



a communication of
associated parishes
3806 Mt. Vernon Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22305



March, 1982

Maundy Thursday at General Seminary

by J. Robert Wright

This article appeared in The Anglican, the quarterly gazette of the Anglican Society in North America, Volume 11, Number 14, Winter, 1981, and is reprinted here by permission.

The Rev. J. Robert Wright, D.Phil., is Professor of Church History, General Theological Seminary, New York.

The parish records of Mosbach in the Northern Baden region of Germany from the nineteenth century preserve a remarkable story -- recorded in the parish register and affirmed by the signature of the parish priest. A rather backward child from a devout family was getting on very badly with preparation for his first communion (with what we might have called "confirmation instruction"). With sad heart the parish priest decided to let the child's parents know that their son was not yet ready and that his first communion must be delayed until the class of the following year. Some days later, on a night in the middle of the week before the Sunday when

the class was to receive first communion, the priest was awakened at 2 a.m. by the father of the rather backward child, his face fraught with an expression of urgency, anxiety, and sadness. "Father," the man implored the priest, "I have only one desire. Please let my son make his first communion on Sunday. I know it will be his last chance." The priest said he would pray about it, and went back to sleep quite tired. As he awoke the next morning and prepared to celebrate Mass, he heard the sacristan tolling the requiem bell. The anxious father had died that night, after he had spoken with the priest. His last desire in this life, and thus his first request in the life to come, had been for the first communion of his backward child. The priest managed to give the child a rapid but sufficient preparation, and he received his first communion on Sunday with the rest of his class. And it was well that this happened, for in the very same year the boy followed his father into eternity. (This story is taken from Bernard Häring, *(A Sacramental Spirituality.)*)

Reflecting upon this, in the light of the commemoration of the Last Supper now this Holy Thursday, I think we can say that, in one sense, the last great wish of Christ in his life, before he was given up to be betrayed, was the Eucharist. His longing was for this moment. "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer, for I tell you I shall never eat it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." (Luke 22:16). "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." (1 Cor. 11:26). His death and resurrection for the love of us, and the institution of the Eucharist as their abiding memorial, form the goal that lay before him throughout his earthly life and ministry. All his deeds and words, in fact, take on deeper and fresh significance when considered in the light of this dying wish. As Jesus went out to suffer and die, and ultimately to rise again, he gave us the Eucharist as the pledge and primary of his new covenant for us. This sacred sacrificial meal was the last desire of our Lord in this world, and it fulfills his desire in heaven, where he ever lives to make intercession for us.

What then can be said of this holy day? -- of our commemorations in this observance? What are we doing? The liturgical celebration of the Thursday before Easter is something we do not encounter in the earliest sources, such as the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus from the early third century, but by the time of the Pilgrimage of Egeria in the early fifth century it is present. In the very early church then, this Thursday was not so much a fast on its own as a day of preparation for the following three days, for the Sacred Triduum of Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday, in which the mighty acts of our redemption were accomplished. And as rites of preparation for the Sacred Triduum, the earliest ceremonies associated with this Holy Thursday are the rites for the reconciliation of penitents and the blessing of the Holy Oils, both of which date from the third century. Neither of these is part of our liturgical observance here today, but their relationship to the days that follow should not be overlooked. The reconciliation of penitents, whereby those who had been doing public penance for major sins were formally ab-

solved and re-united to the church, took place on this day so as to enable them to participate in the great Paschal or Easter celebration soon to follow. And the Holy Oils were blessed or consecrated on this day so that they would be ready for use in the rites of Christian Initiation that are properly so integral a part of the Resurrection feast on Easter eve. In our time, the public reconciliation of penitents can still be seen on this day in some overseas mission areas, and the principle of sacramental reconciliation in preparation for Easter is still very much alive in the practice, optional of course, of making one's private sacramental confession today or tomorrow, with the forms provided in the new American Book of Common Prayer, so that dying once more to sin we may rise to new life in the power of Christ's resurrection. The blessing or consecrating of Holy Oils, also, is still done on this day by many bishops in their cathedral churches, often in a Eucharist concelebrated there with other priests of the diocese, sometimes together with delegations of lay people from each parish, and the three traditional Oils (healing, exorcism, and chrism for initiation) may possibly be seen as early as the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus in the early third century. From many diocesan cathedrals now, the clergy regularly obtain these Holy Oils; and especially the Oil of the Sick for Healing now is increasingly used, with prayer, in the Ministration to the Sick as provided in the new Prayer Book.

The reconciliation of penitents and the blessing of Holy Oils are integral to this day, then, but we do not see them in this service. What we do see is the solemn commemoration of the first Eucharist, the washing of the feet, and -- later on -- the stripping of the altar and the watch of adoration at the altar of repose. This joyful commemoration of the Last Supper, our Lord's last desire in this life and his first in the next, is obviously the dominant emphasis. Already by the fourth century this day was being called the "Thursday of the Lord's Supper;" in the early fifth century the pilgrim Egeria saw an evening Eucharist being celebrated on this day in Jerusalem; and it was both natural and inevitable that (as the post-Constantinian church began to be reconciled to its continued chronological existence

n history) the institution of the Eucharist should soon come to be commemorated. The celebration of the Eucharist: on his very day at about the same hour when the Lord's Supper was instituted. This Thursday thus became a feast day on its own, to be celebrated before the Sacred Rite began. Because of this connection, therefore, the Eucharist of today is celebrated in a festival mood, with white vestments and Gloria, and also for the same reason it has traditionally seemed appropriate to make this day's celebration appear a bit more realistic, and hence our celebration here at the Refectory is set in a context more resembling that of an actual meal. The concelebration of the Eucharist, also, recalls the communal nature of the sacred meal around the table in the Upper room.

ship in the power of the resurrection. On the Passover, Jews remember their deliverance from Egypt, and thereafter from all the enemies of their historical experience. But Christians, in their worship remember their deliverance from 'the last enemies,' sin and death. We say 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us' because we believe that Christ, through his death on Good Friday and his resurrection on Easter, has brought the fulfillment of God's promised deliverance. It is the death and resurrection of Christ, rather than the Last Supper, which most nearly correspond to the Exodus from Egypt; and thus the Great Vigil of Easter which most nearly corresponds to the Passover Seder of the Jews. Christians who celebrate a Jewish Passover on Maundy Thursday are not truly respecting

The (Standing Liturgical) Commission urges that, contrary to the practice followed in some parishes, a Christian celebration of a Jewish Passover Seder meal is not appropriate for a Maundy Thursday

We may do well to note, however, a sober warning against one danger of excessive realism in the liturgical commemoration of this day, issued recently by the Standing Liturgical Commission of the Episcopal Church. The Commission urges that, contrary to the practice followed in some parishes, a Christian celebration of a Jewish Passover Seder meal is not appropriate for Maundy Thursday because, most of all, to quote from the Commission's official statement:

"Every aspect of the Jewish religion has been transformed for Christians by the death and resurrection of Christ. Even Maundy Thursday is not simply an historical reconstruction of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Although our attention on Maundy Thursday is fixed on the scene in the Upper Room in Jerusalem, nevertheless our primary act of worship on that day is a full Christian Eucharist during which we proclaim, as we do throughout the year, 'Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again.' Thus, even on Maundy Thursday, Christians wor-

ship in the power of the resurrection. On the Passover, Jews remember their deliverance from Egypt, and thereafter from all the enemies of their historical experience. But Christians, in their worship remember their deliverance from 'the last enemies,' sin and death. We say 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us' because we believe that Christ, through his death on Good Friday and his resurrection on Easter, has brought the fulfillment of God's promised deliverance. It is the death and resurrection of Christ, rather than the Last Supper, which most nearly correspond to the Exodus from Egypt; and thus the Great Vigil of Easter which most nearly corresponds to the Passover Seder of the Jews. Christians who celebrate a Jewish Passover on Maundy Thursday are not truly respecting

Two further actions follow today's Eucharist: the procession and watch at the altar of repose, and the stripping of the main altar. To consider the second of these first: immediately following this service, those who wish may follow the crucifer back to the chapel, where, as has been the custom at least since the seventh century, the altar and pulpit are stripped, as the sacristans remove all candlesticks, altarcloths, prayer desks, cushions, and indeed everything, from the sanctuary, so that the Holy Table will be bare tomorrow for the more sombre Good Friday service in commemoration of our Lord's death. Psalm 22, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" is appropriately recited by the congregation during the actual stripping. This activity is not exactly the liturgical highlight of the week, but it is nonetheless impressive in its sheer austerity, and over the centuries it has afforded the opportunity for

Christological meditation upon such verses from the psalm as "They stare and gloat over me; they divide my garments among them; they cast lots for my clothing."

The procession of the Sacrament, which will leave for the Oratory immediately when communion is over today, and the optional watch at the altar of repose there, which extends throughout the night, are also actions, like the stripping of the altar, in preparation for Good Friday. As a sign of mourning the Lord's death, there was in the early church no celebration of the Eucharist on Good Friday, but an increasing consciousness over the centuries brought about the strong desire nevertheless to receive Holy Communion from the reserved Sacrament on that day, and the new American BCP recognizes this and provides for it. Egeria's pilgrimage speaks of processions and hymns and candles and Scripture readings and prayers throughout this Thursday night, as the faithful people visited the various places where our Lord's passion had actually taken place, especially Gethsemane where he had spent his night of agony in the garden. We can not go to Jerusalem physically, literally to do this, unless we are lucky enough to be able to afford a trip or pilgrimage, but we can go there spiritually, to the altar of repose where the sacramental bread and wine are reserved for Friday's communion and meditate upon that which tomorrow will happen. Spiritually or symbolically, we can do there what the apostles failed to do: watch with Christ throughout his agony in the garden.

The most distinctive feature of today's service, finally, is the washing of feet, or Pedilavium, or Maundy, as it also called. Dating back to the fourth, or possibly even third, century, the washing of feet is found in many different contexts in Christian tradition: as a symbolic preparation for Baptism, as a sign of hospitality for guests and pilgrims, as a sign of charity toward the poor, as a sign of community in a religious house, and so on. It has often been neglected in the liturgical observance of Maundy Thursday, but happily it has been restored in the new Prayer Book. This restoration is especially happy because it is from "mandatum," the first Latin word of the Scripture verse of

John 13 traditionally emphasized in the actual washing -- "Mandatum", meaning "commandment," in the verse "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you." -- that the word "Maundy" in "Maundy Thursday" is derived. "Maundy", that is, comes from "Mandatum", meaning "commandment", and this is how "Maundy Thursday" gets the name we give it. We have already heard the Gospel account read from the thirteenth chapter of John, in which Jesus exhorts us: "If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you."

When the footwashing was being considered for the Holy Week liturgy of General Seminary in the late 60's and early 70's, there were many alternatives suggested for it as possibly being more relevant -- such as the celebrant polishing shoes or even vacuuming the carpet, but in the end it was decided that the ancient symbolism of the celebrant, as did Jesus, actually washing the feet of twelve persons was the most appropriate. The washing of feet is an action traditionally understood in many different cultures as a sign and symbol of love to one another, for a love that does not issue in selfless service is hardly worth its own name and certainly not worth the name of Jesus. Perhaps Archbishop Cranmer may be allowed a word on this point: "Our Lord did wash the feet of his disciples, teaching humbleness and very love and charity by his example... We, in like manner, as Christ washed his disciples' feet at his Maundy, should be ready at all times to do good unto our Christian brothers, yea, even to wash their feet, which seemeth to be the most humble and lowly act that we can do unto them."

To summarize, this Maundy Thursday has two obvious emphases: the institution of the Eucharist, our Lord's last wish for this life and his first desire for the next, which is the dominant emphasis, and the washing of feet of Maundy, which is the most distinctive. They are both integral to each other, for together they represent the two poles of our Christian vacation between which we move: worship, above all in the Eucharist, and selfless service, even to the washing of feet. +++

On the State of Music in the Episcopal Church

by Mason Martens

This article in its original form came to the AP office last Spring. I sent it back to Mason for some cutting down...he promptly went to California, and when the new text was returned for our October issue, page 6 was missing. Finally, we are able to print the article, somewhat edited by me. Mason, a long-standing friend of AP, has been deeply involved in the revision of the music for the new Prayer Book and has, as you will see, some highly original approaches to our present problems.

Editor

The recent debate on church music in *OPEN* has been very exciting for me; very heady. The day I read the first article, (*OPEN*, Nov. 1980), I called the author, Henry Louttit, and talked his head off for an hour, and I wrote him a long letter, too personal to publish, Winnie Crapson's article (*OPEN*, March 1981) brought more excitement and more phone calls to friends. The issue with Elizabeth Downie and the Rev. Peter Fleming (*OPEN*, June 1981) joining the debate, triggered phone calls to Ray Glover, general editor of the new Episcopal hymnal, and my longtime friend and colleague, Howard Galley. When Ray asked why I didn't put some of my ideas down, I begged off, still considering myself no writer. But it seemed to me, on further reflection, that it was time for me to get a few ideas down on paper.

What I have to say may strike some as the sort of introduction-to-the-beginning-of-the-discussion-of-a-problem observations of which I myself am very suspicious. My justification? There are two principal reasons. In our society, music (of all the arts) seems the most "removed" or arcane as a discipline to the non-musician, although our society is a vast consumer of many forms of music. Second, we seem to have little idea as to *what* the music in our churches should be.

For several decades I have had an intense curiosity about the history of Western music, especially the music of the Church. As a result, I now possess a vast store of information on that subject, far more than

anyone needs to know, and much no doubt useless, or close to it. In addition, I have been closely involved with the process of liturgical renewal in the Episcopal Church. For eight years I was a predominantly volunteer staff member in the Office of Prayer Book Revision and continue to be involved with ongoing research and editing connected with our new Book of Common Prayer and the new hymnal.

I have also been involved with the verbal texts that shape the character and structure of what we sing in church. These include versions of the psalms done for General Seminary before the BCP revision process was fully underway; comments on the work of Charles Gilbert's Psalter committee; later, work on the text of the eucharistic Prefaces with Howard Galley (and then their music also); translations and "arrangements" of other texts, such as the now-discarded *Improperia*, and burial anthems; the wording of rubrics; in recent years, involvement with Latin metrical hymnody.

This background is given to set the stage for the first comment I have to make in this debate -- to make it seem less vain.

1) I have hesitated to enter this debate publicly because I think that much of what I have to say would not be correctly understood by many people. I made two comments to my friends the other day: a) I think it would be necessary to write a 32-page "definition of terms" before entering this debate; and b) experience has shown me that

When I do speak out in such circumstances, what I am saying does not seem to be perceived by most auditors, or they hear me saying something *other* than what I'm saying. I hope, by the way, that these remarks will not be thought arrogant. Far from it -- they come to you from great perplexity and confusion at *not* being able to say clearly what I have to say and feel it has been received by others, even if they don't agree with me.

As a prelude to the second of my three points, I would like to remind you that in the issue of *OPEN* which began this debate, there were remarks on music by a second person: the editor, Henry Breul. Henry contributed, in his wonderfully direct way, a devastating account of the music at the opening services at the meetings of Liturgical and Music Commission chairpersons in New York and Atlanta.

Henry is a person very familiar with music, to whom music is important. He is not by profession a musician. His father was a musician, a church musician, moreover. Singing has been an important thing in his life. He numbers some outstanding musicians as his friends. All of which, I believe, gives him special insights into music, especially church music. Along with the knowledge, there is also a certain distance, which is valuable when making judgments. I am sure, also, that Henry does not subscribe to the "mystery wrapped in an enigma" view so prevalent about music in our culture, but instead sees it as a living, vibrant thing with which men and women wrestle daily -- trying to shape the unseeable into order, and trying to earn a living in a traditionally underpaid field.

Which brings me to my second observation:

2) Henry Breul's witty, succinct, and devastating article (*OPEN*, June 1981) on the historical error/tragedy of the Romantic revival of Gothic architecture for churches in the last century says much more about the problems of present day church music and how we got into them than the two contributions made specifically to the church music debate in the same issue.

At the present time, the Episcopal Church, in spite of a reputation for learning that has seemed at times almost a hallmark of

Anglicanism, appears not to heed the lessons of history sufficiently well or deeply in some areas. Our new BCP seems to me, and no doubt to many readers of these lines, a very model of historically informed, renewed Catholic Christianity.

Where, in the Church at the national level, do you turn, *in the field of music*, for an analogous experience? Is there a national society to foster music in our churches, according to the BCP? Is there a periodical devoted to such ends? Is there an extensive program of training in church music in any of our seminaries or church-related colleges? Is there a church-related music publishing company?

It has been deemed proper to bring history -- its messages and materials -- to bear on the revision of our liturgy. Henry's essay shows that it is deemed proper to follow similar lines of enquiry into the history of architecture, and the lessons, *good and bad*, that such investigation can teach us. It would seem, however, that music in relationship to the Church, has no history, no literature, is not a worthy field for a loyal son or daughter of the Church. As I said to Ray and Howard, it's a lot easier to sit on a chair inside the nave of the Washington Cathedral for several hours and contemplate structure in Gothic architecture (strained through a Broadway theatrical family!) than it is to sit inside a Kyrie melody and explore *its* structure.

Yet the latter is necessary, for such contemplation is one of the sources of information we need in order to renew the music in our churches. These issues of musical structure, remember, exist even when a congregation is not worshipping in a church building -- a fire house, out of doors, or a school gym like my parish (recently burned out of its holy house).

Music, we must constantly remind ourselves, is more closely linked to the liturgy than any of the other arts, due to its intimate relationship to the words of the liturgy themselves.

Henry's essay points the way to one of the principal things we must do *before* we can proceed to any serious renewal of music in the Episcopal Church. We must re-

over the idea that the study of history, of the past, can inform the present and future. "Those who do not understand history are condemned to repeat it." So said George Santayana in some of the wisest words ever penned. And his strictures apply not only to political history, and to social history, but can easily be seen to apply to liturgical history, and to musical history, and even to that rare bird that is our goal for today, the history of liturgical music.

Liturgical music is the largest as well as the oldest established area of Western music of the last 1,500 years or so. Practically everything musical that could be done to the words of a liturgy has been done somewhere, somehow, by someone, before now. Often long before now. I'm not saying we should study history to find out "what to do" -- the "correct" way to do things. I say we should study history to find ways that things can be done -- and then study those models, both in the context in which they originated and how they might work in our present day contexts. But we must cautiously try them, study them, before we either adopt them or throw them on the crap heap. This seems almost impossible today. Where should we try them?

I am now lumbering toward my third and final point. It's a hard one, and will make many people unhappy. Some it will make angry. For all of this I am sorry. But remember always not to blame the messenger for the bad news.

3) We cannot begin a debate on whether music in the Episcopal Church is good or bad or, whichever it is, why it's that way, unless we first lay aside undying allegiance to some of the most obvious historical errors that have infected Anglican church music for the last one hundred and fifty years.

This is not the time or place to explain why these areas have become problems since the beginning of the Church renewal that began in the 1830's. They are such and are generally recognized by the few historians familiar with such matters. And I bring them forth now, not as a way of "winning some points" by clever parliamentary manipulation of the debate, but because I truly believe that unless some of the

troublesome areas are set aside before that debate, we will never get to the main matters at all.

Instead, we will expend our energies debating whether type X or Y music is well performed in our churches, in a case where neither music X or Y is among the better solutions to music in the liturgy, and where the issue of performance quality is at best secondary.

We must recover the idea that the study of history, of the past, can inform the present and the future.

Some of the well-loved views we should set aside are:

- a) The function of a choir is primarily or entirely to lead the singing of the congregation, except on "special occasions".
- b) Anglican chant is suitable for congregational singing.
- c) Celebrations of the Eucharist should contain 3-7 metrical hymns.
- d) Size and quality of the organ and organ playing are indicators of good church music.
- e) The Psalms are not as important hymns as the metre hymns in the hymnal.

Harmless, you may say, when they are so simply put down on paper. But the implications of some of them are staggering -- setting them aside would require whole new repertoires of music and hiring or recruiting choirs for churches and services which don't have them now. In fact, if you read this list as a list of what is currently believed by many of our clergy (and not a few of our church musicians, I would hazard), you will see that they are almost a list of *credenda* about practical church music, for they reflect what actually goes on in our churches, whether or not they were arrived at by intellectual reflection.

BOOKS

Theology as Thanksgiving: From Israel's Psalms to the Church's Eucharist. Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr. New York. Seabury Press. 253 pp. \$15.95.

This excellent book goes well together with Geoffrey Wainwright's *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life*. Guthrie writes from a complementary point of view: the theme of thanksgiving as set forth in the Bible. Louis Boyer, in *Eucharist*, traced the origins of liturgy back to the Jewish table blessings. Guthrie traces them back at least a thousand years earlier in the psalms. In a remarkable analysis of psalm twenty-nine, he develops the difference between praise and thanksgiving (*todah* in Hebrew) and uses that to make a distinction between the covenant community of Israel and the kind of paganism that surrounds them, which Israel encountered and transformed in its entry into Palestine. Using the recital of thanksgiving that is expressed in deliverance from Egypt and the Red Sea, Guthrie then takes us forward with this viewpoint for all the Old Testament. It is the cult which recalls the event of salvation that shapes the making of the life of the people. Faithfulness to God who saves and the implications of that commitment underlie the conflict within Israel and between Israel and her neighbors. The theme is carried forward with a perhaps less helpful analysis of how the cult of Israel is displaced by the cult of the Christian community.

Now I suppose all of this is familiar enough, but I found the way in which Guthrie develops the thesis engrossing. For me it made the Old Testament fall into place in a way which had never really

been clear to me before. I think that now that we have got an Old Testament lesson at most celebrations of the liturgy, this book makes very clear why we should have and how it relates to the other lessons.

If we take liturgy seriously and not just as an experience of warm fuzzy-wuzzys that takes place when we gather so that we can get on with the important work of the Church, then we see that it is a eucharistic liturgy. For Christians the reasons for thanksgiving are the same as for Israel (and we need to remember that in Jewish/Christian dialogue). They are the creation, the deliverance from Egypt, the creation of the Covenant community, the land and its promise. Emerging from these the inclusion of us all into the great community of all races, tongues, and languages that are to make known God's presence and purposes.

We forget sometimes that the Church's first confession of faith was the great thanksgiving. That it was rooted in creation, in an historical event, in the incarnation, and therefore sacramental in the proclamation that God acts in the very substance of his creation, the earth, in a people, in the particularities of time and place. Spiritual religion we do not have. Guthrie is so helpful in making clear the remoteness of the pagan pantheons from the life of the people. They were above; their devotees are on earth. The gods play with those below for whom they do not care and in whom they have no stake. Much popular religion, and some of the heterodoxies of the Christian Church, have been similarly spiritual. It might be pushing it, but doesn't Calvinism partake of this remoteness of God from human life?

The significance of Guthrie's book is the significance of liturgy for life.

Liturgy is the assembly of people to be the people of God in order to make him known (mission) and to do his will in the world (ministry). It is liturgy that separates Christians from mere revolutionaries, though they can be revolutionaries; from liberal or progressive politics, though they can be active in both. Those who would change this world through the manipulation of power are simply reliving the past and are condemned to failure to produce a better world. Theology as thanksgiving, liturgy as thanksgiving, suggests a far more profound way of letting change happen in our world, by letting the Lord of all creation be known in it so that the world itself can respond to him.

My only disappointment with this book, and I am not sure whether or not I am being fair, is that it does not deal at length with *anamnesis*. I would like to know more of the origins of this understanding in relation to *todah* and *berakoth*.

I think this book would be an excellent one to use as a basis for a course in the Bible. Use it for the text and *The Bible for Today's Church* from the Church's Teaching Series, as a reference.

(The Rev.) Peter C. Moore
Church of St. Michael & All Angels
Albuquerque, N.M.



The Liturgy Explained. Thomas Howard.
Wilton, CT. Morehouse-Barlow Co., Inc.
1981. 48 pp. paper. \$2.75.

Much in this booklet is good; little, if anything is bad; but it has some weaknesses which keep it from being as useful as it might be.

Its primary fault is that it is too much a commentary on the particular way the liturgy is done in one parish. A way of celebrating, I add, which I like. Nevertheless, at a number of points the writer's parish customary sounds as though it is the only way of doing something, rather than one of the ways. A few of those ways are unlikely to find favor with many liturgists or with members of the Standing Liturgical Commission: in particular, singing the "doxology" at the conclusion of the Offertory, or assuming that there is to be a "collection" of alms at the time the Table is being prepared, or that it is the celebrant who prepares the Table with no mention of a deacon. And there are other, more minor points which ought to be acknowledged as *one* parish's way of doing things.

While that which I find good will not be to everyone's liking, it is well done; namely, the theology of the liturgy and the sacraments. Dr. Howard is a devout Christian and an effective writer of that theological point of view popularized by C.S. Lewis and including Charles Williams and J.R.R. Tolkien. As a fan of much of that thought, I found it congenial. The writer's explanation of sacraments in terms of mystery is very good and wonderfully succinct. He does a very good job of explaining why liturgy, sacraments, ritual, and ceremonial are necessary parts of the worship of God.

As an example of what one parish has done to aid its people in understanding the liturgy, the booklet is superb. It is also admirable in demonstrating that there are lay people who can teach very effectively about the Mysteries of the Faith. Parishes with an Anglo-Catholic tradition may find it very helpful in demonstrating that Rite Two fits easily into their tradition.

Well-written, certain to be helpful in many places, a little too parochial for others, it reveals one literary scholar who appreciates the new liturgy.

(The Rev.) Michael W. Merriman
Church of the Good Shepherd
Granbury, Texas