

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

# AVE

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

VOL. XLV      JANUARY, 1976      No. 1

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

# AVE

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

VOL. XLV      JANUARY, 1976      No. 1

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 JOHN L. SCOTT

THE REVEREND RONALD T. LAU

---

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE REVEREND DONALD L. GARFIELD, *President*

JOHN Z. HEADLEY, *Vice-President*

JAMES P. GREGORY, *Secretary*

IRVING P. GRAEB, JR., *Treasurer*

PHILIP W. CALLANAN

RAY KIRBY

G. EDWARD MUELLER

CARRINGTON RAYMOND

CHARLES ARTHUR SCHAEFER

---

# AVE

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

---

---

Vol. XLV

January 1976

No. 1

---

---

My dear people,

The New Year opens with peace and with hope for our world and our city. And, I believe, for our parish.

We wish the Episcopal Church faced a year of growing together in the faith. We wish we could look for a year of peace. General Convention in September brings us together to face an issue which will not be resolved peacefully or permanently from anyone's point of view. Our point of view is stated so compellingly by Father Boyer that I have made this issue of AVE a one-issue presentation. His address is in several sections, each of which should be read with time for reflection. I hope it will tell you why we cannot walk away from the issue as if it would somehow go away.

It may seem to you, as it does to me, that the particular issue is only the tip of the iceberg—the real issue, that is, is the authority of the Episcopal Church or Anglican Communion, by itself to make fundamental changes—changes of sacraments and ministries that we share with all branches of the Catholic Church and receive from Christ himself. These changes, if made by our General Convention, will put us in a most difficult position and the Episcopal Church into divisions we dare not contemplate.

Your concern may move you—I hope it will if you have not already joined—to contribute to the Coalition for the Apostolic Ministry, 230 East 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022. CAM's message to the Church is that there *are* theological questions and ecumenical consequences and internal domestic divisions—and that there are men and women whose consciences must be respected.

The other issue for Convention 1976 is the Prayer Book, but its revision need not be an issue if you study it—and we have begun to in my sermons. When you see the book next month, you will say, "Thank God!"

Affectionately your priest,

DONALD L. GARFIELD

THE ORDINATION IMPASSE:  
WHY, WHAT, WHITHER?

An address by Father Boyer to the  
Coalition for the Apostolic Ministry

*THE QUESTION BEFORE THE CHURCH* — whether to ordain women — the peculiar agony and quandary of the Episcopal Church at this moment and indeed of the Anglican family of churches generally — brings to mind some words of suffering Job (28: 12-13):

But where shall wisdom be found?  
And where is the place of understanding?  
Man does not know the way to it,  
and it is not found in the land of the living.

How comforting it would be, in this question of the priestly ordination of women, if we could know where wisdom might be found and where the place of understanding might turn out to be. We do *not*, however, know the way to it, and as the crisis deepens, and as certain provocations continue, we might well despair whether in this matter wisdom can be found at all in the land of the living.

The point is, you see, that I do not *know* that women cannot be priests. I do not *think* they can, any more than I think I can be a mother. But since matters of the spirit are less obviously tangible than matters of biology, I cannot make so absolute a claim for the one as I can for the other, though I should like to point out in passing that part of our problem all along has been the inability of the proponents of women's priestly ordination even to conceptualize our touchstone that the realm of the spirit is not less real than the realm of the here and now — of what can be seen and touched. I shall return to this point. But the present point remains that I do not, cannot *know*. I cannot claim absolute certainty in this matter, though I can see a wealth and a weight of cumulative evidence of sufficient force to suggest to me that for our little Church to go merrily on its own separate way at this time and under these circumstances is little short of madness.

In any event, I do not intend to argue the matter here and now. You have, I suspect, heard all the argument by now anyway. And I suspect you are as heartily sick of them as I am. In the past two years we have been polarized quite beyond the point where argument does any good. The matter is no longer capable of being approached

rationally on the practical level — in the arena or the councils where decisions will be made. Nothing I could now say, though I spoke with the tongues of angels, would convince the Philadelphia Eleven or the Washington Four that they were wrong, let alone that they should desist, or attempt to undo what has been done. The idea of wrongness, or even of there being any longer two sides to the question, is no longer open to them. This is sadly unfortunate, for as I have said and will now say again, I cannot *know* — absolutely, for all time, eternally, — that they are not right. The pity is that they cannot see that for me to admit that, is the other side of the coin of their admitting the same thing. I do not know that they *cannot* be priests, but they do not know that they *can*.

I

ALL OF THIS is to say little more than that this whole controversy is much more complex than has generally been admitted. The proponents of women priests, for example, have reduced the whole matter, all along, to a simple question of human rights. Our plea that there are serious questions here — questions which reach right into the heart of what we mean by church and sacrament and sexuality and authority and even the nature of reality and of creation — have thus been brushed aside as so much rationalization for deep-rooted male supremacist neuroses. *A priori*, and beyond all argument, it is asserted that there are not, and by the very nature of the situation cannot be, any theological reasons of weight why women cannot be priests in the Holy Catholic Church. Such reasons as we advance, even if only to urge cautious delay, are dismissed as being not really "theological" — they are, we are told, mere smoke-screens for prejudice and for vested interest. On this view, the rightness of women's ordination to the priesthood is self-evident and axiomatic. Far from having to be argued or defended, it only need be intuited. If you cannot grasp this obvious intuition you are certainly blind and certainly, therefore, an oppressor. And therefore — and this is the tragedy of the matter — you do not deserve, and have no right to expect, consideration or conciliation or serious dialogue or any disposition to delay for prudential reasons or out of charity or of concern for the Church's unity — or even common fairness. On the contrary, you are the *enemy*, to be fought and to be conquered.

Now, as a matter of fact there *are* some theological reasons against

the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate. I am not sure that any *one* of them, in and of itself, proves anything conclusively. I do think that, taken together, they suggest every reason for delay, every reason for some very deep thinking, every reason for attempting to achieve something like an ecumenical consensus. I do not intend to rehearse these reasons now; my purpose is not, as I hope will become clear in due course, to argue the case against women's ordination. Suffice it say in passing, however, in answer to the glib assertion that *of course* there are no theological reasons why women cannot be priests, that those who think they can be seem almost always to be operating on the basis of an assumed and unexamined world-view which can be shown to be implicitly Gnostic, Montanist, Nestorian, Nominalist, and Naturalist — all of which are dubious and most of which are classical heresies. I am, of course, being somewhat flippant, though no more so than those who have determined in advance what can and what cannot be truly "theological". If they can make bald assertions, so, I suppose, can I. I could, and can if you ask, say more of what I mean by my Gnostics, Montanists, Nestorians, and what not — there is more meat here than perhaps meets the eye.

What I am saying, actually, is that the women's ordination controversy is more symbol than cause; it is a focal point for two ultimately different ways of looking at the Christian religion. I am suggesting, in fact, that those who favour the priesting of women are in great danger of altering the faith even if — and I think this is usually the case — even if they are not aware of what they are doing, and do not consciously know that they are doing it!

One thing, I think, they are *not* doing, even though a certain amount of rhetoric, both on their side and ours, has occasionally claimed it: they are not trying to revive Baalism or nature religion or the great Mother Goddess. One of our bishops, it is true, has said that the ancient Hebrews were wrong so resolutely to set their faces against all but a male-imagined conception of deity, and that their understanding of God would have been greatly enriched and enhanced if they could have borrowed some of the notions of their Canaanite neighbours. And another of our bishops has taken to consistently referring, even in casual conversation, to the Holy Spirit as "she". Christians who have never known ancient fertility cults would recoil in horror if they *saw* them. They would know also how terribly demeaning of womanhood those cults really were

at heart, and thank God that Hebrew religion had freed woman and given her both legal right and personal honour.

## II

THE POINT IS that those who talk of needing a female image of God know little of its background. If we really were dealing with recrudescing Baalism we should at least be dealing with a real religion, though a false one; we should be dealing with a system of belief suffused with awe before the elemental powers of the universe, a system which took the divine and the demonic seriously, a system which knew, however crudely or even obscenely, that there is more in heaven and in earth than our moderns have dreamt of in their philosophy.

But that is precisely what we are not dealing with here. We are dealing, not with resurgent paganism, but with the last gasp of modern rationalism. It is not that those we must oppose want, most of them, to worship Astarte alongside the LORD. It is that they do not really think of the divine as being sufficiently *personal* at all for the personal make-up of its earthly representatives to make any difference. It is not that they esteem the Earth Mother as greatly as the Sky Father. It is that this way of thinking about God *at all* is incomprehensible to them. Their God is not really God. He, or rather it, is abstract divinity, rational deity, whose symbols, whether of ministry or of anything else, are merely symbols, not God-bearing images cutting vertically across the natural order and transforming it into supernatural grace. Thus indeed the sexuality of the minister is irrelevant: if you worship abstract deity, the "priest" is an arbitrarily chosen, archaically named, conventional symbol; he, or she, is not an inherent image, a God-bearing image, an incarnational image, an *icon*, at all — and all the tradition of Catholic Christendom that *he is*, is so much outmoded superstition.

Thus, you see, I can claim that those we must oppose are, to use but one example from my earlier list, really though unconsciously Nestorian. Nestorianism was the heresy condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. The heresy asserted that there were two persons in the one Christ; that the divine and human were separate and distinct and were joined in Jesus of Nazareth because the man Jesus willed at every moment of his earthly existence to be fully united to and filled by God. He was an exceptionally inspired, even a uniquely inspired, man; but when all was said and done, there was

no *essential* union in him of the divine and human. The human person of Jesus and the divine Second Person of the Holy Trinity remained distinct; their union, though it proved to be permanent, was a merely moral union, a willed union, the holding together of two basically different things in a creative tension: there was *no essential unity*.

Now, orthodox Christianity maintained then and maintains now that Jesus the Christ is one Person, in whom the divine and human are fully and eternally joined. Jesus is not the God-filled man, he is the God-Man, fully and equally representative of God to man and of man to God. In him the whole fulness of the Godhead dwelt, and dwells, bodily. I have to suggest that that is, though unconsciously and unawares — that that is *not* what is proclaimed by much of the argument of the proponents of women's priestly ordination. I suggest that in their arguments they tend to sunder the one Person of Jesus the Christ into an essentially human prophet on the one hand — a moral leader of unparalleled goodness, to be sure, one to be loved and followed and imitated but in whom one could hardly be said to *participate* — and on the other hand an abstract Christ not usually thought of in the same mind's thought as Jesus the prophet of Nazareth: an abstract Christ who is simply the sum total of what we conceive to be the Ideal Humanity — which can be symbolically represented — with equal force and equal validity — by any human being of either sex.

I can show you something of what I mean by a personal anecdote. I participated in a television debate with another priest and with Carter Hayward, who has since become quite famous, of course. During the discussion the other priest said, very matter-of-factly, "Of course *Jesus* wasn't a priest." With more than some amazement I turned to him and said, "According to the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus is the *only* priest for Christians, and our priesthood is simply an extension and an expression of his one priesthood." Whereupon Miss Hayward turned to me and said, "Why, I never thought of that!" Which is precisely the point: it is not an idea which has normally occurred to them, though it is the Biblical picture. They meant to say that Jesus was not a professional religious functionary, which is true.

That people should think Christian priesthood to be no more than professional and functional is symptomatic of our whole problem. Not for them the ancient Catholic picture of the priest as

the Christ-person, the *proistamenos*, the sacramental stand-in — especially in the Eucharist — of the one priest Jesus the Christ, the Son of God incarnate by the power of the Holy Spirit of the flesh of his Virgin Mother. He lived as a real person in a real world at a particular moment in real history, and thus transformed and redeemed the real natures not of abstract phantoms but of real flesh-and-blood men and real flesh-and-blood women. By the power of his resurrection he still lives and rules his Church as its living Lord, shaping it, giving it its structure and basic constitution, establishing its ministries both priestly and other, providing its sacraments as channels of real and effective grace and not as symbols, only, of a merely human conviviality.

The Catholic Church is a divine institution grounded in eternity and expressive of the will and nature of God's incarnate Son. It is less than Catholic if the Church is viewed as an essentially human institution devised for the emulation of the prophet of Nazareth and devoted to the advancement of human values and, as such, responsive to the present wishes and needs of its human constituency. If its structure does not suit with our present apprehensions of what is progressive and enlightened, then change it. Did Jesus appoint only men as his apostles? No matter — the man Jesus was conditioned by the prejudices of his age; if he lived now, he would agree with us. Did his apostles appoint only men as their successors? No matter, they were ignorant souls who lived in a primitive time. We know better than they, for we live in an advanced time and are the wave of the future; if they lived now, with our advantages and superior insights, they would sincerely regret their rustic, first-century hang-ups.

Radical? We are not radical enough, if we cannot see how drastically the real God has dealt with his creation, who shattered our preconceptions, invaded the self-sufficiency of our assumptions, and sits in judgment now on our vaunted values and insights. Christians are living in the new creation; we have been baptized into the New Adam, Jesus Christ; we are members of a new order which operates on totally different assumptions and values from those perceived by this world. What is progressive here may be meaningless in heaven, and apparent justice may be far from real justice. Our "justice" may be nothing more than a stumbling over the block of reality — a valiant but foolish attempt to ignore what really is — to close our eyes to the sheer factness, the sheer quidity,

the sheer concreteness of the order of redemption. It would be irony indeed if we were to solve our problem by a simple reference to our modern world's simplistic and superficial notions of obvious "justice", only to find that we provoked not divine wrath, but heavenly laughter.

### III

NOW YOU WILL OBSERVE, I hope, that I have not *proved* the case against women priests. I am not trying to prove anything. I do not know, indeed, if it is the kind of thing that can be proved. You will also notice, I hope, that I have not attributed to those we must oppose any *conscious* motives for Nestorianism, or whatever. They may never have heard of Nestorius and certainly could care less. For most people — average people, good people, people trying to be good Christians in a difficult world — the priesthood controversy seems to be much ado over little or nothing. I think the average lay person is inclined to say, "Oh, what difference does it make? If they want to be priests all that badly, for heaven's sake let them. Besides, are you saying that that nice girl in our parish isn't *good enough* to be a priest?" And the misunderstanding is, nine times out of ten, compounded by the fact that she *is* a nice girl — a truly dedicated Christian girl who wants to serve God fully and who presumes that that means being some kind of ordained minister and, anyway, sees that in the Episcopal Church "real" ministers, "full" ministers, are priests, not deacons. She has never bothered her head about the sort of thing I have gone on about, and she would, perhaps, find it all rather repulsively "mystical" and strange if confronted with it. After all, has she not been brought up to believe that being Christian means leading a good life and helping other people? Why do you want to clutter things up with all this supernatural, sacramental, complicated stuff? Her friends and maybe her parish priest ask why, too. And the only answer, of course, is because this is the way things really are — which may be right intellectually, but emotionally and psychology is, I admit, cold comfort.

But that *is* the way things are: supernatural, sacramental, and, from our viewpoint, complicated. Reality is always richer, more complex, more subtle than we ever perceive, understand, or in fact appreciate. I have tried, not to prove that women cannot or should not be priests, but that the question has not been dealt with in its

complexity and, for that matter, its richness. My concern is not whether I am right or wrong. I should not mind so much if the Church took a deep and profound look at the question and then told me I was being silly. My concern is that the Church has not *thought* about it enough — has not, really, *thought* about it at all — has not considered the implications.

If the Episcopal Church soon decides to ordain women to the priesthood, it will not be because a deep, prayerful decision has been made that that is the right thing to do; it will be because we were pressured into it, jumped into it with our eyes closed; because, in short, it was the easiest thing to do, the least painful thing to do, the most accomodating thing to do. And that disturbs me.

Many of us hoped, after Louisville, that the Episcopal Church had gained a breather in which to do some real thinking, some hard grappling with the many horns of the controversy. That is precisely what has not happened. We are almost exactly where we were over two years ago and it looks as though, by the time of the next Convention, we shall be in exactly the same place. The only difference when we reach Minneapolis is that feelings will have been badly — hopelessly? — exacerbated by the provocations which meanwhile have polarized the Church even more than we were polarized before. Under these circumstances we have no choice but to make our voices heard very loudly in the councils of power. We must speak to be heard, and we must say, quite simply, that the Episcopal Church is *not ready* to take the step proposed. Saying this is not a delaying tactic. It is speaking the truth. We have not done our homework and we are not ready. We never will be unless we can stop shouting at each other and start thinking with each other. And that will not be, quite frankly, until the other side stops attacking the church with its illegalities, looks at sad divisions in it, and at least listens to our questions about its doctrines which they seem to be unaware of. We would like to be dealt with not as opponents to be overcome nor as obscurantists to be ignored, but as Christians of good will and some theological sense.

Whether or not we can hope for fair dealing, what do we do? Well, for one thing, we do not panic. Nothing is inevitable. What looked inevitable in 1973 turned out not to be. What looks inevitable for 1976 may well turn out not to be, either. God has a strange way of confounding human expectation. In the fourth century Arianism was clearly the wave of the future, and Athanasius, it

seemed, stood alone against the world, but Athanasius won and Arianism failed.

Secondly, we witness. We speak up. We stop feeling guilty and defensive. We represent what the Catholic Church always has represented, and if they want to change that, it is up to them to make the case, not up to us. We can stop giving in by default. We can start to challenge the nonsense that there are no theological objections to women priests. We can make it our business to study the question so that our objections are informed and are not expressions of mere distaste or prejudice. We can support organizations like CAM by giving our time, our money, and our signatures; we can read their literature and help to distribute it. We can — especially our lay people — make our views known by writing our bishops and our deputies to General Convention.

Above all, we can refuse to give up. Even if the vote goes against us, I think we must stay and fight, always with charity, I hope, and with calm certainty rather than frightened anger or bitter recrimination. For I do not think, in all honesty, that there is any refuge for us either in Rome or in Constantinople. I cannot be a Roman Catholic, quite simply because I cannot accept the modern papacy; and in any event we should not be "safe" even at Rome, where this question begins to be argued with some foretaste of our own bitterness. I cannot be Eastern for other reasons no less cogent, and by no means entirely cultural. So much for external escapes.

There is an alternative, which is a split in the Episcopal Church, in which case we would claim to be in some sense "continuing" Anglicans. We may come to that in the end, but that is the last resort, not the first. Frankly, I see no future for a continuing Anglican sect which has no other *raison d'être* but its refusal to ordain women to the priesthood.

No, I think we must stay where we are. Maybe we will be forced out — it depends upon whether our putative victors are respecters of tender consciences or not — but as long as we can maintain it our stand must be, "No compromise, no cooperation." Living like that would be an anomaly, no doubt, and our future Holy Orders would have a new factor of doubt attached to them; but there have been other anomalies in Christian history, eventually resolved, and since the sixteenth century after all we have maintained our Orders under some questioning. It may be our vocation to limp along with impaired (that is not to say invalid) Orders in

order to show that women's priesthood does not work, and to hope that the problem will eventually be subsumed in the economy of an eventually reunited Christendom. That has been the vocation of Catholics in the Swedish Church, and we do not urge them, after all, to pull out.

If we are wrong, if it really is God's will to have women priests in his Church, well, that presumably will become known in time, too, and we would not want to have bolted the Church or to have painted ourselves into a sectarian corner. Would it not be embarrassing to have separated ourselves in the name of Catholic integrity only to find sometime that the greatest of Catholic prelates had changed his mind and that the great majority of Catholic Christians would henceforth be ministered to by women priests as well as men? One does not have to accept all ramifications of the modern papacy to see how ridiculous it is to be more Catholic than the Pope!

ALL OF WHAT I HAVE SAID, you know, is predicated upon an *if*. Nothing has happened yet. Even the rebel women are irrelevant. The Episcopal Church has not ordained any women to its priesthood: the Philadelphia Eleven and the others are virtually self-ordained and represent no official act of this Church. Though their action has embittered the situation they have not affected the question in any essential way. Regardless of what you read, they are *not* priests of the Episcopal Church.

But what of our future? It is in the hands of God. We do not know where wisdom shall be found, nor where the place of understanding is, but

God *does* understand the way to it, and he knows its place, for he looks to the ends of the earth, and sees everything under the heavens . . . and he saw it and declared it; he established it, and searched it out.

The future is in the hands of God, and so is his Church. We — the Episcopal Church or even the Anglican Communion — are not the whole Church and have never claimed to be. The Episcopal Church by itself has not been promised protection against the gates of hell, but we belong to the whole Church and our future is bound up with the common future of Christendom. We may have hard days ahead and ways most unclear, but Christ is our Lord — Light never to be overcome, Lord of the Church not to be prevailed against. He has promised to be with us always.

### 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.



### SAINT VINCENT'S GUILD

**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** at the shop next to the parish hall after Sunday High Mass. There are also crucifixes, rosaries, medals, and other aids to devotion.



### SAINT MARY'S PUBLICATIONS

*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)

*A Walk around Saint Mary's*, self-guided tour of the church and chapels, with plan: 25c (mailing 10c)

*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. Th. THE HOLY NAME OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST  
*High Mass 11*  
*No Mass at 12:10 or 6:15*
2. F. *Abstinence dispensed*
3. Sa. *Of our Lady*
4. Su. CHRISTMAS II
5. M.
6. Tu. THE EPIPHANY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST  
*Evening Prayer 5:30*  
*High Mass with Procession 6*
7. W. *Requiem 7:30*
8. Th.
9. F.
10. Sa. William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury & Martyr, 1645
11. Su. THE BAPTISM OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST  
*High Mass with Procession 11*
12. M. St Benedict Biscop, Abbot of Wearmouth, 690
13. Tu. St Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 367
14. W. *Requiem 12:10*
15. Th.
16. F.
17. Sa. St Antony, Abbot in Egypt, 356
18. Su. EPIPHANY II
19. M. THE CONFESSION OF SAINT PETER THE APOSTLE (*Tr.*)
20. Tu. St Fabian, Bishop & Martyr of Rome, 250
21. W. St Agnes, Martyr at Rome, 304
22. Th. St Vincent, Deacon of Saragossa & Martyr, 304
23. F. Phillips Brooks, Bishop of Massachusetts, 1893
24. Sa. St Francis de Sales, Bishop of Geneva, 1622
25. Su. EPIPHANY III
26. M. THE CONVERSION OF SAINT PAUL THE APOSTLE (*Tr.*)
27. Tu. St John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, 407
28. W. St Thomas Aquinas, Priest & Friar, 1274
29. Th. *Requiem 6:15*
30. F. King Charles the Martyr, 1649
31. Sa. *Of our Lady*

1976 ORDO KALENDAR from the shop \$1.25; 25¢ mailing.

## MUSIC FOR JANUARY

- JANUARY 4—CHRISTMAS II  
 Missa Vidi speciosum ..... Tomás Luis de Victoria (1549-1611)  
 Deus enim firmavit ..... Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1526-1594)  
 O sacrum convivium ..... Victoria  
 5:30 p.m.  
 The Columbus Boy Choir
- JANUARY 11—THE BAPTISM OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST  
 Missa Je suis desheritée ..... Nicolas Gombert (1490-1556)  
 Jubilate Deo omnis terra ..... Gregor Aichinger (1564-1628)  
 Tribus miraculis ..... Luca Marenzio (1553-1599)  
 5:30 p.m.  
 The Metropolitan Brass Quartet
- JANUARY 18—EPIPHANY II  
 Missa Puer qui natus est nobis ..... Francisco Guerrero (1528-1599)  
 Jubilate Deo universa terra ..... Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1526-1594)  
 O sacrum convivium ..... Juan Esquivel (16th century)  
 5:30 p.m.  
 Hedwig Klebl, soprano, with string quartet
- JANUARY 25—EPIPHANY III  
 Missa Iste confessor ..... Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina (1528-1594)  
 Dexter a Domini ..... Orlandus Lassus (1532-1594)  
 Mirabuntur ..... Heinrich Isaac (1450-1517)  
 5:30 p.m.  
 Norman Linscheid, organ



## ALTAR FLOWER MEMORIALS

- January 1—The Holy Name, Helen Elizabeth Butler  
 January 4—Christmas II, Charles Augustus Edgar  
 January 6—The Epiphany, Edwin Gorham, Sr, Caroline Gorham,  
 Edwin Gorham, Jr, & James H. Gorham, Priest, OHC  
 January 11—The Baptism of Christ, Grieg Taber, Priest & Rector  
 January 18—Epiphany II, Mary Louise Raymond  
 January 25—Epiphany III, M. Eleanor Stone



## FROM THE PARISH REGISTER

## BURIALS

"My flesh shall rest in hope."

- November 11—Elizabeth Brookes  
 December 3—Charles William Thompson  
 December 11—Margaret B. James

## SERVICES

## SUNDAYS

Morning Prayer . . . . .	7:10 a.m.
Mass . . . . .	7:30, 9:00, 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.* and 12:10 and 6:15 p.m.
Evening Prayer . . . . .	6:00 p.m.

\*Except Saturday

*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.*



CONTRIBUTIONS to the cost of AVE are gratefully acknowledged:  
Bernard Andracilio, \$5; Robert S. Buys, \$5; Miss Eleanor Engstrom, \$5;  
Mrs James L. Graves, \$10; Edwin V. N. Hatfield, \$5; Mrs Edward  
Hetherington, \$25; David A. Kopp, \$5; Warren Le Tarte, \$5; B. Lee  
Marsteller, \$5; The Rev'd George C. McCormick, \$5; Terry L. Nickey, \$5;  
George W. Perkins, \$5; Miss Margaret L. Rigler, \$5; Mrs Townsend  
Wolfe, \$5.

*Annual contributions of five dollars or more are asked from those  
who do not make other contributions to the parish and wish to  
receive AVE. Please notify us promptly of change of address.*

## 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.  
except Saturday, open from 11 a.m.*

## RECTORY

144 West 47th Street, New York  
The Rev'd Donald L. Garfield, *Rector*  
The Rev'd John Paul Boyer

PLaza 7-6750

## PARISH OFFICE

145 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y. 10036

*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  
Brother Mark-Charles, *Program Director*

PLaza 7-3962

Mr Irving P. Graeb, Jr., <i>Treasurer</i> .....	PLaza 7-6750
Mr McNeil Robinson, <i>Director of Music</i> .....	MOnument 3-3259
Mr Andrew P. Attaway, <i>Head Server</i> .....	CEremony 7-1356
Mr William J. Abdale, <i>Head Usher</i> .....	MAin 4-5027
The Rev'd John L. Scott .....	KRAehen 5-9214
The Rev'd Ronald T. Lau .....	UNiversity 5-1842
Miss Teresa Rogers, <i>Church School</i> .....	CANal 8-4263
Miss Mabel Lewis, <i>Hostess</i> .....	GRamercy 5-8097
Mr Kenneth C. Ritchie, <i>Tours</i> .....	OXford 1-4915
Miss Virginia O. Greene, <i>Bookshop</i> .....	OREgon 3-0159
Mrs Judy Lanham, <i>Sacristan</i> .....	SYmbol 9-2117
Mr Ralph M. Morehead, <i>Funeral Director</i> .....	RHinelander 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.*