

· BENE·DICTA · TU · IN · MULIERIBUS ·

· AVE · MARIA · GRATIA · PLENA · DOMINUS · TECUM ·

· ET · BENE·DICTUS · FRUCTUS · VENTRIS · TUI ·



AVE

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

· BENE·DICTA · TU · IN · MULIERIBUS ·

· AVE · MARIA · GRATIA · PLENA · DOMINUS · TECUM ·
· ET · BENE·DICTUS · FRUCTUS · VENTRIS · TUI ·



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 JOHN PAUL BOYER

THE REVEREND ROBERT H. SCHUMANN

THE REVEREND SYDNEY J. ATKINSON, O.H.C.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE REVEREND DONALD L. GARFIELD, *President*

CARRINGTON RAYMOND, *Vice-President*

JAMES P. GREGORY, *Secretary*

JOHN Z. HEADLEY, *Treasurer*

GEORGE E. DIX

HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD

G. EDWARD MUELLER

CALVIN NASH

AVE

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

Vol. XLII

January, 1973

No. 1

My dear people,

All of us at the rectory want to thank you for your kind greetings at Christmas. We wish you every blessing in the New Year.

A year ago, I wrote that New Yorkers mostly want to be left alone and that Saint Mary's never had been a close-knit parish and never will be 'folksy'. Maybe I was wrong — at any rate, I think I am right that this year has seen an up-surge of care for one another at Saint Mary's that almost can be felt. It is so evident, to me and to others who equally have been delighted to feel it. It is more than human 'togetherness' — it is fellowship of the Holy Ghost — *koinonia*.

It was most evident, this many-being-one in Saint Mary's, at the parish brunch on November 19 and the parish reception on December 8. Those who prepared and served the food and drink had the reward of seeing it appreciated as a means of bringing widely different, sometimes separated, sorts of people together. What a strange mixture we are at Saint Mary's! Doesn't it demonstrate the meaning of Catholic? One faith for many; all sorts and conditions finding God's saving health in the Catholic Religion.

Now I think we should build on what has happened to us. I think we should get together again — and again — if you like. And I think we should tie it in with some holy days we all keep. So I propose parish evenings, with supper and a program of instruction, discussion, or entertainment; and as a start I have chosen January 5 and February 2. Epiphany Eve and Candlemas, following High Mass, therefore, you have a supper invitation — but there is going to be a charge of \$2 (what is left over, if any, to build up a fund for when we don't charge). Reservation should be 'phoned' in at once for January 5. That night, since our LORD's Epiphany is his first showing to the world and inspires his Church's mission, Father Atkinson will show slides he has taken in Jerusalem, Liberia, and Sewanee, illustrating our LORD's command to be witnesses to him "both in Jerusalem . . . and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

Pray, as I know you do, for peace in the New Year. God could give us no greater gift, and the only true peace is his. For his world, for his Church and our parish, we pray to him: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore.

Affectionately your priest,

Donald L. Garfield



FROM THE PARISH REGISTER

BAPTISM

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

November 26—Nicole Jacqueline Marie File



ALTAR FLOWER MEMORIALS

- January 1—The Holy Name, Helen Elizabeth Butler
 January 6—The Epiphany, James H. Gorham, Priest, OHC, Edwin Gorham, Sr, Caroline Gorham, and Edwin Gorham, Jr
 January 7—The Baptism of Christ, Grieg Taber, Priest and Rector
 January 14—Epiphany II, Mary Louise Raymond
 January 21—Epiphany III, David Thayer Batchelder
 January 28—Epiphany IV, Joseph H. Schuman



CONTRIBUTIONS to the cost of AVE are gratefully acknowledged: Anonymous, \$5; Mrs Mabel D. Bouvier, \$3; Mr & Mrs Benton J. Case, \$85; Miss Elizabeth Clark, \$3; Mrs Anna Friedauer, \$5; The Rev'd Charles B. Hoglan, Jr, \$3; Miss Rebecca Howe, \$4; The Rev'd James H. B. Kenyon, \$3; The Rev'd Edward Kronvall, \$10; Terry L. Nickey, \$10; Richard M. Pietro, \$4; Miss Jane Purney, \$3; Laurence R. Sears, \$10; The Rev'd Richard G. Shepherd & Mrs Shepherd, \$20; Paul E. Spahr, \$2; W. Phelps Warren, \$4; Mrs Marion E. Wiethorn, \$10; Mr & Mrs Austin M. Wynne, \$4.

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.

BIBLICAL STUDIES — XVI

WE LEFT DAVID, when last we considered him, in control of Jerusalem, and we devoted some considerable space to a discussion of what this new capital was to mean in terms of unifying the kingdom and revolutionizing the understanding of the kingship. There can be no question, however much David may have *appeared* to value and conserve the traditions of the past, that his accession and his establishment of himself in a city free from old associations marked a new departure in the history of the nation. Before David, it was an open question whether monarchical government would survive, or, if it did, in what form; after him, there could only be a question of *who* was to be King—the *form* of the kingship and its meaning were firmly established, and would endure (at least in Judah) for half a millenium. The most accessible parallel, perhaps, is what Augustus did for Rome: the forms of the Republic were kept and even revered, but the substance of what really moved the state was forever altered. Augustus and his successors, however, did not have to face the kind of counterweight which would be provided by the prophets, and their empire was not to be seriously threatened from the outside for some generations. Given the opposite situation in Israel, then, it is perhaps not too unreasonable to claim an even greater genius for David. His successors, it is true, made some disastrous mistakes; that so much survived for so long, in spite of that, says a great deal for the foundations which their great ancestor laid.

There were, of course, other Canaanite cities in Palestine besides Jerusalem. Perhaps they had been Philistine vassals and merely switched allegiance after David's decisive defeat of the Philistines early in his reign, but in any event by the time of the King's death all of these cities, all of the Canaanite enclaves, were firmly under Israelite control. No effort seems to have been made, by the way, to integrate these new territories into the old tribal system: they became Crown lands under royal governors, and were therefore useful bolsters of the King's authority. However accomplished, their capture left all of what we now call Palestine under David's control, except the coastal strip still held by the Philistines in the southwest. The King was free to turn his attentions to the Trans-Jordanian kingdoms to the east, and to the Aramean (Syrian) states in the north.

We do not know whether David embarked on a career of conquest from set purpose or from accident; we do not know, that is, whether he *planned* to found an empire, or whether he was forced into it bit by bit to defend what he already had from the aggression of alarmed and frightened neighbours. Whatever his motives, it was his reign which was to extend Israel to its farthest bounds, to fulfil the ideal "promise" (read retroactively into the Pentateuch) of a land stretching "from the brook of Egypt to the great River", from Sinai, that is, to the Euphrates. It was to be a comparatively short-lived idyll: Solomon managed (barely) to keep most of it together; *his* son, Rehoboam, however, stupidly provoked the northern half of the kingdom into rebellion, and this, combined with the resurgence of Mesopotamian power under the Assyrians and (later) the Neo-Babylonians, ensured that Israel's future would be, politically speaking, distinctly second-class.

The first step on the road to empire — however brief — was the conquest of Ammon (the chronology of II Samuel is somewhat difficult, but the Ammonite campaign, II Samuel 10-12, must have preceded the campaign of 8:3-8, since the king defeated in the latter intervened in the former). It happened that the King of Ammon died, who had been a friend of David. An embassy of condolence was sent to the new king, but he was persuaded by his advisors that the real purpose of the visit was to spy out the weakness of the country, so he took the ambassadors and cut off half their beards and all of their clothes below the waist — an unimaginable insult in those days — and sent them home again. After this, war was inevitable, and the Ammonites hastened to hire mercenaries from the Aramean kingdoms north of them. David's army commander, Joab, had by this time invested the Ammonite capital (Rabbath-ammon, the present-day Amman), and the Aramean allies arrived only in time to be disastrously defeated. A second force was dispatched, but David himself met the invaders in northern Trans-Jordan and routed them thoroughly, leaving their commander dead on the field. The siege of Rabbah (i.e., Rabbath-ammon) was resumed.

It was during this campaign that the Bathsheba affair took place, which was the most discreditable incident of the entire reign. The story, of course, is well known: David saw the beautiful young wife of Uriah the Hittite, one of his officers engaged at the siege of the Ammonite capital, while she was bathing on the roof of her house,

which adjoined the royal palace. The two had an affair, and the woman became pregnant. Fornication in ancient Israel was no serious thing, but adultery with someone else's wife was very serious indeed. David's position had, at a stroke, become most precarious, and he began to scuttle around in an effort to cover up. The first thing was to order Uriah home upon the pretext of making a report of the battle situation. Perhaps, if he had intercourse with his wife, no one would ever be the wiser about who the actual father of the child was. Uriah, however, nobly refused to enjoy the comfort of his home or the charms of his wife while his comrades were enduring the discomforts of the siege (there are religious overtones here too: war was in some sense a "sacred" task, and one was expected to be ritually pure, one of the conditions of which was temporary continence in sexual matters; Uriah, though a "Hittite", seems to be a stricter Yahwist than David, which heightens the irony and the pathos of what was to come) — he chose to sleep instead with the palace garrison. The next night was no better: David got the man drunk, hoping, obviously, to confound his inhibitions; but apparently he overdid it, for Uriah never got beyond the royal ante-chambers. There was no choice, then, but to send him back to the siege. With him went a message to Joab, a man totally without scruples who could be relied upon to do what the King wanted with no questions asked. What the King wanted this time, however, was simple murder, disguised as a battle casualty; and this Joab provided easily enough. Uriah was put in the front line very near the city wall, and when the enemy made a sortie, Joab simply withdrew everyone else — no problem. Joab sent a report of the battle to the King, with the death of Uriah as a sweetener for what was otherwise a military reverse, and David sent and took — after a decent interval — the wife of the man he had killed at long distance. Such are the temptations of power.

"But the thing that David had done displeased the LORD." Shortly after Bathsheba's son had been born, David's court prophet, Nathan, came to the King and told him a parable disguised as an actual law-case. It is the famous story of the rich man, who had flocks and flocks of sheep and goats, but who took the one solitary lamb of a poor man — which he had raised as a pet — and killed it to provide for a guest of his own. David was furious:

"As the LORD liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall surely die: and he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he

did this thing, and because he had no pity." And Nathan said to David, "Thou art the man. Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, 'I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul; and I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have given unto thee such and such things. Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the LORD, to do evil in his sight? thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken his wife to be thy wife, and hast slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon. Now therefore the sword shall never depart from thine house . . . Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun. For thou didst it secretly: but I will do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun.'"

David confessed his sin, begging pardon of God; but the child died, as Nathan had foretold. The King wept and fasted beforehand, hoping to change the word of judgement, but after the child was dead he said:

"While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept: for I said, 'Who can tell whether GOD will be gracious to me, that the child may live?' But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

And so, the siege of Rabbah went on; and in due course the city was taken, and David added the crown of Ammon to his collection. And after that the Aramean states were to be taken care of, which had supplied aid to the Ammonite enemy; and then there was Moab, to the south of Ammon, and Edom to the south of that — both kingdoms ferociously subdued. But something of the glory was gone, something of the gold tarnished. The King was King, and a good King at that; but he never quite got his honour back again. Or perhaps it would be fairer to say that time took its toll, and the realities and sins common to us all caught him up. We cannot, after all, remain young forever, and the clarity of the youthful vision fails us all in time.

J.P.B.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

Dear Brethren in Christ:

We, the undersigned, having been ordained priest in the American Episcopal Church and currently studying or working in England, feel moved (in light of the recent decision by the House of Bishops) to lay before our Church certain considerations touching upon the ordination of women to the priesthood which we hope will make a useful contribution and add an 'international' dimension to the current debate. In doing this, it is our desire to be positive, constructive, and, above all, Christian. After much prayer, reading, and reflection on the issue at hand, we respectfully submit the following for your consideration.

A Basic Consideration

Underlying any deep consideration of this question must be one consideration of fundamental importance: that no arguments relative to this question have in fact succeeded in convincing our Church as a whole. Honest and conscientious Churchmen may be found on both sides of this issue. In other words, it would appear that the Holy Spirit has not yet given us clear guidance on this matter, and that, insofar as faith and doctrine are concerned, the issue itself is thus far ambiguous. Given this premise certain observations are in order.

Cultural Pressures and the Church

Opponents of the ordination of women are not the only ones vulnerable to the charge of negativism. It cannot be denied that one of the primary motivations behind the move to ordain women derives from cultural pressures in our society, dominated as it is by those egalitarian ideals which had their historical origin in the Enlightenment. To the extent that the advocates of the ordination of women are merely reacting uncritically to charges of discrimination stemming from such ideals, they too are involved in a form of negativism. If, however, as Christians claim, Christ is the Light of the world, then a mere negativism of this kind clearly will not do.

Cultural pressures in themselves are not necessarily either good or bad. If, however, the Church simply accepts them at face value and attempts in an uncritical manner to accommodate its image to them, then such behavior is not only destructive of the Church, even worse, it is of no value to the world which we have been sent to

serve. The pattern exhibited by the Church in this regard since the Enlightenment (and particularly since Darwin) has not been an encouraging one. Increasingly, many Christians have let others do their thinking for them. The repetition of this pattern in the issue at hand seems to be painfully evident.

Cultural pressures can play a positive role if they provoke us to think deeply about the fundamental problems which they raise and to seek to understand them in the light of our inherited Christian vision of reality. It is our conviction that this is precisely the approach called for in the present controversy. Like the Fathers of the early Church, it is our responsibility to think *through* the superficialities of the matter and to produce a positive notion of what we are doing and why. Given the ambiguity referred to above, this cannot be done easily or quickly, but failure to make the attempt does a disservice both to ourselves and to those outside the Church. Shortcuts are rarely, if ever, helpful when one is dealing with matters of fundamental importance.

The Importance of this Question

With those who would say that the ordination of women is not such a matter of fundamental concern, we would agree to this extent: taken in isolation it may or not be a life-or-death matter for the Church. However, such a compartmentalization of thinking is artificial and indicative of the analytical era of thinking *from* which our culture is emerging.

In particular, the question of the ordination of women is bound up with the more fundamental questions of priesthood and ministry; and those areas are vital, especially if one views the priest as representative of Christ.

In periods of great change, it is only natural to examine our foundations. One of the disturbing aspects of the current debate is that, in any deep sense, this does not appear to be the case. Undoubtedly such questioning is going on among certain groups and individuals, but this is not enough; it must also be seen to be happening. If we proceed to ordain women without any positive doctrine of priesthood and ministry, then critics will be justified in asking us why we are doing what we are doing. *To* what and *for* what can we say that we are ordaining anyone, male or female? To those who might retort that this is asking too much of Anglicans, we can only say *perhaps*. Failure to attempt at least to clarify our position can satisfy no one.

Furthermore, what unforeseen consequences would such a move have on other areas of the Church's teaching? This question and others need to be considered, or we shall be left open to the charge of being both inconsistent and shallow.

The Role of Charity

Charity, so vital to the Christian life, must play a significant role in relations between Churches as well as between individuals. On the ecumenical front, the negotiations being conducted by the International Commission on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations (currently considering the question of Ministry and Orders) have reached a delicate stage. If the American Church proceeds unilaterally on this issue, it should first consider the ecumenical consequences, which could well be serious.

This is not to say that our action would kill the growing rapprochement between ourselves and the Church of Rome, but it would complicate the matter considerably at a most inopportune moment. The difficulties presented by such a move now, would, it seems to us, extend beyond the work of the commission itself to the social scene in Britain, and particularly in Northern Ireland where the rocks of history pose a much greater threat to the ecumenical ship and the social fabric than in the United States. In short, the issue of the ordination of women is not a local one, nor is it limited to relations within or between Churches.

In light of this, if we insist on going ahead, then we shall be asked pointedly how seriously we take our ecumenical obligations as well as our duty to the Anglican Communion. To those who rejoice in the opportunity to play a pioneering role in the Christian world, we would point out that the greater the potential of a decision for good or evil, the greater the responsibility to exercise one's influence properly.

To those who would say that charity begins at home, we would agree. Given the apparent ambiguity of the question, there are a substantial number of Churchmen who want to do the right thing, but cannot see their way through to accepting the ordination of women. To force a *fait accompli* upon them at this stage would provoke a sincere crisis of conscience, the proportions of which would be far greater than many seem to realize. This is complicated by the appearance that the decision is being made precipitately and in the midst of an emotional atmosphere, when a cool head and clear thinking are called for. Thus it is not surprising that many who are

dubious about the proceedings feel that the Episcopal Church is considering something which smacks of presumption and isolationism vis-a-vis other and major parts of Christendom.

This argument from charity equally applies to those who sincerely believe that the ordination of women is a good thing, and in particular to those women who feel that they have a vocation to the ministry. For either party to run roughshod over the other would put us in danger of doing the right thing (whatever that might be) for the wrong reasons. We might find that we had gained the world only to lose our own soul in the process.

For these reasons we feel that the General Convention of 1973 would be ill-advised to sanction the ordination of women to the priesthood. Our motivation for advocating the deferment of this issue is by no means obstructionist, as if deferring the matter would enable it to go away. On the contrary, we are convinced that in this debate profound matters have been unearthed, and that they should be pursued. Moreover we feel that a question of such importance should be taken up by the Church as a whole, and not just by professional theologians. What then should we do?

Recommendations

Other important changes in the life of the Church, such as the liturgical changes and the COCU plan, have been submitted to the whole Church throughout its dioceses, and we believe that a similar procedure should apply to the question of the ordination of women to the priesthood as well. Thus a Theological Commission on Ministry might be established at the National and/or Diocesan levels. Such a commission should include representatives of both points of view, both theologians and others from the clerical and lay orders, as well as observers from other churches.

It would be appropriate to take note of what the National and International Commissions on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations report on the subject of Ministry and Orders, as well as of the COCU plan.

Finally, we can pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Throughout all of this we should keep one consideration in mind: not what is best for individual men and women, but what is best for the Church.

It is possible that there are other and better recommendations which might be made, but we believe that the reversal of a two-

thousand-year-old Christian tradition should not be undertaken lightly; the spirits need to be tested. Hopefully both we ourselves and most of our fellow Christians are now in a position to learn from the mistakes of the past, and to approach this question with the depth of understanding and the courage and charity which its importance plainly demands.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

J. L. HOLLEMAN	R. P. VAGGIONE
M. K. BICE	R. G. CIPOLLA
A. C. MEAD	H. T. LEWIS

★

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.
Mass	5:00 p.m.
Evensong and Benediction	6:00 p.m.

WEEKDAYS

Morning Prayer	7:10 a.m.
Mass daily	7:30 a.m., 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 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.

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

CHURCH SCHOOL

CHILDREN attend 9 o'clock Mass on Sunday and receive instruction afterwards in the Mission House. For ADULTS there is discussion at 10 o'clock in Saint Joseph's Hall.



ORDER OF SAINT VINCENT

ACOLYTES of the parish. Men and boys who wish to serve at the altar should speak to the clergy.



SAINT RAPHAEL'S GUILD

USHERS at services of the parish. Men who can help should speak to the clergy.



SAINT MARTIN'S GUILD

TOURS of the church are conducted after Sunday High Mass. Those who would undertake this mission of welcome should speak to the clergy.



SAINT MARY'S GUILD

SACRED VESTMENTS AND VESSELS are cared for by women working on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Those who can sew, wash and iron, and polish should speak to the clergy.



DEVOTIONAL SOCIETIES

SAINT MARY'S WARDS of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Guild of All Souls, and the Society of Mary are open to all communicants.

PARISH LIBRARY

BOOKS MAY BE BORROWED from the William Edward Jones Memorial Library of theology, apologetics, ecclesiastical history, religious biography, and the devotional life. The library is open on Sundays after High Mass.



SAINT FRANCIS DE SALES SHOP

BOOKS MAY BE BOUGHT after Sunday High Mass at the shop next to the parish hall. There are also crucifixes, rosaries, medals, and other aids to worship.



SAINT MARY'S PUBLICATIONS

Ecce Sacerdos Magnus, The Archbishop of Canterbury at Saint Mary's: monaural \$6.50 (mailing 50c)

Towards a Living Liturgy, essays by seminary professors and parish priests: \$1.00 (mailing 25c)

A Tribute to Saint Mary's, Dr. Macquarrie's articles on Benediction, Stations, and Saint Mary's: 25c

Music at Saint Mary's, James L. Palsgrove's historical review with music lists today: 50c

Worship in Spirit and Truth, papers at the 1970 liturgical conference on Prayer Book proposals: \$2.95

Vêpres du Commun, Dupré's organ antiphons played at Saint Mary's by McNeil Robinson: stereophonic \$5.95 (mailing 50c)

Order from the Saint Francis de Sales Shop



SAINT MARY'S SPECIAL MUSIC FUND

CONTRIBUTIONS from individuals who want to support musical activities which lie beyond the essentials of liturgical worship are gratefully received through the parish office.



REMEMBER SAINT MARY'S IN YOUR WILL

BEQUESTS may be made in the following form:

"I hereby give, devise, and bequeath to the Society of the Free Church of Saint Mary the Virgin, a corporation organized and existing under the Laws of the State of New York, and having its principal office at 145 West 46th Street, New York City, . . . [here state the nature or amount of the gift]."

CALENDAR FOR JANUARY

1. M. THE HOLY NAME OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST
High Mass 11
No Mass at 12:10 or 6:15
2. Tu.
3. W.
4. Th.
5. F. *No abstinence*
Evening Prayer 5:30
High Mass of the Epiphany 6
6. Sa. THE EPIPHANY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST
7. Su. THE BAPTISM OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST
High Mass with Procession 11
8. M. *Requiem 7:30*
9. Tu.
10. W. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury & Martyr, 1645
11. Th.
12. F. St Benedict Biscop, Abbot of Wearmouth, 690
13. Sa. St Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 367
14. Su. EPIPHANY II
15. M. *Requiem 12:10*
16. Tu.
17. W. St Antony, Abbot in Egypt, 356
18. Th. THE CONFESSION OF SAINT PETER THE APOSTLE
19. F. St Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, 1095
20. Sa. St Fabian, Bishop & Martyr of Rome, 250
21. Su. EPIPHANY III
22. M. St Vincent, Deacon of Saragossa & Martyr, 304
23. Tu. Phillips Brooks, Bishop of Massachusetts, 1893
24. W. St Francis de Sales, Bishop of Geneva, 1622
25. Th. THE CONVERSION OF SAINT PAUL THE APOSTLE
26. F. SS. Timothy & Titus, Companions of St Paul
27. Sa. St John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, 407
28. Su. EPIPHANY IV
29. M. *Requiem 6:15*
30. Tu. King Charles the Martyr, 1649
31. W. St John Bosco, Priest, 1888



ORDO KALENDAR FOR 1973: Seasons and saints' days shown in color;
picture of people at our church door; 75¢; \$1 mailed

LECTIONARY (YEAR ONE)

For trial use

JANUARY

	Genesis	Hebrews	John
2.	12:1-7	11:1-12	6:35-42, 48-51
3.	28:10-22	13-22	10:7-17
	Exodus		
4.	3:1-12	23-31	14:6-14
	Joshua		
5.	1:1-9	11:32 — 12:2	15:1-16

EPIPHANY I

	Isaiah	Ephesians	Mark
M.	40:1-11	1:1-14	1:1-13
Tu.	12-17	15-23	14-28
W.	18-23	2:1-10	29-45
Th.	41:1-20	11-22	2:1-12
F.	21-29	3:1-13	13-22
Sa.	42:1-9	14-21	2:22 — 3:6

EPIPHANY II

	Isaiah	Ephesians	Mark
M.	42:10-17	4:1-16	3:7-19a
Tu.	43:1-13	17-32	20-35
W.	43:13 — 44:5	5:1-14	4:1-20
Th.*	44:6-8, 21-23	15-33	21-34
F.	44:9-20	6:1-9	35-41
Sa.	44:25 — 45:7	10-24	5:1-20

EPIPHANY III

	Isaiah	Galatians	Mark
M.	45:5-19	1:1-5, 11-17	5:21-43
Tu.	20-25	1:18 — 2:10	6:1-16
W.	46	2:11-21	30-46
Th.*	47	3:1-14	47-56
F.	48:1-11	15-22	7:1-23
Sa.	12-21	23-29	24-37

EPIPHANY IV

	Isaiah	Galatians	Mark
M.	49:1-12	4:1-11	8:1-10
Tu.	13-23	12-20	11-21
W.	51:1-8	21-31	22-33

**These two days are major feasts, and proper lessons will be read at church.
In private reading, for sake of continuity you may wish to read lessons in
course, which we give here.*

MUSIC FOR JANUARY

JANUARY 7—THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST

11 a.m.

Missa tertii toni Costanzo Porta
 Motet, Jubilate Deo Gregor Aichinger

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis Thomas Tallis
 Motet, Almighty God, which by
 the leading of a star John Bull
 O salutaris hostia Anton Bruckner
 Motet, Ave verum corpus 14th century French
 Tantum ergo George Henschel

JANUARY 14—EPIPHANY II

11 a.m.

Mass in E minor Anton Bruckner
 Motet, Virga Jesse Anton Bruckner

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis Herbert Howells
 Motet, Like as the hart Herbert Howells
 O salutaris hostia Flor Peeters
 Motet, Jesu dulcis memoria Mode I
 Tantum ergo Flor Peeters

JANUARY 21—EPIPHANY III

11 a.m.

Missa brevis Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina
 Motet, Dexter a Domini Orlandus Lassus

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis Thomas Tomkins
 Motet, My shepherd is the living Lord Thomas Tomkins
 O salutaris hostia Mode VII
 Motet, Ave verum corpus Josquin des Prés
 Tantum ergo Mode V

JANUARY 28—EPIPHANY IV

11 a.m.

Missa brevis Zolton Kodaly
 Motet, Confirma hoc, Deus William Byrd

6 p.m.

Magnificat & Nunc dimittis Robert Fayrfax
 Motet, Laudate Domino Hans Leo Hassler
 O salutaris hostia Jacob Handl
 Motet, Adoramus te Jacob Handl
 Tantum ergo Jacob Handl

DIRECTORY

CHURCH OF SAINT MARY THE VIRGIN
 139 West 46th Street, New York
 (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
 The Rev'd Donald L. Garfield, Rector
 The Rev'd John Paul Boyer
 The Rev'd Sydney J. Atkinson, O.H.C.
 PLaza 7-6750

PARISH OFFICE

145 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
 Mr William R. Anderson, Parish Secretary
 Office hours from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.
 Monday-Friday except legal holidays
 PLaza 7-6750

MISSION HOUSE

133 West 46th Street, New York
 Society of Saint Francis
 ROckefeller 5-3895
 Saint Mary's Center for Senior Citizens
 Mrs Emil F. Pascarelli, Program Director
 PLaza 7-3962

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 Benjamin A. Bankson, Head Usber SUsquehanna 7-7267
 Mr Scott H. Helferty, Seminarian CHelsea 3-5150
 Mr Ronald T. Lau, Seminarian WATkins 9-5922
 Sister Brooke Bushong, C.A., Church School MUrray Hill 7-1365
 Mrs William J. Abdale, Hostess AXtell 7-4539
 Mr Edward Thompson, Bookshop WATkins 4-1767
 Miss Frances Flagg, Librarian PLaza 7-3434
 Mrs Charles A. Edgar, Flowers PLaza 7-6750
 Mr Ralph M. Morehead, Funeral Director RHineland 4-2500

The Church of Saint Mary the Virgin depends on the offerings of parishioners and friends. Pledge envelopes may be obtained from the Parish Secretary. Your support is appreciated.