

Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music
March 29th-April 1st
The Maritime Institute, Linthicum Heights

Members Present: Devon Anderson (Chair), Wayne Smith (Vice-Chair), Liza Anderson (Secretary), Tom Breidenthal, Sam Candler, Christopher Decatur, Paul Fromberg, Athena Hahn, Ellen Johnston, Shannon Johnston, Drew Keane, Dorsey McConnell, Jessica Nelson, Steven Plank, Jim Turrell, Sandye Wilson

Others Present: Paul Burrows (Representative of the President of the House of Deputies), Nancy Bryan (Liaison with Church Publishing), Juan Oliver (Custodian of the Book of Common Prayer), Michael Pipkin (Project Manager)

Excused: Martha Burford, Ana Hernandez, Jeff Lee, Thomas Alexander (Liaison of Executive Council)

March 29th, 2017

The meeting opened at 1:30 with prayer and a review of the agenda. We welcomed new member Sam Candler and spent time getting to know one another better and updating about our lives.

We resumed with business at 4:00. Devon led us through four reports that she has posted on the extranet about writing our Blue Book reports and submitting budget requests.

Devon and Dorsey will be compiling and editing the SCLM Blue Book Report, but all of the subcommittees need to take responsibility for writing the reports and any resolutions from their subcommittees.

There is a Budget Request Info file from the Executive Council. This information is due by **April 30th**, asking both about next triennium and whether there is additional funding needed for this triennium. In our case, there should not be any groups that need additional funding for this triennium. For next triennium, there are some strategic questions that we need to answer at this meeting. How do we budget for something like Prayer Book when General Convention could choose any of our 4 options, and those options have totally different budget implications?

Some of these liturgical resources also have budget implications in terms of translation. Who is responsible for certifying these translations? Where precisely in the budget is the money for translations expenses coming from? We will ask Michael Barlowe to speak with us about this.

Our committee report is due to the General Convention Office on **December 1**, but our subcommittees will need to have our individual reports in at a date prior to this, to be determined. We will spend a lot of time at the next meeting working on all of that in detail, but don't come to that meeting having never looked at any of those materials before!

If any resolutions are going to have canonical impact, it is definitely helpful to know that now rather than in October, because they will have to pass canonical review at General Convention, and the sooner we start working through any potential issues the better.

Ellen and Jim presented to us about the upcoming conferences that will be held at Virginia and Sewanee. When the 1979 prayer book came around, a lot of people had no idea what was actually happening; for some of them it was just people taking away their pretty language. Important to have a conversation in the church about all of these issues that is both broad and deep. In this dual consultation, the first part of it at VTS on June 1 and 2, 2017 will be talking about the historical piece- how did we get from 1928 to 1979. Frank Griswold will lead the first plenary, looking at the transition from 1928 to 1979, and Lizette Larsen-Miller will lead the second, covering the period from 1979 to the present. Then there will be panel discussions.

The Sewanee conference will be October 11-14. There will be a plenary on the state of liturgical revision around the Anglican communion, and then breaking into groups to talk about the different “chunks” of the prayer book. Finally, there will be a plenary about unfinished agendas and possible directions for the future.

This is mainly an academic conversation. They have invited the liturgy professors from all of the seminaries. We also have funding to send 4 people from the SCLM to these conferences. The hope is that for the most part people will go to both. Talk to Devon if you would like to go.

There will be a special issue of the Sewanee Theological Review will publish papers from both conferences, which should be out before General Convention.

VTS is also going to host a conference on hymnal revision on October 23 and 24.

The question was raised of whether the SCLM should be hosting private conversations by academics for academics, or should we be hosting public conversations for the benefit of the church? It was pointed out that we are not technically hosting these conferences at all, but the respective seminaries are. We need a real dialogue going on between the academic community and the church, because all of our liturgies come from certain theological presumptions, and those risk being incoherent.

The hope is to record the plenaries for distribution for the rest of the church, but perhaps not the round table discussions. Livestreaming might be a possibility, but there may not be technological capability for that. Livestreaming can work really well as a communication tactic, to build momentum and enthusiasm, so at least with the big name keynote speakers that might be a helpful tactic. They will investigate whether that is technologically possible or not.

There is also the pastoral task of ministering to the anxiety that the question of Prayer Book revision raises on the ground, whether that is from people who desperately want revision or from those who desperately don't. These are often passionately held views that are often blessedly free of actual information.

Devon will be on sabbatical from four and a half months. Wayne is going to chair in her absence and Drew will provide backup support.

We adjourned for dinner.

Joint meeting of members of the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music and members of the Standing Commission on Structure, Governance, Constitution, and Canons

March 29th, 7pm-9pm

SCLM members: Devon Anderson, Drew Keane, Wayne Smith, Liza Anderson, Paul Burrows
SCSGCC members: Polly Getz, Wendell Gibbs, Molly James, Megan Castellan, Christopher Hayes, Sally Johnson

Drew gave an overview of his proposal- an addition to article 10 and a change to canon 2, which would specify a Book of Occasional Services (those not in the BCP), Propers for the Calendar, Liturgical alternatives to what is in the BCP (with approval of bishops), and previous BCPs (with approval of bishops)

Probably do need different categories for what is supplemental and what is additional, with a lower bar for what is supplemental.

The need for approval by the bishop is not actually in the canons. Currently these liturgies are entirely extra-canonical, and there is (perhaps) a norm, or (perhaps) just a few previous instances of the practice, that nevertheless creates some kind of precedent and expectation.

It's going to be a problem to get something in the canons that makes a liturgy subject to the bishop diocesan. But there could be a category that is "terms and condition set in the resolution", which includes authorization, time limit, feedback, etc.

Right now no precedent for how these canonical vessels would be changed. The proposal differentiated well between the categories of vessels, but did not differentiate between how to change them. Right now it would seem as easy or hard to change something "made available" as it is change something that is an alternative to the BCP. That is presumably not what we would intend?

We ended up with the "made available" category by mistake, because we didn't know how to say no to people.

Not clear how to amend something that is merely "made available", or if the SCLM even should when it has no official status.

The Canons recognize other authorized liturgies, but the Constitution has only the BCP and trial use liturgies intended towards the passage of a new BCP. Article 10 "no alteration or addition thereto" arguably does prohibit other liturgies, although that certainly hasn't stopped anyone.

Might think about taking provisions for trial use out of the constitution and put them in the canons where they can be more easily changed.

Most bishops assume that the BOS and LFF are authorized and require no additional authorization by the bishops. But nowhere does it actually say that!

Perhaps a paper or piece of history needs to be written to General Convention to deal with the lore and to educate people about this history.

Is it possible for something to move up the chain from a lower level of authorization to a higher one? How?

Really two separate issues- one is the issue of these canonical vessels (all of these little boats), and the other is the issue of how to amend the prayer book, which is really like a whole separate flotilla of boats.

Might be worth explicitly saying what is already implicit, which is that the BCP is the standard of doctrine, and that there are other things which are fully authorized but are *not* the standard of doctrine.

What is the Episcopal Church's doctrine? It is explicitly defined in title IV.

Rather than trying to amend the Constitution at this stage, it might be better to present "amend Constitution" as part of one of the options to the church, and not to try to touch any of that now.

Could make it so that every liturgy has to have one of these designations, so that you can't just wantonly make up a new category like "made available". Every liturgy must specify what canon it is being adopted in accordance with.

In addition to designating places for new liturgies, we have to have someone go back and look at everything that already exists and figure out which category governs it. And also someone needs to keep track of all of these liturgies, and that is something that could arguably be made part of the mandate of the SCLM, along with looking at new liturgies to certify that they are in conformity with the BCP (if that is the standard of doctrine).

Things could then be re-classified from category to category by General Convention resolution.

Perhaps alternatives to the Book of Common Prayer should require a super majority and a vote by orders, but not two conventions, and supplemental liturgies would require only a simple majority, since we do want there to be a higher standard for the former than for the latter.

The SCSGCC will get the SCLM a draft by **June 1st**. Wayne will take point for the SCLM on this, so that Devon can enjoy her sabbatical.

Thursday March 30th

We met in subcommittees all morning, and reconvened in plenary at 2pm for a read-through of the draft liturgies for the Book of Occasional Services.

We were urged to send grammatical or minor corrections directly to author. This is the place for big overview thematic questions that need discussion.

Saint Francis:

- Problem with naming the first person of the Trinity as Creator.
- Creator, Redeemer Sanctifier: don't automatically assume that EOW language can be transferred to the BOS. If the BOS is to have a higher level of authorization, that needs discussing.
- Psalms are not usually used as a reading
- p. 3 the different responses for people can cause confusion
- Francis is a lot more than just animals and creation
- “creation” is not just what is out there in “nature”, but we are also a part of God's creation
- cut the language of icons of unconditional love
- “friendship” might be better rendered as “communion” or “fellowship” to more adequately reflect our theology
- Prayer attributed to Saint Francis- lots of problems with this, not Franciscan and Francis would probably never have said it. Maybe hide it in the back in the written material rather than in the liturgy proper.
- Presider/celebrant/officiant is an issue that needs to be taken up at greater length later, for consistency across liturgy.

Seasonal Blessings

- Passed into the heavens, or ascended into heaven?
- Instead of Ascensiontide, have “from the Ascension until the Eve of Pentecost”
- “overshadowing” can be a somewhat complicated word. Can we think of something that sounds less threatening?
- instead of Christ, use either Son or Word
- Careful about consistency of Trinitarian language across liturgies so that the book feels internally coherent

Concerning the Advent wreath

Given that a lot of parishes do make a big thing of this at the Sunday liturgy, do we acknowledge that? Do we explain why you should not do that? It might be helpful to explain why, because no one is going to stop what they are doing just because the SCLM says so! There are a lot of contradictory theologies going around, where each candle has a particular significance, and they don't agree with each other. Might be useful to be more didactic in the report.

Lessons and Music

- Why is it Lessons and Music when everyone calls it Lessons and Carols?
- If it can't be carols, then perhaps Lessons and sounds a bit better
- Weird benediction? The Son is the King of the angels, so this is Father, Son, and Son?
- Cut reference to the lucernarium since we cut it

Blessing of a crèche

- Do we need this? Are people using it? Yes, in a number of places.
- Presumably people who do this know why there is incense and holy water in the procession...
- Change sacrament to sign, since “sacrament” is a bit of an overtranslation of the Latin here
- Change mass to eucharist

Candlemas

- Son who lives and reigns with you God...problematic Trinitarian theology

- Procession- ideally involves everyone, but best not to define that rubrically because various churches have architectural limitations
- Beeswax- it may not be made by bees.
- It's arguably not the candles that are important; it's the light. But, for some people it is the candles!
- Could we have multiple collects, with an option that's more about the bees and the wax and an option that is more about the light?

Tenebrae

- “This”- what is “this”? “This service”.
- Is the history lesson necessary? Might be best to cut that.
- May not want to put a link to the SCLM website in a public document. And right now we don't really have an online repository of liturgies.
- Might help us to be aware that most parishes that do this have it on Wednesday night, and therefore can perhaps simplify the directions about all of the different other times when one could do it.

Catechumenate

- Addressing all these petitions to Christ in the litany “we pray to you O Christ”? Much more normal in the tradition to address prayer to the first person of the Trinity...Did this happen just because we didn't want to say “Lord”?
- Prayers for catechists are lengthy, but they are intended to be chosen from, not that one should do all of them. Might nevertheless be a good discipline to go through some of these and see what might be omitted.
- p. 2, don't separate subject from infinitives
- nothing in here about mission- but perhaps shouldn't be, because that promise to commit to the mission of God happens in baptism, whereas now we are asking them to attend worship and be formed.
- Unto the ages of ages seems archaic
- p. 12 Trinitarian theology needs fixing
- not just deceit and sin, but also sin and death

Preparation of Parents and Godparents

- “They have been interpreting God's Word, getting to know us, making friends, and participating with us in worship.” “getting to know us” and “making friends” seems problematic- may or may not be happening, and is more about their social experience in the congregation than faith as such.
- Feels a bit scripted at points. Might be “officiant might say some such things”
- Might be worth saying “parent(s)” with the s in brackets, because you can't assume that every child is being presented by two parents.
- Feels perhaps like a germ of something that needs to be developed rather than something that is fully baked.
- Don't necessarily want a false distinction between parents and sponsors because we have all kinds of family structures and it is not necessarily the case that people are being presented by “parents”.
- Priesthood might be a model in the sense of “this is what you are getting yourself into. Do you feel called and willing to do it?” What we are really asking them to do is take on the teaching office of the church, which is a solemn charge, not just “getting to know us”.
- We want to take this seriously, but we don't want to put too many barriers in the way either.

-“We embrace you and pledge our support and prayers” seems a little thin. Is there a way to beef this up more?

-Rite doesn’t really say anything about what baptism IS. No washing, regeneration, resurrection.

-Maybe if that piece was in there, it might impart some of the gravitas and what one is about to embark on.

-Might ask the editor to integrate the language of the three rites so that they are consistent. But perhaps the committee can get a start on it, because that’s really beyond the scope of what we have hired him to do.

-A way of pushing back against the parents who come and say, “The grandparents are in town. Can we get the baby done next week after church?” (Although all of this is optional.)

-Parishes are at really different places on this, including even the question of public vs. private baptism, so this is a way to push them gently in the direction of living more deeply into the ’79 prayer book.

Confirmation/Reception/Reaffirmation

-Might we invite them to serve with us and seek justice? A good place to talk about kingdom of God

We adjourned for the night.

March 31st

We began the meeting by continuing the work of looking at draft liturgies from the Book of Occasional Services.

Reincorporation after traumatic absence

-Does it seem odd to be using the same rite for both returning from war and returning from prison?

-Would it be possible for all of these to be made generic? There can be healing in naming the traumatic event, but if we left it as a fill-in-the blank, people can adapt as appropriate.

-The order may need some work. It feels pastorally strange for the person to address the congregation followed merely by a prayer from the celebrant. If we moved the versicles and responses, that might help. Or even a rubric saying “silence may follow”, since you don’t just want to go ripping through the liturgy right after someone shares what may be a very personal story.

-Does this make sense freestanding, or should it really be in a Eucharistic context?

-When we try to devise rites for use outside of the worshipping assembly and then try to stick them in the BOS, are we doing things that we don’t really need to do and basically telling people that they don’t know how to pray?

Service of Healing

-Seek your healing for others- does this collect endorse the practice of being anointed on behalf of someone else? We do not want to encourage that.

- “God creator” seems odd. And also a theological issue of referring to God the Father as creator.

-Confession is felt to be problematic by many people.

-Don’t refer to the first person of the trinity as “God”

-Might want to revert back to the litany in EOW 2, since that maintains the Father, Son, Spirit language in the Trinity, and it is not possible to claim that the EOW wasn’t sensitive to issues of gender and language.

-“desire the health and salvation of all people”. Seems a bit weak. Even we desire the health and salvation of all people! Reduction of the sovereignty of God into the sympathy of God, so that instead of the author of life who is on your side, you have a sympathetic but ineffectual hospital volunteer who is going to hold your hand.

-Confession- not really a confession and not really an absolution either. EOW had both a traditional confession of sin and also this “confession of need”.

-Perhaps shouldn’t think about the confession of sin and confession of need as parallel things, so that the confession of need doesn’t pretend to take the place of the confession of sins.

-Even if the particular sin committed is not the cause of the illness, sin is also something in need of healing. Best to stick with a regular old confession of sin that doesn’t drag illness into it at all.

-Also, familiarity of language is also comforting to people who are sick.

-The blessing of oil is a presbyteral rite in the 79 prayer book, so strike “or bishop”. (Bishops are priests anyway.)

-“health care workers” sounds like a union statement. “those who care for the sick and dying” is better.

-Have we reached the point where we don’t want to make the anointing optional? No, we really haven’t.

-Collect on pp. 5-6 is inelegant- “and on...and on”

-The last blessing participates in so many heresies that it probably isn’t redeemable. EOW has one from Thessalonians that should be unobjectionable.

-Strike all 3 of these blessings and add another. Perhaps also drop in as an option the closing sentences from morning and evening prayer.

Ministries in Church and World

Is celebrant problematic if this is happening outside of the Eucharist? Raises the unresolved celebrant vs. presider question.

Eucharistic visitation

This is going to go where liturgies die, and we will bring in the one from EOW 2.

Home blessing

-Angels of light- can we make it so that the angels of light are dwelling rather than living?

-Do angels even “dwell” with in places? Well, they do in the BCP....

-Use the prayer from compline “visit this place O Lord”. Both familiar and theologically helpful.

-Can we please do something with brackets so that we don’t imply that a home must necessarily have at least two people? Not a bad thing to have a blessing for an entire family, but maybe have an alternative one as well that doesn’t assume that as the default.

Blessing of water

- less didactic

-Can’t excerpt baptismal stuff from the context of the baptismal liturgy

-Might not want to include this at all. It’s a private service, and most places that do this already have a form for it.

-Can we just have “Concerning Holy Water”? And also “Concerning Holy Oil”? Those would be things that would be very helpful for the church and would help clear up a lot of confusing practices.

Is anything getting taken out of the BOS? Yes- see the separate tab of the spreadsheet. Anthems at Candle Lighting, Anthems at the Breaking of the Bread, Blessing of Homes at Epiphany and Easter (to be incorporated into home blessing more generally), Vigil for the Eve of the Baptism of Our Lord, Vigil for the Eve of All Saints, Vigil on the Eve of Baptism, Blessing of a Pregnant Woman

We then listened to a presentation from Lizette Larson-Miller about the state of liturgical revision in different parts of the Anglican Communion.

After lunch we continued look at the draft liturgies from the Book of Occasional Services.

Our Lady of Guadalupe.

- Seems a bit outside of our tradition to have a prayer directly to the Virgin Mary. Although arguably not alien to the tradition even if it not the norm. But might nevertheless redraft to address to God rather than Mary.

- Seems somewhat uncomfortable to put the Eucharistic prayer itself in the BOS, although it might work in the EOW series or someplace like that.

- In the daily office it is permitted to have a first reading from something other than the Bible, but not in the Eucharist. It is important to have this story; but that might be better in a different place anyway, perhaps the beginning, with the reading from Revelation as the first reading.

- If we don't put the Eucharistic prayer in this book, we could publish it separately alongside of multiple alternative options.

- Might be worth thinking about asking General Convention to fund a body of people specifically to develop Spanish language liturgies (that would still come through this body) since it is unlikely that this body will ever be equipped to undertake that work itself.

- Intercessions need a petition for the departed to conform to BCP rubrics.

- Post-communion prayers usually give thanks for communion, which this one does not.

- “blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord” is problematic since the “he” in question refers to Jesus, so there is no need to make this gender inclusive.

- problematic to refer to “friends” instead of disciples since it is a far more radical thing for a teacher to wash his disciples’ feet than it is for a friend to do that for his friends.

- “pray with us and for us” would be language helpful for those who are uncomfortable with asking Mary to talk to Jesus on our behalf.

- Might be worth considering the option of only printing this in Spanish to deter liturgical Anglo-tourism. Although Latino congregations might also want an English option.

Day of the Dead:

- Might be worth having a note about cultural appropriation

“Christians in parts of Mexico and Central America keep All Saints’ Day (November 1) and All Souls’ Day, (November 2) with special devotions to honor the dead and pray for them.” Not just Latino, but very, very widespread in Catholic countries. So it is not just an issue of appropriating one particular culture. Perhaps more helpful to look at this as a widespread phenomenon that we can therefore encourage our local adaptation of, rather than something that we would import directly from one particular other culture.

Next we had an update from the BCP committee. They discussed with Gay Jennings and Michael Barlowe how to make our plan for 4 options go forward legislatively, and in response they have

condensed three of the options into one, so that we will now present only two pathways to General Convention.

Path 1: Comprehensive Plan for BCP revision

Path 2: Leave the BCP alone, have a program to deepen our relationship with the BCP, and develop alternative authorized rites.

We will need to talk about constitutional and canonical changes that will give status to different kinds of rites. This has been attempted before and has not succeeded, but we have been working with the constitution and canons people and they are trying to get us some language that we can use. We will need clear methods and budget for all of these pieces.

The presiding officers urge us to endorse one of these options and encourage General Convention to adopt that one.

Does this preclude making small technical fixes to the Prayer Book as an option? One person's technical fix is another person's car bomb. So yes, option 2 would presumably also preclude the possibility of making some technical fixes to the prayer book, and option 1 would most likely result in a more major revision.

What about people who really don't want a new prayer book OR other authorized alternatives, or those for whom "other authorized rites" raises the specter of Common Worship and its vast number of volumes? Remind people that they can vote against both proposals. Emphasize the importance of process. Clear process and information about how one can participate alleviates anxiety. Also, other authorized liturgies are what is already happening de facto, and so what this does is give additional structure and clarity about that.

Whatever we send to General Convention, they can still change it and can also reject it. If we sent them four pathways, they combine them, and if we send them two they can divide them up. This is an attempt to send them what is going to be most helpful, informative, and user-friendly.

April 1st

We opened at 9:30, and turned to a completely revised version of preparation of parents and godparents for baptism brought to us by the Book of Occasional Services subcommittee.

This version was received very positively. Suggestion to enroll using only the first name, to reinforce that this is different from signing your kid up for soccer.

Rubric says that children of "catechetical age" should be themselves enrolled as catechumens, not using this rite. But we did not want to define canonical age since it is really dependent upon the individual child.

We then walked through a list of tasks left to do on the Book of Occasional Services. They will check with the editors about rites. Paul B. and Jim will draft a preface. Address issues of cultural appropriation. The spreadsheet will be updated to say specifically what is to be retained without change. Wayne will take another look at "Concerning Exorcism".

We discussed the language of “presider” vs. “celebrant”/ “officiant”. BCP uses the latter; there is a general preference for “presider” in contemporary liturgies. General preference of the committee towards the new language, but some feel compelled to keep the BOS in conformity with the BCP, especially when we are trying to clarify canonical status for these books. But it is also problematic when the words we are using are different from what our intent is.

Might be helpful to introduce this discussion in the preface, and say that we are using language in conformity with the BCP, but raise the issue up for people. Or, have the preference say that presider is used throughout and explain why. Especially since no one ever reads the preface, it doesn’t seem sufficient to keep the default language and then just address it in a document that no one ever reads.

It was suggested to use the language of presider, but to discuss this rationale in the preface.

What about the question of a Latino prayer book? There would be tension involved in starting such a project, and it is something that those of us who are white don’t necessarily understand. If it comes from this committee that is problematic. If there are Latino deputies who want to bring this forward, we should encourage the initiative on that to come from them.

Book of Common Prayer:

Drew and Devon will work on path 1, Dorsey and Tom will work on path 2.

Questions to be addressed: What is the methodology? The timeline? What canonical or constitutional work would need to happen? What kind of budget request would be necessary?

Each group will be getting us some actual language and a plan, and there will be a period of time for feedback.

We will be populating both of these options with a lot of information so that bishops and deputies will have a lot of information at this disposal to help them make a good decision. We will also be getting someone to transcribe all of those talks from Anglican partners so that there will be a written record. Also methodology- how do you engage people at a diocesan or parish level?

Bulletin collection project. Have been working with archives to help realize the project that Derek developed the technology and the methodology behind it. Questions about how parishes would be randomly selected, whether they would comply, how to code all of the parts of the service (especially if the IT person doesn’t have a lot of liturgical knowledge).

It may be impossible to do this by October, so we may want to bracket this and include it as part of our data collection process for either path 1 or path 2.

Do we want data that is randomly selected, or data that is representatively selected? Is this intended as a pilot project towards something larger? Some fear that it would not be legitimate if it was not a scientific random sample and was instead based on our own biases.

Intended as a pilot, but unless we definitely have someone who is able to do the project by October, it is not going to be possible. The full project would be actually every parish.

For now, we decided that it may be best to just get a detailed plan to the archives and give them a 3-year heads up that they may be asked to do this if it is funded. But also check if there are people who would be able to do this project for free or at a reduced rate. (People who are paid tend to be better at meeting deadlines than people who are nice volunteers.) Could also see if they would be able to create the database, but not yet populate it with data.

We moved to reports from other subcommittees:

Marriage:

The committee on marriage is required to consult with us in monitoring the impact of same-sex marriage rites around the church. Drew introduced them to the survey instrument he has created for our group that will go live next week, and is helping them compile data. Right now, no one has a complete list of which dioceses have approved what, and what provision has been made in those dioceses that have not approved anything. They have divided up the dioceses between the 4 of them, and hope to have a final list by May 1st.

There is no reason to assume the rites have been through a first reading and need to go through the second reading. Many people had thought so, but since it was not structured as an amendment to the prayer book, that is not correct. They are in trial use, and could remain there indefinitely. (Which does show that there needs to be some constitutional and canonical work done.)

Music:

They are organizing symposia, planning to invite people (maybe 15) for two days from small to medium sized parishes to tell us what people are actually singing on Sunday mornings and why. Why are things not being sung? Is it unfamiliar tunes? Un-singable tunes? Problematic theology and lyrics? What is currently in the book that really does not need to be there?

Perhaps another symposium later on new hymns and what might be added.

Looking at ways to get some quantifiable data about what is and is not being used, so that it is not just “we feel this way about hymn X”

Need to make sure that plans are relevant to the (unfunded) resolutions that came from General Convention. So, need to work on that link. Will be bringing a resolution that they are still working on the language of, to show the clear linkage about what they are planning and what General Convention has asked for.

Calendar:

Have been going through HWHM, GCW, and new names from General Convention in accordance with LFF criteria. Intend to present a draft of the whole thing to the SCLM to be discussed during a teleconference before the fall meeting.

Separate section at the end of the book- names commended to the church for local commemoration. Short bio, which of the generic collects is most appropriate. This is also a place for those who have died more recently and thus do not meet the criteria of Lesser Feasts and Fasts, which say that that ordinarily two generations should pass before adding someone to the calendar.

To “graduate” to the full churchwide calendar, show us that you are actually being used. Allows for a more organic, grassroots approach, so that it is not the SCLM imposing a calendar on the church from the top down. This is technically what the process has been all along, but it has never really been used in practice.

A couple of things to raise in particular:

We are putting people back on their actual death dates, which will help the problem of overcrowding the calendar since people will have to pick. (e.g., if 4 people died on July 1, parishes will have to choose which one to commemorate rather than us sticking them in any empty slot and filling up all the holes.)

Liza’s list of questionable Englishmen. Can some go to local commemoration? The English heritage of our church is important, but not to the extent that this imbalance would imply. Wulfstan, Willibrord, Alphege, Ethelbert, Chad, Cuthbert, Dunstan, Alfred the Great, Edmund, etc.

LFF 2006 15% women, Great Cloud of Witnesses 19% women, currently at 24% women. Trying to keep an eye on this, but not to the extent of stretching the criteria just to get more women.

Lesser Feasts and Fasts...Now with added fasts! (Thus far, only Genocide Remembrance Day, but looking at other options too, so that the content of the book more accurately reflects the title.)

We adjourned at 11:45.