



September 1988

the **associated parishes**
for liturgy and mission

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

An Editorial

Ring Up the Bishop of London

For years the Church has been struggling with the whole problem of authority in the Church, and the central issue has always come down to the authority of the bishop. Now the General Convention, in the name of charity, seems to have ruled that, for three years at least, the authority of the bishop depends upon the assent of the local congregation. If the local congregation decides that a woman is not a bishop, then she isn't, and a male bishop will be dispatched.

We need only to cast our minds back a few years and imagine one of the country parishes in Southern Maryland (Diocese of Washington) rejecting a visitation from Bishop Walker because he is black to realize how reprehensible all this is. The rejection of a black bishop would have caused an explosion in the Church at large, and punitive measures would have been invoked immediately with general approval.

Now we have decided to be a congregational Church for three years. As one AP member who is a woman priest wrote:

"Good God, I can just hear the riddles: 'When is a bishop not a bishop?' 'When she's at (St. Swithin's)!' Utterly idiotic! I cannot understand what on earth people could have been thinking of! It's utterly anomalous to the definition of a bishop!

"Actually, it leads me to think that this is a truly important sign — the evidence of a near-consensus of some *other* definition of episcopacy living in the mind of the people (and, obviously, in the mind of the House of Bishops itself). It sounds like food for some wonderful interpretive *OPEN* articles. What is being understood by the people as the role and person of the bishop if they can have a bishop who is barred from part of the (her) diocese?

→

(Editorial — cont.)

And what does that mean to the life of the Church — not just in dioceses where there is a female bishop, but in all dioceses? And what does obedience mean in the Church at large if it will mandate such a posture of disobedience? In what or whom does the unity of the Church reside if parishes, by canon, do not have to obey their bishop? Or, worse still, have only to obey the bishop if the bishop is male? And will this mean that if a parish thinks its *male* Ordinary is unsuitable (for whatever reason) they too may invite another male episcopal visitor? Does that change, for example, the judgment upon the situation in that Oklahoma parish which had an English bishop come over to function for it? In the end, what is the authority of the bishop?"

She raises all sorts of interesting questions, all of which point to the fact

that, in its desire to be "pastoral", the House of Bishops has debased the coinage of episcopacy to a new low. It may be that women candidates for the episcopate should refuse to be ordained while the three-year proviso is in effect. Perhaps some of our parishes will refuse all episcopal visitations until this is cleared up.

Whatever the responses are, it is clear that the question "What is the authority of the bishop?" has been asked again, and the answer is clearly "Only that which the local congregation seems to give him/her."

All in all, the Detroit Convention was great for the congregationalists among us, but a serious self-inflicted wound for the bishops.

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

General Convention Report

by Robert J. Brooks

Fr. Brooks, a member of the AP Council, is a member of the SLC. He was responsible for bringing these items to the floor of Convention and for ensuring their adoption.

The 69th General Convention considered the largest report of the Standing Liturgical Commission (SLC) since the 1979 Book of Common Prayer. Three parts of the report were responses to mandates by the 68th General Convention to the SLC during the last Triennium. Other parts concerned ecumenical texts. All in all, the Convention enacted extraordinary breakthroughs in several areas of liturgical reform.

INITIATION

(Mandate of the 68th Convention)

In response to the mandate, Convention adopted "Principles of Implementation" and "Additional Directions" to be added to the rites for the catechumenate in The Book of Occasional Services:

Rites for "Preparation of Baptized Persons for Reaffirmation of the Baptismal Covenant" to be added to the Book of Occasional Services. These rites are patterned on the catechetical methodology of the catechumenate and are for pastoral use with baptized and uncatechised adults.

Rites for "Preparation of Parents and Godparents for the Baptism of Infants and Young Children". These are also patterned on catechumenal methodology.

Repeal of 1971 guidelines on admission into communion by House of Bishops. New guidelines allow infant communion.

Funding approved for pilot diocesan projects on the catechumenate in collaboration with Education for Mission and Ministry Unit.

(Brooks — cont.)

SUPPLEMENTAL LITURGICAL TEXTS
(Mandate of the 68th Convention)

Approved for use in the next Triennium under the direction of the Ordinary, from no later than Advent 1989, the texts of Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, the Order of Worship for the Evening, and two alternative Eucharists as submitted to Convention by the SLC and as revised for publication by the SLC in consultation with the House of Bishops Theology Committee. This action of Convention affirms the liturgical methodology of the rites, establishes a process of prayerful reflection in the Church, and mandates future work based on insights gained from the reflection.

CALENDAR

(Mandate of the 68th Convention)

In response to the mandate to provide additional commemorations of women, Convention approved for trial use five women to be added to the Calendar (Julia Chester Emery, Brigid, Florence Nightingale, Evelyn Underhill, and Lucy).

Also approved for trial use Gallaudet and Syles as a common commemoration.

LECTIONARY

Ceased to authorize the proposed CCT Lectionary (The Common Lectionary) due to liturgical critiques of it and its substantial revision by CCT due in 1991.

ECUMENICAL

1. Consultation on Common Texts (CCT)
(North American successor to ICET)

Commended for study and evaluation *The Common Baptismal Liturgy* and its *Commentary* adopted unanimously by all North American liturgical churches. Could be used pastorally for baptism of children where parents are different denominations and for ecumenical Easter Vigils.

Commended for use under the rubrics of An Order for Marriage in the BCP, *The Ecu-*

menical Celebration of Marriage. Already approved by the U.S. Roman Catholic bishops, it can be used for celebrating marriages of those from different denominations.

2. English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC) (Worldwide successor to ICET)

Approved for use, under the direction of the Ordinary, proposed revisions of the ICET Common Texts of the Eucharist and Daily Office.

INTER-ANGLICAN

Commended for study the document *Children and Communion* of the International Consultation of Anglican Liturgists (1985).

COORDINATOR

Called for reorganization of the Education for Mission and Ministry Unit to fund position of coordinator for Liturgy and Music to resource SLC and SCCM and the Church.

BIBLE

Authorized the New Jerusalem Bible and the New International Version for use in public worship.

SLC and SCCM

Voted to keep the commissions separate.

Despite the fact that the Prayer Book and Liturgy Committees of both Houses began meeting two days before Convention, the last piece of the report was not acted on until five minutes before adjournment sine die of the House of Deputies. Much credit for the positive action on such a wide-ranging liturgical agenda must go to Bishop Thomas Ray and Mr. Ralph Spence, chairs of the respective committees in each House.

The 69th General Convention should be considered a watershed for the liturgical movement in the Church. +++



BOOKS



Baptismal Moments; Baptismal Meanings.
Daniel B. Stevick. New York, Church Hymnal Corporation. 1987. pp. xxii and 218. No price given.

The Initiation Rites of the Book of Common Prayer 1979 are described in the context of a comprehensive historical development. Dr. Stevick begins his work by rooting Baptism, Confirmation and First Communion in the Gospels and in the Tradition, and then traces with great care the theology and the practice of Christian Initiation with special attention to the Anglican tradition, expressed in the early Books of Common Prayer. Underscored throughout is the tremendous meaning and centrality of Baptism in the life of the Church. For as he says, "Baptism is the sacrament of birth and of maturity, of beginnings and endings; it is the sacrament of dedication to Christ's service for the sake of the world; it brings one into the common life of Christ's people; it gives the Holy Spirit."

The present rite is not new, but really old, the restoration of the one true Rite of Initiation, which is sacramentally complete and whole. The standard is the rite of Baptism-Consignation-Eucharist.

He indicates, as do other liturgical scholars, that Confirmation was a post-baptismal blessing which developed in such a way in understanding and practice as to produce much theological confusion. It makes clear that "Confirmation has no independent meanings." Confirmation is seen as one of the several ways in which baptism is remembered and renewed, what he calls a "nonroutinized" occasion. This superb work makes the Rite of Christian Initiation in the Prayer Book 1979, very right indeed.

The Revd. Dr. Richard Cornish Martin
Rector, St. George's Parish
Washington, D.C.

The Creed of Chalcedon

by Christopher Pierce Kelley

The General Convention of 1985 passed Resolution A050a, expressing the "intention (of the Episcopal Church) to restore in liturgical usage the original form of the Nicene Creed as promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon (*i.e.*, without the *filioque*), provided that such restoration is endorsed and commended by the Anglican Consultative Council and by the Lambeth Conference."

In passing such a resolution, the Convention committed itself to more than it thought. The Creed endorsed in 451 at Chalcedon (across the Bosphorus from Con-

stantinople) differs from the widely known Latin text *in more than one place*. The other may be even more significant. The late Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury suggested that *filioque* dealt with "a speculative metaphysical relationship within the Godhead," but the other point dealt with "the factual nature of the Incarnation." In 1981, Lord Ramsey spoke of this in a public lecture at Lambeth commemorating the 1600th anniversary of the Second Ecumenical Council, but was disappointed that others did not then take up the matter. Yet it would hardly be sensible to "restore the Chalcedonian text" at one point only, when we know perfectly well what the original Greek says, and not complete the job "while we have the patient on the table." The Con-

Father Kelley is assistant to the dean, St. James' Cathedral, Fresno, California.



(Kelley — cont.)

vention Resolution commits us to the whole task.

Indeed, Lambeth Conferences since 1888 have asked member Churches to consider removing *filioque*. Clearly patience is a Christian virtue! One hundred years later, little has happened. The same Conference of 1888 had adopted the Lambeth Quadrilateral: "Holy Scriptures & Apostolic Creeds, Holy Sacraments & Apostolic Order" (as per the inscription on the Presiding Bishop's throne in Washington Cathedral). This was to be a platform for unity, and the bishops recognized that only the text of the Creed recognized by the East — the unaltered original of the Ecumenical Councils — could fulfill the purpose of the Quadrilateral. They knew the East rejected *filioque*, which had been uncanonically inserted into the Creed in the West. But few then knew of the other deviation in the prevailing Latin (and dependent English) version.

The Greek reading of the Incarnation Clause was unknown to me until I heard a lecture at the summer conference of the Fellowship of Saint Alban and Saint Sergius in England in 1976.¹ It was given by a Canadian Orthodox layman, professor of French literature, Dr. William Bush. His subject was the difference in the Doctrine of Grace in East and West. The Incarnation Clause, for him, was a focal point of that difference: He was incarnate by the Holy Spirit AND the Virgin Mary... is the original reading. (Greek: *kai*) This highlights the cooperative relation of Mary the Virgin and the Holy Spirit. When the Latin text (after St. Leo the Great² slid from *ET* to *EX*, a general Latin understanding tended to see the Blessed Virgin as a "passive vessel" of the Incarnation, despite St. Cyril of Jerusalem's vehement rejection of such an Apollinarian notion in his Catechetical Lectures. (IV.9)³

I began to raise the issue with Archbishop Ramsey and others, and soon felt compelled for Christian Unity's sake to make the matter a public issue. From 1979, I "rode my hobby horse" through a variety of resolutions in the annual convention of the Diocese of San Joaquin; the matter was sent forward to General Convention and other bodies, only to be lost in a labyrinth of committees. Annual letters to

The Living Church were also part of the campaign. One of these caught the attention of Associated Parishes, and wider action followed at last! The squeaky wheel does finally get some oil. (The Synod of New Zealand has acted officially in favor of this restoration, through the good offices of a friend, but would not move on *filioque*.)

Some have said, "The Orthodox never raise this issue, so we'd better not." But an Orthodox layman *did* raise it, and now we know this difference exists. We know the original Greek is the Council's true text. The Creed was adopted by the Ecumenical Councils as an "insurance policy" against heresy; no party to a policy can alter the text without the consent of the other. Not to correct the Latin mistake is dishonest. The Orthodox *have* raised the issue of *filioque* and our Lord tells us to "go the second mile" even with an oppressor (MT 5:41). Can we not more gladly do so with fellow Christians? Our Lord's expressed will (John 17) is our visible Unity; such a humble act of restoration could not but help inch further toward that unity, provided it is not coupled with an arrogant act to the opposite purpose.

The Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381 produced the Creed we now use. The 150 fathers present included more canonized saints than any other of the seven Councils. It was referred to as "the Council of the Saints". Their purpose was to deal with a heresy denying the deity of the Holy Spirit. They drafted the third paragraph almost entirely, since the Creed of Nicaea ended, "and (we believe) in the Holy Ghost," followed by the anathemas against Arius.⁴

The Council sought to state clearly that the Holy Spirit is God: the Old and New Testament senses of the word "Lord" (*Yahweh/Adonai/Kyrios*) are applied; the Spirit is active at Creation as "Giver of Life"; the Spirit is given the same worship and glory as the Father and the Son, *without* idolatry;⁵ and Jesus is quoted, saying, "The Spirit proceeds from the Father" (John 15:26b; Is. 57:16). This is understood to express the *eternal* relation of the Father and the Spirit, distinct from, but comparable to, the relation of the Father and the Son, expressed by "eternally begotten."⁶

(Kelley — cont.)

In addition, the Second Council expanded the Incarnation Clause in order to emphasize the act of the Holy Spirit at the Incarnation. Nicaea had said only, "Who for us men and for our salvation came down and was incarnate and was made Man." The Council wanted to express the eternal nature of the Spirit and the work of the Spirit prior to Pentecost. Thus the involvement of the Spirit in the Prophets, and with Mary in the conception of our Lord, were crucial. By using "and" they made clear Mary's consent (as Luke does), showing that she actively cooperated (at great personal risk) to bring God to birth from her womb. In this expression, they also illustrate the working of grace in every Christian's own life: each of us is called to *cooperate* with God the Holy Spirit. The Eastern theologians lay great emphasis upon *synergy* — working together with God.⁷ In Mary the Theotokos, then, we are constantly presented in the Creed with "the prototype of Christian vocation", and our eyes settle upon "the one truly complete and whole Christian," (Wm. Bush, p. 370) in order that we may model our response to God on hers.

For Luke, Mary is the "Ark of the New Covenant". The old Ark contained the Jar of Manna, the Tables of the Law written with the Finger of God, and Aaron's Rod. Now she, the new Ark, contains Him Who is the Bread of Heaven, come down to give life to the world; Him Who is the Word made flesh; Him Who is the Great High Priest! (What a shame that the 1982 Hymnal cut the original 3rd stanza from #264:

*How blest that Mother, in whose shrine
The great Artificer Divine,
Whose hand contains the earth and sky,
Vouchsafed, as in his Ark, to lie!*

It was for this verse in particular that I suggested the hymn to the Commission! (See *The English Hymnal* #214.) The Prophet David leapt before the Ark of old,

now John leaps in his mother's womb before the New. But I digress.

The Emmaus Report of the Anglican Ecumenical Consultation, prepared for the Lambeth Conference, lists the responses of various Anglican provinces on the *filioque* question. By early 1987, about seven provinces had moved to delete *filioque*. However, Australia wisely sensed that the matter was not simply the deletion of a word, but a question of authority: "who has the right to add to, and delete from, the only truly ecumenical Creed?" When we stop to think on this question, we realize that the Ecumenical Councils adopted the Creed for the entire Church of God, and that only a council of comparable authority can alter the text. A Latin addition, without Eastern consent, is unlawful; a Latin spelling error just has no place, whether in the Latin text, or in a vernacular translation. No province can add to, or take from the Ecumenical Creed; the Anglican Communion cannot add to, or take from the Creed. ICET cannot gratuitously add "by the power of". All that is proper for the Anglican Communion to do is to return forthwith to the only properly authorized text, rendered into felicitous and accurate translation. (ELLC isn't quite there yet.) The Lord Jesus prayed for our visible unity, that unbelievers should see evidence of His Messiahship, and give glory to God. For that reason, it is vital that the Anglican Communion as a whole act in concert with the universal Church. Return to the Ecumenical Creed's only properly authorized text will be an important step forward for unity, to glorify God by our humble obedience.

A thorough study of the Eastern understanding of Grace would help us all to approach the content of the Creed with freshness and joy, and a new yearning for the work of the Holy Spirit in us.

+++

FOOTNOTES

1. Published in *Christian*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp.366-373, Michaelmas, 1976, by the Institute of Christian Studies, All Saints', Margaret Street, London.

2. In the Tome, St. Leo quotes the Creed

in Latin as he knows it: "Incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto *ET* Maria Virgine, et homo factus est." This last part expresses the *particularity* of the Incarnation: God becomes *one particular Man* in order to redeem the entire race. The text does not



(Kelley — cont.)

read "et *humanum* factus est." The same sense may be seen in the Greek, *enan-thrōpēsanta*. There is no need that any Christian take offense at this. *The Stowe Missal* also witnesses to the original Latin reading. It is possible that the spelling change came as a result of "contamination" from the Apostles' Creed.

3. See also St. Gregory Nazianzen, Letter to Cledonius against Apollinarius. *Ep. CI*: St. Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, I.vii.2, quoting a docetic heresy, "that Christ passed through Mary just as water flows through a tube."
4. It must be stated emphatically that the "Creed of Nicaea" was *not written there*, but was almost entirely dependent upon the ancient Creed used in Jerusalem and Caesarea of Palestine, dating back to around AD 200, a distillation of the

Christian faith used in catechumenal preparation. The famous "homo-ousios" was the only substantive contribution made by the First Council. The Councils never set out to change the Faith received, but only to make clear "what had always been believed."

5. Note here the ancient importance of *Gloria Patri* as a credal statement.
6. *Filioque* refers to the *temporal* mission of the Spirit on and after Pentecost. Thus its presence in this clause introduces an anomaly no grammar teacher can allow. It might also be "tampering with God's Word" (2 Cor 4:2)!
7. See 2 Cor 6:1; 1 Cor 3:9; Gal 5:6; Gal 5:25, etc. The Eastern grasp of *Synergy* destroys the false dichotomy of faith *vs* works at its root.

INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE:

The Future of an Illusion?

by Peter C. Moore

The issue of inclusive language will be with us for a while. Whether or not the General Convention authorizes the texts prepared by the Standing Liturgical Commission, that work will be too conservative for some and too radical for others. I think most would agree that they are superior to much of the material already in use, simply because those who produced them are persons sensitive to liturgical requirements. Since I am an American, white, male priest, of course I have a bias. It is also true, however, that I have had the experience of being excluded, for reasons that had to do with nothing in particular. My experiences have been but few and trivial compared to the very real exclusion that many undergo in our time. Just accept the fact that I am biased and then see if I make any sense.

Father Moore, a member of the AP Council, is rector of St. Paul's Church, Seattle, Washington.

In the Summer *Info*, put out by the Office of Communications of the Executive Council, Madeleine L'Engle is quoted: "I am disappointed in the softening, and to some extent abuse of the language in some of our translations... So it is not that all the critics of the new translations are against change (though some are), but against shabby language, against settling for the mediocre and the flabbily permissive. Where language is weak, theology is weak."

Is liturgy about language? Carroll Simcox, one of the most articulate opponents of the present Prayer Book, wrote a book a number of years ago, *The Words of our Worship*. Those who were most vehemently critical of the texts we are now using were teachers of English. It was the language that bothered them. It still bothers the Prayer Book Society.

Obviously, language is important. The rites that we celebrate, however, are those

(Moore — cont.)

surrounding a bath and a meal, that is, things we do together, in which the words are the accompaniment. They recall and make present the story of creation, redemption, sanctification, expectation of the parousia. It is the bath and the meal that are central. In the principal Sunday rite, we celebrate Word and Sacrament. The words of the Word are indeed critical. Anyone who has reason to listen to many sermons these days would certainly agree with Ms. L'Engle. Jesus did not say, "Speak this", but "Do this"; not "Tell them", but "Baptize them."

Telling the stories of God's actions is to try to tell them well. There are lots of ways to tell them. Telling the story is the liturgical act; explaining the story is not. Doing the symbols is basic; explaining them is to render them powerless. Good liturgy is telling the story well and gathering to listen. Good liturgy is making the symbols clearly present: water, not dinky fonts; bread, not fish food; wine that is drunk and not sipped.

Baptism and the Rite Two Eucharist have the same root metaphor (I learned this point from Robert Brooks): Exodus. The passage from slavery in Egypt to freedom in a promised land, from being no people to being a covenant people, from the bondage of sin into the freedom of new life in Christ, from darkness into light, from being a race or tribe into a people made up of all nations, races, tribes.

The root metaphor in our previous Prayer Books, and still to a large extent in Rite One Eucharist, is like the Court of Chancery in Dickens's *Bleak House*. We have to hire a lawyer (the priest or bishop) to represent us and to launch appeal after appeal before a court that grinds secretly towards an appointed end that leaves us as "a worm and no man". We grovel endlessly before a distant king who must be propitiated in some horrifying way lest we perish forever. No doubt the metaphor Cranmer used was drawn from the medieval liturgy and piety of his time. It also had a useful secondary purpose that, since the words would now be heard, they could express the proper attitude of subject before monarch. So the wealth of royal images he used. These are, of course, to be found in scripture, but not quite of the sort that he developed.

The significance of the two contrasting root metaphors is clear when we come to talk about inclusive language. Rite One is clearly sexist. Only men do the work; only men go to heaven or hell. Only the King is sovereign and lord.

The Exodus metaphor is inclusive. The Gospel is inclusive. The kingdom (or the blander dominion) of God is inclusive. All the symbols associated with Exodus or Gospel are inclusive. Just telling the story and using the symbols is to proclaim, celebrate, and enact inclusion.

The problem with inclusiveness in English or American language is that it really works against the language itself. Other languages do not confuse gender with sexual identity. So when we use our language, one of whose purposes is to identify and discriminate, to make distinctions and to describe, we cannot really include without also excluding at the same time.

The other question I would raise is whether didacticism is a wise liturgical practice. Cranmer's Prayer Books abound in it. So do many present rites, both among Protestants and some places in the Roman rite as well. Even our Book is not entirely free of it. Didacticism is using the liturgy to teach. In this sense it would mean to teach a specific viewpoint. For Cranmer, it was a reformed understanding of the Eucharist and what the Christian life is like (the exhortations). The Thirty-nine Articles do not belong in a Prayer Book unless in a section of historical documents. The Athanasian Creed has never been a required part of our Prayer Books, for which we can be thankful. If the Exodus metaphor, if the Gospel proclamation, do not make the point, will words do it? I do not think so.

Now, having run on a bit on the matter, it is important that the metaphors not be contradicted by the language used to accompany them, and that is a very serious matter. We do have work to do there. We could begin by getting rid of all the Rite One services. We can be especially grateful for the Canadian ASB for its superior work. Let's not *explain* the stories and symbols, let's *tell* them and *use* them. Let Gospel be enacted, and the right words will follow.

+++

ISSUES

ISSUES, a daily giveaway paper at General Convention, was originally published in Seattle in 1967. AP joined forces with a coalition of liberal groups supporting it in Houston in 1970 and has been active in the publication ever since. The excerpts which follow are from the ISSUES of General Convention in Detroit.

SPONSORS

Appalachian Peoples' Service
Organization (APSO)
Associated Parishes
Church and City Conference
Coalition of Hispanic
Episcopalians
Episcopal Asian Pacific
American Caucus
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Episcopal Urban Caucus
Integrity
The Consultation
Union of Black Episcopalians
Urban Bishops' Coalition

CAN THE CHURCH BE OPEN TO CONTEMPORARY ISSUES AND REMAIN ORTHODOX?

This is perhaps the major question troubling all religious communities today. It is as important to Islam and Judaism as it is to Southern Baptists, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and Methodists; and it underlies most of the debates on issues at this General Convention.

It appears that there are only two choices: either require all issues of human concern be answered by rules arrived at in the past, or throw all the rules away and let the issues dictate new rules. As a result we have two groups; one insisting that any change in Christian principle is a threat to orthodoxy and the other certain that orthodoxy is blind to human need.

Yet there are many of us who cannot accept change without faithfulness to orthodox faith and practice, nor can we accept an orthodoxy unable to embrace new practices and new ways of communicating the faith. We often felt like the forgotten few and we are disturbed to find ourselves misunderstood by those on the two extremes.

The alternative liturgical forms being presented to this convention by the Standing Liturgical Commission are a case in point. The principle used by the SLC is simple and straightforward: language about God which uses masculine gender is important and essential in expressing Christian faith and should be preserved; and masculine language about God alone does not do justice to the great variety of other verbal images about God contained in the Bible and in Christian Tradition. The SLC has done a superb job of producing alternative forms for the Eucharist and the Daily Office to be used *alongside* the forms in the Prayer Book. The goal is to preserve the language we already have and to enrich our ability to express our faith with other rich images of God's relationship to the human race.

For example, it is possible to name the persons of the Trinity without resorting to the masculine "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" while remaining faithful to orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. The SLC refused the unorthodox substitution often heard around the Church, "Creator, Savior, Sanctifier" (all words describing the function of the

Godhead rather than distinct functions of the divine Persons) with this form: "God, and the Eternal Word, and the Holy Spirit." This language is biblical, orthodox, and avoids confusing the persons of the Trinity.

It seems, however, that other images, particularly ones which are feminine, mothering, or drawn from nature are attracting the ire of many Church people. Perhaps this is because of the failure on the part of some of the orthodox to recognize that "Father" and "Son" are just as metaphorical as "Lady Wisdom" or "Mother". If one reads the orthodox theology of the "fathers" one is made aware of the metaphorical nature of all theological and liturgical language.

There are those who are opposing these alternative liturgical forms from both extremes of the issue. Both believe they are defending the true faith. Can it be that both are failing to take the Faith seriously enough to recognize that our faith is large enough and full enough to encompass a much wider variety of expression than their limited orthodoxies are aware of?

ISSUES, July 4

EPISCOPAL VISITORS

The Episcopal Church once again grapples with the question of women in the episcopate under the guise of pastoral concern for those who may "be forced either to go against their consciences or leave the church" because of the consecration of a woman as bishop. Resolution B022 allows for "the rector, vicar or minister-in-charge and a majority of the vestry concurring (of) any parish or mission located in a diocese where a woman is functioning as bishop, (to) request...that the diocesan bishop arrange a visitation by one of the appointed Episcopal Visitors." Acceptance of this resolution by the Episcopal Church would have far reaching implications.

Whether a bishop is elected on the first of fiftieth ballot, we accept is as directed by the Holy Spirit speaking to and through the people of that particular diocese. Any alternative annuls the 1976

legislation authorizing the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, and denies the work of the Holy Spirit.

Further effects might follow. Such a resolution, if adopted, opens the door to pains of conscience on receiving the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and the Eucharist by a bishop of color, a gay bishop, a fat bishop, an ugly bishop, or a physically impaired bishop. We strongly identify with the struggle of all women and minorities for full participation in the life of the Church. Consideration of the adoption of this resolution raises fears in the hearts of all of us that if the Church backs down on its decision of 1976, other casualties will follow.

On Thursday morning and again on Saturday evening impassioned pleas from the new "oppressed minority" of the Church were heard. Arguments in favor of the resolution ranged from the maleness of Jesus to maintaining peace and unity in the Anglican Communion and in ecumenical circles. The only thing the Episcopal Church can say to the Anglican Communion, other communions and at Lambeth is that this is how the Spirit leads us.

The threat to leave the Church is like taking home the ball and bat or all of the marbles when you are losing the game. No one has asked those whose consciences are leading them not to accept women as priests and bishops to leave the Church. That is their decision. We believe the challenge to them is to stay.

The need to be pastoral is of critical importance. This resolution, however, is not the answer. Pastoral care cannot be legislated or dictated. It can only be acted out. Canonically, any bishop can already do what is called for in this resolution. And reconciliation can come about only as the diocesan bishop struggles with his or her group directly. Anything else will cause more wounds on one side or the other. We must pray more, and be more open to the will of God and the direction of the Holy Spirit.

On the facetious side, the resolution could be amended to direct all Episcopal Visitors to wear purple and white striped shirts (like referees), all regular bishops

to wear solid purple shirts, all female bishops to wear lilac, so that everyone will know who the players are.

We believe that we must move forward under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in this matter. We should not retreat from the position taken by Convention in 1976 when the premise that women can serve as bishops in the Church was affirmed. Reconciliation is always of primary importance, but there should be no capitulation on this matter.

ISSUES, July 4

EPISCOPAL VISITORS REVISITED

The Ministry Committee's substitute provision for Episcopal Visitors only just barely resembles its thorny predecessor. It looks as though Bishops and Deputies are beginning to hear each other at long last!

For starters, it cuts both ways. Any congregation whose views differ from their bishop's may request the ministry of an Episcopal Visitor...congregations who *desire* the ministry of clergywomen as well as those who oppose!

The new provision explicitly restores the constitutional consent of the diocesan, and does away with any innuendo of "heterodoxy".

Perhaps most noticeable to the vast numbers of clergywomen and their friends is the warm tone of appreciation and affirmation and the recommendations protecting the priesthood and episcopacy of women.

The few remaining dioceses which have not experienced women as priests (9 of the 99 domestic dioceses, according to the Church Center) are strongly urged and encouraged to do so. Bishops, Standing Committees and Commissions on Ministry opposed to the ordination of women are urged to comply with the Montgomery/Chicago model (unanimously commended by the 1987 Interim Meeting of the House of Bishops) and conform to the discipline of the Church!

There is even a pastoral provision for the *women* elected bishop. Imagine that!

Finally, the provision expires after two trienniums and is restricted to the transition and incorporation of *women* only.

The big questions which remain are: Do we *need* such provisions? Do we *trust* each other? And, are we prepared to be *trustworthy*?

ISSUES, July 4



PURPLE PARANOIA

Although the debate in the House of Bishops on the proposed canonical changes regarding lay ministry attracted far less attention than other issues, it revealed a basic division at least as sharp as those over human sexuality and the ordination of women.

A few bishops saw this canon as at least a small step toward empowerment of lay people to live out their baptismal vows. But another group appeared almost paranoid in their fear that lay preachers would be spreading heresy, that untrained lay pastors would be providing inadequate counseling, and that administrators would become local lay popes. To prevent such dire happenings they proposed a series of amendments to increase the requirement for licensing and to insure that clearly defined chains of command prevented any usurpation by uppity lay persons of clerical duties.

Although most of the amendments failed, the issue will be with us for a long time. Even those of us most enthusiastic about the need for a woman's voice to be heard in the Junior House must recognize that these women will be ordained, and will be



on the other side of the collar line from their lay brothers and sisters.

The Prayer Book Society and its allies correctly point to the continuing loss of dedicated lay persons. But is this drain really a result of unhappiness over liturgical change, or is much of it because of the refusal of our Church to allow the laity to really function as the first order of ministry?

ISSUES, July 8

INCLUSIVE WORSHIP

We are in favor of the proposal for experimental use of inclusive language in the liturgy. We are generally in favor of the texts being proposed, though we hope the efforts will involve continuing discussion of the names of the Trinity and of the paradigmatic in worship. For example, is "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" only a metaphor equal to other possible metaphors, or is it a root symbol or paradigm which may be augmented by metaphors? Our bishops should think on this.

We hope, however, that the Episcopal Church understands that there is more to inclusive worship than words. If Episcopalians worship in spaces in which the clergy are secluded behind a fence and the rest of the people are herded into pews, then the vital symbolism of space and movement will say that this liturgy is exclusive.

ISSUES, July 8

LITURGY AND MISSION

Occasionally General Convention goes will note that it seems odd that one of the groups sponsoring *ISSUES* is a liturgical renewal organization, while most other sponsors are social action groups. Isn't liturgy something quite different from social action?

The Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission, and *ISSUES* as a body, think not. Liturgy, the work of the people of God, is not simply sets of prayers and ceremonies which make up church services.

Liturgy is all the varied works of the Church.

We cannot be faithful to Christ while setting our charity and our actions for justice in the world apart from our prayer and sacraments. When that happens, our worship is enviscerated and made idolatrous, and our mission to the world loses its orientation in faith: loses its soul.

Some of the most controversial issues of this convention are perceived as liturgical (inclusive language, ordination of women and gays, blessing same sex relationships) and may be thought unrelated to economic justice, peace, or human rights for women, racial and ethnic minorities, and for gay and lesbian people.

We believe, however, that our liturgical and social justice concerns are all one. Liturgical language which is exclusively masculine dulls our awareness of women and their need to be full members of the Church and full members of our society. We cannot talk about economic justice if we are so shaped by the language of our prayers that we do not see women, people of color, and the disabled as victims of economic injustice.

If gay and lesbian Christians are not allowed full participation in Church life, in its ordained ministry, or respect and affirmation of their loving relationships, we will not be able to speak to their needs for civil rights, job equality, or protection from violence and persecution.

When we refuse women a place in the episcopate we are in no position to urge our society to give women the right to leadership in secular positions. When we require lesbian and gay aspirants to ordination to lie about their sexuality we turn our baptismal promise to "seek and serve Christ in all people" into a lie. A church which is not committed to concrete actions to alleviate poverty and discrimination cannot honestly celebrate the sacraments of the Gospel, for it has betrayed its own baptism.

It is not that there is one group involved in *ISSUES* which is concerned about liturgy. EPF, UBE, Integrity, and the Urban Caucus are just as liturgical. The

(ISSUES — cont.)

same can be said for all the committees of this Convention, all the organizations in the exhibit hall, and all of the Episcopal church. Liturgy is Mission and Mission is Liturgy.

ISSUES, July 10

THE LINES DRAWN

When the Presiding Bishop spoke, he said a mouthful.

His words are quoted daily. "There will be no outcasts in the Church." They are wonderful words. The spirit of those words goes to the heart of the Gospel. They are words that have hovered over this Convention and which have guided the hearts and minds of Deputies and Bishops assembled. Can one really quarrel with them?

Paul Tillich once said, in a now oft-quoted sermon, that there are those moments of grace in our lives when we are alive with the full peace, power and forgiveness of God. Rather than explain them, he said, we should just accept them. There have been gracious moments here in Detroit. There have been moments when we have not felt the presence of grace. The Presiding Bishop's line — There are no outcasts in the Church — is not only a wonderfully mysterious and inclusive line, it is also a line with a bite.

"But don't we have to draw some lines in the name of the Gospel?" Two quick re-

sponses come to mind. Louie Crew, testifying at a recent hearing, was heard to say that Jesus *did* draw the line. He drew it in the sand as he challenged the righteous response to the woman caught in adultery. The line he drew obliterated all lines. "He or she who is without sin, cast the first stone." Pretty inclusive.

There is another line that's been drawn to which no one here at Convention has made reference. It's the line that Amos drew in the little picture story he told about the plumbline. The image, you will remember, was used to say that God was setting a plumbline in the heart — in the midst — of the people, to determine whether God's people had constructed their faith and life with justice.

We, as a church, will be judged by that same line. How well do we embrace the poor and those who have been discriminated against by the world? Will the church measure up when it comes to extending full rights to gay people, women, people of color, laboring people and the exploited poor? The Presiding Bishop's words — There will be no outcasts in the Church — are they true? Or is there a line that excludes? There is no room for racism, classism, sexism, imperialism in the Church.

God is setting a plumbline in the midst of the people.

ISSUES, July 11

A View of General Convention

from the AP Booth

by Winnie Crapson

My fifth General Convention provided a new and very different perspective. At previous Conventions I have served as alternate, deputy, and staff for the House of Bishops. Those assignments co-opted huge chunks of time, necessarily limiting the chance to meet and visit with people.

In Detroit my responsibility was to coordinate the booth for AP, the best assignment yet. It's impossible to decide whether I enjoyed most visiting with those aware of and a part of AP for 40 years, or someone who had never heard of us. In describing AP, I took my cue from our latest



(Crapson — cont.)

introductory leaflet containing excerpts from statements issued by the Council. Also, without exception, there was a light in the eye and enthusiastic commendation for our having raised the question of communion for children.

The AP booth was one of the few (including the publishers) with Spanish language material. We need to provide more. And we need to have bookmarks in Spanish. The AP bookmarks first appeared at Denver. This year we added some new ones with quotations from the inclusive language work of the SLC. A number of people took enough of them for the members of their parishes as a memento of GC.

Our booth was shared with the North American Association for the Diaconate, the Association of Diocesan Liturgy and Music Commissions, and the Association of Anglican Musicians, designed with hospitality in mind — lots of chairs, often full, and a water cooler which provided a great draw. By actual count, we gave away over 900 cups of water.

Generally, people visiting the booth were neither disinterested in nor fascinated by the issues. They were thoughtful and somewhat concerned about lack of visibility of major issues facing the world. There was overwhelming support for and pride in the Michigan proposal on economic justice. The Diocese of Michigan was respected for initiating the proposal and especially for providing the bus tours to give deputies an eyewitness experience of what this was all about.

Concern was expressed about the vote in the House of Bishops on Episcopal Visitors. Many, whether pleased or disappointed, related it to the single issue of a woman bishop. Others saw it as a sacrifice of the unity expressed in the episcopate for

a mere cosmetic appearance of unity. Interestingly, were you to interview thirty bishops about their reason for their vote, you might have gotten fifteen different answers. One of the most unusual reasons was that it was self-limiting and, while probably wrong, it would go away. A common concern was that the resolution assumes there is no pastoral sensitivity in the Church unless it is legislated.

Many people commented on the proliferation of daily publications and a loss of quality and humor in the midst of this expansion. Most of the sheets were regarded as less news than propaganda.

Unquestionably, these publications reflect the fact that General Convention mirrors the tendency today in all political arenas to concentrate on single issues. Every vote is regarded as a vote "for me" or "against me", and reactions are intensely personal. A kind of tribalism develops where the theological or ecclesiological basis for a vote is less important than alignments it may establish or personal support it may demonstrate.

Two comments stand out in assessing this Convention. At a Convention consumed by concerns about inclusion, it was left to Bishop Walker of Long Island to amend a resolution on the floor by substituting "the child" for the word "it". The resolution came to the House of Bishops from the Standing Liturgical Commission through the committees of both Houses.

A booth visitor wondered when the Church would address the issue of major health care, given the scientific advances in medicine and technology and limited resources: Who will die, and who will decide?

Winnie Crapson, a member of the AP Council, lives in Topeka, Kansas.

and, speaking of inclusive language...

The following translations of The Lord's Prayer were prepared by Harold C. Fleming, a good friend of the Editor's, and first appeared in *OPEN* in May, 1976. We thought they would bear repeating:

The Lord's Prayer, as it might have been translated by a committee of career government employees:

Highest Designated Authority, occupying maximum allocable space, VIP be your status. May your jurisdiction be conceded, your directives implemented, in the field as they are in headquarters. We request that you transmit standard supplies and materials, including but not limited to minimum man-day internal requirements. Disregard occasional infractions of applicable regulations, in the same manner as customary disciplinary measures are frequently waived at this level. Refrain from employment of techniques of entrapment, but take appropriate steps to assure that all personnel receive adequate positive guidance. For acknowledgment is hereby made that yours is the duly constituted authority, the statutory mandate, and the top priority. For an indefinite period.

The Lord's Prayer, as it might have been translated by a committee of the Bar Association:

Party of the First Part, in loco parentis, wheresoever domiciled, resident, or otherwise situated, may you be tendered the respect befitting your station. May your estate be conveyed without encumbrances, your requests be honored in common law as in probate. Furnish us, your rightful dependents, with reasonable daily subsistence. And grant us full and absolute remission of all obligations and liabilities in the same and equal measure as we may grant such remission to others similarly situated. Accept our petition for relief from any and all provocations, enticements and blandishments that might induce us to commit acts of turpitude, and grant us immunity from self-incrimination. For in you are vested the rights of eminent domain, habeas corpus, and certiorari, in perpetuity.

The Lord's Prayer, as it might have been translated by an interdisciplinary committee of social scientists:

Anthropomorphic Parent Surrogate, in your abstract, idealized habitat, mystical be your apostrophization. May your ethical construct be validated, your volition be effectuated, on the corporeal no less than on the ideational plane. Provide us with our requisite quotidian caloric intake, and permit us to cathart our guilt feelings as we permit catharsis of the guilt feelings we have engendered in others. Subject us not to those stimuli which might activate socially disapproved behavior, but strengthen our super-ego structures. For yours is the ethos, the cathexis, and the charisma. Ad infinitum.
