



JUNE 1988

the **associated parishes**
for liturgy and mission

3606 Mt. Vernon Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22305 (703) 548-6611

The Sanctification of Time: What Does It Mean?

by Louis Weil

This is the keynote address given at the annual meeting of the Association of Diocesan Liturgy and Music Commissions in Houston, Texas last November. It is reprinted here by permission of the author.

Father Weil was for many years professor of liturgics and church music at Nashotah House. He has left to take the same post at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, in Berkeley, California.

On Maundy Thursday of the coming year, I shall celebrate the thirty-fifth anniversary of my confirmation in the Episcopal Church. Like many of you, I suspect, my entrance into what was to become my spiritual home was accompanied by an enormous enthusiasm as I discovered one dimension after another of the "goodly heritage" into which I had been grafted. It was as though I wanted to swallow the whole in one great gulp, to take on not only the faith but also the machinery of the tradition as well.

In recent years, I find that at quiet moments I often reflect upon the ways in which my understanding of the faith and the particularities of our tradition has shifted during this third of a century. There are many continuities in structural matters, what I now see to be the basic essentials. But my perception of

how those structural matters are to be lived in their authenticity has changed almost dazzlingly. One such matter is the Divine Office, and what its role is in the life of prayer. I learned of something called a "rule of life," and through the guidance of a good friend I was brought into contact with a priest who was well known as a spiritual director. Let me say at the outset that I am the beneficiary of much that I received from him in relation to priorities which have continued to be significant for me throughout all these years. But somehow, in regard to the meaning of the Divine Office, I missed the target. I do not remember whether the problem was the way the priest presented Daily Morning and Evening Prayer to me as a part of my rule of life, or whether it was my immaturity in assimilating what he tried to form in me (for he loved the Office very much) — or whether it was simply that



(Weil - cont.)

Law comes before Grace — but my approach to the Daily Office became rigidly legalistic.

I kept a very careful record each day of all the parts of my rule which I was to perform, including Morning and Evening Prayer, and felt it a very grave matter indeed if I did not fulfill the rule. That attitude might have gone on much longer than it did if it were not for an experience which happened to me about four years later. I seem to learn from the ludicrous, and what happened was ludicrous indeed. I had finished college at S.M.U., and begun study at Harvard for a graduate degree in musicology. Along with that, I had been obliged to start doing serious academic work. My days were very full, but I stuck with my rule of daily Morning and Evening Prayer. But one day was so filled with work that I found it was 8:00 p.m., and I had not kept my obligation. I reached for my Prayer Book/Bible combination and rushed through Morning Prayer. As soon as I finished, I did the same with Evening Prayer. At 8:30 p.m. I closed the book, and the moment of illumination came: I distinctly remember saying to myself, "What have I just done?" No matter how I tried to rationalize it, and no matter which forms I had used, at 8:00 in the evening, the only prayer possible is *Evening Prayer!*

I have carried that moment of insight with me ever since, convinced that whatever meanings we may attempt to impose upon liturgical rites, surely a kind of basic realism must shape those meanings, or else we seriously stray from the meanings which are integral to those rites into strange worlds of liturgical fantasy or narrow realism. Just two years later, during my first year in seminary, a classmate took me off to a parish which celebrated the Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday morning, and I can remember still the confirming reaction within me when, with sun streaming through the stained glass windows, the Deacon sang "This is the night." Whatever it was, it was not that.

It is this kind of practical liturgical realism that I am taking as a basis for my discussion of our subject: "The Sanctification of Time: What is It?" The phrase itself, of course, evokes the memory of the

well-known eleventh chapter of *The Shape of the Liturgy* by Gregory Dix. In that chapter, Dix proposed an interpretation of the phrase which has had considerable influence. For a variety of reasons, Dix's writings on this point and others, have *not* been a major influence on my approach to liturgical questions. What I have most admired in Dix has been his extraordinary gift for writing the English language. The major influences upon me, however, have been scrupulous historians of the liturgy, and certainly Dix cannot be numbered among them. Unlike Tom Talley, I never even had an opportunity to hear Dix lecture since his death occurred the year before I entered the Episcopal Church. So Dix has simply not been a major influence for me. In fact, a couple of years ago a review of my book on the Oxford Movement was published in England in which the reviewer expressed his delight at reading a liturgical study which did not mention the name of Gregory Dix.

Dix's basic point can be summarized very briefly. He draws a distinction between the Divine Office and the eucharist as types of prayer. The Office he sees as a "liturgy of time." It is the form of prayer in which the sanctification of time takes place. The eucharist by contrast is an eschatological type of prayer, a liturgy out of time. This is, frankly, a theory which never convinced me. Out of respect for Dix, I left it on a back burner, hoping that in due course I would come to understand Dix's point. My intuition, however, based upon my experience of these two forms of prayer never led me in that direction, and so I simply left the matter alone.

I left it alone, that is, until I came up against a situation during my early years at Nashotah House, and like my experience of Morning and Evening Prayer said back-to-back, the situation became an occasion for illumination on this subject.

Nashotah House has a long-standing commitment to the daily celebration of Morning and Evening Prayer and the eucharist. When I first began teaching there in 1971, Morning Prayer and the eucharist were celebrated in tandem each morning. As soon as the Grace was said at the end of Morning Prayer, the assigned clergy and assistants

(Weil - cont.)

went out to the sacristy to vest for the eucharist. I felt vaguely uneasy with this pattern — bringing one liturgical rite to an end and then immediately beginning the entrance rite of another as though we were starting fresh. For a while I tried having a ten-minute period of quiet between the two rites, but that did not seem satisfactory either. Finally, I suggested that we join the two rites according to the Prayer Book rubrics so that the morning liturgy would be prayed as a single whole. The faculty approved the proposal, but when I announced it to the student body, one student responded with enormous distress that such a model did not respect the difference between the two different types of liturgical prayer. It would have been easy to ignore the student's point of view because my intuition told me it was absurd, but I decided to engage him in discussion, to acknowledge his view (which had originated in his rector's acceptance of Dix's theory) and to try to work through the issue with him.

Unfortunately my attempt did not work: the Dixian view was so firmly entrenched that it had become a kind of filter imposed upon the question so that even a different experience in worship could not open up a further horizon, but only confirmed the abrasive impact of the united model upon his piety. What it came down to was that for him a break between the two rites was essential — even a three-minute break for vesting — in order that the different relations of Office and eucharist to time would not be violated. I found this very hard to relate to in any serious way simply because my experience indicated that the distinction was false. In addition to that, and as a test of my own experience, I felt that the fact that the Prayer Book offered rubrical authorization for joining the two rites had to be taken seriously as amounting to more than a rubrical excuse for laxity, a defection from a great tradition. What I saw and continue to see beneath the rubrical directions (BCP, p. 142) is an important insight into the nature of liturgical assembly: at the most common-sense level, an assembly undertakes a common action, participates in that action, and then brings it to a close. To have a mid-way conclusion followed by a new beginning robs a corporate ritual of this internal logic and

leaves us with mere ritual drill.

If the latter view is in force, that is, if the dominant concept is the integral repetition of an authorized text, it would seem that the texts are not there as a servant to our common prayer but rather as a canonically required model to which we are obliged to adjust. The *sense* of a text ceases to have any real importance, but only getting it said, meeting the obligation. This attitude is reflected, of course, in my experience saying Morning Prayer in the evening, or in hearing a deacon sing "This is the night" when it is broad daylight.

Yet my most memorable anecdote of this phenomenon comes from a semester I taught as a visiting professor on the Dominican faculty of Aquinas Institute, then at Dubuque. (This was just before I began teaching at Nashotah, so it is now a long time ago.) I took part in the daily cycle of offices and eucharist with the Dominicans for four months, and it was very well-planned common prayer. But one day in conversation, a member of the community told me that they had only recently changed from a very different pattern for their daily prayer. The former pattern had begun the day with Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, said in a quick sequence before Mass in the morning. (That is, the hours of prayer associated with 7 and 9 a.m., 12 noon, and 3 p.m.) After morning classes, Vespers was said at noon just before lunch. After lunch the community returned to the chapel to say Compline. Then, in late afternoon, Vigils was said before dinner, and after dinner, Lauds was the final prayer of the day. The individual offices were anticipated to such an extent that, on the whole, their traditional association with the times of day and night were reversed. As I suggested, in such a model the clear sense of the texts had ceased to matter. After my Dominican friend had described this now-abandoned routine to me, I commented that at least Compline was being said at the right time — as the community went to bed for the post-lunch siesta.

Although this is an extreme example, this basic failure to understand the common-sense imperatives of liturgical symbols is a part of a yet more fundamental defection



(Weil - cont.)

from the authentic nature of the Church's prayer, and that is quite precisely its nature as the *Church's* prayer. This defec-tion, of course, goes hand-in-hand with the gradual clericalization of the Church's prayer: the loss of Morning and Evening Prayer as the common daily prayer of the people at the close of the patristic age, and the complementary clerical domination of the eucharist as it came to be seen more and more as the private domain of the or-dained clergy.

I am intrigued by a certain historical phenomenon in this regard. Like all the shifts in the history of the liturgy, it was a somewhat erratic development, but I find it significant that the golden age of the popular Daily Offices of Morning and Evening Prayer (what is commonly called the "cathedral type") saw also a primary emphasis upon the Sunday eucharist as a fundamental characteristic of the Chris-tian assembly on the Lord's Day. (I am aware of the practice of daily communion at home on weekdays from an early period, and of the gradual emergence of weekday cele-brations, but my concern here is with the broad common lines of the community's worship — in other words, what was the normative model.) An emerging clericalist domination of the liturgy did not permit this model to hold. The Divine Office was gradually privatized as the obligation of the clergy and religious, and the increas-ing frequency of celebrations of the eucha-rist even as the customary weekday focus for lay piety was nevertheless character-ized by an increasing clerical domination of the eucharistic celebration itself. My point in speaking about this shift is to note that at no time in the Church's his-tory do we have an assembly of the people for both Daily Offices and daily eucharist. Although there are witnesses to occasions when Office and eucharist occur on the same day (I would especially note the Sun-day morning eucharist and evening Vespers in the Church at Jerusalem in the fourth century), there is no sign that these were seen as contrasting experiences of the nature of liturgical time, but rather two occasions (whether for Office or eucharist) which were seen to be of importance for the assembly of the local Church for common prayer. For the ordinary Churchgoer (Aidan Kavanagh's famous Mrs. Murphy), it is quite

simply a question of assembly — not of prayer *in* time or *out* of time.

Thus, at either end of this evolution from ecclesial to clerical models of litur-gy, I see no evidence which supports Dix's distinction between the Divine Office as a sanctification of time and the eucharist as an eschatological form of prayer. In fact, I see this as a theory which Dix attempted to impose upon the historical evidence by resorting to sweeping generali-zations which cannot stand. The Dixian distinction is a false issue. The real issue is the progressive loss of a sense of the relation of liturgical acts — whether Of-fice or eucharist — to their ecclesial identity as corporate actions of the whole body of the baptized.

It is interesting to note that Dix himself acknowledges the radical significance of the emerging clericalism which obscured the ecclesial basis of the liturgy. In the same eleventh chapter of *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dix speaks of "the increased share in the conduct of public worship which [fell] to the clergy (p. 318) during the fourth century, and the consequent effect of altering "the relative positions of the clergy and laity in what was meant to be a corporate action" (p.319)... "The cor-porate action of the church disappeared, and what was left was a rite conducted chiefly by the prayers of the clergy, in which the people still made responses but had otherwise little part...the increase in the number of prayers (said by the clergy)" had "the undesigned effect of making these the outstanding thing in the rite, and so preparing the way for the change in its character, from a corporate action of the whole church to a service said by the clergy to which the laity listened" (p. 319).

If it is in any way appropriate to speak of Christian liturgy — whether Office or eucharist — as "the sanctification of time," it is, I believe, in regard to the early and normative understanding of that liturgy as the common faith-actions of the Chris-tian assembly. At the heart of these actions there is our common memory, the events in which we see redemption made manifest, the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ. In our liturgies — whether Office or eucharist — it is that history of redemption which is

(Weil - cont.)

proclaimed in the midst of the assembly of Christians to renew and deepen our memory of the reality into which we have been baptized. And it is in the midst of time and space that these assemblies take place, and through which we may speak of both time and space being sanctified. Yet at the same time, our liturgies are always eschatological, for it is the Risen Lord, the One in whom all things will be consummated, who stands among us when we assemble in his name. Our rites always point beyond time and space to the promised fulfillment — they are "here and now," yet also "not yet."

I am a very intuitive person. I very often arrive at a conviction through intuition long before I can give a supportive exposition for it. My experience of liturgical prayer has shaped my intuitive conviction that Gregory Dix was wrong in his distinction between Office and eucharist. But there appeared several months ago a book which offers formidable support for my conviction. That book is Robert Taft's *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West*, published in 1986. Robert Taft is unrivaled in his knowledge of the history and theology of the Divine Office. So it was no small encouragement to me to read Taft's view of Dix's distinction, based upon a massive survey of the materials, that there is "no warrant for any of this in the sources" (p. 334). Taft offers us another interpretation: "Remembrance," he writes, "anamnesis, is...at the heart of all ritual celebration, for celebrations are celebrations of something: through symbol and gesture and text we render present — proclaim — once again the reality we feast. In the early liturgical tradition this reality is one unique event, the paschal mystery in its totality, the mystery of Christ and of our salvation in him. This is the meaning of baptism; it is the meaning of Eucharist; it is the

meaning of the Office as well. The anamnesis of the Christ-event is the well-spring of all Christian prayer." (p. 358).

To remember is one of the most mysterious and yet one of the most essential aspects of our human nature. In our memories we find our identity and also penetrate the events of our daily lives to the core of their meaning. And so it is that at the heart of our Christian identity there is memory, memory of the wonderful acts of God which have continued throughout generation after generation.

Many years ago — it was in the late sixties, I believe — I spent two weeks in Cambridge, England, on a research project. While I was there, I made the short trip to visit Ely Cathedral, which was celebrating its 900th anniversary year. It was a very quiet afternoon. There were no other tourists around, so I had the cathedral to myself. I wandered around slowly, savoring that marvelous building. As I walked through the ambulatory around the choir, I noticed that what looked like a new marble inlay was shining brightly from the midst of the choir, and I walked over to see what it said. I shall never forget that moment as long as I live. The newly-laid tablet said: "Christians have worshipped on this spot for over 1300 years." My mind and heart were suddenly flooded: images of generation after generation, of their baptisms, their marriages, their ordinations, their burials — and week after week their assemblies for Office and eucharist. That place, and every place of Christian assembly, is sanctified by what the people of God have done there. So also time is sanctified as we gather to remember the acts of redemption, and remembering them, to be transformed.

+++

CULTURAL COLONIALISM or, Better Brit and Dead

by Mason Martens

Mason Martens, music historian, composer and publisher, is responsible for a great deal of the service music in *The Hymnal 1982*, and for eighteen years has published music for the Episcopal Church under the imprint *Music for Liturgy*. He has recently been commissioned to compose a fanfare for the opening Eucharist of General Convention at Detroit. A catalog of his publications may be obtained from him at 175 W. 72nd St., New York, NY 10023.

The principal Eucharist of the 200th anniversary General Convention of the Episcopal Church took place in the Arena of the Anaheim Convention Center at 10:00 a.m., Sunday, September 8, 1985. The Celebrant was the Rt. Rev. John M. Allin, the outgoing Presiding Bishop of the Church, and the preacher was the Most Rev. Robert Runcie, the 102nd Archbishop of Canterbury.

But it is not to tell you of the details of the service that I write. Rather, these comments will concern my reactions to the source of the music used in this service. Fourteen sung items were used in the service, of which eight were metrical hymns, (two in arrangements as "hymn anthems"), six were settings of prose texts forming part of the basic liturgy. Of these fourteen pieces, two were adaptations of traditional plain-song, the Psalm sung after the Old Testament, and the Alleluia with verses, sung before and after the Gospel.

It is with the remaining dozen pieces that we will deal. The four that are not metrical hymns are settings of the *Gloria in excelsis* and *Sanctus*, a Fraction Anthem "Be known to us, Lord Jesus", and an anthem sung during communion "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men". In the discussion which follows, be aware that I

am unaware of the nationality of two or three of the composers of hymn tunes and settings, but I am assuming that Peter Cutts is English, and Jane Marshall and Percy E.B. Collier are or were American. Even if I turn out to be wrong on one or more of these, it won't change what follows very much.

Six of the eight hymn tunes appear to be the work of English or Welsh composers; three of the four pieces of service music are the works of English composers. The one exception, by the present writer, is the fraction anthem, and of this, only the refrain is original. It's in plainsong style, and the verses to it are Benedictine Plainsong, so this piece can barely be counted on as original work by an American composer.

When we turn to the vivific status of the composers involved, we find just the same figures. Of the composers of hymn tunes and hymn anthems, six are dead and two alive, to the best of my knowledge (again, I am not sure about Percy Collier and Jane Marshall, but I believe the former to be dead and the latter alive, along with Peter Cutts), and of the service music and anthems, three of them are by two dead English composers (two by Healy Willan and an



(Martens - cont.)

anthem by William Harris). So once again the total statistic is nine to three: nine pieces are by dead composers, and three by those still living. There are only ten, not twelve, composers involved, because there are not only two pieces by Willan, but two hymn tunes by C. Hubert H. Parry.

Still, the basic figures stand: nine of the twelve pieces are by English or Welsh composers, and nine of the twelve by dead rather than living composers. Therefore, the motto which I have taken for my subtitle "Better Brit and Dead", a succinct way of expressing the fact that it is easier for a dead British composer to find his way onto the "service list" of music for this important service in the life of the Episcopal Church than it is for a living American composer. Three times as easy, in fact. To repeat: 75% of the music used in this service, which celebrated the 200th anniversary of the meeting of the first General Convention of the Episcopal Church, held in Christ Church, Philadelphia in September, 1785, was music by British composers.

No one surpasses me in love for the musical products of the British Isles: for three decades my greatest areas of research in church music since the 16th century have been Italy and England. I have edited and published much music by British composers. I am especially fond of the music of Parry, whose stirring tune of 1917 for Blake's "Jerusalem" was one of the musical high points of the service, at least to me.

But is it right that on this occasion, two hundred and two years after the close of the American Revolution, that so much of the music we used to worship with should "come from overseas"? Have we so far failed to develop music of our own which speaks to our own needs, hopes and aspirations? Have we failed to develop a music which speaks with an authentic American voice, and not only an authentic American voice, but more especially an authentic American voice of the late twentieth century? Are there no musical voices of worth in the Episcopal Church, or, casting the net more widely, as is appropriate in this ecumenical age, are there no musical voices in this country that are worth hearing, not only of the 1980's, but of the 1960's and 1970's?

In 1979 the Episcopal Church adopted a new Book of Common Prayer, very rich in texts to be sung, and rubrics which referred to untold other texts to be sung. Has that work, which began in the very late 1960's, and still goes on today, not created any ferment which in turn has cast off musical works suitable for use in worship, which speak to our age? If all we are doing is reutilizing the recent past (and not our own recent musical past at that), then it suggests that the Episcopal Church is lifeless, moribund in this area.

Music of the past is a wonderful thing. The concept of a "historical repertory", of works more than twenty years old which are still performed, first appeared in Western art music in the early 19th century. It is now firmly ensconced in our music-consuming life, especially due to the wonders of modern recording techniques. And it's certainly true that the traditional church bodies of both East and West have been very "conservative" of some music of their past, in the sense of keeping some of it alive and in use. However, the tradition of Western Christianity, at least since the ninth century, has been to foster new music for use in the liturgy, as well as the loving preservation and reuse of music from past ages.

And, keeping with my personal tradition of directness and openness, it's no secret that for thirty years my musical career has dealt primarily with music of the past, as a scholar specializing in the history of Western Church music, and in preparing editions of it. But this was not the first choice of my musical life. I started as a keyboard player, and while I still play, I won't take the world by storm in that area. My other major ambition was to be a composer, but that also failed to work itself out in the normal way, though compositorial instincts have been mighty important in many aspects of my work in musical editing. Some obvious examples are continuo realizations in editions of Baroque music, and the vast amount of work I have done in the field of English plainsong adaptation.

A principle which I believe composers realize most clearly, is that when the creative aspects of our musical life die down, then all aspects of our musical life

(Martens - cont.)

tend to become routine, to stagnate. A vibrant, living musical life requires a constant flood of new impressions being struck off, of which admittedly only a few will join the ranks of "masterworks".

There is a third and last test which can be run on these twelve pieces of music. We have already examined the nationality of the composers, and whether they still walk this earth. The last test is a more precise look at when the pieces were written. Again, I am lacking the exact dates of composition of some of the pieces (four, at most), but I have a fairly good idea of when those were written.

First, a seemingly positive point. All of the music (again, with the exception of the plainsong pieces, which are not included in my count) was written in the 20th century. However, once again it's nine to three; nine of the pieces were written in just about a third of the century, in the 35 year span from 1905 to 1941. According to my information and educated guesses, three of the hymn tunes date from 1905-1917 (and none of the service music); three of the hymn tunes come to us from the years 1918-1941, as well as three of the four pieces of service music, and the remaining two hymn tunes and one piece of service music (my little part-plainsong Fraction Anthem) date from the period 1942-1985.

Note that these 43 years are just half of this century to date — 86 years. Is there a message we can read in this? I think there is. A catchy way of expressing it might be to say that "too many people have been watching too much Masterpiece Theater" (or is it "Theatre"?). It certainly seems to me that the choice of music unmistakably shows a yearning for a world of the past, now dead and gone, which many of us didn't even know. I find it quite strange that one of the hymn tunes used was written the year before I was born, another a year before that, and the setting of the Gloria and Sanctus five years before I saw the light, and the year before my parents met.

There seems to be a terrible nostalgia here for the years before the Great War, as well as for the years between that war and the Second World War. Is it totally coincidental that these two periods are

among the most popular in recent years on Anglo-American television programs, which have had numerous reflections in men's fashion and other design fields? I don't think so. It's so easy to wallow in the warm soup of synthetic pictorial memories of a past we never experienced, or experienced only very slightly. For me, these are the ages of my grandparents and my parents — I was only twelve when the Second World War ended, though I had been composing for three years!

The music of a people tells us what that people is. It reflects, as I said, their hopes and aspirations. But it does other more personal things. It sets style, it has style, it describes the style or manner of a people. It, along with other artistic and cultural productions, expresses what a people is, what they consider valuable, and gives us some sense, in an often non-verbal way, of where that people wants to go and perhaps even how they plan to travel.

Did the use of so much music from these past parts of this century, coming mostly from a culture other than our own, express those things for us, as Americans, in 1985? I don't think it did.

First, the aspect of cultural colonialism, or of importing "cultural Englishness" along with the planting of Anglicanism in far-flung lands (of which the United States is the first major example) was expressly mentioned by Archbishop Runcie in his sermon at that service. He specifically mentioned the fact that many 19th century missionaries took quite the wrong tack in this area, especially in Asia and Africa.

The situation with the British settlements planted in North America in the 17th and 18th centuries was of course somewhat different. There were a substantial number of English settlers in many of the colonies for some time, and very little attention was paid to the culture of the indigenous people that they found there. Yet many circumstances conspired to make the Anglican experience in North America different from that in the "mother country", even though many in the colonial population may not have been aware of how different their brand of Anglicanism was becoming.

A few of the obvious ways in which this

(Martens - cont.)

manifested itself are: absence of bishops, and therefore of confirmation; the use of the Tate and Brady (New Version) metrical Psalter after it was published in 1698, rather than the "Old Version" of Sternhold and Hopkins. Another obvious musical difference was the absence of choirs, and (in most cases) organs as well, especially the endowed choirs of the English choral foundations, in the cathedrals and chapels.

One of the major events in the history of the Episcopal Church which I believe symbolizes the cultural *and* ecclesiastical separation of the American Church from its English mother was the consecration of Samuel Seabury in 1794 by Scottish non-juring bishops, and the concordat he entered into with them regarding the eucharistic prayer.

This action, while partly symbolic in its importance, was also very practical in its effects, in that it headed the American Anglican Church in a decidedly different way from the English, not only in its eucharistic theology, which has often been remarked upon, but also in the way of independence of England — here an independence not of political system, but of culture, of manner, of style. And there is no need to belabor the obvious point that this cultural divergence from England was vastly reinforced by the many migrations of peoples into this country in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Contrary to what many people have believed, Anglican church music in this country is not a total wasteland. Although the earliest collections of such music published in this country, before the Revolution, were reprints of music from England, shortly after the war's end publications started to appear containing music written by American Anglicans, especially in Connecticut.

This American musical industry continued through much of the 19th century, and though there was obviously some interest in church music in England, especially after the 1840's, and the first stirrings of the Oxford Movement in this country, it is nonetheless true that there was a lot of music written for the Episcopal Church in that period. It embraced all aspects of such music: hymn tunes, chants, anthems, and "service music".

It was not until near the end of the 19th century that the taste for English church music started to appear strongly in this country. The importation of Edward Hodges in 1838 to be organist of New York's Trinity Church, from Bristol Cathedral, was a fairly singular event, even though other church musicians and composers, like George F. LeJeune, at St. Paul's Chapel of Trinity Parish, New York, came from England and settled here, as immigrants, as it were.

The importation of English church music, as well as English church musicians, of whom the most prominent was T. Tertius Noble, brought from Ely Cathedral to St. Thomas', New York in 1912, seems to have some parallel to the shipping off to England of New York society fillies to find husbands among the English milords.

Increasingly there seems to have been fostered two closely related ideas, especially, in regard to the music in the larger Anglican churches of this country. The first is that the English cathedral/college chapel is the greatest and best model for church music, in both repertory and style of performance. The second, which flows effortlessly from it, is that English organists and choir-masters, being trained in this tradition, are naturally the greatest exponents of valid, authentic Anglican church music.

As must be clear by now, I do not agree with this view. In fact, I think it in many ways downright wrong. Not only are our circumstances different, in terms of our musical forces, financial resources, and needs, but our spiritual and cultural aspirations and needs are quite different also. We, as Americans, have our own authentic musical voice, and we have had it in varying degrees for some two hundred years.

Recent years have seen the foundation of the Sonneck Society, named for the first head of the Music Division of the Library of Congress, Oscar Sonneck, who was the first important scholar in the field of American musical studies at the beginning of this century. This has both reflected the considerable growth in the study of American musical traditions in recent decades, but it is now helping to foster it, with its annual meetings, newsletter and handsome quarterly, *American Music*, pub-

(Martens - cont.)

lished jointly with the University of Illinois Press.

But concern with the past of American music, though very valuable as a source of inspiration, and serving in a certain sense as "validation" for those composers and editors who wish to move boldly in the direction of a "more American" music, is not the most important thing.

The crucial matter is to give our composers the go-ahead to write the music we need for our services. To do this well, they must be carefully instructed in the Church's needs, and given workshop situations, in which their music can be tested. To do this and remain happy, a way must be found to pay them for their work in a way that is consonant not only with the quality and quantity of the work they do, but also to

enable them to live freely and pleasantly in our society, and not constantly cramped by financial worries, which is so often the case.

Still more needs to be done, too long to enter into here. But attention needs to be paid to the way the Episcopal Church makes provision for its musical needs, especially regarding "official" matters, such as committees and commissions dealing with music and liturgy at diocesan and national levels. Those active on such bodies, those who plan conferences and those who prepare lists of music, guidelines for its use, and who prepare compilations of music for use in our churches, must be made sensitive to the fact that this country is a cultural entity of its own, and not a colony of England in artistic matters.

+++

WHO THOUGHT UP THE VESTED CHOIR?

Anonymous

(Editor's note: This appeared in our files some time ago, provenance unknown.)

In about the eighteen fifties, a remarkable phenomenon known as the "Gothic Revival" took place, and suddenly people began to build Gothic churches again, even though the last one had been built some five hundred years before. One of the features of the Gothic church was the Choir, where the chapter of monks sat well away from the peasantry and near the altar. In many Gothic churches these choir stalls were completely obscured from the congregation by the Rood Screen, which in some places was a thick wall with peepholes.

When all this was revived, the revivers found that the nineteenth century church had nothing to put in the choir. The music was usually supplied from a balcony and was just enough to support congregational singing. The clergy began to worry about the empty seats staring at them. Then, at some point, someone suggested dressing up the village choir as though they were monks

(everyone loved Sir Walter Scott in those days) and placing them in the stalls. When this was first done in the U.S.A., at the Little Church Around the Corner, a riot ensued, but all this was soon forgotten as the procession of male and female monks spread across the land, and the congregations stopped singing.

An architectural fad ravaged the Church and made the choir into a dominating entity in worship. Instead of the choir supporting the congregation's participation in the service, now the word went out that the congregation should be quiet and listen to the choir. Instead of simple settings of the congregation's music, wild and wonderful settings were written by choir composers dedicated to keeping the congregation out of the music. Therefore now in many places worship is a "spectator sport", and huge sums are spent to maintain the vested choir...an architectural fad.

+++



The Church Divinity School of the Pacific

A Seminary of the Episcopal Church

2451 RIDGE ROAD, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94709-1211 · [415] 848-3282

GEOFFREY CUMING, 1917-1988 **May Light Perpetual Shine Upon Him**

The Rev. Dr. Geoffrey Cuming, D.D. of Oxford, died last night in Houston, Texas, a month after successful arterial bypass surgery. He was making preparations to return to England and had talked with his daughter about his excitement in returning home only hours before his death. Miss Rachel Cuming, his daughter who visited him at CDSP several times, can be written to at her home, 113 Goodwood Road, Leicester, LE5 6TQ, England, U.K. A memorial service will be held in Houston and also in Oxford upon return of his ashes there for interment.

Geoffrey, as he was affectionately known here, taught liturgics for us and the GTU in three continuous Spring semesters, 1982-84. Born in 1917 in Gilston, Hertfordshire, England, he was a student at Eton College, and then Oriel College, Oxford. He held three Oxford degrees, including the D.D. awarded in 1962. During World War II, he was in the British Non-Combatant Corps. Four years as an Anglican Curate preceded his appointment as Vice-principal of St. John's College, Durham. He then served as vicar in Billesdon and then Humberstone. He later was appointed to the faculty of Ripon College, Cuddeston.

His writing was in the fields of music history, church history, and liturgics. Among eleven major titles were three texts he used with students here: A History of Anglican Liturgy, 1969, revised and enlarged 1980; Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed (edited with Ronald C. Jasper) 1975, revised and enlarged 1979; and Hippolytus: A Text for Students, 1976.

He is survived by Ann Rachel Lucas Cuming and two children, Mark Alexander and Rachel Mary.

March 25, 1988

W. S. Pregnall

The Early Monastic Office

by Howard E. Galley, Jr.

The three brief descriptions of the early "cathedral office," in the article "The Daily Office in the Parish Church" (*OPEN*, March 1988), were also presented in April of this year at the Church of St. Luke in the Fields, New York City, as part of a series of sessions on daily prayer intended primarily for the adults who had been presented for baptism, confirmation, reception, or the renewal of vows at the Easter Vigil.

Because one of the purposes of the session was to demonstrate that our present form of Evening Prayer includes monastic as well as "cathedral" elements, the following description of early monastic practice and concluding remarks were written for the occasion.

The Monastic Office

What we have been looking at up until now is what scholars call the "cathedral office," not only because it was originally developed for cathedrals (and later used in parish churches as well), but also to distinguish it clearly from another form of office, to which we must now turn our attention. Let us return to the fourth century.

The sheer material success of Christianity in that century, the magnificent churches built in the time of Constantine and his successors, the almost overwhelming social acceptance of what had shortly before been a despised and persecuted religion, and, above all, the lavish patronage of the Church by the Roman imperial government, struck many people as wrong.

Was this what it was all about? The gospel spoke of treasures in heaven, of sharing the suffering of Christ, of repentance and

simplicity of life; not worldly success. And so, suddenly, a movement was born, a protest movement, if you will — a movement known to history as the monastic movement. It began, and long continued as, a lay movement. The bishops, as someone has said, were not consulted.

And the momentum it gained did not slack. Year after year saw thousands of men and women, most of them young, many of them extremely bright, turn their backs on the society of the day to seek refuge in remote places as hermits, monks, and nuns. What they wanted was a life of prayer, and nothing more.

The surprising thing is that, though they were not happy with much of what was happening in the Church, they did not separate themselves from it. Sacramental communion with their sisters and brothers living "in the world" they considered essential.

Where the communities they founded were located near towns, the members attended the Sunday Eucharist in the local church. Where the communities were located far from a church, other arrangements were made.

The most common of these was to invite a sympathetic priest to visit the community several times a year. On these occasions, the priest would not only celebrate the Eucharist and give communion, but would consecrate enough Bread so that the abbot or abbess could give communion to the members of the community on the Sundays and holy days that occurred between visits.

But a community of lay people only, located far from a church, could scarcely celebrate a form of Morning and Evening Prayer designed to be led by bishops, priests, and deacons. And thus it came about that the "pure" monastic type of office was born —

designed by monastics for monastics. Its core is the systematic recitation of all 150 psalms in biblical order. Let's look at one of the oldest forms of it.

In this particular scheme, the morning and evening services have exactly the same pattern: 11 psalms "in course" and a final psalm taken from those that in the Greek Bible begin with Alleluia.

It is the middle of the fourth century. Our setting is a *laura*, a monastic community of women in the Egyptian desert. The *laura* consists of forty-odd detached cells — small separate crude buildings actually — each just large enough for one or two sisters, or a sister and a guest. There is also a larger building that serves as both common room and dining room, and a chapel.

It is about four o'clock in the afternoon, and the sisters have just finished their evening meal, the only meal of the day. On a signal the sisters rise, and the abbess leads them in grace after supper.

Some fifteen minutes later, all are assembled in the oratory (as the chapel is called). Since the use of lamps, when not absolutely needed, would constitute an indulgence, the evening service must be performed while it is still light.

In the oratory, the sisters sit on the floor, arranged in a semi-circle, so that they can see both the chancel and the ambo (or lectern) that stands in the center of the church. Since it is customary for the sisters to pray while working, so is it customary for them to work while praying. They weave mats and baskets from rushes, which is how they support themselves. On a signal by the abbess, given by a small wooden clapper, the evening office begins.

One of the sisters rises and goes to the lectern. Since the eleventh psalm that morning had been Psalm 56, she begins Psalm 57, singing it as a solo, and from memory:

*Be merciful to me, O God, be merciful,
for I have taken refuge in you: *
in the shadow of your wings will I
take refuge
until this time of trouble has gone by.*

*I will call upon the Most High God, *
the God who maintains my cause....*

At the end of the psalm, she gives a signal. All stand, make the sign of the cross on their foreheads in memory of their baptism, and say the Lord's Prayer silently, standing with arms extended. She then gives a second signal. All make the sign of the cross a second time, prostrate themselves on the floor briefly in acknowledgment of their sins, rise, make the sign of the cross a third time, and stand with arms extended in silent prayer. Finally, she gives a third signal, and all the others sit.

She then begins the chanting of Psalm 58, "Do you indeed decree righteousness, you rulers? do you judge the peoples with equity?" After the psalm all again stand for signs of the cross and silent prayer with prostration.

Psalm 59, however, is somewhat longer, so she divides it into two, making it, in effect, two psalms.

At the end of the sixth psalm, with its prayer and prostration, she returns to her place, and a second sister goes to the ambo to lead the remaining psalmody.

The twelfth psalm, however, is not taken in course. It is an alleluistic psalm, in this case Psalm 111.

"Alleluia," she intones, and all repeat the Alleluia. She then sings the psalm, and after each verse the sisters repeat the Alleluia:

*I will give thanks to the Lord with my
whole heart, **

*in the assembly of the upright, in
the congregation.*

R. Alleluia.

*Great are the deeds of the Lord! *
they are studied by all who delight
in them.*

R. Alleluia.

At the end (unlike the preceding psalms):

*Glory to the Father, and to the Son,
and to the Holy Spirit: *
both now, and always, and to ages
of ages.*

R. Alleluia.

A third sister now goes to the lectern to read the two Scripture lessons. Had it been Sunday, or Easter season, both lessons

(Galley - cont.)

would have been taken from the New Testament. But this is an ordinary weekday, so the first lesson is from the Old Testament, and the second from the New.

At the end of the second lesson, the abess rises, and goes to a place near the lectern. One by one the sisters approach to exchange with her, and then with the others present, the kiss of peace.

Such was monastic Vespers in the fourth century.

Note, if you will, the contrasts. It is not just a case of no candles or ecclesiastical pomp and circumstance. There is no elaborate music, no hymns or canticles, no public prayer for others.

Concluding Remarks

Now it is obvious, I hope, that our present form of Evening Prayer owes something to both these traditions, the monastic as well as the cathedral. Our service includes the monastic elements of variable psalmody and Scripture reading. It also contains fixed elements appropriate to the time of day and intercessory prayer.

Oddly enough, however, most commentaries and instructional booklets which deal with our offices tend to focus primarily on the monastic parts. Some even seem to suggest that the reason the offices exist is to get through the whole psalter and read (virtu-

ally) the whole of the Bible. It is true that Archbishop Cranmer's thinking headed in that direction, but even the "desert fathers" and "mothers" would have found the assertion a bit embarrassing.

Psalms and readings may have constituted the *content* of the monastic offices, but not the *reason* for them. The reason was to lift their hearts to God in common worship at the beginning and end of the day, just as their brothers and sisters in the cities and towns did.

To our ancestors in the faith, whether monastics or not, prayer — and especially prayer in common — was a privileged part of the Christian vocation, a priestly ministry to which every Christian is called. As for the two common times of prayer, morning and evening, they served (and still serve) to mark the boundaries of what were, for most people, the hours of work and the hours of leisure and rest, and dedicated both to God.

But there was more to it than that. An ancient Christian hymn (*Te Deum laudamus*) confidently asserts: "All creation worship you." But how? To the minds of the ancients, through the ministry of human beings, whose prayer is the God-given way of "giving voice to every creature under heaven" (Eucharistic Prayer D, BCP, page 373). And it is by means of the human voice that the words of the psalmist are continually fulfilled: "You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy" (Psalm 65:8). +++

THE ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING

reported by Winnie Crapson
and Nigel Renton

The 1988 meeting of the Council of the Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission was held in Cuernavaca, Mexico, April 20-25. Twenty-three Council members and four guests attended. Council member Gayland Pool, former rector of St. Michael and All Angels Parish in Cuernavaca and sometime assistant to the bishop of Central and South Mexico, the Rt. Rev. José G. Saucedo, had for some years urged us to hold an annual meeting in Cuernavaca. We

finally voted last year to accede to his urging, being mindful of our need to affirm the interrelationship of mission and liturgy, especially in the light of Third World experience. Many of us had doubted that we could continue to produce quality material without theological reflection arising from common study. So, the decision was made to meet in Cuernavaca, combining study and experience of the Church in Mexico with work.

(Meeting - cont.)

Assembling Wednesday Afternoon at the Hotel Majestic in Mexico City, we set forth for Cuernavaca in two mini-buses graciously provided by the Department of Tourism of the State of Morelos. The first stop before leaving the capital was at St. Andrew's Seminary where we were met by Bishop Saucedo. We were introduced to some of the bishop's associates and informed that there is now a second seminary in Mexico.

We crossed the mountain range south of Mexico City, descending to Cuernavaca. Smog and dusty haze, so much a part of life in the capital, hangs over the streets of Cuernavaca at this time of the year, almost at the end of the dry season. The baked earth and the dusty highways seemed to gasp for the first rains. But one has only to get behind the high walls of an estate or a hotel, where watering has kept alive the green grass and beautiful flowers, to realize why this is a favorite vacation spot for those from Mexico City and the U.S.

Our first morning was spent with Bishop Saucedo who gave us an overview of his diocese. Professor E. Llinas of the seminary and the University of Mexico then led us through consideration of the future shape of the Church in Mexico, using a series of questions he had prepared: How can the essence of Anglicanism contribute to the growth and development of Mexican culture? What is it Anglican culture can offer to Mexican culture that no other religious group could offer? How can we avoid making Anglicanism a transplanted element in Mexican culture, but rather a religious expression with life and strength of its own that can enrich the Anglican Communion? We barely scratched the surface of these profound questions, but our continuing reflection on them throughout the meeting resulted in The Cuernavaca Statement issued at the end of the meeting (p. 16).

Under the guidance of Ray Plankey, Roman Catholic lay director of the Cuernavaca Center for Intercultural Development and Dialogue (CCIDD), we visited squatters' homes near the main railroad station, homes built illegally out of scrap materials. The families we met there freely answered questions about their daily experiences, their hopes, their faith, the gospel and its meaning for them — a reality we can envy.

If there is one thing in common among those who welcomed us, it is hope. Hope, not so much for themselves, but for their children. With Ray's help we learned to understand the importance of the "base community" model in bringing the gospel to the poor. Essentially, such communities consist of cadres of believers, without a local church or the regular services of a priest, under leadership discerned by the local community itself.

We returned to our hotel for a discussion of liturgy and mission with Gerard Thiessen, a Dutch missionary working in Latin America since 1952. As director of the Paolo Frere Methodology School, Thiessen is presently engaged in training leaders of base communities to incorporate their theological understanding in leadership: "A missionary, before anything else, has to be a seer, someone who, within the context of faith, has to discover how God is manifested within human life. Differently and in different contexts we encounter live and human solidarity." Commenting on liturgy, Thiessen emphasized that its celebration must be true to a sense of hope and optimism. "Where it is possible, I think any celebration should be more spontaneous. Our poor people in the barrios, we celebrate a lot. We can never prepare long celebrations. We pray and try to discover what the Lord tells us through the Bible, how he manifests himself in the reality. We think about problems of hunger and misery. In the effort of the people to come together to organize themselves to become more aware within the context of history, we come together to celebrate. Perhaps it seems like a contradiction, but I always think celebration that emerges with profound faith and is not so prepared is better."

On Saturday we went to Taxco, visiting the typically ornate cathedral and a new mission of Bishop Saucedo's diocese. On the way, we stopped at the Pyramid of Teopanzalco at the archeological site of Xochicalco, where the Aztec calendar was developed. We said Morning Prayer there to the bemusement of hordes of sightseeing Mexican school children and to the surprise of a very pukka couple from the U.S. The lady remarked, "Why, they're American!"

On Sunday we separated to visit various local Anglican parishes, and then came to-



(Meeting - cont.)

gether for lunch at a parish whose sanctuary AP president Joe Morris Doss had helped build 20 years ago. Our hosts at lunch were Bishop Saucedo and the clergy and parishioners of some of the parishes we had visited earlier. It was a joyous occasion: good Mexican food, beer and soft drinks, folkloric dancing, and short speeches. It was fun, and it wasn't formal.

In the course of the meeting we established a new category of Council membership, that of Associate Member. Two bishops (Joe Fricker and Dick Grein) and two seminary professors (Marion Hatchett and Bill Petersen) accepted election in this category. All are former members of the Council. We elected four new members of the Council:

Juan M. Cabrero Oliver, a recent M.Div. graduate of CDSP; Betty Gray, executive director of the Japan International Christian University Foundation, New York; the Rev. John W.B. Hill, rector of St. Augustine of Canterbury, Toronto, Ontario; and the Rev. Leonel L. Mitchell, professor of liturgics at Seabury-Western.

The sum of a very rich four days is astonishment at both the affluence and the poverty and a profound appreciation of the power of faith and the vision of Roland Allen and Henri Nouwen. Nouwen's *Gracias* perhaps best captures both the experiential and reflective responses to this very brief Latin American experience.

+++

Declaración de Cuernavaca

El Concilio de Parroquias Asociadas Para Liturgia y Misión, en su reunión en Cuernavaca, México, del 20 al 25 de Abril de 1988, ha empezado a conocer una Iglesia Anglicana foránea para la mayoría de los Episcopales. Las Iglesias Latinoamericanas están desarrollando su propia identidad. Algunas están dirigiéndose a la autodeterminación. Esta dirección queda firmemente dentro de la tradición Anglicana, la cual incluye el derecho de las Iglesias nacionales a desarrollar sus propias liturgias, estilos pastorales y métodos de reflexión teológica.

Nos alegramos en la búsqueda, de parte de las Iglesias Mexicana y Latinoamericanas, por modelos indígenas de liturgia y de misión.

Urgimos a la Iglesia Episcopal que apoye formas del Anglicanismo que sean auténticamente Latinoamericanas, fieles a la tradición cristiana y arraigadas en sus propias culturas.

Exortamos además a todos los Anglicanos a que aprecien la diversidad étnica dentro de sus propias Iglesias.

The Cuernavaca Statement

The Council of the Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission, meeting in Cuernavaca, Mexico, on 20-25 April 1988, has begun to experience an Anglican church foreign to most Episcopalians. In Latin America the Anglican churches are developing their own identity. Several of them are moving towards self-determination. This movement stands firmly within Anglican tradition, which includes the right of national churches to develop their own liturgies, pastoral styles, and methods of theological reflection.

We rejoice in the search of the Mexican and other Latin American churches for indigenous models of liturgy and mission.

We urge the Episcopal Church to support authentically Latin American forms of Anglicanism, faithful to the Christian heritage and rooted in their own cultures.

We also encourage all Anglicans to appreciate ethnic diversity in their own churches.

"TAKE A PEW, OLD BEAN!"

One of a series of 'unpopular opinions'

by Nigel A. Renton

Thirty years ago I couldn't really enjoy the novels of P. G. Wodehouse. I was a recent immigrant from the United Kingdom, and I found too many Americans whose idea of "a proper Englishman" was that he should behave like Bertie Wooster. I took a lot of kidding, not always gracefully. As time passed, the dated speech of the characters of Dorothy L. Sayers, created about 60 years ago, has become a cause of amusement to me. Freddie Arbuthnot is by no means a stupid character, but he does say things like "take a pew, old bean!", which sound ridiculous today. Yet some Brits were still talking like that when I began my business life, shortly after World War II.

One place where we really are stuck with pews is in the Episcopal Church. Why are we stuck with them? Because for centuries some sort of wooden bench was all that could be provided with the resources available for churches. In my opinion, retaining pews in churches makes no more sense than sticking to the King James version when more accurate and more readily understandable translations are available.

Have you ever sat in a pew at St. Mark's during an organ recital or a concert? Even though it is more important to hear what is being played and sung than to see those performing, we miss a lot because of those dreadful forward-facing pews. Sometimes I sit at the side, and turn around as much as I can without actually straddling the bench! But the sound is better balanced at the cen-

Nigel Renton, a member of the Council of Associated Parishes, is a parishioner at St. Mark's Church, Berkeley, Calif. He occasionally writes these "unpopular opinions" for his parish newsletter.

ter, and so I risk a stiff neck by looking over my shoulder from time to time. I feel a bit guilty and self-conscious about this. I avert my gaze quickly, just as I do when I don't want my wife to catch me looking at another pretty woman at a party.

If I express myself a bit strongly on the subject of pews, perhaps I am partly influenced by the time that a rather painful splinter entered my soft tissue through the seat of my pants, as I slid along one of those jolly old pews at St. Mark's.

St. Paul suggested that we should "mortify" our members — he was referring to parts of the body, and not to members of the congregation. Well, I'm no masochist, and I don't really think that it helps my worship to sit through a long service, such as the Easter Vigil, on a hard wooden bench. One blessing in the Episcopal Church is that the sermons are relatively short, and we're always standing up, kneeling, and then sitting down again. I honestly believe that some of the Episcopalian jack-in-the-box syndrome is caused by the hard pews we sit on. I should never be surprised to learn that some candidate for a Master's degree in Theology has chosen this topic for a thesis.

Some of my best worship experiences have been in churches in which the seating has been in the arena style, so that everyone has had a clear view of the altar, and also some opportunity to see fellow worshippers. Obviously, such seating is not practical in the typical rectangular church, such as St. Mark's.

Many of us will remember an experiment with the first few rows of pews some years

(Renton - cont.)

ago, when Fr. Tittmann had them turned to face the center. I rather enjoyed that experience, but it didn't last. Besides, there was no getting away from the same old hard wooden pew.

What are the alternatives? It is unrealistic to suppose that we would settle for open space, as in many Orthodox churches. We still need something to sit on, and the obvious answer is to have chairs. One church which recently purchased some comfortable individual chairs is St. Christopher's in San Lorenzo. The chairs bought by St. Christopher's came with a kneeler and a rack for hymnal and prayer book. That's fine, except for those in the front row, who may need to make do with a hassock to kneel on, and perhaps a small table for the books. But then the front row has few devotees at the best of times.

Think of the advantages that a more flexible worship space would give us. Imagine the possibilities for liturgical dance or

religious drama. We could also set up the chairs for Sunday services to create at least the arc of a circle, instead of being in the rigid ranks that the pews demand. Perhaps the children would fidget just as much as usual, but the adults wouldn't, if they had a comfortable chair to sit on.

What would we do with the old pews? It would be nice to donate them to some other branch of Christ's kingdom. Maybe we could keep a couple of rows for those who just *have* to sit in pews or it doesn't feel like church. I would also offer a pew to Bev Hodghead, in the hope that he could cut it up and make small wooden crosses. These could then be sold as souvenirs, to help defray the costs. Any better ideas?

Then, of course, I would offer pews to any member of St. Mark's who wanted a personal memento, perhaps as a bench for a deck or back yard. That would be a time when I could cheerfully say, "Take a pew, old bean!"

+++



BOOKS



The Day of Light: The Biblical and Liturgical Meaning of Sunday. H. Boone Porter. Washington, The Pastoral Press. 1987. pp. xi and 84. Paper. \$6.95.

This book was first published by Seabury Press in 1980 and has been out of print for twenty-five years. It is a tribute to Dr. Porter that it is still so admired that it has been re-issued, this time by a Roman Catholic group. Dr. Porter's writing style is delightful and his sensitivity to natural phenomena, which we have all seen in his writing for *The Living Church*, illuminates the whole book.

The very fact that the book is still relevant, after all the liturgical reforms that have been produced, is an indication

of how far short the churches still are from the goals for Sunday that he had set forth in the sixties. Our rubrics may declare solemnly that Sunday is *the day* — and our lectionary undergirds that concept — but as yet this understanding has not permeated our living or, indeed, our worship in many places.

Thus, while we may rejoice in the re-publication of this wonderful book, the very fact of the need to re-publish it is a sign of failure in the Church to understand what Sunday really is and a reminder that just because we have our ideas bound in a book there is no indication that the job is done.

(The Rev.) Henry H. Breul
Editor, OPEN

THE COUNCIL OF
THE ASSOCIATED PARISHES FOR LITURGY AND MISSION

Officers

President: The Rev. Joe Morris Doss, Palo Alto, California
Vice President: The Rev. T. James Bethell, Austin, Texas
Secretary: The Ven. Neff Powell, Raleigh, North Carolina
Treasurer: Arthur S. Jenkins, Alexandria, Virginia

The Council

Thomas C. Babbitt, Litchfield, Connecticut
The Rev. Henry H. Breul, Washington, District of Columbia
The Rev. Robert J. Brooks, Washington, District of Columbia
Juan M. Cabrero Oliver, San Francisco, California
Sister Jean Campbell, OSH, New York, New York
Mrs. Winifred Crapson, Topeka, Kansas
Fritz Frurip, Los Angeles, California
Howard E. Galley, Jr., Jersey City, New Jersey
Mrs. Betty Gray, New York, New York
The Rev. John W.B. Hill, Toronto, Ontario
Mrs. Marianne Kessell, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Mrs. Vivian Kingsley, Holland, Michigan
The Rev. Henry I. Louttit, Jr., Valdosta, Georgia
Carlos H. Mercado, Jr., Rochester, New York
The Rev. Canon Michael W. Merriman, San Francisco, California
The Rev. Barbara A. Mitchell, Drumheller, Alberta
The Rev. Leonel L. Mitchell, Evanston, Illinois
The Rev. Peter C. Moore, Seattle, Washington
The Rev. Richard A. Norris, Jr., New York, New York
Deacon Ormonde Plater, New Orleans, Louisiana
The Rev. M. Gayland Pool, Fort Worth, Texas
The Rev. H. Boone Porter, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Canon Borden C. Purcell, Toronto, Ontario
Nigel A. Renton, Oakland, California
Jean Smelker, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio
The Rev. Philip R. Strange, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Paul E. Strid, Albany, California

Associate Council Members

The Rt. Rev. J. C. Fricker, Mississauga, Ontario
The Rt. Rev. Richard F. Grein, Topeka, Kansas
The Rev. Marion J. Hatchett, Sewanee, Tennessee
The Very Rev. William H. Petersen, Rochester, New York

Honorary Council Members

The Rev. John O. Patterson, San Francisco, California
The Rt. Rev. Frederick W. Putnam, Minneapolis, Minnesota
The Rev. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., Sacramento, California
The Rev. Bonnell Spencer, OHC, Adisadell, Cape Coast, Ghana
The Rev. Samuel E. West, Richmond, Virginia