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Chapter 1: Introduction

Change is inevitable. Change in the liturgical life of any one congregation rarely stays the same regardless of the will of the people there to keep it the same. Change happens in any number of ways—sometimes change is deliberate, and other times change is unintentional. It is the same regarding change in the liturgy of a congregation.

When deliberate change is being approached, however, having a method of approach will likely behoove those wishing to implement the change. A congregation, a diocese, or an ecclesial body will see a more positive reception to the liturgical change when the leaders of the church body offer a thorough program of formation, attention to the pastoral care of members of the body, as well as consideration to how people internalize liturgy and experience change. It is key that as many people as possible participate in the formation program as well as take advantage of the pastoral opportunities.

In order to communicate how this topic of the formational and pastoral aspects of liturgical change has been of incredible interest to me since I was a child, I share with you the experiences imparted to me by my paternal grandmother.

My grandmother, Mary Ann Moser Johnstone, is a lifelong Episcopalian. She was baptized at St. James Episcopal Church in PeWee Valley, Kentucky, which is the closest Episcopal church to the dairy farm where she grew up. She attended both the University of Kentucky, and then later, Berea College, where she earned her bachelor’s degree. After she had gotten her four children on into school, she went on to teach elementary, middle and high school
Language Arts, Social Studies, Art, and Math for many years, and obtained advanced degrees in education.

I have heard my grandmother speak of the time of liturgical revision many times in my life, and it was never spoken of in a positive way. My grandparents attended Christ Episcopal Church in Richmond, Kentucky\(^1\), which was the closest Episcopal church to Berea, Kentucky, where my grandfather taught at Berea College, and my grandmother taught at the local community school.

My grandmother remembers beginning to attend church more regularly in the late 1960s, after they had settled into living in Berea, after arriving in 1964\(^2\). When they began to attend Christ Church, the BCP 1928 was used regularly, with Holy Communion typically on the first Sunday of the month, with Morning Prayer and sermon the other Sundays. This was the liturgy they were accustomed to, having grown up in the Episcopal Church and they had worshipped with that rite in Kentucky, Illinois, and North Carolina before arriving in Berea.

She remembers liking the priest at Christ Church, Richmond quite a lot.\(^3\) That priest went to another parish in the diocese around 1970. She remembers that there was a switch to a green worship book, and that it was used for a while, and then they returned to the BCP 1928, and she remembers using the black and white “zebra” book a little bit, and returning to the BCP 1928, and then she remembers that the BCP 1928s went away.

Her most vivid memory is one that stays with me still. She remembers coming to church one day in the 1970s, but does not remember the reason for coming, and when she arrived, the

\(^1\) Christ Church, Richmond closed in 1988.
\(^2\) Oral history conversation conducted with Mary Ann Johnstone in Richmond, Kentucky, December 26, 2019.
\(^3\) The Rev. John Cavendish served at Christ Church, Richmond from the time she started attending the congregation in the late 1960s until early 1970.
1928 BCPs were all in a trash can on the street, waiting for the trash pickup\(^4\). I cannot underscore how much this action was offensive to her. As the chaplain for Berea College at that time was an Episcopal priest, and a friend of hers, she called The Rev. Henry Parker after finding the BCPs in the trash and he agreed to come and pick them up and take them to Danforth Chapel at Berea College. After the college kept the copies they felt they could use and before Fr. Parker went on to his next call at the Absalom Jones Center in the Diocese of Atlanta, the other copies were given to my grandmother. When she started attending St. Hubert’s Episcopal Church in Clark County, Kentucky, she brought those 1928 BCPs for usage there, and most of them continue in use today.

My grandmother remembers no classes, no introductions, no teaching, no sermons, no conversations, no readings, no newsletter articles, or any type of formation regarding any of the trial rites. She simply remembers that books were switched out from time to time, and it felt very haphazard. She remembers that she wrote one Bishop of Lexington a letter regarding the ‘new Prayer Book’ and she wrote “God is not my buddy.” One might not be surprised that she has very little positive to say about the BCP 1979 and the thought she shared with the Bishop encapsulates her perception of the text.\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) I suspect that this incident solidified for my grandmother a continued negative outlook on the BCP 1979 and the liturgical revision process. I also think it made Fr. Parker a very highly regarded person in my grandmother’s estimation.

\(^5\) I spoke briefly with a colleague who was attending Christ Church, Richmond in the early 1970s as an undergraduate student at Eastern Kentucky University at the time and he, too, remembers a similar experience of switching back and forth between trial versions, with no education involved. What he and my grandmother remember may not have been the case—there might have been some training or introduction, but it was not such that it made an impact on their memories. My grandmother also shared a thought she recalled (I am not sure of the provenance of the thought, if it is original to her, or to someone else) that also focuses her experience of the 28 vs 79 BCPs: “The new prayer book is a book of theologians; the old one is a book of worshippers.”
My grandmother’s experience of liturgical revision⁶, and the negative experience of other family members, and members of the parish that sponsored me for ordination, have led me, for many years, to want to look back more clearly to the period of time of liturgical revision to see what led them to their negative reactions and lack of receptivity to the BCP 1979. In what ways were formation and attention to pastoral sensibilities during the time of liturgical revision in the Episcopal Church attended to, especially in the Episcopal Diocese of Lexington?

Thus, I wish to take a deliberate look at the approaches of formation and pastoral sensibility in the implementation of liturgical change. In the subsequent chapters, I will set out why it is important to attend to the formational and pastoral aspects of liturgical change. First, I will examine how liturgy affects a person, through an examination of ritual and ritual theory, to focus on the importance of how change is approached: when ritual is internalized, which it often is, to change the ritual is to discount that a person or a body of people have made that ritual a part of themselves. Second, there is a review of the implementation of the trial rites of the Episcopal Church in the late 1960s-1970s as a case study of how some parts of the Church approached the implementation of the trial rites from a formational and pastoral viewpoint. Third, there is an examination of approaches to Christian Formation in our current time. Fourth, two sample approaches of liturgical change are offered, considering all that will be presented, followed by concluding remarks.

---

⁶ It is difficult to call what my grandmother experienced “liturgical revision” if what happened was a simple switching of books from one set of months to another set of months, without any accompanying unfolding of the “why” it was happening.
Chapter 2: Ritual and Ritual Theory

Introduction

“The Outline of the Faith” defines the duty of all Christians as: “The duty of all Christians is to follow Christ; to come together week by week for corporate worship; and to work, pray, and give for the spread of the kingdom of God.”7 The Outline of the Faith, commonly called ‘The Catechism’ goes on to provide questions and answers as to how The Book of Common Prayer (1979) approaches corporate worship, but does not, in the answer to the question about ‘duty of all Christians,’ prescribe particular types of worship.

Our acts of worship include our body, especially in traditions where responsorial language and bodily postures such as standing, kneeling, dancing, and more exist. Our minds, bodies, and tongues are how we act in the worship of God. Also, a large part of our worship is the use of symbol. The cross is more than two sticks of wood affixed together, but it is also simply two sticks of wood affixed together. The rites in which we participate form us; the symbols we use, see, and communicate are inextricably bound up in those rites. Of course, we change, and the world changes, and there are times that our acts of worship are not adequately dealing with our needs or expressing how we approach God. When that is the case, our acts of worship may need to change, but it is helpful to assess how worship is internalized in a person, or in a body of worshippers. It behooves a worshipping community to consider the effectiveness of a rite to engage a person or community with God.

There are merits to examining ritual theory, or ritual studies, as this question of the formational and pastoral aspects of liturgical change is examined. After speaking with people at

---

St. Hubert’s Episcopal Church, in Clark County, Kentucky, which still uses The Book of Common Prayer (1928), with the permission of the diocesan bishop, I heard a common theme amongst a number of people over the years. Some of these thoughts are: ‘when they changed the prayer book (28), it was like they told me the way I spoke to God was not acceptable.’ Or ‘The prayers from the prayer book (28), that is the language of my heart, it is how I speak to God.’ What I began to realize is that people had very much internalized over years, and for some very many years, the ritual actions and words from the BCP 1928. The ritual had become, in many ways, a part of them. And while there maybe other reasons that people did not wish to change their mode of worship, their internalization of the rites and rituals they associated with the older prayer book was a real concern considering potential change.

Ritual is practice or a set of practices that are performed or observed regularly or consistently.8 Bernard Cooke and Gary Macy define ritual as a “symbol that has been acted out.”9 Rituals can be religious in nature, or non-religious. There are ritual aspects of many things that humans do on a very regular basis, and those rituals influence the people who perform them, or who participate in them. What is hoped to be discovered in using a ritual theory lens to examine are some of the following: to look thoroughly at how those rituals shape a person or a group of people, the effects of the use of rituals over time, and how a body might either discover or be informed that the rituals may not be conveying what the overall body hopes they would convey. How does ritual action shape us? To consider these questions it may be helpful to know how a person, or a body of people have internalized ritual and thus, may have particular types of feelings when the ritual is changed.

---

8 Webster’s New World College Dictionary, 5th ed. 2018
What is Ritual Theory?

Émile Durkheim, in his work *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, studied deeply the subject of what the source of persistent human identity in community was and also was one of the first to be given credit for the more modern concept that came to be known as ritual theory. He did this by exploring the religious practices and experiences of native peoples. He was amongst the first to assert a connection between ritual and emotion. Durkheim was also one of the earlier scholars to make the connection between the external action being connected to an internal, larger reality: “As for rites, they seem from this point of view to be merely an external, contingent, and material expression of these inner states that were singled out as having intrinsic value.”

Many have researched in this field, and there are many attempts at a definition of what ritual theory is. In order to sum up the concept that is ritual theory, Erika Summers-Effler states:

Ritual theories assert that focused interaction, which these theories refer to as ritual, is at the heart of all social dynamics. Rituals generate group emotions that are linked to symbols, forming the basis for beliefs, thinking, morality, and culture. People use the capacity for thought, beliefs, and strategy to create emotion-generating interactions in the future. This cycle, interaction $\rightarrow$ emotions $\rightarrow$ symbols $\rightarrow$ interaction, forms patterns of interaction over time. These patterns are the most basic structural force that organizes society.

In essence, ritual theory is to try to put a language, a shape, around the practices that we do as individual people, or as small or large communities. We try to “make sense” of the realities we see ourselves living in, even though the “reality” is not always grounded in what is

---


actually going on around us. We use signs and symbols in this process. There are numerous ways of ritualizing any number of situations.

Ronald Grimes argues that there is a challenge regarding definitions and language around rite and ritual. He has offered a differentiation between the terms ‘rite’, ‘ritual’, ‘ritualizing’, and ‘ritualization.’ He considers the rite a ‘specific enactment located in a concrete time and place’; ritual ‘as the general idea of which a rite is a specific instance’; ritualizing as the ‘activity of deliberately cultivating rites’; and ritualization as the ‘activity that is not culturally framed as ritual but which someone, often an observer, interprets as if it were potential ritual.’

Many actions that humans undertake, then, can be interpreted as rite, ritual, ritualizing, and ritualization. It is constructive, though, to examine how actions that are repeated and internalized in their different ways effect human beings. In considering how humans act and react in religious experience, ritual theory is a very helpful tool. In considering this idea of ritual theory, it will be helpful to see how emotions, beliefs, actions, thoughts, and strategy are linked to the religious rituals undertaken by people, and in the case of this project, by Episcopalians who may be experiencing liturgical change.

The How and Why of Internalizing Ritual

How Brains are Affected by Repeated Practices

Prior to the emergence of Siri, Google, and Global Positioning Systems, taxi drivers in London, England, had to know an expansive system of streets like the back of their hands. In order to be hired as a taxi driver, applicants had to be trained and tested on their ability to know how to get from a seemingly countless number of locations to another yet seemingly countless

---

number of locations, and as such, were considered a highly developed group due to this needed acumen.

The training that the taxi drivers undergo is commonly known as “being on The Knowledge” and it takes the great majority of potential drivers about two years to obtain. For a driver to receive a license to operate a taxi in London, each driver must pass a set of police examinations that are considered extremely difficult. Because of “The Knowledge” that the London taxi drivers have had to acquire, they are a wonderfully situated test group. Their repeated actions of driving back and forth in countless patterns of the grid of metropolitan London makes them quite suited for the study of spatial navigation.¹³

A group of researchers decided to see if learning a large number of sequential actions like driving through a very complicated and busy city had effects on the human brain. The research team found that the hippocampi of the taxi drivers were reliably larger than the hippocampi of the control subjects.¹⁴ They posit that this is connected to the fact that the London taxi drivers have had to develop the repeated actions and thought processes required to reliably navigate a large city for their clients.

Robert Turner, in referencing the study of London taxi drivers, and in other ways, asserts that ritual, that is the repeated action like the taxi drivers undertake on a regular basis, changes a person’s brain.

Many would agree that ritual, almost by definition, is not obviously practical or instrumental. Aztec human sacrifice, for instance, may appear to be the complete opposite. I will argue that ritual action may have, instead, the function of physically changing the brains of the participants, the world inside, but not necessarily outside. Because such changes are in themselves covert (although they may result in an altered repertoire for observable action), the effectiveness of

ritual can be easily overlooked, and it can be dismissed, scornfully, as “meaningless” by those who have not fully entered into the experiences it offers.15

Another way of looking at ritualization is through the human’s experience of music. Turner asserts that, “music can thus be regarded as ritualized language,”16 and shares information from a 2010 study where a group of volunteers listened to skilled musical performances. The researchers in the study found very comparable operational changes in each of their brains, with the main differentiating factor being the degree of musical training of the subjects.17

If the brain does indeed change as a result to repeated action, or to the experience of “ritualized language” in the form of music, this seems to affect a person or a community of people. “Ritual structures our cognitive systems, forming collective representations.”18 Collective representations are important elements of human life that have significant existence since we give clear or unspoken approval that they should be19 and those collective representations work in our brains—they are mapped onto biologically prearranged areas—visual, auditory, and more.

Cultures act to provide repeated experiences or single experiences that are so salient that one-shot learning takes place. This often takes the form of conscious training and imitation. The framework for such formative experiences is usually provided by ritual. For instance, rites of passage (van Gennep 1909; V Turner 1969) transform social persons through processes of separation, seclusion, initiation, and reintegration. But the common factor in common between such ritual experiences, when they are effective, is emotion.20

16 Ibid, 37.
17 Ibid
19 Ibid, 39.
20 Ibid, 40.
Most scholars acknowledge that emotion is real. Emotion is also heavily connected to the ways in which we create memories. Emotions are also important in that they are cognitively “indexed in the form of ritual symbols.”21 And as such:

    ritual symbolism provides sensory experience that powerfully links autonomic activity with conscious thought, in a highly structured way relevant to important societal concerns. It induces physical responses that are experienced as complex emotions, which render particularly salient and memorable the conscious reflections or teachings made at the time that the ritual symbols are brought into play.22

Emotion is a powerful thing, and while it seems quite logical that a repeated action, a ritual, is connected to the emotional self, it may not be logical to everyone. In considering broadly the oral history conversations that were conducted as a part of this project, one thing that was common between nearly all of the lay people who took part in the conversations that had a negative experience of liturgical change during the time of prayer book revision was a strong emotional response. The factor that seemed to limit the emotion was distraction. At least two people who briefly considered engaging in an oral history conversation shared less emotion because they recall that their main activity in church at that time was attentively caring for newborns or toddlers.

Scholar Frank C. Senn also proposes that there are biological effects of ritual as assembled in the research of Eugene d’Aquili, Charles Laughlin, and Andrew Newberg. He sums up the biological work into two primary accomplishments. Firstly, ritual organizes the neural systems and tasks of ritual participants to make possible unit action. A broad trait for many species concerning ritual would be permeating community distance between units so they can organize their unit in a manner that helps the species to endure, with behavior like a group

---

21 Ibid
22 Ibid, 41.
howl before a wolfpack goes hunting. Secondly, ritual, biologically, has an impact on cognitive
growth or socialization within the particular being. Ritual educates the younger ones on what is
essential and how to act.\(^{23}\)

We are indeed biological beings—how we act, how we behave, how we think—all of
those things affect our biological systems, and there are indeed biological signs that we have
internalized our actions, thoughts, and behaviors. All of these things shape who we are as
sentient beings, and they affect how we approach our faith lives.

**Ritual and Power**

We have looked briefly at what ritual is, and that repeated practices affect a human’s
system. It can be beneficial to look at what people often ritualize and why they do this, and in
what ways they do it. A notable aspect of ritual is experienced in religious principles and
commitments. Ritual can have different effects in a group setting and some scholars recognize
that ritual can affect the power dynamic in a person or in a group. The stress on the act of
ritualizing has the advantage of respecting the inherent truth of rituals as communal actions.
There is still a retention of the uniqueness of any particular ritual undertaking and it still points to
the community that is generated by rituals.\(^{24}\)

An examination of ritual in relation to power is appropriate in this current context
because a notable number of Episcopalians communicated that the rites they used in prayer to
and worship of God—the language of their heart—experienced power being used in that process


of change. The different types of power that occurred in the liturgical changes in the Episcopal Church were several. Some of those types of power are the power that the laity themselves are exerting—this could be positive or negative power; there is power that leaders sharing the change are employing to make the changes; and there is power that the ritual is exerting on those people.

Catherine Bell has done distinct work on the issue of power in relation to ritual.

The deployment of ritualization, consciously or unconsciously, is the deployment of a particular construction of power relationships, a particular relationship of domination, consent, and resistance. As a strategy of power, ritualization has both positive and effective aspects as well as specific limits to what it can do and how far it can extend.25

Each person who participates in ritual is a social being and they bring to any ritual experience their whole self. This is made up of obedience, confusion, opposition, as well as a delivering individual adoption of the dominant order and experience.26 Ritual can be controlling and manipulating; people can use the ritual to control or manipulate; ritual can also be a form of resistance; it can be liberating. There is often a tension of domination and resistance.27 An old phrase comes to mind, one used over many years, that “The Book of Common Prayer protects the people from the clergy.”

Bell uses an example of power in a ritual setting: the way in which many American Roman Catholics do not concur with or observe the stance on birth control firmly asserted by the papacy in Rome. The quiet rebellion sometimes comes as a revelation to all people except Catholics. Non-Catholics are inclined to think that Catholics have accepted fully the authority of

26 Ibid, 208.
27 Ibid, 213.
the pope, particularly since the papacy is overwhelmingly the most unique tradition of Catholicism and a definitive illustration of traditional power.\textsuperscript{28}

Consider the power that a presider may have. The power that a presider has over most assemblies is significant. When a presider makes a change in a worship service on the spur of the moment, that presider is potentially disrupting the worship experience and the ritual experience of the assembly members. There are times when those kinds of disruptions are necessary, if a member of the assembly has experienced a medical emergency, it would be ideal if a system has already been prepared for such situations. For instance, a vestry member or other medical person who is designated to call for emergency personnel. For the presider to stop the liturgical leadership and pray for the person in medical extremis is, in balance, better than not giving the assembly the opportunity to have a pastoral action for something that is causing direct anxiety to at least one member of the assembly, and other anxiety for the rest of the assembly. For the presider to make a spontaneous change when there does not seem to be a reason that is constructive for the worship of God, however, this is a likely misuse of power on the part of the presider. One example of that misuse of power might be changing the way that the assembly receives communion right before that action happens for no obvious reason. There is power in the assembly, as well, but that power, in the moment of worship, may be more passive—emotional or physical disengagement, or very noticeable, if a member of the assembly dissents verbally with the communion changes. Power is a factor in ritual.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid, 214.
Ritual in Practical Context

I will briefly look at ritual in its practical context in three ways: sacrament; approaches to ritual in light of the wide-scale tragedy of September 11, 2001; and one example of a ritual practice changed.

Sacrament

Frank C. Senn writes, “Theologically, if God is going to transform our minds (conversion) he must do so through the body”\(^{29}\) and “The Outline of the Faith” alludes to this connection as it defines sacraments as “outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, given by Christ as sure and certain means by which we receive that grace.”\(^{30}\)

The seminal act of the Church, the gathered Body of Jesus Christ is sacrament. The sacrament of Holy Baptism initiates new members into Christ’s Body, the Church. The sacrament of Holy Eucharist is the action given to the Church by Christ for the active remembrance of his life, death, and resurrection, until he comes again.\(^{31}\) Both of these primal and defining acts, Baptism and Eucharist, are bodily in nature. One cannot be baptized without water being put on a human body in some amount. One cannot receive the Eucharist without some bodily reception of the blessed bread (Body) and wine (Blood). There are numerous other bodily actions and words that occur in these sacraments. All the words and actions in those sacraments have an impact upon a person and upon a people. This connection between body-mind-action has not always been appreciated or acknowledged. David Power asserts, “One of the criticisms of Enlightenment philosophy, with its effect on human disciplines and on the use

\(^{29}\) Senn, *Embodied Liturgy*, 7.

\(^{30}\) BCP 1979, 857.

\(^{31}\) Ibid, 858-9.
of language, is that it fostered a disjunction between mind and body.”32 There is more openness to connect mind and body, or mind-soul-body, in more recent generations. We, as humans, are embodied, and we, as baptized humans, make up the Body of Christ; we, as the Body of Christ, receive the Body and Blood of Christ. All sacrament is tied to the actions and words that attempt to point to something massively bigger than us, or our attempts to describe it.

All language falls somewhat short in trying to describe what is happening in a sacrament. If we, the Church, are Christ’s Body, then in our brokenness and God’s grace, when we are incorporated into the Body and fed in Eucharist, it is helpful to acknowledge that there are myriad occurrences that are taking place in the sacramental act. To consider the ritual is a significant aspect of the occurrences and issues, but that consideration alone does not suffice to be able to say what is happening in the sacrament of Baptism or in the sacrament of Eucharist. It is in the action of the sacrament that the fullness exists. As Louis-Marie Chauvet wrote, “Every sacrament is a rite, but the rite does not become a sacrament unless it is in-dwelt by the word of God and converted by the Holy Spirit.”33

*September 11, 2001*

There are innumerable experiences that we have rites and rituals for and experiences about which we ritualize and then have ritualization. One experience that has been ritualized in a number of different ways was the shared experience that was the occurrence of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, as experienced by people both in the United States and around the world. I remember particularly that I was working as a corporate travel agent, and had

---

clients who were flying, as was their custom, all over the country, and being told that someone flew their plane into the World Trade Center again. The other agent in my immediate area and I spoke about this briefly but continued with our work, but after another odd call from another client’s office, we turned on the television without cable, so the reception was not excellent. A second plane then came, and found myself praying for my cousin who worked in the second tower, and all who were there, and then the hearing of the plane into the Pentagon, and into the field at Shanksville, Pennsylvania. I can remember what I was wearing, and the gauging of prices at the gas station at the noon hour on that day, talking with clients all over the country who were stranded and were sharing car rentals to get home or to the next business engagement. I remember how everyone, along with myself, that I interacted with that day was in shock. I believe that I correctly remember, too, the following Sunday, a member of our church, a retired Army Colonel asked to carry the American flag in the opening procession at St. Hubert’s Episcopal Church in Clark County, Kentucky. The rector, who would not have been one who would normally have embraced such practices, permitted the flag to be in the procession.

That, of course, was my experience, but the ritualization of that tragic moment in the history of the United States seems to come when people who either had a very close relationship or almost no relationship at all as they share their stories of where they were, how they found out, what they did, how they reacted, how they felt. And, more distantly, how they now place that in the context of remembrance.

When, in 2011, 10 years after the event, I was presiding at a church where I was relatively new as the Priest-in-Charge, September 11 fell on a Sunday. During coffee hour following worship, not only did we share those stories of where we were, or people we knew who were a part of the tragedy in some way. Stories were shared for the first time, some
who had heard the story numerous times before, we also felt that it was proper to remember this sad anniversary in our worship context. To build it up in American triumphalism seemed inappropriate in so many ways. Fortunately, the Revised Common Lectionary seemed just right for the day:

Matthew 18:15-20, as Jesus shares how one should handle a member of the church sinning against another member of the church. Our community looked at the day as a day of remembrance, but also a day of how we resolve conflicts amongst ourselves and in our communities. We heard that passage of scripture, and experienced the word broken open in the context of the brokenness of our world. We considered how God is a part of resolving that brokenness, in light of the sadness of the terror attacks 10 years prior, we confessed our sins (in the context of a general confession) and were assured of God’s absolution. We then came together to the altar, to receive the Body and Blood of Christ, broken and poured out for us, that the brokenness in us might be made whole through Christ.

We tried not to over-ritualize the event, and to not re-create the feelings in the days immediately following September 11, 2001, but to put the anniversary in its wider context of who we have become in light of that day, as well as reflect on the compassion that the event may have given us for people who live with the threat of terroristic incidents every day. All of this was set in the context of Holy Eucharist.

This particular experience—the emotional and symbolic experience of September 11, 2001 and the experience of how it is remembered over a number of years, will continue to shift, in a ritual way.

There are the basic aspects that fit the pattern of Summers-Effler’s diagram of interaction → emotions → symbols → interaction,

---

34 The lessons from Proper 18, Year A of the Revised Common Lectionary
but the ways that Durkheim, Summers-Effler, and Grimes have looked at the concept around ritual certainly pertains to religion, but not exclusively to Christian religion. Many non-Christians (of a different faith tradition or people who identify with no faith tradition) have been ritualizing the events of September 11, 2001. Occasionally, I still see bumper stickers or hats that have the World Trade Center towers focused as the number “11” along with words like “never forget” or “in memory.” The owners of these items may be people of faith, or of no faith tradition, so creating memory and ritual around the event can happen in numerous ways. In the context of how I, personally, and the church community I was serving at the time, followed that pattern. How we responded had more to do with the fact that we are/were a community of people who were foundationally centered in the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ. It is helpful to consider the ways that this puts a different light in looking at the idea of ritual.

Ronald Grimes wrote of how the university where he is now an Emeritus Professor approached the actions of September 11, 2001, some of his observations, how the community responded to the events of 9/11, and how he and his students particularly handled the extraordinarily difficult issues of those events. While it was not easy to read, he noted that the act of the bombing was a ritual in itself, as newspaper readers got to read excerpts from the preparation manual for the bombers: “It was a liturgical text prescribing the men’s activities: Shave closely. Polish your shoes. Wear tight-fitting clothes. Chant verse. Visualize your goal. Anticipate your reward.”35 To read these words, as an American, reminds me viscerally that ritual is a humankind concept, and that humans who have a different worldview than I do also

---

undertake and participate in ritual, even ritual that I, and many others, but clearly not all people, experience as horrifying.

There is ritual immediately on the other side of the horrific act, ritual that I can identify with more. Grimes noted that in the early times after the bombings, “the roles assigned to ritual were that of wrapping victims in a blanket of comfort and of replacing factionalism with solidarity.”  

Dr. Grimes was asked to speak in a non-ritual context at a town hall gathering following 9/11 at his university. The organizers of the event felt that it was best to leave the construction and implementation of ritualization of the sad event to religious communities. Grimes, in referring to the school’s choice not to offer a ritual experience, rather than a marked moment where professors shared their thoughts on the tragedy, wrote:

Ritually speaking, we are profoundly disabled. Our gestural, postural, and symbolic vocabulary is pinched, poverty-stricken. We reach for candles or flowers and then dead-end; that’s it. We’ve exhausted our ritual resources. So we turn them over to professionals—to clergy and undertakers. But they were no better prepared for September 11 than us ordinary lay folk. They reached for what was nearby: flags, national anthems, military garb, and military cadences.  

Grimes found himself in a difficult place, and so he chose to ritualize the talk he was being asked to give and the result was a sort of non-metered extended poem that spoke of, amongst other things, symbols, myths, the sacred, good and evil, scapegoating, peace. Peoples’ responses were divided on the result—many wished he had simply given a talk, and others shared they wanted him to publish his ritualized talk. Grimes felt that both responses did not seem adequate.

---

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid, 76.
With his students in class, soon after, they created a ritual to mark September 11, and some remarked that this was awkward, Grimes responded thus:

…when we first construct rites, invent a tradition, if you will, it seems silly, and we all become self-conscious. But rites start somewhere. And right now ceremonial innovations, borrowing from the past, are transpiring as Americans, and British and Canadians, as well as students and faculty around the world struggle to transpose their emotions and politics into gestures, postures, and ritual texts. If you don’t want to be drafted into someone else’s politics and religiosity, then your only option is either to ensconce yourself in a tradition you trust or to use your imagination to choreograph what you are driven to enact.38

He stated succinctly the challenge of how we all struggle to respond—both to the tragic events of September 11, 2001, as well as other occurrences of profundity in our lives, and Grimes presents us with two basic choices—to surround ourselves in a tradition we trust or to create rites we are compelled to embody.

Example of Shifting a Ritual Practice

In 2011, I began serving as the Priest-in-Charge at the Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Georgetown, Kentucky. This congregation39 was founded in 1847 and the building, built in the late 1860s, was originally built by the Clarke brothers, who were English carriage builders, transplanted from New Jersey to Kentucky40. The first Bishop of Kentucky, The Rt. Rev. Benjamin Bosworth Smith, who served from 1832-1884, had also spent time in England, and while there, he found a church building in the English Country Gothic style that he found to be the ideal. It was said that he carved a model of this church to bring back to Kentucky, and that it would be after this model that new church buildings in the Episcopal Diocese of

38 Ibid, 85.
39 I have chosen to primarily use the word congregation in this project, rather than parish, as in my local context, there is history with the words ‘parish’ and ‘mission’, which has to do with a lack of resources. With the use of the word ‘congregation’, I hope to avoid some of the baggage that comes with somewhat more traditional words.
40 A History of The Church of The Holy Trinity by Ruth Bowling, 1979
Kentucky would be built. The model, however, did not prescribe the interior of the building. So, while a few new church buildings were built according to the model, the interiors of the churches were different. At Holy Trinity, there was located, at the rear of the nave, just by a door to the very small bell tower and tight narthex, a very small altar, and when I arrived there, just by the very small altar affixed to the right outer wall was the baptismal font, covered by a wooden cover. I was told that the altar guild did not keep water in the font, or keep the font uncovered and open to deter bats (which were indeed an issue in the church and had been for many years) from coming into the nave.

After serving in the congregation for a short period of time, it appeared to me that people seemed very disconnected from their baptism, and while there were many factors that contributed to this disconnection (a lack of formation, consistent presbyteral leadership, very few baptisms being celebrated, etc.), at least one aspect of this was the diminutive continually covered baptismal font stuck up by a tiny altar in the back of the nave that no one seemed to pay any attention to.

So, I began to preach more about the rooted-ness of our faith in our baptism, and after a while of conversations and considering formation opportunities regarding baptism, I brought up the topic with the vestry. We talked about how we might have people consider their baptism more fully on a regular basis, and I suggested that, if I was willing to maintain the water in the font so that it did not encourage more bat activity, what if we were to move the font to a place that people noticed it more. It was agreed that I would preach about this more, as well as include some formational opportunities on why the font and our baptism was important to our common faith, that they felt that moving the font to a more noticeable location was something they would
support. I did this—sermons, bulletin inserts about baptism and how the font is an important tie to our being a part of the Body of Christ, and then after several weeks, we moved the font.

I will mention that this church building is no exception to the awkward but true adage, “the building always wins.” While I would have liked the church to have had a large narthex where we could place the font for people to see and touch on their way into worship, as well as hold baptisms in this space that would represent the entry into the Body of Christ, the narthex was very small. To place the font there would have created a log jam every Sunday, and probably would have made people resent the font, rather than it be a recollection of one’s baptism. However, there was a prominent open place in the front of the nave that would allow for the font’s placement there to be a place of noticeability as well as a location that people would pass on their way up to receive communion at the altar rail as well as on their way back.

Upon moving the font, I made sure that there was water in it and that the wooden lid was removed. The altar guild also seemed to appreciate that I took the water out each Sunday and replaced the lid whenever the church building was not in use. After several weeks of this, though, the altar guild took this responsibility on themselves. In sermons, I regularly included a small bit about touching the water in the font and remembering that we were all rooted in the Body of Christ through our baptism. I regularly checked in with people to see how they were feeling about the font and its new location, all to very positive effect. The font stayed in that location the whole three years I served there, and I believe it is in the front of the nave still. The only time it ever must be moved somewhat is for a funeral with a casket.
Changes in Ritual

We have looked at ritual, and some of the approaches to how ritual is a part of beings. We see that there is evidence that ritual action changes a person biologically and affects a person emotionally, and socially. With all of that in mind, if a community deems change in ritual necessary, the question of how to go about making the change arises. It becomes necessary to identify the basics to keep in mind when this occurs for it to be a healthy and faithful change, optimally receiving the desired outcome that the initial change anticipated.

There are a few basic thoughts to offer before proceeding. First, the power aspect of ritual: considering that the next chapter will examine aspects of how liturgical change was implemented from a formational and pastoral angle in the time of the trial rites of The Episcopal Church, it is helpful to keep in mind that those wishing to change ritual may not have the needed power to do so successfully. Or they may have enough power to make the change occur, but in the long-term, the trust that Ronald Grimes writes of finding a tradition that one feels comfortable ensconcing oneself may not exist for all parts of the community and people react negatively. Secondly, that even if that level of trust exists within a community, the leaders who are leading the changes should be humbly aware of the power granted them by the community and the power of the rituals. They should use that power as wisely as they are able. Consider the Protestant Reformation, which came out of people with seemingly less power than the Vatican, the Counter-Reformation, coming out of a place of authority, but in reaction to the Protestant Reformation, and in a more modern context, the authority behind Sacrosanctum Concilium, and the ecumenical effects that had on the authoritative bodies of other Christian traditions. Third, knowing that every community wishing to change a ritual may not take the time to consider that ritual changes a person’s biology— the community should make allowances for this.
Scholar Lesley Northup asserts she believes that liturgy should work in concert with ritual studies, asserts that:

The fundamental principles of effective ritualizing dictate the ritual symbol and action should be clear, understandable, accessible, and transformative. These qualities suffuse the rituals of various peoples around the world, in both tribal and multicultural societies. They are much less evident in Christian liturgy, all the more so because they command so little respect from liturgical theologians, who often succumb to the temptation to see them as primitive or naïve. The peculiarly Christian arrogance that eschews straightforwardness in ritual as a kind of awkward early phase of liturgical development, now supplanted by Western intellect and polish, frequently blocks our appreciation of good ritual done well. 41

Ritual change is often challenging, though. There are many dynamics at play. Consider the many changes, especially liturgical ritual changes brought about by the Second Vatican Council. Some were quite happy about these changes, and others were not. Some did not receive Vatican II well, despite the deliberate approaches taken to implement it. Victor Turner was quite critical of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to Vatican II changes attempting to be ‘relevant’, but Catherine Bell and John Baldovin both point out that if the Ndembu people of Zambia, who Turner thoroughly studied, had undertaken the very carefully deliberated and implemented ritual changes, that he would not have been quite so critical.42 The dynamics at play in changes in the largest Christian ecclesial body are different than the dynamics of change in a tribe of people in Zambia. When ritual changes occur, the criticism coming from different perspectives should be taken in context.

42 Catherine Bell asserts this in her article “Ritual, Change, and Changing Rituals” from Worship, January 1989, p.32 and John Baldovin asserts in his book Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 92.
With ritual change, it seems that it is helpful to look carefully at potential changes from many angles. One should examine the current ritual to ascertain if there a lack that the current ritual is not meeting. Northup offers an example of the Peace in the Episcopal liturgy not fulfilling communal bodily engagement in the liturgy:

If liturgical theologians will not give it to them, congregations will try to achieve some measure of bodily engagement on their own. Recent complaints about “the chaos that erupts at the exchange of the Peace” fail to recognize the non-official adaptation occurring as people seek a more embodied manifestation of community, belonging, joy, and forgiveness.43

She seems to suggest that detractors to an engaged exchange of the Peace will adapt the rite to manifest more joy and community engagement.

It is important for those who wish to change rituals to consider what the perceived lacks in the current practices are. It is also important is for those wanting to make changes to be aware of the bodily effect of ritual on a person and on a community. Those desirous of change in current rituals should consider how those effects will be compensated for in the process of change. In considering the primary topic presented here, those desirous of change in current ritual should contemplate in what ways formation regarding the potential change can be helpful. It is important to contemplate how the leaders of the congregation being pastorally responsive—having a comforting, listening stance-- to those experiencing the change.

43 Northup, 344.
In the next chapter I will attempt to review the ways in which the trial rites were implemented in The Episcopal Church in the late 1960s and 1970s, with this backdrop of how the ritual affects individuals, and the wider community.
Chapter 3: Case Study on Implementation of Trial Rites in the 1960s and 1970s

Introduction

In St. Louis, Missouri, October 1964, the governing body of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States in America gathered for the 61st General Convention. From 1950, leading up to the 1964 Convention, the Standing Liturgical Commission had been preparing and publishing a series of “Prayer Book Studies.” Sixteen Prayer Book Studies were published between 1950-1963, and the 1964 General Convention voted:

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Commission be appointed by the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies to propose to the next General Convention a plan by which a revision of the Book of Common Prayer can be undertaken, beginning at the next General Convention of this Church, with a special view to making the language and the form of the services more relevant to the circumstances of the Church's present ministry and life.44

That resolution, along with many years of work leading up to the 1964 Convention, set into motion a long process of trial liturgy that culminated in the 1979 General Convention affirming a draft presented three years earlier: The Book of Common Prayer (1979).

Over the course of the trial period, three trial books were published for Sunday worship: Prayer Book Studies XVII: Liturgy of the Lord's Supper; Services for Trial Use (“green”); Authorized Services (“zebra”); and in 1976, the Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer. In addition to these, several other Prayer Book Studies were also published during this time regarding Baptism, the Church Year, the Daily Office, Ordination, the Psalter, Pastoral Offices, Episcopal services, as well as prayers, litanies, and thanksgivings.

Michael Moriarty has already completed an excellent study of the process of revision, especially in light of the involvement of Associated Parishes in that process. Rather than attempt to rewrite the work of Dr. Moriarty, as his thorough overview of the revision process is presented in *The Liturgical Revolution: Prayer Book Revision and Associated Parishes: A Generation of Change in the Episcopal Church*, the approach of this chapter is to take a directed look at the formational and pastoral aspects of implementation.

In this chapter, I will attempt to look first at wider church perspective on how the implementation of liturgical revision occurred in formational and pastoral angles. In particular, there will be a focus on some dioceses that seemed, according to the information available, to be deliberate especially about formation, and to a lesser extent, pastoral sensibilities, as the pastoral sensibilities are more difficult to ascertain from archival materials.

To look at the implementation from a formational standpoint, a review of reported information including sermons preached about the trial rites; education classes offered for either clergy or laity, or both; presentations from liturgical scholars; reading material used and other similar types of experiences will be examined. In looking at implementation from a pastoral angle, the primary vehicle seems to be conversations between clergy and members of faith communities about how they feel and experience the trial rites. Those kinds of conversations appear to have taken place both in group and dialogue settings.

The research efforts are concentrated on discerning what the formational and pastoral efforts around liturgical revision were in the 1960s and 1970s, with specific attention to the

---

46 I visited the Archives of The Episcopal Church in Austin TX 2 separate times. The first was during General Convention 2018 and was only able to be a short visit due to the fact that the archival staff was assisting work at
implementation to the first of the trial rites, *Prayer Book Studies XVII, The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper*, published in 1967, with some attention to the response from the *Services for Trial Use*, published in 1971.47

The different media used are information stored at the Archives of the Episcopal Church in Austin, Texas, oral history conversations, a review of the diocesan newsletters of the Diocese of Lexington, more in-depth information about two particular congregations: the Cathedral of St. Philip in Atlanta and the Church of the Redeemer, Hyde Park in Cincinnati, Ohio, and a brief look at editions of *The Living Church* appropriate to the time period. The information from TEC Archives includes surveys compiled by the Standing Liturgical Commission of information about implementation of different dioceses as well as letters to and from diocesan liturgical chairs and the chairperson of revision, The Rev. Leo Malania. A series of oral history conversations were conducted with people who experienced the trial rites. Some conversations were with lay people, some were seminarians, and some were ordained during that time period or slightly later and went on to lead congregations through the later phases of the trial rites that culminated in the 1979 BCP. I will share insights from those oral history conversations.

What I hope to be able to observe is the manner in which a number of representative dioceses handled the formational aspect, as well as how the formational aspect was handled both in different dioceses: Fond du Lac, Indianapolis, Atlanta, Southern Ohio, Kentucky and Lexington. When a diocese or a congregation was responsive in reference to time and deliberate in their formation and pastoral approach in the implementation of the trial rites, there seems to be

---

the Convention. The second visit was in December 2018 for nearly a week. I am very grateful to Christopher Ann Paton, the institutional archivist, for her excellent guidance and support of my research efforts.

47 *Services for Trial Use: Authorized Alternatives to Prayer Book Services*, (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1971).
a connection between the responsiveness and that the effort resulted in a more positive experience of the trial rites and thus the current BCP 1979. When a diocese or a congregation was not as responsive in reference to time, and there was a less deliberate program of formation or attention to pastoral sensibilities, it was more difficult to have a positive experience of the trial rites, and for some, the current BCP 1979.

It is also helpful to note that there were educational resources made available the last time The Episcopal Church underwent liturgical revision, in the late 1920s. Then Historiographer of the Church, E. Clowes Chorley, D.D., composed and published a book called *The New American Prayerbook: Its History and Contents*. “Important as is the revision in the New Prayer Book, its large enrichment is even more so…A living Liturgy must express in its forms of devotion the thoughts of the time.”48 While it was not the overarching effort that was undertaken in the 1960s and 70s, there was an overture at educating church members about the new prayer book in a previous period of liturgical revision.

**Dioceses and Specific Congregations with Timely and Deliberate Implementation**

Some dioceses and parishes were thorough and systematic in their approach to introducing the clergy and laity to the initial trial rite, *The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper*, as well as their sharing of those experiences with the Standing Liturgical Commission.

*The Diocese of Fond du Lac*

The Diocese of Fond du Lac, in Wisconsin, was the first diocese to respond to the SLC survey sent out regarding experience of worshipping with Prayer Book Studies XVII, The

Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper (LLS). Fond du Lac, while a small diocese, had 100% clergy participation in the use of LLS—35 out of 35 active clergy both used LLS as well as completed the survey and submitted their feedback. Of those 35 clergy, all of them used LLS for at least 3 months, and several used it for closer to 5-6 months. 33 of those 35 clergy reported that they read the “Introduction to the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper,” only one person reported to not having attended any diocesan study sessions regarding LLS, 14 went to at least one session, 19 went to 2-3 sessions, and one person went to more than five sessions. 19 of the 35 reported they also studied other materials such as information from Associated Parishes, articles from the Church Press, attending lectures presented by The Rev. Massey Shepherd, as well as other formational resources regarding LLS. 21 of the 35 offered training sessions for the laity. 11 of that 21 offered 2-3 sessions, and 10 offered four or more sessions. 31 of the 35 clergy preached sermons relating to the topic of the trial liturgy, with 18 of those preaching 4 or more sermons on the topic of the LLS. Other methods of formation opportunities regarding the LLS used in Fond du Lac included parish discussions, letters to the parish, a special training for lay readers, as well as mailing summaries of sermons to parishioners. The survey results were somewhat less clear in their overall “where people stood” information. The analysis of “changes in attitude of people” seem to refer to the 35 clergy who took the survey: it is clearer that 19 clergy who responded that they “changed in favour” were most likely speaking of themselves, as well as the 10 people who responded “no change” in their attitude were also commenting on their own personal experience of the LLS as clergy people, with a clear response of 1 person who wants to “return to 1928” and another who was “opposed”, but two people responded “people stayed

---

49 Typescript of Memo from The Rev. Leo Malania to the Standing Liturgical Commission and the Drafting Commission on the Eucharist, “Results of the Questionnaire of the Clergy: Diocese of Fond du Lac,” June 26, 1968, Record Group 122, Box 2, Folder 9, Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.
away” and two people responded, “people positive because priest was positive.” One commenter wrote: “Being used to the Missal, our people are flexible.”\(^{50}\) This comment may refer to the English Missal, the American Missal, the People’s Missal, or the Anglican Missal. This comment seems to indicate that the congregation that this priest is making the comment about is one that would be accustomed to both using a text different than the 1928 BCP as well as being accustomed to weekly communion. Both this comment, and a general understanding of many congregations in Fond du Lac over a long period of time lead me to think that this comment may be indicative of more than just one congregation in the diocese, given that Fond du Lac has espoused an Anglo-Catholic leaning for a number of generations. This may contribute to the overwhelming response that 33 of the 35 respondents said that a revision of the BCP was indeed needed, and the LLS was on the right track.

The clergy survey results seem to indicate that the laity were not extremely opposed to this undertaking, but that if the priest was on board, the people were more inclined to be on board as well, showing that the behavior and stance of leadership in a time of change has a considerable impact.

Regarding the Services for Trial Use (STU) in Fond du Lac, there is a more succinct report\(^{51}\) from Fond du Lac. For the second trial, the clergy report revealed that 25 out of 38 responded\(^{52}\). Those who responded appear to primarily have praise for the work of the SLC and

\(^{50}\) Ibid, Fond du Lac.

\(^{51}\) It appears that the tabulation surveys that I could find from the SLC were more succinct for the STU. This may be due to the increased volume and clearer systematization that the Coordinator of Prayer Book Revision now found himself operating more smoothly now that this was the second set of trials. It could be that there was information not passed on to the archives, or it could also be that I was unable to find the information in the archives due to limited time or being a neophyte archival researcher.

\(^{52}\)“Report to Standing Liturgical Commission: Diocese of Fond du Lac Clergy Survey Compilation regarding Services for Trial Use” (date uncertain), Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 5, Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
Indianapolis

Malania considered the report from the Diocesan Liturgical Commission of Indianapolis the best of the reports that he had received as of August 1969, which would have been a period of over a year since he had received the first report in the summer of 1968. The Indianapolis commission reported that they held a 2-day conference for clergy and church musicians as well as prepared a six-session course for laity required for use throughout the diocese. Following this, a daylong conference, described as a “command performance” was held for the clergy and liturgical committees, which had been appointed in each congregation. This conference introduced the members of the parish liturgical committees to both the trial liturgy itself as well as the six-session course to be used in every congregation.

The six-session course included a tape-recorded introduction from The Rt. Rev. John Pares Craine, the eighth Bishop of Indianapolis, as well as a booklet. The first session invited participants to consider what makes up the service of Holy Communion in the BCP 1928, followed by a session that set the actions of the Eucharist in historic context over many centuries, with sessions three and four dedicated to introducing the LLS with the third concentrating on word and the fourth concentrating on communion, the fifth concentrates on the nature and purposes of ceremonial in the liturgy, and the sixth is a celebration of the Eucharist using the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper. It appears, from the information provided, that each congregation

53 Typescript of Memo from Leo Malania to the Standing Liturgical Commission and Drafting Committee on the Eucharist “Clergy Summary Questionnaire from the Diocese of Indianapolis”, August 21, 1969, Record Group 122, Box 2, Folder 10, Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.
was to undertake the six-session course of study and then Bishop Craine set out that all congregations were to use LLS during Lent and Ascensiontide in 1968. Apparently only one congregation failed to conform to the bishop’s direction.

James K. Taylor, then chair of the Standing Liturgical Commission of the Diocese of Indianapolis reported to the Standing Liturgical Commission of PECUSA: “Toward the end of accomplishing local liturgical teaching and practice, the Trial Use has been invaluable as a vehicle. Those places which have experienced negative leadership by the priest or local commissions indicate the same generally closed attitudes as they had prior to the use.” It is notable that a diocese that was so very deliberate in its educational efforts saw fruit in the process of teaching both about the trial liturgy, but also about the wider background of both the 1928 BCP and our liturgical heritage stretching back for centuries.

For Indianapolis, communicant surveys submitted to the Standing Liturgical Commission as well as the clergy survey summation were available. Nearly 2000 people completed the survey, and 56% felt that the LLS was generally “on the right track,” with 40% disagreeing with that premise. It is unclear about the remaining 4%. For the clergy, of the 62 clergy reported in Indianapolis, and there was usable information from 42 clergy. Of those, 37 reported they felt that a revision of the BCP 1928 was needed and 35 felt like the LLS was “on the right track.”

Taylor, the diocesan liturgical chair, reported:

While not engaging in extended analysis it is clear that there is apparent distrust of the national Standing Liturgical Commission’s procedure of publishing a trial use for the sake of gaining response which will help determine the future course of liturgy in the Church. Many narrative comments seem to carry with them the

---

54 Included in Malania memo regarding Indianapolis, a quote from the preface to “The Report on Trial Use of the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper in the Diocese of Indianapolis”, James K. Taylor, Chairman, Standing Liturgical Commission of the Diocese of Indianapolis
55 Ibid: SLC reports that an additional 2 of the surveys were “ruined.”
idea that no one will read or care about the opinions of the communicants of the Church after the trial use. It is vitally important to emphasize that the original purpose of the Commission is still being carried out: to try out a serious proposal for a liturgy for the future in order to obtain the best thinking of all the people of the Church.\textsuperscript{56}

Here we have a diocese that was extremely deliberate in its practice of education to all congregations and more than half of the communicant responses indicate that they feel that the trial use “will be good when they are more familiar with it”\textsuperscript{57} and while there is some mistrust in the overall system, that leads to the question of what the experience is of the people of the congregations of Indianapolis with the church-wide body—if there is much at all, or if this is an unknown. The fact that there were over half of the respondents who were in favor of the trial liturgy despite the feeling of distrust toward the national SLC, is still quite positive. As diocesan leadership and clergy were very deliberate and thorough about the formation program, the positive assessment may be a result of the comprehensive preparation.

Regarding the survey compilation of clergy responses to the STU, there were 36 respondents out of what it seems is a possible 47. Given that Indianapolis undertook such a deliberate process of training clergy and laity regarding \textit{The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper}, this comment on the survey compilation is not surprising:

Both clergy and laity need better training for participation in the Rites. It is good that the Church is concerned for suggestions and feelings of the congregations and has allowed for all the churches to participate in trial use and evaluation. The majority desire a variety of services, both for trial periods and for final authorization; the Green Book should be better arranged for easier use.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid, Taylor preface to report on the trial use.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid, survey memo Indianapolis
\textsuperscript{58} “Report to the Standing Liturgical Commission: Diocese of Indianapolis Clergy Survey Compilation regarding Services for Trial Use,” (date uncertain, likely 1971 or 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 5, The Archives of The Episcopal Church.
Atlanta

The Diocese of Atlanta, for having its Cathedral undertake a very thorough study and implementation of the LLS, the diocese as a whole did not seem to at least participate very fully in submitting information to the Standing Liturgical Commission. 26 clergy submitted information that was shared with the SLC. Of that 26, 22 felt that a revision of the BCP 1928 was needed, and 19 of the 26 felt that the LLS was on the right track.

There were 10 clergy who reported using the trial rite for six months or more, with 11 using it for somewhere between three and six months. Of the 26 clergy, only three of them reported not participating in any training sessions for themselves at all. 13 participated in two to three sessions, and one clergy person participated in more than five sessions. 24 of the 26 read the Introduction to the LLS, and 19 studied other materials such as a film strip with dialogue, seminary journals, clerical seminars, and hearing lectures from H. Boone Porter, as well as reading A.G. Hebert and David Babin’s work.

Four of these clergy offered more than five training sessions for their congregations, with 17 offering between two and five training sessions. Only five of the clergy preached no sermons on the topic, and 14 preached at least two and some more than five sermons regarding the trial rite. While it is difficult to get at what the clergy are meaning from their comments, they also mentioned pastoral concerns regarding the trial rite—one commenter wrote: “(I would make) one
change only—I would start from the beginning to build a Liturgy with a pastoral concern ever present.”

*The Cathedral in Atlanta takes a deliberate approach to implementing the LLS*

The Very Rev. David B. Collins, Dean of the Cathedral of St. Philip in Atlanta from 1966-1984, along with the clergy and many lay leaders in the Cathedral, undertook a deliberate process of introducing liturgical revision to the 4000-member congregation. After the 1967 General Convention that approved *The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* for trial use, Collins returned to Atlanta and met with the Cathedral clergy. They decided that the undertaking of considering how, if, and when to use the LLS could not rest on the clergy alone and a very large Parish Committee on Worship was put together. Even if one was not a deputy of some parish organization, or appointed by the Dean, the membership of the committee was open to all,

---

59 Typescript of Memo from The Rev. Leo Malania to the Standing Liturgical Commission and the Drafting Commission on the Eucharist, “Tabulation of Clergy Questionnaires, No. 28: Diocese of Atlanta,” October 2, 1969, Record Group 122, Box 2, Folder 11, Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas

60 I do not have the clergy survey compilation from the Diocese of Atlanta in order to see their responses to the Services for Trial Use.


62 “The Committee was to be composed of representatives (of various Parish groups and organizations, chosen by the organizations themselves), appointees (appointed by the Dean), and volunteers from the communicants of the Parish. Groups represented included the Cathedral Clergy, the Chapter (Vestry), the Adult Education Council, the Youth Council, the Church School, the Episcopal Church- women, the Daughters of the King (who include among their services acting as an Altar Guild), the Men’s Club, the Vergers, and the Ushers. The Dean appointed the second group because of some kind of special qualification, mostly professional interest in and love of the English language. In this group were the associate editor of a national magazine, two university professors of English (one was a man over thirty, the other a woman under thirty), a talented amateur musician, one of the lay deputies to the General Convention which had authorized the Trial Liturgy, a free-lance writer for the Sunday Constitution supplement, a member of the Choir, and the chairman of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee (who also represented the Bishop). There was one consultant, Father Henry Gracz, on the staff of our neighboring Cathedral of Christ the King, and chairman of their Archdiocesan Liturgical Commission. (His major contribution, incidentally, was to tell the committee that its job was not to prepare the parish to move from one fixed and unchangeable form of service to another equally fixed and unchangeable form of service, but to get ready to live with change for a long, long time. This observation was greeted with something less than enthusiasm.)” from “We’ll Never Be the Same”, page 34-35
provided that read Prayer Book Studies IV and XVII, as well as Associated Parishes’ “The Parish Eucharist” and works by Massey Shepherd, Bonnell Spencer, and David Babin.

The committee, comprised of about 50 people, was sub-divided into groups that dealt with “Position of the Penitential Order and Frequency of its use, Music, Format and Ceremonial of the Service, How Often to Use the Trial Liturgy, and How to Prepare the Parish as well as the origins and historical background of the proposed changes.” The sub-groups and large group worked over the course of four months, with each session beginning with a celebration of the LLS. After the whole group felt that they were ready to proceed with introducing the LLS to the Cathedral, the committee charged with preparing the parish arranged a script and slide presentation showing how the LLS would be used at St. Philip’s. Over a period of time LLS was used, and during the sermon time, the script and slide show presentations were used, educating the congregation on different aspects of the trial rite.

In addition, 50 people took part in the Lenten program which was comprised of material from Associated Parishes. When the sermon time was not used for scripted education, other sermons were preached on the LLS, and a brochure was developed that described the full changes being made in the LLS and a schedule of how the LLS would be used at St. Philip’s, and the brochure was sent to every member of the Cathedral.

Collins and the Parish Worship Committee were able to make some assessment of the large and deliberate undertaking. Even with the very intentional educational process the committee put forth, there was a notable understanding that many lay people did not understand

---

63 Ibid, 35.
64 Ibid.
the necessity for change. Some felt that “Madison Avenue (or its ecclesiastical equivalent) was trying to manipulate them.”\textsuperscript{65}

There were positive takeaways, as well. Collins asserted:

Liturgy is truly LAY WORK. The worship of the Church belongs more to lay persons than to anyone else, and they are saying this in no uncertain terms. The old line from Confirmation classes that Prayer Book forms helped to deliver the people from clerical tyranny is coming alive in a new and vital way. As a priest, it helped me see that it is THEIR service, more than the PRIESTS', and we do well to remember it.\textsuperscript{66}

Collins also noted that there was demonstrated great maturity and depth in a great number of lay people, and that using the trial use was helpful to re-engage in study of the BCP 1928, and liturgy in general. They also discovered that while the Cathedral was primarily a Morning Prayer congregation, that people engaged in communion more frequently than they would have expected. Communion, however, was in the form of the abbreviated communion service after Morning Prayer, as there was a general sense that people did not enjoy Holy Communion services more, but rather the ability to receive communion more frequently.

\textit{Southern Ohio}

The Diocese of Southern Ohio also completed the first round of surveys by September 1968.\textsuperscript{67} Of the 102 clergy in the diocese, slightly fewer than half, 45, completed the survey. Of that 45, though, 43 generally thought that there needed to be revision of the BCP and the LLS was on the right track in that regard. 33 of the 45 used the LLS for at least three months, and of that group, 11 used it over 6 months, with nearly all of the 45 using the LLS on Sundays. 43 of

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid, 39.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid, 40.
\textsuperscript{67} Typescript of Memo from The Rev. Leo Malania to the Standing Liturgical Commission and the Drafting Commission on the Eucharist, “Results of the Questionnaire of the Clergy: Diocese of Southern Ohio,” September 24, 1968, Record Group 122, Box 2, Folder 9, Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
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the 45 read the Introduction to PBS XVII, but only 14 of the 45 attended a training session. 32 of the 45 did read other material to prepare them for using the LLS: from *Findings, The Living Church, The Episcopalian*, other PBS editions, and the Associated Parishes study guide were all mentioned.

While the clergy themselves did not attend that many preparatory sessions, 39 of the 45 offered some kind of training sessions for the laity, with 21 clergy offering at least 4 or more sessions. 37 of the 45 preached at least one sermon on the topic, with 28 preaching at least two or more, and 4 preaching more than 5 sermons regarding the trial rite. Some of the other methods used to prepare people were home celebrations, discussions at vestry and ECW meetings, the Lenten program, articles in the parish newsletter, bulletin inserts, directed coffee hour conversation, offering orientation sessions (4-5 min.) before the trial liturgy was to be used, and instructed Eucharists.

While it is hard to sum up the comments, the largest number have to do with the thought that continued usage brought more people around to generally liking the LLS. There were a few that stated that their members did not like the liturgy. A few comments particularly stood out: “Demands a lot more use and education… Attitudes are difficult to change,” “They did not like it when they began, and they do not like it now, and this priest hates it, too,” and “16% of the congregation left to join the Anglican Orthodox church (Cincinnati), attendance dropped to \( \frac{1}{2} \) normal. T.L. became, along with the Rector, the immediate target of all other feelings of frustration and disagreement.”\(^{68}\)

\(^{68}\) Ibid, Southern Ohio
Regarding the *Services for Trial Use*, the information shared in the compilation report is brief. It may be helpful to note that there was episcopal transition in Southern Ohio during this time. The Rt. Rev. John McGill Krumm began serving as diocesan in 1971. The report disclosed that people who have responded to surveys in Southern Ohio believe that the SLC was generally headed in the right direction and that ample time has been given to the people who wish to share their thoughts on the subject. According to the report, Bishop Krumm urged continued use of the STU in the diocese. The report shares this summative thought regarding the general thoughts of Southern Ohio: “We have dragged Trial services and questionnaires out much too long; the ‘powers’ should make final changes and give them to us…it is apparent we are not going to return to 1928, let’s get ready to go…”69 The people of Southern Ohio were ready to move forward.

*Redeemer, Hyde Park, Cincinnati in the Diocese of Southern Ohio*70

In conversation with Mike Krug and Elizabeth Grover, parish archivists, it was clear that the people of Redeemer knew they were intended to be a test parish for the trial rites of the 1960s and 70s. The “test parish” aspect of the revision process was communicated to the parish clearly71 and it appears to be something that people in the parish at the time experienced as important. It was an expression of pride in the congregation, as the people at Redeemer knew

---

69 “Report to the Standing Liturgical Commission: Diocese of Southern Ohio Compilation Survey regarding Services for Trial Use” (date uncertain, likely 1971 or 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 5, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.

70 Conducted 2 oral history conversations at Redeemer: one with Michael Krug, retired parish archivist, and Elizabeth Grover, current parish archivist and one with The Rev. Andrew MacAdoih Jergens, who was sponsored for ordination by Redeemer, read for orders, and also served for many years as an associate priest at Redeemer. He was ordained a deacon and a priest in 1973. These conversations were conducted on February 10, 2020. Krug is a nearly lifelong member of the parish and Grover began attending in the late 1980s after moving to Cincinnati.

71 See Appendix: photo from Church of the Redeemer, Hyde Park, Cincinnati’s parish history timeline on the wall in the undercroft of the parish.
that their input, their experiences with the trial rites were important. Mr. Krug remembers several parish forum opportunities being offered on the trial rites where the priest went through the changes in the trial rites, as well as coffee hour conversations between services on a regular basis on the topic. He also remembers that Bishop Krumm was the speaker at a couples’ retreat for the people of Redeemer and the topic of the retreat was Prayer Book revision.

In regard to the shift from Morning Prayer three times a month to the Eucharist each week, at some time during the revision period, the clergy shifted to having Morning Prayer followed by Eucharist for a period of time, and then eventually, shifted entirely to Holy Eucharist. There was a sense that gradual change, along with education in many different forms and times, was a deliberate method at Redeemer during the time of liturgical revision. Mr. Krug also remembers that peoples’ sense of humor with the continued reminder that the input of Redeemer’s peoples’ experiences was needed and important made liturgical change something more palatable. The liturgical change aspect of parish life seemed to be experienced in generally positive and supportive ways.72

In conversation with The Rev. Andrew MacAdoih Jergens, who was reading for orders in the heart of the liturgical revision period, but was primarily at Redeemer, Hyde Park through the time of revision. He remembers that there were some at the parish who were not as happy about the trial liturgies—he also commented that in the tumult of the 1960s and 70s, that the trial rites removed the “anchor” quality that the church had in a time of uncertainty; that one could not go to church and be a part of the internalized, comfortable services that people had known for

---

72 Elizabeth Grover, as a younger person growing up in North Carolina, remembers attending worship at a summer chapel in the mountains of Western North Carolina during the trial rite period, and she remembers that the chapel employed a young seminarian (possibly from Sewanee, given proximity) who introduced the people there to the trial rites, and his energy and positive spirit was incredibly helpful in receiving liturgical revision well.
decades. He remembers, though, that the Holy Week services were something that, with education and introduction, were received well and that Redeemer has continued a positive experience of Holy Week services since the time of revision. He also remembers some instructed Eucharists being a part of the education around the trial rites, as well as a “liturgical festival” that occurred in the mid-70s, where the parish worshipped over a period of some weeks using all of the different Books of Common Prayer from 1549 to the current time, in order to help people live into the idea that the BCP 1928 was not always the only way that Anglicans worshipped. He also remembers that Bishop Krumm of Southern Ohio was very much on board with the revision process, which was helpful to have leadership who was embracing of the trial rites, and he recalls that early diocesan convention liturgies in the trial period employed trial liturgies. Fr. Jergens also recalls that Bishop Krumm and the Diocesan Liturgical Commission brought in speakers like Capt. Howard Galley and The Rev. David Babin to offer formation for the clergy and people.

Elizabeth Grover, the current archivist at Redeemer, had reviewed the parish archives, and had made copies of relevant portions of the parish newsletters from 1970-1977. There were 28 different articles in the Redeemer newsletters over that period of time regarding the trial rites. Some concerned how the parish would approach particular liturgies on Sunday mornings, some were very educational in nature—these articles were composed by members of the Parish Liturgical Committee, and some were informational and invitational—to encourage attendance at educational opportunities regarding the trial rites offered by the Diocese of Southern Ohio. More generally, the information is educational in nature, but there are a few articles over the years that seem to be responding to negativity about the trial rites in various forms, and the responses are very kind, but also educative in nature.
It also appears that The Rev. Bonnell Spencer, O.H.C. came to Redeemer after the General Convention in Louisville, 1973, and was a guest speaker for the parish, to share his reflections both on the overview of General Convention, as well as specific conversation regarding the trial rites and the idea of liturgical revision. The newsletters also go into detail on the “liturgical festival” mentioned by Fr. Jergens—it occurred in 1976, and over each Sunday in October, the congregation experienced Holy Communion from the 1549 BCP, Morning Prayer from the 1662 BCP, Holy Communion from the 1792 BCP, Morning Prayer from the 1928 BCP, and then they closed on October 31 with the Holy Eucharist from the newly approved draft 1976 BCP.

There is a wealth of information written in these parish newsletters, but two things particularly stand out. One is from an early article, the January 1970 edition. It makes clear that the Diocesan Liturgical Commission has requested that all parishes and missions use again (indicating that a use had already occurred) the trial liturgy. The newsletter article shares:

We feel that it is important to give members of the congregation a chance to discuss, question, and react to this Trial Liturgy, therefore, following the 8:00 A.M service on February 15 and all Sundays through Lent, there will be a discussion in the lounge for anyone who would like to take advantage of it. The 9:15 A.M. service will use the Trial Liturgy every Sunday through Lent, after which there will be a brief sermon dealing with one part of the Liturgy, followed by a small group discussion in the undercroft… It is hoped that through this process, we can all grow in our understanding of worship and what the Church is asking of us and that we can come to an agreement about what our worship will be for the future.73

73 No title, article on using trial liturgies at Redeemer, the Episcopal Church of the Redeemer Parish Newsletter, Cincinnati, January 1970.
And not long after they had begun using the trial liturgy in 1970, Mrs. Franklyn Alcott, who appears to be a member of the Parish Liturgical Commission, offered these thoughts in the parish newsletter:

The proposed New Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, together with alterations made following its first trial use, has been returned for our further consideration. Let us all be aware that our participation in this undertaking is important, particularly to those scholars who have worked for years on possible revisions of The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper.

Our trial is a test, and a test requires preparation and involvement. Our clergy are prepared to discuss with us the history of the Eucharistic rites (which have changed many times over the centuries). They ask that we give the proposed New Liturgy a “fair shake: and make known to them and to the Conventions of the Church our considered reactions.

Those of us who have found a life-time comfort and inspiration in the Order for Holy Communion, as we have known it until now, must find it hard to see the Order altered; some of our “Comfortable Words” are threatened at a time in our lives when change is difficult to accept. Others of us joyfully embrace change as a stimulant, a necessary challenge to our attention. Novelty is what this giddy-paced time demands imperiously. (Letter of Sir Walter Scott to Lady Louisa Stuart, 1820)

What is needed now is that all of us join in a real listening experience and some careful comparison with earlier Communion orders.74

The two individuals who have made contributions to this parish newsletter have done so with the aim to prepare and educate, but also with a pastoral sensibility in mind. The writers of the articles over the whole time period are quite conscious that change, especially this type of change, is something to take seriously, and with great care. And continually, it is emphasized the importance of getting the input from the people at Redeemer—that this is a source of pride for this congregation, that their input and experience is needed and wanted from the wider Church.

Kentucky

The Diocese of Kentucky submitted their information to the Coordinator of Prayer Book Revision in January 1970, with 18 clergy respondents, 16 of those feeling that a revision of the BCP 1928 necessary. Of those, 11 felt that the LLS trial liturgy was on the right track, and three did not respond. Seven responded that they did not attend any training sessions, and nine attended at least one, with six of those nine attending two to three sessions. 17 of the 18 read the Introduction to the LLS, and eight prepared themselves in other ways, by reading work by David Babin, Massey Shepherd, Dom Gregory Dix, Associated Parishes, other Prayer Book Studies, and magazines. Of the 18, six of the clergy offered more than five training sessions for the laity and eight of the clergy offered between two and five training sessions. Ten of the clergy preached two to three sermons on the topic of the trial rite, with four more preaching one or more sermons on the topic. Three of the clergy offered small group instruction, four of them offered instructed Eucharists, and four wrote about it in the congregational newsletter.

Regarding the responses for the Services for Trial Use, 14 congregations out of 35 used the STU, but their report does not mention any issues regarding training, formation, or pastoral considerations. It may be helpful to note that it is this diocese who would host the 1973 General Convention, where Authorized Services (the ‘zebra’ book) would be affirmed by the Church leadership.

The Rt. Rev. C. Gresham Marmion, then diocesan of Kentucky sent letters to his clergy in late 1970 and early 1971 regarding the ordering and usage of STU. He set out a specific schedule of usage for every congregation that was to ensure that STU was used at least once a month in every congregation, and in congregations that had multiple services, they were to use
STU (Rite I) more frequently and made it clear that the new lectionary was going to be the lectionary of the diocese for the time being.

Bishop Marmion, along with the coadjutor elected in 1972, The Rt. Rev. David Reed, also made expectations clear to the clergy of the diocese in a report that was the follow up to a clergy gathering in November 1972 where they hosted The Rev. Dr. John Coburn in Louisville, then President of the House of Deputies to help ready them to host the 1973 General Convention. In the report for those who missed the clergy gathering, it was shared that the bishops would be expecting to use the Christian Initiation\textsuperscript{75} services set out in the STU for the next year, 1973.\textsuperscript{76} Bishop Marmion also directed in a newsletter to the diocesan clergy that the bishops wished all the congregations to use the lectionary set out in the trial rites, as well as the Proper Prefaces from STU at all Eucharists (regardless if they are 28 or STU), and have at least one of the STU rites each month on a Sunday, alternating #1 and #2, “so as to give all of our people an opportunity to participate in them.”\textsuperscript{77} Bishop Marmion also directed the clergy to use the Trial Use Daily Office at least once a month on a Sunday. He did allow people to use the marriage or burial rite of their choice.

Grace Church, in Paducah, Kentucky had their parish liturgical committee report forwarded to the SLC. A thorough survey of parishioners’ feelings, thoughts, and experience was undertaken. Before the STU was used, the parish liturgical committee conducted an

\textsuperscript{75} I was baptized at St. James Parish in Pewee Valley, Kentucky, in the Diocese of Kentucky in June 1975, using the BCP 1928, an afternoon private service. While my parents cannot recall specific conversations leading up to the baptism, the priest who celebrated had served that congregation since 1934.

\textsuperscript{76} “Report to the Clergy of the Diocese of Kentucky” included in reported information to the Standing Liturgical Commission (Nov 21, 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.

\textsuperscript{77} “Ad Clericum: a Personal Letter from the Bishop of Kentucky to the Clergy of the Diocese” included in information to the Standing Liturgical Commission (Oct. 14, 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
“introductory preparatory presentation.” The congregation seemed more inclined to return to the 1928 BCP but seemed to appreciate the opportunity to consider the liturgy thoughtfully.

*Experience in more dioceses*

Some of the people who offered their perspectives on liturgical revision experienced that revision outside the Diocese of Lexington. One individual, The Rev. (Henry) Paul Wanter, who graduated from Union College in Barbourville, Kentucky, in the Diocese of Lexington, continued to experience the trial period upon entering graduate school at Vanderbilt. He first attended St. George’s in Belle Meade, Nashville, briefly, but became very active at St. Andrew’s where The Rev. Edwin Conly was the rector. The community worship life at St. Andrew’s was very active, with a sizable group praying the Daily Office and having weekly Communion. Fr. Conly was heavily influenced by the Tractarians and the congregation primarily used the English Missal. They did not use Authorized Services there, however, Fr. Conly had a large number of people from St. Andrew’s participate in a series of classes, four or five sessions, around 1979 led by The Rev. Julian Gunn, a former member of the Order of the Holy Cross, and Fr. Gunn introduced the group to the new BCP, and educated them on its background, theology, and practice. After that series of classes, Fr. Conly announced that St. Andrew’s would exclusively use Rite I from the new BCP. Fr. Wanter remembers that the classes led by Fr. Gunn were excellent and very helpful for all who attended them. It is also helpful to note that the shift from the English Missal to Rite I of the 1979 BCP, especially with the educational opportunities from Fr. Gunn, seemed to be a somewhat easier shift, possibly than congregations who had been

---

78 Ray Larson, chair, “Report of the Parish Liturgical Committee of Grace Episcopal Church, Paducah, Kentucky”, included in information to the Standing Liturgical Commission (report not dated, presumably 1972 or 1973) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.
accustomed to worshipping using Morning Prayer and sermon three times per month, with Communion typically on the first Sunday.

What is particularly notable about the experience of St. Andrew’s is that Dr. Harold Weatherby and Dr. Walter Sullivan, both founders of the Society of the Preservation of the Book of Common Prayer were active members of this congregation. Fr. Wanter seems to remember that as St. Andrew’s went to using the new BCP, that Dr. Weatherby joined the Greek Orthodox church and Dr. Sullivan joined the Roman Catholic church.

The Rev. Robert L. Sessum\textsuperscript{79} entered Virginia Theological Seminary in 1967 and graduated in 1970. He recalls using the \textit{Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper} booklets in chapel services at VTS but does not recall being immersed in the material. He does remember the educational premise that the work of liturgical revision was trying to bring the church closer to the worship experience of first century Christians. Fr. Sessum’s first call to a parish was serving as Assistant Priest at St. Paul’s in Chattanooga and remembers that there was an organized series of dinner conversations to walk parishioners through the STU. He does remember that they used the STU “green” book at St. Paul’s to the point that the books fell apart, and that experience did not help people in their acceptance of the trial rite. In 1972, he went to serve at St. Paul’s parochial mission, Nativity, in Ft Oglethorpe, Georgia. He remembers introducing Authorized Services in 1973 and 1974, and that the congregation members were not big fans of the “zebra” book. He remembers the trials and errors of introducing people to the trial rites. He does not remember people leaving the church over the trial rites. He remembers that one of the irritants of the

\textsuperscript{79} Conducted oral history conversation with The Rev. Robert L. Sessum on December 31, 2019. I served as Assistant to the Rector at Good Shepherd, Lexington, under Fr. Sessum’s leadership from 2005-2010, the time of his retirement. This oral history conversation was conducted via telephone as Fr. Sessum is currently living in Raleigh, North Carolina.
people was the fact that they did not know the trial rite by memory. Sometime in 1974, he went to be Associate Rector at Christ Church in Raleigh, North Carolina, and remembers that both there and at Nativity, people missed worshipping using Morning Prayer, and that shifting to Holy Eucharist each Sunday was difficult for a number of people, and that there was generally a lot for people to get used to.

He remembers doing a lot of listening to people’s feelings and reactions to the trial rites and that any negativity in the congregation seemed to be focused on the trial rites. He recalls when the draft BCP was published that members of the congregation were glad that it was not another trial rite, and that the process, for the people he served, was simply too long. There was a reasonable appreciation that peoples’ input was wanted, but they felt that there was too much time given to the rites, and he commented that two books and a draft might have been easier for them, rather than three books and then a draft BCP. He remembers that this process took a lot of energy from the leadership as well as the congregation.

While it was something that took energy, he does not remember feeling that the trial rites were being “shoved down their throats,” and in addition to the shift from Morning Prayer to weekly Eucharist being a challenge, the other significant challenge was the exchange of peace. He does not recall that any of the congregations where he served had to pay for the trial books, and while that might be able to be verified, if a diocese or other church entity provided for the expense of the various books, that might have some impact on the overall reception of a congregation, if there was not a financial stress to them in making the purchase of potentially 5 sets of books over a 12 year period. Fr. Sessum absolutely agreed that liturgical revision needed to happen, and that time period was probably the right time period, but that if the implementation on higher levels had been smoother, it might have been a better process in local congregations.
The Rev. (John) Joseph Pennington and Gail Pennington have been in the Diocese of Lexington since the late 1980’s, but they are both natives of Massachusetts. Fr. Pennington grew up Roman Catholic and was introduced to the Episcopal Church when in college at North Carolina State University, where the Episcopal chaplaincy there was Anglo-Catholic. He remembers weekly Communion with a sense of inviting mystery. He entered seminary at Virginia in 1968, and remembers using the LLS, but that the prayers seemed truncated and the booklet did not make sense. He remembers some instruction on the coming revision, but also as the trial rites emerged found them refreshing, but he also remembers that the VTS campus was somewhat divided on their feelings toward the trial rites, although there was a general sense that changes were needed in the BCP 1928. He was ordained with the service from Prayer Book Studies 20, “The Ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons” in the Diocese of Massachusetts. He went to serve in Lynn, Massachusetts as the associate, and while there met and married his spouse, Gail, who grew up at St. Stephen’s in Lynn. They were the first couple to be married at St. Stephen’s using *Prayer Book Studies 24*, the new service for marriage. Gail had been away at college in Missouri where she remembers using the LLS. She also remembers working in St Louis right after college and the vicar at the congregation she attended used the trial rites and she remembers adapting to them well, and had good experiences with the house communions the vicar led.

In 1974, they moved to Plymouth, Massachusetts, where Fr. Pennington served as rector. This congregation had a mild Anglo-Catholic leaning, but used the BCP 1928, not the English Missal. There was also some amongst the congregation who felt that those leading liturgical

---

revision were communists, which did not help the reception of the trial rites in that congregation.
Being that Plymouth had a tourist population, Fr. Pennington started a Saturday evening service
there looking to welcome tourists, and at that service, he used the new liturgy, in mimeographed
form. That service grew, and on Sunday mornings, he was able to begin more positively
introducing the services from the draft BCP, and over the course of the year, he used Rite I and
Rite II, and alternated the Eucharistic prayers over the seasons of the church. He discovered that
he had to do continual teaching with the congregation about the BCP. He also remembers that it
was the congregation who paid for the books.

From the perspective of the Penningtons, the shift to The Hymnal 1982 and the
incorporation of women in ordained ministry was more difficult for the congregation than the
trial rites leading up to the BCP 1979. Fr. Pennington was also the only person who particularly
brought up the challenge parishioners had in shifting to children receiving communion before
confirmation. Gail was trained as a Christian Educator and has been leading Christian
Formation for many years, and she also communicated thoughts about constructive ways of
formation in congregations. She felt that small group settings where people felt comfortable
talking, and she felt that trained group leaders who could encourage small group members to
share what, specifically and concretely, in the liturgy touched them, and in addition to offer
people background on the topic, but in a way that is approachable to the average person in the
group—not something totally academic that goes over their heads.

Overall, each of the dioceses, congregations, and clergy leaders who were willing to
positively engage the process and employ formation methods and/or be pastorally available to
members of the congregation made it more possible for a positive reception of the trial rites and
new BCP.
The Diocese of Lexington Begins Looking at Revision later in 1970

The examination of trial rites in Lexington includes information from the Archives of the Episcopal Church, a review of the diocesan publications from the time, primarily from *The Church Advocate*, the diocesan newsletter, and oral history conversations from people who either live or have lived in the Diocese of Lexington and also experienced the period of liturgical revision.

The information from the Diocese of Lexington regarding the implementation of *The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* from the Archives is quite easy to report—they did not submit any information to the Standing Liturgical Commission for that trial rite.81 Regarding the STU, Lexington did submit a compilation survey report and informed the SLC that 40 out of 40 congregations participated and from the information, there were two periods of usage of the STU. The general comments shared from the compilation were:

The response to use of Rite I was full; response to use of Rite II in 1972 was spotty. A minority want no change; the majority are prepared to accept change with improvement in rubrics, consistency of responses and altered ICET texts. ‘Perhaps extend the legal period for use of 1928 for five years after a new book is adopted to give the ‘diehards’ time to swallow the bitter pill.’ Conferences prepared the clergy to teach the congregations. The tone of response appears positive overall.82

It may be helpful, again, to note that there has been a change in episcopal leadership in Lexington, as there was in Southern Ohio. While I will spend more time on this topic further into

81 According to my notes from the visit to The Archives of The Episcopal Church, someone in the Diocese of Lexington ordered 5000 communicant questionnaires and 0 clergy questionnaires in April 1968; I could not find any evidence that any had been returned. It also appears, that as of 1970, no one had been identified as the chair of the Diocesan Liturgical Commission in Lexington, according to what was reported by the SLC. Later in 1970 or 1971, The Rev. Charles Lawrence was appointed as DLC chair.
82 Report to the Standing Liturgical Commission: Diocese of Lexington Compilation Survey regarding Services for Trial Use” (date uncertain: likely 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
the chapter, it is simply helpful to note here that The Rt. Rev. Addison Hosea was elected as coadjutor in 1970 and began serving as diocesan in 1971, after the retirement of The Rt. Rev. William R. Moody, who continued to live in the diocese after his retirement, and led the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Kentucky for a few years after retiring as bishop diocesan.

In terms of specific correspondence included in the Archives from Lexington, they do shed some light on how the diocese was receiving the STU. One priest wrote to the chair of the DLC, “It is very ‘nice’ that the Convention and meetings at the Domain\(^83\) can suggest—or order—how a parish spends its money. It so happens that St. John’s could not—and cannot—afford the expenditure to reproduce the material necessary.”\(^84\) This same priest goes on to offer his thoughts about the receiving of input: “the approval or the rejection of the ‘trial’ services should not be a matter of ‘what one likes’ but rather on what is indicated historically or theologically.”\(^85\)

In correspondence from Bishop Hosea to the clergy of Lexington, it is clear he wished that the lectionary and liturgical calendar in Prayer Book Studies IXX be used in all congregations. He also asked that the clergy study the introduction to PBS 19 very carefully, and “explain to his congregation the rationale of the changes, and the purpose of this trial use.”\(^86\) This missive informed that there was a directed period of use of the STU Rite I for all congregations in the diocese and that directed period had ended, but that optional use of Rite I

---

\(^83\) The Camp in the Diocese of Lexington is the Cathedral Domain

\(^84\) Letter from The Rev. John-Philip Storck to The Rev. Charles Lawrence, included in information to the Standing Liturgical Commission (June 30, 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.

\(^85\) Ibid.

\(^86\) Addison Hosea, “Letter from the Bishop Coadjutor to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lexington” included in material to the Standing Liturgical Commission (December 16, 1970) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.
would continue. He also directed that when Morning and Evening Prayer occur, that the trial period from the STU has ended and that all should use MP and EP from the BCP 1928 through Epiphany 1972. Amongst other optional uses, he mentioned that he had lifted the interdiction on use of *The Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* as he had the opportunity to explain to the clergy his objection to it, and told them to substitute a clearer statement of consecration of the bread and wine for LLS’ ‘holy mysteries.’

He wrote this letter as coadjutor, and stated that the diocesan, Bishop Moody, is supportive of all he wrote. He would not, though, have had much time to have authorized LLS as he was ordained in 1970 as coadjutor. The information from the Archives seems to suggest that trial use likely did not occur before 1970, and it appears that its very directed usage occurred under Bishop Hosea, not Bishop Moody.

With the Lexington material is a tabulation of communicant surveys for STU Rite II, and it appears that around 400 people completed the survey, with an overall report of only 83 of those people saying they liked STU Rite II. This is somewhat countered, however, by some specific responses—nearly half of the respondents liked the opening rite (introduction) better than the opening rite of the 28 Communion service, and again, half of the respondents like the Prayer of Consecration better in Trial II, than in the 28 BCP—an interesting distinction from the overall negativity to Trial II.

One additional piece of archival material to note is a letter from the priest at the Church of the Holy Trinity, Georgetown, Kentucky. The priest at that time, The Rev. Scott Peddie,

---

87 Ibid.
88 This parish has already been mentioned previously in the paper as I served there as Priest-in-Charge from 2011-2014.
who came to the diocese about 1970, and had used the LLS in his previous congregation in
another diocese. Peddie wrote to the diocesan liturgical commission that the people of Holy
Trinity were generally unfavorable towards STU Trial I. He wrote: “I personally, having had the
benefit of a year of the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, tend to think that the change from 1928 to
Eucharist (I) to be rather ‘namby-pamby.’’ If we are going to change, let’s change. In hindsight,
I wish we’d gone directly to Eucharist (2). I fear their ‘backs are up’ and he who insists on
changing one iota of 1928 is in for some flak.”

In reviewing *The Church Advocate*, the diocesan newsletter of the Episcopal Diocese of
Lexington, the first time that the issues of the trial liturgies are mentioned are in the article from
the 1967 General Convention that summarizes the actions that occurred there in Seattle, which
appears to be a reprint from *The Living Church*. The information is listed simply, with no
elaboration: “The trial use of the new Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper was approved for three years,
and a study of Prayer Book revision by a special commission was approved.” Following that
article, the Bishop of Lexington, The Rt. Rev. William R. Moody wrote in a reflection article
about his opinions of the Seattle General Convention: “Honesty compels me to reply that I did
not like a good many of the decisions made by the Convention, which is our supreme legislative
body. This will not keep me from voicing opposition to policies which I think are wrong, and I
shall do this both in writing and in speaking, in the time ahead, in the hope of bringing the
opinion in our Church around to a more balanced and reasonable ground.” While Bishop Moody

---

89 The Rev. Scott Peddie, “Letter from Scott Peddie to the Lexington Diocesan Liturgical Commission” included in
the information of the Standing Liturgical Commission (January 7, 1972) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 14, The
Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
90 It appears that *The Church Advocate* was not published consistently in the 1960s, with the December 1967
edition being the last one of that decade until June 1970, as a note in the Jun 70 edition states that the publication
has started back up after a pause that began at the end of 1967.
91 Reprinted from *The Living Church*, “Summary of the Acts of the General Convention” *The Church Advocate of the
does not name liturgical revision specifically in his article, he does go on to say, “In the
Convention in Seattle we saw a highly organized ultra-liberal group which has captured, for the
time being, the central machinery of the Episcopal Church, go to work and get much (but by no
means all) of its program adopted. The opposition, while present and much larger than the
outcome of the Session suggests, was not organized and had no central leadership.”

*The Church Advocate*, after its hiatus from late 1967- mid 1970, picks back up after the
c consecration of the Bishop Coadjutor, The Rt. Rev. Addison Hosea. In reviewing the editions
of the publication from June 1970- December 1980, there appear to be approximately 80
different occurrences that liturgical revision is written about, in one way or another. It is helpful
to note that there would have been about 105 editions of the periodical in that time period, given
that it generally seems to have been produced 10 of 12 months of each year from 1971-1980.
The initial assessment of the occurrence of writings regarding liturgical revision in the diocesan
publication was that it could have been covered more widely, but in considering a count, that
about 80% of the editions having information about liturgical renewal was a relatively good
percentage.

The type of content regarding liturgical revision varied. Several mentions were
referencing actions either from General Conventions, or from the House of Bishops. Both the
Rev. Dr. Massey Shepherd as well as The Rev. Dr. H. Boone Porter came to speak in the
Diocese of Lexington. Dr. Shepherd presented at a joint conference of the clergy of both the
Dioceses of Kentucky and Lexington at the Cathedral Domain camp in the Lexington diocese.

---

94 “Kentucky, Lexington Clergy Meet at Domain” *The Church Advocate* in the Diocese of Lexington, October 1970, page 3
Dr. Porter spoke at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Kentucky (ETSKY), a seminary that was reactivated by Bishop Moody, and operated from 1951-1990 in Lexington, although from the article, Dr. Porter spoke more on rural, non-urban ministry than he did on liturgical revision.95

It is also helpful to note that in addition to having Dr. Shepherd and Dr. Porter visit and educate the clergy of the Diocese of Lexington, The Rev. Canon Albert duBois, the president of the American Church Union,96 spoke at ETSKY in early 1972. In November 1972, it was reported that ETSKY was to award four honorary degrees, one to Canon duBois, as well as three of the founders of the Society of the Preservation for the Book of Common Prayer (SPBCP): Dr. Walter Sullivan, Dr. John Michael Aden, and Dr. Harold Weatherby. In the *Church Advocate* article, it is reported that Sullivan and Aden would speak about the SPBCP following the service granting them the honorary degrees. Canon duBois would then go on to teach liturgics, church history, and pastoral theology97 at ETSKY from 1974-1977 after he stepped down as the president of the American Church Union. In 1976, Canon duBois became the president of Episcopalians United, an organization founded against both prayer book revision and the ordination of women.98

---

95 “Dr. H. Boone Porter Seminary Lecturer” *The Church Advocate* in the Diocese of Lexington, March 1972, page 7. 96 The American Church Union, from what I have been able to put together historically, was founded in the 1930s to promote unity between The Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church. What is somewhat is somewhat discordant in some ways, but becomes clearer in other ways, is that the Diocese of Lexington had very little Anglo-Catholic leaning, with a few exceptions (St. John’s Dayton, KY), and was primarily a Morning Prayer diocese before liturgical revision. One of the aspects of the Roman Catholic Church that the Diocese of Lexington in the 1960s and 70s had more connection with was in the consideration that all ordained people should be men. 97 “ACU Meeting Set” *The Church Advocate* in the Diocese of Lexington, August 1974, page 7 and https://episcopalchurch.org/library/glossary/dubois-albert-julius accessed February 23, 2020. 98 The glossary on The Episcopal Church website goes on to say that Canon duBois went on to found Anglicans United in 1977. *The Church Advocate* reported some time in 1977 that Canon duBois had been inhibited by Bishop Sherman of Long Island (apparently his canonical residence), and this would have likely overlapped some with his teaching at ETSKY, TEC’s website reports that “he renounced the ordained ministry of The Episcopal Church, he
The Church Advocate was diligent in its reporting of occurrences around the church-wide approval of trial rites, as well as reporting about the provisions of trial use in the diocese. It was also thorough in sharing some information about how congregations in the diocese experienced the trial rites. There were some good efforts around general education about the evolution of The Book of Common Prayer since its inception, with a page-long article entitled “Where the Prayer Book Came From” in March 1974. Another article, about the trial rites of baptism and confirmation, includes this opening parenthetical comment:


Also reported was “Demonstration of trial use rite planned March 3” from February 1974’s edition regarding a service to be held at the diocese’s largest congregation, Christ Church, Lexington on a Sunday afternoon. The article states,

The next General Convention of the Episcopal Church will be asked to vote on a new Book of Common Prayer containing two versions of most services, one in traditional Prayer Book language, the other in contemporary English. Several clergymen in the diocese have expressed the opinion that most of their previous exposures to these services have been unfortunately haphazard and awkward, including especially the Inaugural Eucharist of the recent General Convention in Louisville. The Liturgical Commission of the Diocese of Lexington feels that every member of the diocese and especially delegates to the next convention should have opportunities to worship according to these new rites in planned and rehearsed situations with appropriate ceremony and music… The Liturgical Commission intends that this become a regular column in the Advocate.100

was deposed on September 28, 1977” and it appears he was involved in Anglican splinter groups until his death in 1980.


100 “Demonstration of trial use rite planned March 3” The Church Advocate in the Diocese of Lexington, February 1974, page 3. Also of note is the next edition that includes the “Where the Prayer Book came from” article in
There are also a few brief articles on efforts that individual congregations understood regarding education efforts regarding the trial rites. One congregation reported that they were willing to lend out (for a small fee) cassette tapes on the background of the liturgical movement and the changes in the liturgy, both by Dr. Massey Shepherd. More than one congregation offered, what seems to be a singular class in a series of different classes during Lent, a class on the revision. One congregation, Calvary Church, in Ashland offered a series of classes on the revision process.

There are also a few editions in the mid-1970s that include an opportunity for members of the diocese to write in with questions, most of which have to do with liturgical revision of some sort, and the editors respond to those questions. The editors’ responses are very factual and measured.

The *Church Advocate* also offered several articles on the progress of the SPBCP, as well as work being done by the American Church Union. In all the editions of the *Church Advocate* from 1970-1980, there was one brief article about Associated Parishes, in August 1973, after a meeting of Associated Parishes occurred in Bardstown, Kentucky (in the Diocese of Kentucky). In the December 1974 edition, an article entitled, “SPBCP strategy planned in Nashville” which reported that the ranking clergyman in attendance at the meeting was Bishop William Moody, retired, of Lexington. Otherwise, it appears that there was almost no other coverage of work being done by Associated Parishes on a diocesan communications level in Lexington.

continuing to educate the members of the diocese on the background of the BCP, the cover article is a full page on Canon duBois as he begins teaching at ETSKY.

101 “AP Meets” *The Church Advocate* in the Diocese of Lexington, August 1973, page 10. It is notable that on page 10 of that edition, the article about AP takes up less than one half of one column. The remainder (7/8) of the page is an article entitled “Prayer Book promoters’ group now tops 17,000” about the expansive growth of the SPBCP.
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The following month, the Advocate reported on diocesan reaction to trial service usage, and 14 congregations gave their input with the Diocesan Liturgical Commission.103 Considering the reactions shared by Mary Ann Johnstone in the introduction, it is notable that Christ Church, Richmond, is not among the congregation who submitted feedback. Of the 14, there are a few strong opinions that are shared: positive feedback about the flexibility of the prayers of intercession, strong preference for the Confession and Absolution at all services, ‘virtual universal acceptance of the phrase “The Gospel of the Lord” after the reading of the Gospel, again, ‘virtual universal acceptance’ of three lessons from the Bible, with a laity-clergy split around the placement of the sermon (laity in favor of it after the Gospel, with clergy being opposed), and this comment: “most persons approved of the Peace in theory but, based on the very negative reaction to its practice, it will probably rarely prove meaningful.”104

The February 1975 edition offers an article entitled “Fr. Malania Praises Trial Use Evaluation,” in which Fr. Malania’s comments to Bishop Hosea on the survey comments regarding trial use are shared. In 1975, there were about five articles over the year that concerned the Standing Liturgical Commission’s work, and in 1976, there are about four. What is interesting to note is after the 1976 General Convention, there are many fewer articles about the draft BCP. One in January 1978105 reports that 97% of diocesan parishes are using the Proposed BCP, and that article shares that diocesan clergy met in Fall 1976 and agreed to use the Proposed BCP throughout the diocese. Another article in August 1979 with the headline “Gallup

105 “97% of diocesan parishes using PBCP,” The Church Advocate in the Diocese of Lexington, January 1978, page 1/
Poll shows 71% of Laity want 1928 Prayer Book” shares that the poll was commissioned by the Society for the Preservation of the Book of Common Prayer.

*The Church Advocate*, after the 1976 convention, begins reporting with frequency the discontent of leaders in the Diocese of Lexington with the ordination of women in the Episcopal Church. October 1977’s edition reports that both Bishop Addison Hosea as well as the Bishop of Kentucky, Bishop David Reed, were in attendance at the Congress of St. Louis, as well as 6 clergy and 9 laity from the Diocese of Lexington.¹⁰⁶ The Evangelical Catholic Mission,¹⁰⁷ which was a group that was founded, foundationally against the ordination of women, was a topic that was covered on a regular basis, possibly due to the fact that amongst the leaders of that group were diocesan leaders in Lexington. After 1976, Lexington’s diocesan energy seems to shift in this direction, and away from issues regarding the Proposed BCP.

*Individual experiences in the Diocese of Lexington*¹⁰⁸

---


¹⁰⁷ According to [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forward_in_Faith#Forward_in_Faith_North_America](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Forward_in_Faith#Forward_in_Faith_North_America), accessed on February 23, 2020, the Evangelical and Catholic Mission was one of the organizations that was a precursor to Forward in Faith North America, an organization that continues to oppose the ordination of women to the Anglican priesthood and episcopate.

¹⁰⁸ Here are a few notes about the oral history conversations conducted. There are, of course, limiting factors in regard to these conversations, the largest being the passage of time—affecting both the precision of the memory of most people as well as the effects of aging making recalling those memories more challenging. The youngest person interviewed about 70 years old, and the oldest was about 94 years old. Regardless, all of the people who were able to speak to me have some particularly strong memories of the time, and I am grateful to them for sharing their experiences with me. Another challenge concerns mobility—three of the people primarily shared about one parish, in Cincinnati, and two of those three were a part of that congregation in the 1960s and continuing forward, and another came later, but is quite involved in archiving the parish’s history. I was able to speak with three people whose experience primarily was in the Diocese of Lexington, and then I spoke with other people who are now in the Diocese of Lexington, but experienced liturgical revision in the Episcopal Church in Tennessee, Massachusetts, Southern Ohio, Virginia Seminary (three of the five clergy attended VTS during the revision period and subsequently went to lead congregations in liturgical revision), Washington. D.C., and North Carolina. From each of these people’s sharing, I have gained helpful insight that is broader than just the Diocese of Lexington.
Two individuals who experienced the period of revision in the Diocese of Lexington, Frances Barr, and The Rev. Bruce Boss, shared their experiences of the trial period in Lexington. They offer two different viewpoints, one who experienced worship as a member of the laos, and another who, as a recent college graduate, attended seminary, and returned to lead congregations through the continuing change.

Frances Keller Swinford Barr\(^{109}\) has been incredibly active in The Episcopal Church for many decades.\(^{110}\) She remembers the period of trial use, and her recollections are more of the articles that were shared in the diocesan newsletter, *The Church Advocate*, of which she was the associate editor for a considerable number of years. She remembers that there was some formation around the trial rites, but she also remembers that she was a supporter of the BCP 1928, and spoke on the floor of General Convention, possibly both in 1976 and 1979, in support of the 28 book. She also spoke well of the the Bishops of Lexington as they have allowed St. Hubert’s Episcopal Church to continue to use the BCP 1928.

The Rev. Bruce Boss\(^{111}\) grew up in the Diocese of Lexington and entered Virginia Theological Seminary in 1971\(^{112}\). His sponsoring parish, St. Patrick in Somerset, Kentucky, he recalls trying out the *Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* briefly in 1968 or 69, for about 1-2 months, although he does not remember if there were training sessions that accompanied the use of the

---

\(^{109}\) Oral history conversation with Frances Keller Swinford Barr, January 7, 2020 in Lexington, Kentucky

\(^{110}\) In addition to being a very active member of Christ Church Cathedral, Lexington, she has also served as the associate editor for *The Church Advocate*, the newsletter of the Diocese of Lexington, the diocesan president of the Episcopal Church Women, a multi-triennium deputy to General Convention as well as the ECW Triennial, the long-serving historiographer of the Diocese, a member of the board of trustees at Nashotah House, active in the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, and very active in the Evangelical Catholic Mission in the Episcopal Church. She co-wrote the first part of the history of the Episcopal Church in Kentucky, and wrote the history of the Diocese of Lexington.

\(^{111}\) Oral history conversation with The Rev. Bruce W. Boss, December 30, 2019, Georgetown, Kentucky

\(^{112}\) Fr. Boss was a college student at the University of Kentucky at this time, and remembers LLS being used when he was home during a summer visit to Somerset for about 4-6 weeks. This would be the primary instance of the LLS being used in the Diocese of Lexington that I can find thus far.
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LLS. He recalls the service schedule at St. Patrick’s being an early service that was always Holy Communion, and the later service being Morning Prayer with a sermon 3 Sundays a month, with Holy Communion typically on the first Sunday of the month.

As a student at VTS, he remembers being exposed to the BCP 28, as well as the Services for Trial Use I and II, and Authorized Services from 1973, that they were all used, at some point in the chapel at VTS, and recalls that adaptation was going to be an important skill coming out of seminary. He recalls not being overly fond of the STU and wondering how far the revision process was going to go. He was ordained in 1974 and was in charge of St. James Mission in Prestonsburg, Kentucky. At that point he recalls that Bishop Hosea had printed up Rite II booklets for use and provided those booklets at no charge for the mission congregations. While he was there, remembers leading worship using the BCP 1928 some, with some Rite I, but toward the end of his time there, it was primarily Rite I and Rite II from the Draft BCP 1976. He remembers conducting adult classes about liturgy and the revision process. When he moved to St. Gabriel’s Church in Lexington, they had primarily been using Rite I, but they shifted to using Rite I at the early service and Rite II at the later. He offered instructed Eucharists at St. Gabriel’s, and remembers that a sticking point for people was the “we” in the Nicene Creed and the Confession and doing some additional education there around the issue of the “I” in the baptismal Creed (Apostles) and the “We” in the Nicene. The Peace was not so much of an issue in the congregations he served, and he remembers it being a more subdued exchange.

Additionally, The Rev. (Henry) Paul Wanter\(^\text{113}\) spent some time in the Diocese of Lexington as an undergraduate student. He initially attended college in both Washington, D.C.

\(^{113}\) Oral history conversation with The Rev. H. Paul Wanter on December 27, 2019 in Cynthiana, Kentucky
at American University and then transferred to Union College in Barbourville, Kentucky. At American, he remembers using the *Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* on a regular basis at the Episcopal chaplaincy, led by The Rev. Earl Brill, who was also the priest at St. Columba’s in Washington, D.C. He had grown up in the Roman Catholic Church and was received as an Episcopalian while in college. He remembers the LLS being closer to the English version of the Roman Catholic rite. He was introduced to the English Missal while occasionally attending Ascension St. Agnes in Washington, but when he transferred to Union College in Kentucky and began attending St. John’s Episcopal Church in Corbin, Kentucky from 1969-1972, he does not remember St. John’s using any of the trial rites.

*Some Additional Diocesan Experiences*

Included in with the lay survey tabulation from West Virginia is “The Manual for the New Trial Liturgy”¹¹⁴ prepared by The Rev. Clifford Schane and while the information does not indicate which congregations, if all, or most, or just one or two used this document, it is a teaching document identified as being provided by the Diocese of West Virginia. The surveys from West Virginia indicate that slightly more than half of the respondents believe that the trial liturgy is on the right track. It is difficult to tell if there is a correlation between a preparatory manual and the percentage of respondents being in favor, but the possibility does indeed exist. One interesting comment which may be a particular insight was shared in the summary tabulation from the Diocese of West Virginia: “those who had gone through several training

---

¹¹⁴ Clifford Schane, preparer, “Manual for the New Trial Liturgy: Adapted from Original Text” included in information to the Standing Liturgical Commission from the Diocese of West Virginia (date uncertain, likely 1968-70) Record Group 122, Box 3, Folder 3, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
sessions seemed to feel more keenly the need for change.” And a question followed this comment on their survey tally: “Could it be that those who already felt the need for change were the ones who attended the training sessions?”

In the Diocese of Louisiana, regarding the LLS, it was directed that every congregation was to use the LLS for 6 months, and the clergy all attended a two-day workshop on the LLS led by The Rev. Dr. Massey Shepherd. It is helpful to note a few things: over 5000 lay people responded to the survey and nearly 3000 of them felt the LLS was on the right track. It appears that half of the congregations (50 of 95) participated in at least four or more training sessions on the LLS. The chair of the diocesan liturgical commission, The Rev. Robert Ratelle, makes a few comments in his correspondence to The Rev. Leo Malania: some felt more disturbed about change itself, rather than change of the BCP; the required use for 6 months in every congregation was an asset; and that “many developed a fresh appreciation for the sacrament itself because of the training sessions and their involvement in the Trial Use.”

**General Observations**

Given the vast amount of correspondence and reporting, in general, it does seem that in the places where a concerted and deliberate formation process occurred, there was more receptivity to the trial rites.

One of the things that the undertaking of the trial rites uncovered as a whole in the Church was a need for deeper general Christian education. In a letter to The Rev. Canon Robert

---

115 Ibid.
116 Robert Ratelle, “Report to the Standing Liturgical Commission"
H. Johnson, then serving at St. John’s Cathedral in Jacksonville, Florida and secretary to the Diocesan Liturgical Commission, The Rev. Leo Malania writes this regarding one letter included from a Florida parishioner:

If he thinks that restoring ‘We’ to the Nicene Creed is a shift to the ‘socialist condition,’ what would he say if he should chance to read the Book of Acts! What a notion for the Church: No man can speak for another—so what are we doing with intercession, or with Jesus, for that matter, who thought he could atone for the sins of others, let alone, speak for them to the Father? I am beginning to think that what we need in the third period of trial is a massive program in Christianity. There is, of course, the risk of unleashing yet another period of persecution.\footnote{Leo Malania, “Letter to Canon Johnson from Leo Malania” included in the information of the Standing Liturgical Commission from the Diocese of Florida (April 27, 1970) Record Group 122, Box 2, Folder 22, The Archives of The Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas}

It is hard for people to know why there might be the necessity of change unless they have some level of background knowledge of why they do what they do.

Conclusions

\textit{Some general reflections on the Diocese of Lexington's process}

From a review of the 1967-1980 editions of \textit{The Church Advocate} in Lexington, the editors presented information from both sides of the liturgical revision process. It also, on occasion, offered humorous relief. While cartoons in the Advocate were not necessarily broadly embracing of liturgical revision, they did shed some humor on the situation.\footnote{See Appendix B}

An absence of a publication from most of 1967-1970 leaves some of the story untold, from an official position, it appears that the diocese was a bit of a late adopter to the revision process. This likely is some of the influence of Bishop William Moody,\footnote{Bishop Moody founded St. Hubert’s Episcopal Church in Clark County, Kentucky in 1969. The parish was founded as a “peculiar,” outside the jurisdiction of a diocese. Parish lore is that Bishop Moody founded St. Hubert’s as a church that would be protected from liturgical revision and the ordination of women. The congregation was incorporated into the diocese in the 1980s, eliminating its “peculiar” status, and it continues to}
love of the English language and thought it was at its best in the 1928 Book of Common Prayer. He fought for its preservation until the day he died.” Bishop Moody preached a several-times-published sermon during the 1973 General Convention in Louisville about preserving the language of the 1928 BCP. Moody continued to speak throughout his retirement against the trial services and the Proposed BCP.

Bishop Addison Hosea’s leadership was more receptive to the revision process, and certainly he empowered the Diocesan Liturgical Commission to undertake this work. Bishop Hosea seemed to offer few opinions on the subject, but certainly allowed and supported education to occur in the diocese. In the history of the Diocese of Lexington, it is clear that Bishop Hosea found this time a challenging one:

The bishop considered the two most severe issues to arise during his episcopate to be the new Prayer Book and the question of ordination of women to the priesthood. His desire was to be bishop of all his people, to those who loved the 1928 Prayer Book and to those who liked the new, to those who felt that women could be ordained to the priesthood and to those who thought not, and he endeavored to be pastoral at all times.

The diocesan history shares that the process of liturgical revision went smoothly in the diocese, “due largely to the bishop’s determination to be pastoral, and there were no feuds as a consequence of the 1979 book’s introduction.” In considering the process in individual parishes and missions, it is unclear how much education was able to happen in each

---

use the 1928 BCP with the permission of the ecclesiastical authority. They have, however, sponsored both me to the priesthood (we started attending there in the late 1980s, after Christ Church, Richmond was closed), as well as another woman, Carolyn Howard, to the diaconate, although Carolyn died of cancer before her ordination process was completed.

121 Ibid.
122 F.K. Swinford, 144.
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congregation—we have reports from some places, such as Christ Church, Lexington, or Calvary, Ashland, but much less in nearly every other congregation.

Considering the oral history shared by Mary Ann Johnstone, Christ Church, Richmond, was in clergy transition in both 1970 and in 1973, and the Advocate does not report a survey from that congregation in 1974, and while there may be more support out there for a wider story, given the clergy transition twice in the revision period, her memory of simply switching from one rite to another with no educational background seems like it very well could have occurred.

The Diocese of Lexington, like much of the country at the time, was in a time of transition, from a long-serving and dedicated bishop who was not in favor of liturgical revision to a bishop who was more open to it. Any kind of change should be approached with deliberation and sensitivity to the matter at hand, and this process in the Diocese of Lexington could have occurred with more challenges than it did. St. Hubert’s, in some ways, is a living result of people who, for various reasons chose to drive out in the country to attend a church that uses the 1928 BCP, and some of those people, including Mary Ann Johnstone, were not afforded a positive formational introduction to the trial rites. It might have helped if the Diocese of Lexington had started in 1968, as many other dioceses did, when the formation materials and processes that occurred in some places were in full use. It appears that Lexington did have to play a bit of “catch up” beginning in 1970 and 71.

---

124 The parish I attended with my family until it closed in about 1988, and we began attending St. Hubert’s ca. 1989.
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Overall conclusions

In looking at a nationwide publication, a brief look at *The Living Church* in the beginning of the liturgical revision period\(^{125}\) found at least 20 articles, editorials, or letters to the editor that concerned the LLS. The overall tone, with some exception, of the articles published are very educational in nature, and while some of those articles make suggestions or alterations, or bring up shortcomings in the LLS, there is very much a tone that this is indeed a trial liturgy, and people need to study it. In a November 12, 1967 editorial titled, “The Trial Use: Just That,” *The Living Church* reported an excerpt of a letter from Bishop John S. Higgins, Rhode Island, with the diocesan clergy: “Since this service will be in many ways a great surprise for many of our people, I would hope that in general we should delay the use of this Service until the Lenten season when a special program of instruction and demonstration has been set up by the Department of Christian Education.”\(^{126}\)

The attitude of leadership about liturgical revision was extremely important in regard to the implementation process.\(^{127}\) The information from the Standing Liturgical Commission, as

\(^{125}\) The digital archives of *The Living Church* are easily accessible from 1942-1968, and again from 1976 forward, I reviewed the editions on 1967 and 1968.


\(^{127}\) Leadership seems to be the key in so many situations. In considering St. Andrew’s, Nashville, an Anglo-Catholic congregation, whose revision process was shared by The Rev. Paul Wanter, Fr. Conly was deliberate and careful about formation and implementation. The parish continued in TEC through his retirement, in spite of the fact that at least two of the founders of the SCBCP were active members for a number of years, although Fr. Wanter did not specify at what point Drs. Weatherby and Sullivan departed for different ecclesial bodies. However, two rectors later, the priest did not support the actions of General Convention 2003, regarding affirming the election of TEC’s first openly gay and partnered bishop, The Rt. Rev. V. Gene Robinson, and the congregation left TEC, and the property now houses the offices of the Episcopal Diocese of Tennessee. St. John’s in Dayton, KY, also Anglo-Catholic leaning, whose rector shared the comment regarding who would bear the burden of the cost of revision, ably was navigating the liturgical revision period, even if he was not completely on board. He retired about 1975, and his successor was one who was not on board with either liturgical revision or the ordination of women, and his successor then took the congregation out of TEC in the late 1970s.
well as information provided regarding Redeemer in Cincinnati and the Cathedral of St. Philip in Atlanta: this review includes a number of places that were very deliberate about educating clergy, liturgical commission members on parish and diocesan levels, and educating members of congregations. If a leader of a diocese or a leader of a congregation was not on board with the concept of trial use, it appears that it was more difficult for the clergy or then the laity to embrace it. In considering the formational and pastoral aspects of liturgical change during the time of liturgical revision in The Episcopal Church, it appears that formation, education, training—however it was phrased—it generally was helpful. It did not appear to hurt. Dioceses that took up a deliberate and fulsome formation process like Indianapolis tended to have more people who were generally in favor of the process and felt that the LLS was on the right track.

It also appears that it is difficult to assess pastoral application when looking back, except in a few instances. It would be helpful for those undertaking revision to respect past traditions, even when it is deemed right to change those worship practices. Given the oral history conversation with The Rev. Robert Sessum, he reported doing a profound amount of listening to people during the time of revision, which appears to be a very pastoral action. The desire of Standing Liturgical Commission to have the input of people—to hear their feedback, and the attitude that Redeemer, Cincinnati took on the importance of peoples’ input regarding the process was affirming of their experience, their feelings—these practices have pastoral aspects to them.

Given all this information, and considering the ritual internalization of liturgy, how it changes people, it seems that formation and pastoral sensibilities are necessary when considering a positive experience of liturgical change.
Chapter 4: Constructive Approaches in Christian Formation and Pastoral Leadership

Introduction

In considering how churches might begin to approach liturgical changes in a positive way, the last chapter addressed some dioceses and some congregations that were quite deliberate particularly from a formational standpoint when implementing aspects of the trial rites process in the late 1960s and 1970s. Some made efforts, but there was not a thorough application of the formational approaches, and at least in some occasions, this was detrimental to the acceptance of the trial rites and the Book of Common Prayer (1979).

A notable number of years have passed since then—the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper was published in 1966 and made widely available in early 1968, after its passage as a trial rite at the 1967 General Convention—54 years since its publication. Given that some of the most modern aspects of the formation done during the liturgical revision process concerned filmstrips and audio recordings, which were quite current innovations in the late 1960’s, I wished to consider what general approaches seem to be effective to the people of the second decade of the 21st century by reviewing some formational programs as well as holding conversations with people who implement Christian Formation in Episcopal Churches, and in one case, the Anglican Church of Canada.128

128 I attended “Rooted in Jesus:” a conference co-hosted by Forma (Episcopal Christian Formation network), Forward Movement, the Episcopal Church Foundation, Missional Voices, the Episcopal Evangelism Society, the Episcopal Preaching Foundation, Evangelism Matters, and the Episcopal Diocese of Atlanta. It occurred January 21-24, 2020 in Atlanta, Georgia. I took part in seminars and learning opportunities in order to delve more deeply into constructive and positively received Christian Formation in this current time.
In every case, the program, formation leader, seminar, and learning opportunity encouraged faithfulness, thoughtfulness, prayerfulness, and deliberation. Interestingly, a pastoral approach has been integrated into all the methods.

The Church is indeed different in 2020 than it was in 1967, but even with those differences—the role of women, different numbers of active members, economic resources of congregations—there are also similarities of the Church of 2020 and the Church of 1967. While they are worded differently, the teaching, the catechism, of the Church has some similarities between the 1928 and the 1979 BCPs—one similarity is the call of the people of the Church to worship God. In the 1928 catechism, one is taught what is chiefly learned by the Ten Commandments: duty towards God and towards neighbor. The duty to God is expressed in this way: “To believe in him, to fear him, And to love him with all my heart, with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength: To worship him, to give him thanks: To put my whole trust in him, to call upon him: To honor his holy Name and his Word: And to serve him truly all the days of my life.”

In the 1979 catechism approaches the topic differently, but in more ways. The idea that worship is a central part of our faith occurs throughout the 1979 catechism, as well as in numerous other places in that edition. Worshipping God is one of the primary aspects of a faith life. Formation is another, and there is a large intersection between the two.

---

129“A Catechism, that is to say, an Instruction, to be Learned by Every Person before he be brought to be Confirmed by the Bishop,” from The Book of Common Prayer, (New York: Church Publishing Corp, 1928), 579.
Considering the formation approaches from past generations in the Episcopal Church to the current formation approaches, it may be helpful to note some demographic changes in the Church over that period of time.

In demographic reports provided by The Episcopal Church, the number of baptized members in 1962 was just over 3.5 million people. In 1982, the Church reported a membership of just over 3 million, and in 2002, there were reported about 2.3 million. Here were 1.7 million reported in 2018. It is helpful to note that in 1930, there were about 1.9 million members reported in the Episcopal Church, and the times when TEC grew the most were in the post-World War II period. Decline is not limited to TEC. Gallup reported in 2018 that since 1998, there is at least an 8% decline in Americans affiliating as church members, in Generation X, Baby Boomers, and Traditionalists (people born before 1945).

While all the conversations had many similarities, each formation leader offered their own slightly different viewpoint on positive approaches in Christian Formation. Conversations offering insights on formation occurred with Missy Morain, Director of Program Ministry at St. Matthew’s Episcopal Church, Pacific Palisades, California; Christina Clark, Director of Christian Formation at St. John’s Episcopal Cathedral, Denver, Colorado; Lisa Brown, the Director of Digital Ministry for Membership Vision, The Rev. Canon Dawn Davis, Faith Formation

---


131 According to “Is the Episcopal Church Growing (or Declining)?” by C. Kirk Hadaway, Director of Research, Episcopal Church Center from 2004, there was a marked decline in numbers in 1986—one was to remove all members from non-domestic dioceses, as well as a change in the way that baptized members were reported, which added more scrutiny. [https://episcopalchurch.org/files/2004GrowthReport(1).pdf](https://episcopalchurch.org/files/2004GrowthReport(1).pdf) accessed February 28, 2020.
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Coordinator for the Diocese of Niagara in the Anglican Church of Canada; and Gail Pennington, who has been mentioned earlier in this paper. Gail is the Christian Formation director at St. Andrew’s Episcopal Church in Fort Thomas, Kentucky.

These leaders emphasized establishing an educational foundation on which to build. Other key approaches are intentionality, careful and prayerful preparation, giving the learners an opportunity to reflect on what they are learning both practically and spiritually, accessibility and doing very little off the cuff. Another common theme was identifying the “why” of why something needed to be taught or absorbed by a community.

Lisa Brown offered that any good formation program must have a historical background: does the congregation have a solid formational grounding in the BCP 1979? Brown asserts that solid formation in the current liturgical practices is essential in order for congregation members to consider the background and tradition of the current rites. After that work has occurred then formation around new liturgical change could then occur. She suggested if the one who is offering this formation knows there was a possibility of liturgical change occurring in the future, the formation around current rites could include inviting a few questions of what might be missing, or if there is something that is in a current rite that may not be evoking as constructive an image of God as it might have been in the past? Is there scholarship or a need in the community that is not being met by the current rites? This would have to be done with great care and a considerable amount of formation around our common liturgical practices—with attention to solid Trinitarian expression, some understanding of the basics of the ordo and Eucharistic prayer development from the earliest times, credal understanding, and a core understanding that worship is not for us, but for God. These would be questions not asked lightly, of course.
Careful intentionality as the landmark of good formation programs was a quality asserted by Christina Clark. In considering the quality of intentionality, she invited a review of the community in question: who is present? Is the community primarily made up of people of one generation, or are there many generations present and engaged? In what manners are people of different generations and learning styles involved? What different methods of teaching are available? Is formation on the basics of the Christian faith being attended to overall? She mentioned that St. John’s Cathedral offers a class on the historic Creeds of the Church on a relatively regular basis, as a particular example of continual formation on the foundations of the Christian faith.

Careful and prayerful preparation was a quality emphasized by Missy Morain. She proposed all formation in a congregation should connect to the Baptismal Covenant, or if a congregation was less informed by the Baptismal Covenant, it is key to establish what the congregation’s foundational document is and build and connect to that. She also stressed long lead times for a congregation to deal with any sort of change and that any change should begin with the leadership: the rector and vestry, the staff. When all of those parties generally are on board with the change, the congregational preparation can begin. How many different ways can a potential change be communicated in an inviting and constructive way? In years past there was a bulletin board, a bulletin, possibly a newsletter, and then the verbal forms of communication, like sharing information through verbal announcements at Sunday worship. Today, there is the e-blast, podcast, instagram, Facebook, Twitter, text updates, and more—and the older forms of communication still exist. How could all possible ways of communicating used by a congregation be employed to communicate an upcoming change? There is the delivery, and there is also the message. The language used in the different delivery methods is also extremely
important. Morain would invite congregational leaders to consider what the anxiety points are in a particular congregation and how this upcoming change might either be an anxiety point itself, or if the change might be triggering another anxiety point. Congregational leaders would not avoid making the change, though. The leaders would need to be as conscious of the anxiety points as they are possible, trying to make available and known pastoral support, naming the anxiety point. The whole undertaking of the upcoming change would have to be done in a non-anxious way, and aware that others might be responding with anxiety. The leaders, then, when experiencing someone’s anxiety, could respond not with anger or a lack of affirmation in some way, but with a listening attitude. They could take an attitude of being open to connect that person with an appropriate resource, depending on the needs of the person—it could be a resource person to listen to them, it might be a book or website, or something else entirely. The person feeling anxiety because of the change should truly be heard.

With all of the types of communication, then, the methods of formation might vary depending on the congregation and its makeup. If it is a congregation that is accustomed to lecture style learning, then it may not be the time to introduce a learning + response method. Different methods of offering the formation regarding the change might be considered, depending on the congregational context: times of offering formation—establish the different time periods the people of a particular congregation are best able to engage in formation opportunities: for some it might be on Sunday morning, and others it might be a weeknight.

Offering opportunities to continually reflect spiritually in order to encourage change in a faith community was a quality highlighted by The Rev. Canon Dawn Davis. Davis, the author of
Revive, a small group formation program developed to help congregations to grow in spiritual vitality. In creating Revive, she delved deep into the concept of integration into change behavior as connected to spiritual health and energy. She came at this from a belief that congregational leaders (and many members) were tired, worn out, and under-equipped, and wanted to be able to empower them to live into their baptism more deeply and fully. In studying how lay members could live into their baptism more fully, she found that many people had a very private spiritual life, and did not verbalize their spiritual experience. She found that people needed to live into self-efficacy, which she identified as the belief that a person is able to do something, and that many lay people, especially, did not believe they had the ability to lead a prayer for a group.

This lack, along with the weariness of congregational leaders, led her to create Revive. In the small group, people are given space to reflect on spiritual experiences with another person, and indeed, change behavior through integration. The formation program worked: members in the small group could have actions, behaviors, and practices modeled for them. They then could begin to see that they could be energized by their faith, as opposed to drained by it.

As she considered how people experience and tolerate change, Davis turned to the Diffusion of Innovation Theory. This theory offered a way of explaining how, over time, something (an idea, a product) gains energy and circulates through a particular social system. The outcome of the diffusion is that a social system, made up of individuals, adopt something new. As with any theory, it has its limitations, but Davis, in knowing that congregations needed

---

134 https://revive.forwardmovement.org/
to get out of a rut of being weary and distanced from the empowerment given to them by their baptism into the Body of Christ, used the model as she created and tested *Revive*.

According to Davis, the basis of the formation program is about developing relationships with the group members, as well as deepening (or establishing and then deepening) a relationship with God. She also spoke of managing the risk for the members of the group, as well as the congregation, and when small risks were taken and experienced as successes, then the level of risk could be incrementally increased. When she and I spoke specifically about the topic of constructive approaches to formation considering how liturgical change might be tackled, she felt that any formation regarding potential change, liturgical or otherwise, needed to be grounded in scripture, in order that people could reflect on the change from a Biblical standpoint. This Biblical grounding would give people a common faith language and connect their experiences with the wider story of God and God’s people. She recommended dialogical conversations, rather than lecture or sermon-style teaching and in small groups, as she found that dialogue affords more direct reception of material and more immediate reinforcement because a person processes the information as well as responding to it. She suggested that people needed to be in

---

136 Ibid
a commitment, over a period of time, where they were developing relationships with each other, and with God, as well as deepening their understanding of the change. One other essential, from her perspective, was the ability of people to be able to share their reflections with someone they had established a trusting relationship with.

Accessibility was a quality highlighted by Gail Pennington. As Davis did, Pennington also encouraged formation in a small group, where group members could establish relationships with one another, as well as trust with the group members and the material, in order that the group members would feel comfortable asking open questions as opposed to learning defensively. She also recommended a formation approach that was accessible to the majority of the group. If the group did not have many people in it with an advanced theological education, then aspects of the formation approach might need to be adjusted in order that the group members would find the information attainable and accessible. If there were to be a specialist brought in, that person, optimally, would be a personable speaker.

While there was not agreement that there is any one program, or method that is the ideal for all, the qualities described by these formation leaders share many similarities. Any approaches to formation would be well served by these qualities of intentionality, foundational teaching, careful and prayerful preparation, opportunities to reflect on what is being learned, accessible programs, and inviting and establishing the ‘why’ of a particular area of formation. Additionally, one quality that seems to pervade is context. What works in one large, economically well-resourced congregation is not necessarily possible or appropriate in a congregation with an average Sunday attendance of 7.
Pastoral Approach

After conducting both the oral history and the formation leader conversations, I have surmised that the constructive and positive approaches to formation naturally include a pastoral approach. In thinking back to the oral history conversation with The Rev. Robert L. Sessum, he spoke about being available to listen to people about how they were feeling, how they were experiencing this shift, and he described listening extensively to a number of people over a long period of time. He made himself pastorally available to those congregation members who needed to be able to express what they were feeling about the changes.

Practically, the recommendation from Missy Morain of St Matthew’s Episcopal Church, Pacific Palisades, where she shared the importance of being aware of anxiety points in a congregation to be a part of the process leading up to a change is absolutely pastoral in nature, as well as considering the learning styles of all people involved. Depending on the size and resources available in a given congregation, that may expand or limit the breadth of an implementation process, however, pastoral sensibilities will take the resource of time, but otherwise there is likely not another associated cost.

Concluding Thoughts

The question of “constructive approaches to formation and pastoral sensibilities” emerged from a basic standpoint: the Standing Liturgical Commission, Associated Parishes, and other diocesan and congregational leaders’ formational offerings would naturally change to some extent because of the change in educational resources and technology over time. There were shifts in the understanding of how people best absorb a change that the Episcopal Church did not employ in the 1960s and 70s, compared with formation approaches in the current time.
There was some consistency from the formation leaders regarding the need for people to be able to reflect and respond in dialogue with other people concerning the information they had been given, rather than to simply hear it. The formation programs available in the 1960s and 70s were not devoid of reflection and response on the part of those learning about the trial rites, as the surveys themselves were absolutely a way to reflect and respond and the efforts the SLC undertook to make, distribute, collect, and analyze those surveys was great. There is some evidence that people were thankful for being asked their input, but there is also evidence that people were distrusting of the SLC and their process, and were doubtful that anyone “on Madison Avenue”\textsuperscript{137} would even reflect on what they had written. We know this is not the case.

It is less clear about how much dialogical reflection occurred in the trial rites period, but it is not unreasonable to take away that current leaders would encourage that kind of action in order for the information to be better and optimally, more positively absorbed.

There were some similarities between what happened in some ways with the trial rites implementation and the current recommendations around positive formational approach—the primary one that comes to mind is deliberation. It was certainly the intent of the SLC that all dioceses and congregations would have some “training” on the trial rites: members of the SLC made themselves available to teach about the trial rites. At one point, H. Boone Porter went on a cross country tour teaching, and others like Bonnell Spencer and Massey Shepherd were making presentations in different locations across the church. Leo Malania wrote many pieces of correspondence to the seemingly countless people who wrote to him about this, and a notable number of those people were the chairs of diocesan liturgical commissions,

\textsuperscript{137} David B. Collins, “We’ll Never Be the Same,” 39.
but he was very deliberate in carefully responding to many, many people about their insights, complaints, and thoughts about the trial rites.

Some other insights gained from speaking with formation leaders about current constructive approaches, such as having an engaging speaker—the qualities of the speakers were harder to ascertain. An attempt to track down the audio recording provided to all congregations in the Diocese of Indianapolis was unsuccessful, however, there is reasonable evidence that showed that there were speakers qualified in different areas of liturgical revision that went to any number of places, and that people found the speakers informative and helpful, but not more information on the ways in which the speakers were engaging.

Overall, the differences between the time of liturgical revision in the Episcopal Church and our current time in reference to formation approaches are somewhat but not totally different. One thing to note is that the places that did have thorough and deliberate formation in the revision period seemed to have a generally more positive reception of the trial rites than the places that did not have those opportunities afforded to them.
Chapter 5: A Possible Formational and Pastoral Approach to Liturgical Change

Given what has been asserted about ritual theory, the case study concerning the implementation of the trial rites, and input from current formation leaders in the Episcopal Church and Anglican Church of Canada, the following is offered as a possible approach to liturgical change.

Two slightly different approaches will be offered. The first approach is a more specific hypothetical situation that might apply to the formational and pastoral aspects of implementing an overarching possible proposed supplemental text for wider use in The Episcopal Church. The second would be a brief outline of implementing liturgical change more generally.

The first hypothetical situation is for the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music (SCLM) to propose a hypothetical trial rite that, if affirmed by the hypothetical General Convention, might be available for alternate use throughout the Episcopal Church, something akin to the Church of England’s *Common Worship*, which is an alternate set of rites that are used widely but have not supplanted the Book of Common Prayer (1662). It will be referred to as the proposed supplemental rite.

First hypothetical situation

*Beginning with Liturgical Commissions and foundational formation*

Much like Standing Liturgical Commission did in the 1960s as well as the 2018 General Convention did when it passed resolution A068,138 diocesan bishops would be called on to ensure that diocesan liturgical commissions would be in place as well in advance as is feasible,

---

optimally at least three years before any actual education on the new trial rite would occur.\textsuperscript{139} Knowing that each diocese in the Church operates differently and at different paces, some of that time would be needed for the diocesan bishop and the bishop’s advisors to assemble the diocesan commissions. Where feasible, congregational liturgical commissions would also be encouraged.

The culture of every diocese is somewhat different, and the relationship between a bishop, clergy, and congregations is somewhat unique in each locale. During this proposed three years, in addition to establishing, re-establishing, or re-acquainting diocesan and congregational liturgical committees to their activity, the advice of The Rev. Leo Malania would be brought to the forefront: “what we need in the third period of trial is a massive program in Christianity.”\textsuperscript{140} This time would provide bishops and liturgical commissions an opportunity to have a deliberate time of formation on the basics of Christianity, and an even more deliberate formation time on the Book of Common Prayer (1979). The forms of this are myriad, but the bishop, (ideally the diocesan clergy), and the diocesan and local commissions could direct this on a local level. Congregations that are very small could look to the diocesan commission for formational implementation, if such support was needed.

How would bishops, clergy, and members of congregations consider this kind of foundational formation effort was a needed thing? Consider the overall decline in Christianity since the peak of the post-World War II generation: with the growth in population, there has not been an accompanying amount of growth in the mainline Church. Theologians David Lose and

\textsuperscript{139} I am not taking into account the actions needed at General Convention to allow this process to occur. There is another level of education and communication that is needed in order for the GC to pass such an action. In this hypothetical scenario, I am assuming all needed General Convention actions. I should also mention that I am assuming a relatively good relationship between a bishop and the clergy of that bishop’s diocese, as well as a relatively good relationship between the clergy leading a congregation and the members of that congregation. I also realize that this proposal is being suggested for an Episcopal vacuum, and many Episcopal entities may not wish to undertake such a process, but this is a jumping-off point, and suggesting an ideal that could be adapted in diocesan and local contexts.

\textsuperscript{140} Malania, “Letter to Canon Johnson.”
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Dwight Zscheile, among others, have spoken about the plurality of stories that now exist in the world today and that many Christians in developed countries, the United States especially, have abdicated their faith stories. Even if a bishop, clergy members, or congregational members might not initially be in favor of liturgical revision in the form of a supplemental rite, there is great evidence that basic Christian discipleship is needed in many, many areas in the Episcopal Church. And as one of the Episcopal Church’s primary charisms is a deep connection to God through the liturgy, Christian formation about the liturgy as it currently stands would serve the people of God well.

While a diocese could indeed craft a plan together for this work on their own, a foundational reminder is that the act of the liturgy, in many ways, is a mystery and it is formational all by itself. Teaching about the Book of Common Prayer, its history, its theology, its composition, its message centered in baptism is appropriate and good in formation classes, as well as in sermons, in newsletters, podcasts, the occasional instructional Eucharist, or in the time for announcements having one teaching moment about the liturgy each Sunday that does not interrupt the flow of the liturgy—all of that is good. What could be advised against is a regularly interrupted principal service Eucharist where everything is explained on a regular basis.

Reaching back to chapter 2 on ritual theory, we learn that there is very strong evidence that ritual action, such as liturgy, changes a person biologically and emotionally, so the formation of the liturgy itself is something that acts without constant education accompanying every moment.141

141 It might be as if one shared with a friend that she was going to the library and the friend described every item in detail about the computers the library uses to check out books to a patron, and the type of paper that is used to give the patron their receipt—many of those details are not necessary and very well could overwhelm and discourage the patron from having a positive experience at the library.
The Supplemental Rite is Approved for Trial Use

It would be the hope that the congregations have now been more thoroughly grounded in the foundations of the Christian faith and the liturgy that is currently in use. I am going to use as my premise a bishop and a diocese that are not against the implementation of a proposed supplemental rite, but it may not be fully embracing, either. It would be the hope that bishops and diocesan leadership might look back to how diocesan leadership who were not embracing of the trial rites, or of the BCP 1979, that there were challenges of community that existed in those locations, and that they might at least try to be open to this new process for the sake of unity and the movement of the Spirit.

The SCLM (or other appropriate body established by General Convention) would have produced quality materials about the proposed supplemental rite. These would offer the rationale, the background, the theological research, as well as a ritual theory outlook on how ritual shapes people, and how the proposed supplemental rite recommends responding to the Church’s current theological and more that the local diocese would have access to.

A bishop and a diocesan liturgical commission would undertake to study those background materials thoroughly. The bishop and DLC would be encouraged begin communicating with diocesan leadership about the proposed supplemental rite—via online messaging, through whatever means the bishop would normally communicate to the leadership, to get the leadership informed that formation was coming about the proposed supplemental rite.

The bishop and DLC would then hold formation sessions about that material with the diocesan leadership—both the clergy, as well as the lay members of diocesan leadership bodies, like the Standing Committee, or in many dioceses, there is also a diocesan council which goes by many names. These sessions might be included in normal meeting times, and the foundational
sessions would be presented in an engaging and questioning kind of way. From the beginning, the message that peoples’ input, their experience regarding the proposed supplemental rite and the formation around it was essential to the wider Church. In gleaning from the experience of the Church of the Redeemer in Cincinnati, the fact that the congregation was assured on a regular basis that the wider Church needed their input and reflections on the trial rites was a significant impetus to that congregation undertaking the revision process as well and as thoroughly as they did.¹⁴²

Also to be considered would be how each congregation would begin to form the leadership locally. Clergy and congregational leadership could undertake a similar method employed by the Cathedral of St. Philip, although it could be modified slightly in light of the Diffusion of Innovation model. Congregational leaders could consider who are the innovators, early adopters, and even the early majority might be in the congregation, and invite those people, in addition to vestry and other key leadership to be a part of the initial formational task force. Depending on the size of the congregation, the group could be subdivided as to be able to have about six but no more than around twelve people in each subgroup of the task force. Some small congregations might have the entire congregation undertaking the exercise.

As the leadership at St. Philip did, to invite any others who wished to be a part of the group to do so, provided that they, and all the people on the early team covenanted to read the

¹⁴² Something to note: a significant number of people who attend Redeemer have, for a long period of time, been connected with the Procter and Gamble Company, based in Cincinnati. This is purely conjecture, but I wonder if the environment of a congregation where people worked for an entity that valued research, development, and feedback added to the positivity of the implementation of formation for the trial rites and the rites themselves was a part of a culture that feedback is important and valued, therefore, that charism at Redeemer was particularly appropriate in that context. This leads to the thought of bishops, DLCs, and congregational liturgical commissions considering what the charisms of particular congregations are and looking at formation and implementation through the lens of that charism.
agreed upon formation materials.143 Considering the positive experience of the spiritual 
formation that exists in small groups, as offered in the Revive program, this task force could be 
set out in a small group model, with typically no more than 12 people in the group. Key factors 
would be relationship building both with other group members as well as a deepening of 
relationship with God. Each subgroup,144 with a leader trained both in the content as well as in 
small group formation and development, would meet on a regular basis for a prescribed period 
of five months. Ideally, the group would meet at least every other week for the timeframe, and 
attention would be given in each session for prayerful reflection, reading, reflecting, and 
responding on the foundational information provided by the SCLM as well as worshipping using 
the rites on a regular basis. At each subgroup gathering, an appointed person would write down 
the reflections and responses of the group and respond to any specific input requested by the 
SCLM. A particular piece of this work would be for very deliberate listening to occur—both on 
the part of those who are excited about the proposed supplemental liturgy as well as those who 
are less excited about it, and all of those reflections would be shared with the Diocesan 
Liturgical Committee, who in turn would share it with the SCLM.

Given input from congregational task forces, the bishop and DLC could then evaluate if 
additional formation was needed—in the form of additional formation, and the bishop, in 
consultation with the DLC could set a time for congregational usage of the proposed 
supplemental rite. Ideally, this would be something like the season after Epiphany—longer than 
Advent, but possibly not so long as the season after Pentecost. Before the season was to begin, a 
congregational and diocesan communication strategy would be developed. The strategy would

143 Note that most Episcopal congregations are not the size of the Cathedral of St. Philip in Atlanta, GA, so most 
would rarely have the group size they did in the late 1960s, a group of over 50 members.
144 This group model could also be a model for a diocesan liturgical commission.
consider the different types of messaging in every congregationally used form. Messaging would be employed in positive ways—and this would be tailored to the particular congregation, but the bishop, clergy (or senior/bishop’s warden, in the absence of clergy in charge), DLC, and appropriate members of the congregational task force would consider, as appropriate, how the message should be conveyed in each context. The SCLM could also develop some communications assistance in this regard, that local dioceses could adapt in their context, as well as call upon appropriate people in the SCLM to help to develop appropriate messaging. Some of this messaging would be more like a simple announcement to let members know what is happening, and other messaging would be more deliberately formational in nature. This might take the form of sermon-based teaching, congregational forums that were giving a background on the proposed supplemental rite, as well as formation on the rite and its background in the bulletin, newsletter, and other formats. Appropriate social media formation platforms should also be employed, if there is adequate support to accomplish that task. Would a formational video or podcast be appropriate for a given congregation?

The congregational messaging should employ the congregational charism quality referred to earlier as occurred at Redeemer in Cincinnati. It would be vital to communicate that the input of this congregation is valuable and needed in this process or connect with a charism unique to that particular congregation in encouraging both an open mind and heart to the liturgical experience. Added to this is that the congregation is informed of what is happening. In many congregations, a small group model could be offered openly and widely throughout the congregation, much like what the task force group/subgroup undertook for those people who would be interested in studying and reflecting in that way, for the people who were not quite ready to participate on the first go-round, but have been interested or intrigued by the task force’s work. The SCLM, or if this were to occur on a diocesan level, the DLC, might also
wish to be prepared for more organically-grown groups that reflect on the trial rites through social media format, and be prepared to be in relationship with those groups as well.  

As the trial period began, formational opportunities and messaging would continue, and availability to pastoral reflection should be made widely known. The clergyperson/people, or original task force group members who are particularly pastoral listeners could and should be ready to hear from people who wish to share their input in a more personal way. These pastoral listeners would optimally be continually non-anxious, as there could be anxiety shared from congregational members.

The community, optimally, would then be the active participants in the liturgy, and experience the proposed supplemental rite from the worshipping perspective for a period of time. As the time continues, the clergy and the congregational task force could assess if another period, after returning to the rites regularly used by the congregation, would be appropriate to this congregation. Throughout the trial time, messaging about the need of peoples’ input would continue. At the end of the trial time, the input would be received, reviewed, and analyzed, and then shared with the DLC, who would also review, analyze, reflect on from a diocesan perspective, and share with the SCLM.

Optimally, the SCLM would then assemble and analyze the input they had received and share their reflections widely, so people would be affirmed in the fact that they had participated and shared their reflections and experience. Some of this might take the form, as Malania did with his profuse letter writing, in direct feedback, and some might take the form of shared reflection on a wide scale, like the publishing of a report, and there could be other formats used, 

---

145 These organic groups might be open to the formation process as described for the congregational task force, but modified for the format in which the group assembles.
like a video reflection or podcast, or other appropriate forms of messaging that is thankful and encouraging in nature.

Bishops, in consultation with DLCs, local clergy, and congregational task forces, could then decide if more trial time would be helpful, or the bishop could make the proposed supplemental rite approved for use subject to her/his direction. If a diocese were so inclined, they could decide in what ways they wished to engage with the proposed supplemental rite on the General Convention level. Formation and a non-anxious pastoral attitude should continue in appropriate ways, given that the Church is an organic body that expands, contracts, and changes.

**Second hypothetical situation**

*A general system of implementing liturgical change*

In this second hypothetical situation, it is very deliberately general, so it could optimally be applied in different situations. First, a need for a change is identified. It could be introducing *Enriching Our Worship*, or the new expansive language versions of Eucharistic Prayers A, B, and D, or it could also be something to do with spatial change in the worship space—taking flags out of the sanctuary or nave. An assessment of the relationship between the clergy leader and the congregation should be reviewed. Does this clergy person have a positive relationship with the congregation? Are there significant stresses that the congregation is dealing with right now that would make such a change very difficult or impossible to healthfully make at the current time? Asking the “why” and being able to begin to share the answer of the “why” question of the potential change is extremely important on the part of the clergy leader—how will this enrich and build up the Body of Christ?
Once that initial assessment has occurred, the clergy leader begins prayerfully, thoughtfully, and dialogically talking with the congregation’s leadership—the vestry, in many Episcopal churches—about the change. Formation that absolutely includes the “why” would be important in these early conversations, as getting the leadership on board from the beginning will be a determining factor to the overall healthy transition in this change process.

Once the vestry is on board, and a program of formation is agreed upon (and this could be somewhat informal, or as formal as proposed in the first hypothetical situation, but it the type of change will determine what level of formality the formation should be: is this a new and different worship service, or is the clergy person wishing to go from a lectern and pulpit to a central ambo, given the architectural feasibility of such a suggestion?), then the messaging and formation time begins. Sermon-based teaching, formation classes, bulletin/newsletter-based information and formation, social media-based information/formation, and more would likely make up the communication and formational formula. People would be asked to be open to the formation and given a chance to give their feedback both in a pastoral setting (“that lectern was given in memory of my beloved grandmother”) and if the type of change warrants it, other avenues for feedback would be created—an online or paper feedback form, if appropriate.

This would occur over a number of weeks, in order to be able to reach as much of the congregation as possible. After the time of formation, then the clergy leader and vestry would make the change, continuing to offer formational support in print, and in verbal form, and continual opportunity to come and speak to the clergy leader or vestry about the change would be reiterated for a period of time. Depending on the feedback, the clergy leader and vestry would review how the change is going, and then make a determination if some level of alteration would be appropriate—going back to the former system, or modifying somewhat, or living fully into
the new change. Opportunities for formation in sermons or other print/online formats might be used periodically to bolster both that change, as well as continued disciple development.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Change is inevitable. Liturgical change is no exception to this. Liturgical change, when done purposefully, often has the opportunity to be done more successfully when constructive formation occurs before the change, and the time of formation as well as the time during and after the change are approached with a respectful and helpful pastoral sensibility.

In considering this question of liturgical change, ritual theorists have offered studies that show that the human body is altered by ritualized behavior. These scholars assert that ritual is internalized. There are studies that show emotions are affected. When considering a potential liturgical change, or a series of changes, these qualities should be taken into account, and while formation and a positive pastoral approach will not change the hearts and minds of every person, a constructive and deliberate formational approach will serve dioceses, congregations, and individuals well.

Looking back to the implementation of the trial rites in the Episcopal Church in the 1960s and 1970s, the Standing Liturgical Commission, and those who supported its efforts, such as many in Associated Parishes, were actively offering formational opportunities, and they were also encouraging formational opportunities. The chair of the revision process, The Rev. Leo Malania, modeled pastoral behavior in his careful work to respond to correspondence, to reports submitted by Diocesan Liturgical Commissions, and to encourage dioceses, congregations, clergy, and individuals in their efforts of formation. The great challenge the Episcopal Church encountered is that not all dioceses, congregations, clergy, and laity participated in such formational efforts. The ones who did have more constructive and deliberate formational opportunities seem to have more positive receptions of the trial rites, and thus the BCP 1979. The extremely thorough process implemented in the Diocese of Indianapolis or at the Cathedral
of St. Philip, Atlanta are excellent examples, or the continued energy and deliberation in the revision process at the Church of the Redeemer, Hyde Park, Cincinnati is another good example.

Timing also was important. The first step of the change to the *Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper* was, in some ways, a baby step. A church entity that missed that first baby step, as the Diocese of Lexington did, seem to have had a more challenging time of revision. Leadership being on board with the revision process also seems to be key in positive reception. Bishop Hosea of Lexington was open to the revision process, but his predecessor was not.

Formation approaches that might be used in considering how to implement liturgical change are contextual, but they optimally build on a constructive foundation of Christian Formation that has included conferring a basic understanding of the Christian faith as well as formation on the current liturgies. Leadership would ideally be the first people formed, and they would hopefully join in forming others. Any formational approaches used should be intentional, done with careful and prayerful preparation, give opportunities to reflect on what is being taught, be accessible to those in the community, and establish the ‘why’ of the formation topic.

Pastoral approaches to the implementation of liturgical change include honoring a person’s or a community’s experience and their emotion, and intentional listening to those experiencing the change, and honoring their experience as valid are essential.

Liturgical change should rarely be done without prayerful and deliberate thought and preparation, as the act of liturgy is our worship of God. Presiders have a distinct and humbling responsibility to the laity to lead them in this sacred worship, and liturgical change may indeed be appropriate and sometimes is warranted, but it should seldom be done without deliberate and constructive formation and particular attention to the pastoral sensibilities of the people of God.
Appendix A

Timeline on the wall of the undercroft at Redeemer, Hyde Park in Cincinnati. Note that under the 1960s sign on the left, it indicates that Redeemer was designated as a “test parish” for the trial liturgies. On the right panel is pictured all four trial books preceding the 1979 BCP.
Appendix B

Graphic Communication in *The Church Advocate* from the Diocese of Lexington

Graphic on the top from the May 1971 edition, graphic on the bottom from the September 1971 edition
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From the September 1972 edition
Appendix C: Conversations

Oral History Conversations:

Mary Ann Johnstone, December 26, 2019 in Richmond, Kentucky

The Rev. (Henry) Paul Wanter, December 27, 2019 in Cynthiana, Kentucky

The Rev. Bruce Boss, December 30, 2019 in Georgetown, Kentucky

The Rev. Robert L. Sessum, December 31, 2019, via telephone. He lives in Raleigh, North Carolina

Frances Keller Swinford Barr, January 7, 2020 in Lexington, Kentucky

The Rev. (John) Joseph Pennington and Gail Pennington, January 12, 2020 in Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky

Michael Krug and Elizabeth Grover, February 10, 2020 in Cincinnati, Ohio

The Rev. Andrew MacAdoih Jergens, February 10, 2020 in Cincinnati, Ohio

Formation Conversations:

Gail Pennington, January 12, 2020 in Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky

Lisa Brown, January 21, 2020 in Atlanta, Georgia

Christina Clark, January 21, 2020 in Atlanta, Georgia

Missy Morain, January 21, 2020 in Atlanta, Georgia

The Rev. Cn. Dawn Davis, January 22, 2020 in Atlanta, Georgia
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