

Chapter 1 : State Services - calendrierdelascience.com

King Charles the Martyr, or Charles, King and Martyr, is a title of Charles I, who was King of England, of Scotland and of Ireland from until his execution on 30 January. The title was used by high church Anglicans who regarded Charles's execution as a martyrdom.

Cover Story Why the cross? The creed says Jesus was crucified "for us," but what do those two little words mean? March 11, Daniel C. What good is the cross? To ask that is to ask what is in technical parlance a soteriological question. But English-language theology has long used a good old English word as the comprehensive name for what the question is about: Charles Hefling. Charles Hefling is an instructor in the diaconal formation program of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts and an adjunct member of the faculty at the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge. He was formerly a professor of systematic theology at Boston College. Nor is there consensus. But however they are categorized, explanations of the cross are not only different but disparate. That is why there is a question. Of the available positions, which one should be taken seriously, taught, believed and preached? The word atonement itself is no help. In a way it is part of the problem. On the one hand, we were all taught that it wears its meaning on its face: That does seem to have been what the word was invented to mean. On the other hand, however, the verb atone, which came later, has veered off in another direction. No one ever translates 2 Corinthians 5: I atone for something, some failure of mine, some offense on my part; and my atoning consists in acting, or more especially suffering, so as to compensate for the wrongdoing. Consequently what is meant by atonement may be either of two things. It can mean being or coming to be at one—the original, etymological sense. It can mean leveling the score, redressing the balance, making reparation or restitution or the like—probably the more usual sense. The two meanings are not unrelated, and the distinction between them is often blurred, but to insist on it is by no means splitting hairs. For one way to sharpen the question at hand would be to ask: Does atonement depend on atonement? Otherwise stated, does reconciliation with God depend on compensating, making amends, paying a price? Is that what the cross is all about? He maintained that atonement that is, reconciliation can best be conceived as the triumphant outcome of confrontation and conflict, with Christ as the conquering hero. Hence the title of his book, *Christus Victor*. Enormously influential though the book has been, however, the stirring imagery of the *Christus Victor* motif has yet to reclaim the primacy it lost to the scholastic tradition inaugurated by Anselm, which still predominates in Western theology. The next question is how. There is a default setting for that too, although it has never gone unchallenged. In its most clear-cut form it usually goes by the name of substitutionary penal atonement. The straightforward logic of this account runs as follows. Justice, divine or human, requires that wrongdoers, whose wrongdoing makes them liable to punishment, should be punished. Humans, one and all, are sinners. As such they incur a penalty, which in justice ought to be paid and which has, in fact, been paid—not, however, by those who owe it and deserve to pay it, but by Jesus. The verdict never changed. But because he died, the sentence has been suspended for everyone else. Instead of punishing, God pardons. That is the good news. There is much to be said for this traditional explanation. For another thing, it gives God all the credit. My reprieve is none of my own doing; it is altogether an amazing, gracious gift. And for yet another and perhaps the most important thing, substitutionary penal atonement is not just conceivable but imaginable. The greater my conscientious dread of well-deserved punishment and the more vivid my experiential awareness of myself as a sinner, the greater the blessing of being assured that despite my guilt I shall not be given my just deserts. That is why penal substitution preaches well: Penal substitution may be a theory of atonement—an intelligible explanation, that is—but its appeal is not in the first instance intellectual. It is emotional, imaginative, existential. It is sometimes said that theology and spirituality have parted company. Is the undeniable emotive power of this account enough to guarantee its truth? Newman held that there is no genuine belief without real apprehension. Even so, it does not follow that the criterion of credibility for a claim is whether it packs a visceral punch. I may be inclined to accept a statement because it engages my deepest desires and fears and yet discover that upon examination its implications are intellectually bogus or morally repulsive. The standard account of atonement, for all its

affective effectiveness, might be like thatâ€”convincing, but only until you start to think about it. There are, of course, serious objections to atonement conceived in terms of substituted punishment. All of them have been raised again and again, but it is worth rehearsing the main one. Recall the beginning of the argument summarized above: That sets the context for everything else, and the sequel makes it clear that by justice is meant, more specifically, retributive justice, which consists in attaching rewards to merit and penalties to fault. Now justice, so defined, is an attribute of the God described all through the Bible. There can be no objection on that score. The problem, rather, is that penal substitution cannot be squeezed inside the same definition. To punish the guilty is just. The innocent do not. To punish them is not just; it is just outrageous. But Christ was innocent, tempted in every way as we are, yet without sin Heb. Nobody would deny that Pilate, Caiaphas and the rest acted unjustly; but if by doing what they did they were executing a divine planâ€”if God intended to punish his Son by their handsâ€”then evidently God is not just after all. From this internal contradiction there are two escape routes, one incredible, the other reprehensible. The first introduces the remarkable claim that Jesus was guilty, but only because the guilt of others was transferred from them to him. This expedient so undermines the very idea of moral responsibility that it would be better not to speak of justice at all. Guilt in the relevant sense is not the sort of thing that can be siphoned out of one person and into another. There is a name for that: The point of these well-worn objections is that atonement, conceived in terms of penal substitution, cannot be conceived coherently. Much the same point has been made, in more robust fashion, by writers who declare that what Western tradition calls atonement is divine child abuse or the vengeful violence of a tyrannical God. Those are caricatures, which is not to say they are utterly mistaken. Retributive justice does leave something to be desired as an intelligible framework for making sense of the cross. What it leaves out, above all, is a personal dimension. In the forensic context of strict retributive justice, rewards and punishments correspond to desert and nothing else. It does not matter who the deserver is. In the same context, being forgiven is not a positive good; it is only a double negative. Punishment, by definition, takes away from an offender something valuableâ€”liberty, physical well-being, companionship, possessions. Forgiveness would mean the remission or cancellation or cessation of deserved punishment. It comes down to taking away the taking away. But a person is more than a party at law; and among persons forgiving is not reducible to omitting retribution. Forgiveness involves a change in both the forgiver and the forgivenâ€”in their attitudes, their motivations, their selves. Enemies they were; friends they become, or become again. Hostile interaction gives way to concord. Such a reconciling shift in personal relations does not always happen, and when it does it is difficult, painful and costlyâ€”but not because suffering is an extrinsic preliminary condition that has to be met before forgiveness can occur, but because willingness to suffer is intrinsic to what forgiveness, in the personal sense, is. Because, in the first place, evil is like the good it undoes in that it is infectious. Suppose, then, that I have injured you. As a person, you are free to choose your response. If you choose to retaliate, you perpetuate the evil by causing a new injury. The choice may be wholly justifiable, but it is no less injurious for that. If instead you choose to hold a grudge, to brood on your injury and cultivate your dudgeon, you will still perpetuate the evil, internally, by diminishing yourself, souring your character and becoming your own victim as well as mine. On the other hand, if you choose to forgive, you are choosing to absorb the infection, as it were; to contain its self-diffusion, to forgo the gratifications of revenge, resentment, self-vindication and righteous indignation. Furthermore, you are choosing to make your willingness known to me, to offer me your friendship, to accord me a status and value no less than yours, all without denying my offense or ceasing to be my victim. At the same time, conversely, until I have chosen to acknowledge you as such, to own the injury, ask for your benevolence and reciprocate your offer, the forgiveness that we must both choose if it is to occur has yet to be fully chosen. On this very abbreviated analysis, forgiveness is a matter of honesty, humility, communication and exchange, none of which takes place automatically or effortlessly, even for saints, much less for sinners. To forgive is not to forget, the adage notwithstanding.

Chapter 2 : Anniversary Days Observance Act - Wikipedia

The Oxford guide to the Book of common prayer: a worldwide survey User Review - Not Available - Book Verdict. Hefling (systematic theology, Boston Coll.) and Shattuck (vice president & editorial director, Church Pub.) have compiled essays on the origin and evolution of *The Book of Common Prayer*.

His feast day in the Anglican calendar is 30 January,[1] the anniversary of his execution in The cult of Charles the Martyr was popular with Tories. The observance was one of several "state services" removed in from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England and the Church of Ireland. There remain some churches and parishes dedicated to Charles the Martyr, and his cult is maintained by some Anglo-Catholic societies, including the Society of King Charles the Martyr founded in He believed in a sacramental version of the Church of England , called High Anglicanism , with a theology based upon Arminianism , a belief shared by his main political advisor, Archbishop William Laud. Laud was appointed by Charles as the Archbishop of Canterbury in and started a series of reforms in the Church to make it more ceremonial. This was actively hostile to the Reformist tendencies of many of his English and Scottish subjects. Many of his subjects thought these policies brought the Church of England too close to Roman Catholicism. These disputes led to the English Civil Wars. Trial and execution After the royalists were defeated by the Parliamentarians, Charles was put on trial. He was charged with attempting to govern as an absolute monarch rather than in combination with Parliament; with fighting against his people; with continuing the war after the defeat of his forces the Second English Civil War ; with conspiring after defeat to promote yet another continuation; and with encouraging his troops to kill prisoners of war. When Charles was beheaded on 30 January , Philip Henry records that a moan was heard from the assembled crowd, some of whom then dipped their handkerchiefs in his blood, thus starting the cult of the Martyr King. However, no other eyewitness source, including Samuel Pepys , records this. It is possible he relented and agreed to do the deed, but there are others who have been identified. William Hewlett was tried for the murder after the Restoration and convicted. In , two people identified as "Dayborne and Bickerstaffe" were arrested but then discharged. Henry Walker, a revolutionary journalist, or his brother William, were suspected but never charged. Various local legends around England name local figures. It was common practice for the head of a traitor to be held up and exhibited to the crowd with the words "Behold the head of a traitor! Martyrdom The Eikon Basilike , a purported spiritual autobiography attributed to Charles I, published days after his execution Charles is regarded by many members of the Church of England as a martyr because, it is said,[4] he was offered his life if he would abandon the historic episcopacy in the Church of England. It is said he refused, however, believing that the Church of England was truly " Catholic " and should maintain the Catholic episcopate. But on this point Charles stood firm: In addition, a proclamation made at the beginning of each reign from Charles II to Victoria annexed special services for these days to the Prayer Book by royal mandate approved unanimously by Convocation. Special sermons were preached, and hundreds of sermons on King Charles the Martyr were printed from the s until the late eighteenth century. The title of the service for 30 January was: In the State Services were omitted from the Prayer Book by royal and parliamentary authority but without the consent of Convocation. Vernon Staley in described the deletion as ultra vires and "a distinct violation of the compact between Church and Realm, as set forth in the Act of Uniformity which imposed the Book of Common Prayer in ". It is included in some of the calendars of other Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Chapter 3 : Theology Department - Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences - Boston College

Hefling, Charles C. & Shattuck, Cynthia L. , The Oxford guide to the Book of common prayer: a worldwide survey / editors, Charles Hefling, Cynthia Shattuck ; editorial advisory board, Colin Buchanan.

He believed in a sacramental version of the Church of England , called High Anglicanism , with a theology based upon Arminianism , a belief shared by his main political advisor, Archbishop William Laud. Laud was appointed by Charles as the Archbishop of Canterbury in and started a series of reforms in the Church to make it more ceremonial. This was actively hostile to the Reformist tendencies of many of his English and Scottish subjects. Many of his subjects thought these policies brought the Church of England too close to Roman Catholicism. These disputes led to the English Civil Wars. Trial and execution[edit] See also: He was charged with attempting to govern as an absolute monarch rather than in combination with Parliament; with fighting against his people; with continuing the war after the defeat of his forces the Second English Civil War ; with conspiring after defeat to promote yet another continuation; and with encouraging his troops to kill prisoners of war. When Charles was beheaded on 30 January , Philip Henry records that a moan was heard from the assembled crowd, some of whom then dipped their handkerchiefs in his blood, thus starting the cult of the Martyr King. However, no other eyewitness source, including Samuel Pepys , records this. It is possible he relented and agreed to do the deed, but there are others who have been identified. William Hewlett was tried for the murder after the Restoration and convicted. In , two people identified as "Dayborne and Bickerstaffe" were arrested but then discharged. Henry Walker, a revolutionary journalist, or his brother William, were suspected but never charged. Various local legends around England name local figures. It was common practice for the head of a traitor to be held up and exhibited to the crowd with the words "Behold the head of a traitor! Martyrdom[edit] The Eikon Basilike , a purported spiritual autobiography attributed to Charles I, published days after his execution Charles is regarded by many members of the Church of England as a martyr because, it is said, [4] he was offered his life if he would abandon the historic episcopacy in the Church of England. It is said he refused, however, believing that the Church of England was truly " Catholic " and should maintain the Catholic episcopate. But on this point Charles stood firm: In addition, a proclamation made at the beginning of each reign from Charles II to Victoria annexed special services for these days to the Prayer Book by royal mandate approved unanimously by Convocation. Special sermons were preached, and hundreds of sermons on King Charles the Martyr were printed from the s until the late eighteenth century. The title of the service for 30 January was: In the State Services were omitted from the Prayer Book by royal and parliamentary authority but without the consent of Convocation. Vernon Staley in described the deletion as ultra vires and "a distinct violation of the compact between Church and Realm, as set forth in the Act of Uniformity which imposed the Book of Common Prayer in ". It is included in some of the calendars of other Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Chapter 4 : Alexander Charles Hefling () - Find A Grave Memorial

The state services /Charles Hefling The social and cultural life of the prayer book. The prayer book and the parish church: from the Elizabethan settlement to the Restoration /Judith Maltby.

Episcopalians now have an officially approved way to do what some of them have been doing, informally and unofficially, for quite a while. By a surprisingly large majority vote, it authorized for provisional use a liturgy that prescribes what is to be done and said at a service of blessing a same-sex union. Like every liturgical text, this one is, among other things, an expression of theological convictions. Inasmuch as the Anglican tradition to which the Episcopal Church belongs has typically found its theological identity in appointed forms of common prayer as much as in confessional formulas, it is all the more appropriate to ask what beliefs will be enacted when the new liturgy comes into use in Advent. What does this service say, theologically, about the church that has produced and endorsed it? It would be a mistake to suppose that what is most obvious about the rite is what the rite obviously is. After readings from scripture and a sermon, the couple is presented and the presider asks each of them whether they truly mean to do what they have come for. Stated prayers are recited. Charles Hefling Charles Hefling is an instructor in the diaconal formation program of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts and an adjunct member of the faculty at the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge. He was formerly a professor of systematic theology at Boston College. Sep 05, issue Yet a nuptial it is not. The Episcopal Church has not endorsed marriage equality. Neither church law nor the Book of Common Prayer entitles two persons to marry each other, or a member of the clergy to officiate at the marriage, unless one of the two is a woman and the other a man. General Convention did nothing to change that. Appearances notwithstanding, then, the new liturgy makes no claim that couples of the same sex can, in the ecclesiastical sense, marry. What it does say is more interesting. It says, explicitly and by implication, that two persons, both men or both women, are capable of making with each other a covenant so sacred, so religiously or spiritually significant, as to invite public recognition, welcome, celebration and benediction on the part of a Christian community in an act of Christian worship. This capability is not, perhaps, self-evident. It needs to be argued for, and the argument needs to refute a well-worn syllogism: But God does not favor same-sex coupling; far from it. The long apologia it provided implicitly accepts the major premise: A formal blessing on the part of the church is both thanksgiving for what happens and petition for its continuation, enhancement, perfection. It follows that promises, which initiate but do not necessitate some determinate future, are eminently blessable—depending, of course, on what future is being promised. In the case of the new Episcopal liturgy, the couple promise to support and care, hold and cherish, honor and love, forsaking all others, as long as they both shall live—vows much the same as those made by brides and bridegrooms. The theological question is not whether two women or two men can genuinely utter this kind of performative speech. Of course they can. Either way, it is collaborative participation in the divine purpose that makes the lifelong union of two persons not only blessable in itself but also a blessing to others. By building its argument around the forward-looking biblical notion of covenant, the commission responsible for proposing the new liturgy has taken a theological stand somewhat removed from the traditional Augustinian concern with quarantining sexuality. The vows themselves are traditional enough, but the rationale for blessing them has shifted toward discerning in relations of intimacy anticipations of the life of the world to come. This shift—from Genesis to Revelation, so to say—is evident but not obtrusive throughout the new liturgy: But never does the wording call attention to the fact that the two principal ministers are both men or both women. Although that fact is the reason for composing a new liturgy in the first place, it is almost incidental to the liturgy as composed. The text could be used, just as it stands, by a man and a woman. They would be inaugurating a covenant with the same content, meaning and purpose as the one same-sex couples will make. At least one diocese, in a state where same-sex marriage is lawful, has already taken this theological trajectory to its logical conclusion. Perhaps that is what the commission had in mind all along. For the theology on which its liturgy rests does not attempt to justify same-sex covenants as unique or exceptional; it regards them, as it does marriages in the conventional sense, simply as variations on the same theme.

Chapter 5 : Holdings : The Oxford guide to the Book of common prayer : | York University Libraries

Get this from a library! The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: a Worldwide Survey. [Charles Hefling; Cynthia L Shattuck;] -- The Book of Common Prayer runs like a golden thread through the history of the Church of England and the worldwide Anglican Communion.

Chapter 6 : The Oxford Guide to The Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey - Google Books

We would like to show you a description here but the site won't allow us.

Chapter 7 : King Charles the Martyr | Revolv

Charles Hefling is an instructor in the diaconal formation program of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts and an adjunct member of the faculty at the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge.

Chapter 8 : Herman Clyde Hefling () - Find A Grave Memorial

The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the church according to the use of the Church of England in the Dominion of Canada: together with the Psalter of the Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of bishops, priests and deacons.

Chapter 9 : Texas Department of State Health Services Mobile

A searchable listing of all State of Tennessee Departments' Services and Programs.