

FAITH AND THOUGHT

*A Journal devoted to the study of the inter-relation of the
Christian Revelation and modern research.*

1971

Vol. 99

Number 3

COLIN BROWN

Presuppositions in Christendom: Anglicanism

In this paper Dr. Brown, formerly Dean of Studies at Tyndale Hall, Bristol, discusses both from a historical and modern point of view the ideas underlying Anglicanism.

To speak of *the presuppositions of Anglicanism* may be misleading. The words suggest a more or less coherent belief-system. I believe that Thomas Cranmer and the framers of the *Book of Common Prayer* and the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* had such a system of interrelated beliefs. I do not see how a religion could maintain credibility or survive without a system of beliefs. But I do not think that one could say that the Church of England at the present day - still less the so-called Anglican Communion - has a single system of beliefs. To the less sympathetic observer the parable of the wheat and the tares growing together in confusion might seem a more appropriate picture.

There is another difficulty. In its simple sense a presupposition is a supposition adopted beforehand. The beliefs that I am going to describe could be held in this sense. But most of those who hold them would want to say that they are not merely suppositions, axioms that are unquestioned. They might fulfil the role of a regulative principle in a person's thinking and actions. But most practising Anglicans would want to add that we are not dealing solely with abstract notions that cannot be validated.

Moreover, I for one, would wish to add that with Anglicanism - as with other forms of Christian belief - we are not dealing with something that is complete and finished at some point in time such as 1571 or 1662. We are concerned with something that is subject to modification and change - I will not say *development*, as that implies improvement or perhaps organic evolution. There are certainly organic connections. But it would be unrealistic and unhistorical to pretend that the beliefs held, say, by the bench of bishops today could all

be explained in terms of a set of laws or principles such as Newman formulated in *The Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845). Anglicanism, as it is today, is not a single organism that has grown out of a single embryo. It is a heterodox body, united by a number of intersecting allegiances which are religious, theological, legal, sociological, historical and even in a broad sense political.

If, therefore, we wish to examine presuppositions in Anglicanism, we must look at various beliefs, practices and historical events. What follows is in no sense an *apologia*, but an attempt at analysis. Inevitably it will be shallow, for the subject is very broad. The points may appear to be oddly assorted. But this rather diversified approach is called for by the subject.

Theism

The most fundamental presupposition of Anglicanism is its committal to a theistic view of God in accordance with the Jewish-Christian tradition.

An integral feature of this biblically grounded theism is belief in the historical incarnation of the Son of God, his atoning death, and resurrection, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. All this Anglicanism shares with the historic Catholic church and the other Protestant churches of the Reformation. I mention it, however, for two reasons.

(i) On the one hand, it is this theistic, Trinitarian conception of God and the world which provides the framework, vantage point, or conceptual models for Anglican faith and thought. (ii) On the other hand, it is precisely the question of theism which has become the most fundamental theological question of our day. Early on in *Honest to God* (1963) John Robinson had a chapter on 'The End of Theism?' The question mark left Bishop Robinson a little room for manoeuvre and retreat. But on the whole he spoke very disparagingly of theism which he seemed to think scientifically untenable and intellectually unacceptable to modern man. And the remainder of the book was devoted to a non-theistic restatement of Christianity. Bishop Robinson favoured in its place an approach adopted from Tillich which

spoke of God as 'depth of being', 'power of being', or 'being itself'. More recently John Macquarrie in *Principles of Christian Theology* (1966) has advocated what he calls an existential-ontological approach which similarly speaks of God in terms of 'being', and of creation as 'letting-be'.

This is not the place to embark upon a defence of theism. I wish simply to make two observations. First, I think that there are more difficulties attached to the thought of 'being' than there are to the idea of God. Secondly, if you substitute 'being' for God, then you have in fact a very different religion. Although Anglicans may be found among the supporters of such a religion, and although it finds that it cannot completely dispense with the language of theism, it is nevertheless radically different. To a traditional Anglican theist, it would seem to dissolve the Trinity and confuse the Creator and the creature.

Authority and Theological Method

Article VI of the Church of England speaks of "the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation"¹ and Article XX states that "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written". Taken together these Articles, in their entirety, might be said to express the Anglican principle. In view of the importance of the subject certain comments are necessary.

(i) It might be objected that to stress these two Articles - or even to appeal to the *Thirty-Nine Articles* at all - is to represent the more Protestant and evangelical wing of the Anglican Church. In reply it must be said that this type of thinking has underlain all official liturgical formulations and theological pronouncements from the Reformation to the present. It has found contemporary expression in the *Report of the Anglican-Methodist Unity Commission*.² Moreover, subscription to this principle is required of all Anglican clergy in the context of their declaration of assent to the Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and the ordering of bishops, priests and deacons.³

(ii) The Church of England is not hereby committed to a single, monochrome view of revelation or scripture. Indeed,

no definitions of either are attempted here. Revelation is not confined to scripture. Nor is the claim made that there is no truth about God to be found outside scripture. The Articles do not identify revelation with the disclosure of a series of propositions. On the other hand, they do not do what William Temple did in his *Nature, Man and God*⁴ – that is, exclude the possibility of revelation in and through words.

(iii) What the Articles do is not to pre-empt discussion either of revelation or the historical origins of Christianity, but to recognise the normative character of scripture. (This also comes out in Articles VIII and XXI which declare that the authority of both the creeds and the councils of the church depends upon the demonstrability of their teaching from scripture.)

(iv) There is here a kind of public verification of teaching. This certainly is not a matter of referring everything to the individual conscience. Nor does it prohibit individuals from believing things not held by their fellow members of the church. But for common teaching of essential belief, doctrines are to be referred back to Scripture. Not only have they got to be referred back to Scripture, but they have to be seen to be capable of being referred back.

(v) To bring this Anglican position into even sharper focus, it may be contrasted with the Catholic view and the strict Nonconformist concept of the regulative use of scripture.

The Catholic view embraces a wide spectrum. At one end there is the ultramontanist of Vatican I with its definitions of papal authority and infallibility, making *ex cathedra* papal pronouncements binding upon all the faithful. Somewhat more restrained is the affirmation of Vatican II that: "Sacred tradition and sacred Scripture form one sacred deposit of the word of God, . . . committed to the church. . . The task of authentically interpreting the word of God, whether written or handed on, has been entrusted exclusively to the living teaching office of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ."⁵ An attempt to locate authority in the Spirit-guided church was made by Charles Gore and the Anglican liberal Catholics in the nineteenth century⁶ and more recently in the *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church* (1963).⁷ The

latter was rejected by the dissentient Methodists⁸ and subsequently clarified in the final report on *The Scheme*.⁹ The difficulty about such views is that they break down under historical criticism and they offer no criteria for discerning truth from error. Whatever is - or is held by the church at the time - is true. At bottom there is here a confusion of the Word of God and the word of man.

On the other hand, the Anglican position does not rule out tradition and reason. It allows for development and adaptation. It does not imagine that a healthy, living church is one which tries to copy the New Testament church in every detail. For Scripture does not give a blueprint for the structure of church and ministry and the conduct of daily life in every age and situation. There is room for interpretation, flexibility and adaptation. No church in Christendom is an exact duplicate of the church of the New Testament. In the New Testament itself there were differences of order and structure. The important point is to recognise the principles embodied in the New Testament church, and apply them.¹⁰

Historical Factors

At this point a generalisation may be in order. In Germany the Reformation began as a theological one, and then it became a political one. In England it was the reverse: it was first political and then theological. At Wittenberg the Reformation began as a theological act through Luther's rejection of indulgences and the publication of his *Ninety-Five Theses* in 1517. Almost immediately it acquired political connotations. In 1520 Luther was himself urging the right of princes to intervene and reform the church in his *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. He did so on the grounds that the clergy have no monopoly of the church, that the Christian layman is equally a member of the church, and therefore the godly prince has the right and duty to implement reform.

The same right of the prince to implement reform was also argued by Anglicans. Richard Hooker,¹¹ for example, held that under certain circumstances church and state were distinct entities. Such was the case of Israel in Egypt and the

primitive church in pagan Rome. But when ancient Israel was free from bondage, the church and the commonwealth formed one society, both governed by divine law. This analogy, Hooker argued, served as a model for the Anglican church.

In the meantime, however, the Church of England was inaugurated by a political act, occasioned by the divorce question of Henry VIII. In order to divorce Catherine of Aragon (because he believed that the marriage was under divine judgment), Henry had to break with Rome, and form a national church in which the king was declared to be "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia*".¹² At the same time Henry's religion was a form of Catholicism without the pope. The practices, worship and teaching of the church remained unreformed so long as the king was alive. Even the dissolution of the monasteries was a political act, although certain reforming reasons were dug up to justify it. While Cranmer and other bishops were privately becoming increasingly reformed in their outlook, men like Bilney and Tyndale were prosecuted and martyred. The reformed Prayer Book, Articles and ordinal came only with the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I. Although times have changed considerably since the sixteenth century, the historical origins of the Church of England have left their mark. We must now consider some of the implications.

(i) *The Sovereign, the State and the Church.* Henry's claim to be "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England" with its overtones of the medieval power struggle between kings and popes was duly modified and softened by the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy (1559). The latter's oath of allegiance required declaration in conscience "that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm and of all other her Highness' dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal".¹³ This included the authority to reform and to make appointments, including the bishops.

With the rise of parliamentary democracy the power of appointment has passed into the hands of the prime minister who need not be a professing Christian at all, still less a

member of the Church of England. In the same way parliament still retains legislative authority over the Church of England. At one time this was justifiable, since members of parliament were *ipso facto* communicant members of the Church of England, and Parliament was thus (with the bishops in the Lords) the lay assembly of the church. This matter came to a head in 1927-28 when parliament rejected the proposed new Prayer Book which had been accepted by the Church Assembly (a body invented to meet the needs of the changed situation). The incident was significant not only for the fate of the Prayer Book and the role of parliament, but also in bringing to light the motives of the parties concerned. The 1928 Prayer Book was a somewhat more liberal and catholic version of the Book of Common Prayer which (apart from the names of the sovereigns mentioned in various prayers) has remained unchanged since 1662.

Some members of parliament felt that the book should be accepted, since it had been passed by the Church Assembly. Others saw in the book the seeds of popery, and since they regarded the Church of England as a bastion against Rome, they voted it out. Among these were many who were not Anglicans at all. Some of them were evangelicals who on other grounds would have no truck with the Church of England. The rejection of the 1928 Prayer Book was a victory for biblical Protestantism. But the question must be faced whether the position of parliament can be theologically justified on the premises of the same biblical Protestantism. Some saw in parliament a safeguard for the church against itself, and many who are not evangelicals regard the rejection of the 1928 book as an act of providence. It is doubtful, however, whether parliament would ever again veto a motion of this nature submitted to it by the church. But if the present church-state ties cannot be justified theologically, do we really desire the link to be completely severed and the state adopt a pagan stance? It may be that we conclude with the recent commission on church and state that the relationship should be revised, and even bring other communions into it.¹⁴ The one thing we cannot do is to justify theologically the present relationship now that the original premises no longer obtain.

(ii) *Uniformity and Unity.* Uniformity of worship and church policy was imposed upon England by various Acts of Uniformity (1549, 1552, 1559 and 1662) which made successive versions of the Book of Common Prayer obligatory for all. This was not without some justification in an age less literate than our own and already accustomed to conformity in religion. Given the political circumstances of the sixteenth century and Rome's opposition to the Reformation, it was inevitable that reforms should be implemented by civil law. Moreover, from the time of Constantine onwards rulers have felt it safer, if they had only one brand of Christianity to contend with. This was certainly true of the Tudors, and not without good reason. For religious differences were all too often aligned with political ones, and the monarch's tenure of the throne was nothing if not precarious.

When Mary was on the throne all the reforms of Edward's reign were swept away, and Protestants were systematically persecuted. When Elizabeth succeeded her sister, Protestantism was restored. But neither the crown nor the Anglican Church were secure from rebellion at home and invasion from abroad. In 1570 Pope Pius V published the bull *Regnans in Excelsis* which declared Elizabeth both a usurper and a heretic, absolved her subjects of allegiance, and ordered them to disobey her laws. English Catholics were thus placed in a position of conflicting loyalties, where to be a Catholic was tantamount to being a traitor. Anti-Catholic penal laws inevitably followed.

At the other end of the religious spectrum nonconformity came into being through the opposition of those Protestants who felt that the reforms of the Elizabethan settlement did not go far enough. The old parish structure had been retained together with the threefold order of ministry of bishops, priests and deacons. The Prayer Book services were largely modelled on those of the pre-reformation church. Although they had an unambiguous reformed character, certain practices were retained on the grounds that they did not conflict with scripture. The separatists and independents felt that the Church of England was too broadly based, and that a gathered church of professing and believing Christians in which each congregation governed its own affairs was

required by the New Testament. Presbyterians wished to abolish episcopacy in favour of a church governed by presbyters. The Baptists enjoined adult baptism only.

With the hindsight of subsequent history one can only wish that those in power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had been more flexible in paying heed to the suggestions of the nonconformists. The Acts of Uniformity contributed to securing national unity. They bestowed to the church an unequalled book of devotion, but it was at a price. They established Anglicanism as the official religion of England, but failed to secure either uniformity or unity.

Various reasons for this failure have been put forward, but the fundamental one seems to me to be that this kind of unity and uniformity is an impossible goal. The dividing line between unity and uniformity is often a thin one. It is not necessarily fixed once and for all. Each generation must ask itself where it lies. We must never again fall into the trap of confusing the two. The church of the New Testament enjoyed a unity without rigid uniformity. The ideal is not an impossible one. The chief dangers are, on the one hand an indifference to truth which would produce a body which stood for nothing in particular, and on the other hand, a mentality which thinks rigidly in terms of organizational structures.

In the meantime, Anglicans are prone to forget that the situation which gave rise to the universal standardization of worship according to the Book of Common Prayer no longer obtains. Nevertheless, we continue to use the Book of Common Prayer with each church making relatively minor alterations to suit its needs. In recent years alternative services have been sanctioned for experimental use.¹⁵ These allow a certain number of variations, but the Anglican Church remains wedded to the ideal of prescribed services with prescribed forms.

It may be argued that to use such forms facilitates worship in a way which, for those who use them, would otherwise be difficult. It cannot be convincingly argued that use of set forms guarantees a spirit of worship, or that it ensures doctrinal unity. Nor can the argument be sustained either from the New Testament or pastoral experience that such forms meet all possible needs of the local congregation.

Anglican churches have been largely designed and built for these services. Consequently they are of little use for anything else. Most of them are difficult to use for teaching Christian doctrine or meeting for informal prayer! In a similar way the pattern of the Prayer Book has shaped the pattern of Sunday services and activities. Until comparatively recently it has been an unexamined presupposition that the right way to spend Sunday was to attend Holy Communion at 8 a.m., followed by the almost identical services of Morning and Evening Prayer. The richness and fulness of these services have militated against the ministry of teaching. At the present time Anglicans would do well to question the underlying premises of this pattern of worship and life. Ought not a much greater degree of flexibility be contemplated concerning the use and taking of services? Could it not for example be that, at least in some churches, Sunday evening might be better spent in less formal fellowship and more detailed study of the Christian message and its application to modern life?

The Ministry

At the Reformation the Church of England retained the threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons. In practice, bishops mean essentially the diocesan bishops, plus the archbishops and suffragans or assistants to the diocesan bishops. The word priest was stripped of its pre-reformation connotations and is substantially the same as presbyter. The deacon has virtually become a probationer priest. The form of ordination is by imposition of hands by a bishop.

These three forms of ministry are justified by the *Preface* to the Ordinal on the grounds that:

It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

Here I am afraid that I must dissent. It is true that one can find ministers bearing these titles in the New Testament. But

do these names stand for the same thing? Are there only three orders? Here we must apply to the Church of England the principle that I earlier called the Anglican principle, i.e. we must examine the biblical basis of the idea¹⁶ in willingness to change if need be, though not expecting modern forms to conform to the letter with ancient ones. Diocesan bishops are patently not the same as bishops in the New Testament. The latter would seem to be identical with presbyters. Instead of there being several churches to a bishop, there appear to be several bishops to a church in New Testament times. The office of deacon does not seem to be a probationary step to the priesthood, but a ministry in its own right even though it did not necessarily obtain in every church. Indeed, the patterns of ministry described in the New Testament seem to have been highly flexible and capable of adaptation to local needs. The basic essential was the ministry of pastoral oversight and instruction, exercised by the bishop or presbyter in the local church and the apostle and his assistants (like Timothy and Titus) in the church at large. From these considerations several points follow.

(i) Although the Anglican pattern of ministry has continued for over four hundred years, it cannot be regarded as sacrosanct and inviolable. If the church is to be true to the Reformation spirit as the *ecclesia semper reformanda*, the structures and orders of ministry should fall within the scope of further reformation.

(ii) If the present threefold order is to be justified, it is to be done so on historical and pragmatic grounds, i.e. by showing the positive gains that have emerged from this type of ministry rather than by rationalizing historical contingencies as divinely appointed ideal patterns.

(iii) If the New Testament shows a degree of flexibility in the ministries practised in the early church, the modern church has good precedent for recognizing ministries outside the defined threefold order. These might include, for example, the office of evangelist. That of the deacon might be revised and become once more a permanent order.

(iv) The office of bishop is not to be justified on the grounds that office holders with the same title can be found in the New Testament. The latter served the local church and

appear to have no jurisdiction outside it (except when they met corporately with the apostles to discuss policy matters). On the other hand, there was a wider ministry of oversight which linked the churches. This was exercised by the apostles and men like Timothy and Titus, and this is a more appropriate precedent and model for episcopal oversight today.

(v) These points have bearing on the vexed question of church unity. With the rise of Anglo-Catholicism in the nineteenth century the claim gained wide currency that the only valid orders of ministry were those in the apostolic succession of episcopal ordination. The claim is now generally recognized to be theologically unwarranted and historically unfounded. Nevertheless, it has become a tacit assumption of a good deal of both Anglican and non-Anglican thinking in unity discussions. It was embodied in the Lambeth Quadri-lateral of 1888 and in successive affirmations of the latter of the Lambeth Conferences of bishops of the Anglican communion.¹⁷ The notion lies at the bottom of the Service of Reconciliation in the Anglican-Methodist unity scheme which makes the episcopal laying-on-of-hands on Methodist ministers the *sine qua non* of Anglican Methodist union. It performs no service to the wellbeing or credibility of either Anglicanism or Methodism, when church leaders on both sides regard this tacit form of conditional, episcopal ordination as an indispensable presupposition.

The Anglican Communion

The Church of England began as the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the national church of England (though not, significantly, of Scotland). With the growth of Christian missions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was inevitable that this home-product should be exported. When Anglicans went to the colonies or to some new mission field, the brand of Christianity that they took with them was inevitably Anglicanism. In due course forms of Anglicanism - each in communion with Canterbury - were established throughout the British Empire.

In 1867 the first Lambeth Conference of bishops was held. Such conferences have met ever since at roughly ten-yearly

intervals. After the last conference in 1968 there were those who asked whether there ever would - or should - be another.

The Presuppositions of Anglicanism

The question reflects an awareness of the difficulty and legitimacy of Pan-Anglicanism. With the collapse of the British Empire and the disintegration of the Commonwealth is it right to perpetuate this kind of allegiance to Canterbury and keep widely different churches in step? Should the Anglican communion try to be a kind of duplicate of Rome? Should it not rather encourage its member churches to cultivate closer relations with their fellow Christians in their own lands?

A Confessional Church and a Way of Life

It is sometimes urged that the comprehensiveness of the Anglican church is its glory. The remark reflects the fact that since the reformation three main streams of churchmanship have emerged: an evangelicalism which stresses the reformed heritage of the Prayer Book and Articles, a catholic stream which sees continuity with the catholic church at large, and the broad church with its rejection of narrowness and professed concern for the wholeness of truth. Such eulogizing may easily slip into sentimental rationalization. Each of the streams has its weaknesses and strengths, and the latter do not alter the incongruity of mutual contradiction. Erroneous belief held by any of these streams in tension with truth is not a sign of strength, but of confusion and weakness. Nevertheless, to be a member of a church in which there are differences of emphasis and practice is not alien to the New Testament. To pursue purity of life and faith is a goal for the church, but the idea of establishing a perfect church is a chimera. The conduct of the disciples during Jesus' public ministry, the parable of the wheat and tares, and the warning against attempting to remove the speck from one's brother's eye should put the church on its guard against ill-conceived plans to establish a pure church. The apostle Paul did not abandon the Galatian church because of heresy or the church of Corinth because of schism and irregular conduct.

In the words of Article XXVI, 'in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good.' Nevertheless, the Church of England remains committed to the following ideal of the church:

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same (Article XIX).

The Church of England is not merely a cultic unity. It is a confessional church in which the laity are bound by their baptismal vows and their profession of the creeds and acts of penitence and commitment in public worship. The clergy are committed to upholding the teaching of the Church, as expressed in the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal.¹⁸ In making such subscription, it is recognized that there are differences of interpretation and emphasis, and that these documents reflect the age and conditions in which they were written. This is only right. They are not a statement of the whole truth. No historical confession can ever be. The Word of God is the ultimate source and criterion of faith. Nevertheless, the importance of confessional standards remains. They serve as a signpost pointing to truth and a boundary indicating the line between truth and error.¹⁹

It may appear to some that this account of Anglicanism has given too much weight to intellectual and theological considerations. The justification for this lies in the recognition that theology is inseparable from life. Nevertheless, the Anglican faith is first and foremost a way of life. Its ideal might best be described as living by the grace of God to the glory of God. In the spirit of the Prayer Book it is a pilgrim life. It concerns the individual's walk with God, though this is never contemplated as isolated individualism apart from man's relationship with his fellow man in church and society. It is grounded on the reconciling, atoning, life giving work of Christ on the cross and in his resurrection, which issues in justification by faith.²⁰ It is sustained by the Word of God in Scripture and the visible words of God in the sacraments.²¹ Its hope is eternal life. And if we wish to catch the

mood of Anglican devotion down the ages, we should meditate on the prayers and collects of the Prayer Book, perhaps beginning and ending with the Communion Collect:

Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help; that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy Name, and finally by thy mercy obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

REFERENCES

1. Book of Common Prayer. Art. VI goes on to list the books of the Old Testament, sharply differentiating them from the Apocrypha which may be read 'for example of life and instruction of manners', but not 'to establish any doctrine'. The canonical books of the New Testament are received. On the background of the Articles see C. Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*, 1890.
2. Part 2, *The Scheme*, 1968, pp. 10-22, especially paras. 49-64.
3. On this see the report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, *Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles*, 1968. The commission proposed a revised form of assent (§ 97): "I, A.B., profess my firm and sincere belief in the faith set forth in the scriptures and in the Catholic Creeds, and my allegiance to the doctrine of the Church of England."
The commission also drew attention to the recently promulgated Canons A 2 and A 5 (§ 101):

'The Thirty-nine Articles are agreeable to the Word of God and may be assented unto with a good conscience by all members of the Church of England.'
 'The doctrine of the Church of England is grounded in the Holy Scriptures, and in such teachings of the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church as are agreeable to the said Scriptures. In particular such doctrine is to be found in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal.'
4. *Op. cit.*, 1934, pp. 317, 321.
5. *Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, III, § 10, Eng. tr. W.M. Abbott and J. Gallagher, editors, *The Documents of Vatican II*, 1966, pp. 117f.
6. See especially Gore's essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' in *Lux Mundi*, edited by Gore, 1889.
7. *Op. cit.*, pp. 17ff.

8. *Op. cit.*, pp. 57f.
9. *Op. cit.*, pp. 18-22 (§§ 49-62).
10. This approach was elaborated in the two great defences of Anglicanism in the Elizabethan age, John Jewel's *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (1562) which was directed at Roman Catholicism, and Richard Hooker's *Treatise on the Laws of Ecclesiastical Policy*, I-VIII (1594-1662) which replied to nonconformist criticism.
11. *Ecclesiastical Polity*, VIII.
12. Act of Supremacy (1534): 26 Henry VIII, c.1.
13. Act of Supremacy (1559): 1 Elizabeth I, c. 1.
14. *Church and State, Report of the Archbishops' Commission*, 1970.
For discussion of issues raised by the report from a more traditional Anglican standpoint see Lord Fisher of Lambeth, 'Church and State' and R.R. Williams, Bishop of Leicester, 'Richard Hooker on the Church and State Report', *The Churchman*, Vol. 85, No. 2, 1971, pp. 90-96 and 97-104.
15. In 1965 two series of *Alternative Services* were produced and subsequently given permission for experimental use. *Series I* was substantially a revision of the rejected 1928 Book. *Series II* contains essentially new services, though it still embodies elements of the traditional ones. In September 1971 the Liturgical Commission produced a *Series III* Order for Holy Communion, a further modernised version of *Series II*.
16. The present writer has attempted to justify the views of the ministry here outlined in 'New Testament Patterns of Ministry' in J.C. Porthouse, ed., *Ministry in the Seventies*, 1970, pp. 10-22.
17. Cf. *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports*, 1968, pp. 122-25.
18. Cf. above n. 3.
19. Cf. Canons A 2 and A 5 cited above in n. 3.
20. Liturgical and theological expression of this may be found in the service of Holy Communion in both the 1662 Prayer Book and the subsequent experimental services. See also Articles II, IV, XI-XIV.
21. Cf the definition of sacraments in Article XXV.