

tion: forgive us and heal us by your grace, that we may serve you in the power of his risen life, who is alive and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.
England 1980

Almighty God, whose blessed Son restored Mary Magdalene to health of mind and body, and called her to be a witness to the Resurrection: mercifully grant that by thy grace we may be cleansed from all our sins and serve thee in the power of thy Son Jesus Christ; who now lives and reigns with thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.
Wales 1984

Almighty God, your blessed Son brought healing to Mary Magdalene, and called her to be witness of his resurrection: Forgive us and heal us by your grace, that we may serve you in the power of his risen life, who is alive and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.
Ireland 1984

Almighty God, whose Son restored Mary Magdalene to health of mind and body, and called her to be a witness of his resurrection, forgive us and heal us by your grace, that we may serve you in the power of his risen life; who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.
Canada 1985

Merciful God, your Son restored Mary Magdalene to health of body and mind and called her to be a witness of his resurrection; heal us and make us whole that we may serve you in the power of his risen life; through Jesus Christ our Lord.
New Zealand 1989

Almighty God, your Son Jesus Christ restored Mary Magdalene to health of body and mind, and called her to be a witness of his resurrection. Heal us now in body and mind, and call us to serve you in the power of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and forever.
Lutheran 1978

O almighty God, whom to know is everlasting life, grant us perfectly to know your Son Jesus Christ to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life that, following his steps, we may steadfastly walk in the way that leads to eternal life; through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and forever.
Lutheran 1982

Father, your Son first entrusted to Mary Magdalene the joyful news of his resurrection. By her prayers and example may we proclaim Christ as our living Lord and one day see him in glory, for he lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.
Roman Catholic 1970

Books for review:

The following books will be available this year. Those interesting in reviewing a volume will be provided with the book which may be kept in return for a review submitted to the LC Review Editor:

The Mystical Language of Icons, Solrunn Nes (Eerdmans, 2005)

The Truce of God, Rowan Williams (SCM-Canterbury Press, 2005)

Voicing God's Psalms, Calvin Seerveld (Eerdmans, 2005)

Faith and Order: Toward a North American Conference (WCC, 2005)

Clues to the Nicene Creed, David Willis (Eerdmans, 2005)

A More Profound Alleluia, Leanne Van Dyk, ed. (Eerdmans, 2005)

Sexuality and the Jesus Tradition, William Loader (Eerdmans, 2005)

The Nuptial Mystery, Angelo Scola (Eerdmans, 2005)

LiturgyCanada

VOLUME X ■ ISSUE 4 ■ EASTER 2005

Our Sunday worship:

One flock, one shepherd

In our lead article, Paul Bosch argues against the proliferation of worship services in many parishes. His compelling case has drawn a response from a number of others, some of whom agree with him in principle but find the practicalities of parish life have shown them the necessity of multiple services. We welcome our readers' responses as to how they have dealt with this issue in their own settings.

The case against multiple Sunday services

Paul F. Bosch

In my regular schedule each week, I try to find time to swim, before lunch, in our university's pool. One day a couple of months ago I found myself in the locker room sauna, when another faculty member joined me. As he took his seat he said, "Well, Paul, how's the God business?"

As I now remember the event, I laughed spontaneously, and returned some light-hearted quip. But the incident, and my friend's wisecrack, has recently returned to rankle me. "The God business": Is that what we're all about? Is that how we are perceived? As the local religion franchise, next door to McDonald's and Burger King?

Let's, for example, address this question: Should a parish schedule two services, one 'contemporary' and one 'traditional'? I have attempted to answer this question, at greater length, in another context in my essay "Should we schedule a menu of worship services?" in the volume "What is 'Contemporary' Worship?" which appears in the series "Open Questions in Worship" edited by Gordon Lathrop (Augsburg Fortress, 1995). My answer there, at the time somewhat tentative, was "no." But I'm still persuaded that the principle I put forward in that essay, "One Flock, One Shepherd," has some fruitful, unexamined ecclesial implication for our common life today.

Let me confess up front that in the old days I was an advocate of multiple Sunday services. But that was then, this is now. Today, I'd be slow to recommend multiple Sunday services because, it seems to me, they exact a terrible price in contemporary church life. At worst, they are ecclesiologically unfaithful and, at best, they are inimical to the needs of contemporary worship. Here's my case:

Do we want to allow our congregations at worship to become the local "God business," patronized by laypeople but owned and operated by their ordained clergy...?

Today I'd list four good reasons to be suspicious of the movement to proliferate Sunday service "opportunities," as they are sometimes advertised. At the risk of sounding like Hamlet's Polonius, I'll call them 1) the pastoral-professional, 2) the sociological, 3) the theological-ecclesial, and 4) the liturgical.

1) The *pastoral-professional* argument should be clear enough: Multiple services exhaust the pastor's energies. Many pastors and priests have come to look forward to the weekend with dread. Sunday is no longer a "Sabbath" for religious professionals who have to serve "up front" at two or three or even more Sunday services. Multiple services unnecessarily tax the pastor's endurance. And they tax the energies equally of faithful volunteer lay leaders.

2) I'm sure you've also heard the *sociological* argument against multiple Sunday services: A single assembly is divided into two or more sociological units. The "9:00 o'clock people" don't know the "11:00 o'clock people"—or even honour them, in some cases.

Despite situations where worship leaders take pains to advertise both services as "identical," after a time, two different and distinct sociological groups always emerge. One service attracts the younger crowd, and the second service attracts the older church members, simply by reason of the time of day they're offered. The pastor becomes not unlike a 19th-century Methodist circuit-rider, serving two (or more!) distinct parishes—albeit without the horse and saddlebags!

3) Here's the *theological/ecclesial* argument: To offer two or

(Continued on page 5)

I don't have clear answers. But in any case, clergy with multiple services and multiple staff do well to respect the reality that each assembly of believers is a separate sociological entity, another distinct and discrete Christian congregation, with all its demands on the time and energy of its leaders, lay as well as ordained.

Paul F. Bosch

Do we have one flock at St. Luke's? Everyone who attends services at St. Luke's, even if only occasionally, believes he or she is a member of the flock. Their expectation is that the parish will continue to offer a variety of worship styles to suit different preferences.

Sharyn Hall

“One flock, one Shepherd”: Why does this appeal fall on deaf ears?

...when we remember Christ's death while simultaneously condoning the very social condition he died to save us from, we imply that we are collaborating in his mutilation.

John W.B. Hill

In the parish I serve there are two celebrations of the Eucharist each Lord's Day: an earlier one using the 1962 *Book of Common Prayer* rite, and a later one using the contemporary rite.

We have frequently debated the desirability of combining the two congregations (something we do, in fact, every summer), and I find the debate both revealing and frustrating.

I have argued that in every other way our parish works as a unified community, so it makes no sense to be two congregations on Sunday. However, they say, “Just because we have two services doesn't mean we're two congregations.” All my attempts to explain the meaning of the word ‘congregation’ simply fall on deaf ears. “Congregation” for them is not the name for the thing we *do* on Sunday; it is merely a synonym for “parish.” And both words seem to have only an institutional sense: Worshipers “attend church” (or belong to the parish, or to the congregation) as consumers who are served by this institution, free to choose the form of service they find convenient or preferable. (Needless to say, it is rather hard to persuade baptismal candidates that they are being adopted into “the household of God,” whose “members” behave more like concert-goers than members of a house-

hold.)

Likewise, St Paul's account of the institution of the Eucharist with his warning that “all who eat and drink without discerning the body, eat and drink judgment against themselves” falls on deaf ears. If “discerning the body” means recognizing the people gathered as Christ's body, have we then resigned ourselves to corporate mutilation? My reading of Paul's comment about “eating and drinking judgment” is that when we remember Christ's death while simultaneously condoning the very social condition he died to save us from, we imply that we are collaborating in his mutilation. But the point seems lost on parishioners accustomed to the choice between two celebrations on the Lord's Day.

“Among the symbols with which liturgy deals, none is more important than [the] assembly of believers,” says the venerable document, “Environment and Art in Catholic Worship.” But my congregations (sic) apparently don't believe that. Why?

There are, it seems to me, a host of factors, all linked to the individualism we bring to the liturgy. When I first arrived in my parish, the Eucharist was celebrated infrequently, and communion still took place at the communion rail; and so I began harping on the relationship between “communion” and “community.” But very soon

after, one of the young people took me aside to point out the flaw in my logic. “We may be a community when we are sitting in the pews,” he said, “but then we go up alone to make our communion with God.” I was thunderstruck. He understood better than I that when I argue against the architecture, the architecture always wins. (We began to change the architecture!)

One aspect of the architecture we cannot change, however, is the raised “stage” area (commonly called “the chancel”). It has in the past functioned quite literally as a stage on which the liturgy has been performed by the costumed actors for the benefit of the audience. Stage and costumes together make clear the distinction.

Another aspect of the architecture that we can change is the “audience seating” (the pews), although this change has been more bitterly fought than relocating the Holy Table, or removing the communion rails! Replacing pews with chairs is more than changing the “drama”: It is changing the “audience,” and that is something for which they must do more than merely give consent.

Pews announce to all who enter that their role is audience; neither standing nor moving about is really part of the plan (except for getting in and getting out). And if all face the “stage,” then this is definitely

the United States, took part in this revival. Here I will describe the scripture readings and collects chosen for the feast of Mary Magdalene, in the following order: gospel, collect, epistle (including *Acts of the Apostles*), lessons from the Hebrew Scriptures, and psalms. I will comment upon the gospel, collect and epistle selections, and invite readers to reflect as well. . . .

Collects

The collects for the feast of Mary Magdalene in most of the liturgical books considered here have a general similarity, but there are also a number of interesting and significant differences among them. The collects of Roman Catholic (1970) and Lutheran (1982) are entirely distinct from the others. The collects studied here have four distinct parts or sections: *address* to God, a basis that tells what God has done, the *petition* that states what we ask of God, and a conclusion or *doxology*. I will comment on these in turn. In terms of overall literary style, some may be considered “older,” using less direct constructions, while others may be considered “newer,” using more direct constructions. As this point does not affect content, I will not consider it further.

Address

The principal address is “O Almighty God” or simply “Almighty God.” A few prayers instead have “Merciful God” or “Merciful Lord,” while Roman Catholic 1970 uses “Father.”

Basis

The basis of England 1928 is the starting place for most subsequent collects. It reads, “whose blessed Son did call and sanctify Mary Magdalene to be witness to the resurrection.” In subsequent texts, “whose blessed Son” was changed slightly, to “your Son,” “your blessed Son” and “your Son Jesus Christ.” What Christ did is to “call and sanctify Mary Magdalene” This double action was subsequently divided into separate actions, within the single sentence. Thus Canada 1962 said, “sanctify Mary Magdalene, and call her to be witness to his resurrection.” while others used the form, “and called her to be witness..” The word “sanctify” here was a challenge. What might it mean to “sanctify Mary to be a witness to the resurrection,” even if this action were separated from

“call” her to be a witness? In subsequent liturgical books, “sanctify” underwent several kinds of transformation; In one case (Australia 1978) it was simply omitted entirely. In several other cases it was changed to refer to healing, both physical and spiritual. Thus: “[Christ] restored Mary Magdalene to health of body and of mind” is used frequently, while one text has simply “brought healing to Mary Magdalene” (Ireland 1984). The principal scriptural basis for Mary Magdalene's being called to be a witness to the resurrection obviously is John 20. That for restoring her to health of body and of mind, or simply healing, is Luke 8:3: Soon afterwards he went on through cities and villages, proclaiming and bringing the good news of the kingdom of God. The twelve were with him, as well as some women who had been cured of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, and Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward Chuza, and Susanna, and many others, who provided for them out of their resources. (Luke 8:1-3)

Petition

Most of these collects contain a double petition, just as most include a double basis. “Older” style collects begin the petition with the traditional “mercifully grant that” followed by a passive construction that includes other verbs, for example “Mercifully grant that by thy grace we may be healed of all our infirmities and always serve thee in the power of his endless life” (England 1928). “Healed of our infirmities” is a reference to Luke 8:1-3, quoted above, now applied to ourselves instead of Mary Magdalene (to whom it was applied in the basis). This idea is omitted by one collect, and changed to “Heal us and make us whole” in another. Several others change the image more extensively: “forgive us and heal us by your grace”, “we may be cleansed from all our sins” and “cleanse us and make us new”. This seems to me to call Luke 7:36-50 to mind, the story of the unnamed sinful woman who washes Jesus' feet with her tears and whose sins are forgiven because she has shown so much love Using this allusion here, however, would seem to confuse Mary Magdalene with that unnamed woman, when these are two separate persons. This confusion of Marys was of course a long tradition in the church,

though rejected by Anglicans and Protestants at the time of the reformation. The second petition is “always serve thee in the power of his endless life” (England 1928), and the dual motive of “serving God” through the “power of the resurrection” is continued in most of these collects. Though Mary Magdalene's “service” is to witness to the resurrection (in the basis), our response is the more general and vague “serve” without any specification. The resurrection and its consequences are variously referred to as [Christ's] “endless life”, “unending life”, and “risen life”; Wales 1984 simply says “in the power of thy Son Jesus Christ.”

Doxology / Conclusion

Most of these collects use a long, trinitarian, conclusion, while a few have a short, christological conclusion. I will not comment specifically on the collects in Roman Catholic 1970 and Lutheran 1982, as these are quite distinct.

Collects

O Almighty God, whose blessed Son did sanctify Mary Magdalene, and call her to be witness to his resurrection: Mercifully grant that by thy grace we may be healed of all our infirmities, and always serve thee in the power of his endless life; who with thee and the Holy Spirit liveth and reigneth, one God, world without end. Amen.

Canada 1962

Almighty God, whose blessed Son restored Mary Magdalene to health of body and of mind, and called her to be a witness of his resurrection: Mercifully grant that by your grace we may be healed from all our infirmities and know you in the power of his unending life; who with you and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns, one God, now and for ever. Amen.

United States 1978

Merciful God, whose Son Jesus Christ called Mary Magdalen to be a witness to his resurrection: mercifully grant that by your grace we may serve you in the power of his risen life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Australia 1978

Almighty God, whose Son restored Mary Magdalen to health of mind and body and called her to be a witness to his resurrec

LiturgyCanada

Volume X, Number 4, Easter 05
ISSN: 1493-6259

Executive

David Harrison, Chair
Marion Jenkins, Secretary
John Wilton, Business Manager
Steven Mackison, Treasurer
Members (Ontario): Judie Arrowood, Paul Bosch, Sharyn Hall, John Hill, Linda Hill, Ken Hull, Dean Mercer, Sue Nicolls, Hilde Lorenz, Peter Wall;
(Nova Scotia) David Fletcher;
(Alberta) Greg Kerr-Wilson;
(British Columbia) Kevin Dixon

Review Editor

John Hodgins <jhodgins@sympatico.ca>

This issue

Paul F. Bosch, Editor
Willem Hart, Design & Production
Jane Hodgins, Copy Editor

Episcopal Advisor

Joachim Fricker

Letters to the Editor, Correspondence & Membership

Liturgy Canada, 77 Canterbury Place, North York, Ontario M2N 2N1 <litcan@liturgy.ca>

Membership Rates

\$25CDN (4 issues)
\$45CDN (8 issues)
\$60CDN (12 issues)
Cheques payable to: Liturgy Canada

WEBSITE

Check out our website: www.liturgy.ca for a developing archive of Liturgy Canada's past issues and information about membership. We value contributions to this journal from our Lutheran and other companions on the Christian journey.

Liturgy Canada is an association for all Canadians and others interested in liturgy and mission.

With the recent popular interest in St Mary Magdalene expressed in novels, films and other media, the following excerpt from the work of J.F. Henderson on historic liturgies may be of interest to Anglican, Lutheran and other readers. For those who have a particular interest in the subject of women in early Anglican liturgy his website is noted.

AN EXCERPT FROM

The Feast of Mary Magdalene in modern Anglican liturgies

J. Frank Henderson's Page on Liturgy and Medieval Women

<http://www.compumart.ab.ca/fhenderson> © 2004

John Hodgins



Images of St Mary Magdalene (Clockwise from top left): Hendrick Bruggen (15th c.); Rogier van der Weyden (15th c.); interior of the Church of St Mary Magdalene, Toronto (Willem Hart); Medieval manuscript.

During the last half of the twentieth century the feast of Mary Magdalene was again included in Anglican liturgical books, after having been absent since the year 1552. The Mary Magdalene described in the collects, scripture readings and psalms set forth in contemporary liturgical books is, however, a different woman than the one raised up in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. Then, as in the medieval liturgy, the gospel reading shows us the penitent, caring and forgiven woman of Luke 7:36-51.

Today, however, the gospel reading speaks of the witness to the resurrection in John, chapter 20. Contemporary liturgical books, however, also exhibit considerable insight and imagination in their choice of other scripture readings and in the composition of the collect for this feast. Here I will consider the scripture readings, psalms and collects for the feast of Mary Magdalene used by ten Anglican liturgical books published in the late twentieth century, together with certain earlier Anglican texts and those of several other churches.

The process by which Mary Magdalene returned to the Anglican liturgy may be said to have begun with the *Proposed or Deposited Book of Common Prayer* of 1928. This book never received parliamentary approval, however, and therefore was never officially used. Its draft text of a feast of Mary Magdalene, however, influenced the 1962 *Book of Common Prayer* of the Anglican Church of Canada and the 1963 *Book of Common Worship* of the Church of South India. Other influences on post-1970 Anglican liturgical books were the renewed Roman Catholic sacramentary and lectionary published in English in 1978. Finally, a series of Anglican liturgical books published between 1978 and 1989 brought this feast to its present state.

Lutheran liturgical books, at least in

a community. So until this most dominant of architectural symbols has changed, all appeals to the true nature of community will fall on deaf ears.

One of the changes we are making, therefore, is to ensure that the Presider is never positioned over against the community. When the community gathers in the nave to hear the Word proclaimed and to offer priestly prayers of intercession for the world, the Presider stands or sits amongst them. When the Presider moves to the Table, so does the community, in a Procession of Gifts that includes all the baptized.

And the goal of changing pews to chairs is that we shall be able—as a community—to shape the seating (rather than having the seating shape us). Above all, we need to learn all over again, in the face-to-face encounter, to recognize the body of Christ, gathered to enact the faith and hope and love we profess.

Perhaps then, when the question is raised, “Why we are still acting like two congregations?” people will be able to hear the question.

The Reverend Canon John W.B. Hill is the incumbent at St. Augustine of Canterbury, Toronto, Ontario, and a member of the Executive of *Liturgy Canada*.

Now it's your turn

If you have been touched, stimulated, informed, angered, inspired, confused or otherwise affected by “One flock, one Shepherd”, we would love to help you share your work with others. Your responses are most welcome!

Send your responses to *Liturgy Canada* at:
77 Canterbury Place
North York, ON M2N 2N1
OR By e-mail to: litcan@liturgy.ca

A rationale for multiple Sunday services

...if a congregation is adding a new liturgy because of space, the best way forward is to replicate the existing style rather than fashioning a new one.

David Harrison

Paul Bosch lays before us a series of compelling reasons why not to offer multiple worship services on a Sunday morning in arguing for the idea of “One Flock, One Shepherd.”

In imagining the reasons *in favour* of multiple worship services, he focuses (quite correctly) on what is probably the most common: style. Speaking from the perspective of the Anglican Church, there are many parishes who now have sought to “modernize” their parish’s liturgical diet *not* by making changes to established liturgical patterns, but rather by *adding* a “contemporary” service, usually at 9:00 or 9:30. (A priest-colleague of mine has described it as “planting a new congregation” within his existing parish.) These liturgies tend to be quite informal, are often abbreviated, with music largely of a “praise chorus” style. As such, they are meant to offer a counterpoint to the “traditional” service. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this response is not restricted to Anglicans (and Lutherans), but is being tried in other mainline non-Roman Catholic parishes. (And, of course, in most Roman Catholic parishes, multiple worship services are a fact of life, extending to the almost universal “Saturday/Sunday Mass.”)

Multiple worship services on a Sunday morning are nothing new for Anglicans; several generations have been formed by the custom of an early morning said eucharist (“the 8 o’clock”) followed by the “main” Sunday service (whether it be a celebration of the eucharist or—less commonly now—morning prayer). At least for most single-point parishes, *two* Sunday services have long been the established norm. So, when we speak of *adding* a Sunday service in a typical urban or suburban Anglican context, we are speaking of moving from *two* to *three* Sunday morn-

ing services. (It needs to be said that the context is entirely different in multi-point parishes.)

But there is another reason why a parish may decide to add a Sunday morning liturgy to its pattern: *space*. It is this consideration that I will reflect on in this article, based on my own experience as the incumbent of a parish which, one year ago, moved from two to three Sunday morning services because of a lack of space.

The parish I serve worships in what was, when it was erected in 1869, a small village church in a small village. Its pews hold, at a squeeze, 90 adults, and even with chairs filling every available square inch of floor space, and the choir stalls crowded, and kids on parents’ laps, and the priest having nowhere to sit (my Christmas Eve dilemma), we max out at about 150 people. Space has become our challenge because this quaint village church now sits amidst a burgeoning community of over 12,000 people, and is expected to grow to twice that in the next ten or 15 years.

St. Thomas’ liturgical pattern before the change was standard fare: an 8:30 said eucharist (using the Book of Common Prayer) followed by a 10:30 sung eucharist (using the *Book of Alternative Services*). While we were far from crowding out the early morning service (!), the predicament in which we found ourselves was that the 10:30 liturgy had become too crowded. Many speak of a “rule of thumb” which says when a liturgical space is 80 per cent full it is, to the visitor or seeker, for all intents and purposes, *completely* full. Anecdotal evidence seems to back this up. I think of one family—two parents and four children—who moved into the area, came once, quite liked the experience but decided that it would be unfair of them to return because, just on their own, they

took up an entire pew, and space seemed to be so limited. (Happily for us, they were unhappy with other churches, eventually returned and got comfortable cozying up with the children sitting on the floor when needed!)

While the longer-term solution was (and is, we hope) the building of a new liturgical space, this is no short-term answer. For a year we experimented with a peripatetic response. As the “space crunch” happened for us at the Offertory, when the young people of the community came from our children’s programs to join the rest of the community, we experimented with moving from the liturgical area to the parish hall during the offertory hymn where people could stand and there was more room. Some loved it (particularly the opportunity to celebrate the eucharist in a different configuration and to invite the children to stand around the table); others hated it (particularly because of the disruption of moving and because of

Our experience at St. Thomas’ has launched us head-first into the demands of three Sunday morning services, and the community has risen to the challenge with generosity and grace...

the fact that the parish hall didn’t feel like “holy space”). It became clear that, despite some advantages, this could not be a medium-term solution.

And so, together, the parish came to the conclusion that the only way forward was to add a third Sunday morning liturgy. (Importantly, we took this decision at the same weekend-long parish conference at which we formed a consensus to build new liturgical and program space.) At this point, we faced a decision—about which there were sharply contrasting points of view. Some in the parish saw this as an opportunity *not only* to address the issue of space but also, at the same time, to fashion a contrasting liturgical style. This would result in a “contemporary” service and a “traditional” service, plus the early morning eucharist. Others (including myself) were less sure that it was wise to make *two changes* at once. (One of my parishioners likened it to the time when the CBC moved the time of *The National* from 10:00 to 9:00 and changed the format *at the same time*—the 9:00 o’clock experi-

ment didn’t last long!).

What were the considerations which animated this decision?

- Moving to three services from two forced us to accept a new way of being a community. While it was true that the worshipping community was already divided into two, this was a well-established reality and there were ways in which the “8:30 people” and the “10:30 people” interacted. But dividing the principal worship service meant that people would not necessarily see the people they were used to seeing at church. This extended to children. For my own young children, it was difficult for them to get used to the fact that some of their friends might show up for Sunday school at 11:00 while they had already gone at 9:15. This involved a certain amount of heartache, for children and adults alike. *How then could*

we best preserve a sense of unity despite this proliferation of Sunday morning liturgies?

- There was no question—as Paul Bosch suggests—that leading and preaching three times in quick succession placed more of a burden on me. But it was not only *clerical* energy that would be required, because having two principal worship services means two of almost everything, and so the effects filtered down to every ministry of the parish: two Sunday school programs, two nursery care-giving rotas, two “quick changes” for the chancel guild to manage, two rotas of sidespeople, greeters, readers, intercessors, chalice bearers, and so on. It was a huge undertaking and required a great deal of commitment from us all.
- But it also raised a deeper question about liturgical style and the role of liturgy itself. Following the pattern set by other parishes, it certainly was an opportunity to sub-divide into “con-

temporary” and “traditional.” And yet I asked the question, is our experience of liturgy to be labelled? Is it to be homogenous? Is it like a buffet—I’ll have a little of this, and a little of that, but I don’t want any of *that stuff!* We had to ask ourselves if we wanted to become a parish where people are identified by the time at which they worship or, what’s more, by the style of music they sing.

- Indeed, how accurate are these labels of “traditional” and “contemporary”? The celebration of the eucharist—even if celebrated using the newest rite with the most contemporary of language and with music written last year—is still, in a sense, “traditional”; it is what the Church has been doing since apostolic times. And what is “contemporary”? Much of the “praise chorus” repertoire is a generation old by now, and yet John Bell’s hymns—which don’t “sound” contemporary—were written within the past ten or 15 years. And this question doesn’t just pertain to musical style. For some, “contemporary” is really a short-hand for an informal style with an often abbreviated rite, while “traditional” is short-hand for a more formal style with “everything in.” Labelling can encourage false assumptions about what we are doing. Given that our musical diet was already what I like to call “unbridled eclecticism” and that a typical Sunday morning liturgy at St. Thomas’ had times of great solemnity and times of somewhat chaotic informality, I would argue that it was *neither* “traditional” nor “contemporary.”
- There is some literature, moreover, which suggests that if a congregation is adding a new liturgy because of space (as opposed to wishing to branch out with a new liturgical pattern or style), the best way forward is to *replicate* the existing style rather than fashioning a new one, on the basis that the existing style is proving to be attractive. (See *The In-Between Church: Navigating Size Transition in Congregations*, Alice Mann, The Alban Institute, 1998, p. 47.) Interestingly, this seems to be the solution favoured by Pentecostal and other conservative denominations

May He who rose from the dead, Christ our true God, through the prayers of His most pure Mother . . . of the holy and righteous Ancestors of God, Joachim and Anna; and all the saints; have mercy on us, and save us, for He is good and loves humanity.

Rounding out the symposium papers, Timothy George of Samford University, gives a sympathetic Baptist perspective, naming the Theotokos as the embodiment of sola gratia and sola fide, the material and formal principles of the Protestant Reformation.

This collection of papers is a significant contribution to the ongoing dialogue amongst Christian communions on the subject of Mary, the God Bearer, and of her continuing place in liturgy and belief. This book encourages us in this generation as we find our own way to call

The Conviction of Things Not Seen: Worship and Ministry in the 21st Century.

Todd E. Johnson, ed. (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2002) 236 pages.

Reviewed by *David Harrison*

“Contemporary worship” and “traditional worship” have become common shorthand to differentiate worship styles in many parishes and denominations. For some Anglicans, these categories seem to be displacing “high” and “low,” “catholic” and “evangelical” as the tidiest way to encapsulate the style of a particular liturgy or parish. What’s more, tensions about liturgy seem increasingly to gravitate around these poles. “Contemporary worship,” a style pioneered in particular by Pentecostals and other conservative evangelical denominations, has manifested itself in mainline denominations, and has butted heads with the idea of “traditional worship.” (This dichotomy is, of course, relevant to the topic of this issue of *Liturgy Canada*. For example, more than a few Anglican parishes now offer at least two different principal liturgies on a Sunday morning—one “contemporary” and one “traditional.”)

Into this debate wades this cogent and clear-headed collection of essays, published as a *festschrift* for Professor

blessed the one who has always found a place in the lex orandi of Christians.

Mary in the Plan of God and in the Communion of Saints

Alain Blancy and Maurice Jourjon and the Dombes Group. Foreword by Joseph A. Fitzmeyer (Paulist, 2002)

This translation introduces the English-speaking world to the ecumenical work of the Dombes Group in France. The group’s labours represent a high-water mark in continental ecumenical discussion of sensitive theological issues. The Dombes Group builds upon the work of the 12 American scholars who produced *Mary in the New Testament* (Fortress, 1978) and later, *One Mediator, the Saints and Mary* (Augsburg, 1992).

The editors of *The Dombes* book auda-

Robert Webber, former Professor of Ministry at Northern Baptist Seminary. The *curriculum vitae* of Professor Webber encapsulates the very debate this volume addresses. Raised the son of a conservative fundamentalist Baptist preacher, Webber was ordained as a Presbyterian and eventually found his home in the Episcopalian Church. Through this journey, Webber gradually became disillusioned with the rigidities of his upbringing, and became a leader in the effort by some in the evangelical community to reclaim what they called “classical Christianity.” The watershed of his work was a document produced by a group of 45 evangelicals, called together by Webber in May 1977, entitled “The Chicago Call: An Appeal to Evangelicals,” which sought to discourage wall building, look for the common Christian basis, and seek unity amidst diversity.

One of Webber’s tag lines, according to the preface of this volume, is “ancient-future faith.” And it is that understanding of Christian worship which underpins this collection of essays—one that eschews the well-worn traditional/contemporary dichotomy in favour of a view of worship which is both “historically rooted and future focussed.” As such, Webber—and, by extension, this volume—advocates the idea of “blended worship” which seeks to capitalize on the synergies between post-modern culture and the ancient and

ciously set out a plan: “showing how Protestants and Catholics can eventually become a reunited Christian Church despite differences about Mary” (p. 5). Years of conversations and the building of relationships between dozens of Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians in France have led to these reflections on one of the most controversial issues for the churches of Europe, churches which share some very difficult history. Their experience may be of help to Anglicans, Lutherans and others as we live through some tough history.

Sancta Maria ora pro nobis.

Fr. John Hodgins is Review Editor for *Liturgy Canada* and Pastor of Holy Trinity Church, Chatham, Ontario. jhodgins@sympatico.ca

classical way of understanding scripture and worshipping.

The 13 essays in this volume mine this perspective richly and comprehensively, and defy pithy summary in this brief review. Questions of ritual, style, music and culture are all included. The ancient catechumenate, the place of visual arts, pastoral care, and the exigencies of evangelism, all find their place. Authors include well-known names such as William Willimon and Ruth A. Meyers. The editor of the volume contributes an essay entitled “Disconnected Rituals” which explores the origins of the “seeker service movement” as it took shape at the Willow Creek Community Church. The articles are scholarly and well-written, but also accessible and engaging.

The ideas in this collection of essays present a challenge to parishes, denominations and, indeed liturgical thinkers and planners, wherever they may perceive themselves on the “contemporary/traditional” spectrum. They challenge us to strive for worship which is rooted in the deep traditions of the Church, and yet is not stale; worship which is contemporary in expression and ethos without being set adrift from its anchor. For those struggling with how to live out this call to fresh-yet-anchored worship in their own parishes, this volume will be a welcome read.

Anglican Identities

Rowan Williams (Darton, Longman, Todd, 2004)

Those seeking to comprehend the irenic spirit of the present Archbishop of Canterbury in the midst of the current crisis of authority in the Anglican Communion would do well to consider his reflections upon the life and thought of our Anglican forebears.

Rowan Williams has been criticized for being a Hegelian in his desire to keep at the table those of widely different theological persuasions in the task of finding a new synthesis for the Anglican Communion. This collection of works by the Archbishop presents us with eight lectures given on various occasions before his elevation to Canterbury. The book constitutes an appreciation of the trajectory of Anglican thought and theology and gives clues to the genesis of Rowan Williams' conciliatory style in the exercise of authority.

Amongst other things, Archbishop Williams reminds us that the teaching of William Tyndale at the Reformation included the revolutionary notion that Christians might learn from infidels. Richard Hooker, that touchstone of classical Anglicanism, is considered in his efforts to develop a comprehensive ecclesiology allowing Catholics and Evangelicals to co-exist. The author assesses Hooker's unpopular contention that Roman Catholics and Protestants might both achieve the beatific vision.

Looking to more recent times, particular admiration is expressed by Dr. Williams for his Anglo-Catholic predecessor at Canterbury, Archbishop Michael Ramsey (*The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 1931). He celebrates Ramsey's efforts to elucidate the central doctrines of the Gospel and its Catholic development in a society in need of stability amidst radical change and ascendant materialism.

Anglican Identities is more than a reflection upon the past. If not a roadmap, it is certainly an accounting of milestones on the highway and an indication of the direction the current Archbishop of Canterbury discerns from past Anglicans

who have been leaders in dealing with the often-contentious issues of their own generation.

Mary, Mother of God

Edited by John Braaten and Robert Jensen (Wm. Eerdmans, Cambridge, UK, 2004)

As we await the final report of the ARCIC, dealing with theological, ecclesiological and liturgical aspects of the Blessed Mary's role in salvation, a series of books exploring and re-appropriating the Marian dimension of Christian faith are being produced and reviewed.

Mary, the Mother of God looks at the various aspects of thought, piety and liturgical expression abandoned by many ecclesial communities in the course of the 16th century. In his ecumenical and respectful paper, the Lutheran scholar David Yeago responds to John Paul II's encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*:

the Holy Father has, I believe, brought the ecumenical discussion of Mary to a new level of theological seriousness, articulating with unusual clarity the deep assumptions of which might be called the long tradition of "Marian consciousness" in the Church, the awareness of Mary as a singular presence within the mystery of salvation ... significantly for Protestants ... he has done so primarily by way of meditative exposition of the Bible.

Yeago goes on to assert that Mary is not only inseparable from the plan of salvation, but that she has a continuing relationship with the Church as a prototype, mother and arch-prophet. In response to minimalist and post-modernist criticism Yeago writes: "The goal of faith and theology is not to see how little Scripture we can take seriously. . . the goal is the maximum of integrity in taking seriously and holding together in our understanding the whole canon of testimony with which the Church has been provided by the Spirit."

Yeago goes on to put into context the editors' comment that since the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), Christianity has confessed that Mary is the Mother of God.

"After all," he asserts, "the New Testament canon itself is superfluous to what is 'necessary to salvation' since the foundational apostolic preaching went on without it."

In one of the papers in this collection, "Most Generations Shall Call Me Blessed: An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Liturgy," the celebrated Orthodox (formerly Lutheran) scholar Jaroslav Pelikan adds to his past considerations of Mary in the liturgy ("Ave Maria, Salve Regina" and "Stabat mater dolorosa" in *Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture*, Yale U. Press, 1996). Here, he looks to Eastern Orthodox sources made known in the culture of the West most recently through performances of the Vespers settings of Rachmaninoff as performed by the late Robert Shaw and Mstislav Rostropovich.

In reference to the seven prayers and the "beautiful hymns" of *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*, Pelikan outlines the intercessory role of Blessed Mary in the liturgical life of the vast majority of Christians past and present. He explores what Newman pointed to as the necessary space in theology for the *Theotokos* which, if ignored in liturgy and devotion, leads to a displacement of Christ:

...it is not in those religious communions which are characterized by devotion to the Blessed Virgin that have ceased to adore her Eternal Son, but those very bodies which have renounced devotion to her.

Blessed Mary is seen by Pelikan as a metaphor for the history of salvation in the Divine Liturgy, expressing in worship the relation between the *Theotokos* and the New Jerusalem. The liturgy invokes the redeemed humanity of Mary as the apex of God's salvific work in Christ. Finally, her role is confirmed again in the liturgy at the Benediction. Pelikan insists that the grammar of the Orthodox Liturgy carefully keeps these relationships straight. Unlike the Western form of the Aaronitic blessing (Numbers 6:24-26) or the Apostolic blessing - *Benedictio omnipotentis Dei* (2 Corinthians 13:14) - the Orthodox Liturgy pronounces:

when their space becomes overcrowded:

They choose simply to offer the same worship service twice in a row on a Sunday morning.

Taking all of these things into consideration, and with the help of a survey of parishioners' thoughts on worship, together we decided to do two things. First, the two principal Sunday liturgies (at 9:15 and 11:00) would be identical, and would retain the style and shape of the former 10:30 liturgy. Second, we would make an effort to experiment, *on specific Sundays*, with other styles. For example, on certain Sundays both liturgies are intergenerational (that is, the entire community is gathered together for the whole liturgy), with a more informal style, nave altar, and an interactive homily. On other specific Sundays, the music is of one particular style; for example, African music; praise chorus music. But rather than these things being offered once on a Sunday, they are offered *twice*. The only consistent exception is baptism: On some occasions, baptism is celebrated at both liturgies, but on other occasions at just one of the two liturgies.

With a year under our belt, some preliminary conclusions about this decision have begun to emerge:

- Given the necessity of expanding our liturgical offerings to meet the needs of the growing community, this solution comes as close as it can to preserving the principle of "One Flock, One Shepherd." We have *not* gravitated into separate communities based on liturgical and musical style. At the same time, we have strived to try new things and avoid becoming liturgically stale.
- What's more, attendance patterns have shown that a group of people have not attached themselves to a particular service time. While there certainly are those who always come at 9:15 or always come at 11:00, others migrate back and forth, based on convenience. Importantly, whenever they come, they will find something familiar, both liturgically and in terms of the programming for children. (The exception has been our teen discussion group on Sunday mornings, which at the moment meets only once.) This migration

has *also* helped to mitigate the polarization of the community.

- This past summer we decided (based on the realities of summer church attendance) to revert to two liturgies. We did this without any conflicting ideas of what the style of the principal liturgy ought to be, and avoided the necessity of alternating back and forth between two styles throughout the summer.

Our experience at St. Thomas' has launched us head-first into the demands of three Sunday morning services, and the community has risen to the challenge with generosity and grace, while acutely aware of the disadvantages to community-building that this pattern entails. And yet, this particular solution has suggested a way forward which strives to preserve the principles which Paul Bosch so persuasively argues for, at least in the medium-term, while we prayerfully await a long-term solution.

The Reverend David Harrison is Incumbent of St. Thomas' Anglican Church in Brooklin, Ontario, and Chair of *Liturgy Canada*.



MULTIPLE SUNDAY SERVICES

(Continued from page 1)

more distinct Sunday services at different times (and often in a variety of styles) is to deny the catholicity of the Church, or, at the very least, is to obscure its perception as such among our people. In some parishes, there develops a discernible contempt of one group for the other, especially if two different forms of worship are used, say, "contemporary" and "traditional," Prayer Book and Alternative Services. It usually turns out that the "Prayer-Book people" become the "old fogies" and the "contemporary people" are dismissed as "that happy-clappy crowd."

Is the Christian Church—is your Christian congregation—willing to be divided into a multiplicity of special-interest spiritual lobbies? When we offer multiple worship opportunities to distinct populations of worshippers, can ecclesial *apartheid* be far behind? A service for "white folks" and a "separate-but-equal" service for "black folks"? Replace "white" and "black" with "traditional" and "contemporary" and you can begin to see the ecclesial threat in multiple services targeted at different groups.

The strategy of targeted worship opportunities may well mean church growth, and it may, indeed, bring people in the door, people of "our kind." But what the community ends up with is not the Church. It may be an interesting social club of like-minded and attractive people, but it is simply no longer the Christian Church: rich and poor, old and young, black and white, conservative and liberal, all together at the Table of the Lord. Surely one of the Church's finest gifts is its *pleroma*, its rich and even, at times, contradictory fullness.

And it's worth noting that you can't find this kind of fullness anywhere else in North America today: You find it only in the Church. I recently heard an anthropologist observe that North American society is the most segregated society on earth: age-segregated, class-segregated, income-segregated, education-segregated, and opinion-segregated. The Church's *pleroma* (fullness) stands as an important counter-cultural judgment against that kind of *apartheid*, and it's one of our glories!

Sure, every assembly of Christians gathered for worship, over time, takes on

its own distinctive personality. But in a consumerist society like ours, I fear that our congregations are increasingly under threat of being perceived as the local religion franchise, the local “God business”: St. Peter’s the local Lutheran franchise; St. John’s, across the street, the local Anglican franchise. That’s bad news.

4) A final argument against multiple Sunday services is the *liturgical* one. Multiple services encourage a perception in our communities that worship consists of laypeople coming to their ordained clergy to be “filled,” as at a gas station, a misperception at least as old as the Middle Ages, and against which both Aquinas and Luther protested. And we have effectively denied not only our oneness in Christ in “the priesthood of all believers” but also our understanding of worship as the “work of the people.” We have succumbed to our era’s demonic addiction to consumerism. Our clergy have become purveyors of “designer liturgies”: a liturgy for every taste and preference.

[Think] of the second service as simply a second congregation, utilizing the same building, but calling its own clergy and creating its own program[.] Thus the principle “one flock, one shepherd” could still be honoured.

Do we want to allow our congregations at worship to become the local “God business,” patronized by laypeople, but owned and operated by ordained clergy, who must perforce dream up ever more clever menus and premiums, ever more ingenious marketing promotions, to keep the customers coming through the door?

But, I hear you say, what if it becomes a matter of space? I suppose multiple Sunday services then become a necessity, and a necessity preferable to building a bigger building. (Surely Western Christendom has more than enough church buildings!)

But in that case, can the congregation consider this: Thinking of the second service as simply a second congregation, utilizing the same building, but calling its own clergy and creating its own program? Thus the principle “one flock, one shepherd” could still be honoured. The result would be two independent but – Surprise! – genuinely co-operating congregations sharing the same space, the same building.

Further: Can the “church growth” people be dismissed when they argue that

multiple services actually increase the total number of worshippers, each assembly growing in its own distinct expression of the faith?

I don’t have clear answers. But in any case, clergy with multiple services and multiple staff do well to respect the reality that each assembly of believers is a separate sociological entity, another distinct and discrete Christian congregation, with all its demands on the time and energy of its leaders, lay as well as ordained.

Perhaps, in our time, there’s simply no easy answer. Perhaps in most communities in our day we’ll simply have to learn to live with multiple services, and put the ideal of “one flock, one shepherd” on hold. But we ourselves should be clear – we should make it clear to the people of our parishes as well – that in offering multiple services we’re paying a heavy price, in professional and volunteer energies, and in public perceptions of who we are as Church.

In any event, Christians have some ecclesiological homework to do, as we face

the exciting challenges of the early 21st century. The copy of *Liturgy Canada* you hold in your hand examines some of the issues we face.

Paul Bosch is a retired pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada and a member of the executive of *Liturgy Canada*. He has served parish ministries in Pennsylvania, New York State, Massachusetts, and Ontario.



[The worshippers] expectation is that the parish will continue to offer a variety of worship styles to suit different preferences.

Overcoming obstacles to worship together

Sharyn Hall

The theological argument that all members of a parish, “the flock,” should come together to worship every Sunday morning has merit, but sometimes barriers to that goal seem impossible to overcome. In my parish there are two major obstacles to having only one service on Sunday morning: the size of the building and the deeply entrenched liturgical pattern.

St. Luke’s Anglican Church in Burlington, Ontario, is the oldest church in the city. The original portion of the building dates from 1834 and because of its connection to the family of Chief Joseph Brant, the church is regarded as an historic landmark. Although the building has been altered and slightly enlarged over the years, it is confined on three sides by a graveyard. The historical significance of the parish and its surroundings forestall any plans to enlarge the building.

The peak capacity of the church is about 280 people. On an average Sunday morning, we have 300 to 350 people in total attend three services. It is not possible to accommodate that many people in one service. On special Sundays the attendance can rise to 500, and we need five services at Christmas to welcome about 1100 people. With a parish list of almost 1000 family units, we are fortunate that not everyone comes to church on a regular basis!

Because of the parish’s history in the city, several generations of families claim a connection to St. Luke’s, and they expect long-standing traditions to continue. Each service on Sunday morning has its own liturgical style. The early service at 8:15 a.m. is always the Holy Communion service, without music, from the 1959 *Book of Common Prayer*. Even though the *Book of Alternative Services* was published almost 20 years ago, many parishioners at St. Luke’s regard the maroon *Book of Common Prayer* as the only acceptable prayer book. Traditional use of the older liturgy is firmly entrenched, not only at 8:15 a.m. but

also at the 11:15 a.m. service, which is the third service of the morning. It alternates weekly between Holy Communion and Morning Prayer.

At 9:30 a.m. we celebrate the Holy Eucharist using the newer rite of the *Book of Alternative Services*. Our experience is that youth and families with children prefer the more contemporary liturgy. Consequently, we provide nursery supervision, a children’s curriculum, and a youth program only during this service. Currently the largest attendance is at the 9:30 a.m. service, but it does not exceed the combination of the two services of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

In the summer months, we reduce the number of services to two – 8:15 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. – but then the challenge is to offer enough liturgical variety to suit everyone. There is always grumbling, and some people stay away until we return to the autumn schedule of three services.

Do we have one flock at St. Luke’s? Everyone who attends services at St. Luke’s, even if only occasionally, believes he or she is a member of the flock. Their expectation is that the parish will continue to offer a variety of worship styles to suit different preferences. As a consequence, each service has its own flock. Our only opportunity for building a sense of overall community occurs at the coffee time, which is squeezed between the second and third services.

How can we overcome our obstacles to worship together? We are taking small steps to join or blend the congregations. Next year our parish hall will be completely renovated and we hope to hold some larger services in that new facility. We plan to introduce the 11:15 a.m. congregation to the 1962 *Book of Common Prayer* rite as presented in the *Book of Alternative Services*. This may encourage more people to be comfortable with the newer liturgies. To vary the present pattern, we have created different liturgies on specific themes such as peace in our world.

Some people may say that we are fortunate to have these problems. We have too many people attending church for the size of our building. We have the resources of clergy, choir and lay leaders to offer a variety of worship styles. Nevertheless, the challenges remain, and we continue to search for ways to draw our parishioners together so that all may share the diversity of worship possible in our church today.

Sharyn Hall is the Parish Vicar of St. Luke’s Anglican Church in Burlington, Ontario, and the Ecumenical Officer of the Diocese of Niagara. She is a member of the Executive of *Liturgy Canada*.

Do we have one flock at St. Luke’s? Everyone who attends services at St. Luke’s, even if only occasionally, believes he or she is a member of the flock.