

Some Free Church Reactions to Episcopacy

LOOKING back over the first half of this present century, O. Tomkins¹ is no doubt right when he suggests that perhaps the outstanding feature of the history of the Christian Church during these fifty years is the Ecumenical Movement. In this country, the Movement has roused considerable interest in recent years, largely as a result of the sermon, *A Step Forward in Church Relations*,² preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury on November 3, 1946, before the University of Cambridge. In it,³ the Archbishop made the suggestion that the Free Churches in this country might adopt episcopacy and try it out on their own ground in order that ultimately they might grow to full communion with the Church of England.

This sermon was followed by a report of conversations between representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and representatives of the evangelical Free Churches in England,⁴ dealing with the further implications of the Archbishop's sermon, whilst three other statements from different branches of the Church were also presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. The first to appear was *Catholicity: a Study of the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West*,⁵ drawn up by Anglicans of the "catholic" school of thought. The second was edited by R. Newton Flew and Rupert E. Davies, representing the Free Church view-point, and entitled, *The Catholicity of Protestantism*.⁶ The third was compiled by representatives of the "evangelical" school of thought in the Anglican Church and bore the title, *The Fullness of Christ*.⁷ All these reports were concerned primarily with the underlying cause of the contrast or conflict between the catholic and protestant traditions, and the possibility of a synthesis at any particular point or points.⁸

Since that time the various branches of the non-episcopal churches in England (notably, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Congregational and the Methodist) have been concerned to discuss the question as to what would be involved if they attempted to take episcopacy into their systems. It is still too early perhaps to say whether anything definite will come from their consideration of the Archbishop's suggestion, but sufficient time has already elapsed for us to pause for a moment in order to take stock of the reactions thus far.

Such reactions are of two kinds :

(a) *Official Pronouncement.* The Methodist Conference of 1951 set up a committee to examine the Report that followed the Archbishop's sermon with the result that the Methodist Church, at the Conference of 1952, adopted an official reply⁹ to the Archbishop, making clear precisely where they stood in the matter of episcopacy. The Baptist Union Council, similarly, appointed a special committee, as a result of which a report¹⁰ was approved and published in March 1953. At the time of writing, no official word has yet come from the Presbyterians or Congregationalists.

(b) *Personal Opinion.* A Presbyterian, Mr. J. M. Ross, has written a pamphlet called *Presbyterian Bishops?*¹¹ It takes the form of a dialogue in which a certain "Telling" points out to other clergymen how episcopacy could be fitted into a Presbyterian system without the sacrifice of Presbyterian conviction. Though this is not to be taken as the voice of the whole Presbyterian Communion, it is not to be despised on that account for its writer was one of the Presbyterian representatives in the recent conversations which resulted in the report, *Church Relations in England*.

From the Congregational side there comes *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*¹² by Nathaniel Micklem, who besides being well qualified to speak from the point of view of the Congregational churches, was one of the two chairmen of the commission which drew up the Report on the Archbishop's Sermon, whilst much the same thing has been done for the Methodists by J. Lawson, *Full Communion with the Church of England*.¹³ He discusses what it would mean for Methodists to take episcopacy into their system and, as might be expected, sees no real obstacles, though Rev. J. Huxtable¹⁴ questions whether his view point is typical of Methodism.

From a slightly different angle, the Archbishop's suggestion has also been the subject of more than one address or article by prominent Free Churchmen. Dr. Hugh Martin, for instance, made *The Free Churches and Episcopacy*¹⁵ the title of his address to the Free Church Congress, and Dr. E. A. Payne dealt with the question, "What are the Free Church Objections to Episcopacy?" in an article in *Theology*,¹⁶ bearing the same title as Dr. Martin's address. Other articles in *Theology* have included one by L. Hodgson on "The Religious Value of Episcopacy,"¹⁷ which was prepared for the Anglican-Free Church conversations in September 1949, and one by G. Every on "The Historic Episcopate,"¹⁸ consisting of three objections to the view of the ministry as presented in K. E. Kirk's *The Apostolic Ministry*. In *The Ecumenical Review* for January 1952, two articles were published on "The Apostolic Succession as an Ecumenical Issue";¹⁹ the Anglican point of view was put forward in one by F. Gray, and a reply to it was provided by Henri d'Espine.

This is by no means to be regarded as anything like a complete bibliography, but merely serves to give the reader some indication of the amount of literature which has been produced in a comparatively short space of time.²⁰

I.

When first confronted with the Archbishop's Sermon, the immediate reaction of the Free Churches is to ask why such a suggestion is made at all, and the simple answer is that it is intended to be a step towards reunion. This may seem trite but it is important. The suggestion is not made with a view to uniformity, but because it is felt that if the Free Churches have an episcopal ministry they will at least be one stage nearer to intercommunion, and therefore to reunion. To regard this suggestion as an end in itself is to miss the all-important point that such parallel Churches could only be tolerated as a temporary stage on the road to full unity.²¹ The underlying assumption, of course, is that any re-united Church will have episcopacy in it somewhere, and E. W. Thompson, in a paper prepared for the Methodist Faith and Order Committee,²² even goes so far as to maintain that since those Churches based upon a Presbyterian, Independent or Methodist polity form but a small minority, when compared to the Episcopal Churches throughout the world, it is reasonable that unless there be something contrary to Scripture or inherently unchristian in episcopacy the views and practice of the many should prevail rather than those of the few. It is, however, an argument which will not commend itself to every Free Churchman,²³ and even those who are inclined to accept it will want to pause first in order to understand further what is involved.

He is justified in asking, for example, whether any advantages are to be found in the episcopal government of the Church, other than as a step to reunion. Strangely enough this is a question which has scarcely been dealt with, though Ross²⁴ has drawn attention to five points in this respect :

- (a) it would ensure a good Moderator of Presbytery whereas the current practice of appointing the most senior minister to the position does not necessarily do so.
- (b) a permanent official would be more satisfactory than one that changes every year. Ross²⁵ does insist, however, that such an official would be appointed by the Presbytery, subject to ratification by the General Assembly or its Executive Commission, and E. W. Thompson²⁶ also makes it clear that in any Episcopal order, which Methodists would accept, the Bishop would be chosen by the Church and would be, in effect, a *Constitutional Episcopate*.

- (c) To have someone, to whom a congregation where trouble was brewing could turn, would enable that trouble to be solved far more quickly than if it had to go through the slower and more cumbrous constitutional method of appeal to Presbytery.
- (d) Such a person would be able to keep in closer touch with the various congregations under his wing.
- (e) He would be an excellent person to whom young ministers could turn for counsel and advice.

All the advantages of episcopacy which Ross here claims would result from its adoption are already enjoyed by the Baptist Churches through their Area Superintendents. Yet no-one would dare to equate a Baptist Area Superintendent with a Bishop, neither would the Baptists be anxious to change the status of their Superintendents to fall into line with the Bishop's suggestion.

Thus it is apparent that apart from the question of reunion there is no valid reason for the Free Churches to take episcopacy into their system. Many would claim, no doubt, that that in itself ought to be sufficient reason, but let us first see what the cost of episcopacy would be.

II

In the first place, it would mean the acceptance by the Free Churches of the 'historic episcopate.' That is to say, it is not sufficient for us to enlarge the powers of our Moderators and Superintendents, nor in fact to adopt the name of 'Bishop'; they must also submit to consecration through Bishops of one or more of the historical Episcopal Churches.²⁷ With this also go the theories of validity and Divine grace.²⁸ This is where the Free Churches want to object most.

It must be admitted that we are being asked to accept episcopacy without any particular theory of it, and that the same liberty of interpretation will be allowed as is at present permitted in the Anglican Communion²⁹ but, as we shall see presently, this is by no means an unmixed blessing. P. T. Forsyth³⁰ points out, for instance, that such a plea does not cohere, since if a fact is to have a monopoly claimed for it, it can only be in virtue of a theory of it establishing such a right. It cannot be as mere fact.

The Free Churches welcome this liberty of interpretation³¹ and, where there is a leaning towards episcopacy, feel that the Free Churches could develop their own interpretation and later offer it as one facet of the truth to the rest of Christendom. Even K. D. Mackenzie³² feels it necessary to point out that no one is being asked to take the episcopal system of the Church of England as a model, and allows the possibility that we might be able to teach episcopalians how to improve episcopacy.

Be that as it may, it is important to know what we are accept-

ing before we accept it.³³ E. A. Payne³⁴ maintains that no small part of the objection of the Free Churches to episcopacy lies in the fact that it has become difficult to the point of impossibility to find an agreed definition of what episcopacy really is, but Bishop Stephen Neill³⁵ makes it plain that in modern discussions on the subject 'the historic episcopate' is meant simply to express the element of historic continuity "and nothing else." If such is the case, the reply of the Methodist Church³⁶ is a clear rejection of it, and no doubt the other Free Churches would say the same. Indeed the Free Church objections to such an interpretation have been clearly and concisely stated by E. A. Payne,³⁷ who finds both Biblical and theological grounds for his argument. Finally he concludes by drawing attention to certain protestants' unfortunate experience at the hands of Bishops, and contrasts that with the indubitable fact that God's spirit has been given even to the non-episcopal branches of the Christian Church.

But would anything less than this satisfy? It should be borne in mind that the Report itself has been disowned by the Anglo-Catholic Council, which has stated that either the reunion of, or intercommunion between, the Church of England and a body that remained wholly or partly non-episcopal in its ministry would involve discarding the theological basis of episcopacy to which the Church of England is committed.³⁸ If the 'catholic' party in the Church of England remains firm on this point it seems quite certain that reunion will never come, but it should not be overlooked that for the Church of England to adopt such a position³⁹ it would mean that they are demanding more of those who unite with them than they demand at present of their own members, since not all they accept the sacerdotal theory of apostolic succession.⁴⁰

We must not fire our shots at the 'catholic' party in the Church of England, however, as if they were the only "awkward" people.⁴¹ L. A. Zander,⁴² speaking for the Eastern Orthodox Church,⁴³ says that for them the episcopacy is essentially a eucharistic institution, for the Bishop is the one who celebrates the sacrament; he is the priest performing the "un-bloody" sacrifice. Consequently, where there is no priesthood, there is no episcopate, but only the administrative functions of a senior pastor, even if he is called a Bishop and has received this name in the order of apostolic succession.

If we have our eye on the world-church (and what else can ecumenicity mean?) it clearly does matter what interpretation of the apostolic succession we have.⁴⁴ The Report⁴⁵ itself makes it clear that episcopacy cannot be offered to or accepted by the Free Churches as a mere matter of expediency or in a completely undefined form, but it has been pointed out that there is grave danger

of this being the case,⁴⁶ and this seems to refute the suggestion⁴⁷ that we might first 'try out' episcopacy on our own ground. The Abbot of Nashdorn⁴⁸ maintains that the Church of England ought really to have developed a clearer doctrine of episcopacy for themselves before offering to hand it over to another body.

If, therefore, the 'catholic' half of Christendom is going to say 'No' to reunion unless the 'historic episcopate' is an essential part of it, it seems that all the discussions on ecumenism might as well stop now so far as the reactions of the Free Churches hitherto can be estimated. Henri d' Espine⁴⁹ says, "I make so bold as to claim that the doctrine of the apostolic succession, and the ecclesiology it implies, form the great obstacle to the unification of the Church, since those who maintain it are unable, much as they would often like to, to state that the non-episcopal Churches are part of the Church of Christ," but Hodgson⁵⁰ makes it clear that he does not believe it is right for the Anglican Communion to interpose obstacles in the way of sharing their episcopal orders with others by demanding of them a repudiation of their existing ministries and sacraments, or subscription to theories involving their repudiation. Such a view sounds strangely like P. T. Forsyth's remarks in 1918⁵¹ when he said that from the episcopal side there must come frank recognition of our existing orders, before any conditions can be discussed of regularising us in the episcopal system.

Supposing, however, that some way round that problem could be seen, what have the Free Churches to say then? Here we are able to turn to more positive material, for few Free Churchmen will go so far as to reject episcopacy in all its forms. Craig,⁵² for instance, is willing to admit that if by historic episcopacy all that is meant is some adaptation of a diocesan form of organisation, that would be acceptable to all but the most rabid independents. Indeed, the protestants claim that they themselves have a succession which is even more valid than that of the episcopate, and that is the faithful preaching of the Word, the believing celebration of the sacraments and the exercise of Gospel discipline.⁵³ Here, at least, is a theory which cannot easily be gainsaid, which is more than can be said either for the three-fold ministry⁵⁴ or for the evolution of the episcopate from the apostolate.⁵⁵ How far, then, can the Free Churches go in adopting the form of episcopacy?

III

In order to answer this question it is necessary to examine the *functions* of a Bishop. According to the Report,⁵⁶ his functions are three:

- (a) ordination;
- (b) decision, in concurrence with Presbyters and laity, in any suggested changes in matters of doctrine and polity;

(c) pastoral oversight of ministers and congregations.

Concerning ordination, Micklem⁵⁷ finds little difficulty. He points out first how the custom of laying-on of hands at ordination is rapidly becoming the custom for Congregationalists, and it is asking but a small thing to suggest that the "Bishop" should be among those taking part in this ceremony. Ross⁵⁸ has a similar finding from the Presbyterian point of view, but the Baptist report⁵⁹ very carefully points out that, for them, ordination is the task of the whole church, and to say 'that someone must of necessity by virtue of his office take part in such a service because, if he does not, there will be no regular or proper ordination, would be to introduce a new and alien element.' Micklem⁶⁰ and Ross⁶¹ also agree similarly regarding changes of doctrine, the former commenting that he can as little envisage the Congregational Union changing its doctrinal basis against the judgment of its leading ministers as without the consent of deacons and church-members. Ross notes that it would necessitate a change in Presbyterian policy in that any such proposals would not only have to go before the Presbyteries, but would also have to be approved by the "Bishops" voting as a separate body, but he feels there is something to be said in favour of such a change, in that it would be difficult for Bishops to guide their Presbyteries on principles of which they did not approve. No comment is made on the question of pastoral oversight, presumably because this has already been incorporated in most Free Church policy.

What are we to say concerning authority, for the very suggestion of Bishops seems to strike at the very roots of independent Church government under the guidance of the Spirit? Micklem⁶² has been a staunch advocate of our independence and has claimed that our objection to episcopacy lies simply in the claim of the Bishop to rule by virtue of his office. He even maintains⁶³ that we have asserted the independence of the local congregation as the sole Congregational principle. In the same work, however, he is careful to point out that true Congregationalism involves a mutual interdependence of all the Churches,⁶⁴ and he quotes Henry Dexter to the effect that Congregationalism differs from Independency by its recognition of this practical fellowship between the Churches,⁶⁵ whilst, in 1917, P. T. Forsyth⁶⁶ emphasised the weakness of autonomy. E. A. Payne⁶⁷ has also been careful to draw attention to the fact that whilst among the early Baptists a group of believers which duly observed the sacraments and exercised discipline over its members might claim to be a Church, it must be in communion with other local Churches. He also goes on to say how that although the decisions of the "assembly" could not be imposed upon the particular Churches, yet the spiritual authority of such an assembly was, in fact, very great.

Thus, it would appear that modern independence has lost some of its real basis. Micklem,⁶⁸ however, sees something akin to episcopal authority in the Congregational Union where the keeping of the list of recognised ministers is concerned, as well as in the legal authority concerning trust funds. At the same time, he stresses the fact that every Bishop uses his legal authority as little as possible, working mainly by persuasion and exhortation, and in this way he sees no real gulf between episcopacy and independency. To the present writer, however, the important point seems to lie in the fact of the body imposing the authority rather than in the way it is imposed; authority might very profitably be imposed on occasions, but it should be by a body comprising both ministers and laymen, rather than by a body of ministers alone or, even worse, by an individual minister.

We turn next to the question of the lay-administration of the sacraments. Here again the divergence is not so great as it might appear at first sight. The Report⁶⁹ states the matter simply when it says that in the Free Churches which practice the lay-celebrations of Holy Communion it is infrequent, and in almost every case depends on formal authorisation by the Church to meet a special situation or a special need. This is a position with which most of the Free Churches would agree.⁷⁰

The difficulty concerning episcopal confirmation is greater. The Report⁷¹ expresses the hope that in due course episcopal confirmation would come to be widely, in fact generally, used in the Free Church. This would lead to a great revelation in Free Church practice, as Micklem⁷² has pointed out and one which he believes would not quickly commend itself to us, though he is careful to draw attention to the fact that there is something to be said for having the admission of new members on one day in the year and inviting the Moderator to preside at such a service. Such a change in practice would not violate any Congregational principle. The real question, however, is whether such a change would be desirable, and it should be remembered that it is only within the last hundred years that episcopal confirmation has become universal in practice in the Church of England, owing partly to improved communications and partly to the insistence of the Tractarians on its necessity.⁷³ The Methodists, at any rate, are doubtful about the desirability of such a change in method, but declare that if no exclusive claims were made for episcopacy, and if Presbyters were associated with Bishops in the rite, the possibility of episcopal confirmation becoming the general practice might come to be sympathetically considered.⁷⁴ Since such a possibility is envisaged in the Report itself⁷⁵ this is perhaps the most likely solution to the difficulty.

This brings us to the point when it is convenient to draw

attention to some of the ways in which this suggestion of the Archbishop would necessitate certain changes in Anglican practice, for it is often asserted that the Free Churches are being asked to do all the 'giving'. Ross⁷⁶ draws attention to three ways in which the Anglican Church is called upon to make sacrifices :

- (a) the Church of England would have to relax the rule regarding episcopal confirmation as necessary for admission to Holy Communion.⁷⁷
- (b) Many Anglicans would think it illogical to have inter-communion with a Church which remained on terms of inter-communion with other (non-episcopal) Churches with which the Church of England cannot be in communion.⁷⁸
- (c) To many Anglicans it is a cardinal principle that the Bishop of any place is the symbol and focus of Christian unity in that locality, which would be contradicted if there were more than one Bishop in the same place, all in communion with each other.⁷⁹

How, then, are we to sum up the reactions of the Free Churches to episcopacy? As regards the historic episcopate the answer is an emphatic 'No', unless it can remain only as permitted theory.⁸⁰ In other ways it appears possible to modify Free Church practices in such a way as to come one stage nearer to the Anglican Church. Most people now feel that some such modifications would be desirable in the interests of reunion, but it should not be forgotten that we are, in reality, dealing with two fundamentally different kinds of Church.⁸¹ It would indeed be a sad day if, even in the interests of reunion, by a slight change here and a modification there, we finally signed away those convictions for which our forefathers fought so dearly and which have undoubtedly made a contribution to the Church in Christendom. The Archbishop's suggestion is to be greatly appreciated. The question for us now is how far we can go towards reunion without losing what we have always believed we held in trust for Him who is the Head of the Church.

A. GILMORE

¹ *The Church in the Purpose of God*, p. 19.

² *Church Relations in England*, pp. 5-12.

³ *op. cit.*, pp. 9-11.

⁴ *op. cit.*, pp. 13-48.

⁵ Dacre Press, London, 1950.

⁶ Lutterworth Press, London, 1950.

⁷ S.P.C.K., London, 1950.

⁸ *Catholicity*, p. 9; *The Fullness of Christ*, p. vii; *The Catholicity of Protestantism*, p. 5.

⁹ *The Report of the Faith and Order Committee on "Church Relations in England,"* Epworth Press.

¹⁰ *Church Relations in England,* Carey Kingsgate Press.

¹¹ Presbyterian Publishing Committee, London, 1952.

¹² Independent Press, London.

¹³ Epworth Press, London; cf. E. W. Thompson, "Can the Methodist Church take Episcopacy into its system?" in *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 40 (June, 1951), pp. 11-16.

¹⁴ *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 43 (June, 1952), p. 22.

¹⁵ For an abridged version of this address, see *The Free Church Chronicle*, June, 1952.

¹⁶ *Theology*, vol. LIV (1951), pp. 209-217. This article was also published separately in 1952 by the Carey Kingsgate Press, London.

¹⁷ *Theology*, vol. LIV (1951), pp. 281-284. Cf. *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 41 (November, 1951), pp. 13f.

¹⁸ *Theology*, vol. LV (1952), pp. 83-87. Cf. *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 43 (June, 1952), pp. 7f.

¹⁹ *Ecumenical Review*, vol. IV (1952), pp. 139-161. Cf. *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 43 (June, 1952), pp. 9ff.

²⁰ For a fuller bibliography on the Ecumenical Movement, see O. Tomkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-109.

²¹ *Church Relations in England*, p. 46; Micklem, *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, p. 12; The Methodist Church, *Report of the Faith and Order Committee on "Church Relations in England,"* p. 3.

²² *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 42 (February, 1952), pp. 15-20.

²³ It may be noted further that the other two arguments which E. W. Thompson puts forward here in favour of episcopacy will also be questioned by many non-episcopalians. He argues, for instance, that the Episcopate, more than any other institution of the Church, has been the means by which the organic continuity of the Church has been maintained through the centuries, and that there is an indefeasible reasonableness about the Episcopate, in that it is the embodiment in the Church of the principle that a great society must have a great minister.

²⁴ *op. cit.*, pp. 5f.

²⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 8.

²⁶ *loc. cit.*, p. 19.

²⁷ *Church Relations in England*, p. 44.

²⁸ Abbot of Nashdom, "Brief Notes on Certain Points in the Report, 'Church Relations in England,'" in *Faith and Unity*, No. 59, Vol. II (April, 1951), p. 250.

²⁹ *Church Relations in England*, p. 44.

³⁰ *Congregationalism and Reunion*, p. 11.

³¹ The Methodist Church, *The Report of the Faith and Order Committee on "Church Relations in England,"* pp. 4, 6; Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Micklem, *op. cit.*, pp. 14f.

³² K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 465-466.

³³ Cf. H. Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

³⁴ *The Free Churches and Episcopacy*, p. 5.

³⁵ *The Ministry of the Church*, p. 19.

³⁶ *op. cit.*, p. 2.

³⁷ *op. cit.*, *passim*. Cf. G. Every, "The Historic Episcopate," in *Theology*, vol. LV (1952), pp. 83-87.

³⁸ *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 41 (November, 1951), p. 8; *The Times*, September 21, 1951.

³⁹ The possibility of the Church of England being swayed by the 'Catholic' party is not to be scorned. C. T. Craig (*The One Church in the Light of the New Testament*, p. 65), reminds us how the Church of England

had to postpone for five years a decision on whether those who had entered the Church of South India were still in the Church. Obviously the 'Catholic' party held the upper hand on this matter. (cf. Henri d'Espine, "The Apostolic Succession as an Ecumenical Issue," in *The Ecumenical Review*, vol. IV (1952), pp. 154-155.)

⁴⁰ Craig, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁴¹ cf. Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁴² *Vision and Action*, pp. 168f.

⁴³ And incidentally for the Anglo-Catholics. cf. L. B. Haselmayer, "Priest and Presbyter," in *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 44 (November, 1952), p. 8.

⁴⁴ cf. M. B. Dewey in *The Approach to Christian Unity*, pp. 30-31; E. W. Thompson, Report of an Address given at a meeting of the Council of the Friends of Reunion held on Sept. 11, 1951, and printed in the *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 41 (November, 1951, p. 3; A. G. Hebert, "Priest and Presbyter," in *Friends and Reunion Bulletin*, No. 44 (November, 1952), p. 14.

⁴⁵ *Church Relations in England*, p. 38.

⁴⁶ Abbot of Nashdom, "Brief Notes on certain Points in the Report on 'Church Relations in England'," in *Faith and Unity*, No. 59, vol. II (April, 1951), pp. 248-249; the relevant extract is also quoted in the *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, No. 41 (November, 1951), p. 10.

⁴⁷ *Church Relations in England*, p. 43; cf. Micklem, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 246.

⁴⁹ "The Apostolic Succession as an Ecumenical Issue," in *The Ecumenical Review*, vol. IV (1952), p. 159.

⁵⁰ *Apostolic Succession and Christian Unity*, pp. 15-16.

⁵¹ *Congregationalism and Reunion* (1918 ed.), pp. 13f.

⁵² *op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁵³ Micklem, *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, pp. 53ff.

⁵⁴ B. S. Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*, p. 226.

⁵⁵ J. P. Hickinbotham, in S. Neill, *The Ministry of the Church*, p. 39.

⁵⁶ *Church Relations in England*, p. 39.

⁵⁷ *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, pp. 16f.

⁵⁸ *op. cit.*, p. 4. Ross does point out, however (*op. cit.*, p. 3) that the Bishop would not by himself determine the fitness of candidates for ordination.

⁵⁹ *loc. cit.*

⁶⁰ *loc. cit.*

⁶¹ *Church Relations in England*, p. 8.

⁶² *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, pp. 24-25.

⁶³ *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁶⁴ *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁶⁵ *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁶⁶ *Congregationalism and Reunion* (1918 ed.), p. 5.

⁶⁷ *The Fellowship of Believers* (enlarged edition), pp. 29f.

⁶⁸ *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, pp. 17f.

⁶⁹ *Church Relations in England*, p. 42.

⁷⁰ Micklem, *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, p. 59; Micklem, *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, pp. 19ff.; *The Lord's Supper: Baptist Statement*, pp. 44f.

⁷¹ *Church Relations in England*, p. 45.

⁷² *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, pp. 9-11.

⁷³ Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁷⁴ The Methodist Church, *The Report of the Faith and Order Committee on "Church Relations in England,"* p. 4.

⁷⁵ *Church Relations in England*, p. 40.

⁷⁶ *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁷⁷ *cf. Church Relations in England*, p. 45.

⁷⁸ It may conveniently be added at this point that the Free Churches welcome the point that if a Free Church accepted episcopacy and subsequently entered on terms of inter-communion with the Church of England, this would not effect the relationship between that Church and other Free Churches which may still be quite separate from the Church of England (*Church Relations in England*, pp. 38, 45). They make it emphatic, moreover, that unless some such clause were inserted they would in no way consider the suggestion. (Mickletham, *Congregationalism and Episcopacy*, pp. 11f.; The Methodist Church, *Report of the Faith and Order Committee on "Church Relations in England,"* pp. 4, 6). There are those in the Church of England, however, who believe that this may well prove an insuperable obstacle to Anglicans. (The Abbot of Nashdom, *op. cit.*, p. 249.)

⁷⁹ *cf. Church Relations in England*, pp. 25-26, 45.

⁸⁰ Craig, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁸¹ Henri d'Espine, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

The Claims of Christ. A Study in His Self-Portraiture, by Hugh Martin, (S.C.M. Press, 7s.).

Dr. Martin has given us a sane and well written little book which is free from some of the extravagancies sometimes found under this heading. He seeks to affirm the Person of Christ as the centre of Christian faith. The author is sympathetic with the difficulty felt by some with the phrase "The claims of Christ"—not from scepticism but from a reluctance to think of His insistence upon personal dignity and upon particular categories and titles. Nevertheless Jesus did associate His own person intimately with the Divine mission. Dr. Martin maintains that the view that Jesus made claims for the Kingdom and not for Himself is a mistaken antithesis. He goes on to examine terms used explicitly by our Lord—Son, Son of Man, concepts implied in His words, such as Servant of the Lord, Saviour, and sayings which have a deep implication, such as those on forgiveness.

But Dr. Martin's is no 'jigsaw' method of fitting sayings together, but to let the Person of Jesus make its own challenge through the words spoken. It may be summed up in a sentence in the closing chapter: "We have been concerned with the title Jesus gave Himself and with the claims implicit in them and in His deeds. Many more are the titles given Him by His followers. For hardly less astonishing than His claims is the fact that men acknowledged His right to make them: that the Church was born and the New Testament written."

W. S. DAVIES