

# MANDATE

The Bi-Monthly Magazine of the Prayer Book Society

Volume 32, Number 4

July / August 2009

## IN THIS ISSUE

*Reflections from the  
Editor's Desk:  
Not a "Party Book"*  
Page 2

*Letter from the President  
Trinity and Sacrifice: the  
doctrine of the Trinity  
in the Book of Common  
Prayer*  
Page 4

*Finding the Trinity in the  
Book of Common Prayer*  
Page 7

*The Order of the Service  
of Holy Communion and  
the Logic of Christian  
Redemption, Part 2*  
Page 8

*Anglicanism and the Gay  
Controversy: a book review*  
Pages 9

*What was the Wickedness  
of Sodom in Genesis 19?*  
Page 11

*Daily Service*  
Page 13

*In Remembrance*  
page 16



# THE Trinity

## SEASON

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker, and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. —*Articles of Religion*, Article 1



# Not a “Party Book”

By Roberta Bayer, Ph.D., Assistant Professor,  
Patrick Henry College, Purcellville, Virginia

## Reflections *from the* Editor's Desk

In the United States, people who use the traditional Book of Common Prayer are mistakenly called ‘High Church’ by Anglicans and Episcopalians who worship in evangelical parishes. This is something of a misnomer because the traditional Book of Common Prayer, which belongs to Reformed Catholicism, does not require in its usage the ‘catholic’ elements of churchmanship which high churchmen normally seek. Its ceremonial provisions are austere by comparison with the medieval and counter-reformation rites, and the doctrine of its prayers adheres to the theological consensus of the 16th century Reformers. Its theology dates from a period that is prior to the Tractarian, or high church movement of the nineteenth century.

The high church tradition in contemporary Anglicanism comes out of the Tractarian Movement, which by and large desired to reject certain aspects of the Reformation for the sake of adopting a practice and aesthetic closer to that of the Roman Catholicism to which it was contemporary. Tractarian churchmanship, with its high doctrine of the church, ministry, and sacraments, also came to embrace a full-scale “ritual revival” of counter-reformation ceremony and ornament. Originally mounted as Prayer Book, it soon began to embellish, or even replace altogether, the Prayer Book rites with rites borrowed from the Sarum or Tridentine use. In the post-war period, anglo-catholic liturgists (Dom Gregory Dix et al.) began to reject in great part not only the reformed, but also the medieval and counter-reformation developments of liturgy, and sought to reconstruct liturgy on the basis of hypotheses about ancient and patristic liturgy.

The Evangelical Movement, also of the nineteenth century, emphasized the supremacy of Scripture and the Thirty-nine articles, and was

for the most part quite satisfied with the Book of Common Prayer, and in the party warfare of the 19th and early 20th century, usually interpreted it as a touchstone of evangelical doctrine and practice, in opposition to Anglo-Catholic doctrine and practice. It was only in the late 20th century, as evangelicals embraced the “Parish Communion” promoted by the Liturgical Movement, and then the priority of subjective experience promoted by the Charismatic movement, that evangelicals began to have reservations about the Book of Common Prayer. Although some evangelicals, including non-Anglicans, have great reservations about the loss of Morning Prayer and Sermon and the “seeker-driven” and charismatic trends in liturgy today, many have embraced them uncritically, and hold ideas about liturgy and church discipline which are quite different from their nineteenth century namesakes.

Thus the Prayer Book does not belong to Anglo-Catholics or Evangelicals. It is not a party book. This is its strength and value. Anglicanism can accommodate both charismatic worship and anglo-catholic additions as a matter of churchmanship. Different parishes have different styles that appeal to different populations, and so long as the dominant theological formation offered in the church has a common basis in the historical teaching of the Anglican Reformation, churchmanship would seem a matter of indifference. Attachment to the traditional Book of Common Prayer is neither high church, nor low. To be a Prayer Book Anglican is to be Anglican, the traditional Book of Common Prayer, in conjunction with the Formularies and Ordinal, is the lodestar for adhering to the Bible, the ancient church, and the Reformation.

### Common Prayer

People pray extemporaneously on public occa-

### THE MANDATE

July / August 2009 • Volume 32, Number 4

Editor: Dr. Roberta Bayer • Design/Layout: Boldface Graphics

The Officers for the Year 2009 are:

President: The Rev. Gavin Dunbar • Vice-President: The Rev'd Fr. Edward Rix

Treasurer: Kathleen Stephans of Philadelphia • Secretary: Mrs. Rhea Bright of Oklahoma

MANDATE is published six times a year by the Prayer Book Society, a non-profit organization serving the Church of God.

All gifts to the P.B.S. are tax deductible. Recipients of Mandate are encouraged to send at least \$28 each year to maintain the ministry.

Editorial and all other correspondence: P.O. Box 35220, Philadelphia, PA 19128. Phone 1-800-PBS-1928.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the above address.

sions, whether at the beginning of a meeting or a class, often under the mistaken impression that it is a form of 'common prayer'. Of course, people may want to bring particular concerns before the Lord as part of public devotion, but sitting silently by, while someone else prays a petitionary prayer of their own construction for everyone else (because how can one join in when the person praying is making it up as they go along), is not common prayer.

The Book of Common Prayer offers real common prayer because all can join in praise to our Lord, saying aloud psalms, passages of scripture, or carefully constructed collects, many of which have been handed down from the early church. There are scripturally based prayers to suit most every place and situation. At the very least, one might choose to pray the Lord's Prayer in public, as it is the most commonly known prayer, is petitionary, and has obvious scriptural warrant.

### Final Comments on Marriage

I want to thank those who contributed to the last issue for helping to discuss divorce and remarriage in the church today. In light of this discussion, one might say the following:

1) The definition of marriage in the contemporary church is theologically obscure, as one can see in comparing the marriage services, new and old, and in canon law.

2) In national law, the legal procedure of no-fault divorce effectively puts an end to the old meaning of marriage as permanent, as it opens up the possibility of divorce without the agreement of both parties. Insofar as one spouse may divorce another against their wishes, even when one of them holds to the old idea of marriage as permanent, the civil order has effectively been granted primacy over the church.

3) At one time remarriage was allowed either after an annulment, or a period of penance (as in the Orthodox tradition). But does that make sense when there is no-fault divorce? Does it make sense when the state and the church hold different ideas about the ground for divorce. There is need for justice and consistency in rules about remarriage.

4) There needs to be much more emphasis placed on marriage preparation.

One more thought about the relation of Christian marriage to the story of salvation. The union of male and female is in the first place a natural union. By that I mean it can be found in the mating instinct in the animal kingdom, and in the rational desire for the legacy of children among humans. Even in the animal kingdom one can find mammals and birds which mate for life, and among humans

there is a rational reason for constancy in union, in order that children be educated to recognize the legacy for which they were born. Even in primitive communities marriage was protected in order to preserve the legacy of the natural family or tribe.

The Old Testament begins with the story of God giving to the family of Abraham a very important legacy, and that is knowledge of God's presence and the promise of salvation. Abraham is told that his natural legacy, the son of his loins, will play a part in the great salvation story of God's created world, and so his natural and rational desire for legacy through marital union has a role in God's holy plan for the salvation of the people of Israel.

In the Ten Commandments the role of the family in salvation is further explained as part of the holy law. Both the fourth commandment, to honor father and mother, and the sixth, against adultery, elevate the marital contract, the union of male and female, to a role in salvation.

That having been said, it is also the case that Moses was told to allow divorce for the hardness of their hearts. This is fitting because, as the book of Exodus shows, the people of Israel were unable to keep the faith during their desert wanderings. This

failure set the stage for the historical eventuality of losing Israel to the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Greeks. The twelve tribes which followed Moses are mainly lost by the time of the arrival of our Lord.

The revelation of God in Christ is the moment when new meaning is given to marriage. As we are reminded in the season of Pentecost, it is his death and the sending of the Holy Spirit which founds the spiritual community which is the church. Marriage is not for the sake of the natural legacy, nor is being a descendent of the family of Abraham a sign of salvation, as under the Old Law. Rather marriage is for the new community found in the body of Christ, the church universal.

The Christian believer understands, therefore, that marriage is for the sake of the body of Christ. The married man is in the church now as father and husband, as well as individual man, the married woman, mother and wife, as well as woman. The role of mother, father, husband and wife are taken up within the body of Christ, yet these roles must be fulfilled as Christ desires they be fulfilled, as part of the great drama of salvation, which is to build up the church, and to bring others to love and serve the Lord. The marriage vow places the marriage within the body of Christ, and it is because the marriage is within the church that the grace may be found to sustain it, to overcome hardness of heart. The natural desire for union is made good in Christian marriage, and the natural desire for legacy, made part of God's plan for all mankind.

We need your gifts in order to carry out your mandate to defend the 1928 Book of Common Prayer.

You may send a contribution in the enclosed envelope.

Please give generously.

# *A Letter from the President* **Trinity and Sacrifice** *The doctrine of the Trinity in the Prayer Book*



*The Rev. Gavin Dunbar,  
Rector, St John's,  
Savannah, GA*

**T**he historic Prayer Books are not short of points of contact with the chief doctrine of our religion, the dogma of the Trinity. One cannot go very far in any service without running into them. The pre-Nicene development of the doctrine is reflected in the ancient baptismal formula, based on Matthew 28:18; in the baptismal symbol known as the Apostles' Creed, recited twice daily at Morning and Evening Prayer; in the great Doxologies known as *Gloria in Excelsis* and *Te Deum laudamus*. Its Nicene and post-Nicene development is reflected in the Nicene Creed (actually the Nicene Creed as revised at Constantinople in 381 with one western addition dating from the 6<sup>th</sup> century), recited at the Eucharist; the Athanasian Creed (now largely omitted, but recognized as a benchmark of the doctrine); the lesser doxology, *Gloria Patri*; the collect and proper preface for Trinity Sunday, and the full Trinitarian conclusion of the collects and many other prayers addressed to God – “through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end.” (It is a *desideratum* that the use of this full ending for the first and last collects of a series, assumed by Cranmer, be restored in use.) One might also mention the hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, used at ordinations, which ascribes divinity to the Holy Spirit in unity with the Father and the Son.

## **The Difference between the Economic and Theological Understanding of the Trinity**

Yet there is one area of the communion service which contemporary liturgists think is missing a Trinitarian aspect, and led them to change what is called the eucharistic prayer in the 1979 Prayer Book. In the 1928 Prayer Book, this corresponds to those elements known as the “preface” (from “Lift up your hearts” to “Holy, holy holy”), and the Prayer of Consecration (or “Canon”). In the 1662 Prayer Book, this also comprises the prayer of oblation *after* communion.

In constructing the contemporary eucharistic prayers of the 1979 Prayer Book, liturgists chose to follow the precedent of 4<sup>th</sup>- and 5<sup>th</sup>-century Eastern liturgies, which to their mind are strikingly Trinitarian in structure. So the first paragraph (leading up to the Sanctus) often speaks of God the Father as Creator; the second paragraph (incorporating the Institution Narrative and Anamnesis) speaks of God the Son as Redeemer; the third paragraph speaks of God the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier in the

Church. These eucharistic rites not only appear to exhibit a pronounced Trinitarian structure, but also to provide a comprehensive recital of the history of God's work in history, beginning from creation and the promise of redemption to Israel, working through the advent, death, and exaltation of Christ, and concluding with the Invocation of the Spirit and intercession for the mission of the Church.

In this structure, the economic Trinity, as theologians label it, is made more prominent than the theological Trinity. The economic Trinity refers to the distinctions of operations outside the Godhead, in the divine economy – his operations as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier. The theological (or immanent) Trinity refers to the distinction of persons within the Godhead – the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The theological Trinity refers to God as he is in himself, the economic Trinity to God as he acts towards us.

In historic orthodoxy, such as the Creeds and the invocations of the Litany, the theological Trinity is made prominent. The Father creates the world, but he does so by his Word, who is his Son, and through the Spirit (cf. Genesis 1.1-5; Psalm 33.6; 104.30; Heb. 1.2; John 1.1-3). The Nicene Creed speaks of the Trinity in this way: the Father is the “maker of Heaven and earth”, the Son is he “by whom all things were made”, and the Spirit is “the Lord and Giver of Life”. These distinctions may seem arcane – the kind of doctrinal subtlety which even Christians may consider irrelevant. But fine distinctions can have immense consequences.

It seems to me that at least in the tradition of the western church, there was a strong interest in maintaining the proper relation of the economic Trinity to the theological Trinity. One may observe this in the Prayer of Consecration found in the classical Prayer Books, as in its predecessor, the ancient Roman canon of the Mass. Cranmer inverted the canon's emphasis – from the sacrifice of the church to the sacrifice of Christ – but the focus on sacrifice remains the overriding concern.

By the standard of modern liturgists' search for a fuller account of the economic Trinity and the history of salvation, the eucharistic prayers of the older Prayer Books (1549, 1552-1662, 1789-1928) may appear deficient in their treatment both of the Trinity and of the history of salvation. In them the work of God in creation, the fall and promise of redemption, the sending of the Spirit – all these receive what attention they do only in tight relation to the work of Christ. Moreover, this rehearsal

of Christ's saving work is itself broken up into most important components, found in the "proper prefaces" commemorated on major feasts.

The aspect of salvation history that does receive fulsome and invariable commemoration in the Prayer of Consecration (in the second part of the "eucharistic prayer") is the Sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, at the point where modern rites pass from the institution narrative and the commemoration of Christ's death and exaltation to the invocation of the Spirit and intercession for the Church and its mission in the world, the historic Anglican rites either move directly from the institution narrative to the church's self-offering (as in 1928), or directly to communion (as in 1552-1662) as a preliminary to the church's grateful self-offering. Thus the invocation of the Spirit, and the treatment of his mission in the Church and world finds little explicit treatment (although one might point to the Prayer for the Church).

### The Christological Emphasis in the Western Rite is Trinitarian

Such differences are so striking that they deserve further examination – more than they have. Generally speaking, the tendency in modern discussion of these matters is to measure this western "Christological" structure (sometimes called "binitarian", because it is more silent about the work of the Spirit) against the eastern "Trinitarian" structure, and find it wanting. Yet this will not do.

For the "binitarian" emphasis on God and Christ is undoubtedly ancient. One finds it frequently in the New Testament, as for instance in Paul's greeting: "Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ" (Philippians 1:2 cf Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 1:2; Galatians 1:4 etc.). One finds it also in ancient hymns of the church like *Gloria in excelsis* and *Te Deum Laudamus*, in which the Spirit is mentioned rather perfunctorily. Moreover, the Roman Canon is itself one of the ancient liturgies of the church, quoted in the 4<sup>th</sup> century by St. Ambrose, and so deserves to stand with the ancient liturgies of the east as a benchmark of catholic faith and worship.

Moreover, it is clear that this "binitarian" structure was never understood by the west (or east) to be inconsistent with Nicene Trinitarianism. As we have already seen, the Prayer Book rites are replete with texts of indubitable Trinitarian orthodoxy, and in this regard they follow the western tradition generally. (In the Sarum rite, the Athanasian Creed was to be recited *daily*! The Prayer Book was very moderate, in ordering its use only thirteen times a year. Modern Anglicans have trouble finding a place for it once a year.) The Prayer of Consecration, like the Canon of the Mass, was understood as consistent with the faith of Nicea, and *vice versa*.

In my own, admittedly contrarian, view, the western eucharistic prayer, especially in the Prayer

Book, exhibits a more deeply and fully developed Trinitarianism than that of the eastern model employed in contemporary liturgical revision. For the structure of the modern rites is that of the economic Trinity – the operations of God *ad extra*, outside himself, in creation, redemption, and sanctification, in which God reveals himself to us. They privilege the work of God in relation to the world. Yet this, it is acknowledged by all, is only Trinitarian in a secondary sense. When we speak of the Trinity, we must speak of the *theological* or *immanent* Trinity, the relation of persons in the Godhead to one another, which is prior to the persons in relation to the world.

An examination of the classical Prayer Books demonstrates this. Note that the Prayer of Consecration, begins with the "tender mercy" of the Father, revealed in his gift of his only Son "to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption", and in the Son's obedient response to the Father's mercy, in offering himself as a "full, perfect, and sufficient, sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world". God's relation to the world – the Father's mercy, the Son's sacrifice for its sins – is anchored in the relations of the Father and the Son in the Spirit. For the Son's sacrifice responds to the Father's mercy: in the cross, the Son both receives fully and responds fully to the Father's gracious will, in the conditions of his incarnate humanity. In his sacrifice, the Incarnate Son thus represents both God to Man, and Man to God.

The Prayer then recalls the institution of the sacrament, as the means by which the Church may participate in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, and moves (either before communion, as in 1928, or after, as in 1662) to the Church's imitation of Christ's sacrifice, in virtue of its communion with him. That is, in virtue of its communion with Christ in his full and perfect sacrifice of himself for us, his full return of himself to the Father, the Church is caught up by the "grace and benediction" of the Spirit in that same motion of return to the Father: "here we offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice". There is thus in the sacrifice of Christ for his Church and in his Church a full taking up of manhood into Godhead, a full participation of human nature in the Trinity through the mediation of Christ.

### Some Problems in Modern Scholarship

The implications of this difference may be explored further. In the modern eucharistic prayers, the action of God traced in salvation history may be expressed in turns what is called Aulen's "descending line". Gustav Aulen was a 20th century Swedish bishop whose little book on the atonement, *Christus Victor* has had an impact beyond its merits as historical or theological scholarship. In this "descending line", divine *agape*, God's action toward the world is described entirely

as self-giving love. There is, of course, some truth in this seen in Christ's sacrifice, but also a problem. For Aulen, the world is made the last and final object of God's love – as if the infinite God could find an adequate object and response to its love from the finite creature! Moreover, if the love of God can be understood only in terms of the “descending line” of self-giving *agape*, it becomes completely unclear how there can be any *return* to the Father in love.

The theological Trinity, however, with its focus on the relationship between the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (rather than on God's relation to the world), and united in love, as St Augustine wrote, means that the only adequate object of God's knowing and loving is God himself. God's love for the world must therefore be understood in terms of the immanent Trinity, the Father's love for the Son in the Spirit. In Aulen's “descending line” one may also discern the seeds of the contemporary collapse of the gospel into the world-improving agendas of sexual liberation and the Millenium Development Goals, and of the tendency to reduce God to historic process.

What is thus missing in the modern liturgies is the same thing as is missing in Aulen's descrip-

tion of God's love, namely the ascending line of divine *eros*, of man's return to God in Christ, both God and man. It is through God himself, namely the sacrifice of Christ, that love is expressed, and we are redeemed because through that sacrifice man may do something not possible before, that is return to God. The two lines, which Aulen and some modern liturgists can see only as mutually exclusive alternatives, are reconciled in the sacrifice of the God-man. That is to say, they are reconciled in the Son, who, in response to the Father's own love, offered himself to God “through the eternal Spirit” at the cross (Hebrews 9:14).

There is, I believe, in the western liturgies, above all, the Prayer Book, a fuller and closer integration of the economy of salvation (the manifestation of the persons in salvation history) with the immanent Trinity (the relations of the persons within the Godhead.) In the sharp focus on the saving work of Christ, in his sacrifice for us, and in the Church's sacrifice in him, as found in the historic Prayer Book, we find the realization in time and history of the eternal coming forth of the Son from the Father, and his return to him in the bond of mutual love, which is the Holy Spirit.



# Finding the Trinity in the Book of Common Prayer

The Reverend Gavin G. Dunbar

The emphasis on God and Christ has ample scriptural precedent. Despite his rich and extensive writing on the Spirit, Paul is often content with alluding to the first two persons of the Trinity. This ancient “binitarianism” which in the western church gave rise to a very strong emphasis on the saving work of Christ, received a powerful re-interpretation in the Trinitarian doctrine of Augustine of Hippo. If one considers the doctrine of the Trinity in the historic Prayer Books, there is much material that speaks of this doctrine, and either reflects or is derived from the critical formulation of this doctrine in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries. These texts can be specified as follows:

- ✠ The ancient baptismal formula, based on Matthew 28:18: “I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost”
- ✠ The ancient baptismal symbol, known as the “Apostles’ Creed”, which despite its medieval emendations, reflects the earliest (pre-Nicene) stage of Trinitarian doctrine
- ✠ The Great Doxology known as *Gloria in excelsis*, a strophic hymn based on Luke 2:xx.
- ✠ The 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century strophic hymn *Te Deum laudamus*
- ✠ The “Nicene” Creed—a text first promulgated by the Council of Nicea in 325, but expanded at the Council of Constantinople in 381.
- ✠ A version of the 4<sup>th</sup> century doxology known as the *Gloria patri*: “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen”.
- ✠ The collect for Trinity Sunday: “grace, by the confession of a true faith, to acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity”
- ✠ The Proper Preface for Trinity Sunday: “O Lord, Almighty, Everlasting God, who art one God, one Lord; not only Person, but three Persons in one Substance; for that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same

we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality”

- ✠ The 5<sup>th</sup> century “Creed of Saint Athanasius”. Though it was not composed by Athanasius, but originated long after his death in the monasteries of southern Gaul, its name reflects loyalty to the Athanasian theology of Nicea. Though omitted altogether from the American Prayer Books and Articles, and rarely used in other provinces of the Anglican Communion, it remains a historic touchstone of Trinitarian doctrine.
- ✠ The Collects (and numerous other prayers). Most of them, addressed to God, are (or are meant to be) offered “through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end”. Those addressed to Christ have a similar Trinitarian ending. (The formula, “through Jesus Christ our Lord” is a contraction that was meant to be expanded by the priest.)
- ✠ The hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, used at ordinations, which ascribes divinity to the Holy Spirit in unity with the Father and the Son.
- ✠ The first Article of Religion, together with the next five, which expand it, affirm the ancient Trinitarian consensus as the basis of the Reformed theological developments.
- ✠ “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all.” This Trinitarian benediction (2 Corinthians 13:14), is used at the end of Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany.
- ✠ The final blessing at Holy Communion, Confirmation, and at Solemnization of Matrimony: “God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, bless preserve and keep you...”
- ✠ The Absolution in Particular Confession, which ends, “I absolve thee from thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

# Holy Communion *and the* Logic of Christian Redemption

by Paul Epstein, Ph.D., Associate Professor of  
Classics, Oklahoma State University

Part 2

**A**t the beginning of the service of Holy Communion, the reading of the Decalogue summons the believer to the divine origin of all community and human individuality. Its demands then lead him to acknowledge that he cannot accomplish them, and there arises in the believer a felt need for a Saviour.

This acknowledgement is, for the believer, at once theological, historical and individual. In light of his knowledge as a Christian, the believer sees that the community of Israel which God formed through the Ten Commandments was insufficient, and his need for a community founded on the gracious forgiveness of sins. Similarly, he knows that the God who reveals himself through the Law has not fully disclosed his true nature. Finally, it is recognized that human individuality, which was formed in relation to God as law-giver, is itself not complete. This incomplete knowledge of both the divine and human natures allows the believer to acknowledge a mediator between them. The reading of the Decalogue thus prepares the believer to participate in the deeper spiritual community brought into being through the life, death, and resurrection of the God-man, Jesus Christ.

The reading of Epistle and Gospel instruct him in the nature of that community, and how it came into being. Then, in the Creed, the believer affirms his faith in the tri-une God who has established the spiritual community. The Epistle, perhaps counter-intuitively, is read before the Gospel. The events narrated in the Gospel all come before the establishment of the various churches to which Paul has addressed his epistles. Since the Epistles, however, all assume the establishment of the Church by the Spirit, they help the believer to understand the Gospel, which shows the path that led to that establishment.

Since the believer who uses the Prayer Book lives in post-resurrection times, he too assumes the stable existence of the spiritual community and is ready to be instructed in its nature. For example, the epistle provided for a first celebration of Holy Communion on Pentecost instructs the believer that one spirit is the source of all gifts in the Church.

The Gospel then shows how this community

came into being through Jesus Christ. Some readings narrate his birth, crucifixion, and resurrection. Others record his teaching about the Kingdom of Heaven, or the nature of God. The gospel for Pentecost is Jesus' exhortation of his disciples to ask the Father for the gift of the holy Spirit.

The Epistle and Gospel of course vary from Sunday to Sunday. This calendar of readings presents a summary of essential teachings. The Advent Season confronts the believer with the ultimate return of all things to God. The season from Christmas to Trinity Sunday presents the great events of Christ's birth, death, and resurrection, and the sending of the Spirit at Pentecost. Trinity Season then instructs the believer more particularly in what living in the spirit means.

To be sure, the Church Year is not strictly speaking an essential moment of Christian belief. Many Protestant Churches do not have a liturgical cycle of readings. Nevertheless, the Church Year follows a deeply Christian logic. Its three main divisions show first, the end for which the spiritual Community exists, that is, the return of all things to God; second, the divine foundation of the Spiritual Community; and third, our participation, in time, in the Spiritual Community.

The readings from the Epistle and Gospel thus show the believer the nature of the Spiritual Community and how it came into being through Jesus Christ. In the recitation of the Nicene Creed, which follows, the believer then declares his belief in the tri-une God who is the absolute source of the spiritual Community. The believer affirms that God is at once the Father who created the world, the Son who became man to establish God's fellowship with man, and the Holy Spirit who sustains that fellowship.

The Creed concludes what one can call the instructional part of the Service. In this part, the believer learns the nature of the spiritual Community that he needs, through the recitation of the Decalogue. By affirming his belief in the God who has established the Spiritual Community the believer makes the transition to that part of the service which will not only present the real existence of that Community, but show his more particular inclusion in it.

# Anglicanism *and the* Gay Controversy

by Roberta Bayer

**T**he facts of the crisis in the worldwide Anglican communion hardly need repeating. It began in the wake of other movements to implement legal equality, the civil rights movement and the womens' right movement. The Episcopal Church, embarrassed by a past which they considered politically tainted by both elitism and a too easy acceptance of racial discrimination, was entirely desirous to excise past errors by publicly endorsing political movements for social equality. That is the news story.

But there is another story which passes almost unnoticed, except in the halls of higher education, and that is a story about currents and developments in philosophy and theology which feed, at a highly theoretical level, all kinds of fissures and incoherencies in the church today. These fissures are rooted in the presence of various conflicting, or incommensurable modes of historical dialogue, which is a complicated way of remarking that there are conflicting traditions of philosophical/theological thought existing in a rather uncomfortable truce, as many of these intellectual disputants see themselves as having a stake in current public battles about rights and equality, on opposite sides.

And the stakes are high when one considers that the seminary is the place where parish ministry and university life intersect. It makes for the difference between a seminarian who takes up the life of a civil activist because he sees ministry as a means for social change, or a seminarian who sees ministry as a way to live a life dedicated to the worship of God. I admit quite frankly that placing the opposition in those terms is far too simplistic. After all, by teaching people to love and worship God, may change the way we live together, if we see ourselves as brothers and sisters in Christ. But nonetheless, there is what one might call a split between those who see Christianity as having primarily a practical end in this world, and those who do not.

Finding points of contact between those two opposing poles of theological discourse in order to find a common space for dialogues is the task of the day. To do this within the debate about homosexuality is the task which Oliver O'Donovan takes on in his book *Church in Crisis: The Gay Controversy and the Anglican Communion*. Oliver O'Donovan, Professor of Ethics and Practical Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and former Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at the Uni-

versity of Oxford has written a book which places the debate about homosexuality in the Anglican Church in a contemporary intellectual context.

O'Donovan has written many books over the course of his distinguished career which are of great import for thinking about the history and development of moral theology. *Resurrection and Moral Order: An Outline for Evangelical Ethics* and *The Desire of the Nations: Rediscovering the Roots of Political Theology* are treatises, but more accessible are his books *On the Thirty-Nine Articles*, and *Begotten or Made?* on abortion.

He writes that the gay controversy poses this question to the church: what is the relation of the gay experience to the historical dialectic between creation and redemption? This is another way of asking the question of how the experience of homosexuals today can be discussed in light of what we know about the history of salvation as revealed in the Bible, where we are told of God's intentions for us, as fallen creatures in need of redemption.

O'Donovan draws out the complexities of the gay controversy in a manner which deepens, rather than closes off discussion by placing it in the context of a much larger questions, such as how do we read the Bible to gain its lessons, and what kind of access do we have, in this world, through our reason, to a knowledge of nature, and in this case, human nature, human sexuality, and marriage.

Throughout the book there is the great desire to push those who are attached to innovation to a greater consideration of the theological complexity of requesting that the church bless same-sex relationships as holy. Where does this fit into the story of creation and redemption? And lest he be seen to place blame on one side, he clearly desires to make those opposed to homosexual behavior take seriously the complex ideas dominating church culture which brought about this desire in the first place.

The church faces a dilemma which is intellectually serious because the truth is not self-evident, or to put it another way, what is self-evident to one party is not self-evident to the other. When the truth is not self evident, there is need for practical reason, for interpretation, for argument. The Anglican tendency to accept innovations in the hope that by moving ahead slowly contention will disappear will not do in current circumstances, the theological fissures are too destructive.

A characteristic mistake of the liberal theology

which has been so influential in the seminaries is to some degree at fault; “confusing the good with the future”, and failing to distinguish between the present world and the next, leads some to think that this world should take on the perfection of the next. This desire for a perfection where all real, natural, and rational problems are gone, is at the root of their desire to move ahead with a political agenda as the fulfillment of the Christian message. Liberal theology tends to project onto this world freedom of an immediate knowledge of what God wants for us, as if we were without sin or error.

All this, as he points out, has the unfortunate effect of denying the real effect of original sin. The real context in which we live is as fallen creatures with partial knowledge of the truth, and only partial ability to be good. Denying this fallen state not only ignores sin, but creates what, in philosophical terms, one might call a epistemological difficulty. It leads people to deny that this world carries any real meaning in it which can be known.

Ironically, liberal theology appears to end up denying the goodness which God put into nature (as stated in Genesis 1.31) in their desire to obtain the goods to come. Concomitantly, it sets aside the difficulty, which sadly enough comes with our fallen state and the imperfections of this world, that we actually have to argue about what we know about the created world around us, and about nature. To put this another way, we were made to know the created world by our reason, but our reason is fallen. Reason is perfected by grace, but not made unnecessary by the coming of Christ. So in our current crisis, which calls us to consider whether or not same-sex marriage is in any way intended as part of the created world that God made, we must not deny the rational ground on which this must be argued.

In making such a criticism of theological liberalism, O'Donovan is entering into one of the most hotly contested philosophical debates of the last two centuries, namely whether or not we can know nature or natures as bearing moral information available to reason, and if so, how. Consequently, for the sake of common ground for dialogue, he explains at some length that all parties must re-

acquaint themselves with the lessons in the creation narrative which reveals that God created the world for us, and mankind to know the world.

One must ask whether or not same-sex marriage is intended within God's creation as given in this light. Secondly, another question arises, namely what is the body for? Revelation tells us that soul and body are created by God as one. We know that the body is for physical action, such as sex, but it also is intrinsically connected to our immortal soul, so that in some way soul and body are connected to our redemption. Our physical action reveals a disposition of the soul. In that light marriage is for both offspring and faith, it has a relation to both soul and body.

O'Donovan states that if one is going to speak of something as unnatural to human life, one might put it in the context of the fact that we know that God intends us to be integrated beings, soul and body. We know that it has been revealed to us that in the second coming we will have our bodies back. If one seeks a definition of the unnatural with this in mind, one might, he states, say that the unnatural is an “overreaching, of the transcendence of soul over body,” a moment when soul and body are in some way separated, or diverging as to purpose. This is a helpful insight. It has struck me from time to time that the desire to justify gay-marriage might be part of a too great desire to transcend or deny the reality of the body, to deny the goodness of nature because it cares not that such a union [is] sterile, [and] incapable of the good of offspring.

O'Donovan brings to light something that is not often said in church circles, which is that there is need to see moral issues as a matter of rational argument, not to treat them all emotively, as a matter of feeling or identity. In this light it is clear that he sees the gay crisis as the product of a larger intellectual crisis about the place of practical reason in relation to moral judgement. It is for that reason that this issue does need to be dealt with seriously and comprehensively at the level of moral thinking. It will not go away through political maneuver. Its roots are in the ideas that shape us in ways of which we are far too unaware.

**Please remember the  
Prayer Book Society of the U.S.A.,  
both in your charitable giving and  
in your will. Thank you.**

# *What was the* **Wickedness of Sodom** *in Genesis 19?*

by The Reverend Charles Flinn, priest of the  
diocese of Quincy, Th.M. Westminster Seminary,  
M.A. Hebrew and Aramaic, Catholic University

**I**n the current debate about biblical teaching on sexual relations between two members of the same sex, those who deny that such activity is a sin place great reliance on their rejection of the interpretation of Genesis 19 that the men of Sodom who sought to “know” the two “angels” visiting Lot (described as “angels” or “messengers” in verses 1 and 15, and as “men” elsewhere in the chapter) were seeking to have sexual relations with them. In doing so, these critics make the argument, among others, that the offense of the Sodomites was inhospitality, and this disables one of the two most important passages to which Christians have looked for understanding of Old Testament teaching on such relations.

Until the 1950’s the abomination done in Sodom referred to in Ezekiel 16:50 had always been seen to be the lying of one man with another, described as “an abomination” in Leviticus 18:22, the other of the two important passages. The failed attempt of the men of Sodom to “know” the “men” who were guests of Lot, described in Genesis 19, has been so interpreted by Christians beginning in the New Testament at 2 Peter 2:6-10 and Jude 7 and considered as the reason for the destruction of the city. Then in the 1950’s the contrary view was advanced that the offense of the Sodomites in Genesis was inhospitality (and no one has ever argued that they were hospitable).

That view has gained much ground since then and starts from the fact that the common Biblical Hebrew word for “know” used in Gen 19:5 and 8 can have a wide range of meanings, including by way of illustration but certainly not in limitation of the possibilities: “be(come) acquainted with,” “understand,” “recognize,” or “have carnal knowledge of.” A closer look at some of the texts considered in connection with these counter arguments

shows their weakness as an accurate evaluation of the teaching of the Bible.

In undertaking that evaluation the reader will remember that two visitors to Sodom were going to spend the night in the street, but that Lot vigorously urged them to be his guests. Thus, the argument goes, the Sodomites were anxious about who the strangers were and their anxiety was increased by the fact that they were taking shelter with Lot who was not a native son of Sodom himself. Therefore they wanted to investigate the identity of the visitors in order to allay an understandable anxiety about their intentions in the city.

Of course there is nothing in the biblical narrative itself about a threat to the city from the

visitors; in the ancient world visitors to a city were checked out when they arrived at the gate of the city. Rather there is an expression of grave concern about the safety of anyone who was out of doors in the city at night. The reader may also observe that there is inconsistency even in these interpretations, since investigating suspicious strangers need not imply an expression of inhospitality.



Furthermore, the specific cause of the hostility of the men of Sodom toward Lot himself only arose at the point that he made the judgment that their conduct was wicked. It is clear from the narrative that sojourner Lot would have been quite acceptable if he had acquiesced in their wickedness.

An attentive reading of Genesis 19 does not support the position of those who argue that the sin of Sodom had nothing to do with same sex carnal knowledge. Lot immediately responded to the local men who demanded that he turn over the visitors so that those local men might “know” them, saying, “Do not act so wickedly.” Then he offered the men his two daughters who had not “known” a man. Advocates of the view that no negative view of same sex carnal knowledge is intended by Genesis 19 argue that this second use of “know” has a different meaning from that of the first use of the

same Hebrew word. This position exhibits a culpable insensitivity to the literary quality of Biblical Hebrew Narrative.

Imagine a narrative in which someone said: "I would like to get to know your friend." And then imagine that the addressee replied: "I would never assent to such a wicked acquaintance. Take your pleasure with my virgin daughter." The absurdity of such an exchange illustrates the artificiality of the argument. The narrative only hangs together as acceptable literature if both uses of "know" have the same meaning. There is a very similar story in Judges 19 where an old man, not from Gibeah, was living there. The old man took a passing traveler and his concubine into his house because of the danger of spending the night out of doors in Gibeah. Men of Gibeah came to the door during the night and demanded that the old man produce the traveler that they might "know" him. The old man remonstrated with them, offering his virgin daughter and the traveler's concubine instead. Just as in Sodom, the men preferred to "know" another man rather than a young maiden. The story ends differently in Judges since the traveler takes the initiative and chivalrously throws his concubine to the villainous louts. In fact they have carnal knowledge of her, but they also "abuse" her so that by morning she is lying dead at the door of the old man's house. The similarity of the stories (aside from the difference between Lot's morality and the callous selfishness of the traveler at Gibeah) corroborates the view that the knowledge sought was carnal. What it also shows is that the evil of same sex carnal knowledge is judged even greater than that of violating a maiden's virginity, itself a great evil in the order of biblical morality.

Some commentators who reject the view that same sex carnal knowledge was the issue in Genesis 19 argue that nowhere else in the Old Testament is such activity associated with Sodom (and that in the New Testament it only becomes an issue in the late epistles of 2 Peter and Jude). Some of those advocates refer specifically to Ezekiel 16:48-50, arguing that there is no reference to same sex carnal knowledge, only to pride, gluttony, and failure to aid the poor. Here again, such advocates are not reading the text carefully because they overlook the fact that in verse 16:50 the people of Sodom are said to have done "an abomination" or "an abominable thing." The very same Hebrew phrase used here in Ezekiel is used in Leviticus 18:22 to characterize negatively the lying of one man with another as with a woman. Some modern translations render the Hebrew in Ezekiel as plural, but it is not and a translation in the plural cannot be justified. Of course, other practices are abominable, but the mention of "an abomination" or "an abominable thing" in connection with Sodom has

to alert the competent reader of Ezekiel to Leviticus 18:22. And the Old Testament was written to instruct that kind of reader.

Reading the prose narrative of the Bible is a great adventure when one immerses oneself in its details as a disciple seeking to be instructed. As Robert Alter has observed in chapter 6 of *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981) the Bible is reticent in its disclosure of the motives and mental processes of its leading characters and stingy with other descriptive details. The reader must be drawn into the narrative in order to learn the complex teaching that emerges from the concise text. C. S. Lewis complained about critics who fail to do this: "They seem to me to lack literary judgment, to be imperceptive about the very quality of the texts they are reading" *Fern-seed and Elephants* (Glasgow: Collins, 1975), 106. "These men ask me to believe they can read between the lines of the old texts; the evidence is their obvious inability to read (in any sense worth discussing) the lines themselves. They claim to see fern-seed and can't see an elephant ten yards away in broad daylight." *Id.*, 111. Sadly, this shortsightedness afflicts not only those critics who reject the traditional interpretation of the Bible, but also others who sometimes accept traditional interpretations without immersing themselves in the details of the passages being interpreted.

Quite a bit more could be advanced to show what both the Old and New Testaments are saying about the conduct considered here. The allegedly new insights advanced to the contrary are advanced with the intention of discrediting the conclusion that Scripture leaves no place for same sex carnal knowledge in the obedient lives of those obedient to its teaching. These claimed new insights do not have their source in careful biblical exegesis. They are the product of the sexual revolution and its ideology. Nevertheless, as Christians who seek to live obediently we need to learn better the lessons St. Paul gives in I Corinthians 5 and 6. There he makes clear that we do not judge those outside the Church who engage in or sanction the kinds of conduct identified in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. Two of those items he names in those two verses involve the conduct discussed here. He makes clear too that those who have repented of their disobedience in these respects are our fellow Christians. It is those who claim to be part of the Christian Church who do not repent or believe repentance is unnecessary whom he confronts about their faith and practice.

(For extensive material in support of the Classical Christian understanding of this question, the website of Robert Gagnon is very valuable. He is a professor at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and the website is [robgagnon.net](http://robgagnon.net).)



# Daily Service

by Roberta Bayer

**F**irst since we owe our highest and supreme duty, our greatest, and all our allegiance to him, from whom all power and authoritie is derived, and flowes as from the first, and onely fountaine, and being especiall souldiers emprest in this sacred cause, we must alone expect our succeſſe from him, who is only the bleſſer of all good attempts, the King of kings, the commaunder of commaunders, and Lord of Hostes, I do strictly commaund and charge all Captaines and Officers, of what qualitie or nature soever, whether commanders in the field, or in towne, or townes, forts or fortresses, to have a care that the Almighty God bee duly and daily served, and that they call upon their people to heare Sermons, as that also they diligently frequent Morning and Evening praier themselves by their owne exemplar and daily life, and duties herein, encouraging others thereunto, and that such, who shall often and wilfully absent themselves, be duly punished according to the martiall law in that case provided.

Everie man and woman duly twice a day upon the first towling of the Bell shall upon the working daies repaire unto the Church.... Likewise no man or woman shall dare to violate or breake the Sabbath by any gaming, publique or private abroad, or at home, but duly sanctifie and observe the same, both himselfe and his familie, by preparing themselves at home with private prayer, that they may be the better fitted for the publique, according to the commandements of God, and the orders of our Church, as also every man and woman shall repaire in the morning to the divine service, and Sermons preached upon the Saboth day, and in the afternoon to divine service, and Catechising....

These excerpts are from a document entitled *The Articles, Laws, and Orders, Divine, Politic, and Martial for the Colony in Virginia 1610-1611*. Virginia was set up by royal statute, it was set up as an Anglican colony, and those in charge of what was no doubt soon to be called Jamestown, set down these laws as a means of keeping peace in

the colony during the first couple of years of its existence.

Among the first settlers were many fortune hunters, and not the rigorous, self-governing, devout, and middle class Puritans who settled in Massachusetts, which accounts for what are, by our standards, severe punishments for not performing the offices of the church. Jamestown was a military settlement, in a dangerous land where a previous colony at Roanoke Island just disappeared. These are military laws, people who disobey are grievously punished.

But what is interesting, given its military character, is the fact that the document made of first importance the complete obedience of all people in the authority to God, and listed all the religious services that military officers and civilians were to attend. This was the the first order of discipline in the colony, no matter what other duties. No one was to violate or break the Sabbath, everyone was to prepare themselves at home with private prayer, so that they may be better fitted for public prayer. On the Sabbath they were to repair to the church in the morning and in the afternoon followed by a weekly catechising. In addition, every man and women duly twice a day, upon the tolling the the church bell, was to leave their work and to go Church to hear divine Service. Preachers and ministers were to say divine service twice each day and preach every Wednesday.

In the opinion of these Christian men, in the first generations after the English Reformation, the state could not expect to be properly ordered if divine duties were not performed to our Lord. So the officers of the crown had their first duty to God, and that meant that everyone put aside whatever else they were doing to attend the daily offices. Also, one notes that people really did follow the Book of Common Prayer in its particulars, and that it was a book in daily use. As an aside, one might point out that in the Virginia of that day the Prayer Book in use was most probably the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, the 1552, which was a

*This article is based on a talk given on behalf of the Prayer Book Society at the Anglican Province of Christ the King parish of Christ the King, in Georgetown, D.C., where I was warmly welcomed by the congregation and the rector, the Reverend Dr. Paul Russell. They are a prayer book parish in an interesting old church in the heart of one of the most scenic and historic parts of our nation's capital.*

slight revision of the 1549.

Is this simply the product of a society which has not evolved sufficiently to recognize the freedom of religious conscience? Well, a case for freedom of conscience was being made at the time, and in Pennsylvania and Maryland a few years later non-conformists and Roman Catholics would be free to worship as they wanted, but that really is beside the point. The most interesting aspect of this document to a contemporary Anglican should be to recognize that, written less than a century after the English Reformation, it is snapshot of the world where in the Book of Common Prayer was in daily use. In this example one sees that life revolved around the saying of the church offices, as they were clearly intended to be said in accordance with Cranmer's plan. The offices of the day, private preparation, and catechesis governed daily life. People were intended to live in the world as Christians, to be in it yet not of it. It is as if the first order of the military colony was to live a religious life, a life of prayer.

That was the idea of the Anglican Reformation. One thing should to be said in defense of the establishment of the Church of England. The architects of the Anglican Reformation were quite aware that having an established church was not enough to make a country Christian. (Nor does Christian rhetoric, or the presence of many Christian churches make a country Christian.) A Christian nation is a nation of people wherein the majority of people have made an inward assent to that faith as the truth. Hence, Anglican reformers sought to shape the nation to be a Christian nation, something which they thought it had been lost in the decay of the old church, by requiring church attendance, the daily reading of the Bible, and an educated clergy.

This book was to guide daily Bible reading and prayer. It was the way to teach the faith so that everyone might hear the whole Bible read to them every year, even if they themselves could not read. The people would be held together in worship, knowledge of the Bible, and spiritual formation; the outward practice and inward belief, institutional rule and private devotion reinforced each other. The idea was that Christianity should shape the state, under the guidance of Christ's word.

The spirit of political freedom, what one might call the democratic spirit, put an end to this short-lived idea of public and private religious order. But even though that world is dead and gone, the Book of Common Prayer remains as a reflection of its

piety, designed to be used by everyone as a means to an ordered soul, to peace in the nation, and to integrate the life of prayer into the work of daily life.

There is a lesson to be learned from this. The all-encompassing plan for living in this book shows that to be a faithful Christian is a way of life, not simply an attachment to a concrete set of ideas that one wills to be true. Christianity is not an ideology or a set of ideas, or subset of ideas among the many ideas that govern one's day to day life. Christ said "I

am the way, the truth, and the life." Life is for prayer, it is a continual conversion, turning towards God in the face of trial, entering into the faith as a means to an end, which is to know our Lord. So one needs first of all to live with the Lord by reading the Bible, and in prayer. It is for this that the Book of Common Prayer was originally conceived.



Roberta Bayer and the Rev. Dr. Paul Russell, APCK parish of Christ the King, Georgetown, D.C.

Today Anglicans can still use the Book of Common Prayer as a guide and companion. But if such a regimen seems difficult, or this life envisioned by the architects of the Anglican Reformation an insupportable abrogation of personal freedom because it asks too much, one might remember the words of the Second Collect for Peace found in Morning Prayer:

*O God who art the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom; defend us thy humble servants in all assaults of our enemies, that we surely trusting thy defence may not fear the power of any adversaries through the might of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.*

This collect states that our peace lies in service to God. When the *Virginia Orders* were written this prayer was on everyone's lips. It helps one understand why a military document for the governance of a small colony in a new and dangerous world made so much of saying the daily offices, and made those offices a matter of public duty, and of political allegiance. As the collect states, it is God who is the author of peace, our eternal life stands in knowledge of him. It is God from whom all power and authority is derived, and it is as soldiers in his sacred cause that these soldiers took up their military posts. Perfect freedom lies in serving the King of Kings, the commander of commanders, and Lord of Hosts. Prayer is the service He is owed, it is on prayer that all other accomplishments hinge. Richard Hooker, the Anglican Divine who lived in this same period wrote much the same end: "Is not the name of prayer usual to signify even all the service that ever we do unto God?"

# Remembering Peter Toon

*from the pages of The Mandate*



*Peter Toon with the Prayer Book Society Board, Houston, 2002, and reading the Gospel, 450th anniversary of Cranmer's death.*



*In front of Canterbury Cathedral, 2002.*



*With Debbie Remenyi, Wynnewood, 2002.*



*With the Bishop of Lichfield, Fall 2002*

# Dr. Peter Toon

**1939 - 2009**

Dr. Peter Toon, priest and theologian, passed away on the evening of the feast of St Mark the Evangelist, in San Diego, California, where he and his wife have resided for the last months. He will be sorely missed by all those who love the Anglican Way. As readers of *Mandate* are well aware, Dr. Toon has been, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the most vocal and prolific defender of the theology of the Anglican Reformation and the traditional Book of Common Prayer over the last decades. The absence of his voice on so many issues facing the church today will be an irreparable loss. Clarity of mind, depth of knowledge, and vigor of presentation marked his work, making his arguments both distinctive and convincing. An evangelist like St Mark, he was a lion of the faith.

During the last year, Dr. Toon has been suffering from a rare disease called amyloidosis. Diagnosed last spring, he underwent various treatments that were intended to slow the progress of the disease. Sadly, the disease was stronger than the medications, and we have lost him sooner than was hoped.

At the end Dr. Toon was attended by Fr Tony Noble, rector of All Saints' Episcopal Church, San Diego. Over the last weeks they have prayed together with the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, and his final words were to the praise of God who

he has served and loved so well. In his last hours, Fr Noble prayed with Dr. Toon the commendatory prayer.

*O Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of just men made perfect, after they are delivered from their earthly prisons: We humbly commend the soul of this thy servant, our dear brother, into thy hands, as into the hands of a faithful Creator, and most merciful Saviour; most humbly beseeching thee that it may be precious in thy sight. Wash it, we pray thee, in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, that was slain to take away the sins of the world; that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable and naughty world, through the lusts of the flesh or the wiles of Satan, being purged*



*and done away, it may be presented pure and without spot before thee. And teach us who survive, in this and other like daily spectacles of mortality, to see how frail and uncertain our own condition is; and so to number our days, that we may seriously apply our hearts to that holy and heavenly wisdom, whilst we live here, which may in the end bring us to life everlasting, through the merits of Jesus Christ, thine only Son our Lord. Amen.*

Please visit our website at [PBSUSA.org](http://PBSUSA.org) to read tributes to Dr. Toon.

**The Prayer Book Society will hold a Memorial Service for  
the Reverend Dr. Peter Toon  
at All Saints' Church, 1325 Montgomery Avenue, Wynnewood, Pennsylvania  
on Friday, July 24, at 5:00 p.m.  
Preacher: The Reverend Graham Eglington,  
former Chairman, Canadian Prayer Book Society.  
All are welcome to attend. A reception will follow in the Parish House.**