

## Chapter VII

### THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY IN DISCIPLINE

#### Article XXIV

##### ON SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH<sup>1</sup>

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

IF there is one corruption confirmed by the Roman Church at the Council of Trent which is against reason, the teaching of the New Testament and the practice of the Primitive Church, it is the use in worship of a language not understood by the people. A common tongue is the great medium of realizing the advantages of public worship, the concerted approach to God of His people in intelligible service of praise and prayer, and the spiritual comfort and strength which comes from hearing together the history of our redemption and its meaning expounded. Agreement in our petitions, which Jesus teaches is so important, is obtained by voicing them together in the meetings of His followers: 'If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them.'<sup>2</sup> Speaking with tongues (*glossolalia*) was a familiar form of the Spirit's manifestation in the early Church, and he who had this gift might indeed speak to God and edify himself; but unless his utterances were interpreted in language known to all, they contributed nothing to the benefit of Christian assemblies; spiritual support and enlightenment could only come from intelligent worship. St. Paul did not rate the use of tongues highly: 'Greater is he that proph-

---

<sup>1</sup>Derived partly from the Confession of Augsburg, and partly from The Thirteen Articles of 1553.

<sup>2</sup>Mtt. xviii.19f.

esieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the Church may receive edifying'<sup>1</sup>. 'I thank God', the Apostle continues, 'I speak with tongues more than you all: howbeit in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue'<sup>2</sup>.

Speaking with tongues is almost the last of the gifts of the Spirit listed in I Corinthians xii.4–11, and after the rapture and enthusiasm of the first Christian generation had subsided, it waned; ecstatic outbursts made for disorder, and without interpretation were unprofitable. The language in ordinary use was always that used in the Church's worship. Among Christians, says Origen, 'the Greeks use Greek names, the Romans Latin names, and everyone prays and sings praises to God in his mother tongue'<sup>3</sup>. St. Augustine exhorted the priests to cultivate good Latin, so that the people might understand clearly what it is to which they reply, Amen. 'There is nothing more certain in history, than that the service of the ancient Church was always performed in the vulgar or common language of every country, that is, such as was either commonly spoken, or at least commonly understood.'<sup>4</sup>

How the Church's services came to be rendered in an unknown language is easily explained. The two greatest world-conquering powers of antiquity, Greece and Rome, spread their languages Greek and Latin, throughout their domains. In the West this meant that Latin became the official tongue; the standard version of the Scriptures, St. Jerome's Vulgate, and the Church's Liturgy were in Latin. It was natural that such should be the case, for Latin was then the language used by educated people throughout the greater part of the Roman Empire, and it was very fitting that Latin should be used in the worship of the Church. But Latin gradually became a dead language, unintelligible to the majority of the people, for racial and cultural differences

<sup>1</sup>I Cor. xiv.5.

<sup>2</sup>I Cor. xiv.19; cf. Eph. v.18f.; Col. iii.16.

<sup>3</sup>*Contra Celsus*, viii.37.

<sup>4</sup>Bingham, *Antiquities*, xiii.4.

effected modifications of the general imperial language, and various dialects developed which eventually led to modern European languages, such as English, French, Spanish or Italian. Nevertheless, the Roman Church insisted on the use of Latin in her services, and tried to justify its retention on the ground that it strengthened the unity of the Church, was conducive to reverence, and helped to preserve the Faith since it was less liable than modern languages to suffer corruption.

The Anglican Reformers were particularly anxious to follow the Apostolic principle that 'all things be done to edifying'<sup>1</sup>, and insisted that Public Worship should be in the vernacular. This is in full accord with the biblical emphasis on edification—'Unless your tongue utters language that is readily understood, how can people make out what you say? You will be pouring words into the empty air,'<sup>2</sup> says St. Paul. He therefore emphasizes that praying and singing<sup>3</sup>, as well as preaching or 'prophesying'<sup>4</sup> should be 'with the understanding'<sup>5</sup>, and therefore in the vernacular.

The Article appeals to 'the custom of the Primitive Church' as well as to the Bible. All the primitive liturgies were in the native language of the people for whom they were written. Latin cannot be regarded as more sacred than any other language. The Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew, but was translated into Greek to suit Greek-speaking Jews. A Roman Catholic writer points out that 'the Italo-Greeks of Southern Italy have said Mass in Greek for over a thousand years, while the Melkites of Syria, Palestine and Egypt use Arabic and Greek. The Byzantine rite is used by the Eastern Orthodox Church in fourteen different languages. . . . Greek was originally the language of the Roman Liturgy, Latin superseding it by the beginning of the 5th century'<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>I Cor. xiv.26.; cf. Acts ix.31; I Cor. viii.1; x.23; Ephes. ii.21.

<sup>2</sup>I Cor. xiv.9 (Moffatt).

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. xiv.15.

<sup>4</sup>I Cor. xiv.6f.

<sup>5</sup>I Cor. xiv.16, 18, 19.

<sup>6</sup>Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question Box*, p. 272.

Some men regard this Article as justifying the revision of the entire Prayer Book on the ground that its Tudor English is 'not understood of the people'<sup>1</sup>; others extend its scope to include audible and distinct pronunciation, since even the mother-tongue may be unintelligently rendered<sup>2</sup>.

## Article XXXII

### OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS<sup>3</sup>

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

The Anglican Church in this Article also exercises her authority to abolish the pre-Reformation law of the celibacy of the clergy. It is well known that the Jewish priests married<sup>4</sup>, and that the High Priest's office was hereditary<sup>5</sup>. St. Paul's views on marriage vary; sometimes he prefers the unmarried state<sup>6</sup>, probably due to his belief that Christ's Second Coming was imminent<sup>7</sup>; at other times he regarded the married state as normal in the Church<sup>8</sup>. Our Lord recognized the value of celibacy in certain circumstances,<sup>9</sup> but by His attendance at the wedding in Cana<sup>10</sup> and in His teaching He stressed the sanctity of marriage as a Divine institution.<sup>11</sup> In fact, so sacred is it, that it is portrayed as a type of 'the union betwixt Christ

<sup>1</sup>K. N. Ross, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (1957), p. 81f.

<sup>2</sup>W. H. Griffith Thomas, *The Principles of Theology*, p. 340.

<sup>3</sup>This Article was written by Parker in 1563; the 1553 Article on the subject was less positive.

<sup>4</sup>Judges xx.28.

<sup>5</sup>The High Priest was succeeded by his son, or son-in-law (John xviii.13).

<sup>6</sup>I Cor. vii.1, 7f., 38.

<sup>7</sup>I Cor. vii.29, 31.

<sup>8</sup>Col. iii.18ff; I Cor. ix.5.

<sup>9</sup>Matt. xix.10-12.

<sup>10</sup>John ii.

<sup>11</sup>Matt. v.32; xix.9; Mark x.5ff.; Luke xvi.18.

and His Church.<sup>1</sup> St. Peter was a married man,<sup>2</sup> as were 'the rest of the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord,<sup>3</sup> and the Pastoral Epistles require both deacons and bishops to be the 'husband of one wife.'<sup>4</sup> There is, therefore, no Biblical authority for imposing celibacy as an universal condition upon all clergy: on the contrary, 'forbidding to marry' is classed with 'doctrines of devils.'<sup>5</sup>

No law enforcing clerical celibacy was passed until the fourth century. There is ample evidence of married clergy in the earliest centuries of the Church's life. For instance, Clement of Alexandria (150-216 A.D.) mentions married priests and deacons,<sup>6</sup> and the historian Socrates refers to a married episcopate in the Eastern Churches.<sup>7</sup> The Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) refused to enforce celibacy. In the Eastern Church, celibacy is not enforced upon priests and deacons, though bishops have been expected to observe celibacy since the time of the Emperor Justinian (527-565 A.D.). In Western Christendom, the Popes have used their influence to promote celibacy since the fourth century, when Pope Siricius in 385 A.D. issued a decree to the Bishop of Tarragona, forbidding the marriage of priests and deacons.

But despite Papal decrees and decisions of Councils, celibacy was not universally observed, and did not become the universal law of the English Church until the time of Anselm in 1102 A.D. A Roman Catholic writer says, 'Clerical celibacy is not a divine law, but a Church law dating only from the fourth century. It does not depend on precedent; it is founded on the Church's estimate of the more perfect following of Christ by her clergy.'<sup>8</sup> The Anglican Church, following the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, permits celibacy to those who prefer it, but does not enforce it as an universal law. We

<sup>1</sup>Ephes. v.22ff.

<sup>2</sup>Mark i.30.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. ix.5 (Moffatt).

<sup>4</sup>I Tim. iii.2, 12; Tit. i.5f; cf. Acts xxi.9.

<sup>5</sup>I Tim. iv.3.

<sup>6</sup>Strom. iii.12.

<sup>7</sup>Hist. Eccles. v.22.

<sup>8</sup>Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, of the Paulist Fathers, in *The Question Box* (1929) p. 317.

recognize that 'There is nothing in marriage that cannot be consecrated to the service of God.'<sup>1</sup> Clergy of the Anglican Communion are therefore free 'to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.'

### Article XXXIII

#### OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED<sup>2</sup>

That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

Like any other society, the Church has the right to expel, temporarily or permanently, those who are disloyal to her principles. The Jewish Church practised excommunication<sup>3</sup> at least from the time of Ezra.<sup>4</sup> In the Gospels we find several references to 'separation from the synagogue' as a penalty imposed on offenders.<sup>5</sup> Our Lord gave the Church authority to 'bind and' to 'loose',<sup>6</sup> which are Rabbinical expressions meaning to 'prohibit' and to 'permit,' and would suggest to Jews a form of ecclesiastical discipline.<sup>7</sup> He also suggested a definite procedure (possibly based on a similar Jewish procedure), consisting of (a) private admonition of the offender, (b) admon-

<sup>1</sup>E. J. Bicknell, *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

<sup>2</sup>The original title of this Article when it was published in 1553 was 'Excommunicate Persons are to be avoided'. No other change of substance has been made.

<sup>3</sup>To excommunicate means to exclude from the communion and privileges of the Church.

<sup>4</sup>Ezra. x.8.

<sup>5</sup>Jn. ix.22; xii.42; xvi.2; cf. Lk. vi.22.

<sup>6</sup>Mtt. xvi.19; xviii.18; Jn. xx.23.

<sup>7</sup>J. H. Bernard, *St. John I.C.C.*, vol. ii., p. 680.

ition in the presence of two or three witnesses, and (c) if both of these failed, then the offence should be reported in the presence of the Church. If the offender failed to hear the Church, he was to be treated as 'an heathen man and a publican,'<sup>1</sup> that is, as one outside the fellowship of the Church. Here 'Our Lord lays down a general principle which the Church has embodied in her system of discipline. She can only enforce obedience by spiritual penalties such as depriving the offender of certain privileges of membership. The final penalty is that of depriving him of membership altogether.'<sup>2</sup>

In New Testament times we find that the Church did in fact exercise such discipline. For instance, when St. Paul discovered that a member of the Church in Corinth had committed a grave moral sin,<sup>3</sup> he exercised his authority as an Apostle to excommunicate the offender<sup>4</sup> and directed the Church to carry out the sentence at a public assembly.<sup>5</sup> But the object of such a severe sentence was remedial 'for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' In another case, he orders the reinstatement of an offender who had apparently shown signs of remorse, saying 'This censure from the majority is severe enough for the individual in question, so that instead of censuring you should now forgive him and comfort him, in case the man is overwhelmed by excessive remorse. So I beg you to reinstate him in your love.'<sup>6</sup>

In Apostolic times, a very serious view was taken of those who deliberately proclaimed false teaching. Hymenaeus and Alexander were excommunicated for false teaching about the resurrection.<sup>7</sup> II John 10f. directs that a teacher of false doctrine should not be admitted to one's house, 'do not even

<sup>1</sup>Mtt. xviii.15-18.

<sup>2</sup>E. J. Bicknell, *Op. cit.*, p. 315.

<sup>3</sup>I Cor. v.1, 2.

<sup>4</sup>I Cor. v.3.

<sup>5</sup>I Cor. v.4f. The expression 'deliver unto Satan' expresses the belief that the Church is the sphere of salvation, and exclusion from the fellowship of the Church means that the offender is put out into the sphere in which Satan is supreme (Cp. Col. i.13). Sickness and death was sometimes regarded as a punishment for sin (Acts. v.1-11; II Cor. xii.7; Heb. ii.14).

<sup>6</sup>II Cor. ii.6-8 (Moffatt).

<sup>7</sup>I Tim. i.19f; cf. II Tim. ii.17f.

greet him, for he who greets him shares in his wicked work.<sup>1</sup> St. Paul went so far as to anathematize false teachers: 'As we have said before, so say I now again. If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema,<sup>2</sup> which is, in effect, a sentence of complete excommunication.

The Article was composed by the English Reformers in 1552 to assert the Church's power to excommunicate and that such excommunication ought to be recognized by the faithful members of the Church. In the early Church, discipline took three forms: (1) Admonition, as in Matt. xviii.15-17, Tit. iii.10; (2) Lesser Excommunication, which included suspension from Holy Communion, but not from the Church; and (3) Greater Excommunication, or Anathema, was imposed on persistent sinners who ignored repeated Admonition. If those excommunicated did not repent they were excluded from the Church, and denied all privileges of Church membership, including Communion before death, and Christian burial. Although excommunication is not often now practised, the Irish Prayer Book makes provision for all three of the above forms: (1) If a person '*living in open and notorious sin*' proposes to come to Holy Communion, he is to be '*privately admonished*' not to do so, '*till the cause of the offence shall have been removed.*'<sup>3</sup> (2) If the offender ignores the Admonition, and comes to Communion, he is not to be received as a communicant:<sup>4</sup> (3) The Burial Office is 'not to be used for any that die unbaptized or excommunicate.'<sup>5</sup> In the 1662 Prayer Book, the

<sup>1</sup>I Jn. 11 (Moffatt).

<sup>2</sup>Gal. i.9 (R.V.); The Greek word *anathema* is the LXX equivalent of the Hebrew word *cherem*, (meaning 'curse' or 'ban') and its use in Gal. i.9, and I Cor. xvi.22 means 'permanent exclusion from the Church and doubtless from heaven.' (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible* (1946), p. 248). Cf. Archbishop Trench's evidence that St. Paul's use of the word *anathema* implies 'utter loss,' *Synonyms of the N.T.*, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>Rubric 2 in the H.C. Office.

<sup>4</sup>Canon 49, Irish Prayer Book.

<sup>5</sup>Rubric 1 in Burial Office of Irish, Scottish, S.African (rubric 3 in Canadian) Prayer Books; American rubric directs Burial Office is 'to be used only for the faithful departed in Christ, . . . in any other case the Minister may, at his discretion, use such part of this Office, or such devotions taken from other parts of this Book, as may be fitting'.

rubric directed that excommunications should be read out after the Nicene Creed.

Excommunication is to be '*by open denunciation,*' which presupposes an open trial and promulgation of the Church's sentence by some duly authorized person. Such excommunication is to remain effective until the offender is '*openly reconciled,*' as publicly as he was denounced. The '*Judge*' in such cases would be the Bishop or Ecclesiastical Court.

#### Article XXXIV

#### OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgement, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

This Article asserts the liberty of National Churches '*to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites,*' and at the same time condemns any individual who '*willingly, purposely, and openly breaks the traditions and ceremonies of the Church.*' It will be observed that the liberty of a National Church is limited

<sup>1</sup>The first paragraph of this Article was derived from the fifth of the Thirteen Articles (1538), the word 'times' being added in 1563 for more comprehensiveness. The last paragraph was also added in 1563.

to the variation of rites and ceremonies 'ordained only by man's authority;' it cannot 'ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written.'<sup>1</sup>

The basis of the right to change custom is the historical fact that customs have varied in the past. Local branches of the Catholic Church in various places developed, often unconsciously, customary ways of worship, and formulated rules for the guidance of their members. Such customs and rules varied from place to place, and were recognized and approved by many of the highest authorities in the Church. For instance, a ceremonial feet-washing (the 'Pedilavium') accompanied Baptism in the Gallican Church and in Milan, but was not practised in Spain or in Rome.<sup>2</sup> Many non-Roman customs and usages were practised in the early Celtic Church.<sup>3</sup> The Eucharist was celebrated on Wednesdays and Fridays in Africa and in Jerusalem, but not in Rome.<sup>4</sup> Saturday was observed as a day of fasting in Rome and North Africa, but not in Milan.<sup>5</sup> St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan (375-397 A.D.) advised St. Augustine to conform to local customs: 'When I am here (in Milan) I do not fast on Saturday; but when I am at Rome I do: whatever Church you may come to, conform to its custom, if you would avoid either giving or receiving offence.'<sup>6</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that in the Primitive Church absolute uniformity in rites and ceremonies was not considered desirable or essential. But as the influence of the Church of Rome spread, she tried to bring all local customs into conformity with the Roman customs. Article XXXIV is a reply to the Council of Trent's refusal to recognize National Churches, and its insistence on uniformity of doctrine, ceremonial, and discipline.

It was the declared aim and object of the Anglican Reformers to return to the faith and practice of the Primitive Church.

<sup>1</sup>Article XX.

<sup>2</sup>Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origin & Evolution*, p. 326.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. W. G. Wilson, *Church Teaching*, p. 8ff. for a brief summary.

<sup>4</sup>Duchesne, *Op. cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. p. 231.

<sup>6</sup>Ep., 54.

They justified the changes they made by appealing to Scripture and Antiquity,<sup>1</sup> and believed that due weight and authority must be given to the ancient customs of the Church. In reviewing the Ceremonies that had been in use before the Reformation, they rejected those which 'blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God.' but retained others for the sake of 'order in the Church' and 'edification.' To those who objected to the retention of any of the old Ceremonies, they pointed out that 'without some Ceremonies it is not possible to keep any order or quiet discipline in the Church,' and therefore 'where the old may be well used' they ought to be revered 'for their antiquity,' in preference to 'innovations and new-fangleness, which (as much as may be with the true setting forth of Christ's Religion) is always to be eschewed.'<sup>2</sup> The Anglican attitude to Tradition was well expressed by Bishop Francis White:<sup>3</sup> 'Genuine Traditions agreeable to the Rule of Faith, subservient to piety, consonant with Holy Scripture, derived from the Apostolical times by a successive current, and which have the uniform testimony of pious Antiquity, are received and honoured by us,' and he gives as examples of such traditions: 'The historical tradition concerning the number, integrity, dignity, and perfection of the Books of Canonical Scriptures,<sup>4</sup> the Catholic exposition of many sentences of Holy Scripture<sup>5</sup>, the Holy Apostles' Creed,

<sup>1</sup>The primitive beliefs and customs not explicitly mentioned in the Bible. Cp. Preface to the Ordinal: 'It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors . . .'

<sup>2</sup>The quotations are from the Preface *Concerning Ceremonies* (1549).

<sup>3</sup>Bishop of Ely, 1631-1638.

<sup>4</sup>It should be observed that the decision as to which Books should be in the Bible is a matter of Tradition. Dean Robinson points out that at gatherings for Christian Worship in the early Church some Christian writings were read as well as passages from the Old Testament. 'At first there was no rule of limitation, apart from the judgement of the bishop of each church as to what tended to edification. But soon a *tradition grew up* in the greater churches as to what was and what was not of apostolic origin. Some books were not read in certain churches, though afterwards they were universally accepted; such were the Epistle to the Hebrews, which some assigned to St. Paul, while others did not; the Revelation of St. John; and the Second Epistle of St. Peter . . . By the end of the second century, nearly all the books of our present New Testament were accepted by the general consent of all the churches.' *Excluded Books of the N.T.*, p. x.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Article XX (Wm. Payne's Dictum).

the Baptism of Infants, the perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the religious observance of the Lord's Day, and of some other Festivals, as Easter, Pentecost, etc., Baptizing and administration of the Holy Eucharist in public assemblies and congregations, the Service of the Church in a known language, the delivering of the Holy Communion to the people in both kinds, the superiority and authority of Bishops over Priests and Deacons in jurisdiction and power of Ordination, etc.<sup>1</sup> Other examples of tradition which we follow include the Observance of Lent,<sup>2</sup> the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism,<sup>3</sup> and the holding of ordinations at the Ember Seasons.<sup>4</sup>

While resisting the Roman Catholic demand for universal uniformity of Traditions and Ceremonies, the Article also strongly condemns those who go to the opposite extreme and claim the right of exercising their private judgement to decide whether traditions should be observed. Such individualists are condemned on the grounds that:

(a) They offend against the common order of the Church. The Article is supported by the Preface *Concerning Ceremonies* (1549) which emphasizes that 'the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. "Let all things be done among you", saith St. Paul, "in a seemly and due order;" The appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any public or common<sup>5</sup> order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto.'

<sup>1</sup>A *Treatise of the Sabbath Day* (1635), p. 97f.

<sup>2</sup>Penitential Service: 'Brethren, there hath been from ancient times a godly custom in the Church . . .'

<sup>3</sup>'The sign of the Cross is by this Office appointed to be used in Baptism according to the ancient and laudable custom of the Church.'—Rubric following *Baptism of Infants*.

<sup>4</sup>Irish Prayer Book, Canon 18: In accordance with the ancient custom of the Church, whereby certain times were allotted in which only Sacred Orders might be given or conferred . . . only upon the Sundays immediately following . . . Ember weeks.

<sup>5</sup>The word 'common' does not mean 'vulgar.' but 'common to all,' as in 'Common Prayer.' The Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church are part of the heritage of the whole Church, accepted by the representatives of the whole Church in a Synod or Convocation, and therefore no individual man has any right to alter or depart from them to satisfy his personal whims or fancy.

(b) They offend against authority.<sup>1</sup> Every Clerk in Holy Orders who signs the Declaration of Assent is a man 'under authority'<sup>2</sup>, and is not free to do or to teach whatever he pleases. 'Acting under the order of lawful authority is the antithesis of acting according to one's own caprice or fancy. It excludes eccentricity, unrestraint, indiscipline, idiosyncrasy. It implies control, submission, regularity, orderliness.'<sup>3</sup> Since laymen, in most cases, share in making the laws governing Traditions, Rites, and Ceremonies, they are also under a moral, if not a legal, obligation to observe such laws.<sup>4</sup>

(c) They wound 'the consciences of the weaker brethren,' for they may by their bad example weaken the scruples of others. St. Paul regarded such conduct as a serious sin, declaring 'When ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ.'<sup>5</sup>

## Article XXXV

### OF HOMILIES<sup>6</sup>

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome

<sup>1</sup>The Article mentions the Magistrate, because when it was drawn up the ordinances of Religion were enforced by the State.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Declaration of Assent (*Canon Law of C. of E.*, p. 215).

<sup>3</sup>The Hon. Mr. Justice Vaisey, in *Canon Law of the C. of E.* (1947) p. 221, and Heb. 13, 7.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., in the Church of Ireland, such laws are made by the General Synod, comprising representatives of the laity of the Church, as well as representatives of the Clergy.

<sup>5</sup>I Cor. viii. 12.

<sup>6</sup>The corresponding Article of 1553 ran: 'The Homilies of late given, and set out by the king's authority, be godly and wholesome, containing doctrine to be received of all men: and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly.' The reference was, of course, to the First Book of Homilies. The present Article on this subject first appeared in its present form in 1571.

The American Church has the following note to this Article: 'This Article is received in this Church so far as it declares the Books of the Homilies to be an explication of Christian doctrine and instructive in piety and morals. But all references to the constitution and laws of England are considered as inapplicable to the circumstances of this Church; which also suspends the order for the reading of the said Homilies in churches until a revision of them may be conveniently made for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases as from the local references.'

Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

#### Of the Names of the Homilies

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1 Of the right use of the Church.  | 10 Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.                                 |
| 2 Against peril of Idolatry.   | 11 Of Alms-doing.  |
| 3 Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.                                  | 12 Of the Nativity of Christ.  |
| 4 Of good Works, first of Fasting.   | 13 Of the Passion of Christ.   |
| 5 Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.  | 14 Of the Resurrection of Christ.  |
| 6 Against Excess of Apparel.   | 15 Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. |
| 7 Of Prayer.   | 16 Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.   |
| 8 Of the place and time of Prayer.   | 17 For the Rogation Days.  |
| 9 That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue. | 18 Of the state of Matrimony.  |
|  | 19 Of Repentance.  |
|  | 20 Against Idleness.   |
|  | 21 Against Rebellion.  |

At the time of the Reformation, preaching was obviously important if the reformed doctrines were to be taught. But, unfortunately, many of the clergy were not highly educated, and some were incapable of writing sermons. It was decided, therefore, that Homilies or discourses<sup>1</sup> should be issued for reading in the churches. The First Book of Homilies was presented to Convocation in 1543,<sup>2</sup> but apparently King Henry refused to authorise their publication,<sup>3</sup> and they did not

<sup>1</sup>The word is derived from the Greek *homilia*, which means 'social intercourse' or 'familiar discourse.' The noun occurs in I Cor. xv.33 in the first sense 'evil company doth corrupt good manners' (R.V.), and the verb occurs in Lk. xxiv.14; Acts xx.11, xxiv.26.

<sup>2</sup>The records of Convocation for 16th February, 1543 state: 'there were produced the Homilies composed by certain prelates of divers matters: they were delivered to Mr. Hussey to be kept'—cited in J. T. Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies* (1897) p. 230.

<sup>3</sup>Tomlinson, *Op. cit.*, p. 230.

appear until 1547. In the 1549 Prayer Book, the rubric following the Nicene Creed in the Holy Communion Service directed: 'After the Crede ended, shall folowe the Sermon or Homely, or some porcion of one of the Homelies.' The Second Book of Homilies was prepared between 1561–62 and was issued by Convocation in January 1563 (with the exception of the Homily 'Against Rebellion' which was added in 1571, following a rising in the North of England in 1569). It consisted of twenty-one sermons, mainly the work of the learned apologist of the English Reformation, John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. The need for the Homilies arose not only because of the inability of many of the clergy to write sermons, but also because disaffection and licence were rampant among them, and just when the people required careful direction and instruction, only uncertain effusions came from many pulpits. The confusion became so great that preaching had to be controlled, and was frequently prohibited except by special permission; we hear at one time of eight thousand parishes without preaching ministers.

The remedy for this state of affairs was to provide the clergy with sermons composed by scholarly divines, and relevant to the religious, social and political questions of the day, which were to be '*read in churches . . . diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people*'. This reading of non-canonical writings in the congregation goes far back into history; St. Jerome in the 4th century witnesses to a similar use of the Epistles of Hermas, Clement of Rome and Polycarp. And later still, in A.D. 813, the Council of Rheims acknowledged the incompetence of many bishops to compose sermons, and authorized the translation for preaching of discourses of the Fathers.

The Homilies are never read in Public Worship nowadays, though the 1662 and 1928 Prayer Books retain the reference to Homilies in the rubric following the Nicene Creed. The Irish Prayer Book omits this reference, but in *The Ordering of Deacons* the Bishop says: 'It appertaineth to the Office of a Deacon . . . to read Holy Scripture and Homilies in the Church, . . . and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the

Bishop'. Whereas a Priest has authority to preach by virtue of his Office; a Deacon may only preach if the Bishop gives him a licence to do so. It has been pointed out that 'Occasionally Bishops have ordered the reading of printed sermons by Deacons; many do so in the case of lay readers'<sup>1</sup>. Hence, although the Homilies in the Article are not now read, the principle of reading homilies has not been entirely abandoned.

## Chapter VIII

## THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

## Article XXIII

OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION<sup>1</sup>

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

## Article XXXVI

OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS<sup>2</sup>

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

THESE two Articles must be considered together in order to get a complete statement of our doctrine of the Ministry. In

<sup>1</sup>Derived partly from the 10th of the Thirteen Articles of 1538 (which attempted to find a compromise between Anglicans and Lutherans), and partly from the Confession of Augsburg. This accounts for its vagueness.

<sup>2</sup>This Article dates from 1563 and was drawn up to vindicate our Ordinal against (i) Roman Catholics who denied the validity of our Orders, and (ii) Puritans, who objected to the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' and regarded parts of the Ordinal as 'superstitious or ungodly.'

<sup>1</sup>Lowther Clarke, *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered*, p. 30.

general, Article XXIII asserts the distinction between clergy and laity, and the necessity of being 'lawfully called and sent,' against Anabaptists who held that only the inward call of God is necessary. While Article XXXVI refers to the form of the Ministry, and the requirements for valid ordinations and consecrations as set forth in the Ordinal.

Even a cursory reading of the New Testament indicates the very significant difference between the Apostles and other members of the Church. During His Ministry our Lord had given them authority to preach and to heal.<sup>1</sup> But after His Resurrection He gave them a special commission and authorization to do His work,<sup>2</sup> and before His Ascension promised to endow them for the work with power from on high.<sup>3</sup> Their dominant position is indicated in the fact that the history of the early Church is entitled 'The Acts of the Apostles.' They exercised supreme authority in the administration of discipline,<sup>4</sup> safeguarding the Faith against false teachers,<sup>5</sup> supervising Church finances,<sup>6</sup> and ordaining by the laying on of hands.<sup>7</sup> 'The Church exists by Divine authority, and authority in the Church was committed to the Apostles, who were divinely designated as its organs, to exercise it in a permanent stewardship of grace and truth. Thus, not only was a Society established; it received the beginnings of a structure. The Church grew up round its Apostolic Ministry. There is a given-ness both in its faith and in its form. There was always a *cleros* and there was always a *laos*. They stood side by side from the beginning. There was no question of a *laos* spinning a *cleros* out of its own vitals. The *cleros* was as fixed and fundamental a feature in the Society as the eye is in the physical body.'<sup>8</sup>

Article XXIII denies the right of any man to preach or administer the Sacraments 'before he be lawfully called and sent.'

<sup>1</sup>Mark iii.14f.

<sup>2</sup>John xx. 21.

<sup>3</sup>Acts i.4, 5.

<sup>4</sup>Acts v.1-10; I Cor. v.1-5; II Thess. iii.6.

<sup>5</sup>I Tim. i.19f.; cf. II Tim. ii.17f.; II John 11.

<sup>6</sup>Acts iv. 32-37.

<sup>7</sup>Acts vi.5f.

<sup>8</sup>Archbp. J. A. F. Gregg, *Reunion*, p. 3f.

The inward call of God to serve in the sacred Ministry is essential, as the Ordinal recognizes;<sup>1</sup> but it is not sufficient in itself. If the individual were the sole judge of his call, the Church would be at the mercy of every man who felt so called, whatever his doctrinal views might be. The New Testament makes it quite clear that in this, as in other matters, the character and views of the individual must be tested and confirmed by the Church. The Epistles to Timothy and to Titus, for instance, emphasize that no man is to be accepted for the Ministry, unless he satisfies certain requirements, and great importance is attached to sound doctrine.<sup>2</sup> The idea that anyone may perform ministerial functions without being ordained is clearly at variance with New Testament teaching and practice.

Article XXXVI endorses the Ordinal, and the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons therein set forth. The Ministry developed with the growth and expansion of the Church. But it is important to notice that the initiative was taken by the Apostles. On their direction,<sup>3</sup> the people chose seven men whom they brought before the Apostles to be ordained by the laying on of hands.<sup>4</sup> Likewise, with the evangelization of new areas, the Apostles appointed Presbyters<sup>5</sup>, to whom they delegated the pastoral oversight<sup>6</sup> of the local branches of the Church. But the 'Presbyters, like the Deacons, were subject to Apostolic authority and supervision,<sup>7</sup> and there is no evidence that they had power or authority to ordain others.<sup>8</sup> The Ministry in the earliest period was thus a three-

<sup>1</sup>Cf. first question in each Office in the Ordinal.

<sup>2</sup>Note the qualifications required in I Tim. ii.1-10; Titus i.5-9; cf. I John iv.1-3.

<sup>3</sup>Acts vi.3.

<sup>4</sup>Acts vi.6.

<sup>5</sup>Acts xiv.23; xv.2; xx.28; Phil. i.1; Jas. v.14; I Pet. v.1.

<sup>6</sup>Acts xx.28. Thus Presbyters were sometimes called 'bishops' (Acts xx.17, 28) or 'overscers.' But they were not Bishops in the strict sense of the term, and are therefore usually called 'presbyter-bishops'.

<sup>7</sup>Phil. i.1; ii.19, 24, etc.

<sup>8</sup>If they possessed such authority it would have been unnecessary to send Timothy to Ephesus and Titus to Crete with specific authority to ordain, Tit. 1.5. (The list of qualifications of a presbyter-bishop given in I Tim. iii.1-7 is superfluous if Timothy was not intended to select and ordain suitable men. Cf. Hooker, *Op. cit.* VII, vi.3-5).

fold one of Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons. The Apostles may not have been localized as Bishops now are, but they exercised the functions now peculiar to Bishops, and the lower Orders were appointed by them and functioned with their consent and authority. Timothy and Titus, though not Apostles, were obviously superior to Presbyters, for they had authority to ordain Presbyters<sup>1</sup> and to rule over them.<sup>2</sup> They thus performed the most important functions formerly exercised only by Apostles and subsequently by Bishops. They are therefore sometimes designated 'Bishops,'<sup>3</sup> and are represented as deriving their authority from an Apostle.<sup>4</sup> St. James, the Lord's brother, was obviously leader of the Church in Jerusalem,<sup>5</sup> and 'as early as the middle of the second century all parties concur in representing him as a Bishop in the strict sense of the term.'<sup>6</sup> St. Paul gave him precedence over Cephas (Peter) and John.<sup>7</sup> He presided at the Council of Jerusalem and gave his personal judgement at the conclusion of it.<sup>8</sup> He was succeeded as Bishop of Jerusalem by Symeon,<sup>9</sup> a complete list of whose successors is preserved by Eusebius.<sup>10</sup> Irenaeus (b. 130 A.D.) declared 'We can enumerate those who were appointed as Bishops in the Churches by the Apostles and their successors to our own day',<sup>11</sup> and he instances Polycarp as having been 'appointed by the Apostles for Asia as Bishop in the Church at Smyrna.'<sup>12</sup> Ignatius, writing c. 110 A.D., bears the clearest testimony to the threefold Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.<sup>13</sup> The evidence (only a fraction of which has been given) thus justifies the statement in the Ordinal

<sup>1</sup>I Tim. iii. 1-13; v. 22; Tit. i. 5.

<sup>2</sup>I Tim. v. 17-22; Tit. i. 5-13.

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Lightfoot calls them 'iternant bishops' (*Clem. of Rome*, ii. p. 433) and describes them as exercising a 'moveable episcopate' (*Ignat.* i. p. 377).

<sup>4</sup>I Tim. i. 3, 18f.; Tit. i. 5.

<sup>5</sup>Acts xii. 17; xxi. 18.

<sup>6</sup>Bishop Lightfoot, *Dissertations*, p. 168.

<sup>7</sup>Gal. ii. 9.

<sup>8</sup>Acts xv. 19.

<sup>9</sup>Hegesipp. in *Euseb. H.E.*, iv. 22.

<sup>10</sup>*H.E.*, iv. 5.

<sup>11</sup>*Adv. Haer.* III. 3. 1.

<sup>12</sup>*Adv. Haer.* III. 3. 1; 3. 4.

<sup>13</sup>*Trallians* iii; *Mag.* xiii—your revered bishop and with your presbytery, . . . and with the godly deacons.'

that 'From the Apostles' times there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' The Ordinal makes it clear that those '*who have public authority . . . to call and send Ministers*' are the Bishops.

Article XXXVI asserts that all those who have been consecrated or ordained according to the Rites in our Ordinal are '*rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.*' The Roman Church alleges that our clergy are not validly ordained and therefore not really Bishops, Priests and Deacons of the Holy Catholic Church. The point was illustrated a few years ago in a correspondence in the London '*Times*,' in the course of which the Roman Catholic Bishop of Brentwood declared that from the Roman point of view, the Anglican Bishop of Winchester is a layman.<sup>1</sup> He would, of course, say the same of all non-Roman clergy.

For an ordination or consecration to be valid, four requirements must be satisfied. There must be (1) the proper minister, (2) the proper form, (3) the proper matter, and (4) the proper intention. These four tests must therefore be applied to our Ordinal.

(1) A valid ordination or consecration can only be performed by a Bishop who has himself been validly ordained Priest and consecrated Bishop. It is important to remember that during Queen Mary's reign (1553-58) the reforming process was halted for a time and an attempt was made to bring back Roman doctrines and the supremacy of the Pope. Roman Catholic writers acknowledge, for instance, that the men who were Bishops in Ireland in Queen Mary's reign were 'true Bishops of the Church in Ireland.'<sup>2</sup> Dr. Lawlor has shown that 'In each diocese of Ireland the Marian bishops were the true Bishops of the Church of Ireland, and they were in every case followed by a regular line of lawful successors, the last in each series being the occupant of the see at present recognized by the Irish Church. The rival lines of Roman titulars have no valid claim to be the successors in the several sees of the pre-

<sup>1</sup>The correspondence was published in booklet form entitled *Catholicism To-day* (1949).

<sup>2</sup>H. Jackson Lawlor, *The Reformation and the Irish Episcopate* (1932), p. 18.

Reformation bishops.<sup>1</sup> Hence the Irish clergy ordained since the Reformation must be regarded as having been ordained by proper ministers. The same is true of the clergy of the Church of England.

(2) The proper *form* refers to the use of the correct words. Roman Catholics argue that the 'form' in our ordinations and consecrations was insufficient, on the ground that from 1550–1661 the words accompanying the Imposition of Hands did not mention the particular order, whether Bishop, Priest or Deacon, which was being conferred. We reply (a) Our 1550 and 1552 ordination Services make it quite clear which Order was being conferred. (b) Neither the Roman Pontifical nor the earliest known Eastern ordination rite, that of Bishop Sarapion (c. 340 A.D.), mention the Order at the laying on of hands. Yet the Roman Church does not suggest that either is defective in form. (c) During Queen Mary's reign, when the English Church was reconciled to the Pope, no attempt was made to re-ordain all those who had been ordained according to the 1550 and 1552 rites. They were permitted to continue exercising their ministry in full communion with Rome and with the full knowledge of the Pope. If Rome considered in 1553 that their ordinations were valid, how can they now be deemed invalid?

(3) By the proper *matter* in an ordination is meant the performance of the correct action. In the pre-Reformation ordination rites the Bishop presented the candidates with *instruments* symbolical of their office. For instance, a Subdeacon received an empty chalice and an empty paten, a Priest received a chalice with wine and a paten with bread. This 'delivery of the instruments' came to be regarded in the 13th century as the 'matter' of ordination and the accompanying words as the 'form.' Because this ceremonial delivery of the instruments is omitted from our Prayer Book ordination services, Roman Catholics used to allege that our ordinations were therefore invalid. But in the 17th century a Roman Catholic scholar, Morinus, proved conclusively that the ceremony had not existed during the first 1,000 years of the

<sup>1</sup>H. Jackson Lowlor, *The Reformation and the Irish Episcopate* (1932), p. 18:

Church's life. If it is essential for a valid ordination, the Church possessed no valid Orders for a thousand years! There is no reason to doubt that the laying on of the Bishop's hands, with prayer for the Holy Spirit, is sufficient 'matter' to constitute a valid ordination.

(4) Lastly, Pope Leo XIII in 1896 declared that our Orders are invalid because our ordination rites lack a proper *intention* to make Priests in the sense that the Church has always given to the word 'Priest.' But the Preface to the Ordinal, after stating ' . . . from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: . . . ' goes on to say, 'To the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church' the prescribed Form of Service must be used at all ordinations. This Preface makes clear our intention to make Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the sense that these titles have borne since the Apostles' time.

If, as some Roman Catholics claim, mention of the Priest's power of offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice is necessary to make an ordination valid, then not only are our own clergy invalidly ordained, but so also are an innumerable host of Roman priests. For (unfortunately for the Roman argument) the earliest Roman ordination rite of which we have knowledge, in the '*Apostolic Tradition*' of Hippolytus of Rome (c. 215 A.D.), contains no mention whatever of the power of offering sacrifice.

Hence we find that these Roman arguments used against the validity of our Orders can be met at every point, and shown to be without substance. The fact that Roman theologians have had to change their arguments so often indicates the weakness of their case.

The Articles, apart from asserting that the Ordinal contains 'nothing superstitious or ungodly'<sup>1</sup>, make no explicit statement concerning the Anglican attitude towards non-episcopal ministries. In view, however, of current discussions about Church Unity, the inclusion in this chapter of some Anglican statements on the subject of the Ministry of the Church may

<sup>1</sup>The Puritans disliked the formula "Receive the Holy Ghost" in the Ordinal, but it is justified by John xx.22.

be deemed relevant and desirable. Much has been written about the Ministry in recent years by scholars of different ecclesiastical traditions, but for Anglicans the statements made by the Lambeth Conferences are more authoritative than the views of individual scholars however eminent.

The 1948 Lambeth Conference emphasized the importance of safeguarding "the integral connection between the Church and the ministry", and this relationship was admirably maintained by the Church Unity Committee of the 1958 Conference in the following statement (which was endorsed by the whole Conference—Resolution 13):

'We believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which takes its origin not in the will of man but in the will of our Lord Jesus Christ. All those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity are incorporated into the Body of Christ and are members of the Church. Here is a unity already given.

'We believe that the mission of the Church is nothing less than the remaking and gathering together of the whole human race by incorporation into Christ. In obedience to this mission we must continually pray and work for the visible unity of all Christian believers of all races and nations in a living Christian fellowship of faith and sacrament, of love and prayer, witness and service.

'The recovery and manifestation of unity, which we seek, is the unity of the whole Church of Christ. This means unity in living Christian fellowship, in obedience to Christ in every department of human life, and plain for all men to see. There can be no limit to the range of such unity. We are working for unity with the non-episcopal Churches in our own countries and elsewhere. We continue to seek for such complete harmony of spirit and agreement in doctrine as would bring unity with the Eastern Orthodox Church and other ancient Churches. We must hope and pray for such eventual agreement in faith and order as shall lead to the healing of the breach between ourselves and the Church of Rome.

'We therefore recall the words of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 as follows:

'We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:

'The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief;

'The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ;

'A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

'Loyalty to the age-long tradition of the Church, and to our own experience, compels us to believe that a ministry to be acknowledged by every part of the Church can only be attained through the historic episcopate, though not necessarily in the precise form prevailing in any part of the Anglican Communion. This ministry we believe to have been given to the Church by Divine Providence from primitive Christian times with its traditional functions of pastoral care and oversight, ordination, leadership in worship, and teaching. We fully recognize that there are other forms of ministry than episcopacy in which have been revealed the gracious activity of God in the life of the universal Church. We believe that other Churches have often borne more effective witness, for example, to the status and vocation of the laity as spiritual persons and to the fellowship and discipline of congregational life than has been done in some of the Churches of our communion. It is our longing that all the spiritual gifts and insights by which the particular Churches live to his glory may find their full scope and enrichment in a united Church.

'The unity between Christian Churches ought to be a living unity in the love of Christ which is shown in full Christian fellowship and in mutual service, while also, subject to sufficient agreement in faith and order, expressing itself in free interchange of ministries and fulness of sacramental Communion. Such unity, while marked by the bond of the historic episcopate,

should always include congregational fellowship, active participation both of clergy and laity in the mission and government of the Church, and zeal for evangelism.'

The emphasis in the above statement on 'the historic episcopate', and 'agreement in faith and order' as a condition of 'free interchange of ministries, and fulness of sacramental Communion', recalls the fuller statement on these matters which was made by the 1930 Lambeth Conference. In fact, the principles so succinctly stated in 1958 can only be appreciated and justified by studying the carefully-worded explanation of the Anglican attitude given in 1930, as follows:

'The problem confronting those who work for the restoration of union is primarily one of Faith and Order. Appreciation of spiritual devotion affords grounds for desiring re-union, but agreement upon Faith and Order is the essential matter, in the sense that to secure a common Faith and Order is in itself to accomplish re-union. Previous Lambeth Conferences have approved, as the Anglican basis for negotiations with a view to reunion, the four points sometimes referred to as the Lambeth Quadrilateral; the Scriptures; the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds; the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion; and the Historic Episcopate.<sup>1</sup>

'Of these the last appeared in the Lambeth Appeal (1920) as the one means of providing the "ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church" which is, in the Appeal, the fourth point declared to be involved in the visible unity of the Church.

'Among the Churches with which we have held Conference, we find that in the Episcopal Churches these four points are all secured; in the Non-Episcopal Churches we find that as regards three of the four points there is such a measure of agreement as to form a hopeful basis of further negotiation; these are the Canon of Scripture, the Faith as set forth and safeguarded by the Creeds, and the use of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. The outstanding point is the Historic Episcopate, and on this we desire to offer some further explication.

---

<sup>1</sup>The difference between 1958 and 1930 in the use of capital letters is characteristic of changing fashions, and not necessarily of any theological significance.

'When we speak of the Historic Episcopate, we mean the Episcopate as it emerged in the clear light of history from the time when definite evidence begins to be available. It is, indeed, well known that the origin of episcopacy has been much debated. Without entering into the discussion of theories which divide scholars, we may affirm shortly that we see no reason to doubt the statement made in the Preface to our Ordinal that "from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Whatever variety of system may have existed in addition in the earlier age, it is universally agreed that by the end of the 2nd century episcopacy had no effective rival. Among all the controversies of the 4th and 5th centuries the episcopal ministry was never a subject of debate. We may therefore reasonably claim that it is "Historic" in a sense in which no other now can ever be. The Episcopate occupies a position which is, in point of historic development, analogous to that of the Canon of Scripture and of the Creeds. In the first days there was no Canon of New Testament Scripture, for the books afterwards included in it were still being written. For a time different Churches had different writings which they regarded as authoritative. The Canon was slowly formed, and the acceptance of a single Canon throughout the Church took several generations. So, too, the Apostles' Creed is the result of a process of growth which we can in large measure trace. If the Episcopate, as we find it established universally by the end of the 2nd century, was the result of a like process of adaptation and growth in the organism of the Church, that would be no evidence that it lacked divine authority, but rather that the life of the Spirit within the Church had found it to be the most appropriate organ for the functions which it discharged.

'In the course of time the Episcopate was greatly affected by secular forces, which bent it to many purposes alien to its true character, and went far to obscure its spiritual purpose. It is hard to recognize the successors of the Apostles in the feudal Prelates of the mediaeval Church, or in the "peers spiritual" of eighteenth century England. Moreover, the

essential character of the Episcopate was distorted by the development of the Papal Supremacy. Such deviations from its true principle are mainly responsible for the general abandonment of Episcopacy by the Protestant Churches. The Historic Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry.

'For it is not a mere fact, but an institution fulfilling certain purposes. As an institution it was, and is, characterized by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. And it had generally recognized functions: the general superintendence of the Church and more especially of the Clergy; the maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist; the ordination of men to the ministry; the safeguarding of the faith; and the administration of the discipline of the Church. There have been different interpretations of the relations of these elements in the Historic Episcopate to one another; but the elements themselves are constant. When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions. What we uphold is the Episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration, as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times, and discharging those functions which from the earliest times it has discharged.

'We readily agree that there are other elements in the full life of the Church, and we hold that the episcopate should be "constitutional" in the sense that provision should be made for the due co-operation of the presbyterate and the congregation of Christ's faithful people in the ordering of the Church's life. Indeed, this is already secured in varying degrees in all parts of the Anglican Communion by the revival of Diocesan and Provincial Synods, or by other similar means. We recognize that in this respect we have much to learn and to gain from the traditions and customs of the non-episcopal Churches. But our special responsibility as an Episcopal Church is to bring into the complete life of the united Church those elements

which we have received and hold in trust. Chief among these, in the matter of Order, is the Historic Episcopate.

'In laying this emphasis on our own inheritance, we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-episcopal communions. On the contrary, we re-iterate the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, that "these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace". But when we consider the problem which must be paramount in all our discussions, namely, the restoration of the broken unity of Christ's Body and the drawing together of the separated groups of His followers, we realize that one necessary element in that visible fellowship must be a ministry universally acknowledged. Thus considered, there is at present no ministry which fully corresponds with the purpose of God. Yet we are persuaded that the historic continuity of the episcopal ministry provides evidence of the Divine intention in this respect such as to constitute a stewardship which we are bound to discharge.

'We cannot regard the maintenance of separately organized churches as a matter indifferent or unimportant. The will and intention to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the Body of Christ must of necessity underlie all its organisation; and where that unity has been broken, the earnest desire to restore union makes possible a recognition by the Church, in some respects, of ministries which, in separation, must stand on a different footing. The will and intention of Christians to perpetuate separately organized Churches makes it inconsistent in principle for them to come before our Lord to be united as one body by the sacrament of His own Body and Blood. The general rule of our Church must therefore be held to exclude indiscriminate Inter-communion, or any such Inter-communion as expresses acquiescence in the continuance of separately organized Churches.

'From what has been already said it will be evident why we hold as a general principle that Inter-communion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of union, and also why the general rule of our Church has been, as set

forth by the 1920 Lambeth Conference, that members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church or of Churches in full communion with it.

‘But we recognize that the rule quoted above is a rule of discipline, and as such is subject to exception where the purpose of that discipline can thus be better served. We hold that the administration of such a rule of the Church falls under the discretion of the Bishop, who should exercise his dispensing power in accordance with any principles that may be set forth by the national, regional, or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned. Nor (we hope) will the Bishops of the Anglican Communion question the action of any Bishop who may in his discretion so exercised sanction an exception to the general rule in special areas where the ministrations of his own Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances, or may give permission that baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with our own, should be encouraged to communicate in Anglican Churches when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special and temporary circumstances. We would repeat the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 that “in cases in which it is impossible for the Bishop’s judgement to be obtained beforehand, the priest should remember that he has no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling before the Lord’s Table unless he be excommunicate by name, or, in the canonical sense of the term, a cause of scandal to the faithful”.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*Report of Lambeth Conference 1930*, pp. 114–117.