

· AVE · MARIA · GRATIA · PLENA · DOMINUS · TECUM ·
· ET · BENEDICTUS · FRUCTUS · VENTRIS · TUI ·
· BENEDICTA · TU · IN · MULIERIBUS ·



AVE

· A · MONTHLY · BULLETIN ·
· OF · THE ·
· CHURCH · OF · SAINT · MARY · THE · VIRGIN ·
· NEW · YORK ·

· AVE · MARIA · GRATIA · PLENA · DOMINUS · TECUM ·
· ET · BENEDICTUS · FRUCTUS · VENTRIS · TUI ·
· BENEDICTA · TU · IN · MULIERIBUS ·



AVE

· A · MONTHLY · BULLETIN ·
· OF · THE ·
· CHURCH · OF · SAINT · MARY · THE · VIRGIN ·
· NEW · YORK ·

THE CHURCH OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN
New York City

CLERGY

THE REVEREND DONALD L. GARFIELD, *Rector*
THE REVEREND TIMOTHY E. CAMPBELL-SMITH

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE REVEREND DONALD L. GARFIELD, *President*
HAROLD M. LINDSTEDT, *Vice-President*
CARRINGTON RAYMOND, *Secretary*
JOHN Z. HEADLEY, *Treasurer*
ROBERT L. COE
GEORGE E. DIX
HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD
JAMES P. GREGORY
G. EDWARD MUELLER
CALVIN NASH
CHARLES E. WIEGNER

Parish founded 1868

Church built 1894

AVE

A Monthly Bulletin of
THE CHURCH OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN
New York City 36

Vol. XXXVII

February, 1968

No. 2

My dear people,

We begin February with the Feast of Candlemas, proclaiming to a dark world that in Christ is light. The candles we carry seem to us a symbol clear enough for the world to see, if only the world will look. But if not, then light must be seen in us. We are the light of Christ.

Here is an example of the need for a symbolism that is both clear and compelling, of which Canon Weil spoke on the opening night of the Liturgical Conference. His address was provocative and not every one of us will agree with everything he said. But he was responsibly provocative and purposely so — so that we are forced to ask what answer *we* would give to the problems of the Church ministering in this era.

I have been disturbed by the lack of real participation of acolytes in their annual festival and at this year's, at noon on Saturday, February 10, they will sing the ordinary of the Mass. That participation is needed to make it something done by, not for, them. We will have the privilege of welcoming our Suffragan Bishop, the Right Reverend J. Stuart Wetmore, to preside at Mass.

His colleague, Bishop Boynton, will confirm during the night Vigil on Holy Saturday, April 13, and candidates for confirmation should speak to the clergy at once and arrange for instruction.

We end this month with Ash Wednesday and we should set aside the Saturday following, March 2, for a quiet day during which the Reverend A. M. Allchin of Pusey House, Oxford, will help us consider "Keeping Lent in a Changing Century".

The Christmas offering was \$5,026.81, much better than the year before; yet in the year to come we must find support, increasingly,

from friends who look to Saint Mary's to be a leader in Catholic renewal. The leadership has been made a manifest destiny (may I call it?) by the great response to the Liturgical Conference. Of that I will be able to say more in next month's AVE.

Affectionately your priest,

Donald L. Garfield



THE IMPERATIVES OF RENEWAL

By the Reverend Canon Louis Weil

IT IS almost impossible to find a usable vocabulary to describe the situation of the Church today. The words and phrases which are most commonly heard are either seriously ambiguous or misleading, or else, through excessive repetition, they have become trite. Who wants to hear again that "we live in a post-Christian era"? And in the end, what does this mean? What does the phrase mean when such profoundly different theologians as Marie-Dominique Chenu of Paris and Joseph Mathews of Chicago can both suggest that in our time — a time in which the Church is generally ignored — that in our time, the Church may come to be more faithful to the Gospel than ever in history? And so the cliches mislead us — for the post-Christian era may in the end become the most profoundly Christian era yet known.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the Church, along with society in general, is passing through a period of intense unrest: we are facing situations and problems which we have not faced before, and much of the equipment which we have carried with us has been found inadequate. We might be much more calm in trying to deal with these matters if we had some clear idea where we are going; but the truth is that we do not. Change is everywhere — overwhelming change; but we do not see what the change is moving toward. One priest with whom I spoke last summer told me that he fully accepts that the world we live in requires enormous changes and adjustments in the mode of the Church's life — but what disturbed him was that it is not at all evident what those changes should or must be.

Are we, he asked, simply moving into chaos? I would suggest that we are not moving into chaos — rather I believe that we are participating in a dynamic and far-reaching activity of the God of history; once again, as always, God is turning the world upside down; he is unsettling us; he is calling us into the unknown. But isn't that what we find God doing in the whole of Scripture? Isn't that what we find God does in the life of each one of us because there is simply no other way to get us moving? Given the apparently inevitable human inclination to enthrone a book, or a person, or a theological system, or a pattern of worship — what other way does God have to deal with us except by unsettling us?

The subject of my address tonight is "the Imperatives of Renewal". Those imperatives are the urgent pressures which are at work upon us; they are the pressures which leave us no choice, for it is really no longer possible to oppose the changes going on all about us. I plan to examine some of these imperatives in so far as they have particular significance for the development of Christian worship. At the end, some of you may feel that I have not said enough about the liturgy specifically, and yet I am convinced that what I shall say deals with the renewal of the liturgy in the only way in which it is possible to approach that renewal today — that is, in the context of the Church's life as a whole.

Some of the things which I shall say may offend some of you; therefore let me say at the very beginning that my purpose is not to offend, but to be honest. I do ask that if you disagree with me, it be with what I have actually said. I have chosen my words carefully.

I do not pretend to read the future: I am trying only to consider the significance of the forces which are moving us — and it is clear that we are being forced to move. "Last year's words belong to last year's language" — the situations of today and tomorrow demand a new language if man, as he is, is to be enabled even to hear the Gospel.

I am concerned primarily, then, to look forward. In doing so, we shall probably find that we have a lot of old furniture to get rid of. Yet let me say that one cannot look at the mysterious and unknown road before us without a terrible and profound nostalgia. If a person demands sweeping reform of the Church's life without

nostalgia — without real longing for some of the values of the past that are being swept away — then I suspect that his understanding of renewal is superficial. I consider it to my distinct advantage that my own conversion to Catholicism predated the present upheaval by several years. I experienced as my own heritage the settled stability of Western worship. Those who share this advantage with me know that we have participated in something very beautiful. We have a perspective — potentially — which those born in the time of transition cannot have. We were heirs to a remarkable and authentic tradition; ours was 'a goodly heritage'. The reformer who sees the past as all wrong fails to grasp that genuine renewal must be established on the foundation and experience of the past. If the future is to yield its best fruit to us, it will be in the perspective of that past. And yet, we cannot cling to that past, for it is gone. What is required of us is a confident openness: the new wine of our time must be put into new bottles; and we should have every confidence that the form which those new bottles should take will become clear to us as we open ourselves to God's activity among us today. What, then, are the imperatives which are forcing us to move?

The first imperative — I hesitate even to say the word for fear of losing you before I begin — the first imperative is *secularity*. Let me make my use of the word very clear, for there is almost no word in the popular theological vocabulary of today which is used more frequently and often more ambiguously than the word 'secularity'. By 'secularity' I am referring to what is the mentality of our time — and if it is the mentality of our time, then it is inevitably our own mentality. The secular mentality is not that of non-Christians, to be contrasted with some so-called Christian mentality on our part. The secular mentality is the world view of a responsible adult in 1968. The secular world is not the world outside those doors — the world in which non-Christians spend their lives, and from which we Christians escape into the sacredness of our parish church. The secular world is not somehow distinct from that of religious men: the secular world is our world — it is the only world which any one of us here knows.

I want to make my point very clear, for it is absolutely basic if we are to understand the relationship of the secular mentality to Christian worship. One hears constantly that if the Church is to be

relevant to contemporary man, the Church's faith and practice must be adapted to the secular world. It seems to me that this is to put the whole thing the wrong way: when I speak of the imperative of secularity to the life of the Church, I am *not* speaking of the Church's imitation of the structures and ideas of the secular world; I am *not* speaking of the absurd notion that simply by taking contemporary society as our model for an updating of Christianity, the world will once again see the relevance of Christ. If our renewal is that superficial, the world will only see in the Church more world. The imperative of secularity is far more significant than that.

The imperative of secularity is the imperative of our own mentality — that is, it is the imperative of something acting from within ourselves, not from the outside world. It is the recognition of the consequences of the way we actually look at life — and that secularity is, in effect, a rejection of religion. I realize that to speak of Christians rejecting religion will be confusing to some of you, and so, to avoid confusion, I must discuss this idea in some detail.

It was Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German pastor who died at the hands of the Nazis at the end of World War II, who first suggested that we are living in a time of "religionless Christianity". If we can understand what he meant by this, we shall see the point which I am attempting to make. Bonhoeffer recognized that secularization is not in opposition to Christianity — quite the contrary, secularization is a coming to fruition of many ideas which themselves lie at the heart of the meaning of Christianity. If this idea is rightly understood, it is enormously significant for the evolution of the Church's life and worship in the future. Bonhoeffer recognized that with the increasing development of man's knowledge and control of his world, the basis of most men's concept of religion was undermined: belief in God had too often been grounded simply on the areas of man's ignorance; God was the explanation of what man could not explain. With the development of man's scientific knowledge, religion as the fear of the unknown or unexplained in life was completely undermined. This was the basis of the apparent threat which science posed to religion — and of which the absurd examples are too well-known to bear repeating. When asked to condemn psychoanalysis, Pope Pius XI had the good sense to say he did not want to be responsible for another Galileo incident.

Bonhoeffer saw this development of man's knowledge not as a denial of the reality of God, but simply as the natural evolution of the authority which God gave to man over the universe at Creation: the Book of Genesis gives Bonhoeffer excellent theological support. The religionlessness of contemporary, secular man is not a rejection of Christ — rather, it is a rejection of religion as a compartment of life; it is an insistence that if Christ is Lord only of religious men and women, then he is not Lord at all. Christ is Lord of creation. How is this to be affirmed and realized in the patterns and structures of the Church's life? What does it imply in regard to the forms of the Church's worship?

I believe that the most evident imperative which secularity exerts upon Christian worship is in regard to the liturgical signs. What is required is that the signs communicate in their simplicity and integrity what is their essential content. This subject has been too much discussed in recent years for me to belabor the point that the power of the Christian signs — I am speaking pre-eminently of Baptism and Eucharist — the power of those signs is in no way diminished or impaired when they are so celebrated that their root meaning is evident. The rite of Christian Initiation loses none of its meaning when the liturgical action is so performed that it is evident that its core is a human washing; the Eucharist loses none of its awesomeness when it is evident that it is the fellowship meal of those who share a common bread and cup. I trust that the idea is virtually extinguished that the "sacredness" of these mighty signs is blemished when the ordinary human action is manifest. Initiation is most fully Initiation when its meaning as a human washing is fully effected; the Eucharist is most fully the Eucharist when through it is revealed that ours is one life nourished by one bread.

If these essential meanings are to be made manifest in our liturgical rites, then it means that a great deal of the debris with which our rites (and our manner of celebrating them) are now cluttered, will have to be done away. The rites must be tightened and clarified: they must express with the greatest simplicity what we are saying theologically. Structure becomes a question of the greatest importance. Our present rites for Baptism and Confirmation are an incredible mosaic formed by the accumulation of vestigial elements. There is no question that structurally the new Trial Eucharist is a

significant improvement over the present authorized rite — but I am convinced that it does not really go far enough. We seem to be terrified of simplicity.

The reason that I believe this question of structural simplicity to be so important is that contemporary man at best is insensitive to symbolic expression — and to face him with a complex and elaborate world of private symbols which require extensive explanation and which through this situation show religion to be a very particular category of life, is to erect an impossible barrier. Rites which speak clearly and whose foundation in the fundamental human symbols is evident are the only rites which can possibly communicate to the secular mentality.

This assertion says something, by the way, about us who are practicing Christians — if, as I believe, the secular mentality is our own. It means that through the gift of faith, we have continued to participate in public worship — but that we are, in effect, liturgical schizophrenics. I am certain that no one here can sing most of the texts of the 1940 Hymnal with any conviction that this language corresponds to the reality of the world in which he lives. The situation may be amusing — but it is also perilous.

In speaking of this problem, I am not touching on some academic question external to my own experience. I have found increasingly in the past three or four years that I am truly a *religionless* man — and through this experience I am coming to grasp far more deeply what it is to be a Christian. Increasingly, the debris of religion does not speak to me at all — and yet I find Christ speaking more clearly, more profoundly than ever. If one chooses a full, responsible, adult participation in this world as it is, he will find that this secular world reveals Christ at every turn. Christianity has often served as an escape-hatch for those who have opted out on such adult participation in our world — so is it any wonder that so many of today's secular men do not see in Christianity the illumination of the meaning of all of life? If we follow Bonhoeffer's development of the idea of 'religionlessness', then religionless man is adult man — the man who is not intimidated by the mysteries of life, but seeks responsibility to explore and to understand them.

In our time, man does not have to resort to God to explain what he does not understand; man has achieved a certain degree of matur-

ity. This is not a basis for atheism, but is rather the realization and fulfilment of the implications of the 'dominion' — or rule and lordship — which God gave to man in creation. In the past, the Church has tended to attack this adulthood of man — we all know of past opposition within the Church to the development of man's scientific knowledge: through these attacks on man's adulthood, the Church has accomplished only the alienation of modern man from the Gospel. Today, if the Church is to have meaning for man, it will not be, as some writers almost seem to imply, through conformity to much that is pagan in our society; but, on the other hand, it must involve the active affirmation of man's capacities and powers — for that is what contemporary man is called to offer at the altar of God.

I would like to close my discussion of the religionless man with an anecdote from my experience in Puerto Rico. Some of you have perhaps heard of the rather incredible number of automobile fatalities which we have year after year in Puerto Rico. In proportion to the number of cars, the death rate is considerably greater than that of any state in the United States. When one drives in Puerto Rico, it is impossible not to be amazed by the number of cars which have a statue of the Blessed Virgin or, less often, of Christ, affixed to the dashboard. When one has to drive in Puerto Rico, one becomes sensitive to practically every detail of the adversary's car — and I've noticed time and again that often the most dangerous and obnoxious drivers have these small statues firmly attached. Both as a Christian and as a religionless man, I find this offensive; and it is a good example of the point I have tried to make — for the contemporary man at the wheel, his primary security for a safe trip is his own responsible driving; a man with the secular mentality does not glue a religious charm to his car, and then drive like a madman — and that secular mentality is my mentality and that of vast numbers of men and women. As Bonhoeffer pointed out, religion which fills in the holes of man's ignorance or sin has no meaning for contemporary man. Religion which somehow makes up for the driver's incapacity to drive turns man into an irresponsible puppet, and in spite of all the agonies of human existence today, man will not accept that role. Man's adulthood is not an exclusion of God; rather, it is the acceptance of the responsibility which God has given to us in this world. If Christian worship is to engage the whole man, it will only be in the acknowledgement of that man as he truly is.

The question is not one of fitting modern man to the liturgy: that would be a contemporary version of making man for the Sabbath. The liturgy does not descend as a block from heaven so that man might fit himself to it more or less as best he can: man is responsible for the forming of the liturgy. The liturgy is the living expression of the Church's life, and that means that it will correspond to the givenness of the structures of that life. But if it is not a question of making modern man fit the liturgy, neither is it, I think, a matter of making the liturgy suit modern man — numerous recent experiments have tended to fall into this error, but perhaps they will stir us to a recognition of what the fundamental questions of liturgical reform are.

One hears constantly in recent years of complaints among Roman Catholics of illegal experimentation — and it would seem that some of these experiments have gone quite far out indeed. We can find this same desire for constant — and sometimes irresponsible — experimentation among Anglicans and other Christian Communion as well. It would be wise to see this activity in a certain perspective — for we are all reacting against the extremes of a rubric-mentality both in regard to the liturgical texts and to almost the same degree in the manner of celebration. The roots of this liturgical fixity can be traced back to the third century, when the practice developed of writing down the hitherto spontaneous Eucharistic Prayer, as an assurance of orthodoxy, and probably as a guide to the less-inspired. Those same needs, in combination with various and complex historical factors, guided the evolution of the liturgy along a path of increasing fixity until, in the sixteenth century, in the upheaval of the Reformation and in the reaction focused at the Council of Trent, the worship of the Church arrived at a state of absolute fixity. It is from this period of extreme rubricism that we are emerging at this time, and thus it should not surprise us that the experiments now taking place often jump to apparently irresponsible extremes. It is evident that experimentation is another imperative of our time, and I am perhaps more patient with the excesses than many people find it possible to be; for although I believe that the experimentation of the irresponsible, and of those who act without sufficient knowledge of what they are doing, will probably serve for little profit to the Church, nevertheless I think the extremes are an unavoidable element in the transition now taking place. The lid has been kept too tightly

on the jar for too long for it to surprise us now, when the jar is bursting, that we are all being splattered a bit. I am perhaps naively optimistic, but I think that norms will begin to emerge as some experiments prove their value, and others show their worthlessness. On the other hand, it seems evident that the rigid conformity of the past will never be able to assert itself again.

Another set of imperatives in regard to the patterns of Christian worship arises from the extraordinarily complex question of population. I do not intend to discuss matters on which I am not qualified to speak, but hardly a week passes that one does not come across a scholarly or popular article on the subject of world population or the wide variety of sociological questions attached to it. The fact is that man is now faced with an unprecedented problem of absolutely staggering proportions. Certainly here in the city of New York, no one needs to be reminded of the fact of the population explosion — and the same is true in my own experience in Puerto Rico. One is increasingly aware of the vast numbers of people. Simply in order that society may function, we are forced to use ever-more-impersonal systems and structures for the organizing of society. We have all heard jokes about the various series of numbers by which we are known instead of by our name.

This particular development leads me to a discussion of two other imperatives in the Church which touch directly on our patterns of worship. The first is the imperative for radical changes in our concept of the ordained priesthood. I am speaking of the priest in this regard in his role as the president of the liturgy. Much has been written lately about the breakdown of the traditional parish structure — and although a great deal might be said on this question, it is at least evident that if the Church is going to have any effective ministry to mankind, it will have to equip itself to deal creatively with far greater numbers of men than it has been called upon to minister to in the past. Further, the question of vast numbers is complicated by an extraordinary mobility which is characteristic of contemporary society.

What all of this will mean for the Christian ministry is far too complex for us to be able to fathom here, but there are certain things, I believe, which must be said. One of the fruits of the liturgical movement has been the conviction that the effectiveness of

the Eucharist as a sign of unity is best realized in terms of a community of rather modest size. In other words, just at the time when we are being faced with a vast human community, we are seeing that enormous churches filled with large congregations of men and women whose lives have little or no personal contact are not the best setting for the celebration of the Eucharist. Many of us have in recent years experienced the Eucharist in intensely personal surroundings where only a small number of people was present, and we know that these Eucharists have given us a very particular insight into the meaning of the eucharistic banquet.

In recent years there has been a developing awareness of the fact that the professional clergy as we have known it has become a burden too heavy to be borne. Too great a percentage of the Church's resources is used to pay what in the end are still inadequate salaries. As in so many things, we fall between two stools. The idea that a substantial number of the clergy should be drawn from responsible laymen who have other professional commitments and income appears as an ever-more-necessary alternative to the present system. Although such an idea merits a more profound consideration than can be given here, it can at least be said that a far more numerous but for the most part unsalaried clergy whose primary function would be that of President of the Eucharist in their own professional community would go far toward permitting the Church to celebrate the Eucharist under more personal conditions. To avoid confusion, let me add that the Church would continue to require full-time clergy — and this would perhaps be the normal situation of the bishop. The bishop would be the fully-trained theologian of his diocese — a small diocese in which he could function as evangelist and teacher of the various individual eucharistic communities; further, and of great importance, the bishop would emerge in his ancient role as symbol of unity of the various small communities within his diocese, and of that diocese with all the dioceses of the universal Church.

I am not so naive as to think that such a mutation in the structuring of the priesthood would not be fraught with difficulties, not the least of which is human opposition to change. Yet it is evident that our present patterns simply cannot deal with the situation emerging before us.

A second imperative is directly related to the same question of enormous population — it is the imperative of beauty. In a society where human beings are known by numbers; in a society where more and more elements exert pressure toward the dehumanization of man, where impersonal structures control more and more of man's life simply that society may function, where utility has become a primary value of life: is not the Church obliged to act as a humanizing force, to preserve man's personhood? We need the beautiful so desperately if we are to remain human. Toward this, the Church must see that it can afford nothing less than beauty of gesture, beauty of sound, beauty of setting, and — God help us — beauty of word. An absolutely pre-eminent value in the revision of our liturgical rites must be: are they beautiful?

In closing, I want to draw together a few ideas related to what I have said, but from a very personal angle. I am now almost three years past thirty — I realize, therefore, that I am probably as suspect as anyone to those who are under thirty: but I share with them a profound impatience with the Church as we know it — that is, the organized Church, the ecclesiastical machine. I fully recognize and affirm the need for structure — structure is necessary to human societies, and therefore the meaning of the Incarnation, in God's taking of the human into himself, affirms the need for structure in the Body of Christ. But if the superstructure which we know defeats human values; if it acts — as often it does — as an instrument of separation of man from man; if it makes God inoptable for contemporary man — then something is profoundly wrong, and the inhibiting debris must be swept away.

As a witness of the marvelous renewal which is sweeping through the whole Body of Christ, I can only say that much of what I have known of the organized Church has little meaning for me: at best, it leaves me untouched; at worst, it offends me in the depth of my being as a person. It has been too often an instrument of establishment, mediocrity, and hypocrisy: for those under thirty, it is not our failures which they denounce — failure of one kind or another is the experience of every man; rather, it is our hypocrisy which they reject. The question of the hippies is too complex to enter into here — but do not the great unwashed stand as a judgment on us who are so washed that we are sterile? Is not their bread shared in poverty

a judgment on our impersonal parishes? And the wine they drink because they cannot afford the scotch that you and I drink: who is closer to the Eucharist *essentially*? They reject the Church because the Church has nothing to say to them. They will not share in the life of a Church which seems so often concerned with its own security and property — and which manifestly, and to this very day, remains preoccupied too often with its own comfortable pew: new buildings to replace old ones; new organs to replace old ones; new stained glass, new carpets, new luxury piled upon new luxury, which serve to protect us from the reality of the world to which we have nothing to say.

Our fundamental symbols condemn us: when Baptism has spoken with any vigor at all, it has often been to signify separation from the world — the elect, initiated into its private world of language, symbols, and actions. Surely the fundamental meaning of the Sign of Baptism is not separation from the world but the renewal of the world: the affirmation of the essential goodness of the whole Creation as God's work — the sign of its conscious dedication to his purposes. Yet, if possible, we are more condemned by the Sign of the Eucharist: we have continued faithfully in the breaking of bread and prayers — but if Christ reveals himself to us in the breaking of bread, is it not because that breaking is the sign of love, of community? I break a piece of bread so that I may share it with my neighbor: we have celebrated the liturgical rites, but how often has the Sign condemned us because it has not found its required — its imperative — expression in a living concern of the eucharistic community for the community around it? Is the Eucharist of a parish fully the Eucharist if the people who celebrate it are unconcerned for the hungry outside? Have I not touched here at the true beginning of liturgical renewal?

If the liturgical symbols are to speak to mankind — and I believe that their universality is such that they can speak profoundly in our time — they will speak only if the Church carries the Signs to the full extent of their implications. Think of the power of the Baptismal Sign — if the non-Christian world sees in the Christian community a community given to human renewal, and peace, and unity; think of the power of the Eucharistic Sign in a world which sees us completely given in love to every man. The imperatives of renewal are ultimately the imperatives of Christian integrity.

KALENDAR FOR FEBRUARY

1. Th. St Ignatius, B.M. Comm. St Bridget, V.
2. F. THE PURIFICATION OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN.
Abstinence. Mass 6:30, 7:30, 9:30, 12:10.
Evening Prayer 5:30. High Mass with Candlemas Procession 6 p.m.
3. Sa. St Blase, B.M. Comm. St Ansgarius, B.C.
- ✠ 4. Su. EPIPHANY V.
5. M. St Agatha, V.M. Comm. the MM. of Japan.
6. Tu. St Titus, B.C. Comm. St Dorothy, V.M.
7. W. St Romuald, Abt. *Mass also 9:30.*
8. Th. Feria. *Requiem 7:30.*
9. F. St Cyril of Alexandria, B.C.D. *Abstinence.*
10. Sa. St Scholastica, V. *High Mass, Procession and Benediction (Acolytes' Festival) 12.*
- ✠ 11. Su. SEPTUAGESIMA.
12. M. Feria. *Requiem 12:10.*
13. Tu. St Kentigern, B.C.
14. W. St Valentine, P.M. *Mass also 9:30.*
15. Th. Feria.
16. F. Feria. *Abstinence.*
17. Sa. Feria. *Of our Lady.*
- ✠ 18. Su. SEXAGESIMA.
19. M. Feria. *Requiem 7:30.*
20. Tu. Feria.
21. W. Feria. *Mass also 9:30.*
22. Th. Feria. *Votive for Peace 7:30, 12:10.*
23. F. St Peter Damian, B.C.D. *Abstinence.*
24. Sa. ST MATTHIAS, AP. *Mass also 9:30.*
- ✠ 25. Su. QUINQUAGESIMA.
26. M. Feria. *Requiem 12:10.*
27. Tu. Bl. George Herbert, P.C.
28. W. ASH WEDNESDAY. *Strict Fast and Abstinence.*
Mass 6:30, 7:30, 9:30, 12:10. Evening Prayer 5:30.
High Mass with Penitential Office 6 p.m.
29. Th. Greater Feria. *Fast.*
✠ *Days of obligation.*



FROM THE PARISH REGISTER BAPTISM

*"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ
have put on Christ."*

January 6—Christopher Alarcon Ignatius Whitney
BURIAL

"My flesh shall rest in hope."

January 10—Lilian Forge

MUSIC FOR FEBRUARY

FEBRUARY 4 — EPIPHANY V

11 a.m.

Missa quinta Hans Leo Hassler
Motet, Cantate Domino Hans Leo Hassler

6 p.m.

Magnificat and Nunc dimittis Thomas Morley
Motet, O God, thou art my God Henry Purcell
O salutaris hostia P. Otto Rehm
Motet, Ave verum corpus Edward Elgar
Tantum ergo Georg Henschel

FEBRUARY 11 — SEPTUAGESIMA

11 a.m.

Mass in D Georg Henschel
Motet, Bonum est confiteri Ernst Eberlin

6 p.m.

Magnificat and Nunc dimittis Henry Purcell
Motet, I will love thee, O Lord Jeremiah Clarke
O salutaris hostia Guiseppe Terrabugio
Motet, O sacrum convivium Giovanni Batista Pergolesi
Tantum ergo Giacomo Antonio Perti

FEBRUARY 18 — SEXAGESIMA

11 a.m.

Mass for five voices William Byrd
Motet, Hear my prayer, O God Adrian Batten

6 p.m.

Magnificat and Nunc dimittis Horatio Parker
Motet, Urbs Syon unica Horatio Parker
O salutaris hostia F. M. Breydert
Motet, Ave verum corpus Everett Titcomb
Tantum ergo F. M. Breydert

FEBRUARY 25 — QUINGUAGESIMA

11 a.m.

Messe solennelle César Franck
Motet, Let nothing ever grieve thee Johannes Brahms

6 p.m.

Magnificat and Nunc dimittis Giovanni Maria Nanino
Motet, Ecce nunc tempus Francesco Guerro
O salutaris hostia Ettore Desderi
Motet, O bone Jesu Marc Antonio Ingegneri
Tantum ergo Ettore Desderi



ALTAR FLOWER MEMORIALS

February 2—Purification B.V.M., Georgiana Margaret Huck
February 4—Epiphany V, Joseph H. Schuman
February 10—Acolytes' Festival, Mrs Archibald Russell

SUNDAYS		SERVICES
Morning Prayer		7:10 a.m.
Mass	7:30, 9:00 (Sung), and	10:00 a.m.
High Mass (with sermon)		11:00 a.m.
Evensong and Benediction		6:00 p.m.

WEEKDAYS	
Morning Prayer	7:10 a.m.
Mass daily	7:30 a.m. and 12:10 p.m.
Mass also on Wednesdays and Holy Days	9:30 a.m.
Evening Prayer	6:00 p.m.
Litany after Evening Prayer on Wednesdays.	
Rosary and Benediction after Evening Prayer on Fridays.	

*Other services during the week and on festivals
as announced on the preceding Sunday.*

CONFESSIONS

DAILY, 12:40 to 1 p.m., *also*
FRIDAYS, 5 to 6 p.m.
SATURDAYS, 2 to 3 and 5 to 6 p.m.
SUNDAYS, 8:40 to 9 a.m.
and by appointment.

OCCASIONAL OFFICES

THE MINISTRATIONS OF THE CLERGY are available to all. Holy Baptism is ministered to those properly sponsored or prepared. Preparation for First Confession, Confirmation, and Holy Communion can begin at any time. Holy Matrimony according to the law of God and the Church is solemnized after instruction by the clergy. Holy Unction and Holy Communion are given to the sick when the clergy are notified, and regularly to shut-ins. Burial of the Dead usually follows Requiem Mass in the Church, and the clergy should be consulted before any arrangements are made. Music at weddings or funerals should be arranged with the Director of Music. ★

CONTRIBUTIONS to the cost of AVE are gratefully acknowledged: Anonymous, \$10, \$3; Miss Bernice E. Anderson, \$2; The Rev'd Charles H. D. Brown, \$3; George P. Campbell, \$5; Miss Amy Dearden, \$4; Miss Virginia L. Herzog, \$2; Miss Sarah Neale, \$2; Paul Spahr, \$5; William J. Trentman, \$2.

DIRECTORY

CHURCH OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN
139 West 46th Street, New York 10036
(East of Times Square, between 6th and 7th Avenues)
Church open daily from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.

RECTORY

144 West 47th Street, New York 10036 — PLaza 7-6750
The Rev'd Donald L. Garfield, *Rector*
The Rev'd Timothy E. Campbell-Smith

PARISH OFFICE

145 West 46th Street, New York 10036 — PLaza 7-6750
Mr William R. Anderson, *Parish Secretary*
*Office open Monday to Friday (except legal holidays)
9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 2 to 4:30 p.m.*

Mr John Z. Headley, <i>Treasurer</i>	PLaza 7-6750
Mr James L. Palsgrove, <i>Director of Music</i>	JUdson 6-0237
Mr McNeil Robinson, <i>Organist</i>	MONument 3-3259
Mr Richard L. Stoving, <i>Ceremoniaris</i>	454-3957
Mr Curtis R. Pruitt, <i>Head Usher</i>	LEXington 2-1294
Mr Louis Fellowes, <i>Funeral Director</i>	PLaza 3-5300

The Church of Saint Mary the Virgin is supported largely by voluntary offerings through the use of weekly envelopes, which may be obtained from the Parish Secretary.

Annual subscriptions of two dollars or more are asked from those who do not make other contributions to the parish and wish to receive AVE.