

Volume 41
Number 1
Summer/Fall 2018

ANGLICAN WAY

The magazine of the Prayer Book Society

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2** Reflections from
the Editor's Desk
*The Revd. Canon
Alistair Macdonald-
Radcliff*
- 6** From the President
of the Prayer Book
Society: Articles of
Religion, Part III
*The Revd. Gavin G.
Dunbar*
- 9** Beyond Imagination:
The True Meaning
of Creation
Dr. Paul Julienne
- 11** Is the Historic Prayer
Book an Evangelistic
Liturgy?
The Revd. Gavin Dunbar
- 13** Justification by Faith
in Anglican History
*Bishop FitzSimons
Allison*
- 17** A Response to ACNA's
Proposed Prayer Book
2019
Drew Nathaniel Keane

Please see the back
cover to for a form to
submit to continue
receiving *Anglican Way*





Reflections FROM THE Editor's Desk

The Reverend Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff

We need your gifts in order to carry out your mandate to defend the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer*. Please send a contribution in the enclosed envelope using the form supplied or you can do so online via our website anglicanway.org.

Please give generously.

Please read our websites pbsusa.org and anglicanway.org

Please contact Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff at macrada@hotmail.com in order to discontinue receiving *Anglican Way* magazine. Or send a note to the PBS using the coupon on the last page.

Cover: Looking across the Old City of Jerusalem from the Church of the Holy Sepulcher past the Dome of the Rock towards the Mount of Olives.

Photo credit: iStock.com/Fred Froese

2018 has already been an active and important year both for the Society and the life of the Anglican Communion worldwide as well as Episcopalians and Anglicans in North America.

But before turning to that wider context, it is of the first importance to express on behalf of this publication and the Prayer Book Society as a whole, our tremendous gratitude to Dr. Roberta Bayer for serving as the Editor of the *Anglican Way*, in direct succession to the Revd. Dr. Peter Toon. He passed on the baton to her exactly ten years ago and commended her then as, "a woman of learning and energy" which is a description her subsequent work as Editor has manifestly fulfilled. Dr. Toon was a formidable figure to follow and Dr. Bayer has amply repaid his trust. For this, together with all her hard work and commitment we are all profoundly grateful.

In introducing herself within these pages in 2008, Roberta discerned, in respect of what might be termed her personal Hippo-Cantuarian journey that:

"Augustine's story seems somewhat like the story of my life I do not know if I would have returned to the church, much less taken the Prayer Book to heart, if I had not at a crucial point in my life read Plato. . . . I saw that it was perfectly reasonable to know God, that he was a God who wanted us to know Him and to love Him with the fullness of our intellect, and moreover that it was not possible to love Him and know Him from within the philosophies and ideologies of our age because these philosophies deny the good of the intellect, and that with the denial of the good of the intellect has come the denial of God. It is no more virtuous to deny the good of intellect in the

name of faith, than it is in the name of ideology. For one thing it may lead to corrupt practices. That is a central truth which Christians of our age need to know. God gave us our intellects. . . .

So I think that I ought to work with the Prayer Book Society in order to assist my own thinking about historical Anglicanism because Cranmer, and his fellow Anglican divines did not deny the good of the intellect, they did not separate faith from learning, and I think they should be emulated. . . .

Augustine brought about the renewal of Christian thinking in the early years of the Christian church by elevating its teaching about the nature of God, Cranmer renewed our worship by renewing historical practices, and today we must learn what he knew. Worship with Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer is one of the means of return to where we have been, a guide to who we are now, and a signpost to where we are going."

Dr. Bayer's conclusion remains as needful and compelling now as it was then. And happily, we need to extend no adieux, for she has indicated, with characteristic generosity, that she will continue to write as a Contributing Editor and support both the Society and the *Anglican Way*, even on sabbatical, and as she takes up a Fellowship this year at Princeton. Thus, once more, are the boundaries of our gratitude to be further expanded!

Looking to our wider context it is striking that in his valedictory Editorial in August 2008, Dr. Peter Toon observed that on the one hand, "the GAFCON Conference occurred in Jerusalem" and that on the

Anglican Way

Volume 41, Number 1, Summer/Fall 2018

Editor: **The Revd. Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff** • Design/Layout: **Electronic Quill**

The Officers for the Year 2018 are:

President: **The Revd. Gavin Dunbar** • Vice President: **Dr. Stephen Blackwood**

Treasurer: **Patti Victor** • Secretary: **The Very Revd. Gordon Anderson**

Anglican Way is published by the Prayer Book Society, a non-profit organization serving the Church of God.

All gifts to the P.B.S. are tax deductible for U.S. citizens.

Editorial and all other correspondence: 1 West Macon Street, Savannah, GA 31401 • Phone 1-703-349-1346

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the above address.

Visit our websites: www.pbsusa.org • www.anglicanmarketplace.com • www.anglicanway.org

other “The Lambeth Conference will begin in Canterbury”. It is strange to find ten years later that a parallel recurs. The two conferences will not both happen in the same year this time, as the next Lambeth Conference is still two years away, but they do represent two poles around which much of the future of Anglicanism worldwide will still turn. This fact speaks to the long drawn out period of increasing stress that the Communion has endured now for more than twenty years, and sadly, it is very hard to be optimistic that any very positive resolution of these stresses will be found soon. The realities of division continue to increase both internationally and in North America, where the potentially devastating impact of litigation in South Carolina, Fort Worth and elsewhere, continues tragically to unfold.¹ Some Editorial comments on key aspects of what happened at the Episcopal General Convention are set out below along with a reflection on the global Anglican scene after the GAFCON meeting in Jerusalem and the challenge now facing the Communion in the period leading up to and at the next Lambeth Conference in 2020.

The Expanding Work and Reach of the Society

This wider context has immediate importance for the Society as it means that the relevance of the Prayer Book tradition as, the one “uniting Anglican formulary”, as Peter Toon called it, continues to grow rather than diminish. The fundamental fact remains true for all Anglicans, of whatever flavor they may consider themselves to be, that we all must acknowledge our shared roots in this Prayer Book heritage. There can be no more important task for the Society therefore than to set out and to demonstrate what this entails and to call everyone to what authentically defines the Anglican Way.

Happily for the Society, evidence of growth and increasing impact is to hand. Not only have we been able this year to hold the second of our now Annual Conferences but we are rapidly increasing our reach through the various new media of the internet.

Our two websites of *pbsusa.org* and *anglicanway.org* are reaching more than 3000 people a month and our outreach through Facebook and from our online advertising has reached well over 50,000 this year. These figures reflect the growing impact of our online *Anglican Way* and the regular updates in the form of the *Anglican e-Way* that we send out. These have enabled us to increase dramatically the number and length of articles we distribute. They also allow ready access to our extensive archives and the catechetical resources for weekly use in the volume *I am His*, written by the Society President Fr. Gavin Dunbar (and downloadable from both websites).

1. See the online post: “A Letter from Bishop Mark Lawrence after the Supreme Court Decision Re: South Carolina”, <https://anglicanway.org/2018/06/18/a-letter-from-bishop-mark-lawrence-after-the-supreme-court-decision-re-south-carolina/>

These developments mean we really do need all our members and supporters to sign up online via our websites to make sure that everyone interested receives these communications. We remain committed to our physical print edition of the Anglican Way but, given that it costs us about \$14,000 a time to print and dispatch, we are going to be asking everyone to confirm that they still want to receive it and to confirm the right address so to make sure the copies go where they really need to be.

The inherent flexibility of the online edition does mean that we will increasingly be carrying longer texts online rather than in print, however, so once again—please do sign up for our e-mail updates! (And donations can be made online also, as well as by post to help fund our expanding work, they are very much needed and welcome.)

A further sign of our growing reach is that over 70 congregations and parishes have signed up in just the last few months and we need to keep that list growing so please also sign up as a parish online if you have not already done so.

In this Edition

It is a pleasure to be able to include articles that reflect the wide range of our activities and concerns across theology, doctrinal standards and apologetics through to liturgical revision and its perils. The Society President concludes his three part commentary on the Thirty Nine Articles and clarifies too just how truly Evangelistic the Prayer Book is; Bishop FitzSimons Allison gives a characteristically erudite presentation on Justification by Faith; and Drew Nathaniel Keane provides a thorough commentary on the Draft of the Proposed new ACNA Prayer Book due out in 2019 while our noted Physicist Dr Paul Julienne clarifies powerfully what Christianity really means in its doctrine of Creation. So there is much here to enjoy!

Mission Statement

The Society is dedicated to the preservation, understanding, and propagation of Anglican Doctrine as contained in the traditional editions of The Book of Common Prayer.

SAVE THE DATE ! THE PBS ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2019

***What is Classical Anglicanism?
Historically rooted answers for today's church***

**14–16th February, 2019
Washington, DC**

Presenters will include:

Professor Oliver O'Donovan and Dr Joan O'Donovan
Professor Jesse Billett
Professor Samuel Bray
Bishop Fitzsimons Allison
Richard Mammana (founding Director of anglicanhistory.org)

Exact venue and further details will be announced shortly online and by e-mail.

The Annual Conference 2018:

The Prayer Book: Doctrine Liturgy and Life

Once again, the Society was able to hold its now Annual Conference in Savannah at St John's Church this last January. We have unfortunately faced major technical issues with regard to making available recordings of the lectures but we shall be issuing the Papers in a collected book form as also those from the Conference in 2017 as *PBS Proceedings*. News of how to download or order a print edition will be made available very soon online and in the next print edition of the Magazine. In the meantime, please find in this edition, the paper by Bishop Fitzsimons Allison on *Justification by Faith in Anglicanism* and the Paper on the *true* meaning of the concept of Creation by Dr. Paul Julienne (who is currently leading our work Apologetics Science and Faith) as foretastes of the rich content made available in the Conference presentations.

This year's Conference opened with a session Chaired by Bishop Michael Hawkins (Bishop of Saskatchewan and the Conference Preacher) entitled "The Ancient Catholic Lectionary at the heart of a Reformed Liturgy" by the Society's President The Revd. Fr. Gavin Dunbar. The Very Revd. Fr. David Thurlow next chaired the paper on "Justification in the History of Anglicanism" by The Rt. Revd. C. Fitzsimons Allison, D.Phil. the retired Bishop of South Carolina, and The Very Rev Dean William McKeachie chaired the following presentation on the "The Offertory & Pelagius: Did the Prayer Book Tradition protect us from an ancient heresy re-opened in the 1979 BCP? How can we maintain a right balance in our views of self-offering?" given by the Very Revd. Dr. Laurie Thompson III the Dean of Trinity School for Ministry in Ambridge PA. " The day closed with a session under the title "Being "Reasonably Anglican" and "Prayer Bookish": a Religion without tears?" by Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff.

The retired Professor of Journalism, William Murchison chaired the first session of the following day, addressed by The Revd. Dr. Paul Avis under the title, "Knit together in one communion and fellowship: What does the liturgy tell us about the Church and its Unity?" Canon Macdonald-Radcliff then chaired the session on "Catholic apologetics: retrieving older precedents" by Dr. Christopher Wells, the Editor of the *Living Church*. A Paper then followed by Dr. Paul Julienne, emeritus of NIST and The Joint Quantum Institute, University of Maryland entitled "Renewing the Christian Imagination : Inhabiting the City of God in a Secular Age.

On the final day of the conference, the high level of the papers presented was further sustained by that of Dr. Jesse Billett, of Trinity College, University of Toronto on the subject, "The Twentieth-Century Baptismal Revolution: Is the Classical Prayer Book Really Obsolete?" to which rhetorical question the answer was of course a resounding "no!". Dr. Stephen Blackwood, President of Ralston College, gave a paper entitled "(Being) Made for Eternity: Liturgical Patterns and Habits of Soul" and this was followed by the

second presentation of The Revd. Dr. Paul Avis on the topic " 'Not a Synod, only a Conference': The Lambeth Conference and the Councils of the Church" The very full final day was rounded out by a presentation 'On the Virtues of Re-Reading' by Dr. Michael Hurley of Cambridge University after which there were two break-out sessions on respectively "The Ancient Catholic Lectionary at the heart of a Reformed Liturgy" introduced by The Revd. Fr. Gavin Dunbar, and an "Overview of The Plans for the 'Comprehensive Revision' of the 1979 Prayer Book coming up before the General Convention with Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff, Dr. Jesse Billett, and William Murchison and the proceedings ended with the Conference Eucharist.

One Day Colloquium on Apologetics Science and Faith

The Society was also pleased to be hosted for a one day conference just outside Washington DC, by The Revd. Fr Mark Michaels and the Parish of St Francis Potomac. The day was introduced by Canon Macdonald-Radcliff and Dr. Paul Julienne and opened with a lecture by the Nobel Laureate in Physics Dr. William Phillips on the subject "Ordinary Faith, Ordinary Science". This was followed by a paper on, 'The Liturgical Brain' by Daniel Dorman a neuroscience researcher at the Krasnow Institute for Advanced Study at George Mason University.

The afternoon opened with a presentation by Dr Michael Hanby of the John Paul II Institute ACU, Washington DC. Under the title "No God No Science" followed by Dr. Julienne's presentation on "Renewing the Christian Imagination: Where do we go from here?" and the day concluded with Choral Evensong.

Two Wider Reflections

The General Convention of the Episcopal Church 2018 in Austin

There had been widely canvassed concerns about the possible outcomes of the Convention in several areas, most notably regarding revisions to the liturgy for, and understanding of Marriage, and the plan for a "Comprehensive Revision" of the 1979 Prayer Book, for which the previous Convention had *mandated* the Commission on Music and liturgy to develop proposals. The Society had held a seminar on this terrain as well as sessions in our Annual Conference and the possible options for revision had also been covered in the Anglican Way.²

Members of the Society were highly engaged in seeking to hold back the potential tide of further

2. See Report of The Revd. Canon Jordan Hylden and the articles: 'Important responses to the Proposals of the Task Force on Marriage' <https://anglicanway.org/2018/07/02/two-responses-to-the-tec-marriage-task-force-proposals/> and the article 'Proposals from the Task Force on Marriage to the coming TEC General Convention' <https://anglicanway.org/2018/07/01/proposals-from-the-task-force-on-marriage-to-the-coming-tec-general-convention/>

innovations in breach of the Prayer Book tradition and historic teaching of the Church on Marriage that were in prospect at the Convention. Among these William Murchison was again prominent his comments are telling and begin with a deep irony for a board member of this Society, as he wrote: “I couldn’t stand the ’79 book when it came out.” And yet faced with the possibility of a vastly more radical new version which would then likely be made obligatory when once unveiled, therefore, in Austin, I voted enthusiastically for its preservation.” The reason for this being the best possible line of action in the circumstances was that it upheld the status quo which allows for the 1928 Book of Common Prayer to be used. Moreover the 1979 Book is “not going anywhere. Especially it’s not going to have a new marriage service worded so as make of the marriage rite whatever you’d like it to be. It’s still “man” and “woman,” not “these persons.” And it’s going to stay that way.” Thus to borrow a phrase the option of allowing a “Thousand flowers to bloom” liturgically means that the widespread use of the 1928 Prayer Book and traditional language liturgies will be able to continue, albeit with a growing plethora of alternative and experimental rites.

However, as William Murchison went on to explain the issues of same-sex rites and the revision of the Prayer Book were closely connected and led into a further large problem regarding the security and place of those Bishops and others unable in conscience to carry out the new Rites, “The Prayer Book question abutted the same-sex marriage question directly. Was the Episcopal Church going to order the eight American dioceses not using same-sex rites to begin doing so forthwith? Many on both sides of the matter expected the collapse of opposition to the new way of doing things. It didn’t happen. A compromise happened instead. Bishops in the eight dioceses escaped the falling hammer. They must make same-sex ceremonies possible in parishes desiring them. They are permitted, while retaining the property and funds of such parishes, to put them under the pastoral jurisdiction of a bishop, probably a neighbor, willing to let such ceremonies go forward. No rector, called on to make a particular church available for a same-sex union, has to comply. . . . His canonical right to oversee the worship of the parish remains intact.” (Ibid.)

This outcome was the result of a great deal of work at the Convention, in which the role of the Communion Partners was highly significant and the statement of Province IX bishops was also important.³ The result represents an outcome consistent with what was seen in the prior discussions and colloquium

3. See the articles: “Two Statements were Issued regarding provision for same-sex liturgies by Communion Partners and Province IX Bishops”, <https://anglicanway.org/2018/08/13/two-statements-issued-before-and-after-the-tec-general-convention-from-communion-partners-and-province-ix-bishops/>; and “Key Resolutions of the 2018 General Convention in Austin”, <https://anglicanway.org/2018/08/13/three-key-resolutions-of-the-2018-general-convention-in-austin/>

held by the PBS to be the most feasible: namely one where the historic tradition still has a place.

All this connects in turn to the unfolding sense of crisis in the wider Anglican Communion and the potential significance of the GAFCON meeting held this last summer and the future of the Lambeth Conference coming in 2020:

*After GAFCON III—Whither Lambeth 2020 & Whither the Communion?*⁴

The GAFCON conference was a joyful event of unprecedented scale that demonstrated most powerfully the rising organizational capacity of the movement—and the consequent importance for Anglicanism of whether or not it is enabled to see its long-term future, within the Communion.

While, the overall outcome can only emerge over time it has to be viewed currently in the light of the statement issued at the end, which through its potentially damaging impact on the Lambeth Conference may yet cost traditionalist Anglicans dear. By setting out conditions which are most unlikely to be met, and by saying that in the absence of such being fulfilled, all bishops and Archbishops from GAFCON Provinces (however they define that) should decline the invitation to attend the next Lambeth Conference, the stage is set now for a transition into a fundamentally divided Communion which it will be ever harder to put back together. Ironically, to act thus is to risk completing what the radical Provinces started in breaking with the mind of the Church expressed at the last fully attended Lambeth in 1998!

After all, if many of the GAFCON bishops and Provinces plan effectively to withdraw from all practical participation in the structures of the Anglican Communion, even though (for reasons that are likely to become ever less clear), they continue to assert that they are in Communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury and are most certainly still Anglican, they risk facilitating radical change rather than halting it. Just as they also risk appearing to be the ones splitting the Communion, when they have previously suggested that this was what the radicals would do, by ignoring the mind of the whole in preference for new, albeit local and quite literally Provincial insights.

While it may be true that only a relatively small number of actual Provinces of the global communion are in GAFCON, the number of Anglicans in those provinces is huge. It stands at about 36 or 37 million, which represents more than half of the worldwide total, particularly when one recalls that while the Province of Canterbury may claim 25 million members in England, in all probability less than 10% are truly active members!

4. A longer online version of this section can be found on the Anglican Way website at <https://anglicanway.org/2018/06/25/after-gafcon-iii-whither-lambeth-2020-whither-the-communion/> and <https://anglicanway.org/2018/06/21/anglicanisms-costly-vocation-and-the-fight-to-belong/>

How can the trajectory towards disintegration of the Anglican Communion then be halted? There are two years to go before the next Lambeth Conference convenes and there is much that can be done in between.

With the benefit of hindsight, it was surely a mistake for the the Archbishop of Canterbury to have reportedly referred to GACFCO as a mere “ginger group” and a far deeper one not to have made an appearance there himself and not to have followed the example in doing so of Archbishop Suheil Dawani the Archbishop in Jerusalem who was widely praised for doing so. As Archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby could have experienced and addressed the assembled throng to significant mutual advantage. If the office of Canterbury has found it hard or even impossible to facilitate Communion-wide discipline, it surely must now seek to do what is needful to sustain Communion-wide cohesion, while still minimizing damage to overall integrity.

There is, an urgent need to undertake ecclesio-diplomatic outreach to try and overcome the impasse

over Lambeth 2020 and to achieve restraint on the part of any Provinces that might be tempted, in the meantime, to go the way of TEC and the Episcopal Churches of Canada and Scotland by way of radical innovation in the area of human sexuality. Similarly too, it is time to explore what room there is for the Archbishop to seek (privately no doubt) to mitigate or even mediate in places of crisis where secular litigation is clearly causing scandal and threatens to undermine the ministry of the Church.

But perhaps above all, now is the time to commend across the Communion a close engagement with the historic formularies that lie at the heart of our understanding of what it means to be Anglican. There is no more urgent time to engage the riches of the Prayer Book heritage which all Anglicans share and to understand what fidelity to that tradition requires.

The active pursuit of work to hold back the creeping separation within the Communion—which risks every day becoming more formal—is deeply urgent, since history makes sadly clear how difficult such divisions become to reverse.



The Revd. Gavin G. Dunbar, President, Prayer Book Society, and Rector, St John's Episcopal Church, Savannah, Georgia

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

The Reverend G. G. Dunbar, St. John's Episcopal Church, Savannah, Georgia

Articles of Religion (Part III)

Doctrinal Authorities

First things first. The first five Articles deal with “first things” in the order of reality—*what* we know about God and Christ, his incarnation, atoning death and triumph. The next three articles deal with “first things” in the order of knowledge—*how* we know what we know. What are the authorities by which we may establish the truth of religion? At the Council of Trent in 1546, the Roman Catholic Church had affirmed that the teaching of unwritten apostolic tradition was necessary to salvation; and in our own time, authority is said to be “dispersed”; but in line with reformed teaching the Articles affirmed that *Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation*. Its doctrine is *sufficient*, and needs no supplement, no additions, to make us “wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (2 Timothy 3:15). As Cranmer wrote in the first official homily, “a fruitful exhortation to the reading of Holy Scripture”:

For in holy Scripture is fully containyd what we ought to doe, and what to eschew; what to beleue, what to loue, and what to looke for at GODS hands at length. In these Books we shall finde the father from whom, the sonne by whom, and the holy Ghost, in whom all things haue their being and keeping vp, and

these three persons to be but one GOD, and one substance. In these books we may learne to know our selues, how vile and miserable we be, and also to know GOD, how good he is of himselfe, and how hee maketh vs and all creatures partakers of his goodness. We may learne also in these Bookes to know GODS will and pleasure, as much as (for this present time) is conuenient for vs to know. And (as the great Clerke and godly Preacher Saint Iohn Chrysostome sayth) whatsoever is required to saluation of man, is fully containyd in the Scripture of GOD. He that is ignorant, may there learne and haue knowledge. He that is hard hearted, and an obstinate sinner, shall there finde euerlasting torments (prepared of GODS iustice) to make him afraid, and to mollifie or soften him. He that is oppressed with misery in this world, shall there finde releefe in the promises of euerlasting life, to his great consolation and comfort. He that is wounded by the Diuell onto death, shall finde there medicine whereby he may bee restored againe vnto health.

The authority of Scripture is the authority of the apostolic witness—which is to say the authority

of Christ himself, who commissioned the apostles as chosen witnesses of the revelation made in him. As Article 2 already had affirmed, he is “the Word of the Father,” the living personal revelation of God, incarnate for us men and for our salvation. It is because we believe in Christ as the Word of God, that we believe in the Scriptures as the Word of God *written*—and not the other way around. But conversely, it is only through the Word of God written that we have saving knowledge of the Word of God. Despite much speculative ingenuity, we have no other knowledge of Jesus of Nazareth than that which the Scriptures give us.

The authority of Scripture raises three questions concerning about the authority of the Old Testament, of the Apocrypha, and of the Creeds. One tendency has been to treat them as all of equal authority; the other has been to deny them all any authority at all. At times Christians have been tempted to follow the lead of the 2nd-century heretic Marcion, and to lay aside the Old Testament as if it were a different and inferior revelation, but the Articles are insistent on the unity of Scripture in their witness to Christ: *The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.* (The liturgical expression of this idea is signified in the pattern of reading a chapter from the Old Testament as well as from the New at Morning and Evening Prayer.) Within the unity of the Scriptures, however, the Article allows for certain distinctions. The ceremonial and civil laws of the Old Testament *do not bind Christian men. . . ; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.* Following the New Testament’s interpretation of the Old Testament, the former laws belong to the time of the preparation for his coming, and are abrogated by it, the latter commandments to all time.

The Articles are also nuanced in their treatment of the books known as Apocrypha—books that did not appear in the Hebrew Scriptures, but only in the ancient Greek translation known as the Septuagint. Here the Articles adopts the distinction proposed by Jerome, the great 4th century biblical scholar: *And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine.* Jerome was following the hint given in the ancient prologue of the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus): that it was written “to the intent that those which are desirous to learn . . . might profit much more in living according to the law”. Though other reformed churches omitted the Apocrypha from their Bibles, Anglicans have not, and they are read (as Cranmer’s lectionary provides) in the liturgy.

The sufficiency of the canonical Scriptures, therefore, does not mean that there are no other authorities which a Christian ought to consult.

Article 8 names the ancient catholic Creeds, whose doctrine of the Trinity and of Christ *ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.* They have doctrinal authority precisely because their doctrine is subordinate to that of Scripture and depends upon it. The Articles in their original form cite three ancient Creeds—those commonly called the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian. (The American church, under the influence of anti-dogmatic Enlightenment rationalism, contemplated retaining only the Apostles’ Creed, but was persuaded to accept the Nicene also, the Athanasian alone being omitted).

The three Creeds transmit the witness of the early church in three phases of its history. The Apostles’ Creed transmits the primitive Rule of Faith, the witness of the ancient church in the first three centuries. The Nicene Creed transmits the witness of the ancient church at the fourth century, as articulated at the first and second ecumenical councils of Nicea (325 AD) and Constantinople (381 AD). Specifically it affirms (against the Arians and Apollinarians) the true Godhead of Christ and of the Spirit, and the true manhood of Christ. The Athanasian Creed bears witness to the fifth century development of Nicene faith, and corresponds therefore to the council of Ephesus (431 AD) and the council of Chalcedon (451), in its fuller teaching on the Trinity, and on the distinction of natures in the unity of Christ’s person. As to the Councils themselves, their subordinate authority is implicitly and obliquely mentioned in Article 21, in a cautionary note about the authority of General (or Ecumenical) Councils:

. . . when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and word of God, they may err and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

In the great late medieval debates over the Church’s polity, the choices were papalist or conciliarist. Anglicanism rejects the first without unconditionally embracing the second. In the proposed *Reformation Legum Ecclesiasticorum* of 1552, Cranmer’s draft reform of canon law, that fell afoul of Tudor politics and was never formally adopted, the comment about councils (1.14) is still cautionary, but more affirmative:

For even though we willingly grant great honor to councils especially universal ones, nevertheless we judge all of them are to be placed far below the dignity of the canonical Scriptures and we also make an important distinction among the councils themselves. For some of them, such as especially those

four, Nicea, Constantinople, First Ephesus, and Chalcedon, we accept and embrace with great reverence. The same judgment we make concerning many others which were held afterward. In them we see and confess that he most holy fathers have established, according to divine Scripture, many things in a most important and sometimes holy way concerning the blessed and most high Trinity Jesus Christ, Our Lord and Saviour, and the human redemption procured through him. However we do not consider our faith bound by these except the extent that they are able to confirmed by the Holy Scriptures. For it is obvious that some councils have sometimes erred and have defined things which are contrary to each other, partly in our juridical actions and even partly in matters of faith. Thus the councils are certainly to be read with esteem and Christian reverence, but for all that are to be examined according to the pious, certain, and correct rule of Scripture.

The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticorum* adds a similarly affirmative but nuanced chapter on the “authority of the holy fathers” (1.15):

Finally, we consider that the authority of the orthodox fathers is in no way to be despised, for much of what they say is outstanding and useful. However, we do not admit that judgment should be made about the sacred Words [i.e. Scripture] on the basis of their opinion. For the sacred Words should be the rule and indicator of all human doctrine for us. Even the fathers themselves were reluctant to grant themselves such an honor and frequently warned the reader that he should admit his own [i.e. the father’s] opinions and interpretations only to the extent that he was aware that they agreed with the sacred Words. Therefore, let their authority and respect remain with them but let it yield and be subject to the truth and authority of what the sacred books teach.

The rediscovery of the Bible is not the abolition of ancient Catholic church tradition, but the rediscovery and revival of its principled subordination to Scripture.

In our age, the Church has become confused about *what* it knows of Christ, the incarnate Word of God, and *how* it knows it. The doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture set forth in Articles 6–8 means that on matters of salvation, we may not look to evolving popular opinion, the “leading of the Spirit”, the pronouncements of prelates, or the decisions of conventions, as authorities supplementing or correcting Scripture (as liberals, charismatics, and Roman Catholics tend to do). Nor may we deny those subordinate authorities which

Scripture establishes (as evangelicals tend to do). To err on either side is to err from the revelation which God has given his Church.

The sufficiency of Scripture as the supreme authority for saving doctrine, and its mediation by subordinate authorities, explains distinctive features of the Prayer Book Liturgy; its reading of Scripture; its use of Creeds; and of course the modifications made of pre-Reformation forms to bring them into line with Scriptural teaching.

Though modern Anglicans, both conservative and liberal, have largely deserted the daily office of morning and evening prayer, Cranmer’s intention was for this to be a corporate daily discipline for entire congregations; and there is evidence that up to the late 18th century, this practice was not uncommon in town churches, and on a less frequent basis in country parishes. It is significant that in the original Preface to the first Common Prayer Book, Cranmer devotes his attention to the daily office, whose primitive ideal he seeks to restore in his reform:

THERE was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so surely established, which (in continuance of time) hath not been corrupted: as (among other things) it may plainly appere by the common prayers in the Churche, commonlye called divine service: the firste originall and grounde whereof, if a manne woulde searche out by the auncient fathers, he shall finde that the same was not ordeyned, but of a good purpose, and for a great advaancement of godlines: For they so ordred the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest parte thereof) should be read over once in the yeare, intendencyng thereby, that the Cleargie, and specially suche as were Ministers of the congregacion, should (by often readyng and meditation of Gods worde) be stirred up to godlines themselves, and be more able also to exhorte other by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the trueth. And further, that the people (by daily hearyng of holy scripture read in the Churche) should continuallye profite more and more in the knowledge of God, and bee the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.

It is equally significant that in Cranmer’s original design, the Apostles’ Creed was said twice daily (as well as at Baptism), the Nicene Creed was said at every celebration of the Eucharist, and the Athanasian Creed was to be said on thirteen occasions through the Church’s year, including Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday. The immersive reading of Scripture in its canonical fullness and sequence was accompanied by the regular use of the doctrinal standards in Creeds as act of worship.

To be continued. The full article is available on the website anglicanway.org.

Beyond Imagination

THE TRUE MEANING OF CREATION

By Dr. Paul Julienne

If we are to have a sounder and better interaction between the worlds of science and theology, it is necessary to have a renewal of our scientific and Christian imaginations. Here “imagination” does not point to things “imaginary” but to that human faculty by which we access Reality in its depth. It is close to what the ancient Greeks meant by *nous*, by which we grasp the world in its wholeness. As St. Paul tells us: “be transformed by the renewal of your *nous*” (Rom. 12:2).

Eugene Peterson once said at a conference I attended, “what our imagination does with Reality is the Reality we live by.” The Reality of the modern mind is the immanent frame of secular modernity with its flattened imagination driven by its “scientific” metaphysics of reductive naturalism. That is to say, whether one invokes Newtonian corpuscles or more contemporary quantum fields, all things are reduced to matter in motion according to the laws of physics. Not that such things are unimportant, but I would prefer to think that the fact that there are scientists with minds that penetrate how Reality works is perhaps the most wondrous and imagination-provoking feature of the Reality in which we participate. The problem with reduction is that it reduces the scientist and his or her very understanding of Reality to meaningless matter in motion. What blindness keeps us from seeing this?

Michael Hanby points out in his book *No God, No Science* that in the very act of excluding God from its considerations “science” requires an unavoidably theological distinction in defining what “god” is to be excluded. Moreover, the “god” excluded by science is precisely NOT the God of classical Christian theism.

I would like therefore to recover some basic concepts that remain sound and help us understand better the relation between God and the world. My premise is that the reductive immanent frame of secular modernity is too small and constrictive to represent what we actually know about Reality.

Near the very end of the Bible, Jesus says: “I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end” (Rev. 22:12) This remarkable claim places Jesus before and after all things, before the creation of the entire cosmos and after its end. In the words of St. Paul to the Colossians, “He is the image of the invisible God . . . all things were created through him and for him. And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together.” (Col. 3:15–17) So we, as Christians, need to be able to state how “in him all things hold together.”

Indeed, if science and theology are to hold together, we as Christians need to be able to state how “in him all things hold together.” So let us start at the beginning.

St. John’s Gospel opens with these familiar words: “*In the beginning was the Word . . .*” (John 1:1). We normally take this to mean that “way back, in the beginning” the Word of God was active in the creation of the world. But you get a much richer understanding if you look at the Greek or even the Latin for these words: *En arché ên o Logos . . .* or *In principio erat Verbum . . .*

The Greek word rendered “beginning”, *arché*, means more than just a beginning in time, it has the sense of a “source,” “origin,” “principle,” or “what governs.” You can see this in the Latin cognate word “*principio*.” But *arché* is not so much a logical “principle” as an originating source that governs what happens. Furthermore, John the Theologian deploys the word *Logos*, and means much more than just “Word.” To the philosophers of the time it also carried a sense of the basic Reason or “Logic” behind the cosmos; the governing source of all that exist is an intelligible Reason that speaks an intelligible Word. There is order and not random chaos behind the cosmos. John points back to the opening words of Genesis, where God speaks the world into existence.

Let us keep this in mind as we ponder the amazing fact that the world is indeed intelligible to our minds, that there are scientists to comprehend the world’s order.

But let us next consider the nature of the relation between God and the world indicated in speaking of creation *ex nihilo*. I do not mean here some kind of “fundamentalist” creationism but rather the classic philosophical doctrine worked out long before the modern era.

Simon Oliver, a Canon of Durham Cathedral and a Professor of Theology at Durham University in his book, *Creation: A Guide for the Perplexed*, covers the broad historical development of the idea of creation from antiquity to the modern era, especially as understood by St. Thomas Aquinas. To me, St. Thomas’s metaphysical treatment is adequate to what modern science knows about the world and helps us to understand why the empirical sciences can be so successful.

Creation *ex nihilo*, means that God created the entirety of the universe strictly from nothing, no-thing, as a free act of his love and goodness. He did not take some pre-existing “stuff” and shape it into something. Consequently, creation *ex nihilo* is not a statement about a change, or a beginning in time, but a statement about the relation between the Creator and what is created (the creature, or



Dr. Paul Julienne, Emeritus of the Joint Quantum Institute of the University of Maryland and the National Institute of Standards and Technology

creatures). Creation was not “back then” but is always taking place as God sustains the created order by his upholding of its existence. St. Thomas says:

Creation denotes the accomplished fact, . . . [not] a change effected by the Creator but merely the beginning of existence and a relation to the Creator from whom the creature receives its being.¹

Any created entity receives its very being or existence from the Creator. Therefore, God is not another being in the created universe to act as a cause within the creation. Rather God utterly transcends the created order as the source of its existence, and has his own mode of primary causation with respect to creation. God’s act is to bestow existence, which is to say being, upon that which is created. The created entities within the created order then can act as causes within creation, according to their created mode of secondary causation. It is this mode of causation that is studied by the sciences, not God’s mode of primary causation. St. Thomas goes on to say,

“He can make a thing from nothing, and this action of his is called creation. . . . being is by creation, whereas life and the like are by information: . . . the causation of all that is in addition to being, or specific of being, belongs to second causes which act by information, on the presupposition as it were of the effect of the first cause.”²

The secondary causes within the created order act *per informationem*, “by information,” by which St. Thomas meant that life, and changes within the created order, act by the communication or changing of form,³ which is to say, by the “in-forming” of things by other things through their interrelated activity. All of this secondary capacity of things acting is a consequence of God’s first primary causation, which grants to things the form that they have, and by virtue of which they are what they are. A created entity is thus free to act according to what it is and according to the end (Greek *telos*) given to it by the Creator. One end of any creature is simply to be what it is according to its form.

St. Thomas tells us that God works intimately in all things, even while things have their own proper operation:

“God works in things in such a manner that things have their proper operation. . . . God himself is the cause of every operation as its end. . . . all agents act in virtue of God Himself.”

“Therefore He is the cause of action not only by giving the form which is the principle of action . . . but also as preserving the forms and powers of things. . . . because in all things God Himself is properly the cause of universal being which is innermost in all things; it follows that in all things God works intimately. For this reason

in Holy Scripture the operations of nature are attributed to God as operating in nature, according to Job 10:11: “Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh: Thou hast put me together with bones and sinews.”⁴

Thus, it is never a matter of asking whether God did some act in the world or whether it was “nature” or natural causes. It is always both which act together.⁵ Job is clothed with skin and put together with bones and sinews by God, since God, by virtue of being the Creator, is the primary cause of all being and change, including Job’s development. But Job also gets his skin and bones from the natural processes by which he develops from an embryo to a child and then an adult human being, all of which happened according to the secondary causation of molecular and cellular biology and organ systems that are studied by science.

It is therefore a false choice to have to choose between nature and God as the cause of some action or event: both are always simultaneously active in all things, according to their proper mode of causation. Simon Oliver’s book sets out this understanding in much more detail than I can offer here.

On one very important point St. Thomas went well beyond Aristotle’s understanding. For Aristotle, any “substance” in the world was a union of form and matter. This union can be called a hylomorphism, or a hylomorphic union, after the two Greek words, *hylē*, for wood, matter and *morphē*, for form. To Aristotle, “matter” was not “stuff” as we think of it, rather “matter” reflected an indeterminate potential to receive form and become a “substance” with a nature to be what it is given by form.

If we think about this in terms of modern physics, the immaterial equations grant form to matter, which in turn conforms to the equations. There is no such thing as “bare” matter in physics—rather all matter is already embodied form, and thus “informed” by the equations and governed by them: the electron in the hydrogen atom “knows” where to be near the proton; it has to be where the governing equations tell it to be. Matter embodies form: this is its end, its *telos*. To classical thinking, form is the “formal cause” of the entities in the universe, whereas *telos* provides their “final cause.”

Yet form does not compel existence. Just because we know the nature or essence of a thing, “what it is,” we do not know that it actually exists. I can understand what a horse is and what a unicorn is, but one actually exists in the world of our experience and the other does not. Existence makes a real difference, we might say. Why are there actual atoms? The immaterial equations do not make them. To paraphrase Steven Hawking’s question, what breathes the fire into the equations so we have an actual universe?

1. *De Potentiae Dei*, Q3.3

2. *De Potentiae Dei*, Q3.1

3. “Form” is not simple to explain; it is not “shape” or “idea” but expresses the principle of a thing, its “what-ness” or what-it-is.

4. *Summa Theologica* I.105.5

5. *Summa Contra Gentiles*, III.70.8: “. . . the same effect is not attributed to a natural cause and to divine power in such a way that it is partly done by God, and partly by the natural agent; rather, it is wholly done by both, according to a different way. . .”

Now we have arrived at one of the most important distinctions St. Thomas made in the whole of his thinking: namely the “real distinction” between essence and existence, whereby it is evident that, essence does not imply existence.

To Aquinas, the most important unifying principle in all of Reality is *esse*, which is being, existence. To him, it was the “act of all acts”, the “perfection of all perfections.”⁶ *Esse* is the fundamental property that everything in the universe actually has, which all actual things have in common. This is true whether we are talking about actual atoms or quantum fields, or DNA, or cells, or frogs or trees or planets or galaxies. They all EXIST. To St. Thomas all existent things are hylomorphic entities, a union of form, matter, and existence.

Creation *ex nihilo* is nothing less than the constant granting and upholding by the Creator of the existence, form and matter of all things in the created order. This includes absolutely everything; nothing is

6. *De Potentia*, Q7.2, reply to objection 9: “Wherefore it is clear that *being* (*esse*) as we understand it here is the actuality of all acts, and therefore the perfection of all perfections.”

left out. Except God is not a creature, a created being, in the universe. God absolutely transcends the created order.⁷ Yet it is precisely that absolute transcendence, God’s utter otherness from the created order, that allows him to be intimately present to each and every thing in the universe, in its “interior,” so to speak, upholding its being (existence) and granting each thing its power to be precisely what it actually is. This applies to atoms or trees or human beings.

Now we can begin to understand the vast import of this analysis. This way of seeing creation gives us nothing less than a way of understanding both the universality of being, the universal characteristics of the entities we can study by way of science, as well as the individuality of things, and the utter uniqueness of individual things that we actually encounter as individual things, and which we as individuals are ourselves.

7. God is *Ipsum Esse Subsistens*, Subsistent Being Itself or Existence Itself (*Summa Theologica* 1.4.a2). It is beyond the scope of this talk to discuss St. Thomas’s “proofs” for the existence of God, which can be given more force and credibility that most modern philosophy has been willing to grant. Simon Oliver discusses this in his previously mentioned book, *Creation: A Guide for the Perplexed*.

Is the Historic Prayer Book an Evangelistic Liturgy?

By The Revd. Gavin Dunbar

Is the historic Prayer Book an evangelistic liturgy? Can a church that uses one of the classical Prayer Books (England 1662, USA 1928, Canada 1962) fulfill the Great Commission to “make disciples of all nations”?

It is a mark of our time that many Anglican and Episcopalian Christians would answer these questions in the negative. The Prayer Book may be good for some things—but not evangelism. So runs the current wisdom. So prevalent is this view, that even many Prayer Book Episcopalians share it!

Two intersecting influences are responsible for this negative view of the Prayer Book—first, the influence of revivalistic evangelicalism and its 20th century charismatic development, and second, the influence of the “church growth” movement, with its use of modern marketing techniques to boost church membership.

The first perceives the genuine movement of the Spirit and genuine faith, in worship which is emotionally exciting and open to spontaneous self-expression. In Anglican or Episcopalian churches, this is often expressed in a resistance to “worship styles” that seem old or dated, and an expectation that corporate worship will be varied—thus demonstrating, it is thought, a willingness to be flexible and responsive

to the Spirit’s leading. Where these presuppositions exist, the ancient, predictable objectivity of Prayer Book worship appears unspiritual, rigid, and dead.

The second influence, the church growth movement, uses worship services as evangelistic outreach events. Thus, services are carefully designed to attract and hold worshippers, who are treated as religious consumers. In this approach, what happens during a service should be immediately understandable and accessible both to the unconverted and to Christians coming from non-liturgical backgrounds. Such “seeker-sensitive” services are deliberately unchurchy and undemanding, providing upbeat contemporary music, and upbeat “messages” that aim at “relevance”. The “churchiness” of the Prayer Book, its preoccupation with the administration of Word and Sacrament, the demands it makes of the worshippers, these are thought to be useless for church growth.

There is a real loss to Anglican Christianity when the evangelistic strategy embodied in the reformed and catholic tradition of the Prayer Book is abandoned for the sake of ideas drawn from revivalistic-charismatic Christianity, or from the marketing approach of the church growth movement. Though these are not without certain strengths, they are at best only part of the Christian and Biblical tradition, and do not represent historic Anglican Christianity.

For the sake of Christ, and the Church's witness to him, Anglican Christians need to rediscover in understanding and practice the Prayer Book as an evangelistic liturgy.

In this essay we shall consider (1) the historic record on the Prayer Book as an evangelistic liturgy; (2) the Biblical teaching about evangelism; (3) the Prayer Books conformity to the Biblical teaching; (4) the practical use of the Prayer Book for evangelism.

The Historical Record

To suggest that the Prayer Book is something less than adequate as an evangelistic liturgy, flies in the face of the historic evidence.

The Prayer Book emerged from the 16th century rediscovery of the Gospel (the "evangel" of evangelism) and is itself a primary witness of the degree to which the gospel mandate to "make disciples of all nations" was embraced as a normative characteristic of all faithful Christian ministry. At no other time in church history—certainly not the heyday of 20th century liturgical revision—was there a comparable clarity of conviction about the Gospel.

As an instrument of evangelism, moreover, the Prayer Book has been effective for more than four centuries, from the mid-16th century onwards, not only in England but around the world. Wherever English traders, explorers, navies, armies, settlers, government officials, and missionaries went, they went with the English Bible and the English Prayer Book. Missionaries expended enormous energy not only in translating the Bible into local languages, but also the Prayer Book. The present-day Anglican Communion was a result of that Prayer Book Christianity.

The Bible's Teaching about Evangelism

It is in Saint Matthew's Gospel that we find the best-known expression of the Church's evangelistic mission, in the "Great Commission", given by the risen Christ to the apostles:

"All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth: Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matthew 28:19–20).

There is another version of it in the ending of St. Mark's Gospel, also given to the apostles:

"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:15, 6).

While in St. Luke, the commission is given to other disciples as well as the apostles:

"Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third

day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations: and ye are witnesses of these things" (24:46–48).

In St. John's Gospel, Jesus tells the disciples, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (20:21–23).

In the Acts of the Apostles, Jesus tells the apostles, "ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8).

Finally, there is the witness of Paul:

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Corinthians 4:17–21).

While there are many more that could be cited these six verses allow us to identify the four primary aspects of this commission, namely its goal, agency, means, and duration.

First, the goal of the mission: the mission consists in *the making of disciples of all nations*.

The word "disciples" means literally "learners", by which it understands not only the instruction of the intellect but also the training of the will in subjection to the authority of Christ's teaching and example, and by participation in the fellowship of his Church.

The sketch of the Church in Jerusalem after Pentecost in Acts 2:41–47 illustrates the ecclesial form of discipleship. The reference to "all nations" bespeaks the catholicity of the church's evangelistic mission, because Christ died "not for that nation only", that is, the Jews, "but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad" (John 12:52 cf. Ephesians 1:10), without respect to any distinction of nature—sex, age, race, language, culture, economic or social status, and religious background (see Galatians 3:28; Ephesians 2:11–22).

Second, the agency of the mission: authority to evangelize is granted primarily to the *apostolic ministry* (thus Matthew, Mark and Acts) ordained of

Christ and empowered by the gift of his Spirit. This authority should not be understood as excluding other Christians (the other disciples mentioned in John and Luke), for the mission belongs to the whole Church. (Remember the Israelite slave girl, whose testimony sent Naaman the Syrian to be healed and converted by Elisha the prophet.) Rather, this authority to make disciples is vested in the apostolic ministry, as their special office and responsibility, to ensure that is a priority of the Church as a whole.

Third, the means by which the mission is carried out: the *preaching of the gospel*, the *administration of baptism*, together with the *teaching and learning of Christ's commandments*. The first two (preaching and baptism) are not essentially different activities, but complementary aspects of Word and Sacrament, both of which require *repentance*, and authoritatively proclaim *remission of sins in his name*, thus bringing about *reconciliation* with God. Moreover, what Word and Sacrament proclaim (as signs) they also effect: those who receive the Gospel and Baptism in repentance and faith are indeed *saved*; those who do not are, by their own choice, *damned*. "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained".

As for the *teaching and learning of Christ's commandments*: although disciple-making has a beginning point (baptism and faith in response to the preaching of the gospel), the Bible presents it not as a "one-time" event (a conversion experience), but rather as a continuing process of growing to maturity in the knowledge of God (see Ephesians 1:15–18; 4:8–16), and learning to obey his commandments (e.g. Matthew 5–7 esp. 8, 24–27, John 13:17, 34–35, 1 Corinthians 11:23–29). Of necessity this will include growth in doctrinal, moral, spiritual, ecclesiastical and sacramental knowledge and practice.

If the preaching of the gospel and the administration of baptism correspond to justifying faith, the teaching

of Christ's commandments corresponds to the sanctifying good works of charity in which lively faith is expressed. This pattern corresponds to the pattern of disciple-making set forth in the Great Commission, and the pattern of Christian conversion and spiritual growth envisioned by the Prayer Book in its pattern of initiation through Baptism, Catechesis, Confirmation, admission to Holy Communion, and perseverance in the fellowship of good works. Thus neither preaching for conversion by itself (the "altar call"), nor baptism by itself, nor both together, are sufficient for disciple-making: ongoing theological, moral, and spiritual formation, by catechesis and common prayer, is also necessary.

When the whole scope of Biblical teaching is taken into account, the calling of the Church cannot be restricted simply to the mandate to turn unbelievers into believers (evangelism, narrowly construed). If this were the sum of the Church's calling, it would make sense for her corporate gatherings to be oriented primarily to the "outsider" whose adherence she is seeking to woo. (Though one wonders then what the Church triumphant would do in heaven.) But when all the implications of the Great Commission are allowed to shape our understanding of Christian duty and calling, evangelism in this narrow sense must be seen as but part of the whole.

Evangelism must be understood as terms of discipleship: learning to know, love, worship and obey the Lord. Therefore, the making of a disciple cannot be regarded as simply making converts to the Faith. It is rather a transformative process which embraces the whole of a disciple's life, and begins with his conversion. A Christian is always a learner in the school of Christ, and the Church's calling is to embrace and manifest the fullness of Christ's commandment to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them . . . and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you".

Justification by Faith in Anglican History

By Bishop FitzSimons Allison

(This article comprised one of the Papers given at this year's Prayer Book Society Conference in Savannah in February, 2018)

Part I

There are an unlimited number of ways that the biblical and Prayer Book teachings on Justification can be distorted or denied. However, they all share one factor, sin. God's righteousness, Luther thought, was the righteousness that condemned the unrighteousness

and Luther knew himself to be a sinner and thus God's righteousness was a permanent condition of condemnation. It was only after the Gospel news broke through that Christ's righteousness was disclosed in making us righteous—in his birth, life, teaching, suffering, death and resurrection for us sinners. The justice (same word as righteous) is precisely for the saving of sinners, including Martin Luther. That was the spring board for the Reformation: not condemnation but justification for sinners.

We can, however, hold this experience out before us as an idea without participating in it with our



Bishop C. FitzSimons Allison

personal shame, guilt, hopes, despair, and pride. We must repent. There is a symbiotic relationship between repentance and justification. The wonderful freeing confident experience of justification (catch 22) is not accessible without repentance and true repentance cannot be accomplished without the experience of justification. I am not unaware that I am treading on slippery ground but we have recently been given an exhilarating recovery of true repentance that helps with this dilemma.

It is Dr. Ashley Null's book, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of Repentance: Renewing the Power to Love*. Reflecting on Cranmer (and Melancthon) he recovers for us a deeper grasp of our human condition that underlies our Prayer Book. "What the heart desires, the will chooses and the mind justifies." Repentance is not mere remorse and regret and wishing for more will-power. It is deeper than mind or will. We tend to blame our will power when we do what is wrong. Actually it is our heart that needs to change. Our wills are the tools of our hearts. What the heart desires, the will chooses and the mind justifies.

With a change of heart, repentance becomes not mere remorse or regret but a "renewing of the power to love". Our pride will continue to blame our will power and protect our heart from responsibility or change. Jeremiah, along with the other prophets, tells us, "The heart is deceitful above all things." But Jesus said it best: "But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart and defiles a person. For out of the heart comes evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander." (Matt. 15:18,19) Only when the heart hears the Good News of true righteousness (justification) can regret and remorse turn into "renewing the power to love". St. Paul shows us what Christ's righteousness truly is (2 Cor. 3:9) "For if there was splendor in the dispensation of condemnation (the law), the dispensation of righteousness must far exceed it in splendor."

This is the great counter-culture text where the opposite of condemnation is righteousness. The message to the heart must be more than the message of law, which always condemns, The message of righteousness, which justifies the sinner, far exceeds it in splendor.

Ashley has a way of showing Cranmer's approach to sinners with God's enthrallment, his allurements that evokes response from hard hearts. Has anyone said it better than John Donne? "Batter my heart three personed God . . . for I, except you enthrall me, never shall I be free."

How does God enthrall, captivate, entice and charm us and change our hearts. He enthralls us with the infinite wonder and complexity of his creation. His enticement with us begins in what we call Christmas. He visits us as a weak and , vulnerable baby that Christopher Smart marvels at in hymn 491, "Oh the strength of infant weakness." He enthralls us with his wisdom at the age of 12. He captivates us with his healings and especially with his mercy.

He continues to entice us with his courage to face down the Pharisees with their cruel hope of their own self-righteousness. He entices us by treating us sinners as righteous. He enthralls us by rebuking the cynical Sadducees who denied the blessed hope of resurrected life. He captivates us by not riding on an Arabian steed carrying a sword but on a lowly donkey. He awes us by his humble realism about the cost of mercy and even more by his willing painful payment of that cost in crucifixion and death. And does he not enthrall us as in his everlasting power over death at a meal on the road to Emmaus and eating fish with his disciples after the Resurrection?

Why have we missed this great good news about repentance being the renewing of the power to love? I would like to add something that Ashley doesn't mention.

The dictionary definition of repentance tells us that it means "to change our minds," "to regret," "to feel sorry," "to feel remorse". Repentance is certainly not a happy word. But the good news is that the dictionary is wrong. Repentance is not mere regret or remorse, rather it is the "renewal of the power to love".

How did we get this wrong? It has to do with translation. Cranmer knew our problem has to do with our hearts not our minds. The Greeks, not having the revelation of scripture, believed that it was our minds not our hearts that needed changing. The Greek word *metanoien*, means change of mind. Thirty eight pages in Volume IV of Kittel's *Word Book of the Bible* tell us that repentance in scripture in all contexts without exception, means change of heart, not change of mind, in spite of the Greek word *metanoein*.

Why does it matter? For 2000 years translations of repent have falsely called it change of mind. The Greeks believed that "knowledge equals virtue" so if you become educated virtue will follow. Hence the Greeks had no word for "change of heart." There is no such word as *metakardia*. To truly repent we need to know what needs changing and it is not simply our minds. Mark Twain said that giving up smoking was the easiest thing in the world. "I've done it a thousand times." We can change our minds 6 times before breakfast but changing our hearts (*metakardia*) is a matter of God's enthrallment. That is why true repentance and justification are symbiotic.

Part II

The righteousness, wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come, is both perfect and inherent. That whereby we are justified is perfect, but not inherent. That whereby we are sanctified, inherent, but not perfect. (Hooker, "A Learned Discourse of Justification," *Ecclesiastical Polity* (Everyman Edition, p. 16)

Richard Hooker (1554-1600) is the example of classical Anglican teaching on Justification. He summarizes this teaching in these three simple sentences while making it clear that the "grand

question which hangeth yet in the controversy between us and the Church of Rome, is about the matter of justifying righteousness.” (op. cit., p. 17) Hooker then proceeds to list all the significant agreements between the two communions culminating with the “grand question,” the issue of the *formal cause* of justification that separates us.

The formal cause is defined as “that which make a thing to be what it is.” The Council of Trent (1545–1563) had claimed it to be the “infusion of inherent righteousness” thereby making the justified truly righteous by a righteousness of their own. This true righteousness being inherent renders the justified sinless unless or until one commits a mortal sin which then results in the loss of grace and must be restored by the sacrament of Penance.

The result of this decree denies that Christians are sinners until they commit a mortal sin. “Venial expressions of concupiscence hath not the formal nature of sin.” (Session V) This denial of sin in the regenerate, what the Reformers called *simul justus et peccator*, at the same time justified and a sinner, stems from Trent’s claim that the formal cause of justification is the infusion of inherent righteousness. In contrast, the Reformers claimed that Christ’s righteousness alone makes us treated, or worded, or reckoned as righteous before God. It is not that we ourselves now satisfy the righteousness of God, as Trent claimed, but it is Christ’s perfect righteousness imputed or reckoned to us.

The imputation of Christ’s righteousness is the classical Anglican position from Thomas Cranmer, Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, George Downam, John Davenant, James Ussher, Joseph Hall, Robert Sanderson, John Donne, and John Prideaux: all following Prayer Book teaching until the middle of the 17th century.

Trent’s position, in reaction to the Reformers, did not easily prevail. The Conference of Ratisborn (Regensburg) in 1541 had three Roman Catholics and three Reformers who found a middle way by holding that justification of sinners was accomplished by acknowledging that although there be inherent righteousness in a justified person “nevertheless the faithful soul depends not on his own but only on the righteousness of Christ . . . thus by faith in Christ we are accepted through his merits and not on account of righteousness inherent in us . . .”

The singular advantage of this agreement acknowledges that even in the regenerate there is yet sin and in our frailty we must depend upon the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. Unfortunately, Luther could not be persuaded by this affirmation and the subsequent Council of Trent in its 6th Session overwhelmingly defeated the position of acknowledging sin in the regenerate, the position held by Cardinals Contarini (who was a major figure at Ratisborn but died in 1542) and Seripando (head of the Augustinian Order), as well as Reginald Pole (later Cardinal).

The Cambridge scholar Dermot Fenlon has written a most important and poignant account of the fight put up by Seripando and Pole at Trent and how devastated the latter was as he rode away from the Council in depression. (*Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation*, Cambridge, 1972)

What is at stake in this argument? We get a clue from the General of the Jesuit Order, Diego Lainez, the successful leader at Trent on this issue who claimed that the position of Pole and Seripando “would undercut the structure of *satisfactions, indulgences* and *purgatory*. (Italics provided) (Pelican J., *Reformation of Church and Dogma*, p. 284)

Each of these issues, plus the Roman Catholic teachings of works of supererogation, stem from the assertion that our own infused righteousness satisfies the absolute righteousness of God which most people, excluding sociopaths, know is not so and are left with a hunger for righteousness other than their own. Other consequences of Trent’s teaching that inherent righteousness is the formal cause are the denial of the possibility of unconscious sin or corporate guilt which cripples pastoral ministry and curtails the nurture of responsible citizenship.

The Roman Catholic Dominican, Dom Victor White, shows the pastoral irresponsibility of denying unconscious sin.

This idea of “unconscious sin” is often a difficult one for the moral theologian to grasp. Especially if he has been brought up in the traditions of Post-Reformation Catholicism [after the Council of Trent] he may find it particularly hard to square with his correct notions that mortal sin must be voluntary, performed with full knowledge and consent. But it is a fact that the psyche is much less indulgent to unconscious breaches of its own laws and demands . . . and will revenge itself for their disregard . . .

He appends a valuable observation:

The exclusive emphasis of later theologians on “full knowledge and consent” can have the unfortunate result of putting a certain premium on unconsciousness, irresponsibility and infantilism. (Mairet, ed. *Christian Essays in Psychiatry*, p. 165.)

As an obedient Roman Catholic, White must put unconscious sin in quotation marks because it seems to conflict with the “correct” notions that, since Trent, sins must have full knowledge and consent. But clearly he feels quite unhappy with this restraint under which spiritual directors and psychiatrists must work to stay in accord with the church’s teachings after Trent.

The article on “The Psychology of Guilt” in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* recognizes unconscious guilt to be a pervasively destructive phenomenon. It

does not relate such guilt to one's spiritual condition and distinguishes it from moral guilt by terming it material guilt.

The issue of material guilt has no meaning to it other than its producing a feeling of excessive fear of retaliation in interpersonal relationships about wrongdoing (due to ignorance, misconceptions, immaturity, or to repression, displacement, and substitution), which loses its significance at death since it vanishes then, or before death as one learns from experience. Moral guilt, however, binds one to an accounting for wrongdoing in the relationship with God, to be resolved by His judgment at death; therefore one must consciously seek to do good and avoid evil.

This outrageous sealing off sinfully destructive unconscious aspects of human self-damage is a direct necessity of Trent's claim that our righteousness, though given, is without sin. How can one possibly exegete Matt. 25:44–46.

Then they also will answer,

“Lord, when did we see thee hungry or thirsty . . . ? Then he will answer them, “Truly I say to you, as you did it not to one of the least of these you did it not to me.”

Following the necessities of Trent this *New Catholic Encyclopedia* teaches that as long as you were ignorant and did not know you were responsible, responsibility vanishes at death. This insistence by Trent that there cannot be sin while in a state of grace was reasserted by the article on “Grace” in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*

For since sin and grace are diametrically opposed to each other the mere advent of grace is sufficient to drive sin away . . . immediately brings about holiness, kinship with God, and a renovation of spirit . . . and therefore a remission of sin without a simultaneous interior sanctification is theologically impossible. As to the interesting controversy whether the incompatibility of grace and sin rests on merely moral, or physical, or metaphysical contrariness, refer to Pohl (1909), Scheeben (1898)

A similarly fatal consequence of Trent is its logically consequential denial of corporate political responsibility. The article “Collective Responsibility” in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* deals with collective guilt as a legitimate Old Testament phenomenon and teaching but not appropriate in the New Testament or in subsequent Christian history. The refusal to acknowledge collective responsibility is a consequence of Trent's denial of sin in the regenerate. Only those who have full knowledge and consent to bribery or torture are responsible. This fact has had a debilitating effect on Roman Catholic cultures and countries. Without a sense of corporate accountability democracies do not flourish; tyranny and corruption do.

Russell Reno, an Anglican convert to Roman Catholicism and editor of the excellent journal, *First Things*, has an interesting wish in a recent edition (Jan. 2012) He had hoped that the *Confiteor* would be used instead of the *Kyrie* in the new revision of the Mass because of the need to confess during Mass that what we have done and failed to do is through “my fault . . . through my most grievous fault. . .” It is interesting that is exactly Hans Kung's argument that Trent does not really mean what it has traditionally been understood to mean about sin in the regenerate (*simul justus et peccator*). He shows that the Mass revised after Trent made it clear that even the celebrant in a state of grace was yet a sinner by words and actions of “my fault, my most grievous fault” said as the celebrant strikes his chest three times.

Trent's denial that sin is in a person who is in a state of grace was rebutted by the *Confiteor* and Anglicans, especially Lancelot Andrewes, by his asking to be shown any saint who claimed on his deathbed an inherent righteousness of his own. Instead, all without exception confessed their hope in the mercy of Christ.

One of the difficulties involved in the teaching regarding the “imputation of Christ's righteousness” is the various English translations of *logidzomai* as “imputation,” “reckon,” “regard,” “treat as.” The stem of the word is *logos* as in “Word was made flesh . . .” *Logidzomai* is the Word-made-verb.

My friend, Tom Wright, objects to Hooker's teaching on imputation because it is “not the ‘righteousness’ of Jesus Christ which is ‘reckoned’ to the believer. It is his death and resurrection.” (*Justification*, 232–233) But the death and resurrection *is* the righteousness of Christ. In II Cor. 3:9 “For if there was splendor in the dispensation of condemnation the dispensation of righteousness must far exceed it in splendor.” This righteousness is the opposite of condemnation and the righteousness of Christ is action by which he makes righteous. As a clean housewife is clean by cleaning so Christ's righteousness is the righteousness by which He makes us righteous. It is not a passive, aloof righteousness by which we are condemned but, to quote the Litany, it is “the holy Incarnation, the holy Nativity and Circumcision, the Baptism, Fasting and Temptation, his Agony and Bloody Sweat, his Cross and Passion, his Death and Burial, his glorious Resurrection and Ascension. . .” (It was this very transforming understanding of righteousness that was crucial in Luther's conversion.)

After posing a contradiction between righteousness, on one hand, and death and resurrection, on the other, Wright goes on to say that because Christ has died “God *regards* (*logidzomai*) (italics supplied) me and I must *regard* (italics supplied) myself—as someone who had died to sin and raised to newness of life.” “The challenge to the believer . . . is to reckon (*logidzomai*) (italics supplied) that this is true. . .” Here he uses “regard” and “reckon,” two standard synonyms for imputation, to repudiate imputation. What Wright

is fighting is not 16th and early 17th century Anglican understanding of imputation, nor of modern evangelicals such as John Stott and J. I. Packer, but the teaching “that Jesus ‘obeyed the law’ and so obtained ‘righteousness’ which could be reckoned to those who believed in him.”(p. 232) Such a view as “obtained righteousness” cannot be found in Hooker or any of these classical Anglicans, or in the Wesleys or Charles

Simeon and seems to be a caricature of Evangelical teaching.(I would recommend the article on Imputation in the third edition of the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* which provides a much needed replacement of the previous misleading article which misinformed us for 40 years.)

To be continued. The full article is available on the website anglicanway.org.

A Response to ACNA’s Proposed Prayer Book 2019

By Drew Nathaniel Keane

The Anglican Church in North America has been preparing a new revision of the Book of Common Prayer for several years. Its Liturgy and Common Worship Task Force began gathering feedback once working drafts were made available for use in 2013. The task force is near the end of the work, and the texts now available online represent years of work and incorporate the feedback of hundreds of worshippers.

The process has been quite transparent. The final text is slated for publication in 2019, but even at this late stage the task force is once again inviting feedback. November 1 is the final deadline, after which the task force and a Bishops Review Panel will prepare for a final sign-off on texts for a College of Bishops meeting in January.

I am an Episcopalian, but I think it’s important for Episcopalians to be aware of developments in the ACNA, especially as we contemplate the possibilities of comprehensive liturgical revision in our church. I offer the following observations on these latest drafts as friendly responses from a fellow Anglican and a scholar of the Prayer Book.

The overall approach seems to begin with the 1979 Prayer Book as a base text and bring it into closer alignment with historic Anglican Prayer Books. So, for instance, Holy Communion and Baptism begin with the “opening acclamation” that was new to the 1979 BCP (adapted from the Eastern Orthodox tradition). Rather than simply providing the historically Anglican offices of Morning and Evening Prayer, this proposal follows the 1979 Prayer Book, the Canadian 1962 BCP, and the C of E’s Common Worship by including a liturgy for Morning, Midday, Evening, Compline, and Family Prayer. Unlike the older Prayer Books, it includes special liturgies for Holy Week.

Like the 1979 Prayer Book, this proposal uses *celebrant* for the presiding minister in Holy Communion

and Baptism. This word is not found in the historic Prayer Books, which use *priest* and *minister* interchangeably, nor is it the current usage of most of the rest of the Communion, in which *president*, *presiding minister*, or the historic usage of *priest/minister* appear (*celebrant* is also used in the Canadian *Book of Alternative Services*).

All the liturgies are in contemporary English. The advantage of this approach lies in having only one version for all the liturgies, rather than including two versions of some of the liturgies as the 1979 BCP does.

In the case of Holy Communion, two slightly different rites are included (though they could easily be combined). The difference in the two Communion rites isn’t one of linguistic style; rather, the first rite represents what the task force calls a Standard Anglican Text and the second rite a Renewed Ancient Text. The preface to Communion, “Concerning the Service,” allows for the original text of 1662, 1928, or the Canadian 1962 to be substituted. The ACNA’s bishops passed a resolution in 2017 that allows parishes to substitute the older texts for any services, with the diocesan permitting. They also authorized a contemporary language version of the 1552 Prayer Book’s Communion rite. While that text is not in the current revision, it would continue to be authorized and available for use as an alternative.

One of the unique features of this proposal is the use of the English Standard Version for most content derived directly from the Bible, except for the Psalter. Rather than follow the translation of the psalms newly prepared for the 1979 book or the classic Coverdale Psalter, the task force prepared a revision of the Coverdale Psalter in contemporary idiom.

Like 1979’s Historical Documents, this proposal includes a section called *Documentary Foundations*. Many of the documents included are the same. The Definition of Chalcedon is not included. The Fundamental Declarations of the Province—among ACNA’s constitutional documents—are also included. These declarations include a recognition of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles as doctrinal standards.



Drew Nathaniel Keane, lecturer at Georgia Southern University and a member of St. John’s, Savannah, Georgia

Note: This article was first published on *Covenant*, the weblog of *The Living Church* and printed here with gratitude.

I will give a very brief survey of Morning Prayer, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, and the lectionaries. For each of these I will note (1) how this proposal follows the 1979 Prayer Book, (2) how this edition departs from 1979 by restoring elements from the old Prayer Book tradition, by which I mean the 1662 Book of Common Prayer and the Episcopal Church's 1928 revision (I will specify where these differ), and (3) elements original to this proposed revision. I have tried to be thorough, but this is not comprehensive. The organization should also allow readers to move to the sections of most interest.

MORNING PRAYER

Following the 1979 BCP

Includes the rubric "Silence may be kept" after the call to confession and advances that approach a step further with "Silence is kept."

Removes "miserable offenders" from the traditional confession of sin.

Removes the historic American Prayer Book heading "The Declaration of Absolution, or Remission of Sins" (historically, many Anglicans read this as a clarification that the priest does not absolve, but only proclaims what the Lord does for those who turn to him; this has remained a point of dispute among Anglicans, especially since the Oxford Movement.)

Removes the Lord's Prayer following the absolution (in the 1662, the Lord's Prayer followed the absolution and appeared again after the Apostles' Creed; American Prayer Books before 1979 made the second but not the first of these two optional).

The heading "Invitatory" is included before the initial *preces*.

The *Jubilate* (Psalm 100, historically the alternate Canticle following the second lesson in Morning Prayer) is given as an alternative to the *Venite* (Psalm 95); and, like 1979, the *Pascha nostrum* (drawn from 1 Cor. 5:7–8, Rom. 6:9–11, and 1 Cor. 15:20–22) is required for the first week of Eastertide and may be used throughout that season (the *Pascha nostrum* was included in the 1928 BCP but not within the main text of the office and not required for use).

Includes both a traditional and contemporary Lord's Prayer.

Restores to Morning Prayer (an adapted version of) the full *versicles* from the 1662 BCP (included in full only in Evening Prayer in the U.S. editions from 1789 to 1928. Following the readings, "The word of the Lord"/ "Thanks be to God" and "here endeth the reading" are both options.

Instead of specifying which canticles may follow the first and second lessons, it allows any of the Canticles to follow either of the readings. Includes the rubric "Unless The Great Litany or the Eucharist is to follow, one of the following prayers for mission is added" and gives three options for the collect.

Does not include in the office the Prayer for The President of the United States, and all in Civil

Authority (which replaced the prayers for the monarch and royal family in the American Prayer Book), the Prayer for the Clergy and People, or Prayer for all Conditions of Men included in historic BCPs.

Includes the *versicle* "Let us bless the Lord/Thanks be to God" and the option to add two Alleluias from Easter to Pentecost. Includes three options for the concluding sentence.

Following the Historic Prayer Book Tradition

Restores the traditional declaration of absolution along with the shorter option (in 1979 Rite I, only the shorter option is included; this shorter option is only found in Evening Prayer in the historic Prayer Book tradition).

Restores "O God, make speed to save us" to the *preces*; this phrase from the 1662 BCP was removed in the first U.S. Prayer Book (1789) and never restored, except partially in 1979, in which it is included only in the *preces* for Evening Prayer, in place of "O Lord, open thou our lips."

Restores "Praise ye the Lord"/"The Lord's name be praised" to the *preces*, which was replaced in 1979 with "Alleluia" without a response.

Restores the *Venite* (partially), *Psalm* 95:1–7 (following Common Worship). The last four verses are included following a rubric that specifies they are only to be used during penitential seasons such as Lent and Advent. These had been removed and replaced in the United States since 1789. The 1979 BCP included Psalm 95 as an alternate option (but one has to flip from p. 45 to p. 146 to use it).

Restores to the *Te Deum* the last five verses cut off in the 1979 Prayer Book (but included as a set of *versicles* following the Creed and Lord's Prayer). A rubric allows them to be omitted.

This proposal only includes the traditional Canticle options for Morning Prayer in Morning Prayer and the traditional options for Evening Prayer rather than the 21 different options in 1979 (following the offices, ten of those additional options from 1979 are provided as "supplemental canticles").

Restores "Lord have mercy/Christ have mercy/Lord have mercy" from the 1662 BCP that was excluded from the U.S. editions.

New to this Proposal

Unlike any previous edition, in this proposal the first page of the office only includes three options for opening sentences; other options, including those that are seasonal, are included at the end of the rite.

In the confession of sin, the phrase "there is no health in us" removed in 1979 is restored, preceded by "apart from your grace." Samuel Bray has written an excellent article for *The North American Anglican* that explores this proposed addition.

Following the declaration of absolution, this proposal adds a rubric ("A deacon or layperson remains kneeling and prays") and this prayer: "Grant your faithful people, merciful Lord, pardon and peace; that we may be cleansed from all our sins, and

serve you with a quiet mind; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” This is an adaptation of the 1662 BCP’s provision for the Offices. The difference: it is not presented simply as an option for when a presbyter cannot be present, but is in addition to the priest’s pronouncement.

Rather than the traditional Morning Prayer collects for Grace and Peace, this proposal provides a single collect for each day of the week.

BAPTISM

Following the 1979 BCP

Includes the opening *versicles* from the 1979 rite, which are drawn from *Ephesians* 4:4–6.

Like the 1979 rite, this proposed rite requires Baptism be included in the context of Holy Communion. It does not allow for the historic Anglican position of Baptism following the second lesson at Morning or Evening Prayer.

Following the Historic Prayer Book Tradition

More closely follows the historic vows of Baptism from the 1662 BCP than the 1979’s novel “Baptismal covenant.”

Restores the historic “flood prayer” to Baptism, though not all of the baptismal collects.

Removes the historic Confirmation prayer for the seven-fold gift of the Spirit that the 1979 book had inserted into Baptism. (However, it does not restore this prayer to Confirmation, but cuts the prayer altogether).

Restores the opening Exhortation for Baptism (removed from the 1979 book, this text was written for the first BCP [1549] and retained in all U.S. editions down to 1928).

Restores the post-baptismal signing with the cross “as a token of your new life in Christ, in which you shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, to fight bravely under his banner against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and to continue as his faithful servant to the end of your days.”

New to this Proposal

Following the Church of England’s *Common Worship*, adds the question “Do you turn to Jesus Christ?”

Adds an exorcism (with the option of using oil) into the service, following the renunciation of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Adds an emphasis on chrism that is not present in 1979 or the historic Prayer Book tradition, but is drawn from historic Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic precedents.

CONFIRMATION

Following the 1979 BCP

Includes the full baptismal vows for reaffirmation (rather than a summary reaffirmation of the historic Prayer Book tradition).

Does not include the traditional Confirmation prayer for the sevenfold gift of the spirit.

Includes two options for the prayer to accompany the laying on of hands: the historic Prayer Book’s “Defend . . . until he comes into the fullness of your everlasting kingdom.” and 1979’s “Strengthen . . . all the days of his life.”

Includes forms for reception and reaffirmation.

Following the Historic Prayer Book Tradition

In the 1662 Prayer Book, the bishop reads a preface explaining (and defending) the purpose of confirmation. This preface was derived from an opening rubric (not read aloud) for confirmation composed for the first (1549) Prayer Book and retained as a rubric in 1552, 1559, and 1604. The 1789 and 1892 U.S. editions follow 1662 by including the spoken preface; the 1928 does not include this text as either a rubric or spoken preface. This proposed revision includes a similar preface spoken by the bishop near the beginning of the rite (following the opening *versicles*). It differs from the historic preface in one significant way. This historic text reads: “none shall be confirmed but such as can say the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and can also answer to such other Questions, as in the short Catechism are contained.” This proposed preface reads: “know and affirm the Nicene Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments; and have received instruction in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and the Catechism of the Church.” The Apostles’ Creed, not the Nicene Creed, is the baptismal creed and the creed taught by the historic Prayer Book catechism. This preface is also somewhat out of alignment with the exhortation in the proposed baptismal rite: “learn the Creeds”—implying that the candidate should learn and be instructed in both the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds. There is a proposed catechism available online that includes both instruction in the Apostles and Nicene Creeds.

New to this Proposal

A rubrical preface to confirmation explaining its purpose (this is newly composed, not based on the old prefatory rubric, which forms the basis of the spoken preface in this proposed rite).

New opening *versicles* drawn from *Joel* 2:28–32, the prophecy Peter quotes in his first Pentecost sermon to explain the miraculous pouring out of the Spirit. The 1979 rite uses the same opening *versicles* as in its baptism rite (drawn from *Eph.* 4:4–6). Opening *versicles* are not used in the confirmation rite in the historic Prayer Book tradition, but there are *versicles* (drawn from *Ps.* 124:8, 113:2, and 102:1) following the renewals of baptismal vows, before the prayer for the candidates.

To be Continued (with the sections on the Holy Communion and Lectionaries). The full article is available on the website anglicanway.org.



The Society for the Preservation
of the Book of Common Prayer
(The Prayer Book Society)
1 West Macon Street
Savannah, GA 31401

NONPROFIT ORG.
US POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA, SC
Permit No. 487



SUBMIT THIS FORM TO **CONTINUE** RECEIVING *ANGLICAN WAY*

We trust that you enjoy your print edition of the *Anglican Way*!

We want to be sure you continue to receive it and that our address records are up to date so that copies are not wasted.

Please therefore tell us that you want to continue getting your print edition and confirm your address. And please sign up also for the e-mail updates (as they are issued more frequently and connect to the website where longer versions of articles and many other resources are available including our multi-week program for catechesis, *I am His*).

We are continuing to expand both in terms of our individual and parish supporters and we are increasing our activities and events which include

- The Annual Conference (next scheduled for February 14–16th, 2019);
- colloquia and parish visits around the country;
- our much enlarged websites and online *Anglican Way* archives;
- catechetical and teaching resources.

The expansion in our activities is costing a great deal more money so your donations are needed more than ever!

YOU CAN HELP WITH YOUR DONATION *TODAY!*

(Donations can be posted using the form below or given online and are tax deductible in the USA)

To become a supporter, we suggest a donation of \$40 or more. Supporters receive our magazine for one year, and a free copy of Peter Toon's *The Service of Holy Communion Annotated: A Commentary upon the Order for the Administration of Holy Communion from The Book of Common Prayer of 1928* or equivalent.

Please use the Form below to give us your correct postal address for the print magazine and your e-mail address for e-mail updates and the Anglican e-Way and enter the amount if enclosing a donation.

Name: _____ Donation Amount: _____

Address: _____

Email Address: _____

Please send to:

The Prayer Book Society of the United States
1 West Macon Street, Savannah, GA 31401

Or sign up/renew online via our websites pbsusa.org and anglicanway.org