusses the commandments, although the

Veronica she mentions twice (10:30, 54). So although I see in her description of the thirteenth vision an outline for a Eucharistic prayer – our praise for God’s creation of all things, for the excellence of the human creature, for the atonement which turns all our blame into endless worship, and God’s hope that we be kept in the faith and truth of holy church (1:31-39) -- I am taken aback that, given her circumstances, about the liturgy she has nothing to say.

Were I to speak with Julian, I would say that I could not write pages and pages about God without grounding my discussion in Christian liturgy, its setting, and its effect on me. I would tell of being perhaps seven years old and, one Sunday sitting in church, finding in the front pages of *The Lutheran Hymnal* the propers for Mary Magdalene’s Day, and although my congregation did not keep this festival, it was obvious that some Lutherans did.⁵ In 1963 while in high school I visited the art museum at Yale University and was awed by what was then on display: the myrrh-bearing women in the wall art of the baptistery at Dura Europas. In 1965 I complained to the chaplain at Valparaiso University about the Sunday intercessions, and he then employed me to write prayers for the university community. For my 1968 senior honors project, I analyzed several contemporary Eucharistic prayers and crafted one of my own, which, by the way, wasn’t half bad. When writing worship resources for a master’s project at Sarah Lawrence College, I arranged for Alexander Schmemmann to be my advisor, and while sitting in his office learned about transformation by and into the divine. After reading the entire corpus of Thomas Merton for my dissertation on his poetry, I like best his description of liturgy: “Animated clergy storms conceptual void in theo-drama while Deity groans.”⁶ Christian liturgy has been my anchorhold. I would ask Julian why the liturgy means so much to me, and seemingly so little to her.

Yet as a Protestant woman I smile at the ways that she, like other medieval women, anticipates aspects of the Reformation. She writes, “Oure faith is grounded in Goddes worde”

(32:31-32). She claims that she prays directly to God, without intermediaries (6:5). She describes herself as avoiding self-imposed penances (77:21-22, 81:13). She argues for the primacy of interior prayer (44--43). Much of the humility expressed in her early report has been edited out of her expanded text: I saw, I understood, I say, she writes repeatedly. She speaks with gentle authority as she interprets her visions, which she claims are meant for all Christians. "Prayer oneth the soule to God," Julian writes (43:1). Julian writes that to encounter God's grace, she goes "to holy church, into oure moders brest: that is to sey, into oure owne soule wher oure lord wonneth" (62:20-21). Perhaps she, like many medieval women, lay or religious, felt so distant from the machinations of the established church that she could find God only in the inner soul. As for me, I do not much use the word "soul." A daughter of Martin Luther, I consider that I have been given the community gathered around word and sacrament that, despite its errors and shenanigans, is a way to counter the machinations of what I imagine is my soul.

But Julian makes three points that I find most helpful for my current work: first, about the Trinity; second, about metaphor; third, about the phrase "no such sitting."

Here are the opening sentences of *A Revelation of Love*. "This is a revelation of love that Jhesu Christ, our endles blisse, made in sixteen shewinges. Of which the first is of his precious crowning of thornes. And therin was comprehended and specified the blessed trinity, with the incarnation and the oning betweene God and mans soule" (1:1-4). And later: "Sodenly I saw the red bloud trekile downe from under the garlande. . .and in the same shewing, sodeinly the trinity fulfilled my hart most of joy" (4:1, 6).

To Julian, the meaning of the vision of the suffering Christ is the Trinity, for in the crucifixion, she meets the triune God. Perhaps you know of Carmen Renee Berry's guide to contemporary Christian denominations, in which she denotes each church's Trinity Affinity.⁷

Berry is quite correct that the Trinity Affinity of Lutheranism is the Son. And from within my second-person Trinity Affinity, I encounter Julian declaring that in the passion and death of the Son is the triune God. Julian reminds us that no Christians ought ever to stop with whatever their Trinity Affinity is: rather, through the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, we are brought into the mystery of the Trinity. Many Christians of my generation, some of you in this room, are running as fast as we can back to Julian, to discover there the threeness of God, and many of you agree with me that the Trinity is the most Christian way to counter the tedious patriarchal Mr. God.

It can be argued that the triune God is the central focus of Julian's entire essay. "For alleoure life is in thre" (58:25), she writes, since the tri-unity of God effects the tri-unity of all things. Some of the threes are three properties of God (58:16), three manners of longing in God (75:7), three gifts of God's grace (2:3), three degrees of bliss (14:10), three manners of knowing (72:43), three properties of the hazelnut (5:14), three wounds in her life (2:35), three virtues in Mary (25:16), three means to come to heaven (39:22), even three aspects of the fiend (13:29). All threes reflect the three-ness of God, who is all mighty, all wisdom, all love (8:8 and passim). The Triune God is Fader, Sonne and Holy Gost: the Maker, Lover, and Keeper (5:16); the Father, Mother, and Spouse (52:1-2); Truth, Wisdom, and Love (44:9-10). For Julian, the descriptors of the triune God permeate the universe. It is as if, for a Christian, the threefold divine that is God creates a triangle in which all things find their existence. I am now somewhat critical of the abecedary that I published in 1984, because its meditations do not much express the Trinity, and I ask preachers that their sermons lead the assembly not only to Christ, but to the fullness of the divine.

For eight years of my childhood, I worshipped in a Connecticut church that boasted a relatively dreadful apse mural depicting the three persons of the Trinity: the Father a white-

bearded old man, the long-haired Son bare to the waist, and the Holy Spirit a white fluffy thing with a radiant upraised hand. One old pastor once said to me that perhaps my entire career was an attempt to rid my brain of that mural. However, in reacting against that meager depiction of God, I have not adopted the aniconic practice of many recent churches, a Puritan iconoclasm that I find inexplicable for sacramental Christians and the blank walls of which I have long since tired. Rather, I am superimposing on that Connecticut mural my favorite icon of the Trinity – not, as you might assume, Rublev’s famed rendition, but rather one of the more commonplace icons of the Hospitality of Abraham. The three colorfully-robed angels sit at a table covered with a white tablecloth with orange stripes; on the table is the food for the meal; both Sarah and Abraham are in attendance, their house in the background, and all are underneath a great spreading tree. I especially like the three carrots, one for each angel. (The icon merchant in Athens yelled at me: “Not three angels! That’s the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit!”) I note such an image above the sacred doors in many Orthodox churches. When I see a depiction of the disciples with Christ at Emmaus, glad that finally one of the two is a woman, I want to see layered upon it the three angels visiting Abraham and Sarah. As Julian wrote, the risen Christ of Emmaus should comprehend and specify the Blessed Trinity.

I ask Christian scholars: was Joseph Jungmann correct, that liturgical prayer must always be to the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit?⁸ Or is this dictum more descriptive of the West than prescriptive for the future? In a Eucharistic prayer published by the Irish Anglican church, each section of the prayer addresses individually one of the three persons of the Trinity.⁹ What do you Christians think of that? Reading Catherine Mowry LaCugna’s work altered my sense of how the Trinity might be addressed in Christian prayer.¹⁰ My Eucharistic prayer that I call Triple

Praise is addressed to the triune God, “Holy God, holy One, holy Three,”¹¹ as I try to lead worshipers through Christ to the Trinity.

Thank you, Julian, for calling Christians into the Trinity. Now, metaphor.

In my childhood reading Psalm 22 in *The Lutheran Hymnal*, I wondered why we pray to be saved from the horn of the unicorn, since I knew that unicorns are marvelous creatures that grant wishes.¹² Recent psalm translations render this as wild oxen. So even as a kid I wondered whether we have our metaphors right. Julian interrupts our liturgies with her inventive metaphors. It is indeed my experience that metaphors are able to birth some of the new possibilities that worshipers seek.¹³ Julian writes that the universe is something like a hazelnut (5:7). God is the midpoint of all things (11:16), the ground of our beseeching (41:8). Christ has been, like wet clothes, hung out to dry (17:32-33). Christ’s blood is a great shower of rain (7:18). We are his crown (22:17-19). We are the city in which God dwells (51:124). Christ has changed clothes with Adam (51:192-227). Christ is nurse (61:56), friend (65:21), highest bishop and solemnest king (68:6).

In thinking about metaphors, I have replaced Thomas Aquinas’s critical views of metaphor with those of Paul Ricoeur, who accorded the human practice of metaphor the highest possible status and for whom the ability to construct metaphor is the sublime creativity that likens us to God.¹⁴ I have been much influenced by the rhetoric of a contemporary of Julian, Catherine of Siena, whose ecstasies came upon her after she communed and whose poetic prayers echo the texts that were proclaimed at Eucharist.¹⁵ In my Triple Praise Eucharistic prayer, I borrowed from Catherine of Siena, praising God as Three, our Table, our Food, and our Server,¹⁶ and in imitation I call God, for example, Rainbow, Ark, and Dove. I like what Carl Jung wrote in his *Red Book*: “If we possess the image of a thing, we possess half the thing.”¹⁷

Most famously in Julian, God the Son is the mother (59--62) who as a perfect mother feeds us with her milk (60:25-28). For medieval Westerners, who thought that in the nursing mother, menstrual blood backed up and reconstituted itself as milk for the infant, the connection between the mother's blood and the mother's milk was natural.¹⁸ Julian writes of being fed -- note: fed -- by her mother's milk. Perhaps Julian was granted only to eat the bread, and not to drink the wine, of the Eucharist. She is eating the milk: that's metaphor squared. While in 1978 completing an M.Div. at Union Theological Seminary, where by the way I studied worship with Cyril Richardson and Bible with Raymond Brown, I for the first time read Julian and wrote a thesis about including this metaphor in our liturgical prayers.¹⁹ Although the 2006 *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* book does not include her prayer to Christ (61:40-42), "My kind moder, my gracious moder, my deerworthy moder, have mercy on me," several of our prayers and hymns do use the metaphor of mother for the divine.²⁰ And I hope Julian would be pleased to encounter the Eucharistic prayer that, crafted by several Episcopalians, is filled with phrases from her *Revelation*.²¹

I bring to Julian's text two current concerns, feminism and postcolonialism. I agree with Julian that in metaphor, gender is best not an essentialist category. For Julian, it is not God the creator who is the mother of the universe, but the incarnate Son who is mother of Christians, and Julian herself is not Eve, but Adam. I argue that metaphors can function with more complexity than can gendered dichotomies, which I always suspect as being narrowly cultural or purely theoretical, the specter of Aristotle arising from his grave. If I had to choose between androcentric metaphors and essentialist theories, I would take the metaphor, and then in the next sentence, offer an opposite metaphor. In one sentence Christ is Mother, and in the next, he is wet clothes hung out to dry. In one sentence, God is Judge -- you know, Ruth Bader Ginsburg -- and

in the next, City. And I hope that postcolonial critics approve of Julian's riff on God as the light of endless day.²² She does not move from light to the color white or to fair skin, and it is not others, but herself, who lives in the night (83:11-20). Perhaps our prayers ought to do more with the metaphor of darkness for God.

Thank you, Julian, for all your metaphors.

Now to the three words in Julian's *Revelation* that at this point in my life's work challenge me the most. When Julian is elaborating on the metaphor that we are God's crown, she writes:

For it was shewede that "we be his crowne": which crowne is the faders joy, the sonnes wurshippe, the holy gostes liking, and endlesse, mervelous blisse to alle that be in heven. Now stondeth not the sonne before the fader on the lefte side as a laborer, but he sitteth on the faders right hande in endlesse rest and pees. (But it is not ment that the sonne sitteth on the right hand beside as one man sitteth by another in this life – for ther is no such sitting, as to my sight, in the trinite. But he sitteth on his faders right honde: that is to sey, right in the hyest nobilite of the faders joy.) (51:270-276).

No such sitting. Julian reminds us that the language we use is metaphor. Christians say, even in their creeds, that the Son sits at the right hand of the Father. But Christians must know that there is in the Trinity no such sitting. "Sitting" is a metaphor.

We are being told that one of the greatest dangers in this century will be world-wide religious fundamentalism. That so many Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Hindu believers are espousing a literalist and self-serving hermeneutic when interpreting their scriptures and tradition is being recognized as terrifyingly injurious to human society. Yet all of us tend to literalize our favorite scriptural passages: indeed, it is precisely because we literalize these passages that they

become inviolate to us. As a child, I was taught to accept literally Adam's creation from soil and Eve's from Adam's rib (Genesis 2:7, 22). Nowadays, many Christians assign to the enigmatic phrase in Genesis 1:27, that humans are created "the image of God," the literal meaning of divine bisexuality – an interpretation as convenient for us and our worldview as the rib was to my teacher. I no longer literalize the twelve men whose feet Jesus washed, but in advocating for the restoration of the liturgies of the Three Days, I am perhaps literalizing the foot-washing itself.

I rejoiced when first seeing that in the psalter translation in *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*, that God is never a "he," but reacted against the several places that God is a king, and only later realized that although I urge dozens of metaphors applicable for God, I had so literalized "king" that for me it could no longer serve as metaphor. If something is literal, it "is," enjoying itself on a throne. If something is metaphor, it "is and is not," and it thrives by dancing back and forth, in and out, in our imagination. Literalist interpretation contains metaphor in a straight jacket, and what metaphors we literalize, future believers may have to discard. Several articles in the spring issue of *Liturgical Ministry* discuss the demise of metaphor – in this case, sacrifice -- that follows upon taking metaphor literally.²³ Centuries of Father, Father, Father God have led many Christians, who refuse God as a literal Father, to reject also the metaphor Father. The dictum that every Eucharistic prayer must be addressed to the Father no longer governs the approved worship resources of some American denominations. Is "Father" metaphor, or somehow other than metaphor?

When I teach the Christian faith, I make it clear that I reject literalist interpretations of Scripture and tradition. Since, following the Lutheran Augsburg Confession, I as a laywoman never preach, I need not personally struggle with how to make a non-literalist interpretation apparent in my sermons. However, I have endured far too many sermons that elaborate what

Jesus was feeling at some event that never took place, and so I am harassing some of you homileticians about how to preach in a way that remains faithful to the critical biblical studies to which you subscribe. I am a Lutheran: one's biblical interpretation ought to determine one's preaching. I fear that the preacher's goal of imaginative engagement with the narrative is heard merely as literalism. If for the last several decades I worked to revive the biblical metaphors, I now am working on the next step: to display the metaphor as metaphor. That is, I must employ metaphors in such a way that their being metaphoric is celebrated. For there is no such sitting in the Trinity.

Many of you agree with me that one way to illumine metaphor as metaphor is to pile on the metaphors, giving each one only a quick breath before another metaphor is layered on top. No single image can sear itself into our consciousness, since there are always other images appearing before our eyes. Some Christians are content to worship in churches with white walls, stained glass windows that resemble drop cloths, and a single cross and perhaps statue of Mary up front, but I travel to Scandinavia to visit the fifteenth-century churches in which every square foot of the walls and ceiling are covered with paintings of Bible stories, to encounter God in this story, God in that story, story after story.

What are my obligations as a writer of liturgical prayer? If a liturgical prayer thanks God for saving Noah from the flood, will worshippers assume that the flood was a historical fact? In a collaborative project in 1986, I was struck that Mark Searle advocated that the opening questions at baptism not mention the devil: such literalism, he said, was unhelpful. I did not then, nor now, agree with him about that. I argue that the text of the Christian rite of baptism can both include the metaphor and expound on it. The baptismal candidate can renounce "the devil, all the forces

that defy God, the powers of this world that rebel against God, and the ways of sin that draw us from God.”²⁴

In the Eucharistic prayer I am currently working on – it takes me many months to write a decent Eucharistic prayer – I have two goals: to praise God for the scientific facts of the cosmos and to celebrate that creator God in metaphors. In the line “O God, for billions of years, you have cradled matter and energy in your arms,” will it be clear that we who pray in this community praise God who, like a mother with her infant, has overseen life in the cosmos for eons since the Big Bang? To keep from literalism, is it helpful for the prayer to thank God “for the stories of Abraham and Sarah”? Of course those who craft liturgical prayer need to respect the position of their community concerning what in the Bible is imaginative metaphor and what is remembered history. When at Pesach the rabbi of a Los Angeles Conservative synagogue said that the Exodus had never happened, even “The New York Times” reported on the subsequent fracas.²⁵ The religious culture expects literalism by those who worship. But I have come to believe that authors of liturgical texts are not excused from the literalist debate.

What, for example, ought Christians do with what are called the words of institution within or directly following our Eucharistic prayers? In the past, most Christian theologians claimed that Jesus really spoke those words at an historical event on the Thursday before he was executed and that this meal instituted a Christian ritual to be repeated in perpetuity.²⁶ Now, many mainstream New Testament scholars reject such historical literalism, and I ask liturgists not to invoke a literalism to which they do not subscribe. Jesus was renowned for his many meals, and the Pauline and synoptic accounts of that one meal are mid-century theological reflections on the meaning of the crucifixion for those Sunday meals held by the early resurrection communities.²⁷ So what ought Eucharistic prayers do with these biblical words? What happens to the bread and

wine, to the community, and to God, when the words are proclaimed? If Christians omit these words, how do they ensure that in the festive meal of resurrection is the living commemoration of the death of Christ? If the words are spoken, how are Christians to proclaim the mystery of Christ rather than the magical power of either the clergy or a biblical citation? I have begun a book about Eucharistic prayers for Fortress Press, and I will be glad for any ecumenically useful and hermeneutically honest suggestions you may have.²⁸

Finally, to Julian I would say this: She did phenomenally well, meditating for decades in that room of her own,²⁹ conversing with visitors,³⁰ and writing about the Trinity, metaphor, and “no such sitting.” I have needed far more interaction with others than she had, and for questions of liturgical language, gracious – though occasionally feisty – dialogue with you, the members of this North American Academy of Liturgy. Since 1979 I have attended every single annual meeting of this beloved association. At a time when many churches have hunkered down for the depressing task of institutional survival, I thank God for the ecumenical and interfaith companionship that this organization affords, and I encourage us all to shoulder whatever work it takes to maintain and strengthen its life.

For many Christians, today is the Sunday of the baptism of Christ as told in Luke 3.³¹ The reading from Acts 8 makes us smile, for even in the first century there seems to have been a debate about which words to use at Christian baptism. I hope that Julian would see in today’s readings each of her three points. First, the Trinity: in the narrative of Jesus’ baptism, the believing church looks at Christ, and encounters the Trinity -- the man at the river, the descending dove, and the voice from heaven. Second, the readings offer a plethora of metaphors. Christians are to be baptized with fire; the Messiah is threshing the wheat from the chaff; the divine spirit is a dove; and in the first reading from Isaiah 43, when we pass through the waters,

God will be with us (and there we are again at the Exodus); even when we walk through fire, God will be with us (and there were are again with the three men in the fiery furnace). In the response to the first reading, the extraordinary psalm 29, we hear the voice of God in thunder and lightning; it is breaking apart my beloved cedar trees and stripping forests bare -- unsettling to those who imagine God's voice as only a gentle whisper. Psalm 29 verse 10 is a scholar's puzzle: to what waters does "the flood" refer?³² Well, according to the hermeneutic of the lectionary, these waters are in the church's baptismal font. Finally, the psalm praises the Holy One who as king is sitting on a throne in the heavens; yet we know as we sing these words, yes Julian, that in God there is no such sitting.

Thank you, Julian. Thank you, deerworthy members of the North American Academy of Liturgy.

-
- ¹ *The Writings of Julian of Norwich: A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman and A Revelation of Love*, ed. Nicholas Watson and Jacqueline Jenkins (University Park, Penn: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 387.
- ² Benedicta Ward, "Julian the Solitary," *Julian Reconsidered*, ed. Kenneth Leech (Oxford: SLG Press, 1988), 18-26.
- ³ The excerpt from *The Book of Margery Kempe* can be found in *The Writings of Julian of Norwich*, 435-37.
- ⁴ See Roger Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings in English and Welsh Church* (Woodbridge, G.B.: Boydell Press, 2008), 116, 273, for medieval church art in the Norwich area that Julian does not mention.
- ⁵ *The Lutheran Hymnal* (St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1941), 91-92.
- ⁶ Thomas Merton, *Cables to the Ace, or Familiar Liturgies of Misunderstanding* (New York: New Directions, 1967), 48.
- ⁷ Carmen Renee Berry, *The Unauthorized Guide to Choosing a Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos Press, 2003), 56-60.
- ⁸ Joseph Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, foreword by Balthasar Fischer (Collegeville, Mn.: Liturgical Press, 1989), 157.
- ⁹ Prayer 3, *The Book of Common Prayer* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2004), 216-17.
- ¹⁰ Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harper, 1973), 334-35, 339, 367-68.
- ¹¹ Triple Praise. See for example *Celebrate God's Presence: A Book of Services* (Etobicoke, Ontario: The United Church Publishing House, 2000), 256-58, and *Upper Room Worshipbook*, ed. Elise S. Eslinger (Nashville: Upper Room Books, 2006), 50-51.
- ¹² *The Lutheran Hymnal*, 127.
- ¹³ Janet R. Walton, "Dwelling in Possibility," *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy*, 2009, 32-39.
- ¹⁴ Paul Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, trans. Robert Czerny (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 45, 97, 188.
- ¹⁵ *The Prayers of Catherine of Siena*, ed. Suzanne Noffke, OP (New York: Paulist Press, 1983).
- ¹⁶ Prayer 12, *The Prayers of Catherine of Siena*, 102.
- ¹⁷ C.G. Jung, *The Red Book: Liber Novus*, ed. Sonu Shamdasani (New York: Norton, 2009), 232.
- ¹⁸ See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 132-33.
- ¹⁹ Edited and published under the name Gail Ramshaw Schmidt as "Lutheran Liturgical Prayer and God as Mother," *Worship* 52(1978) 517-42.
- ²⁰ *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2006), 25/37, 41, 69, 87, #397, #566, #735, #755. Also see #445 and #736.
- ²¹ Paula S.D. Barker and Leonel L. Mitchell, "Eucharistic Prayer," *Gleanings: Essays on Expansive Language with Prayers for Various Occasions*, ed. Ruth A. Meyers and Phoebe Pettingell (New York: Church Publishing Incorporated, 2001), 115-17.
- ²² For example, see Stephen Burns, *SCM Study Guide to Liturgy* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 115-118.
- ²³ In *Liturgical Ministry* 18 (spring 2009), Scott O'Brien, "Partakers of the Divine Sacrifice: Liturgy and the Deification of the Christian Assembly," 69, and Barbara E. Reid, "From Sacrifice to Self-Surrender to Love," 84.
- ²⁴ *Evangelical Lutheran Worship*, 229.
- ²⁵ See www.jweekly.com, May 4, 2001.
- ²⁶ For this conservative view, see John Koenig, *The Feast of the World's Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2000).
- ²⁷ Gordon W. Lathrop, "The Reforming Gospels: A Liturgical Theologian Looks again at Eucharistic Origins," *Worship* 83(2009), 194-212.
- ²⁸ Tentatively titled *Eucharistic Prayers: A Guide to What, Why and How*.
- ²⁹ Thanks to Denise Nowakowski Baker, *Julian of Norwich's Shewings: From Vision to Book* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 166, for this.
- ³⁰ My sister Elaine Julian Ramshaw sees oblique references in *A Revelation* to fruitful conversation Julian had with others about the meaning of her visions.
- ³¹ Readings according to the Revised Common Lectionary: Isaiah 43:1-7, Acts 8:14-17, Luke 3:15-17, 21-22.
- ³² Lowell K. Handy, ed., *Psalm 29 through Time and Tradition* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2009), 16, 19-20, 22, 33.