

MANDATE

THE BI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF THE PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY

A PRAYER TO BE OFFERED IN THE TIME OF WAR AND TUMULT

O Almighty God, King of all kings, and Governor of all things, whose power no creature is able to resist, to whom it belongeth justly to punish sinners, and to be merciful to them that truly repent: Save and deliver us, we humbly beseech thee, from the hands of our enemies; abate their pride, aswage their malice, and confound their devices; that we, being armed with thy defence, may be preserved evermore from all perils, to glorify thee, who art the only giver of all victory; through the merits of thy only Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

[*The Book of Common Prayer*, 1662]

There is no moral ambiguity in the war against terrorism [*Prime Minister Tony Blair*]

PRAY WITHOUT CEASING

St. Paul wrote to Timothy: “I exhort therefore, that, first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour” (1 Timothy 2:1-3).

For those who have an Anglican heritage, the basic way to “pray without ceasing” for the President, his cabinet, the Congress, the Armed Forces etc., as the war against terrorism proceeds at a variety of level from military to diplomatic, is to make use of the two daily offices and their set prayers in the morning and evening, to add to them when possible the Litany, and at other times to offer brief prayers to the Lord our God as we go about our daily routines.

In the required prayers in Morning Prayer of the **BCP** (1928) are two “Prayers for The President of the United States, and all in Civil Authority.” The second one reads:

“O Lord our Governor, whose glory is in all the world; we commend this nation to thy merciful care, that being guided by thy Providence, we may dwell secure in thy peace. Grant to THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, and to all in authority, wisdom and strength to know and to do thy will. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness; and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in thy fear; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.”

In the Collection of Prayers and Thanksgivings (**BCP**, 1928, pp.35ff.) to be used to supplement the prayers in Morning and Evening Prayer, there is a Prayer for the Congress, to be used during their session:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate and Representatives in Congress assembled; that thou wouldest be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of thy glory, the good of thy Church, the safety, honour, and welfare of thy people; that all things may be ordered and settled by their endeavours, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessities, for them, for us, and thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the Name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.”

And because God created the whole world, let us pray also for those in authority in other lands, whether we deem those places friendly or hostile to the USA. St Paul’s exhortation to Timothy covered all rulers known to them! Finally, a Prayer for the Armed Forces:

“O Lord God of Hosts, stretch forth, we pray thee, thine almighty arm to strengthen and protect the armed forces of our country. Support them in the day of battle, and in the time of peace keep them safe from all evil; endue them with courage and loyalty; and grant that in all things they may serve without reproach; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”✚

MANDATE

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2001

NUMBER 6

Editor: The Rev’d Dr. Peter Toon

Design/Layout: Branch-Smith Printing, Inc.

The Members of the Board of Directors of the Prayer Book Society: The Rev’d Wayland Coe (TX); The Rev’d Joseph S. Falzone (PA); Mr. Michael W. Freeland (PA); The Rev’d David C Kennedy SSC (FL); The Rev’d Jonathan Ostman III, SSC (RI); Mrs Marilyn Ruzicka (NY); Mrs Miriam K.Stauff (WI); The Rev’d Dr. Peter Toon (TX); Mr. Luther Dan Wallis (CA); Mr. Joseph E. Warren (IL); Mr. David Williams (TX) & Mr. W.Denman Zirkle (FL).

MANDATE is published six times a year by the Prayer Book Society, a non-profit organization serving the Church. All gifts to the P.B.S. are tax-deductable. Recipients of *Mandate* are encouraged to send a minimum gift of \$28.00.

Editorial and all other correspondence: P.O. Box 35220, Philadelphia, PA 19128. Phone 1-800-PBS-1928. **Postmaster:** Please send address changes to the above address.

world-wide web address is <http://www.episcopalian.org/pbs1928>



Reflections from the Editor's Desk

The Rev'd Dr. Peter Toon

In time of war – how to pray

What provision does the current, official Prayer Book of the ECUSA make for public prayer – a collect – in time of war? The answer is apparently none.

If we examine the “Prayers for National Life” on pp.820ff of the 1979 Prayer Book there is no prayer specifically for a nation in time of war. Likewise in the abundance of collects and prayers in other pages of this Book there is not a single prayer for a time of war.

However, in the classic *Book of Common Prayer* (edition of 1662) as well as the American edition of 1928 of the *BCP* (where there are many less prayers for special occasions than in the 1979 Book), there is certainly one for a time of war, based on that in the 1662 *BCP*.

On page 41 of the 1928 edition of the *BCP* there is this prayer for “In time of War and Tumults”:

“O Almighty God, the supreme Governor of all things, whose power no creature is able to resist, to whom it belongeth justly to punish sinners, and to be merciful to those who truly repent; Save and deliver us, we humbly beseech thee, from the hands of our enemies; that we, being armed with thy defence, may be preserved evermore from all perils, to glorify thee, who art the only giver of all victory; through the merits of thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.”

Also as a required Collect for every day of the year the traditional *BCP* has this prayer in daily Morning Prayer:

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

In the 1979 Prayer Book this Collect is optional in the Rite I and Rite II forms of Morning Prayer, and is apparently rarely used.

I think that it is true to say that the classic *BCP* (1549 first edition, 1928 last USA edition) assumes that there is a Christian doctrine of the Just War and frames its prayers on this basis (the principles of the Just War derive from the Fathers of the Early Church, were systematized by Thomas Aquinas and were taught by leading Protestant Reformers such as John Calvin).

I think it is also true to say that this assumption is wholly missing from the 1979 Prayer Book for its compilers were either pacifists or believed that war for seemingly good reasons is at best a necessary evil.

I recall that a decade or so ago, when I was newly arrived in this country, and was teaching in an Episcopal seminary (where the 1979 Book was seen by some as the most catholic prayer book yet created by Anglicans), that when the Gulf War began, no celebrant or officiant prayed for the armed forces of the USA and their allies – in fact never mentioned the Gulf War at all in prayers. I was amazed and horrified! When with a few others I urged that it was our duty to pray for the armed forces we were much resisted; eventually it was agreed that a prayer be offered but only if a prayer for “those who suffer for the sake of Conscience” were also prayed at the same time (see 1979 Prayer Book page 823, numbers 25 & 26).

The folks who did not want to pray at all for the armed forces involved in the Gulf War may have been pacifists, but the point is that they seemed to believe that the 1979 Prayer Book guided and supported them in NOT praying for safety or victory for the national armed forces in an apparently just cause. I think that they were probably right in their judgment of the teaching of the 1979 Book. Much of the material in the 1979 Book in relation to justice, peace and social reality is a religious interpretation of the themes of the 1960s, the period when America was turned inside out and upside down socially. War meant Viet Nam and few if any wanted that war again! Rather (see the “Baptismal Covenant”) all were to work for “peace and justice.”

If (as we are told often by modern liturgists) the “law of praying is the law of believing,” and if the prayers of the 1979 book do not help us to believe in the Just War and the Christian duty to pray not only for our enemies but also for our Armed Forces and for their success in war, how can modern Episcopalians face realistically and prayerfully the possibility of (if not war then) military campaigns to seek to root out terrorism? They may be reduced to silence or even opposition to fervent prayers! On the other hand they may decide to dig deep in the Christian tradition, beyond the 1960s, and find comfort in wisdom & prayers from earlier times.

I am grateful to God for the privilege of representing a Society that commends the use of the classic *BCP* for therein is a law of praying that is truly able to help us believe that there is such a thing as a Just War (whose principles must be taught & set forth & obeyed) and that we must pray without ceasing at this time, holding up to the throne of grace on high in fervent supplication the President, his Cabinet, the Congress, the Armed Forces, the CIA, the FBI and so on. (Certainly at the same time we are to pray tenderly for all those who suffer because of the atrocities! And at the level of personal relations — in contrast to government decisions — we seek to love our enemies and pray for those who maltreat us.) +

Onward, Christian Soldiers

The Rev'd Dr. Louis R. Tarsitano

A sentimental song of another era exclaims, "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier." Well, I did, or at least one of my sons thinks that I did. He is a freshman at The Citadel, and he entered this distinguished military college for much the same reason that I entered the seminary thirty-six years earlier—to test his vocation.

The flat, unapologetic statement "I believe that I have a Christian vocation to be a soldier" may sound strange to the contemporary ear, but it was not always so. We are saturated with a newfangled, philosophical definition of "peace" that came out of the Enlightenment: "an absence of war, achieved by the rational efforts of mankind." It follows from this definition that if nobody fights, or fights back even when attacked, then there will be no war, and we will have established "peace" on earth.

Peace: what is it?

Christians, on the other hand, for most of history, have held that "peace" is a right relation to God the Father, in and through Jesus Christ, by the grace of the Holy Ghost. St. Augustine put the matter poetically in the opening prayer of his *Confessions*, where he wrote "Thou hast made us for thyself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in thee." Aquinas put it analytically, when he defined true peace as a freedom from outward distractions in the love and enjoyment of God, who is the sole and perfect object of our love (see *S.T.*, Pt. I-II, Q.70, Art. 3).

For orthodox Christians, then, peace is not an achievable human goal, but a divine gift of grace, to be perfected at the Second Coming, when all the distractions of sin (and the human weakness that gives them power over us) will be done away (cf. Romans 8). Under such a definition, moreover, "an absence of war" is not necessarily peace at all. A failure by nations to fight when the weak and the helpless are harmed is actually war against God, who is Justice, Mercy, and Love.

War, therefore, is not the mere multiplication of private enmity and strife, as so many seem to believe in our overly-personalized and self-centered age. War is a positive duty of nations, administered by those who have received the divine calling to govern, for the purpose of correcting and punishing evil (Romans 13:1-7). Of course, this authority can be abused, but that is why Christians over the centuries have developed from the Scriptures the requirements for a just war: (1) the declaration of war by the proper governing authorities; (2) a just cause, namely some clear and objective evil to be corrected; and (3) a rightful intention on the part of those who fight, "so that they intend the advancement of good or the avoidance of evil" (*S.T.*, Pt. II-II, Q. 40, Art. 1).

These three points can easily be expanded into a treatise of their own, but here it is sufficient to note that St. Thomas deals with the just war under the heading of "Charity," because just warfare is an effort to restore peace with God, the basis of which is God's love for us and our love for God and his goodness. He explains, "Those who wage war justly aim at peace, and so they are not opposed to peace, except to the evil peace which Our Lord *came not to send on earth* (Matt. 10:34)." He also cites St. Augustine's advice, "Be peaceful, therefore, in warring, so that you may vanquish those whom you war against, and bring them to the prosperity of peace."

Soldier & Priest

A Christian soldier, then, is a subordinate minister of God, deriving his authority to make war from the divine appointment of his superiors. In terms of his derived authority to act, he is little different from the Christian priest. The members of the ministerial priesthood receive their authority to minister to the spiritual needs of God's people from God the Father, through Jesus Christ, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, and at the hands of their superiors in the ministry. The Christian soldier receives his authority to bear arms in a just cause from God the Father, through Jesus Christ, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, and by the appointment of those earthly governors that God has made his ministers for the restraint of evil.

The spiritual ministry and the temporal ministry also have this in common: they exist for the sake of those they serve, and not as ends in themselves. The medieval system of Estates reflected this reality. The First Estate consisted of those ministers who protected the spiritual welfare of the nation. The Second Estate, "second" because the kingdom of God is eternal and the kingdoms of this world are temporary, included all those ministers (soldier, constables, etc.) who protected their nation's physical welfare. The Third Estate was the nation itself, whose people were to be protected as God's own, and it had the highest dignity, since the ministerial Estates had been called to sacrifice themselves to serve it in the Name of God.

We may not use this language any more, but the truth behind it has not changed. There are still evils to redress in this world, and if my son discovers his vocation is to serve God in redressing them, he will have received an honorable and Christian calling. That is all any father can ask for his children.

(*Dr.Tarsitano is the Rector of St.Andrew's Church, Savannah, Georgia.*) †

All Saints Church Thomasville



In the afternoon of All Saints' Day, November 1, 1980, forty-three members of St. Thomas Church in Thomasville, Georgia, met in the Key Room of Thomas County Federal Savings and Loan Association to discuss the formation of a new Episcopal congregation. The primary motivation for this gathering was the preservation of the traditional doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Anglican Communion in Thomasville.

Many believed that the liturgies in the 1979 so-called "Book of Common Prayer" and the theological changes resulting from the Church's adoption of this book had weakened the overall theological fabric of the Church. Accordingly, the new congregation would use the historic *Book of Common Prayer* (1549-1928).

Another issue was the desire to use on a regular basis the service of Morning Prayer and Sermon which had all but disappeared due to the Eucharistic liturgical experimentation in the church from the 1950's-80's. The group also hoped to sidestep the increasing emphasis on so-called Christian and Renewal music which was proliferating itself throughout the Church.

Under the leadership of William H. Flowers, Jr. and Amos R. McMullian, this handful of Episcopalians asked Bishop Paul Reeves' permission to establish a new congregation. Bishop Reeves' approval came after he had made clear to Mr. Flowers and Mr. McMullian that there would be no financial help from the Diocese of Georgia. Further, to strengthen the connection with the rest of the Episcopal Church, the three-year Lectionary from the 1979 Prayer Book would be used. Given that the initial meeting happened on All Saints' Day, the new congregation would be named All Saints.

All Saints' was admitted as an organized mission of the Diocese of Georgia in December 1980, and proceeded to call the Rev'd James Law of Anchorage, Kentucky as its priest. Among Father Law's gifts is the ability to build church families. Under his leadership, the congregation was admitted as a parish at the diocese's annual convention in February 1982. In recent history, no congregation in the Diocese of Georgia has ever become a parish so quickly.

In November, 1989, The Rev. Frederick A. Buechner succeeded Father Law after the latter's call to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Father Buechner, his wife, Kathy, and their two teen-aged children have entered not only the life of the church, but of the community, as well, bringing All Saints' into the full mainstream of Thomasville, and providing the church family the stability needed to consolidate and grow.



The first worship services of the new congregation were held in the chapel at Thomas County Community College now Thomas University. Meanwhile, a separate Georgia corporation, All Saints' Episcopal Church of Thomasville, Inc., was formed to acquire land as a site for a church to be used by the mission/parish. Once land was acquired, the corporation made arrangements with Thomasville Landmarks, Inc. to acquire and move the abandoned Saint Augustine's Roman Catholic Church building, with the understanding that it would be restored as faithfully as possible. St. Augustine's was built in 1881, but in 1961, the church building was abandoned and a new one built. In January 1981, All Saints' Episcopal Church of Thomasville, Inc. moved the old church to its current location on South Hansell Street in Thomasville's Tockwatton Historic District.

While the corporation's plans included the conversion of a warehouse into a parish house, the main focus was the moving and renovation of the old Saint Augustine's church building.

ST. THOMAS continued on page 6

continued from page 5

This included restoring the original structure as closely as possible; increasing the size to accommodate a larger church family; and updating the facilities for modern comfort. Space prohibits our relating some of the fascinating stories connected with the acquisitions of the original font, the restoration and doubling of the pews, as well as the restoration and extension of the very handsome wood ceiling, or the acquisition of the Victorian altar for the chapel.

The All Saints' Episcopal Church of Thomasville, Inc. buildings, Thomasville, Georgia were consecrated to the use of All Saints' Mission by Bishop Reeves on All Saints' Day, November 1, 1982. The year 2000 saw the completion of a renovated and expanded organ from three and one half ranks of pipes to eleven complete ranks, as well as the addition of a handsome memorial garden and columbarium.

In remarks prepared for the Diocesan Council in October 2000, former Senior Warden R. Carter Arnest stated, "We are a traditional Episcopal Church. Many think we are defined by our exclusive use of the 1928 Book of Common Prayer. This is not true. We considered many liturgies including the 1549, 1552, 1559, 1662, 1789, 1892, and 1928 prayer books. The 1928 was and is our preference."

Mr. Arnest continues: "We have many newer members who have no knowledge of the prayer book controversy or that there are alternatives! Our use of the 1928 prayer book is not the singular definition of who we are. Further, we do say the General Thanksgiving, the Prayer of Thanksgiving, and the Prayer of Humble Access along with Father Buechner. We also say the 'Peace,' only in its proper place after the Lord's Prayer - while we're still on our knees. That is, we are not slaves to the 1928 book.

"At a time when traditional Anglican music is disappearing from the fabric of the church, we for a number of years have sent three to eight students each summer to the week long Royal School of Church Music Choir Camp (southeastern region) where they are taught by instructors from all over the world in traditional Anglican music. At All Saints' our music program begins with two junior choirs, one for five to eight-year-old and one for nine to fourteen-year-olds."

"Twenty years later we have a congregation of about 360 members, and are grateful that we have communicants - not just visitors - but members who attend regularly from Thomasville, Cairo, Moultrie, Valdosta, and Hahira, Georgia, and Miccosukee, and Tallahassee, Florida. Most of these towns have one or more Episcopal Churches."

The congregation's Episcopal Church Women's annual bazaar/auction recently raised more than \$45,000.00 which was distributed to local and diocesan charities.

The parish stands committed to the "Faith once delivered to the Saints" while striving to be a spiritual home for all Episcopalians who want to follow the Lord Jesus Christ according to the traditional doctrine, discipline, worship, and teaching of historic Anglicanism. She has been blessed to have Bishops who appreciate this aspect of our parish. Bishop Reeves, as well as Bishop Harry Shipps and present Bishop Henry Louttit are



pastorally and theologically sensitive to administer all our confirmations according to the 1928 rite. Meanwhile, the congregation remains grateful to Bishop Louttit, whose care and ministrations allow us to remain part of the Diocese of Georgia.

[Compiled by:
R. Carter Arnest
Robert H. Ayers
Roy M. Lilly, Jr.
(The Rev'd) Frederick A. Buechner, Rector] ✚

continued from page 12

scriptural texts, should be limited because the aesthetics of singing distract from the message of the text.

There are certainly forms of music which can work against the message of the text and the spirit of worship, and the faithful pastor should take care to avoid the unseemly and irreverent, as well as music whose spirit is opposed to that of the text being sung. On the other hand singing is an essential part of Christian worship. Both modern psychology and the tradition of the Church tell us that combining music with text involves more of our being in the act of worship, reaching deeper levels of our conscious and subconscious selves. As St. Augustine says, *Aqui cantat, bis orat*, he who sings prays twice. Singing adds to the uniqueness of the act of worship. In Judaism and the early Church it would have been considered irreverent to have simply said the scriptural text: Scripture was of such importance that it could only be proclaimed by music. Further, as anyone knows who has heard the scriptures sung, singing makes it easier to memorize the text of Scripture. I have much of the Passion narratives practically memorized because I heard them chanted for so many years at Palm Sunday and Good Friday services, and I have been able to memorize many of the psalms because I sang them regularly in church to Gregorian or Anglican chant. These have provided me comfort and support in many trials. ✚

(Michael LaRue lives in Philadelphia, has degrees in Classics and Theology, and is a R.C. layman.)

Lay Celebration and the Autonomy of Anglican Provinces

(a lecture given in St Paul's College, University of Sydney, on August 31st 2001 by Dr Peter Toon, at the kind invitation of the Warden of the College, Dr Ivan Head. Dr Toon was in Australia to take part in the celebrations for the 20th Birthday of the Prayer Book Society in Melbourne, Victoria. Whether or not to allow lay Celebration of the Holy Communion is a hot topic in Australia, especially in Sydney.)

To innovate (to make changes in something established) may be judged good, bad or indifferent depending upon what it is that is being introduced as novel/new. We have come to expect innovation in technology, design and marketing as part of western culture and we judge it according to price, usefulness, attractiveness and so on. In other areas of life, when innovation occurs, there are mixed feelings about it. For example, innovations in arrangements (relationships & partnerships) as to what are deemed to be "families" raise for some people profound moral, religious and social problems. Likewise, innovations in medical research – say on human embryos – also raises penetrating questions for some.

The effects of innovations are varied and not always predictable. A development in technology may be an improvement in the lot of many specific persons, but at the same time it may have a cumulative, disastrous effect on the environment. An innovation in one social area may have consequences that affect all kinds of people not involved in the original innovation.

Christianity and Innovation

When we come to the Christian Religion we have to say that in its origins it presented itself as being both old and new, traditional and yet innovatory. The Founder claimed not to destroy but to fulfill the Old Covenant by establishing a New Covenant. There were major innovations in terms of the Naming of God, the worship of God, human relations with God, duties owed to God, the person of the Messiah, the reception of Gentiles into fellowship, the nature and number of Sacraments, the call and nature of Ministers and so on. This was to be expected if the Founder were the Son of God Incarnate!

Recognizing the fact of innovation by the Lord Jesus Christ, we need to be clear as to the nature of the innovations. Though they were startling to the religious establishment of his time the changes he made and that which he introduced were not an imposition *de novo* (or *ex nihilo*). Rather they were profound developments and applications of what had already been revealed in principle within the old covenant. Or they were the fulfillment of promises made in prophecy.

This distinction between development of a principle and fulfillment of prophecy on the one side and absolute innovation, *de novo* & *ex nihilo*, on the other is very important and we need to hold it in mind as we proceed.

Once the new Covenant created by the Founder and explained and applied by his Apostles was in place and the general structure and content of the Faith established and recorded in what we call the New Testament, then the only kind of innovation that was in harmony with this foundation was in terms of application of a revealed doctrine or accepted principle to a new situation.

Innovations of this kind that came generally to be accepted by all in the Early Church were such things as (a) the necessary definition of doctrine in opposition to heresy in order to produce a dogma in certain crises; (b) the delineation & explanation of the three fold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon; (c) the Lord's Day as the First Day of the Week replacing the Sabbath as the Day of worship; (d) the canon of Scripture, now having the Books of the new Covenant; (e) the calling of General Councils to ascertain the mind of Christ in his Church; (f) the organization of the Church based on the divisions of the Roman Empire; (g) the use by analogy from the Old Testament of the word priest for bishop and presbyter, and so on. None of these innovations were changes in the Nature of Christianity or of the Church but were adaptations of it to new circumstances.

In contrast, innovations, or excessive developments in the medieval Latin Church [e.g., excessive attention to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Cult of the Saints, the absolute requirement of celibate, unmarried clergy, and the dogmatic Papacy] prepared the way for the cry for reform that came to fruition in the sixteenth century.

The Protestant Reformation and Innovation

During the Protestant Reformation of the 16th Century there were many changes – innovations – introduced into the life and administration of the Church in Europe. The justification for many of these was that they were simply the restoration of primitive practice and the removal of medieval superstition and errors. But we know now, through historical study, that some of the things that were introduced were actually really novel, and had never existed in the Church of God before. Often these were in terms of exaggerations or excessive developments of that which in its normality is good in itself: e.g., the teachings and practices of the Anabaptists/radical reformers.

But some novelties became normal as the years went by and had a profound effect. One such, greatly helped by the invention of printing, was the insertion of not only chapters [these had been introduced in the 13th century by Cardinal Hugo] but also and specifically verse numbers into the Books of the Bible. At one level this was helpful in that it aided mastery of the contents of the Bible. But at another it was not helpful in that it fostered the idea that man has mastery over the content of Scripture and that its meaning is only that which is available at the literal, grammatical level. In other words, what has been called the mystic meaning of Scripture and had been generally accepted in the Church over the centuries was made the more difficult to encounter and delve into when a rational system of numbers, a mathematical grid was imposed on the sacred text.

continued on page 8

To put this in another way, whatever the intention of the insertion of verse numbers (e.g., in terms of ease of citation) the net, practical effect of the imposition of verses on the sacred text was a movement away from “units of complete thoughts” within a wider context to “units of manageable number of words,” which can remove the context for the unwary.

In terms of the situation in the Church of England, innovation in terms of major changes in worship, doctrine and discipline, seeking to restore primitive practice and remove false medieval developments, ceased with what is called the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion (1559) and the reformed Church of England assumed the shape that it has held ever since. Churches that have their origins in and from the Church of England and now called the Anglican Communion of Churches are also committed by their constitutions and canons generally speaking to this same shape based on the same Settlement, with due allowance made for different relations of church and state.

One may reasonably argue that the claim made concerning the English Reformation was that the Church of England as a National Church has the disciplinary authority to maintain the doctrine, discipline and worship that are received from the undivided Church of the first five centuries or so and is to do so according to the “use” [in terms of precedent and long standing custom] of this same Church. The general rule was summed up in the statement of Lancelot Andrewes – “One Canon, Two Testaments, Three Creeds, Four Ecumenical Councils and Five Centuries.” And thus the theological study for degrees in Divinity in the ancient universities had until very recently a very major component of patristic study along with biblical study.

From the sixteenth to the late twentieth century, any innovations that affected the basic terms of the Elizabethan Settlement had to be approved by the Convocations of the whole Church and by the King/Queen in Parliament. More recently with the creation of the General Synod, itself an innovation, and the granting to Synod of certain powers by the Parliament, proposed innovations are first considered and voted on by the Synod and then, only certain matters, sent on to Parliament. So in recent times the publication and use of Books of Services other than *The Book of Common Prayer*, the ordination of women to the presbyterate, the creation of Episcopal Visitors (flying bishops) have all been innovations that have had to go through long and painful study, debate and voting in Synod, and, in the case of the ordination of women, to be approved by Parliament.

In terms of our earlier attempt to make distinctions concerning innovations, we now have to ask whether all of these innovations are simply the application of basic principles to new contexts. Certainly a General Synod wherein are bishops, clergy and laity is sound in principle and so is the allowing of extra services that are in doctrinal accord with the teaching in *The Book of Common Prayer*. But the ordination of women and measures taken to protect those who in conscience cannot accept it probably seem to belong to innovation that is *de novo* – something really new. And it is apparently new in this case in that its origins and/or motivation seem to be found in the secular culture and society and within the modern western emphasis on equality and human rights. Having arisen in this context, it looks as if it then looked for biblical and theological support.

The Anglican Family and the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion

As Anglicans we find ourselves in a situation that, in the jurisdiction [or branch] of the Church we know as the Church of England and the Anglican Communion of Churches, any basic change to the Elizabethan Settlement needs to be, and ought to be, generally approved by the whole of the member Churches. But this is easier said than done because there is a very strong doctrine of provincial autonomy present in the Anglican Communion and this autonomy is emphasized by the constitution and canon law of most of the provinces. The temptation for any province in the North or South is to do its own thing, to go its own way, when a majority is passionate about an innovation. Those who worry about consulting the whole Communion are always a minority and they know that such consultation is a very long and tedious business.

Many believe that the decision made in the 1970s to ordain women belongs to this category of innovation and was introduced in the West/North without the general approval of the whole Communion. And that is why to keep the Communion together the “doctrine of reception” as it has been called was created by the Eames Commission for the accommodation of this particular practice. The idea behind this “doctrine” is that the whole Anglican Family is in the process of receiving, that is testing this innovation, and that the innovation will not be truly accepted as an Anglican doctrine until all the Provinces have agreed to it. To date this “doctrine of reception” seems to have been successful in terms of keeping all together in what is called “impaired communion.” Yet there are tensions and all kinds of flaws and weaknesses in the doctrine have been noted.

It may be questioned as to whether this doctrine has the inherent power to keep people together much longer since it is now being applied not only to the acceptance of the ordination of women but also to the testing of new teaching on sexuality and the sexual practices associated therewith. The latter causes even greater emotion and disarray than does the ordination of women.

We are all aware that major innovations in sexual relations and morality are taking place now, especially in the West/North, with the approval of dioceses and synods and that they also belong to this category of *de novo*. These novelties not only set aside the basic moral assumptions of the Elizabethan Settlement but also the whole of Christian teaching on holy matrimony and chastity.

First of all, there is the increasing practice of second and third marriages, involving divorced persons, being conducted in churches as if they were the equal of first marriages before God and in the Church. In the USA, for example, a very high proportion of the members, including clergy, of the Episcopal Church is divorced and remarried. And a similar situation is also developing in Canada, Britain and Australia.

We now have at least six forms of “matrimony”: 1) traditional Christian/Biblical marriage between a man and woman for life; 2) “marriage” between a man and woman as long as they find the marriage mutually fulfilling; 3) “marriage” between two persons of the same sex, exclusively, for life; 4) “marriage” between two persons of the same sex, as long as they find their “marriage” mutually fulfilling; 5) “marriage” between two persons of the same sex, but open to other sexual

relationships outside the “marriage,” as part of an “authentic homosexual lifestyle”; and 6) something not quite “marriage,” but a “committed relationship” between two persons of any sex, blessed or at least recognized by the ECUSA.

Secondly, there is the now common practice in a majority of the dioceses of the Episcopal Church USA of ordaining active homosexual persons and of the blessing in church of same – sex partnerships. These practices probably deserve to be called “contradictions” of, rather than “innovations” *de novo* in, the Christian Religion.

In regard to these innovations in heterosexual and homosexual relations, many in the Episcopal Church, USA see them as pioneering innovations and thus, like the ordination of women, doctrines that are really in the process of reception for the Anglican Family – whether all of that Family wants them to be so or not right now. However, what is clear is that they have never been declared to be in the process of reception by the Lambeth Conference of Bishops, the Anglican Primates’ Meeting or the Anglican Consultative Council, or by the Synod or Convention of any of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion (except perhaps the ECUSA at its General Convention of 2000).

Yet we remind ourselves that these innovations in sexuality are only able to be considered by the “instruments of unity” because dioceses within at least one province have introduced them and become advocates for them.

The effects of modern innovations

Innovations in society and culture have both predictable and unpredictable results and effects. Likewise in the Church of God.

Take, for example, the ordination of women. This has led, or at least contributed to, the questioning of the validity of always using the received Names for the Holy Trinity (e.g., the Father & the Son); the creation of liturgies that use Names and pronouns for deity with which feminists are happy; the mandating (in the ECUSA for example) of the acceptance of the ordination of women as right by all office bearers; new ways of reading and interpreting the Bible to accommodate them to this new fact; and the creation of the doctrine of reception to account for its mixed reception and progress in the Anglican world.

Take, also, the marriage of divorcees in church. This has led, or at least been connected with, new ways of reading and interpreting the Bible, to new definitions of the purpose of marriage, and especially of the place of procreation, as well as to a general lowering of the moral sense and conscience of congregations which have a sizeable percentage of remarried divorcees, just to name a few results.

Then it is clear that the acceptance and blessing of same-sex partnerships by a Christian congregation has the effect of changing the whole moral and social world-view of members. Where such unions are accepted, a congregation has to change the received Christian understanding of divine law and grace, of sacraments and ordination, in order to justify these new arrangements.

What about so called “Lay-Celebration” at the Holy Communion?

Those who oppose the ordination of women claim that Lay Celebration began in any province or diocese the moment that “ordained women” began to celebrate. Thus for them the fact of Lay Celebration already exists!

However, the innovation of licensing a lay person to celebrate at the Order for Holy Communion is being proposed in New South Wales, Australia, and elsewhere. The argument put simply is that as we now license lay persons to preach in a public service, there is no sound reason to prevent such persons, or others of equal status, to be the celebrant at the Holy Communion when occasion or need requires. It is further argued that if we take the basic principles of the Reformation from the sixteenth century, especially as they were set out initially by Martin Luther, we find every support in the combination of such doctrines as justification by faith alone and the priesthood of all believers for such an innovation.

Both supporters and opponents of Lay Celebration, however, all seem to agree that to introduce this innovation would be to go directly against the terms of the Elizabeth Settlement, against the Anglican Formularies, and against the present mind of the Anglican Communion of Churches.

Supporters argue that it is worth innovating because at stake are such things as:

- The practical need especially in rural parishes to provide a Celebration when required.
- The application of the basic principle of “the priesthood of all believers” in the context of justification by faith alone, which is part of an integral Protestant and Evangelical understanding of Christianity. This principle needs to be asserted, it is claimed, at a time when sacerdotal views of the Ministry are being widely propagated in the Anglican Family.
- The distinction made between the authorization of the lay Ministry of the Word but not of the Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper may suggest that the Sacrament is more important than the preached Word.
- Prohibiting authorized lay persons from one activity but not from the other may suggest an improper distinction between clergy and laity. Likewise allowing lay persons to assist at Communion but not celebrate the same may have the same effect.
- Allowing lay persons to administer Baptism (even in an emergency) but not the Lord’s Supper may suggest an inappropriate distinction between the two Sacraments.
- The restricting of the administration/celebration of the Lord’s Supper to bishops and priests may suggest that the value of the Sacrament is related to the ordination of the clergy and to their saying the Prayer of Consecration.
- If the unique things that the priest/bishop can do that no one else can do are the praying of the Consecration Prayer, the pronouncing of the

absolution and the giving of the blessing this unique role may suggest that he is in some sense a mediator between God and man, and that thereby the sole mediatorship of Christ is compromised.

Opponents of Lay Celebration point out that the Elizabethan Settlement allowed the use of laymen to read the homily in divine service and to minister at home in the family, but not to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Also they point to the tremendous amount of preaching done by the lay brothers of the Franciscans and the Dominicans in medieval Europe at a time the Mass was celebrated only by the presbyters/priests.

Opponents also argue that the English Reformers chose not to disturb certain arrangements that had long been in place. Thus, on the one hand, they allowed emergency Baptism by laity but they opposed Lay Celebration of the Holy Communion because these were long-standing customs and seemed to reflect divine order and a sensible arrangement. For here in the one case is a Dominical Sacrament that is received only once in this lifetime and thus there may be an urgency in administering it, while in the other is a Dominical Sacrament that can be received many times.

Opponents also point out that the priesthood that belongs to the whole Church of God is not to be confused with what has come to be called "the ministerial priesthood," which refers to the particular vocation of the bishop and the presbyter as those who in God's name bless, absolve and celebrate the holy mysteries.

If a diocese or province within the Anglican Communion of Churches were to introduce Lay Celebration in an official manner and notify the same to the whole Communion, it is probable – based upon the evidence accumulated over the years – that there would be a whole series of effects/results, most of which are not predictable with any precision in advance. These will probably include such things as (a) impaired communion between the innovating diocese/province and most of the Anglican Family, including the evangelical provinces in Africa, (b) further moves away from Anglican norms by the innovating diocese in a Nonconformist direction, (c) the raising of questions about the purpose and usefulness of ordained clergy, and a general drift into popular Protestantism in the innovating diocese/province.

Where what has been regarded as an expression of divine order in the Church is tampered with, changed or neglected, there are always consequences, and these differ according to place and time. Further, when one member of a family acts contrary to the mind of the rest of the family, then also there are consequences.

Bearing this in mind it has been suggested that one can profit by meditating upon the story of Dathan, a Reubenite, and Korah (Numbers 16). Korah was a Levite and thus of the proper family, but not called to the priesthood. His rebellion against the appointed ministry on the grounds of "I'm just as good as Aaron and his sons" led to disaster.

Also worth pondering is Saul's usurpation of the ministerial, priestly office, partly from pride but also from impatience and claims of utility. This sin of offering sacrifice at Gilgal (1 Samuel 13:7-15) led to disaster for Saul and his family and it set the stage for civil war amongst the Israelites

Conclusion

When discussing innovation we need to be clear as to its varied meanings, not all of which fit with Christianity as a revealed religion.

Innovation *de novo* & *ex nihilo* in worship, doctrine and discipline, where major changes that effect the substance of Faith & Order are introduced, is wrong. For example, accepting Unitarianism and rejecting Trinitarianism would be such an innovation, as would be the calling of a homosexual partnership "marriage."

Innovation in terms of the application of basic principles to new situations and times is most appropriately considered and engaged in when there is an effort in a missionary context to adapt the worship, doctrine and discipline to new circumstances where there is a different language, culture and society. And when such does occur it should receive very general support in the appropriate diocese/province and not merely be the fad of a small constituency.

The question arises as to whether the innovation *de novo* of Lay Celebration of the Sacrament would be as significant in its effects as have been such innovations *de novo* & *ex nihilo* as the ordination of women, the blessing of second and third marriages in church, and the ordaining of active homosexual persons. Most people would probably say "no" for they assume that it is unlikely to be taken up by more than a small number of dioceses and they believe that the innovators – if they be from New South Wales – are really orthodox believers. But as we have already indicated one can never predict precisely the effects of any innovation *de novo*.

And it may be argued that the introduction of Lay Celebration is a setting aside of Divine Order as received in the Church and thus the consequences could be severe, and be actually the judgment of heaven.

To all in New South Wales, who accept the final authority of Holy Scripture and are committed to the Anglican Formularies, and who would innovate in terms of Lay Celebration, I would pose with urgency these questions:

Can the validity and efficacy of Lay Celebration be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture?

And if it can be so proved, can the necessity of introducing it, when its introduction will most probably lead to a major division in the Body of Christ and in the Church as defined in Article XIX, be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture?

And, if this form of Celebration is not judged to be doctrinal and necessary but pertaining to discipline or governance, what is wrong with forbearance and self-restraint on the part of the advocates of it?

Finally, is the example of the Episcopal Church, USA, which has introduced innovations *de novo* and has shown no forbearance or restraint or concern for the rest of the Anglican Family, to be followed by those who claim to be a scriptural people? ✚

PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS

A Brief Overview of Certain Sources of Anglo-American Church Music

Michael LaRue



The singing of psalms and hymns is among the most ancient customs of Christianity, and the injunction of St. Paul to sing “psalms and hymns and spiritual songs” (Col. 3.16) has been taken seriously by Christians in all ages. The Psalms themselves are traditionally called the *Psalms of David*. Many of them date back to the time of King David, and it is very likely that he composed some of the Psalms. They were the chief component of early Christian worship, as they had been of Jewish worship.

PSALMS

The Psalms provide different kinds of prayer for all occasions. To take a sampling, Ps. 63 (in the numbering of the Prayer Book and of the Authorized Version of the Bible, 62 in the Vulgate Bible) is the traditional psalm sung in the morning. Ps. 141 (140) is the evening psalm. The penitential psalms are 6, 32 (31), 38 (37), 51 (50), 102 (101), 130 (129), and 143 (142). These were traditionally prayed by Western Christians as a prelude to the Litany. The cursing psalms, such as 109 (108) reflect the depth of human pain and provide a prayerful way of turning of turning over to God one’s anger at the most difficult of enemies. Psalm 1 is the student’s psalm, and can be prayed before studying scripture.

In the early Church the psalms were sung to a body of monophonic tunes many, if not all, of which were derived from the Jewish liturgical tradition. One noteworthy example of these has survived. In the classical Roman Rite the music used for the chanting of the *Lamentations* of Jeremiah is the same as that used by Yemeni Jews, who are known to have a very ancient form of chant. In the Latin west St Gregory the Great undertook the organization of the chant of the Roman rite, whence this music is known as Gregorian chant. Gregorian chant was also the first music to be written down, and it now constitutes the earliest known Christian music. One of the great benefits given to Christians in the last century was the restoration of the original tunes of Gregorian chant and their publication by the monks of Solesmes. Canon Winifred Douglas did English-speaking Christians a further favor by adapting the chant for English translations of the psalms and other liturgical texts, and it is unfortunate that his work is not more widely known and appreciated.

From the earliest days of Christianity extra-scriptural hymns were written as well, and a large number of Latin and Greek hymns stand alongside the psalms as part of the Church’s official worship, or liturgy. St. Ambrose was a prolific composer of hymns, and many more of doubtful authorship have been attrib-

uted to him, such that the metrical hymns of the Roman Rite are called *Ambrosiana*. A number of these have found their way into the present repertory of hymnody, many through the translation work of John Mason Neale and others involved in the Oxford movement. Among these are *Come ye faithful, raise the strain*, *Christ is made the sure foundation*, and the well-known eucharistic hymn of St. Thomas Aquinas, *Adoro te devote*, (*Humbly I adore Thee*).

MEDIEVAL RELIGIOUS SONGS

With the development of the European national tongues, religious songs began to be written in those languages. Caedmon (fl. ca. 670), a devout English cowherd, is the first English poet whom we know by name and is customarily reckoned the first English hymnographer. His hymn, *Nu sculan we herian*, (*Now shall we praise*), is the first vernacular English hymn, and it is unfortunate that no modern translation of it is available for singing. It stands at the beginning of a long tradition of vernacular, extra-scriptural English-language hymnody, one continued throughout the Middle Ages.

In mediaeval England the standard type of vernacular hymn was the carol, which was not just for Christmas. Sung outside of the Church’s official worship, or liturgy, which was with a few exceptions in Latin, the vernacular carols drew on the scriptural and theological themes of the liturgy and reveal the degree to which the liturgy was understood by lay folk. Carols were an integral part of the popular culture of the day; they fulfilled an important spiritual need, and singing them was a common pastime. An interest in carols was revived in the 19th century, but it was not until the twentieth that carols such as *God rest ye merry gentlemen* begin to appear in hymnals. What is more important, the tradition of carol-singing shows that from early on in the English-speaking world religious songs were a part of the popular culture outside of church. The best source for those now interested in carol singing is the *Oxford Book of Carols*.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION AND MUSIC

Among the reformers Martin Luther early on realized the importance of song for promoting the Reformation. He translated some Latin hymns and wrote new compositions. Lutheran hymnody inspired English hymn writers from the 17th century on, and the large number of German Lutheran immigrants to North America ensured for Lutheran hymns a key place in American hymnody. Perhaps the most famous Lutheran hymn to

PSALMS AND HYMNS continued on page 12

be found in American hymnals is *A Mighty Fortress* written by Luther himself.

Unlike Luther, John Calvin and his followers tried to restrict musical texts to those based on scripture, with especial attention to the Psalter. Metrical psalm singing took the place of vernacular hymnody in Calvinist churches, and the Church of England. In England, Calvin's followers, the Puritans, were so zealous in eliminating any vestige of Catholicism, and their compositions so singable that the carols all but disappeared. While some (e.g. George Herbert) continued to write hymns for private and local use, the metrical psalter of Sternhold & Hopkins and later that of Brady & Tate had a practical monopoly on religious singing from the end of the 16th century through the beginning of the 18th. While limiting the former range and variety of religious song, the metrical psalms did provide a valuable enrichment to English-language hymnody. In the Anglican service they were sung before and after the service, while in the non-conformist churches they were a key element of the actual service.

This Calvinist tradition of metrical psalmody was brought to North America by the Puritans, and the earliest extant printed book in the English colonies is the Bay Psalm Book of 1640. Some metrical psalm texts with their tunes became a standard element in American hymnals, surviving the gradual disappearance of the metrical psalters, perhaps the most famous being the tune *Old Hundredth* with the accompanying metrical version of the 100th psalm, *All people that on earth do dwell*.

The tradition of singing prose settings of the psalms continued, and starting in the 16th century simple polyphonic settings were written, known as Anglican chant. These were originally harmonizations of the tunes used in Gregorian Chant, though after the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 many original tunes began to be written. Originally composed for cathedral choirs, these began to be sung by ordinary congregations in England and North America. A large number of tunes for Anglican chant were composed in the 17th and 18th centuries, and a brief survey of American hymnals of many kinds, not just Anglican, shows a surprising number of texts pointed for singing to Anglican chant, accompanied by collections of these melodies.

EVANGELICAL HYMNODY

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was a growing need felt for wider musical expression as a devotional vacuum had been left by the suppression of the old customs, including the suppression of carols. It was an easy exercise to write new hymns using the meter and style of the metrical psalms to fill this devotional need. Brady and Tate added a few hymns to the end of their psalter, but it was the English Congregationalist Isaac Watts (1674 – 1748) who really broke the monopoly of the metrical psalters by publishing a collection of hymns in 1707. Watts's compositions are standard in most hymnals, the most well-known being the Christmas hymn *Joy to the world*. One hymn writer who followed Watts's example was the Anglican

priest and former slave trader John Newton, and his hymn, *Amazing Grace*, is arguably the best-known hymn in the English-speaking world.

The Wesley brothers, John and Charles, added further to a growing repertory of hymns. Of the two, Charles was the more gifted poet, writing such hymns as *Love divine, all loves excelling*, and *Come, Thou long expected Jesus*. It is striking that Charles's hymns are as theologically sophisticated as they are devotionally profound, and the Methodist movement which they spawned has spread the Wesley's hymns throughout the English-speaking world.

The popular religious songs of the black slaves in the Americas were known as spirituals. These provided a new and rich source for the devotion of all American Christians in the nineteenth century. Perhaps the best known of these is *Were you there when they crucified my Lord*. These spirituals influenced the hymnody of the Evangelical movement in the new United States during the second Great Awakening (1797-1805), and helped produce the gospel song, the musical style now associated with American Evangelicalism. The *Sacred Harp* hymnal was one very important collection of this music, and it helped popularize singing by providing shape note, note whose shape, a triangle, square, etc., changed according to whether it was do, re, mi, fa, or sol. Hymn writers were very productive in the nineteenth century, and it can be considered a golden age of hymnody.

The Roman Catholic Church also continued to produce new hymns in the centuries after the Reformation, some of these were Latin hymns. Perhaps the most famous of these is the *Stabat mater*, known to English speakers by its first line *At the cross her station keeping*. Vernacular hymns were also produced, a good example of one of these is the Christmas Hymn *Stille Nacht, (Silent Night)*.

It may be difficult to imagine in this secularized age, but psalm and hymn singing in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was not restricted to Church and was an important social pastime, to be indulged in the parlor, while walking, or even while working. Many hymnals emphasize this in their titles, or by having sections of hymns appropriate for such singing.

THE SITUATION TODAY

In the last half-century a variety of objections have been raised to the old body of hymnody. Much of the music that has been written in this time to replace the older music is theologically very poor, and often of a sentimentality which trivializes the truth and seriousness of the Christian message. Others have written cogently defending Christian hymnody against the attacks of those who would destroy this treasure, especially the promoters of that form of ideological jargon falsely called inclusive language, and I do not propose to repeat their arguments here. I would however like to answer one criticism of Church music which I have heard even from those who are otherwise faithful Christians: that singing, especially of