

* · B E N E D I C T A · T U · I N · M U L I E R I B U S · *

* · A V E · M A R I A · G R A T I A · P L E N A · D O M I N U S · T E C U M ·

* · E T · B E N E D I C T U S · F R U C T U S · V E N T R I S · T U I ·



A V E

* · A · M O N T H L Y · B U L L E T I N ·
· O F · T H E ·
· C H U R C H · O F · S A I N T · M A R Y · T H E · V I R G I N ·
· N E W · Y O R K ·

* · B E N E D I C T A · T U · I N · M U L I E R I B U S · *

* · A V E · M A R I A · G R A T I A · P L E N A · D O M I N U S · T E C U M ·

* · E T · B E N E D I C T U S · F R U C T U S · V E N T R I S · T U I ·



A V E

* · A · M O N T H L Y · B U L L E T I N ·
· O F · T H E ·
· C H U R C H · O F · S A I N T · M A R Y · T H E · V I R G I N ·
· N E W · Y O R K ·



AVE

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

Vol. XLI

May, 1972

No. 5

COME ALIVE!

Bishop Moore's Sermon at the Easter Vigil

IT IS A GREAT JOY to be here tonight, this holy and wonderful night.

During these last few moments we have seen the last of darkness, even as the light is beginning to shine through it. And even now we feel as if we stood suspended between two worlds: the world of loneliness, frustration, separation, doubt, pain, death — the world of night; and the world of courage, truth, expectation, faith, hope, and joy — the world of day.

But such is the nature of night that we can endure it with perseverance only because we hope faithfully for the dawn. And such is the nature of day that it can only be born in splendor out of that darkness.

And so now death is dead, and pain transcended. Now is the dawning. Now is the light.

Come alive! Leap from your graves, wherever they may be! Enjoy the laughter and joy, song and praise, with our risen Lord and King!

The Holy Eucharist is offered this evening to the glory of God and in thanksgiving for his risen Son: to ask a special blessing on those baptized and confirmed tonight, a blessing upon this parish — its love and its work in the service of his Kingdom, and finally God's blessing upon this city and all who suffer here, and for the peace of the world.

Pictured opposite, after the Vigil, Bishop Moore with one of those confirmed. We were blessed to have our new Bishop with us. We pray God to bless him richly.

My dear people,

You may by now have seen brown-habited friars in church. They are Franciscans of the Society of St Francis, the motherhouse of the American Province being at Little Portion, near Mount Sinai, Long Island. It sounds and they look right out of the Middle Ages. They are — but a long way out, right in our city and century, working and studying in New York. They are living on the top floors of our Mission House, which they have renovated, at the invitation of our Board of Trustees.

It is an answer to prayer to have a Religious Order living again in the Mission House. The three here now are Brother Mark, Brother Dominic, and Brother John Baptist. They are studying for the priesthood and for pastoral counselling. Though we must not presume on their time, they volunteer some of it for counselling, for which they already are trained. Also, the Society once a month will send in a priest for confessions, which can be helpful to parishioners who want a confessor not on the parish staff and to any Churchmen who prefer a Religious as their confessor. For easy remembrance, the first Friday of each month, 5-6 p.m., is the hour, and the confessor will be, usually, Brother Stephen or Brother David. (In the spirit of their founder, Franciscan priests wish to be called Brother.) I cannot say how happy I am to have them here, sharing the Mission House with the old people of St Mary's Center and sharing, as they will be, in our weekday worship.

With us as preacher at the May Festival on Sunday the 7th at 6 p.m. will be the Reverend Grahame Butler-Nixon, Rector of Grace Church, Newark. We look forward to welcoming him for himself and as successor to Father Herbert Brown, our friend for so many years, and to Dr Christian, who left Grace Church to become our second Rector in 1899.

I wish I could look forward to Diocesan Convention on the 9th with a feeling that we will be a happy family. I cannot but dread the division on ordination of women to the priesthood. A resolution *pro* came from the Council of the Diocese by a very narrow vote. A resolution *con* has since been signed by fifty-four priests of the Diocese, including yours. Read what Father Boyer has written. Pray that we all try to speak the truth in love.

Affectionately your priest,
DONALD L. GARFIELD

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

John Paul Boyer

WITHIN THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS it has become commonplace to say that "there are no serious theological objections" to the ordination of women to the priesthood of the Church. This has been said so often and by so many different people that its truth is accepted as self-evident in many quarters, not least amongst many of those who make up the officialdom of the national Church. This is unfortunate for at least two reasons. In the first place, the widespread acceptance of the notion as axiomatic — that there are *no* serious theological objections to the ordination of women has tended to stifle serious theological discussion of the subject from the outset, in spite of the fact, as we shall attempt to make clear, that there remains much to be said in another direction and that serious and far-reaching implications attend whichever course is finally adopted. In the second place, an impression has been given to many in the Church that the "bureaucracy" is trying to steam-roller the measure through General Convention, and it is this impression, perhaps, which accounts for the unfortunate note of hysteria which of late has begun to creep into the editorial columns of some of the more traditional elements of the Church press.

The present writer would be very loath indeed to believe that there is a "conspiracy" to force something upon the Church which the Church does not want, or which large numbers in the Church do not want. What one suspects to have happened is that the proponents of ordaining women to the priesthood are, really, *unaware* of the extent to which the proposal causes genuine alarm to many. Armed with the axiom that no intelligent person could oppose what they see to be self-evidently just, they proceed to formulate parliamentary weapons to bring about what they desire, safely assuming that the opposition is nothing more than a collection of cranks, bigots, and automatically reactionary traditionalists who may be dismissed, as one writer in the official Church press did dismiss them recently, with this kind of blanket condemnation: "I subscribe to the basic thesis: whoever opposes the ordination of women opposes the Gospel of Jesus Christ and disqualifies one half of the human race." (Professor William J. Wolf, writing in *The Episcopalian*, February, 1972.) One may be pardoned for observing that such a statement is at least as hysterical as anything yet to be said on the

other side, and one is moved to speculate on what has driven Professor Wolf, usually the most mild-mannered and gentle of men, so harshly to consign to outer darkness, not only many sincere and dedicated men (and women) of his own Communion, but also that eighty percent of Christendom which is composed of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches.

The quotation does at least have the virtue, however, of illustrating the degree to which emotional and subjective considerations have played their part in this sad controversy. The proponents of the ordination of women to the priesthood see the matter as one of justice: women have been denied something they have a right to, and this must be redressed. The opponents see it as something which will change the entire conception of priesthood as the Church has hitherto understood it, and that in a way not to the good. On either side, therefore, deep springs of emotion are touched, and while this is understandable it is hardly conducive to constructive thought.

In view of this, at least part of our own purpose is to be dispassionate. The writer has a definite position to take on this question, as has probably already been made clear enough, but he at least intends to try very hard to keep his temper and to treat his opponents as he would wish to be treated — that is, seriously, and as people with serious concerns. He asks only that he be accorded the same attention; for it is not true, as one would sometimes be led to believe by some of what is carelessly said or written, that our objections are frivolous or that our disquiet is prompted by nothing more than the salivary reactions of threatened male chauvinism. On the contrary, it is our contention that to ordain women to the priesthood of the Church is to call in question the Catholic understanding of the nature of the Church, the nature of the ministry, the nature of authority in the Church, and the nature of human sexuality itself. And these *are* serious issues, at least to those of us for whom the Catholicity of the Episcopal Church is *the* vital question. If our opponents cannot see the seriousness of what we are about when we urge, at the least, caution, perhaps it is because they do not feel or cannot empathize with our anguish, nor sense the fearful frustration with which so many of us whose loyalty to Anglicanism is deep and sincere nonetheless feel that we are being pushed step by step towards the precipice of schism, to an either/or situation in which

we must choose *either* Anglicanism *or* Catholicism — we who had always rested confident in the conviction that to be Anglican was to be Catholic.

This is indeed the crux of the matter. The Episcopal Church, as a part of the Anglican Communion of Churches, has always prided itself on its comprehensiveness. We have claimed to embody the positive elements of both Protestantism and Catholicism, heirs of what in the Reformation was truly reform, but heirs also of an unbroken tradition reaching back behind the Reformation to the Church of the Apostles and the Fathers. We have claimed to be no new Church, but the same Church as always existed, first in England, then in her colonies, finally beyond the colonial system in a mission nothing less than world-wide. It is this continuity with the unbroken Church, the Church which is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, which we have stressed in recent years in ecumenical dialogue with our brethren of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Communion. We are not, we have said, a different *kind* of Church from you; we repudiate nothing in our Reformation experience which is truly reformed, but we have maintained intact the Catholic creeds, the Catholic sacraments, and the Catholic and Apostolic ministry. This sort of thing is said almost routinely by Episcopalians of all shades of churchmanship; it is not, indeed, a partisan issue at all — the Anglo-Catholic might wish to emphasize it more than the “low” churchman, the Evangelical might wish to define it in a slightly different way from his “high-church” brother — but all would pretty much accept it as an accurate description of the Anglican *via media*. The writer has never met a “low” churchman who denied that the Episcopal Church was in some sense Catholic and continuous with the pre-Reformation Church; he has never met an American “high” churchman who wished to deny the positive gains of the English Reformation.

The question is, does the Episcopal Church still believe that it is Catholic, and that it has, therefore, obligations to a body of teaching and practice which exists objectively and, even, independently of its local life as a merely national Church? Or, if it does believe this, does it believe it so truly that it is prepared to resist the pressures of the here and now and stand for a tradition which is universal and forever. It will be answered, of course, that the ordination of women to the priesthood is in no sense a contravening

of Catholic principle; it is our intention in what follows to try to show that it *is*, or at least that it raises serious questions about the Episcopal Church's intention to "look to that rock whence we are hewn."

THE CONSIDERATIONS WHICH FOLLOW are primarily those of principle, if only because that has been the area which has so far received the least attention. This does not mean that there are not weighty *practical* arguments against the ordination of women to the priesthood. Two of those, indeed, we have already touched upon: ecumenical relations with the Roman Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox, and the threat to our own internal unity.

With regard to the former, we content ourselves with two observations in passing. In the first place, Roman Catholic theologians like Hans Küng, whatever else may be said of them, are *not* representative of the Roman Catholic Church, and it is specious to appeal to their example as if they were. This is not to say that they ought not to be considered if what they teach is of value in its own right; it is to say that the positions they advocate, in a number of directions, are simply not going to be adopted by the Roman Catholic Church in any conceivable future. Americans are much misled by the fact that much of the modern, English-language Roman Catholic theology they are likely to be exposed to is *avant-garde* (this is so, largely for journalistic reasons), and also that the sort of Roman Catholic one is apt to meet at ecumenical gatherings is of the same type; but, like it or not, the liberal Roman Catholics of the North American-North European intelligentsia are not the Roman Catholic Church. This may be a pity, but it is a fact; and if we are going to be serious in our ecumenical encounters we must be prepared to deal realistically with the Roman Catholic Church as it is, not as a sprinkling of young idealists, rightly or wrongly, would like it to be.

In the second place, it will be said that we are also engaged in ecumenical discussions with our Protestant brethren, many of whose churches already ordain women as ministers. This is true, of course, and the present writer would be the last to wish such discussions to cease; but we ought, perhaps, to keep our perspective. It is a fact that our most fruitful ecumenical encounters in the past hundred years have been with the Orthodox and the Old Catholic Churches and with similar Churches in the Wider Episcopal Fellowship, the very groups which are least likely to ordain women to the priest-

hood or, if we do, to continue even to consider the possibility that our priesthood is the equivalent of theirs. It is also true that the Protestant churches between them comprise some twenty percent of Christendom. It is distasteful to have to deal in percentages, to be sure, but it is undeniable that the Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, and the Old Catholic Churches between them represent some eighty percent of the Christian world. The late Lauriston Livingston Scaife, Bishop of Western New York — who was anything but a partisan in his churchmanship and who had devoted a good portion of his ministry to working for closer relations with all Christian groups, but especially with the Orthodox — remarked to the writer at the time of the last Lambeth Conference, with a sad shake of the head, "I cannot understand, I *cannot* understand, why we are turning our backs on eighty percent of Christendom in favor of twenty percent." It is a thought worth bearing in mind.

The threat to our own unity as a Church is more ominous. It is our contention that Anglican comprehensiveness is in danger, and if this danger is not more widely recognized it is only because the proponents of the scheme before us do not yet see how seriously some of us view the matter. Comprehensiveness has been preserved in the past, somewhat precariously at times, by a kind of godly apathy — a refusal to upset the apple-cart in one direction or the other by any sort of precipitate action or any sort of overly definitive statement of doctrine. We have appealed to the Holy Scriptures, to the Catholic creeds, and to the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church; but we have allowed great variations of interpretation with regard to these things, and we have refused to commit ourselves to the detailed and exclusive confessions of faith which were the mark of the Reformation period. Even our own Articles of Religion, broad though they are, have no *confessional* authority in the Episcopal Church. This broad freedom of interpretation, however, was securely set in a context of Catholic order inherited from the ancient Church, and although there have been great variations in detail (much ceremonial, for example, or little; eucharistic vestments or surplice and stole, etc.), the main outlines of Anglican practice and polity, as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer and (for American Episcopalians) in the Constitution and Canons of the Church, have remained in unaltered conformity to the general practice of Catholic Christendom. It is our fear that this heritage is now being threatened, that we are being presented with a situation

which will upset the precarious balance which has hitherto existed in our Church, and that American Episcopalians are being asked to commit themselves, corporately, to a course of action which contradicts Catholic order and which, therefore, will tie the Episcopal Church as never before to one end, the Protestant end, of the Protestant-Catholic continuum which has hitherto been our pride and our boast. What will happen after that is anyone's guess: at the worst, schism (which God forbid); at the least, continual internal bitterness and the disaffection of a considerable minority of the Church's membership. The proponents *must* ask themselves if the ordination of women to the priesthood is worth that sort of price.

WITH REGARD TO THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS, we began by observing that our objection to the ordination of women to the priesthood (and the episcopate) is not rooted in our doctrine of God. We do not argue that God is masculine, and it is an axiom in Christian theology that God is without sex, or, more accurately, that he comprehends within the mystery of his being *all* the positive values of sexuality — masculine, feminine, or whatever — and that to a degree beyond human imagining. It is true that within the Christian tradition (and in the tradition of Israel before Christ) God has invariably been designated by masculine pronouns and described by masculine images. It is also true that the pagan cultures in the midst of which Israel defined her own being were very familiar indeed with images of an opposite sort, as was the Graeco-Roman culture to which the early Church addressed her mission; and it is very well worth asking why, this being the case, both the Christian Church and Israel before her ignored the feminine images almost totally. (The argument that certain strains of Semitic Christianity spoke of the Holy Spirit as "she" is specious: the peculiarity is due to the exigencies of the Semitic languages — one might as well construct an argument from the fact that in Greek the Holy Spirit is "it" — and, besides, the Christian communities in question were never part of the mainstream and early passed into heresy and oblivion.) But when all is said and done, we must agree that, whatever traditional usage might dictate, God is not "he", nor "she", nor "it", nor anything to which sexual labels might appropriately be attached.

Secondly, it is true that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." This text is usually cited as an argument *for* the ordination

of women to the priesthood, on the grounds that men and women share equally the image of God; and it is unquestionably true that they do. Our argument is not in any way founded nor dependent upon the proposition that women are inferior to men, or that they are unworthy of the priesthood. It will be observed, however, that when God created "man" (in the generic sense) in his own image he also made a distinction between man and woman. This would seem to indicate that, although men and women share equally in the image of God, they are meant to fulfil the potentialities of that image in different ways. If it is argued that St Paul's remark to the Galatians (3: 28-29) — that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" — obliterates that distinction, we can only reply with some wonderment that such would be news to that Paul who accepted (as we do not) both the institution of slavery and the social inferiority of women. His remark is clearly intended as eschatological — having to do with "the last days" — when "God will be all in all." In other words, the Galatians passage is irrelevant to the issue under discussion.

This, indeed, raises serious questions about the proponents' use of Scripture, and of the authority they attach to Scripture. We are condemned for "fundamentalism" when we make reference to the masculine images of God, though these go very deep into the human psyche; but they use the Galatians passage as a proof-text in exactly the same way a real fundamentalist would, and unless they are prepared to state by what criteria this particular passage is to be preferred, say, to I Corinthians 14: 34 ("the women should keep silence in the churches") — a dictum to which, on other grounds, we do *not* subscribe — we are justified in observing that they cannot have their cake and eat it too. Indeed, if one is to consider the scriptural evidence, it seems safe to say that the *general* tenor of the Biblical witness is in favor of male superiority (which, as we have seen, is not really tenable in view of the Christian doctrine of God and of creation); and it is certain that the *universal* witness of Scripture is that women were not included in the apostolate, the episcopate, nor the presbyterate. The diaconate is another matter, and will be considered later on. It would be dangerous for an Anglican to argue that because something is not found in Scripture it is, therefore, not permissible; for it was precisely Hooker's argument against the Puritans that such need not be so. But when something

novel is proposed in such an important area of the Church's life, unknown alike to Holy Scripture or to Christian antiquity, it is at least not presumptuous to point out that the burden of proof is on those who advocate change, not upon those who wish to maintain a tradition which is, after all, apostolic.

God, then, made man in his own image, male and female, equal but different; and he used both "manhood" and "womanhood" to bring to a climax the history of salvation: God became man—through the cooperation of a woman. Thus it is that we speak of the Son of God; but thus also it is, as the Third General Council decreed, that we speak of the *Mother* of God (*Theotokos*). The incarnate God was born into the world as a Son, but she who bore him was a woman. Indeed, though it is presumably possible for God to have chosen to have become incarnate as a Daughter, it would seem to be both biologically and semantically impossible for "her" to have been born other than of a woman: no one can be born "of" a man, and conceptually it is not possible for a man to be the God-bearer in any other than a merely metaphorical sense. That this raises womanhood and, one might add, motherhood to unimaginable heights of dignity ought to be obvious. Once again our argument is not based on any inferiority of women or of the female function. Quite the reverse: we feel that if women were valued more *as women* there would be less need felt for them to exercise the ministry of men. Indeed, there is a call in *this* area for us all to repent!

But, in fact, God did choose to become incarnate as a man, i.e., as a male human being. Perhaps it could have been otherwise, but it was not otherwise. There is something called "the scandal of particularity": the incarnation necessitated a kind of limiting of possibilities. If Jesus was born a Jew, he could not, by definition, have been born a Chinese; if he was born in Palestine, he could not have been born in Argentina; if he was born in the days of Caesar Augustus, he could not have been born in the days of Richard Nixon. This is what it means to say that God was incarnate *in history*: Jesus is not an abstraction, not an idealistic symbol, but a person. And if he was born a man, he could not have been born a woman.

Being a Jew, being a Palestinian, being a first-century man— all these are what we might call, in the language of Aristotelian

metaphysics, the "accidents" of Christ's humanity; but his being a man rather than a woman is of the "substance" of his humanity. He could have been a twentieth-century Chinese and been, cultural differences notwithstanding, much the same person he was; but he could not have been a woman without having been a different sort of personality altogether.

It is our belief that the priestly ministry of the Church (the episcopate and the presbyterate) are indissolubly linked to the person of the incarnate Christ. It is Christ who is priest, Christ who is bishop; it is Christ who stands at every altar and celebrates every Eucharist—and the priestly ministry of the Church is viable only if it is seen as an extension, into the life of the Church, of the incarnation of him who was born the Son of Man. The priest presides at the altar and says what Christ said, does what Christ did; there is a very profound sense in which, at that moment and in that ministry, he *is* Christ. And Christ was a man.

This fact is re-inforced by the additional fact that Jesus chose only men for his Apostles (and they chose only men as their successors). It is often argued that this is so for cultural reasons: Jesus himself, it is said, was limited by the conventions of his time; the Church was limited by the need to communicate with a society in which women were inferior. It is hard indeed to see how the Christ who defied the conventions of the Sabbath, the Christ who (in defiance of *all* convention) spoke to the woman at the well, the Christ who chose women to witness his resurrection at a time when their evidence was not acceptable in a court of law, could not have had enough originality or courage to defy this convention as well. But he did not. Further, the inferiority of women in ancient society has been greatly exaggerated: women were often extremely prominent in Graeco-Roman society (and were often priestesses at important cult-centers); Jewish women were dispensed from much of the ritual obligations of the Law not so much because they were inferior as because it was felt that they ought to be free to order the home.

The argument above does not, of course, refer to the diaconate, which is a different sort of ministry, a ministry of the "servantship of Jesus Christ" (Ignatius of Antioch), and we are all called to exhibit that sort of servantship, man and woman alike (not that we are all called to be deacons, but that the diaconate is a crystal-

lization of a universal Christian obligation). That the Church realized that there was a difference is illustrated by the fact that at various points in her history there have been "deaconesses" whose functions have varied but have included, at least occasionally and under special conditions, the usual liturgical functions now associated with the diaconate. Women in the diaconate, therefore, are not the total novelty that women in the priesthood or the episcopate would be—and with good reason. This is not, by the way, to say that the diaconate is inherently an inferior order of ministry. Such was not always so in the Church's history; such need not be so again; and, in the light of the biblical witness, such ought not to be so. The diaconate is a ministry in its own right, with its own value. It is tragic that we have called it an "inferior Office" and seen it only as a stepping-stone to "the higher Ministries". And perhaps it is the modern Church's failure to find an adequate use for the diaconate which has, in large measure, prompted the feeling that women are denied "full" participation in the life of the Church.

Part of the problem, of course, is the way one looks at "Church". If the Church is simply an organization, and if the orders of her ministry are simply functional, simply "offices", and if their purpose is simply administrative, pastoral, and concerned with the preaching office, there is, indeed, no reason whatsoever why women ought not to share that ministry on an equal basis with men. Such is the case with our Protestant brethren, for their view of what they would call "the institutional Church" is precisely this—and it is no injustice to them nor derogation from the value of their ministry to point this out. Women are no anomaly in the Protestant ministry, for that ministry is primarily one of preaching, teaching, and pastoring; and women can do such things as well as men (and often better). But the Catholic priesthood, though it includes the functions listed above, is *primarily* a ministry of sacrifice: the priest at the altar, the Father of the Family standing in the place of Christ, re-presents Christ's "one oblation of himself once offered" dissolving in his person and by his office the barriers of time and place, that we may be with Christ in "his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension". A priesthood of this sort is not merely functional; it has, rather, a certain *character*, which traditional Catholic (and therefore Anglican) teaching has described as indelible. It is the character of the incarnate Christ,

and the priest bears it through eternity. Such a priesthood is not merely functional; and the Church with such a priesthood is not merely organizational. It is, rather, an organism, a living body, each member of which has his own function and his own place, each place and function being alike equal of honor. But also different in character: not all men are called to be priests; not all women are called to be mothers—and yet such functions are proper to each sex. But whatever our place in the body, all are called to join with angels and archangels in praise of the risen Christ who is our head.

One can only ask whether one local, national Church, or even one Communion (which is but a faction of the Church Catholic), has either the canonical or the moral authority to change in so radical a manner the constitution of the Church's ministry—deriving from the practice of the Primitive Church, the example of the Apostles, and, we believe, the mind of Christ.



FROM THE PARISH REGISTER

BAPTISM

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

April 2—Gregory Jerome Bruce Casprini

CONFIRMATIONS

*"Grieve not the Holy Spirit, whereby ye were
sealed unto the day of redemption."*

April 2—Daphne Pamela Mary Brewster	Nzinga Natasha Garvey
Charles Albert Carson	Bruce Stuart Johnson
Gregory Jerome Bruce Casprini	Susan Elizabeth Walenta
Lawrence Moseley Davis	

BURIAL

"My flesh shall rest in hope."

April 2—Mary Laurence, Sister, C.S.M. (Hildegarde Aymar Nicholas)

ALTAR FLOWER MEMORIALS

May 7—Easter VI, Emma Frances Taber
 May 11—Ascension Day, Helen Ray
 May 14—Easter VII, Christian and Ada Troutwine
 May 21—Pentecost, George Martin Christian & Joseph Gale Hurd Barry,
 Priests & Rectors
 May 28—Trinity Sunday, Albert and Charlotte Grant
 May 31—Visitation B.V.M., Augusta Dinter

SERVICES

SUNDAYS

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 and 6:15 p.m.
Evening Prayer	6:00 p.m.

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



CONFESSIONS

DAILY, 12:40-1 p.m., *also*

FRIDAYS, 5-6 p.m.

SATURDAYS, 2-3 and 5-6 p.m.

SUNDAYS, 8:40-9 a.m.

*On the first Friday of each month, 5-6 p.m.,
a priest of the Society of Saint Francis
is scheduled to hear confessions.*



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.

MUSIC FOR MAY

MAY 7 — EASTER VI

11 a.m.

Mass in D	Georg Henschel
Motet, Non vos relinquam orphanos	William Byrd

6 p.m. *Vespers B.V.M.*

Magnificat	McNeil Robinson
Marian Litanies	Seth Bingham
O salutaris hostia	Geoffrey Bush
Tantum ergo	Geoffrey Bush

MAY 14 — SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY

11 a.m.

Missa Festiva	Alexander Gretchaninov
Motet, He that descended man is ascended God	John Amner

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis	Thomas Tallis
Motet, If ye love me	Thomas Tallis
O salutaris hostia	Jacob Handl
Motet, Adoramus te	Jacob Handl
Tantum ergo	Jacob Handl

MAY 21 — PENTECOST

11 a.m.

Missa in honorem Sancti Spiritus	Hermann Stratigier
Motet, Confirma hoc, Deus	J. B. Hilber

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis	Pelham Humphrey
Motet, O Lord, give thy Holy Spirit	Thomas Tallis
O salutaris hostia	Anton Bruckner
Motet, Jesu, dulcis memoria	Mode VI
Tantum ergo	Anton Bruckner

MAY 28 — TRINITY SUNDAY

11 a.m.

Mass in G minor	Francis Poulenc
Motet, O beata et gloriosa Trinitas	Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina

6 p.m.

Magnificat et Nunc dimittis	Thomas Attwood Walmisley
Motet, Duo Seraphim	Tomás Luis de Victoria
O salutaris hostia	Tomás Luis de Victoria
Motet, O sacrum convivium	Blasius Amon
Tantum ergo	Tomás Luis de Victoria

CALENDAR FOR MAY

1. M. SAINT PHILIP & SAINT JAMES, APOSTLES
2. Tu. St Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, 373
3. W. *Requiem 7:30.*
4. Th. St Monnica, Mother of Augustine of Hippo, 387
5. F. *Abstinence dispensed.*
6. Sa. St John before the Latin Gate
7. Su. EASTER VI
Evening Prayer 5. May Festival 6.
8. M. ROGATION DAY
9. Tu. ROGATION DAY (St Gregory of Nazianzus,
Bishop of Constantinople, 389)
10. W. ROGATION DAY
11. Th. ASCENSION DAY
Evening Prayer 5:30. High Mass 6.
12. F. St Pancras, Martyr at Rome, c. 304
Abstinence dispensed.
13. Sa. *Of our Lady.*
14. Su. THE SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY
High Mass with Procession 11.
15. M. *Requiem 12:10.*
16. Tu.
17. W.
18. Th.
19. F. St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, 988
Abstinence dispensed.
20. Sa. Vigil
21. Su. THE DAY OF PENTECOST
High Mass with Procession 11.
22. M. *Requiem 6:15.*
23. Tu.
24. W. EMBER DAY (Jackson Kemper, First Missionary Bishop
in the United States, 1870)
25. Th. St Bede the Venerable, Priest & Monk of Jarrow, 735
26. F. EMBER DAY (St Augustine, First Archbishop of
Centerbury, 605)
27. Sa. EMBER DAY
28. Su. TRINITY SUNDAY
High Mass with Procession 11.
29. M. *Requiem 7:30.*
30. Tu. St Joan of Arc, 1431
31. W. THE VISITATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

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 John Paul Boyer

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

MISSION HOUSE
133 West 46th Street, New York 10036—PLaza 7-3962
Society of Saint Francis

and
Saint Mary's Center for Senior Citizens
Open Monday to Friday, 1 to 5 p.m.
Mrs Emil F. Pascarelli, *Program Director*

Mr John Z. Headley, *Treasurer* PLaza 7-6750
Mr James L. Palsgrove, *Director of Music* TEmpleton 1-5005
Mr McNeil Robinson, *Organist* MOnument 3-3259
Mr James P. Gregory, *Ceremoniaris* ACademy 2-1659
Mr J. William Burgess, *Head Usher* SUsquehanna 7-3300
Mr Randolph L. Frew, *Seminarian* CHelsea 3-5150
Mr Ronald T. Lau, *Seminarian* WAtkins 9-5922
Mrs William J. Abdale, *Hospitality* AXtel 7-4539
Miss Ruth Culley, *Bookshop* SUsquehanna 7-0871
Miss Frances M. Flagg, *Librarian* PLaza 7-3434
Mrs Charles A. Edgar, *Flowers* PLaza 7-6750
Mr Louis Fellowes, *Funeral Director* PLaza 3-5300

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