

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *The Lambeth conferences and the development of Anglican ecclesiology, 1867 - 1978*

Philip H. E. Thomas

#### How to cite:

---

Thomas, Philip H. E. (1982) *The Lambeth conferences and the development of Anglican ecclesiology, 1867 - 1978*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7671/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

## ABSTRACT

The Lambeth Conferences and the development of Anglican ecclesiology, 1867 - 1978 by Philip H.E. Thomas.

The discussion of Anglican ecclesiology usually concentrates on particular periods of the Church of England's history. This thesis proceeds from the standpoint of the Anglican Communion. When Anglicans found themselves to be outside the bounds of the English establishment, they were forced to make a response to their new social, political and religious environment. They did this by founding Churches upon the basis of voluntary compacts and organising them under constitutional synods. This thesis argues first that the new challenges led to a changed perspective on received Anglican doctrine and liturgies, episcopal government and the Church's relationship to the State, and secondly, that in the light of this experience Anglicans have transformed the definition of their own communion and the claims made for the whole Anglican theological tradition.

It is in this second area that the Lambeth Conferences are important. By reference to the Conferences' discussion of Christian unity and Anglican organization (often utilising previously unexamined records) the thesis examines the debates over Anglican doctrine, authority, organization and mission. Successive expositions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral form one line of investigation together with a recognition of the ambiguous position of the English reformation formularies in the Anglican Communion. Another approach is taken through the developing conviction that Anglicanism consists of a fellowship of "national Churches". With these debates underlying questions of authority, comprehensiveness, conciliarity and ministry are also considered within the framework of gathering Anglican self-consciousness. A number of such elements of theory are finally tested by their capacity to assist Anglicanism in its adaptation to changing theological, ecumenical and social pressures.

The study concludes that, in the Lambeth Conference documents, the Anglican Communion is able to present a distinct, though not unique, and by no means final contribution to Anglican and ecumenical theology.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCES AND THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF ANGLICAN ECCLESIOLOGY

1867 - 1978

by  
Philip Harold Emlyn Thomas

A thesis submitted for  
the Degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy, to the  
University of Durham  
following research  
conducted in the  
Department of  
Theology in that  
University.



1982

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE:	
Introduction: the Problem of Anglican Ecclesiology.	5
1. The problem defined	6
2. The method adopted	11
3. The development of Anglican ecclesiology	16
4. The immediate background to the development of ecclesiology in the Anglican Communion	20
CHAPTER TWO:	
The Emergence of Anglicanism	28
1. The Anglican Communion: from Colonial agency to indigenous churches	31
2. The Church of England: from Christian commonwealth to voluntary society	45
3. Anglicanism: from a national church to a world communion	59
CHAPTER THREE:	
Anglican Beliefs: declared doctrine in the Anglican Communion	73
1. The standards of Anglican belief	75
(a) Theological definition in the early Conferences	76
(b) The Lambeth Quadrilateral	86
2. The Quest for Unity	99
(a) The Quadrilateral elaborated	105
(b) The Lambeth Appeal	110
(c) The Appeal discussed	121
3. Anglican comprehensiveness	130
CHAPTER FOUR:	
Anglican Authority	152
1. Structures of Anglican authority	155
(a) The centre of Anglican authority?	155
(i) The Lambeth Conferences;	155
(ii) a central advisory body;	158
(iii) metropolitanical authority;	161
(iv) the Archbishop of Canterbury;	162
(v) Confession and Liturgy	168
(b) The doctrine of "dispersed" authority	176
2. Patterns of Anglican Authority	186
(a) Constitutional material in the Anglican Communion	187
(b) Standards of Anglican doctrine	192

	(i) A universal faith	191
	(ii) A particular expression	199
	(c) The exercise of authority	201
	(i) disciplinary authority;	201
	(ii) the locus of ecclesiastical authority;	203
	(iii) the extent of such authority	205
	(d) Metropolitan authority	207
3.	The nature and unity of the Anglican Communion	212
	(a) The ideals of the Anglican Communion: Lambeth 1930	213
	(i) Palmer's vision	215
	(ii) The Conference's assessment	220
	(b) The status of the Lambeth Conference - The reality of Anglican conciliarism	227
CHAPTER FIVE:	Renewal in Faith, Unity and Mission.	239
1.	Renewal in faith: the 1968 Conference and declared doctrine	241
	(a) The role of the Thirty-nine Articles	241
	(b) The use of the Quadrilateral	253
2.	Renewal in Unity: structures of Anglican self-expression	266
	(a) The Anglican Congresses - a quest for mutuality	267
	(b) The Anglican Consultative Council - the need for consultation	270
	(c) Multi-lateral conversations - the need for common action	280
3.	Renewal for mission: the test of Anglican credibility	285
	(a) The Church, the laity and a changing social order	286
	(b) Anglicanism and the renewal of mission	295
CHAPTER SIX:	Summary and Conclusion	307
NOTES		314
BIBLIOGRAPHY		377

### Declaration

No part of this thesis has been previously submitted for a degree in this or any other university.

### Statement of copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

## CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION : THE PROBLEM OF ANGLICAN ECCLESIOLOGY.

In February 1846, John Henry Newman turned his back on Oxford and on the Church of England. For him five years of heart-searching were over and the long anticipated parting of friends had become a reality. (1) Almost immediately the Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine set forth a positive defence of his new allegiance, but nearly four years were to elapse before Newman published the supplementary reasons for his decision; his perception of the shortcomings of the Anglican Church. After theological study and ordination in Rome, Newman returned to establish an Oratory in Birmingham and there, in an address entitled "Prospects of a Catholic Missioner", he undertook to describe various competing religious systems. By comparison with Rome none could lay claim to any degree of Catholicity, he concluded, but the Church of England was singled out for comment:

It is its establishment which erects it into a unity and individuality; can you contemplate it, though you stimulate your imagination to the task, abstracted from its churches, palaces, colleges, parsonages, civil precedence, and national position? Strip it of this world, and it has been a mortal operation, for it has ceased to be. (2)

Not only did Anglicanism exist by virtue of its social status, it survived by disadvantaging all other, non-established bodies. It was in fact no more than a passive extension of the English state. As such it was even less credible than Methodism or Congregationalism which, although misguided, at least sought to justify themselves by appeal to theological convictions. In the Church of England, claimed Newman, there were no convictions left. It lacked any "church idea". It was a church in name alone.



1. THE PROBLEM DEFINED.

Newman's accusation is a fitting prologue to a study of Lambeth Conference documents and the development of the Anglican Communion in general for two reasons.

First, it raises a fundamental question for Anglican ecclesiology. Can Anglicans summon a coherent theological account of their claim to be part of the universal Church, or, is the existence of Anglican Churches merely the result of a succession of historical accidents, doctrinal confusions and ecclesiastical compromises? The social context in which even the Church of England operates has changed markedly since Newman's day, but when he claimed that its life was primarily a cultural and political and not a spiritual reality, he threw down a gauntlet that Anglicans are still unable to step over with impunity. The Lambeth papers offer indirect but important ripostes to this challenge.

Secondly, the papers do this because the Conferences from which they stemmed were themselves the outcome of a remarkable transformation which began to overtake the Church of England at the very time in which Newman wrote, and which eventuated in a transformed self-estimation of the place occupied by the Anglican Communion in the spectrum of world Christianity.

In some measure, the mere extension of the Church of England "beyond the seas", the planting of indigenous organizations and leadership around the globe, and the formation of a world-wide Anglican Communion might seem to offer a refutation of the change that state patronage alone animates Anglican life. (3) The story of that expansion contains many notable examples of Christian devotion and missionary endeavour. (4) Furthermore, since the mid-nineteenth century, Anglicans have progressively learnt to live without the support of the state, and often in the face of active

hostility from it. Non-established Churches have become not just an exception to the rule but the norm for Anglican life and practice. Impressive though this evidence may be however, it goes only part way towards meeting Newman's accusation. He was not concerned to deny that individual and even collective examples of faith and sacrifice could be found among Anglicans. His complaint was that irrespective of piety or devotion, the Church of England lacked the 'church idea'. It had lost the central convictions and structures which guaranteed membership of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

Now it would doubtless be possible to attempt to defend the Church of England from Newman's strictures by pointing to the ecclesiology of the Anglican reformers,<sup>(5)</sup> of Hooker,<sup>(6)</sup> or of the seventeenth century.<sup>(7)</sup>

But while it is one thing to point to Anglicans who have written on the doctrine of the Church, it is another to delineate the self-understanding of the communion from its own documentation. Whilst the charge of being a paper church is by no means met entirely by the latter method, it has to be admitted that the accusation begins to look less substantial, if it can be shown that not merely individual Anglicans, but also representative Anglican assemblies, have engaged in a coherent tradition of reflection upon the church. Indeed if this latter condition is satisfied, it becomes relevant to ask what contrary evidence there would be to substantiate the initial charge.

It is in the light of this consideration that the Lambeth Conference documentation begins to seem important. The Conferences are not admittedly, primarily theological in intent. Any attempt to use their reports as a source of dogma, as a kind of Denzinger for constructing Cantuarian orthodoxy, has been

explicitly repudiated by successive meetings of the Conference. (8)

Nonetheless the Conferences have regularly consulted on points of theology, and even more, their successive reports represent the central record of the process whereby Anglicans have come to terms with their existence as a world communion of churches. Cut off from the familiar environment of the English establishment, Anglicans overseas were forced to look again at the essential beliefs that bound them together; at the organization and structures of authority which maintained their unity and promoted their holiness; at their relationship to each other and to other bodies of Christians; and at the way in which the prosecution of their contemporary witness maintained contact both with the heritage of the past and the needs of the present and future. (9)

The Lambeth Conferences may not be expected to provide a normative Anglican ecclesiology, but the consideration of such themes as faith, order, authority, unity and mission does at least offer the constituent parts of a 'church idea'. The ways in which Lambeth has dealt with these issues provide the lens by which a gathering Anglican self-understanding can be observed. Taken together, the conference papers offer a record of the way in which contemporary Anglican thought concerning the Church has developed.

This thesis sets out to trace the pattern of this self-understanding.

The fact that a task of this kind still needs to be undertaken indicates a lacuna in Anglican studies. In the first place, it reflects the way in which studies of Anglicanism have concentrated almost exclusively on the history and experience of the Church of England. The central importance of the English church to the Anglican tradition cannot be denied of course, but it does not exhaust the tradition and increasingly it is not even typical of

it. Too often an exposition of the Anglican tradition reduces the Anglican Communion to a footnote or a concluding chapter. (10) By the same token, reference to Lambeth Conferences is generally limited to a passing illustration or, because of the importance of a particular decision, to a local situation. Then secondly, attention to the Lambeth Conferences has been largely restricted to narrative descriptions or a chronicle of the decisions reached. Printed books on the Conferences have often been intended as background information for forthcoming meetings or as objective records of those which have recently ended. (11) Even A.M.G. Stephenson's Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (1978) is content to fulfil that sort of function and consequently fails to live up to the promise of its title, let alone the admirable standards of his earlier and longer volume on the first Conference of 1867. (12) Where the theological issues have been treated more prominently, as in studies by Haselmeyer, or Lacey, attention has been concentrated upon questions of unity and ministry which appear to be independently motivated, and they draw upon the Lambeth material simply to illustrate their particular convictions. (13) Two exceptions to this charge may be found in the work of G.K.A. Bell and W.H. van de Pol. Both writers recognised the independent tradition evident in the Conference documents and used it as an indicator of contemporary Anglican thinking, although only with respect to unity discussions. (14) Individual conferences have been subject to periodical review, and a similar approach is evident in the limited range of thesis research undertaken. (15) In short, attention given to the Lambeth Conferences has been incidental rather than systematic, and that because the usefulness of the Conference material as a mirror of Anglican self-understanding, possessing an integrity of its own, has been

overlooked. (16) To bear out the force of this last assertion it may simply be noted that the working records of all but the inaugural Conference have remained unexamined since their deposition.

Throughout this thesis a number of previously undisclosed notes and minutes will be used. However the intention of the thesis and the case for its originality, lies less in the uncovering of documentary sources than in the arguments about the nature of that tradition in which they are set and which they clarify. In particular it first seeks to provide a historical and theological context in which specific debates of the Conferences can better be understood. It is the lack of such a synthetic interpretive framework which reduces the usefulness of many of the treatments referred to above. Incidentally this also demonstrates some of the ways in which the English religious tradition has been transformed in the new social and theological climate of the Anglican Communion. The third and dominant way in which this thesis claims originality is in its use of Lambeth material to trace the conferences' developing understanding of ecclesiology in its various aspects, both for the clearer exposition of Anglican theology and as a basis for the examination of its claims.

In essence, the thesis advances and confirms two propositions. First, there is a general proposition that Anglicanism is best understood from the standpoint of the Anglican Communion and not just from that of the Church of England; and, secondly, the particular proposition is that the life of the Anglican Communion has given rise to a set of theological responses to the problems of Anglican doctrine, authority, organization and mission which provide both an adequate justification of the Anglican tradition itself and a substantial contribution to ecumenical theology.

## 2. THE METHOD ADOPTED

This thesis then is concerned with arguments: arguments about the nature of Anglicanism and specifically arguments which find their locus in the eleven meetings of the Lambeth Conference. (17) As has been seen, the Lambeth Conference reports do not pretend to comprise a unified body of Anglican dogma or even the source material for such a formulation. Consequently care must be taken in the way in which the documents are used to pursue the end of the thesis which is in view.

Typically, Lambeth Conference reports distinguish between those statements which have been endorsed by the whole Conference - namely Encyclical letters and Resolutions, and Reports which were produced by sections or committees of the Conference. (18) This distinction is drawn upon the principle that Lambeth statements possess only the authority of their authors. (19)

To these two categories can be added a third, the opinions held by discernible numbers of those present. Such opinions can be inferred from those occasions on which voting figures have been recorded by the Conference or when internal differences are explicitly referred to in the reports. (20) They can also be traced in the working records of the committees or sections which, when they are available, often disclose the structure of discussions which led eventually to the Conferences' published conclusions. (21)

Plainly these distinctions must be respected and reference to Conference papers will note their status accordingly. (22) However the consultative and educative function of the Conferences must also be kept in mind. It is not necessary to ignore the committee reports just because they do not have the formal endorsement of the whole conference any more than a scholastic assemblage of

voting figures and compatible resolutions is required in order to decide what a Conference has authoritatively said. Indeed, as far as the Lambeth reports are concerned, it especially holds true that the reason why something was said (or not said) is just as important as the fact that it was said at all.

The reason for this is apparent to anyone familiar with the Sitz im Leben of Conference reporting. The need to record the scattered achievements of a meeting means that in a resulting document the search for a consensus is more important than intellectual creativity; commonplace agreements will replace provocative suggestions. The method of compilation also has its effect. The pressure of time, the role of a drafting group, the last minute amendments and modifications, all make their mark upon a characteristic conference statement with which no one is entirely happy but which the majority are willing to endorse in the absence of a more excellent way. It is rarely a simple matter to discover what degree of unanimity actually lies beneath well-rounded phraseology. However, in this study it is a whole corpus of the Conference reports which is of interest rather than their individual parts. The concern of the thesis is with the developing self-understanding of a representative Church assembly rather than the status of isolated ideas at specific points in time.

The thesis attempts to peel back the various layers of Conference reportage in order to expose the issues and the arguments involved. At times this will involve a lengthy examination of particular debates or Committee procedures or influential spokesmen, but throughout the aim will be to illuminate the substantial issues which make up the problem defined above: the justification of Anglicanism. The Lambeth Conferences will be taken to offer

sample treatments of these issues on behalf of the Anglican Communion which discovered itself to be isolated from the protective embrace of the English Church and nation (ch 2); which was forced to produce an independent assessment of its received beliefs (ch 3), experience of religious authority, and the basis of its internal cohesion (ch 4); and which, despite all shortcomings, has been able to adapt its form and structures to the needs of modern religious and social developments (ch 5). While each chapter is thus presented thematically it can be treated historically. In general, questions about the nature of shared Anglican beliefs occurred in the earlier Conferences. The need to outline conditions for reunion came to a climax in 1920 and have been elaborated ever since. Since the second world-war the greater ease of international communications has made the question of overall Anglican organization vital, while the increasing tempo of social change has also thrown the problem of the Church's mission into relief. These respective questions have recurred throughout the course of the conferences' history and so they can be dealt with both in the context of particular discussions and as part of an unfolding general understanding. The questions concerned - doctrine, authority, organization and mission - have arisen principally though not exclusively in that sequence. A broadly chronological framework for the whole discussion is not fundamentally misleading. Generally speaking the focus of attention moves from the earlier to the more recent conferences as the thesis proceeds.

The first major task to which attention must be given however is in the presentation of a brief outline of the way the Church of England's ecclesiology was framed and how this provided the setting in which world Anglicanism developed.

A word must be said about the term 'Anglicanism'. A.R. Vidler

has claimed that the abstract noun was only coined in 1846. (23)  
 However more than a question of origins is at stake. How should the term be used? General descriptive terms in the history of ideas (such as Platonism, idealism, realism, Marxism etc) are notoriously elusive. They are useful as a kind of code, by which to refer in general to a position which can be distinguished from other positions. They are dangerous because they are acute abbreviations, and because different theses or propositions can be smuggled in and out under the protective label.

It is undeniable that the churches of the current Anglican communion exist, and that there is a history which binds them together. To that extent, at least, it makes sense to speak loosely, as above, of "the Anglican tradition". But is more involved in proceeding to refer to 'Anglicanism'? Certainly, if by that term it were thought to be implied that there exists a single intellectual system, sharply differentiated from other systems, to which this designation could be exclusively referred, one would be in immediate conflict with a number of serious observers of the Anglican churches. At the very least it must be said (indeed this thesis demonstrates it) that this 'system', if such it be, is capable of quite radical internal transformations.

At the same time none of the general descriptive terms referred to above are, in fact, capable of that strict type of usage. Platonism, idealism, realism, or Marxism are no more precise, nor are they, at the same time, less useful or more dangerous than 'Anglicanism' would be; provided, that is, that it is allowed that the undoubted historical existence of the Anglican tradition is capable of being elucidated as an intellectual, spiritual and moral tradition, or rather, and this is the preferred position of this thesis, a family of such traditions.

In a sense, therefore, it has to be admitted that the use of the term 'Anglicanism' is, strictly speaking, an anticipation of the conclusion of the thesis, that the catalogue of modern Anglican documentation lends itself to analysis as a discernible family of traditions. To save however the endless repetition of an approximately similar periphrasis, the term 'Anglicanism' has been used in what follows. It should not be thought that the author has covertly presupposed what he proposes to demonstrate. Nothing would be lost if the term 'Anglicanism' was translated, at each of its occurrences, into the following: the problem presented by the history of the Anglican communion as to its intellectual, moral and spiritual coherence in a discernible family of traditions.

It is to an analysis of this family tradition that attention must now turn.

### 3. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANGLICAN ECCLESIOLOGY.

After the 1930 Lambeth Conference T.S. Eliot observed that readers of the conference report could be misled unless they were familiar with some peculiar Anglican habits.

The Church of England washes its linen in public ... In contrast to some other institutions both civil and ecclesiastical, the linen does get washed. To have linen to wash is something; and to assert that one's linen never needed washing would be a suspicious boast. (24)

The observation applies to more than that one Lambeth Conference alone. The tendency to engage in public disputations over what outwardly appear to be quite fundamental matters is almost a distinguishing characteristic of Anglican theology.

The reason for this predilection can be traced to what is arguably the most influential "laundering" in English church history, the 16th century Reformation. (25) While the English reformers shared fully the convictions of their continental counterparts, the opportunity for the correction of abuses in the English church was more overtly political than was the case on the other side of the Channel. (26) As a result, reform proceeded pragmatically rather than by the logical application of some basic doctrine or ecclesiastical position.

The official formularies adopted by the Church of England at that time - the Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer and the Canons Ecclesiastical - were not taken up in the same sense as the later continental confessions. They are "confessional" in their intention but do not purport to set out a specifically Anglican corpus of doctrine as the starting point for all later Anglican teaching. (27)

As the introduction to a thorough exposition of the function and teaching of the Anglican formularies, Leonard Hodgson explained:

In the form in which they have come down to us they reflect the chequered history of Anglican divinity over a period of more than a century, from 1548 to 1662. In seeking to detect and reform abuses the English reformers all turned to Scripture to find the norm or standard of what church life should be. But different elements in the Church of England approached the Scriptures with different presuppositions influencing their interpretations. (28)

In consequence the conservative-minded read the Bible through the eyes of the Catholic fathers and from the perspective of the ancient Church, while more radical reforming spirits turned to the continental protestants, Lutheran or Calvinist, to find their starting point. A further factor throughout was the influence of humanist scholarship which moved the Church to study the Scriptures to see what they taught rather than just to find support from them for already established doctrinal positions. The Elizabethan settlement aimed to include as many of the participants in this tri-partite discussion as possible, and in one way or another the official formularies reflect this fact. (29)

The nature of the formularies helps explain at least two characteristics of Anglican ecclesiology: first, the rather pragmatic way in which it is presented, and secondly the way in which controversy does seem to encompass Anglican discussions of the Church.

In the first instance it will be noted that in the pages which follow there is virtually no reference to what could be called metaphysical dogmatics. Questions of the Church are not resolved, for instance, by reference to its relationship with the Word, or the Covenant, or the Kingdom of God. If this is deemed to be a failing then it is partly to be explained by the fact that the Lambeth Conference discussions have rarely been carried on upon that plane. (30) But equally it can be claimed that such an

approach is foreign to the Anglican theological tradition in which discussion of the Church has taken place, not as part of a dispassionate quest for doctrinal or confessional purity, but in the context of the emergence to nationhood, or revolution or the social upheavals of the English-speaking people. So E.M. Pusey, who could hardly have been accused of doctrinal indifference, wrote to a German correspondent:

You will doubtless have observed that few, if any, of our writings have originated in an abstract love of investigation; our greatest and some immortal works have arisen in some exigencies of the times; the writings of Chillingworth, Hooker, Butler, Bull (and so of the rest) were written not merely to solve the problems of importance in themselves, but such as the good of the Church in our own country at that time required. (31)

Such an incidental approach may lack order and finality, but the insistence that the doctrine of the Church be concretely associated with the realities of Christian faith and life and discipline is not without its own significance.

This however leads to the second point which arises from the nature of the formularies, the fact that their indecisiveness leaves open the way to a conflict of opinion, and to the public conduct of such disputes. Since the reformation settlement sought to comprehend all but the most extreme of puritans on the one hand and medieval papalists on the other, the formularies were necessarily charitable in their requirements. In terms of public worship the Prayer Book sought the "mean between two extremes" and only the most objectionable of ceremonies were abolished. (32) The structures of ministerial order and ecclesiastical organisation were retained virtually intact. (33) Similarly, in matters of doctrine considerable variation was permitted. Certainly limits were prescribed, but a number of contentious issues such as those

associated with ideas of the "invisible" Church, the eucharistic presence, and baptismal regeneration or the doctrine of election, were passed over in silence. The over-riding principle of the perspicuity of Scripture meant that doctrines which "may be proved thereby" could be asserted, but particular speculative interpretations were taken to be matters of indifference. (34)

Such freedoms entail their own responsibilities. By seeking, as far as possible, to include rather than exclude the various participants in the Reformation debate, the Church of England ensured that debate would continue. Because the formularies act as the written deposit of a dialectic which took place during the formative century of the English Church's separate existence it is possible for differing groups to value the different elements of the English settlement. Each can claim to be loyal successors of its founding intention. Such a co-habitation of opinion has rarely been harmonious - even at Lambeth Conferences. Anglican ecclesiology has developed dialectically as a result of the inter-play of different ideas concerning the Church and the best interests of the Church at different periods of English history.

4. THE IMMEDIATE BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
ECCLESIOLOGY IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

As the Anglican Communion came into being during the middle decades of the 19th century it was certainly heir to a long tradition of conflict concerning its proper nature. This is not the occasion to trace the development of toleration and the emergence of non-conformity in late seventeenth century or the suppression of high-church clergy, the advancement of latitudinarianism and its over-shadowing by the evangelical revival during the eighteenth. (35) It is sufficient to say that by the time Anglican churches were being found beyond the confines of the British Isles a number of discernable alternatives were available as explanatory interpretations for their ecclesial experience. The extent of that variety can be briefly outlined by returning to the figure of Newman.

Certainly, when Newman complained about the Church of England's lack of the church "idea" he was not suggesting that there were no ideas about the church current at the time. Ideas were abundant and they were espoused with conviction. Indeed Newman's own life story, from an upbringing in what he charitably referred to as "Bible Christianity"; his evangelical conversion; his flirtation with religious liberalism; and his attraction to the old high-church party at the time of its incipient renaissance, provides, as it were, an index to the varieties of Anglican ecclesiology available at the time. (36) Even his eventual acceptance of Roman Catholic claims was an alternative adopted by numerous Anglicans. These different "schools" as Newman called them can be introduced successively. (37)

Newman remained grateful for his family background. He was brought up in an atmosphere of biblical piety, austere moralism and

un-dogmatic protestantism which he later came to see as typical of English religion. He appreciated its benefits to himself but increasingly came to despise the way in which such religion could degenerate into sterility. It was dutifully unimaginative at best, hypocritical at worst, and either way, totally without system, conviction or dogma. (38)

The first "influences of a definite creed" came to the young Newman through the impression made by an evangelical schoolmaster, the Reverend Walter Mayers. (39) The evangelicals of Newman's day took their descent from the eighteenth century revival preachers. (40) While Anglican formality and suspicion of enthusiasm had forced many of the revivalists to secede, many others had remained within the established church and come to represent a significant movement in it. Chief among them had been Charles Simeon (1759 - 1836), a Fellow of Kings and for 54 years the incumbent of Holy Trinity, Cambridge. Simeon provided the focus of evangelical preaching and churchmanship, saw those principles established in the Universities and the parochial system, stood behind the groundswell of missionary and philanthropic work which it generated, and in his life-time saw evangelicalism pass from being derided as eccentric to the occupancy of a position of respect and influence in the Church of England. (41)

Although the period of greatest formal evangelical influence had to await the patronage of Palmerston's government, the full power of their moral and spiritual vitality had been reached. (42) Even in Newman's time their preoccupation with biblical and evangelistic concerns kept evangelicals remote from the theological ferment which so gripped his circle. (43) At their best evangelicals were churchmen and their theology included a doctrine of the visible

church, but it also stressed a Calvinistic notion of the mystical body of Christ, and in the wrong hands this idea could quickly degenerate into a religious utopianism which saw the saving of souls as the beginning and end of the church's duty. (44)

Evangelical theology during the period in which the Anglican Communion developed became largely devotional or else reactionary, and, forsaking the broad sympathies of an earlier generation, came to appear as little more than a factional interest opposed to Catholicism, be it Roman or Anglican in its origin. (45)

Newman's incipient Calvinism had flickered uncertainly during his undergraduate days in Oxford. It was quietly extinguished after he was elected a Fellow of Oriel in 1822. The dual influence of Edwin Hawkins, first Newman's vicar at S. Mary's, then the Provost of his college, and the colourful Richard Whately who was later to become Archbishop of Dublin, forced him to re-examine his beliefs. He was compelled to realise the problem of easily distinguishing Christian from non-Christian, especially if this was drawn subjectively from an experience of conversion rather than upon the objective act of baptism. In turn this directed his attention to the formularies and order of the church. (46)

In later life Newman was to regret the influence of these years as leading him to drift towards "liberalism". (47) Not that Whately or Hawkins were excessively liberal in their views, but they were willing to identify themselves with the Latitudinarians of the previous century in their dislike for dogmatic definitions in theology, and their opposition to any attempt to limit church membership on the basis of a strict theory of ecclesiastical order. Liberals rarely make good party organisers, but for Newman the spirit of liberalism was represented by Thomas Arnold (1792 - 1842) the headmaster of Rugby. (48) Arnold's Principles of Church Reform, published in 1833,

may fairly be taken as bearing marks of a "liberal" ecclesiology.

Believing that Christianity was the soul of the English nation, Arnold sought to find a way to overcome the reproach of sectarianism by means of comprehending most religious opinion within a truly national Christian Church. All Christians were agreed as to the basic content of their beliefs, claimed Arnold, and it was therefore not unreasonable to expect at least the Presbyterians, Methodists, Independents, Baptists and Moravians to form a single united body with the existing established Church. (49) Only Quakers, Roman Catholics and Unitarians need be excluded on principle, the former two because of their reluctance to admit the adjective "National", and the latter that of "Christian", Church. Once brought into being, the United Church would be legislatively empowered to compose suitable creeds, articles and liturgies, not so as to test orthodoxy of beliefs but in order "to provoke the least possible disagreement, without sacrificing, in our own practical worship, the expression of such feelings as are essential to our own edification". (50)

Arnold's proposals met with little support. They were not well presented and ran against the tenor of the times. (51) However such an attempt to minimise dogma (even though Arnold's agreed minimum looks amazingly illiberal in the light of later events) and to find a basis for religious unity in social utility and edifying feelings, was to be re-echoed in many ways as the century wore on. (52)

By temperament and by conviction, Newman was destined to be the antagonist of liberalism in all of its forms. He recorded how his personal circumstances and the study of history re-directed his path. (53) Even more, a growing friendship with his pupil Hurrell Froude (1803 - 1836) and through him, an association with John Keble (1792 - 1866) and E.B. Pusey (1800 - 1882) turned his

energies in a quite different direction. (54) These men saw themselves among the High Churchmen, the successors of Andrews, Cosin, Bramhall and Pearson. (55) They believed that a tradition transmitted throughout the history of the Church of England by groups such as the Laudians and the non-Jurors had been neglected too long and was overdue for some fresh expression in their own day. The outcome of this conjunction of stars in the Oxford firmament, and the portents wrought in the church below are well known. (56) The Oxford movement was by no means the only 'school' in the development of 19th century Anglicanism, but it undoubtedly did introduce a number of new items to the agenda of Anglican ecclesiology. It laid renewed stress on the fact that the Church of England was more than a state church. It was also the rightful claimant (against all dispute of Rome or protestant dissent) to the title of universal, catholic church in the realm of England. The claim was buttressed by appeal to the apostolic succession of the Anglican ministry, and to the authority of antiquity conveyed through its Prayer Book and formularies. As a practical consequence, the Oxford reformers looked for a reduction in Parliamentary control over the affairs of the Church and a restoration of primitive sacramental practice and discipline within it.

The principles were worked out in different ways. Froude was particularly attracted by some of the adornments of Roman medievalism and hoped for their introduction into Anglican ritual. Newman by contrast consciously retained "English habits of belief" even after his conversion to Rome - a fact which led to some tension with ultra-montanists! (57) Indeed until Newman's decision, all the leaders of the Oxford movement were emphatically Anglican. In their Tracts for the Times they specifically rejected as anti-Christian many features of Post-Tridentine Catholicism. (58) Tract 71 referred to

Rome's denial of the cup to the laity, the dogma that sacramental validity depends on priestly intention, compulsory auricular confession, unwarranted anathemas, the doctrine of Purgatory, the invocation of the Saints and the worship of images, as all being proof of Roman error. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was repudiated. And papal claims to universal authority were dismissed as arrogant and schismatic. Newman represented the Church of England as upholding the Via Media, a middle path between the excesses of Rome and the fanaticism of popular Protestantism. (59) Other members of the movement expressed this conviction in terms of a Branch Theory in which the Church of England represented the branch of Catholicity in England, the Roman and the Orthodox Church (because of their possession of episcopal orders) were corresponding branches in other parts of the world. (60) In one way or another the veracity of the English Church was upheld and maintained.

In the end Newman left the Church of England because he was unable to sustain that conviction. (61) Consequently he was not involved in seeking to hold together the High Church movement as it sought to come to terms with differences of view-point within its own ranks and in the Church as a whole. Even less was he troubled by the questions of authority and discipline which the fragmentation of Anglican theology eventually exposed. But it was in this situation that Anglicans who sought to found churches in other parts of the world found themselves, and this was the dilemma which confronted them when they came to reflect theologically on their new position. There was no authorised interpretation of the formularies available. Instead they were found to appeal to a bewildering array of apparently competing ecclesiological opinion.

For some commentators the existence of a plurality of doctrinal positions represents no problem. (62) For others it presents the

opportunity to exhibit the splendid complementarity of Christian insights. (63) Others again see it as the proving ground for a new amalgam of Christian self-awareness. (64)

In a study which has recently served to re-awaken theological interest in Anglicanism, S.W. Sykes has indicated some of the reasons which make the mere co-existence of contradictory ideas inadmissible for Anglicans but he only sketched the outlines of a positive response to the problem. (65) The experience of the Anglican Communion is itself a demonstration of the inadequacy of uncontrolled doctrinal pluralism for a modern understanding of the Church. That experience gave rise to the sequence of Lambeth Conferences between 1867 and 1978, and their reports outline the degree of positive articulation which has been achieved concerning what it means to be an Anglican.

This chapter has outlined the essential problem which Anglicanism confronts: its theological justification as a world religious family. It has sought to indicate the sources of this problem within the formative tradition produced by the Church of England. It has also indicated something of the means and the methods by which this thesis is investigating the problem. In the concluding section of the chapter the divided condition of Anglican theology has been explored. The Lambeth Conferences provided one opportunity for the divisions to be clarified and even to some extent overcome. The time has come to consider this expansion and transformation of the Anglican tradition and to follow some of the historical developments which took place both before and after Newman's seminal accusation.

CHAPTER 2

THE EMERGENCE OF ANGLICANISM

CHAPTER 2  
THE EMERGENCE OF ANGLICANISM

It has been said that Britain gained an Empire during "a fit of absence of mind". (1) The existence of the Anglican Communion exhibits something of the same unpredictable mental condition on the part of the Church of England. Until the mid-nineteenth century the idea that Ecclesia Anglicana would become the centre of a world-wide fellowship of Churches was as unexpected as it was incomprehensible. Certainly no master-plan of ecclesiastical expansion ever existed in the English Church. (2) The principles of Anglican worship and polity were carried into the new world largely by way of ad hoc responses to the unforeseen circumstances of colonial opportunism. Unpremeditated it may have been, but the process was to call forth fresh resources of energy from Anglican apologists and to provide the setting for the transformation of Anglican ecclesiology.

The Swedish Missiologist Bengt Sundkler has propounded what he calls the principle of ecclesiastical "mutation". (3) Drawing upon a botanical analogy he sees the transference of a religious system from one cultural setting to another as introducing the necessity of structural change to which the parent stock will either adapt or fossilise. In the former case the resultant 'strain' will exhibit many characteristics of the original body and will provide the opportunity to evaluate their respective strengths and weaknesses. In the latter, the Church becomes culturally isolated, representing a museum exhibit of the state of affairs believed to pertain at its foundation. A new setting allows the Church to decide afresh which features of its tradition are essential and which peripheral to its life. The

birth of the Anglican Communion confronted Anglican theology with the need to examine its heritage and responsibilities in a new light. (4)

An example of the principle can be readily found in the life of one of the architects of Modern Anglicanism, George Augustus Selwyn (1809 - 1878). (5) Selwyn, the first Bishop of New Zealand, stood in the first rank of those who took responsibility for Anglican outposts in the colonies. His most recent biographer has discussed the position in which Selwyn found himself on his arrival.

The difficulties of transforming the machinery of Establishment to colonial rule were not recognized at the time when Selwyn was appointed to New Zealand. Bishops were appointed by Letters Patent from the Crown, and were sent overseas with theoretically autocratic powers which they had no means of enforcing in a colony, especially as the demand for political self-government gathered momentum. (6)

That was the problem of the colonial church. It had been carried overseas by trade and planted in the new world through colonisation. To survive, it had to come to terms with independence. Selwyn's mainland diocese was spread out over 1200 miles and consisted of isolated whaling stations, even more scattered settlements, and disturbed Maori tribes among whom missionary work had begun promisingly but had become steadily more fragmented, disorganised and competitive. (7) For him the first pastoral responsibility was ecclesiological. Without the "Machinery of Establishment" how was he to give order, cohesion and unity to "the fortuitous concourse of atoms" that made up the Church? "My first problem", he wrote to a correspondent in 1843, "is, how to give tenacity to a rope of sand?" (8) The problem was crucial. It was faced in one way or another by Anglicans around the world.

With Selwyn however, the narrative has progressed too fast. Before giving further attention to the answers he proposed and those that the Anglican Communion eventually adopted, it is necessary to understand on a broader scale how Anglicanism penetrated beyond the confines of the British Isles, the precedents that Selwyn and others were able to draw upon, and "mutations" that Anglicanism underwent in the process.

This chapter deals first with the way in which Anglican Churches came to be established around the world; then sets this expansion against the background of the situation of the Church of England; and finally, considers the way in which the Churches began to feel confident of their own identity and to offer their own solutions to the ecclesiological problems they were facing. It thus lays the essential basis for appreciation of the function of the Lambeth Conferences and an estimate of their teaching.

1. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION : FROM COLONIAL AGENCY TO  
INDIGENOUS CHURCHES.

The reign of Elizabeth witnessed not only the settlement of religious controversy in England, but also the dawning of a new day of British maritime and commercial influence. With a decline in the fortunes of Spain and Portugal the sea routes to the new world lay open to English trade and exploration. The centre of gravity for the known world shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and the British found themselves to be no longer isolated on the periphery of western civilization, but at its very heart. (9)

The Elizabethan adventurers who were at the vanguard of this realisation were loyal to their Queen and to her settlement of religion. Their men-of-war were seen as a necessary protection for British trading interests and providing a defence against any future encroachments of popery. (10) Chaplains of the established church accompanied the voyagers and religious observance on Her Majesty's ships was regulated according to the Book of Common Prayer, and Foxe's Book of Martyrs. (11) The first known act of worship in North America which followed the rites of the Church of England came about during Frobisher's search for a North-Western passage to China. In the following year, on June 21, 1579, a similar service was held on the Pacific coast when Sir Francis Drake's circumnavigation briefly put into shore a few miles north of what is now known as San Francisco Bay. (12) An interesting prologue to this service indicates something of the religious spirit of the occasion. It so happened that the chaplain, Francis Fletcher, had incurred Drake's displeasure during an earlier part of the voyage. As the representative of the sovereign aboard Her Majesty's ship Drake thereby exercised what he took to be his rightful authority over

the church, excommunicated the chaplain and sentenced him to be manacled to the foremast as a traitor. After spending an uncomfortable night in that position, Fletcher was once more brought before the captain who solemnly absolved him of his sins and restored to him his pastoral duties.

This bizarre sidelight is illuminating for it indicates the way in which the Church of England was first transported from its island home, very much as a department of state. The assumption of every Elizabethan was that citizenship of the nation inevitably implied membership of the national church. Such a state of affairs could not be confined geographically. Where Englishmen went, there went the Church of England. When English law was enforced then were English churchmen subject to it.

This sense of transporting the English establishment was logical enough in the case of the merchant explorers. After all, the decks of Her Majesty's ships were but extensions of her sovereign territory. When those ships put in to a foreign shore it was not initially with the intention of establishing English rule or the English church there. (13) However, with the accession of James I exploration turned to colonisation. Jamestown, the first permanent British colony in Virginia, was established in 1607 and the first service of Holy Communion was held after the settlers had hung "an awning (which is an old saile) to three or four trees". A more imposing building was quickly provided as a chapel and in the following months, according to a contemporary diarist,

"We had daily Common Prayer morning and evening, every Sunday two sermons, and every three months the Holy Communion, till our Minister died. But our prayers daily, with an Homily on Sundaies, we continued two or three years after, till more Preachers came." (14)

Quite apart from this splendid example of lay initiative and perseverance (especially considering that this colony, unlike Massachusetts, was not founded with any overtly religious motivation), what is seen here in this new setting, is the life of the Elizabethan church exactly reproduced. When the first colonial legislature met in Jamestown during 1619 it seemed natural for the liturgy and doctrine of the English church to be adopted as normative for public religion in the territory, and that in due time the whole paraphernalia of English ecclesiastical institutions - church tithes, glebe-lands, the parson's freehold, and until 1699 even the right to impose fines for non-attendance at Sunday worship - would be introduced. (15)

Time in fact showed that such assumptions were untenable. The English pattern was dependent upon the existence of a stable and ordered society. Perhaps even more it relied upon the support of a moneyed aristocracy. In the flexible situation of the frontier and under the constraints of a purely rural economy quite different forms of church organisation were to prove necessary. (16) But there was another factor as well. With the familiar religious institutions there were also imported to the new colonies elements of old religious controversies. The spreading influence of New England puritanism sought to repudiate any concordat between the Church and the State with as much vigour as the Virginians sought to reduplicate it. Gradually the church in America was forced to articulate a question that had barely been raised anywhere before : was legislation and the coercive power of government the best way to promote the cause of Christianity in general and Anglicanism in particular?

The same assumptions and the same process recurred elsewhere.

Whenever the Church of England came to be set-up overseas it was automatically held to be an Established Church. In Canada, as late as 1839 and long after the interests of church and state had irretrievably diverged from each other, Anglican clergy in Montreal were petitioning the Colonial Office in London to the effect that the so-called Clergy Reserves (nearly 4,000 square miles of prime prairie land that had been set aside by Act of Parliament "for the benefit of the Protestant clergy") were intended solely and exclusively for members of the Church of England. (17) The legislative body in Jamaica enacted laws in 1802 and again in 1807 which imposed one month's imprisonment on any unqualified Methodist found preaching to the 'negroes'. A second offence carried the penalty of six months in prison with hard labour. If it were a black who had the temerity so to preach, his sentence was also to include 39 lashes - one perhaps, for each of the Articles! (18) Although Bishop Porteous of London remonstrated against such provisions, and although the Church of England was already a small minority among the churches of the West Indies, it seemed impossible for Anglicanism to avoid entanglement with the seeming "privileges" of its colonial power.

The situation in India may appear to be different but it was only superficially so. The East India Company at its foundation in 1600 was not intended as a colonising or religious agency, but was, as its name suggests and its charter made clear, concerned solely with trade. The company "factories" which were set up, first in Surat north of Bombay in 1612, and later in Bengal (1633), Madras (1639), and Hoogly (1640) were in fact self-contained trading fortresses. From them the riches of the Indies flowed into the coffers and the drawing rooms of the English merchant.

classes. Chaplains regularly travelled on company ships and from time to time ministered to the companies employees in the settlements. (19) In the early days, it seems, Puritan rigour was on its own sufficient reason to provide spiritual guidance for Englishmen far from home. Later, the conviction that religion encouraged discipline and that discipline was good for business guaranteed that chaplaincy services would continue. Either way it is clear that no 'missionary' ideals were entertained. As in the other examples already given, the Church of England came to India simply because Englishmen were there. The "factories" were administered as detached portions of British territory, and the accepted degrees, conventions and institutions of British life were part of that administration. Even when the decline of French and Dutch influence in the area meant that British trade was able to extend almost throughout the sub-continent, any attempt to Christianise the native peoples was actively discouraged. (20) To risk the danger of religious controversy and racial conflict was seen as an act of diplomatic insanity and commercial suicide. (21) Gradually however, this same sense of political realism was to force open the doors for genuine contact by the church with "Mohammedans and Hindoos". By the early 18th century chaplains found that the care of the mixed marriage families of Company employees was part of their pastoral responsibility. From this, Christian instruction began to be given to the Gentoo (that is the Eurasians) and household servants, and some knowledge of native dialects and customs by the chaplains was encouraged. By the end of the century, as a result of the Evangelical revivals in England and Wales, and of the influential ministry of Charles Simeon especially, the missionary movement was beginning to burgeon forth and the

establishment of an authentically Indian Church became an accomplished fact. (22) When a fresh Charter for the company was drawn up by Parliament in 1813 it included provisions for supervision of the Indian church by a Bishop and three Archdeacons, paid for from the territorial revenues of India, and also afforded facilities for more missionary workers at the same time. (23)

The first Bishop, Thomas Fanshawe Middleton, arrived in India late in 1813. He held a reputation for learning and as Archdeacon of Huntingdon had proven himself hard-working and conscientious, but it is not too much to claim that the task of working out his role in the tangled situation of his new environment was beyond him. (24) His authority over the clergy was uncertain. Clergy in India had been licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London and were appointed to their cures by local administrators of the Company. It suited local government to keep things that way. The bishop's Letters Patent did not refer to any responsibility towards Missionaries either. Middleton felt that if he encouraged them to preach to white congregations the Company might feel justified in reducing the number of chaplains they provided, so while he supported the work of the S.P.C.K. he ignored its serving members and thus gave the impression that he saw missionaries as interlopers. (25) A similar ambiguity existed in his relationship with the Indian church. He cared deeply about the evangelisation and education of Indians (and his instrumentality in founding Bishop's College, Calcutta, was an enduring memorial of his nine year episcopate), but he felt unable to ordain native catechists like the Tamil, Christian David, or Henry Martyn's most notable convert, Abdul Masih,

because they were not among 'the king's loving subjects'.

It is easy to dismiss Middleton as bringing many of his problems upon himself, but his problems were part of a much greater dilemma. What did it in fact mean for the Church of England to offer its ministrations in a foreign land? And in this case, just what authority did an English bishop have outside England and what was his relationship to developing churches under his oversight? Middleton accepted the only answer to those questions that he knew. Despite his own High Church proclivities, Middleton saw himself, and was seen by others, as first and foremost a servant of the state. He was supported by the government and accepted the limitations of living under its patronage. Just what this attitude meant as far as the spread of Christianity in India is concerned is beyond the scope of this examination. (26)

What is meant for Middleton is clear enough. He was a bishop of the English church, and his prime responsibility was for the souls of Englishmen. In as much as Christian ministry was extended towards the native population then there was hope that they would come more fully under English influence. Then, perhaps, he could be their bishop too.

What has been demonstrated in these examples is the way in which Anglicanism was first introduced on several continents - as an extension of England and of English ways. All this is understandable. A nostalgia for English architecture, ecclesiastical dress, music and liturgy was all innocent enough. But the theological understanding which determined Middleton's course was English too, and it was the full Hookerian identification of the Church with the State which simply would not fit the new conditions as trading posts and colonial settlements began to flex the muscles of their own independence. (27)

At this point attention must return to North America.

Middleton of course was not the first bishop to be consecrated for service overseas, and of his predecessors one had come to the episcopate with the question of independence clearly before him : the Bishop of Connecticut and Rhode Island, Samuel Seabury (1729 - 1796). (28)

For an episcopal church to be deprived of the episcopate is something of a contradiction in terms, but American Anglicans existed in this condition for nearly two centuries. Since the arrival of the first settlers numerous attempts had been made to provide a bishopric for the Americans. (29) Virtually all the Archbishops of Canterbury supported such a move in principle. (30) As early as 1638 Laud had made arrangements to send a bishop to New England, and during the reign of Charles II Letters Patent were actually drafted to enable the creation of an episcopate for Virginia. In 1708 Dean Swift toyed with the possibility of being appointed to the Virginian post - in his case clearly in an absentee capacity even though a house had been secured as a bishop's residence two years earlier. (31) The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, created by the S.P.C.K. as its North American missionary agency in 1701, constantly agitated for an appointment and in 1712 came very close to completing plans for an ambitious project which involved sending two bishops to the American mainland and another two to the Islands of Bermuda and Jamaica. In each case the combination of circumstance in England and resistance in America prevented the fulfilment of their purpose. (32) By mid-century the rising tides of American nationalism made further initiative from England unwelcome, and the outbreak of the Revolutionary war in 1776 seemed to put any idea of an English episcopate beyond question.

In the event, the contrary proved to be the case. The achievement of Independence provided just that state of urgency in the church to make some decisive action essential. At the end of the war the Episcopal Church was left in a suitably apostolic if hardly promising condition described in II Corinthians 6 : 9 - punished, yet not quite killed off. The death-blow could not be long delayed however. As one 19th century chronicler saw it:

The war of the Revolution may therefore, in truth, be said to have desolated the Church, for out of that struggle it came forth with deserted temples, broken altars and alienated property - deprived of its ablest clergy by death or exile - destitute of the means of ordaining others, and labouring under the popular odium of attachment to monarchical principles and a foreign government, and that government the very one from whose thralldom the country had just freed itself. (33)

If such a church was to survive then local leadership was an essential pre-requisite, and for an episcopal church that meant the achievement of episcopal ordering. The incongruity of the church's position was aptly summed up by Benjamin Franklin when he reportedly expressed his amazement that the episcopalians' chosen leaders dared not fulfil their office "till they had made a voyage of 6,000 miles out and home to ask leave of a cross old gentleman at Canterbury". (34) Of course other solutions were put forward. In 1784 John Wesley made the historic decision to "set-aside" Thomas Coke as the superintendent of the Methodist work in America. (35) Some evangelical clergy would have been willing to merge their orders with the Moravians, while others sought to perpetuate apostolic succession by union with the Scandinavian churches. The most influential suggestion was made by William White, curate of Christ's Church, Philadelphia, who at the end of the War of Independence found himself the only remaining episcopal clergyman in the area, and, as tribute to

his patriotic energy, Chaplain to the first Continental Congress. In the summer of 1782 he published an anonymous pamphlet entitled The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered. (36) White believed that Great Britain would refuse to acknowledge American independence and that the introduction of episcopacy from England was thereby precluded. As an interim measure he suggested that a democratic system of Diocesan and national conventions should be set up to unite all episcopalians and that a three-fold order of ministry should immediately be established. In the meantime the smallest order, while not technically an episcopate, could be given the authority to ordain, with the expectation - so White surmised - that the British parliament would eventually recognise America as an independent nation and the Church of England accordingly legitimise the American ministry as that of an independent national church. Events swiftly rendered White's expedients unnecessary. His proposals for a synodical structure were fulfilled when the first General Convention met in White's church and under his presidency in September 1785. (37) More immediately though, his suggestion of adopting a provisional episcopacy galvanised a group of high-church clergymen in Connecticut who decided that a legitimate episcopate must be secured without delay. They elected Samuel Seabury, as their nominee in March 1783 and by July he was in England seeking consecration.

The story has often been told of how Seabury's request to Archbishop John Moore was refused on the grounds that consecration involved an oath of allegiance to the crown; of how Seabury then turned to the Non-juring Scottish bishops who had no such inhibitions; and how three years later White, Samuel Provost of New York, and finally in 1790 James Madison, Virginia, were to be

consecrated under special regulations in Lambeth Palace Chapel. (38)

The story is familiar enough, but the implications of these events, which in effect mark the birth of the Anglican Communion can be drawn more sharply. A number of significant precedents were to provide pointers for developments on a wider front. Two especially deserve mention.

First, there is the decisive place occupied by synodical bodies. It is no coincidence that the constitutions of the U.S. Congress and the Protestant Episcopal Church were both enacted in Philadelphia. Many of the same people were involved in both processes, and certainly the same ideological spirit pervades both documents. (39) The ideals of liberal democracy were deeply instilled by the Revolutionary war and these ideas, formed by the pervasive philosophy of John Locke, are clearly evident for instance in the writings of William White. At the time no overtly theological defence for the institution of synodical government was forthcoming. It simply seemed the only way for American churchmen to act. Certainly the independent action of small groups of Christians concerned for the future well-being of their Church showed a new direction for Anglican ecclesiology.

Closely related to this fact is a second. The first Episcopalian Bishops in America were not given to the Church, but were elected by it. (40)

These facts are not just historically interesting, they represent a radical alteration in the perspective of Anglican theology. History and the birth of the Republic had made it impossible for Anglicanism to depend on state recognition or support. A different foundation was required, and that

foundation was discovered in the notion of "consensual compact". The initial Philadelphian convention outlined certain fundamental principles upon which representatives of the Church agreed to act together in forming policy for their Church. These principles concerned the independence of the church from the state; a conformity in liturgy (and as far as possible its agreement with the liturgy gained from the Church of England); commitment to the ideal of three-fold ministry; and a commitment to a form of democratic assembly for decision making in the Church, and they eventually formed the basis of the Constitution adopted in 1789 by the Episcopal Church as a whole. (41) A further and perhaps equally far reaching precedent resulted from the Connecticut meeting's association with the Scottish Church. As a token of the universality of the episcopal office, Seabury agreed to urge his church to accept a six point formula of concord between the Episcopal Church of Scotland and "the now rising Church of North America". (42)

These examples of the way in which the American Church began to perceive itself as voluntarily bound together by commitment to certain constitutional principles and beliefs was to provide unimagined impetus for the spread of Anglicanism throughout the world. In particular Selwyn learned the principles of synodical government and popular episcopacy, at least in part, from the precedent of the American Church. (43) These features, along with the use of concordats or compacts of agreement between different sections of the Church became distinguishing marks of Anglicanism as the Anglican Communion came into being.

The American experience foreshadowed another development too.

More than geographical barriers separated the Church in Philadelphia from that in Connecticut. White and his colleagues were at the centre of republican democracy, and perhaps more than slightly tarred with the brush of republican deism: Seabury's supporters had been held together through times of intense opposition, and as a result were more aware of Anglican theological distinctives and more insistent on the need to embody them in the new churches. For White and Provoost the episcopate was conceived as a coping stone to hold together the democratic edifice of synodical government: for Seabury it was rather the cornerstone upon which the whole structure of the church was built. (44) It has been said that in its early days the American church possessed two episcopates: one Scottish, High Church and Tory, the other English, latitudinarian and patriotic. (45) This potentially disastrous situation was defused by the request from the Church in Connecticut that the three American Bishops, Seabury, White and Provoost, act as consecrators of their second elected nominee, Dr Edward Bass. The request effected a reconciliation between the two factions and at the 1789 National Convention a compromise was reached over the Constitution of the Church. Seabury allowed lay representation in the Convention and the omission of the Athanasian Creed from the formularies, but in return saw the more radical proposals for revising the Prayer Book dropped, and gained general support for the elements of the Scottish concordat, especially as it affected the liturgy. Sydney Ahlstrom has concluded: "A quiet revolution had been wrought in the tradition of Anglican episcopacy, as monarchical institutions gave way to those of democracy". (46)

This "quiet revolution" was in fact the beginning of Anglicanism as a religious system. It was notably different

yet obviously similar to that of the English Church from which it sprang. (47) The actual extent of those similarities and differences, and the effect they had on the theological self-consciousness of the Church of England must now occupy our attention.

2. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND : FROM CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH  
TO VOLUNTARY SOCIETY.

The difficulty with which the Church of England came to terms with the existence of an Anglican Church in America is understandable. The English Church had proven durable enough to ride out the ebb and flow of English history but was hardly rigged for journeying on a wider sea. The fact that English settlers had to set up recognisably Anglican churches in circumstances markedly different from those which shaped the consciousness of the Church of England, was in itself a source of misunderstandings. The movement towards independence pioneered by the American Church presaged similar developments, as has been seen, on other parts of the world over the next half-century. By then the situation faced by the Church of England was complicated by challenges to its self-understanding from within its own social environment.

The Church of England was ill-prepared to cope with change or challenge for three principal reasons: its leadership, its immediate circumstances, and the theological assumptions under which it laboured.

First, leadership. It was not just the existence of the new world that perplexed English churchmen as the frontiers of their church expanded. By training and by expectation they seemed unprepared to cope with anything that was new anywhere! The provision of the American episcopate provides a case in point. Archbishop John Moore (1783 - 1905) who was faced with the dilemma of Samuel Seabury presenting himself as a candidate for consecration was neither as "old" nor as "cross" as Benjamin Franklin had been led to suppose, but he was none the less

temperamentally and (in the literal sense) constitutionally unable to make a positive response to the request. It was not that he lacked sympathy for the Americans, or the desire to see Christian influence extended, but he was unable to see how he held any responsibility in the matter. Plainly it was difficult for Moore to ascertain the general will of the American Church at the time but more than that uncertainty stifled his action. (48) His biographer has characterised the Archbishop as "being dominated by a fear of change" and as one who, seeing his office as that of a great state official, did his duty as such. (49) His duty was to king and country. He was unable to regard himself competent to deal with affairs beyond the confines of the English realm and nation. The fact that the king was known to hold Seabury's plaint in distaste added weight to the conviction.

The same attitude can be seen in Moore's response to Wilberforce's petition on behalf of the newly founded Church Missionary Society. Wilberforce reported to the executive in 1799 that "His grace regretted that he could not with propriety express his full concurrence in an endeavour on behalf of an object he had deeply at heart". (50) This attitude of good-will restrained by total incomprehension marks the response of English church leaders to the new situation of the 18th and early 19th century, and it was taken into that situation by leaders like Middleton.

It was not that the church was entirely moribund. The evangelical revival was reaping a wholesome harvest as the overseas missionary movement testified. Anti-slavery agitation, largely inspired by Christian consciences, reached its climax in the 1790's and came into law by 1807. The old High-Church party, while lacking public influence, took increasing responsibility for education and charity schools. In 1811 "A National Society

for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church" was formed and by 1847 claimed to instruct one million pupils in more than 1700 schools. (51) Men of letters saw the Church as worthy of attention. Throughout, it was held that it was the Church's duty to do good. Typical was Shute Barrington's definition of Christianity given in his Durham Diocesan charge of 1797: "In truth, genuine Christianity is no other than the union of pure devotion with universal benevolence". He went on to summarise "Various means of doing good Bodily and Spiritually". (52) He advised encouraging schools and religious societies; reading the Bible; talking seriously and affably; dispersing printed or written pieces of paper against particular sins; giving coal or stockings; sending wine, spoon meals or herb teas to the sick; paying rents and apothecarys' bills; and providing implements for industrious workmen. It all appears rather patronising in hind-sight, but was apparently typical of English Christianity at the time. (53) Among a plethora of relief societies, Barrington joined with the High Churchman, Sir Thomas Bernard and the evangelical, Wilberforce, to form the Society for bettering the Conditions of the Poor in 1796. (54)

In general then it seemed that honest devotion and good intentions were to be found in the Church, but the vision of the appointed leadership lagged behind. Leadership at anything more than the local level was rendered almost impossible in any case. Since 1717 the Convocations of the Church of England had been prevented from undertaking business of their own. (55) They had not been particularly effective, especially in the controversy which led to their suspension, but as a result there was no machinery through which the Church could corporately discuss the theological, moral and social problems it was involved with. The

Church of England entered the nineteenth century with its hands tied. When, to the challenges of missionary expansion and Church growth were added the radical changes in fortune wrought upon the general populace and the state of the nation, along with the founding of the British Empire and the Anglican Communion, this deficiency takes on a seriousness which is little short of tragic. (56)

This fettering of the Church's freedom is closely linked with the second factor which helps explain the English Church's reluctance to come to terms with changed conditions beyond its boundaries: circumstances actively discouraged it.

During Moore's arch-episcopate the excesses of French revolutionary fervour reached their height. After an initial enthusiasm among English intellectuals over the events in Paris had subsided, Moore's successor, Manners-Sutton (1805 - 1828) presided in an atmosphere of universal revulsion against the threat of a similar occurrence in England. This simply validated the pattern of leadership which had been adopted for some time. As one observer has put it, from "the end of the war of American Independence the people who mattered in English church and state were becoming aware that the structure and quality of their Society were undergoing drastic change: change mainly, they feared, for the worse". (57) The drift of social change strengthened resistance to innovations. The measured conservatism of Burke and the political conversion of William Pitt stand as indicators of this resolve in the state: the Bishops, largely isolated from the life of the Church were not likely to regard novelty in the Church with favour. (58) Beyond the eccentric reign of George III and the rise of Whig power the very constitution had been stretched to breaking point. The scales of political reality were so finely balanced that the Bishops could allow only the

most limited alteration to the status quo. With their own survival seemingly at risk, the English bishops could give scant attention to the needs of the Church overseas.

In 1828 William Howley succeeded Manners-Sutton as Archbishop (1828 - 1848). In that year too, a Whig Parliament energised by the liberalism of Lord John Russell, the radical criticism of Joseph Hume, and the secular utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham first turned its attentions to questions of religion. The Test and Corporation Acts were seen to be the bastion of church privilege which had to be overthrown. (59) This was also believed to be the key which would unlock the storehouse of non-conformist political pressure to enable further, more radical reforms in future. Many Churchmen were actually in favour of the measures. (60) However others still saw them as their necessary protection, as Sydney Smith once acidly put it, "without which no clergyman thinks he could sleep with his accustomed soundness". When the Reform Bill was presented to the House of Lords in 1831, twenty out of 22 bishops voted against it.

The details of the resulting upheaval are not of consequence here. (61) What is significant is the way in which Howley, aided by Newman's former mentor Whately who by then was Archbishop of Dublin (1831 - 1863), and above all by C.J. Blomfield, the Bishop of London (1823 - 1856) worked to turn the thrust of the criticism and ensure a working relationship for the Church in a modern parliamentary democracy.

In fact the Whigs were not ever in a position to carry the full weight of a radical programme. The assault was directed against the question of the Church's public utility and it was by the fact of its public utility - in education, in the care of the poor, and through the exercise of clerical duty at the parochial

level - that the Church survived. In the process, the theological question of what it meant to be an Anglican was raised in new ways.

The theological under-pinning of Anglican self-consciousness, or perhaps the lack of such a theology, is the third factor which explains the Church's unpreparedness to meet its opportunities overseas. How was it that, as the English nation reached out towards new frontiers and a world-wide influence, the national Church had declined to the position of what A.E.J. Rawlinson called "an isolated, semi-Erastian, wholly insular sect"? (62) Granted the practical difficulties, how was it that a Church which possessed so many signs of vitality could, in a crisis situation, allow itself to be held in such subservience to the state?

Once again the answer to this question lies in the character of the English Reformation. (63) The occasion and course of the Henrican reforms is well enough known, but it is not always appreciated that the device used to assert English independence from Rome was the outcome of a serious intellectual debate which had developed in the Western Church over the preceding three centuries. It has been demonstrated that Cromwell quite consciously based his policies upon the arguments of Marsiglio of Padua, and was active in promoting them through his publicist, Thomas Starkey. (64) The reforming measures were carried out under Marsiglio's presupposition that the Commonwealth, or "body politic", was of two parts - the spirituality and the temporality - but that only a secular power could exert the cohesive force necessary for sustaining civilized life for mankind upon earth. The role of the spirituality was to minister to the nations soul and to prepare men for life in heaven - in the meantime effective authority resided with the

Prince. In a series of Acts between 1531 and 1533 Henry established his claim to be Supreme Head and Emperor of his realm, thus clearing the way for his divorce and a new relationship between Church and State in England. Only then was specifically anti-papal legislation introduced. In this situation the Protestant reformers found a suitable vehicle for the promotion of their interests and in return provided the degree of popular legitimation necessary for the King's cause.

In succeeding years and under successive monarchs a theological justification for this state of affairs evolved. In a sequence of Prayer Books and Articles the doctrinal position of the national Church was gradually defined. Throughout, the process was carried on under state patronage and by Acts of Parliament. Under Elizabeth the position of the Sovereign was modified, and under pressure from Puritan criticism, Anglican claims were given what amounted to their normative exposition by Hooker. (65) By Act of Parliament too the Commonwealth over-threw the emerging synthesis - yet even then the central issue was not to do with the legitimacy of an established Church but concerned the sort of establishment which best would serve the interests of a Christian nation.

At the Restoration the Elizabethan settlement was re-asserted. Yet with a difference. For the Elizabethans the notion of 'establishment' principally implied that one form of liturgy (as distinct from a multiplicity of local uses) and the subjection of clergy to the laws of the land (rather than a system of independent Church courts) was embodied in a set of civil statutes. For them there was no suggestion that the Church of England was the creation of parliament, just that as a national Church its legal and constitutional entity should be included in the framework of national

decision-making. After 1661 the Laudians sought to continue this tradition of interdependence but, as a result of the recent upheavals, the enforcement of uniformity had become much more of a political issue than a matter of liturgical discipline. The resulting settlement reflected this reality. "The political strength of the High Church Party was bought with a price - the Church surrendered to Parliament its last shred of independence". (66) Non-conformity turned into dissent. The Clarendon Code was introduced to keep both Catholics and disaffected Protestants within the national church and to protect the state from instability. (67)

During the eighteenth century various exceptions were made to the rules and, as the proportion of Englishmen who were consciously not members of the national church increased, so the notion of an established church endowed with state privileges as distinct from voluntary non-established bodies gained currency. Leadership of the national church lost touch with the nation. The Church of England came to be seen as a civil institution, founded and supported by the state for its own purposes, with no powers of its own except those delegated to it by Parliament. (68) A.E.J.

Rawlinson, in an earlier study to that mentioned above traced the course of the century as follows:

The death of the Queen in 1714 meant that the Whigs came into power and the Tory and High-Church Clergy, suspected of Jacobitism, were viewed with suspicion. The Convocations were suppressed, Whigs and Latitudinarians were appointed to Bishoprics, and preferment in the Church became without disguise the reward of political services. (69)

These three factors, the personal limitations of the leaders, the circumstances in which they found themselves, and the set of expectations they had inherited, help to explain the hesitancy with

which the Church of England came to view the opportunities provided by British expansion overseas. The Anglican system, it seemed, could not be transplanted to a foreign setting.

Of course there were exceptions from which the Church could have learnt. Norman Sykes has traced the way in which throughout the eighteenth century the idea of respublica Christiana had survived in certain quarters. (70) This asserted that the proper partnership of the Church and the State is established when each party recognises the limits of its own power and the proper sphere of the others operations. Neither Church nor state lose their sovereignty by entering an alliance which is for their mutual benefit and for the well-being of a considerable majority of the populace - although the unity given to society by the amalgam is essentially spiritual. For a number of Bishops the nature of their office meant that they were not wholly to be absorbed into the state system. The idea of a "purely spiritual episcopate" did not die. (71) And above all there was a remarkable "mutation" of Anglicanism which had been successfully transplanted available for anyone willing to see its significance.

The experience of the Episcopal Church in Scotland was virtually lost to English consciousness for 150 years. (72) Episcopacy had been restored in Scotland after the Reformation in 1610, and further consecrations for the Scottish Church took place in England at the Restoration. However, when the Scottish bishops refused to transfer their allegiance from James VII/II to William of Orange, the episcopal church entered upon a period of severe persecution which increased as the years went on. The Jacobite rising of 1745 brought penal measures to bear upon episcopalians whose worship and organization was rendered illegal. (73) Throughout this period the Scottish Church was in communion with the

English non-Jurors: the Church of England's contacts, north of the border, were with the "qualified congregations" whose clergy had been ordained in England or Ireland, used the English services, prayed for the House of Hanover, and were not under the authority of the Scottish bishops. The existence of the independent Scottish episcopals virtually passed unnoticed until Seabury, who had failed to persuade the English bishops to consecrate him, was made the first Anglican bishop to serve outside the British Isles by the Scottish Bishops, in Aberdeen on 14th November, 1784.

In 1788 the last Stuart claimant to the throne died, thus removing the cause of Scottish episcopalian offence. The penal terms were withdrawn, and at the synod of Laurencekirk in 1804 the Scottish Church, then reduced to four bishops and about 40 clergy, adopted the Thirty-nine Articles as its permanent confession thereby uniting the "qualified" with the indigenous ministries. (74)

The relationship between the two sectors was not always harmonious but early in the 19th century the Scots body stood in relation to England as the closest geographical member of the Anglican "communion". Belatedly, it provided a fitting demonstration for English churchmen of the fact that the Anglican system could survive without adventitious support from the state or from national history, but solely by reliance upon the just claims of its faith and order.

If the voice of these countervailing examples was not heeded in England, what of the convictions of the various groupings of churchmen who variously sustained the momentum of the Church at this time? Had they no insight on the nature of the Church which would help the Church of England come to terms with its new position?

Of the distinguishable 'parties' evident during the preceding

century, the evangelicals held the most obvious interest in planting churches overseas. As has been seen however, evangelicals took little formal interest in ecclesiological questions. Their concerns were practical and largely restricted to the fields of evangelisation, education and charity. For them questions of church government and order were strictly secondary. The intention of the London Missionary Society to spread the message of "pure Christianity" without reference to denominational allegiance or questions of polity, is well known. (75) Even a convinced churchman like Wilberforce urged his supporters to cultivate a "catholic spirit of amicable friendship" with other Christians, "who, differing from them in non-essentials yet agree in the grand fundamentals of religion". (76) Many evangelicals found the atmosphere of non-denominational work more congenial, and even those who remained within the Anglican structures saw the doctrine of the church as peripheral. (77)

Quite apart from the content of their opinions, evangelicals had little opportunity to put them to the Church at that time. The universal distaste for fanaticism on the part of those of "high rank and good peerage" told against serious clergy for some time. After Middleton was made bishop for the Indian churches, Manners-Sutton proposed his health with the words, "Remember, my Lord Bishop, that your Primate on the day of your consecration defined your duty for you:- that duty is to put down enthusiasm and to preach the gospel". (78) However even when evangelicals did rise to prominence, after what Samuel Wilberforce was to refer to as the "wicked appointments", they had little by way of theological guidance to offer.

In this of course they were not alone. Indeed a complaint frequently heard bemoaned the fact that even the most conscientious

of the clergy were unconcerned with fundamental questions of dogma. E.J. Carpenter reports:

Bishop Hobart of New York, visiting England in 1824, complained that the best educated among the English clergy were well versed in other branches of learning and conscience, but ignorant of theology. 'The country clergy', said Mr Norris of Hackney, 'are constant readers of the Gentleman's Magazine, deep in the antiquities of the signs of inns, speculations as to what becomes of swallows in winter, and whether hedge-hogs, or other urchins, are justly accused of sucking cows dry at night'. (79)

Of course, many of their fellows were reputedly unconcerned with learning or conscience at all, and rarely found it necessary to entertain speculations of any sort.

Reference to H.H. Norris however directs attention to one group which did take theology seriously, the High Church party. To be more precise, Norris' name is associated with one aspect of High Churchmanship which was to be influential in the early period of the Lambeth Conferences. As a movement it is possible to distinguish the Hackney Phalanx in which Norris was pre-eminent from the older Church and State men, and from the later Tractarians to which they gave place. (80) Throughout though the High Churchmen retained an emphasis upon the spiritual authority of the ministry, the importance of the liturgy (along with a comparative indifference to the Articles), and the normative example of the undivided church and the traditional orders of ministry. These ideas, fused in the idealistic ethos of Romanticism and charged with the central idea of "apostolic succession" comprised the dynamic which propelled the Tractarians into prominence by the mid-nineteenth century.

Such ideas too made up the principle doctrinal affirmation bequeathed to the emerging Anglican Communion. Not that such affirmation was uncontroverted. The period in which Anglicanism

spread overseas saw the Church of England existing in an uneasy state of tension between evangelicals whose influence was increasing at the time their intellectual energies were finally spent, a variety of churchmen who may be considered successors of the Latitudinarians and whose expectations were as varied as their number, and the high church groups, which, while not identical in their motivation at least brought a clear set of priorities and aims to the developing Churches. But the central question which came to concern them all was to do with the subject of the Church.

When he was asked whether Newman's conversion to Rome meant that the Oxford Movement had failed, H.E. Manning responded, "it is almost incredible that a body which fifteen years ago was elated at being an Establishment should now be conscious of being a Church". (81) This certainly represented a marked change of direction in which all English churchmen participated. The Church had come to take on a life of its own and was not just existing by dependence on the state. (82) There was disagreement as to how that life should be lived - by repristinating an idealised version of the undivided church? by retrenchment and adjustment to the requirements of a changing society? by redoubling charitable and evangelistic efforts irrespective of differences of ecclesiastical principle and organisation? In the end it was the moderate course of adaptation charted by Howley, Whately and Blomfield that prevailed but the debate was not suppressed by that fact. (83) The question of the Church had been placed formally on the agenda. The Church of England was not able to give it an unequivocal answer. The Anglican Communion was forced to fabricate its own response from new spheres of experience.

This section of the Chapter has sought to outline the situation in the Church of England: attention must be re-directed again towards Bishop Selwyn, and the new experiences of Anglicans overseas.

### 3. ANGLICANISM : FROM A NATIONAL CHURCH TO A WORLD COMMUNION.

The internal developments within the Church of England, were, needless to say, imperfectly understood at the time. Selwyn, was sent to New Zealand by a church undergoing transition but unaware of its precise nature.

He went as the first recipient of support from the Colonial Bishopric Fund. The Fund was one of the fruits from that period of reconstruction which followed the Reform Bill. It too was initiated by the remarkable Bishop of London, C.J. Blomfield. The Bishop had already undertaken wholesale reforms of church property and education, and in 1839 he was forced also to consider the needs of the church overseas. The Church Missionary Society pressed him to assist with the provision of an episcopate for Sierra Leone and for New Zealand. Typically, Blomfield saw this request as pointing to a wider responsibility and in the following year he composed an open letter to Archbishop Howley in which he called for a "great effort" by the Church of England in order to endow bishoprics for the new churches.

The idea of a colonial episcopate had gradually won recognition. A few months after the consecration of the American bishops, Provoost and White, Charles Inglis had also been consecrated in the Lambeth Palace Chapel to the see of Nova Scotia. He was the first English bishop to go overseas. Others (including Thomas Middleton) followed, but by 1839 there were still only ten colonial episcopates in existence. (84) Even that degree of acceptance had been hard won. Certainly the situation had improved since Walpole refused Secker the right to consecrate a bishop for the Americans because it would be impossible for an American to take his place in the House of Lords, but even so, Hobson, the Governor of the e.

Zealand colony, still dismissed the possibility of a bishop coming to New Zealand because there were as yet no roads for his coach! (85)

It was fitting that Blomfield should initiate the new moves. Since 1634, the Bishop of London had held nominal oversight of Anglicans overseas, and Blomfield had been sharply reminded of this fact when he received a complaint from a clergyman in what is now known as British Columbia, about the scant attention paid by His Lordship "to this part of his Diocese". (86) Once alert to the need, Blomfield's efforts were indefatigable. In Whitsun week, 1841, the Archbishop was persuaded to issue a declaration concerning the priority which this aspect of church extension should receive. The principal missionary societies agreed to co-operate and opened the Fund with capital grants - £10,000 from S.P.C.K., £7,500 from S.P.G., and £6,000 from C.M.S. - and shortly thereafter the scheme was launched at a great public meeting. (87) Between 1840 and the first Lambeth Conference in 1867, 40 new overseas dioceses were founded. In less than 50 years, to 1889, £840,000 was raised for the Fund and expended on establishing 55 bishoprics in every part of the world. (88) It is in this period that it becomes possible to speak of the 'emergence' of the Anglican Communion.

This dramatic phase of development was brought about by two factors: the impact of the missionary movement, and the pervasive influence of ideas contributed by the High Churchmen.

By the 1840's the missionary movement was reaching towards the zenith of its powers. Since the initial impetus at the beginning of the century, the three founding societies had achieved a significant prestige within the English Church and developed their work to an impressive extent overseas. Other missions proliferated. During the 19th century numerous specifically Anglican societies were founded, usually with some particular area as the focus of

their interest. (89) The work of the societies cannot be underestimated, and at the very least an awareness of it helps to counter the impression, perhaps given even in some sections of this chapter, that the frontiers of the Anglican Communion were peopled by bishops alone. The experience, at least in North America, the Indian sub-continent, and then in what was to become known as the "white commonwealth," gives a clearer indication that it was through the existence of the colonists and the colonial chaplains, as well as the labours of the missionaries that the Church of England was established overseas. Eventually the insistent call for pastoral support and organisation was heard. The bishops responded. But at least in the beginning, the church was there first.

This situation was to change, and here the High Church attitude towards episcopal office was a vital stimulant. (90) After an initial reluctance to allow the very possibility of an English bishop going to the colonies, they were eventually consecrated for overseas work in profusion. (91) An important precedent was established in 1841 with the passing of the Jerusalem Bishopric Act and the installation of Michael Solomon Alexander as the first Bishop of Jerusalem. To this the Tractarians objected vehemently. (92) For them it was a denial of Catholicity and a betrayal of the Church of England's historic claims. Moreover it was yet another example of Parliamentary interference in the affairs of the Church. (93) The scheme was ultimately to falter but significant precedents were established by it. (94) Previously, and for sometime thereafter, English bishops went to provide ministry to English communities and under the patronage of English law and authority, in places where there was no (or at least very little) other formal ecclesiastical

provenance. Alexander's jurisdiction lay outside the limit of British political authority, his relationship to the Church of England was ambiguous to say the least, and he held a parallel jurisdiction with Orthodox and Roman Catholic bishops in the area. The Jerusalem Bishopric was in no way typical of later developments, although in some ways it fore-shadowed the greater flexibility and innovations that would press bishops to the frontiers of missionary outreach.

"Church principles" concerning the spiritual freedom of the church and the apostolic succession of the episcopate did however give impetus to the move to involve bishops more directly in the Church's expansion. Especially significant was the ideal of 'a missionary bishop'. This concept was first expounded as such by Bishop G.W. Doane of New Jersey in a sermon to the 1835 national convention of the American Episcopal Church. Doane saw the American experience of episcopacy as pointing to the need for "a new office in this Church". As the gospel was to be sent, so the need was for "a Bishop sent forth by the Church, not sought for of the Church; going before to organise the Church, not waiting till the Church has been partially organized; a leader, not a follower". (95)

This address clearly stimulated the commencement of missionary activity by the American church. (96) Its vision helped clarify the resolve of the Church of England to accept the responsibility for supporting an episcopate in its territories overseas. (97) The logical outcome of this conviction, which had also won Selwyn's allegiance before his departure for his new See, was provided in the consecration of C.F. Mackenzie as Bishop to Zambezi in 1861, literally as the vanguard of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. (98) Thus bishops were conjoined

with the missionary task.

This dual thrust in the period of development after 1841 meant that the Anglican Communion developed from the first with three notable characteristics.

First, it developed with a marked tendency for the church to maintain its independence from the state. Partly this was a result of high church inclinations, but equally it reflected the independent and pioneering attitude of the missionary societies. Debate may proceed as to whether trade followed "the flag" or the reverse. What is clear is that in the early 19th century missions preceded them both. The fact that Anglican missions were in the hands of voluntary societies rather than the state church can be seen, from one point of view at least, as providential. While the actual relationship of colonialism to Christian mission is a confused and often tragic affair, it is none-the-less clear that by comparison with, say, the Spanish or even the Dutch dependencies, the position of the Church of England in the British Empire was different both in kind and degree. (99) Religion was not imposed upon the new territories like a department of state by legislation and this presented a two-fold advantage. On one hand it meant that Anglicanism was able to spread beyond the limits of English political influence and, to some extent, was safeguarded from dependence on the political fortunes of the Empire, and on the other, it was able to establish a measure of local autonomy from the start and to begin achieving a degree of local identity within its new environment. (100)

Secondly though, this very sense of independence tended to exaggerate the tendency towards a split in the theological understanding of the Church. Where evangelical Anglicans were involved in Church of England missions then they held a notion

which, if not exactly grudging, held no truck with autocratic ideas of prelacy or the suggestion that missionaries should offer servile obedience to their appointed Bishop. As Middleton (and several others) had discovered, the society principle tended to engender a spirit of rugged self-sufficiency which did not always sit easily with the need for any broader pattern of organisation. This difference could be acute. T.E. Yates has suggested that an essential background to understanding this period is found in the conflict of ideas about the episcopate. (101) The Tractarian view of the bishop and the apostolic succession insisted that episcopacy was of the esse of the Church and that the Church was therefore not present without a bishop. Ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia was the formula. Such a view found its logical outcome in the mission of Bishop Mackenzie. The evangelicals willingly acknowledged that Bishops were necessary for the completion or fulfilment of the Church. But the Church was comprised of more than just bishops, and where the faithful gathered, there the Church could be planted. (102) Episcopacy was of the bene esse of the Church. This difference of emphasis, already observed in the American situation, and to some extent an inevitable outcome of the course of English church history since the Reformation, was to be at the forefront of Anglican thinking for the next century. (103)

The third characteristic of Anglican organisation is in many ways an inevitable outcome of the previous elements. As the particular churches moved towards adopting independent forms, their method of self government varied between a dependence upon the legal recognition by the developing colonial legislatures, and total self government on the American pattern. Once again this was a factor involving theological principle and historical

opportunity. Partly it reflected convictions about the place of church and state, or the relationship of the church to its episcopate, and partly it simply reflected the degree of self-determination the churches reached before gaining a full episcopal order or total legal independence. (104)

This compound of theological conviction and local opportunity is what gives the matrix of Anglican ecclesiology its distinctive colour. Anglicanism took shape in response to the way three cardinal questions were posed by the new situation in which Anglicans found themselves. How did the forming of each Church relate to the State? its own episcopate? and its own voluntary standards of belief and discipline?

To see an example of the way in which these questions were answered it is possible now to observe how Selwyn came to terms with the dilemmas he confronted in New Zealand.

Selwyn faced his task with a variety of theological resources at his disposal. He is normally described as a moderate High Churchman, and was in fact deaconed a month before Keble's memorable sermon. However, he never associated with the Tractarians as such, although church principles had been in the air at Cambridge for some time too! (105) Carpenter felt able to conclude that it was the influence of Hugh John Rose that was decisive in Selwyn's intellectual formation, and it is now known that he also met and corresponded with Bishop Doane at a crucial period in his career. (106)

Whatever the source, Selwyn clearly believed in the divine character of the Church and the spiritual authority of its ministry, and his whole episcopate was dedicated to giving substance to those beliefs. When appointed to New Zealand his views on episcopacy led him into conflict with the English crown

lawyers, at the heart of which was the claim that his right to ordain was given by Letters Patent. In the end he recorded his protest:

I think it right in expressing my readiness to accept the Patent as now framed to state to Your Lordship that whatever meaning the words of it may be construed to bear, I conceive that those functions which are merely spiritual are conveyed to the bishop by the act of consecration alone. (107)

Such authority implied a corresponding responsibility. He conceived the role of a bishop to be at the head of his Church's mission, and his own example, as he traversed the length and breadth of the diocese, even extending this to skills of navigation and seamanship in sailing to the Melanesian dependencies, is one of the great stories of missionary endeavour. (108) His ambitions for the Church were shaped by the same beliefs. In a letter to English friends he explained:

My desire is, in this country, so far as God may give me light and strength, to try what the actual system of the Church of England can do, when disencumbered of its earthly load of seats in Parliament, Erastian compromises, corruption of patronage, confusion of orders, synodless bishops, and an unorganized clergy. None of these things are inherent in our system, and therefore are not to be imputed as faults. (109)

This conviction determined Selwyn's decision to refuse state land grants to the church (which had caused considerable difficulty in Australia) (110) and to insist that missionaries should not be land-holders. The bishop "preferred to maintain the Church's independence, and to commit her support to the free charities of the servants of God". (111)

Such ideals would remain empty, however, if they were not translated into a positive system of Church government and it was in this matter that Selwyn's most lasting contribution was made to the

Church in New Zealand and to the development of Anglicanism.

In 1844 and again in 1847 the bishop summoned his clergy to meet in Conference at Waimate North. In England, where no such gathering had been held since the Convocations were silenced in 1717, such acts were seen as illegal if not the flagrant usurpation of the Royal prerogative. (112) Selwyn's answer was given in his charge to the second assembly which went so far as to include laymen and talk of a possible constitution for the church. He saw synodical conference as a function of the spiritual authority of the episcopate, the neglect of which had led to the diminishing of the Church as a whole. The nature of the episcopate had been quite inverted. What had originally been a descriptive term defining a field of work had become but a title of honour. For him synodical government was simply an outworking of the episcopal principle. He expounded this to his second synod:

Upon this principle it follows at once, that I am placed here to act, not so much over you as with you ... I believe the monarchical idea of the Episcopate to be as foreign to the true mind of the Church as it is adverse to the Gospel doctrine of humility ... it remains then to define, by some general principles, the terms of our co-operation. They are simply these: that neither will I act without you, nor can you act without me. (113)

In the months that followed various parliamentary devices were proposed in Britain which would allow the colonial churches a greater measure of freedom in the ordering of their affairs. (114)

All came to nothing. The promise that legal action would not be pressed against Selwyn was scant compensation. But gradually the realisation that the colonial churches required the liberty to organise their own forms of government was recognised. (115)

In 1849, while Selwyn was pressing the case for the constitutional autonomy of the Church in New Zealand, Gladstone - then the British

Colonial Secretary - in advising Selwyn that legislative changes were unlikely to be forthcoming, also recommended that the new Churches should "organise themselves on the basis of voluntary consensual compact, since that was the basis on which the Church of Christ has rested from the first". (116)

In 1850 parliament allowed Colonial Legislative assemblies to be created and with that came a de facto acknowledgement of other colonial institutions such as the church. Later that year Selwyn attended a conference of the Australian Bishops convened by W.G. Broughton, Bishop of Sydney. (117) There it was firmly resolved to pursue a goal of full synodical autonomy.

Numerous diocesan synods began to meet in different parts of the world during the 1850's. By the end of the decade Provincial organisation had developed in many places. Despite the reservations of C.M.S. and the initial reluctance of at least one diocese, a Constitution for the Province of New Zealand was adopted in 1857 and its first General Synod met in the following year. A similar process led to the forming of a Canadian Provincial Synod in 1859. (118) South Africa followed suit in 1861. (119) From that point the process towards the full autonomy of the colonial churches proceeded apace. In 1861 McKenzie in Capetown and Patteson in Auckland, were consecrated for their new spheres of work without parliamentary warrant. (120) McKenzie and then, three years later, Samuel Crowther were destined for service in locations beyond any pretence of British authority. In 1865 the New Zealand bishops, assured that their royal warrants were as unnecessary as they were legally voided of significance, sought to return the Letters Patent under which they had taken up their jurisdictions to the Colonial Offices. (121)

This chapter has been concerned to trace the ways in which

Anglican faith and order expanded beyond the limits of English territory and English power. In the process it has indicated some of the ways in which the unexamined assumptions of the Church of England were tested, and how unrealised theological resources of the Anglican tradition were drawn out. As a result, by the second half of the nineteenth century, a network of Anglican Churches was spread throughout the world. These Churches were plainly Anglican in their forms of worship and the identity of their ministerial order, but from their beginnings their policy and organisation was markedly different from that of their progenitor in England. Most obviously these Churches lived (or were in the process of coming to live) in complete independence from the civil authorities in the territories they served; as a result, they were able to develop their own patterns of leadership and their own methods of government; and finally, they learnt to adopt a variety of structures for their own unity to discipline which sometimes reflected particular convictions imported from their English background, but equally often were also intended to hold together different theological emphases in a way the English Church had not yet been found to contemplate. Thus was the Anglican Communion born.

It is from this period that it is possible to speak of 'Anglicanism' as a distinct entity. In doing so however, is it fair to press the distinction which has been drawn at a number of points between the 'Anglicanism' of the Church of England and the wider phenomenon experienced in and expressed by the Anglican Communion? The question can be answered affirmatively for two reasons. In the first place the Church of England is legally and administratively distinct from the Anglican Communion. That was the importance of the Privy Council's decision in 1863 that English

ecclesiastical authority was void in self-governing overseas countries. The significance of that fact provides the second reason for giving a distinct identity to the Anglican Communion. Because of their isolation, at first simply as a result of location but increasingly as a factor of their own history and culture, the Anglican churches were forced to undertake a theological appraisal of their character which had been neither necessary nor possible for the Church of England over the preceding two centuries. As a result the Churches of the Anglican Communion provided an identifiable new context for the consideration of questions about declared doctrine, patterns of authority, the nature of their own inter-relationships and unity, and their function in emerging new societies. To the legal distinction between the Church of England and the Churches overseas is added<sup>a</sup> theological transformation of Anglicanism in the matrix of Anglican expansion.

Of course this argument is not meant to imply that the Church of England is not a part of the Anglican Communion. It has remained a vital and arguably the most significant member of the world-wide family. But as the Lambeth Conferences came to provide a distinguishable forum for generating inter-Anglican discussion, it became increasingly clear that the Church of England could not be the normative or even a typical example of Anglicanism as it has come to be expressed within the framework of world confessional bodies.

Neither can it be claimed that the theological synthesis represented by the Anglican Communion was conceived self-consciously from the beginning. The questions of Anglican identity were raised gradually, and any answers have followed at a distance. Yet the consciousness has grown. When Newman was still optimistic about the future of the Church of England he spoke of the need to

encourage a recognisably Anglican theology:

We have a vast inheritance, but no inventory of our treasure. All is given in profusion; it remains for us to catalogue, sort, distribute, select, harmonize and complete. (122)

The Lambeth Conferences have in part provided the opportunity to undertake that task within a wider frame of reference.

Consideration must now be given to some of the ways in which that task has been carried out.

CHAPTER 3 : ANGLICAN BELIEFS : DECLARED DOCTRINE  
IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

CHAPTER THREEANGLICAN BELIEFS : DECLARED DOCTRINE IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The forms of synodical government adopted by the colonial churches pre-disposed them towards the possibility of taking council together. In 1850 Broughton had invited the Australian bishops and Selwyn to meet in Sydney. During 1851 the Canadian bishops met similarly, and later that year, as the society for the Propagation of the Gospel celebrated its third Jubilee, representatives of most of the overseas churches honoured the occasion in London. For many of those present, and especially the North Americans, this latter event provoked consideration of the benefit to be gained from some synod or council of all the Anglican bishops. (1)

Howley's successor at Lambeth Palace J.B. Sumner (1848 - 1862), was not inclined to encourage such suggestions. He was fully occupied in restraining proposals for the revival of his own Convocation and any idea of wider inter-Anglican gatherings was far from his thoughts. (2) The next Archbishop, Thomas Longley (1862 - 1868) was to prove more amenable. By this time, the need for some Anglican Conference had become pressing. The obligation to offer some reply to the papal claims had been recognised for some time and the summoning of the first Vatican Council was making this matter urgent. The publication of Essays and Reviews in 1860 caused a popular uproar, and the Colenso affair eventually made the determination of the Colonial Churches to confer, irresistible. (3) In the end it was a memorial from the upper house of the Canadian Provincial Synod in 1865 which prompted the circumstances and an invitation from Longley in 1866 which provided the occasion for 76 of the 151 Bishops of the Anglican Communion to assemble in the Guard Room of Lambeth Palace on Tuesday 24th September, 1867.

Despite reservations at the time, this first Conference created a pattern for inter-Church consultation within the communion. The colonial bishops at least were convinced of the value of the venture. Encouraged by Selwyn, who became their corresponding secretary after the 1867 meeting, they persuaded A.C. Tait to repeat the experiment in 1878. E.W. Benson needed little persuasion to call a third Conference ten years later. In fact since 1878 it seems to have been expected that Conferences would be held at roughly ten yearly intervals, and they have continued to be held ever since. (4)

Apart from three irregularly held Anglican Congresses, the Lambeth meetings - along with some consultative organisations set up by them - have been the sole means whereby Anglican Churches have mutually undertaken to confer and reflect together. These deliberations are therefore of primary importance for any examination of Anglicanism.

This chapter will observe the manner and the results of the Conferences' efforts to define the general doctrinal stance of the Anglican Communion both by the declaration of normative standards of Anglican belief, and by the outworking of such beliefs in the search for Christian unity. This will raise the question of the compatibility of different beliefs within the Anglican spectrum and the chapter concludes with a discussion of comprehensiveness. This acts as a preliminary to the further treatment of the whole topic of Anglican authority in chapter four.

## 1. THE STANDARDS OF ANGLICAN BELIEF

From their beginnings the Lambeth Conferences have resisted the temptation to legislate for the Anglican Communion. The legal situation in England at the time, as well as the conflicting expectations of the bishops attending, made it necessary for Longley to offer a disclaimer of the Conference's right to possess binding authority, before the first meeting was even convened. In February 1867 he reassured the Canterbury Convocation about the forthcoming assembly:

It should be distinctly understood that at this meeting no declaration of faith shall be made, and no decision come to that shall affect generally the interests of the Church, but that we shall meet together for brotherly counsel and encouragement .... I can assure my brethren that I should enter on this meeting in the full confidence that nothing would pass but that which tended to brotherly love and union, and would bind the colonial Church, which is surely in a most unsatisfactory state, more closely to the Mother Church. (5)

For Longley this meant that questions of theology such as those posed by Colenso and the Essays and Reviews writers should not be discussed by the bishops, but such a resolve proved impossible to sustain. (6) "Brotherly counsel and encouragement" tends to create a body of shared opinion. "Love and union", or the bond of a "Mother Church" to its progeny, survives only on the basis of agreement in matters of principle. It is impossible to rule out the discussion of theology from an assembly of Churchmen - even when it is an assembly of Bishops! It is of course another matter to refuse to legislate for the Churches or to define their theological positions (and in the end the circumstances which determined the purely consultative character of the Lambeth Conferences were to have a profound effect on the shape of Anglican ecclesiology) but moral authority is not without its own weight, and the deliberation of the Lambeth bishops created its own

significance. (7)

This distinction between discursive theological statements and dogmatic definition is not always appreciated among Anglicans. (8)

Even in the late 1920's, when Cosmo Lang was preparing for the seventh Conference and sought to depress the place of theological debates among the conference priorities, it was only a determined minority of his colleagues who persuaded him that while the latter responsibility may fall outside Lambeth's competence, the former was an essential part of it. It is through the quality of its discussion and the wisdom of its recommendations that the Lambeth Conference exercises its authority within Anglicanism. Theological issues, and especially the problem of delineating the nature of Anglican beliefs have recurred in the Conferences, irrespective of Longley's determination, and from their very inception.

(a) Theological definition in the early Conferences.

The agenda for the first Lambeth Conference was carefully drawn up so as to avoid controversy. It is difficult now to appreciate the extreme apprehensiveness with which the English bishops approached the whole proceedings. The Archbishop of York and most of the northern bishops indicated that they would not attend at all. The Dean of Westminster, A.P. Stanley, refused to allow the Abbey to be used for a Conference service. The fact that a Conference prayer was printed without Parliamentary approval was noted as effrontery. Above all the threat to the tenuous balance of powers between the different "parties" in the Church of England caused anxiety to them all. The English church was virtually without experience of synodical procedures, and the idea of a gathering of bishops seeking to exercise voluntary and not juridical authority was beyond comprehension. (9)

In such an atmosphere the colonial bishops were hardly likely to find their concerns taken up by the Conference. They set about the task of preparing a revised agenda which would at least get the situation in Natal on to the order paper. (10) However the principal theological discussion of the Conference took place before that tactic was introduced and in a way which could hardly have been anticipated.

It had been agreed by the planning committee that the business of the Conference would be undertaken by means of debate over specific resolutions, and that the resolutions eventually agreed upon would be published. To facilitate this, a preamble to the resolutions was suggested in order to describe the general doctrinal standpoint of the Conference and, as such, of Anglicanism as a whole. Unexpectedly, all of the first day was given to a discussion of this document.

A draft for the preamble had been issued with the agenda. It began:

We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, professing the faith of the primitive and undivided Church, as based on Scripture, defined by the first four General Councils (See I Eliz c.i., xxxvi), and reaffirmed by the Fathers of the English Reformation ...(11)

and went on to express gratitude for the opportunity to take counsel together, regret concerning the current divisions in the "flock of Christ", and hope that reunion might be found in a "return to the faith and discipline of the undivided Church which was the principle of the English Reformation". The statement appears bland enough - a first example of what F.R. Barry has called the "rather plummy stilted style" typical of Lambeth utterances - but at the time it was bound to run into difficulties. To the undeniably protestant sympathies of most Englishmen it appeared to give a distorted picture of what the Reformation had been about, and an inadequate

treatment of the authority of scripture. (12) The more liberal among the Bishops saw it as an attempt to compose the very rule of faith which they felt committed to oppose. And although the High Church majority were glad to see reference to the General Councils and the normative example of the undivided primitive Church, the question of reunion exposed the different ambitions even among their number. The Evangelical bishops, McIlvaine of Ohio, and C.R. Sumner of Winchester, supported by Tait and encouraged by the impatience of most of the colonials to get on to more substantial business, managed to push through a number of amendments. The opening clauses of the Preamble, as eventually adopted, read:

We, Bishops of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, in visible Communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, professing the faith delivered to us in Holy Scripture, maintained by the primitive Church and the Fathers of the English Reformation ... (13)

In this way a clearly protestant slant was given to the statement. Not only was the contentious reference to the Councils omitted and the ambiguous notion of the faith of the primitive Church replaced by that of a deposit of faith delivered in Scripture, but the Catholicity of the Bishops present was also clearly linked to the Catholicity of the English Church and the English Reformation.

By the end of the day, with the agenda itself still unconsidered, only one further minor change of wording was achieved, and the revision of the remainder of the Preface was committed to a small sub-committee.

In the sub-committee Gray of Capetown and E.H. Browne, Bishop of Ely and a noted historical theologian, set themselves to work for the re-inclusion of a reference to General Councils once again. Eventually the revision went on to express the expectation that the

cause of reunion would be best assisted,

by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils .... (14)

Not only the Councils but the normative faith of the primitive Church and the definitions of the Creeds were thus re-employed in a formula which was to exercise considerable power in the shaping of Anglican Consciousness. (15)

So it was that on the very first occasion that a represented body tackled the subject of ecclesiology in the Anglican Communion, a notable confusion arose. The tension between Catholic and Protestant norms in theology, characteristic it would seem of Anglicanism, was resolved on this occasion by the listing of various standards which different groups of those present valued highly. Similar tactics were to be tried in the future although the question as to whether the two approaches were compatible could not be put off indefinitely. At this point, however, it is worth noting that in 1867 at least, the difference between the two approaches was largely one of emphasis. Clearly, all the assembled bishops were uncompromisingly 'Protestant' as far as papal claims and dogmas were concerned. A.M.G. Stephenson has shown the formative role played by what he calls Moderate High Churchmen in the Conference. (16) Only the Bishop of Salisbury laid any claim even to a Tractarian title, and the High Churchmen had no doubts as to where their opinions lay. Evidence of this fact is demonstrated in "Address to the Faithful" which was composed by precisely the same committee as interpolated the 'Catholic' elements into the Preamble of the Conference declaration. The Address urges diligence in maintaining "the faith once delivered to the saints", especially in the face of "frauds and subtleties" which

assail it and 'the growing superstitions and additions' with which the Truth of God is overlaid. Specifically it refers to 'the pretension to universal sovereignty' asserted by the See of Rome, and to 'the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as mediator in the place of her Divine Son'. (17)

The confusion in the discussions at the first Lambeth Conference was a matter of tactics rather than strategy. It did reveal a notable difference of opinion among the Bishops over the source and methods of theology, but this difference was accentuated by the defensiveness that both sides felt with respect to Roman Catholicism. (18)

How best was the Catholicity of Anglicanism to be asserted? By 'holding the line' of the Reformation, no matter how severely that buttress had been under-mined by the Tractarians, or, by claiming the Catholic heritage of the Anglican settlement as its essential patrimony, irrespective of what Rome may claim to the contrary?

In 1878 those questions were answered less ambiguously. By then the Anglican Churches could be described as being,

United under One Divine Head in the fellowship of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, and maintained by the Primitive Church, receiving the same Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation - these Churches teach the same Word of God, partake of the same divinely-ordained Sacraments, through the ministry of the same Apostolic Orders, and worship one God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit, who is given to those that believe, to guide them into all truth. (19)

In fact the story of successive Conferences can be told as one of a gathering self-confidence. This stemmed from the realisation that Anglican claims were best made by reference to historic standards and can be seen in the way the question of unity was broached. (20)

In 1878 tentative overtures were made towards the Old Catholics who had seceded from Rome following the Vatican

Council. (21) Ten years later the Bishops felt able to lay down (in a manner which must be examined shortly) "certain articles as a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion" and to hold themselves "in readiness to enter brotherly Conference with any of those who may desire inter-communion with us in a more or less perfect form". (22) By 1897, they felt they should go further and actually "originate such conferences", while in 1908 the peculiar destiny of the Anglican Communion was seen in "its power and hope of mediating in a divided Christendom". (23) The climax of this journey of self-discovery is found in the 'Appeal to all Christian People' issued by the Conference of 1920, which again will require further consideration in due course. (24)

Two elements in this process should be underlined now however. First, development of Anglican awareness was built-up by reference to universal standards of doctrine, secondly, it was formed in the context of discussion about the Church's unity. Both factors contribute to some of the characteristic strengths and weaknesses of Anglican ecclesiology.

In the first instance, it meant that Anglicanism invited assessment in terms of its relationship to the Church of Christ. The particular historical and cultural background of the English Church and especially the English Reformation was not denied, but it was definitely allotted a secondary significance by comparison with wider norms of Creed, Scripture and so forth. (25) Typically, Anglican self-consciousness was expressed by the Conferences in terms of the Catholic standards. At times this may have served simply to supply tokens of authenticity rather than any convincing demonstration of its existence in the Church, but at best it also served to identify Anglicanism within a wider, universal context of

Christian belief. So a 1930 Conference Committee could speak of a changing connotation to the term 'Anglican' from one implying a purely localised or racial connection to that of spiritual bonds between those whose faith "has been grounded in the doctrines and ideals for which the Church of England has always stood". It went on to specify:

What are these doctrines? We hold the Catholic faith in its entirety: that is to say, the truth of Christ, contained in Holy Scripture; stated in the Apostles and Nicene Creeds; expressed in the Sacraments of the Gospel and the rites of the Primitive Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer with its various local adaptations; and safeguarded by the historic threefold Order of the Ministry.

And what are these ideals? They are the ideals of the Church of Christ. Prominent among them are an open Bible, a pastoral Priesthood, a common worship, a standard of conduct consistent with that worship, and a fearless love of truth. (26)

Such a statement is attractive but it is not in fact as helpful as it appears to be. Nothing is actually said about the substance of the doctrines in which Anglicanism is grounded. Scripture and Creeds are not doctrines but the source of doctrines; Sacraments and Order are doctrinal only to the extent that their significance is explained. Even as ecclesiological norms these articles are formal rather than material. No attempt is made to explain how "doctrines" help to fulfil "ideals", or how the "Catholic faith in its entirety" is related to either of them.

There can be no complaint with the 1930 Conference Committee's Conviction that the term 'Anglican' has undergone a change in meaning. The refusal of Anglican theology to use particular and localised experiences as the over-riding criteria of Christian authenticity has much to commend it. Anglicanism should not be allowed to out-live the credibility of the Christian faith. What is required as well though, is some indication of what it is that the term 'Anglican' connotes in its new field of meaning if it is to

be regarded as anything more than a superfluous synonym for the word 'Christian'?

Consideration of this question indicates the serious limitation imposed upon contemporary Anglicanism by the loss of the 'confessional' strand of its thought. The omission from the 1930 statement of the Articles from the formularies which "set forth" the Anglican bond to the Catholic faith is significant. Indeed the Articles were not referred to by a Lambeth Conference after 1888 until the closing minutes of the tenth conference in 1968. (27) Of course the Articles are the product of their own age and circumstances and are quite inadequate as a permanent Anglican standard. But they do provide an indication of how Anglicanism was conceived at a decisive period of the Western Church's history. That is the confessional stance; to show how the universal standards of the Church are construed by a particular body with respect to central issues of faith and experience. It is necessary for an ecclesiology to align itself by reference to the historic norms of Scripture, Creeds, Sacraments and Order, but it is also necessary to go beyond simple affirmations so as to demonstrate how these standards are used in order to understand the life of the Church and the meaning of the Faith. Since the seventeenth century Anglicans had not found it necessary to so define their general ecclesiological orientation. (28) When it was necessary to undertake that responsibility in the mid-nineteenth century, Anglicanism did not appear to possess the resources necessary for the task. (29)

This deficiency is partly explained by the way in which doctrinal discussions were approached by the Lambeth Conferences. This is the second feature of ecclesiological development in the Anglican Communion which helps to characterise its theological self-understanding: namely that the doctrine of the Church mainly arose in the context of discussions of Christian unity. Again this

leads to some positive aspects of Anglicanism. Anglican ecclesiology represents no idealised picture of the Church. It is not based scholastically, upon abstractions, but carved out of the historic experience of Christians intent upon demonstrating their faith in the real world. On each occasion that the Lambeth Conference has discussed the nature of Anglicanism it has been with the practical motive of either cementing the bonds between Anglican provinces, or in exploring foundations which might be adequate for constructing a re-united Church. While admirable in itself, this fact does still give rise to certain shortcomings. In the one case, concern to establish the common ground within its own Communion tends to reduce Anglicanism's capacity for self-criticism. The fact that some feature is held in common by the churches becomes its own justification without leading on to questions about how such a feature can or should function within the churches. There follows the tendency for conferences to be satisfied when they have simply listed characteristics - Scripture, Creeds, Sacraments, a common Order, the Prayer Book, a shared ethos or ideal - which are supposed to bind Anglicans together. In the other case, the fact that such endeavours have also been attempted in order to lay the groundwork for the re-union has tended, paradoxically, to exhaust Anglicanism's ability to be constructive. Positions have been taken up dialectically or in reaction to the supposed deficiencies of other partners in the dialogue. Hence Anglican ecclesiology has shown the tendency to assume the central features of its heritage which have seemed beyond dispute, and to concentrate upon more peripheral concerns simply because they are the ones which are under scrutiny.

The one factor tends to reinforce the other. Anglican ecclesiology has been developed at practical conferences which deal with problems and are content to summarise agreements; the

resulting sets of generalised theological conclusions provide a convenient 'short-hand' for expressing the general stance of the Anglican Communion rather than a detailed exposition of its doctrinal convictions.

Both of these reasons help to explain why in the effort to delineate its typical features many observers have come to believe that Anglicanism has given disproportionate attention to the discussion of its orders and the defence of its Historic Episcopate. They do not necessarily dispute the value of these institutions, but consider that an undue attachment to them has deflected the Anglican Communion from a fuller appreciation of its own potential. So William Temple, then the Archbishop of York, who had played a leading role in the 1930 Lambeth Conference (although not, be it noted, in the discussion of the Anglican Communion) was led to reflect on what he saw as a major deficiency in its treatment of the reunion issue. A concentration on the separateness of Churches eventually exaggerates the differences between them, he argued. And he concluded:

I am convinced that the Anglican Communion is right to maintain its insistence on the Historic Episcopate, but I am equally convinced that Anglicans think far too much - not necessarily too highly, but assuredly too often and too long - of that same Episcopate. (30)

To pursue this general limitation in the structure of Anglican ecclesiology, as well as the attempts to spell out the substance of Anglican beliefs in particular, it is necessary to return to some of the earlier Lambeth Conferences and the way the reunion issue was treated by them. So far we have seen how the very fact of inter-Anglican discussions imposed upon the Lambeth Conferences the obligation to stipulate the substance of Anglican beliefs, and the way this obligation was accentuated when

Anglicans had to indicate the ways in which their beliefs impinged upon the beliefs of other Christian Communities. We come now to a central feature of Anglican ecumenism which has also become a cornerstone of Anglican ecclesiology, the formulation which became known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

(b) The Lambeth Quadrilateral

As has been indicated, the vision of reunion had been conjured at the first two Lambeth Conferences, but it was not until the third, in 1838, that serious attention was given to the principles upon which Anglican thinking on the subject should be based.

The third conference was held captive by the subject from its first day. (31) The sermon at the opening service and Archbishop Benson's address concentrated attention upon the need for reunion, and when the conference began its business, the first item for consideration was "The Anglican Communion in relation to the Eastern Churches, to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches, to the Old Catholics and Others". During the opening speeches the "Reformed" Churches in view were the small indigenous groups in Italy, Spain and Portugal who had broken away from the papacy following the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility at the Vatican Council. Towards the end of the first session, the Bishop of Jamaica (Dr Nuttall) who had been invited to speak on the "Others", pointed to this as a lacuna in the proceedings. "I have been a little surprised", he began, "that nothing has been said directly .... in regard to our relations to the great bodies of Non-Conformists throughout the world". (32) He went on to stress how on the mission field this deficiency was severely weakening the work of the whole Church. In his opinion it was no longer possible to assert that Presbyterian orders, for instance,

were invalid, especially in the light of the admirable evangelistic and pastoral work performed by Presbyterian clergy. Only an exclusive interpretation of Anglican orders could prevent reunion with such a body, argued Nuttall, and Anglicanism as a whole had never adopted an exclusive position.

This speech was enthusiastically greeted. The Bishop of Rupertsland (Dr Machray) supported it and immediately recorded the wish of his Synod that this whole question be examined. (33) Bishop Barry of Sydney then pressed successfully for the formation of an additional Conference committee to those already planned in order to look at the question thoroughly. A committee of 17 was appointed with Barry as chairman, and with a brief "To consider what steps (if any) can rightly be taken on behalf of the Anglican Communion towards the Reunion of the various Bodies into which the Christianity of the English Speaking Races is Divided".

When the committee first met, on Monday 9th July, it was not altogether clear to those appointed just where their responsibility lay. (34) The comments favourable to the ideal of reunion expressed by the Convocations and by several overseas synods were noted. Various suggestions regarding the committee's agenda were canvassed, until, near the adjournment, A.B. Suter, Bishop of Nelson, recalled that the American Church had recently produced a definite 'scheme' which might provide a basis for discussion. At the next meeting Suter and Nuttall were both able to produce copies of a resolution adopted by the upper house of Protestant Episcopal Church's General Convention, held at Chicago in 1886. (35)

It was of the nature of things that the question of reunion should have arisen in an acute form in the Americas. The Anglican church had taken root there in a pluralistic religious situation from its inception, and the dynamism of American society

even at that time caught up the Church in its train. Even since the 1850's the Convention had been agitated by various memorials seeking to clarify the proper grounds upon which local unions could be contemplated. (36) In response to one very insistent petition, a Committee of Bishops had been appointed in 1830 and had made its report in 1886. This report expressed itself "ready to yield to the utmost in any matter of human ordering" in order to join with all "who desire to stand upon the unchanging basis without which no external unity is possible". The basis, suggested originally in a remarkable book by the evangelical vicar of Grace Church, New York, William Reed Huntington, was then tabulated:

As inherent parts of that sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to wit:

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God.
2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.
3. The two Sacraments - Baptism and the Supper of the Lord - ministered with unfailing use of Christ's word of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.
4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church. (37)

When this statement was tabled before the 1888 Lambeth reunion committee it did not win immediate approval. The Bishop of Brechin and Primus of Scotland, Dr Jermyn, held that the time was not ripe nor the committee competent to evaluate such propositions, but at Barry's urging the American document was taken up as a basis for discussion.

Initially the debate was over verbal details. An introductory sentence was drafted to express the conviction that as far as Non-Conforming Communions were concerned "there would

not only be less difficulty than is commonly supposed as to the basis of a common faith in the essentials of Christian doctrine, but that, even in respect of Church Government, many of the causes which had originally led to secession had been removed". The duty of the Anglican Communion was to indicate the basis on which it conceived that an approach towards reunion might be made. In this respect, the Lambeth formulation was from its first intention rather different from the American original on which it was based. The Quadrilateral was seen by the Lambeth bishops not so much as an inventory of the doctrinal deposit to be safeguarded, as the outline of a foundation on which to build. (38) By comparison the articles themselves were subjected to only minor revisions. The somewhat superficial treatment of Scripture was qualified by an allusion to Article 6; the Apostles Creed was added to the Nicene as a Baptismal symbol; and the two Sacraments were specified as "those ordained by Christ himself". In general these modifications gave the quadrilateral a more comprehensive intonation. The authority of Scripture was only claimed in religious matters, the additional creed sounded a more Catholic note, and reference to the sacraments left open the question of non-dominical ordinances. The fourth item, concerning the Historic Episcopate, was adopted as it stood, although most of the committee's efforts and the bulk of reaction which greeted them was directed at that particular provision.

Throughout, Barry insisted to his committee that the question of the order and validity of ministry should be faced. When the fourth article came under review he again asserted that experience showed Non-Conformists were willing to accept episcopal government in the future if only a way could be found to recognise the authenticity of their ministry in the meantime. Some indication of

what the article on episcopacy did and did not imply was therefore necessary. It was generally accepted in the discussion that reference to historic succession was essential because Anglicans believed "the historic episcopate had existed from the beginning", but that no one theory of episcopacy could be superimposed upon that belief. In the light of this limitation an attempt to add a further article concerning the need for "Confirmation episcopally administered" was defeated. Confirmation was a normative Anglican practice but not a pre-requisite for re-union, it was argued. (39)

Although after the second meeting, the Secretary of the Committee, Kennion, Bishop of Adelaide, was asked to minute only resolutions which had been voted upon, discussion at the next three meetings was apparently prolonged. Notes which were made indicate that the idea of conditional (or what was called "hypothetical") ordination was debated and that "various proposals" were considered on the most suitable way to distinguish a valid from an in-valid ministry. (40) It is obvious that the Scottish bishops were quite opposed to the drift of these deliberations. (41) Others, like Suter and apparently the Secretary himself, were content to identify the points of doctrine and to detail the formulations by which Anglicans might proceed to discuss reunion, but felt that anything more than this would be precipitate. Eventually a report was stitched together. In committee it was adopted by "a large majority" although Jermy and Dowden of Edinburgh indicated that they would seek to introduce a minority report when the Conference considered the Committee's work.

The report as submitted consisted of four sections, each of which concluded with a resolution. (42) The first and longest recalled the recent history of reunion discussions and led up to the restatement

of the Chicago 'quadrilateral'. This was in fact the first resolution, and the committee explained its belief that

upon some such basis as this, with large freedom of variation upon secondary points of doctrine, worship and discipline, and without interference with existing conditions of property and endowment, it might be possible, under God's gracious providence, for a reunited Church, including at least the chief of the Christian Communions of our people, to rest.

There followed a comment on the need for some definite programme of action, and a suggestion that the branches of the Church should "invite Conference" with representatives of other Christian communions. A third section called for "the dissemination of information respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies in use in the Anglican Church". The report concluded with a lengthy reflection on the basic problem which had troubled the Committee. It was also to trouble the Conference. Yet the nettle had to be grasped. "The one crucial difficulty" which confronted any reunion scheme was the recognition by the Anglican Communion of the existing ministries of non-Episcopal Communions. While "the elements of the proposed basis of Reunion" included reference to the Anglican conviction about the Historic Episcopate as it was evidenced in Articles and Ordinal, it had to be recognised (so the argument of the fourth section ran) that while the Anglican Communion could define her own position in this manner "she has nowhere declared that all other constituted ministry is null and void". Furthermore, precedents from the 17th century indicated that special circumstances could permit "exceptional action". Even the High Church divines had at that time recognised that ministers not episcopally ordained were, in certain cases, fit to hold office in the Church of England. (43) The case presented by the committee was essentially that as the need for reunion constituted such "special circumstances" so analagous

"exceptions" would be justified. The final resolution to be presented to the Conference read:

That, in the opinion of this committee, Conferences are likely to be fruitful, under God's blessing, of a practical result, only if undertaken with willingness on behalf of the Anglican Communion - while holding firmly the three-fold order of the Ministry as the normal rule of the Church, to be observed in the future - to recognize, in spite of what we conceive as irregularity, the Ministerial character of those ordained in non-Episcopal Communion, through whom, as Ministers, it has pleased God visibly to work for the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom; and to provide, in such way as may be agreed upon, for the acceptance of such Ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ. (44)

So, on Wednesday 25th July, the report was presented. (45) In his opening speech, Barry threw down the gauntlet urging the adoption of the Report as a whole. Despite the controversial nature of some parts of it, he believed that the urgency of the situation demanded "a new step". If unity was to be discussed at all, it must be made clear from the beginning that Anglicans could not consider other duly constituted non-Episcopal Ministries as null and void or treat them as usurpers in the Christian Ministry.

The debate had been intended to consider each resolution in turn, but opposition was quickly directed against the whole approach of the Committee. The Bishop of Ely, Lord Alwyne Compton, who had been the Chairman of another party examining "Authoritative standards of Doctrine and Worship", rejected what he saw as the attempt to create a new doctrinal formulary. If the report with its Quadrilateral were to be accepted, he claimed, it would "in fact and in practice replace the standards of Doctrine of the Church of England". (46) The Bishop of Brechin (Jermyn) then voiced his deeply-felt opposition. The whole subject of reunion had been

raised prematurely, he began. Any recognition of non-Episcopal ministries would render it impossible for Presbyterians to "come over" to Anglicanism, and make the position of the Episcopal Church in Scotland untenable. Others spoke in the same vein. The Americans, with one exception, were especially vehement. Several felt that their own 1886 resolution had reduced rather than enhanced the prospects of union and the standing of Episcopalians. (47) Of this point of view, Bishop Doane, the Bishop of Albany, was the leading spokesman. (48) God may not be held to Apostolic Order, he conceded, but the Church certainly was. To recognise "the Ministerial Character" of other Communion was either a denial of Article 23 (which the conference was not at liberty to condone) a meaningless and patronising gesture, or it was a trumpet call of uncertain pitch, incapable of calling Christians to battle against Sin and Satan, and only succeeding in stirring up dissension within the Church. "Ministerial Character" was a technical term, meaning that a particular ministry is held to be in the "express image" of Christ's priesthood. Such a claim on behalf of non-Episcopalians went far beyond the intentions of the original American resolutions, and would mean that the 'local adaptation' of the Episcopate would in effect herald a universal dispensation from it.

Defenders of the report reiterated that the Quadrilateral was seen to provide a starting point for discussion not a fixed standard of doctrine, but the opposition was not to be stifled. Barry then indicated that he was willing to surrender the final section of his report (the section which directly addressed the problem of non-episcopal ministries) if the rest could be accepted. Apparently this satisfied enough of the uncommitted Bishops present, and on a division, Resolution II of the 1888 Conference was adopted as follows.

That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion:-

- (A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation", and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- (B) The Apostles Creed as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.
- (C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself - Baptism and the Supper of the Lord - ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.
- (D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adopted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God unto the Unity of His Church. (49)

The remainder of the report was dealt with summarily. It was felt that the Conference itself was not empowered to initiate discussions affecting local unions and so the second resolution was modified and adopted with very little debate, but the third proposal - to disseminate information - met staunch opposition. Despite Suter's explanation of what the committee had hoped for, this was only just carried on a division. (50) Barry then sought leave to withdraw the final section of the report, but others wanted to see the whole thing talked through.

The opposition case was that a sacramental system had to be seen whole, and that therefore the role of Episcopacy within Anglicanism had to be safeguarded as an essential element in that system. Various amendments to the fourth resolution were brought forward, but none won general support. Finally the resolution was put, defeated, and the report re-committed. Two days later, during the hectic final hours of the Conference a rearranged report, which refrained from passing any comment on the position of non-episcopal ministries was submitted and adopted with only minor alterations. (51) The three resolutions accepted

earlier in the week were confirmed en bloc. (52)

So it was that the Lambeth Quadrilateral came into being. For all practical purposes the Bishop of Ely's prophecy that these articles would become a new standard of Anglican doctrine was about to be fulfilled.

As far as can be ascertained, the manner in which the 1888 Home Reunion report was composed has not previously been revealed, except in the personal recollections of some of the Bishops present. Stephenson notes some of the impressions so recorded, commenting that the debate on the Quadrilateral provided "the most fascinating part of the Conference". (53) Curtis is concerned only with the organisational structures of the Conference just mentioning that the Quadrilateral provided "a coherent basis for discussion" of unity; Dewi Morgan has little more to say; and Sydney Dark passes over the formation of the Quadrilateral, including it simply among "various other proposals" put forward at the time. (54)

The new information disclosed above throws some light upon the interpretation of the Quadrilateral itself, and upon the whole procedure of doctrinal definition in the Anglican Communion.

(i) First, it exposes the central role played by Bishop Barry and the colonial bishops as a whole. Conversely, it shows that the American bishops played little part in commending the Chicago precedent for the Lambeth Quadrilateral and that most of the English Bishops were indifferent to the question. Apparently it lay outside their field of interest. It is interesting to note that Lightfoot only contributed to the discussion on one occasion, when he complained that his essay on the Ministry should not be used for special pleading. (55)

(ii) It also indicates the extent of the revision to which the Chicago declaration was subjected. The wording of the

articles was carefully re-phrased and even more, the purpose to which they should be put was re-directed. A.T. Hanson has suggested that a major hindrance to Anglican ecumenical progress stems from the uncertainty as to whether the standards of the Quadrilateral are intended to indicate a maximal or a minimal requirement for Christian Union. (56) Do they represent the pre-condition for all ecumenical negotiation Anglicans are involved in, or are they more of an agenda to indicate the basis upon which a union might be consummated? (57)

It is clear that the proponents of the Quadrilateral in the 1888 conference worked with the second assumption in mind, but that the degree of opposition this aroused meant that a more ambiguous approach was necessary. Barry certainly felt that the constructive power of the Quadrilateral was lost when the fourth explanatory section of the report was dropped.

(iii) This tendency towards ambiguity is a consequence of the policy of defining doctrinal positions by reference to universal standards, but without allowing interpretation or application of them. This is evident in the 1888 discussion. Under the circumstances, and as a response to contemporary Roman Catholic claims, it was necessary for the early Lambeth Conferences to identify Anglican doctrine pre-eminently with the universal standards of the Church. However, without any corresponding particularisation of Anglican beliefs, a number of questions about faith and order were left open - and increasingly these questions became the crucial ones.

The limitations imposed by this situation will become apparent in the next section. A series of interpretive glosses was given to the Quadrilateral at succeeding Conferences. This gave rise to the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 and even to the treatment

given to the subject of unity by the 1968 Conference. To speak of this sequence as a development or a progression of thought is rather misleading though. In effect the debate throughout the sequence of Conferences is the same. The position Barry wanted to adopt is virtually identical with that explored in the "Appeal to All Christian People." The 'progress' towards a consensus on questions of unity represents a diminution of dissent more than the clear resolution of doctrinal uncertainties. It seems that the eclipse of Anglicanism's confessional dimension condemns it to constantly recapitulate the confessional task until the underlying theological ambiguity is resolved.

Whether this procedure signifies an inherent self-contradiction within the Anglican synthesis or an effective, if ungainly method of ecclesiological definition, must await a closer examination of the facts and especially a discussion of the notion of comprehensiveness at the conclusion of this chapter.

In the meantime the positive achievement of the early Lambeth Conferences must not be overlooked. Anglicans, in their new guise as world citizens, had begun to undertake the responsibility of defining their doctrinal positions in a way which the Church of England had not been required (or able) to do for over two centuries. By 1888 the specification of the essential standards with which Anglicanism was to be identified had provided the Lambeth Conferences with the method by which it sought to fulfil that responsibility, and also the essential problem which it entailed. In one of the concluding speeches of the 1888 Conference, Edward Bickersteth, then a young missionary bishop in Japan, had reduced the major theme of the meeting to its simplest terms. From his point of view, that of the Christian Church in the East, two things were needful: first to maintain the importance

of the historic orders of ministry, and secondly, to promote the cause of unity in the Faith. Both were urgent. The difficulty was in finding the means to advance both causes without sacrificing either one of them. (58)

## 2. THE QUEST FOR UNITY

Inasmuch as the need for doctrinal definition arose for the Anglican Communion in the context of Christian unity discussions it is fitting that further explication of Anglicanism's distinctive claims should proceed by a closer examination of these debates. Here especially the question of episcopal order most clearly presented itself. The problems inherent in the questions of ministerial character were compounded for Anglicans by a critical failure of English dogmatic theology.

The retention of the episcopate by the English reformers was not in itself a contentious issue. The actual detailed arrangement of the Church's government was not at first a concern in England or on the Continent. The reformers were content with any provision which ensured the proper preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. None of the first series of Reformation standards rejected episcopacy, only the improper exercise of its powers. The Augsburg Confession is typical in stipulating that ecclesiastical authority was to be distinguished from civil power. The judgement of godly and learned men was,

that the power of the keys, or the power of the Bishops is a power or commandment of God to preach the Gospel, to remit and retain sins, and to administer the Sacraments .... Bishops do not have power to institute anything contrary to the Gospel .... our purpose is not to have authority taken from the bishops, but this one thing only is requested, that they would suffer the Gospel purely to be taught, and that they would relax a few observances, which cannot be received without sin. (59)

The Schmalkaldic Articles similarly approved "real bishops" who would ordain and confirm reformed ministers, although "not as though it were a matter of necessity", while Calvin's well known insistence on the primacy of Word and Sacraments meant that he

was able to recognise the true Church under many forms of order. (60)  
 He urged that "one Church should not despise another because of diversity of outward discipline". (61) In this matter the Church of England's position in Articles 19 and 20, and the provision for ordering of the ministry in Article 23 is at one with the reformed churches. The perpetuation of episcopal orders in the Ordinal attached to the Book of Common Prayer sought to amalgamate these convictions with many of the traditional features of earlier Roman and Gallican rites. (62)

If the existence of episcopacy in the Reformation settlement was uncontroversial, the rationale for its continuation was not. Although the Preface to the first prayer book was optimistic in its assessment of the self-evident scriptural examples of the three-fold order of ministry, the actual claims made for episcopacy there are modest. The Ordinal is supplied so that the traditional forms of ministry "may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England". Estimates varied however. While the contents of the Ordinal as well as the interpretive standards of the Articles stood as contradictions to extreme sacerdotalist views of ministerial order, the unfolding of reformation history presented questions as to whether such order was necessary at all. The classic definition of Anglican polity was worked out by Whitgift and Hooker in response to puritan complaints and this was strengthened by the 1662 revisers, following the disorders of the Commonwealth. (63) The conclusion of the former was that questions of church government were not finally decreed in Scripture and that episcopal order was certainly a permissible alternative; for the latter, this alternative was necessary for the good order of the English church and nation. (64)

However the mere affirmation that something is not forbidden is

not a strong defence when feelings about the subject run high. This was the case at several points in English church history, and became a crucial issue for the Tractarians. In an illuminating editorial comment, John Keble regretted that Hooker and the other Anglican apologists of that era, failed to take the highest ground in their defence of episcopal succession.

It is enough, with them, to show that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy sacraments. (65)

Different interpretations of episcopacy had been put forward throughout the 17th and 18th century, but it was the Tractarians' first insistence that "we must necessarily consider none to be really ordained who have not been thus ordained" that introduced a new element to the Anglican dialectic. (66) With the ascendancy of High Church opinion in the Church of England, the exclusive view of episcopal government gradually became the virtual sine qua non of Anglican polity.

This fact provides the necessary background for Lambeth Conference discussions about Anglicanism and unity, and the progressive hardening of Anglican opinion can be seen by a simple contrast between two High Church spokesmen. The Reverend Charles Wordsworth, Master of Trinity and brother of the poet, was encouraged by the Archbishop of Canterbury to publish Theophilus Anglicanus in 1843. His intention was to steady those who were sympathetic to the aims of the Oxford Movement but unsettled by Newman's defection. He strongly upheld the doctrines of apostolic succession and the office of bishops as the divinely appointed guarantors of the Christian Ministry, but along with them, he also defended the special relationship of the Church of England to the state. On that basis he was willing to argue that Free-Churchmen



and dissenters were also members of the national Church.

Wordsworth's eirenic dictum - "children, if disobedient children" can hardly have pleased non-Anglicans but it did represent a serious attempt to do justice to episcopal claims and also to the historic existence of other Christian bodies within the English nation. Forty years later, Charles Gore could write

It is absolutely certain that for a large number of centuries it had been understood beyond all question that only Bishops could ordain .... it follows then - not that God's grace has not worked and worked largely through many an irregular ministry where it was exercised in good faith, but - that a ministry not episcopally received is invalid, that is to say it falls outside the conditions of covenant security and cannot justify itself in terms of the covenant. (67)

This movement of thought from regarding non-episcopal ministries as disorderly in the one case to irregular in the other, throws light upon the debate of the Quadrilateral during the 1888 Lambeth Quadrilateral. (68)

This gathering contest over the nature of ministerial authority was complicated however by the fact that English theology was called upon to face a time of rigorous testing.

From a sociological stand-point, the disruption of traditional demographic patterns by the industrial revolution also broke up what remained of the corporate life and values upon which the English religious tradition had been sustained. (69) The replacement of religious by political norms, a process which accompanied the emergence of the collectivist state, also resulted in a reduction in the status of religion to individualistic and personal concerns and a corresponding refusal to allow religion to enter the public domain, except in so far as it applied to questions of personal morality. (70) Certainly the whole spirit of liberal reform which ebbed and flowed through the 19th century had the overall

effect of withdrawing intellectual sanction from any position of privilege. As far as the Church of England was concerned its privileged property and position escaped more lightly than did its system of belief.

At a different level, the doubts which assailed English theological scholarship during this period can be seen as a result of the eventual breaking down of the intellectual isolation of the English Church by forces unleashed at the time of the Enlightenment. (71) More conventionally, it demonstrates the eroding effect of modern studies in science, philosophy and history upon traditional patterns of faith. (72) In either case the study of the historical antecedents of the Church or the development of its dogma appears to represent a means by which it was possible to maintain intellectual credibility which was denied to concerns of a more metaphysical nature.

A related approach could follow lines suggested by the history of ideas. In this, at least one effect of Enlightenment rationalism is seen in a re-awakening of confidence in sentiment, over against probability, as the very guide of life. (73) If religion is not to find its public bulwark in reason or revelation, then perchance it is best defended from a position of inward repose in the soul. Hence the evangelicals' appeal to personal conversion, the Tractarians affinity for elements of romanticism, the liberal predilection towards religious 'sensation' and the idealism of T.H. Green, all illustrate the way in which English theology altered. It turned from the study of fundamental, dogmatic issues towards a concentration on precedents and examples drawn from selected normative periods of the past.

Certainly by the end of the century there was more than a little truth to Mark Pattison's complaint that "Our clergy know

only of pamphlets which must be either for or against one or other of the parties in the Church". (74)

English theological scholarship survived through the acknowledged brilliance of its historical and textual studies. This by-passing of synthetic and confessional theology, along with the disinterest of the evangelicals and the isolation of liberal churchmen meant that debate on the historical and prudential grounding of episcopacy was left to dominate Anglican thinking. (75)

In the well known confrontation between Hatch and Gore, following the former's 1880 Bampton Lectures, it seemed that the only question to trouble Anglican theology was the precise shape that its defence of episcopal form and order should take. (76)

This brief survey of one aspect of English theological history throws into relief the issues which confounded the discussion of ministry by the Lambeth Conferences after 1888. The overseas bishops continued to take a significant part in Conference business but the discussions tended to reflect the situation of the English church in the first instance. Moreover, the nature of the Conferences militated against the possibility of producing any new theological synthesis. The office of bishops is primarily conservative and pastoral, and although the Conferences contained notable theologians among their number, they tended to reflect on past decades rather than pioneer the way into those which were to come. It is regrettable however that the one forum available for Anglican consultation was not able to give a clearer lead concerning questions of moment. For instance, while Colenso provided the material reason for calling the inaugural Lambeth Conference, the problems of 'The Critical Study of the Bible' did not appear on the Conference agenda until 1897, while 'The Faith and Modern Thought' did not come up until 1908. There was no

reference to the subject of Ritualism in 1858 although the Lincoln case was due to come before the English church in 1889. The Conferences of 1897 and 1908 provided no comment on the Royal Commission dealing with ecclesiastical discipline which reported in 1904, and despite its achievements the 1920 Conference provided no inkling of the modernist controversy which erupted from the Modern Churchmen's Fellowship conference at Girton in 1921. (77)

Alternatively, the cautiousness characteristic of a body of Bishops meant that the official emphasis upon episcopal order was not as extreme as might be expected. The 1888 formula which stated that "The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted" was a necessary foundation for any proposed union without offering any explanation of the clause was, as has been seen, a compromise measure. The ambivalence revealed at that time was not easily resolved, but something more was plainly required. The unfolding response of following Conferences can now be considered.

(a) The Quadrilateral elaborated

When the 1897 assembly convened, the reunion issue was again prominent on the agenda. (78) The committee dealing with the question was grateful for a series of sympathetic exchanges with Orthodoxy, and attempted to mask the disappointment with which the Roman Catholic denial of Anglican Orders in Apostolicae Curae had been received some ten months earlier. (79) It was at least a reasoned document, they conceded. In neither case could any imminent reconciliation be expected.

Much more hopeful however was the interest which had been expressed by non-Episcopalian bodies as a result of the circulation of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. In confirming its provisions, this committee went on to state that no concessions could be made on these four points because they represented "the Catholic and

Apostolic inheritance bequeathed by our Lord, and that not only for ourselves, but for millions who speak our language in every land - possibly for humanity at large". (80) Self consciously aware of the enormity of such a claim, the report proceeded to acknowledge a jibe of Lord Macaulay that the Anglican faith was "almost as local as the court of common pleas" but set against that the remark of "a Roman Catholic jurist" who had seen in the English Church the capacity to combine irreconcilable substances! No attempt was made to explore these remarks or explain how such wonder-working powers might be used, but the Anglican strength was at least claimed in "its quiet adherence to truth, its abstinence from needless innovation, its backbone of historical continuity". (81)

More specifically, the Committee welcomed the general acceptance by other Churches of the first three articles of the Quadrilateral. For some it even seemed that acceptance of the fourth Article was within the bounds of possibility. A study undertaken by the Church of Scotland was cited as support for this optimism. Finally, a well argued section presented again the imperative need for unity and repeated Anglican willingness to explore means of responding to it. On this occasion an active readiness to initiate such projects was added to the more passive response with which the 1888 Conference had contented itself.

A.M.G. Stephenson dismisses this report as simply 'quoting' the Quadrilateral, but it did rather more than that. (82) A defence of the Quadrilateral, even if only by way of simple affirmations, was begun, and provides telling evidence of the way in which the Quadrilateral (despite the misgivings expressed at its inception), had begun to win the support of a number of people. The gathering self-confidence of successive Conferences has already been noted. It is not too much to claim that the Quadrilateral hastened that

process, and was rapidly to become the cornerstone of Anglican apologetics.

This process was continued at the next Conference in 1908. By then it was clearly possible to speak of Lambeth as a continuing process. The fifth Conference received several reports commissioned in 1897, and a number of the bishops attending had been involved in previous years. (83) The architectural influence of Randall Davidson (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1901 - 1925) had moreover begun to have its full effect on the development of Anglican policy. 1908 also marked a high point of Anglican self-awareness in the Pan-Anglican Congress which met immediately prior to the Conference. (84)

At the Conference itself, considerable attention was given to the organisation of the Anglican Communion, while in connection with a study of "Modern Thought" the formative influence of the Creeds was emphasised. The Encyclical combined both topics with that of reunion when it spoke of "The peculiar position of our Communion, with its power and hope of mediating in a divided Christendom, (which) has long been recognised by members of our own Churches and by others". (85) This fact must encourage greater efforts in the cause, it concluded.

The Conference's reunion committee reported at length. The priority must remain 'Home Reunion' achieved with "spiritual motives and upon Catholic lines". (86) Among other possibilities, constructive conversations with 'the Latin Church of the West' still faced barriers which "we cannot of ourselves remove" it recorded. Still, no schemes of reunion "can be regarded as satisfactory which deliberately leave out the Churches of the Latin Communion". (87) As far as the Orthodox were concerned, some permanent and official lines of communication should now be established to build upon the

good-will developed so far. Of other negotiations, those with the Swedish Lutheran Church were note-worthy. A number of clarifications had been made but the assurance "that the actual succession of the Swedish episcopate is unbroken" was especially welcome. (88)

This demonstrates again the pattern and the limitation of Anglican theological definition at this time. Doctrinal agreement is assumed to rest in common possession of the Catholic creeds, while ecumenical encounter is largely restricted to ascertaining the security of respective episcopal pedigrees.

Warming to its principal task, possible reunion with Presbyterian and non-Episcopal Churches, the committee did make some **advances**. Once again this section of the report began by affirming that much doctrine - the first 3 articles of the Quadrilateral for instance - was held as common stock with these bodies too. Moreover, in some quarters the idea of ministerial orders being historically communicated by presbytery could provide a basis for negotiating remaining differences, it was felt. As yet the will to overcome the barrier of a common ministry was not universal, but as a token the committee put forward as an analogy for discussion, the per saltum Scottish consecrations of 1610. (89)

This little known event in Scottish history had taken place at an important point in the convoluted struggle between episcopacy and presbyterianism. In the convulsive years immediately after the Reformation it was not at first the existence of bishops which disturbed the Scots, but the sort of authority which was ascribed to the rite of their consecration. From 1572 until 1592, as a compromise, titular bishops were permitted in the Scottish Church with the powers of superintendency. (90) In effect these men fulfilled an episcopal function without receiving an episcopal consecration. Eventually a hard line **Presbyterianism** prevailed

and the 'bishops' were banished, ironically at the very time when the popular abhorrence of episcopacy was beginning to wane. With the accession of James VI/I to the English throne (1603) a positive approval of bishops began to be expressed and in 1610 a General Assembly gave full recognition to the idea of episcopal government. As almost his final official act, the Archbishop of Canterbury Richard Bancroft (1604 - 1610), invited three Scottish bishops to London where he arranged for their episcopal position to be regularized. In fact not all points of Canon Law could be fulfilled. The bishops had certainly not been episcopally consecrated prior to this, but neither had they been episcopally ordained. Anxious to avoid misunderstanding, Bancroft waived that objection on the ground that the ordination of presbyters was sufficient if episcopal ordination could not be obtained. (91) This was the doctrine of per saltum ordination.

This situation was not brought forward in 1908 as a simple precedent. The committee explicitly denied that they were recommending a repetition of this method for conferring episcopal orders on a presbyterian church. They were not ignorant of the ambiguities involved. But the proposal did represent a new ingredient in Anglican ecumenical policy. Given the traditional insistence on episcopal order on the one hand, this 17th century case on the other opened up the possibility of justifying certain interim arrangements in order to achieve a unification of ministry which could not be otherwise found. There was no blue print to suggest, but just the beginnings of new approaches to the question of Christian unity.

The committee believe that such arrangements might be framed as would respect the convictions of those who had long and faithfully fulfilled their ministry in Presbyterian orders, without any surrender on our part of the essential principle, laid down in the Preface to our Ordinal, that those who are to minister the Word and Sacraments in the Churches of the Anglican Communion must have been episcopally ordained. In the process of time the two streams of Christian life would mingle in the one Church, strengthened by the benefits which each of these contributory streams would be able to bring to the other. (92)

This suggestion, while tentative enough, was nevertheless destined to have some important implications in succeeding conferences. In effect, the door-way slammed shut on the positive proposals of the 1888 Committee was re-opened here by this recognition of the worth of non-episcopal ministries. The Anglican position was found to hang on the horns of a very powerful dilemma.

Anglican churchmen must contend for a valid Ministry as they understand it and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves and for any Communion of which they are members. But it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other Communions. (93)

The two sides of this paradox give rise, quite directly, to what can be described as the most outstanding achievement, and as the most disturbing failure of the Lambeth Conferences so far: respectively, the general principles on which Anglicans should proceed towards union as laid down in the 'Appeal to All Christian People', and the difficulty of applying these principles to the specific proposals put forward by the Church of South India.

(b) The Lambeth Appeal

The "Appeal", launched by the Conference of July 1920, can be realistically described as "a land-mark in Christian history", even if it hardly lived up to the claim of its first advocate, to give

"a new impetus to the whole cause" of reunion. (94) The story of the framing of the Appeal and the events which followed it has been often told, but closer examination of its "vision" of a Church "genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who 'profess and call themselves Christians'" is necessary at this point.

In R.H. Lloyd's estimate of the Appeal,

Its influence lay in the Catholicity of experience of the bishops who issued it, in the circumstances of the moment in history when it was proclaimed, and in the actual phrasing and arrangements of its contents. (95)

Each of these points - the circumstances and the leadership behind its composition, as well as the actual framing of the Appeal's provisions - deserves comment.

Certainly the circumstances which lay behind the Appeal's composition were dramatic enough. The sixth Conference had originally been due to meet in 1918, but the prolongation of the Great War had of course rendered that impossible. The Bishops eventually met at the earliest practicable moment after the Armistice. They did so aware both of the enormity of the recent hostilities and equally, of the problems posed by what already appeared to be an unsatisfactory peace settlement. The theme of the Conference was "Fellowship", and it was introduced in relation to a number of human, industrial and international problems. However, the Conference is remembered for its work on the subject of Christian unity, and that because it was here most evident that a new era stood desperately in need of a new approach. The old complacencies had been shaken and the reunion of Christians had come to be seen "not as a laudable ambition or a beautiful dream, but as an imperative necessity". (96)

If the world had been changed since 1908, so had the church.

The ecumenical movement, long germinating in the seed-bed of co-operation on the mission fields of the nineteenth century, came to life at the 1910 International Missionary Conference in Edinburgh. After some uncertainty, the Church of England was officially represented by Gore, E.S. Talbot, (Bishop of Southwark) and W.H. Frere, superior of the newly formed Community of the Resurrection. (97) Other Anglicans were also present, and among them was Bishop Charles Brent, Bishop of Pennsylvania. He returned to this diocese fired by what he had seen at the Conference, and was instrumental in launching the effort for a greater theological understanding of the progress towards reunion. This was to come to fulfilment in the first Faith and Order meeting, held at Lausanne in 1927. So the experience of the bishops and especially the broadening of their theological convictions by wider contacts with non-episcopalians was an important factor in making the Lambeth Appeal possible.

While it is possible to idealise the importance of the Edinburgh Conference, nevertheless the years immediately following it witnessed a remarkable outburst of energy in the cause of reunion. When the 1920 Unity Committee met at Lambeth there was placed before it a mountain of material relating to the participation of Anglicans in union discussions from places as diverse as North America, Gibraltar, India, Singapore, China, Scotland, Ireland, Capetown and Sydney. A new degree of spontaneity was evident too. John Mott's Student Volunteer Movement underscored a dominant mood among younger Christians, and consciously saw itself responsible to "move the churches" to a clearer appreciation of their position in a changing order of things. (98) When Lang, the Archbishop of York, addressed the Lambeth Conference on the subject of unity and cited the aphorism of Edmund Burke that the decrees of providence

could be read in the current of human affairs, he had good reason to believe that the tide had turned so far as his topic was concerned. (99)

Perhaps the most significant event for Anglicanism in the period between the fifth and sixth Lambeth Conferences, was in the 1913 meeting, insignificant in itself, between representatives of various churches in East Africa at Kikuyu. The proposals for a future Federation of Churches in the area were not really remarkable but the joint communion service with which the Conference ended, caused an enormous fuss. Randall Davidson as Archbishop of Canterbury was subjected to sustained pressure from all around the Anglican Communion to adjudicate in the affair. He refrained from any action until the Central Consultative Body set up by the 1908 Lambeth Conference could be convened, and that body considered the question for five days at the end of July 1914. (100) Its conclusion was rather more measured than the caricature that is usually placed upon it (i.e. that the Kikuyu service was an event "eminently pleasing to God and on no account to be repeated") but focussed the problem facing Anglicans in any co-operative situation: exceptions to Catholic order could only be made where rules were clearly understood. Precipitate action, no matter how well motivated, could only serve the purpose of discord, not unity.

In this light, the achievement of the Lambeth Appeal is at least partially a result of the second factor, the enlarged experience of the Bishops concerned.

The sixth conference witnessed a considerable change in the personnel attending. (101) Those who came were united by their experience of the war through which they had passed, and deeply impressed by their experience of ecumenical engagements. But above all they were influenced by a changing climate of opinion, namely the

moderation of the predominantly Catholic understanding of the Anglican tradition.

The way in which Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar (1908 - 1924) and chief adversary of the Kikuyu proposals, came to support the essentially similar approach of the Lambeth Appeal was memorable. Weston though was always an individualist and hardly deserves to be taken as representing a general mood. (102) However the influence of Gore can be taken as a much more reliable indicator. Although Gore only attended one Lambeth Conference, and that for but a few days, his position was most influential throughout this period. (103) The uncompromising position adopted towards non-episcopal communions in his earlier writings has already been noted. (104) Although the representative of second generation Tractarians who were wishing to adopt the canons of literary and historical criticism for their understanding of Scripture, Gore was quite unwilling to contemplate anything but a fully orthodox formulation of Catholic faith and order. For him the dogma of episcopacy was the foundation stone on which was laid all Christian ministry and mission. This remained so throughout his life, but increasing contact with non-conformists made for some softening of the tone in which his convictions were expressed. (105) In his opening address to the 1920 Conference, Lang was able to quote as Gore's assessment of non-episcopal ministries: "To deny God's presence with them and His co-operation with their work and ministry would seem to me to approach blasphemy against the Holy Spirit". (106) However for Gore at least, the way by which such ministries could be incorporated in the Church remained that of submission to episcopal order. (107) To him the Lambeth Appeal was to appear noble in sentiment but flawed in its execution. While it rightly acknowledged what non-Conformists had to give to a United Church, it was ambiguous

as to what it was they must receive. (108)

All those who claimed to carry on the tradition of the Oxford Movement were faced by a similar paradox. They found it increasingly difficult to deny the reality of non-episcopal ministrations or the will for reunion, and at the same time to maintain their unequivocal convictions regarding the necessity of episcopal succession. (109) Darwell Stone, Gore's successor at Pusey House, while an uncompromising defender of Tractarian orthodoxy had been forced to conclude that the Church of England's formularies only specified that episcopal ordination should be unfailingly practised. They did not exclude anyone from holding the opinion that episcopacy is not a theoretical necessity in the Church. (110) Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's contribution to Essays Catholic and Critical indicates how at this time he found it impossible to adopt the simple Tractarian apologia for historic succession. (111) E.J. Bicknell's avowedly Catholic Theological Introduction, first published in 1919, contained the acknowledgement that Non-Conformist ministries should be spoken of as "precarious" rather than "invalid" and that Anglicans had no cause to deny that non-Conformists possessed the means of grace. (112) T.A. Lacey added the note that all ministry was to some extent precarious, in that all Christians were more or less schismatic. (113) Lacey's position as a recognised High Churchman who was unable to sustain the strict orthodoxy of the older Tractarian position, was important in 1920. Undoubtedly his reservations were shared by a number of the Bishops at Lambeth, and he exercised a direct influence upon them both as a witness before the Reunion committee and as an authority whose support gave several wavering High Church bishops the confidence to accept the principles of the Lambeth Appeal. (114)

It was this willingness by many of those considered to be

guardians of the Tractarian vision to moderate the historical and dogmatic certitude of their position, that made the Lambeth Appeal possible. For many, Gore and Stone for instance, that moderation was limited to a mere acknowledgement of positive qualities in non-conformist ministries, but for others the new era called forth a radical re-appraisal of the meaning of Catholic order. What was more, a variety of alternative theological systems had begun to emerge in England. O.C. Quick and William Temple had anticipated the position of Lacey, although from the standpoint suggested by F.D. Maurice rather than Pusey. (115) The Bampton Lectures of A.C. Headlam (shortly to become Bishop of Gloucester), entitled The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion, which sought to undermine the historical grounds upon which a strict interpretation of apostolic succession could be built, exercised very considerable influence upon the Conference. (116) Further, by 1920, a number of Bishops were openly asserting that it was a moral and theological necessity that Anglicanism positively recognise the claims of the Protestant denominations and actively seek a reconciliation with them, no matter what the cost to supposed Anglican sensitivities. In 1908, Hensley Henson had preached a sermon prior to the Anglican Congress urging this point of view and had repeated it regularly since. (117) By 1920 he was about to move from the See of Hereford to that of Durham, and was able to exercise something of the enhanced authority of that post.

In such an atmosphere of contending viewpoints, the successful composition of the Lambeth Appeal is a tribute to the third element of Lloyd's evaluation, the skilful drafting and organisation of its contents.

The story of the impasse reached in the discussion of reunion with non-episcopal churches, and how a group consisting of the two

Archbishops, Rhineland of Pennsylvania, Brent, Wood of Peterborough, and Edith Davidson (whose name was omitted from Bell's account) sat on the lawn together and settled upon the idea of issuing an appeal in order to try and break the dead-lock, is well-known. (118) The real achievement behind it must not be overlooked however. Davidson himself did not expect as much from the Conference. (119) The full Reunion committee received its initial evidence in a highly charged atmosphere. (120) When the committee divided, the Moderator of the Evangelical Free Church Council, Tissington Tatlow, Canon Lacey, Temple and Quick all appeared before its 'non-episcopal' section to urge a more generous treatment of the topic. Temple and Quick reflected the conclusions of the Mansfield College Conference held earlier in the year, which saw the task of reunion, not as a treaty between separate states but as a practical effort for the reconciliation of members in a single family. (121) "A basis must be found" insisted Temple, "in the fact that each has gifts to bestow that the other lacks. Episcopacy must vindicate its spiritual value". (122) Reports were also given concerning recent proposals for a united church in South India, and on some of the implications of the Kikuyu affair.

In that situation the idea of an Appeal was born on the Sunday afternoon mid-way through the Conference, introduced to the committee by Lang next morning, and brought to realisation by a number of the younger bishops including Brent, Weston, Neville Talbot, Azariah of Dornakal and E.J. Palmer of Bombay with G.K.A. Bell acting as their pen-man. (123) By the end of the week it had been vigorously debated by the whole committee, and thereafter adopted by an overwhelming majority on the floor of the Conference. (124) It was incorporated in the Conference Resolutions and remains the most enduring document produced by any

of the Lambeth Conferences.

The Appeal itself can be seen to embody a number of innovative features. (125)

First, it captures something of the new approach which Lang had seen to be so necessary. The very fact that it was an appeal and not simply a report or scheme was significant. It was an appeal moreover which was not addressed merely to member Churches of the Anglican Communion, but to "All Christian People" and it was issued with something of that sense of urgency which the times made compelling. The whole tone of the document is affected accordingly. It does not seek to lay out conditions or terms of union, but sets forth a "vision" of the Church wherein "all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made servicable to the whole Body of Christ". (Section IV). It was this expressed willingness by Anglicans to receive the benefits possessed by other communions that largely explains the impact that the Appeal made on the Churches which responded to it. This was more than a ploy. The shift of focus from the problems bequeathed by the past to the hope projected on the future represents a profoundly theological movement. The idea of Catholicity is thus seen more as something which has yet to be achieved than as a quality once possessed and now by some means to be restored to reluctant churches. (126)

Secondly, this perspective called forth a new articulation of the doctrinal foundations of unity. In the preamble it was stated "we acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership of the universal Church of Christ which is His body". Charles Gore had resigned his Episcopate

largely over the question of whether full membership of the Church hung on baptism alone or whether baptism required its completion in episcopal confirmation, so this statement at the beginning of the Appeal, if not an innovation, at least came down on one side of an ambiguity in contemporary Anglican thought. (127) This being the case, reunion had to be seen as "an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith" by all who are members of Christ's Church. (Paragraph V) There was no question of 'unchurching' any body of baptised believers, or of seeing reunion as a process whereby one group was admitted to share the privileges possessed solely by another. Consequently the questions of doctrinal agreement had to be carefully worded. Paragraph VI read:

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.

Here plainly is a major re-statement of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. Most apparent is the way in which the first two propositions of the Quadrilateral have been coalesced, but of greater significance is the way the whole function of the statement is seen to operate. Rather than a 'basis' of agreement or a doctrinal pre-condition from which union may be approached, the Appeal spoke of doctrinal unanimity as the outcome which an approach to reunion would make necessary. This is well illustrated by the third article. Whereas in 1888 the conference had stipulated that certain requirements,

namely the words of institution and the elements instituted by Christ, were necessary for proper sacramental procedures, the formulation in 1920 tended to assume that a Christian community would inevitably find a sacramental expression for its fellowship, and so simply stated the belief that in Baptism and Eucharist a sufficient expression of this fellowship would be found. In the one case conditions were laid down which participants in reunion would be expected to negotiate: on the other, the fruit of Christian experience was summoned as a guide to their future expectations. Most important though is the treatment given to the paragraph on ministry. Here reference to the Historic Episcopate is altogether absent. The need of a united Church is instead identified as that of a universally acknowledged ministry. (128) Such acknowledgement would rest both on the reality of inward assurance and the extent of outward authorisation such ministry possessed. With this in mind, the claims for Episcopal government were made in a separate section (Paragraph VII). Plainly the Holy Spirit "blessed and owned" ministries not possessing the Episcopate, it asserted, but the arguments of history and experience suggested that Episcopacy "is now and will prove to be the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church".

It is this spirit of realism, historicity and experience and the effort to exclude empty ideals, dogma and a priori considerations that marks the change in direction of the 1920 Appeal. It is not fair to claim that the Appeal represents a dilution of the Lambeth Quadrilateral as L.A. Haselmeier alleges. (129) The Appeal represented a further stage in Lambeth's attempt to explain the meaning of the Quadrilateral. As has been seen, what was accomplished in 1920 was no more than Barry's Reunion committee had intended to say in 1888. The 1920 Conference simply found the

occasion and opportunity to clarify what had previously remained ambiguous. Particular interpretations, especially relating to the Episcopate, could be read 'into' the Quadrilateral: it was very hard to read them 'out of' the Lambeth Appeal. (130)

(c) The Appeal discussed

Despite its historic importance, the Appeal actually achieved comparatively little as far as the fulfilment of reunion was concerned. It was well received by a wide range of churches and churchmen, and numerous discussions were initiated upon its proposals throughout the world. (131) Despite its eirenic tones, and a genuine clarification of the Anglican position which it represented, a central dilemma still remained. After the Conference Davidson reflected upon the inevitable problem,

which they will say is this, 'Episcopal ordination is vital - You outsiders have not got it - Come to us and we will give it to you, and thus for the first time you will be ordained, and we shall be able to regard you as acquiescent in the theory that we have always held that the whole thing turns on Apostolic succession'. To say this would have an element of truth, but it would be quite unfair if expressed as I have here written it. We do distinctly believe that the Church cannot be rightly organised and managed in the future except on episcopal lines. The Non-Episcopal people in many Conferences have nearly all of them said so. But what they want is that we should say that it is not important enough to render it necessary that we should ask those who are already Ministers to receive Episcopal ordination. Therefore we will simply recognise their Ministry as it is in the hope and expectation that they will gradually transform it into an Episcopal system in the future. This I am quite sure we cannot say (apart from the question as to whether it is fundamentally sound) without creating at once and irrevocably a deep schism among our own people and giving triumph to the Romans and others who would laugh such a conference to scorn. Thus the difficulty really consists in our finding a mode of getting over the intervening period without either evoking defiance from Non-Episcopalians, or creating among ourselves an incurable Schism". (132)

By and large the will to overcome this obstacle was lacking. (133)

To the Central Consultative Body, in July 1927, Archbishop Lang expressed the opinion "that the desire for Reunion was still insufficient, and that since 1920 the whole subject had been kept too much within the orbit of special Committees". (134)

Thus the impetus slackened. By then though a notable exception to this generalisation had become apparent. It was to trouble Lambeth Conferences on several occasions.

The Church of South India became the test case against which the doctrinal development of Anglican self-consciousness would be traced. The procedure by which the South Indian Church was born is well known. (135) For the purposes of this study however its importance lies in the fact that this represented the first clear attempt by Episcopal and Non-Episcopal communions to unite on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and to provide a solution to the problem of inaugurating a union which had so dismayed Davidson.

The first direct move towards a united Indian Church took place at a Conference held at the Lutheran Mission of Tranquebar from April 29 to May 2nd, 1919. At this gathering, representatives from the Anglican, Wesleyan, Swedish Lutheran, and South Indian United Church (an earlier local amalgamation of Congregational and Presbyterian groupings) missions met unofficially. It came to the conclusion that a Church uniting Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal elements could be formed by means of a mutual service of commissioning for all participating ministers at the hands of bishops who had been duly elected and consecrated from among the four different groupings. The Lambeth Quadrilateral was specifically cited in the Conference's Manifesto on the doctrinal basis for union, and the phraseology of the 1908 Lambeth Conference was utilised in spelling out the comprehensive character of the church. (136)

The 1920 Conference committee received a report on the progress

of South Indian thinking, which in some respects foreshadowed the approach outlined in the Appeal. (137) However the Lambeth resolutions met with a mixed reception in India. Supporters of the Manifesto looked eagerly to Lambeth for encouragement in the approach they had taken, but the Appeal and its supporting resolutions proved a mixed blessing for them. Most non-Anglican participants had proceeded on the understanding that episcopacy should be strictly qualified as a functional office and one to be exercised within a system of absolutely equal ministries. To them the Appeal, despite its wording, seemed to suggest that some form of re-ordination was necessary. The idea of a ministry "owned and blessed by God" and yet lacking a degree of authorisation appeared a contradiction in terms. (138) However, the negotiations persisted, and by 1929 a definite scheme of union was completed. By then a number of Anglicans were troubled by the same difficulty.

The South Indian scheme was presented to the 1930 Lambeth Conference for its opinion although not for its judgement. The final decision as far as Anglicans were concerned lay with the Province of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, to which the four dioceses involved in the proposed merger belonged. Still, Lambeth's opinion counted for something, both among Indian Anglicans and for the way it gave concrete evidence of the way Anglican ecclesiology was developing.

It is generally agreed that the Conference in 1930 did little to advance the cause of reunion. Cosmo Lang, now President of the Conference, was almost totally absorbed with the possibility of cementing relationships with the Orthodox, a task which by then also consumed A.C. Headlam's energies. William Temple, Archbishop of York, was an untiring chairman of the Unity Committee, but suffered one of his rare ecumenical failures when he was unable to win the

confidence of the Free Church delegations which waited on the gathering. (139) In some respects the Conference seemed to restrict still further the interpretation being given to the understanding of the Historic Episcopate, which, it was acknowledged, even on a most charitable reading had proved the main stumbling block for the Non-Episcopal Churches in the Lambeth Appeal. As a clarification it was held that the Episcopal ministry was at least "'historic' in a sense in which no other now can be", and that it therefore held a position in the Church analagous to the Canon of Scripture and the Creeds. It was **an appropriate** organ upon which the functions of the Holy Spirit might be **exercised**. (140) Consequently, without disputing the various theories used to explain episcopacy, "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". (141) As a result "The general rule of our Church must be held to exclude indiscriminate Inter-communion" and consequently "members of our Church should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church or Churches in full communion with it". (142)

This general tendency did not bode well for the consideration of the South Indian proposals. For Henson, that debate would be the touch-stone of Anglicanism's sincerity in seeing through the intentions of the 1920 Appeal. (143) Even when the discussion was well advanced his apprehensiveness remained:

we shall give some sort of blessing to the South India Scheme .... it is very doubtful that the modest advance towards a Christian attitude which was made at the Conference of 1920 will be maintained. The truth is that, under the description 'the Anglican Communion', there are gathered two virtually contradictory conceptions of Christianity. How long the divergence of first principles can be concealed remains to be seen. Sometimes I think the rupture is very near. (144)

In the end the Conference's blessing on the scheme was quite generous. (145) The general transitional approach was approved, and limited communion was anticipated between Anglicans and the united Church from the first, with "complete interchangeability of ministers and complete mutual admissibility to Communion" expected when the details of the scheme were complete. (146)

That that this much was granted depended upon two principles enunciated within the Conference. The first was developed by Bishop E.H.M. Waller of Tinnevely at a time when the sub-committee dealing with the topic was threatening to get bogged down in details. The Church which would result from a union in South India should be seen as autonomous and not technically as an Anglican Church at all he argued. Therefore the criteria by which the Scheme was to be judged should be those of the Universal Church and not the domestic rules of Anglicanism. Bishop Bell stressed this when he piloted through the final report. The Dioceses of South India were not simply seeking to form a new Province of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. If that was so then the "union" would be no more than the absorption of Congregational, Presbyterian and Wesleyan groups into Anglicanism.

Those dioceses will therefore not be Anglican dioceses in which we are asked to recognize elements foreign to the Anglican system; they will go forth from the Anglican Communion in order to make their own distinctive contribution to the faith and order of the new united church. Moreover, the Church in which those dioceses are to be embraced will be itself 'a district province of the Universal Church' with a rule and character of its own. It is understood on all sides and is recognised in the scheme itself that no province of the Universal Church is free to act according to its own choice in contravention of the faith once for all delivered to the Saints or without regard to the preservation of the fellowship of the Church Universal. (147)

The second principle upon which the C.S.I. Scheme was approved did not arise initially in connection with South India at all, but in

a parallel discussion between Bishop Headlam and Meletios, the Patriarch of Alexandria, the spokesman for the Orthodox delegation at the Conference. In a discussion of "Apostolic Succession", the Patriarch raised the question of the attitude to Non-Episcopal ministries in the Lambeth Appeal. Then in a further clarification with the Archbishop of Dublin (J.A.F. Gregg), it was agreed that the "exception to the rule" that was envisaged in the South Indian scheme by Anglicans was similar to the Orthodox idea of "Economy". (148)

This notion was also carried into the South India report, and utilised extensively by Azariah and Palmer in their attempts to implement its findings in succeeding years. (149) In this they had the powerful support of William Temple. (150) According to Sundkler the three keys which opened the locked door of unity in India were expectation, experience and economy. (151) When it was believed that union was imminent, then in order to foster that union it was proper to anticipate the reality of shared gifts, ministries and sacraments. The anomalies to Catholic order were justified by the fact that they were seen to illustrate what the norm to be achieved should be.

In fact, the inauguration of the union was not completed until 1947. When the Lambeth Conference of 1948 convened, it greeted the achievements in South India with laudatory praise, but still felt unable to recommend that the new Church should be recognised as being in full communion with the Anglican Churches. Full communion, it was stated, "in a complete and technical sense ... must await till the ministry of the Church of South India has become fully unified on an episcopal basis". (152) Only in 1968 were the Bishops able to agree that history and experience made it possible to recommend that Anglican Provinces, after 21 years, should establish full communion with the Church of South India. (153)

This delay was not only painful for members (and especially former Anglicans) of the united Church, it also created the impression that for Anglicanism, reunion simply meant absorption into their own system. Episcopal, that is to say Anglican ordination, was presented as the sole means of access to the Universal Church! This was precisely the attitude that the Lambeth Appeal had been intended to overcome.

This survey of the Lambeth Conferences' treatment of the theme of reunion in general and the Church of South India in particular has not only been undertaken because of its intrinsic interest, but also because of the way it demonstrates how Anglicanism as a world communion was forced to articulate beliefs about its own existence and its relationship to other bodies of Christians. We have seen how successive Lambeth Conferences sought formally to identify Anglican beliefs with the Catholic norms of Faith and Order, but that the explication and defence of those beliefs was carried out in the context of discussions about the unity of the Church. Moreover, as discussion covering Roman Catholic and Orthodox issues was theoretical at best, most attention was given to explaining the Anglican position to Protestant and non-conformist groups without much opportunity for Anglicanism to give expression to its own reformational character. The asymmetry of this position was accentuated by the fact that most interest in the subject was taken by those of Anglo-Catholic persuasion, and that the progressive re-formulation of Anglican ecclesiology by the Conferences was largely dependent upon the gradual movement of thought demonstrated among followers of that tradition. The disproportionate attention given to ministerial order, and to episcopacy in particular, inevitably followed.

The importance of these factors can perhaps be reinforced by two further references. Before the 1920 Conference Davidson, when pressed

to undertake some condemnation of heterodoxy, met with a group of Bishops and persuaded them to withdraw their proposal for a debate on the status of the Creeds in return for some reference to the subject in the Encyclical. (154) Even that failed to eventuate, although Davidson did make reference to the centrality of the Creeds to the Anglican system in his Presidential Address. This omission takes on added point when it is remembered that in 1921 the Girton Conference raised the issue of fundamental beliefs in an uncompromising manner, for the Church of England at least. The 1920 Conference certainly faced up to several of the compelling problems that were in the air at the time, but equally, it avoided many others!

The second point is recognised in the 1948 Conference's decision regarding the status of ministry in the Church of South India. According to the report and Resolution concerned, a majority of those present believed that those consecrated or ordained in the united Church "should be acknowledged as true bishops, presbyters and deacons in the Church of Christ and should be accepted as such in every part of the Anglican Communion". (155) A substantial minority held that it was not yet possible to pass any judgment upon their precise status, and so no decision was taken. (156) Of course Lambeth was only exercising an advisory office in considering the Indian situation and several Provinces exercised their right to establish reciprocal relations with the united Church, but the fact that the Anglican Communion as a whole was not able to make up its mind was not without significance.

Two points in particular can be made. The first is that the means of decision making in the Anglican Communion appears ponderous in the extreme - and this points forward to the discussion of Anglican organisation in chapter four. The second is more immediate and more disturbing. The situation regarding the South Indian union

seems to suggest that Anglican beliefs concerning the Church and its unity are never subject to any authoritative interpretation but simply depend on whatever consensus of opinion can be cobbled together at one time. It appears that beyond a list of formal standards to which its churches theoretically subscribe the Anglican standpoint is limited to whatever can be said by some Anglicans without incurring a major dispute with some others: a Via Negativa indeed! Is this a fair judgment? If so, then Newman's animadversions are justified and Anglicanism is shown to be as bereft of intellectual support as it is shorn of social eminence. If not, what clearer construction is to be put upon these events?

Attention is turning, as it must, to the whole question of religious authority in the Anglican Communion, and before that to the vexed question of Anglican Comprehensiveness.

### 3. Anglican Comprehensiveness

The South Indian reunion scheme and the questions it raised for Anglicans about the necessity or otherwise of episcopal ordination, threw into relief the issue of comprehensiveness. If the Lambeth Conferences were unable to decide on their relationship to the united Church, what did this say about the credibility of the Anglican Via Media? How can members of the same communion both insist upon and dispense with the necessity of a continuity of orders without lapsing into ecclesial incoherence? At a time when the South India scheme was first coming into prominence R.H. Malden outlined the difficulty which always faced the Anglican claim that it was both Catholic and Reformed.

If the Church of England is Catholic it is not what the largest body of Catholics in the world (the Roman Church) understand by that. If it is Protestant it is not what all other Protestants understand by that. If it is both, is it merely holding side by side two irreconcilable ideals which can never coalesce, and is this made possible partly by an illogical and none too reputable compromise, and partly by the containing power of the State? Or does its apparently anomalous character represent a real ideal which is not found elsewhere, which is becoming more completely articulate as time goes on and the Anglican Communion harvests new and wider experiences in many lands? (157)

Those alternatives still remain. Does Anglican comprehensiveness represent the mere juxtaposition of theologically irreconcilable opposites, a disreputable compromise, or "a real ideal which is not found elsewhere" in the Church?

The problem of binding together the various threads which make up the English Church was evident from its earliest history. The medieval syntheses of Celt and Latin, Saxon and Norman, local and universal, were incomplete at the best of times and attempts to unify religion under the acts of successive Reformation parliaments fared little better. The English Church, like the

English nation, has always represented an uneasy blend of diverse influences and the final attempts to enforce conformity under the Clarendon Code succeeded only in institutionalizing dissent and drastically foreshortening the professed aims of the English reformers. After St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662, it was no longer possible to speak of ecclesia Anglicana as the Church of the English-speaking people, and with the Toleration Act of 1689, it was effectively acknowledged that legal appeal to uniformity in religious affairs was no longer a viable means for defending the national Church. The significance of neither event was fully realised at the time. Indeed it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that the ideals of uniformity finally withered to give place to new growth in the notion of **comprehensiveness**.

Uniformity and comprehensiveness are obviously not the same thing. The goal of uniformity was to tie together Christians with differing allegiances and expectations within a single liturgical and administrative structure. Comprehensiveness seeks to give intellectual recognition to the internal tensions of a Christian community and to provide a framework within which divergent interpretations of belief can co-exist. The one approach attempts to confine differences institutionally, the other to justify their existence by a principle of theological accommodation. Yet while the two strategies differ, they are both concerned with **the same problem**. How can differing approaches to liturgy or competing understandings of the faith be authorised within a single ecclesial body?

The term "comprehensiveness" pre-dates the nineteenth century of course. The idea of embracing diversity of opinion, as has been seen, was deeply ingrained in the thought of the Elizabethan apologists but the actual word was first explicitly used (according

to Roger Thomas) by Richard Baxter in his efforts to make elbow-room for some degree of conscientious dissent within the established Church. (158) In 1667 these efforts led as far as the framing of a Comprehensive Bill, but only succeeded in winning a measure of tolerance - by way of the Act of Indulgence (1672) and the Toleration Bill of 1689. Laud's avowal that unity at the altar was sufficient to allow variety in the pulpit may have been sincerely meant, but subsequent events had proven that political concessions could not really extend to permitting variety in religious opinions. (159) The theological and political climate had to change before that kind of liberality could flourish, and the move from tolerance to comprehensiveness is a comparatively recent phenomenon. (160) The nineteenth century, with its questioning of the privileges of power and opinion brought about the necessary changes in the social climate, and the impossibility of resolving questions of ritual and criticism with the corresponding emergence of the 'parties' in the Church of England meant that some rationalization of the existence of apparently contradictory viewpoints within the Church became necessary. As a consequence, the Anglican Communion came to its present form with this requirement constantly, if subconsciously, in mind.

The details of this development need not be of concern here. (161) What is necessary is to provide a theological account of what comprehensiveness involves for Anglicanism.

In a recent study S.W. Sykes has pointed to the issue of Comprehensiveness as the essential crisis which confronts Anglican ecclesiology. He explains:

Toleration of diversity itself needs to be justified theologically if it is to be able to claim any kind of integrity. There is a point at which a natural desire to avoid a fuss shades off into an unwillingness to seek for any clarity; and another point at which a serious, but corrigible state of muddle shades off into a loss of integrity. (162)

His argument is that radical criticisms have made the traditional explanations of Anglican diversity untenable, but that an "impermeable confidence" in the strength of Anglo-Saxon institutions means that the revision of the Church's doctrine remains unfulfilled and that something less defensible than mere "muddle" eventuates. (163)

Such a challenge cannot be shrugged off, but Professor Sykes' own solutions are but lightly sketched. Admittedly the book is acknowledged to be critical rather than constructive in its scope. (164) However there is a degree of uncertainty as to whether the author thinks that comprehensiveness can be successfully defended or not. For instance, of the four historical strands which he sees as leading to the present unsatisfactory condition of Anglicanism, the representative figures who stand behind three of them expressed their own dissent from the tendencies towards indifferentism which the Church exhibited in their own day. Thus, Newman left the Church of England when he came to believe that the Via Media was an unattainable ideal; Charles Gore resigned his bishopric because in his view the Church had strayed beyond the limits of acceptable diversity; and F.D. Maurice, despite his well-known advocacy of the attraction of opposites, was drawn to resist what he saw as the dilution of theological standards. (165) Each writer recognised that his views required stronger theological defence, and they cannot themselves be held responsible for the way the partial absorption of their ideas contributed to an indefensible outcome.

The fact that everything is not said does not mean that nothing has been said and despite the fact that inadequate formulations of the

idea of comprehensiveness have been entertained, in itself this does not rule out the possibility of more positive presentation. Lykes' own expectation, that Anglican decision making should take place on the basis of the public reading of scripture in the framework of liturgy and canon law, does not indicate how Scripture is seen to function in reaching an ecclesial consensus, or how any revision of liturgy and canons is to be undertaken. To locate the boundaries of Anglicanism within a liturgical rather than confessional framework is to provide formal but not material norms for the expression of comprehensiveness. The justification of comprehensiveness itself must look to a different sort of analysis.

Comprehensiveness was not simply attractive to the English temperament. While a line of thought can be traced from Coleridge's convictions regarding the common tenets of Christendom to F.D. Maurice's vision of the attraction of opposites and Gore's espousal of the 'glory of the Anglican Church' in its claim to maintain Catholic structures while also welcoming new and free intellectual movements from the Reformation, and on to strategies of William Temple and the promotion of the Church of England as a "school of synthesis", the notion was given even clearer expression in other parts of the Anglican Communion. (166)

In 1841 (the coincidence of that date with events already discussed in England is noteworthy) an episcopalian clergyman coined the phrase "bridge church" as descriptive of Anglicanism and declared its mission to be that of bringing "into one Comprehensive Church all the disciples of Christ". (167) This provided the first modern apologia of Anglican comprehensiveness. It also drew forth a most telling critique by Horace Bushnell.

Bushnell was a tutor in law at Yale prior to his admission to the Congregational ministry and brought a fine sense of legal

discrimination to the study of theology. Although recognised as a founder of New England liberalism, talk of harmonising religious differences to Bushnell smacked of theological complacency. Bushnell borrowed his terminology from the French philosopher Victor Cousin. (168)

He insisted that conflict was an inevitable factor in theology (as it must be in any intellectual pursuit) for four reasons: the complexity of the subject matter always made more than one point of view possible; the quantity of the subject matter spills over the limits of human ordering; the personal factor of an individual or national temperament is a necessary element in the theological task; and, even when allowance is made for all this, the limitations of language confuse all but the best attempts to reach agreement.

This being so, Bushnell then identified five elements likely to be present in theological controversy. An "extreme" statement of a position will quickly call forth its polar "opposite". Between them is likely to be found a "neutral" position which Bushnell dismissed as belonging to "a wooden-headed school .... moderate men who praise moderate things .... prudent but not wise". Such self-conscious efforts are likely to adopt a position "half-way between somewhere and nowhere". Bushnell's "liberal" takes a different position. Liberalism takes the argument of both sides seriously, according to Bushnell, but it is reluctant to press them towards a conclusion. He sees the liberal as indulging in the luxury of being patient with error without being anxious to establish the truth. His fifth option is that of "true Catholicity". This approach seeks to push beyond particular arguments so as to reach a "higher position" than that suggested by the apparent conflict of propositions. Only when this is done and a state of radical agreement has been reached by contending parties is it possible to speak of the harmony of differences or to assert the proper values

of comprehensive Christianity.

Bushnell's treatment was remarkably prescient. His justification for diversity of opinion within the Church foreshadows that of Rahner. (169) His typology for discriminating between different understandings of comprehensiveness has a number of recent parallels. (170) Even his conclusion prefigures the efforts of the Faith and Order Movement by more than a century. (171) He also lacks what his successors lack: the agreed **criteria** by which it can be shown that a "higher position" has been reached. Without them, talk of "comprehensiveness" or "unity in diversity" runs the constant danger of appearing to solve problems that it has only postponed. Comprehensiveness can only resolve conflicts when appealed to within acceptable limits of diversity. It cannot be allowed to camouflage incoherence, in Anglicanism or anywhere else.

Bushnell was not an Anglican and does not seem directly to have influenced the course of Anglican thinking in America. However the ideal of denominational comprehensiveness was a feature in the development of Anglican ecumenical thinking and quickly made its appearance in the Lambeth Conference papers.

In 1878, "the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion" was considered. Gratitude was expressed for the unity given by adherence to one Faith, but along with that (echoing Article 34) it was affirmed that "particular and national" Churches maintained the power to "change and abolish ceremonies ... ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying" (172) A traditional position was thus asserted in which the fixity of the Faith could allow a flexibility of organisation, and the report extended this to "legitimate expressions of devotional feeling" as well. (173)

Similar statements were made by succeeding Conferences, but it

was not until 1908, after the Unity committee's report on Presbyterian relations, the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and an expression of their hopes for future co-operation and discussion, that a first overt reference to comprehensiveness appeared.

The committee would commend to the Church an ideal of reunion which should include all the elements of divine truth now emphasised by separated bodies; in a word, the path of efforts towards reunion should be not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth, and the goal not uniformity but unity. (174)

Although only a passing reference, that comment illustrates a major change of perspective. Instead of an inner capsule of faith, which may be administered in a variety of sugar coatings, this conception envisages theological truth as something which must be actively pursued - a medicine of immortality of which all Christian communities stood in need. Different aspects of truth were possessed by different traditions, and the pathway which led by way of comprehensiveness towards unity was also one which was directed to a better appreciation of Christianity itself. It was on this approach that the Appeal of 1920 was built. A shared baptismal unity implied shared theological resources, and with that, a vision in which "all treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in Common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ". (175)

The way in which the Appeal to All Christian People was posited upon an understanding of comprehensiveness was perceptively analysed by J.G. Simpson, Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral, in an influential series of lectures which sought to explore just what a discussion of the Appeal might mean. (176) He did this by means of a comparison between the discussions which had followed the Appeal and the earlier bid for comprehensiveness in the 17th century. The original effort had been politically motivated and managed; it

sought not the unity of truth, but merely a manipulation of formularies which would remove the force of non-Conformist objections; and it was promoted by theologians (like Tillotson, Tenison and Burnet) who believed that the fundamentals of Christianity were separable from historic controversies and who held an ideal of the Church totally unrelated to any historic reality. By contrast the modern discussions were committed to maintaining and enhancing the identity of the individual Churches and realising the essentials of Christian unity. This was to be done through the mutual enrichment to be gained from what were at present separate religious traditions. The approach initiated by the Appeal utterly rejected any sense of reunion by amalgamation or by the pursuit of a lowest common denominator, just as it eschewed the idea of creating "an ecclesiastical Noah's Ark, affording accommodation for animals of incompatible theological habits". (177) However, for progress to be made required the emergence of a common mind among the partners, and this Simpson was unable to discern.

Simpson's view was confirmed by another contributor to the series. W.B. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, spoke for the non-conformists in general when he referred to the difficulty of reaching an understanding with Anglicans when the latter had been unable to reach an agreement among themselves.

If the Anglo-Catholic view of Church tradition is to prevail, it is quite unthinkable that either we, or indeed the liberals and evangelicals within the Church, will ever be able to come to anything like an agreement. There will have to be a ..... **different** understanding and I am bound to say that so far matters of that kind have been avoided and slurred over .... (178)

Inasmuch as the Appeal expressed a positive appreciation of comprehensiveness, the failure of subsequent reunion negotiations emphasised the way in which such an ideal can only succeed when it is ready to confront and to resolve fundamental theological

**disagreements.**

The 1930 Lambeth Conference seemed to recognise both the challenge and the problems involved in such an effort. While regretting that reciprocity with other Churches had not been achieved more quickly, the Unity Committee went on to specify the nature of the Anglican contribution to union discussions.

Our special character and, as we believe, our peculiar contribution to the Universal Church, arises from the fact that, owing to historic circumstances, we have been enabled to contribute in our one fellowship the traditional Faith and Order of the Catholic Church with that immediacy of approach to God through Christ to which the Evangelical Churches especially bear witness, and freedom of intellectual enquiry, whereby the correlation of the Christian revelation and advancing knowledge is constantly effected.

This additional acknowledgement of the 'liberal' along with the Catholic and Protestant strains within Anglicanism represented a new departure for Lambeth, and also heightened awareness that the approach presented difficulties for other observers.

This very combination makes difficult the manifestation of our real unity, and sometimes creates an impression of vagueness and indecisiveness which others are able to avoid. Yet we believe that such difficulties are incidental to that mode of corporate life which, as we are persuaded, most facilitates the search for truth, and best responds to and most adequately exhibits the diverse operations of the one Spirit. (179)

That is persuasively put. However, once again a clear specification of what is involved in this mode of corporate life is lacking.

Without this, it is difficult for Anglicans to avoid the charge that Anglicanism does not manifest unity because it does not possess it, and creates an impression of being vague and indecisive because it is precisely that! (180) Just what is it - apart from "historic circumstances" - which enables Anglicanism to claim that it combines the various strata of Christian thought and experience?

The 1948 Conference once more repeated the claim, and again

acknowledged the difficulties. (181) The unity committee referred to the problem posed by differing Anglican interpretations of episcopacy; and went on:

The co-existence of these divergent views within the Anglican Communion sets up certain tensions; but these are tensions within a wide range of agreement in faith and practice. We recognise the inconveniences caused by these tensions, but we acknowledge them to be part of the will of God for us, since we believe that it is only through a comprehensiveness which makes it possible to hold together in the Anglican Communion understandings of truth which are held in separation in other Churches, that the Anglican Communion is able to reach out in different directions, and so to fulfil its special vocation as one of God's instruments for the restoration of the visible unity of His Whole Church. If at the present time one view were to prevail to the exclusion of all others, we should be delivered from our tensions, but only at the price of missing our opportunity and vocation. (182)

This statement is often quoted in defence of Anglican comprehensiveness, but is in fact an extremely problematic expression of it. Its tone smacks of an ecclesiastical arrogance. (183) While it properly emphasises that Anglican authority operates as a process of interaction, it appears to promise too much by way of reaching out in different directions, and gives no indication of how such a gesture can reach its fulfilment. (184) And this failure is accentuated by the elusive way in which appeal is made to the permissible differences within a "wide range of agreement in faith and practice" in a context where the point of contention, episcopacy, has also been referred to as an essential feature of Anglican polity.

The closest to an official exposition of Anglican comprehensiveness provided by a Lambeth Conference was offered by a 1968 Unity sub-section. In response to the perplexity expressed by the Orthodox, the committee explained:

Comprehensiveness demands agreement on fundamentals, while tolerating disagreement on matters in which Christians may differ without feeling the necessity of breaking communion. In the mind of an Anglican, comprehensiveness is not compromise. Nor is it to bargain one truth for another. It is not a sophisticated word for syncretism. Rather it implies that the apprehension of truth is a growing thing: we only gradually succeed in "knowing the truth". It has been the tradition of Anglicanism to contain within one body both Protestant and Catholic elements. But there is a continuing search for the whole truth in which these elements will find complete reconciliation. Comprehensiveness implies a willingness to allow liberty of interpretation, with a certain slowness in arresting or restraining exploratory thinking. (185)

This paragraph provides a highly ramified argument which unites a number of the themes indicated previously. Negatively, the suggestion that comprehensiveness involves compromise, concession or syncretism, is repudiated. Positively, defence of the notion falls into two parts - a statement on the basis of Anglican unity, and an explanation of the reasons for the existence of theological diversity.

The opening sentence offers a reworking of the traditional Anglican claim that the Church is united by its commitment to a number of doctrinal fundamentals, but beyond that can allow liberty in the interpretation of secondary matters. This argument has a long history. Among the reformers, Philip Melancthon utilised the concept of the "adiaphora" to strengthen the unity between Lutheran factions. (186) Much of the history of early Protestantism can be understood as a ruling dispute over what could or could not be included on any index of non-essentials. Melancthon, who had extended the category from such things as liturgical dress, ornaments and bills, feast and fast days, to include questions of episcopal rule, confirmation, unction, confession and absolution, had considerable influence in England, especially upon Elizabeth and the Vestiarian Controversy. (187)

The distinction between doctrine and charity, matters pertaining to salvation and those which were comparatively unimportant, was formalised in English theology by Hooker. (188) In the years which followed it became a motif of religious toleration, pre-eminently expressed by the aphorism associated with Richard Baxter: unity in essentials, diversity in non-essentials, charity in all things.

Despite its lineage this argument was subject to a number of criticisms. Even in the sixteenth century it was opposed by the Puritans who argued that nothing could be regarded as non-essential. Details of liturgy, ceremonial or government may not be doctrinal in themselves but they reflected and expressed doctrine and as such should be subject to theological agreement. Newman faced the other side of that objection in his correspondence with the Abbé Jager. (189) The conviction that Catholic truth was an organic whole and not capable of arbitrary divisions was one of the things which overthrew his confidence in Anglicanism.

Late in the nineteenth century further difficulties presented themselves. In the first place it was realised that the ecclesiological status of a distinction between fundamental and secondary matters was open to serious questions. Was the distinction itself to be seen as an essential or non-essential feature of Anglicanism? If it was not essential, then it could hardly support the burden of argument which was being placed upon it. And if it were deemed to be essential, then the problem of deciding precisely which doctrines were to be regarded as fundamental and which secondary, rendered it important. This latter problem was presented in a particularly virulent form by the emergence of liberalism in the mainstream of Anglican life. Were certain beliefs immune from historical criticism? And if not, did this leave the way open for churchmen to deny every tenet of the Church's faith while still

professing membership of it? The failure to answer such questions lies close to the heart of Anglicanism's uneasiness as an ecclesiological system.

The 1968 statement on comprehensiveness makes a rather different use of the traditional argument. Agreement on fundamentals is there contrasted, not with a diversity of secondary interpretations but with the need to "break communion". The approach may seem evasive. Certainly the "communion of saints" involves some element of common doctrine, and this particular formulation ("tolerating disagreement ... without feeling the necessity of breaking communion") is in danger of falling into subjectivism. But it can also be taken, at best, as an example of Anglican realism too. Fundamental agreement is in fact that agreement which enables a community to maintain its identity. It is not measured against some idealised minimal doctrinal statement. Comprehensiveness is to be judged as a function of the Church's understanding of discipline and authority rather than by some independent standard of permissible variations in belief or worship. Because of this, "liberty of interpretation" and "exploratory thinking" are an inevitable outcome. This is quite appropriate because the truth of the gospel has still to be fully apprehended, and different appreciations of it (for instance the Catholic and Protestant elements within Anglicanism) still await "complete reconciliation". This view of comprehensiveness envisages a Church continuously and progressively clarifying its understanding of the Christian message. It does not believe that the truth of the gospel can be exhaustively defined by a set of infallible decrees, but by the same token it does not anticipate that because the whole truth has not yet been apprehended there is no truth which can be attained. A Comprehensive Church is not wholly absorbed in the formularies and

controversies of the past, but it does not neglect the achievements of the past either. The centre of the Church's unity is defined by reference both to historic formularies and a growing awareness of the truth of Christianity: the limits of diversity are determined by the articulation and exercise of a theory of religious authority by which the Church is seen to operate.

This may seem simply to postpone the issue for Anglicanism. It does so necessarily. Comprehensiveness must be understood as an aspect of religious authority, not an alternative to it. The pursuit of the truth and the commitment to credal and confessional standards is carried out within a "communion" of faith and order. Comprehensiveness allows freedom to interpret and explore that faith and order up to the point at which communion is broken.

While this may appear to have temporarily rescued Anglicanism by placing its comprehensive character in a category of penultimate rather than ultimate importance, the conference statement does allow a number of things to be said about the actual Anglican practice of comprehensiveness. Chief among them is the realisation that comprehensiveness is not an end in itself. The existence of two (or more) schools of thought within the one body is only seen to be justifiable if it contributes overall to the Church's better understanding of the whole truth. The existence of 'parties' within Anglicanism must be seen **in the light**. Their existence may be welcomed to the extent that they ensure a vigorous contribution to ongoing theological debates. It is regrettable only when they appear to exist solely to isolate and insulate a point of view from internal criticism. In the same way "exploratory thinking" is given freedom within Anglicanism, not as an expression of intellectual anarchy but out of the conviction that the Holy Spirit will lead the Church into all truth. (190) Thus "liberty of interpretation"

is presented as one aspect of the Spirit's guidance, which along with "agreement on fundamentals" (a unity of Faith) and the experience of "communion" (the unity of Order), is presented as the third plank in the single platform of authority upon which comprehensiveness rests.

Before turning to the practical question of how comprehensiveness binds together the diverse strains of Anglican consciousness, it is worth summing up the measure of clarification so far attained.

To talk of comprehensiveness, it is universally agreed, does not involve a course of compromise, easy syncretism or the attempt to bargain one truth for another. It is not entertained as a device to conceal the regrettable results of historical contingency, but as the necessary outcome of responding to different aspects of the Christian message. This being the case, a great deal hangs on the way in which the goals of comprehensiveness are described. The traditional distinction between essential and non-essential articles of faith, in which the former command agreement while reasonable tolerance can be exercised with regard to the latter, has been shown to suffer from two major defects. Inherent in the position is the problem of judging precisely which articles must be said to be fundamental and indeed whether theology lends itself to such categorisation. Then, extrinsically, the rise of critical studies has meant that even those elements normally considered to be fundamental (such as the propositions of the Nicene Creed) can no longer be exempt from examination. As a complement to the traditional approach, diversity of belief has also been taken to represent the way in which different movements contribute to the development, unfolding or filling out of Christian truth, and the achievement of a "higher position" in the Church's understanding of the gospel than was to be found in any of its partial representations.

It is the actual means for producing this synthesis that presents the greatest difficulty for the defence of comprehensiveness. More than the simple juxtaposition of competing claims is required. (191)

The various interpretations must be brought into such a relationship that a new understanding can be born from them. Augustin de Mendietta, who was attracted to the Church of England because of its potential for "rigorous dialectic", wrote:

I am convinced that the historic mission or destiny of the Church of England, and, on a wider scale, the destiny of the world-wide Anglican Communion, is to make a theological and also a practical synthesis of Catholicism and Protestantism. Up to the present, we may say, the Church of England has too often been content with a more or less tolerant co-existence, a mere juxtaposition of different ideas, points of view, theologies, and practices, having no higher ambition than to keep a kind of precarious peace or rather truce, by letting sleeping dogs lie. But, to that extent, this so-called 'comprehensive' Church of England has failed to rise to the height of its historic and providential vocation. Our church must bestir itself and become a genuine dialectical Church ... committed to the view that all these views or particular theologies (Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, Liberal) must all be transcended in a higher synthesis. (192)

From a more philosophical standpoint, Paul Avis has seen a similar power in a concept of polarity in which the Church develops by,

learning to distinguish without dividing between, for example, protestant and catholic, individual and corporate, spiritual and formal, transcendent and immanent elements in the wholeness of Christian experience. (193)

Avis seems excessively concerned to avoid the negations which such a polarised view entails, but the attempt to distinguish without dividing between competing viewpoints has critical as well as constructive implications.

The two approaches - that of commitment to a historic confession and that which emphasises a developing appreciation of the truth, can

be held together in a framework of shared fellowship and discipline. (194) Theologians, despite their differences, agreed to work within a common tradition. On such an understanding it is the role of a confession to act as an indicator of the shape of the tradition, not to define inviolable dogmas or to proscribe the possibility of its further understanding.

This whole approach represents an ideal which John Macquarrie identifies as the underlying ecclesiological decision between the need to preserve structures of holiness and lay them open to prophetic renewal. (195) Tillich wrote of the synthesis between "catholic substance and protestant spirit". (196) There is a New Testament vision, epitomized in the pivotal text of Ephesians 4, in which the unity of the Church was not just maintained by the restraints imposed over tolerated diversity but discovered as the product of individual differences.

In the end though these ideals can only be tested by the way they are applied to concrete situations. It may be argued that the Lambeth Conferences have failed to realise the implications of their own ideals of comprehensiveness and that this had led to the stultification of Anglican theological and ecumenical endeavour. This is implicitly the case in the discussion of Episcopacy following the 1920 Conference and explicitly so when the same problem was raised by the Church of South India.

Attention has already been given to the way in which Episcopal order was isolated as the central feature of Anglican ecclesiology, and also the way in which Newman's successors (who were largely responsible for this state of affairs being perpetuated in the Lambeth Conference documents) came to abandon the more extreme expressions of it. Taken together, these two factors indicate that the problems that Anglicans have created in the quest for reunion

represent not so much a failure in candour as of comprehensiveness. Anglicanism has been unable to fulfil what it has promised to do and "reach out in different directions" to help secure the visible union of the whole church. Rather than "holding together ... understandings of truth which are held in separation in other churches" the Anglican Communion reveals itself as merely reflecting the divisions by which Western Christendom as a whole is riven.

One example can suffice to illustrate the point. Darwell Stone, whose commitment to a high view of episcopacy has already been noted, was insistent that such opinion could not be readily supported by the Anglican (that is to say Reformation and post-Reformation) formularies. To Lord Halifax he confided his anxiety that if an exclusive interpretation of doctrine is sought from such sources it will prove to be a Protestant one, and went on:

There always seems to me to have been something providential in the notion of the Tractarians that they had support for their position in a post-Reformation tradition, because without this belief they very likely would not have had the heart to go on. But I think that we have now to face the facts that, so far as the Reformation and post-Reformation formularies and divines are concerned, there are loopholes which we can use but not the support for an exclusive position. (197)

For Stone no deception was intended by this remark because as he explained to Halifax, the 16th Century documents could not be regarded as binding for Anglican Catholics, but irrespective of that, the remark throws an alarming shadow on any idea of comprehensiveness. Even if the Catholic view of episcopacy is to be maintained by reference to other doctrinal sources, the fact that a dominant viewpoint within Anglicanism is here reduced to seeking "loop-holes" in the Reformation statements, indicates both a disturbing blindness to the implications of doctrinal authority and

a refusal to acknowledge the existence of contrary positions within the Anglican spectrum. The catholic and protestant elements are not dialectically related in a search for more complete truth - even to the extent of attempting to refute countervailing evidence. Comprehensiveness has been reduced to a mere co-existence and that of the most tenuous kind. On Bushnell's analysis the thesis that episcopacy is a necessity for the Church has been balanced by the admission that it is useful to the Church's well-being. Between the two, a "wooden-headed" position which damps excessive claims on either side of the divide - or perhaps suggests as a compromise that the fact of episcopacy is important and its meaning open to various interpretations - can be discerned. In due time an attempted third way was to be proposed, to the effect that episcopacy is necessary not to validate the Church's ministry but to express the fulness of its order. (198) But no realistic attempt was made to find the "higher position" of "true Catholicity" which seeks for a radical agreement behind apparently contradictory positions.

A.E.J. Rawlinson once proposed that Anglicanism's Via Media would best be demonstrated by exhibiting a distinct role for the episcopate within a generalised schema of religious authority. He outlined as alternatives the Roman view that the Magisterium is the guardian of truth; the Orthodox notion of a mystic union of the total ecclesial body which possesses the gift of knowledge (as distinct from the sacramental and disciplinary role of the hierarchy); the Lutheran concept of the authority of the Word; and the high Calvinist belief in the shared authority of the theocratic community. (199) The challenge was never directly taken up. Perhaps the experience of Episcopacy within the Anglican Communion does suggest that a bishop, under the authority of Scripture and in the council of his Synod can actually exercise a teaching authority for the whole

People of God, but until that can be realised within Anglicanism it seems unlikely that Anglican claims for episcopacy will convince any but the most compliant of non-episcopalians.

In the meantime what has become apparent is that Anglican reluctance to pursue the implications of its stance towards reunion is not so much a matter of the painful struggle towards a better theological understanding as it is the result of the political failure of any one grouping within the Church to impose its will upon the whole Communion.

This fact is especially clear in the case of the Church of South India. Norman Sykes has stated that the attitude of the Anglican Communion towards the C.S.I. between 1930 and 1948 was "incomprehensible". (200) The term is unintentionally ironic. The course of the Lambeth debates outlined previously shows precisely that in this case too a failure to achieve "comprehensiveness" lay behind the Conference's reluctance to acknowledge openly the South Indian achievements. When the new Church had plainly demonstrated that it wanted to adopt the functions and the reality of the "historic episcopate", a minority of Anglican bishops stopped short of offering the fellowship of full communion to the united body on the basis of a theory of episcopacy that the Anglican Communion had never itself adopted. Certainly the South Indian procedure of gradually creating a complete episcopal system over thirty years presented problems. It was recognised at the time that the situation over this initial period was an anomalous one for an episcopal system. But an anomaly clearly acknowledged is closer to the ideal of a comprehensive church than a situation in which differences of opinion are tidied away under cover of doctrinal ambiguity.

CHAPTER 4 : ANGLICAN AUTHORITY

CHAPTER FOUR  
ANGLICAN AUTHORITY

During the eleventh Lambeth Conference the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. F.D. Coggan, did not speak often. His major contribution however was judged to be of such importance that it was recorded in an Appendix to the 1978 Conference Report. He began:

Brothers, I think that many of you have been feeling during our last two weeks that a word needs to be said about the complex and difficult subject of authority in our Anglican Communion ... We have been searching somewhat uneasily to find out where the centre of that authority is. (1)

A number of points in the Conference agenda had contributed to the sense of disquiet. Perennial problems concerning the Church and Society had been raised. Multi-lateral discussions with Roman Catholic and Orthodox Commissions were coming to a head and decisions were shortly to be required as to their findings and future. A major theme of the Conference, "Episcopacy", had opened up the topic, and the decision taken by several Provinces to ordain women to the priesthood, raised the question of religious authority in a critical manner. Who made decisions for Anglicans and on what basis were they made? What was the nature of ministerial authority? More particularly, how did the decisions of individual Provinces relate to the life of the Communion as a whole?

Such questions had been implied in previous Conference discussions, and the significance of Coggan's words was more in the fact that he explicitly asked the Conference to face the problem of Authority than in any solutions he was able to bring to it. (2) This chapter of the thesis seeks to trace the centre of Anglican authority.

So far it has been shown that the Anglican Communion, in seeking to demonstrate its distinctive ecclesiological character, had been largely content to define its doctrine by reference to universally

accepted standards of belief but was hard-pressed to explain how these acted as symbols for its own particular unity. For a variety of reasons, not least the fact that Anglican doctrine was largely defined by the Lambeth Conferences as a response to the ecumenical imperative, several interpretations were adopted by Anglicans. This was especially true of questions of episcopal order. It led to a number of ambiguities over the practical issues of ministry and reunion. It has been argued that such "comprehensiveness" can only be sustained while it can be shown that the existence of different theological interpretations positively commit the Church to a fuller and clearer articulation of its doctrinal convictions. This second stage of self-awareness has been comparatively neglected by Anglicanism and is itself dependent upon a fuller understanding of the way religious authority functions within the Communion.

The eleventh Conference, in considering the basis of Anglican unity, recapitulated the work of its predecessors. The Anglican Communion held an "unambiguous" doctrinal position in the "pattern of theological elements" shared by its member Churches, one of the sections recited. It was referring to Scripture, Creeds, the "standards of ordered worship" and the Lambeth Quadrilateral as the indicators of Anglican belief. (3) The cohesiveness of Anglicanism was reinforced by such shared resources as the Lambeth Conference, the threefold order of ministry, and the recognition of the Archbishop of Canterbury as a focus of unity. The section concluded, "we do not intend a 'confession' which will mark us off from other communions; rather we desire a unity of doctrinal conviction sufficient to express our abiding will to live together and to worship together the one Lord of the one holy, catholic and apostolic Church". (4) That however is precisely the problem. A unity of confession, such as

that professed by the Reformed Churches, or a unified hierarchy, such as that traditionally proclaimed by Roman Catholicism is relatively easy to describe. (5) But what sort of unity is necessary to sustain the will of Anglicans to live and worship together? Does any such unity of "doctrinal conviction" exist, and if so how does it determine the character of Anglican thinking and the scope of Anglican diversity?

In this chapter such questions will be pursued, first by tracing the various "centres of authority" which have been proposed by the Lambeth Conferences; then through a survey of the supposed "pattern of theological elements" shared by Anglican Churches; and finally, if it can be said that particular Anglican Churches share a family resemblance, the way in which the Anglican Communion exercises its authority will be examined. The first and third sections will seek to unfold the general development of Lambeth's thinking, while the second will concentrate upon the doctrinal commitments of particular Anglican Provinces.

## 1. STRUCTURES OF ANGLICAN AUTHORITY

When Archbishop Coggan addressed the Conference over which he presided, he referred to some of the claimants for the central Anglican authority. The attempt to define such a centre was characteristic of a number of the earlier Conferences, and the difficulty of reaching agreement on the definition has been seen as typical of Anglican ambivalence. This section will explore some of the suggestions which have been put forward concerning the proper focus for Anglican authority - namely the Lambeth Conferences themselves; advisory or disciplinary bodies created by them; the metropolitan authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the official formularies of the Church of England. It will conclude by arguing that the notion of "dispersed authority" expounded by more recent conferences, offers the best available explanation of both the organisational development and theological character of Anglicanism and can therefore serve to unify further Anglican thought and action.

### (a) The centre of Anglican authority?

#### (i) The authority of the Lambeth Conferences.

As the most prominent, and indeed for much of its history, the only organisational structure of the Anglican Communion, the decennial meetings of the Lambeth Conferences would seem to suggest themselves as the locus of Anglican decision-making.

As has been seen, successive Conferences have repudiated any such suggestion. The meetings are Conferences, not councils or commissions or synods of bishops. Such decisions as are taken bear only the authority of those making them. They are passed to the Churches by way of report or recommendation, but they only assume binding powers as far as the Churches are concerned, when they have been considered and adopted by their respective Provincial

legislative bodies.

Even this is more than Longley had expected at the time of the first Conference, but it is clear that the restraints which he adopted were neither necessary nor workable. The bishops meet to confer not to govern, but that does not mean that the Lambeth Conferences are purely domestic affairs of significance only to those who were present at the time. Moral authority is real authority, and the opinion of bishops for an episcopal church must be of some moment. What the conferences refuse to do however is to act as a legislative or coercive body. The 1920 Conference's Encyclical sought to reflect both sides of this conviction when it said of the Conference that it "focuses the experience and counsels of our Communion" yet claims "no powers of control or command". (6)

Such a position had not suggested itself automatically. The younger churches of the Communion needed time to become aware of their own potential and also to become conscious of the world around them before any such self understanding of Anglicanism could become explicit. The 1930 Conference took the opportunity to elaborate upon it. The way the committee on The Anglican Communion spelt out the doctrines and ideals of the Anglican view point has already been noted. There may be an ambiguity in the way doctrine is seen to operate in that report, but the underlying principle upon which Anglicanism had developed was seen clearly enough. "There are two prevailing types of ecclesiastical organisation: that of a centralised government, and that of regional autonomy within one fellowship". (7) In common with the church of the first centuries, and with Orthodoxy to the present day, the Anglican Communion was seen to be constituted upon the second model. Unity between Churches was not definable in terms of administration but by way of its common life in faith and sacraments. This of course

is the reason why at least some identity in doctrine and ideals was necessary. It is also consistent with the traditional Anglican freedom of particular and national churches to alter rites, ceremonies, usages, observances and discipline. This freedom the 1930 Committee was anxious to reiterate. The correlate of such freedom is of course a certain vulnerability. The report went on:

This freedom naturally and necessarily carries with it the risk of divergence to the point even of disruption. In case any such risk should actually arise, it is clear that the Lambeth Conference as such could not take any disciplinary action. Formal action would belong to the several Churches of the Anglican Communion individually; but the advice of the Lambeth Conference, sought before executive action is taken by the constituent Churches, would carry very great moral weight. And we believe in the Holy Spirit. (8)

The Lambeth Conference are thus seen to hold authority within the Anglican tradition, but it is an authority of a very specific kind, and as such it represents a conscious attempt to grapple with the long-standing ecclesiological problem of freedom and authority.

Before returning to this theme it is worth reviewing some of the other, more authoritarian views of the Conferences, which had sought to give a greater degree of cohesion to the idea of Anglicanism.

As has already been seen, the call for the first Lambeth Conference was accepted with varied expectations. The desire for a disciplinary body to resolve the Colenso problem or the ritual question plainly motivated some. Others perhaps yearned for some assembly which could act as an Anglican counter-balance to the proposed Vatican Council. (9) However, the judgment of John Hind has to be moderated:

There can be little doubt that many of those who supported this appeal [for a Conference] had visions of a central council with legislative powers, which would be able to co-ordinate the synods in every part and impose its will on the several provinces of the Church. (10)

While some may have entertained this vision, others were equally adamant in rejecting it. (11) The circumstances of the early conferences, as well as the personalities involved, made any such goal unattainable. (12)

(ii) A Central Advisory Body

Stephenson has shown that the moving spirit which lay behind the first Conference was much more modest and moderate than has often been assumed. (13) This applies even to the discussion about setting up a Spiritual Court of Appeal. (14) While Selwyn saw such a body as securing "unity in matters of Faith, and uniformity in matters of Discipline, where Doctrine may be concerned" (15) the practical concern behind the proposal was to enable colonial Churches to organise their lives at a time when they had no legal rights within their own countries and yet were also denied the right of appeal to the Privy Council in England. (16) Such a solution to the problem can be seen to reflect a confusion about the proper part played by the state in the disciplining of clergymen. Yet it also reflects a proper instinct for ecclesiastical order. (17) The most fitting expression of that instinct emerged slowly.

The provisions for a Court of Appeal were never enacted. McLeod Campbell saw the whole procedure as "inconsistent with the spirit of the Anglican Communion: final Courts of Appeal should be left to the decision of local and regional Churches". (18)

In 1878 the idea of a Voluntary Board of Arbitration was mooted. Emphasis was laid upon the voluntary character of such a body but even then the committee investigating the proposal was "not prepared to recommend that there should be any one central tribunal of appeal". (19) It was recognised that the Province was the proper locus of disciplinary authority. While a Province may refer beyond

its own boundaries to some external body, it was for the Province itself to decide how this should be done and to whom it would refer.

The following Conference discussed a modified idea for a Council or Councils of Reference, set up "to advise upon, or even to decide" questions referred to it by the colonial churches. Particular churches were free to appoint such councils. (20) Yet even in this the Encyclical warned:

We would counsel patient consideration and consultation, of such character as may eventually supersede the necessity for creating an authority which might, whether as a council of advice, or in a function more closely resembling that of a Court, place us in circumstances prejudicial alike to order and to liberty of action. (21)

The need for consideration and consultation was reaffirmed in 1897 when a Central Consultative Body was constituted. The Encyclical ran:

This body must win its way to general recognition by the services it may be able to render to the working of the Church. It can have no other than a moral authority, which will be developed out of its action. (22)

The Consultative Body's **brief** was simply to strengthen the unity of the Communion by means of spreading information and advice, but even this seemed to threaten the sovereignty of individual Churches. The Americans would have no part in it. The consultative body was instituted in 1901 and reconstructed as the Central Consultative Committee in 1908. (23) At this time any attempt to form a disciplinary court was finally repudiated. The South Africans did indeed nominate the Consultative Committee to act as their reference body, and others would be free to do the same thing if they so desired, but the essential understanding of the process was now clear.

Your committee desire to assert the general principle of the autonomy of national churches within the Anglican Communion, believing that national churches will give their best contribution to the life of the Church Universal if allowed to grow up freely in their own soil, and to develop under local conditions. (24)

This sequence of discussions is of interest not just as an example of administrative evolution but because of the way it provides an example of the development of ecclesiological consciousness. It represents a clear progression from authoritarianism to consultation as the ruling principle of Anglican government. As such it shows how the implications of synodical government, as adopted by the colonial churches, were taken up and applied to the life of the Communion as a whole. (25) Anglicanism, as a world faith, functions under a consensual jurisdiction and by means of voluntary Compact. (26) And it does so, not as a last resort in the absence of any viable alternatives, but out of conviction that this best serves the church's mission and most adequately reflects the nature of the Christian message. When the 1920 Conference renounced the power to control or command the constituent churches in the way previously noted, it went on to evaluate the ideal character of Anglican Communion.

It stands for the far more spiritual and more Christian principle of loyalty to the fellowship. The Churches represented in it are indeed independent, but independent with the Christian freedom which recognises the restraints of truth and love. They are not free to deny the truth. They are not free to ignore the fellowship. (27)

At its best the succession of Lambeth Conferences and the processes of consultation to which they have given rise, are seen as exercises in apprehending the truth of the gospel and guarding the integrity of the Christian fellowship.

Having said that it is important to notice the way in which Lambeth utterances also attempt to ensure a proper structure for the

Anglican fellowship. The instinct to be 'under authority' is appropriate for the Christian Church. As well as the possibility of consultation the Lambeth Conferences also display an attempt to maintain what Yves Simon once spoke of as "the felicitous combination of authority and freedom". (28)

(iii) Metropolitical Authority in the Anglican Communion.

The problem of both affirming the independence and autonomy of the colonial churches and providing them with a fitting structural relationship was raised at the first conference by those who saw Lambeth as the first step towards the formation of some sort of Anglican council. (29) Selwyn's resolution "That, in the opinion of this Conference, Unity in Faith and Discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them" was a compromise because it left open the question as to where that higher authority ultimately lay. (30) But it was a clear endorsement of the synodical system of the overseas churches. Moreover reference to "canonical subordination", tied it both to any precedent that may be found in the past history of the church and to a process of consultation for its future development. (31) The committee report on this resolution concentrated on the problem of local identity. Individual dioceses should endeavour to associate themselves as Provinces which would most adequately correspond to the civil administration of a region. The metropolitan's authority was solely that invested by synodal compact except insofar as any ruling of a General Council supervened. In particular this compact should provide the mechanism for such united action as might be necessary in matters of discipline, the confirmation and election of bishops, and the adaptation of liturgical and pastoral resources to the circumstances

of the region. (32)

In 1878 this movement towards Provincial organisation was strongly reinforced. The disciplinary function of the Province was underlined, and provision made for isolated dioceses to fall under the Metropolitan authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury. (33)

The 1888 Conference gave practical effect to these intentions by ensuring a mutual respect for diocesan jurisdiction, and by regulating the movements of Anglican clergy through the provision of letters Testimonial. (34)

At the following Conference, in 1897, the authority of the Provincial system was further consolidated. Here it was stipulated that Oaths of Canonical Obedience should invariably be made to appropriate Metropolitans, and should only be offered to the Archbishop of Canterbury when he was acting in that capacity. (35)

At the same time a spirit of mutuality was encouraged by the proposal that bishops consecrated in England for service overseas while reserving their view of obedience for their own Metropolitan, should still solemnly declare that they would "pay all due honour and defence to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and will respect and maintain the spiritual rights and privileges of the Church of England and of all Churches in communion with her". (36)

The autonomy of the Provinces was clearly established, and yet so too was the fellowship existing throughout the communion. The principle of the Provincial system was "that no Bishop should be left to act absolutely alone". (37)

The same principle was observed however in the lengthy report on Anglican Foreign missions. The fact that parallel or overlapping jurisdictions could develop from English and American sources was quickly acknowledged as intolerable. (38)

The formation of an independent Province in Japan, which had been almost exclusively formed by American missionaries, gave proof that the Provincial organization of Anglicanism was more than simply a British

expedient. (39)

Once again the idea of autonomy amid interdependence, of independence with fellowship is seen as a characteristic of Anglican ecclesiology. If it was necessary to stress the former feature in the days when the British (or American) origin of the Anglican churches was quite apparent, it was equally necessary to emphasise the latter when that provenance eventually became less apparent. The 1930 and the 1948 committees on "The Anglican Communion" were searching for the appropriate way to indicate what it was that bound Anglicans together. The development of the Central Consultative Council reflected this, but to the 1930 Conference this was only an expression of the Provincial structure which enabled a diocese to "realise its proper relationship to the whole

Church". (40) That conference provided a most complete defence of the Provincial system and detailed recommendations for its implementation. (41) In 1948 a committee was seeking further

ways to demonstrate the cohesiveness of the Communion and by then too the outlines of a permanent Anglican organization had become evident. (42) Indeed since the second World War the Conferences

have paid more attention to the world-wide expression of Anglicanism, just as prior to that, the concentration had been upon the autonomy of the Provinces. Having achieved the freedom of the particular it was also necessary to safeguard the unity of the universal dimension of the Church. Both aspects need recognition in a fully framed ecclesiology, and both will require further exposition. (43)

#### (iv) The Role of the Archbishop of Canterbury

Discussion of metropolitical authority in Anglicanism has inevitably involved reference to the role played by the Archbishop of Canterbury. What position does this office hold in the authority

structure of the Anglican Communion? In his speech to the 1978 Conference, Coggan alluded to an incident prior to that of 1897 when Randall Davidson, then the Archbishop's chaplain, tactfully deflected an attempt to promote Frederick Temple as the Anglican patriarch. (44) Plainly this was no solution to the problem of authority. (45) The See held no historic precedent for such an honour, and Anglicanism could provide no practical or theological support for the idea. Since that time the Conferences, over which the Archbishop presides as host and chairman, have repeatedly offered tokens of honour and respect but no formal function as the fountain-head of Anglican order.

At the earlier Conferences, when the principle of Provincial autonomy still had to be fought for, restraint was required. Thus the 1908 Conference bluntly recorded the conviction that "no supremacy of the See of Canterbury over Primatical or Metropolitan Sees outside England is either practicable or desirable", yet even then it also acknowledged a "universal recognition in the Anglican Communion of the ancient precedence of the See of Canterbury". (46) In 1930 it was stipulated that in those cases where overseas bishoprics were still filled by appointment of the Archbishop, he should only act after consulting the Church concerned. (47) In the measured tones of a 1948 Conference statement it was explained that no single pattern or mould could govern the life of the Anglican churches, and that:

While historically the Anglican Communion sprang from the British Isles, the Churches which now from this Communion do not recognize any peculiar authority as being vested in the Archbishop of Canterbury: but he is given by all the Churches of the Anglican Communion a position of leadership. (48)

Recently, the positive aspects of the Archbishop's role have been to the fore. In 1968, when discussing Anglicanism's

contribution to the reunion of Christendom, it was said "We believe that the concept of 'communion with the See of Canterbury' affords a sacramental link of abiding value". (49) The 1978 Conference spoke less guardedly of the way in which the Anglican Communion was personally bounded by "the loyal relationship of each of the Churches to the Archbishop of Canterbury who is freely recognized as the focus of unity". (50)

Just how such unity is established, and what the concept of 'communion with the See of Canterbury' implies requires further examination, but from what has been indicated it is apparent that the Archbishop's role is generally seen by the Lambeth Conferences as being analogous to the other tokens of authority previously discussed. The Archbishop of Canterbury holds a primacy of honour but not of command. He acts as a symbol of loyalty in the Anglican Communion not as a source of power over it.

Randall Davidson, who above all was instrumental in giving shape to the functional responsibilities of the Archbishop in the wider Anglican orbit, spoke of his role as that of a pivot. In America he once surveyed the ramifications of the Anglican world in and beyond the British Empire and his own position in it:

One feels at once the necessity for something of the nature of a central pivot - a pivot which takes tangible shape as a man, an Archbishop, round whom the work may spin, and who, if he be nothing more, furnishes at the least (and thus perforce) a point of common touch, common information, common life. I am not speaking even indirectly of any question about jurisdiction, however shadowy. I am speaking about a pivot, not a pope. (51)

The fulfilment of such responsibilities is of course very dependent on the personal style brought to the office by each occupant. (52) So Longley and Tait, as has been shown, found the task difficult. Steeped in the Erastianism of the English episcopate, they found it

hard to know how or why they should act with regard to the overseas churches, and yet their generosity and (especially in the case of Tait) willingness to meet with all who called upon them established the centrality of Lambeth for the Anglican Communion as nothing else could. Benson's vision was more magisterial. Although he was never able to implement the proposal of an Anglican 'Cardinalate' urged on him by Lightfoot and Westcott, his adherence to cyprianic views of episcopacy nevertheless made him anxious to re-emphasise the possibilities of a brotherly conference of bishops in England and further afield. (53) The preparation and presidency of the third Lambeth Conference was for him a welcome fulfilment of his best hopes, and this perhaps explains the general sense of loss occasioned by his death a few months before the fourth Conference, in 1896. His successor, Frederick Temple, a man of considerable intellectual and moral stature, while in no way diminishing the office brought to it a spirit of self-reliance and isolation which somewhat stifled the developments of his predecessors. (54) When Davidson returned to Lambeth Palace as Primate in 1903, he found the pigeon-holes for overseas correspondence erected when he was Tait's chaplain (and known for that reason as Davidson's folly), stuffed to overflowing with unanswered letters. (55) It was Davidson's determination to correct that kind of situation as much as his unequalled experience of the office, the length of his own tenure in it, and his masterly chairmanship of two crucial Lambeth Conferences that make him so much the model of a modern Archbishop of Canterbury. (56) He embodied the principles he had enunciated, although it must be added that his pragmatic approach to controversial issues rather accentuated the tendency of the Lambeth Conferences to skirt around decisive theological issues. (57) Lang and Temple both did their most enduring work in Lambeth Conferences while they

were consecutive Archbishops of York. (58) Fisher's main contribution was to rebuild and refit after the devastation of the second world war. (59) His administrative genius put the Archbishopric, and to a lesser extent the continuing role of Lambeth on a sound footing, and with Davidson he remains the only man to have chaired two Lambeth Conferences. His successor, Michael Ramsey, enabled to travel in a way that was impossible for his predecessors, brought to his term of office a new and more personal dimension to Anglican internationalism. In this he was followed by F.D. Coggan. A full estimate of Ramsey's theological contribution to the development of modern Anglican thinking is still awaited. (60)

While each of its occupants undoubtedly give a different emphasis to the office of Archbishop, it is clear that a common appreciation of their role has developed. The Archbishop of Canterbury is a necessary catalyst for the fusion of Provinces in the Anglican Communion but he is not an essential element in that process. He represents a prominent **strand** in the tapestry of Anglican authority but is still only one part of its design.

So far the question of Anglican authority has been directed to the possible solutions which have been proposed from within the structure of the Anglican Communion. Neither the Lambeth Conference along with any of its continuation committees, nor a hierarchical organisation culminating in the Archbishop of Canterbury, has been found to offer anything more than a partial solution to the problem. Positively though, a common feature of the situation must be noted. Although none of the proposed contenders for ecclesial authority could be said to stand at the centre of the Anglican system, each can be said to have a part to play. The part to be performed by each element is moreover to be determined by its utility. Thus, the Conference consults and the Churches judge the importance of its

recommendations; the consultative body may be called upon for its opinion but has no right to force itself upon the constituent members; metropolitical authority provides support for the Churches not command over them; and even the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury is honoured, in the end, for what it does rather than what it is. On such a line of argument it will be seen that Anglican authority must be discussed in the multiplicity of its structures and the search for a 'centre' or single source given up altogether. Whether such an arrangement can be maintained without falling into anarchy will be examined subsequently.

However a different kind of argument is possible. Instead of a more Catholic concern with the structures of authority, attention can be given to the more Protestant approach which seeks authority and unity in confessional **agreement**. Such an approach would suggest that, irrespective of the way the Anglican Communion has sought to organise itself, authority ultimately lies in the normative patterns of belief and worship which **are** displayed in the historic formularies. What have the Lambeth Conferences made of this argument?

(v) Agreed confession and liturgy

As has been seen previously, the official formularies of the Church of England do not figure prominently in the considerations of the Lambeth meetings. After the effusive Preamble to the first Conference little was made of the Protestant nature of Anglican belief or even the reformation's contribution to its history.

This is especially so in the case of the Thirty-nine Articles as has been indicated. The nearest to an endorsement of the Articles as a centre of authority came from an 1888 Conference Committee studying the Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship which included a reference to the English standards in the Encyclical. (61) It spoke of the unity given by the Catholic Faith, and went on:

as standards of doctrine and worship alike we recognise the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles - the special heritage of the Church of England, and, to a greater or lesser extent, received by all the Churches of our Communion. (62)

The committee urged that all such standards should be set before other Churches as a means to facilitate understanding and as conditions of communion. It was not felt necessary to impose the Articles, "coloured as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they were originally drawn up", upon other churches. (63) Nevertheless,

it would be impossible for us to share with them in the matter of Holy Orders, as in complete intercommunion, without satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same form of doctrine as ourselves. (64)

The recognition of the cultural conditioning of the Articles was a necessary correlate to the acknowledgement of autonomy for Provinces of course, but seems hardly enough to explain the complete absence of reference to that document in succeeding Conferences. The ambiguous attitude of the Church of England to its 'special heritage' comes closer to providing an explanation. The 1865 Clerical Subscription Act contained its own ambiguities and in the circumstances of the period did little to resolve the difficulties concerning clerical orthodoxy or the doctrinal stance of the Church of England. The ghost of that particular confusion was only laid for the Anglican Communion when, in its dying moments, the 1968 Conference discussed the main conclusions of the English doctrine commission which had reported shortly beforehand. (65) These years of neglect reinforced the idea that Anglicanism found its unity in liturgy not in confession, in ways that can now be described.

If the Articles received a limited treatment at the hands of the Lambeth Conferences, the same cannot be said of the Book of

Common Prayer. (66) The Prayer Book of course had been a primary instrument of Anglican expansion during the colonial period. For many the language and liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer were what essentially constituted Anglicanism, and so it was not difficult to make out a case that it was the possession of a Common Prayer Book that bound the Anglican Communion together in exactly the same way that it had given the Church of England its cohesion. Equally obviously, it was the liturgical tradition that was a primary example of the effect of 'mutation' in the newly established Churches. It was this problem that captured the attentions of successive Lambeth Conferences.

The possibility of the adaptation and supplementing of the Prayer Book was not unknown in the English Church prior to the period of overseas expansion, but even that was not achieved easily. (67) To take root in a new situation, the Prayer Book would require some immediate and far-reaching revisions - as the experience of the Church in North America had shown. The question was, how could changes be made without losing the binding character of the Prayer Book throughout the Communion? Once again a chronological treatment of the Conferences' conclusions is called for. In it can be seen not only a changing attitude towards the Book of Common Prayer but also a differing appreciation of the form of authority in exercises for Anglicans. The dictum, Lex orandi, lex credendi has a long history which witnesses to the fact that more than doctrine is involved in a vital Christian faith. During the 19th century, as the Lambeth Quadrilateral replaced precise theological formulation and the Prayer Book took precedence over the Articles as the norm for Anglican beliefs, the idea took root that doctrine was relatively unimportant for the Anglican Communion. Yet the Prayer Book itself was to be subjected to intense scrutiny at Lambeth.

The first conference resolved that the Faith and Doctrine of the Mother Church must remain unaltered in new bodies, but, in the spirit of Article 34, also recognised that:

each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require. Provided, that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the Spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer .... (68)

This provision was also tied to an appropriate authorisation procedure. (69)

The concession was repeated in 1878, when the Book of Common Prayer "in their own tongue" was stated to be among the given standards of each of the national churches. (70)

This awareness of the needs of increasingly indigenous fellowships was given further emphasis by the third Conference. (71) By this stage the need for revision, had led to the real possibility of a divergence of liturgical tradition throughout the Communion. (72) A principle was enunciated to meet this possibility in Resolution 10.

That, inasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is not the possession of one Diocese or Province, but of all, and that a revision in one portion of the Anglican Communion must therefore be extensively felt, this Conference is of the opinion that no particular portion of the Church should undertake revision without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church. (73)

Here plainly the authority of the Prayer Book is seen to be caught up with and subordinated to the emerging principle of the authority of inter-provincial consultation. And this view confirmed by the committee on Authoritative standards when they spoke of "a spirit of mutual and sympathetic concession" as the best defence against excessive variation in liturgical use. (74) Mutuality and sympathy were not always sufficient though. In 1897 the need for supplementary liturgical materials for local situations was still acknowledged but the ritual controversy and the attendant Royal

Commission in England also made the need for restraint more apparent. The Prayer Book stands next to the Bible as the authoritative standard of doctrine in the Anglican Communion, ran the Encyclical from the Conference, and then it warned:

The great doctrines of the Faith are there clearly set forth in their true relative proportion. And we hold that it would be most dangerous to tamper with its teaching either by narrowing the breadth of its comprehension, or by disturbing the balance of its doctrine. (75)

Despite such reservations, the need for greater flexibility prevailed. In 1908 the Encyclical confessed that the adaptation and enrichment of received forms of worship was "essential if our Church is to meet the real needs of living men and women today". (76) Committee 5, "Prayer Book Adaptation", made some detailed recommendations on what might be possible. (77) Among the resolutions came an acknowledgement of the value of the Prayer Book as a bond of union and standard of devotion. Yet it also insisted that "every effort should be made, under due authority, to render the forms of worship more intelligible to uneducated congregations and better suited to the diverse needs of the various races within the Anglican Communion". (78) The requirements of the new situations were thus seen to outweigh the need to preserve accumulated resources from the past.

As in other matters the 1920 Conference was willing to grasp this particular matter in a way that previous meetings had been unable to do. For them the reality of the Church's situation in the world, meant that a single form of liturgy could not be the primary bond of union at all.

While maintaining the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, we consider that liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

The conditions of the Church in many parts of the Mission Field render inapplicable the retention of that Book as the one fixed liturgical model. (79)

This statement is an important indication both of the way authority in doctrine moved from the Articles to the Prayer Book, and how the Prayer Book was to become a liturgical standard instead of a liturgical model. In both instances further revision of liturgies would have important effects and so a system of authorisation was necessary. This should not act as a deterrent to reasonable variation however. The extent of the changes envisaged was spelt out in the discussions of the committee on "Missionary Problems". Not only an adaptation of existing forms was called for. To meet the real needs of the new churches quite different patterns of service would be needed. The Act of Uniformity could not be applied in such a situation and the only restraints necessary were those imposed by the balance of scriptural and Catholic Truth, the precedents of the early Church, the decisions of higher synodical authorities, and "brotherly consideration" for other branches of the Anglican Communion. (80) By 1920 then, the Book of Common Prayer was no longer seen as a cut and dried authority in itself. It still functioned as a normative standard of doctrine and practice as far as Anglicans were concerned, but took its place as part of the backdrop against which the creative energies of contemporary Anglican liturgies should be tested and tried.

As in the case of the unity discussions, following Lambeth Conferences were not quick to follow up the initiatives taken in 1920. (81) It was not until 1958 that serious attention was again given to the principles of Prayer Book revision. Only then was the question of what constituted the 'essentials' of Anglican Unity broached. The committee referred to the 1948 Conference's apparent conviction that the Anglican Communion owes its unity to the Prayer

Book. Rather was it the case that

our unity exists because we are a federation of Provinces and Dioceses of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, each being served and governed by a Catholic and Apostolic Ministry, and each believing the Catholic faith. These are the fundamental reasons for our unity. (82)

Certainly the Book of Common Prayer was capable of winning deep loyalty and affection, and it could still fulfil the important symbolic role of aiding the Anglican Churches' consciousness of its Catholicity, common history and ecclesiastical culture. But only in this secondary sense could it be said to safeguard Anglican unity.

Such an argument led to a rather different configuration for the idea of liturgical unity. The essential features were then suggested as the Canonical Scriptures; the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds; Orders of Baptism with water and the threefold Name; Orders of Confirmation by the Bishop, by prayer with the laying-on of hands; Orders of Holy Communion, with the use of bread and wine and explicit intention to obey our lord's command; and forms of episcopal Ordination to each of the three Holy Orders by prayer with the laying-on of hands. Along with this categorisation there was a second which located features effective for conveying Anglican 'culture'. The various 'forms' of service should strive to be in the vernacular; wholly communal; simple; involving a due balance between word and sacrament; involving the use of Creeds, the Old Testament and Psalms where appropriate; and allowing for the honouring but not the invocation of the Saints. (83) From the conjunction of such elements the Anglican liturgical tradition would be maintained. By 1978 the Book of Common Prayer was not referred to at all when the Conference spoke of the "ordered worship" which was a part of the distinctive basis of Anglicanism. The variety of prayer books used in the different Provinces was in itself "a witness to the apostolic

Gospel in word and sacrament, (which) patterns and limits the diversity which characterized Anglicanism from the first". (34)

From the point of view of this study, two points are of particular significance. First, the reluctance with which the Lambeth Conferences came to abandon the provisions of the Act of Uniformity is instructive. Although the legal requirements of the English establishment were known to be inapplicable from the earliest period of the overseas church, and long after the formal authority of individual Provinces to govern their own affairs had been acknowledged, the defence of Anglicanism still presupposed the existence of a single liturgical form and disciplinary procedure as the common stock upon which the different churches all drew. It suggests that only when this quest for the essence of Anglicanism in the structures or formularies of the English Church had been abandoned, was the full theological force of the doctrine of Provincial autonomy and government by synods, capable of recognition. It was an ambiguous achievement. For while accountability in matters of liturgy was progressively moving towards the Anglican Provinces, it was being accompanied by a withdrawal from the authority of doctrinal agreement. The reiterated plea that liturgical changes should be made in harmony with agreed standards of doctrine runs the risk of circularity when it is also held that doctrine is primarily transmitted by liturgy - and such circularity was not always avoided. But the realisation that authority in such matters lay with the Churches rather than in any central standard of worship clearly placed responsibility where it rightly belonged, with the Provinces and their synods.

Secondly, when the knot was eventually cut by the 1920 and 1958 Conferences and recourse made to the fact of a shared liturgical tradition rather than a common liturgical form as a bond of Anglican

unity, the fabric of authority within the Communion was complete. As in the case of the Articles, the Archbishopric, the Conference and its attendant councils, the idea of a single, definitive centre of Anglican authority is dismissed. The Prayer Book thus takes its place as distinctive witness to a particular Anglican tradition of worship, and reflects the theological convictions of a decisive period in Anglican history. It is a singular but not the only distinguishing characteristic in the make-up of an Anglican family likeness.

(b) The doctrine of "dispersed authority."

The search for a centre of Anglican authority by the Lambeth Conferences has been an elusive affair. Each of the apparently straight forward contenders for the title has been seen to suffer a withdrawal of credibility rather than endorsement of support. The structures and standards can be said to possess authority only of a highly qualified kind - and none can lay claim to the possession of the rights of final appeal. Indeed the investigation so far seems to support the popular assumption that Anglicanism is bereft of authority, and that any apparent authority structures adopted by Anglicans, suffer a fatal diminution of power. It is one thing to claim that Anglican authority is not hierarchical, coercive or legalistic, but quite another to indicate what it positively is. The contrary affirmation that authority is de-centralised, voluntary, moral and "spiritual" is not self-explanatory. Some exposition of the content of Anglican authority is clearly necessary.

When the 1978 Conference report used the idea of "family resemblance" to explain how the Anglican Communion was held together amidst all its strains and tensions, it claimed that this was the outworking of a theory of "dispersed authority" advanced by the Conference thirty years previously. (85) Attention must now be given

to this theory.

This concept of distributed or dispersed authority had been introduced in the committee report on "The Anglican Communion" to the 1948 Conference. After reflecting upon the nature of the Anglican fellowship of autonomous, regional churches, the committee turned to face the crucial question: "is Anglicanism based on a sufficiently coherent form of authority to form the nucleus of a world-wide fellowship of churches, or does its comprehensiveness conceal internal divisions which may cause its disruption?". (86) While recognising the dangers of authoritarianism, the report concluded that a coherent authority did exist. Certainly former Lambeth Conferences had repudiated any central government or a legalistic basis of union (in the way outlined above), but by that very determination,

The positive nature of the authority which binds the Anglican Communion together is **therefore** seen to be moral and spiritual, resting on the truth of the Gospel, and on charity which is patient and willing to defer to the common mind.

This two-fold basis was then expanded.

Authority, as inherited by the Anglican Communion from the undivided church of the early centuries of the Christian era, is single in that it is derived from a single Divine source, and reflects within itself the richness and historicity of the divine Revelation, the authority of the eternal Father, the incarnate Son, and the life-giving Spirit. It is distributed among Scripture, Tradition, Creeds, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the witness of saints, and the consensus fidelium, which is the continuing experience of the Holy Spirit through His faithful people in the Church.

Although the records of the 1948 Conference are still unavailable under the Lambeth Palace fifty year rule, it appears that this particular formulation stems from a variety of writings from the pre-war period of English theology. During this period two major groups of churchmen sought, in somewhat similar ways, to

overcome the theological impasse bequeathed to them by the previous generation. As was argued earlier, the controversies of the nineteenth century were generally the result of appeals to different forms of authorisation in matters of doctrine. Despite their differences, the invocation of inspired Scripture or historical tradition, crypto-papalism or the example of the undivided Church, private judgment or personal experience, all carried the shared conviction that there was some source of final pronouncements in matters of faith. For the West, the propagation of the papal dogmas by the Vatican Council in 1870 marked the high-water mark of this tendency. And it is interesting to observe that most of the opposition to such ideas was not produced as an analysis of the nature of religious authority as such but by canvassing the claims of alternative organs of infallibility. As one outcome of the struggle for the proper application of historical and literary canons to theological reasoning (to which Lux Mundi bore distinguished testimony) it had become apparent that a totally different approach was necessary. Gore's refusal to admit anything other than an historical basis for all points of dogma, alienated him from the successors to the Lux Mundi school in just the same way that he himself had been forced to depart from Liddon and his predecessors by their insistence that history had nothing to do with dogma at all. (87)

It was in response to this situation that the movement which became known as liberal Catholicism, did its major work. The logic of their position was stressed by A.E.J. Rawlinson in the group of essays in which their views became known.

The rejection of the claim of the Roman Church to be possessed of authority in the form of what I have ventured to describe as an external and oracular guarantee of the intellectual truth of its doctrines carries with it, in the long run,

the rejection of the purely oracular conception of religious authority altogether. Neither the oracular conception of the authority of the Bible, nor that of the authority of the oecumenical Councils and Creeds, is in a position to survive the rejection of the oracular conception of the authority of the Pope. (88)

An equivalent realisation was accepted by a majority of the evangelical churchmen, who during this time were steadily retreating from views of biblical inerrancy. The significance of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement was to be found in the personalities of its members rather than any formal development of this theology. (89) During the 1930's and 40's a number of them rose to positions of prominence in the church, but few were conspicuous for their doctrinal efforts. Without the same concern for theological systems which characterised their Catholic counterparts, and with the idea of "conversion" replacing the older evangelical convictions concerning justification and the "testimonium", the evangelical standpoint degenerated either into a form of protestant subjectivism or, when orthodox dogma was retained, pietistic individualism. (90) In either event, the major systematic attempt to give form to ideas about religious authority was that provided by the liberal Catholics and it is their work which lies behind the 1948 Conference report. (91)

The theory advanced by the 1948 committee is built upon two assumptions. First, there is unity in the source of religious authority in the Triune God-head, and secondly, such authority is only mediated by means of various modalities. Taken together, each assumption leads to certain axiomatic conclusions. One: if ultimate authority is unified in God, then the different modalities cannot be utilised in a mutually contradictory manner. Two: while repudiating oracular infallibility such a view does not lead to a state of intellectual anarchy. Theological disciplines remain intact.

The elements of authority are, moreover, in organic relation to each other ... Catholic Christianity presents us with an organic process of life and thought in which religious experience has been, and is, described, intellectually ordered, mediated, and verified.

On the other hand, because authority remains where it belongs, with God, no single part of the modality of divine Revelation can claim to be identified with the whole of it. Diversity in the modes of revelation is inevitable, both because they are a result of Trinitarian activity, and also because every mode reflects the "richness and historicity" of its original source. No claim to authority, be it based on scripture, dogma, learning or experience, can be taken as self-authenticating.

The committee report went on to describe Anglican authority as "dispersed" rather than centralised because it is comprised of

many elements which combine, interact with, and check each other; these elements together contributing by a process of mutual support, mutual checking, and redressing of errors or exaggerations to the many sided fullness of the authority which Christ has committed to the Church.

It then adds,

Where this authority of Christ is to be found mediated not in one mode but in several we recognize in this multiplicity God's loving provision against the temptations to tyranny and the dangers of unchecked power. (92)

Both remarks need to be kept in equilibrium. The qualification of unchecked power is necessary in the Church. The dispersal of authority is a characteristic of Anglicanism as has been seen. But it is authority that is dispersed, and it is not to be assumed that authority is necessarily diminished in the process. The end result of the process of combination, interaction and mutual checking between the various agents of revelation is intended to lead to a fresh appreciation of the "many-sided fullness" of the authority of

Christ.

Can this idea of "dispersed" authority rescue Anglicanism from the charge of practical indecisiveness and doctrinal compromise? Two factors seem to tell against it. One is the fact that the notion is comparatively obscure even within Anglican thinking and the other is that it therefore lacks compelling demonstration of its effectiveness.

In reply to the first criticism it must certainly be acknowledged that between the 1948 and 1978 Conferences, the idea of dispersed authority received only cursory attention. Certainly none of the standard Conference commentaries referred to it and it has scarcely become common coinage among Anglican apologists. However it should not be thought that this neglect displaces the significance of the idea, or that it is reduced to the level of a post hoc argument which seeks to make a virtue of Anglican comprehensiveness out of the necessity of its doctrinal vagueness. Anglicanism's historical experience since the Reformation and especially since its expansion overseas has suggested that authority is best exercised in a dispersed or distributed manner. This may seem unsatisfactory to those Christians who still see religious authority functioning on a "hierarchical" or "oracular" model. (93) Talk of the "multiplicity of God's provision" will appear evasive to them. But the organization and life of the Anglican Communion would make it necessary to speak of the reality behind dispersed authority there, even if the idea had never been thought of.

The second criticism is more telling. It suggests that no explicit application of the idea of dispersed authority <sup>can</sup> be adumbrated, and that if it is to be suggested that the general experience of Anglicanism is an implicit demonstration of the idea,

then the disorder of Anglican life and doctrine is hardly a commendation of its merits. In the final chapter of this thesis it will be argued that the decision-making structures of the Anglican Communion do in fact work and that authority, when properly disposed in its parts, does lead to wholeness of life for the Church. However it is true that on a superficial examination the ideal propounded by the 1948 Conference committee seems to give carte blanche to all forms of authority and the ecclesiastical anarchy to which that gives rise. It has already been explained that such a conclusion is misconceived and that in the interaction of different elements of authority, the unity of God is emphasised in equal proportion to the diversity of His operations. To acknowledge a multiple authority is not to create a theological smorgasbord in which one aspect of Christianity can be selected while others are ignored.

It must be admitted though that the positive dispersal of authority has not yet reached the general stage of conscious reflection within Anglican experience. The 1948 Committee were not unaware of this possibility. Towards the end of their exposition they responded to the complaint that a "dispersed authority" was less easily understood than appeal to authorities of "a more imperious kind". The problem was recognised. However they also recorded their conviction that the idea could be rendered simple and intelligible if the Church was conceived of on the model of a human family rather than as a political or business enterprise. The life of faith and obedience was lived in the context of the Church, with the bishop as father in God wielding his authority "in synodical association with his clergy and laity" with the humility fitting for one who was himself under authority. The question of authority is to be answered at the lectern and the altar as well as in the theological academy. (94) And if the idea of dispersed

authority is not yet well understood within the Churches, then the fault may not lie entirely with the idea.

If the more positive and creative aspects of the idea of dispersed authority were to prove credible they would provide the most fitting rationale yet available for the defence of Anglican comprehensiveness. On such an assessment the differences which so manifestly exist within the Anglican spectrum would be resolved not by reference to some irreducible minimum of belief or organisation but rather by the attempt to apprehend a greater degree of the fullness of the gospel. The limits of Anglican diversity would then be seen to be reached, not just when some formal norm is contradicted, but when a group (or individual) refuses any longer to submit its life or thinking to the process of "mutual support, mutual checking, and redressing of errors or exaggerations" which the structure of Anglican faith and order provides. Such a process is not unprincipled. The Catholic standards and the reformation formularies retain their force as the framework, the intellectual context in which individual differences are to be explored. (95) They do not however point to any fixed canon of orthodoxy against which the adequacy of all subsequent ideas is to be judged. The consensus fidelium is a living tradition which must be constantly examined, tested, corrected and carried forward. Neither does this process imply that truth is established by the ballot box. The Christian tradition has an "organic life", and the weight of consensus (as the 1948 committee expressed it in words of the Archbishops' Doctrine Commission) "does not depend on mere numbers or on the extension of a belief at any one time, but on continuance through the ages, and the extent to which the consensus is genuinely free". (96)

Such at least was the vision of the Lambeth Conference committee.

At its best this has always been the hope of Anglican theology.

Leonard Hodgson was fond of the suggestion that Anglican

"comprehensiveness" would be better described as "fertility", not just as a matter of semantics but because it helped to draw attention away from secondary matters and concentrate it upon primary points at issue. (97)

H.E.W. Turner, in a brilliant survey of the development of orthodoxy in the early church, concludes that the formulation of every major doctrine was a result of the convergence of previously independent theological traditions. "The junction of traditions revealed potentialities which did not exist in any single form taken in isolation". (98)

S.W. Sykes has argued that the sixteenth century formularies of the Church of England were intended to achieve the same end. (99)

If this vision is matched by reality, the Lambeth Conference's belief that

Anglican authority rests on "the truth of the Gospel, and on charity which is patient and willing to defer to the common mind" is worthy of serious consideration.

Yngve Brilioth has pointed out that one result of Newman's determination to seek the voice of living tradition in the Roman Catholic Church, was that Anglican responses (Tractarian and

Evangelical alike) reverted to much more static views of revelation and authority. (100)

The argument of this section has been that in the theory of dispersed authority Anglicanism possesses the most adequate doctrine as yet available, with which to join the standards of the past with the living experience of the Church in the present. (101)

Anglican life and decision making is therefore to be worked out by the interplay of its varied ecclesiastical structures and theological resources. It is to be judged not so much in terms of its history or on the formal terms of what it claims to possess, but by its conformity in word and deed to the

consensus fidelium, "which is the continuing experience of the Holy Spirit through His faithful people in the Church".

## 2. PATTERNS OF ANGLICAN AUTHORITY

This thesis has so far argued in favour of two propositions. First, that the Anglican Communion is not to be seen as an extension of the Church of England but rather as a family of independent and autonomous Churches. It is drawn together by a common allegiance to doctrinal standards and the will to live together and not just the nostalgic appeal of a shared history or ecclesiastical culture, both of which are increasingly irrelevant to the course of Modern Anglicanism. Secondly, it has been demonstrated that the structures and understanding of religious authority which Anglicanism has settled upon, provide in principle, a justification for the range of liturgical and theological diversity so apparent within the Anglican Communion and indeed in its member Churches. This principle means that the diversity of Anglican traditions, its comprehensiveness (when properly understood), is not just a concession to theological uncertainty but is a vital element in the Anglican family bond.

The question must now be faced, however, as to the status these propositions should enjoy in any estimation of Anglican integrity. Enough has been shown of the inner workings of Lambeth Conferences to remove any suggestion that these are ideological statements drawn from purely conceptual notions about the nature of Anglicanism. Neither can they be seen as an example of being wise after the event: an attempt to rationalise an otherwise theologically intolerable situation. The fabric of the argument is too varied and too sustained for that. But given the case that the above propositions do represent the settled convictions of the Lambeth fathers, what follows? Do they in anything but the most incidental manner represent the beliefs of Anglicanism, the principles upon which one can speak theologically of the Anglican Communion? How far, for instance, do the standards of Anglican belief as

adumbrated by successive Lambeth Conferences cohere with the beliefs of different autonomous Provinces? And to what extent can dispersed authority be spoken of as a characteristic feature in the life of national churches as distinct from a method appropriate for their dealing with each other? It would not be unreasonable for the whole Communion to comprise something other than the sum of its constituent parts, but if the convictions which undergird the one are seen to be inconsistent with those professed by the others, then any claim that they represent the makings of an Anglican ecclesiology must fail. No matter how conscientiously it has been developed, Anglicanism as such subsides into merely a paper religion. The ideals of the Lambeth Conference would correspond to no existent reality.

To pursue this question the focus of attention must change. As a parallel to the study of Conference material there must now follow an examination of the references to belief and authority in the constitutional material of the Anglican provinces.

(a) Constitutional material in the Anglican Communion.

During the survey of the emergence of Anglicanism as a world faith in chapter two, the importance of episcopal constitutionalism was first noted. When Anglicans, for one reason or another, found themselves outside the protective embrace of the English establishment, they were forced to define their beliefs and the character of their Christian community and to make provision for its future organisation and well-being. This they accomplished by means of voluntary association in synods and by a system of self-government under constitutional formularies. Since then every Anglican Province, with the exception of the Church of England, has followed the same practice. Constitutional documents scarcely make compelling reading but their importance in the present

context must not be over-looked: they are primary evidence of the way in which Anglicans have sought to give substance to the beliefs and character of their churches. What is more, constitutions have often been written at critical times and in circumstances of considerable historical and theological urgency. To read between the lines of some of the older compacts - like those of the Churches in Scotland, the United States, South Africa and Ireland, or some of the more recent - such as those from Uganda, Jerusalem and the Middle East, or South America, is to catch a glimpse of the way Anglican churches have struggled to maintain the integrity of their faith.

This being so it is surprising that Anglicans have given so little attention to a comparison of the contents of constitutional materials in the Communion. A definitive study was carried through by a former Archbishop of Melbourne, Henry Lowther Clarke, in 1924, but at that time there were only nine Provinces outside the British Isles and those with geographical boundaries often quite different from those recognised today. (102) In 1948, G.W.O. Addleshaw, then a Canon of York, reviewed the situation while in 1964 an American, Spencer Ervin, began a comprehensive survey of the polity of different Provinces. The most spectacular proliferation of Provinces has of course taken place in the last thirty years. (103) Ervin's death cut short his project with only five studies complete. (104) Since then no systematic attention has been given to the topic. As has been seen, the 1978 Conference assumed that an examination of the constitutional documents "reveals a marked resemblance between member Churches of the Anglican Communion", but in fact, no such examination had been carried out. (105) Indeed, at the time of this investigation no complete set of documents was available for examination anywhere in the world. (106)

How is the assumption to be tested? In what is the Anglican "family likeness" to be found? It is beyond the scope of this section to revise Lowther Clarke's province-by-province review, but a briefer comparative study is able to show the underlying character of the Anglican constitutional material.

Such a process inevitably involves a degree of selection, but some comparisons and contrasts can be drawn even after due attention has been paid to differences in material.

There is no such thing as a typical constitution. For that matter there is no typical Province. The means by which dioceses are associated, vary. Some Provinces (e.g. England; Ireland; U.S.; Australia; Canada) utilise a sub-structure of "regional provinces". (107) Still other dioceses combine as Councils even though they are located in quite independent nations (e.g. the Councils of East Asia, South America, and the South Pacific). (108) In general however, a Province is never less than national in extent, and its significance is not related to physical size or numerical strength but in the way it seeks to find an adequate basis for corporate Christian organization and mission.

In the composition of Constitutional documents three general ecclesiological themes are apparent. These provide the basis for a preliminary classification of the material.

In the first place, the Colonial churches of the nineteenth century can be grouped together. As has been seen, these Churches were forced to make provision for the proper ordering of their affairs by their legal isolation from the Church of England. They did so in the sonorous tones of Victorian jurisprudence. So the South African constitution relates:

Whereas it is expedient that the members of a Church, not by law established, should, for the purpose of its due government, as well as the management of its property and the ordering of its affairs, formally set forth the

terms of the compact under which it is associated ....

The situation of the Irish and Welsh Churches can be compared with the Colonial Churches and as has been indicated, the example of the Scottish and American Churches was vital in each case. The association of the Scottish episcopalians under Canons after 1727 provided the first example of constitutional and synodical government, and the Americans used this precedent to develop their own ecclesiastical and democratic ideals from 1789. The colonial churches consciously followed suit.

A second category is made up of Provinces formed more recently, not because independence was thrust upon them but because it became necessary for the Churches to assume responsibility for their own life within their own regional setting. Here the newer African Provinces are typical. The way in which Tanzania and Kenya formed into separate Provinces in 1970, or West Africa, (a composite Province founded in 1970) sub-divided to create a separate Province of Nigeria in 1979, might be seen simply as a reflection of nationalistic rivalry. At best it also expresses a sense of self-awareness and self-reliance. In the Provinces or Councils which are made up of dioceses from more than one nation (Central Africa, West Africa, South America, East Asia, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem and the Middle East, South Pacific, West Indies) there are hopeful signs of the way Christian community can transcend national frontiers. This sense of proper independence can also be seen in the way the Sudan assumed its own Metropolitan rights which had previously been exercised by the See of Canterbury (1976), or when Melanesia established its independence from the Province of New Zealand (1973). Understandably, similarities of constitutional form occur in such instances.

The third category exemplifies the way in which independence can be woven together with interdependence. For much of the world, Christianity in general and Anglicanism in particular is a minority faith. Because of the factors of distance and size it is important for self-governing churches to be aware that they are not alone.

The Province of the Indian Ocean provides an example of how various dioceses met the first problem - of distance; Jerusalem and the Middle East associates churches very aware of their miniscule size; the Regional Councils of S. America, E. Asia, S. Pacific present attempts to meet both problems at the same time. In a way, Australia (which only achieved a Provincial constitution in 1955) is another example of the way regional churches strive for an adequate basis of partnership. So too is the existence of Extra Provincial dioceses within the Anglican Communion. It is further demonstrated by the way the Anglican fellowship has been enlarged through agreements of intercommunion with the Old Catholics (1932), the Philippine Independent Church (1961), the Iberian Churches (1963) and the Mar Thoma Syrian Church (1974).

Despite the range of constitutional types certain characteristics can be enumerated without suggesting the existence of any composite or normative framework.

In virtually every case, after a preamble which names the Church concerned or gives something of the circumstance which has given rise to its present formulation, prominence is given in the Constitution to some statement concerning Faith and Order. Typical details of these statements are the concern of a subsequent section, but the fact and the manner in which such declarations are made is of interest in itself. They are often given in the form of Fundamental Clauses which are taken to be unalterable (e.g.

Australia, C. Africa, Melanesia, N.Z., Nigeria, Scotland, S. Africa, W. Africa). (109) Others profess a Solemn Declaration (Canada) or make a Statement of General Principles, as for example, Japan - which does so in a form of the Chicago Quadilateral (1887), adopted prior to its being taken up by the Lambeth Conference in the following year. Virtually all the other Provinces give a distinct article to state their beliefs regarding Doctrine and Worship (e.g. Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, S. America, Sudan, Tanzania). The Melanesian Church outlines certain "Foundations of Faith". Ireland and the W. Indies offer a Preamble and Declaration to their Canons and this includes a controlling clause about Doctrine. Some of the churches (e.g. Sudan, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Kenya, Melanesia, S. Africa, Uganda) specifically disclaim the right to modify their fundamental standards, while others emphasise that alterations to standards of doctrine or worship can only be carried out under the most stringent conditions. These provisions are qualified by exceptions, at least in matters of worship, to allow such changes as:

1. May from time to time be made by the Church of England (C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Kenya, N.Z., Nigeria, S. Africa (the Creeds are explicitly excepted), Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, W. Africa);
2. may be required to meet the requirements of local conditions (Australia, Canada, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia and N.Z. (both of which distinguish between an unchanging faith and the possibility of varying forms of worship and discipline), Nigeria, S. Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, W. Africa):
3. or, may result from the authority of some higher Synod (S. Africa).

There is also sometimes a statement to the effect that although bound by universal standards, the Church is bound by no interpretation of such standards other than those of its own Provincial tribunals (Indian Ocean, Kenya, Nigeria). The only exceptions to this pattern are in the Regional Councils which

initially at least, tend to define their faith as identical with that of their member churches; the Church in Wales which refers to the standards of the C. of E. as foundational; and the Episcopal Church of U.S.A. which simply refers to the formularies - its own version of the Prayer Book, Ordinal and Articles.

Following articles on faith and order which sometimes include a denial of the right to racial discrimination (C. Africa, Sudan), procedures of government and principles of worship generally follow. The question of ecclesiastical discipline is dealt with and some system of judgment and appeal provided - sometimes at length - although this is often taken up in a separate Canon or regulation. In this connection questions of metropolitical authority are covered.

From this diverse material it is possible to perceive certain ways in which the Provinces define their faith and exercise authority.

(b) Standards of Anglican doctrine

Anglican Faith and Order appears to be defined in two ways - first it expresses the universal faith of the Church and secondly it expresses it in a particular fashion.

The universal referent is provided by the claim that the Church concerned is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church (Australia, Canada, Scotland, Melanesia, China and Japan - the last two of which omit the reference to unity); that it is "a fellowship within" that Church (U.S.); or is simply the current embodiment of "the Ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church" in that place (Ireland). Alternatively, churches profess "the Christian faith" (Australia, S. America); "the Faith of Christ" (C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Sudan, Tanzania); "The Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (S. Africa, W. Indies); or some variant of the formula "the faith, doctrine, sacraments and discipline of the Lord" or "the Church of Christ"

(N.Z., Nigeria, W. Africa). Some (e.g. Australia, Melanesia) refer to a combination of such phrases.

More particularly this Universal faith and order is seen to be Anglican. Some constitutions relate this to their historical or missionary origins (China, Japan, Ireland, N.Z.), others because they hold, receive or retain full communion with the See of Canterbury and the Anglican Communion (Canada, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Nigeria, S. America, Sudan, Tanzania, U.S.A., W. Africa). Scotland simply lists those churches with which it is in communion. Yet other churches define their Anglican character by reference to the manner in which they receive the Christian faith - as it is taught or explained by the Church of England in Prayer Book, Ordinal and Articles (Melanesia, N.Z., Nigeria, W. Africa, S. Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Wales, W. Indies).

The relevant passage from the Melanesian constitution is perhaps illustrative of this two-fold method of reference (although in many respects the Melanesian document is perhaps the most idiosyncratic of all the constitutions). It states:

"We accept and teach the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teachings, sacraments and discipline of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church as the Anglican Communion has received them".

It then lists the standards (in this case simply Scripture and Creeds) which "set forth" the faith thus received. This pattern can be seen in the constitution of other Provinces too. It can also be seen in the universal/particular dimensions already outlined and these in turn can be more specifically identified.

(i) A Universal faith. This faith is defined by various constitutions as Scriptural, Credal, Catholic, Sacramental and Episcopal.

Scriptural. Almost invariably the Catholic faith is

defined in terms of the Bible. The faith is "revealed in Holy Writ" (Canada) or "Commanded by the Lord in His Holy Word" (N.Z., Nigeria, W. Africa). Scripture is generally specified as comprising "the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments", and spoken of as "the revelation of God" (Japan), or the authority by which Christian faith is "taught" (C. Africa, S. Africa, Sudan, W. Indies). It is received, typically, as the "ultimate rule and/or standard" (Australia, China, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, Uganda) or "faith" (Australia, China, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, Uganda) or "faith and life". Some Provinces speak of Scripture as "inspired" (Australia, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, Tanzania, Uganda). The most characteristic phrase, however, refers to scripture as "containing all things necessary to salvation" (Australia, Canada, China, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Japan, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, Tanzania, Uganda, U.S.).

A bare recitation of these phrases may be misleading. Some provinces do indeed outline their doctrinal standards by way of a series of separate propositions which seem intended to define the status of scripture as an authority (pre-eminently Japan, but also Australia, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda). Others however, provide a historical preamble to introduce a whole scheme of divine revelation within which the function of scripture is mentioned incidentally (e.g. Canada, N.Z., S. Africa). This leads to a rather distinctive phraseology whereby scripture is acknowledged to teach the faith, which was also in turn preached by the apostles and held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and confirmed, affirmed or confessed by the General Councils. (Canada, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, S. Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda,

W. Indies). (110) The differences of approach should not be pressed too far, and some constitutions (e.g. Jerusalem, Tanzania, Uganda) adopt both methods, but a certain difference of emphasis concerning doctrinal authority can perhaps be noted. The one approach appears to safeguard the existence of certain dogmatic standards which are presumed to guarantee authoritative teaching: the other tends to see religious authority more as a matter of organic development and commits the church to identify itself with that process.

Other standards of faith are involved in this ambiguity too, but they can be treated more briefly.

Credal. The constitutions which lean towards more organic views of revelation speak of the Creeds as "summing up" the content of the apostolic faith. (Canada, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, S. Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, W. Indies). Canada also speaks of them "defining" it; in Australia they are seen to "set forth" the faith; Japan "holds" the faith of the Creeds; while the Melanesians adopt them, with scripture, as their formal standards. The Irish simply "profess the Faith of Christ which was professed by the Primitive Church". Other constitutions, whose definitions of faith are linked by history to the Church of England's standards (N.Z., Nigeria, Scotland, S. America, U.S., Wales, W. Africa) adopt the creeds as contained in those formularies even if they do not explicitly mention them.

Catholic. Mention of the Creeds usually leads to the qualification that they were "confirmed" or "affirmed" by the General Councils. Most citations specify these to have been "the undisputed Councils of the Holy Catholic Church", although Jerusalem further delimits the procedure to the "dogmatic discussions of the first four Councils" and Canada to the undisputed Councils of the "Undivided

Primitive Church". Melanesia is involved in a familiar dilemma when it notes that along with its standards, it also gives "special honour to the teachings of the early Church, especially the decisions of those General Councils of the Church as are accepted by the Eastern and Western Church".

Sacramental and Episcopal. Administration of "sacraments" is generally listed along with a Church's general commitment to the faith, doctrine and discipline of Christ (Australia, China, C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Ireland, Jerusalem, Kenya, Melanesia, N.Z., Nigeria, S. Africa, S. America, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Wales, W. Africa, W. Indies), and is most often also linked with principles of worship received from the Church of England or in the Anglican Communion. Canada and Japan see their respective participation in "the divinely ordained Sacraments" and "the two sacraments which (Christ) instituted" as marks of their catholic authenticity. The Episcopal Church in Scotland treats the matter of sacramental discipline at some length although no mention of the sacraments occurs as a fundamental article. The same situation occurs in the American constitution.

Standards of "ministry" are treated more variously. Any Church committed to the use of an Anglican ordinal is presumably thereby committed to episcopacy, but as is to be expected, no single explanation as to what this involves can be found. Some Provinces simply state their intention to maintain the principles of the Church of England's Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal (C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, N.Z., S. Africa, Sudan, U.S.A., Wales). Others separately state their adherence to the three-fold order of ministry as a matter of principle (Australia, C. Africa, Japan). Still others offer a rationale for their form

of government: Canada speaks of "the ministry of ... Apostolic Orders"; China of maintaining the orders "which have been in Christ's Church from the time of the Apostles"; Tanzania and Uganda both have an article which declares that their Provinces hold and teach "that from the Apostles' times there have been these orders in Christ's church: bishops, priests, and deacons". The Tanzanian constitution goes on to exclude from ministerial office anyone who has not been admitted by episcopal ordination. The U.S. has a detailed Canon regarding the proper qualification for episcopal ministry and the provision of "conditional ordination" in cases where doubt exists. Melanesia, in rather different vein, contends that while the three-fold order is agreeable to Holy Scripture and the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church, and while lawful ministry in the Province is founded upon ordination in the historic succession, yet.

this article does not mean that other forms of ministry in other Communion are not real, nor does it mean that only those who are ordained share in the ministry of the Church. The whole people of God, clergy and laity, shares in that ministry.

Legal documents are not the best places in which to expose theological controversies, but these references clearly reflect wider issues. However, the Melanesian note does provide one of the few indications in Provincial constitutions that the Church contains laymen! Their existence is assumed (and it is a significant assumption) for the purposes of synodical government, but beyond that there are only occasional references to the need for discipline among laymen (S. Africa), the need for greater lay education and responsibility (Japan), and an outline system of pastoral oversight (Scotland).

The meaning of standards such as these can really be understood only by observing how they work. This is the purpose of the administrative provisions in constitutions, and the concern of a

later section of this summary. The West African and Nigerian constitutions do however make clear the meaning of ministerial authority with respect to its particular responsibilities.

(Bishops hold) responsibility and authority for the preservation of the truth of the Church's doctrine, for the purity of its life, and for the worthiness of its worship; the Priests, in co-operation with and under the guidance of Bishops, have a special responsibility for preaching the Word of God and administering the Holy Sacraments and generally for the care of souls: and the Deacons have a special responsibility for the care of the poor and distressed, for the instruction of the young and ignorant, and for giving assistance to the Priests in divine service.

(ii) A Particular expression. Provinces further define their grasp of the Faith as Anglican and yet also indigenous.

Anglican. For the faith of Scripture, creed and tradition to be received or maintained, it must be embodied within a concrete historical and liturgical tradition. This double emphasis is underlined by such Provinces as S. Africa and W. Indies. Their constitutions show that it is the faith of the Holy Catholic Church that is adopted, but "according as the Church of England received (and set forth) the same". Virtually every Province makes a similar declaration and also ascribes a normative authority to Anglican formularies, often stating that they adopt them as "agreeable to the Word of God".

The earlier constitutions (Canada, Ireland, U.S., N.Z., and Wales) take over the English standards of the Book of Common Prayer, Ordinal and Articles in toto, claiming them as their possession by virtue of a common historical tradition. Even the more recently founded Provinces, which have had only indirect connections with English history, refer to B.C.P. and Ordinal as central authorities (C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, Nigeria, S. America, Sudan, Tanzania, W. Indies). In virtually every case a vernacular

liturgy is an established fact, but all insist that they follow "the principles of worship" of the Prayer Book and that the work of revision is consistent with its "spirit and teaching". There are only slight exceptions to this rule. Japan and China follow the American Church's liturgical standards. The history of Scottish Canon Law is riven by the competing claims of English and Scottish liturgical traditions. Melanesia states its resolve to pursue a single liturgical pattern with reasonable liberty for local adaptation, but does not indicate what that pattern should be.

Thus, conscious use of the Book of Common Prayer as a liturgical model raises important points concerning mutual accountability within the Anglican Communion. As has been seen the Lambeth Conferences have recommended that the Churches share a common liturgical structure, not a single liturgical form. The ability of the Prayer Book to sustain that structure must be under severe pressure, especially in view of the independent liturgical developments in the Church of England. As the Prayer Book increasingly becomes an historical rather than a living example of liturgy, the need for more substantive standards of worship becomes urgent.

In the case of more recent constitutions, the Thirty-nine Articles are rarely mentioned - only Australia and Uganda do so. Kenya also shares with Uganda a statement to the effect that even though the Articles are not mentioned in the fundamental clauses, this does not "preclude their use" as standards for diocesan discipline or clerical subscription. West Africa and Nigeria refer to the Articles as expressing the faith which the Church of England contributed to their own development but do not refer to them as authoritative for their own life. For historical reasons which have already been indicated, the Episcopal church in Scotland adopted the Articles at the Synod of Laurencekirk (1804). In 1979 and 1980 the Provincial

Synod decided that assent to Articles would be no longer required, and references to the Articles in the Canons were deleted.

When subscription to the Articles is required it occurs in various forms, both verbal and written. In the American Church subscription is not required but clergy are expected to assent to the "formularies" as consistent with the word of God. The Church of England was the last Church to "read in" clergy with the Articles at their institution or induction. This practice became voluntary in 1975. Lay members of the New Zealand General Synod are expected to subscribe and to this extent the Articles are binding upon diocesan synods which are subject to Provincial review. The Australian Church provides a full exposition of the authority of doctrinal standards in its documents, and in Sydney diocese, subscription is required not only from clergy but also from catechists (lay-readers).

Indigenous. To mention the revision of the Prayer Book and the development of vernacular liturgies is to introduce a second element. While the Provincial Constitutions give a clear acknowledgement of their theological and historical antecedents, they also insist that the faith so received is to be adapted to meet the needs of local conditions. As has been already indicated, more recent constitutions make provision for such adaptation: the existence of the older Provinces indicates some of the ways in which it has already been done.

Adaptation is not innovation, and most documents state that any changes in worship for instance must remain consistent with fundamental articles (Australia, Nigeria, W. Africa), the principles of the Prayer Book (C. Africa, Indian Ocean, Jerusalem, Kenya, S. Africa, S. America, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda), Scripture (Melanesia), or Creeds (Tanzania). Others (Canada, Ireland, N.Z. - which explicitly distinguishes between changes in doctrine and changes in worship, S. America, Uganda, Wales,

W. Indies) require that changes should only be made by due authority, which in turn is governed by more fundamental requirements.

Ireland reaffirms its "constant witness against all innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the Primitive Faith hath been from time to time overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject". W. Africa and Nigeria claim "power to order its discipline to banish and drive out all erroneous and strange doctrines which are contrary to God's word as understood and interpreted" by their formularies - an interesting application of familiar words from the Ordinal.

Beyond this, casual reminders about the non-racial character of the Christian doctrine of man, agonising efforts to provide Provincial unity across sharply divided national frontiers, or provisions for the continued administration of a Province should its synods be prevented from meeting, all attest the way in which the life of Anglican Provinces is formed amidst the harsh realities of particular societies and cultures.

(c) The Exercise of Authority. The connection between authority and power is a complex issue. In the last analysis authority lies not in formal standards but in the way power operates. Ecclesiologically, this question devolves to one concerning the ways - if any - in which the formulations of the Church shape and direct its life and witness. It is at this level that constitutional study is at its least effective. People transcend their institutions and history over-runs convention, but within the limits of this study, certain observations about the way authority is exercised can be attempted.

(i) Disciplinary authority. The most obvious sign of potential power is found in the disciplinary machinery of the churches. Some constitutions (e.g. U.S.) provide extensive regulations. Others

simply outline procedures for complaint, trial, sentencing, with arrangements for appeal, review, and restitution. The offences which an ecclesiastical court is competent to investigate and the punishment it can impose are often enumerated. Such charges as habitual neglect of duty, a breach of vows or violation of the constitution, are listed along with immoral or scandalous behaviour and false doctrine. Such charges, if upheld, can result in sentences ranging from censure, to suspension, to deprivation of office. The disciplinary powers of the Provinces are in every case restricted to the voluntary sphere of the synodal compact (although in some instances oaths and evidence do also fall under the authority of civil statutes) and primarily concern questions of ministry.

The details of particular provisions vary, but taken together, two principles of authority can be recognised. First, the exercise of disciplinary power is directly linked with the constitutional standards under which the Province operates. Secondly, discipline is exercised by a graduated succession of authorities. The decision of a diocesan court is subject on appeal to a Provincial body, and beyond this various forms of ultimate appeal are available. These latter bodies provide examples of the exercise of metropolitanical authority. But before considering that question, other more immediate issues arise.

(ii) The locus of ecclesiastical authority. The summons of an ecclesiastical court itself depends upon notions of authority. Who after all has the right, the power, to pronounce judgement in the Church? Should this lie with the episcopate or a more widely devolved process of consultation? In some Churches this is ultimately an episcopal function (Indian Ocean, Japan, Kenya): Scotland interestingly vests such authority with the Bishop and his cathedral chapter; Australia specifies that the chairman of its supreme "appellate" tribunal should

be a layman, trained in the law. By and large the decision of the Provinces is that courts should be made up of a body representative of the synods - bishops, priests and laymen - chosen by election. But their various solutions illustrate a certain tension between episcopacy and synodical government which is mirrored in a number of discussions about Anglican authority.

When the colonial churches first gained their independence they were forced to locate the source of ecclesiastical authority in their synods. The system of voting by houses, and the requirement that all three houses concur, rendered episcopacy constitutional, while providing that the bishops still retained the power of veto over proceedings. To that extent the Australian decision to appoint a lay chairman over its disciplinary body is quite consistent, as is the stipulation about his legal rather than spiritual qualifications. Most constitutions today adopt a similar solution. Some of the provincial structures (e.g. W. Indies, E. Asia) began as bishops' conferences and retain the house of bishops as a kind of "upper chamber", independent of the synod. Tanzania and China give the bishops the right to approve candidates for the episcopate prior to an electoral synod although they do not normally have the right to impose their own selection on the diocese.

The same episcopal/synodical tension can be observed in the way in which some constitutions tend to limit the role of Archbishops to formal duties whereas others (notably C. Africa, W. Africa, Nigeria, Tanzania) outline duties which are not only administrative but include the right to visit and supervise the individual dioceses. Melanesia, following local tribal customs, goes so far as to require a vow of obedience from diocesan bishops to their Archbishop. The Scottish church stress the fact that Primacy is a shared responsibility of all their Bishops, with the Primus simply acting as their chairman. In America, this view of

primacy is accentuated by the fact that the Presiding Bishop holds tenure for an elected period.

Such differences may be merely those of emphasis but they seem also to reflect two views of authority. The first tends to be hierarchical, institutionalised and authoritarian, the second more corporate, dispersed and constitutional. However when it is recalled that the Church of England actively debated until the 1930's whether laymen had any place in a true 'synod', it can be seen that the Provinces of the Anglican communion overall, chose to walk a distinct and innovative path.

(iii) The extent of ecclesiastical authority. Another complication is to be observed in the way in which spheres of authority overlap and interlock. Most obviously there is a certain tension in the relationship between diocese and Province. What is that relationship? And what effect does the existence of regional provinces have upon it?

It was partly the lack of any clear resolution of these problems that delayed the completion of the Australian constitution for so many years. Eventually a formula was agreed whereby the Canons of the General Synod became effective in a diocese only when adopted by that diocese's synod. Any constitutional concerns undertaken by a regional province (and it is here that the individual diocese's consent is primarily required) must in turn await ratification by General Synod. The Australian situation raises most of the possible difficulties to be found in this question, but the solution in principle is illuminating. Clearly provincial government is more than a democratic system of checks and balances. At best it refrains from imposing unilateral decisions on a local situation, but also prevents local concerns from becoming all consuming. To borrow a phrase from another context, Anglican Provincial polity is an expression of Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence. This principle informs the Welsh constitution

which operates at three levels: dioceses confer, a representative body administers business, and a Governing Body legislates. In a number of the documents (e.g. N.Z., Indian Ocean, Jerusalem) the degree of approbation that legislation requires is proportionate to its subject matter. Fundamental matters need a greater sense of unanimity than policy or administrative decisions. The principle outlined at the 1st Lambeth Conference is referred to in the Tanzanian and Ugandan Constitution: matters of common concern are Provincial decisions, local problems require local initiatives. As an example, these Provinces cite the subdivision or re-arrangement of Diocesan boundaries. Such decisions are a Provincial prerogative but no existing diocese can be subdivided or altered without its consent. In the same way, liturgical revision is ideally a Provincial affair, but the Province cannot impose revisions on a Diocese, and as a corollary to that, a Diocese should not initiate liturgical change without Provincial approval.

Once again contrary patterns can also be traced. It is best exemplified by South Africa in its understanding that the Provincial Synod "empowers" the holding of Diocesan Synod, and retains the right to review its decisions. In turn, the Province is unique in expressing its readiness to be subject to the "higher authority of a General Synod of the churches of the Anglican Communion to which this Province shall be invited ....". This echoes the nineteenth century ideal of Gray that the Lambeth Conference should be the forerunner of a genuinely universal Anglican synod. A similar position is held in the Sudan where the Provincial Synod can consider objections from the Dioceses to its decisions, but is under no obligation to do anything about them. In Melanesia too the Diocesan Synod meets in conscious subjection to the Province and the Archbishop. The Melanesian Church, again following local practices, seeks to act only

when unanimity has been reached on any issue.

This difference of emphasis between local initiative and central authorisation is perhaps inevitable in any system which seeks to uphold both authority and freedom. It is also to some extent a result of the circumstances in which Provinces were founded. If a Province came into being through the sub division of a larger unit, its authority will tend to be centralized: if it is an amalgamation of local churches then its structure is bound to be of a more federal character.

(d) Metropolitanical authority. As has been seen, the provincial structure was from the first intended to provide a pattern of consistent metropolitanical oversight. At the very time when it became clear that, for practical and legal reasons, the Archbishop of Canterbury could no longer exclusively perform these functions, it was necessary to provide for the self-sufficiency of churches where isolation was an acute problem. This provision is clearly evident in a number of constitutions. Of special interest are the cases where metropolitanical authority is exercised, not by an individual but by a Council (e.g. S. America; E. Asia [where the Council for the meantime preserves the Canons of the Church not only in Hong Kong but also the Chinese mainland], and potentially, the S. Pacific).

However in this connection, an earlier reference to "higher authority" introduces another recurring problem of Anglican ecclesiology. Is the Province subject to any other control beyond its own constitutional standard? Does the existence of metropolitanical authority imply any theory of universal authority for the Anglican communion? A positive answer to this has been suggested by a number of the more recent constitutions, even if the question was not considered previously. Several of the newer Provinces have felt the need for a final authority beyond their own boundaries. Inevitably

there is no consensus as to what, or who, that authority should be. For example, changes to the Fundamental provisions of C. Africa, and Nigerian constitutions must be referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in the case of Nigeria, to all the Metropolitans to ensure that they do not affect terms of inter-communion. In a number of other cases, final appeal in problems of discipline can be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury (W. Africa): or the Archbishop and two other bishops of his choosing (C. Africa; S. Africa): or the Archbishop and the Anglican Consultative Council (Jerusalem), or its Secretary General (Sudan). Others nominate the A.C.C. or the Lambeth Conference as their "higher authority" (Indian Ocean, Uganda). Even when practical considerations do not demand it, some churches (Sudan, W. Indies) accord "honour and defence" to the Archbishop of Canterbury as the first among equals in the Episcopate and in effect this applies to all Provinces, whether it is referred to Constitutionally or not.

Reference to the office of the Archbishop brings this part of the survey full circle. The Archbishop of Canterbury is both primate of a particular Province of the Anglican Communion, and in the way discussed earlier, also one of the symbols of unity for the Communion as a whole. As such he uniquely portrays the pattern of inter-relationships which make up the texture of Anglicanism. The foregoing examination of Provincial constitutions however, necessarily precedes further consideration of that pattern of relationships. It has sought to answer the question as to whether sufficient points of comparison exist between the various Provinces to make any form of inter-relationship possible. Within the limits of this study it is possible to answer that question in the affirmative.

In the first place, it has become apparent that there is a considerable degree of overlapping in the manner by which individual

Provinces set out to define their doctrinal stance. Although not "confessional" Churches in the usually accepted meaning of that term, the Anglican Provinces are all constituted by reference to objective theological and liturgical standards. Admittedly there is no single formula which permits instant recognition of an Anglican faith and order, but comparison of the constitutional material relating to doctrine indicates that different Provinces have grown from common (or at least closely related) stock and have largely traversed the same path of doctrinal development. It is this common tradition or shared heritage that primarily links the Anglican Provinces to each other. What is more it is a tradition which is recognisably the same as that articulated by the Lambeth Conferences as evidence of the character of Anglicanism. In their different ways the Provinces prefigure, parallel or reflect what has been said about Anglican beliefs at Lambeth.

Secondly, the Lambeth Conferences have repeatedly asserted the right of particular and national churches to amend their rites and ceremonies. Anglican Provinces have consistently exercised this right. The significance of this fact is enhanced by the way Provincial Constitutions also qualify the means of changing and modifying the tradition by referring to the theological standards previously defined. Moreover, the Churches of the Anglican Communion exercise their stewardship of doctrine and the rights of national churches by means of government by synods. It is too much to claim that Anglican Provinces also share a common view of religious authority, but the fact that all define their doctrine by a multiplicity of standards and that synodical government imposes its own style of decision making, does mean that in this respect too, the Churches of the Communion tread converging ecclesiological pathways.

From what has been said it would seem that the 1978 Conference was

justified in speaking of the Constitutional documents of the Anglican Communion revealing "a marked resemblance between the member Churches ... such as might characterize the different members of a single family". (111)

The question remains: how does the Church of England relate to this family pattern? As an established Church it is not easily assimilated in the above study. As a church it has not had to face the implications of its own constitutional character as the other Provinces have. However when those implications are faced a comparable situation is revealed. During meetings of the Archbishops' Commission on the constitutional relationship of Church and state which reported in 1970, it became necessary to compile a summary of the laws under which the Church of England functioned. This survey indicated that the Church was bound by a variety of constitutional measures to standards of doctrine and worship which centred upon the historic formularies and which provided a system of reference for departures from such standards. (112) In the opinion of Dr E. Garth Moore, probably the leading English Canon Lawyer, the Church of England is subject to the doctrinal and legal standards of the Western Catholic Church, along with the explicit and implicit modifications introduced by the Reformation. He concludes that authority in the Church of England is to be defined by recourse to:

... the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Canons ... and the Homilies; to Acts of Parliament and to the judgments of the courts ... In addition to these authoritative sources, there are others of considerable persuasive authority, such as the resolutions of Lambeth Conferences, acts of Convocation and the Reports of various Commissions. (113)

It can therefore be seen that the Church of England shares the universal and particular standards of doctrine professed by the Anglican Provinces already examined, and although only partially

embracing the system of government typical of Anglican Churches overseas, the doctrinal similarities along with the seminal influence of the English Church and theology on the other Provinces, make it perfectly credible to speak of all the Churches of the Anglican Communion being bound together by the threads of a single theological tradition.

To that extent, Anglicanism is not an illusion. Anglican Churches exist. The question now to be considered is, in what way do they make up a communion?

### 3. THE NATURE AND UNITY OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

William Temple once voiced the complaint that while he sincerely believed in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, he regretted that it did not exist. By analogy, reflection on the Anglican Communion poses the opposite problem. It plainly exists, but is its existence worth believing in? Does the existence of the Anglican Communion hold theological as distinct from historical or sociological significance? At the level of abstraction, how can the Anglican Communion be said to participate in the life of the Church Universal? More prosaically, what is the theological status of the Lambeth Conferences?

So far this thesis has sought to indicate that the Lambeth Conferences had, indirectly but genuinely, tackled serious ecclesiological questions raised by the development of Anglican Churches in different parts of the world. In various ways they defined the substance of Anglican beliefs by sets of doctrinal standards and with them they have also developed and gradually articulated a distinctive theory of religious authority. More immediately, a comparison of the standards of the belief and authority systems of individual Anglican Churches shows that they share an identifiable doctrinal character. In some ways this makes the goal of this section more difficult to achieve. The suspicion recurs that Anglicanism is held together by a common history and culture, and even by a similar range of theological sympathies but not by any apparent ecclesiological principle. It may be possible to speak of Anglican Churches: in what way is it possible to speak of an Anglican Communion? How can Anglicanism be portrayed as a cohesive entity, as a genuine "communion" of national and particular churches?

This challenge was most directly taken up by the 1930 Conference's committee on "The Anglican Communion." (114) The statement

of that committee on the "doctrine and ideals" of Anglican Churches has already been referred to on several occasions, but its work was done on a wider scale than has so far been suggested. During the 1920's the principle of Provincial autonomy had been well assimilated into Anglican thinking. A much more pressing problem in 1930 was that of the unity of the communion in general. The independence of the North American church, for instance, was taken to preclude its participation in membership of the Consultative Body set up at the 1920 conference. Among the commonwealth churches, the East African dioceses were seeking to come to terms with their regional independence while the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (established as a separate Province in 1928) had propagated a body of Canons quite distinct from anything previously adopted in the communion. (115) Moreover, the refusal of the British Parliament in 1927-8 to allow the Church of England freedom to adopt a revised Prayer Book, disclosed the chasm that had developed between the English church and those Provinces which had begun life as its dependencies.

The general question concerning the claim of the Anglican Communion to universality can be approached by way of the 1930 Conference committee's work. The particular question concerning the theological status of the Lambeth Conference is considered as a separate though related practical issue.

(a) The Ideals of the Anglican Communion: Lambeth 1930.

When the Bishop of Salisbury, (St Clair Donaldson) introduced the theme of "The Anglican Communion" to the Conference, he was at pains to stress the relevance of his task. The topic had come to be regarded as "uninspiring if inevitable" by successive Conferences, he acknowledged, but changing circumstances within the Communion made some clarification of the situation an urgent necessity. (116) Not everyone was convinced. Even at the end of the Conference, Henson

could dismiss the whole effort as simply an attempt to see spiritual significance in all of Anglicanism's "silly conventional make-believe". (117) Certainly the plenary discussion which followed the opening speeches did not augur well for the committee's work. It was largely limited to an expression of anxiety about the supposed pretensions of the Consultative Committee, and as to whether the adjective "Anglican" was the best title for the Communion as a whole. However, Bishop Donaldson had spoken to the point by identifying the essential question as the relationship of Anglicanism to the Church Universal and its crucial problem as centering upon distinct and irreconcilable theories of the Church. One theory saw the Universal Church as structural unity with a centralised and hierarchical authority. The other saw it as a federation of autonomous bodies whose bond was spiritual rather than organisational. In the first case, conditions of communion could easily be established by reference to a position in the hierarchy, but what equivalent bond existed in a federal system? Donaldson sought a response. A centralised system such as that of Roman Catholicism may stand in need of an infallible vice-regent and Anglicans could not accept such a solution, but when a more federal system dissolved its legal connections then what was left to hold it together? Independent Churches could state their beliefs, but what machinery and even more, what theology, would enable them to intercommunicate?

It is unclear whether the Committee appointed to discuss the Anglican Communion felt itself equal to the task. After an initial meeting, the committee split into two groups to consider the agenda proposed to them by Lang and his organising body. One group undertook to look at the ideals, and the other the organisation (both central and provincial) of the Anglican Communion. Unfortunately the minutes of both sub-committees are sketchy. (118) The second group

kept a fuller record of its discussions but seems to have been pre-occupied with individual cases and details of drafting which would be likely to command general support. (119) The minutes of the former group are frustratingly brief and these are the records which apply most directly to this discussion. It was initially agreed that a statement prepared by the Chairman "and such others as he wished to consult" should be discussed, but no record of the ensuing debates survives. The first section of the final committee report is built around Donaldson's distinction between centralised government and "regional autonomy within one fellowship" as the two principles of ecclesiastical organisation. However, initially at least, the implications of this distinction for a defence of Anglicanism were scarcely appreciated. After a revised statement by the whole committee had been discussed with representatives of the unity committee, the first of a series of impasses was reached. The exact cause is not disclosed, but as a result Bishop E.J. Palmer was asked to attend the committee. (120)

(i) Palmer's vision

Palmer had recently returned to England after many years in India, where as Bishop of Bombay he had been intimately involved both with framing the Indian Provincial canons and the process which was leading towards the South Indian Union. He, like Donaldson, had taken a leading part in the 1920 Conference and was an intimate of the principal English bishops. Lang especially promoted Palmer's views. He asked Palmer to write a preliminary paper for this item of the agenda, quoted it in his opening address, and then invited him to address the Conference in its plenary discussion. (121) After the Conference, Palmer wrote one of the Lambeth monographs entitled The Destiny of the Anglican churches, which began "Never before had we so clearly conceived what Anglicanism is". (122) Although the

work of Committee IV may have been Donaldson's responsibility, the vision which lay behind the 1930 report on the Anglican Communion, belonged to Palmer. (123)

The substance of that vision is expressed in a central paragraph from the paper written prior to the Conference. The key to the problem of the Anglican Communion was to be found in "the traditional theory of the Church of England about itself". He continued:

The Anglican Communion is a federation of Churches which wish and try to be to the lands in which they are situated what the Church of England has tried to be, and in a measure has been, to England. If so, it takes its place beside the Holy Orthodox Church in preserving the primitive constitutional idea of Christendom. This is that the only God-designed divisions in Christendom are local: that in one place there ought to be only one Church: that the diocese is the only necessary unit in the Church: that the essentially corporate character of the Church finds expression in groups of dioceses, such as provinces and patriarchates, such as the natural barriers of place and race allow: that, while no administrative unity above these is possible, the administrative units which rightly exist are bound together by a common loyalty to the one Spirit in the one faith, and the implications of this are declared, when necessary, by Councils of Bishops, whose declarations, however, are not of final authority unless and until they are found to be accepted by the Church in general. (124)

Palmer's memorandum went on to amplify each of these propositions.

At the heart of his thinking were three interrelated principles:

Palmer's vision of Anglican constitutionalism was that it was national, connexionalist, and conciliar.

#### A national polity

The idea of a national church must await further discussion in a concluding chapter, but for Palmer it meant that as the Church of England had sought, unsuccessfully as it happened, to remain open to all Christian people in England who would come within its sway, so this same ideal would be maintained among churches in communion with

her. This was no claim to denominational superiority let alone an excuse to impose doctrinal or liturgical uniformity upon the nation. It was simply an outcome of the conviction that the faith of the Church of England was the faith of the Catholic Church, proclaiming no "peculiar doctrines" and eschewing all hints of sectarianism. In his preliminary paper Palmer had referred uncritically to Pusey's dictum "Our Church at the Reformation did not lay down anything new, and declared against nothing which had been a matter of faith from the first". (125) In his address to the Conference he modified this position, apparently at Lang's suggestion. The Church of England had adapted the Vincentian Canon in a number of ways. In the first place, in any dispute concerning the substance of what the faith was "from the first" Anglicanism would appeal first to the example of Christ and Scripture, reinforced by the precedents of the primitive Church. Then within a "more or less agreed" theological inheritance, autonomous national churches were free to develop their own expression of faith. Thirdly, though less clearly, "matters of faith" were embodied in a particular liturgical tradition. Despite such a specific delineation of the faith, Anglicanism still appealed in the last analysis to the universal standards of the Church. The goal of national Churches associated with its Communion was not to make all Christians Anglicans, but to allow the character of a nation to make what it would of the life of Christ. In his monograph, Palmer made much of the traditional teaching of Article 34, and the claim of the Book of Common Prayer to provide for the "sacraments, rites and ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England".

In the Conference's final report national churches are spoken of as preserving apostolic faith and order but also "growing up freely on their own soil and in their own environment as integral

parts of the Church Universal". That passage goes on, with insufficient caution, to assert, "It is after this fashion that the characteristic endowment of each family of the human race may be consecrated, and so make its special contribution to the Kingdom of God". (126) A late addition to the closing paragraphs of the report corrects this by referring to the function of a national church as both finding an appropriate local expression for the Church's worship and work, and also seeking effectively to influence national life. The warning is quite explicit:

A 'National Church', however, must be on its guard lest the spirit of nationalism weaken its loyalty to the whole Catholic Church, lest it lend itself to unworthy political ends, and lest it expose itself to undue interference by the secular state. (127)

It could be argued that this warning is unnecessary for as long as it is remembered that the national principle is to be held alongside those concerning the connexional and conciliar character of the Church.

#### A connexional form

The term "connexionalism" is well known in Methodist circles. It is equally applicable to Anglican ecclesiology although it tends to be assumed rather than defined. As a result, Anglican discussions often deal with the particular questions of episcopacy or synodical order without establishing the basic structural foundations which undergird them. Anglicanism has always been connexionalist in that while it respects the interdependence of various local congregations in one area or nation, it also believes that the Church in that area is more than the sum of its separate congregations. It sees them as part of an organic whole which is amenable to unified decisions about faith and practice and mission within its own sphere of influence. Episcopal order in its presidential function and synodical government by its participatory nature, reinforce and actualise this familial

multiplicity of congregations. It is in this sense that all Christians in each place are part of the one body that gives rise to the diocesan and provincial structure of the Anglican Communion, and the belief that it is comprised of a fellowship of "national and particular" churches.

Palmer's experience as a missionary and bishop in India had left him deeply convinced of the propriety of this connexionalist principle, though he did not use the term as such. (128) His vision of 'constitutionalism' was based on the unitary nature of the Church and the conviction that within the limits of "place and race" the Church should think and act as one. This being so he urged that metropolitanical dependence upon the Sec of Canterbury should be seen as a temporary measure, necessary only until such time as a "holy Catholic jurisdiction" could be established in a Province. (129) The Anglican fellowship would continue, but ideally it would continue as an element of the Universal Church. It will be recalled that it was just this argument, sponsored by Bell, that cleared the way for approval of the C.S.I. proposals by the 1930 Conference.

#### A conciliar procedure

Beyond the Provincial level Palmer held that "no administrative unity ... is possible". However he did believe that a common loyalty and a common spirit still enabled the administrative units which did exist to exert an authority which was not merely local. The implications of the common faith could be discussed through the council of Bishops. The authority of their decisions could be ratified by the particular churches and in due time by the whole Church of Christ. Thus the conciliar principle gave rise to a universal dimension for the church, just as the national and connexionalist principles provided direction for its local expression.

In this sense Palmer held the highest expectations for the future

of the Lambeth Conferences. Certainly it was limited in its representation and in its powers, but therein lay its greatest strength. The fact that its powers were consultative rather than legal, its authority moral rather than coercive, provided the Conferences with the credentials of true conciliarity. It was in this context that Palmer remarked on the fortunate accident, which made those who inaugurated the Lambeth Conferences "tread the true path of ecumenical constitutionalism". (130)

(ii) The Conference's assessment.

Despite Palmer's optimistic evaluation of the achievement of the Conference, it is plain that not every one shared his enthusiasm. Apart from the twin pastoral problems of encouraging the younger churches to accept the responsibilities of their independence, and the sending churches or societies to allow them the freedom to do so, the very terms of the debate were unclear to many participants. During the final stage of the committee's work a further stalemate occurred over the concept of a "national church". Eventually the previously cited explanatory note was salvaged from that discussion, but prolonged attempts to give force to it in a resolution came to nothing. When the report came before the whole Conference it faced similar problems. (131) The report was received on the morning of Saturday 2nd August, but when the Conference adjourned at 1 p.m. the first substantial resolution outlining the general idea of the autonomy of national churches based on a common Faith and Order, had still not been voted upon, despite lengthy debate and repeated amendments. When the debate resumed on the following Monday, it fared little better. By then the whole question of the authority of the English Church and the role played in the Anglican Communion by the Book of Common Prayer added confusion to the discussion of provincial autonomy and responsibility. By lunch time the maze was

proving impenetrable and business was rearranged to allow further discussion. Even then the results were inconsequential. After further desultory debate on the Tuesday morning, it was moved from the floor that the resolution "be not put". The Bishop of Norwich (B. Pollock) argued that Anglicanism needed no definition: like the character of a gentleman, it could be recognised on sight! The Bishop of Killaloe (H.E. Patton) was less complimentary. He typified the whole subject as one of vague episcopal imaginings, when the Church demanded that its leaders face reality. The Conference was plainly not ready for a resolution. Others however argued that it was necessary for Anglican leaders to give some account of what their Church stood for. The proposal to void the motion was defeated and the debate went on.

Why was it that the passage of the report on the Anglican Communion met such resistance? The answer can only be that the principles upon which it was constructed were not generally understood, and what Palmer confidently claimed to be "the traditional theory of the Church of England about itself" was not one that was shared by most of the Bishops present at the 1930 Conference. What is the source of this misunderstanding?

In the first place the very notion of a "national church" lacked cogency for many people, even though the idea was deeply woven into the fabric of English ecclesiastical history. The rights of a "particular or national Church" contained in Article 34 have already been referred to. This paragraph was added to the 1553 article on "The traditions of the Church", apparently on the initiative of Parker who drew its language from the 13 Articles of 1535. One line of argument saw this as an extension of the "immemorial" freedom of the English Church, which had survived the Synod of Whitby and the Norman invasion. Both of these events had

enforced an obedience to the papacy but also provided for a healthy measure of administrative disregard of his rights. This freedom was repeatedly asserted throughout the Middle Ages and encouraged the claims of territorial independence under the Tudors. When independence was turned into Royal Supremacy it was done under the reformational edict of cuius regio, and under the Elizabethans, Parker and Hooker, political opportunism was given sanction as the received dogma of established religion and the national Church.

The way in which the Hookerian synthesis crumbled has been referred to. The progressive restriction of the settlement of religion under the Stuarts and the complete subjugation of the Church to the State under the Hanoverians, meant that for the period principally in view throughout this thesis, ideas concerning the independence of the Church from the nation came most readily to mind. Even when explicit notions of a "church revival" (be it catholic or evangelical) had faded, the first third of the twentieth century saw English churchmen still carried by the momentum of similar ideas. The effects of war, the claims of life and liberty, and the movement towards the Enabling Act pre-occupied the Church of England. Overseas, the developing confidence in synodical administration exerted its own influence and when the Prayer Book crisis highlighted the way in which freedoms assumed throughout the Anglican Communion were denied to the Church of England, even so stout a defender of national Christianity as Hensley Henson was forced to change his ground. (132) At a more theoretical level, the collapse of the Broad Church movement into a deracinated religious liberalism, along with the emergence of neo-confessional theologies from the Continent, deprived Anglicanism of any compelling intellectual defence of its "traditional theory ... about itself". (133) All these reasons made it most difficult to

think of Anglicanism as a fellowship of national churches even before the sinister tendency to identify church and nationhood became openly apparent.

Similar factors had also obscured the constitutional element. In seeking to shake itself free from the entails of Erastianism, the Church of England had been forced to cast about for a principle on which to establish its independence. The Tractarians' commitment to apostolic succession had achieved this end, but it also meant that those who opposed the tendencies of the Oxford Movement had to do so by adopting one or another antithetical position with respect to ministerial authority. As has previously been seen, the discussion of Anglican ecclesiology became restricted to discussions about the degree to which episcopacy was necessary, or incommensurable disputes over the relative place of bishops, the Bible, canons and confessions, private judgment or the Book of Common Prayer. The value of the 1930 statement was that it redirected attention to fundamental questions of authority and order. The endeavour to construct a statement around the differences between "types of ecclesiastical organisation" concentrated attention on structure rather than ministry alone as the key to polity. Instead of seeing the essential character of the Anglican Communion in terms of its possession of episcopal, as distinct from presbyterian or congregational government, the whole question of ministry was subsumed under the issue as to whether organisation was essentially hierarchical or connexional (or it might be added, independent) in its conception. With the recognition that Anglicanism was held together by "no administrative bond" but by the nexus of "a common life resting upon a common faith, common sacraments, and a common allegiance to an Unseen Head", the way was opened for a re-alignment in the whole discussion of Anglican ecclesiology. (134)

Whenever hidden assumptions are under scrutiny, difficulties will be found in presenting an alternative set of ideas. It seems that while Palmer and a few others had a clear understanding of the nature of the theory they were promoting, few of the bishops present were able to move out of their entrenched positions. (135) In such a situation it is not so much a clearer argument or a greater measure of personal support that is required as a "conceptual shift" analogous to that often experienced in scientific theory formation. (136) As the protracted debate over the South Indian scheme indicated, the 1930 Conference was not the most likely place for such an intellectual shift or transformation to take place.

If the concept of connexionalism was unfamiliar to those attending the 1930 Assembly, that of conciliarity was well enough known but apparently irrelevant. The example of the undivided Church and the ideal of a General Council had been profoundly influential in Anglican thinking since the mid-nineteenth century. (137) However the prospect of replicating the conditions in which a Council could meet was so remote that the historical reference to the "organ of expression" for the common life of interdependent Churches, seemed to shed no light on the problems of the Anglican Communion. The unsatisfactory nature of the plenary debate was evidence of the difficulty which the Conference encountered in coming to terms with the implications of "regional autonomy". Even at the conclusion of the discussion, despairing cries were still heard about the need for a definitive standard which would hold the Anglican Communion together. Another attempt was made to declare that the 1662 Book of Common Prayer fulfilled that office - with a predictable response from the North American bishops present.

Perhaps the most significant contribution to the debate came

from the Bishop of Monmouth (G.C. Joyce) who cited Harnack as an objector. Referring to one of Harnack's books which he called The Constitution of the Church,<sup>(138)</sup> the Bishop had argued that the committee's report seemed to suggest that the church was comprised of a number of parts which occasionally acted in concert to declare the will of the whole. By contrast, he claimed, Harnack had shown that the Church had to be seen as a whole which expressed itself in its parts; that the apostolic authority tied together various forms of leadership; and that the life of the Church penetrated from its Head to the members, not the other way round.<sup>(139)</sup>

Such a point was apparently no more comprehensible to the Conference than the theses it was meant to modify. It was not pursued. If it had been however it might not have led to the conclusion the Bishop of Monmouth expected. For Harnack's central conviction was that the Church existed anywhere that the gospel of God had become a living power of righteousness issuing in a community of self-giving love. The first Christian centuries were characterised by a spread of such communities which enjoyed fraternal relationships (inasmuch as they had any contact with each other) because each saw itself as the Church in its own locality. The local Church was thus seen to be complete and self-sufficient to the extent that it bore the image of the heavenly Church and realised the "dominion of the Good". Only in later centuries did the process of "Catholicization" reverse that understanding so that the local Church came to represent a dependent outpost of the central organisation.<sup>(140)</sup> Without necessarily seeing catholicisation as a discreet process beginning in the third and fourth centuries, claims made by the 1930 Report concerning the structures of the early church would seem to be supported rather than contradicted by the researches of Harnack on the original constitutional form. For him the Church

was essentially local in its practical manifestation even if universal in its scope and authority. (141) The proposals before the 1930 Conference ran parallel with Harnack's concern to show that the structures of the apostolic constitution could enable the universal dimension of the Church to be demonstrated without subsuming local authority under a centralised bureaucracy.

The conceptual difficulties faced by the Conference were magnified by the insistent way Palmer and Donaldson pursued their programme. To them and to their few supporters, the task seems to have become something of an obsession. (142) For others it seemed they were trying to achieve too much. Henson overcame his distaste for the subject in order to make a series of interventions to the effect that it was impossible to claim that the Anglican Communion's provincial autonomy and common faith and order embodied the "true constitutionalism" of the early church. The most that could be asserted was that it was not inconsistent with such principles. (143)

On the basis of this distinction progress was eventually made. Once the move to have the committee's resolution "not put" had been overturned, the Bishop of Middleton, H.G. Parsons, was given liberty to frame a descriptive rather than normative resolution. The substance of Resolution 49 read:

The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:-

- (a) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches;
- (b) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and
- (c) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference. (144)

An introductory paragraph indicated that the resolution was intended to be explanatory rather than stipulative, and that Anglican Churches would seek to enter communion with other branches of the Church, on the basis of such an understanding.

The essentials of Palmer's vision were caught up in the resolution. The Universal Church was seen as a communion defined by a constitutional relationship based upon common faith and order, national autonomy and the expectation that universal decisions would be taken by the free conference of diocesan bishops.

In the end the resolution was adopted with relief. But was this really a victory for anything more than the tactics of ecclesiastical diplomacy? Does an "ideal" actually provide a theological justification for the Anglican Communion? The answer to these questions must be found by observing just how the principles of national, connexional and conciliar polity are worked out between the Provinces. Attention must be directed to the way in which the Anglican Communion comprises a fellowship of national churches. In particular this must be observed with respect to the theological significance of the Lambeth Conference.

(b) The status of the Lambeth Conference - the reality of Anglican Conciliarism.

Although the 1930 Conference discussions may have lacked conviction, the preparatory work and the final resolution did create a theoretical framework for the defence of Anglicanism.

In the first place, this theory is based upon a conscious distinction between centralised and de-centralised patterns of church organisation.

It can be argued that the principle of Church connexion can be extended from the congregation to the diocese, to the Province, to a situation where the world-wide Church would form a single

constitutional entity. It might be alleged that Anglicanism's decision to terminate its legal requirements at the level of Provincial autonomy is an arbitrary decision dictated by practical requirements rather than theological necessity. In principle this may be so. Theoretically a centralised authority may not be ruled out of consideration, but practically it can be seen to suffer from major defects. The problem inherent in any system of universal government, political or ecclesiastical, is that it tends to become either unwieldy or unrepresentative. To remain fully representative at a universal level is to condemn any body of government to ineptitude. To achieve effective government a considerable measure of centralisation is necessary, and this gives licence to the possibility of authoritarianism. Anglicanism does not deny the possibility of a genuinely universal council which would possess the authority contributed to it by participating national Provinces. It does reject the desirability of authoritarian rule by a council, a primate or any single source of coercive power whatsoever. It is the historical failure of both conciliarity and primacy to provide demonstrable examples of unity in diversity, rather than any ideological rejection of universality, which has led to Anglican scepticism concerning the claims of popes and councils alike. (145)

If then the fundamental distinction between forms of centralised government and the need for "regional autonomy within one fellowship" is accepted, and if Anglicanism is firmly located within the latter category, the basic ecclesiological problem is that of providing structures to ensure its unity. The strength of Palmer's theory is then seen by comparison with its alternatives. On the one hand "denominational" approaches which look for the criteria of distinct doctrines or recognisable forms of order and liturgy are seen to be

too mechanical to meet the pastoral needs of indigenous churches. (146)

On the other hand, the idea that Catholic faith and order is in itself a sufficient identification of Anglican unity, is either unrealistic or vague. It is unrealistic because it fails to show how Christian faith is applied to doctrinal, historical and practical problems. (147) Its vagueness can degenerate into the kind of class arrogance instanced earlier by the Bishop who dismissed the whole discussion of Anglican distinctives, because Anglicans, like gentlemen, recognise each other. (148) Between such extremes, efforts to typify Anglicanism as the product of a discernible historical culture or a particular religious temperament draw attention to the role played by such things as the Prayer Book or the See of Canterbury, or to the prevailing atmosphere of tolerance, moderation and spirituality which appear to underly the Anglican tradition. Such features may help to explain how the Anglican Communion has developed in the way that it has done but they give no reason why it should continue to exist in its present or in any other form. At least, they provide necessary but not sufficient reasons for maintaining belief in the Anglican fellowship.

By contrast, Palmer's theory of "ecumenical constitutionalism" and the descriptive resolution of the Lambeth Conference, gain in conviction. This phenomenological approach to Anglican unity properly complements the realistic approach to doctrinal definition noted previously. The Anglican Communion is a fellowship of national Churches, or at least a fellowship of Provinces whose ideal is to embrace the diversity of Christian life and witness in their particular regions. It is a fellowship based on mutual recognition and sustained by common counsel. There is no legal connection between the Churches. The Communion exists because each Church recognises both the marks of Apostolicity and Catholicity and Holiness

displayed in the constitution and formularies, and the life and witness of every other member of the fellowship. They are not compelled to confer. Each Church is complete in itself and independently responsible for its own decisions and destiny, but, recognising that Unity is also a mark of the Church, the Anglican Provinces also maintain "common counsel" with each other and for the most part take seriously the obligations imposed by it.

This is the reason why the structures to maintain unity remain near the heart of the question of Anglican organisation. If Anglicanism is to be defined by what it does, rather than by abstractions as to what it is, then the reality of its inter-provincial unity will hang upon the ways in which "common counsel" is rendered practicable. Further consideration must be given to the theological status of the Lambeth Conference, and to the whole experience of conciliarity and primacy in Anglicanism.

When it is stated that the counsel of the Bishops in conference is sustained by "mutual loyalty" rather than "central legislative and executive authority", it becomes clear that the actual method of consultation is of secondary importance. The Lambeth Conferences can claim no other vindication than their evident usefulness. The Conferences and the consultative machinery created by them can be superseded or absorbed into other structures so long as the same understanding of moral authority and regional integrity is respected. The most that any Anglican structure can claim is that it provides an adequate basis for the consensus fidelium to be discussed and expressed for successive generations. That is a considerable claim.

In a formal sense, such a claim is ludicrous. No Lambeth gathering could claim to speak on behalf of the universal church. Even as an episcopal conference it is unrepresentative, since many

bishops whose authority and wisdom is in no doubt among Anglicans, are not present. However the formal categories of canon law or head counts of bishops are not the only factors to consider. Recent studies associated with the second Vatican council and the World Council of Churches have drawn attention to more functional questions regarding conciliarity, and it is in this connection that the status of the Lambeth Conferences must be judged. It is not too much to argue that the Lambeth meetings present distinctive responses to the central problems of conciliar representation and reception: how does the Church participate in a Council? how are a Council's conclusions communicated to the Church?

Among Catholic writers there has been a considerable enlargement in the understanding of conciliar decision-making. Not only does the term 'Council' apply to the traditional classification of Diocesan, Provincial, Plenary, Patriarchal, General or Ecumenical conferences but the conciliar process also extends to a variety of meetings or synods modelled on various political entities and even to the gathering of a congregation in worship or a meeting of Christians studying the implications of their faith. (149) This reappraisal is associated in the English-speaking world at least, with the work of Hans Küng. His understanding of Church structures is based upon an idea of the Church as a divine assembly. It is seen as such when "two or three" meet in Christ's name (Matt.18:20). If that is the case what is the potential for a universal gathering? Reflecting on the promise of Christ's presence, Küng remarks:

If this is true of a small gathering how much more is it of a large gathering, which consists not just of a few individuals but behind which stands expressly - and this is not just a quantitative but a qualitative distinction - the whole, the oikumene, the people of God of the whole inhabited world. (150)

Küng is not arguing that the size of the assembly validates its

decisions. He is clear that the distinctiveness of the conciliar process does not lie just in its democratic make-up. The power of a Council's decisions lies in the fact that the Council is itself a "re-presentation" of the Universal Church. (151)

Küng is aware of the need for reform of conciliar meetings. The re-presentative character of the Church is diminished not guaranteed by the dogmas of papal absolutism. For him, a council represents the universal Church to the degree that its life and thought embodies the traditional "marks" of the Church and its decisions reflect "an objective harmony with the apostolic message". (152) Equally however, he is compelled to reject what he understands to be the Reformational view of Councils: simply a means for reaching consensus decisions and unrelated organically to the faith and life of the universal Church. He concludes that both the community and offices of the Church are necessary to sustain genuine apostolicity and that the co-responsibility of council and papacy "corresponds best to the Church united with its head". (153)

The Vatican Council's Constitution on the Church did not fully support Küng's interpretation. In his commentary on the relevant section, Rahner expresses regret at the "over-anxiety" to preserve the doctrines of primacy which intruded needlessly on the reality of communio. (154) Although the Council worked valiantly to give the layman a renewed prominence in the vocation of the people of God and to provide a model of collegiality for its decision-making responsibilities, the office of the papacy still retains the locus of deliberative authority in the Church. Thus the episcopal college is constituted by "hierarchical communion with the head of the college and with its members". More explicitly still:

The College or body of Bishops has no authority, if the meaning of the term excludes its connection with the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, as its head, and unless the power of his primacy over

all, pastors or faithful, be maintained in its entirety. (155)

In the end it appears that it is in the papacy that the esse of the Roman Catholic Church resides.

However it is not the Vatican's decision but the discussion which has surrounded it that is important here. Anglicanism has been reluctant to claim anything more than moral authority for the consultative rights of its bishops. The Catholic study indicates a wider potential for the ideals expressed by the 1930 Conference. To the extent that the bishops present really do represent churches promoting "a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship", and to the extent that their decisions do sound a note of what Küng called "objective harmony" with Catholic and Apostolic faith, then it is possible to claim a conciliar function for the Lambeth Conference. It is not a General Council certainly, but by its very nature it is more than a meeting of individual bishops. (156)

Representation is only one aspect of the problem of conciliarity however. Along with the constitution of the Council itself is the question of the way in which conciliar decisions are to be received by the churches.

Roman Catholicism answers this question as the corollary to that of representation. As the Council is constituted by the papacy, so its decisions are ratified and validated by it. The process of reception is simply an aspect of "obedience" to the faith. (157) A different approach has necessarily been followed by the World Council of Churches. There the problem of conciliarity is a typically protestant one: how can the decision of a Council be promulgated with any authority at all?

The W.C.C.'s Faith and Order Commission began to study that question in 1967. Beginning from the same premise as Küng (although independently of him) they attempted to see the Council standing in

the same relationship to the Church as does the preacher to a congregation - at one with it, but confronting it with a word of authority. (158) The word must be heard, but also judged, by the community. The reception of the conciliar decision by the Church cannot add anything to the Council's authority. Authority resides ultimately in the apostolic faith. But neither is reception an empty gesture - a kind of theological cong  d' lire. The Church must actively judge the issue. What is involved is a confirmation and voluntary acknowledgement by the Church of the authority of the Council's teaching. The actual procedure by which this is done will vary according to the local circumstances and ecclesial structure of the Churches involved. It can create division as well as unity. In the process of "critical appropriation" the implications of the Catholic faith become clearer. The task of reception is an open one. It is the responsibility of each community and of each generation to reinterpret, reapply, and to correct its understanding of the past. The business of responding to the guidance received from Councils is part of this responsibility and, the report stresses, a potential means to bridge the divisions caused by confessional differences.

In successive studies since then the W.C.C. has broadened its understanding of the issues. (159) The role of local as well as universal consultations has achieved prominence - especially in connection with the pursuit of a contextualised theology. The need to uncover the limits and necessity of diversity is seen to complement the function of a council to establish unity. Since the Uppsala Assembly (1968), the idea of conciliarity has been tied to the Council's vision of church unity as a token of the unity of all mankind. At Nairobi (1975) the Assembly formally adopted the pursuit of a "genuinely universal council" as a function of the W.C.C. (160)

Again it is not the success or failure of the W.C.C.'s thinking which is important, but the way in which its conceptualisation of the relationships of Church to Council gives an explanation for Anglicanism. It has already been seen that the regional autonomy of the Anglican Communion and the restrictions imposed upon the authority of Lambeth's utterances, make up a unique pattern of ecclesial organization. It is clear that, when the 1978 Conference for instance prefaced its report with the words,

The resolutions have no legislative authority unless or until they have been accepted by the synods or other governing bodies of the member churches of the Anglican Communion, and then only in those member churches ..... (161)

this was not so much an admission of the Conference's impotence as it was an affirmation of a quite radical theory of conciliar reception. The Anglican principle is: bishops consult, the whole church judges.

Anglicanism has never rejected conciliar wisdom. The reformers, like their continental counterparts, directed their appeal for unity towards a General Council, and this hope remained alive at least until the reign of James VI/I. (162) Their confidence is reflected in Article 21, which along with a parallel statement in the Scottish Confession of Faith (1560), is the fullest reformed statement on the subject of General Councils. The primary concern of the Article was to refute the authority of Trent, but the positive aspect of its provision can be appreciated by comparing it with the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum which insisted that the teachings of General Councils are to be received "with great reverence". (163) The point made by the Article is just that no Council is automatically granted infallibility for its decisions and that these, like doctrines, are to be judged by the teaching of Scripture. In this context, whether a Council is a General Council or not is a decision that can only be

taken post hoc where it is clear whether or not its teaching has been generally received by the Church. (164) By its implicit understanding of both representation and reception, the Lambeth Conference can be spoken of as a pre-conciliar fellowship, perhaps even as an anticipation of a Universal Council yet to be.

One further point requires comment. In recent discussions between Anglicans and Roman Catholics it has been suggested that the Anglican view of conciliarity and the Roman Catholic understanding of primacy could be regarded as complementary. (165) No easy reconciliation seems possible on this basis however. As has been seen, Catholic dogma awards priority to one aspect over the other, and quite apart from Anglicanism's tendency to decentralisation, there is an Anglican experience of primacy which ill-suits the Roman understanding of the office. (166) Within Anglicanism the balance between primacy and conciliarity is not just found in an equal weighting of the two elements, but in the mutual submission of both to scripture and the judgment of the Church through the ages. (167) Any balance between pope and council will prove unstable unless both are subject to controls. (168) A Lambeth style of conciliarity and primacy sets its own controls. Whereas Anglicans may be able to concede a primacy of order, responsibility and service to the See of Rome, there is as yet no indication that the Vatican is able to entertain a similar conception of its own authority. (169)

To conclude: this section has sought to show that the Provinces of the Anglican Communion do achieve an organic unity through the conference of their bishops and that this unity, together with a common faith and order and similar views of religious authority, justifies the claim of the Anglican Communion to be part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

It is not being claimed of course that Anglicanism conforms to its

ideals in every respect or even that the theoretical under-girding provided by the Lambeth Conferences is widely understood in every part of the Anglican Communion. After the 1978 Conference, Bishop John Howe, Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council, outlined the three most pressing questions which confronted Anglican ecclesiology. The unique role of the Anglican episcopate in the ministry of the whole people of God needed to be defined more clearly; the extent to which current leadership structures actually manifested the Anglican understanding of episcopé had to be examined; and the implicit "collegiality" of the Lambeth procedure stood in need of explanation. (170) There is no need to disguise the fact that Anglican apologetics are under-developed at a number of important points. Howe was quite correct in pointing to that fact. What this Chapter has shown however is that the Anglican Communion, both as an entity and in its separate parts, has adapted the structures and standards of the Church of England so as to provide a consistent account of Anglican beliefs, authority and organisation.

In the next chapter the adequacy of Anglican ecclesiology will be tested by observing how well it is able to cope with the practical problems of belief, organisation and witness within the Anglican Communion.

CHAPTER 5 : RENEWAL IN FAITH, UNITY AND MISSION

CHAPTER FIVERENEWAL IN FAITH, UNITY AND MISSION : SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ANGLICANISM

So far this thesis has been predominantly concerned with the theoretical character of the Anglican Communion. It has sought to trace the way in which its doctrinal standards have been clarified and its understanding of ecclesiastical authority expressed. It has attempted to respond to the charge that Anglicanism lacks theological convictions or that it exists by the arbitrary dictates of history alone. The creative ability of Anglicanism to address questions of theology, organisation and mission must now be considered. Can the Lambeth theories be exhibited in practice?

Such a question is quite proper.

The Lambeth Conferences have rarely adopted a defensive posture and have been more concerned to ensure a responsible present for the Communion than to demonstrate its defensible past. Indeed, if it is true that the 'marks' of the Church involve more than the possession of certain static forms or structures or formulae, then the vitality of Anglicanism must be displayed as much by its ability to address current problems faced by the whole Church as it is by any recitation of its historical credentials. This chapter will follow some of the ways in which recent conferences have sought to undertake this responsibility. It will deal with the renewal of the Church in faith, unity and mission, examining respectively the capacity of contemporary Anglicanism to reformulate doctrine, to adapt its ecclesiological structures, and to organise itself for united action.

Contemporary relevance gives added point to this aspect of the argument but it is not in itself the reason for pursuing it. The second world-war caused a hiatus of two generations in the sequence of Lambeth Conferences. More than that, it meant that from 1948

onwards the Conferences have met against the background of an entirely different world situation from that of the pre-war Conferences, and accordingly they have been concerned with a quite different set of problems. In general, while the early Lambeth Conferences' ecclesiological concern was largely that of ensuring a proper measure of autonomy for Anglican Provinces, more recently the emphasis has been upon expressing the 'universality' and corporate life of the Anglican Communion. (1) Consequently the post-war Conferences can be taken together as evidencing a consistent line of theological development in Anglican self-awareness.

Newman's criticism of nineteenth century Anglicanism provided a starting point for this examination. His positive dictum that "growth is the evidence of life" is relevant too: are there signs of growth in the Anglican understanding and experience of the Church?

1. RENEWAL IN FAITH : THE 1968 CONFERENCE AND DECLARED ANGLICAN DOCTRINE.

The tenth Lambeth Conference was crucial for the present development of Anglicanism. Certainly it was one conference which was prepared to give serious attention to matters of theology. The situation in the church and in Western Society demanded that this should be so, but quite apart from this the Conference was better equipped than many for that aspect of the Lambeth agenda. For the first time, theological consultants and inter-church observers took part in the proceedings. (2) Three volumes of preparatory essays developed the conference topics of Faith, Ministry and Unity. (3) The Conference itself felt the organisational benefit of having a full-time executive officer and in its plenary sessions at least, was aware of the presence of outside reporters. Above all, for the first time, the Conference was under the presidency of one who was first and foremost a theologian. The hand of the one hundredth Archbishop, A.M. Ramsey, is evident throughout the Conference preparations and in the endeavours of the Conference squarely to address theological issues.

The theological pre-occupation of the 1968 Conference can be seen in its willingness to broach again the question of declared doctrine in the Anglican Communion. It did this by a re-examination of the status of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Lambeth Quadrilateral as statements of Anglican belief.

(a) The role of the Thirty-nine Articles

It has been seen earlier that the Articles held an ambiguous place during the development of the Anglican Communion. While they were widely acknowledged to provide a judicious and restrained exposition of principles underlying the English reformation, the

inability to relate them to problems of discipline in the Church of England during the latter part of the nineteenth century meant that they had been virtually disregarded as a statement of Anglican belief throughout the period in which world Anglicanism had come into being. Indeed that failure had meant that Anglicanism developed without the two-fold unifying and apologetic benefits which the Articles had originally been meant to supply, and with the attendant problems of theological and organisational pluralism to which attention has already been given.

It has also been seen that the Articles played virtually no part in the progressive delineation of Anglican beliefs proposed by earlier Lambeth Conferences. (4) Accordingly, they were given different status in the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion. (5) As a part of the Anglican heritage, warmly approved by some, vehemently rejected by others, and benignly neglected by most, the Articles presented an anomaly which clearly needed to be resolved. (6)

When the Lambeth Consultative Body met in Jerusalem during April 1966, the agenda for the forthcoming Conference was discussed. The Archbishop of Capetown (R.S. Taylor) hoped that some clarification and perhaps a revision of the Articles might be contemplated. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Ramsey, referred the meeting to the work of a Church of England commission on the whole subject, and expressed the hope that it would provide guidelines for the conference too. He agreed that the subject must be dealt with, preferably in the whole context of Faith and Ministry discussions. The minutes of the meeting record, "It was generally thought best not to revise the Articles but perhaps to depress their status". (7)

The English Commission, chaired by the Bishop of Durham, I.T. Ramsey, duly presented its findings. The report, Subscription and Assent to the Thirty nine Articles was published a month before the

Lambeth Conference met, although it was not discussed by the English Church Assembly until the following year. As well as a thorough survey of the historical and legal position in the Church of England, the commission also reflected on the situation throughout the Anglican Communion, before opening up the essential questions: how the Church should seek to define its faith, and how such definitions should be applied to questions of ministerial discipline. In the end the Commission felt unable to commend the Articles as a contemporary expression of Anglican belief, for, "As long as the relation between the Bible and the Word of God is treated as problematical, it is logically possible to question the normative status of any biblical categories". (8) Although a modernisation of the Articles may be possible, it could only act as a vehicle for ecclesiastical order in the most generalised sense. The Articles could command no ex animo assent. The whole notion of general assent was quite unsatisfactory. The idea that the Articles indicated the kind of response expected if the Church still existed in the sixteenth century possessed a Pickwickian charm but no practical utility. (9) The Articles simply bore testimony to one part of the path along which the Church of England had moved. Assent to the Articles could only indicate willingness to continue that journey. Put rather differently, the Articles represent a decisive historical filter through which the Anglican tradition must be understood. They are not a dogmatic standard providing fixed interpretations of Anglican belief and practice. Such at least was the commission's conclusion. I.T. Ramsey summed up this point of view when he remarked, on the publication of the report:

We do not want to sweep the Thirty-nine Articles under the carpet but to send them to a stately home in England where we can visit them from time to time. (10)

The commission was not so much concerned with the content of the Articles as such as it was with the question of what should (and even more what should not) be done with them. Sending them to "a stately home" meant the Articles were assigned to a fitting historical context, but by the same token this was not seen as an attempt to do away with all norms of doctrine. The Articles had originally fulfilled their role as the basis of clerical unanimity. While the Articles should not be revised there was a need for a much clearer form of clerical assent. Such a formula should not attempt to tie down every detail of belief or practice, and it should not threaten the comprehensive character of Anglicanism, the report suggested. It should be related to the historic formularies, emphasise both what was distinctive in the Anglican tradition and what it held in common with other Churches, and it should leave open the possibility for fresh understandings of the faith. To achieve this, the commission commended a simple statement of belief, prefaced by a declaration outlining the different sources of authority acknowledged by the Church of England. (11)

The Commission's report certainly had a considerable influence on the doctrinal formulations of the Church of England. In effect, it determined the policy of deflecting attention from the substance of declared doctrines in favour of an examination of the ways in which such doctrines were held. Recent Doctrine Commissions have consciously focussed on how the Church believes rather than what it believes in, although there are signs that the current body is preparing to move beyond these necessary prolegomena. (12)

Just how widely the report influenced the Conference is unclear, although I.T. Ramsey's personal contribution was considerable. While the Conference working papers are still unavailable the transcript of the plenary discussion does suggest that preparation for the debate

was limited and the time allocated to it quite inadequate.

In the event, the subject of the Articles was brought before the Conference, quite literally in its closing minutes. H.E. McAdoo, Bishop of Ossory and Ferns, and the Chairman of a conference committee entitled "Confessing the Faith Today", introduced the topic. (13) The Articles, he began, were not a statement of the Anglican faith but rather an Anglican interpretation of the faith. Therefore they could not be considered to possess any binding authority. Beyond recognising this fact, McAdoo acknowledged it was not clear to him how the Conference should proceed. Nor was it clear to anyone else, to judge from the debate which followed. Eventually Pamsey, who as a Section officer had not been involved in the committee discussions, was moved to resist the generally dismissive tone adopted. The consideration of the Articles and clerical subscription had to do with the question of truth and honesty in religion and should not be minimised as irrelevant or inward looking, he insisted. In the first place, the Articles themselves were not as irrelevant as was sometimes imagined - as the current upsurge of Anabaptism proved. Secondly, while the Articles (unlike the Lambeth Quadrilateral) had not been a distinguishing mark of Anglicanism to which appeal was regularly directed, and whilst the idea of "subordinate standards" would win less than general support among Anglicans, the Articles held a place of respect within the Anglican Communion. For some people they still reflected a definitive understanding of what the communion stood for. Even though only a minority of Anglicans would adopt that view, abandoning all attempts to sustain a workable form of subscription would seem to suggest that doctrine was unimportant for the Church. Pamsey reiterated the conviction of the English Commission that clerical assent should be set within a three-stranded argument about authority in doctrine. This should attempt to unite

the catholic standards and reformational confessions of the church with the continuing experience of its life and ministry.

A general motion which commended the English report was at that time before the Conference, and in the light of Ramsey's comments it must have come as something of a surprise when the Bishop of Huron, G.N. Luxton, moved an amendment to it. He sought to end equivocation by severing the Articles from all ordination standards and removing them from all Anglican Prayer Books. Even more surprising was the way in which this amendment was supported - although not before Ramsey had added a further clause outlining his more positive recommendations. So, Resolution 43 of the 1968 Conference reads:

The Conference accepts the main conclusion of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine entitled Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles (1968), and in furtherance of its recommendation

(a) suggests that each Church of our Communion consider whether the Articles need be bound up with its Prayer Book;

(b) suggests to the Churches of the Anglican Communion that assent to the Thirty-nine Articles be no longer required of ordinands;

(c) suggests that, when subscription is required to the Articles or other elements in the Anglican tradition, it should be required, and given only in the context of a statement which gives the full range of our inheritance of faith and sets the Articles in their historical context. (14)

Although a division was not taken when the motion was put, 37 bishops signified their dissent and this fact is recorded in the Conference report.

The Conference concluded minutes later, and the President referred to this discussion in the final news conference. "I said at the beginning that I hoped the Conference would tackle the 39 Articles. It did so, but I was very sorry it came right at the end of the Conference". He was glad it had commended the 'Durham Report' although it had to be acknowledged that the Conference "took a rather more radical line than the Report did, rather more radical though

rather clumsy, last moment line". (15)

To the adjectives "clumsy" and "last moment" he could almost have added the word "self-contradictory", for a connection between the suggestions of the motion and the conclusions of the Durham report was only tenuously established by the Bishop of Durham's addition. More was to be said however. When the Conference report was published it included an Addendum on the Articles attached to the Section report on "Renewal in Faith". (16) It is not hard to identify I.T. Ramsey's hand in this addition. (17) Certainly the Addendum offers a clear presentation of his views, and in fact, as a significant exposition of the idea of dispersed authority, has already been referred to in this thesis. (18) Central to the statement is a paragraph outlining the "threefold inheritance of faith" - Catholic, Reformed and contemporary - and a concept of authority "which refuses to insulate itself against the testing of history and the free action of reason". Among these multiple sources of theology the Articles hold a **distinct** place. For this reason, so it is explained, the English Commission on subscription and assent had not advocated either the disposal or the revision of the Articles but rather had assigned them to their appropriate historical context in the "continuous, developing, Anglican tradition".

The addendum clearly helped to make up some of the inadequacies in the Conference debate and resolution. It still left open a major question concerning the way in which the Articles should function in the development of the Anglican tradition. No-one would suggest that the Articles provide an **exhaustive** or even an adequate statement of contemporary Anglican belief - that instant answers to the problems of Anglican dogmatics or discipline can be found "in the back of the book". It is self-evident that the Articles are written for the situation of the sixteenth century and must be read against that

background. (19) But when they are so read, what is the contemporary church to do with them? When visiting that stately home, are the Articles to be viewed as a museum piece, or historical record, or part of a living heritage?

This question takes on added significance when it is recalled that in spite of all their inadequacies the Articles provide Anglicanism with its only confessional document. Certainly it is only one among several historic formularies adopted by the Church of England but it is not rendered more easily dispensable by that fact. Confessional documents not only give contemporary meaning to credal formulae but, as has been argued previously, they also make explicit what is only implied in forms of liturgy or provisions for Church order. The dictum lex orandi, lex credendi may rightly point to the fact that Christianity consists of more than rational systems and propositional beliefs, but it becomes unmanageably ambiguous if it is taken to suggest that Christianity can exist without the sort of theological confession that the Articles provided for the Church which produced them. Anglicanism needs a confessional theology, both to explain the content of its liturgies and to provide a framework within which to define the acceptable range of its diversity. The Articles are historically conditioned in the issues they define, but as was seen in the discussion of comprehensiveness, without any such framework the existence of a pluriformity of opinion is likely to degenerate into self-contradiction. (20)

The problem with the Articles is not only that they fail to deal with the questions currently dividing Anglican opinion, but that as a confessional standard they are regarded as holding various degrees of authority by different groups within the Anglican spectrum. It is one thing to place the Articles in their historical context, but it also needs to be made clear just how (if at all) they are then to

function in unfolding the "developing Anglican tradition". Even the addendum to the 1968 Lambeth Conference report failed to fulfil this second requirement.

The English Commission had at least recognised the extent of this problem. It was the fact that different attitudes were adopted to the Articles, that constituted for them the principal difficulty. One group within the Church could see the Articles as anachronistic, archaic or wrong-headed, while another would regard any attempt to tinker with their provisions as proof of the doctrinal decay of Anglicanism. In the sixteenth century the Articles had been intended to provide a formula for peace: in the twentieth, they were themselves the cause of a break-down in the armistice. For the Commission however, of greater significance than open antagonism was the fact that for the majority of church-people the whole discussion of the Articles was a source of indifference and embarrassment. The question of subscription and assent for them, it was felt, was a mere formality. (21) In a time of intellectual uncertainty and public confusion the Church really needed a clear-cut and heart-felt affirmation of its beliefs. It was by means of this argument that the Commission had determined to restrict its proposals to those concerning a revised form of assent with an explanatory Preface, in the way previously noted.

While the description of the situation regarding the Articles is useful, the inferences drawn from it in the English report are not incontestable. In the first place, the extreme positions outlined are not necessarily antithetical. (22) Secondly, even if it is granted that the most pressing issue concerning subscription and assent is the positive requirement of an unambiguous affirmation of faith, this does not absolve would-be reformers from the obligation to show that any new statement of belief retains its continuity with

those that went before. (23) The English commission, like the Lambeth Conference debate which proceeded from it, was unable to show how the development of Anglican tradition absorbed rather than simply ignored the Thirty-nine Articles. (24)

Although it is beyond the precise concern of the present thesis, it is interesting to notice how this deficiency was highlighted by the Church of England's discussion of the Commission's report and how as a result in England at least, the connection between the historic formularies and the doctrinal development of Anglicanism was retained and strengthened.

Between the publication of the Durham report and its reception by the Church Assembly in 1969, the compilers were given cause to revise their original proposals. This revision specified that the contemporary theological responsibility of the Church was to witness and work out its historic faith especially as it was shown forth in the Catholic creeds and the reformation formularies of the Church of England. The form of assent thus looked back to decisive periods of theological definition not simply as examples of earlier patterns of understanding, but in order to establish its own continuity with them. The Church of England's responsibility to further the "witness to Christian truth" was thereby seen as a development of its previous theological achievements, not a departure from them. When the General Synod, as successor to the Assembly formulated the Worship and Doctrine Measure in 1975, this connection was made quite unambiguous. (25)

The Form of Assent finally adopted by the Church of England omitted the Commission's exposition of the "contemporary strand" of authority altogether. Clerical assent was itself a way of making contemporary the Church's confession. So an acknowledgement of the Church's historic subjection to Scripture and Creeds, and the testimony of her formularies led directly to the question:

In the declaration you are about to make will you affirm your loyalty to this inheritance of faith as your inspiration and guidance under God in bringing the grace and truth of Christ to this generation and making Him known to those in your care?

The declaration then follows as a reply:

I, A.B., do so affirm, and accordingly declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the Catholic Creeds and to which the historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, I will use only the forms of service which are authorised or allowed by Canon.

So it was that the Church of England was able to take the discussion of assent to formularies considerably further than the Lambeth Conference had foreseen. Whilst placing the Articles in their historical context in the way that I.T. Ramsey had insisted was necessary, the English Church also saw that it was possible to retain them in the framework of its normative beliefs. (26)

The Articles and other formularies may not express the whole substance of Anglican belief, but when properly appreciated they are more than the archaisms that many of those at Lambeth seemed to imagine. In the end, the question under discussion is not whether the Articles should be bound "in the back of the book" or how they should be framed in any declaration of assent, but how declared doctrine controls and contributes to the developing Anglican tradition. McAdoo may have been correct in telling the Conference that the Articles provided an interpretation and not a definition of Anglican beliefs. What he and others overlooked was the fact that for the Church of England at least, and in various ways therefore for the Communion as a whole, the Articles also provide (within their own limitations), an authoritative interpretation. The "stately home" to which the Articles are properly consigned should

be an Elizabethan manor-house where the conservation of their historical setting and importance can be assured, not a Victorian terrace converted as an eventide home for distressed ecclesiological gentlefolk.

It was quite understandable that the Church of England would provide a more balanced estimate on the place of the Thirty-nine Articles than did the Lambeth Conference. The discussion of the 1968 Conference was, as has been seen, held under an intolerable restraint of time. Moreover the Conference lacked that historical and legal familiarity with the Articles that the English church took for granted. The Conference was neither equipped nor empowered to undertake a confessional task, and the notion of "the Anglican tradition" it settled upon to resolve its difficulties was not clearly enough elaborated to bear the burden imposed upon it. The fact that the question of the Articles was raised at all was evidence of Anglicanism's desire to at least examine its theological credentials in the light of changing circumstances, but in the end it revealed the inadequacy of the Lambeth Conference to accomplish that task.

In 1976 the Anglican Consultative Council again raised the question of the status of the Articles. Apparently nothing came of the request for further information. <sup>(27)</sup> The real need, as far as the future of Anglicanism is concerned, is not just the clarification of the legal status of the Articles or even agreement on how its provisions should be modernised. It is the wholeness of the Anglican tradition that needs to be reappraised. As the Articles sought to revise and re-state the English religious tradition in the light of history and circumstances, so Anglicanism in the twentieth century must reflect upon and piece together its diverse experience as a fellowship of Churches and thus develop a contemporary

confessional stance which shows what it believes and where it is heading.

(b) The use of the Quadrilateral

If the short-comings in the Lambeth Conference's treatment of the Thirty-nine Articles are understandable, no such exoneration can be extended to its discussions of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The Articles were only on the margin of the Conference's concern, and the debate at the 1968 Conference has been criticised not just because it "depressed" the status of the Articles but because it did so upon the supposition that Anglicanism had no need of an explanatory theology. The Quadrilateral however was a creation of the Anglican Communion. It has provided, in ways already described, the pivot upon which Anglican ecumenical relationships have revolved, and co-incidentally, the foundation upon which Anglican self-understanding has been built.

The progressive revision of the Quadrilateral in response to changing situations and especially its restatement in the Appeal to All Christian People, has already been noted as one of the benchmarks for Anglican ecclesiology. It comes as no surprise then that when the need for theological affirmation was paramount, as in 1968, the Lambeth Quadrilateral should once more come under review. As would be expected, the subject arose in the discussion of Christian unity, but quickly spilled over into a consideration of the doctrinal commitments of the Anglican Communion. As such it provided a fitting indication of the way in which Anglicanism has sought a renewal in faith and a development in its theology.

The centrality of the Quadrilateral became apparent on the opening morning of the Conference when the Chairman of the Unity section H.L.J. De Mel, Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of the Indian Church, devoted his introductory address to an historical

review of the Anglican initiatives in the field of Christian unity. The 1920 Appeal, he insisted, was the bed-rock on which Anglican attitudes to reunion rested. Since its composition only spasmodic progress had been made in bringing its ideals to reality. The time had come again to find ways in which the Appeal could be revitalised with a sense of urgency and flexibility. (28)

Within the Unity section, sub-committee 26 was to deal with "Principles of Union" and it was here that questions of theology could principally be expected to arise. A member of that committee J. Stuart Wetmore, a Suffragan Bishop of New York, has recorded his impressions of the Conference. He notes, "it was easy to establish as committee 26 began [its work, that] its primary focus must be the Quadrilateral". (29) He listed the abstract principles upon which the committee agreed: that obedience to Christ's commands must take precedence over human inventiveness; that unity involves more than agreement on the ecclesiastical and organisational plane, even though it is there that misunderstandings occur and concrete demands must be met; that the quest for unity is inseparable from the quest for truth and holiness; that unity is inseparable from renewal; that unity should be seen as a frontier to be reached rather than a state to be recovered (and as such, reference should be made to 'unity' not 'reunion'); and that the mysterion of God's unity is the basis for the churches' present unity and the unity that is yet to come. (30)

It was this two-fold emphasis on unity as both a present responsibility and a future hope that dominated the committee discussions, and made it reluctant to pin the prospects of unity upon any set of propositions or formulae. (31) Wetmore records that another American bishop, L. Stark of Newark, raised the question of the Quadrilateral in this respect. The Quadrilateral

should be seen as a basis for fuller union, not a measure of Christian integrity, said Stark. Anglicans needed to make a much more hospitable reference to non-episcopal ministries, and to this end the Quadrilateral should emphasise the degree of unity already experienced as well as the goals to which the Churches were moving. Wetmore added "My own anxiety was that we should revise the Quadrilateral to make clear that the Anglican Communion was no longer using it as a yardstick to measure other churches by ....." (32)

With these discussions in mind, Oliver Tompkins the committee chairman, prepared a draft statement. This referred to the "variety of formulations" given to the Lambeth Quadrilateral as an embodiment of the Anglican goal of unity, and saw these emphasising four elements:

1. Common submission to Scripture as the Word of God, the uniquely authoritative record of God's revelation of himself to man;
2. Common profession of the faith derived from that revelation, especially as witnessed to in the primitive Creeds;
3. Common acceptance of the divinely instituted sacraments of baptism and the Holy Communion;
4. Common acknowledgement of a ministry through which the grace of God is given to his people. (33)

In the general context of the report and then in a more detailed treatment of each statement, the four points were taken to affirm "both that which God has given and that to which he calls us". The whole approach was characterised as a dynamic rather than static view of unity, inspired especially by the vision outlined by the New Delhi assembly of the World Council of Churches. (34) The Quadrilateral is concerned with the renewal of truth, holiness and mission as much as unity. As such it is not to be taken as a statement of entrenched Anglican positions. Such was the committee's argument.

The statement was approved by the Conference Unity section and

was presented for a preliminary hearing by the Conference on August 9th. De Mel had once again begun the session by urging the implementation of ideals held since the 1920 Appeal, and when the section on "principles" was presented, an observer from the World Presbyterian Alliance, Dr William Stewart, spoke in similar vein. When the Quadrilateral had been first formulated in 1888, he began, it had a valuable and legitimate function in pointing to certain elements which might be looked for in the coming great church. He went on:

Unfortunately in the period which has elapsed since 1888, this Quadrilateral and especially the fourth point of it, has sometimes been used in quite a different way as if it supplied a kind of measuring rod whereby in our time of division we could determine our closeness or otherwise to the life of the Church into the grace of God. (35)

Almost immediately A.M. Ramsey rose to deliver the first of two very significant speeches from the chair. He spoke without notes, although Wetmore indicated that the Archbishop had consulted with the unity section and spent time conferring with Tomkins beforehand. Ramsey said:

In my reading on the Doctrine of the Church in the last few years, I have got the impression that the most valuable and creative trend in the study of the doctrine of Church has been what some writers call the eschatological aspect of the Church. I understand it means this: the Church of God is something once for all given to the world - and also (guided by the Spirit of God) moving towards - plenitude - final realization - and that applies to every note of the Church.

Holiness is given once for all in the holiness of Christ. The Church grows into the perfect realization of that holiness through all the struggles of the centuries.

Truth is given once for all - in perfect revelation through the centuries. The Church, guided by the Spirit through the centuries, grows into the complete understanding of that truth.

So, too, unity is once for all given in the incorporation of Christians into Christ, but the Church grows into the full realization of unity through centuries of time.

Now that may sound so obvious and platitudinous, but in fact it has not always been apparent in our thoughts and actions about Christian unity. And if we have an eye upon this double polarity of the Church once given and awaiting plenitude, it does affect things a good deal.

Ramsey declared his conviction that it was this "polarity" which stood behind the theological renewal in the Roman Catholic Church.

The Archbishop's reading encompassed a life-time of scholarship and reflected a major shift in the study of ecclesiology. After the Conference, in his book The Charismatic Christ (1972) Ramsey reflected on the movement of his own thought since his first publication, The Gospel and the Catholic Church (1936). Whilst he still believed that the Catholic structures of the Church carried the gospel, he had learnt not to press the metaphors of structure too far. Increasingly he had become aware of the open-ness of the Church to history and to its future. The biblical image of the Church as the people of God now seemed more fitting than the apparently organic pictures of the temple and the body of Christ. In the light of this transposition, Church structures could be viewed with greater flexibility, although not dispensed with.

The inter-connection of judgment and grace had always been a dominant theme in Ramsey's writing and he was not reluctant to apply that insight to the present Anglican position. His speech went on:

As Anglicans we have always been accustomed to think of Church unity in a rather static way - looking back to the norms of the Catholic tradition, and conserving those norms, and spreading those norms to unfortunate people who are without them!

Now it is perfectly right to do that, but that is only half our duty and understanding. The other half is, while doing that, we ought also to be looking ahead to the plenitude of the Church, and where we and other Christians are really set upon that plenitude, where we

have a common understanding of it and a commitment to it in our minds, we can already be doing things in anticipation of that plenitude.

It was Ramsey's willingness to hold in tension both what the church has already received by grace, and what it has yet to achieve in its fulness which provides the key to the 1968 Conference's treatment of the Quadrilateral. The speech was greeted with prolonged applause and the section of the Unity report which was under consideration was approved without further debate. As a method of resolving the recurrent problem of maintaining Catholic order while at the same time acknowledging Christian freedom, it was only partially successful. The understanding of the principles Ramsey had enunciated had yet to be tested in practice. In this case, the practice in question was that of intercommunion.

When the Conference reports were being finally adopted and appropriate resolutions moved, the Unity section's principles gave rise to a generalised motion which was approved without audible dissent. (36) This was followed by three resolutions on intercommunion which recommended that in order to meet pastoral needs or to cement an agreement between Churches to unite, reciprocal sacramental acts should be permitted. (37) The third of these proposals actually stated the principle that where agreement had been reached in unity discussions, and where this agreement included a shared view of the ultimate faith and order of a united body, "reciprocal intercommunion" should be allowed, even before a formal unification had taken place. (38)

Bishop Mortimer of Exeter objected to these resolutions which,

When they are all taken together reveal a trend away from the principle of episcopacy that almost amounts to advice from this conference to the Anglican communion that it would surrender or at least severely dent the principle to which the Communion has hitherto tenaciously held, that the celebrant of the Eucharist must be a Bishop or priest, episcopally ordained. (39)

It was one thing to allow Anglicans freedom of conscience to judge the efficacy of non-episcopal ministries, he continued, but never before had it been so unequivocally asserted that they were valid. If episcopal and non-episcopal ministers were to be united, then it should be on the clear basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. Among several supporters, the Archbishop of Wales, W.G.H. Simon, complained that the Anglican Communion's traditional unity had been found in the Book of Common Prayer and the notion of episcopacy. The Prayer Book's authority had been eroded away it seemed. Now episcopacy was to be dismissed after it.

Later in the debate the Bishop of Leicester, R.R. Williams, took up the theme, and explicitly related the work of Committee 26 to the proposals for intercommunion. The whole Quadrilateral had been re-written in a way which diminished its objective authority, he claimed. All four points had been re-written in a subjective sense in the conference report. "There is a subtle difference between presenting these as subjective attachments rather than as objective facts which have some significance in themselves". The loss of authority which had be-fallen the Quadrilateral was immediately apparent in the advice now given concerning intercommunion, Williams said. In particular the fourth point, which had certainly been subject to modifications over the years, was now reduced to acknowledging that Anglicans possessed a ministry given by God. Most Christians agreed that all ministry came by the grace of God. That however was not the point with which the Lambeth Quadrilateral had been concerned.

The point at issue is whether the Historic Episcopate is the means whereby the ministry now is related organically to that ministry which has been in the Church since the time of our Lord. (40)

The debate continued for most of the morning. Some speakers

demanding that the Conference face the implications of contradicting the Church's formularies, others welcomed the attempt to avoid the impression that Anglican norms were to be imposed as a kind of test of the authenticity of other churches. Ian Ramsey of Durham observed that this represented a contest between two views of Catholicity, one of which was logical and historical in character, the other more variegated and maze-like.

Then, just before the luncheon adjournment, Michael Ramsey rose again to speak. He cited his own correspondence as a young man with William Temple. Temple had held that Scripture, Creeds, Sacraments and Ministry were necessary elements for the Church's unity, but also that the church lived essentially by the grace of God. As a consequence Temple believed that churches which deviated from the catholic norms could still display signs of the divine life, just as a fractured branch could still be seen as part of the tree from which it drew its life. Fidelity to God-given norms should not make Anglicans insensitive to the evidence of God-given life.

Ramsey continued:

Now see the Anglican Communion against this background. First, the Anglican Communion adheres to certain norms, for its own life, and for its requirements for the reintegration of Christendom. These norms are in the Lambeth Quadrilateral. I share the regret that this report didn't describe the Lambeth Quadrilateral quite plainly in terms of facts. For this reason, just because our Anglican Communion is getting more and more involved and mixed up, and we know that its frontiers are going to be indeterminate, we ought to be the more ready, rather than less ready, to describe our data in objective terms and say what they are rather than wrap them up in a kind of subjective opinion. But, of course, the failure of the Conference to discuss this when it had the draft before, didn't give much guidance to the Section. Perhaps, even now, the section could put in a footnote quoting the 1888 Quadrilateral, (I always like to call it the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral in honour of our friends over there), as facts, facts to which we adhere.

Second, while adhering to those facts, the Anglican Communion has not discouraged, or forbidden,

its members to recognize the existence of God's Grace in other forms of Church ministry and Church order, and those who say that they receive the Holy Sacrament in other ministrations can claim, historically, that they are a part of the Anglican fact and tradition as much as we who disagree with them can claim to be a part of the Anglican fact and tradition. And, indeed, it's just inevitable that there's been a mixed variety of practice because in the divided Christendom the relations between grace and order are inevitably very much confused.

Ramsey illustrated this diversity of conviction by reference to his own position. As a witness to the episcopal norm he did not feel able to receive communion from what, according to that point of view, was an 'irregular' ministry. Other Anglicans however could be justified in seeing as the essential thing in the sacraments of any church, the fact that Christ gives himself in grace to his faithful people. Therefore they participate, even while being aware that the plenitude of faith which the sacrament celebrates has yet to find full expression in their community.

This was the background to the Resolution on Intercommunion which Ramsey saw as being quite cautious in its provisions. He urged its adoption in the following terms.

We don't only have to have our doctrine of the Church tidy, we have to relate our doctrine of the Church to the doctrine of Grace - and to the doctrine of God - a mighty difficult, a mighty difficult thing to do.

After lunch - when Ramsey had announced news of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and led the Conference in prayer - the debate continued, with Oliver Tomkins as the principal speaker. Tomkins denied that the Report subordinated fact to opinion. Like all other Conferences since 1888, the sub-committee had assumed the original formulation as its starting point. The present interpretation was only 'subjective' to the extent that it spoke of accepting what 1888 had objectively stated. More positively, he argued, the report attempted to create a mediating position between

a Catholic emphasis which might not take "grace" seriously enough, and a Protestant point of view which may overlook the demands of unity. The committee had tried to provide a theological basis whereby the Church could actually start to live between the gift and fulfilment of God's promises. This basis had to be relevant to the requirements of theological agreement and urgent unity negotiations.

The only further flurry came when Resolution 47 was debated again. A.M. Ramsey sought to have eventual "agreement in faith and order", the condition for reciprocal intercommunion, qualified by reference to the Lambeth Quadrilateral: and in this case he made clear that it was the 1888 form that he had in mind. On this occasion Tomkins and Wood, the Secretary of the Ministry Section, (who had supported an earlier proposal of the Archbishop to include the original Quadrilateral as a footnote to the report) opposed him. Despite its values, the Quadrilateral was an Anglican document they claimed. The future church needed agreement in Apostolic faith and order. The resolution was finally passed without amendment, by 341 votes to 87 - a substantial minority.

There are two reasons for following this debate in such detail. First it has served to complete the record of the way in which the Lambeth Quadrilateral has been re-formulated and re-interpreted ever since the time of its first composition. Secondly, it provides a telling illustration of the way in which Anglican theological statements can develop in response to the practical demands of unity and mission.

Not all observers would see it as an example of doctrinal development. L.A. Haselmeyer would undoubtedly have seen the 1968 Conference as fulfilling his worst fears: the degeneration of the Quadrilateral. On his reading it would represent a dilution of

doctrinal clarity which was apparent from the time Lambeth rescinded the Chicago Convention's declaration and turned an affirmation of the 'deposit' of catholic faith and order into a programme for the re-unification of Christendom. (41) Certainly Simpson and Story shared Haselmeyer's essential viewpoint when they summed up what they saw as the failure of the tenth Lambeth Conference.

... the Conference of 1968 made it obvious that the Anglican Communion of Catholic Churches is fast forgetting what it once was, uncertain of what **it** now is, and doubtful of what it should be. (42)

Even the anonymous editorial writer for Crockford's Clerical Index was of the opinion that the Conference had been unacceptably protestant and doctrinaire in its conclusions. (43)

On the other hand, the various formulations and interpretations of the Quadrilateral, so frustrating to Haselmeyer and others, can also be seen as a process whereby 'order' and 'grace' have sought to come to terms with each other. On this view, the tortuous pathway to self-definition which discussion of the Quadrilateral has marked out, represents a continuation of the "wisdom of the Church of England" in seeking the "mean between two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting any variation". (44) The doctrinal progression of the Lambeth Conferences has extended, in a way that was not possible in the conditions of the English church, the dialectic between Catholic substance and Protestant principle.

Of course each Conference has carried on its discussions in the light of its own perception of the circumstances. The pressures and opportunities of the moment have determined the outcome of theological debates more than any over-riding principle of doctrinal development. Nevertheless in its own way, each discussion has contributed to an understanding of the history and literature of Anglican consciousness.

This was certainly the case in 1968. No conference, with the exception of that held in 1920, has been so responsive to the sense of intellectual and social challenge which coloured its deliberations. A general sense of urgency generated the willingness to contemplate new possibilities. The treatment of the Quadrilateral for instance rejected the supposition that it represented a static, 'deposit' theory of faith and order, yet avoided the purely subjective understanding that some participants seemed to fear. Ian Ramsey's insistence that Catholicity was not only a matter of logic but also of truth and love, was capable of further elaboration. And A.M. Ramsey's "eschatological" view of the Church, in which principles and practice did not need to coincide existentially as long as the principles were clearly drawn and the practice was moving towards them, was of considerable dogmatic and ecumenical significance. The Conference's treatment of the Church of South India, the Inter-communion question, and its development of some of the organisational structures to be considered in the next section, indicate that this significance was recognised to be more than a matter of words alone. These examples provide evidence, however modest, of theological renewal in the Anglican tradition. The understanding of Anglican ecclesiology was clearer as a result.

The discussion at the 1968 Conference represents neither the ultimate collapse nor the final correction of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. It simply offers, within its own terms of reference, an interpretation and explanation of Anglican faith and order for ecumenical purposes. It also provides an example of the way in which Anglicanism can confront some of its own inconsistencies and, in concert with the theological work of the wider Church fellowship, make definite progress in correcting and refining its self-understanding. The cause of unity, no less than Anglican awareness, is best served by bringing what A.M.

Ramsey referred to as the "objective data" of Anglican experience into contact with the perceived needs of the Church and the world. In this way the theological renewal of Anglicanism is set forward. It will be the best evidence of Anglicanism's vitality.

## 2. RENEWAL IN UNITY : STRUCTURES OF ANGLICAN SELF-EXPRESSION

Ideas can be tested not only by the abstract examination of their internal consistency but also from observation of the actions they inspire. In this section attention will turn from the capacity of the Anglican communion to deal with the theological questions of declared doctrine and ecclesiology, to the way in which its ecclesial structures have developed as a response to these considerations.

The way in which the Anglican experience of authority has had a centrifugal effect on the organisation of power within the Communion has already been noted. (45) But, under those circumstances, can Anglicanism also generate the institutions to actualise the vision it professes to uphold? What institutional obligations and opportunities does membership of the Anglican Communion confer? Are these institutions themselves subject to theological renewal?

Once more it is possible to direct attention to post-war Lambeth Conferences as representing a distinct phase in the development of Anglicanism. In 1908 the Lambeth Conference offered the dictum that if the Communion was to reach maturity, "regard must be had both to the just freedom of its several parts, and to the just claim of the whole Communion upon its every part". (46) The earlier Conferences were properly concerned with the first part of that equation, for only as the ties between the mother church and her dependent daughters were severed, could Anglicanism develop as a Communion at all. The fact that affection remained even after the legal bonds were broken is of course the reason that the Communion survives. Equally, it gives urgency to the question of how the "just claim" of the whole upon its parts is to be exercised. It is that question of how the Anglican Communion is to create machinery to increase mutuality, consultation and decision making, that has frequently concerned the more recent Conferences.

While the Lambeth Conferences have remained the dominant mode of Anglican self-realisation, other structures have developed laterally from them. Three of these structures can now be considered - namely the Pan-Anglican Congress; the Anglican Consultative Council; and the Multi-lateral ecumenical consultations which the Communion has undertaken. Such efforts to modify and extend Anglican corporate life lead on to a consideration of Anglican structures for mission.

(i) The Anglican Congresses - a quest for mutuality

It is perhaps not surprising that the 1908 Conference should give such early expression to the balance between independence and interdependence which characterizes Anglican polity. The Conference in that year had been preceded by the first pan-Anglican Congress. A series of services and study conferences took place in London for a fortnight prior to the Lambeth Conference itself and won support from the overseas bishops who were present, as well as a considerable following from among Church people in general. (47) The Congress had been five years in the planning, and involved a very thorough study programme co-ordinated by E.J. Palmer (then a Fellow of Balliol). This concentrated its attention on delineating the nature and responsibilities of the Anglican Communion. As the Introduction to the General Report of the Congress acknowledged, Anglicanism "had arrived at the psychological moment when any effort to deepen the sense of corporate life throughout the world would meet with success". (48) Perhaps it was not so much the inspiration of the moment that ensured the Congress' success as the expenditure of hard intellectual effort during the preparations and the high standard of material presented to its meetings. This was certainly a factor in the apparently unexpected attention given to the Congress by the world's newspaper services, with over 300 reporters in attendance. (49)

Before the Congress concluded however, it was apparent that in

future such events should be kept quite distinct from Lambeth Conferences. Not only did it place a demanding schedule before the bishops in attendance, it gave too little time for the ideas of the Congress to be absorbed and implemented in the deliberations of the Conference. The value of the Congress had to be seen in the inspiration and instruction it provided for those involved, but even more in the quality of thinking which would give impetus to Anglican life and witness. (50)

Further Conferences were held in 1954 and 1963 at Minneapolis and Toronto respectively, and these consciously sought in the first instance to provide an exposition of the Anglican theological and liturgical tradition, and in the second, to seek contemporary lines of action for that tradition. (51)

The Congresses were too spasmodic and too indefinite in their function to endure. The 1968 Conference decided that there should be no further Congresses, but proposed instead a series of regional meetings and also joint meetings at the time of World Council of Churches meetings. (52) By then other structures had come to fulfil the needs previously met by the Congresses. However at least one monument to the Congress spirit remains, and this must be examined further.

The Toronto Congress was dominated by the call to open up the meaning of "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ". This call came from a meeting of primates and advisers in the Lambeth Consultative Body and the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy. It was presented to the Congress by Dr Coggan, then the Archbishop of York, and immediately captured the imagination of those present. The call was for each Province to review its needs and resources in order to invigorate its own life, and also to further the corporate life of the Communion. The programme, encapsulated in the

slogan "The Church that lives to itself dies by itself", was launched with enthusiasm and for some years 'M.R.I' with its Projects Directory and disbursement of funds, provided the most tangible expression of Anglican fellowship throughout the world. (53)

In time a number of deficiencies became apparent in the M.R.I. programme. It could be criticised for being imposed on the Communion rather than arising from it. More seriously, despite the intention to include man-power as well as monetary resources within its province, M.R.I. came to be regarded as synonymous with an overseas aid programme - apparently content to help prop up struggling Anglican institutions. Most regrettable of all, the aid necessarily travelled from the traditional 'sending' to the traditional 'receiving' churches. (54) Despite all that, the project at least underscored the fact that the Anglican Communion was a world-wide family, and in principle at least, one that shared a single vision of co-operation, personal contact, and mutual understanding between its Provinces. (55)

The 1968 Conference supported this concept. At its first meeting, the Anglican Consultative Council (which it will be remembered had been set up by that Conference) extended its significance by referring to M.R.I. as "the **one shared statement on contemporary mission that we Anglicans have**". (56) However, it went on to distinguish between the principle upon which M.R.I. was based and the directory project which was but one way in which Anglican inter-relationships could be expressed. It also urged that the resources offered and required by Churches be expressed in **wider than just financial terms**. At the following meeting the shopping-list mentality was criticised even more forcefully. In consequence, a series of consultations was set up in which representatives of different churches could assist each Province in

turn to assess its own life, and then engage in joint planning and co-operation for the future. Thus M.R.I. was transported into "Partnership in Mission". Each church was meant to retain responsibility for its own priorities, but among the Churches of the Communion, attitudes of either dependence or interdependence were to merge in a common attitude of interdependence. (57)

Over the next five years twenty four consultations were held under the guidance of the Reverend David Chaplin. (58) At successive meetings of the A.C.C. the potential of the Partners in Mission concept was enthusiastically endorsed, and recommended as a model for further development of ecumenical, evangelistic, and ministerial ventures, as well as co-operative efforts in Inter-Church aid. (59)

Quite apart from any practical achievements though (and the A.C.C. was aware that the whole project was to be commended for its aspirations as much as its accomplishments), the Partners in Mission programme gave Anglicans the chance to explore some new dimensions of what the New Testament called 'fellowship'. (60) As such it is a worthy memorial to the vision of the Anglican Congress, and a useful stimulus to the quest for an Anglican consciousness.

(ii) The Anglican Consultative Council - the need for consultation.

Reference to the Partners in Mission programme has necessarily led to a consideration of the part played in its implementation by the Anglican Consultative Council. The Council, set up by the 1968 Conference, was in itself a development in Anglican ecclesiological thinking.

Attention has already been given to the ways in which the Lambeth Conferences attempted to provide for some measure of continuity between their meetings, and to create the machinery which would implement decisions reached by one Conference and prepare the ground for the work

of the next. As has been seen this process reached its first state of permanence with the Lambeth Consultative Body which, under the terms of its 1920 Constitution, was described as a Continuation Committee of the Conference. It was made up of eighteen bishops appointed by the major Provinces as their representatives. (61) With the growth of the Anglican Communion, and especially with the increased possibility of international travel after the Second World War, something more was required. The 1948 Conference called for the setting up of an Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy alongside the L.C.B. The new organisation, meeting every two years and with representatives from each Province entitled to attend, was intended to strengthen the bonds of co-operation and friendship in areas of missionary activity. Special opportunities were seen for co-ordinating the resources and programmes of the voluntary missionary societies, but the Council was also asked to formulate policies regarding world mission and to advise on future developments of Provincial structure as well. (62) Ten years later the Conference recommended an extension of the Council's mandate in the light of "unprecedented expansion" in the life and witness of the Communion. (63) Pre-eminent among these recommendations was the proposal to appoint a full-time secretary whose task would be that of collating and disseminating information. In addition, the inclusion of lay persons among Provincial representatives was permitted, to enable the Council to draw upon "the largely untapped spiritual resources and knowledge of many outstanding Churchmen". (64) The authority of the Council was quite specific. It was an Advisory Body and could not settle policy. The Council could deliberate but decision-making powers remained with the Provinces. Whilst the question of inter church relations may arise in the context of missionary planning, the Council was not empowered to deal with such issues in its own right. (65)

Partly as a consequence of these restrictions, attention was also given to the function of the Lambeth Consultative Body. (66) As well as its work as a continuation committee, a revised constitution gave the L.C.B. the right to consider matters submitted to it, including "questions of faith, order, policy, or administration". Yet like the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy, the Lambeth Consultative Body was without executive or administrative powers no matter how much its scope had been enlarged. (67) Its potential was enhanced however by the decision to appoint a secretary who would presumably also be Secretary of the Missionary Council. The L.C.B. was made up of the Primate or Presiding Bishop of the Communion (or their episcopal alternates) along with representatives of the extra Provincial dioceses, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

These moves were made with the principle of Provincial autonomy in mind, and the dangers of bureaucratisation were clearly recognised. Yet the evident growth of the Anglican presence throughout the world and the increasing complexity of the challenges it faced, meant that the Communion needed to consider afresh just how its corporate life was expressed. As the 1958 Report put it:

It needs to be reminded in all its parts that no one lives to himself, and that as a body with a common life the whole is always something greater than the sum of those parts. In the context of the modern world with its pressures, competing systems, rival philosophies, and expanding frontiers of knowledge, the need for consultation is of paramount importance.

If the responsibilities of a world-wide Communion are to be grasped and its resources mobilized, fuller expression must be given to four vital principles of corporate life - co-ordination, co-operation, consolidation, cohesion. (68)

It was the attempt to give substance to such principles that motivated the development of inter-Anglican structures during the 1950's. However the attempt lacked an over-riding theological principle which would hold the developments together. Co-ordination and co-operation, the

elements of planning and deployment, largely lay in the hands of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy: decision-making powers, those on which consolidation and cohesion can be said to depend, were the responsibility of the Lambeth Consultative Body. At the time this division of labour mattered little. The two groups mainly overlapped in the personnel involved. (69) Consequently the hidden implications of this two-fold structure did not become apparent for some time.

The next stage of development occurred at the 1968 Conference when the Anglican Consultative Council was formed and when in effect the two bodies were combined. The effort by this Conference to integrate the pursuit of unity, renewal and mission has already become apparent. This was the perceived reason for a new stage of inter-Anglican relationships, and the formation of the A.C.C. (70) The Council's functions included all those previously undertaken by the L.C.B. and A.C.M.S., but a number of them were re-emphasised and given a more positive, confident tone. (71) For example, the Council was held responsible "To develop as far as possible agreed Anglican policies in the world mission of the Church ..." and "To encourage and guide Anglican participation in the Ecumenical Movement ... and to make arrangements for the conduct of pan-Anglican conversations with .... other Churches". It was to be the body which would advise on local Church union negotiations and on the subsequent relationship between the Anglican Communion and newly united churches. It was clear from its Constitution that the Consultative Council was intended to disseminate not only information but ideas, policies, advice and authorised opinion.

Even more distinctive was the basis of membership. Members were appointed by their Churches for a six year period, with each delegation consisting (after an agreed schedule) of a bishop, plus clerical and lay representatives. (72) That this was a Council of the

Churches was reinforced by the fact that while it was created at a Lambeth Conference, that decision was to be ratified by a two-thirds majority of the member Churches. This was also necessary in the case of any proposed amendments to the constitution. (73) The Archbishop of Canterbury held ex officio membership and was to preside over the opening session of each A.C.C. meeting, but the Council would elect its own Chairman. While no major infra-structure was anticipated, the position of the Anglican Executive Officer was replaced by that of a Secretary General appointed by and responsible to the Council.

When the Council first met at Limuru in 1971, it reported to the Church in a fashion which sought to develop a coherent line of argument, on questions of unity, church and society, and mission and evangelism. This was a distinct change from the more matter-of-fact style of its predecessors. The Secretary General, Bishop John Howe spoke of the new ground being broken by the Council and indicated how this brought a new dimension to concepts of Anglican unity.

The fifty-one members came together not to legislate but to consult - to continue the tradition of consultation which is of the essence of Anglican cohesion and the Anglican style of life. But the consultation was not simply a matter of talk. The Council was also to serve as "an instrument of common action". (74)

The importance of this "coming together" was further developed in Howe's report of the Dublin meeting two years later. The Council may be small and insignificant in some ways, he acknowledged, but because members are appointed to the task it is not without value. "... The A.C.C. is a Council, not an open conference .... by the time the Council comes to voting, it is a consensus in the Anglican family, as there represented, that is emerging, and not the voice of any one Church, or any group, or outside organization". (75)

This attempt to give a common voice, to provide a vehicle for

common action by the Communion, inevitably led to controversy. Howe repeatedly reflected on the way the Council explored Anglicanism's family ethos - including its heartaches. (76) His own belief was that in facing the fact of diversity in their own midst, the Council could help develop an Anglican consensus. The limits of this diversity were **nearly** reached in the Council's treatment of the ordination of women. The problem, of course, had been before the Lambeth Conferences since 1948 and was one of the "most pressing and perplexing problems" specifically bequeathed to the A.C.C. at its inception. (77) In particular it posed for the Council a testing question as to its own authority. (78) Rather against its own wishes the Council found itself forced into making an early decision on the matter. In response to a specific request from the Council of the Church in South East Asia, the Limuru meeting ruled that if a "bishop of the Anglican Communion acting with the approval of his Province ... decides to ordain women to the priesthood, his action will be acceptable to this Council: and that this Council will use its good offices to encourage all Provinces of the Anglican Communion to continue in communion with these dioceses". (79) The decision was fiercely contested but became the accepted policy of the Council, and indeed the basis of the 1978 Lambeth Conference's resolution on the same question. (80)

The Council's thinking in reaching this conclusion was based upon two assumptions. One was that the ordination of women did not constitute a contradiction of fundamental Anglican (or Christian) doctrine - and in this it could reasonably point to the reiterated conviction that theological arguments were inconclusive. (81) It may be argued that further efforts should have been made to at least measure the balance of probabilities in an inconclusive argument before making a decision about it. However the Council countered that suggestion on the basis of its second assumption. This was that

Anglican unity was not a matter of maintaining a unanimity of thought and action but in working through differences towards a consensus. The 1978 Conference was to deal with the question of the ordination of women by extending the notion of comprehensiveness from the category of faith to that of order. The Council however had attempted more than that. Its aim was not just to ensure toleration for different practices but to give voice to an overall policy. At its third meeting in Trinidad the Council reported some progress towards that end and an increasing acceptance within the Anglican Communion of the principle that women may be ordained to the priesthood. It continued:

While it is recognised that the work of the Spirit of God is not bound by majority opinions, the A.C.C has committed itself to listen to its member churches, on this and on other matters, and to describe the consensus as it forms .... In all of this there have been countless discussions and debates among people of goodwill and strongly held convictions. Such is inevitable in any body of redeemed sinners. What is not inevitable is that disagreement should lead to disunion. (82)

In hindsight it is possible to judge that while it may not have been feasible to await conclusive theological arguments for or against the ordination of women before seeking to promote an Anglican consensus, the Council should have considered more carefully the implication of encouraging certain Provinces to ordain ministers who would not enjoy sacramental communion with all other Provinces. On the other hand it may equally be argued that the Council's decision only extended a situation which has existed (on other grounds) within the Anglican Communion and in relation to other episcopal churches for the past 150 years. (83) Whether or not the A.C.C.'s action is seen to be justifiable or not will depend on the view taken on a number of other issues such as the nature of priesthood and the limits of diversity that can be contemplated in the Anglican fellowship. What

is significant here is the way in which the A.C.C., by endeavouring to seek out and report on the Anglican "consensus", was embarking upon a new pattern of inter-Anglican leadership. The question of the Ordination of women, besides its intrinsic importance, also poses significant questions about the way in which Anglicans make up their minds, and the character of their unity and fellowship.

This aspect became clearer at the 1978 Conference and with it came the attempt to add a Primates' conference as a further tier of inter-Anglican consultation. Partly owing to Coggan's proposal and partly it would seem out of concern over the direction in which the A.C.C. had led the communion over the previous decade, the idea of a Primates' meeting gained sudden and unexpected support. The 1978 conference's section report on Anglican structures clearly differentiated the representative function of the A.C.C. and the specifically episcopal nature of the Lambeth Conference. It also noted the mutual exchange and enrichment gained by episcopal leadership from occasional meetings of the Primates and hoped these could continue, perhaps in conjunction with the A.C.C. (84)

However when these hopes were given expression in a Conference resolution such a distinction of functions was lost. Indeed it appeared that a Primates' Committee was being set up to act as a final authority and counter-weight to the Council's activities.

The Conference advises member Churches not to take action regarding issues which are of concern to the whole Anglican Communion without consultation with a Lambeth Conference or with the episcopate through the Primates Committee, and request the primates to initiate a study of the nature of authority within the Anglican Communion. (85)

To be sure, when the Primates actually met in 1979 they eschewed any suggestion that they were a committee. Then, and again in 1981, their assembly was primarily intended for the interchange of

experience, enlargement of understanding and mutual encouragement. However a precise understanding of how the two elements relate, representing as they do the synodical and episcopal dimensions of Anglican polity, is yet to be attempted. (86)

Bishop Howe provided one interpretation for the fourth meeting of the A.C.C.

The A.C.C., as I understand it, is based on the good theology that the Christian Church is the whole People of God, and its mission and ministry is the ministry of the whole People of God. In Anglicanism, it is questionable whether practice coincides with that theology. Probably what we are faced with is a swinging pendulum, but we need to know where it should come to rest. Lambeth Conferences may serve as an indicator of the swing. The Conference in 1968 seemed so to stress lay ministry as to distort its position within the whole ministry of God. The 1978 Conference has gone the other way, and too much was claimed or assumed for the decision, leadership and collegiality of the bishops alone. (87)

Howe rejected any sense of episcopacy acting as a kind of "general management" over the church. (88) For him Anglican structures work by a two-stage procedure. "Through their representatives the Anglican Churches confer together. In the light of that consultation action is taken by each member Church through its law-making body, as seems fitting to its own situation". (89) Among all the Anglican structures the A.C.C. is distinct in that it has a constitution and terms of reference authorised by the member churches, with a membership chosen by the Churches which includes laity and clergy as well as bishops. Effectively, the Lambeth Conference maintains its moral authority as an assembly of Bishops, and also as an "indicator of the direction in which the Anglican family is moving". The Primates' meeting is "mainly to enhance cohesion, understanding and collaboration in the family, and to share information among the Churches, not least about the implementation of A.C.C. recommendations made by the A.C.C. under its terms of reference". (90)

It is to the A.C.C. that the "steady slog" of gathering information, promoting consultation and listening for the voice of Anglican synthesis belongs. The responsibility for action remains with the Churches.

On Howe's exposition, the renewal of Anglican structures which has taken place over the last thirty years can be seen as a consistent development of the constitutional episcopacy upon which Anglicanism as a world-wide communion was founded. At the same time the development of the Anglican Consultative Council from a body which was essentially the continuation committee of the Lambeth Conferences to one which acts as the mouthpiece of inter-Anglican policies, has exposed a number of tensions in the way the Anglican Communion comes together. One tension concerns the place of the laity in the decision-making processes of the Church. Synodical government has meant that from the beginning Anglicanism has involved the lay membership as a full participant in diocesan and (when appropriate) Provincial organization. Until recently the laity have had no part in inter-Anglican affairs. Lay advisors were invited to the 1968 Conference, but the fact that lay-people have now joined the A.C.C. as equal members raises the whole issue of the Anglican view of the laity. This subject will be examined in the next section of this chapter.

Another tension which has emerged in the light of recent developments concerns the exercise of metropolitan authority. At the local level it was found that episcopacy and synodical government could be harnessed together. Within the episcopate it appears that a similar amalgamation of the episcopal college with the metropolitans has yet to be accomplished. The Primates' meeting could be useful but as yet it has still to prove its value and to find its theological justification. With the premium placed upon

the relationship of conciliarity to primacy in some current multi-lateral ecumenical conversations (which are also to be discussed later in this chapter), the need for such justification is pressing.

Beneath both these issues lies the question of authority, as Coggan discerned. The theory of dispersed authority has been developed with the autonomy of Anglican Provinces and the diversity of their situations chiefly in view. Now that Anglicanism is finding it necessary to speak with a corporate voice, the theory needs to be re-appropriated in order to allow unity of conviction to develop without the need for a centralization of power. The Lambeth Conference, in its wisdom, encouraged the Churches to set up the A.C.C. It cannot now seek to claw back the authority with which the Council has been conferred without over-reaching the limits of its own authority.

It is the authority of consultation and voluntary fellowship which gives the Anglican Communion its unity. The ability to adapt this to the needs of a re-united universal church is among the most crucial tests of the vitality of Anglican convictions.

(iii) Multi-lateral conversations - the need for common action

Before turning directly to the theme of mission, one further stratification in the process of Anglican self-expression should be noted briefly. The multi-lateral ecumenical conversations carried out on behalf of the Anglican Communion are not perhaps a 'structure' in the sense of the institutions previously considered. Yet, if they are more temporary in organisational terms, they are of potentially enduring significance as attempts to give substance to the 'Anglican position' in relation to other world-wide religious bodies.

This particular form of composite Anglican self-expression first

arose as a result of A.M. Ramsey's historic meeting with Pope Paul VI in March 1966. As a result of the 'Common Declaration' made by the two leaders on that day, a "serious dialogue" was inaugurated between Roman Catholic and Anglican theologians. The 1968 Lambeth Conference received reports from a Joint Preparatory Commission and called for the setting up of a Permanent Commission to "be chosen by the Lambeth Consultative Body (or its successor) and be representative of the Anglican Communion as a whole". (91) It was also charged to take due regard for "the multiplicity of conversations also in progress with other Churches". (92)

In actual fact the Anglican Communion had been in such discussions before. The commission that had forged the concordat with the Old Catholics in 1931 for instance, had met in the name of the Anglican Communion even though its members were appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and drawn only from the Church of England. (93) Plainly the existence of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission reflects the greater ease of modern transportation as well as a more developed understanding of Anglican communal activity. The Anglican representatives for the discussions were appointed immediately after the 1968 Conference, but since its inception they have reported to the A.C.C. whose secretary has also been responsible for circulating information and monitoring the response of the Anglican Provinces. (94)

The 1968 Conference also proposed the resumption of discussions with the Orthodox, and for this an Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission was set up and met for the first time in 1973. An Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group met in 1975 and agreed to pursue conversations on a regional basis. (95) Subsequently a dialogue was begun with representatives of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. (96)

It is not the concern of this survey to follow the actual progress of these negotiations or to pass judgment upon recommendations made by them. Such a judgment can only be made after a much broader scale review, including W.C.C. and other multi-lateral discussions. Reference is made to them here in order to exemplify further some of the ways in which attention has been directed to the problem of giving Anglicanism a unified voice. A fellowship of national churches requires some such means of expression if it is to make good a claim to be also an agent of the Church universal.

The operation of multi-lateral Anglican commissions raises two problems for Anglicanism. First, such conversations presume that it is possible for Anglicanism to draw upon a coherent theological tradition as it engages with various partners in dialogue. Previous discussion has suggested that such a shared tradition does exist but that at worst it is misunderstood or misrepresented by many Anglicans, and at best, it is undeveloped at a number of critical points. In particular Anglican reluctance to confront its own inconsistencies in the name of comprehensiveness, and its lack of acknowledged confessional documents present difficulties for all attempts to portray an agreed Anglican point of view. The appointment, by the 1978 Conference, of an Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Advisory Commission was intended to help rectify this situation. (97) Secondly, but perhaps of more immediate significance, these inter-Anglican negotiations have raised the problem of accountability throughout the communion. Just how can Anglicanism as it is historically constituted, come to a point of decision concerning unity or action? The A.C.C. has put the situation succinctly in relation to the future of A.R.C.I.C. discussions:

How should the Anglican Communion as a whole respond to these or any other Agreed Statements? There can be no question of the abrogation of the proper synodical responsibilities in each member Church, yet it is a reasonable presumption that the Roman Catholic Church would expect a co-ordinated response from one Communion as a whole because the dialogue is at the world-wide level. Agreed statements of this sort are a new species of document and their handling requires careful consideration by both Communions. The **problem** is one of the larger question of universal authority which faces Anglicanism today. Now is the time for rigorous thinking. (98)

The business of listening for consensus and turning it into policy (which Howe sees as the vocation of the A.C.C.) is a demanding task. It is one upon which the future coherence of Anglicanism depends. (99)

The purpose of this section has been to observe some of the ways in which Anglicanism has been able to adapt its organisational forms to the changing needs of the Church and the world. Earlier in this thesis, the ways in which Anglican "mutations" were carried to the newly independent nations were noted, and the Lambeth Conference was presented as the focus of the Anglican fellowship. With the passing of time a further metamorphosis has been required. The need for a more permanent means of inter-Provincial consultation and the requirement that the Provinces increasingly think and act as one, pose special problems for an ecclesiological system which is voluntary and de-centralised, and depends on moral rather than imperial authority. In both the earlier and more recent periods an element of pragmatism has been necessary. The need to act or to utilise the opportunities at hand meant that theoretical reflection took place as church structures functioned rather than before they were formed. It appears that the multiple channels of Conference, Council, the Primates, the Inter-Anglican Commissions, and now too the Doctrinal Advisory body, represent between them a response to the need for unified Anglican decision making. If so, this is quite consistent with the principles of dispersed authority on which

Anglicanism has settled. There are however many questions which await answers. Anglican solutions, and the extent to which a genuinely Anglican voice is heard in the concerns of the Church universal, will depend a good deal on the effectiveness of the organisations which have evolved from Lambeth. Even more, such solutions depend on the quality of theological reflection which will take place in those organisations in the future.

### 3. RENEWAL FOR MISSION : THE TEST OF ANGLICAN CREDIBILITY.

To the casual observer there is little cause to associate the Anglican communion with a vital renewal of Christian mission. In most parts of the world Anglicanism appears to be static in its outlook, if not actually moribund. The impression given is that Anglican faith and order is primarily concerned to maintain everything "as it was in the beginning", and that the Lambeth Conference is an ideal vehicle for that purpose.

Of course this caricature can be readily challenged. There have been many outstanding examples of missionary devotion provided by Anglican churchmen, and the pastoral and parochial ministry can still provide unexpected sources of inspiration. That Anglicans have been and are actively involved in the world mission of Christianity can be readily established. What is in doubt is whether the theological resources of Anglicanism itself can assist the understanding and furtherance of that mission. What does an Anglican view of the Church commit it to in the world? Alternatively, can the practical achievements of Anglican individuals or parishes or Societies be related in any way to their adherence to the theoretical norms and standards of Anglicanism? (100)

The concluding section of this chapter will trace the ways in which the Lambeth Conferences have looked beyond the confines of internal ecclesiastical affairs towards the responsibilities of the church in the world. This has taken place against a background in which the general understanding of Church and mission has been enlarged, and the social context of that mission has changed rapidly. With this in mind, the section will again concentrate upon more recent Conferences in order to see how Anglicanism's total view of the Church has been subject to notable developments and also how some distinctive features of Anglicanism have come into renewed prominence as a result

of these changing circumstances. In the first instance attention will be given to the role of the laity in Church and society; in the second, where the question of the vitality of Anglican forms and structures will once more be prominent, the idea of "particular and national churches" will be considered. The argument that the experience of the Anglican Communion as "a fellowship of national churches" provides a timely demonstration of Anglican credibility, is pursued.

(a) The Church, the Laity and a changing social order.

In recent years it has become axiomatic that Christian mission involves more than the simple extension of the Church's geographical influence, and that the Christian gospel is concerned with more than the purely religious duties of mankind. These convictions however have not been reached without difficulty and in the case of Anglican thinking, not without a considerable revision of previously held assumptions. In successive Lambeth Conferences the expansion of "mission-ary" vision can be discerned as a result of new situations that Anglicanism faced. Eventually this pressure resulted in important shifts in the understanding of Anglican ecclesiology.

For reasons that have already been explained, it was some time before the Lambeth Conferences moved beyond the consideration of domestic concerns. The subject of foreign missions was included upon the agenda of the early meetings of course, but mainly in connection with the need to maintain support for and co-operation with missionary bishoprics. (101) The first attempt to move into discussion of wider issues occurred in 1838 when, as well as expressing its willingness to develop inter-church relationships, the conference addressed itself to some of the problems posed by changing social conditions. Committees reported on some of the pastoral problems associated with intemperance, impurity, divorce, polygamy,

Sunday observance, and the care of emigrants. (102) Understandably, the emphasis of each report rested upon a desire to uphold the Church's traditional standards and to seek more effective methods for the Church to aid those in danger of falling short of them. At that Conference an interesting discussion also took place on "the Church's Practical Work in Relation to Socialism". (103) Christianity, like socialism it was agreed, sought to make men "prosperous and wise and good". However the Church could not support proposals in which the state was urged to take responsibility for the well-being of society. Rather it would be the habits of thrift and self-restraint so much in accord with the spirit and teaching of Christ, that would ensure a fair and equitable distribution of wealth and the maintenance of the common good. The State should protect those who could not protect themselves, and in the end "the best help is self-help". The Church should seek practical ways to "diminish discontent, and to increase the feeling of brotherly interest between class and class". This was the Church's mission.

Succeeding Conferences extended the discussion to international relationships and industrial problems along with the more traditional concerns of personal morality. The discussions were well-meaning and at times even well-informed, but the overall judgment was that the Church's main contribution was to stimulate what one report called "the Christian temper" so that "by this means the true victory of Christian principles may be accomplished". (104) Plainly, the Church felt that it knew what it was doing and all that needed to be discussed was the best way of doing it. The "moral witness" of the Church to Society, a 1908 Committee recorded, in the end was to impart "a Heavenly Vision". (105)

In his preface to a 1927 collection of essays on Christian

Social Reformers, William Temple noted how since the 1914-18 war, the focus of Christian ethical thinking had moved from the question "how can we help so - and - so?" to "what is the true Christian order of society?" (106) Of course social teaching represents only one aspect of Christian mission but Temple's remark is also symptomatic of changes on a wider front. During this same period the characteristic question asked by the Lambeth Conferences moved from "how can we do such - and - such better?" to "what is the true Christian order of the church?" The impact of the war on social thinking and the altered conditions afterwards can be seen in the 1920 Conference reports on international, industrial and social problems. The realism of these studies stands in marked contrast to the shallow optimism of their 1897 counterparts, while the sense of urgency that over-ran the discussion of Reunion at the Conference needs no reiteration here.

An even more striking example of the change in ecclesiological perspective can be seen in attitudes to lay ministry. As the church recognised its changing place within society it inevitably had to realise that its future lay not in its institutions but in its membership. The 1908 Encyclical treated the topic of lay ministry as an aspect of the difficulty of gaining a full supply of clergymen. "We call upon the laity to come forward, and upon the clergy to welcome their coming forward, for work of all kinds, and especially the financial and social work which properly belongs to them". (107) Condescending though that may be, this was the first reference to laity at any Lambeth Conference. It makes the transformation evident in the treatment of the theme in 1920, even more remarkable. (108) Even then some bishops were still unable to see lay-ministry in anything other than institutional terms, and the Church Army and the office of lay-reader received commendation.

But a wider appreciation was also apparent. (109) The committee appointed to examine "the position of women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church" presented a judicious report based on the conviction that "the great commission was given to those who were representatives of the whole Church; and among those representatives we have every reason to think that women had a place". (110) At the time, the prospect of women being ordained to any order other than that of deaconess did not bear consideration, but that is not the point here. However incomplete, this treatment of the role of lay-'persons' sought to distinguish their functions only within a framework of the total responsibility of the Christian mission. Experience in the wider church of the part played by the laity in liturgical and ecumenical initiatives all helped, but the 1920 Conference report took a step forward on its own account. (111) It can be taken as the first modern exposition by the Lambeth bishops of what later came to be typified as the Church as the whole People of God. (112)

This is the seed that has germinated in recent Conferences. As Anglicans have come to recognise that they no longer set the standards to be observed by a compliant society, so they have been forced to give attention to the more holistic aspects of their doctrine of the Church. The pressures of a changing world order have been accompanied by a re-awakened interest in biblical theology. One observer of the British situation expressed the inter-action thus:

The more the Church of England explored the possibility of extending the sphere of usefulness of her laity, the more her understanding of the nature of the Church Catholic deepened, the more she became aware of the meaning of the Pauline assurance: 'ye are the body of Christ and members in particular'. (113)

The example of Anglican initiatives overseas had assisted this

realisation. (114)

The 1930 Conference report on "The Life and Witness of the Christian Community" - its title alone introducing new terminology to the Conference - was constructed around questions of sexuality, race, and peace and war. In each instance the best pastoral solutions were seen to lie in the context of personal relationships developed within the Church. The existence of normative moral values is still assumed throughout the report but a different dimension is added to its writing. The Church is not presented as the guardian of established values as much as it is seen to be the source of a new way of living. The section on race, for instance, locates the ground of true human equality in the New Testament "where we find in Christ the full revelation of the Fatherhood of God and that the Church is a Kingdom in which all are citizens, a Body in which each member has a share in the life of the whole. (115) The Church's chief function in creating racial harmony is to encourage all baptised persons to hold fast to this vision, and to work out the implications of the Christian viewpoint in the sphere of political science and social economy.

This emphasis on the Church as its total membership rather than exclusively its office holders was taken even further by the 1948 Conference. The impact of war and the suffering its aftermath brought was as clear to observers at that time as was the declining influence of the Church. The upsurge of what was popularly called 'secularism' was of central concern by the time the first post-war Conference assembled. In Roger Lloyd's estimate, during the years 1945 to 1948, all the major problems with which the church would have to grapple for the next two decades became visible and took identifiable shape. (116) The Lambeth Conference provided an opportunity for stock-taking and the occasion for the Church to

begin to "weave its life into the actual shapes of the life people had to live". (117) To achieve this end in anything more than words, a deeper sense of commitment was needed at the parochial level. Accordingly, one committee confessed, "The great weakness of the Church is not that its members are too few, but that it has among its members too many who recognize no obligation to keep its rules". (118) Resolution 37 reflected this belief, urging "all Christian people to look upon their membership of Christ in the Church as the central fact of their lives". (119)

Theologically, the direction in which this call to commitment was pointed is significant. In the first place, the major report on "The Church in the Modern World" was presented in the context of a wider section devoted to the main theological topic of the Conference, "The Christian Doctrine of Man". The distinctive viewpoint of the Church was thus underlined theologically and the call to discipleship was presented as the practical outworking of that understanding. (120) Secondly, another committee investigated the subject of Baptism and Confirmation, which in effect began to develop a "theology of the laity". (121) In following the conclusions of an Archbishops' Commission and its Report, The Theology of Christian Initiation, and by developing the fundamental interconnection between Word and Sacrament, baptism and confirmation, this report saw the whole process of initiation as one designed to equip and commission Christian people for service. (122) It was not to be just a 'rite of passage'. Whilst baptism and confirmation together admitted believers to the privileges of Church membership, equally they obligated them to share its responsibilities.

It would be too much to claim that such emphasis represented a fully developed doctrinal statement of even a new general orientation for Anglicanism. It must be recalled that in other

sections of this same Conference the views of K.E. Kirk on episcopacy caused an apparent rejection of the union in South India. It must be remembered that it took ten years before the writings of Yves Congar and Hendrik Kraemar ushered in a new epoch for Catholic and Protestant lay theology. It took nearly twenty years before those ideas were broadcast to the laity as a whole in the virtual publishing industry which sprang up around them. From that perspective the achievements of the Lambeth Conference were not without innovative merit. (123) At least Anglicanism had come to recognise that along with any claims on behalf of episcopacy, the credibility of the Church would depend upon the effectiveness of its laity. The Initiation Committee concluded its recommendations, "secular worldwide movements are often propagated by the enthusiastic, even fanatical witness of their adherents. What secular movements look for in their members, the Christian Church should equally look for from its members". (124)

Ten years later the Conference was led to develop its thinking concerning the role of the laity within the Church's total ministry of reconciliation - the theme of the 1958 meeting. (125) Verbal witness was certainly called for, but more than that was required. (126) For the Church to be the Church, a full integration of ministry and laity was called for.

Ministry and laity are one. There may be a difference in function but there is no difference in essence. Each minister and layman, has a responsible share in the task of the Church to fulfil, each in his own way and in fulfilment of his own gifts. There could be a revolution in the life of the Church if this truth could be rediscovered. (127)

In the spheres of the home, neighbourhood and work, the ministry of reconciliation depended upon the laity, just as the layman depended upon the clergy for training in this task. The scope of Christian Mission was the world, and the agent of mission was the informed and

committed layman.

The Church must therefore claim for God's purpose, and seek to baptize into the service of Christ, all the manifold skills and capacities and the scientific and technical discoveries which have been entrusted to mankind. This can be done only through the laity in their various callings and occupations, in their professions, in industry, and in politics: only by them will it be done at all.

This means that the Christian will be seeking to do God's will, and to be loyal to his vocation, not only in religious activities, but in the doing of the job in which he earns his livelihood during the week. This is an essential expression of his share of the priestly ministry of the whole body. Not everything in the Christian life is specifically and technically religious: but for Christians nothing can ever be merely secular. (128)

The 1968 Conference, partly under the influence of the fifth W.C.C. assembly at Uppsala, took this theme to its logical conclusion.

The Church is equipped by Christ with leaders .... By their ministry they are to equip the whole Church for ministry, so that the whole Church, in all its lay members serving the world in their daily work, may become an effective sign and instrument of God's purpose to renew his whole creation. (129)

Despite obvious short-comings, the 1968 Conference was driven to give voice if not to a theology of mission then certainly to a missionary theology. (130) Indeed the whole treatment of the theme of renewal was carried out in the conviction that a new commitment to Christian engagement in the world was the means and the end of that process. It was seen to be the key for interpreting the Lambeth Quadrilateral and was the motivating force behind the creation of the A.C.C. with its emphasis on planning and participation in mission.

It is too much to claim that the post-war Lambeth Conferences have developed any unified theory or practice for mission by the Anglican Communion, but the fore-going survey of the relevant reports from these four meetings does suggest three particular lines of thought.

In the first place there is a sharpening of the dichotomy between the Church and the world. Despite notable instances of social reform, Anglicanism has generally been characterised by a world-affirming spirit. (131) Successive Conferences have registered the fact that the Christian gospel offers a perspective on life which is increasingly not shared by society as a whole. So the 1948 Conference called the Church to an exposition of "that interpretation of human nature which derives from the Christian faith in God and the total world-view implied in it". (132) Such a view would bring the Church into conflict with the world - its share of martyrs even. But this was the price to be paid if the Church was to fulfil itself as the "divinely created society, the Spirit-filled body of Christ through which he is still working in the World". (133)

Secondly, this sense of the Church as an antithesis to the world was linked with a realisation that ecclesiology must adopt what Avery Dulles has called more "communitarian" models. (134) Its institutional forms are not unimportant but the Church essentially manifests itself as a centre of grace, fellowship and outreach. So the 1968 Conference: "To see the role of the layman in the life of the Church, we must think of it as a society for sustaining men in their faith and mission". (135) Ten years earlier the Conference had **admitted**, "Too often we think of the Church merely as an institution. The Church's primary vocation is to be a Community in Christ ... How shall the Church reconcile conflicts unless in every parish the clergy and laity are forgiving and understanding and helping their brethren in a real experience of Christian community". (136)

This emphasis upon the complementarity of clergy and laity is the third trend in recent thinking by the Conferences about mission. As the distinction between Church and world has sharpened, so that between clergy and laity (as between Episcopal and non-episcopal?) has

diminished. The realisation that Anglicanism must be more positive in its mission has brought with it a recognition that a high view of the Church's leadership cannot be sustained without a total view of its membership.

Again, it cannot be asserted either that the Anglican Communion has developed any coherent missiological insights, or that it has fully evaluated the force of ecumenical insistence that the Church must be viewed as a token of the new creation rather than a fulfilment of the Kingdom of God. But the movement of thought evident over the last thirty years indicates that Anglicanism can at least discuss these issues rather than retreating into those questions solely related to the validity and orders of ministry or a recapitulation of the norms and standards of received authority. The diminishing social status of the church has to this extent helped to enlarge its understanding of itself and its mission.

(ii) Anglicanism and the renewal of mission.

If the purpose of this section had been simply to show that the subject of mission has been undergoing review within the Anglican Communion, or even that such a review gave indication of the vitality still resident in Anglican leadership structures, then enough would have been said. More than a record of changes is required however. The discussion must now revert to the question of whether Anglicanism itself is subject to, or a source of, renewal. Is the interest paid to the cause of mission by recent Lambeth Conferences only an incidental feature, reflecting the concerns of individuals or pressure groups but unrelated to the norms and standards of the Anglican Communion? The ready admission that Anglican discussions have developed within a much wider ecumenical debate, adds weight to the suspicion that any present missiological

vitality draws its strength from outside the Anglican family rather than from its own theological resources.

It is not easy to devise a method to test whether the ideas concerning the Church outlined above can be said to be derived from Anglican sources or not. The best that can be attempted is to examine whether these ideas are consistent with the doctrinal and organisational principles of Anglicanism which were considered previously. Two approaches can be taken. One would seek, in a quasi-empirical way, to show that the acknowledged standards of Anglican polity and doctrine act as a spring-board for Church renewal. The other would seek to demonstrate post hoc that the Anglican experience of mission drew out an unrealised potential from theoretical assumptions largely dormant within the Anglican tradition.

For the former approach, that of vindicating Anglican principles by their outworking in practice, a cause and effect demonstration would be called for. This is virtually impossible to sustain because of the difficulty of controlling extraneous influences, quite apart from the inadequacy of such a mechanistic model of the role of theology in the Church. However, even when conspicuous examples of Anglican vitality can be scrutinised, it is not always clear now they can be shown to be embodying Anglican principles. The urban mission of an Anglo-catholic parish, an evangelical group in the East African revival, or a suburban congregation manifesting signs of the charismatic movement will all see themselves as epitomising quite different aspects of the Anglican ideal! Any attempt to proceed inductively from examples of Anglican life to the theoretical basis which underlies it, is likely to lead to a defence of Anglicanism which is based upon the partial historical precedents and appeal to party loyalties

which this thesis has been at pains to avoid.

Is the 'experiment' reversible? Is it possible to deduce from the study of Anglican norms whether or not they are conducive to a reinvigorated Church and theology? The connection is certainly not automatic since Anglican history is replete with its evidence of failure, as this whole chapter indicates. At the same time it may be possible to infer that a deeper appreciation of the doctrinal inheritance of the Anglican Communion can be a factor in awakening a more vital faith and a more perceptive theology among Anglican Churches. Is this so?

Any such inference will be marginal. The nature of credal and confessional formularies lends itself more to the defence of received traditions than to their adaptation to the demands of new situations. The particular standards of Anglicanism are ill-suited to such a purpose. The Prayer Book and Articles reflect a social situation which no longer exists, if in fact it ever existed at all. Tradition needs to be preserved and Anglicanism should respect its reformation heritage for reasons already indicated, but the sixteenth century formularies provide no more guidance to the Churches of the Anglican Communion in theory than they do to the Church of England in fact. The universal Anglican standards are hardly more applicable. Of the four elements which make up the Lambeth Quadrilateral, Holy Scripture is held by Anglicans as the final authority for Church life and teaching but uncertainty as to how it applies to the practicalities of the Church's existence is the cause of all ecclesiological disputation. Creeds give direction to the Church's mission, but only in an indirect manner. Sacraments and ministry can be said to be directed towards the end of mission, but they are silent as to its means. The very generality of Anglican doctrinal formulations works against this

line of enquiry. While Anglicanism's renewal in faith and unity is incomplete, a direct connection between belief, life and practice will remain less than apparent.

If it is not possible to establish a link between ecclesial theory and practice by means of direct observation, is a more analytical approach any more fruitful? Is it possible to use the Church's experience of mission as the raw material from which to re-construct what it is that the Church really believes about itself, and to compare the results with whatever formally adopted standards may be available? This second method of correlating the Lambeth ideals of the church in the world with the norms of Anglican belief and practice, has the advantage of being a more realistic approach to the way doctrine functions in the Church. Equally, examples of such an approach can be found in the ecumenical movement. It is not necessary to accept the so-called "action/reflection" method recently influential in W.C.C. circles as the standard, but Visser t' Hooft typified the role of ecumenical theology from the beginning as a "conversation" between the distresses and the possibilities of the Church. (137) Currently Jürgen Moltmann's work, in which the juxtaposition of desolation and hope provides the dominant theme, has been shown to have profound implications for the self realisation of the Church as a community structured for mission. (138) The inter-relating of formal and sub-conscious beliefs in practical action might show up the real strengths and weaknesses of the Anglican tradition. As Moltmann contends concerning the Church as a whole, "In the conflicts between the claims of Christ and the claims of society it will discover its historic opportunities". (139)

Unfortunately such an approach is not characteristic of official expressions of Anglican theology, although it is not entirely absent

from them. In 1948, when the dialectic within Anglicanism was clearly exposed by discussion of the South Indian reunion, one Lambeth Conference committee acknowledged that all the disputants "recognized what is clearly the truth, that Catholicity is a matter not only of constitution but also the life of the Church". And, with respect to episcopacy, "it remains true that form and manner alone are not sufficient to guarantee the character of a ministry. That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself". (140) Those words however were directed to another Church. An exposition of Catholicity and an argument for the value of episcopacy drawn from the life and practice of Anglicanism, is still not forthcoming. (141) A.M. Ramsey's willingness to subject institutional structures to Christological criticism has already been noted, and it is perhaps not coincidental that the 1968 Conference which he headed gave such close attention to the perspective of mission and the way the Church's vision is sustained by Scripture, Creeds and the life of the Church. (142)

If this post hoc argument - the illumination of principles in the light of practice - is to be pursued, are there any signs of its potential usefulness? Has Anglican involvement in contemporary mission helped to develop awareness of any unrealised theological resources in its own background? From what has been said previously it would seem that one of the principles of Anglicanism to achieve new prominence is the right of "particular and national Churches" to ordain, change and abolish the way in which their life and worship is organised. In this instance it is the principle which enables a connection to be made between contemporary patterns of mission and the established forms of Anglican faith and order.

This understanding of the relation of the local to the universal church, which came into focus in the 1930 Conference report, asserts

the freedom of a Christian community to revise and reform those aspects of its life which are subject to human ordering in such ways as may be necessary for its own edification. It also implies the responsibility of the Church to adapt its organisation and means of communication so that the message of the gospel can be fully related to a given local situation. In particular, it anticipates that the "edification" to which the ends of such reforms are directed, will include the interpenetration of Christian goals and values into the social fabric of the society to which that Church belongs. (143)

The idea of a "national Church" involves far more than a statement about its geographical limits. (144) It reflects the conviction that Christianity is concerned with the whole of human life, social and political as well as religious and moral and therefore that the Christian Church must be specifically related to the social and political entities of states and nations. As Vidler concluded in a study of some aspects of the church-state relationship during the nineteenth century:

A Church to be worthy of its name, however small a minority it may be in any given society, is charged with the responsibility of bearing testimony to God's sovereignty and God's will before kings and rulers and the whole people. (145)

Lest this duty should appear to breed a carping and self-righteous spirit, Vidler is adamant that the judgment of God can only properly be declared by a Church which knows itself to stand under judgment.

The tradition from which this ideal is drawn by the Anglican Communion, like that with which Vidler's study is concerned, is that of the Church of England. There, uniquely, the life of the Church and the nation have grown together. When it is said that the Anglican Communion is a "fellowship of national Churches" each seeking to replicate in its own country what the Church of England

has attempted to achieve in its particular setting, then Anglicanism is immediately seen to adopt a distinct social and political stance. (146) Alexis de Tocqueville's observation concerning the American nation, that it has "the soul of a church" can be exactly reversed as a comment upon the English church.

Of course the Church and State connection experienced in England could not be duplicated in the new Provinces for reasons already discussed. The political realities in the new states made the idea of established religion unthinkable, while the ecclesiastical developments in England and elsewhere made the whole notion equally unwelcome. The social constraint apparently imposed by the establishment of religion caused the well-known cry of Hurrell Froude on behalf of the Oxford Movement, to be frequently echoed. "Let us give up the national church - and have a real one". (147) The dangers of social constraint however can be equally matched by those of religious isolation, and dis-establishment in itself does not appear to offer a panacea for the ills of the Church of England. Indeed the tension between religious purity and social relevance is constant for the Church, and it is something that the Church of England confronts within itself, as a recent Archbishops' commission concluded:

The man with a stronger sense of continuity thinks that societies do best when they grow, are adapted, cherish the past while they adapt to the present; and is inclined to claim that this manner of proceeding is characteristic of the English genius. The man with a stronger sense of discontinuity retorts that there are times when a clean break has to be made with the past; a complete turning away from old ways. He suspects that the Church of England has come, or will soon come, to such a time. He does not doubt the power of history, but draws different conclusions from its evidence. (148)

It may be thought that the Churches of the Anglican Communion in parts of the world other than England would be relieved of this

anxiety. Delivered from the burden of social privilege and state patronage they would seem able to develop an authentically prophetic stance. This however is not the case. Nominal adherence and social embeddedness appear to be characteristic of Anglicanism on a world-wide scale. (149)

It would seem that the point at issue is the same. It is the question of the Church, not the state, that is central. The Church of England is not necessarily compromised by its political entailment any more than other Anglican Provinces are ensured of spiritual freedom by their voluntary status. (150) Political ties are not the only bonds which compromise the Church. The Church will not be fulfilled simply by adjusting its relationships with the state. But as Moltmann insisted, it is in the intersection of the claims of Christ and the claims of society that the Church realises its historic - and it can be added, its doctrinal - opportunities. (151)

So then, the missionary structure of the Church will be forced to explore the ways in which it fills out a proper method of dialogue with the state. This is the importance of viewing Anglicanism as a "fellowship of national churches". The term was seized upon as a way of rationalising the internal relationship between Anglican Provinces, but in fact it also spells out the external pattern of Christian mission which they are called upon to adopt. In different places the expression of national Christianity will vary according to the political context in which churches are set. (152) But the norms of Anglican practice insist that the Church assume a sense of national responsibility no matter how difficult that may be. So it is that Valerie Pitt, in giving voice to the radical suspicions referred to by the most recent English Church-State commission can say:

In fact Christianity is not a folk or tribal religion, it is not bred into us by the traditions of our ancestors. It is a gospel, a revealed religion, demanding an active and personal assent. To be a Christian a man must himself answer - Jesus is Lord - writing 'C of E' on a form is not enough. (153)

Yet she says this and urges the case of dis-establishment, not in order to remove the Church of England from its place in public life, but so that its influence may be clearer and more definite. (154)

The recent discussions at Lambeth and elsewhere concerning Anglicanism's renewal for mission are essentially the outworking of the principle of the freedom of "national and particular churches". Such freedom is exercised under the control of doctrinal convictions and historic formularies which insist that the mission in mind is that of a Church not a sect.

Considering the interest paid by sociologists to what is called the "church-sect typology", it is surprising that so little theological attention has been given to this aspect of Anglican ecclesial analysis. The relevance of the Anglican claim for its particular social orientation can be appreciated in the light of Troeltsch's well-known contrast between the Church which adapts itself to the world and the sect which sets itself to resist it. (155)

The renewal of Anglicanism in mission, it has been argued, will be measured by the extent to which it can redefine its own distinctive character whilst retaining its involvement with the world as the setting of redemption and the Christian mission.

That such a practical outworking of the principles of Anglican polity is no novelty, may be seen by the way in which W.R. Huntington introduced to the American Church the formulation of faith and order which later gave rise to the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

If our whole ambition as Anglicans .... be to continue a small, but eminently respectable body of Christians, and offer a refuge to people of refinement and sensibility, who are shocked by the irreverences they are apt to encounter elsewhere; in a word, if we care to be only a countercheck and not a force in Society; then let us say as much in plain terms, and frankly renounce any and all claims to Catholicity. We have only, in such a case, to wrap the robe of our dignity about us, and walk quietly along in a seclusion no-one will take much trouble to disturb. Thus may we be a Church in name and a sect in deed.

But if we aim at something nobler than this, if we would have our communion become national in very truth, - in other words, if we would bring the Church of Christ into the closest possible sympathy with the throbbing, sorrowing, sinning, repenting, aspiring heart of this great people, - then let us press our reasonable claims to be the reconciler of a divided household, not in a spirit of arrogance (which ill befits those whose best possessions have come to them by inheritance), but with affectionate earnestness and intelligent zeal. (156)

Those words were written long before Troeltsch's dichotomy was disclosed but they still express the aspiration which the Anglican Communion upholds: to demonstrate a renewal in truth, unity and mission that will validate and commend its contribution to the life of the Universal Church as a whole.

This chapter has sought to indicate ways in which such an aspiration is capable of fulfilment. Throughout the thesis it has been argued that Anglicanism as a phenomenon can best be understood by reference to a particular body of Lambeth Conference material and that this material reveals something of the way in which the theological tradition of the Church of England has been modified and adapted in response to needs experienced by the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Attention to recent Conference discussions has shown how the Anglican Communion has addressed itself to the need for a clearer doctrinal definition and for different and better means of realising the inter-relatedness of Anglican provinces. Furthermore

it has shown how the missiological implications resident in Anglican ecclesiology convey an importance to the further discussion of Anglicanism even at a time when the enormity of social, political and religious changes threaten the continuation of merely theoretical ecclesiological debates altogether.

CHAPTER 6 : SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER SIX  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The reference to Huntingdon at the end of the previous chapter was not intended to offer the "original" or "real" interpretation of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. Enough has been said about the Conferences' theological method to forestall any expectation of a definitive exegesis of the Quadrilateral's meaning. Huntingdon does however provide a fitting illustration with which to draw the argument of this thesis to its conclusion.

The case which has been presented is that the Churches of the Anglican Communion, faced with a new situation both in their individual particularity and in their corporate inter-relatedness, were forced to re-state the essentials of the Anglican tradition and to re-define the structures of Anglican consciousness. Huntingdon and the Lambeth Quadrilateral both provide examples of this process at the theological level.

The concern for a unified Christian presence across the broadest spectrum of American national life motivated Huntingdon's work and the Quadrilateral which eventually evolved from it reflected similar concerns on an international plane. The Lambeth Conference was not only (or even chiefly) concerned with the task of doctrinal definition for the Anglican Churches. It sought mainly to give form to the idea of Anglican fellowship and to maintain the structures which enable Anglican decision-making. G.L. Ellison has asserted that "The Lambeth Conference typifies the Spirit of Anglicanism, its theory of authority and its method of working". (1) This thesis has borne out the truth of his claim. It has however gone beyond it to give substance to what is meant by "the Spirit of Anglicanism", by examining how the Conferences have actually contributed to the formation of standards of Anglican

doctrine, its understanding of authority, and its mode of linking autonomous national Churches in a living communion. The accounts of the discussions behind central Conference documents have shown this process of formation at crucial stages of its development.

This thesis set out to test two propositions: first, that Anglicanism as an ecclesiological phenomenon is best understood from the standpoint of the Anglican Communion and secondly, that the internal discussions generated by the Lambeth Conferences represent a significant contribution to Anglican and ecumenical theology. (2)

The first of these propositions has been confirmed by demonstration. At the level of empirical observation it is apparent that any consideration of Christianity as a world religion must recognise that Anglicanism represents an inter-locking federation of national Churches of which the Church of England is but a single part. The truth of this observation is self-evident. The examination of Lambeth Conference debates has confirmed the distinctiveness of the Anglican Communion at a more profound level however. Those Anglican Churches which have grown and developed outside the protective embrace of the English establishment have been faced with quite different sets of theological, social and missiological problems from those faced by leaders of the Church of England. The responses these problems have provoked have enlarged the scope and character of Anglican ecclesiology beyond anything that could have been imagined by English Christians 150 years ago. To speak of Anglicanism today is in fact to speak of a religious phenomenon which plainly extends beyond the geographical confines of the Church of England. More significantly, it also represents a theological expansion of the English tradition. Anglicanism, as an expression of world Christianity, must be regarded as a mutation or transformation and not just an extension of the Church of England.

This does not diminish the significance of the Church of England. Its role as the bearer of the primary Anglican tradition is not overlooked nor is its intellectual, financial and personal contribution to the well-being of the Anglican Communion under-estimated. The perspective given by the wider reality of the Anglican Communion serves to put the Church of England's contribution (and responsibility) into a truer focus. To recall the names of Selwyn, Gray, Barry, Brent or Palmer is to realise how the course of the earlier Lambeth Conferences was to a considerable extent set by those whose experience of Anglicanism had reached beyond the limits of the English church. (3) It also serves as a reminder of the extent to which the Anglican theological tradition has been expanded beyond purely English concerns. Anglicanism must be understood and judged by its achievements on the broadest scale.

It is at the level of theological judgments upon Anglicanism that the second proposition of the thesis applies. Plainly the assertion that the Anglican Communion's discussion of Catholicity, authority, unity and mission represents a considerable contribution to Anglican and ecumenical ecclesiology, cannot be sustained by pointing to a single, fully articulated Anglican doctrine of the Church. The episodic nature of the Lambeth Conference material does not lend itself to such theory construction and this thesis has not attempted to suggest that it should. Neither has it implied that the particular debates which the documents have recorded issue in unanimous or even settled convictions. At almost every point the debates have exposed tensions and conflicts in the Anglican tradition, consequently important Reports have remained incomplete, showing signs of serious dissent. The formal belief system that unites the Anglican Churches has been shown to be notably deficient

in terms of confessional interpretation and in its capacity for practical usefulness. The attempt to resolve an apparent dichotomy between Catholic and protestant views of ministerial order within the Communion seems only partially successful and the problem is re-asserting itself in an unresolved tension between conciliar and primatial authority. The vision of a fellowship of "national" Churches appears to be blurred by an almost sectarian concentration on theoretical clerical responsibilities as well as the practical difficulty of realising the fullness of Christian mission within secular and pluralistic societies.

If the theological integrity of the Anglican Communion is to be defended, it must be at a more preliminary level - in the fact that theological differences are faced and efforts are made to resolve them. This is the importance of the Lambeth Conferences. In the context of the practical opportunities offered by consulting together, (but without attempting to adjudicate) the idea and reality of the Church is being clarified. For some the Anglican notion of "comprehensiveness" may appear a smokescreen for indecisiveness, but properly understood it is also a clear path towards Bushnell's "higher position": a general growth in maturity, truth and fullness to which the whole Church aspires. At their best the Lambeth discussions give evidence of this transforming process.

Moreover the Lambeth Conferences are not devoid of particular achievements. The fact that they began by addressing a new situation and have all taken place within the last 120 years, means that they have developed a number of distinctive proposals. The treatment of authority and freedom for instance, whilst reflecting wider historical and ecumenical tendencies, has the virtue of being expounded within a setting which takes for granted the existence of critical scholarship and change in the religious situation which has

occurred since the Enlightenment. Similarly, the patterns and structures for consultation which Lambeth has developed are themselves examples of possible inter-relationships between confessional families. They **reflect** the diversity and proximity of autonomous churches which take the universality of the gospel as given, and what is more, they too have developed during a period in which ecumenicity is an assured fact of the Church's life. Again, the attitude to mission of the "national Churches" of the Anglican Communion has been developed at a time when the dangers of mere "nationalism" have become transparent, and the situation of the Church in a pluralistic and often post-Christian world is obvious. The further elaboration of such ideas as they apply to the concrete problems of Christian life and witness has become the test by which the usefulness of future Lambeth Conferences must be judged.

Newman's charge with which this thesis began, that Anglicanism lacked ecclesiological justification, is therefore refuted by two lines of argument. First, the development of the Anglican Communion itself tenders proof that the vitality of Anglican life can be sustained quite independently of support by the state. Secondly, while no single theology of the Church adheres to that Communion, all the elements of an ecclesiology are present in its consciousness and are capable of undergoing progressive clarification in the councils of Anglican consultation.

The Lambeth Conferences are not unique among the councils of Christendom, and their theological attainments are not always particularly admirable. Yet while they continue to pose theological questions concerning the faith, unity and mission of the Church in a distinctive way, they are worth persevering with. On that basis too, Anglicanism itself can be said to make a valid claim that it reflects

the meaning of the gospel of Christ.

It will be recalled that before his disillusionment took root, Newman had been optimistic about the profusion of Anglican theological resources. (4) Since that time the development of the Anglican Communion has enriched those resources, and the discussions of the Lambeth Conference have carried forward the work of organising and collating which Newman saw to be so necessary. It is in this progressive transformation of the Anglican tradition that the ground for a better founded optimism concerning the future of Anglicanism lies.

NOTES

NOTES

## CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

- (1) In fact Newman was received into the Roman Catholic Church in October 1845. The inevitable outcome of his retirement to Littlemore became apparent with his sermon 'The Parting of friends', preached on resigning the incumbency of St. Mary's, in September 1843.  
For details see the first of Meriol Trevor's two volume biography, Newman, the Pillar of the Crowd, (1962), p 228 ff.
- (2) Discourses to Mixed Congregations XII (1849), pp 265 - 6.
- (3) One official Church of England report does in fact represent the emergence of the Anglican Communion as the best evidence of the theological and spiritual character of Anglicanism as a whole e.g. Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion (1957), p 1 ff.
- (4) That story must be told against a much wider background than merely Anglican history however. cf S.C. Neill, A History of Christian Missions (1964), pp 322 - 5.
- (5) H.F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547 - 1603, (1954).
- (6) J.S. Marshall, Hooker and Anglican Tradition (1963).
- (7) H.R. McAadoo, The Spirit of Anglicanism (1963).
- (8) e.g. Archbishop Langley's refusal to "convene any assembly which pretended to enact canons or affected to make any decisions binding on the Church" (Chronicle of Convocation, (Feb. 15th, 1867) p 807) when summoning the first Conference, can be compared with the most recent Conference's statement that resolutions possess "no legislative authority unless or until they have been accepted by the Synods or other governing bodies of the member Churches of the Anglican Communion, and then only in those member Churches". (The Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1978 (1978) p 5).
- (9) These questions of belief, organisation and authority, and mission not only refer to the basic headings of this thesis, they also relate to the essential issues raised by the traditional notes on the Church - Catholicity, unity, holiness and apostolicity. It is perhaps not too far-fetched to suggest a connection too with the descriptive definition of the Church in Article 19 where it is said to be comprised of the preached Word, the ordered Sacraments, and the assembly of the faithful.

- (10) e.g. A.T.P. Williams, The Anglican Tradition (1947), p 124; H.H. Henson, Anglicanism (1921) which recognises the significance of the Lambeth Conferences but is unable to conceal the author's conviction that the Church of England is the centre of which the Anglican Communion is the circumference (E.F. Braley (ed), Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson (1950), p 94); J.W.C. Wand reviews the differences between the Church of England and the Anglican Communion The Anglican Communion : a Survey (1948), p vii, but does not pursue a synthesis of them. Even S.C. Neill in his admirable study Anglicanism (1978), when he notes that it is "always necessary to guard against the error of identifying Anglicanism with the Church of England" (p 398), is driven by his historical treatment to include the Anglican Communion as an appendage. And recently a group of American writers have defined the 'Spirit of Anglicanism' by reference to three English theologians. W.J. Wolf (ed), The Spirit of Anglicanism : Hooker, Maurice, Temple (1979). In the end they represent Anglicanism as a "party" discussion (e.g. p 165) - although it does begin to see Lambeth as a record of the progress of that debate (p viii); H.P. McAdoo's Being an Anglican (1977) not unexpectedly shows awareness of central Lambeth documents, but only discusses them in connection with ARCIC issues.
- (11) e.g. R.T. Davidson (ed) The Six Lambeth Conferences (1929); S. Dark, The Lambeth Conferences : their History and their Significance (1930); D. Morgan, The Bishops Come to Lambeth (1967).
- (12) A.M.G. Stephenson The First Lambeth Conference : 1867 (1967). While neither of Stephenson's studies are concerned primarily with theological issues, the earlier book was especially useful in opening up original records of the conference, while the more recent study generally relies on the autobiographical memoirs of some of those who were present.
- (13) T.A. Lacey, The Universal Church : a study in the Lambeth Call to Union (1921); L.A. Haselmeyer, Lambeth and Unity (1948); E. Morris The Lambeth Quadrilateral and Reunion (1969).
- (14) G.K.A. Bell, Christian Unity : the Anglican Position (1948); W.H. van de Pol, Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective (1965).
- (15) Of the works referred to in the Bibliography, Robert M.G. Libby's Lambeth X and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (University of the South, 1972) is the only thesis directly concerned with Lambeth material.
- (16) W.R. Curtis, The Lambeth Conferences : the solution for pan-Anglican Organization (1942) is an exception, appreciating the "Constitutional" importance of the Conferences as an independent entity. A.M.G. Stephenson (op. cit. (1967) p 4,) believed only one copy of Curtis' book was available in England: there was at least one other available in Durham.

- (17) The official reports of Conferences from 1867 - 1920 are contained in R.T. Davidson (ed) The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867 - 1920 (1929) with consecutive pagination for the first five and the 1920 Conference report appended. Succeeding Conferences' reports are in separate volumes. For convenience, reference to these reports will be indicated by the letters L.C. followed by the appropriate conference date i.e. L.C. 1867 etc.
- (18) The reports are usually received rather than "adopted" by the Conference, although on more than one occasion the Conference has declined to receive a committee's work.
- (19) The principle was first enunciated by the third Conference. L.C. 1888, pp 106, 125. cp L.C. 1968, pp 5, 53, 75, 97.
- (20) Voting is by simple majorities, and only when especially requested are voting figures recorded. L.C. 1888, p 125 and cp p 36.
- (21) Following the unauthorised publication of the first Conference transcripts (See A.M.G. Stephenson op. cit. (1967) p 60) all Conference records are subject to fifty years secrecy. Hence full records are available only for the 1930 Conference and earlier.
- (22) Encyclical letters and Resolutions will be noted with page reference. i.e. L.C. 1920, Encyclical (p 14) or L.C. 1920, Resolution 9 (p 26 ff) etc. Committee or section reports will simply give page reference, i.e. L.C. 1920 p 132.
- (23) "What is Anglicanism?" Theology Li/336 (June, 1948) p 203.
- (24) Thoughts after Lambeth (1931), p 5.
- (25) Hensley Henson's directive has considerable validity: "The key to a right understanding of the modern Church of England lies in a just appreciation of the unique character of the English reformation". (The Church of England (1939), p 7).
- (26) Despite the disclaimer that it is only an interim study whose usefulness has nearly expired, A.G. Dickens' The English Reformation (1964) is still the best guide to the interplay of conservative reform and a full protestant critique in the Henrican era. It clearly demonstrates how the political (and marital) questions provided the occasion for reformation, and how the reforms in turn created a popular legitimation for the king's cause.
- (27) In saying this, a contrast is being drawn between (say) the Augsburg Confession of 1530 with its studiously moderate and eirenic tone and the Formula of Concord (1577) which became the basis of Lutheran traditionalism. The Anglican formularies are "confessional" more in the sense of the Augustana. See R.A. Leaver, "The Augsburg Confession and the Confessional Principle" Churchman, 94 (1980) pp 345 - 352.

- (28) "The Doctrine of the Church as held and taught in the Church of England", in F.N. Flew (ed), The Nature of the Church (1952), p 121.
- (29) The existence of Catholic form and order, reformed doctrine, and a critical use of Scripture can briefly support this affirmation without taking up the question of whether this synthesis is carried out successfully.
- (30) Not of course that some individual Anglican writers and bishops are not willing to work in that way : e.g. L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, (1941); F.W. Dillistone, The Structure of the Divine Society (1951); C.G. Gore, The Church and the Ministry (1893).
- (31) H.P. Liddon, Life of Pusey (1893), Vol i, p 238.
- (32) e.g. the Prefaces to the Book of Common Prayer (1662).
- (33) e.g. the Preface to the Ordinal (ibid).
- (34) e.g. Article VI, XX, XXI etc.
- (35) See N. Sykes, From Sheldon to Seeker (1959); and Church and State in England in the 18th Century (1934); C.J. Abbey and J.H. Overton, The English Church in the 18th Century (1878); L.P. Curtis, Anglican Moods of the 18th Century (1966).
- (36) Dean Church referred to Newman's progression in a Guardian obituary : "Form after form was tried by him, the Christianity of Evangelicalism, the Christianity of Whately, the Christianity of Hawkins, the Christianity of Keble and Pusey; it was all very well but it was not the Christianity of the New Testament and the first ages ...." Reverend Church, Occasional Papers (1897) Vol ii, p 472.  
Newman himself came to see his pilgrimage as an example of the "organum investigandi" given us for gaining religious truth, and which would lead the mind by an infallible succession from the rejection of atheism to theism, from theism to Christianity, from Christianity to Evangelical Religion, and from these to Catholicity". The Grammar of Assent (1870), p 499, Note 2. The problems inherent in this incipient Aristotelianism must pass without comment.
- (37) For a helpful integration of Newman's personal history with the development of his thinking, see C.S. Dessain, John Henry Newman (1966).
- (38) Apologia Pro Vita Sua, ed. Wilfred Ward (1913), p 105.
- (39) ibid, p 107.
- (40) The movement was more complex in its origins than simply to be seen as in the succession of the 16th century reformers or the low-church party. See B.M.G. Heardon, From Coleridge to Gore : A century of Religious Thought in Britain (1971), p 23 ff.

- (41) The most recent biography of Simeon is by H. Evan Hopkins, Charles Simeon of Cambridge (1977). For Simeon's Anglicanism, see C.H. Smyth Simeon and Church Order (1940). His far-reaching influence is recognised in Macaulay's oft-quoted epitaph: "his real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any prelate" (G.O. Trevelyan, Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay (1897) Vol i, p 70).
- (42) The first evangelical bishop was Henry Ryder, Dean of Wells, who against Manners Sutton's advice, was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1815 and promoted to Lichfield and Coventry in 1824. See G.C.B. Davies The First Evangelical Bishop (1958). Gladstone commented "His piety, kindness, and moderation rendered him well worthy of the honours of the prelate; but possibly they did not contribute more to lift him over the bar than his noble birth, and his being the brother of a cabinet minister" (Gleanings (1879) Vol vii, p 210).
- (43) Michael Hennel has modified the view that evangelicalism grew dull and inflexible immediately after the passing of Simeon and Wilberforce: the decline of the movement became apparent in the 1870's rather than the 40's and 50's. (The Sons of the Prophets (1979), p 123). Intellectual leadership however was already declining. Peter Toon's Evangelical Theology, 1833 - 1856 (1979) shows writing on the doctrine of the Church to be extensive but mostly insubstantial.
- (44) This tendency is demonstrated even by the title of the major (indeed almost the only) systematic treatment of the Church by an evangelical in this period: Hugh McNeile's, The Church and the Churches; or, the Church of God in Christ, and the Churches of Christ militant here on earth (1846).
- (45) The propensities of latter day evangelicals are amusingly recounted by O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church Vol. I (1966), p 450 - 1. He later cites Thomas Arnold's judgment of an evangelical: "a good Christian, with a low understanding, a bad education, and ignorant of the world". (A.D. Stanley, Life of Arnold Vol II (1881) p 246). Still, the sustained evangelical commitment to foreign missions until the end of the century shows Dean Church's dismissal of the movement - "an exhausted teaching and a spent enthusiasm" (The Oxford Movement (1892), pp 12 - 16) - to be an exaggeration.
- (46) Newman, op. cit., p 112.
- (47) ibid., p 116 - 117.
- (48) ibid., p 134. See also Reardon op. cit., pp 41 - 59.
- (49) Thomas Arnold, Principles of Church Reform (1962), p 109 ff.
- (50) ibid., p 115.

- (51) Any talk of the reform of the Church was likely to be greeted with suspicion during a period of Whig supremacy. See O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church (1966) Vol i, p 24 ff.
- (52) Reardon points to the continuity between Arnold's ideas and the early convictions of Connop Thirlwall, the first English translator of Schleiermacher (op. cit., p 57). Thirlwall (1797 - 1874) was for 34 years bishop of St. David's and was an influential figure at the first Lambeth Conference.
- (53) Newman, op. cit., p 117, 127. The complaint of Arnold against "the Oxford Malignants" in an Edinburgh Review of 1836 was taken by Newman as epitomising liberal hostility.
- (54) ibid., p 119 ff.
- (55) Membership of the group was not numerous but prestigious e.g. Bishops Van Mildert (1765 - 1836); Chas. Lloyd of Oxford (1784 - 1820) Herbert Marsh of Peterborough (1757 - 1819); Thomas Middleton, later of Calcutta (1769 - 1822). Prior to 1831 this group centred on the Hackney Phalanx (or Clapton Sue).
- (56) Among innumerable books on the movement, R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement (1892) still the most comprehensive; Y. Brilioth, The Anglican Revival (1925); O. Chadwick, The Mind of the Oxford Movement (1960).
- (57) Newman, Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching (1879) Vol ii, p 20.
- (58) See especially Tracts 5, 15 and 20.
- (59) His exposition of the Via Media was first expounded in Tracts 38, 40 and 71, and treated in general in the Prophetical Office lectures which were published as the first volume of a work entitled The Via Media of the Anglican Church (1837). It is explicitly developed in several essays, (1830 - 1841) which make up the second part of that publication (i.e. pp 24, 28, 31 etc).
- (60) This view was classically put by William Palmer Treatise on the Church of Christ (2 volumes, 1839).
- (61) The introduction to the Prophetical Office lectures acknowledged that the Via Media existed only on paper and that until it was shown "capable of being professed, acted upon, and maintained, on a large sphere of action and through a sufficient period" then "doubtless we have not as much to urge on our behalf as we might have". By 1841 he had begun to suspect that the thing he desired was foreign to the nature of Anglicanism. His Advent sermons in that year compared the Church of England to the tribes of Israel - God's people but cut off from the Ark of the Covenant and the Sanctuary. As the possibility of a Via Media faded, so did Newman's confidence in Anglicanism.

- (62) For instance Eric G. Jay, The Church : its Changing Image Through Twenty Centuries (1978) Vol II, p 43 ff simply treats Anglican ecclesiology by referring to its "parties".
- (63) e.g. J.W.C. Ward, Anglicanism in History and Today (1961).
- (64) e.g. E. Amand de Mendieta, Anglican Vision (1971).
- (65) S.W. Sykes, The Integrity of Anglicanism (1978). This book and the whole question of "Comprehensiveness" will be considered shortly. See p 132 ff below.

## CHAPTER 2 : THE EMERGENCE OF ANGLICANISM

- (1) J.R. Seeley, The Expansion of England (1902), p 43.
- (2) The only reference in the formularies which remotely conceives of the idea of Anglicanism extending beyond the British Isles is in the reference to baptising "Natives in our Plantations" in the 1662 Preface of the Prayer Book.
- (3) The World of Mission (1965), p 56 ff. The same principle is expounded with respect to a particular Church with which Anglicans are involved, in The Church of South India (1954), pp 11 - 13.
- (4) So A.C. Headlam reflected upon a century of change: "Originally it (the Church of England) was a national Church, which had certain characteristics of its own, it is true, but was simply important as being the Church of the English nation. Now it is more and more outgrowing that characteristic and coming to stand as a representative of a special type of Christianity". (The Church of England (1924), p 46).
- (5) "The historian of the Anglican Communion is constantly led back to the figure of George Augustus Selwyn" (H.G.G. Herklots, Frontiers of the Church : The Making of the Anglican Communion (1961), p 218). Herklots book, which is "concerned with the gradual transformation of the Church of England which has resulted in part from its expansion overseas" (p 12) is the most accessible historical treatment of the birth of the Anglican Communion.
- (6) J.H. Evans, Churchman Militant (1964), p 135.
- (7) Missionary work was begun by the Church Missionary Society in 1814, in what was then part of the Archdeaconry of Calcutta! It had come under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Australia in 1836, until Selwyn's arrival in 1841.
- (8) H.W. Tucker, Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn D.D. (1879) Vol i, p 158. In its own context, this is precisely the problem that agitated Newman at the same time.
- (9) A.L. Rowse, The Elizabethans and America (1959), p 1.
- (10) ibid, p 24.
- (11) Anglican apologists are sensitive to any suggestion that the Church of England began during the period of the Reformation. As far as the Anglican Communion is concerned this is self-evidently the case, although

McLeod Campbell does suggest an earlier continuity in the existence of "Anglican Missions" in the Northumbrian and Celtic monasteries in Western Europe! (Christian History in the Making (1946), pp 7 - 20).

- (12) Rowse, op. cit. p 27; cp H.G.G. Herklots, The Church of England and the American Episcopal Church (1966), p 4 ff.
- (13) Although as Herklots points out, even 'the Generall' was engaged in a piece of missionary preaching, when like Paul and Barnabas in Lydia, he refused to accept sacrifices offered by the Indians who met him on the beach. op. cit., p 5.
- (14) W.S. Perry, The History of the American Episcopal Church (1985) vol i, p 45 quoting Smith, Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England.
- (15) The inevitable amalgam of patriotism and piety seen in these examples is epitomised by Lord Carlisle who colonised Barbados in 1627 "with the laudable and pious design of propagating the Christian religion and enlarging His Majesty's dominions".
- (16) The Methodist system proved particularly adaptable to the frontier situation, for which Anglicanism seemed singularly ill-prepared. For a commendation of Methodism's "protestant order" see K.S. Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity (1941) Vol iv, p 188.
- (17) The story of this Act (31 Geo III, c 31) and the eventual resolution of the problem in the complete legal separation of Church and State, is told in John S. Moir Church and State in Canada West - three studies in the relationship of Denominationalism and Nationalism, 1841 - 1867 (1959).
- (18) Buchanan, A Brief Review of the State of the Colonies in respect to Religious Instruction (1813) is summarised by McLeod Campbell op. cit. ch 6.
- (19) The full story is told by C.J. Grimes, Towards an Indian Church (1946).
- (20) British power was assured when the Treaty of Breda (1667) neutralised Dutch rivalry, and although the French remained a powerful colonial influence, their interests rarely conflicted with Britain's Indian adventures. The Company's power in India was absolute following the 1660 Charter granted to it by Charles II and remained so until the appointment of a Governor General in 1773 centralised authority. The Company's power declined from that point until the Indian Mutiny (1858) after which the Company was disbanded and all government conducted in the name of the Crown. The company's discouragement of missionary work is indicated by its reluctance to allow the number of chaplains to increase and their insistence that contacts with Indian nationals be restricted to the confines of business affairs.

- (21) The conjunction of commercial and political realism as inhibiting the growth of a national church was especially treated by A.C. Barry, sometime Bishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia, in his Hulsean lectures of 1894-5, The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England (1895), p 31 ff.
- (22) The first sign of the modern missionary movement in England came with the formation of the Methodist Missionary Society (1786) followed by the Baptist Missionary Society (1792), and the un-denominational London Missionary Society (1795). The 'Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge' had been founded in 1698 and an overseas arm, the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foriegn parts" was created in 1701. The major Anglican involvement in the 19th century followed the establishing of the Church Missionary Society in 1799.
- (23) See Grimes op. cit., pp 52 - 3. The actual resolutions given in Appendix, p 224. This provision was the result of 20 years advocacy by Charles Grant (supported by Wilberforce and Simeon) of the so-called "pious clauses" (S.C. Neill, Colonialism and Christian Mission (1966), p 88). By this time indigenous churches were established and growing.
- (24) The only extensive treatment of Middleton is a sympathetic one by C.W. Le Bas The Life of the Rt. Rev. T.F. Middleton, (2 volumes, 1831). His episcopate is analysed by McLeod Campbell op. cit., Ch 6, and by H. Cnattringius Bishops and Societies (1952), pp 72 - 102.
- (25) Middleton's well-known comment on the missionaries "I must licence them or I must silence them" (S.C. Neill, A History of Christian Missions (1964), p 267) was provoked by the itinerant character of their ministries and compounded by the fact that many of the 'Anglican' missionaries in his charge were in fact Danish or German Lutherans.
- (26) C.F. Andrews, Handbooks of English Church Expansion : North India. (1908), p 24 ff, speculates on this point.
- (27) As Canon Herklots has put it: "The beginnings of the Anglican Communion were initiated by men with memories. The time would come for handing over to those who had few memories but many hopes". op. cit. (1961), p 86.
- (28) E.E. Beardsley Life and Correspondence of Bishop Seabury (1882); G.B. Hertz 'Bishop Seabury' English Historical Review, XXVI/101 (January, 1911) pp 57 - 75.
- (29) A.L. Cross The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies (1902), p 12 ff; also Herklots op. cit. (1961), p 86, and op. cit. (1966), Chapters 8 and 9.
- (30) E. Carpenter, Cantuar : the Archbishops in their Office (1971), p 282 f.

- (31) A.L. Cross op. cit. Swift's ambition for the office of a bishop, if not for its responsibilities was notorious. A contemporary piece of doggerel observed his appointment as Dean of S. Paul's:

"A Deanery he has got at last  
By ways, most strange and odd,  
And may a bishop be in time  
If held believe in God"

from Pryings in Private Papers (p 188) - cited by A.H. Plummer, The Church in the 18th Century (1910), p 176.

- (32) Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre (1962) emphasises how much opposition to episcopacy and the fear of the subversion of liberty contributed the motivating force for the Revolutionary war. Bridenbaugh's dissenting position provides a helpful balance to Cross' episcopalianism. Neither writer was much concerned to analyse the kind of episcopacy that metamorphosed in the American Church.
- (33) J. McVicar, The Professional Years of Bishop Hobart (1838), p 224, cited by Herklots, op. cit. p 62.
- (34) Cited by Beardsley, op. cit., p 243.
- (35) In itself this reflects on the Anglican inability to extend its frontiers. An ecclesiastical parish required a civil parish, and so (it was believed) an Act of Parliament for its formation. (See Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church (1958) especially the joint essay by Norman Sykes and Gordon Rupp : cp L.C. 1958, p 2.46) It is interesting to speculate on whether the Methodist separation would have occurred at all if the Church of England had been more flexible regarding its American dependencies (See Herklots, op. cit. (1966), p 99 ff).
- (36) Reprinted by the Church Historical Society, Austin, Texas, 1954 (ed. R.G. Salomon).
- (37) Clara O. Loveland The Critical Years : the re-constitution of the American Church in the United States of America (1956) p 71 ff.; and A.M.G. Stephenson op. cit. (1968), p 37 ff.
- (38) eg Herklots loc. cit. cp. H. Lowther Clarke, Constitutional Church Government (1924), pp 44 - 5.
- (39) Frederick V. Mills has recently drawn attention to the way in which revolutionary republican ideals shaped the whole response of American episcopalianism. Bishops by Ballot (1978), p 35 ff.
- (40) Mills emphasises the radical nature of the federal and democratic system which this step represented. ibid. p 157 ff. The earlier precedents for this procedure are discussed in a forthcoming article by Peter Stockmaier "The Election of Bishops by Clergy and People in the Early Church".

- (41) Lowther Clarke, op. cit., pp 196 - 205.
- (42) W.S. Perry, op. cit. ii, p 56 ff; Beardsley op. cit. p 238 f. H.G.G. Herklots "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Anglican Communion" in Church Quarterly Review CLXV/357 (Oct. - Dec., 1964) pp 444 - 9. Details of the Concordat include the use of common forms of liturgy as the 'capital article' along with belief in the Scriptural Gospel; the spiritual nature of the Church; full communion with a respect for separate jurisdictions; worship according to different customs yet agreeable with apostolic rules; and maintenance of mutual support between the respective churches.
- (43) Letters from the Bishop of New Zealand ed. G.W. Doane (1844); cp. A.M.G. Stephenson, The First Lambeth Conference, 1867 (1967), p 66.
- (44) S.E. Ahlstrom, The Religious History of the American People (1972), p 370.
- (45) As Herklots has pointed out, the rift was healed partly by events and partly by a delightful historical irony in the fact that Seabury, who had been imprisoned during the Revolutionary war for his refusal to omit prayer for the King's majesty from the liturgy, was consecrated by non-Juring bishops who for conscience' sake did not pray for the King at all, while White, the democrat and patriot, was made a bishop in Lambeth Palace chapel - the very centre of what many Americans regarded as the home of prelatival tyranny! The Church of England and the American Episcopal Church (1966), p 104 ff.
- (46) S.E. Ahlstrom, op. cit., p 370.
- (47) Herklots remarks that the American church is 'Anglican' in much the same way that Americans refer to their language as English!
- (48) There was also some justifiable anxieties about how far doctrinal changes proposed by the 1785 Convention might go. L.A. Haselmeyer, Lambeth and Unity (1948) has pointed to this extenuating feature to explain Moore's reluctance, but he is hardly justified in seeing this as the cause (or even partial cause) around which the delay revolved (p 89).
- (49) A.H. Rowden, The Primates of the Four Georges (1916), pp 369, 380 f.
- (50) E. Stock, The History of the Church Missionary Society, (1899) vol i, pp 72 - 3.
- (51) J. Kaye, Public Education (1853), p 114 - cited by S.C. Carpenter, Church and People (1933), p. 68.
- (52) Sermons, Charges and Tracts (1811), p 244 ff.

- (53) It was perhaps less than typical in that Barrington disapproved of giving money alone unless the problem was too far away to do anything else, and sought to defend the poor against the oppression of parish officers.
- (54) This was one of a number of charitable societies founded at this time: e.g. The Society for the Reformation of Manners had been re-established after 80 years in 1787, and the Society for the Suppression of Vice and Profaneness began in the same year. Apart from such bodies various informal alliances were also in existence with the purpose of reforming the poor laws (1776, 1782), resignation bonds (1780 - 3), sabbatarian legislation (1781, 1794), and church reform (1777, 1781) as well as the over-riding concern for the suppression of slavery. (See G. Kitson Clarke, Churchmen and the Condition of England (1973), pp 43 - 52.
- (55) E.W. Kemp, Counsel and Consent (1961), p 163 ff.
- (56) cf A. Plummer, op. cit., p 72 ff.
- (57) G.F.A. Best, Temporal Pillars (1964), p 137 ff.
- (58) There had always been some Bishops who were less reactionary. Joseph Shipley, Bishop of St. Albans (1769 - 1788) and Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff (1782 - 1816) both took the side of dissent in toleration measures debated in 1787. Shipley rather than Moore may have succeeded Cornwallis to the see of Canterbury in 1783 but for his opinion and his equally unpopular support of American independence (Plummer, op. cit., p 192.
- (59) Previous attempts had been made to repeal these Acts in 1787, 1788, 1790. (See note (58) above).
- (60) O. Brose, Church and Parliament (1959), pp 14 - 16.
- (61) ibid., pp 7 - 22.
- (62) The Anglican Communion in Christendom (1960), p 6.
- (63) Although it is also interesting to speculate as to what earlier historical causes lie behind the pattern of reform adopted in the 16th century. cf "The English hierarchy was already habituated to subjection before it was called upon officially to accept it. Erastianism had long been the atmosphere of England, when the storm of the Reformation broke on the Church". Henson op. cit., p 9.
- (64) See A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (1964), pp 78 ff and 179.
- (65) John E. Booty 'Hooker and Anglicanism' in J. Speed Hill (ed.), Studies in Richard Hooker (1972) pp 207 - 240; J.H. Marshall, Hooker and the Anglican Tradition (1963).

- (66) R.S. Boshier, The Making of the Restoration Settlement (1951), p 282.
- (67) The Corporation Act (1661) imposed civil disabilities on those who refused the sacraments of the established Church and was intended to prevent dissent from taking a political form. The Test Act (1673) furthered this intention by adding an oath of royal supremacy and allegiance and a denial of the dogma of transubstantiation as requirements for all those taking up civil or military office.
- (68) The development (or degeneration) of this point of view is traced by J.N. Figgis, Churches and the Modern State (1913) Ch 1.
- (69) The Church of England and the Church of Christ (1930), p 46.
- (70) N. Sykes, Church and State in the 18th Century (1934), p 320 ff, and "The Ideal of a National Church" in G.L.H. Harvey (ed.), The Church in the 20th Century (1936), pp 1 - 50. The outline of this point of view is found in the 1604 Canons 1, 2, 3 and 7, and can be traced in the revised Canons (1969), A1, A6, A7 etc.
- (71) At different times Secker, Sherlock, Butler and Rowth all sought to persuade Walpole of the advisability of appointing a bishop for the Americans. Butler's proposal for a "spiritual" episcopate was:
- "1. That no coercive power is devised over the laity ... only a power to regulate the behaviour of the clergy who are in episcopal orders.
  2. That nothing is desired for such bishops that may in the least interfere with the dignity or authority or interests of the Governors or any other officer of the state ... and no share in the temporal government is desired for the bishops.
  3. The maintenance of such bishops is not to be at the charge of the colonies.
  4. No bishops are intended to be settled in places where the government is in the hands of Dissenters .. but authority to be given only to ordain clergy for such Church of England congregations as are among them, and to confirm the members thereof".  
(W.A. Spooner, Bishop Butler (1901), p 30).
- Walpole's refusal to act on the grounds that a Bishop was a member of the English House of Lords is a good example of his own guiding principle, quieta non movere.
- (72) C.B. Moss "The Disestablished Home Churches" in J.W.L. Wand, The Anglican Communion (1948), pp 253 - 260.
- (73) It must be acknowledged that several English bishops opposed such legislation (cf. Overton, op. cit., p 324 ff).
- (74) There were 24 "qualified" congregations : 19 had submitted to the Scottish primus by 1816.

- (75) S.C. Neill, op. cit., (1964), p 252. It is not without significance that the non-denominational character of the society led to its eventual absorption into the Congregational Union.
- (76) A Practical View . . . . (1797), p 346 ff.
- (77) Non-denominationalism became even more pronounced after the second evangelical awakening. (S.C. Neill, op. cit., p 324).
- (78) Cited by Carpenter, op. cit., p 28.
- (79) ibid, p 69.
- (80) A continuity can be traced however, especially from the Hackney group to the Oxford Movement, in the writings of Alexander Knox and John Jebb (cf. Y. Brilioth, The Anglican Revival (1933), pp 45 - 55). Brilioth sees the earlier movement as isolated from the wells of evangelical religion, both Knox and Jebb's combination of the Catholic and evangelical sources providing the foretaste of Newman's efforts. (See also Dieter Voll, Catholic Evangelicals (1962), and for a more general treatment G.W.O. Addleshaw, The High Church Tradition (1941) ).
- (81) Cited by D. Newsome, The Parting of Friends (1966), p 316.
- (82) There is no doubt that it was the Church - State nexus that the Tractarians sought to dismember. Newman spoke of the Movement's first principle as "ecclesiastical liberty; the doctrine which it especially opposed was in ecclesiastical language, the heresy of Erastus, and in political, the Royal Supremacy" (Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans (1879) Vol i, pp 101 - 2).
- (83) The Church's reform of property, revenues and sinecures brought a major upheaval to the Church of England, but still failed to meet the major practical and theological challenge of the 19th century by what one writer characterises as the "failure to grapple with the new infidelity of the working classes" (R.P. Flindall, The Church of England, 1815 - 1948 (1972), p 4).
- Olive Brose's survey of the period sees the years after 1828 and the Reform Parliament as the final phase of the attempt to maintain a Hookerian, and ultimately Christian polity in England. She sees a paradox in the continuation of an "Established Church in a nation only partially in contact with it, riven by dissent and unbelief, and ultimately ignored altogether." (op. cit. p 3 ff.) Henson, on the other hand sees the "transformation" of the Church of England as stemming from the Reform Acts (op. cit., p 208 ff).
- (84) viz. Nova Scotia (1787); Quebec (1793); Calcutta (1814), Jamaica, Barbados (1824); Madras (1835); Australia (subsequently Sydney, 1836); Bombay (1837); Newfoundland, Toronto (1839) (cf. Carpenter, op. cit., p 430).
- For a full table of consecrations, 1784 - 1924 see H. Lowther Clarke, op. cit., p 44 ff.

- (85) Tucker, op. cit., vol i, p 100.
- (86) The Bishop of London had traditionally been held responsible for "Churches in foreign parts" since land had obtained an order in council, (1st October, 1633) presumably in order to prevent any incursions of Calvinism from soldiers or merchants in the Low Countries.
- (87) The whole story is told by W.F. France, The Overseas Episcopate : Centenary History of the Colonial Bishopric Fund (1941). Blomfield was elected the first chairman, Gladstone was one of the Treasurers, and Archdeacon (later Cardinal) Manning, the Secretary. Manning was to record his conviction that at the time: "There has been no time when the Church of England stood stronger than now in apostolical doctrine and discipline".
- (88) Although initially it was the European settlements which were chiefly in mind, the fund quickly spread its efforts beyond the "Colonies" as China and Japan became open to European influence and Africa was opened up by exploration, e.g. Hong Kong (Victoria) 1849 Sierra Leone 1852; S & E. Africa 1850's; Singapore and Sarawak 1855; W. Equatorial Africa 1864; Mid China 1872. The last See to be endowed by the Fund was Korea and Manchuria, 1889.
- (89) Included among them : Zenana Mission Society; Colonial and Continental Church Society; Jerusalem and the East Mission; Melanesian Mission; Oxford Mission, Calcutta; South American Missionary Society; Universities Mission to Central Africa.
- (90) The unseen influence of Tractarian ideas is seen in the Letters of Frederick, Lord Blatchford. Frederick Rogers was Newman's closest undergraduate friend who, after Newman's conversion, joined with R.W. Church to found The Guardian. From 1846 he was Under Secretary in the Colonial Office, and Gladstone's principal advisor. At the end of his life he recorded:
- "Hence at the time I retired from the public service, the Colonial Churches (with one or two exceptions, which I think no longer exist) were as free as the Episcopal Church of Scotland to regulate their own affairs, to choose and increase the number of their bishops, and to obtain consecration in the colonies if they pleased". (p 305).
- Some of his practical efforts to persuade successive secretaries of the propriety of this policy are also indicated (e.g. p 78 ff).
- This example of theological principle applied to political opportunity - and the conscious modelling of polity on the Scottish experience - casts useful light on the changing attitudes to the colonial churches during the 1840's. (See p 67 below).
- (91) See H. Lowther Clarke, op. cit., pp 44 - 71.

- (92) It was the Jerusalem Bishopric, the reception given to Tract 90, and his research into the idea of 'development' in the history of Arianism that comprised the "three blows which broke" Newman in 1841 (Apologia Pro Vita Sua (1913), p 235 ff). The Tractarian objection to the Act was that it compromised Anglican Catholicity by association with Lutherans, and was a denial of the 'Branch theory' of the Church
- (93) There were clear political advantages for Britain to have increased representation in Palestine during the break-up of the Ottoman Empire. But the sentimental idealism of evangelicals like Shaftesbury really motivated the action, and it was supported by advocates of 'national Christianity' like Arnold. An ironic footnote to the method of this episcopal appointment was that Alexander refused to sail to his post on a warship called Infernal, but travelled on Devastation instead! (O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church (1966) Vol 1, p 140).
- (94) Three occupants - M.S. Alexander (1841 - 5); Samuel Gobat (1845 - 79) and an Irishman, Barclay (1880). When Barclay died after only a few months in office, the Germans withdrew from the agreement and it was formally dissolved. Archbishop Benson revived the bishopric as a solely Anglican venture in 1897 and it has continued to operate as an ecumenical and inter-religious office until the present day. (See P.J. Welch "Anglican Churchmen and the Establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric" Journal of Ecclesiastical History, viii (1957) pp 193 - 204).
- (95) W.C. Doane, A Memoir of the Life of George Washington Doane D.D., LL.D., Bishop of New Jersey (1860). Appendix, "The Missionary Bishop", p 8.
- (96) The American Episcopal Church's Board of Missions was founded with the consecration of the first missionary bishop, Jackson Kemper, for Missouri and Indiana at that Convention.
- (97) Doane's biographer, with understandably filial devotion, argues that this sermon caused the Church of England to adopt its new policy. The most that can be claimed is that it helped steel the English Church's developing resolve. Samuel Wilberforce apparently was greatly impressed while reading the address, but Newman and Pusey had been promulgating a similar idea for some time (T.E. Yates, Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad (1978), p 99 ff).
- (98) O. Chadwick, Mackenzie's Grave (1959).
- (99) The Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion (1957), p 3 ff. While claiming rather too much for Anglican independence at this time, this report does acknowledge the importance of the voluntary missionary societies' contribution to the later ecumenical ideal of "a free church in a free society". Co-operation between missions (and churches) was possible when neither partner was identified in dominant political interests.

- (100) The limits of this supposed independence have been pointed out by M.A.C. Warren "Church and State in the British Colonial Empire from Palmerston to Macmillan" in Social History and Christian Mission (1967), pp 15 - 35. He indicates how deeply Anglicanism assumed its state connections even when officially disestablished, and what a social and theological transformation was (and is) required in Anglican thinking at the missiological level.
- (101) T.E. Yates, Venn and the Victorian Bishops abroad (1978), pp 20 and 195.
- (102) The importance of the "society principle" in the development of Anglican ecclesiastical forms is worthy of further attention. Latourette states that missionary societies were "without exact precedent in the expansion of Christianity or indeed, in the spread of any religious faith" K.S. Latourette, Expansion, Vol III, p 50. "History shows that a church or fellowship of churches either embraces elements of independency to its own greater health or, by demanding a monolithic control, sows the seeds of secession". J.V. Taylor, "Small is Beautiful", I.R.M. 239 (1971) pp 328 - 338.
- (103) Yates takes O. Chadwick to task for his assertion (Mackenzie's Grave, p 77) that the difference represents a dichotomy between a view of mission essentially biblical and one essentially sacramental (ibid, p 196). This tension is the subject of succeeding sections.
- (104) This is illustrated in Australia, where eventually Melbourne, Goulburn and Sydney Dioceses were regulated through local legislatures, while Newcastle and Adelaide operated under voluntary compact without reference to the State parliaments.  
See also H. Lowther Clarke, op. cit., p 77 ff;  
Ross Border, Church and State in Australia, 1788 - 1872 (1962), p 182 ff.
- (105) In his 1847 Synod charge Selwyn referred to the Oxford Movement, expressing his sympathy with its ideals but affirming his own over-riding allegiance to the principles of the Prayer Book. He especially regretted that Newman had been "taken captive by the foreign armies who had usurped the well (of antiquity)". J.H. Evans, op. cit., p 207. Evans also reproduces an interesting recollection of the Bishop's wife from her childhood in Northants. Referring to her Vicar she said "Old Mr Sikes was a far-seeing man, and before there was breath to stir the calm he said 'There is one little clause in the Creed, not much heeded now, which will shake England to her foundations before very long, and that is: The Holy, Catholic Church'" (Feminisces of Mrs S.H. Selwyn, p 3) Mr Sikes was of course Thomas Sykes, a member of the Hackney Phalanx. See B. Reardon, From Coleridge to Gore (1971), pp 35 - 7; and J.H. Overton, The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (1894), p 42, where the same story is told.

- (106) S.C. Carpenter, op. cit., p 116. See also n.43 above.
- (107) Tucker, op. cit., Vol i, p 72. The incident is reported in full, (though without reference) by H. Lowther Clarke, op. cit., pp 169 - 170.
- (108) Melanesia was included in Selwyn's jurisdiction through a mistake in drafting his Letters Patent which extended his diocese to 34<sup>0</sup>N Lat. instead of 34<sup>0</sup>S as intended.
- (109) Tucker, op. cit., Vol i, p 200.
- (110) Border, op. cit., pp 49 - 50.
- (111) ibid., Vol i, 329; Selwyn also applied this principle to his own maintenance, Vol i, p 163.
- (112) It was seriously held that such an action contravened the 1533 Act of Submission.
- (113) J.H. Evans, op. cit., p 138 (no reference is given).
- (114) Principally, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner) sponsored a Bill in 1853 which would grant self-government to the Colonial Churches. This passed the Lords but was rejected by the Commons.
- (115) This realisation was formalised by the well-known Privy Council decision (1863) over the dispute between Gray of Capetown and Walter Long. The Anglican Churches overseas were deemed to be in the same situation as any other religious body in their new country. (e.g. Stephenson, op. cit., (1967), p 74 ff).
- (116) Tucker, op. cit., Vol i, p 350. A.P. Vidler argues that Gladstone's political conversion was the outcome of his realisation that the ideal of the visible identity of Church and State was no longer practically possible, and that the future lay with voluntarism in ecclesiastical matters and pluralism in those social. (The Orb and the Cross (1945) ch 7.
- (117) See G.P. Shaw, Patriarch and Patriot (1978), pp 234 - 242; R. Border, op. cit., pp 173 - 181.
- (118) P. Carrington, The Anglican Church in Canada (1963), p 126 ff.
- (119) P. Hinchcliff, The Anglican Church in South Africa (1963), p 112 ff; in "Laymen in Synod : an aspect of the beginnings of Synodical Government in South Africa", in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker (eds.), Councils and Assemblies (1971), pp 321 - 327, Hinchcliff stresses the pragmatism of the South African decision. But Robert Gray, the Bishop of Capetown was also in constant correspondence with Pusey over the theological implications of the decision. (C.N. Gray, Life of Robert Gray (1876) Vol ii, p 196 ff).

- (120) J.C. Patteson had heard Selwyn's farewell sermon at Windsor in 1841, and accompanied Selwyn to New Zealand in 1855. He developed the Melanesian work begun by Selwyn, was consecrated in 1861 and served there until his martyrdom in 1871.
- (121) The last consecration carried out under Letters Patent for a country (possessing powers of self-government) was that of Mesac Thomas for the Diocese of Goulburn, in 1863.
- (122) The Via Media (1837) Vol i, p 24.

CHAPTER 3 : ANGLICAN BELIEFS : DECLARED DOCTRINE IN THE ANGLICAN  
COMMUNION

- (1) R.S. Boshier has demonstrated that the term "Anglican Communion" was coined at the Jubilee. The American Church and the Formation of the Anglican Communion (1962), p 21.
- (2) The Convocation was eventually convened in 1855. See E.W. Kemp, Counsel and Consent (1961) pp 172 - 186; P.J. Welch, "The Revival of an Active Convocation of Canterbury", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. X (1959), pp 188 - 197.
- (3) Stephenson lists as reasons for the calling of the first Lambeth Conference:- the desire to "cap the edifice" of synodical government; the growing confusion over the relationship of the colonial to the English Church; the revision of some 1603 Canons by the Canterbury Convocation; the publication of Essays and Reviews; and the Colenso controversy. He sees the second and fifth factors as crucial. A.M.G. Stephenson, The First Lambeth Conference (1967), pp 86 - 7.
- (4) Conferences have been held in 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897 (the date being chosen to coincide with the 1300th anniversary of the mission of Augustine), 1908, 1920 (the interval being extended by the Great War), 1930, 1948 (the proposed 1940 Conference had been rendered impossible by World War II), 1958, 1968, and 1978. Details of Conference reports were given on p 11 above.
- (5) The Chronicle of Convocation (15th February, 1867) p 807.
- (6) Stephenson, op. cit., (1967) p 226 ff.
- (7) The first Conference's resolutions were commended to the "careful consideration of the Bishop" and the second's to the "faithful" of the Anglican Communion. L.C. 1867, p 76; L.C. 1878 p 82. In 1878 the Encyclical closed with the words "we do not claim to be lords over God's heritage, but we commend the results of this our Conference to the reason and conscience of our brethren as enlightened by the Holy Spirit ...." (p 98). The formal statement of authority (see p 11 above) was first appended to a Conference report in 1888.
- (8) In Roman Catholicism on the other hand numerous levels of authority are recognised even in papal utterances, let alone those of bishops' conferences.
- (9) The Canterbury Convocation had met only since 1852, and the York Convocation was not summoned until 1861.
- (10) Stephenson, op. cit., (1967) pp 229 - 232.

- (11) R.T. Davidson (ed), The Six Lambeth Conferences (1929) p 9 where the original and revised declarations are printed side by side.
- (12) Stephenson discovered that the Irish bishops refused to attend because of these facts. op. cit., (1967) p 217.
- (13) L.C. 1867, Introduction to Resolutions, p 53.
- (14) ibid.
- (15) The sequence "taught ... held ... summed up ... affirmed" became a typical structure of the constitutional formulae by which the overseas churches established their legal independence. It first appears in the South African Constitution (1870). The structure and significance of Provincial constitutions will be discussed, p 186 ff below.
- (16) op. cit., (1967) p 18 ff.
- (17) L.C. 1867, "Address to the Faithful", p 50.
- (18) The dogma of the Immaculate Conception had been defined in Ineffabilis Deus (1854) by Pius IX, and preparations for the 1st Vatican Council although not officially convoked until 1868 provided an odious comparison for the Lambeth assembly. It was widely expected that the dogma of papal infallibility would shortly be propounded! The prospect of any rapprochement between Canterbury and Rome seemed to be dashed by Apostolicae Curae (1896).
- (19) L.C. 1878, p 83 (The whole 1878 Conference report was presented in the form of an Encyclical in which the reports of committees were incorporated).
- (20) It has been said of the conferences as a whole:  
 "One of the clearest differences between the first two conferences and the succeeding five, is the shift in emphasis. In the first conferences there is a defensive tone in the attitude of the Anglican Communion, especially towards the Roman Catholic Church. Anglican Catholicity needs defence from Roman claims to infallibility and the Roman refusal to acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders. Nor does the Anglican Communion in these first two conferences possess a satisfactory standard against which to measure varying claims to orthodoxy of other Christian bodies. The Old Catholics, the Moravians, the Church of Sweden, and the problem of inter-communication generally were met in the first two conferences as a series of separate problems; and, because there had been more divergence than convergence among Protestants since the 16th century, the first two Lambeth Conferences had to spend most of their energy and attention on internal problems of unity and organisation".  
 W.R. Curtis, The Lambeth Conferences: the solution for Pan Anglican Organization (1942) p 296.
- (21) L.C. 1878, pp 94 - 5.

- (22) L.C. 1888, pp 113 - 4; and see p      below.
- (23) L.C. 1897, p 251; L.C. 1908, Encyclical Letter p 313.
- (24) See p 110 ff      below.
- (25) Of course the authority of the Creeds does not provide a contradiction to the principles of the Reformation (at least as the Reformers understood it), although the repeated reference to the English Reformation by the Conferences - as if it were different in kind from the Continental Reformation - seems to suggest that some of the bishops felt that it did.
- (26) L.C. 1930, p 154.
- (27) The problem of the Articles will be dealt with on p 242 below.
- (28) From the 17th to mid-19th century Anglicans could in fact claim that "Anglican" was synonymous with "Christian" or was at least merely a geographical qualification of it, i.e. "Anglican" = English Christian. The previous chapter has indicated how, especially with the development of the overseas Churches, Anglicans ceased to be exclusively English (eventually they ceased to be even predominantly so), and at the same time more and more English Christians were declining to be Anglican!
- (29) The progressive "de-confessionalising" of the English Church was as much a result of the misuse of the Articles for ecclesiastical litigation and the mis-representation of the English reformation by the Tractarians as it was an indication of the internal failure of the Articles themselves. Central features in the declining status of the Articles are described by I.T. Ramsey, 'Subscription to Articles' in On Being Sure in Religion (1963) pp 48 - 90.
- (30) "Reunion and Validity" Thoughts on some Problems of the Day (1931) p 90.
- (31) The opening sermon was presented by Bishop Whipple of Minnesota, "No branch of the Church is absolutely by itself alone in the Catholic Church; all branches need reunion in order for the completeness of the Church". In his presidential address E.W. Benson said, "It has been pretended that the development of the Anglican Communion springs from the extension of our race rather than from the energy of our faith". He acknowledged that it was difficult to avoid the charge (which echoed the criticism by Newman) so great had been the expansion of English power, yet he insisted that the frontiers of the church did represent the energy of faith not race.  
Lambeth Conference 1888, Various Papers p 6 ff.
- (32) Lambeth Conference 1888, Minutes of Second Day (Wednesday 4 July) Vol i, p 125. The discussion which follows is taken from this verbatim record, details of which have not previously been published.

- (33) P. Carrington, The Anglican Church in Canada (1963) pp 137 - 8 refers to the reception of Canadian proposals by the Conference but these appear to be mainly to do with **Provincial** re-organisation. He confesses ignorance of the events of the Conference.
- (34) Minutes of Committee 4, on Reunion.
- (35) ibid., (Wednesday 11th July). The Minute refers to the resolution of the 1887 Convention of the American Church, but as the Convention did not meet in 1887 it is safe to presume that the document referred to (it is not included in the minutes) is that of the 1886 meeting recorded below.  
R.M.G. Libby's informative thesis Lambeth X and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1972) attributes the introduction of the American resolution in the Lambeth Conference to A.N. Littlejohn, the Bishop of Long Island, but Libby was not able to consult the Conference records.
- (36) Such proposals were based on long standing interests and writings of substance. William Augustus Muhlenberg had suggested a confederation of Protestant Churches in Hints on Catholic Union in 1835. He had proposed four Articles of Union, namely extended use of the Apostles Creed; an ordination sufficient and not repugnant to the Word of God; use of common hymns, prayers and lessons; a council on common affairs.  
Thomas Vail (later the first bishop of Kansas) wrote The Comprehensive Church in 1841 (See p 134 below). It is a book judged by one author to inaugurate "a new mission for the Protestant Episcopal Church - to lead the drive towards Christian unity in America" (D.H. Yoder, "Christian Unity in 19th Century America" in R. Rouse and S.C. Neill (eds) A History of the Ecumenical Movement (1954) p 250).
- (37) Journal of the General Convention of 1886, p 86.  
W.R. Huntington's book The Church Idea had been published in 1870.
- (38) The difference constitutes an interesting gloss on the parable of the talents!
- (39) op. cit., (Friday 13 July) p 16.
- (40) ibid., (Friday 13 July, and Monday 16 July) pp 16 - 20.
- (41) ibid., (Tuesday 17 July) p 24.
- (42) The original report as proposed is bound in a volume Lambeth Conference 1888, Various Papers, p 92 ff.  
In the published report (L.C. 1888, pp 156 - 161) the original first section is divided into two parts, the second section appears as part three, and the third as part four. The original fourth section, on episcopacy, is omitted for reasons that will be indicated.

- (43) Reference is given to the opinion of Bishop Cosin (Anglo Catholic Library : Cosin's Works iv, p 403 ff) where it is allowed that Episcopal ordination was derived from Apostolic custom and practice rather than from the absolute precept of Christ or the Apostles; and to Bramhall (Anglo Catholic Library: Bramhall's Works i, app, xxxvii and The Serpent Salve p 597, folio dated 1643) where he agreed that episcopal ordination was for order, not for validation, which is from God's mercy alone. "Great latitude is left to particular churches, in the constitution of their ecclesiastical Regiment according to the time and place and persons, so as Order and their own Institution be observed".
- (44) op. cit., (Tuesday 17 July)  
 Jermyrn and Dowden sought initially to overthrow this resolution as falling outside the committee's brief, and then to amend it by referring to "a Ministerial Character" of other ministries. Both attempts were defeated in committee. The phrase "the ministerial character" was consciously adopted as an alternative to an earlier draft which spoke of non-Episcopal ministries possessing "some validity".  
 In another last minute amendment, a definite proposal that re-ordination or hypothetical ordination be considered as the means by which "acceptance" could be procured was omitted.
- (45) Lambeth Conference 1888, Minutes of Seventh Day (Wednesday 25 July) Vol iii, p 1 ff.
- (46) op. cit., Vol iii, p 23(a).
- (47) The one American bishop to speak in favour of the Quadrilateral was the Bishop of Massachusetts (Dr Paddock), although the transcript sometimes confuses him with the Bishop of Missouri - who opposed it.
- (48) Doane was the Protagonist of "missionary bishops" referred to previously.
- (49) L.C. 1888, Resolution II (p 122).
- (50) As is customary at Lambeth Conferences, voting figures are only recorded if the secretaries are requested to do so. Apparently no such request was made, and accordingly no details of the voting appear in the Minutes or in the Official record.
- (51) op. cit., (Friday 27 July) The amended report is found L.C. 1888, pp 156 - 161.
- (52) The resolutions are those numbered 11 - 13, ibid., p 122.
- (53) A.M.G. Stephenson op. cit., (1978), p 87.
- (54) R. Curtis, op. cit., p 297 ; D. Morgan, The Bishops Come to Lambeth (1967) p 89 ; S. Dark, The Lambeth Conferences (1930) p 63 .

- (55) Lightfoot was evidently unwell during the Conference. He died in the following year. Stephenson, op. cit., p 37.
- (56) A.T. Hanson, Beyond Anglicanism (1965) Ch 3.
- (57) H.R.T. Brandreth contends "Originally ... the four points were regarded, as a terminus a quo from which there could be no dispensation, but from which, when accepted, one might proceed to the discussion of other matters in dispute". From what has been seen this claim is hardly accurate, although Brandreth's cardinal point is certainly valid. "Considerable controversy has been engendered within the Anglican Communion by an interpretation of the Quadrilateral which would make it a terminus ad quem, that is to say, would regard it as constituting in itself sufficient basis for reunion rather than, as originally intended, as a basis for discussion with a view to reunion". ('Approaches of the Churches towards each other in the 19th century' in Rouse and Neill, op. cit., p 265).
- (58) op. cit., (Wednesday 25 July) Vol iii, p
- (59) The Augsburg Confession, Article XXVIII, in T.G. Tappert The Book of Concord (1959) pp 81 - 2, 86, 93 - 4. Edmund Schlink, Theology of the Lutheran Confessions (1961) pp 248 - 50; 265 ff.
- (60) Schmalkaldic Articles, III.
- (61) Institutes of the Christian Religion, IV, 10, xxxii (ed. J.T. McNeil (1961) Vol ii, p 1210.)
- (62) F. Procter and W.H. Frere, A New History of the Book of Communion Prayer (1905), pp 661 - 9; G.J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy (1969) pp 93 - 5.
- (63) Cuming, op. cit., pp 163 - 4.
- (64) R. Hooker Ecclesiastical Polity e.g. "the necessity of polity and regiment in all Churches may be held without holding any one certain form to be necessary in them all" (III, ii, 1);
- (65) Works of Hooker ed. J. Keble (1836) vol i, p 1 ix.
- (66) Tracts for the Times No.1, p 3.
- (67) The Ministry of the Christian Church (1889) p 345. This book was a reply to Edwin Hatch's Bampton Lectures of 1880, and Gore had worked on it since that time. It will be remembered that the Lambeth Conference debate on the Quadrilateral took place in 1888. See Norman F. Josaitis, Edwin Hatch and Early Church Order (1971).
- (68) The movement of thought was not uninterrupted or unanimously accepted however. The 1870 'Revisers Communion' (which was spoken of by F.J.A. Hort as "the beginning of a new period in Church History") shows that many theologians sought to make exceptions to the rule, although the general furor aroused

by it indicates equally that the rule was widely accepted too. See H. Swanston, 'The Revisers Communion' in Church Membership and Intercommunion, ed. J. Kent and E. Murray (1973), pp 93 - 120; A.B. Webster, 'Church Order and Reunion in the Nineteenth Century' in The Historic Episcopate, ed. K.M. Carey (1954), pp 84 - 104.

- (69) A.D. Gilbert, The Making of Post Christian Britain (1981); R.S. Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (1963).
- (70) Vidé Locke and 'Leviathan'! Edward Norman, Church and Society 1770 - 1970 (1976) and in his celebrated Reith Lectures two years later is correct when he points out how the risk of the collectivist state has altered the position of the Churches vis-à-vis society. He does not seem to be as aware of the way this situation has reduced the concept of Christian faith in Church and Society alike.
- (71) C.C.J. Webb, A Century of Anglican Theology (1923)
- (72) L.G. Elliott-Binns, The Development of English Theology (1952) p 11 etc.
- (73) H.F.G. Swanston, Ideas of Order : Anglicans and the renewal of Theological method (1974).
- (74) Cited from Pattison's Memoirs by C.C.J. Webb, op. cit., p 2.
- (75) The Evangelical Alliance was founded in 1846 to put down popery, Puseyism and (it is often conveniently forgotten) puritanism. With foreign missions taking the predominance, the goals of the E.A. seem to prescribe the limits of evangelical ecclesiology. A major critical study of evangelical history and theology in the latter half of the 19th century is still awaited.
- The loss of the liberal strand of Anglican theology is perhaps more serious in that F.D. Maurice for instance had given thought to the nature of Anglicanism's failure. (e.g. Three Letters to the Reverend W. Palmer (1842) ), whereas when liberal opinion did assert itself in Lux Mundi (1889) it was in a form which only gradually influenced fundamental theological issues.
- (76) N.F. Josaitis, op. cit.
- (77) Apart from the character of the Conferences, the failure to deal with such subjects does suggest a certain lack of willingness on the part of the bishops to deal with essential theological questions, and on the part of the Church of England to recognise the extent of its accountability to the rest of the Anglican Communion.
- (78) Stephenson, op. cit., (1978) p 100.
- (79) L.C. 1897, pp 243 - 247.

- (80) ibid p 247.
- (81) ibid p 248.
- (82) op. cit., (1978) p 106.
- (83) Stephenson records that two of those invited had been bishops in 1867 although they had not attended the first Conference over 40 years earlier. op. cit., (1978) p 177
- (84) See p 268 below.
- (85) L.C. 1908, Encyclical Letter, p 313.
- (86) ibid, p 422.
- (87) ibid, pp 422, 426.
- (88) ibid, p 429.
- (89) ibid, p 432 ( and see p 53 above) 'Per saltum', literally means 'by a leap' and refers to being received into a rank of orders without having previously received lower grades, or without having observed the conventional 'interstices'; For the whole story see T. Hannan "The Scottish Consecrations in London in 1610" Church Quarterly Review cxlii (January, 1911) p 406 ff.
- (90) These 20 years were broken by a short exile, 1531 - 4.
- (91) The story does not quite end here. In 1661 the Laudians, who remained uncertain about Bancroft's ruling, again consecrated Scottish bishops - and the Episcopal Church in Scotland traces its origins to that second act.
- (92) op. cit., p 432. An Appendix added as one interpretation of Presbyterianism that its ministry continued the ministry of the Apostles (albeit excluding Prelacy) and had been transmitted from them in orderly and recognisable succession.
- (93) ibid, p 433. This dilemma had been acknowledged by the Tractarians as far as historical ambiguities were concerned (Tracts for the Times No.4, pp 5 - 6) but for the present and future episcopal ordination was the exclusive mark of "God's ambassadors".
- (94) G.K.A. Bell, Documents on Christian Unity, 1920 - 24 (1925), p vii. Most responses to the Appeal are found in Bell's collection.
- As a more dispassionate comment on the Appeal and its aftermath: "Lambeth 1920 was the high-water mark of Anglican reunion endeavours towards the 'non-conformists'. After Lambeth 1920 the climate became cooler and at the following Lambeth Conference, 1930, home reunion had lost something of its first attraction. The leaders of the Churches had had enough of the great opposition on the part of various groups within their own Church. The chance for a reunion, which before 1920 had seemed so promising, diminished somewhat during the twenties". B. Sundkler, The Church of South India (1965) pp 94 - 5.

- (95) R.H. Lloyd, The Church of England, 1900 - 1965 (1966) p 405.
- (96) L.C. 1920, Encyclical Letter, p 11.
- (97) For the Conference see K.S. Latourette, "Ecumenical bearings of the Missionary Movement" in Rouse and Neill, op. cit., pp 355 - 362; the ambivalence of Anglicans is reflected in G.K.A. Bell, Randall Davidson (1938) Vol i, pp 572 - 4.
- (98) Ruth Rouse, "Voluntary movements and the Changing Ecumenical Climate" in Rouse and Neill, op. cit., pp 342 - 5; Bell, op. cit., (1938) p i, p 499 and C.H. Hopkins, John R. Mott (1980).
- (99) Proceedings of the Sixth Lambeth Conference : the second day, 6 July 1920. p 106 ff. As the outcome of this new responsiveness, Lang went to ask that the Conference proceed (i) with open minds, (ii) to outline principles of reunion (iii) which would lead not just to better understanding but towards the restoring of the fullness of Christendom. (iv) These needed to be expressed in a spirit which broke through the reserve and suspicion existing between the traditions. Not only should it refuse to judge the validity of other ministries (as in 1908) but it should positively recognise the reality of them, and (v) actively seek conference between Christian Churches with the intention of opening doors to reunion.
- (100) Minutes of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (as reconstructed by the Lambeth Conference of 1908), The third meeting (Monday 27 - Friday 31 July, 1914) The formation of this body will be discussed in the next chapter (p 158 ff). It met on seventeen occasions from 1910-1947, and this was by far its longest and most substantial deliberation.
- (101) Stephenson, op. cit., (1978) p 132.
- (102) Davidson's comment on Weston's conciliatory attitude was, "Whether his strange temperament will show itself by some outbreak of another kind now that the Conference is over, I cannot tell. I feel a little uneasy sometimes. I hope this is not faithless" Bell, op. cit (1938) p 1012. Weston's own acknowledgement that he was moved by the occasion rather than by conviction is recorded in H. Maynard Smith, Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar (1926) ch 12.
- (103) Gore suffered appendicitis at the 1908 Anglican Congress and only attended the last few days of the Conference in that year. By 1920 he had resigned his See, although he attended the Reunion committee meetings as a witness. His biographer concludes that Gore's main impression was made upon ecumenical affairs and leaders of the world-wide Anglican Communion: he was too often in opposition to exert his due authority in the English Church. G.L. Prestige, Charles Gore (1935) p 311.
- (104) p 102 above.

- (105) Prestige records Gore's comment "I do love these non-conformists, they are so free. I wish I were non-conformist" (op. cit. p 375).  
At Edinburgh "Gore saw that the foundation of native Churches raised the problem of their relations with one another and with the old established Communion: and he made the Conference see it too" (p 312).
- (106) Proceedings (6th July, 1920) p 113. No reference was given - Lang's case however was that the Conference should not only refrain from judging non-episcopal ministries (as in 1903) but should positively acknowledge their reality.
- (107) In Orders and Unity (1909) Gore re-assessed his earlier work in The Ministry of the Christian Church (1889). God blessed the truth of the Reformation insight on the primacy of the word of God, but its counter-part, human rebellion against divine law (against which Catholic institutions were set) led to sectarianism and biblical literalism typical of Protestantism. The proper response for episcopacy was to admit God's blessings upon non-episcopal work, but not to condone its defects (p 183 ff).
- (108) Prestige, op. cit., p 454.
- (109) e.g. Davidson, after conversation with M. Talbot (son of H.S. Talbot and a member of the Community of the Resurrection). "His position contrasts strongly with that of the Old Tractarians in whose traditions his father brought him up. The war has done much to break down middle walls of partition, and to open people's eyes to one another's fields and flowers and fruits". Private Papers, Diaries and Memorabilia Vol XIV (1920 - 24), Mar. 14 1920.
- (110) F.L. Cross, Darwell Stone (London, 1943) pp 235 - 6.
- (111) Essays, Catholic and Critical (1926) p 153.
- (112) A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles (1919) p 423.
- (113) Unity and Schism (1917) p 150.
- (114) Cross, op. cit., p 146.
- (115) Temple and Quick had been involved in the Mansfield Conference 6 months before Lambeth. (F.A. Iremonger, William Temple (1948) pp 455 - 6) and represented its views before the 1920 Reunion committee. cp Lacey, The Universal Church: A Study in the Lambeth Call to Unity (1921) for his fuller reflections on the outcome.
- (116) The lectures were on sale the day after the final lecture (June 6, 1920) - without parallel in modern times. Plainly Headlam had the Conference in view! So too did his protagonists - C.H. Turner reviewed in Church Quarterly (July, 1920) and D. Stone published an open letter to the Archbishops to summon counter evidence (July 14) which was circulated at the Lambeth Conference.

- (117) Anglicanism and Reunion (1908). His earlier foray into the field is described Retrospect Vol i, p 61 ff, and his opinion of the 1920 Appeal is well known (Vol ii, pp 5 - 23).
- (118) Davidson's Private Papers XIV, (August 15, 1920). Bell thus omits the first recorded influence of a lay-person on the Lambeth Conference. See Bell op. cit., p 1912.
- (119) Davidson had foreseen the problem. He had been pressed on one side by Cecil, Philmore and Gore to resist non-episcopal validation and the heterodoxy of men such as Henson and Rashdall, and on the other by Mrs Creighton, Tatlow etc pressing for greater liberties. He concluded "whether the Lambeth Conference will help matters remains to be seen. I am rather doubtful whether it will". ibid, (March 14, 1920), p 7.
- (120) Bell Papers : Notebook on 1920 Lambeth Conference (July 12, 1920). An early clash between Gibson and Henson over the need to recognise Presbyterian orders, was repeated when Gore, Dean, Ryle, Armitage Robinson and Professor C.H. Turner gave contrasting estimates of the sort of material Headlam had produced.
- (121) The Mansfield College Conference of 1920 was a first meeting of Anglicans and Free Churchmen who were attracted to the importance of Faith and Order principles for reunion.
- (122) Minutes of Sub-committee A(b) 'Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches' Meeting 2, Saturday 17 July, p 7.
- (123) R.C.D. Jasper, George Bell, Bishop of Chichester (1967) p 56 - 7.
- (124) Only 4 votes were recorded against its adoption, yet there were still mixed feelings. Henson sought to submit a minority approach - he was only dissuaded when allowed to insert reference to the divergences of opinion in the committee in its report (L.C. 1920, p 143). Davidson wryly noted that Henson could not believe the Conference able to achieve what he himself claimed beforehand would be impossible (op. cit)! To give Henson the benefit of the doubt, his was a refusal to allow even an achievement for which he had worked to conceal differences of conviction.
- (125) L.C. 1920, Resolution 9, pp 26 - 29.
- (126) A.M. Ramsey in the next systematic treatment of the Quadrilateral said: "In my reading on the Doctrine of the Church in the last few years, I have got the impression that the most valuable and creative trend ...has been what some writers call the eschatological aspect of the Church" (See p 257 below). The first sign of this re-orientation is found in 1920.
- (127) See Prestige, op. cit., p 411 ff. For a thoughtful criticism of this basis, see F.W. Pullar and D. Stone, Who are Members of the Church? (1921).

- (128) Quick's discussion of "validity" distinguishes between the idea of (a) authority of Church given to a ministry, and (b) the performance of the sign. In both cases 'validity' is a matter of degree - the test of the future is what counts: a wider authorisation, and a clearer demonstration of ministerial authority must be sought. Lambeth Conference 1920, Minutes of Sub-committee A (b) (Saturday 17 July) p 9.
- (129) Lambeth and Unity (1948) p 21.
- (130) Haselmeyer acknowledges the connection between 1838 and 1920, because he sees the Lambeth Quadrilateral as itself a serious deterioration from the Chicago statement (p 27). The one is a statement of the principle of Catholic unity and the other a programme for denominational merger (pp 158 - 162). For him the Appeal intensified a tendency evident throughout the whole period.
- (131) See Bell, Documents on Christian Unity (2nd Series, 1930) p 104 ff.
- (132) Davidson, op. cit., (August 15, 1920). He concluded, "In my heart I greatly doubt whether complete effect could possibly be given to what we have foreshadowed except by Disestablishment".
- (133) H. Lowther Clarke "The Lambeth Appeal and its Results". in H. Faige Cox Anglican Essays (1923); And 'Reunion: A Report on Replies to the Appeal, 1920', Documents issued to Bishops - Lambeth Conference, 1930.
- (134) Minutes of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (8th meeting, Monday 18 - Tuesday 19 July, 1927) p 6.
- (135) See Bengt Sundkler, op. cit.
- (136) Sundkler, op. cit., p 99 ff.
- (137) L.C. 1920, p 140.
- (138) Sundkler, op. cit., pp 132 - 7.
- (139) D.L. Edwards "101 Years of the Lambeth Conference" The Church Quarterly 1/1 (July 1968) pp 21 - 35.
- (140) L.C. 1930, pp 114 - 5.
- (141) ibid, p 115 - 6. The functions are referred to as: superintendence, especially of clergy; maintenance of unity in one Eucharist; ordination; safeguarding the faith; and administration of discipline. Interpretation affects relation of functions to each other it was acknowledged, but the functions remain constant.
- (142) ibid, pp 116 - 7.
- (143) Retrospect, Vol ii, 265.
- (144) ibid, Vol ii, p 270. cp Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson (1950) p 204 and also pp 150, 158, 218.

- (145) L.C. 1930, p 123 ff.
- (146) ibid., p 125.
- (147) ibid., p 124.
- (148) Lambeth Occasional Papers 1931 - 8 (1948) pp 101 - 3.
- (149) L.C. 1930, p 128 and Sundkler op. cit., p 231.
- (150) "To make an exception in exceptional circumstances is a way of affirming the general rule". (Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day, (1931) p 123).
- (151) Sundkler, op. cit., p 235.
- (152) L.C. 1948, Pt II, p 46.
- (153) L.C. 1968, Resolution 48, pp 42 - 3; and p 129. For the 1958 discussion see, L.C. 1958, Pt II, pp 25 - 8.
- (154) R.T. Davidson, Private Papers (August 15, 1920); cp Bell, op. cit., (1938) ii, 1005 ff. The concerned Group included Gibson (Gloucester), Burrell (Chichester), Chase (Ely), and Horthey (Southwell).
- (155) L.C. 1948, Pt I, p 39 and Pt II, p 47.
- (156) S.C. Neill has revealed his part in delaying this decision. It was "not a triumph of Anglo-Catholics, but a deliberate and charitable concession granted by the supporters of S. India out of true Christian concern for the anxieties of their brethren" See Neill's letter to Stephenson, op. cit., (1978) pp 191 - 2.
- (157) This Church and Realm, (1931) p 37.
- (158) 'Comprehensiveness and Indulgence' in Uniformity to Unity, ed. O. Chadwick and G.F. Nuttall (1962) p 192, note 1.
- (159) E.C.E. Bourne, The Anglicanism of William Laud (1947)
- (160) It is instructive to compare the Preface of the Book of Common Prayer, in which Uniformity is valiantly upheld, with that of the proposed 1927 book where tolerance of adaptation is enjoined and the Alternative Service Book wherein diversity is celebrated.
- (161) W.H. van de Pol observes: "The principal and most characteristic feature of Anglicanism is moderation. That feature must not be sought in Anglicanism's comprehensiveness no matter how much the latter is praised as its strength - or decried as its weakness. This comprehensiveness is a characteristic of later times, although it is connected with the humanistic tendency which was always stronger in the Anglican churches than in the Reformed and Lutheran churches. At bottom, however, this comprehensiveness is the spiritual offspring of the latitudinarianism that arose in the seventeenth century and the liberalism and

rationalism of the eighteenth century which were connected with the latter .... As late as the eighteenth century, the Church of England tried to maintain a certain uniformity, but it was not able to prevent later currents such as Methodism and Anglo-Catholicism from acquiring permanent recognition even till our own times. It is principally to this fact that Anglicanism owes its present comprehensiveness". (Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective (1965), p 26).

- (162) The Integrity of Anglicanism, (1978) pp 6 - 7.
- (163) ibid, pp 85 and 61.
- (164) ibid, p 87.
- (165) ibid, pp 11 - 23; cp p 25 above; G.L. Prestige op. cit. p 411 and I.T. Ramsey, On Being Sure in Religion (1963) p 49 ff.
- (166) William Temple "Comprehensiveness" in Religious Experience (1958 ) pp91-5, and Catholicity (1947).
- (167) Thomas Hubbard Vail, The Comprehensive Church (1841); See D.H. Yoder, 'Christian Unity in Nineteenth Century America' in Rouse and Neill, op. cit., p 248 ff. My attention was drawn to these North American writings by John G. Huber in his unpublished thesis The Principle of Comprehension as an Ecumenical Context for Christian Unity within Diversity (Berkeley, California, 1972).
- (168) Irving H. Bartlett, "Bushnell, Cousin and Comprehensive Christianity", Journal of Religion, Vol XXXVII (April 1957) p 101 ff.
- (169) Freedom and the Spirit (1977) pp 81 - 92; The Dynamic Element in the Church (1964) pp 71 - 77.
- (170) e.g. P.D.L. Avis, "Polarity and Pluriformity in the Church" in King's Theological Review, Vol 111/2 (1981) pp 55 - 64; J.I. Packer, A Kind of Noah's Ark (1981).
- (171) e.g. C. Simonson, The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement (1972).
- (172) L.C. 1878 p 83.
- (173) ibid, p 86.
- (174) L.C. 1908, pp 433 - 4.
- (175) L.C. 1920, p 275 - 8.
- (176) J.G. Simpson (ed.) The Lambeth Joint Report on Church Unity (1923) pp 1 - 41.
- (177) ibid, p 24.
- (178) ibid, pp 82 - 3.

- (179) L.C. 1930, pp 113 - 4.
- (180) The report went on to urge Anglican schools of thought to "promote understanding and appreciation" (p 122). This request especially reflects an internal crisis in the Church of England. The rise of 'Modernism' had led to the establishing of the Archbishops' Doctrine Commission which eventually reported in 1938. The report was never discussed by a Lambeth Conference.
- (181) L.C. 1948, Part I, p 22.
- (182) L.C. 1948, Part II, pp 50 - 1.
- (183) The above statement concludes with the warning that "no scheme of union can come to a successful issue, which does not take account of and preserve the comprehensiveness of the Anglican tradition" (p 51). But the Anglican tradition of comprehensiveness must be vindicated before that sort of confidence is justified.
- (184) It is this difference between general good-will and specific evasiveness that has marred Anglican ecumenical efforts e.g. C.S.I. It has given grounds for the complaint that Anglicans start unity discussions - and then end them. e.g. A.T. Hanson, Beyond Anglicanism (1965) pp 27 - 47. For a measured comment see S.C. Neill Anglicanism (1977) p 404.
- (185) L.C. 1968, p 140. cf Sykes, op. cit., p 9 ff. Professor Sykes sees this statement as a "rather confused weaving together of three strands which end in a state of happy.. Anglican euphoria" Instead of being seen as an unsuccessful attempt to combine three separate arguments, it can equally be seen as an attempt to present one argument with two corollaries - in the manner expounded below.
- (186) In "Loci Communes" (1551), E.T. by Clyde Manschrek (ed), Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine (1965) p 308 ff. The medieval precedent on which this is based is discussed by Y. Congar, Tradition and Traditions (1966), p 503 ff. and the entry "Adiaphora" in The Catholic Encyclopedia.  
A parallel usage is advanced by Calvin in his discussion of the destiny of the soul at death. No answer to this question is possible he argues, and so differences of opinion should be tolerated in the church - "provided it retain sound and unimpaired that doctrine in which the safety of piety consists" (La doctrine principale de nostre salut) Institutes of the Christian Religion iv, i, 12.
- (187) W.P. Haugaard, Elizabeth and the English Reformation (1968) pp 97 and 244; pp 209 - 232.
- (188) e.g. Ecclesiastical Policy, III, iii, 2.
- (189) L. Allen, John Henry Newman and the Abbé Jager (1975) pp 33 - 41; 63 - 73; 83 - 93; 109 - 116; and 173 - 182.

- (190) The 1968 Conference's paragraph continues by stating that Anglicanism applauds the wisdom of Gamaliel and is alarmed by the Church's hasty condemnations in the past. It concludes by quoting Milner White and W.L. Knox with approbation: "The only authority in the Catholic Church which can ultimately preserve the truth is the power of the Holy Ghost to lead theologians in the end to a true understanding of the faith" (One God and Father of All (1929) p 100) ibid, p 141.
- (191) In one of his first published articles E.L. Mascall complained of the difficulty faced by Anglicans at ecumenical meetings. "It is a common experience at such meetings that, while non-Anglicans are able to present a coherent statement of the teaching of their churches on any given matter, the Anglicans present are usually reduced to inventing a theory which will include the various non-Anglican positions and which they then dignify with the title of 'the Anglican view'. This can hardly be justified by saying that the Anglican Communion is a bridge Church" ("The Future of Anglican Theology", in Theology xxxix/234 (1939) p 411. This was one of a number of articles concerned with the character of Anglicanism, published by the journal during and after the Second World War.
- (192) "From Anglican Symbiosis to Anglican Synthesis" in The Anglican Synthesis ed. W.R.F. Browning, (1964) p 147. de Mendieta pursued a path first opened up by O.C. Quick (Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity (1924) of seeking to combine a Catholic emphasis on the fulness with a Protestant one on the purity of Christian faith. cp. de Mendieta Anglican Vision (1971) where this is carried to greater lengths, and also F.J. Leenhardt, Catholic and Protestant : Two biblical faiths (1964).
- (193) op. cit., p 62.
- (194) Compare the 1968 L.C. statement (p 141 above) with Rahner's treatment of conflict over doctrine. He sees the shared tradition imposing the need for toleration upon theologians and at the same time providing the Church with the strength to tolerate self criticism. In the end it is whether or not theology is self-critical for the Church, whether its questions come from within or without, that determines its legitimacy (Meditations on Freedom and the Spirit, pp 98 - 107).
- (195) Christian Unity and Christian Diversity (1975), pp 34 - 6.
- (196) Systematic Theology (1968) Vol III, p 245.
- (197) F.L. Cross, Darwell Stone (1943) p 245.
- (198) This use of Bushnell's typology is of course suggested by a sequence of publications concerning episcopacy since World War II. The Apostolic Ministry, ed. K.E. Kirk (1946) presented a strong statement on the necessity of episcopacy. This was countered by J.C. Neill (ed)

The Christian Ministry (1947) and N. Sykes, Old Priest New  
Presbyter (1956) which emphasised the utility of the office.  
(Sykes was in turn criticised by A.L. Peck, Anglicanism and  
Episcopacy (1958) etc). In 1954, K.M. Carey edited The  
Historic Episcopate, which sought to overcome the impasse  
by proposing that episcopacy would help the fulness of the  
Church. This dialectic, characterised by the tags, esse,  
bene esse, plene esse, provided the backdrop for several  
recent Lambeth conference discussions, although the details  
of the literary debate need not concern us here.

(199) The Church of England and the Church of Christ (1930), ch 4.

(200) N. Sykes, op. cit., p 237 ff.

## CHAPTER 4 : ANGLICAN AUTHORITY

- (1) L.C. 1978, p 122.
- (2) His own conviction was that a solution lay in the consultative arrangements between the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates (ibid., pp 123 - 4).
- (3) ibid., pp 98 - 99.
- (4) ibid., p 100.
- (5) The distinctions between agreement in confessions, unity of structure and federations of a more comprehensive kind have been well-drawn in Lutheran-Roman Catholic ecumenical conversations. See "Guidelines for Ecumenical Encounter" in Lutheran World 17/1 (1970) pp 43 - 58; Harding Meyer "Confessional Identity and Christian Unity" in Consensus: A Canadian Lutheran Journal of Theology, 2/4 (1976) pp 3 - 12. Anglican ideas of "intercommunion" would have benefitted if they had been carried out in joint discussions with Catholics and Lutherans.
- (6) L.C. 1920, Encyclical Letter, p 14.
- (7) L.C. 1930, p 153. The report will be further considered, p 213 ff below.
- (8) L.C. 1930, p 154. The last sentence need not just be pious optimism. T.S. Eliot, in the monograph referred to earlier, remarked that he did not have great expectations of any individual bishop but that 200 of them together should be able to spot the most obvious nonsense - and they may stimulate each other to real wisdom.
- (9) Gray, Archbishop of Capetown, had hoped that Lambeth would convene as a General Council (A.M.G. Stephenson, The First Lambeth Conference 1867 (1968) p 81) and the South African Provincial constitution still bears traces of that ambition (See p192 etc below). Any such aspirations were laid to rest by the 1878 Conference which acknowledged that the summoning of an ecumenical council was "unhappily but obviously impossible" (L.C. 1878, p 83).
- (10) "The Development of the Lambeth Conference", Theology, Vol Li/336 (June 1948) p 207.
- (11) So the Punch satire on the 1867 Conference:  
 "To grow an Ox the Frog did blow  
 Himself in vain to bursting full;  
 And Canterbury does just so  
 Trying to match the Papal Bull".  
 A.M.G. Stephenson "The First Lambeth Conference and 'Punch'"  
Church Quarterly Review (Jan.-March 1959) pp 99 - 105.

- (12) It will be remembered that many of the bishops themselves refused to attend the Conference because of apprehensions about its supposed pretensions.
- (13) A.M.G. Stephenson, op. cit., (1967) p 17 ff.
- (14) ibid., p 309 ff.
- (15) L.C. 1867, p 63.
- (16) Stephenson, op. cit., (1967) 257 ff and 309 ff. The Americans found this an impossible suggestion, but did not deny the British colonial churches the freedom so to act if they wished.
- (17) The question was already troubling some in England as well as the colonies. Stephenson, op. cit., (1967) p 310.
- (18) Christian History in the Making (1946) p 324. In this he was simply paraphrasing a judgment of L.C. 1930, p 174.
- (19) L.C. 1878, p 88.
- (20) Australia and the West Indies had already done so. (cp L.C. 1888, p 151).
- (21) L.C. 1888, p 113.
- (22) L.C. 1897, Encyclical Letter p 187.
- (23) Its formation had been initially left to the Archbishop of Canterbury (L.C. 1897, Resolution 5, p 199) and the committee first reported in 1908. (L.C. 1908, p 416 ff).
- (24) L.C. 1908, p 418 and 419.
- (25) This represents a considerable measure of progress. When the 1st Conference met, synods were new to all the Churches and still illegal for some of them.
- (26) Admittedly the Lambeth procedure symbolises the consent and association of bishops alone.
- (27) L.C. 1920, Encyclical Letter, p 14.
- (28) The Nature and Functions of Authority (1939) p 1.
- (29) Stephenson, op. cit., (1968) p 257.
- (30) L.C. 1867, Resolution IV, p 54.
- (31) In a memorandum which was influential for the 1930 Conference, E.J. Palmer reflected:  
 "It was a fortunate accident that fear of treading on other peoples' toes made those who inaugurated the Lambeth Conferences tread the true path of ecumenical constitutionalism" (The Anglican Communion: its ideal and future (re item IV (a))(1930) p 7.) See p215 below.
- (32) L.C. 1867, pp 70 - 1.

- (33) L.C. 1878, pp 84, 101.
- (34) L.C. 1888, 149 - 80. Commendatory provisions were first discussed in 1867. (L.C. 1867, Resolution II, p 54.)
- (35) L.C. 1897, pp 187 - 8. Overseas metropolitans had been reluctantly conceded the title of Archbishop in 1888 (p 150).
- (36) ibid., p 188.
- (37) ibid., p 187; cp L.C. 1920, Resolution 43, pp 37 - 38.
- (38) L.C. 1897, pp 236 - 7.
- (39) The Nippon Sei Kokwai was founded in 1866. Other 'American' Provinces were soon to be formed in 'Corea', parts of China and West Africa. See H. Lowther Clarke, Constitutional Church Government (1924), loc. cit.
- (40) L.C. 1930, p 158.
- (41) L.C. 1930, pp 157 - 163.
- (42) L.C. 1948, Pt II, pp 88 - 94; also Encyclical Letter, Pt I, p 23 and Resolutions 78 - 88 (Pt I, pp 46 - 8).
- (43) The relationship established between autonomous Provinces will be discussed with the 1930 Conference report in the third section of this chapter (p 212 ff below), while more recent developments for inter-Anglican co-operation will be treated in Chapter 5.
- (44) L.C. 1978, p 122; cf A.M.G. Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (1978) p 100 ff, G.K.A. Bell, Randall Davidson (1938) p 300 ff.
- (45) Although it had been discussed (by Gray) at the first Conference and actively promoted in 1878 (Stephenson, op. cit., (1978) pp 38, 52 - 54.
- (46) L.C. 1908, pp 418 - 9.
- (47) L.C. 1930, Resolution 56(b) p 58.
- (48) L.C. 1948, Pt II, p 83.
- (49) 1968, p 142.
- (50) 1978, p 98. This reinstatement of a concept of primacy in 1968 (see note 49 above) and 1978 will be discussed, p 236 below.
- (51) G.K.A. Bell, op. cit., Vol, I, p 444. Davidson provided a similar application to world mission in his opening address at Edinburgh Conference (1910) cf ibid, p 574.
- (52) Carpenter quotes (without citing his source) Davidson again regarding this "His authority if we can call it so is almost universally recognised, but it is undefined; it is moral

not legal, and its effective exercise depends in no small degree upon the personal weight, tact and courtesy of the Primate ... any assumption of a definite authority and right to interfere, would probably result in a speedy diminution of his opportunities". S.J. Carpenter, Cantuar; the Archbishops and their office, (1971) pp 340 - 1.

- (53) cf A.C. Benson The Life of Edward White Benson (1900) Vol ii, p 557. Benson's admiration for Cyprian led to his conviction that the problems of the 3rd century were still being solved in the 19th. (Vol ii, p 677 ff.) For Lightfoot and Westcott's proposal see Carpenter, op. cit. p 363 ff, and for a similar suggestion which was rejected by Lang, see J.G. Lockhart Cosmo Gordon Lang (1949) pp 329 - 30.
- (54) (E.G. Sandford ed.) Memoirs of Archbishop Temple by seven Friends (1906) Vol ii, p 246 etc.
- (55) Bell, op. cit., Vol i, p 391.
- (56) In this it is necessary to dissent from Carpenter who describes Davidson as the "last Victorian": in many ways he must be the first modern, and Lang (and even Fisher) seem more Victorian than him.
- (57) See Henson's strictures on the subject, Retrospect on an Unimportant Life, ii, pp 183 and 203.
- (58) Temple of course never chaired a Conference.
- (59) Literally so in the case of Lambeth Palace, while in the Church of England "the most absorbing and all embracing topic of my whole episcopate" was Canon Law revision. W. Purcell, Fisher of Lambeth (1969) pp 206 - 9.
- (60) Some reference is made to his efforts at the 1968 Conference (p 242 below), and see D.L. Edwards "The Gospel and the English Church" in C. Martin (ed.) Great Christian Centuries to Come (1974).
- (61) The committee report is found in L.C. 1888, pp 170 - 175.
- (62) ibid., Encyclical letter, pp 116 - 7.
- (63) The committee however did recognise with gratitude that the Articles were "for the most part accurate in their language and moderate in their definitions". (ibid., p 174).
- (64) ibid., p 117. See also Resolution 19, p 124.
- (65) See p 242 ff below.
- (66) It must be admitted that until 1968, it was usually presumed that the Articles would be bound with the Prayer Book however.
- (67) See R.C.D. Jasper, Prayer Book Revision in England, 1800-1900. (1954) pp 1 - 5, where reference is made to A.E. Peaston, The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the 18th Century (1940).

- (68) L.C. 1867, Resolution VIII, p 56.
- (69) ibid., p 61.
- (70) L.C. 1878, p 94.
- (71) L.C. 1888, Encyclical Letter p 117. This concession was granted in the same context as the refusal to impose 39 Articles, as noted above.
- (72) L.C. 1888, p 152.
- (73) 1888, p 121. Note that even here, the rights and responsibilities of Provincial autonomy are being preserved.
- (74) L.C. 1888, p 173.
- (75) L.C. 1897, p 189. It must be remembered that this Encyclical was largely the work of one man, Temple, and the committee report (pp 271 - 275) showed considerably more interest in the possibilities of adaptation than the Encyclical reflected.
- (76) L.C. 1908, p 307.
- (77) L.C. 1908, pp 382 - 7.
- (78) L.C. 1908, Resolution 24, p 322.
- (79) L.C. 1920, Resolution 36, p 36.
- (80) L.C. 1920, pp 87 - 8.
- (81) The 1930 Conference simply reiterated the resolutions from 10 years earlier (L.C. 1930, p 162); the 1948 Conference spoke of the Prayer Book as Anglicanism's main "bond of unity" and urged caution that revision be "in accordance with the doctrine and accepted liturgical worship of the Anglican Communion". (L.C. 1948, Resolution 78(a), Part I, p 46).
- (82) L.C. 1958, Part II, p 79.
- (83) L.C. 1958, Part II, pp 80 - 1.
- (84) L.C. 1978, p 99.
- (85) L.C. 1978, p 99.
- (86) L.C. 1948, Pt II, p 84. The whole Committee report is found on pp 82 - 94 and the present discussion, entitled "The Meaning and Unity of the Anglican Communion" is on pp 84 - 6.
- (87) Timothy Daykin's, Unpublished Thesis Authority in Liberal Catholic Anglicanism (Durham, 1980) - to which I am indebted at this point - makes the case that the Lux Mundi group represented "Liberal catholicism" in the Church of England, and that the next generation of Rawlinson et al. were neo-Liberal Catholics. But in fact this group too changed its methods (from metaphysical to more historical apologetics), and so it is perhaps not unfair to refer to the whole movement under the single heading of "liberal-catholic".

- (88) A.E.J. Rawlinson's "Authority as a Ground of Belief" in E.G. Selwyn (ed.) Essays, Catholic and Critical (1926) pp 94 - 5, and more completely in Authority and Freedom (1924). The ideas of Liberal Catholicism were popularised by W.L. Knox and A.P. Vidler, The Gospel of God and the Authority of the Church (1937)  
 e.g. "The infallible utterance of an oracular church, the infallible certainty of the guidance of a group by the Holy Spirit, or even a quaint return to the doctrine of the letter of the Scriptures - these are forms of authority which seek to commend themselves at the present day" (p 67)  
 Oracular ideas of authority must be rejected because they always need interpretation; because they lack the possibility of empirical verification; and mainly (it was argued) because of the personal nature of Christian revelation.
- (89) T.G. Rogers (ed.) Liberal Evangelicalism : an interpretation (1923); L. Hickin "Liberal Evangelicals in the Church of England", Church Quarterly Review Vol clxix ( 1968 ) pp 43 - 54. The right to the title of "evangelical" has not been undisputed. The "liberal evangelicals" were the most visible claimants, but others dissented from them. The main alternative line of this tradition is seen in the publication The Fullness of Christ (1948), an evangelical response to Catholicity (1947). By then the current growth (and fragmentation) of contemporary evangelicalism had begun (See Note 90, below).
- (90) The lineage of Anglican evangelism is not straightforward: J. King, The Evangelicals ( 1969 ) has suggested that there are at least twelve modern 'schools' of evangelicals - most of which are represented in the Anglican Communion. It is true to say that the current strength of evangelicalism, especially within the Church of England, has developed on independent lines and has only recently begun to express ecclesiological interests.
- (91) The full impact of Liberal Catholicism as such was cut short by the second World-war, after which the discussion of Anglicanism was largely concerned with the impact of Barthian theology. See William Temple, "Theology Today" in Theology Vol xxxix/233 (1939) p 326 ff, and the essays which responded to it in successive issues and again after the War.
- (92) As a commentary on this section it is possible to cite Rawlinson in words which follow a paragraph quoted previously regarding the rejection of oracular claims.  
 "This does not of course mean that the authority either of the Bible, or of the Church, or of the Ecumenical documents and Councils has ceased to be real. It means only that such authority is no longer to be taken in an oracular sense, and that the final authority is not anything which is either mechanical or merely external, but is rather the intrinsic and self-evidencing authority of truth. It means that authority as such can never be ultimately its own guarantee, that the claims of a legitimate authority must always be in the last resort verifiable claims. The

final appeal is to the spiritual, intellectual and historical content of divine revelation, as verifiable at the three-fold bar of history, reason and spiritual experience"  
op. cit., p 95.

- (93) E.C. Rich, Spiritual Authority in the Church of England (1953) for instance provides a thorough investigation of the English Church's slide into "post Kantian relativity". His own discomfort (p ix), and his search for an "ultimate authority who can speak for the whole body" and provide "inerrancy in interpretation" of the faith (p 183 ff), is based upon a notion of authority which is imperial rather than functional. He is concerned to uphold the "glory" of Anglican comprehensiveness as a safeguard against excesses, but is thereby condemned to find an appropriate organ by which to judge between them. His final solution comes close to Newman's. (p 195).
- (94) This pastoral as well as academic note is sounded in the report when it seeks to commend the idea of authority for its suppleness and elasticity. "The variety of the contributing factors gives to it a quality of richness which encourages and releases initiative, trains in fellowship, and evokes a free and willing obedience".
- (95) "I go to authority because reason sends me to it: reason tells me to check my reasoning with the wise - and to doubt my reasoning if theirs differs from it".  
 L. Andrews.
- (96) Cited from Doctrine in the Church of England (1938) p 35.
- (97) Essays in Christian Philosophy (1930), pp 130 - 1, 148, 156.
- (98) The Pattern of Christian Truth (1954), pp 476 - 7.
- (99) "How is the Church maintained in the Truth? An Anglican Answer". Forthcoming contribution to a Concilium series.
- (100) The Anglican Revival (1933) p 180 ff.
- (101) "If then, one important aspect of the evolution of orthodoxy lay in the cross-fertilization of independent theological traditions, we can penetrate nearer to the heart of the matter by describing the whole process as the product of Catholic thinking, the Working out by the whole Church of the implications of her common subject matter".  
 H.E.W. Turner, op. cit., p 477 (emphasis mine).
- (102) Constitutional Church Government in the Dominion Beyond the seas and in other parts of the Anglican Communion (1924).
- (103) "The Law and Constitutions of the Church Overseas" in The Mission of the Anglican Communion, ed. E.R. Morgan and R. Lloyd (1948), pp 74 - 98.
- (104) Spencer Ervin (1886 - 1967) was an associate of President Truman, and wrote on legal subjects as well as some devotional books. After his retirement he began to take

an interest in Anglican canon law. In this field he completed: Some deficiencies in the Canon Law of the American Episcopal Church (1961); An Introduction to Anglican Polity (1964). The Polity of the Church of Ireland (1965); The Polity of the Church of the Province of South Africa (1965); The Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Anglican Church in Canada (1967); The Development of the Synodical System in the Anglican Church of Canada (1969).

(105) L.C. 1978, p 98.

(106) The constitutional material available for reference in the Anglican Consultative Council and Lambeth Palace archives at the time of this study was as follows:

Church of England in Australia	: revision to 1978
Episcopal Church in Brazil	: - (American survey of Church, 1961)
Church of the Province Burma	: -
Anglican Church of Canada	: revision to 1960
Chung Kua Sheng Kung Hui (China)	: 1912 constitution
Church of the Province Central Africa	: 1969 constitution
Church of the Province Indian Ocean	: 1969
Church of Ireland	: 1878 revision
Japan Holy Catholic Church	: 1971 "
Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East	: 1978 constitution
Church of the Province Kenya	: 1970 "
Church of the Province Melanesia	: 1973 "
Church of the Province Nigeria	: 1977 draft constitution
Church of the Province New Zealand	: (revisions to 1978)
Anglican Church of Papua New Guinea	: n.d.
Episcopal Church in Scotland	: revisions to 1972
Church of the Province South Africa	: 1970
Anglican Council of S. America	: Draft constitution 1980
Council of the Church of E. Asia	: 1966 constitution
Province of the Episcopal Church of the Sudan	: 1979 constitution
Church of the Province Tanzania	: 1970 constitution
Church of the Province Uganda, Ruanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire	: 1972 constitution
Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.	: 1979 revisions
Church in Wales	: 1972 revisions
Church of the Province W. Africa	: 1970 constitution
Church of the Province W. Indies	: 1959 constitution
<u>Extra-provincial dioceses:</u> W. Malaysia (1970) Korea (1965) Bermuda (1900) Gibraltar (1971)	

(107) For the purpose of this discussion regional provinces are given the lower case, while Provinces which are autonomous Churches are capitalised.

(108) To further confuse the terminology, South America is a Province which is called a Council!

- (109) In the case of Scotland, recent synodical decisions have shown that nothing in the constitution is incapable of revision: but a differentiation is made between things which are comparatively difficult, fairly difficult, and fairly easy to change.
- (110) This formula, it will be remembered, is derived from the Preamble of the first Lambeth Conference (See p 79 above).
- (111) L.C. 1978, p 98.
- (112) A list of such provisions was included in the report, Church and State (1970) pp 88 - 98. A full record of all legislation applicable is found in Halsbury's Laws of England.
- (113) An Introduction to English Canon Law (1967) pp 53 - 4.
- (114) L.C. 1930, pp 152 - 163.
- (115) "Declaratory Articles concerning the Faith, Life and Constitution of the Church of the Province of India, Burma and Ceylon", as appended to The Constitution, Canons and Rules of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (1926) - a work of 327 pages. This document, reputedly drafted under the influential advice of Professor C.H. Turner, gave a very clear exposition of the rights of national churches. It was not discussed in the previous section because today it is only operative, in attenuated form, in the extra-Provincial diocese of Colombo.
- (116) "Proceedings of the 1930 Lambeth Conference" (10 July), p 280 ff.
- (117) Retrospect of an Unimportant Life (1942) Vol I, p 277. cp p 261.
- (118) Entitled, "Minutes of Committee IV: the Anglican Communion"; and also two Sub-committee minutes on "The Ideal and Future of the Anglican Communion" (iv, a) and "The Organisation of the Anglican Communion" (iv, b)
- (119) It did also provide some useful clarification in the definition of a Province.
- (120) In the official record, Palmer's name is asterisked as not attending any meeting since he was apparently fully occupied with the Unity committee's work. See L.C. 1930, p 152.
- (121) The preliminary paper was entitled The Anglican Communion: its ideal and future (A private paper issued on Agenda IV a). Palmer amplified his written remarks in an address which immediately followed Donaldson's, on Thursday 10th July (see Proceedings).
- (122) subtitled A short study of the History, Principles and Prospects of the Anglican Communion (1931).
- (123) Palmer's life-long interest in the subject can be seen from the fact that he had written a similar paper for the 1908 Pan-Anglican Congress (for which he had been study organiser). Equally interesting are his changes of thinking in that period. In 1908 he commended the centralised authority of a patriarchal oligarchy. In this matter his experience in India plainly counted.

- (124) The Anglican Communion, pp 4 - 5.
- (125) Cited from Spiritual Letters (1898), p 207.
- (126) L.C. 1930, p 153. The danger of a nation identifying itself with the Kingdom of God, or the church being absorbed in the state, became evident during the 30's. Later implications are drawn by K. Barth, Letters to British Christians (1941).
- (127) ibid., p 162.
- (128) When Palmer was first faced with the problem of drafting the Indian Church's constitution he first researched The Bible and Synods (1913) and later commissioned a detailed study of Anglican constitutions and the role of laymen throughout the Communion. This report, Notes on the Laity, was never published as such but helped form his convictions concerning the need for genuine mutuality throughout the whole Church. He was also in constant correspondence with colleagues in England, especially Professor C.H. Turner whose 7 volume Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima (1899-1930) provided the sources of Latin Canon Law and organisation on which the Indian constitution was built.
- (129) For Palmer the phrase suggested not only catholicity of order but also of jurisdiction - a single ministerial authority for the whole Church. Palmer's conviction regarding the homogeneity of church-ministry and sacraments without it becoming mechanical in form also seems to have been learnt from Turner. e.g. "The Apostolic Succession" in H.B. Swete (ed.) Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry (1918) p 196.
- (130) The Anglican Communion, p 7.
- (131) Proceedings (Saturday 2 Aug) p 96 ff.
- (132) See Retrospect II, pp 171 - 2: there is also an extremely interesting correspondence with Davidson on pp 231 - 2 concerning his change of mind. cp "The Transformation of the Established Church" in The Church of England (Cambridge; C.U.P., 1939) pp 208 - 228.
- (133) An instructive comparison can be drawn between the writings of Mandel Creighton, The Church and the Nation, (a stalwart defender of the traditional theory) and William Temple, Church and Nation (1915). Christianity and the state (1928). Christianity and Social Order (1942).
- (134) This not only indicates that episcopal office is to be exercised constitutionally rather than hierarchically, but also gives room for development of presbyterian and congregational elements in Anglicanism as well.
- (135) Though see Report: "If ever in the days to come a council of the whole Church were to be called together, it would be assembled on a plan of autonomy and fellowship similar to that which is the basis of our Conference today". L.C. 1930, p 155.

- (136) cf T. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962) and its discussion.
- (137) This is surveyed in the third section of C.J. Femmer's unpublished Ph.D. thesis The Concept and theological significance of Ecumenical Councils in the Anglican tradition (Washington D.C., 1974).
- (138) Presumably he meant The Constitution and Law of the Church in the first two centuries (1910), which had been translated into English by H.D.A. Major.
- (139) Proceedings, (Saturday 2 August) pp 134 - 5.
- (140) Harnack proposes as a rule of history: any society struggling for dominion, competes with and dispossesses alternative societies! (p 41) Limited legislative powers increase the severity of those it does possess - mental, moral, priestly rules become increasingly authoritarian (pp 169 - 170).
- (141) Harnack may even have allowed that the local and universal dimensions met in a Provincial one, in that the apostles appear to concentrate on Provincial capitals as the centre of mission.
- (142) i.e. William Chauncey Einhardt, The Nature of the Anglican Communion, who declared the 1930 report to bear the noblest expression of the mission of national Church since Pentecost (p 5)! "In the providential ordering of the affairs of the Church militant, the insular Church of the British Isles has been led, step by step, to an unique and challenging leadership in the trend towards the recovery of the Church Universal" (p 12).
- (143) Proceedings, (Saturday 2 August) p 137 ff.
- (144) L.C. 1930, Resolution 49, p 55.
- (145) viz Article 19, Article 37, and Article 21.
- (146) An instructive example of this is found in the report of several South American dioceses, Regional Episcopacy (1969). In this emphasis is placed upon the Lambeth Quadrilateral's commitment to "the Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church" to resist the expectations of leadership imposed on the Church by English and American Anglicans it is particularly interesting because the Church in South America has been able to plan its development from first principles since 1958, and because from the first it has sought a "legitimate Chilean expression of Anglicanism" (p 8).
- (147) S.F. Baines, the first Executive Officer of the Anglican Communion repeatedly refused to allow Anglicanism to be identified as a World Confessional Family on the laudable grounds that it was a part of the Holy, Catholic Church (See An Anglican Turning Point (1964)). In effect though he stifled the development of Anglican studies at a time when they were drastically needed.

- (148) The attitude is still evident, as seen in a recent dismissal of John Robinson's defence of the Anglican ethos - "There is no such thing as Anglicanism" (Theology, Vol Lxxxiv/701 (1981) p 372).
- (149) e.g. H. Jedin, Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church (1961) pp 1 - 12.
- (150) Structures of the Church (1965) p 18.
- (151) ibid., p 19.
- (152) ibid., p 98.
- (153) ibid., p 222.
- (154) H. Vorgrimler, Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II (1967) pp 196 - 197.
- (155) Dogmatic Constitution of the Church (1965) 111, 22. K ng remarked that this whole section of the Constitution lacked a fundamental grounding in history and exegesis, and concentrated upon defending a historical form of ministry rather than exposing its underlying essence. The Church (1968) pp 419 - 20
- (156) This fact makes even more regrettable Lambeth's failure to include bishops from other national churches (e.g. C.S.I., C.N.I. etc) and even from those churches in "full Communion" with Anglicans among those invited to attend recent conferences. The significance of the so-called Wider Episcopal Fellowship is an important issue for future Anglican development.
- (157) See M.A. Hutchinson's thesis, Obedience as a theme in the documents of the second Vatican Council (Durham, 1981).
- (158) Councils and the Ecumenical Movement (1968) p 11.
- (159) e.g. Churches in Conciliar Fellowship (1978).
- (160) John Deschner "Visible Unity as Conciliar Fellowship" in Breaking Barriers (1975).
- (161) L.C. 1978, p 5.
- (162) For the prospects of and preparation for a Council during Elizabeth's reign, see W.P. Haugaard, Elizabeth and the English Reformation (1968), pp 292 - 302; also, W.B. Patterson, "King James I's call for an Ecumenical Council" in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker (eds.) Councils and Assemblies (1971) p 267 ff.
- (163) Ref. Leg. Ecc c, xiv. This redrafting of the Canon Law (though never legally binding) was carried out by the same body who wrote the 42 Articles of 1553 and therefore provides a useful comment on the Articles as they evolved.

- (164) Such a principle also silences disputes about whether 4 or 6 (or, 19 or 20) Councils are to be recognised by the Church. It is not the make-up of the Council but its teaching which is decisive.
- (165) A.R.C.I.C., Authority in the Church Para. 22. This notion has also been given credence by recent Lambeth references to primacy e.g. L.C. 1968, p 137, and L.C. 1978, p 104, although neither the idea of the "collegiality of bishops" nor the Archbishop of Canterbury as an "acknowledged focus of unity" have yet received an Anglican explication.
- (166) cf. p 163 ff above.
- (167) The idea of equipoise is gained from J.A. Møhler who spoke of the two extremes of egoism in the Church, "namely when everybody or when one individual wants to be all .... Only all can be all .... This is the idea of the Catholic Church". Møhler influenced Kùng (Structures of the Church, p 285) and indeed the development of Catholic ecclesiology up to the publication of Mystici Corporis (1944) (See Philip J. Rosato "Between Christocentrism and Pneumatocentrism: an interpretation of James Adam Møhler's ecclesiology", The Heythrop Journal XIX/1 (1978), pp 46 - 70.
- (168) On this point, See K. Barth, C.D. I/2/p566 ff for the sole primacy of the Word of God: but for the congregationalist implications of that position cp "The Church - the living congregation of the Living Lord Jesus Christ", a paper prepared for the inaugural meeting of the W.C.C. in The Universal Church in God's Design (1948), pp 67 - 76.
- (169) Cardinal Ratzinger's letter which greeted the final report of A.R.C.I.C. would appear to bear out this contention. The Anglican expectation was expressed by A.M. Ramsey: "It seems possible that in the reunited church of the future there may be a special place for a primus inter pares as an organ of unity and authority. Peter will be needed as well as Paul and Apollos, and like them will be chastened and repentant". The Gospel and the Catholic Church (1937), pp 233-4.
- (170) "Lambeth Conference 1978: A brief analysis by the Secretary", in Anglican Information, 20 (November, 1978), pp 3 - 7.

## CHAPTER 5 : RENEWAL IN FAITH, UNITY AND MISSION.

- (1) This analysis of a first and second "phase" in Anglican development is supported by Bishop J.W. Howe, who as much as anyone has been the architect of contemporary Anglican organisation. See A.C.C. - 4 (1979) p 72.
- (2) They are listed, L.C. 1968 p 151 ff.
- (3) A.M. Ramsey (ed.) Lambeth Essays on Faith (1969); Lambeth Essays on Ministry (1969); Lambeth Essays on Unity (1969).
- (4) The previous reference to the Articles (when Provinces had been released from obligatory acceptance of them) was in 1888. L.C. 1888, pp 117; 124; 154; 173 - 4.
- (5) See p 200 above.
- (6) This was especially so in the light of the fact that as the Book of Common Prayer had increasingly fallen into desuetude, the Articles were possibly becoming a more universal yardstick in the Anglican Communion.
- (7) Minutes of the Lambeth Consultative Body (Jerusalem, April 1966) p 19.
- (8) Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine op. cit. (1968) p 17.
- (9) ibid., ch 5. An interesting comparison may be drawn with the treatment of Assent in an earlier Doctrine Commission report Doctrine in the Church of England (1938) pp 36 - 9, with its disputed attempt to distinguish between personal opinion and received teaching of the sixteenth century.
- (10) quoted J.B. Simpson and E.M. Storey, The Long Shadow of Lambeth X (1969), p 145.
- (11) op. cit., p 74.
- (12) e.g. Doctrine Commission of the Church of England Christian Believing: the Nature of the Christian Faith and its expression in Holy Scripture and Creeds (1976) and Believing in the Church: The Corporate Nature of Faith (1982).  
The English approach contrasts interestingly with that of the Americans, who began a parallel process with a revision of the Catechism but have not carried this through to the Ordinal or the form of assent. cp. Wolf, Spirit of Anglicanism (1981) pp 185 - 6.
- (13) The Lambeth Conference 1968: Transcript of tape recordings of the plenary sessions, Vol II (Saturday 24 August) p 522 ff.
- (14) L.C. 1968, pp 40 - 41. Consistent with the direction of this whole discussion, the Resolution was printed under the heading of "Ministry" rather than "Faith".

- (15) Simpson and Storey, op. cit., p 147.
- (16) L.C. 1963, pp 82 - 3.
- (17) This ascription is supported by a notification in the Transcript (21 August) that the Section report was being re-drafted by Dr Noel Davey of the S.P.C.K. with a prologue by the Bishop of Durham. It seems likely that he added an "epilogue" too. Earlier, criticism of the draft report (Transcript Vol I (7 August)) - which included a request by Athenagoras Constantinople for a clearer statement of the understanding of the Articles - had made the section officers uncertain about offering a report at all.
- (18) See p 176 ff.
- (19) The limitations of the Articles as a contemporary expression of belief are acknowledged even by their stoutest advocates, e.g. the English evangelical spokesman, R.T. Beckwith, "The Articles (like the Creeds) pre-date the scientific revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with its profound significance for the doctrines of creation and providence, and for Christian ethics. They pre-date the rise of the historical approach to the Bible, with its profound significance for the doctrine of biblical inspiration and the practice of biblical interpretation. They pre-date the demand of Anglo-Catholicism that the Middle Ages should be reassessed (and the demand of Modern Roman Catholicism that the Reformation should be)..."  
Confessing the Faith in the Church of England Today, (1981) p 28.
- (20) Again, the fact that war prevented a real appreciation of the Doctrine in the Church of England report (1938) by the Anglican Commission is regrettable. Its aim, "to examine the differences of interpretation current in the Church of England and to elucidate the relations of these one to another" (p 7), still stands in need of being redrawn. (See Believing in the Church, pp 112, 134, 285, 295).
- (21) Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, p 30.
- (22) As examples of these positions the report cites W.P. Matthews The Thirty-nine Articles: a plea for a new statement ... (1961) and D.L. Edwards "One Last Heave" in Modern Churchman, X (January, 1967) p 141 ff on the one side, and D.B. Knox The Thirty-nine Articles (1967) on the other.  
In fact Matthews' plea, as his title suggests, was for the replacement of the Articles not the abolition of a confession, and Knox's concern was at least as much for the "body of divinity" which the Articles represented as it was for the preservation of the document itself. The two approaches are more parallel than antithetical and certainly do not cancel each other out as serious arguments. Presumably these examples were chosen as current contributions to the debate, but closer examination suggests that while the extreme

views which the Commission reported might be entertained within Anglicanism, it is harder to find responsible expositions of them than might be expected.

- (23) Not unexpectedly K. Barth gives criteria for the making of any new confession: the Church must hear the word and recognise its need to respond; the occasion must be urgent enough to risk the disunity which a new confession can bring; the whole Church must speak; all the voices of existing confessions must be heard and retained; an attitude of trust must be present in which the Church can be expected to hear the new confession (Church Dogmatics, I/2, p 585 ff).
- (24) The overt attempt to define Anglican belief without referring to Articles by R.C. Moberly, Doctrinal Standards: two lectures (1898) was influential for the second generation Anglo-Catholic theologians e.g. E.J. Bicknell A Theological Introduction (1919) pp 23 - 5.
- (25) For the debate which actually led to this conclusion, see General Synod, Report of Proceedings, 3 (1972) pp 789 - 804.  
The direction of the discussion was fully consistent with the synod's earlier promulgation of Revised Canons A2 - A5, and also the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 which was embodied in Canons G2 - G4 (See The Canons of the Church of England (1969)). This fact was noted at the time, especially by critics of the Articles.
- (26) A contributor to the recent English Doctrine Commission's report traces these developments in the Church of England and concludes that the "natural sense and meaning" of the Preface and Declaration "is still that the Articles, together with the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal, remain as the standard of declared doctrine in the modern Church of England. If this causes problems, they are problems that the Church has declared that she intends to live with" (Believing in the Church, p 134).
- (27) A.C.C - 3 (1976) p 4.
- (28) Lambeth Conference 1968 : Transcript of tape recordings of the Plenary sessions, Vol I (Saturday 27 July).
- (29) J.S. Wetmore "The Lambeth Quadrilateral Now at Two Levels : or a Gad-fly reports" The Anglican 25/1 (Spring, 1969), p 2.
- (30) ibid, p3 (cp L.C. 1968, p 122).
- (31) Wetmore notes that after the preliminary discussion of principles, the committee adopted a minute recording its conviction that unity would be achieved by seeking consistency with Scripture, when agreement in faith took precedence over matters of practice, and provided that "central statements around which union may develop should avoid requiring commitments to the truths to which those words bear witness".  
This last provision may mean simply that no theological statement is a final expression of the truth it seeks to comprehend, but if on the other hand it suggests that such

statements are to be judged by **their** use in promoting unity rather than truth, then all Faith and Order discussion is vacuous.

- (32) ibid., p 3.
- (33) L.C. 1968, p 123.
- (34) ibid., p 125.
- (35) Lambeth Conference, 1968: Transcript, Vol II (Friday 9 Aug) p 197.
- (36) L.C. 1968, Resolution 44 (pp 41 - 2).
- (37) L.C. 1968, Resolutions 45 - 7 (p 42).
- (38) The report made clear (L.C. 1968, pp 125 - 6) that its terminology was chosen carefully from the Church of Englands report Intercommunion Today (1968), ch 3.
- (39) Transcript, 1968 (Wednesday 21 August) p 308
- (40) Transcript, 1968 (Wednesday 21 August) p 312.
- (41) L.A. Haselmeyer. Lambeth and Unity (1948) p 27 ff.
- (42) J.B. Simpson and E.M. Storey, op. cit., p 281.
- (43) Crockford's Clerical Index (1969) p iv.
- (44) Although these words from the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer are referring directly to liturgical variations, the context makes clear that the well-known principles of "moderation" also applies to doctrinal and organizational affairs.
- (45) Chapter Four, Section 1 above.
- (46) L.C. 1908., p 313.
- (47) Stephenson outlines the programme in Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (1978) pp 112 - 116, and draws attention to E.S. Boshier "The Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908" Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, June 1955, pp 126 - 142.
- (48) Pan-Anglican Congress 1908 : Vol I, General Report (1908) p 1.
- (49) ibid., p 12.
- (50) It will be recalled that Palmer's efforts at the 1908 Congress came to fruition in the report and resolution of the 1930 Conference.
- (51) E.R. Fairweather (ed.) Anglican Congress 1963 : Report of Proceedings (1963) Introduction.
- (52) L.C. 1968., p 145; although the following conference did suggest that another congress might be useful L.C. 1978, p 104.

- (53) S.F. Bayne, Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ (1963). Although M.R.I. was the tangible expression of Anglican fellowship, it did not succeed in breaking down the insularity of inter-church relationships and most of the aid programmes highlighted by the Directory were funded through missionary societies. The 'mutuality' achieved by the project was limited.
- (54) See M.A.C. Warren, Crowded Canvas (1974) p 182
- (55) M.R.I. document had been explicit about this purpose, "Full communion means little if it is taken as a ceremonial symbol, but much if it is understood as an expression of common life".
- (56) The Time is Now : Anglican Consultative Council, First Meeting (1971) p 47.
- (57) Partners in Mission : Anglican Consultative Council, Second Meeting (1973) p 55.
- (58) L.C. 1978 p 100; and See Resolution 15 (p 42).
- (59) A.C.C. - 3, pp 8, 17, 33; A.C.C. - 4, pp 23 - 57.
- (60) For an apologetic on these lines see A.C.C. - 3, pp 55 - 7. For the limited achievement of the consultations, A.C.C. - 2, p ix.
- (61) L.C. 1920, Resolution 44 (pp 38 - 9).
- (62) L.C. 1948, Resolutions 80 - 81 (Part I, p 47) and Part II, pp 88 - 90.
- (63) L.C. 1958 II, p 68 ff: See Resolution 60 (I, 43).
- (64) ibid., II, p 70.
- (65) ibid., II, pp 70 - 1.
- (66) L.C. 1958, Resolution 61 (I, pp 43 - 45).
- (67) L.C. 1958, Resolution 61 (I, pp 43 - 45).
- (68) L.C. 1958, II, p 69.
- (69) Both bodies gave the right of attendance to the Primates and Metropolitans plus representatives of extra-Provincial dioceses selected by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the exercise of his Metropolitan authority. The difference lay only in the provision for alternates - for the A.C.M.S. such may be clerical or lay, but for the L.C.B. they were necessarily bishops.
- (70) L.C. 1968, p 145.
- (71) L.C. 1968, Resolution 66 (pp 46 - 49).
- (72) The larger Provinces were entitled to three representatives - a bishop, clergyman and lay person; the smaller, two - a bishop, plus one clerical or lay member (L.C. 1968, p 49).

- (73) It was also anticipated that the A.C.C. would advise the Archbishop of Canterbury regarding plans for future Lambeth Conferences: L.C. 1968, p 145 (cp Resolution 66, p 46). This has been the case - A.C.C. - 3, pp 62 - 4.
- (74) A.C.C. - 1, (1971) p vii. The quotation is from the first clause of the Council's constitution - regarding its functions.
- (75) A.C.C. - 2, pp ix - x.
- (76) e.g. The inaugural meeting's debate on the WCC's 'Facism' programme saw one Bishop withdrawing from the Conference. A.C.C. - 1, p 28 (cp p viii).
- (77) The judgment was that of A.C.C. - 2, p 37. (cp L.C. 1968 Resolutions 34 - 8, pp 106 - 108). The problem was that while the Council was asked to co-ordinate study and information, and the Provinces were asked not to act without consulting the Council, no clear mandate was given to Council on what it was to do with its studies or how it should act when it was so consulted.
- (78) A.C.C. - 1, p 34.
- (79) A.C.C. - 1, pp 34 - 5, and Resolution 28 (pp 38 - 9).
- (80) See A.C.C. - 2 - pp 37 - 42;  
A.C.C. - 3 - pp 44 - 47;  
 cp L.C. 1978, Resolution 21, pp 44 - 47 (cp pp 30 - 82).
- (81) e.g. L.C. 1968, Resolution 34 (p 39).
- (82) A.C.C. - 3, p 46.
- (83) Plainly Anglicans have discriminated against non-episcopilians because of the nature of their orders, but equally (under the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act) have also discriminated against some episcopally ordained clergy on the grounds of their training. (L.C. 1878, pp 99 - 100; L.C. 1897, pp 281 - 2; L.C. 1908, pp 363 - 7). The A.C.C. treated the ordination of women as analagous to the latter example, as an administrative matter unconnected with doctrinal considerations.
- (84) L.C. 1978, pp 102 - 3.
- (85) L.C. 1978, Resolution 11 (p 41).
- (86) cp L.C. 1978, Resolution 12 (p 42 ) which sought such an understanding was proposed by Howe.  
 It would appear that the inclusion of clergy and laity in the A.C.C. is consistent with the episcopal nature of the Lambeth Conference in that the bishops might claim to represent the Church although the other orders are necessary for the Church to reach a common mind. For a Primates' Committee to act as an "upper chamber" over the A.C.C. would seem therefore to contradict the ethos and character of the Lambeth process of consultation without coercive jurisdiction.
- (87) A.C.C. - 4, p 71 (The ministry of the People of God was developed at a previous meeting e.g. A.C.C. - 3, p 38 ff).

- (88) To avoid this impression it might be better for the Primate to hold ex officio positions on the A.C.C. as the Archbishop of Canterbury already does: whether they were then also representatives of their Province would be a matter for the Province to decide, and whether the Primate met together independently of the Council would be a question of their own convenience. What must be avoided is the situation where the Council is left to consult, and the Primate are allowed to legislate.
- (89) ibid., p 72.
- (90) ibid., p 74.
- (91) L.C. 1968, Resolution 53 (p 43).
- (92) ibid., p 136.
- (93) One ecumenical meeting during the same period was quaintly described as "A Conference between the Rumanian Commission on Relations with the Anglican Communion and the Church of England delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (1935)" (See Lambeth Occasional Reports (1948), pp 189 - 206). A doctrinal commission appointed by the Archbishop to engage with Orthodoxy (1931) included representatives from various Provinces though it was a deliberative not a directive body (ibid., pp 39 - 58). Future decisions "must be determined by the bodies to which we would report - the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church and the Convocations and Synods or Conventions of the Anglican Communion" (p 58).
- (94) e.g. A.C.C. - 1, pp 7 - 8; A.C.C. - 2, pp 7 - 8; A.C.C. - 3, pp 11 - 12; A.C.C. - 4, pp 6 - 9.
- (95) A.C.C. - 3, Resolution 5 (p 13) A.C.C. - 4, pp 1 - 2.
- (96) A.C.C. - 4 p 3. See L.C. 1978, pp 105 - 110 for the most recent Lambeth review of such relationships.
- (97) L.C. 1978 Resolution 25 (p 47 cp A.C.C. - 3 p 8).
- (98) A.C.C. - 4 p 7.
- (99) Further examples of multi-lateral Anglican representation might be found in the Communion's participation in meetings of the Wider Episcopal Fellowship and the World Confessional Families. However the ambiguity of that participation suggests that these meetings present further examples of the problem of Anglican unity rather than evidence of the capacity to overcome it.
- (100) The existence of "societies" presents a problem for Anglican ecclesiology. On one hand it proves the benefit of freedom within Anglican order: on the other it leads to insularity of interest and the suspicion that Anglicanism itself lacks the coherence to inspire action. Pusey reputedly complained that "Societies are our episcopacy and newspapers our rule of faith"! (Olive Brose, Church and Parliament (1959) p 146).
- (101) e.g. L.C. 1867, p 72; L.C. 1878, pp 89 - 92; L.C. 1897, p 239.

- (102) L.C. 1888, pp 125 - 147.
- (103) ibid., pp 136 - 141.
- (104) L.C. 1897 p 263.
- (105) L.C. 1908, p 413. There was also an appendix which drew attention (among other things) to the work of the Christian Social Union. It concluded by citing: "The individual Christian is also a citizen. As a citizen he must inform himself on economic matters and take his share in public service". (ibid, p 415).
- (106) Hugh Martin (ed.) Christian Social Reformers (1927).
- (107) L.C. 1908, p 303: To be fair, Resolution 46 referred to clergy and laity working side by side in "the work, administration and discipline of the Church". The Resolution is taken from a Report on "Moral Witness" which spoke of the crucial role of laymen in furthering the Church's social influence.
- (108) The role of the laity had been a topic suggested for the first Conference but it had not reached the agenda paper (A.M.G. Stephenson, The First Lambeth Conference (1963) p 206). The issue arose again from examples found in the Anglican Communion.
- (109) L.C. 1920, pp 76 and 106.
- (110) L.C. 1920, p 96. The Report is found on pp 95 - 106. Resolutions 46 - 54 (pp 39 - 41) - mainly re order of deaconesses.
- (111) H.R. Weber "The Rediscovery of the Laity in the Ecumenical Movement", in S.C. Neill and H.R. Weber, The Layman in Christian History (1963), pp 377 - 393.
- (112) H.F. Hamilton, The People of God : an enquiry into Christian Origins (London: O.U.P., 1912) A Canadian, Hamilton's writing had impressed Gore. An even earlier exposition of the theme was in R.C. Moberly's, The Administrator of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ (1869), the Bampton Lectures of 1868. They spoke of the clergy as official organs of truth, yet the mouthpiece of the entire "spirit-bearing body".
- (113) F.C. Mather "The British Layman in Modern Times", 1780 - 1862' in S.C. Neill and H.F. Weber op. cit., p 229.
- (114) Gore's Essays in Church Reform (1898), examined the place of laity in the early church and in the Anglican Communion. This became the basis of Gore's advocacy of parochial church councils and despite his misgivings, of representative church government.
- (115) L.C. 1930, p 96.
- (116) R. Lloyd, The Church of England 1900 - 1965 (1966) p 482.
- (117) ibid., p 495.

- (118) L.C. 1943, II, p 39.
- (119) L.C. 1943, Resolution 37; I, p 35.
- (120) "The Doctrine of Man" (L.C. 1943, II, pp 1 - 10) and "The Christian Way of Life" (II, pp 29 - 39) provide the context for "The Church in the Modern World" (II, pp 11 - 23). The practical conclusions of the report (II, pp 38 - 9) were drawn from all three sections.
- (121) L.C. 1943, pp 106 - 113.
- (122) The Theology of Christian Initiation
- (123) Yves M. Congar, Lay People and the Church (1957), Hendrik Kraemar A Theology of the Laity (1953); and Gibbs and Morton, God's Frozen People (1964) etc.
- (124) L.C. 1943, Part II, p 117.
- (125) For the appropriateness of this theme, See V. Lloyd, op. cit., pp 239 - 242.
- (126) e.g. L.C. 1958, Part 2, pp 65 - 6.
- (127) ibid., Part 2, p 113. The Work of the Department of Laity, W.C.C., was especially commended.
- (128) ibid., 2, 114.
- (129) L.C. 1963, p 93.
- (130) e.g. ibid., pp 64 - 73. And there too the recognition that laity require a form of commissioning analagous to ordination, found expression. e.g. Resolution 25, p 37; p 99.
- (131) The whole question of Anglicanism's role in society, like its missionary commitment, was dependent upon individuals rather than the development of Church principles. An A.C.C. study of the topic directed attention to the strength of the Anglican tradition in outstanding examples of social awareness in the past and an "all-too-short theological tradition exemplified by such persons as F.D. Maurice and William Temple". It also focussed on the weakness of "its long history of uncritical acquiescence in the prevailing social order". A.C.C. - 3, p 23.
- (132) L.C. 1943, Part II; p 2.
- (133) ibid., Part II: pp 21, 26.
- (134) Models of the Church (1976), ch 3.
- (135) L.C. 1968, p 98.
- (136) L.C. 1958, Part 2: p 123.
- (137) S.G. Mackie, "Conference Methods" I.R.M. (1972), p 288; For Visser t'Hoof's vision even prior to the inauguration of the W.C.C., see W. Visser t'Hoof, The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church (1944) pp 66 - 7.

- (138) For major theme see Why am I a Christian? (1981). The Church in the Power of the Spirit (1977); The Open Church (1973), applies this to practicalities of Church life.
- (139) The Church in the Power of the Spirit, p 103.
- (140) L.C. 1943, pp 45, 47.
- (141) The 1973 Conference's study of episcopacy was notably lacking in this perspective, despite the promise of some preparatory papers. e.g. Today's Church in Today's World (1977) pp 27 ff, 242 ff. This failure stands behind Howe's agenda for the next generation.
- (142) L.C. 1963, p 64 etc.
- (143) The purpose of according freedom to the nations was specified in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, "for we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition ..."  
Of Ceremonies, Why some be abolished, and some retained.
- (144) The geographic constraints do not necessarily lead to nationhood. A.D. Smith Theories of Nationalism (1971) p 169 ff, argues that common descent is not necessary for national identity, but a common culture is. cp Edna McDonagh "Nationalism and the Christian" in Gift and Call (1975).
- (145) A.R. Vidler The Orb and the Cross (1945) p 133.
- (146) cp, p 216 above.
- (147) "Remarks on Church Discipline" Remains, iii (1839) p 274. Although the sentiment was widely shared, few would adopt Froude's method of implementing it by the enforcement of excommunications whereby "all notorious evil liver and professed heretics would be authoritatively cut off from familiar and intimate intercourse with Churchmen".  
(ibid, p 291).
- (148) Church and State : Report of the Archbishops' Commission (1970), pp 7 - 8.
- (149) See J.J. Mol (ed.) Western Religion (1972). Even where a high degree of commitment is typical of Anglican churches i.e. East Africa, social impact remains low.
- (150) In fact the Church of England's position is no less pluralistic and "denominational" than other churches in the estimate of R. Currie et al; "... Churches have come to be voluntary associations whose members join and leave them at will"  
Churches and Church goers: Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700 (1977) p 116. Certainly most of the apparently successful Church of England "parishes" function on a voluntarist if not sectarian basis.

- (151) For another example see K. Barth Letter to Great Britain (1941) where Barth appeals to the English Church to see the Second World War as a theological as much as a political reality.  
 Yet while Barth complained at the willingness of Christians to draw their resources from anywhere other than the Word of God, he was not prepared to deny the state its authority (See "The Christian Community and the Civil Community" in Against the Stream (1954) pp 16 - 17) and he refused, at Amsterdam for instance, to identify Communism as the Anti-Christ - much to Brunner and Niebuhr's consternation.
- (152) e.g. K.N. Mødhurst, "Religion and Politics: a typology", Scottish Journal of Religious Studies, II/2 (Autumn 1981) pp 115 - 134, indicates the range of possible responses against the interaction of two variables - political structures and ecclesiastical polity. The argument here is that Anglicanism possesses a polity which will be variously worked out according to its local setting.  
 The "particularity" of the Church of England in this respect is noted by J. Fogarty, Christian Democracy in Western Europe (1957) who points out that the failure of English Anglicans to present a political critique is partly the result of the success of "establishment" in ensuring a broadly Christian framework for English public life.
- (153) op. cit., p 74.
- (154) ibid., p 78. This whole orientation of Church-State relationship may be the source of a major Anglican contribution to current W.C.C. thinking. See Church and State : opening a new ecumenical discussion (1980).
- (155) Troeltsch's hypothesis is subject to criticism e.g. R. Gill, The Theological Context of Theology (1975) p 4 ff, but its general approach, as refined for instance by Leber, is useful. The attempt to avoid the purely conceptual categories (often inconsistently) applied by Troeltsch continues e.g. Michael Welch, "Quantitative Approaches to Sect Classification and the study of Sect Development" in R. Winthrop (ed.) The Religious Dimension: new directions in quantitative research (1979).
- (156) The Church Idea pp 169 - 70.

## CHAPTER 6 : SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- (1) The Anglican Communion : Past and Future, (1960) pp 33 - 4.
- (2) See p 10 above.
- (3) These names are chosen because of their prominence in the fore-going account and by the fact that their contribution can be noted in the Lambeth Conference records at present available for scrutiny. In due time the contribution of men such as Wand, Neill, Howe or McAdoo will presumably become apparent. This is not to overlook the implicit contribution to world Anglicanism of men like Crowther, Azariah , Luwum or de Mel who have graced the Lambeth Conference tables, but it seems that the theological contribution of indigencous Anglican leadership to the Communion as a whole, has yet to be developed.
- (4) See p 71 above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHYI PRIMARY REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS1. Official Lambeth Conference Reports.

The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867 - 1920. London; S.P.C.K., 1920.

The Lambeth Conference, 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports. London; S.P.C.K., 1930.

The Lambeth Conference, 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with Resolutions and Reports. London, S.P.C.K., 1948.

The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports. London; S.P.C.K. and N.Y.; Seabury Press, 1958.

Lambeth Conference 1968. Preparatory Information. London; S.P.C.K., 1968.

The Lambeth Conference, 1968: Resolutions and Reports. London; S.P.C.K. and N.Y.; Seabury Press, 1968.

The Lambeth Conference 1978, Preparatory Articles: Today's Church and Today's World. London; C.I.O. Publishing, 1977.

The Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1978. London; C.I.O. Publishing, 1978.

2. Related reports and documents.

Minutes of the Central Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference (as reconstructed by the Lambeth Conference of 1908), 1910 - 1947. (Plus Lambeth Conference, Occasional Paper 1 - 3 (1950 - 1957)).

Lambeth Occasional Reports, 1931 - 8. London; S.P.C.K., 1948.

The Time is Now: Anglican Consultative Council, First Meeting - Limuru, Kenya. London; S.P.C.K., 1971.

Partners in Mission : Anglican Consultative Council, Second Meeting - Dublin, 1973. London; S.P.C.K., 1973.

A.C.C. - 3: Anglican Consultative Council, Third Meeting - Trinidad 1976. London; A.C.C., 1976.

A.C.C. - 4: Anglican Consultative Council, Fourth Meeting - London, Ontario, Canada, 1979. London; A.C.C., 1979.

3. Manuscript Sources.

Proceedings of the Conference (1888). Lambeth Palace Library, LC 17 - 19.  
Minutes, Committee 4 (1888) - Home Reunion. L.P.L., LC33.

Proceedings of the Conference (1920). L.P.L., LC 105 - 109.  
Minutes of Reunion Committees (1920). L.P.L., LC 115 - 117.

Proceedings of the Seventh Lambeth Conference (1930) L.P.L., LC 146 - 148.  
Minutes of Committee III (1930) - Christian Unity (1930) L.P.L., LC 159.  
Minutes of Committee IV (1930) - The Anglican Communion. L.P.L., LC 161 - 163.

Lambeth Conference 1968: Transcription of Tape Recordings of the Plenary Sessions (3 volumes). Anglican Consultative Council archive.

Papers of Archbishop Davidson. L.P.L.

Papers of E.J. Palmer. L.P.L.

Papers and Notebooks of G.K.A. Bell. L.P.L.



- Believing in the Church : The Corporate Nature of Faith. A Report by the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England. London; S.P.C.K., 1981.
- Bell, G.K.A. Christian Unity : the Anglican Position. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1948.
- Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. 2 volumes. London; O.U.P., 1935.
- Documents on Christian Unity, 1920 - 4.  
 " Second Series (1930)  
 1924 - 29.  
 " Third Series (1948)  
 1930 - 48  
 " Fourth Series (1958)  
 1949 - 57.
- London; O.U.P.,
- Bell, G.K.A. & Robertson, W.L. (eds.) The Church of England and the Free Churches : Proceedings of Joint Conferences held at Lambeth Palace, 1921 - 1925. London; O.U.P. & Humphrey Milford, 1925.
- Bell, P.M.H. Disestablishment in Ireland & Wales. London; S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Benson, A.C. The Life of Edward White Benson. 2 volumes. London; Macmillan, 1900.
- Berkouwer, G.C. The Church. Grand Rapids, Michigan; William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.
- Best, G.F.A. Temporal Pillars. London; C.U.P., 1964.
- Bettany, Frederick George. Stewart Headlam : a biography. London; John Murray, 1926.
- Bicknell, E.J. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. London; Longmans, Green & Co, 1919.
- Bill, E.G.W. (ed.) Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity : lectures delivered in Lambeth Palace Library, 1966. London; S.P.C.K., 1967.
- The Book of Concord (ed. Theodore G. Tappert). Philadelphia; Fortress Press, 1959.
- Border, Ross. Church and State in Australia 1788 - 1872. London; S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Bosher, Robert S. The American Church and the formation of the Anglican Communion, 1823 - 1853. Evanston, Illinois; Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1962.
- The making of the Restoration Settlement : the influence of the Laudians. Westminster; Dacre Press, 1966.

- Bourne, Edward C.E.      The Anglicanism of William Laud. London; S.P.C.K., 1947.
- Bowen, D.              The Idea of the Victorian Church. Montreal; McGill University Press, 1968.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl.      Mitre and Sceptre : transatlantic faiths, ideas, personalities and politics, 1689 - 1775. N.Y.; O.U.P., 1962.
- Brightman, F.E.      What Objections have been made to English Orders? London; Church Historical Society Publications, 1896.
- Brillioth, Yngve.      The Anglican Revival : studies in the Oxford Movement. London; Longmans. 1925.
- Brose, Olive J.      Church and Parliament. The reshaping of the Church of England, 1828 - 1860. London; O.U.P., 1959.
- Browning, W.R.F. (ed.)      The Anglican Synthesis : Essays by Catholics and Evangelicals. Derby; Peter Smith, 1964.
- Calvin, John.      Institutes of the Christian Religion. ed. J.T. McNeill, Vols. xx and xxi of 'Library of Christian Classics'. London; S.C.M., 1961.
- Campbell, John McLeod.      Christian History in the Making. London; Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1946.
- The Canon Law of the Church of England, being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law. London; S.P.C.K., 1947.
- The Canons of the Church of England : Canons Ecclesiastical promulgated by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969. London; S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Carey, Kenneth M.      The Historic Episcopate in the Fulness of the Church. Seven essays by Priests of the Church of England. Westminster; Dacre Press, 1954.
- Carnegie, William Hartley.      Anglicanism : an introduction to its history and philosophy. London; Putnam, 1925.
- Carpenter, Edward.      Cantuar : the Archbishops in their Office. London; Cassell & Co., 1971.
- Carpenter, S.C.      Church and People, 1789 - 1889. London; S.P.C.K., 1933.
- Carrington, Philip.      The Anglican Church in Canada. Toronto; Collins, 1963.
- Catholicity.      A Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West. Being a Report presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. London; Dacre Press, 1947.

- Chadwick, Henry. "The Status of Ecumenical Councils in Anglican Thought" in D. Nieman and M. Schatkin, (eds.), *The Heritage of the Early Church*. Rome; Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1973. pp 393 - 408.
- Chadwick, Owen. *Mackenzie's Grave*. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1959.
- The mind of the Oxford Movement. London; A. and C. Black, 1960.
- The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1975.
- The Victorian Church. 2 volumes. London; A. and C. Black, 1966 and 1970.
- Christian Believing : The Nature of the Christian Faith and its Expression in Holy Scripture and Creeds. A Report by the Doctr. Commissioner of the Church of England. London; S.P.C.K., 1976.
- Church and State : opening a new ecumenical discussion. Geneva; W.C.C., 1980.
- Church and State. London; Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1935.
- Church and State. Report by a Commission appointed by the Church Assembly in June, 1949. London; Church Information Board, 1952.
- Church and State. Report of the Archbishop's Commission. London; Church Information Office, 1970.
- Church Relations in England. London; S.P.C.K., 1950.
- Churches in Conciliar Fellowship? A Discussion amongst European Churches on unity and co-operation. Geneva; Conference of European Churches, 1978.
- Church, R.W. *Occasional Papers*. 2 volumes. London; Macmillan, 1897.
- The Oxford Movement : twelve years, 1833 - 1845. London; Macmillan, 1892.
- Clark, G. Kitson. *Churchmen and the Condition of England, 1832 - 1885 : A study in the development of social ideas and practice from the Old Regime to the Modern State*. London; Methuen and Co., 1973.
- Clarke, Henry Lowther. *Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions beyond the seas and in other Parts of the Anglican Communion*. London; S.P.C.K., 1924.
- "The Lambeth Appeal and its Results" in W.L. Paige Cox (ed.), *Anglican Essays*. London; Macmillan and Co., 1923.

- Cnatingius, Hans. Bishops and Societies : a study of Anglican Colonial and Missionary expansion, 1698 - 1850. London; S.P.C.K., 1952.
- Collins, William Edward. Queen Elizabeth's Defence of her Proceedings in Church and State, with an introductory essay on the Northern Ireland Rebellion. London; Church Historical Society Publications, 1899.
- Congar, Yves M.J. "The Historical Development of Authority in the Church : Points for Christian Reflection" in Todd, J.M. (ed.), Problems of Authority. London; Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.
- Lay people in the Church : a study for a theology of the laity. London; Chapman, 1965.
- "On the 'Hierarchia Veritatum'" in D. Nieman and M. Schatkin (eds.), The Heritage of the Early Church : Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky. Rome; Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1973. pp 409 - 420.
- Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical 1604 : Latin and English - with notes by J.V. Bulland. London; Faith Press, 1934.
- Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church. A report to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Conference of the Methodist Church. London; Church Information Office and Epworth Press, 1966.
- Councils and the Ecumenical Movement. Geneva; W.C.C., 1968.
- Cross, A.L. The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies. London; Longmans, 1902.
- Cross, F.L. Darwell Stone : churchman and counsellor. London; Dacre Press, 1943.
- Creighton, Louise. The Anglican Communion. London; Press and Publications Board, Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster, 1929.
- Cuming, Geoffrey John and Baker, Derek (eds.). Councils and Assemblies. Papers read at meeting(s) of the Ecclesiastical History Society. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1971.
- Cuming, Geoffrey John. A History of Anglican Liturgy. London; Macmillan, 1969.
- Currie, Robert et. al. Churches and Churchgoers : Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Curtis, Lewis P. Anglican Moods of the 18th Century. New Haven, Conn.; Archon Books, 1966.

- Curtis, William Redmond. The Lambeth Conferences : the solution for Pan-Anglican organization. N.Y., Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Dark, Sidney. Archbishop Davidson and the English Church. London; Philip Allan and Co. Ltd, 1929.
- The Lambeth Conferences. Their History and their Significance. London; Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1930.
- Davidson, Randall T. The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867 - 1920. London; S.P.C.K., 1929.
- Davidson, Randall and Benham, W. Life of Archibald Campbell Tait. 2 volumes. London; Macmillan, 1891.
- Davies, George C.B. The First Evangelical Bishop : some aspects of the life of Henry Ryder. London; Tyndale Press, 1958.
- Dawky, P.M. The Episcopal Church and its work. N.Y.; Seabury, 1955.
- Dessain, Charles Stephen. John Henry Newman. London; Nelson, 1966.
- Dickens, A.G. The English Reformation. London; Batsford, 1964.
- Dickens, A.G. and Carr, Dorothy (eds.) The Reformation in England to the Accession of Elizabeth I. Documents of Modern History. London; Edward Arnold Ltd, 1969.
- Dillistone, Frederick William. The Structure of the Divine Society. London; Lutterworth, 1951.
- Doane, G.W. The Missionary Bishop : the sermon at the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Jackson Kemper in St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, September 25th 1835. Burlington, N.J.; J.L. Powell, 1835.
- Doctrine in the Church of England. The Report of the Commission on Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. London; S.P.C.K., 1938.
- Dulles, Avery. Models of the Church. London and Dublin; Gill and Macmillan, 1976.
- The Resilient Church : The Necessity and Limits of Adaptation. Dublin; Gill and Macmillan, 1977.
- Dvornik, F. National Churches and the Church Universal. London; Dacre Press, 1944.
- Ecclesiastical Law : being a reprint of the title Ecclesiastical Law from Halsbury's Laws of England (3rd edition). London; Church House Book Shop and Butterworth & Co. Ltd., 1957.

- Edwards, David L. "The 39 Articles : One last Heave" Modern Churchman X/2 (1967), pp 135 - 141.
- "101 Years of the Lambeth Conference".  
The Church Quarterly. 1/1 (1968) pp 21 - 35.
- Einhardt, William Chauncey. The Nature of the Anglican Communion. National Council of PECUSA, undated).
- Eliot, T.S. Thoughts after Lambeth. A critique of the Reports of the Lambeth Conference 1930. London; Faber and Faber, 1930.
- The Elizabethan Bishops and the Civil Power : Statute 8 Eliz 1, c1 (1565/6). London; Church Historical Society Publications, 1897.
- Elliott-Binns, Leonard E. The Development of English Theology in the later nineteenth century. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.
- Ellison, Gerald. The Anglican Communion. Past and Future. Greenwich, Connecticut, U.S.A; Seabury Press, 1960.
- Ellul, Jacques. The Presence of the Kingdom. London; S.C.M., 1951.
- Ervin, Spencer. The Development of the Synodical System in the Anglican Church of Canada. Ambler, Pa.; Trinity Press, 1969.
- An Introduction to Anglican Polity. Ambler, Pa.; Trinity Press, 1964.
- The Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Anglican Church of Canada. Ambler, Pa.; Trinity Press, 1967.
- The Polity of the Church of Ireland. Ambler, Pa.; Trinity Press, 1965.
- The Polity of the Church of the Province of South Africa. Ambler, Pa.; Trinity Press, 1964.
- Some deficiencies in the Canon Law of the American Episcopal Church, and related matters. N.Y.; American Church Publications, 1961.
- Evans, John H. Churchman Militant. George Augustus Selwyn. Bishop of New Zealand and Lichfield. London; George Allan and Urwin Ltd. and Wellington, N.Z.; A.H. and A.W. Reed, 1964.
- Faber, Geoffrey. Oxford Apostles : a character study of the Oxford Movement. London; Penguin Books, 1954.
- Fairweather, E.R. and Hettlinger, R.F. Episcopacy and Reunion. London; A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1952.



- Gore, Charles. The Church and the Ministry. London; Longmans Green, 1889.
- Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures, an open letter to the Bishop of Nassau. London; Mowbray, 1920.
- The Church of England in relation to other bodies of Christians. London; Wells Gardner, 1894.
- Orders and Unity. London; John Murray, 1909.
- "Reunion in South India" Church Quarterly Review. cccix (1930), pp 211 - 225.
- Steps towards Unity. London; Mowbray, 1919.
- Gray, Charles Norris. Life of Robert Gray, Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of Africa. 2 volumes. London; Rivington's, 1876.
- Gray, G.F.S. The Anglican Communion : a brief sketch. London; S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Granslade, Stanley Lawrence. The English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church : an inaugural lecture. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Grimes, Cecil John. Towards an Indian Church : The growth of the Church of India in constitution and life. London; S.P.C.K., 1946.
- Hamilton, H.F. The People of God : an Inquiry into Christian Origins. London; O.U.P., 1912.
- Hanson, Anthony T. Beyond Anglicanism. London; Darton, Longman and Todd, 1965.
- The Church of the Servant. London; S.C.M., 1962.
- Hanson, R.P.C. "The Church of England in the trough of a wave". Modern Churchman XX1/4 (1978), p 5 ff.
- Hardy, Edward Rochie. "A View from the Bridge : An Anglican Approach" in Robert McAfee Brown and David H. Scott (eds.), The Challenge to Reunion. New York; McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963.
- Harvey, George L.H. (ed.). The Church in the Twentieth Century, London; Macmillan, 1936.
- Haselmeyer, Louis A. Lambeth and Unity. Westminster; Dacre Press, 1948.

- Haugaard, William P. Elizabeth and the English Reformation : the Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1970.
- Haworth, H.H. "The Origin and Authority of the Biblical Canon in the Anglican Church". Journal of Theological Studies, VIII (1906), pp 1 - 40.
- Headlam, Arthur Cayley. The Church of England. London; John Murray, 1924.
- The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion: being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1920. London; John Murray, 1920.
- "The Lambeth Conference and the Union of the Churches" Church Quarterly Review. cxxxii (1908), pp 257 - 284.
- "The Lambeth Conference" Church Quarterly Review. cxxxiii (1908), pp 1 - 23.
- "The Lambeth Conference" Church Quarterly Review. clxxxix (1920), pp 139 - 156.
- "The Lambeth Conference and Reunion" Church Quarterly Review. ccxxxii (1931), pp 205 - 226.
- Hebbelthwaite, Peter. The New Inquisition? : Schillebeeckx and Küng. London; Collins, 1980.
- The Runaway Church. London; Collins, 1975.
- Hebert, A.G. The Form of the Church. London; Faber and Faber, 1944.
- Hennell, Michael. Sons of the Prophets : evangelical leaders of the Victorian church. London; S.P.C.K., 1979.
- Henson, Herbert Hensley. Anglicanism. London; Macmillan, 1921.
- Anglicanism and Reunion. London; Hugh Rees, 1908.
- The Church of England. London; C.U.P., 1939.
- Disestablishment : the Charge delivered at the Second Quadrennial Visitation of his Diocese, together with an Introduction. London; Macmillan and Co., 1929.
- Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson, Chosen and edited by Evelyn Foley Braley. London; S.P.C.K., 1950.

- Henson, Herbert Hensley. Retrospect of an Unimportant Life.  
3 volumes. London; O.U.P., 1942, 1943, 1950.
- Herklots, H.G.G. Frontiers of the Church. The Making of the  
Anglican Communion. London; Ernest Benn Ltd., 1961.
- The Church of England and the American  
Episcopal Church. A Study in Relationships. London;  
A.F. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1966.
- "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in  
the Anglican Communion : an Eighteenth Century Version".  
Church Quarterly Review Vol. clxv, No 357 (1964),  
pp 444 - 449.
- "The Origins of the Lambeth Quadrilateral"  
Church Quarterly Review Vol. clxix (1968), pp 61 -  
68.
- Hertz, G.B. "Bishop Seabury" English Historical Review  
xxvi/101 (1911), pp 57 - 75.
- Hewitt, George H.G. The Problems of success : a history of  
the Church Missionary Society, 1910 - 1942. 2  
volumes. London; S.C.M., 1971 - 1979.
- Higgins, John S. and Fisher G. The Anglican Communion Today,  
and One Communion and Fellowship. Philadelphia,  
Church History Society; 1946.
- Higham, Florence. Catholic and Reformed. London; S.P.C.K.,  
1962.
- Hildebrandt, Franz. Melancthon : Alien or Ally? London;  
C.U.P., 1946.
- Hill, J. Speed (ed.) Studies in Richard Hooker. Cleveland;  
Case Western Reserve University Press, 1972.
- Hinchliff, Peter. The Church in South Africa. London;  
S.P.C.K., 1963.
- Hind, John. "The Development of the Lambeth Conference".  
Theology LI/366 (1948), pp 207 - 213.
- Hodgson, Leonard. "The Doctrine of the Church as held and taught  
in the Church of England" in R.N. Flew (ed.) The  
Nature of the Church. London; S.C.M., 1952. pp 121 -  
146.
- Essays in Christian Philosophy. London;  
Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Hoekendijk, J.C. The Church Inside Out. London; S.C.M., 1966.
- 't Hooft, (ed.) W.A. Visser The New Delhi Report : The Third  
Assembly of the World Council of Churches. London;  
S.C.M., 1962.

- 't Hooft, W.A. Visser. The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church. London; S.C.M., 1944.
- Hooker, Richard. The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. London; J.M. Dent, Everyman's Library, 1907.
- Hopkins, C.H. John R. Mott, 1865 - 1955 : a biography. Grand Rapids Mich., Eerdmans, 1980.
- Howe, John W. "Lambeth Conference 1978. A brief analysis by the Secretary". Anglican Information 20 (November, 1978), pp 3 - 7.
- Howe, John and Barrett, D.B. Membership, Manpower and Money in the Anglican Communion. A survey of 27 Churches and 360 Dioceses. London; S.P.C.K for the A.C.C., 1973.
- Huntingdon, William Reed. The Church-idea : an essay towards unity. Boston; Houghton Mifflin Co, 1928.
- Inglis, K.S. Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England. London; Routledge, 1963.
- Iremonger, F.A. William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury : His life and letters. London; O.U.P., 1948.
- Jacob, Edgar (Bishop of St. Albans). "The Lambeth Conference to the Pan. Anglican Congress". Church Quarterly Review, cxxx (1908), pp 257 - 277.
- Jasper, Ronald C.D. Arthur Cayley Headlam, Life and Letters of a Bishop. London; Faith Press, 1960.
- George Bell, Bishop of Chichester. London; O.U.P., 1967.
- Prayer Book Revision, 1800 - 1900. London; S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Jay, Eric G. The Church : Its changing Image through Twenty Centuries. 2 volumes. London; S.P.C.K., 1977.
- Jedin, Hubert. Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church : an historical outline. Freiburg; Herder, 1960.
- Jefferson, P.C. (ed.) The Church in the 60's. The Anglican Congress, 1963. Toronto; Anglican Book Centre, London; S.P.C.K., 1963.
- Johnson, Howard A. Global Odyssey. Visiting the Anglican Churches. London; Geoffrey Bles, 1963.
- Johnson, Humphrey J.T. Anglicanism in Transition. London, New York and Toronto; Longman's Green and Co., 1938.
- Josaitis, Norman F. Edwin Hatch and Early Church Order. Gernbloux; Duculot, 1971.

- Kemp, Eric Waldram. Counsel and Consent : Aspects of the Government of the Church as exemplified in the history of the English Provincial Synods. London; S.P.C.K., 1961.
- The Life and Letters of Kenneth Escott Kirk, Bishop of Oxford 1937 - 1954. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1959.
- Kent, John and Murray, Robert (eds.) Church Membership and Intercommunion. London; Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973.
- King, John C. The Evangelicals. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1969.
- Kingston, F. Temple (ed.) Anglicanism and Principles of Christian Unity. Windsor, Ontario; Canterbury College, 1972.
- Kirk, K.E. (ed.) The Apostolic Ministry. Essays on the History and Doctrine of Episcopacy. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- Knox, Wilfred L. and Vidler, Alex R. The Gospel of God and the Authority of the Church. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago; Chicago U.P., 1962.
- Küng, Hans. The Church. London; Search Press, 1968.
- The Church - maintained in Truth : a Theological Meditation. London; S.C.M., 1980.
- The Council and Reunion. London; Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Infallible ? An Enquiry. N.Y., Doubleday, 1971.
- Structures of the Church. London; Nelson, 1964.
- Lacey, Thomas A. Authority in the Church. London; Mowbrays, 1928.
- Unity and Schism : the Bishop Paddock lectures for 1917. London; A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1917.
- The Unity of the Church as Treated by the English Theologians. London; S.P.C.K., 1898.
- The Universal Church. A Study in the Lambeth Call to Union. London and Oxford; A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1921.

- Lambeth Appeal.** Australia and Reunion, being the Official Report of Proceedings of Reunion Conference between Representatives of the Australian Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches in Australia, Holden at the Chapter House, St. Andrews Cathedral, Sydney on March 28 - 29, 1922. Sydney; Angus and Robertson Ltd, 1922.
- 'Lambeth Conference of 1888' Church Quarterly Review, xxxvii (1899), pp 1 - 22.
- Lambeth Encyclical and other Proposals Considered.** Scottish Church Society Conference, 1920. Edinburgh; Andrew Eliot, 1920.
- Lambeth 1948 Reviewed.** A Report of the Theological and Liturgical Committee of the Church Union, April, 1949. London; The Church Union, 1949.
- Lang, Gordon Cosmo.** The Unity of the Church of England. London; S.P.C.K., 1925.
- Latourette, Kenneth S.** A History of the Expansion of Christianity. 7 volumes. New York; Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1938 - 1945.
- Leaver, R.A.** "The Augsburg Confession and the Confessional Principle". Churchman, 94 (1980), pp 345 - 352.
- Leenhardt, Franz Jehan.** Catholic and Protestant : two biblical faiths. London; Lutterworth, 1964.
- Leidt, William E.** Anglican Mosaic. The Anglican Congress 1963. Toronto; Anglican Book Centre, and London; S.P.C.K., 1963.
- Letters of Frederick, Lord Blatchford,** Edited by G.E. Marindin. London; John Murray, 1896.
- Liddon, H.** Life of E.B. Pusey. 4 volumes. London; Longmans, Green, 1893 - 7.
- Lloyd, Roger.** The Church of England, 1900 - 1965. London; S.C.M., 1966.
- Lockhart, J.G.** Cosmo Gordon Lang. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.
- Loveland, Clara O.** The Critical Years : the reconstitution of the American Church in the United States of America, 1780 - 1789. Greenwich, Conn.; Seabury Press, 1956.
- Lunn, Sir Henry.** A Free Church Impression. Lambeth Series. London; James Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1931.

- Lunn, Sir Henry. Reunion at Lambeth. John Wesley's Message to the Bishops in Conference, July 1920 with an introductory letter by Sir Henry S. Lunn. London; The Epworth Press, 1920.
- McAdoo, Henry Robert. Being an Anglican. Dublin; A.P.C.K., London, S.P.C.K., 1977.
- The Spirit of Anglicanism : A survey of Anglican theological method in the seventeenth century. London; A and C. Black, 1965.
- McDonagh, Edna. Gift and Call : towards a Christian theology of morality. Dublin; Gill and Macmillan, 1975.
- Mackenzie, Kenneth (ed.) Union of Christendom. 2 volumes. London; The Religious Book Club, 1938.
- MacMorran, Kenneth M. Reunion and the Lambeth Conference. London; Mowbray, 1930.
- McNabb, Vincent M. "Lambeth Conference Review : The Lambeth Conference and Reunion. A Roman Catholic view". Theology ii, 8 (1921) pp 107 - 110.
- Macquarrie, John. Christian Unity and Christian Diversity. London; S.C.M., 1975.
- Realistic Reflections on Church Union. Albany, Argus Greenwood; 1967.
- Malden, Richard H. This Church and Realm. London; O.U.P., 1931.
- The English Church and the Nation. London; Dent, 1952.
- Manschreck, Clyde (ed.) Melancthon on Christian Doctrine : Loci Communes 1555. N.Y.; O.U.P., 1965.
- Marshall, John S. Hooker and the Anglican Tradition : an historical and theological study of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Policy. London; A and C. Black, 1963.
- Marsilius of Padua. Defensor Fidei. (C.W. Previté-Orton, ed.) London; C.U.P., 1928.
- Martin, Christopher (ed.). The Great Christian Centuries to Come : essays in honour of A.M. Ramsey. London; Mowbrays, 1974.
- Mascall, Eric L. Corpus Christi : Essays on the Church and the Eucharist. London; Longmans, Green and Co. 1965.
- Lambeth and Christian Unity. London; The Faith Press, 1958.

- Mascall, Eric L. "Lambeth and Unity" Church Quarterly Review.  
(1959) pp 158 - 172.
- Via Media : an essay in theological method.  
London; Longmans, 1956.
- Matthews, W.R. The Thirty-nine Articles : A Plea for a New  
Statement of the Christian Faith as understood by  
the Church of England. London; Hodder and  
Stoughton, 1961.
- Maurice, Frederick Dennison. The Kingdom of Christ. 2  
volumes. ed. A.R. Vidler. London; S.C.M., 1958.
- Melinsky, M.A.H. The Ministry of the People of God.  
London; A.C.C.M., 1978.
- de Mendieta, Emmanuel Amand. Anglican Vision. London;  
S.P.C.K., 1971.
- Rome and Canterbury. London;  
Herbert Jenkins, 1962.
- Mills, Frederick V. Bishops by Ballot: An Eighteenth-  
Century Ecclesiastical Revolution. N.Y.;  
O.U.P., 1978.
- "The Internal Anglican Controversy  
Over an American Episcopate, 1763 - 1775".  
Histor. Mag. of Prot. Episc. Ch. XLIV (1975),  
pp 257 - 276.
- "The Protestant Episcopal Churches in  
the United States 1783 - 1789 : Suspended  
Animation or Remarkable Recovery?"  
Histor. Mag. of Prot. Episc. Church. XLVI  
(1977), pp 151 - 170.
- Minear, Paul. Images of the Church in the New Testament.  
London; Butterworth, 1961.
- Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion. London;  
S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Moberly, Robert Campbell. Doctrinal Standards : two lectures.  
London; Longmans. 1898.
- Moir, John S. Church and State in Canada West - three studies  
in the relationship of Denominationalism and  
Nationalism 1841 - 1867. Toronto; University of  
Toronto Press, 1959.
- Mol, J.J. (ed.) Western Religion : A Country by Country  
Sociological Inquiry. The Hague; Mouton, 1972.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. The Church in the Power of Spirit : A  
Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology. London;  
S.C.M., 1977.
- The Open Church : Invitation to a Messianic  
Lifestyle. London; S.C.M., 1978.

- Montgomery, H.H. "Randall Thomas Davidson". Church Quarterly Review, cxi (1930), pp 1 - 14.
- Moorman, J.R.H. A History of the Church of England. London; Black, 1953.
- Moore, Garth E. An Introduction to English Canon Law. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Morgan, Dewi. Agenda for Anglicans. London; S.C.M., 1963.
- The Bishops come to Lambeth. London; A. and R. Mowbray, 1967.
- The Church in Transition. Reform of the Church of England. London; Chatto and Windus, 1970.
- Lambeth Speaks. London; A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1958.
- Morgan, E.R. and Lloyd, Roger (eds.) The Mission of the Anglican Communion. London; S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., 1948.
- Morrell, W.P. The Anglican Church in New Zealand. Dunedin; A.H. and A.W. Reed, 1973.
- Morris, Edwin. The Lambeth Quadrilateral and Reunion. London; The Faith Press, 1969.
- Mortimer, R.C. Western Canon Law. London; A. and C. Black, 1953.
- Moss, C.B. The Old Catholic Movement. Its Origins and History. London; S.P.C.K., 1964.
- The Moving Spirit : a survey of the life and work of the Churches of the Anglican Communion. London, Church Information Board of the Church Assembly Overseas Council; 1958.
- Neill, Stephen C. Anglicanism. London; Penguin Books, 1958.
- and a Revised Edn. London; Mowbrays, 1978.
- Colonialism and Christian Mission. London; Lutterworth Press, 1966.
- A History of Christian Missions. London; Penguin, 1964.
- The Ministry of the Church. London; The Canterbury Press, 1947.
- Towards Church Union 1937 - 1952. A Survey of Approaches to Closer Union among the Churches. London; S.C.M., 1952.

- Neill, Stephen C. and Weber, Hans-Ruedi. The Layman in Christian History. London; S.C.M. 1963.
- Newbigin, Lesslie, "Anglicans and Christian Reunion". Theology 55 (1958), pp 223 ff.
- The Household of God. London; S.C.M., 1957.
- The Reunion of the Church. London; S.C.M., 1948.
- Newman's Apologia Pro Vita Sua: The two versions of 1864 and 1865. Edited and introduced by Wilfred Ward. London; Henry Froude, 1913.
- Newman, J.H. Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching. 2 volumes. London; Burns, Oates and Co., 1872 and Basil Montague Pickering, 1876.
- Discourses to Mixed Congregations. London; Longmans, 1849.
- An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. N.Y.; Longmans, Green and Co., 1949.
- The Via Media of the Anglican Church. 2 volumes. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1837.
- Newsome, David. The Parting of Friends : a study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning. London; Murray, 1966.
- The Victorian Crisis of Faith. London; S.P.C.K., 1970.
- Nicholls, David. Church and State in Britain since 1820. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- The Pluralist State. London; The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1975.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry. N.Y.; Harper and Row, 1956.
- The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1954.
- Nixon, Robin. "Ecumenism, Models of the Church and Styles of Authority". Churchman 91/3 (1977), pp 229 - 241.
- Norman, Edward R. Christianity and the World Order. Oxford; O.U.P., 1979.
- Church and Society 1770 - 1970. A Historical Study. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1976.
- The Conscience of the State in North America. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1968.

- Norwood, Frederick Wm. Nonconformity and the Lambeth Conference. An Address from the Chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales on October 7th 1930. London; Independent Press, 1930.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey and Chadwick, Owen (eds.) From Uniformity to Unity, 1661 - 1962. London; S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Oliver, John. The Church and Social Order. Social Thought in the Church of England 1918 - 1939. London; Mowbray, 1968.
- "Overseas Echoes of the Lambeth Conference". Theology ii/12 (1921) pp 302 - 312.
- Overton, John Henry. The English Church in the 19th Century, 1800 - 1833. London; Longman's, Green and Co., 1894.
- Packer, James I. A Kind of Noah's Ark? The Anglican commitment to Comprehensiveness. Oxford; Latimer House, 1981.
- Page, R. New Directions in Anglican Theology : A Survey from Temple to Robinson. N.Y., Seabury, 1965.
- Paget, Francis. An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Policy. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Paige-Cox, W.L. (ed.) Anglican Essays : a collective review of the principles and special opportunities of the Anglican Communion as Catholic and Reformed. London; Macmillan, 1923.
- Palmer, Edwin James. The Bible and the Synods : a study of Principles. Bombay; S.P.C.K., 1913.
- The Cost of Reunion. London; S.C.M., 1937.
- The Destiny of the Anglican Churches : a short study of the history, principles and prospects of the Anglican Communion. London; James Nisbet and Co., 1931.
- The Great Church Awakens. Ideas and Studies concerning Union and Reunion. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1920.
- "The Proposed Union of Churches in South India" in Church Quarterly Review, ccxx (1930), pp 226 - 251.
- Parker, T.M. Christianity and the State in the light of History. London; A. and C. Black, 1955.

- Paton, David M.        Anglicans and Unity. London; Mowbrays, 1962.  
                           Breaking Barriers. London; S.P.C.K., 1976.  
                           Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism. London;  
                           S.C.M., 1958.  
                           "The Lessons of Anglican Ecumenism".  
                           Lutheran World XVII/1 (1970), p 16 and 18.  
                           "Secular Ecumenism and the Anglican Future"  
                           in Modern Churchman New Series xii, 3 (April 1969),  
                           pp 190 - 200.
- Paton, David M. and Jeffrey, Robert M.C. Christian Unity and the  
 Anglican Communion. London; Church Information  
 Office, 1965.
- Paton, David M. and Latham, Robert.        Point of Decision.  
 London; S.P.C.K. and Epworth Press, 1967.
- Paul, Leslie.        A Church by Daylight. A Reappraisal of the  
 Church of England and its Future. London;  
 Geoffrey Chapman, 1973.
- Pawley, Bernard C. (ed.)        The Second Vatican Council :  
 Studies by 8 Anglican Observers. London;  
 O.U.P., 1967.
- Pawley, Bernard and Margaret.        Rome and Canterbury through  
 Four Centuries. A study of the Relation between  
 the Church of Rome and the Anglican Churches  
 1530 - 1973. London and Oxford; Mowbrays, 1974.
- Pearce, H.F. (ed.)        The failure of a Commission : a reply to  
 the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on  
 Doctrine in the Church of England, by members of  
 the Fellowship of the Anglican Communion.  
 London, Church Book Room for the Fellowship of  
 Evangelical Churchmen; 1939.
- Peck, A.L.        Anglicanism and Episcopacy : a re-examination of  
 evidence. London; The Faith Press Ltd., 1958.
- Perman, David.        Change and the Churches : An Anatomy of  
 Religion in Britain. London; The Bodley Head,  
 1977.
- Perry, William Stevens.        The History of the American  
 Episcopal Church, 1587 - 1883. 2 volumes.  
 Boston; J.R. Osgood and Co., 1885.
- Pittenger, N.        The Episcopalian Way of Life. Englewood  
 Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, 1957.
- Plummer, Alfred H.        The Church of England in the 18th Century.  
 London; Methuen and Co., 1910.
- Pol, William H. van de.        Anglicanism in Ecumenical Perspective.  
 Pittsburgh; Duquesne University Press, 1965.

- Pol, William H. van de. World Protestantism N.Y., Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Prestige, G.L. The Life of Charles Gore. A Great Englishman. London; William Heinemann, 1935.
- Preston, Ronald H. "Introduction - 35 years later : 1941 - 1976" in William Temple, Christianity and the Social Order. London; S.P.C.K., 1976.
- Procter, Francis and Frere, Walter H. A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. London; Macmillan, 1905.
- The proposed scheme of union in South India : an opinion by Charles Gore and others. London; S.P.C.K., 1929.
- Purcell, William. Fisher of Lambeth, A Portrait from Life. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1969.
- Quick, Oliver Chase. Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1924.
- The Testing of Church Principles. London; John Murray. 1919.
- Rahner, Karl. The Dynamic Element in the Church. London; Burns and Oates, 1964.
- Meditations on Freedom and the Spirit. London; Burns and Oates, 1977.
- The Shape of the Church to Come. London; S.P.C.K., 1974.
- Ramm, Bernard. The Pattern of Religious Authority. Grand Rapids, Michigan; Eerdmans, 1957.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael. Canterbury Pilgrim. London; S.P.C.K., 1974.
- An Era in Anglican Theology : From Gore to Temple. N.Y., Scribners, 1960.
- God, Christ and the World. A Study in Contemporary Theology. London; S.C.M., 1969.
- The Gospel and the Catholic Church. London; Longmans and Co., 1937.
- Lambeth Essays on Faith. London; S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Lambeth Essays on Ministry. London; S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Lambeth Essays on Unity. London. S.P.C.K., 1969.

- Ramsey, Arthur Michael. Rome and Canterbury : A public lecture in Dublin, 23.6.67. London; S.P.C.K., 1967.
- "What is Anglican Theology" in  
Theology XLVIII/295 (1945), pp 2 - 6.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael and Suenens, Léon-Joseph. The Future of the Christian Church. London; S.C.M., 1970.
- Ramsey, Ian T. On Being Sure in Religion. London; The Athlone Press, 1963.
- Ramsey, Ian and Perry, Michael. Faith Alert. The Lambeth Conference 1968. London; S.P.C.K., 1968.
- Rawlinson, Alfred Edward John. The Anglican Communion in Christendom. London; S.P.C.K., 1960.
- Authority and Freedom : the  
Bishop Paddock lectures for 1923. London;  
Longmans, Green and Co., 1924.
- The Church of England and  
the Church of Christ. London; Longmans, 1930.
- The Future of Anglicanism :  
a lecture delivered on the Charles Gore Memorial  
Foundation on 12 November 1948 in Westminster  
Abbey. London; S.P.C.K., 1948.
- Problems of Reunion. London;  
Eyre to Spottiswoode, 1950.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. and Smyth, Charles. The Genius of the Church of England. N.Y.; S.P.C.K., 1947.
- Reardon, Bernard M.G. From Coleridge to Gore : A Century of Religious Thought in Britain. London; Longmans, 1971.
- Reckitt, Maurice B. Maurice to Temple : a century of the social movement in the Church of England. London; Faber and Faber, 1947.
- Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century ed. A.C. Cochrane. Philadelphia; Westminster Press, 1966.
- Reindorp, George (ed.) The Guildford Lectures 1961 : The Anglican Communion in the World-wide Church. London; Barrie and Rockliff, 1962.
- Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches : A Joint Report. London; S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Relations between the Church of England and Presbyterian Church of England. A Report. London; S.P.C.K., 1968.

- Report of the Committee of the Representative Church Council on the report of the Archbishop's committee on Church and State. London; S.P.C.K., 1918.
- Reunion. The Lambeth Conference and the Free Churches. London; S.P.C.K., 1924.
- Revised Canons of the Church of England Further Considered. London; S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Rich, Edward Charles. Spiritual Authority in the Church of England. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- Riplinger, Thomas. An American Vision of the Church : The Church in American Protestant Theology, 1937 - 1967. Frankfurt/M; Peter Lang and Bern; Herbert Lang, 1976.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. The Vision of Unity. London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.
- Robinson, J.A.T. Christian Freedom in a Permissive Society. London; S.C.M., 1970.
- On Being the Church in the World. London; S.C.M., 1960.
- Rogers, Travers Guy (ed.). Liberal Evangelicalism : an interpretation. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.
- Ross, Kenneth N. The Necessity of Episcopacy. 'The Historic Episcopate' considered. London; The Church Union, 1955.
- Rouse, Ruth and Neill S.C. (eds.). A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517 - 1948. London; S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Rowden, Alfred William. The Primates of the Four Georges. London; John Murray, 1916.
- Rowse, Alfred Leslie. The Elizabethans and America : the Trevelyan lectures at Cambridge, 1958. London; Macmillan, 1959.
- The Rule of Faith as professed by the Church of England, adopted at the Lambeth Conference, and applicable to the solution of our present difficulties : a letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Oxford, by a priest in the Oxford diocese. Oxford and London; Parker, 1867.
- Sanders, Charles Richard. Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement. Durham, N. Carolina; Duke Univ. Press, 1942.
- Sandford, Ernest G. (ed.) Memoirs of Archbishop Temple by Seven Friends. 2 volumes. London; Macmillan and Co., 1906.

- Sansbury, Kenneth. Truth, Unity and Concord : Anglican Faith in an Ecumenical setting. London; A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1967.
- Schaff, Philip. The Reunion of Christendom. N.Y., Scribner 1893.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. The Church. London; A. and C. Black, 1950.
- Schweizer, Edward. The Church as the Body of Christ. London; S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Scottish Church Society Conferences, 1920. The Lambeth Encyclical and other Proposals Considered. Papers by H.J. Wotherspoon, R.S. Kirkpatrick, James H. Leishman. Edinburgh; Andrew Elliott, 1920.
- Seeley, John Robert. The Expansion of England. London; Macmillan, 1902.
- Segundo, Juan Luis. The Community Called Church. Maryknoll, N.Y.; Orbis Books, 1973.
- Selwyn, E.G. The Approach to Christianity. London; Longman's, 1925.
- Essays Catholic and Critical. London; S.P.C.K., 1926.
- "The Lambeth Conference" Theology 1/4 (1920), pp 211 - 221.
- Shaw, George Peter. Patriarch and Patriot. William Grant Broughton 1788 - 1853. Melbourne; M.U.P., 1978.
- A Short Guide to the Lambeth Conference of 1958. Articles Reprinted from the Official Year Book of the Church of England 1958. London; Church Information Board, 1958.
- Simonson, Conrad. The Christology of the Faith and Order Movement. Leiden; E.J. Brill, 1972.
- Simpson, James B. and Story, Edward M. The Long Shadows of Lambeth X. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Simpson, J.G. (ed.). The Lambeth Joint Report on Church Unity. A Discussion by the Archbishop of York, the Reverend W.B. Selbie, the Reverend J. Scott Lidgett, the Reverend P. Carnegie Simpson, the Bishop of Gloucester, Members of the Lambeth Joint Conference. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.
- Slack, Kenneth. George Bell. London; S.C.M., 1971.

- Smith, Anthony D.S.      Theories of Nationalism. London;  
Duckworth, 1971.
- Smith, H. Maynard.      Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar : Life of Frank  
Weston, 1871 - 1924. London; S.P.C.K., 1926.
- Smyth, Charles, H.E.      The Church and the Nation : Six Studies  
in the Anglican Tradition introduced by sermon  
by Lord Fisher at his Enthronement, Canterbury  
Cathedral, 1945. London; Hodder and  
Stoughton, 1962.
- Simeon and Church Order : a study of the  
origins of the evangelical revival in Cambridge  
in the 18th century. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1940.
- Cyril Foster Garbett, Archbishop of  
York. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1959.
- Snyder Howard A.      New Wineskins : Changing the Man-made  
structures of the Church. London; Marshall,  
Morgan and Scott, 1977.
- Spencer, Malcolm.      Impasse or Opportunity? The situation  
after Lambeth. London; S.C.M., 1922.
- Spooner, William A.      Bishop Butler. London; Methuen and  
Co., 1901.
- Stanley, Arthur P.      Life and Correspondence of Thomas  
Arnold. 2 volumes. London; John Murray, 1881.
- Stephenson, Anthony A.      Anglican Orders. London; Burns and  
Oates, 1956.
- Stephenson, Alan M.G.      Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences.  
London; S.P.C.K., 1978.
- "The Bible and the Lambeth Conferences",  
Theology LXXVIII/661 (1975), pp 361 - 369.
- The First Lambeth Conference 1867.  
Published for the Church Historical Society.  
London; S.P.C.K., 1967.
- "100 Years of Lambeth". Church Times,  
Supplement 19 July, 1968.
- Stock, Eugene.      A History of the Church Missionary Society.  
4 volumes. London; C.M.S., 1899 - 1916.
- Stone, Darwell.      "The Lambeth Conference of 1897". C.Q.R.  
LXXXIX (1897), pp 190 - 215.
- Stone, Darwell and Fuller, F.W.      Who are Members of the Church?  
Statement of evidence in criticism of a sentence  
in the Appeal to All Christian People made by the  
Lambeth Conference of 1920, which is fundamental  
to all the propositions of that Appeal. Pusey  
House Occasional Papers No. 9. London;  
Longmans, Green and Co., 1921.

Subscription and Assent to the Thirty Nine Articles. Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine. London; S.P.C.K., 1968.

Sundkler, Bengt, G.M. Church of South India. The Movement towards Union 1900 - 1947. London; Lutterworth Press, 1965.

The World of Mission. London; Lutterworth Press, 1965.

Swanston, Hamish F.G. Ideas of Order : Anglicans and the renewal of theological method in the middle years of the 19th century. Assen; Van Gorcum, 1974.

Swete, Henry Barclay (ed.) Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry. London; Macmillan and Co., 1918.

Sykes, Norman. Church and State in England in the 18th Century. London; C.U.P., 1962.

The Crisis of the Reformation. London; Geoffrey Bles, The Centenary Press, 1938.

From Sheldon to Secker : aspects of English Church History, 1660 - 1768. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1959.

Old Priest and New Presbyter : The Anglican Attitude to Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Papacy since the Reformation. Cambridge; C.U.P., 1956.

Sykes, Stephen W. Christian Theology Today. London and Oxford; Mowbrays, 1971.

The Integrity of Anglicanism. London; Mowbrays, 1978.

"The Problem of Lambeth 78". Theology LXXXII/685 (January 1979), p 2 - 9.

Symon, Dudley. Lambeth Questions. London; S.P.C.K., 1948.

Symondson, Anthony (ed.) The Victorian Crisis of Faith. London; S.P.C.K., 1970.

Synodical Government in the Church of England Being the Report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. London; Church Information Office, 1966.

Tait, George. Ordination and the Lambeth proposals for re-union. Melbourne, Brown Prior; n.d.

Tavard, George. The Quest for Catholicity. London; Burns and Oates, 1961.

- Temple, William. Christianity and Social Order. Harmondsworth; Penguin, 1942.
- Christianity and the State. London; Macmillan and Co., 1928.
- Church and Nation. London; Macmillan and Co., 1915.
- "Comprehensiveness" in Religious Experience and other essays and addresses. London; Clarke, 1958, pp 87 - 96.
- Thoughts on some Problems of the Day. London; Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1931. pp 69 - 87 and 88 - 132 respectively.
- Thielicke, Helmut. The Trouble with the Church : a call for renewal. N.Y.; Harper and Row, 1965.
- Thompson, Kenneth A. Bureaucracy and Church Reform : The organizational response of the Church of England to Social Change, 1800 - 1965. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Thomson, George Malcolm. The Lambeth Conference. London; Faber and Faber, 1930.
- Thornton, Lionel S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. Westminster; Dacre Press, 1941.
- Richard Hooker : a study of his Theology. London; S.P.C.K., 1924.
- Thung, Mady A. The Precarious Organization : Sociological Explorations of the Church's Mission and Structure. The Hague; Mouton, 1976.
- Till, Barry. Change and Exchange. Mutual Responsibility and the Church of England. London; Church Information Office, 1964.
- Changing Frontiers in the Mission of the Church. London; S.P.C.K., 1965.
- The Churches Search for Unity. London; Penguin, 1972.
- Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology. 3 volumes. London; Nisbet and Co., 1953 - 64.
- 'The Times'. Church and Empire : A reprint of the special number of the Times, June 25, 1930. London; Times Publishing Co., 1930.
- Today's Church and Today's World with a special focus on the Ministry of Bishops. The Lambeth Conference 1978, Preparatory Articles. London; C.I.O. Publishing, 1977.

- Tompkins, Oliver S.      The Church in the Purpose of God.  
London; S.C.M., 1950.
- Tomkins, Oliver S.      A Time for Unity. London; S.C.M., 1964.
- Toon, Peter.            Evangelical Theology, 1833 - 1856 : A Response  
to Tractarianism. London; Marshall, Morgan and  
Scott, 1979.
- Torrance, Thomas F.     Conflict and Agreement in the Church.  
2 volumes. London; Lutterworth Press, 1959.
- Towards the Conversion of England. Being the Report of a  
Commission on Evangelism appointed by the  
Archbishops of Canterbury and York pursuant to a  
Resolution of the Church Assembly passed at the  
Summer Session 1943. London; Press and  
Publications Board of the Church Assembly,  
Westminster, 1945.
- Tracts for the Times : by members of the University of Oxford.  
6 volumes. London; J.G. and F. Rivington and  
Oxford; J.H. Parker, 1833 - 41.
- Trevelyan, George Otto.   Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay.  
2 volumes. London; Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1908.
- Trevor, Mariol.        Newman, the Pillar and the Cloud; and, Newman,  
Light in Winter. London; Macmillan, 1962.
- Troeltsch, Ernst.        The Social Teaching of the Christian  
Churches. 2 volumes. London; Macmillan, 1931.
- Tucker, H.W.            The English Church in Other Lands. London;  
Longmans, Green and Co., 1886.
- Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of George  
Augustus Selwyn D.D., Bishop of New Zealand 1841 -  
1869; Bishop of Lichfield 1867 - 1878. 2 volumes.  
London; William Wells Gardner, 1879.
- Tulloch, John.         Movements of Religious thought in Britain  
during the 19th century. London; Longmans, 1885.
- Turner, Henry E.W. (ed.)   The Articles of the Church of  
England. London; Mowbrays, 1964.
- The Pattern of Christian Truth:  
a study in the relations between orthodoxy and  
heresy in the early Church. London; A.R. Mowbray  
and Co., 1954.
- Vidler, Alex R.         F.D. Maurice and Company : 19th century  
studies. London; S.C.M., 1966.
- The Orb and the Cross. London; S.P.C.K.,  
1945.

- Vidler, Alex R. "What is Anglicanism?" in Theology Li / 336 - 7 (1948), pp 201 - 206 and pp 241 - 246.
- Vockler, John C. Can Anglicans Believe Anything? The Nature and Spirit of Anglicanism. Sydney; The Anglican Truth Society, 1961.
- Voll, Dieter. Catholic Evangelicalism : the acceptance of evangelical traditions by the Oxford Movement during the second half of the 19th century : a contribution to understanding recent Anglicanism. London; Faith Press, 1962.
- Vorgrimler, Herbert (ed.) Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. 5 volumes. London; Burns and Oates, 1967 - 1969.
- One, Holy and Apostolic : studies in the nature and role of the Church in the Modern world. London; Sheed and Ward, 1968.
- Waddams, Herbert. "The Next Lambeth Conference" Theology LXVIII/539 (1965) pp 241 - 245.
- Walsh, J.D. "Origins of the Evangelical Revival" in G.V. Bennett and J.D. Walsh (eds.), Essays in Modern Church History : in memory of Norman Sykes. London; A. and C. Black, 1960.
- Ward, J.W.C. The Anglican Communion. A Survey. London; O.U.P., 1948.
- Anglicanism in History and Today. London; Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1961.
- Warren, Max A.C. Crowded Canvas. Some Experiences of a Life-Time. London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1974.
- The Functions of a National Church. London; Epworth Press, 1964.
- Social History and Christian Mission. London; S.C.M., 1967.
- Some schemes of Church union before the Anglican Communion today .... London; Anglican Society, 1958.
- Webb, Clement C.J. A Century of Anglican Theology and other lectures. Oxford; Basil Blackwell, 1923.
- Welch, P.J. "Anglican Churchmen and the Establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric". Journal of Ecclesiastical History viii (1957), pp 193 - 204.
- "The Revival of an Active Convocation of Canterbury". Journal of Ecclesiastical History (1959), pp 188 - 197.

- Weston, Frank. *Ecclesia Anglicana; for what does she stand?*  
An open letter to the Right Reverend Father in God,  
Edgar, Lord Bishop of St. Albans. London;  
Longmans, 1913.
- Whale, John S. *Christian Reunion : Historic Divisions  
Reconsidered.* London; Lutterworth Press, 1971.
- Wilkinson, John. "Lambeth in 1969" Church Quarterly i/3,  
(Jan. 1969). pp 201 - 205.
- Williams, A.T.P. *The Anglican Tradition in the Life of  
England.* London; Macmillan, 1947.
- Williams, R.R. *Authority and the Church.* London; S.P.C.K.,  
1965.
- Willmer, Haddon (ed.) *Christian Faith and Political Hopes :  
a reply to E.R. Norman.* London; Epworth Press,  
1979.
- Wilson, B.R. *Religion in Secular Society.* London; Watts,  
1966.
- Patterns of Sectarianism* London;  
Heinemann, 1967.
- "The Anglican Church and its decline". New  
Society, 5 December, 1974.
- Wilson, W. Gilbert. *The Faith of an Anglican : a companion  
to the Revised Catechism.* London; Collins, 1980.
- Winckworth, Peter. *A Simple Approach to the Canon Law.*  
London; S.P.C.K., 1951.
- Wolf, William J. (ed.) *The Spirit of Anglicanism : Hooker,  
Maurice and Temple.* Willton, Conn.; Morehouse-  
Barlow Co., 1979.
- Woods, Edward S. and Macnutt, F.B. *Theodore, Bishop of  
Winchester. Pastor, Prophet, Pilgrim, 1874 -  
1932.* London; S.P.C.K., 1933.
- Woods, F.T. *Lambeth and Reunion; an interpretation of the  
mind of the Lambeth Conference, 1920.* London;  
S.P.C.K., 1921.
- Woodhouse, H.F. "Permanent Features of Hooker's Polity".  
Anglican Theological Review 42 (1960), pp 164 - 8.
- cp Egil Gristis and W. Speed Hill.  
*Richard Hooker : A Selected Bibliography.*  
Pittsburgh; The Clifford C. Barbour Library,  
Pittsburgh Theol. Seminary, 1971.
- Woolverton, John F. "Huntingdon's Quadrilateral : A  
Critical Study". Church History 39 (June 1970),  
pp 198 - 211.

- Wordsworth, Christopher.      Theophilus Anglicanus; or instruction concerning the Church and the Anglican branch of it. London; Rivington Press, (6th edition) 1850.
- World Council of Churches.      "The Meaning of Conciliar Fellowship" Report of Committee I, Commission of Faith and Order, World Council of Churches, Bangalore, India, 1978.
- Wright J. Robert (ed.)      A Communion of Communions: One Eucharistic Fellowship. The Detroit Report and Papers of the Triennial Ecumenical Study of the Episcopal Church, 1976 - 1979. N.Y., Seabury Press, 1979.
- Yates, T.E.      Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad : The missionary policies of Henry Venn and their repercussions upon the Anglican Episcopate of the Colonial Period, 1841 - 1872. London; S.P.C.K., 1978.
- Zabriskie, Alexander C.      Bishop Brent, Crusader for Christian Unity. Philadelphia; Westminster Press, 1948.
- Zeevelt, William G.      Foundations of Tudor Policy. Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1948.

III UNPUBLISHED THESES AND ARTICLES.

- Chadwick, Henry Full Communion with other Episcopal Churches. Mimeographed, 1980.
- Daykin, Timothy E. Authority in Liberal-Catholic Anglicanism. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Durham, 1980.
- Fenner, C.J. The Concept and Theological Significance of Ecumenical Councils in the Anglican Tradition. Ph.D. thesis for Catholic U. of America Washington D.C., 1974.
- Glubokovsky, Nicholas N. Union, Intercommunion and the Lambeth Conference. Unpublished manuscript, dedicated to Nathan Söderblom.
- de Haas, Pieter. The Church as an Institution: Critical studies in the relation between theology and sociology. Privately published S.T.D. thesis, University of Leiden, 1972.
- Huber, John G. The Principle of Comprehension as an Ecumenical Context for Christian Unity within Diversity. Unpublished M.Th thesis, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal., 1972.
- Hutchison, Margaret A. Obedience as a theme in the documents of the 2nd Vatican Council. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Durham, 1981.
- Leonard, G.D. The Future of the Anglican Communion. Mimeographed, undated.
- Libby, Robert M.G. Lambeth X and the Chicago - Lambeth Quadrilateral. Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, University of the South, U.S.A., 1972.
- McGarry, Caecilio. The Catholic Character of Anglican Ecclesiology, 1945 - 1963. Dissertation; Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, 1964.
- Stockmaier, Peter The Election of Bishops by Clergy and People in the Early Church. Mimeographed, undated.

