



December 1988

the **associated parishes**
for liturgy and mission

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

AN ANGLICAN ODYSSEY 1987~88

by Reginald H. Fuller

The Rev. Prof. Reginald H. Fuller, M.A. (Cantab.), S.T.D., is a Professor Emeritus of New Testament at the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria. He also served similarly on the faculties of Seabury-Western and Union Theological Seminaries.

*While a Visiting Professor at the College of Emmanuel and St. Chad, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, he prepared this article which is reprinted from the Spring 1988 issue of *The Anglican*, in turn reprinted from *Rotunda* (the student magazine of the College), Easter, 1988. Reprinted with permission.*

One of the blessings of retirement is that you can choose what you want to do. It has been my privilege since 1985 to visit different parts of the Anglican Communion and to teach in theological colleges or seminaries for three months at a time. During the past twelve months I have taught at St. Mark's, Canberra, Australia, and now I am at the College of Emmanuel and St. Chad, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. In addition I visited briefly the Churches of the Provinces of New Zealand and of Central Africa, as well as my own native Church of England and The Episcopal Church in the United States, where I am now canonically resident.

All these churches are either revising their Prayer Books or are now using a Revised Prayer Book. Australia, like Canada, has gone the way of the Church of England rather than that of The Episcopal Church, that is to say, Australia too has an alternative Prayer Book (1977) while leaving its older Prayer Book as the legal Book. The alternative Book was of special significance to them, for until then they had never had a Prayer Book of their own, but had used the English 1662. The Australian Church has been remarkably slow in cutting loose from mother's apron strings. I remember the discussions in Canada during the fifties

→

(Fuller - cont.)

when the Church's name was changed from "The Church of England in Canada" (as it was when I first took services in Ontario in 1956) to "The Anglican Church of Canada." This change did not come to Australia until the 1970's. The main reason for this delay was the dominance of the Diocese of Sydney. This diocese represents a type of Anglicanism rare in the world today. Not only is it conservative evangelical and near fundamentalist, but it is confessionally very rigid—the nearest thing in Anglicanism to the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod! While I was there the Archbishop of Sydney refused permission for a Roman Catholic priest to preach in an Anglican service. He could give an address outside the context of the Holy Communion or Morning Prayer, but not sermon in the liturgy. That would be recognizing false doctrine! A few years ago the archbishop refused to meet the Pope when His Holiness visited Australia. So they have not wanted to depart one inch from 1662 or the Reformation. It is curious that conservative evangelicals are so attached to a liturgy which was basically medieval rather than scriptural, *e.g.*, in its excessive emphasis on the words of institution instead of the scriptural method of consecration by Thanksgiving. This is why the Prayer Book for Australia contains the 1662 Communion Service in contemporary language. But it also has revised liturgies of the modern kind, similar to those of the Anglican Church of Canada. Like the Church of England, however, and unlike Canada 1985 and New Zealand, the eucharistic prayers contain an invocation of the Holy Spirit before, rather than after, the words of institution. One of the most striking features of the Prayer Book for Australia is that it contains drawings of wild flowers indigenous to that continent. New Zealand does not yet have a complete new Prayer Book, though one is in preparation. Meanwhile it has a "Wee Bookie" as the Scots had in the eighteenth century. The language of its prayers struck me as a radical departure from Anglican norms.

While at St. John's College, Auckland, I attended two eucharists, both of which were presided over by a different woman priest assisted by a woman deacon. Only two thousand miles away that could never happen. I found myself in a completely different world in this respect when I arrived

in Australia. They had only just decided to ordain women deacons a few months earlier, about the same time as the Church of England took the same step. Once again it was clear how close the Australian Church remains to England. The issue of women priests was to come up at the General Synod in August 1987, two days after I left for Zimbabwe, and we know it failed to obtain the requisite majorities. There is some thought that it will be possible under the constitution for the separate dioceses to "go it alone." As in the Church of England, women's ordination is being blocked by an alliance between the stricter Anglo-Catholics, mainly in Adelaide, and the conservative evangelicals in Sydney. The Anglo-Catholics argue that the priest at the altar is the "icon" of Christ and must therefore be male. It was ironic that a Canadian woman preaching recently in the chapel at Emmanuel and St. Chad expounded the same "icon" doctrine. The evangelicals, on the other hand, base their opposition upon the "headship" doctrine according to which the man is the head of the woman and, therefore, a woman cannot exercise authority over men (1 Cor. 11:3, 1 Tim. 2:12).

It appears to me that the evangelical argument is a tougher nut to crack. The "icon" theory as commonly propounded lacks a proper scriptural basis. Apart from the fact that there are no Christian priests as such in the New Testament, the "icon" doctrine is expounded quite differently by St. Paul. The Apostle is an icon of Christ, not because he is a male, but because his apostolic sufferings are an epiphany of the cross: "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus" (2 Cor. 4:10). See also the lists of apostolic sufferings in 1 Corinthians 4:9-13, 2 Corinthians 4:7-12 and 11:22-29. As one theologian has expressed it, Paul's life is an expression of the cross-side of the kerygma. You don't have to be male in order to suffer; thus, according to scripture, a woman priest could be an icon of Christ crucified just as much as a man. The argument of headship is more difficult to deal with. The Pauline doctrine cannot be lightly dismissed as merely a reflection of the social structures of his age. It has a doctrinal basis in Genesis 1 and 2. For the evangelicals there is no problem in a woman's presiding at the eucharist—anybody can do that, for scrip-

(Fuller - cont.)

ture lays down no rule — but for a woman to be a rector of a parish or a churchwarden would be unscriptural, for that would mean her exercise of authority over men.

Meanwhile the women deacons were just getting into their stride in the Diocese of Canberra. I found the clergy in that diocese like the American counterparts before 1976 did not know how to use a deacon in the liturgy. It created quite an impression in St. Mark's College when I made the fullest use of a woman deacon. Shortly afterwards I made a speech at the Diocesan Synod in Gouldburn advocating this full liturgical use of deacons. Unfortunately my remarks were misunderstood. The women deacons present at the Synod thought that I was degrading them by suggesting that they lay the table and wash the dishes! I guess the trouble was that they thought of themselves simply as transitional deacons who hoped to be advanced to the priesthood. They did not appreciate that it was the dignity of the deacon to serve at table as well as to serve in the world. Unfortunately, I did not have a chance to explain that this was not a job for female deacons only and that a male deacon, properly used, would do the same chore.

Participation in the Gouldburn Synod was a valuable experience for me. I was invited to preach at the first Evensong at Gouldburn Cathedral when I took the opportunity to say something about the role of Synods in the Anglican Communion. I pointed out that the inclusion of the laity in the synodical process was a contribution of The Episcopal Church to the Anglican Communion. Bishop Selwyn, who first introduced synods in New Zealand in the 1840's, deliberately borrowed from the American model. The Reformers had intended the laity to have such a role, but expected it to be fulfilled by the King in Parliament. This was all right as long as the members of Parliament were all members of the Church of England. But in a time when Members of Parliament can be of all religions or of none, some other machinery is necessary; hence, the synod with its house of laity. Paradoxically the mother Church of England seems to think that they have only just invented synodical government, and that some of the clergy are not too happy about giving so much authority to the laity. Should the

authority of the episcopate be curbed by a possible veto in the house of laity? It is, however, an authentic Anglican belief that the laity partake of the Holy Spirit in virtue of their baptism and that the clergy have no monopoly of the Spirit!

Like Canada, the Australian church has joined with a non-Anglican church (the Uniting Church which has the same components as the United Church of Canada, *i.e.*, Methodists, Congregationalists, and some Presbyterians) to produce a common hymn book. The same admirable ecumenical intentions and the same high musical standards have informed the Australian production as its Canadian counterpart, but unfortunately with the same questionable results. For in both cases the hymns are organized according to the pietistic theme plan which originated in the Methodist hymn books. Anglicans, like Lutherans, require a hymn book arranged according to the Church Year. Moreover, an Anglican hymn book should serve as a companion to the Book of Common Prayer or its revised successors. Today what we need is a hymnal constructed on those lines with hymns for morning and evening, for the Church Year, for Baptism, Eucharist, Pastoral and Episcopal offices. The organists' handbook or other suggestions which accompany the ecumenical hymn book is insufficient as I know from experience. For example, when I was at Emmanuel and St. Chad's in 1978, I attended a service on Advent Sunday in a parish church in Saskatoon where they did not have a single Advent hymn, and similarly on Ascension Day 1987 there was not a single Ascension hymn at the eucharist at St. Mark's College, Canberra. Unfortunately too many of the clergy neglect the importance of selecting proper hymns to go with the service and leave it sometimes to a non-Anglican organist.

All the churches I visited are concerned with more than purely domestic issues. Everywhere I went I found a concern for social justice, and everywhere there is the same problem of the relations between the original inhabitants of the land and European settlers: Maoris in New Zealand, Aborigines in Australia, Africans in Zimbabwe, and Native Americans here [in Canada]. It is a serious problem everywhere and there is no obvious solution, alas.

There is a great deal of discussion going



(Fuller — cont.)

on all over the world about the future of the Anglican Communion. Much of this discussion is focussed on the problem of unity. Until recently we all had substantially the same Prayer Book with only minor variations. There was always the difference between the 1662 Prayer of Consecration which stopped abruptly after the words of institution and the full Scottish-American type of eucharistic prayer which was adopted earlier in the century by South Africa and in 1959 by Canada. But now the differences are considerable. Is the Book of Common Prayer no longer a bond of unity in the Anglican Communion? I think that despite the radical changes in the wording of the prayers, mitigated somewhat by the use of the ICET (International Consultation on English Texts) texts, it *is*. The order and structure of the eucharistic liturgy is identical everywhere, and the way in which it is performed is recognizably Anglican.

The related question of authority is much more difficult. The problem arises particularly because of the prospect of the ordination of women to the episcopate in The Episcopal Church. The matter has apparently not been canvassed yet in Canada or New Zealand. Should national synods be allowed to decide this issue when the epis-

copate belongs to the whole church? In Roman Catholic circles in Germany there has been much discussion of the "reception" of a bishop. His election and subsequent reception is seen as being integral to his authority no less than his proper ordination. It is being suggested that episcopal ordination and consecration is not fully valid until the bishop has been received by the Church. What would it mean if there are women bishops in The Episcopal Church who are not received by some diocese in The Episcopal Church itself and by other provinces in the Anglican Communion? Will their orders be fully valid? On the other hand, if the episcopate represents the fullness of ministry and if women are permitted to share in part of that ministry, is it not logical that they should be eligible to be ministers in the fullest sense and therefore qualified for the episcopate?

We can only hope and pray that the bishops at the Lambeth Conference this year will be able to come up with a solution that does justice to the legitimate concern of both sides and preserves the unity of the Anglican Communion. Humanly speaking that seems to be beyond the bounds of possibility, requiring the wisdom of Solomon. May our fathers in God be granted that wisdom! +++

John Oliver Patterson

1908 - 1988

The Rev. John O. Patterson, prime mover, co-founder, and first president of The Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission, died in San Francisco on Saturday, November 12, 1988. He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth, two sons, two daughters, several grandchildren, and one brother.

After studying architecture at MIT, John entered Seabury-Western Seminary and was ordained in 1934. Later, for his outstanding work in liturgy, mission, and education, he received a D.D. from Seabury-Western in 1951 and an S.T.D. from Hobart College in 1961.

Early in his ministry John served parishes in Chicago, South Dakota, and Madison, Wisconsin. He revitalized each of his parishes by his able preaching and teaching chiefly related to his insights into the emerging liturgical movement which focussed on the parish eucharist as the central act of worship on the Lord's Day.

In 1946, after consulting clergy and lay persons who shared his interest in the liturgical movement, John convened the first meeting of a new, independent Church group which became The Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission.

→

(Patterson — cont.)

John was called in 1949 to become rector and headmaster of the Kent School for boys in Connecticut, originally founded by the Order of the Holy Cross. He revamped the curriculum to bring more emphasis on Christian values and principles. During his tenure, Kent became among the first independent boys secondary schools to open a campus for girls.

In 1962 John moved to Rome to found St. Stephen's School, a coeducational preparatory school with students from many countries. He retired from that post in 1970 and remained in Rome as associate priest of the Episcopal Church of St. Paul-within-the-Walls. He returned to the United States in 1979 and chose San Francisco as his and his wife's retirement home. He continued his interest in AP and attended several Council meetings in his capacity as hono-

rary Council member.

The Rev. Samuel E. West, honorary Council member, with John a co-founder of AP and long-time associate of John's both at Grace Church, Madison, Wisconsin, and at Kent School, had these comments on his old friend:

"After my 42 years of close collegial work and personal friendship, I shall miss the elder brother who never let me fall for any satisfaction in mediocrity. Certainly there will be a stir-up in the heavenly realms when John's wholeness will be restored and he is assigned new tasks for his own growth and for the vitality and rejoicing at the heavenly banquet of our great High Priest and in the life of the Communion of Saints. That is his hope and ours."

+++

An Editorial Essay

Liturgical Narcissism

by Henry H. Breul

Forty years ago Mrs. Lawrence Rose approached me on the Close of General Seminary in great agitation. She was the wife of the Dean, and I was quite surprised when she blurted out, "Henry, do you know what the seminary wives are doing in Seabury Hall right now?" I looked nonplussed — "They are having a discussion on 'what the Incarnation means to me'. Really, what nonsense!" Then she moved on. At the time I was a junior struggling with what *everything* meant and I didn't get the full impact of what she was alarmed about until years later.

Now I get in the mail a postcard from a clergy association, topic: "What is my Faith Response to the Episcopal Visitors Canon?" It all seems to come together. When Mrs. Rose spoke to me, Reuel Howe was regaling Virginia Seminary on "Meeting Felt Needs" and generally turning Buber's "I-Thou" into "I-Me". In the wings were C.P.T. groups, Life Labs, Parish Life conferences and the acceptance of a post-

Freudian psychosocial therapeutic model for the Church and its ministry. In the wake of these events "counselling" and "spirituality" became clang words for clergy.

When AP was founded there was a good deal of highly individualistic liturgical piety in the Church. Each year the congregation of the Church of the Advent in Boston puckered up to hear Father Hale's "Jimmy and Jesus" sermon about the little boy sitting and looking at the reserved sacrament: "Jesus looks at me and I look at him". This is a paradigm of the piety of adoration of the host at Mass and Benediction. The founders of AP saw clearly that the piety in the pews was personal and unrelated to the community or the world, and the first brochure, *Parish Eucharist*, was produced in 1951 to overcome this sort of late medieval corruption. Later AP discovered that indeed the American Prayer Books were so full of this emphasis that a profound revision *had* to take place in order to reform worship.



(Breul — cont.)

While AP and other liturgical reform groups were struggling to objectify worship and call the worshipping community out of its monads and into group consciousness, the psychosocial model was taking hold, and self-referred theology and group interactions were moving ahead. Retreats, instead of being times of silence to "wait upon God", became times of pooling of feelings. "I heard you" and "How do you feel about that?" were the texts used as Carl Rogers took over from Abbé Cousaude and Father Huntington. Self-help groups proliferated in the Church and the society as a sense of lostness pervaded our culture. Robert Frost said it best:

*We dance about in a ring and suppose
While the secret sits in the middle
and knows.*

Spirituality, too, had become highly individuated as it had drifted toward Zen and Yoga. Several years ago Sister Rachel Hosmer wrote a review in the *Anglican Theological Review* of a large group of books on spirituality, pointing out that there seemed to be as many spiritualities as there were books about it.

We are now in a post-Freudian and, I think, a post-Jungian time. Whether most readers got it or not, the first chapter of Erica Jong's *Fear of Flying* put the final nail in Freud's coffin with the hilarious picture of a bunch of psychoanalysts interacting on an airplane flying to Europe. In a sense, all of this has been a spinning-out of Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum* which is reflected in Rembrandt's self-portrait in the world of art. The "lonely crowd", David Reisman called it. We are all infected with it and in some way are self-regarding to the exclusion of others and reality in general. This sort of utter internalization that pervades our time was non-existent before the "enlightenment". Indeed, the invention of the corridor (which Versailles lacked) was a symptom of a profound need for privacy and all it represents. Now privacy is a triple-locked apartment, cable TV, and a pitcher of martinis, while "what's in it for me" and the "bottom line" are the passwords of society.

We have reached the point where individu-

ation has undermined personal definition. We not only no longer know who we are, we don't even recognize that we don't know it.

For liturgy all this is a profoundly disturbing phenomenon. At least Jimmy had Jesus — most modern people have only things to consume and entertain. Liturgy, being the meeting ground of the person with eternal reality and group identity, is undermined by hyper-individuation, and indeed great liturgy may be the cure if it is willing to be authoritative. This is a *bad* word, but *authority* is just what is missing in our modern life style. Liturgy which is valid places the individual in a group under the supreme authority of God. Christian liturgy, when it works, places persons in the presence of Jesus Christ.

We are beginning to see the struggles of modern hyper-individuals where they enter the catechumenate. It is no longer idols and devils we exorcise, but people's ambivalence about belonging to anything or recognizing the authority of anyone. When people approach baptism, the real "angst" lies in giving up semi-solipsism which hides behind the concept of individual freedom and rights in order to become part of a larger whole. The question is not "What does the Incarnation mean to me?", but "Will you take on the incarnate life of Christ as yours and minister in his name?"

This is so foreign to many of our young people that the process of entering the Church becomes deeply traumatic and life-shattering. If the pagan man had a terrible time giving up his idols, modern people are turned inside out by giving up what they have been taught to be personal autonomy, an autonomy that is really *anomie* and lostness.

The Church in the last forty years has been a part of all this. Clergy now seem to see themselves as poorly trained extensions of the local psychological counseling service. Rectors hesitate to exercise authority, bishops look for "consensus" — the conscience clause in the House of Bishops is just one example of shattered authority.

We have to accept the reality that in our liturgical gatherings we are faced with a

(Breul — cont.)

non-group and that the task of the liturgy is to move them out of their separation into unity. Not as in the old days when a group gathered to celebrate its corporate, unspoken unity, but rather a group gathering to find the unity which their lives do not have in the world. *Proclamation* and *Judgment* should replace counselling and "group dynamics". Whether we like it or not, or even feel comfortable about it, we are a

hierarchical church in revealed religion. The truth lies in Scripture, Tradition and Reason, not in our navels or our hearts!! This is not an age in which we can be "successful", for it is a time out of synch with reality.

Once again, we need to say with Pogo, "We has met the enemy and they is us." ++

A HOMILY FOR THE MARRIAGE of Melinda Netson & Thomas Kim

by Michael W. Merriman

Introduction

Thomas and Melinda came into the life of the Cathedral when, in planning for their marriage, Tom expressed the desire to be baptized. Melinda, already a communicant in the Episcopal Church, was eager to be his sponsor. They entered the catechumenate program of the Cathedral and the greatest part of their preparation for marriage was done within the catechumenate. As the participants in the weekly meetings reflected upon their own journeys into faith and conversion, Tom and Melinda were asked to reflect in particular upon their relationship together in the light of salvation history, prayer, worship, and social justice. The process of taking part in the rites of the catechumenate, in the Great Vigil, and in learning to read the Daily Office together produced two people at home in the liturgy who were truly ministers for the marriage rite. They ministered to each other and the congregation with more grace and ease than is seen in many clergy.

Tobit 8:5b-8; Psalm 67; 1 Corinthians 13:1-13; Matthew 5:13-16.

Thomas and Melinda, we gather here between the two most important parts of the Cath-

The Rev. Canon Michael W. Merriman, a member of the AP Council, is vice-dean of Grace Cathedral, San Francisco.

dral: the font and the altar. They mark a journey the two of you have made in this building many times: a journey which began for Thomas on Easter Eve when he was baptized. I wish to talk to you (and we will invite the congregation to listen in on this conversation) reminding you simply of all the things you know about yourselves and your relationship to God. Perhaps the rest of us can learn and recall something ourselves.

Thomas and Melinda, children of God, created by God out of the substance of this earth to bear the image of God before the world.

Thomas and Melinda: Melinda, godmother to the husband she has chosen; Thomas at Easter, a living, visible sign of the resurrection of Christ as he came forth from the water and was clothed in the shining garment of salvation. Thomas and Melinda, because of baptism, brother and sister in Christ.

Thomas and Melinda, participants in the history of God's people that stretches back over the ages; a history so true that in it you can understand your own lives: Melinda as the Moses who led Thomas through the waters of baptism; Thomas, the image of Christ himself offering himself to God as he was buried in baptism and raised to new life.

(Merriman — cont.)

Thomas and Melinda, light to the world, light which shines not on itself but shines out to show other people Christ. You are called now by God into a vocation of modeling in yourselves that life-giving and saving relationship which exists between Christ and all people so that in seeing you two made one we may know the future hope of the whole human race united in God.

Thomas and Melinda, salt of the earth. Salt is not good if so much is used that it overpowers the food. Salt's purpose is to lose itself in giving savor and life to others. Salt's function is to preserve that which is good that it not be lost. Thomas and Melinda, salt of the earth to give life and savor and taste to your own lives and, in doing so, to the lives of those you hold dear and to the lives of all people.

Thomas and Melinda, Adam and Eve restored. The old wrong turned 'round into right because you have come to each other in Christ:

turned 'round to show that love and unity are the will of God for all people.

Thomas and Melinda, teachers to each other, guides to each other, fellow sufferers with Christ at some times in your life and living members of the resurrected Christ at all times in your life.

Thomas and Melinda, who will place bread on the altar to become Bread for others. Thomas and Melinda, who will place wine on the altar that you may witness to the fact that you and all God's children are blood brothers and sisters with each other and with Christ.

Thomas and Melinda, light and salt, joy and peace, signs of the Risen Christ, we rejoice in your love this day, and we rejoice in the gift you give us of yourselves as living witnesses of Christ. To him be glory and honor for ever and ever.

AMEN

THE DAILY OFFICE: ANOTHER VIEW

by Peter C. Moore

The Daily Office was the theme of the annual conference of the Association of Diocesan Liturgy and Music Commissions in November, 1987. Recent articles in *OPEN* by Howard E. Galley, Jr. and Louis Weil are printings of addresses which they gave there. Both writers initiate an overdue discussion of the office as Anglican prayer books have it. It can be said of the office in our present book that it is least touched by the liturgical renewal going on since the end of the Second World War. All that has been done in our present book is simply to provide for enrichment, both in additional canticles and in the provision for the use of antiphons and hymnody, together with a greater flexibility in the use of readings — no longer are we locked into two readings at Morning and Evening Prayer — and with more options in the way the office itself may be done.

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

There are other enrichments: the inclusion of An Order of Service for Noonday and An Order for Compline. The Prayer Book thus now parallels *A Monastic Breviary* currently in use in many American religious communities, the chief difference being the former's more restrained use of psalmody. The revision of Family Prayers into Daily Devotions for individuals and families, which now has a structure that explicitly parallels the office, though much simplified, makes these more useful.

The one really new element introduced is An Order of Worship for the Evening, a form of the Cathedral Office which Howard Galley talks about. As presented in the Prayer Book, it is quite austere. In Galley's *The Prayer Book Office* it is much enriched and therefore that much more useful as a way of marking the transition from day to night as well as season to season. It does indeed present the opportunity for a cathedral office in which the emphasis is on worship — praise, adoration, thanksgiving — rather than

(Moore — cont.)

centering on the psalter and the in-course reading of Scripture. It makes a splendid entrance rite for an evening celebration of the liturgy.

Howard Galley himself has also taken the Prayer Book office one step further in his *Daily Morning and Evening Prayer*, a pocket size volume which contains a two week selection from the psalter as well as short readings from scriptures, so that those who are riders of public transportation or who do not have the time to do the full office of the Prayer Book or travelers might still be able to mark the time of prayer in a richer fashion than does Daily Devotions for Individuals and Families. On a trip to Southeast Asia and Australia I found it both useful and satisfying. So we must thank Howard for his many contributions to new ways to do the office as well as challenging us to think rigorously about it and its place in the lives of prayer of all the baptized.

The result of these minor but helpful revisions is that the office is certainly being used more widely than it was in our former Prayer Book. I am aware of more people doing some form of morning and evening prayer from the Prayer Book than I knew before. The 1928 Prayer Book Office (like its predecessors) was tedium raised to the *nth* power. I remember when I began using the trial office feeling as if I had been let out of prison. The lectionary, still a course reading of the scriptures, now over a two year cycle, is more consciously focused on the Paschal Mystery and thus ties office and liturgy together into the central celebration of our faith.

Whatever may have been the scholarly and liturgical deficiencies of Thomas Cranmer, he had a vision of the Church at worship. If the Prayer Book which he oversaw did not demonstrate that fact, his uncompleted revision of the canons would establish it. He may have been naive, simplistic, and foolish in his notion that people would gather in the way he hoped they would — Sunday for office, litany, holy communion, and weekdays for the office — but it reveals that he understood the Christian life as rooted in the worship of the Triune God and being shaped and formed by that action. So far as I know he never used the phrase

lex orandi, lex credendi, but his work clearly reflects that principle. He wanted to teach people to pray every day, believing that prayer would shape their faith. He wanted them to know the message of the scriptures, the reading of which he seemed to understand as experiencing the Gospel.

In 1955 Louis Bouyer wrote in *Liturgical Piety*:

But in spite of these defects, we must admit frankly that the Offices of Morning Prayer and of Evensong...are not only one of the most impressive, but also one of the purest forms of Christian common prayer to be found anywhere in the world.

He wrote less kindly about the eucharist of the Book of Common Prayer.

Cranmer's liturgical purpose, as I tried to demonstrate long ago in an STM thesis, was to embody conservative reformation principles in Eucharist and Office. He evidently believed that the use of scripture would itself restore primitive doctrine. He turned the old breviary offices into a means of reading the Bible through and at the same time made the psalter such a part of the devotional life of the Church of England that, as we know, the translation he had at hand continues to be the basis of the Prayer Book psalter to this day. We do need to remember that the invention of printing did not make people literate; most would still only know the Bible from hearing it read in church.

Now it may be that Howard Galley is right that the Daily Office is not the place to read the Bible. He is certainly right that over the years Cranmer's scriptural and liturgical intention has been more honored in the breach than in practice, especially in the Episcopal Church. Nevertheless, there is a great hunger for scripture, and I think the hunger is not, for God's sake to explain it, but to *read* it and to read in the context of prayer. The widespread satisfaction with four lessons of scripture every Sunday in the liturgy, even if there is disagreement over what these ought to be, witnesses to it.

Aidan Kavanagh speaks of catchmens being "marinated in scripture". If they are

(Moore — cont.)

going to be marinated, then so must the faithful who are to be examples to them. The interest in "spirituality" among Christians today, the surfeit of books on the spiritual life being one sign, reveals a new seriousness among both the baptized and the unbaptized about faith and the life of prayer. If we are trying to teach people to pray we need to help them enter into the stories and symbols of the Christian people, to hear them over and over, to be gripped by them. Is once a week at the liturgy enough? Even beyond this hunger is the need to shape the faithful to look at the world in the context of God's purposes. How will we strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being, if we do not know what God's justice and peace are, and why every human being has an inherent dignity? If the opening verses of Psalm 137 speak of what we would like to imagine ourselves to be, the last three are the mirror that reveals most clearly what we are much of the time.

When to pray? How to pray? The Prayer Book suggests that it is both a corporate and a personal activity. Thus the daily office is designed in some sense to replicate the liturgy. The times of passage from darkness to light and light to darkness, both echoes of baptism, are the traditional times, *Morning Prayer* and *Evening Prayer*. Howard Galley is right, that as far as either office is concerned, there is little or nothing that ties them to a particular time of day. In fact, the offices are almost interchangeable, which might account for that bizarre behavior that Louis Weil speaks of, reading Morning and Evening Prayer at 8:15 at night. The blandness of the two offices does need some liturgical salt.

The absurdities in the use of the daily office that Louis Weil cites in "The Sanctification of Time: What does it mean?" are common enough, at least among clergy. I suspect that only the ordained would fall into such silly practices. I was never caught up in the notion of "sanctification of time" (I have been having fun wondering what Dom Gregory Dix would say to Louis Weil in response, since Dix reportedly loved to argue). The term never made much sense to me, and was certainly not

the reason that I went to or read Morning and Evening Prayer. I had a book by that title once by someone whose name I cannot now remember, perhaps Gueranger. I thought it was a lot of twaddle then and I still do. Anamnesis and eschatology are what the liturgy and office are both about.

My experience of the daily office, like many clergy, began with seminary where it was done every day — and sung most of the time. After graduation I served in a parish where it was read daily. We even read the psalter by the month. After three years of seminary and five years in the parish, the daily office had become as rooted in my prayer life as the liturgy on Sundays and holy days. I continued laboriously to read it on my own, with the absurd things some of the time, in part because I thought I had to, but also at least some of the time because I wanted to. With the revision of the office in the trial use period, I asked my wife to join me in the reading of the office (where she officiates and I read the lessons). That radically altered both of our prayer lives and particularly our experience of the office. Now that I am in the twilight years of active ministry, I find myself once again in a parish where Morning Prayer is read daily. Lately we have begun to do the kind of Vespers that Howard Galley talks about on Sundays of Advent and continuing through Christmas and Epiphany 1, and picking up again in Lent and going until Pentecost. The fact that we do these services publicly invites others to do them and sustains them in doing so, in-course readings do better if they are heard in course, but most of the time (there are some dreadful exceptions) they stand on their own.

One very practical reform would be to drop the offices on Sunday, except when using the Order of Worship for Evening as a sense of rounding out the day. We do not need two or three, or, God forbid, four scripture readings, and additional psalmody, when we want to focus on the eucharistic lectionary. One might even repeat one of the selections from it, or better a portion of one, if one were using the Order of Worship for Evening.

Why read Morning and Evening Prayer daily (except Sunday)? Well, why not?

(Moore — cont.)

What would we do if we did not? Cranmer's Bible-reading intention, particularly now with the present-day lectionary, is helpful. Psalmody, all of it, even the ghastly parts, has the potential for keeping us honest. We have to run our agendas through them, and isn't that one of the purposes of scripture? Psalms do have a far better "spirituality" than a lot of the stuff being churned out by the gurus and mystics who set much of the tone for prayer today.

And the offices can be transitions in the day, less from darkness to light and light to darkness than from home to work and work to home. The traditional themes of transition still need to be noticed, but more as they relate to the conjoining of the many worlds in which we live, so that we know that all belongs to God.

If we are going to take formation in Christ as a major pastoral responsibility, then we are going to have to let people hear and enter into the story of the people to which they belong. Further, we are going to have to teach them to pray. It seems to me that placing the Paschal Mystery at the center of our life together means that we gather to celebrate that in Word and Sacrament Sunday by Sunday, and that we also gather to remember that Mystery every day, even twice every day, in scripture and prayer.

If we see office and liturgy as rooted in the paschal event, then we will discover that it has a corporate as well as an individual dimension. Reading the office by oneself can only be sustained if there is at least one other individual

somewhere else in the congregation who is doing it, perhaps at a mutually agreed upon time. If some few persons will gather at the parish church to do Morning and Evening Prayer, that will help those lone individuals. They in turn might be encouraged to find others living near them who would gather with them some days of the week to sing God's praises and to ponder the mysteries of scripture. The discipline of the office, if it has any meaning, is that it makes us into disciples, not that we will be arrested if we don't do it.

I wrote "sing" above, but I was being metaphorical. However, *The Hymnal 1982* does give us psalm tones that even the tone deaf could manage, as well as some canticles, in addition to their various metrical versions. Singing, even if there are only a couple of people present, does change the character of what is being done. Why not? Augustine's dictum, "He who sings prays twice," helps.

It is certainly true that the office is never going to be a great, popular, daily service in our time, no matter what form it takes. The lovely pictures that Howard Galley paints of the office in earlier times are lost now in the frenzy of the lives of people rushing to work or returning to their homes. Both the tempo and the quality of our piety are at their best Sunday-centered. Still, my pastoral experience is that it is possible to gather some and to teach others to make the office what the Prayer Book intends it to be in their lives, and until we find something else that shapes the lives of people better, then let us by all means encourage its use. +++

LITURGICAL NOTES FROM ALL OVER #1

From the Holy Week schedule of a parish in California

Friday: 12:00 noon

Children's service for Good Friday
Ruffles-the-Clown will lead the children in
a service of *The Stations of the Cross*.

(Jesus faw down and go boom - a second time! Ed.)

REVIEWS

Books

reviewed by Henry H. Breul

The Bishop in Liturgy: An Anglican Symposium on the role and task of the Bishop in the field of liturgy. Ed. Colin Buchanan. Alcuin/GROW: Liturgical Study No.6. Grove Books Limited. Bramcote, Notts., U.K. Paper. 61 pages. £2.50

This little book should be required reading for every bishop, dean, and chapter in the Anglican Communion. It can be read in an hour, yet it puts so many things in perspective as to be revolutionary. While some of it deals with peculiarly English problems, most of the study deals with the basic concepts of the ministry of bishop and cathedral within the whole life of the Church. Many myths are shattered while many practices are explained in terms of the origins and real meanings.

The introduction by the editor, Colin Buchanan, Bishop of Ashton, Diocese of Birmingham, is a comic gem:

"Over and above native ignorance (which may be neither total nor uncaring), there are at least three great further difficulties in establishing principles for Anglican bishops. These are:

"1. By sheer seniority of age and understanding, the episcopate is more likely to represent yesterday's ways of doing things than to-morrow's. That is all the more likely to be the case in a naturally conservative church, or from a liturgically indifferent episcopate — or where liturgical change has all come recently and had passed the particular bishop by in his pre-episcopal days.

(See BOOKS, page 13, col. 1.)

Music

reviewed by M. Sue Reid

When in our Music God is Glorified is a set of audio tapes that should be in every church's library. The tapes, recently produced by The Church Hymnal Corporation, are an introduction to *The Hymnal 1982* and much more. While the majority of time on the three tapes is taken up with the actual performance of hymns and service music, perhaps the most unique and important section comes in the first thirty minutes of Side A.

Dr. Carol Doran, associate professor of church music and director of community worship at Bexley Hall, Rochester, N.Y., was given this opening time to introduce non-musicians to chant, not just Anglican chant but chant of all types. Her task was a formidable one, and she approached it with great ease and skill. Dr. Doran begins with monotone chant, touches on plainsong, then simplified Anglican chant and finally traditional Anglican chant. Each of her points is illustrated by a choir of unrehearsed seminarians using selections from *The Hymnal 1982*. Her explanations are clear and simple and dotted with Dr. Doran's wonderful sense of humor. This "lecture" could easily be played for a church supper or adult education forum to introduce non-singers to this portion of our musical heritage. Unfortunately, the review copy I received was not properly edited for balance. The volume needed to be turned up quite high to hear the "lecture" portion and then quickly turned down when the examples were sung. The quality of both the spoken and sung words was fine, just be prepared for some quick moves on the volume control.

The other five sides of tape are devoted strictly to music. To quote from the booklet

(See MUSIC, page 13, col. 2.)

(BOOKS - from p. 12)

"2. There is a tremendous difference between different Provinces and different parts of the world — differences of the scarcity value of the bishop, differences of context and the degree of local inculturation, and differences of churchmanship.¹

"3. There is also a tremendous difference between individuals within the episcopate, and liturgy can duly bring out such differences — from the showman on the one hand to the stuffed museum-piece on the other, and from the nervously anxious who must have it all planned down to the last detail on the one hand to the informal character who horrifies his clergy by playing it all off-the-cuff on the other. It is hard to see how general principles will hold all these together..."

The symposium has used the bishop as a point of departure for speaking to the whole Church and its need for a viable ecclesiology with which to deal with the present and the future. Thus the reader is forced to reflect not only on the episcopate but also on the place of the parish church and the laity.

1. This last point comes through in that anglo-catholics have always treated the structure, contents, formality and actual conduct of worship as of higher importance than have evangelicals — and have thus tended to set the direction and pace for evangelicals. The latter, neither having strong principles of their own nor giving the subject such a high priority (and often being few and far between as bishops), have tended to provide a paler form of Ferguson-Davie — or, in reaction, to have been somewhat unprincipled.

(MUSIC — from p. 12)

accompanying the tapes, "None of the performances on this set of tapes is meant to be *definitive*. Each performance is simply one way of performing this music. In every case, style was determined by acoustics, the performing resources available, and the musical ideals of the musicians involved." And so the two sides of service music and three sides of hymns present choirs of varying size and style: St. Paul's, Indianapolis, has about 50 parishioners, ages 8-67, in their choir under the direction of Frank Boles. Christ Church choirs, Charlotte, N.C., has five choirs of various ages, four of which appear on the tape. The choir of All Saints' Church, New York City, under the direction of David Hurd, has nine voices. Emmanuel Church on Mercer Island, Wash., was represented by two groups under the direction of Betty Jean Bartholomew, one of 18 boys and girls, and one of 45 adult men and women.

Service music that a congregation has perhaps never tried because they did not know what it should sound like appears along the "old familiars". The hymns are almost totally new to *The Hymnal 1982*, not that they are all new hymns. Some are sung quite simply; others use unusual instrumentation and elaborate arrangements. It's the kind of music that would be supportive for the small church with limited resources and some creativity as well as the large parish with unlimited forces.

The first time I heard these tapes I was driving to a conference. There were a delight (except for the volume adjustments during the first side), and I relished the wealth we now enjoy in our current hymnal. Consider the set a most worthwhile investment toward the enhancement of music within the context of worship. The tapes are available from The Church Hymnal Corporation, 800 Second Ave., New York, NY 10017. The cost is \$24.95.

Not "Inclusive Language": Rather "Inclusive God"

by Peg and Geoffrey Cheadle

Brig. Gen. Geoffrey Cheadle (USAF Ret.) and his wife Peg have written an interesting response to Peter Moore's article on inclusive language which appeared in OPEN, Sept., 1988. Both Geoff and Peg are active church members, and Peg was a student at Virginia Theological Seminary.

We are "shaped by the language of our prayers"—words taken from ISSUES, July 11, 1988 (OPEN, September, 1988).

In his article entitled "Inclusive Language: The Future of an Illusion", the Rev. Peter C. Moore asks whether "didacticism is a wise liturgical practice." We gather he means, in layman's language: should the liturgy teach? It is a pointless question to ask whether the liturgy should teach, because in fact it teaches all the time and always has. If you ask, should inclusive language be deliberately inserted into the liturgy as a teaching method for the congregation, the answer is bound to come out negative. No one wants the liturgy to become a soapbox for anyone's favorite campaign. If you want to rephrase the question to ask, should that which is being taught by the liturgy be theologically correct and should the liturgical language reinforce this correctness, then the answer must be yes.

The language of liturgy teaches automatically. There is no avoiding being taught by it. And this is a good thing. People need constant reminding about who God is, and who they are, and how the two relate.

We were struck by an excerpt from a recent paper put out by the Roman Catholic organization, Priests for Equality, which

says: "Language, seemingly innocuous, powerfully communicates unconscious attitudes, stereotypes and patterns of discriminatory thinking. Discriminatory language is a major source of pain and alienation in liturgical services."

The pain is not endured just by women. Last Saturday we went to church for the Sunday Eucharist. Instead we had Evening Prayer (as an aside, this was while our clergy were up in Boston electing a woman bishop!). Here's one of the major prayers we recited:

*My soul proclaims the greatness of the Lord.
...and holy is his name.
He...
He...
He...
He...
He...
The promise he made...*

In the Magnificat, Luke puts those words into the mouth of Mary, the Mother of Jesus. The pronoun which is substituted for the word "God" is "he", and this is repeated six times. The word "he" is used in a position of prominence at the beginning of five expressions of praise. Whoever thinks that teaching is absent from this prayer has his/her head in the sand. The prayer might have equivalently been phrased as follows:

(Cheadle — cont.)

My soul proclaims the greatness of God,
and my spirit rejoices in my Savior.

For God has looked with favor upon this
lowly servant...

God has mercy on those who fear God...
God has shown strength of arm;
God has scattered the proud in their
conceit.

God has...

God has...

etc.

The repetition of the word God in the above is no worse a repetition than that of the word "he" in the original, and it is theologically correct. The "he/his" pronouns are inadequate. We have no pronouns for the name of God. But once again, God is not male or female — God transcends both.

And this leads to our main thesis, which has to do with the battle over whether or not our liturgies should adopt the use of inclusive language. On the current battlefield, the implication is that men should gird up their loins, bite the bullet, and substitute for the innumerable male pronouns other words that will mollify the women. It is implicit in many statements made by men on this subject that the outcome will be phraseology which will lack both accuracy and poesy. What a cop-out! This is condescension of the subtlest kind, but it is condescension nonetheless. The real problem is one of theology; and the debate should center on our perception of God.

God has no gender. God is neither male nor female but transcends both. God sub-

sumes human gender and reflects the best of both male and female — and the best of their interrelationship. This truth needs teaching and reinforcing at every juncture, because we are facing, in this issue, the very righteousness of God. Liturgy that presents a male God is inadequate and improper theologically. We are left with a Godhead that is two thirds male and one third ambiguity.

As it has been constructed, our language lacks God-pronouns. A weakness but a reality. Many Eastern religious groups refer to their one, true God by the use of gender-free descriptive nouns: Almighty, Great One, etc. This can become cumbersome, but it is accurate in that there is no attempt to lower God to human status. All we Christians can do in the immediate future is to also turn to nouns which describe facets of our understanding of God. Such a process will rid our liturgies of exclusive language, while drawing us closer to one another in Christ. This would permit us to worship in spirit and in truth. It is not a change to be wrought only to appease women. No, a liturgy which includes all, regardless of sex or race or color, would be a gift to all the people of God.

This kind of awakening does not happen in a church which does not teach. And the church *does* teach in its liturgies. We pray that the whole body, clergy and lay, will be open to the trial inclusive liturgies, always seeking to improve on what has been submitted to us. That we may, indeed, become one in God as God is in us.

+++