The Development of the Concept of Episcopacy in the Church of England from the Nineteenth to the Mid-twentieth Centuries

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford

Steffen Weishaupt, Christ Church

Michaelmas Term 2012

For my parents, with gratitude and love

Table of Contents

0. Abstracts and Acknowledgements ____ *6*

0.1 Short Abstract ____ **6**

0.2 Long Abstract ____ **7**

0.3 Acknowledgements ____ **15**

1. The Theological Significance and the Consequences of the Anglican Emphasis of a 'Historic Succession' of Bishops in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries ____ *21*

1.1 The Refusal of Interchangeability of Ministers with 'Non-episcopal' Churches, Whilst (Re-)allowing Intercommunion, With Special Reference to Meissen ____ **21**

1.2 The Claim of a Significance of Continuity in a 'Historic Succession' for Apostolicity and Catholicity ____ **24**

1.3 The Alleged Continuity Through Personal or Institutional Succession of the Episcopal Ministry or Office ____ **30**

1.4 Theological Implications of an Insistence on Personal Succession of Bishops ____ **36**

1.5 The 'Historic Succession' as an Alleged Historic Core Doctrine of the Church of England ____ **38**

1.6 The Function of the Definition of Anglican 'Orders' Through Succession 42

1.7 Brief Sketch of the Ecclesiological Significance of Episcopacy in the Church of England in High Church Circles Prior to the Nineteenth Century ____ **50**

1.8 The Ecumenical Intention of This Thesis ____ **54**

2. The 'Anglicanization' and 'Episcopalization' of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century ____ *57*

2.1 "Not English but Anglican": The 'Episcopalization' and 'Anglicanization' of the Church of England Due to Its Relations to Dependencies and Former Dependencies ____ **57**

2.2 The Church of England in the 'Plantations' Before the Nineteenth Century: 'Episcopacy Without Episcopate' ____ **58**

2.3 The 'Episcopalization' of Missionary Societies in India as a Means of 'Anglicanization' ____ **65**

2.4 'Anglicanization' by 'Episcopalization': The Establishment of 'Missionary' and 'Colonial' Bishoprics ____ **86**

2.5 'English Episcopacy' Develops Towards a Marker of (the) 'Anglican Communion' ____ **95**

2.6 The American High Church Movement and Their Zeal for English Episcopacy ____ **103**

2.7 The Scottish Episcopal Church ____ **116**

2.8 The Church of England's Establishment of Communion with Episcopal Churches and the 'Catholicization' of the Anglican Episcopate in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century ____ **122**

3 Anglo-Catholicism as Symptom and Catalyst of the 'Anglicanization' of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century and Its 'Catholic' Elevation of Episcopacy *142*

3.1 The Oxford Movement as 'Catholicizing' Counter-cultural Reaction 142

3.2 Ritualism and the Diocesan and 'Episcopal' Revival 149

3.3 The Emancipation of Dissenters and the Gradual Disestablishment and the 'Denominational Diversification' of the Church of England 159

3.4 The Catholicization of Liturgy and Theology 166

3.5 The Anglo-Prussian Bishopric at Jerusalem as a Marker Between Pre- and Post-Tractarian High-churchmanship 183

3.6 The Tractarian Emphasis on the (Episcopal) Church as Divine and Apostolical Society, as 'Catholic Emancipation' from State Control 195

3.7 Bishops as the New Centre of Tractarian Ecclesiology and the Consequences 209

3.8 F.D. Maurice and the Ideal of Institutional Comprehensiveness, Opposing 'Parties' and 'Systems' 223

3.9 The Continuing Anglican Dilemma of 'Denominational' Fragmentation, as Reflected by Maurice's Vision for the Mid-nineteenth Century Church of England 235

4 The 'Historic Episcopate' in Its Liberal (Anglo-) Catholic Interpretation Becomes Established Anglican Teaching in the Early Twentieth Century 243

4.1 Huntington's Quadrilateral, Originally as Model for National, Governmental Ecclesiastical 'Home Union' 243

4.2 Different Usages of the Quadrilateral: as an Authoritative Identity Marker of 'Anglicanism' and as an Ecumenical Model 258

4.3 The Identification of the Quadrilateral with Its (Anglo-) Catholic Interpretation and the Consequences 269

4.4 Different Models of 'Catholicity': Apostolicae Curae (1896) 275

4.5 The Kikuyu-Zanzibar Controversy and the Anglo-Catholic Insistence on Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation for (Inter-)Communion 286

4.6 The Gradual Adoption of an (Inter-)Communion Practice in Accordance with an Anglo-Catholic Understanding of the Confirmation Rubric 302

4.7 'Episcopal' Episcopacy and Confirmation as Conditions for (Inter-)Communion, Union and the Notion of Succession 320

4.8 The Failure of Unity Negotiations with Free Churches on the Basis of (Conditional) 'Episcopal Ordination' 332

4.9 The 'Validity' Terminology in the Report of the Archbishops' Commission "Doctrine in the Church of England" (1922-38) 340

5. Conclusion and Outlook *354*

5.1 The Notions of 'Catholicity' and 'Apostolicity' and 'Sign' and 'Symbol' in the Church of England in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century 354

5.2 Tendencies of a Reversal of the 'Catholicization' of Anglicanism? 362

Cited Literature *375*

0. Abstracts and Acknowledgements

0.1 Short Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the Church of England's understanding of 'episcopal' episcopacy and ordained ministry, including their ecclesiological implications and ecumenical consequences. Special attention is given to the refusal of interchangeability of ordained ministers with 'non-episcopal' churches (whilst allowing inter-communion), on the grounds that they lacked a 'historic succession' of bishops (cf. *The Meissen Declaration and Agreement*). This claim gives the adjective 'episcopal' a denominational, (quasi-)sacramental connotation (hence the inverted commas). Official Anglican statements today claim that the concept of episcopacy in a 'historic succession' is and always has been an integral part of 'Anglican' teaching as part of its 'Catholic', pre-Reformation heritage, whereas it appears that before the nineteenth century the Church of England had been defined largely in territorial and institutional terms. This faced challenges both from without and within, with an increasingly secular and multi-denominational context in Britain (with Non-conformists slowly gaining equal social and political rights) and in the face of the emergence of the Anglican Communion (and ecumenism in the twentieth century). This required the Church of England to forge a distinctive, trans-national, denominational identity for itself and for 'Anglicanism' (which can be described as the **'Anglicanization of the Church of England'**).

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the English episcopate exercised a more active leadership role (the **'episcopalization of the Church of England'**), creating bishoprics in overseas dependencies and strengthening the influence of the Church of England there and also that of the episcopate (a colonial aspect of the 'Anglicanization'). In the second half of the nineteenth century the bishops

established interchangeability of ministers with formerly English, 'Episcopal' churches. This development occurred at the high point of Anglo-Catholic and ritualistic influence (which resulted in a **'Catholicization of the Church of England'**, opposed by Evangelicals and High-churchmen of the pre-Tractarian type). The nature of 'Anglicanism' was increasingly interpreted as 'catholic'/'Catholic'. In the twentieth century the notion of a 'historic succession' of bishops eventually appeared in official documents, whereas earlier statements had been insisting on the 'historic episcopate', but open to an understanding in the sense of 'apostolic succession' or a divinely instituted or sanctioned, or simply ancient form of government (episcopacy as *esse*, *plene esse* or *bene esse* of church). The eventual adoption of the notion of succession, however, the crucial characteristic of the *esse* model, meant a **'theologization' of Anglican ecclesiology** in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with a distinct 'catholic' character, which explains the refusal to agree on interchangeability of ministers with 'Protestant' churches, now on theological grounds.

0.2 Long Abstract

Chapter 1 sets the scene by pointing out the consequences of adopting a 'catholic' ecclesiological identity, based on the model of 'historic episcopate' in an alleged 'historic succession', but not being identical with the Roman Catholic model of historic succession (hence 'catholic' without a capital). Theologically, the result is a (quasi-)sacramental understanding of church and ordained ministry which allows Anglo-Catholics to maintain their exclusive ecclesiological claims but marginalises 'non-episcopal' churches. It is not only Anglo-Catholics who hope on the basis of 'historic episcopacy' for a future reunion with Rome; some

hold Anglicanism to be a providential 'bridge' between (Roman) Catholicism and Protestantism. This thesis argues, however, that this understanding is based on developments of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The claim of succession underpins the privileging of the Church of England as the established, state church but also serves as an identity marker in a double sense: institutionally of 'Anglicanism' (as being confirmed or ordained by an Anglican, or alternatively by an 'episcopal' bishop) and, in a broader understanding of Anglicanism, as denominationally 'catholic' (whilst Protestant characteristics are maintained as well). Thus, 'historic episcopacy' serves as *nota ecclesia* and *nota unitate ecclesiae*. 'Catholicity' (in a diachronic sense) is usually interpreted in a way which is meant to allow 'Protestant' Anglicans to accept 'historic' episcopacy as an identity marker without a commitment to a tactile succession (succession as a 'symbol', for example), although as a result, the requirement of a practice *as if* Anglicanism was committed to a sacramental ('Catholic') understanding of a personal, episcopal succession becomes inconsistent. In *The Meissen Declaration and Agreement*, for example, the Church of England recognizes as churches its 'non-episcopal' ecumenical partners who have the office of bishops (if not in name) and encourages its members to receive Communion in partner churches from ministers who are barred from celebrating the sacrament in the Church of England, with reference to their alleged lack of 'historic succession' of episcopacy.

Chapter 2 examines the increase in importance and influence of bishops in the nineteenth century. After American Independence (1776), some North American High-churchmen, in their persuasion comparable to the later Tractarians but not to the English High-churchmanship of their days, had worked hard to adopt the English succession for their bishops (which they obtained in 1787, after

a first consecration from the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1784). This desire was met with bemusement in England. Episcopacy still stood for loyalty to the Crown; this is why many other Americans were not fond of the idea but agreed to it since the American bishops were to work in a synodal, quasi-republican framework, which would later puzzle Newman.

The American adoption of the 'English succession' had few immediate consequences. Most notably, it did not establish interchangeability of ministers with the Church of England, whereas the American and Scottish Episcopal Churches had agreed on interchangeability. The latter's self-understanding resembled that of the American High-churchmen, both finding themselves under similar circumstances (not being the church established by law and set in a multi-denominational context). Their situation, to some extent, foreshadowed that of the Church of England in the mid-nineteenth century (which had experienced then something like a 'gradual disestablishment'). In any case, 'episcopal episcopacy' as a basis of interchangeability of ministers was not yet a concept in England.

In the first half of the nineteenth century the English bishops, increasingly understanding themselves as pastors and leaders, now placed (English) bishops in the plantations and missions. They also increased their control over the mission societies in which 'lay' churchmen but also clergy of all ranks had been (although some reluctantly) content for more than a century with employing 'non-episcopally' ordained missionaries, especially Lutheran pietists. This was discontinued under the bishops' influence to strengthen the English influence there, and their own ('episcopalization' and 'Anglicanization'). In the second half of the nineteenth century, interchangeability of ministers was established between the 'Episcopal', former English churches (also the Scottish Episcopal Church) and the Church of England, creating a voluntary ecclesiastical fellowship modelled

after the Empire. The basis of the emergent Anglican Communion, setting off only in the late nineteenth century (first only a vision of High-churchmen), was soon to be understood by the post-Tractarian High-churchmen to be based on a theological understanding of ('historic') episcopacy as characterizing 'catholic'/'Catholic' ministries, uniting an alleged family of 'catholic' churches (with Roman Catholics and Orthodox) in a ('historic') succession' (although not in communion with each other, as even the 'Anglican' churches had not been prior to the second half of the nineteenth century). Joint-ventures with Protestants (as the Jerusalem bishopric) were polemically rejected by Tractarians and their Anglo-Catholic followers. The older variant of the *Three-Branches Model* of 'the Catholic Church' had only recognized national 'catholic' churches, unchurching English Roman Catholics, for example, as schismatic.

Chapter 3 examines the nature of the Oxford Movement as 'counter-cultural' phenomenon, setting out a new, 'catholic ecclesiality' against secularism, the decline of moral authority of the Church, its lay government by parliament and the emancipation of Dissenters. Together with the ritualists, the Tractarians fed the emergent Anglo-Catholic movement which transformed the Church of England considerably, giving it a 'Catholic' outlook, with a 'catholic' self-understanding, based on allegedly ancient principles. The Tractarians promoted an institutional understanding of episcopacy as a continuation of a supposed apostolic office, perpetuated by the imposition of hands in consecration, with only 'episcopal' churches representing the Christian church, depending on the 'episcopal' chain (as opposed to the English state establishment). Thus, Protestants and Dissenters came to be regarded as schismatic, whereas Roman Catholics were increasingly regarded as allies. Both marked significant differences between the pre- and post-Tractarian High-churchmen. For the

'Erastian', pre-Tractarian High-churchmen, 'episcopal ordination' had stood for political loyalty to the established, national Church (by *divine right* of the monarch); for the new-style, post-Tractarian High-churchmen it stood for apostolic descent and 'catholicity', independent from state authorities. Thus, the 'Erastian' paradigm was finally replaced by a 'catholic'; the claim of apostolicity now served as a modulation of the theme of *divine right* which had lost for many its plausibility in secular and multi-confessional society.

On the lines of the pre-Tractarian High-churchmen, who, for example, could approve of the joint-venture of the Jerusalem bishopric with Prussian Protestants, F.D. Maurice promoted the ideal of an institutional comprehensiveness of the Church of England as national Church, under an episcopal government, but dismissed the result of the competition of theological parties or 'systems', which radicalised in the nineteenth century.

Chapter 4 examines the gradual adoption of a 'catholic' understanding of episcopacy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In this context, W.R. Huntington's model of Quadrilateral is of significance, adopted by the bishops of the American Episcopal Church in 1886 and by the Lambeth Conference in 1888. Although it was designed to be open to a 'historic' interpretation of the form of episcopal government as ancient, possibly apostolic, it became soon understood to stand for its Anglo-Catholic interpretation in the sense of an 'apostolic succession'. Although the Quadrilateral was originally meant to provide a model for home union (a national church), it was soon used as a model describing inner-Anglican unity and the terms of ecclesiastical union with Anglicans (for inter-communion and communion).

This development was due to the predominant Anglo-Catholic influence of the times, being manifest in the hierarchy; Evangelicalism had virtually retired to

the parishes. On the principle of 'episcopal episcopacy', together with general resentments against the now emancipated Dissenters, intercommunion with 'non-episcopalians' (which appears always to have been continued on an informal basis) came widely out of favour in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1887, the Convocation of Canterbury sanctioned clergy preaching at Dissenters' services. In 1915, Archbishop Davidson ruled that Anglicans should not communicate at Dissenters' churches. In 1920/30, the Lambeth Conferences sanctioned intercommunion with Dissenters, requiring 'episcopal confirmation'. In 1933, the English Convocations confirmed this policy, which was not obeyed by everyone. 'Episcopal confirmation' officially became the precondition for Communion (as prescribed in the Prayer Book but hardly practised), both for Anglicans and also for non-Anglican guests (this practice was relaxed in 1972 and in *Meissen* and *Porvoo*).

This development established a (quasi-)sacramental understanding of confirmation and a more restrictive intercommunion policy in the twentieth century, which underlined the new, 'catholic' character of 'Anglicanism', which, however, has been refuted by the Roman Catholic Church (*Apostolicae Curae*, 1896). 'Episcopal ordination' was promoted as the ancient, 'catholic' form of ministry and as the precondition for ecumenical ventures for Anglicans, in the form of 'conditional ordination' of 'non-episcopal' partners, usually with the assurance that no belief in a succession was necessary (to the dismay of Anglo-Catholics). English attempts of such a kind, for example in the negotiations with English Free Churches in the 1920s, turned out to be unsuccessful due to the implied repudiation of the 'non-episcopal' ministers' previous ministry.

In the years before the Second World War, the notion of succession which had previously been avoided in conjunction with the 'historic episcopate' was

eventually used in official statements and the Roman Catholic terminology of 'validity' and 'regularity' was employed by Anglicans to define the ecclesial status of 'non-episcopal' ministers and their ministrations. Whereas Anglo-Catholics held that 'non-episcopalians' did not have regular and, thus, no valid orders (holding 'episcopal episcopacy' to represent the *esse* of the church), more moderate Anglican 'catholics' held 'non-episcopal' ministrations to be 'efficacious' and valid, but not regular (due to their lack of a historic succession, the latter being understood to represent the *plene esse* of church). The 'validity' terminology, which made the negative judgement of 'non-episcopal' churches too immediately obvious, was widely abandoned in the second half of the twentieth century, while the notion of succession, now even with an emphasis of the imposition of hands, became a more important part of the model of 'historic episcopate'.

The fact that the Church of England, in which Anglo-Catholic influence was still strong after the Second World War, had committed itself to a quasi-sacramental ecclesiology and understanding of ordained ministry became apparent when the Convocations refused to recognize the Church of South India (in the 1950s onwards), due to its 'mixed', 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal', clergy.

Chapter 5 concludes the thesis with an outlook beyond the mid-twentieth century. The more recent re-definition of 'episcopal episcopacy' as (necessary) *symbol* for unity, the 'catholicity' and 'apostolicity' of the church (cf. *The Porvoo Common Statement*), amplified the inconsistency of the theological insistence on episcopacy in a 'historic succession'. It may be taken as an attempt, however, to retreat slowly from the ecclesiological elevation of episcopacy as it had been adopted as a theological concept in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. If this is correct and the trend persists, it will potentially upset the

Anglo-Catholic constituency and may damage negotiations with the Roman Catholic Church. Another potential risk would be to damage one's own self-identity and to weaken the Anglican historic, ecclesiological and ecclesiastical claims (in the case of the Church of England, for example, the state establishment and the honorary primate of the Anglican Communion). It would, however, widen the 'catholicity' paradigm, from a fixation on an alleged 'historic' model of 'catholicity' defined by a succession (of 'Catholic'/catholic churches, mostly former established, national churches) to one in the sense of 'universal'/trans-regional (of 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' churches). *Porvoo*, for example, speaks of the "catholicity of the whole church" (§36ff.), although it appears that it is effectively still made dependent on the "sign of episcopal succession".

0.3 Acknowledgements

I owe a lot to many people and institutions, all of whom I cannot mention here, but only a few. First of all, I would not have been able to start and maintain my doctoral research without financial assistance from various sources. Especially I need to mention the ecumenical St Theosevia Trust, with their long-standing chairman Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia, succeeded in 2010 by Dr David Taylor, and indeed the Director, Revd Dr Liz Carmichael. For the Trust, I served as Assistant Director of Studies from 2007 at the St Theosevia Centre, and also Bursar from 2009. Without the generosity and encouragement of the Trustees, amongst whom I can only mention Prof Sebastian Brock and Dr Elaine Kaye, I would not have started my doctoral research at Oxford to begin with. St Theosevia's and its successive residents, amongst whom I can only mention Dr Julia Konstantinovsky, Dominic Mills and Oliver Murphy, has provided me with a lovely home and refuge from the sometimes tiresome labours of my research. It has been a privilege to meet the various people involved with the Centre and its study days, for example the Revd Maxine West.

I need to thank Christ Church for Hugh Pilkington Scholarships and a number of other bursaries, and overall for having provided an inspiring environment for my research. Beside that, I am enormously grateful for a generous research grant from the *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* in 2009-10. I also received grants from the Southdown Trust, the Crewdson Trust, the Squire and Mariott Trust and travel grants from the Theology Faculty and St John's College, which helped me a lot and encouraged me to work hard.

My time at Oxford and in the United Kingdom would have been very different without all the friendly parishioners and friends whose hospitality and friendship I have been enjoying. These contacts, at Oxford but also at other

places, accompanied me through the considerable part of my life which has been preoccupied with my research on Anglicanism and my working in the Church of England, beginning with a placement sponsored by the *Evangelische Kirche im Rheinland* in 2007-08. At Christ Church, Oxford, I was made most welcome by people like the then Sub-dean, the Very Revd Nicholas Coulton, and his wife Edith. The vergers and other staff, the many volunteers and the congregation of the Cathedral made me feel very welcome, especially Charles Gibbs, Jim Godfrey and Glyn Lyon. The Cathedral Singers and the Bell Ringers, of whom I can only mention Dr Laura Corner, Ian and Eileen Ross, Dr Michele Ellender, Christine Tucker and David and Sue Barrington, made me feel at home very quickly. I would never have developed such an affectionate relationship to the Anglican Church without all these people. Representing the numerous contacts I made at the Cathedral I can only mention the Revd Michael and Jenny Farthing, Michael and Denise Walker and Dr David and Mione MacDowall. I also have to mention the congregation of St Giles' Church, with the Revd Dr Andrew Bunch, the Revd Georgie Simpson (until 2009), David Longrigg, the Revd Dr Paula Clifford, the Revd Sally Welch, the Revd Prof Martin Henig, Melanie Florence, David Marshall and Dr Christine Booth, Prof John and Jane Day, Dr Jim Williamson and indeed Dr Mary Stanley, just to name a few, who let me never forget that Anglicanism is much more than a study object for me but a living relationship. Taking Evensong at St Giles' has always been a privilege and pleasure. During my time at the Cathedral, I also enjoyed the hospitality of the Very Revd Peter Bradley (Sheffield) and the Revd Alan McCormack (London) who gave me some insight into their ministry for which I was very grateful.

I also need to mention the generosity of St John's College which enabled me to study at Oxford in 2000-01. My studies with Canon Prof John Barton,

Canon Prof Henry Mayr-Harting and the Revd Dr John Muddiman are wonderful and important memories. That year at St John's and my working at the Chapel there with the Chaplain, Liz Carmichael, laid the foundation of my interest in and my affection for the Anglican Church and the British Isles. Thus, my year at St John's turned out to be a life-changing experience which initiated my returning to Oxford years later, with Henry Mayr-Harting and Nicholas Coulton being instrumental to arrange my placement.

I need to mention the Christ Church Graduate Common Room with its bunch of delightful people from around the world. Amongst the many friends at Oxford, I may only mention Dr Susan Griffith and Dr Judith Gilliland with their families, Ruth Ogden, David Gherdane, Arne Muus and Davide Vampa, the Revd Stephen Hearn, Dr Manfred and Monika Grünanger, the Very Revd Lister Tonge, the Most Revd Malkhaz Songulashvili, Birgit Kremmers, Helen Sims-Williams and her hospitable Cambridge home, so conveniently near to the University Library and the Green, Dr Rob Wainwright, Anca Todea and David Weis. Brett Masters and Freddie Clarke always gave me a safe haven within good reach of the British Library, the Church of England Record Centre and Lambeth Palace. Dr Jouni Sohkanen, Oliver Murphy, Dr Mario Paganini (always happy to check my Latin), Max Nolte, Dr Kiterie Faller (who helped me with French translations), Richard Zavitz, Marisa Benoit (who brought back books for me from the United States), Urs Mundt (tirelessly prepared to photocopy German articles for me), Justin Floyd, Rob Andrews and many, many more made my time at Oxford unforgettable. Maureen Jones always had a good word for me and cheered me up more than once, and without Olga Smith the gym would only have been a boring place to go. It always has been a privilege to share biscuits with Carina Venter and Lord Archie of Glenrothes at our Study Room, only disturbed occasionally by an

“ach ja” from Meelis Lootus and his preparations for the next ball, or by Amandine Collado singing a French film tune. At Peterborough, I always found a wonderful place to stay, with my former teacher Enid Withers who, together with Alma Sheasby, organised welcome escapes from my research.

Apart from the staff at the institutions already mentioned, I need to thank the staff at the Bodleian Library, especially at the Lower Camera and the Upper Reading Room. The staff of the Christ Church Library, especially Janet McMullin and Dr Cristina Neagu, have always been happy to help most graciously and friendly. Adjunctant to that I am grateful to Erik Goosmann and Tom Clucas for the joy of many coffee breaks at the Bodleian.

Apart from my friends in this country, I also need to thank my friends elsewhere for their support and continuing friendship and hospitality, despite the long distance. Amongst all these people I can only name Dr Sascha Laubinger, Klot Urbschat, Dr Sven Tüddelmeister Jerzembeck, Dr Philipp Schmaedeke, Sabiha and Thilo Leineweber, the late Oliver Hahn, Maike Nimz, Christine Toepffer, the Revd Prof Athina Lexutt, Joachim Philipp (always happy to host me when I need a shelter at Bonn), Marita Münks, Andi Lewe, Padavan Timo Schmidt (who helped me with photocopies from German books) and the Revd Thomas Schmeckenbecher; Alexander and Stella Schmitt (not to forget the fish they named after me) and their families, Thomas and Katja Germain, Sabine von Aderkas, Dr Clemens Kießig, the Revd Alexandra Schütz, the Revd Gunter Nagel, Prof Zhenja Vodolaskin, Prof Tatjana Rudi, Natasha Vodolaskin, the Revd Stephan Gleim, the Revd Simone Lehnert and my whole ministry training course, Martin and the Revd Karin Sauter and, last but not least, indeed Timo and the Revd Alexandra Rosener who always were only too happy to invite me along to discover the beauty of Scotland and meet the friendly people there.

I also need to mention a few people whose pastoral and scholarly example have been of great impact. The late Kirchenrat Revd Prof Hans Strauß encouraged me to dive deeper into theology. His biblical studies and theological outlook have influenced me in my preaching and studies until today. The Revd Ulrich and Margarete Kilger have been a constant support ever since my studies at Bonn for which I have been enormously grateful. I learnt a lot from Prof Otto Strecker for whom I worked in Bonn and whom I owe a lot. I also need to thank Canon Prof Henry Mayr-Harting and Caroline Mayr-Harting, Mette Bradley and Revd Prof Michael and Dr Anne Screech whose abundant hospitality and company I enjoyed so often and undeserved. Canon Prof Marilyn McCord-Adams always made me think that my life needs to be transformed much more radically by prophetic vision and prayer. She made me believe that God almost definitely speaks with an American accent and with a female voice. This came together with the fellowship in prayer with people like the Revd Prof Bob Adams and Dr Betsy Livingstone which does not need many words but perhaps the magnificent silence of Christ Church Cathedral in the early hours of the morning, only disturbed by the Dean's guinea fowls. I thank the Revd David Cooper for being constantly reminded that God's Church in the world needs the willingness to be formed by God's love.

I also owe great thank to the Revd Prof Eberhard Hauschildt and the Revd Prof Reinhard Schmidt-Rost at Bonn, together with John Barton, for their encouragement and support without which I would not have applied for my doctoral studies at Oxford. Without the contact to Eberhard Hauschildt, I probably would not have dared to pursue further academic studies. Without Marilyn Adams, I would never have applied for Oxford and done this particular research.

Finally I need to thank Jim Godfrey ('thank you!'), Oliver Murphy, Richard Zavitz and Helen Sims-Williams for their friendship and indeed their

proofreading and valuable comments on draft chapters at different stages. Dr. Laura Corner and Dr Rob Wainwright took it upon them to read complete drafts towards submission, for which I cannot thank them enough. I need to thank my supervisor, the Revd Prof Mark Chapman, for his support and time and for leaving me considerable freedom to explore my field of interest, always supportive when needed.

I also need to thank all who had the kindness to take the time to discuss particular aspects of my research in conversation and by email: Prof Ingolf Dalferth, Prof Bernd Wannenwetsch, Dr Johannes Zachhuber, Dr Sheridan Gilley, Dr Colin Podmore, Prof William Tighe, the Revd Dr Robert Bates, Prof Bill Gibson, Prof Norman Doe, Canon Prof Martyn Percy, Dr Tim Bradshaw and Prof Andrew Pierce. All errors that remain, are my own, of course. Sébastien Fivaz helped me to come to terms with British law and Dr Philip Endean SJ helped me more than once to obtain photocopies from the United States.

All those I could not mention or whom I forgot I humbly ask for their apologies. Finally but actually foremost, I have to thank my family, whom I missed quite a bit over the last years, especially my sisters Susanne and Svenja and their families. I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Bernd and Inge Weishaupt, whose love and constant support in many ways, have helped me so much to pursue my studies and explore my vocation.

Christ Church, Oxford, on St Nicholas Day, 2012.

Steffen Weishaupt

1. The Theological Significance and the Consequences of the Anglican Emphasis of a 'Historic Succession' of Bishops in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

1.1 The Refusal of Interchangeability of Ministers with 'Non-episcopal' Churches, Whilst (Re-)allowing Intercommunion, With Special Reference to Meissen

The significance of the contemporary insistence on a **'historic succession'** lies in its negative consequences for the interchangeability with 'non-episcopal' ministries in England (with Methodists, for example, who stem from the Church of England) and ecumenical partners elsewhere.

My initial interest in the subject of Anglican ecclesiology arose from my reflections upon the relations between the Church of England and the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* (EKD). In 2007/08, I had the privilege of serving as a non-Anglican, ordained minister at Christ Church, Oxford, on the basis of the ***Meissen Declaration and Agreement***. The consensus laid down in *Meissen* struck me as drawing conclusions which bore no relation to its assumptions.[1] The partners mutually recognize each other as "churches belonging to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ and truly participating in the apostolic mission of the whole people of God" (*Meissen Declaration* A,i), which "advances beyond mutual eucharistic hospitality, but which falls short of the full interchangeability of ministers", "[u]ntil we have a reconciled, common ministry" (B,vi and vii). The reason is the **Anglican**

[1] Dalferth, "Sichtbare Einheit und Bischofsamt", 198f; Dalferth, "Sichtbare Gemeinschaft", 332f; Etchells, "Ministry", 142; Sykes, "Protestantism", 127. The texts of both *Meissen* and *Porvoo* can be found in: Oppegaard/Cameron, *Agreements*.

emphasis of a 'historic succession'. The Church of England pointed this out again in 2012, in a joint report with the United Reformed Church.

> "The Church of England does not hold that the episcopate is of the essence of the Church in the sense that it believes that a body that does not possess the historic episcopate can nevertheless still be part of the one Church of Jesus Christ. That is why the Church of England has been able to give formal acknowledgement to non-episcopal churches in its ecumenical agreements. It is true, however, (as these same agreements make clear) that the Church of England believes that the existence of the historic episcopate is a necessary part of the visible unity of the Church. The United Reformed Church, on the other hand, in common with other Reformed churches, does not see the existence of any particular form of ministry as necessary for the Church's visible unity."[2]

The significance of *Meissen* lies in the fact that it cements the policy of intercommunion with (some) 'non-episcopal' churches in that it would be difficult to go beyond this achievement again. On the other hand, it cements a *status quo* in its explicit sanctioning of steps going beyond it. Thus, *Meissen* can be seen, positively, as an expression of an ecumenical commitment with a view to 'non-episcopal' churches, as well as, negatively, implying a negative ecclesiological judgement, which may be perceived as an insult.

Meissen's historic significance, however, is to be seen in the agreement of intercommunion. Canon B15A of the Church of England (from 1972) grants such a right on a temporary basis, but regular communicating in an Anglican Church would normally require 'episcopal' confirmation (Canon B28 of the same year sets 'episcopal confirmation' as standard for reception into the Church of England).[3] **Episcopal confirmation** had been elevated to the status of a condition for communicating at an Anglican Eucharist in the first half of the twentieth century, drawing on theological convictions of Anglo-Catholicism of the previous

---

[2] Church of England-United Reformed Church Joint Study Group, *Report*, 18.

decades which had seen the revival of confirmation. This policy was not least a result of a desire to mark 'Anglican' identity in opposition to Dissenters (cf. chapters 4.5f.), after the rise of the party spirit and the increasing undermining of the status of the Prayer Book as unifying liturgy. In practical terms, however, it is only in the nineteenth century that confirmations were (more) systematically conducted and that a theological significance was attached to the Anglican practice of episcopal confirmation. This meant that 'presbyteral confirmations' were not recognized (whether conducted by Methodists or foreign Protestant churches, including today's *Meissen* and *Porvoo* partners, or the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches), especially not as fulfilling the Prayer Book's rubric which makes confirmation a precondition for communicating in the Church of England.[4]

The illogicality of establishing eucharistic hospitality but no interchangeability of ministers, however, provokes a criticism which Lampe formulated decades ago when he lobbied for intercommunion with 'non-episcopal' churches (protesting with many others against the requirement of episcopal confirmation for intercommunion).

"[The Anglican formularies leave] the way open for the recognition of that 'reality' and 'efficacity' of the existing ministries of non-episcopal bodies which Anglican spokesmen so constantly assert in word but deny in practice. [… The refusal of inter-communion] is based on a theology quite alien to the main historic tradition of the Church of England…"[5]

---

[3] Cf. footnote 1021.
[4] Cf. "Identitätsbewusste Kirchen im pluralen Europa: Bericht der Meissen Kommission der Kirche von England und der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (2007 – 2011)", 7. Cf. footnotes 1 and 932f(f).
[5] Lampe, *Intercommunion*, 16,18.

The refusal of eucharistic hospitality has been overcome in *Meissen*, but the remaining disabilities amplify the illogicality of the Anglican position, as it is difficult to understand that, following this argument, an assumed lack of 'regularity' of 'non-episcopal' ministers should force Anglicans to treat them as if they were not ordained, although they are recognized to celebrate valid sacraments. Thus, Anglicans still "find themselves practically committed to behaving as though they do accept such teaching [of a sacramental, apostolic succession determining the validity of ministers and the sacraments administered by them]."[6]

"There seems, in any case, to be a theological inconsistency in the developing Anglican tendency to recognize the existing *apostolicity* of a church without 'the historic episcopate' while insisting on the need of its presence for full communion."[7]

1.2 The Claim of a Significance of Continuity in a 'Historic Succession' for Apostolicity and Catholicity

Dalferth once described *Meissen* as 'unrequited declaration of love' of the EKD.[8] This policy seems to copy, which is not without irony, Roman Catholic doctrine. The latter 'unchurches' Protestant churches as not 'apostolic', including Anglicans, on the ground of the Roman sacramental understanding of the (Roman) Catholic Church (which is, effectively, held to represent exclusively 'Catholicity' in the West). This quality other 'ecclesial communities' (they do not

[6] Ibid., 17.
[7] Wainwright, "Dogma", 175.
[8] Dalferth, "Sichtbare Einheit und Bischofsamt", 198,207.

qualify for the term 'church') are declared to lack.[9] In the Anglican case, the ***successio doctrinalis* is linked with a concrete and uninterrupted *successio localis et personalis*** which is styled as necessary for the (full) representation of apostolicity and 'catholicity'.[10] This has consequences. Newbigin complained in 1958, in connection with the South India union, long before *Meissen*:

> "I wonder whether Anglicans generally realize how much their fellow-Christians in other communions have been perplexed by what has often seemed to be the lack of candour in Anglican statements on this subject. Statements have been made which seemed to the simple reader to mean outright recognition and acceptance, but which were subsequently found to mean something much less."[11]

One of the implications of *Meissen* is that ministers of partner churches are not allowed to preside at an Anglican eucharistic service, but can only assist in a way *comparable* to a deacon.[12] Thus, the insistence on a **'historic succession'** is the source of ecumenical embarrassment because it effectively marginalizes ecumenical partners amongst the churches of the **Reformation,** the so-called 'non-episcopal churches' (even if they have the office of bishops), who typically stem from territories where the bishops in the sixteenth century refused to break with Rome collectively, in the way the Church in England did. As a consequence, Reformers abroad (in their 'Reformation from below') had to establish parallel structures to the 'Roman' institution which in England was taken over by Henry VIII (in his 'Reformation from above' as 'supreme head').[13] Haigh suggests: "it is

---

[9] Cf. Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, *Dominus Iesus*, para. 17. Cf. footnote 908.
[10] Gassmann, "Historisches Bischofsamt", 684.
[11] Newbigin, "Anglicans", 226f.
[12] Cf. English Committee of the Meissen Commission, *Meissen*, 23.
[13] Cf. Gassmann, "Historisches Bischofsamt", 683. All relevant Tudor statutes can be found in: Child, *Church and State*, 305ff. Cf. Bray, *Documents*.

likely that most of those who lived in Tudor England experienced Reformation as obedience rather than conversion…"[14]

Even if that was so, the seed of the Reformation fell into fertile English land and bloomed quickly, carried forward not least by Tudor bishops. Henry's religious conservatism (with the exception of the dissolution of the monasteries: "for Cranmer and Cromwell monasticism was a pious fraud, for Henry it was a useful source of revenue") was soon superseded by strong influence of Protestant reform. "The picture that emerges is of a reforming episcopacy held in check by the threat of financial expropriation."[15] "[I]n the 1830s […] the evangelicals tortuously smuggled their views on various matters of doctrine into the Church's official doctrinal statements."[16] Reform happened within the limits which the respective monarch set (MacCulloch: "pick and mix Reformations").[17]

> "Law recognized that the determinations of civil authority concerning religious belief and observance, must be consistent with the Word of God; and law proceeded to assume that they always were so. The authority of the Scriptures became a kind of legal fiction."[18]

Thus, it seems to some that "the English Reformers refrained from taking Protestant principles to their logical conclusion."[19] This situation, especially after the Tractarians, is often styled to be proof for the historical 'Catholic' character of the Church of England.[20] 'Revisionists' like Duffy prominently drew the conclusion that it was "plain that Anglican self-identity was never simply or

---

[14] Haigh, *English Reformations*, 21.
[15] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 25,20.
[16] MacCulloch, "Map", 81.
[17] Bernard, "Religious Policy", 331ff; MacCulloch, "Map", 78f.
[18] Allen, *History*, 172. I am grateful to Mark Chapman for supplying me with the exact reference.
[19] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 39.
[20] Cf. Fleming, *Protestant*, 4; Ramsey, "Theology", 3.

unequivocally Protestant."[21] Nevertheless, it rather seems to stand for the '**Erastian**' character of the Church of England, and English (High Church) divines felt, at best, besides their loyalty to the monarch, bound to a pure, 'catholic' tradition of the early church, a loyalty which Newman eventually would allow to be extended further, to the Roman Magisterium.[22] Despite the Victorian (Tractarian) attempt to interpret the Reformation away, it needs to be acknowledged that nothing "could … be further from the truth".[23] "Any evaluation of the Reformation's impact on Anglicanism must be conducted over the dead body of the nineteenth-century Oxford Movement."[24] Until today, Anglo-Catholic histiography styles the history of the Church of England prior to Tractarianism a temporary decline:[25]

"in the sixteenth century, the fog in the channel had not yet cut off mainland Europe from the theological discourse… [… It is a nineteenth-century myth of the changes of the sixteenth] … as little more than clearing away some medieval popish clutter in order to return to the true church of the apostles that had survived more or less intact in England."[26]

MacCulloch explains this 'myth' as a result of Anglo-Catholic wishful thinking:

"… England did indeed have a Reformation in the sixteenth century. This might seem superfluous: after all, we have all heard of Henry VIII and his marital troubles, and we have all heard of bloody Mary and good Queen Bess defeating the Spanish Armada with a fine speech and a dose of English bad weather laid on by the Almighty. But the Church of England has over the last two centuries become increasingly adept at covering its tracks and concealing the fact that it springs from a Reformation which was Protestant in tooth and claw. This labour of obfuscation began with the aim of showing that Anglicans were as good if not better Catholics than the followers of the pope. It then continued with the perhaps

[21] Duffy, "Continuity", 63.
[22] Cf. footnotes 686f.
[23] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 14ff. (quote); Leuenberger, *Cultus*; MacCulloch, "Myth".
[24] Locke, *Church*, 1.
[25] King, "Review".
[26] Chapman, *Theology*, 1f.

more worthy aim of finding a road back to unity with Rome, in the series of ecumenical discussions which began in 1970, known by the acronym ARCIC (Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission). The participants in these discussions have not been anxious to emphasise difference, and very often they have fallen back on the Anglo-Catholic rewriting of English church history pioneered by John Keble and John Henry Newman in the 1830s, as the Oxford Movement took shape. … there has been a troupe of historians who have been too clever for their own good. […There is also the] peculiar English assumption that England is by definition different and special, and that therefore even if it did have a Reformation, an English Reformation could not have all that much to do with the noises off across the English Channel, let alone whatever noises filtered southwards over the border with Scotland or across the Irish Sea."[27]

Thus, anti-revisionists have been delivering "a few kicks at the twitching corpse of High Church Anglican history."[28]

The fact that the English Reformation appears not to have been 'fully Protestant' does not necessarily mean that it can be labelled **'catholic'**, as Anglicans with an interest in emphasizing Anglican **'comprehensiveness'** like to label it, alleging that it is not accountable to any particular tradition (Catholic *or* 'Reformed'), but borrows from both if it suits. Avis tells his readers:

"[w]e are bound …, I believe, to conclude that the *appeal to the Reformation is necessary but not sufficient to define Anglican ecclesial identity.* […Anglicanism, being catholic and reformed represents a] Catholicism [which] is not enslaved to tradition nor is its reformed character in bondage to biblical literalism."[29]

However, 'comprehensiveness', it seems, is only a long-term consequence of the 'Erastian' history of the Church of England. While the Tractarians tried to deny and undo the Reformation, emphasizing an alleged Catholic heritage, today's Anglicans try to correct this by dating back their 'comprehensiveness', not denying but limiting the impact of the Reformation and **claiming the**

[27] MacCulloch, "Map", 75f.
[28] Ibid., 77.
[29] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 40.

conservative, 'Erastian' element to represent a form of 'catholicism'. The 'Catholic'/'catholic' claim of an *unbroken* preservation of 'orders' in an alleged succession is a prime example of this, whereas one could also simply argue historically that it was the preservation of an **organizational structure**.[30]

Whether or not this **contributes to the catholicity and apostolicity** of a church is a disputed question between Anglicans and 'non-episcopal' churches. Major once observed: "… the Church is cursed with an avowed or implicit belief in the infallibility of its past…"[31] Kirk, promoting an Anglo-Catholic understanding of episcopacy in *The Apostolic Ministry*, pointed out how much the 'catholicity' of 'orders' mattered to him. "If we agree about orders, we can compromise to an unlimited extent upon organization; indeed, the more the bishop can be disentangled from the machine and left to feed the flock, the better for him, for them, and for the whole Church."[32] Buchanan commented: "… Elizabeth and Parker would have been horrified. Their emphasis upon episcopacy for England sprang from a refusal to compromise upon organization."[33] Their concern appears not to have been the preservation of 'Catholic orders' to counterbalance 'Protestant innovations'. Elizabeth's "fossilisation of the Edwardian Church", including the threefold ordering, "bore [not] much ideological freight."[34]

"The Elizabethan Church of England had the advantage that the whole apparatus of the old Church in law and administration had fallen into its hands intact. It was an unreformed structure, … it remained unreformed, much to the embarrassment of senior churchmen and the fury of Puritans. Nonetheless, throughout Elizabeth's reign, Protestants struggled with increasing success to mould this recalcitrant structure to their purposes."[35]

---

[30] Cf. Faith and Order Advisory Group, *Priesthood*, 68ff,74ff.,94; Taylor, "Regiment", 34.
[31] Major, "Reformation", 414 (quote),420.
[32] Kirk, "Apostolic Ministry", 52.
[33] Buchanan, "Apostolic Succession", 27f.
[34] MacCulloch, "Map", 89f.
[35] MacCulloch, *Realm*, 14.

Historical accident or not, Anglicans nowadays hold that the 'historic succession' of the episcopate had preserved a personal succession. This represents a particular interpretation of history, and the succession is held to embrace a special significance for the catholicity and apostolicity of Anglican ministries.

"Anglicans have maintained that ordination in the historical episcopal succession enhances and contributes to the catholicity of the Church. […] In practice, episcopal ordination is a non-negotiable platform of Anglicanism in ecumenical discussions…"[36]

1.3 The Alleged Continuity Through Personal or Institutional Succession of the Episcopal Ministry or Office

In ecclesiological descriptions, Anglicans usually refer to the 'historic episcopate' as a **ministry** of *episcope* which had been preserved from the early or ancient church.[37] It would be more precise to speak of the succession of **office** or **office-holders**, understood in a **personal**, but even more in a **corporate** sense. This means that the 'succession' is not made dependent on the perpetual existence or occupation of particular sees, but on the perpetual creation of bishops. Anglican descriptions of the episcopal ministry seem to merge (if not confuse) aspects of the office (nowadays, leadership in a synodal structure of some kind) and its ministry, styled to represent exclusively certain aspects of the ministry of the

[36] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 66,70, cf. 28,78f.
[37] Cf. Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate, *Episcopal Ministry*, 17.

church, namely apostolicity and catholicity, to an extent which others do not (episcopacy as 'focus of unity').[38]

The difficulty partly derives from the fact that 'ministry' can be used to mean different things: the clergy (the collection of ministers) or the meaning of the Latin *ministerium*, *officium*, *ordo/ordines* (possibly embracing the aspects of different, higher and lower, degrees) and *diakonia*.[39] The term ***ministerium*** embraces primarily the function, whereas the term ***officium*** emphasizes the institutional aspect which appears to be crucial here for the understanding of continuity.[40] '**Non-episcopal' churches usually have a *ministry* of oversight as well, and have offices for it** (bishops, presidents, superintendents etc.). Anglicans tell their 'non-episcopal' partners that 'non-episcopal' ministries lacked dominical authority, transferred/symbolized by the laying-on of hands in an episcopal 'historic succession'. That would mean that it is the (tactual) succession of *office*-holders then, which is believed to add a special quality or symbolism to the exercising of the present *ministry*.

"The difficulty arises over the understanding of the relationship of episcopal succession to this apostolic succession [of the continuity of the Church's life in faith over time]. Although apostolic succession of faithfulness to truth is carried in the whole community, it is widely seen as depending in part upon the continuity in a God-given ministry of leadership. The concept of a sacred tradition of teaching antedates the concept of an apostolic succession of pastors, but the second became necessary to safeguard the first."[41]

Depending on one's historic reconstruction, continuities and discontinuities need precise definition and are then subject to a theological evaluation of their

---

[38] Cf. Grundy, *Leadership*, 30f.,67f.,165ff.,173f.,176.
[39] Cf. Sasse, "Weltkonferenz", 297,312.
[40] Cf. Müller, "Amtsverständnis", 328.
[41] Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate, *Episcopal Ministry*, 145.

implications. The question of continuity, however, is usually more complex than it seems. The German Reformers, for example, saw themselves being forced to 'restore' the episcopal ministry by creating the *office* of superintendents to exercise the ministry of oversight, which they held the bishops at the time to have abandoned. Some of the 'Roman' bishops had not even been ordained (for example, even after the Reformation, elector Archbishop of Trier Johan VI von der Leyen, who died in 1567), and normally hardly exercised ecclesiastical oversight (visitations etc.).[42] In the vast majority of cases, they refused to feel responsible for 'Protestant' ministers, as that would have endangered their earthly powers in the Empire. As the Reformers in the early sixteenth century found that the ministry of oversight had ceased to be exercised by the (nominal) bishops, they felt that they had to revive it.

The more recent notion of a 'symbolic' nature of the succession (cf. chapter 5) helps to bridge possible hurdles with succession (for example, in England the transformation of the theological profile of the English Church under the Tudors, the discontinuity of the episcopal government during the Civil War, any historical or theological doubts about the unbrokenness or invalidity of consecration chains, or the question of whether Anglicans hold a sacramental understanding of ordination). The fact that nowadays the succession of the **laying-on of hands** is styled an *indispensable* symbol, makes such a rationale nevertheless appear to be based on the Anglo-Catholic model of a **transferal of a sacramental grace, or at least conforms to its practical standards** (cf. chapter 5).

---

[42] Dickens, *English Reformation*, 251.

The Anglican imprecision in terms (and often, in fact, in things) becomes more obvious with the **diaconate**.[43] The ministry of 'deacons' has changed considerably since the early church, possibly originally by no means understood in an assisting role, and developed and revived differently in different churches, with its profile ranging from a trainee/assisting minister to a 'diaconal minister'.[44] It is nowadays often exercised as an office of transition, a probation ministry (with lay readers in the Church of England *de facto* having replaced permanent deacons). It would be difficult to maintain a *functional* continuation of the diaconate from the early church (the ministry); this is feasible only in name (of the office). When in 1968 the Lambeth Conference recommended the restoration of a distinctive office of deacon, to be open to women, it also suggested in Resolution 32c "[t]hat those made deaconesses by laying-on of hands with appropriate prayers be declared to be within the diaconate", trying to reconcile the different models, despite their distinct characters. Deaconesses had been revived in the nineteenth century.[45] In the Church of England, the admittedly little developed profile of the diaconate had led to discussions which resulted in reports in 1968 and 1974 which suggested that the abolition of the diaconate seemed justified (which the General Synod declined in 1977). Ever since, the need for provisions for a distinctive diaconate has been voiced.[46]

---

[43] Cf. Cobham, "Readers and Deacons"; Rogerson, "Diaconate".
[44] Cf. Boettcher, *Diaconal Ministry*; Collins, *Deacons*, 1ff.,16f; Collins, *Diakonia*, 8ff.,193ff.,255; Kammer für Theologie der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, *Diakonat*.
[45] *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports*, 38f. Cf. footnotes 547ff.
[46] *Deacons in the Church: The Report of a Working Party Set Up by the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry*, 32ff; *Women in Ministry: A Study: Report of the Working Party Set Up Jointly by the Ministry Committee of the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry and the Council for Women's Ministry in the Church*, 39ff. *Deacons in the Ministry of the Church: A Report to the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England*, 1,119; Howe, "Diaconate", 71ff. *For Such a Time As This: A Renewed Diaconate in the Church of England: A Report to the General Synod of the Church of England of a Working Party of the House of Bishops*.

The definition of the Anglican diaconate remains obscure. Paul Avis once admitted with regard to the distinction between **lay readers** and deacons in the Church of England: "the distinction of functions remains a little hazy. […] … the difference is qualitative, not simply quantitive. The ordination of a deacon is an ecclesial sign in a way that the commissioning of a Reader is not." If, however, the crucial difference between the two is **not 'quantitive'**, that is, in the degree of authorization in function (deacons can be allowed to baptize, for example, but not to celebrate Communion), the difference is attributed to it (almost arbitrarily), but not necessarily logically grounded. The opposite seems to be the case, as Protestants would typically say: the task of the one, ordained ministry is actually 'quantitively' exercised by different offices, with different tasks and authorizations. For Avis, the 'qualitative' difference appears to be a mystical one, but one being read into the different offices, in the same style which is used when describing the episcopate as symbol. "*Diakonia* is the *sine qua non* of ordained ministry because in the ordination of deacons the divine commission that is the essence of the apostolicity of the Church is signified sacramentally."[47]

In another publication, Avis constructs the difference between a reader and a deacon as the latter having to fulfil more 'pastoral' tasks. It may be asked whether this is really is a 'qualitative' distinction, or rather a 'quantitive' one.[48] Whether or not a reader is 'less pastoral' than a deacon, is in practice dependent on his or her abilities ('qualitative') and the tasks the person is entrusted with ('quantitive'). Even the permanent (ordained) diaconate, in most instances, is hardly what he styles "a flagship ministry". To rule that readers did not qualify for ordination *per se*, as opposed to deacons, seems an arbitrary decision, as they are

[47] Avis, "Revision", 106,108.

selected, trained and installed in a similar way, at least to begin with. The distinction is only gradual and is akin to different stages or models of professional development.

The **Anglican difficulty in distinguishing between ministry and office** also becomes apparent when Avis proposes his own definition of ministry, as "God-given work for the cause of God that is acknowledged by the Church".[49] This appears not to describe the ministry of the church as a whole, but specific ministries exercised in and pre-defined by *offices*. Thus, the claim of a *qualitative* distinction between 'representative' liturgical and pastoral tasks attributed to different 'ministries', some ordained and some not, may be perhaps historically plausible but not necessarily practically imperative. It rather appears to be an attempt to justify the traditional order in three different offices by styling them a 'threefold ministry', with 'lay ministers' as an obscure, fourth additum. This presents the different ecclesiastical powers of *offices* as a hierarchy of ecclesial *ministries*, with the (arch-)episcopate as the highest level, with the episcopal proprium, for example, being the general authorization to confirm, ordain and to exercise oversight etc.: "given yet further authority by Christ in his Church".[50] Thus, these (ministerial) powers can remain with an emeritus, without an office, although he needs to be invited to exercise them on behalf of a diocesan colleague, the office-holder in charge.

---

[48] Avis, *Shaped by Mission*, 99,103,114ff.
[49] Ibid., 58.
[50] Ibid.

1.4 Theological Implications of an Insistence on Personal Succession of Bishops

A minister of **'non-episcopal'** churches is said to lack in catholicity and apostolicity and, thus, not to qualify as "a clerk in holy orders" in the sense of the Canon Law of the Church of England.[51] This, in principle, is a matter of formal approval: the crucial Canon C1 of our day speaks of "episcopal consecration or ordination in some Church whose orders are recognized and accepted by the Church of England".[52] In *Meissen*, such a recognition is refused. It is historically significant, however, that the explicit mention of "episcopal consecration or ordination" in Canon C1, in the sense of an 'episcopal *type*' of ordination, or 'orders', only goes back to the proposed canons of 1947. The deposited canons of 1874 and 1879 stated "that in the judgment of the church holy orders have ever been held to be indelible".[53] Before that, the respective canons only emphasized the duty of the diocesan bishop or his deputy to examine the suitability and qualification of the candidates for ordination or installation. The emphasis of the earlier canons that no-one should be ordained without an arrangement of where to serve, in fact, resembles the Reformed practice which understands ordination as installation.[54]

Speaking from the point of view of the EKD, Dalferth explains that the view that the German churches of the Reformation had abandoned the 'sign' of a ministerial succession (*Porvoo*) could be understood from their (functional) understanding of the ordained ministry which forced them to separate from the Roman hierarchy, with its medieval corruptions. Thus, the historical incident as

---

[51] Pearce, "Interchangeability", 7.
[52] *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical Promulged by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*.
[53] Bray, *Canons*, 648,603,219.

such would not need to be understood as a regrettable historical accident of losing the 'historic episcopate', which needed compensation ("Gestalt" versus "Funktion").[55] Bishop Hill once suggested: "… Anglicans would need to recognize that the shape the Church (and its ordained ministry) took in the Reformation Churches is also given in a similar sense by God in history."[56] If one wants to interpret history under the aspect of divine providence, the abandonment of an alleged succession by the churches of the Reformation (which would possibly need to include Anglicans, generally speaking) could be interpreted as a reminder of the danger of corruption and the abuse of power in a clericalistic understanding of church.[57]

The Anglican denial of interchangeability of ministers with 'non-episcopal' churches on the grounds of a historic discontinuity of offices gives the impression of a **(quasi-)sacramental understanding** of succession which appears to suggest that 'non-episcopal' ministers were not actually ('validly') ordained. Had the ordained German Lutheran candidate for the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 2011 accepted the appointment, he would have needed to be (re-) ordained in the Church of England, possibly even (re-)confirmed, as a few German Protestant ministers have been before him. In the same year, the ordained Methodist Stephen Plant was (re-)ordained in the Church of England when taking up the post of Dean of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. The matter was widely discussed in the *Methodist Recorder*. The Anglican *Church Times* made no mention of it.[58] In 2009 it became public that the Bishop of London, Richard Chartres, had proposed to ordain conditionally ('if thou art not ordained') the Methodist

---

[54] McGrath, *History*, 205ff.
[55] Dalferth, "Sichtbare Einheit und Bischofsamt", 200,204.
[56] Hill, "Church of Jesus Christ", 407.

superintendent Lord Leslie Griffiths (this case was, it appears, another blind spot of the *Church Times*). The Methodist Conference had discussed the proposal in closed sessions in 2008/9 but withheld approval. Griffiths was frustrated about the turning down of "the amazingly imaginative and generous offer of the Bishop of London", which may have set an example to short-circuit the official conversations by the virtual acceptance of the Anglican model of ordination, on an individual basis. Consequently it caused controversies and it would have solved the existing problems only on a superficial level, as the examples of the South India and the (unsuccessful) Anglican-Methodist unity scheme illustrate where conditional (episcopal) ordinations of previously presbyterally ordained ministers to some Anglicans did not seem a good enough model of 'reconciliation' of 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' ministries. Griffith, for his part, announced that with retirement he would rather be a "freelance minister" and no longer "'in Connexion' with the Methodist Conference".[59]

1.5 The 'Historic Succession' as an Alleged Historic Core Doctrine of the Church of England

Mary Tanner, one of the drafters of *Meissen* and *Porvoo* and one of the leading ecumenical officers in the Church of England, the Anglican Communion and in the World Council of Churches between 1982-1998, told the *Meissen* partners: **"[t]he question of apostolic continuity and apostolic succession has been a concern of Anglicans since the time of the Reformation…"**[60]

---

[57] Cf. Peck, *Re-examination*, 38f.,41.
[58] Low, "Letter".
[59] Griffiths/Coates, "Ordination Issues".
[60] Tanner, "Porvoo", 108.

This thesis questions the emphasis on episcopal *succession* as a historical, theological feature of the ecclesiology of the Church of England before the emergence of 'Anglicanism' in the second half of the nineteenth century.[61] It argues that the emphasis on **succession** is a specific and relatively late theological variant of the valuing of **episcopal *government*** (traditionally based on the *divine right* of the monarch), drawing on Anglo-Catholic thinking, but now claiming something like a ***divine right* of episcopacy**. Before the notion of succession in connection with the 'historic episcopate' became established Anglican teaching, the interpretation of episcopacy had cautiously been kept open with regard to the different 'denominational traditions' within the Church of England and Anglicanism. When Tanner claims, with a view to the period before 1662, that "Anglicans demanded episcopal succession in the ordering of the Church at home", she seems to read a notion of succession into the valuing and defence of an episcopal *government* and the relative norm (with notable exceptions) of ordination by an English bishop.[62] However, the norm of episcopal ordination is not equivalent to the claim of an apostolic succession. It appears that the ecclesiological 'apostolic paradigm' was not commonly held in the Church of England before the nineteenth century. Pearce, however, told the *Meissen* partners, with a view to the 1662 *Act of Uniformity*, which reinforced the usage of the (revised) Prayer Book and required a declaration of loyalty to the King and the ordination by the restored bishops if not received previously:[63] **"[t]here is a strong argument that, in the context of the time, 'episcopally ordained' meant**

---

[61] Cf. Sykes, *Priest*, 259.
[62] Tanner, "Porvoo", 115.
[63] Cf. Chapman, "Bischofsamt und Politik", 437,450; Green, *Re-establishment*, 144.

'ordained by a bishop in the historic succession'."[64] Against that, one may note that the twenty-third of the carefully drafted Thirty-Nine Articles (which display a "clearly detectable" influence of the Augsburg Confession) had required a **'lawful calling'** of ministers: "it is not … affirmed that this call need be Episcopal".[65] The notes of one of the drafters of the *Act of Uniformity* suggest that the concern at the time had *not* been restoration of an 'episcopal' *type* of ordination, defined by a succession, but not to re-ordain "persons who have been ordained by Bishops according to the former book of Ordination…"[66]

Tanner's and Pearce's historical reconstructions, however, sustain an Anglican claim that **"our own Church, falling in and agreeing with the Church Catholic, has ever deemed episcopal ordination as essential to the reality of the ministerial function..."**[67] The *Cameron Report* of 1990 (Tanner was a consultant to the working party), controversially received with a view to its scholarly assumptions, held that "[i]t has always been of importance in the Anglican tradition that there was no break in episcopal succession in the sixteenth century."[68] The *Rochester Report* (2004), by a working party of mainly bishops of the Church of England, claimed that "the framework of the ancient threefold order of ministry" had been "deliberately maintained in the Church of England by the Anglican Reformers in order to retain continuity with the teaching and practice of the Early Church".[69] However, it rather seems that the Reformers actually thought of episcopacy as *adiaphoron*, a *matter indifferent*. Avis once remarked: "[i]f

---

[64] Pearce, "Interchangeability", 7.
[65] Girdlestone, *Apostolical Succession*, 14; Reardon, "Articles", 100, cf. 103f. Cf. Bray, *Documents*, 661f.
[66] Quoted in: Swainson, *Act*, 27.
[67] Cf. Allies/Rule, *Apostolical Succession*, 153; Bennett, *Principles*, 304.
[68] Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate, *Episcopal Ministry*, 147,xiii. Cf. Bradshaw, "Episcopal Ministry", 117; Dalferth, *Weg*, 136; Hill, "Tanner", 18.
[69] House of Bishops' Working Party on Women in the Episcopate, *Rochester Report*, para. 2.2.1.

Henry VIII had said, 'We will have no more bishops', that would have decided the matter."[70] And, there are different ways to interpret institutional continuity: "the English Reformers did not focus on abuses of priestly prerogatives so much as on the renewal of the theology of the ordained ministry [as lawfully called, preaching, non-sacrificial minister to a congregation]."[71] In that, they were more or less in accord with the Reformers in mainland Europe. Overall, in Elizabethan times, "there was an agreeable harmony in dogma and little controversy over polity…", whereas people did get more passionate about questions of concrete ceremonies, but even that passion had its limits, MacCulloch suggests:[72]

"[t]he first cord to be cut was Protestantism's link with the alehouse. In the years before Protestant triumph in 1558, alehouses had provided the public forum in which Protestants could challenge the public gatherings of the old church's worship… […On the other hand, one may ask:] … what about the possibility that the Elizabethan church left a large section of the nation unaffected, religiously indifferent, and wedded to an amorphous semi-paganism which was the despair of Catholic and Protestants alike? Was the society of the alehouse a breeding-ground for a sceptical, unruly society which was the enemy of the godly?"[73]

Be that as it may, the situation with a view to episcopacy nowadays appears to be that

"Anglicanism, though it nowhere explicitly declares that episcopacy is of the Church's *esse*, or that only ordination by bishops and celebration of the Eucharist by priests who have been ordained by bishops is valid, is certainly pledged to episcopacy in the sense that it will never join a non-episcopal church."[74]

As opposed to that, the American Presbyterian Thompson still judged in 1910 that the claim of an "authorized ministry" represented the view only of a party within

---

[70] Avis, "Episcopacy", 125.
[71] Webster, "Ministry", 286.
[72] Acton, *Cambridge Modern History 2*, 590. Cf. MacCulloch, *Realm*, 8ff.

the Protestant Episcopal Church there in the previous seventy years, "but not [of] the Church itself".[75]

1.6 The Function of the Definition of Anglican 'Orders' Through Succession

In *Meissen*, 'non-episcopal' partners are recognized as a 'true church' but they are effectively told that they are, nevertheless, somehow ecclesiologically defective. One possible reason for this might be the problem of the inner-Anglican plurality ('**comprehensiveness**'). The 'historic succession' provides an institutional identity marker in the otherwise theologically undefinable Anglican churches, conforming to an Anglo-Catholic core doctrine. Thus, Sachs might be right when he says: "The diffuse nature of this [the Anglican] church is both its glory and its frustration."[76]

This may perhaps also become apparent in the diffuse way in which Anglicans tend to use the notion of '**catholicity**'. With regard to the 'historic episcopate' this claim means that Anglican episcopacy is declared to represent a universal model, even though Anglican 'orders', as a matter of fact, are not universally recognized. Tanner, for example, says with a view to the Quadrilateral and the 1920 Lambeth *Appeal*:

"… Anglicans have come to recognize that these principles express not only the gifts of God which hold their own communion together, but that they also point

[73] MacCulloch, *Realm*, 14,26.
[74] Gray, *Anglican Communion*, 136.
[75] Thompson, *Episcopate*, 1f.
[76] Sachs, "Review", 159.

towards that which God is calling the whole Church in unity more fully to become."[77]

The claim of 'catholicity' usually focuses especially on emphasizing proximity to or equality with Rome. The Lambeth Conference 1988 (Resolution 66) asked for the production of a collection of sources to "reflect the catholicity of our tradition from the beginning". The 'handbook' is dominated by the theme of episcopacy, beginning with patristic sources and gives the impression that 'episcopal' ordination and confirmation had always and unanimously been regarded as the heart of 'Anglican' identity. It ignores throughout the legitimate place of Reformers and Puritans in Anglican history, or the significance of the (renewed) rejection of Anglican orders by the Roman Catholic Church in 1896 (which the collection tacitly, or perhaps tactically, omits). "[T]he Puritan vision of godly reformation was widely shared at the highest levels of the ecclesiastical establishment. The Puritans were not knocking at the gates; they were inside the Church all the time."[78]

This may illustrate that there is an Anglican apologetic tendency to "locate the unity of Anglicanism in its catholicity", as it says in the aforementioned collection of sources.[79] Archbishop Carey wrote in his contribution: "it [the book] reflects the integrity and coherence of Anglican belief and practice" as well as "the coherence of Anglicanism with mainstream Christianity and the 'catholicity' of its faith".[80] Its purpose is, thus, the claim of an unchanged and pure 'Catholic' Anglican teaching, dating back 'Anglican' teaching to the early church, to support

---

[77] Tanner, "Future", 387.
[78] Hunt, "Collinson".
[79] Evans/Wright, *Anglican Tradition*, v; Sachs, "Review", 159.
[80] Evans/Wright, *Anglican Tradition*, title page, Foreword and Afterword.

its own authority. It is not untypical to do this on the basis of a selective, Anglo-Catholic historic hypothesis. Tanner, for example, told the Meissen partners:

"[w]hat the *Porvoo Common Statement* says about apostolic continuity and apostolic succession is consonant with what Anglicans have sought to uphold since the sixteenth century. More than that, it is what Anglicans believe is consonant with the faith of the Church through the ages."[81]

Another example of this peculiar Anglo-Catholic historiography, styling Anglo-Catholic belief the default position of the Church of England (sometimes even before its actual existence), is More and Cross's popular collection of sources of the seventeenth century (ahistorically labelled 'Anglicanism', published in 1935), which "wore its Anglo-Catholicism on its sleeve or, rather, on its titlepage [with an epigraph of Newman's]."[82] The same diagnosis MacCulloch makes for Cross' first edition of his *Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1957).[83] One may add here that Mary Tanner's background is Anglo-Catholic as well.[84]

This may suggest that there is a certain **tendency towards an 'Anglo-Catholic captivity' of Anglicanism**, which we encounter even in official documents, as seen. As a result, the Anglican model of church ordering is interpreted as a universal, 'Catholic' model, downplaying all other historical developments, especially the impact of the Reformation. Podmore, to add another example, an Anglo-Catholic who succeeded Tanner and Avis in important functions of a chief ecumenical officer at Church House and is now Director of *Forward in Faith*, wrote: "[t]he English Reformation was marked not by innovation but by rejection of the innovations of Rome. Its intention was to get

[81] Tanner, "Porvoo", 117.
[82] Cross/More, *Anglicanism*; Spurr, *Restoration*, 396 (quote).
[83] MacCulloch, "Map", 75.

back to the pure faith and order of the early or 'primitive' Church."[85] This is probably true, but the Reformers, however, appeared less naïve about the changed circumstances and the uncertainties of historic reconstructions than today's Anglicans. They did not attempt to restore the *institution* of the early church but to model the Church after the *faith* of the early church. "[O]ld Anglicanism as a rule took care not to attach more than a secondary importance to primitive tradition."[86] Even if English divines subsequently praised the Church of England to have preserved the ancient form of episcopacy, they usually did not make a negative judgement on the churches which had not done so, under difficult historic circumstances, and they usually did not argue with a ministerial succession in the sense that today's Anglicans do. Some English Reformers, after all, would have preferred the title 'superintendent' to that of 'bishop'.[87] The Marian exiles in Frankfurt decided against both the terms 'bishop' and 'superintendent' as being reserved to overseers of a larger unit, but finally installed a structure of a 'ministers', 'elders' and 'deacons' under a 'pastor'.[88] Brilioth concludes with a view to the Oxford Movement:

> "the attempt of primitive Tractarianism to define the *via media* by appealing to the standards of Christian antiquity and Caroline Anglicanism was profoundly unhistorical, and doomed to failure. It ignored the fact that neither of the two periods was a unity within itself."[89]

This does not mean that elements of Tractarian teaching were not unprecedented. After all, Brilioth himself styles it a "revival", which may or may not be

---

[84] Runcie, "Tanner", 7,13.
[85] Podmore, "Church of England", 63. Cf. footnote 542.
[86] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 197.
[87] Sykes, *Priest*, 14f.,42f.
[88] Ibid., 33f.
[89] Brilioth, *Three Lectures*, 61.

justified.[90] It is interesting, however, that the Tractarians themselves admitted the relative novelty of their position, despite styling their 'high' ecclesiology a re-discovery of "points which had long remained undisturbed" (preface to the second volume). Tract 74 (not only claiming a chain of consecrations but a chain of Anglican 'fathers'' teaching the succession theory of the Tractarians), however, failed to make plausible what Tanner seems to take for granted.[91] Newman wrote in 1839 that "in the last few years there has been a remarkable return in our Church to sounder principles than have been for many years in fashion."[92] Nevertheless, scholarly Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics like Keble and Darwell Stone were ready to admit that **Anglican history has been less unanimous** than readings of a straightforward 'catholicity' of the Church of England (Spurr, for example, speaks of "Keble's rather desperate attempts … to force Hooker into the mould of Tractarian episcopacy").[93] Nockles notes with regard to the Tractarian re-definition of the *via media* and the "confident claim to be merely renewing the historic Anglicanism of the seventeenth century to a supposedly 'forgetful generation'":

> "[f]or all its rhetoric of Anglican continuity and 'rediscovery' of a neglected tradition, the Oxford Movement … represents one of the most significant discontinuities in the history of Anglicanism. […] The Tractarians manifestly did not carry the whole Church of England with them. … Anglo-Catholicism arguably became sectarian in a way in which pre-Tractarian Anglicanism had never been…"[94]

The emphasis of succession in connection with episcopacy has a far less strong claim to make than Anglican statements today would admit, which highlights the

---

[90] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 16ff.
[91] Cf. footnote 664 and 626.
[92] Newman, "Review Palmer", 352.

shift which happened in the nineteenth century to a theological emphasis of a ***succession***, firmly **established in official teaching only in the twentieth**. This has been shown by scholars like Bardsley, Gwatkin or indeed Norman Sykes, who examined the ecclesiological teaching of leading divines in the Church of England prior to the nineteenth century.[95] Thus, a 'high' ecclesiological emphasis of episcopal succession can hardly claim to represent alone the 'Anglican DNA'. *Theological* reasoning for refusal of interchangeability of ministers and intercommunion with 'non-Anglicans' hardly goes back further than the nineteenth century. Goode, for example, referred in his 1852 preface to "a recent controversy in the Church of England respecting the validity of the Orders of the ministers of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches" (he does not distinguish yet between validity and regularity as Anglicans did in the twentieth century). The "question between the Primate and the Tractarians" he refers to is probably the Jerusalem bishopric, which can indeed be taken as an indication that the Tractarian emphasis of succession had not yet reached the higher ranks of the Church of England. The Tractarians were, he noted, "worshippers of Episcopacy

---

[93] Keble, *Hooker's Works*, vol. I, Editor's Preface, lix,lxxiiff; Spurr, *Restoration*, 395.
[94] Nockles, "Construction", 145 (short quote),158,165,183 (long quote).
[95] Allies/Rule, *Apostolical Succession*; Bardsley, *Apostolic Succession*; an earlier version had been published as: Bardsley, *Principles*; Chapman, *Anglican Studies*, chapter 1; Child, *Church and State*, 293ff; Denny, *English Church*; Gassmann, "Apostolische Sukzession", 258; Girdlestone, *Apostolical Succession*, 10ff; Goode, *Communion*; Goode, *Case*, 14ff; Goode, *Difficulties*, 9f; Goode, *Vindication*; Griffith Thomas, "Relation"; Gwatkin, *Episcopacy II*; Hawkins, *Apostolical Succession*; Hawkins, *Apostolic Order*; Henson, *Relation*; Hickman, *Apologia*; *Historical Enquiry Whether the Ministers of Non-episcopal Churches are Recognised as Ministers of God's Word and Sacraments by the Church of England: And Whether They May Receive Allowance to Preach Occasionally in Her Pulpits*; Hunkin, "Episcopacy [ed. Warren]"; Hunkin, *Ordination*; Hunter, *Doctrine*; Lampe, *Intercommunion*; Marshall, *Theology*; Owen/Williams, *Ordination*, 117ff; Perowne, "Church"; Pinnington, "Gloss"; *Shall Our Pulpits Be Re-opened to Non-episcopal Preachers, As At the Reformation, and For one Hundred Years Afterwards? Extracted from the Christian Observer for October and November, 1871*; Sykes, *Essay*; Sykes, *Priest*; Sykes/Gilley, "Impact"; Thompson, *Episcopate*, especially the Appendix; Tomlinson, *Attitude*; Wilson, *Inquiry*. Cf. footnote 969.

I am grateful to William Tighe who made me aware of an interesting correspondence about the matter of interpreting the Church of England's attitude towards 'non-episcopal' Churches before the Restoration, published in *Theology* 51, 1949.

and the Apostolic Succession".[96] *Frazer's Magazine*, also claiming the novelty of the emphasis of apostolic succession and priesthood, spoke of new mediators to Rome, with the consequence of "Germany being … unchristianised, and Rome and Britain declared the only churches of the West".[97] Goode mourned in 1859:

"there has risen up among us of late years an active, resolute and persevering party who have endeavoured to represent our Church as one which has no sympathy with the foreign Protestants, and as being precluded by her principles from holding communion with any non-episcopal Churches. […] The great point, therefore, to be now aimed at is, not the immediate federation of the Protestant churches, which under present circumstances is impracticable, but visible communion among the true followers of Christ in those Churches, so far as circumstances permit."[98]

Chapman concludes with regard to the exclusivist position with a view to bishops, which was established not least by the 'catholic' hierarchy, with an understanding of the Quadrilateral in the late nineteenth and the twentieth century embracing, implicitly or explicitly, the idea of an 'apostolic succession': "[t]his insistence might have come as a surprise to many earlier Anglican authors."[99] The Anglo-Catholic Stone, was ready to admit in the twentieth century:

"[Henson, in the Lee Lecture, 1911] certainly quotes effectively Anglican opinions which state or imply the non-necessity of episcopacy. But I have long felt myself that probably a large majority of Anglican divines held this in certain cases…"[100]

"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. … I greatly fear that to use these as the ground for battle is in many matters to be on the road to defeat."[101]

---

[96] Goode, *Vindication*, iii and pamphlet I, 1,3, cf. 14,25,28,31,33; Hodges, *Validity*, 11.
[97] "Treason within the Church [I]", 188,190,195. Cf. "Treason within the Church [II]".
[98] Goode, *Communion*, 4,39.
[99] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 121. Cf. footnote 858.
[100] Stone, "Letter Bartlet".
[101] Stone, "Letter Strong". Henson, *Relation*. Cf. Stone, "Letter Hill".

This illustrates that even amongst the prominent promoters of episcopacy the validity of the historical and thus the theological claim of episcopacy has been deemed vulnerable. Thus, it seems justified when Chapman concludes that "the divisive §16 of the Meissen texts seems [not to be] necessitated by the Anglican tradition…"[102] This policy, if I may provoke the reader by saying so, fails to offer a plausible defence against the accusation of establishing some kind of ecclesial and ecclesiological apartheid on the level of ordained ministry, on diffuse theological grounds. Possible reasons for this are the choice to align with 'Catholicism' (unity with Anglo-Catholicism and beyond), to underpin the establishment (that means in England the state church) and to **define institutionally what it means to be 'Anglican'**. Locke concluded regarding the theological and historical ecclesiological developments in Anglicanism:

> "Anglicans … do not present a consistent outlook in their understanding of the historic episcopate. […Looking at the individual and comparing the different models,] …. theological ambiguities become apparent. […] … it becomes unclear why Anglican episcopacy should be seen as superior or more symbolically potent than other forms of church ministry. […] … Anglicanism has not put together a precise doctrine of the ordained ministry which must be accepted by all Anglicans. It is, therefore, misleading to describe Anglicanism as a tradition which tries to hold together the mutually incompatible outlooks of Protestantism and Catholicism."[103]

[102] Chapman, *Anglican Studies*, 30f.
[103] Locke, *Church*, 99.

1.7 Brief Sketch of the Ecclesiological Significance of Episcopacy in the Church of England in High Church Circles Prior to the Nineteenth Century

In the **twentieth century**, one finds Anglicans defending episcopacy as to various degrees as ecclesiologically necessary for church and church unions: as *esse* of 'the Church' (Anglo-Catholicism), *plene esse* (to be found in official Anglican statements, representing a moderate High Church standpoint) and *bene esse* (moderate Evangelicalism).[104] Whereas the Protestant constituency traditionally was less attached to a particular ordering, it appears that even the 'Erastian', pre-Tractarian High-churchmen did not typically defend the *ecclesiological esse* position but defended the established order without the notion of a (quasi-) sacramental emphasis of a *personal* episcopal succession.[105] The administrative 'succession' of bishops was seen as an institutional, corporate succession of the established, national church. In the **sixteenth century**, the threefold ordering of ordained ministry was retained as the traditional, ancient form of government, but as ***adiaphoron***, by choice of the monarch (cf. the Henrican Cranmer, for example).[106] Puritans, however, lobbied for a presbyterian form of government as being scripturally warranted, against the predominant 'conformist' approach.[107] At first, this was refuted with the argument that no form of government was biblically prescribed (Whitgift versus Cartwright), but later, by claiming for episcopal government ***divine right***, like that claimed for the monarchy (or as part of such a claim), meaning either divine sanction or institution (Saravia).[108] Such a

---

[104] Gassmann, "Apostolische Sukzession"; Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*.
[105] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 182; Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 65; Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 126f; Thompson, *Episcopate*, Appendix. Cf. footnote 95. For the 'Protestant' constituency cf. Locke, *Church*, 29ff.
[106] MacCulloch, "Map", 90.
[107] Child, *Church and State*, 206,245; Frere/Douglas, *Manifestoes*, 9,16,6.
[108] Cargill Thompson, "Marten", 54; Nijenhuis, *Saravia*, 110ff.,163f.,207ff.,222ff; Saravia, *Gradibus*, book 1, chapter 21; Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 122.

defense of episcopal government, however, is not to be confused with an ecclesiological claim based on a personal succession.[109] This explains why foreign Protestant ministers appear to have been received **without (re-)ordination** in the Church of England prior to the Restoration, until Churchmen had native 'non-episcopal' communities in their own country (with Non-conformists becoming Dissenters).[110]

The High Church divines defended the *episcopal form of government* on these lines, as the established and ancient model, which some High-churchmen recommended to foreign Protestant churches but without unchurching them (sometimes declaring episcopal government to represent the *perfection* but not the *essence* of church).[111] When James I attempted to introduce episcopacy in Scotland, thereby hoping to gain more control over the *Kirk*, the presbyterian clergy did not have to be re-ordained.[112]

The requirement of episcopal ordination (**1662**) was meant to discipline the clergy working in the restored Church of England, to ensure their loyalty.[113] This practice, however, was treated as a theological matter by the clergy who refused and became Dissenters. It established a practice of '**national orders**' which were not interchangeable with any other church. Roman Catholics were received without re-ordination (apparently as representing the, purified, proto-type of 'English orders') but these men needed to recant their 'errors', which foreign Protestant ministers did not have to do at their re-ordination (it is unclear whether

---

[109] Cf. Henson, *Relation*, 14f; Woodhouse, *Doctrine*, 95f.,106.
[110] Allies/Rule, *Apostolical Succession*, 28,32,163ff; Hall, "Defense", 690f; Hall, "An Humble Remonstrance", 281f; Padley, "Ecclesiology", 6.
[111] Andrewes/Du Moulin, *Episcopacy*, 62f; Andrewes/Du Moulin, "Responsiones", 215; Bramhall, "Vindication of Himself", 518f.
[112] Dawson, *Scotland*, 212ff; Donaldson, *James V-James VII*, 198; Goode, *Vindication*, pamphlet II, 6f; Henderson, *Scotland*, 85(ff.); Spottiswood, *Scotland*, 514 (quote); Sykes, *Essay*, 7.
[113] Sykes, *Essay*, 25.

there have been cases of former Orthodox ministers converting).[114] "The Church of England was … more insular than the country, and its episcopacy more narrowly national than had ever been known in any part of Christendom."[115] Nevertheless, it appears that **intercommunion** with Dissenters and foreign Protestants was practised (continued) after the Restoration, even by High-churchmen.[116]

The ordination practice was used as an argument for the claim of a 'catholic', sacramental understanding of the ministry and ministrations of the Church of England in the **'lay baptism debate'** (after 1708) when the view of invalidity of Dissenter baptisms was refuted.[117] Some of the protagonists became Non-jurors, insisting on a strict hereditary succession both in state (refuting the accession of William and Mary, later of George I) and in Church (recognizing only 'episcopal' ministrations as valid and, thus, questioning George's Lutheran baptism). Such considerations were rejected by the **pre-Tractarian High-churchmen**, although with proximity to the nineteenth century, one finds the Tractarian model of a personal, sacramental episcopal succession foreshadowed with some of them. "[T]hough intercommunion occurred, especially with the French Reformed, a new generation was becoming xenophobic and isolationist…"[118] Nockles characterizes the polemical attitude of the pre-Tractarian High-churchmen to their critics as "to 'play the papist' against Dissent by inveighing against the 'sin of schism', and then to 'play the Protestant' against

---

[114] Cf. Ross to Wilson, quoted in: Keble, *Wilson*, vol. I, 381. Cf. Denny, *English Church*, 36ff; Phillimore/Phillimore/Jemmett, *Law*, vol. I, 116.
[115] Thompson, *Episcopate*, 260.
[116] Griffith Thomas, "Relation", 615; Pinnington, "Gloss", 138; Spivey, *Calamy*, 137; Stillingfleet, *Separation*, 26,31ff; Sykes, "Ideal", 30f; Wilson, *Inquiry*, 189ff,204ff.,215ff.
[117] Bardsley, *Principles*, 17f; Fleetwood, *Judgment [1712]*, 555; Hall, "Defense", 690f.
[118] Pinnington, "Gloss", 138.

Rome, by denouncing papal tyranny."[119] They would typically refer to the Church of England as Protestant and emphasize its establishment. In the transition period between pre-and post-Tractarian High-churchmanship, they could declare the Church of England to be the legitimate, national branch of the 'Catholic Church', still unchurching English Roman Catholics, whereas post-Tractarians would declare Anglicanism a branch of the 'Catholic Church', besides Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy.[120] This may highlight that a personal episcopal succession was not the default ecclesiological model even amongst English High-churchmen prior to Anglo-Catholicism. Thus, the Anglo-Catholic Stone admitted: "[f]or an exclusive doctrine of Apostolic Succession as of the esse of the Church 'any reference to the 16th and 17th century English formularies and divines is a broken reed for anything except the practical requirements'."[121]

After the Oxford Movement had radicalized the ecclesial 'parties', the predominant Anglo-Catholic influence in the hierarchy effected an elevation of episcopacy in 'Anglican' ecclesiology and styled it the virtually unchanged and unchangeable position of 'Anglicanism'. Thus, Henson remarked in 1911, that "[that dogma of Apostolical Succession] now seems to have established itself in official circles", despite the "little support" from history.[122]

---

[119] Nockles, *Context*, 165.
[120] Buchanan, "Apostolic Succession", 19; Newman, "Catholicity [1872]", 18f.,20,25,30,32 (quote),47ff; Palmer, *Treatise*, vol. I, 305.
[121] Stone, "Letter Hill". Cf. footnote 101.
[122] Henson, *Relation*, 65. Cf. Garbett, *Claims*, 13ff.

1.8 The Ecumenical Intention of This Thesis

Having advanced my criticism of modern Anglican ecclesiologies, I need to emphasize that I hope my thesis will be understood as being undertaken with an 'ecumenical intention', a phrase borrowed from Jüngel's work on the doctrine of justification, written under the influence of the dispute over the *Joint Declaration on Justification*, and translated by his editors as "purpose" ("theologische Studie in ökumenischer Absicht").[123] My work in the Church of England ever since my ordination in 2007 reflects my genuine affection for that Church and my commitment to the ecumenical relations between it and the *Meissen* partners.

I am not suggesting that Anglicanism had an easy alternative to its current policy of 'episcopal ordinations', but it is my intention to show that there is an Anglican tendency towards theologically unhelpful mystification in ecclesiology, in connection with the notion of succession, the 'historic episcopate' and Anglican 'catholicity'. Percy diagnosed a lack of "any form of critical engaged histiography" of the theological reflection on ministry and suggests:

> "the Church of England does not own, and perhaps never has, the clear and settled ecclesiology that might be enjoyed by other denominations. It is a creature of its environment, and whilst it has become populous overseas, it remains a curiously English animal. […] The advent of late modernity – replete with secularism and pluralism – has seen many churches struggle to build and consolidate a concrete sense of (ecclesial) identity within an era of considerable cultural fluidity. In the face of such challenges, many churches are tempted to re-describe their histories in order to establish a sense of consistency and direction. Many have resorted to 'myths of continuity', in an attempt to re-narrate the church as single and unambiguous line of development, beginning with the apostles and continuing to the present. Such theologies, so it is thought, guarantee clarity and governance. Correspondingly, many theologies of episcopacy, for example – and perhaps especially in Anglicanism – enage in a kind of complex theological idealization, which closely aligns itself to the varieties of theology more usually associated with Roman Catholicism. But in actual fact, the concept of episcopacy in Anglicanism owes just as much to functionalism, pragmatism and rather

[123] Jüngel, *Justification*.

reactionary organizational dynamics over the course of history, as it does to any received or thought-through Catholic doctrine."[124]

Archbishop Williams asked at a reconciliation service with the United Reformed Church in 2012, marking the anniversary of the 'Great Ejection' of 1662: "Can we as Anglicans bring what we have to bring to the ecumenical table without any empty hierarchical posturing?"[125]

Thomas More is believed to have spoken the oft-quoted sentence that tradition did not mean holding on to the ashes, but passing on the torch. On the one hand, this could be understood as a justification not to over-value institutions but what they stand for. One the other hand, it might be argued that what Anglicanism wins by maintaining an institutional understanding of church is the integration of 'Catholics' and proximity to Rome, even if it is at the price of an inconsistent compromise in *Meissen*, for example. The price, however, is high. It frustrates its own Evangelical constituency and humiliates 'non-episcopal' partners.

In recent times, Anglican officials in ecumenical dialogues have tried to minimize the embarrassment by talking of the 'historic episcopate' as a symbol, which is deemed indispensable (*Porvoo*).[126] This is a concession towards the Protestant side only in words, but maybe it is an indication of a more fundamental change to become more apparent in the future (cf. chapter 5).

My reason for outlining my own position is that I do not wish to be seen as criticizing Anglican ecclesiology without constructive intent. Bishop Stephen Sykes, to whose critical and analytical writings on Anglican ecclesiology I owe a

---

[124] Percy, *Clergy*, 14f.148.
[125] Williams, "Reconciliation".
[126] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 71; Dalferth, *Weg*, 111(ff.).

great deal, once wrote: “[a]n American woman meeting me for the first time said: ‘I thought you would be older and crosser than you are’.”[127] May this not reflect the readers’ impression of the author of this work.

[127] Sykes, "Genius", 233.

2. The 'Anglicanization' and 'Episcopalization' of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century

2.1 "Not English but Anglican":[128] The 'Episcopalization' and 'Anglicanization' of the Church of England Due to Its Relations to Dependencies and Former Dependencies

The nineteenth century challenged the Church of England at home with Dissenters gaining more rights and the internal pluralisation of the Church of England (cf. chapter 3). On the international level, the Church was also challenged, to develop a **trans-national, 'denominational' identity** which was **not dependent on establishment and political alliances**. Historically, until the mid-nineteenth century, there was no strong sense of cohesion and indeed no automatic ecclesiastical or sacramental unity ('Anglicanism') between the Church of England and former dependencies in now independent countries, having broken away and not being part of the legally established Church of the colonial 'mother'.[129] British 'dependency' churches overseas had existed for decades and centuries, until the nineteenth century, without bishops overseeing, ordaining or confirming there. Bishop Sherlock of London, finding himself confronted with the expectation that he should be in charge of all Church of England 'communities' outside the British Isles, lamented this absurd situation in a letter in 1751: "care is improperly lodged, for a Bishop to live at one end of the world, and his Church at the other".[130]

Confirmations only became a common feature in Anglicanism in the mid-nineteenth century, roughly contemporaneous with the rising importance of

---

[128] Ward, *History*, 11.
[129] Podmore, *Aspects*, 26ff.
[130] Letter to Doddridge, 11 May 1751, quoted in: Rhoden, *Anglicanism*, 27.

bishops, as we shall see. When the American Episcopal Church received episcopacy from England, this still did not automatically establish intercommunion and interchangeability of ministers. Episcopacy was, still, more a political than a theological matter, at least in England. This was to change in the nineteenth century, which indeed led to the rise of the model of 'historic episcopate' towards the end of that century. It would underpin a new institutional identity marker of 'Anglicanism', avoiding a creedal self-definition, although soon turning into one itself (cf. chapter 4). It was also an expression of the new, self-confident understanding of a more active 'Anglican' episcopate whose size grew rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth century, in England and elsewhere, actively forming *an* Anglican communion. The number of Anglo-Catholics increased in the second half of the nineteenth century, also amongst the bishops.

These historical developments demand more precision in modern Anglican ecclesiological statements which usually assume a consistent Anglican belief in a 'historic episcopate'. This, it is claimed, had been deliberately preserved in an 'historic succession' and highly valued throughout the ages, establishing and signifying ecclesiastical and ecclesial unity beyond 'Anglicanism' (cf. chapter 1.5).

2.2 The Church of England in the 'Plantations' Before the Nineteenth Century: 'Episcopacy Without Episcopate'

'Plantations' had not been granted their own bishoprics but were treated like extraterritorial extensions of the Church of England (united with the Irish Church between 1800 and 1871; Wales disestablished in 1920). Although the **Irish Church** had bishops, Ford characterizes its status in the seventeenth century as

similar to that of a 'colony', with ministers and bishops being widely 'imported', with a notable Puritan influence: "a wholly colonial church which saw itself as an offshoot, or even a part of, the Church of England".[131]

The political dependence of the **'plantations' or 'colonies'** corresponded to the ecclesiastical dependence of the English churches there. Its ministers ecclesiastically relied on Church authorities in England, at least in theory. Probably from the time of Laud (who wanted to appoint a bishop for New England in 1638 but had to abandon this plan due to political opposition), the Bishop of London had been regarded as being in charge of all overseas churches but – inevitably – exercised only limited supervision.[132] By contrast, a Roman Catholic bishopric had been created in French Canada in 1658 (as an Apostolic Vicariate), and two Non-juror bishops were consecrated for the United States in 1722.[133] After Laud, there had been a few attempts in England to establish overseas bishoprics, not only by High-churchmen, but also by the S.P.G in the early and in the mid-eighteenth century. Queen Anne, surrounded by High Church Tories, took notable interest in the matter.[134] Her death did not only end hopes for an episcopate abroad but was also received with relief by Dissenters who had suffered from resentments during her reign, after the fairly liberal policy of her predecessors, William and Mary.

"Small wonder then that the Dissenters long remembered the dramatic moment on a Sunday morning, August 1, 1714, when, during the sermon, Dr. Thomas Bradbury's brother dropped a white handkerchief from the gallery, a prearranged signal that the Queen had died, enabling the minister to be the first divine in England to end his final prayer with 'God save King George'."[135]

---

[131] Ford, *Ussher*, 23f.
[132] Gray, *Anglican Communion*, 5; Haugaard, "Reformation", 22.
[133] Ollard, "Confirmation", 177.
[134] Rhoden, *Anglicanism*, 39ff. Cf. also the sources in the appendices in: Cross, *Episcopate*.
[135] Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, 26f. Cf. footnotes 929f.

Rhoden, remarks: “the middle of the eighteenth century was not an era of English church reform, but rather an era between reform movements”.[136] Even under Anne’s Lutheran successor, relief for Dissenters was introduced only slowly.[137] This ‘stagnation’ may explain why in Britain, one overall took only little interest in the ‘plantations’ until plans of establishing episcopacy there were increasingly met with opposition, fed by a spirit of independence. After all, bishops in ‘plantations’ would have been state representatives. “In England, bishops had come to be seen pre-eminently as servants of the Crown, and there was much difficulty in imagining how bishops could function or even be legally appointed if they were to serve outside British dominions.”[138]

The ecclesiastical responsibility of the **Bishop of London** for the ‘plantations’ actually appears to be a result of a more or less accidental development. This arrangement appears to have been assumed at least since the Restoration. One finds references to an order of Charles II or (earlier) Laud, but both these alleged origins of the arrangement actually lack evidence.[139] The fact that episcopal visits, visitations, confirmations, consecrations of buildings or indeed ordinations did not happen in, for example, (North) America, was partly due to the practical but also political circumstances, and perhaps also partly due to the generally low ‘ecclesial profile’ of bishops in the Church of England at the time.

---

[136] Rhoden, *Anglicanism*, 46.
[137] Wykes, "Dissent".
[138] Ward, "Communion", 17.
[139] Yeo, "Overseas", 451.

"[A bishop] was an official of State with a large income derived from endowments, with a palace, a coach, and a corps of servants. […] The last thing a bishop was thought to be, or would have wanted to be, was a missionary pioneer."[140]

The plantations, generally speaking, were below the political and ecclesiastical radar, with certain episcopal incumbents of London and Canterbury making more efforts than others. So it happened that "unordained men were still being appointed to colonial parishes even after the removal of all dissenting incumbents in England", which may say a lot about the alleged necessity of 'episcopal ordination' at the time. Laud had actually "arranged a royal proclamation which forbade emigrants to sail for the colonies without a testimonial of religious conformity", but he seems to have failed, overall, to strengthen (arch-)episcopal control, as Yeo concludes.[141]

From the Restoration onwards, the successive bishops of London defined, or sometimes even denied, their responsibilities in different ways. An unusual case was the relatively young Bishop Compton (in office from 1675-1713) who, unsuccessfully, tried to establish the historical origin and the terms of his responsibilities overseas. He insisted, where possible, on issuing licences for clergy installations (as for marriages). This strengthened his influence only in theory. In practice, his licences did not ensure more influence on the clergy beyond England. All his exhausting attempts relied on good relations with the local authorities, whom he had to persuade to act on his behalf. In one case he complained to the authorities in Barbados that there had been ministers who had not been ordained. In another, he (successfully) referred to a Privy Council order which had (re-)stated his responsibilities, but evidence for such an order is

[140] Addison, *Episcopal Church*, 55.

mysteriously missing, with some speculation about an empty page in the Council records.[142]

After Compton, standards slipped again. After the 1680s, "[n]o further European [ministers'] licences were granted by the bishops of London for almost a century", although Bishop Gibson, appointed in 1723, made another attempt to strengthen his overseas influence, even trying to get formal permission to hold visitations on Barbados, with the authorities there opposing the plans. He finally succeeded in achieving the installation of bishop's commissaries there who could act on his behalf in certain cases, not being bishops themselves.

> "At the beginning of Gibson's episcopate the best legal advice had been that spiritual jurisdiction over the colonies belonged wholly to the king who could delegate it to a bishop if he chose to do so. In Bishop Compton's time it had sometimes been said that Anglican churches overseas were simply a further part of the diocese of London."[143]

In 1748, the newly appointed Bishop of London, Sherlock, tried to free himself from "the financial albatross of plantation affairs" by simply refusing confirmation of his colonial authority, drawing public attention to the question of an American bishopric.[144] The opposition was strong on both sides of the Atlantic, theological as well as political. In North America, for example, a 'republican' spirit had grown, and in England, one was aware that in the colonies, the people there were "greeting Anglican arguments for episcopacy with a mixture of scepticism, incredulity and horror", that "the British government might impose bishops, like taxes, upon unwilling colonial communities".[145] "[A] colonial

---

[141] Yeo, "Overseas", 450,453f. (quotes), 455.
[142] Ibid., 459ff.,468.
[143] Ibid., 469(ff.),475 (quote).
[144] Cf. Woolverton, *Colonial*, 220.
[145] Rhoden, *Anglicanism*, 37.

episcopate was out of the question. This was to remain the government's policy for thirty years, until the American revolution took the issue out of the hands of bishop and government alike."[146]

An S.P.G. publication from 1901 claims it had been political considerations with a view to Dissenters which had been undermining Bishop Sherlock's proposals.[147] In any case, on the English side, the dependence on the Bishop of London, more formal than anything else, was not least due to political will. However, the example of the United States had demonstrated that it was too late to impose the ideal of a unitary society on the colonies after the English example. Any such a attempt would have disturbed the fragile peace between some colonies and the British rulers. The *status quo* still allowed the latter to benefit from the 'plantations', but the government had failed to care for sustainable structures beyond short-term, largely commercial interests. "British attempts in the 1760s to change the economic relationship between colonies and metropolis evoked a furious response; the mere suggestion of sending a bishop had a similar effect."[148]

The situation in the colonies was, thus, largely "**episcopacy without episcopate"**, with the governors, the local legislature and the vestries actually being in charge, which may seem, perhaps unjustifiably, to confirm "that common view of the English Church in the 18th century as sunk in a slough of despond".[149] This is why the label of **'Episcopal'** churches was more than ironic to begin with, as there had been no bishops for such a long time. The political dependence on

---

[146] Yeo, "Overseas", 474.
[147] Pascoe, *S.P.G.*, 747.
[148] Doll, *Imperial Anglicanism*, 261.
[149] Minter, *Episcopacy Without Episcopate*, 15ff,295 (quote).

England simply corresponded to the ecclesiastical, if not being largely identical.[150] The adherence to the English episcopal government, and, thus, to the English political establishment, marked the institutional borderline to Dissenters who flourished in the colonies. The lack of bishops supports the view that they did not stand for much else in a *theological* sense. Otherwise, one would have had them right from the beginning. The practical disadvantage of their absence were considerable. Candidates for **ordination** had to be sent on the long and dangerous journey to England. One fifth of these people who went from New England are reported to have died en route.[151]

Considering all the legal and political difficulties, it may seem extraordinary that with the independence of the United States, some High-church-minded clergy, many still loyal to the Crown and of a type of Churchman still untypical in England at the time, were able to establish bishops, even in a succession obtained from England, in their 'Protestant Episcopal Church' – a name which American 'high' Episcopalians found difficult to tolerate (the term 'Protestant' was eventually dropped in 1979).[152] For many in the United States it was a patriotic matter to hold 'no King, no bishop'. Maybe it turned out to be an advantage that episcopacy had not actually been present and could not be seen as a remnant of colonial administration. Thus, it was easier to sustain the claim that episcopacy represented a 'truly apostolic' institution, even though it was sought from the former colonial power. In England, things still presented themselves in a different light.

---

[150] Sachs wrote about Anglicanism in twentieth-century colonial Kenya, beside mentioning more positive examples of clergy: "The missionary message urged cooperation with colonial government and emulation with British decorum." Sachs, *Homosexuality*, 139. Cf. Elkins, *Kenya*, 94,298ff.
[151] Richey/Frank, *Episcopacy*, 47.

"[I]t must be admitted that not all English Bishops in the eighteenth century set an example of the ideals of a chief pastor or father of God. It is easy to exaggerate their concern with politics, their absenteeism, and their opulence; but Sir Robert Peel was evidently not shocked when Charles Lloyd wrote to him: 'What I desire is after a few years to be sure of a retirement with a good provision in some easy Bishopric', for he appointed him Bishop of Oxford in 1827."[153]

2.3 The 'Episcopalization' of Missionary Societies in India as a Means of 'Anglicanization'

The fairly unconcerned attitude of the government for sustainable ecclesiastical provisions in the 'plantations' had been reflected in the episcopal neglect of pastoral provisions there. Mission work had, for a long time, been left to mission societies, often dominated by 'enthusiasts' of whom many were 'laymen'. The early nineteenth century saw an increasing political interest in the fate of the 'colonies' but also an English episcopate which was more determined to increase its influence on the missionary societies and also, generally speaking, beyond the British Isles. The missionary concern of the episcopate in itself was a novelty because for a long time the expansion of the British Empire had been regarded primarily as a commercial enterprise. Generally speaking, Evangelical influence amongst laymen and also the clergy was considerable, but "very limited" in the Church on the diocesan and national level and in the episcopate. The old-style High-churchmen, guardians of the establishment and opposed to Dissenters, were much more influential.[154]

---

[152] Cf. the book by the Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Kansas: Vail, *Church*. Cf. Podmore, *Aspects*, 34.
[153] France, *Oversea Episcopate*, 6.
[154] Podmore, *Aspects*, 9,11f.

An indicator of the new episcopal actionism is the establishment of new sees and suffragans in England and of 'missionary bishops' in Church of England dependencies overseas, as well as bishops were created for, and then by, churches in now independent countries. However, there was a long way between the situation described in the previous chapter and, for example, the appointing of '**missionary bishops**' by the American Episcopal Church in 1835. It highlights a paradigmatic shift in concept: High-churchmen approved of this development because it demonstrated the significance attributed to bishops (because of what they *were*), whereas Evangelicals approved of missionary bishops, because these posts were designed to spread the Gospel (they approved of those bishops because of what they *did*). Wilberforce described the task of a missionary bishop like that of an ecclesiastical Apostle: "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 organised; a leader, not a follower…"[155] This suited the Tractarians, as "a reaction to the perceived excesses of erastianism in England. The missionary bishop with no state connection was idealized."[156]

"To the Tractarians it was plain that the failure to provide bishops for the American Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries … was directly related to that church's weakness. […] To Newman it raised the intriguing possibility of proving to the world that bishops could be put down in territories not administered by the Crown of England and beyond the reach of parliament… […] To the Tractarians this meant having bishops present from the start, representing the church's order and life at its fullest…"[157]

The Evangelicals at C.M.S. (*Church Missionary Society*), in practice, saw things differently, although they had committed themselves to an Anglican polity at their

[155] Doane, "Missionary Bishop", 181ff; Hardy, "Kemper", 717; Wilberforce, *History*, 375 (quote).
[156] Williams, "Venn", 154.

inauguration. C.M.S. stood in the succession of the *Society for Missions in Africa and the East* (founded in 1799) and the *British and Foreign Bible Society* (1804), the latter not being exclusively Church of England. "The Bible Society had been established because of evangelicals' frustration with the inefficiency of the high-church dominated Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge."[158] This explains the C.M.S.'s relative distance from the established Church. "To the C.M.S. the episcopal office was – at best – of the *bene esse* of the Church. The society placed personal piety first, and was unwilling to grant the bishops *ex officio* any place in its committees."[159] It was only in the 1830s and 1840s, as we will see, that C.M.S. aligned itself more closely with episcopal control.[160] This was not simply a very early result of the Oxford Movement as Jenkins suggests, but rather a result of the **raising of the episcopal profile** in the Church of England (cf. chapter 3.2), although **not yet theologically** (as the Oxford Movement did), but **constitutionally and practically** in extending the episcopate's engagement and influence.[161] The episcopate was still more influenced by the Evangelical than the Oxford Movement. At C.M.S., Yates notes, one was rather suspicious of the concept of missionary bishops in the Tractarian understanding. The Evangelicals there "saw the bishop by contrast as the 'crown' or coping stone of the young churches", rather than as a "foundation stone".[162]

Other **missionary societies** such as S.P.C.K. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, founded 1698) and the S.P.G. (Society for the Propagation

---

[157] Yates, "Missionary", 53,58.
[158] Podmore, *Aspects*, 12.
[159] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 231.
[160] Cf. *Brief Statement of Some Objections Entertained by Certain Members of the Church to Portions of the System and Practice of the Church Missionary Society: By a Clerical Member of the Society*.
[161] Jenkins, "Basel", 60.
[162] Yates, "Missionary", 52 (quote),54f.,56f.,60f.

of the Gospel, founded 1701), founded at first with a view of missions at home, had built up a network of libraries and schools abroad.[163] They had been active in supplying missionaries and chaplains for the colonies. In the early nineteenth century, a stronger interest arose in the **'native' people**. Regardless of the churchmanship of their members, the mission societies showed an 'evangelical' approach to mission in which they were ahead of their Church. This does not mean that the societies were disloyal to the Church, but neither were they organs of it. There was a certain tendency of a drifting apart of the issues of the Church's hierarchy and the 'pietist', missionary interests and enterprises.[164] On the other hand, there was not that "certain conflict … between revivalism and office" which was more typical for "Continental Pietism".[165] This was the case even for the more distinctively Evangelical C.M.S. "Anglican evangelicals, as 'members of the Established Church', were committed to working within the Church of England at a time when they were considered theologically suspect. […] Lay leadership and the society's [C.M.S.] voluntary organization reflected evangelical principles."[166] Stock noted that with a view to the other two big missionary societies: "real High Churchmen were but few then. The S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. had both been founded as voluntary societies, and though the latter had a royal charter, it would be the extremest Erastianism to suggest that a royal charter represented 'the Church in her corporate capacity'."[167] Given the objective of missionary societies, one may suspect that many members sympathised with an 'evangelical' approach to

[163] Bray, *Charity*; Campbell, *History*, 35ff.
[164] Philip, *Mission*, 5ff.
[165] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 19.
[166] Davidson, "Ecclesiology", 204. Cf. Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 15,22f.
[167] Stock, *History*, 64f.

mission. “The modern missionary movement is an autumnal child of the Evangelical Revival.”[168]

“Apart from certain exceptions, Pietism has been, up till the present [twentieth] century, the soil in which missionary activity has grown. The missionary enterprise regarded itself as a separate institution concerned with Christian operations overseas within, on the fringe of, in certain cases even outside, the existing Christian bodies; and, in accordance with this understanding of its nature, it developed its own independent organizational structure within or alongside of the organised churches.”[169]

It cannot be a surprise that in the missionary field, as among other benevolent societies which flourished in the nineteenth century, especially **Anglican Evangelicals** were happy to **co-operate with Dissenters and (usually pietist) ‘foreign Protestants’**. In the latter case, the common ground for missionary joint-ventures was a shared suspicion of their respective established churches on grounds of piety, with the rise of ‘rationalism’ and secularism alarming pietist Christians on both sides of the Channel. Again, this does not mean that the people engaged in mission societies were disloyal to their churches, but they worked in a field with which the churches had largely failed to engage. Thus, it may be true to some extent, but perhaps ultimately misleading, to characterize the bonds between these missionary societies in England and, for example, Germany and Switzerland, in the following way:[170]

“[t]he relationship which developed was very much that between the ‘children of God in England’ and the ‘holy seed’ on the Continent. If the holy remnant was forced together in this way for the purpose of propagating the Gospel, some kind

[168] Walls, "Revival", 310.
[169] Andersen, *Theology*, 15.
[170] Cf. footnote 242.

of moratorium on confessional and organizational differences was only to be expected."[171]

In the missionary field work, 'Protestant' denominations usually got along quite well, seeing as their objective the conversion of 'pagans' and 'Catholics' alike.[172] The first recruiting principles of S.P.C.K. for England, sent out to its episcopal and archidiaconal members, did not necessarily reflect this. Amongst the selection criteria to be expected, the Society required from the candidate: "[VIII] His affection to the present Government, and [IX] His Conformity to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England". Furthermore, high moral standards were expected. From successful candidates it was expected that "they lodge not in any Publick House".[173]

A slightly different approach we find with the London Missionary Society (L.M.S.), a remarkable interdenominational venture of Presbyterians, 'Anglicans', Methodists and Independents, in its 'Fundamental Principle' (adopted in 1795):

"it is declared to be a fundamental principle of The Missionary Society, that its design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church Order and Government (about which there may be difference of opinion among serious persons), but the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, to the heathen; and that it shall be left (as it ought to be left) to the minds of the persons whom God may call into the fellowship of His Son from among them, to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the Word of God."[174]

David Bogue, the founder of L.M.S., said in sermon in 1795:

---

[171] Pinnington, "Missionaries", 524f.
[172] Oddie, "India", 230.
[173] Pascoe, *Digest*, 837.
[174] Lovett, *LMS*, vol. II, 747f.

"[w]e have now before us a pleasing spectacle, Christians of different denominations, although differing in points of church government, united in forming a society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen. This is a new thing in the Christian Church. Some former societies have accepted donations from men of different denominations; but the government was confined to one. But here are Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Independents, all united in one society, all joining to form its laws to regulate its institutions, and manage its various concerns. Behold us here assembled with one accord to attend the funeral of *bigotry*: and may she be buried so deep that not a particle of her dust may ever be thrown up on the face of the earth."[175]

When the episcopate finally decided in the first half of the nineteenth century to take the offshoots abroad into the care of their episcopal hands, one was well aware of the difficulties. This contributed to the fact that the main focus of missionary enterprises of the official hierarchy tended to be the native English to begin with. This was not least due to the difficult positions of bishops abroad, being state officials. In **India**, the first bishop of Calcutta, Thomas Middleton, appointed in 1814, held "that his Letters Patent from the crown did not permit him to exercise any powers in relation to native Indians, and he was embarrassed by the presence of missionaries. His successor, Reginald Heber, felt less inhibited."[176]

William Wilberforce had fought for the creation of that see. "Proselytisers saw this massive subcontinent as an unparalleled opportunity to bring millions of souls to God."[177] Wilberforce held a three and a half hours speech in the House of Commons where the proposal had been received with considerable opposition. Many there held that "it would seriously offend the religious prejudices of the

[175] Ibid., vol. I, 35f.
[176] Yates, "Mission", 433.
[177] Bragg, *Book of Books*, 277f.

people of India. One retired official even went so far as to state that it might lead to a rising".[178]

"Middleton, one of the [High Church Hackney] Phalanx's ablest and most energetic members" was the third bishop to be consecrated as an English 'colonial bishop'. Soon he would become persuaded that indigenous clergy should be provided for the "native and other Christian youth".[179] It seems that he had changed his mind in more than one respect. After some hesitation, he licensed some German (Lutheran) missionaries in acknowledgement of their good work.[180] This was not an one-off occurrence. One of his successors, Wilson, facing a power struggle, not least about the presence of an Anglican bishop now claiming jurisdiction, insisted on licensing all missionaries, including the ('non-episcopal') Danish and German missionaries working, among others, for C.M.S. and the East India Company, but issues of hierarchy remained.[181] "Like other Evangelicals of his day, Wilson was not a Low Churchman and he approached the problems of his episcopate with a sense of 'apostolical commission' and a desire for order which struck Bentinck as evidence for high church leanings". Yates notes that he could be described as an "Evangelical of Evangelicals" but that contemporaries also could perceive him as a High-churchman, defending the divine institution and right of the episcopate.[182] The missionary societies were co-operative but also suspicious and reluctant with a view to the new interest which the episcopal hierarchy showed in their work, but the bishops were, after all, also willing to help raising funds in exchange for influence (cf. chapter 2.4).

---

[178] Chatterton, *History*, 123.
[179] Varley, *Mildert*, 76. Cf. Hunter, *Doctrine*, 9.
[180] Neill, "Notwendigkeit", 750.
[181] Yates, *Venn*, 24ff.,28ff.
[182] Ibid., 27.

The **employment of non-English, 'non-episcopal' Lutheran missionaries** seemed permissible but not desirable in this situation when the episcopate was keen to align the missions with England and its Church. To begin with, however, Middleton was happy if they agreed to be licensed. Some of these Lutheran pastors were entitled to an English pension.[183] Middleton's concern with regard to the missionaries was seconded by people like Bishop Horsley who "did not think it was part of God's plan that Britain should seek to change the religion of another country" (Bragg), but also certain institutions with a vital interest in the situation in the colonies took the same line. "The East India Company, so powerful that its own army was bigger than the British Army, agreed with Bishop Horsley."[184]

For our purposes, the employment of 'non-episcopal' ministers by mission societies, at least at first tolerated by the episcopate, raises questions regarding to the ecclesial status which these ministers had in the eyes of Church of England officials. In Southern India and elsewhere, English missionary work was dependent on the work of **Danish Lutherans and German pietists** (the latter especially from Halle).[185] Missioners were also recruited from the Basel Mission when the Church of England failed to supply personnel.[186] This reflected an overall practice, as Buchanan in 1813 showed looking at the figures, concluding "it will not be denied, that, not the Church of England, but other denominations of Christians, are chiefly employed in forming the religion of the natives in the new colonies of Great Britain, and her Asiatic Empire."[187] By 1824, one third of the one hundred men C.M.S. had sent overseas had been from the European

[183] Pinnington, "Missionaries", 532.
[184] Bragg, *Book of Books*, 278.
[185] Campbell, *History*, 68ff.

mainland. “Moreover, of the seventy key, long-serving missionaries from the period 1824-40, almost half of them were not British by origin.”[188]

The fact that these usually were not ‘episcopally’ ordained appears not to have been a theologically divisive issue for the home church, not least because **‘episcopal’ ordination** was not yet a criterion for interchangeability of ministries between the Church of England and its former colonial offspring. It was, however, the norm for English clergy at home. “A national church expanded overseas, carrying with it the self-understanding of a national church, but finding itself in a missionary situation in which such self-understanding did not correspond to the reality of the new context.”[189] In 1713, the Malabar Committee of the S.P.C.K. had agreed to use non-episcopal, Lutheran missionaries “in hopes that their defects might by the good Providence of God be hereafter supplied”, as a member put it in a letter.[190] Whatever these defects may have been, the continuing practice, speaks a different language: “[The] use of Lutheran ministers for nearly a century implies a measure of recognition of these non-episcopal ministers which is notable…”[191] Against this judgement of Norman Sykes, the 1968 Report “Intercommunion To-day” simply held that it had been, “of course”, as it points out, due to the lack of Anglican candidates for missions.[192] This is also the understanding of a publication from the end of the nineteenth century by S.P.C.K.

---

[186] Ward, "Communion", 16.
[187] Buchanan, *Establishment*, 50.
[188] Jenkins, "Basel", 43f(f).
[189] Rowell, "Identity", 456.
[190] Quoted in: Sykes, *Priest*, 155f.
[191] *Intercommunion To-day: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion*, 32; Sykes, *Priest*, 154ff., esp. 164.
[192] *Intercommunion To-day: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion*, 32.

"The employment of Lutheran instead of Anglican Missionaries (to the glory of the former and the shame of the latter be it recorded!) was a matter of necessity, not of choice; and in the establishment of the Episcopate in India, the S.P.C.K. hailed the prospect of putting an end to the anomaly."[193]

This interpretation in the sense of an ongoing, pragmatic response to an 'emergency', lasting more than a century, throughout the different missionary societies, however, is questionable, given the facts. What is true, however, is that S.P.G. had been less inclined to employ non-English missionaries, but there is no indication that this reflected a particular, *theological* (critical) view of Lutheran churches at the time.[194] Such a view would not be implausible with a view to the end of the century when the *Church Association* accused S.P.C.K.F.P. of ritualist tendencies and S.P.G. of "supporting the Romanizing movement".[195]

Pinnington explains the employment of the Lutherans with an 'Evangelical' character of the missionary societies in question, and refers to conflicts and crises about the usage of the Book of Common Prayer by Lutheran missionaries, their subscription to the Articles, their Oath of Allegiance etc., to conclude:

"[t]he C.M.S. as such never committed itself to the idea popular at Basle that all 'evangelical' orders were on equal footing. Undoubtedly there were elements in the Society which shared this view, particularly laymen like the secretary, Dandeson Coates, but among the clergy there was a strong 'formalistic' element."[196]

---

[193] Pascoe, *Digest*, 502.
[194] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 19f.,23,41,135.
[195] *Shall India Bow to English Idols*; *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and Its Connection with the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and the English Church Union*. I am grateful to David Meager from the *Church Society* for providing me with scans of some of the Tracts.
[196] Pinnington, "Missionaries", 526f. Cf. Jenkins, "Basel", 57ff.

This, however, does not sufficiently explain the century-long employment. Members of the missionary societies (especially C.M.S.) cannot simply be styled representing some alien element to their Church, even if one may discuss how representative they were for their Church as a whole, which, however, had accepted the missionary societies' practices which now caused inconsistencies, as one tried to align the societies with the established Church. The fact that the policy change surprised and upset not only the partner missionary societies but also the partner churches indicates that there was a novel element in the policy change.[197] Around 1818, a pamphlet still characterised C.M.S. claiming

"[t]he title, *The Church Missionary Society*, never meant – it was never intended to mean – a Society supported by the collective authority of the Church of England; but simply a Society conducted by Members of that Church, and by Members of that Church only."[198]

With the systematical involvement of (arch-)bishops in missionary societies in the nineteenth century, this character changed.

Cnattingius acknowledges some examples of episcopal reservations towards Lutheran ministries and describes the character of S.P.C.K. as 'Protestant' within the Anglican spectrum, with a "systematic disapproval" of Dissenters. Nevertheless, he concludes from the sources about S.P.C.K.'s systematic employment of Lutheran missionaries:

"[i]t must have meant that, in the society's eyes, the Lutherans held a more recognized position than the Dissenters. The most natural interpretation seems to be that by using these Lutherans the society did recognize the validity of their Lutheran orders. It is difficult to contest this interpretation, since it turns out to be the conception of that time, as far as it is possible to find references to it. The

[197] Cf. Pinnington, "Missionaries", 528f.
[198] Wilson, *Defence*, 12(ff.).

Lutheran missionaries had no doubt about it, though they were well aware that the society preferred episcopal orders. There are evidences from England, too, that the employment by the S.P.C.K. of Lutheran missionaries was considered to mean a recognition of their orders."[199]

Similarly, Warre Cornish judges that especially at C.M.S. there had been Evangelicals "more kindly inclined to Lutherans than to High Churchmen". However, it probably was the outer resemblance of the latter two which effected the alliance, as other Evangelicals would have been theologically closer to Calvinists.

"It is interesting to see how clear a line was then drawn between the Lutherans, whose tenets, being those of foreign community, did not come into practical conflict with our own, and the Calvinists, whose doctrine, though it more nearly resembled that current among churchpeople, was connected with ideas of English dissent. […] 'The Society', he [Josiah Pratt, one of the founders of C.M.S.] writes, 'thankfully acknowledged the zeal and devotedness of a sister church, which put to shame the coldness and backwardsness of their own', and he makes no difficulty about accepting Lutheran ordination, though, as a matter of precaution, Lutheran missionaries were asked not to preach in dissenting chapels while in England, since 'we are surrounded by those who wait for our halting'."[200]

For the attitude of C.M.S., Cnattingius quotes a summary of a committee meeting in 1802 with regard to Lutheran missionaries, holding "that their ordination has been admitted as valid by the English Church", though it is noted that some may have sought re-ordination, but no case had been known so far.[201] Buchanan, Vice-Provost of the College of Fort William in Bengal, acknowledged in 1813 the short supply of missionaries but explains with a view to the Lutheran missionaries employed, at great personal expenses on their sides (as many lost their lives in British service abroad):

---

[199] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 43 (quote),52ff.
[200] Warre Cornish, *Church*, vol. I, 50.
[201] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 44(ff.).

"[i]ts [the mission for the 'the establishment of the Protestant Faith in Hindostan'] Missionaries to the heathen are all from Denmark or Germany, being ordained ministers of the Lutheran Church, which the Church of England acknowledges as a sister communion."[202]

It is indeed difficult to assume that the employment of 'non-episcopal' ministers in missions simply was a matter of 'lax' standards in mission societies (on the grounds of an 'Evangelical' view of ministry, for example). It reflected the respect for foreign Protestants which even the old High-churchmen held (cf. chapter 1.7). '**Succession**' was not a major concern at the time, but what was held to be the 'regular' ordering of the *English* Church. The 'episcopalization' was thus carried out with a 'constitutional' interest (the strengthening of the *English* character of the Church in India), not yet with a theological interest (concerned with a 'historic succession' of that Church). Consequently, the recognition, or at least high valuing of Lutheran ministries, did not distinguish between Lutherans in an alleged 'historic succession', like in the late-twentieth century (*Porvoo* versus *Meissen*). Otherwise, Swedish missionaries would have been in higher regard than German ones.

The high regard of Lutheranism appears to have been on a level of doctrine and discipline, as established 'partner' churches in Europe. Norman Sykes, with some reluctance, concluded a "recognition *de facto* of the validity (as distinct from the regularity) of their orders, [which] did not imply an acceptance of them *de jure*".[203] If that was true, however, one needs to ask why they could possibly have been employed abroad as ordained staff by Anglican missionary agencies, or

[202] Buchanan, *Establishment*, 18.
[203] Sykes, *Priest*, 164.

licensed by bishops, despite all relative freedom from the official hierarchy of the Church of England.

What is true, however, is that the attitude towards Lutheran missionaries was to change. In 1825, the second Bishop of Calcutta, Heber, like Middleton one of the Hackney Phalanx, ordained a German missionary and two Indians who had previously been ordained by German Lutheran missionaries.[204] He claimed that he did not urge anyone to obtain "re-ordination according to the rites of the Church of England" and described the "difference between them and us in matters of discipline and external forms", although he made it clear that he would prefer "episcopally ordained clergymen. Englishmen by nation, as well as in church discipline…"[205] The **re-ordinations** were singular cases and there is no evidence that they were performed due to pressure from a third party. His wife notes:

> "several persons, whose opinions he respected, remonstrated with him strongly against it [These objections arose from the idea, that re-ordination of Lutheran ministers was illegal and profane.]; but he was too deeply persuaded of the advantages which were likely to accrue from thus connecting … [the candidates] with the English episcopal Church…"[206]

The last sentence may give an important clue to the heart of the matter. In a letter to Deacon Deocar Schmidt from 1825, Heber displays a certain touchiness on the subject when he is challenged to justify his action theologically. His reaction is dismissive, but appears to reveal a certain insecurity of his own theological position to justify the (re-)ordinations.

---

[204] Jacob, *Making*, 94.
[205] Heber, *Heber*, vol. II, 348f.
[206] Ibid., vol. II, 363f. (quote); Neill, *'Apostolic Ministry'*, 22ff.

"I have neither time nor inclination to enter into a controversy connected with some of the most important and difficult questions in the whole field of polemic divinity. […] You suppose that I generally admit ordination by Presbyters without a Bishop to be valid. I do not admit this."

He explains that he recognized the historic circumstances of the Lutheran churches and therefore did not judge them nor would he refuse to communicate with them abroad. He makes clear, however, that he wishes missionaries serving in his church to be episcopally ordained, or ordained *sub conditione*. His understanding of ordination, however, appears not to be sacramental (*character indelebile*), but Reformed (Calvinist), in the sense of an "outward" confirmation of the inward call, which "may be often *renewed* and *quickened* by the Holy Ghost … to a new sphere of action in the church, as well as to a new office in it".[207] Norman Sykes judged: "… Heber held episcopacy to be of the *bene* or *melius esse* of the church rather than of the *esse*; representing thereby the traditional pre-Tractarian high-church position."[208] Thus, even in the case of the (re-)ordaining bishop, there is only little suspicion that considerations with a view to a 'historic succession' were the reason for the re-ordinations. This makes it far more plausible that his intention was '**constitutional' and disciplinary**, to make the Indian church to conform to English standards and the missionaries to be answerable to the English bishop now *in situ*.

Thus, between the 1820s and 1830s, the C.M.S. and S.P.C.K. underwent an '**Anglicanization**' of their work in India. In practice this entailed for incoming missionaries the now mandatory use of the Prayer Book (which we know to have been used by at least some Lutheran missionaries in India) and even some re-ordinations of Lutheran missionaries, as mentioned. The **'episcopalization'**, in the

[207] Heber, "Letter", 426 (long quote).

sense of the strengthening of the bishops' influence, not least through the implementation of their control via the insistence on the employment of ordained staff who were regular clergy in the English Church, was a natural consequence of the attempt to 'anglicise' the missions, in aligning them with the standards of the Church of England. In the case of S.P.C.K., Cnattingius argues that this development was only partly a success of a decades-long attempt of High-churchmen within the S.P.C.K. to bring its work into more conformity with the Church of England. He notes that the success of these attempts, now supported by a bishop *in situ*, coincided with less financial support from the German partners. He notes that this previously generous support in money and staff was probably why S.P.C.K. in the 1780s had not made big efforts to recruit English candidates.[209]

With a view to the 'episcopalization' of the mission work, Cnattingius points out significant disparities regarding the question of the employment of 'non-episcopal' missionaries between the Societies' minutes, giving theological reasons, and other sources, giving practical ones. Whereas C.M.S. in one case told the Archbishop of Canterbury that Anglican orders represented a "more apostolic commission", a re-ordination candidate himself made in his application the point of legal recognition by English law. Heber's point, as expressed in the aforementioned letter to Schmidt, was not a general disregard of the 'ecclesiality' of Lutheran ordinations but he held that only Anglican ministers were actually be employable in an Anglican mission, as a rule of the established Church.[210]

---

[208] Sykes, *Priest*, 164ff.,166 (quote).
[209] Cf. footnote 218 and 223.
[210] Cf. footnote 218. Cf. Neill, "Notwendigkeit", 750.

Muthuraj notes a few examples of **Roman Catholic priests** who were **received into the 'Protestant'** church (as one happily referred to the Church in England and India) by S.P.C.K. in the second half of the eighteenth century, without re-ordination, if they were to serve as ordained ministers. At this stage, however, no-one was concerned about the Lutheran missionaries either, but the sources suggest that all partners in the Indian missions held a pragmatic view of their trans-denominational venture, with an occasional emphasis that the ordination of a missionary should be from a 'Protestant' church. Given the circumstances under which they all were working, denominational power struggles probably appeared inappropriate. This might be reflected by the S.P.C.K.'s reference to the first Bishop of Calcutta simply as 'Protestant' (the word 'Anglican' had not yet been established in the denominational sense, nor had 'Protestantism' been discredited yet by the Oxford Movement).

In 1834, the German C.M.S. missionary Rhenius started to challenge the Church of England and the English missionary societies to justify *theologically* the change of policy in favour of episcopacy. The questions of the well-educated and much-liked missionary were silenced over accusations of subversion and possibly financial misconduct, and he was removed from office. His missionary approach may have given another reason for suspicion, as Frenz mentions: "in contrast to many other English missionaries, [he and his assistant, Gundert] had given precedence to Tamil over English: 'It is a great disadvantage to turn English into a major factor…'" Rhenius could not stop what Muthuraj calls the "**triumph of the Episcopal cause in India**". "A missionary in one generation was Lutheran and a descendant in another had to become an Anglican clergyman. From then on,

the English Church flourished in Indian soil. The Episcopates grew stronger in the Indian soil."[211]

Thus, it seems that the **'episcopalization'** was not simply about the insistence on a 'historic succession which the 'non-episcopally' ordained missionaries lacked, being employed by English missionary agencies and some being licensed by English bishops. The co-operation between the English missionaries and the Germans, for example, had never been without any conflicts, as already noted. Muthuraj acknowledges various, theological and ethical reasons for tensions between S.P.C.K. and Halle (controversies about the caste system, the catechism), with the re-ordinations as one of them. Thus, the (re-)ordinations were probably also means and expression of these conflicts, subsequent to the sending of an episcopal representative of the established Church from England, now interfering in and perhaps also taking advantage of this power struggle, with "the appointment of a bishop for the Indian Church and the insistence on Anglican ordination for missionaries [having] accelerated the process of parting of the ways between the Danes, the Germans and the English". The bishops' policy corresponded to the British expansion of political control in India at the beginning of the nineteenth century, around the same time of the 1819 *Ordination for Colonies Act*, which allowed English ordinations specifically for the 'colonies'.[212]

As already indicated, there had been "hesitancy and reservations of some members" of mission societies with a view to the employment of foreign missionaries. The sources of this uneasiness, however, must have been manifold, as one was keen, in principle, to promote a Christian belief in accordance to one's

---

[211] Frenz, *Gundert*, 72ff.,75f. (quote); Muthuraj, *Tranquebar I*, 168ff.,177ff.,185,190ff.,204,207 (quote); Rhenius, *Review*; Rhenius, *Union*; Rhenius, *Memoir*, 498ff; Yates, *Venn*, 31. Cf. footnotes 271 and 272.

own persuasions. 'Episcopal' ordination may have been one consideration among others, but after all, the employment continued, and an instance of a Lutheran ordination of a native catechist was approved of (which, subsequently, happened again). "By its unanimous approval of this Lutheran ordination the Society had nailed its colours to the mast…"[213] A history of C.M.S. from 1899 noted: "the S.P.C.K. was … employing and supporting missionaries in Lutheran orders in India, and rejoicing over the news of those missionaries themselves ordaining Natives after the Lutheran use."[214]

The change in policy became even more apparent when S.P.C.K. in 1825 handed over the administration of the Indian missions to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, **S.P.G.F.P.**, "an incorporated society different from the voluntary status of the SPCK", with a "direct relationship with the Church Establishment in England".[215] This marked a considerable difference as the Indian missions had been understood to be a trans-denominational venture, with both Lutheran and Anglican liturgies being used, in principle.[216] This understanding had been disturbed by the arrival of an English bishop claiming ownership.

"The emergence of episcopate in India (1814) was concomitant to the gradual breaking up of relationship in the 'Danish-German-English' mission, particularly on account of the issue of the status of ordinations of missionaries and by the missionaries. Anglicanisation, in the form of re-ordination, was the issue that decisively broke the relationship and led to the parting of the ways."[217]

---

[212] Muthuraj, *Tranquebar I*, 152,174ff. Cf. footnote 358.
[213] Sykes, *Priest*, 156f.
[214] Stock, *History*, 65.
[215] Muthuraj, *Tranquebar I*, 185(ff.).
[216] Ibid., 157f.
[217] Ibid., 151.

Cnattingius suggests that the somewhat surprising preference of 'episcopal ordination' was not a theological decision but, once again in Anglican history, one of discipline.

"Perhaps the enthusiasm of the C.M.S. for Anglicanization appears to be somewhat surprising. It may then be permissible to call attention to some facts. The practical and legal reasons were of course really important, but they do not give the whole truth. The C.M.S. had met sufficient opposition from some of its Lutheran clergy in India to make it fear that they might form their congregations on a model not consistent with the society's character as an association of exclusively Church of England members. […] There was also the risk that through these Lutheran ordinations in India the 'spirit of independence' would be perpetuated… […] The society continued, however, for a time to send out missionaries with Lutheran ordination to areas without an Anglican episcopal organization. Thus the C.M.S. demonstrated that it by no means questioned the validity of Lutheran orders as such [as the C.M.S. lay-secretary made explicit in a 1836 statement, Cnattingus explains]."[218]

However, the aforementioned S.P.C.K. publication quotes the S.P.C.K. Report for 1829, making the **paradigm shift** explicit and claiming it to be consistent with the Society's previous policies:

"[t]he circumstances under which the English Mission was first formed, and for more than a century continued, naturally occasioned the appointment of divines from Germany and the North of Europe; but those circumstances have ceased to exist. The discipline of the Lutheran Church, to which most of the early missionaries belong, is inconsistent with the system which must regulate a body of clergy, acting under a bishop of the Church of England. The Missions have been transferred from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to that for the Propagation of the Gospel, which being a chartered Society, under the presidency of the Primate, its Missionaries are in fact the Missionaries of the Church of England, not of a voluntary association, and a degree of national countenance is thus afforded them which they never could obtain under the former system; but it is essential to the efficiency of the new system, that Clergy in the Orders of the Church of England should be sent to the Indian stations."[219]

---

[218] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 48ff., chapter VII, 127f.,130ff.,131f. (quote),136ff.
[219] Pascoe, *Digest*, 503.

A footnote in this text explains with a view to the S.P.G., which had taken over the management of the S.P.C.K.'s East India Mission in 1825: "[f]rom the first it had been the invariable practice of the S.P.G. to employ, as Missionaries, only 'episcopally ordained clergymen'." This, however, does not give the whole picture, as even S.P.G. took over a few 'non-episcopal' missionaries from S.P.C.K. then.[220] In any case, the three Calcutta ordinations of Lutheran missionaries in 1825, hardly theologically motivated (with a view to a succession), marked a novelty, after more than a century of employment of 'non-episcopal' missionaries, some of whom had even been licensed in the previous years.

2.4 'Anglicanization' by 'Episcopalization': The Establishment of 'Missionary' and 'Colonial' Bishoprics

In the long term, the **'Anglicanization'** of the mission societies had consequences. S.P.G. in India displayed "eagerness … to get episcopally ordained missionaries", resulting into "the episcopal establishment in India and the S.P.G.'s plan to make Bishop's College a centre of its Indian mission."[221] From the 1840s onwards, the episcopal hierarchy gained more and more influence and control in and over the mission societies, due to grown, mutual interest in each other. Even though the 'episcopalization' of the missionary societies later appeared to play into the hands of the rising Oxford Movement, the objective of the former was an 'Anglicanization' and thus an alignment of the missionary societies with the established Church. One important factor was that the missionary societies sought

[220] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 135ff.

expansion and hoped for financial support from the Church whose desire to get involved provided the chance to explore ways of more co-operation. In 1839 S.P.C.K. campaigned with the help of Archbishop Howley for the establishing of the **Colonial Bishoprics' Fund**, eventually created in 1841. It was clear that state funding would get less and less, so leading Church of England clergy felt that they needed to take the initiative into their hands. This development added to the declining interest in ecumenical co-operations in missions, but also of the 'lay' participation.[222] Government and Church would provide bishops and the missionary societies would have some kind of intermediate function with the work undertaken abroad. In 1846, a Board of Examiners was set up in the S.P.G., nominated by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London, whom an Act of Parliament had empowered in 1819 to ordain or consecrate clergy for service in the colonies (not necessarily English candidates). This setup meant a considerate episcopal control of policies and of the missionary personnel.[223] The successive *Principles* of C.M.S. in the nineteenth century also reflect the change. The version of 1882 highlights more clearly than earlier versions the idealistic, although not extensive, practical involvement of the episcopate in its earlier years.[224] The earlier versions of 1862 and 1840 had stressed, besides hinting an originally strong lay character, the loyalty and "strict conformity with the Ecclesiastical principles of the Church of England" and affirmed the principle of obtaining licenses from colonial bishops.[225] The 1857 version had highlighted the impact of the Danish missionaries, hinting that the support from the established

---

[221] Ibid., 136.
[222] Cf. Jacob, *Making*, 112ff.
[223] Allen/McClure, *Two Hundred Years*, 430ff; Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 136ff.,195ff.
[224] Church Missionary Society, *Principles and Proceedings [1882]*, 4f.
[225] Church Missionary Society, *Principles and Proceedings [1862]*, 4 (quote); Church Missionary Society, *Principles and Proceedings [1840]*, 3f.

Church was low ("scarcely any effort was made by the Church of England for the spiritual welfare of the Heathen").[226]

The 'Anglicanization' of the missionary societies happened at a time when in **England** the repeal of the *Test and Corporation Acts* (1828) and the *Catholic Emancipation* Act (1829), together with the *Reform Act* (1832, about parliamentary representation), appeared to weaken the influence of the established Church in England, which coincided with a stronger desire in the colonies for independence, not only in a political respect. The bishops had voted against the *Reform Act* and overall displayed political conservatism. This amplified anti-clericalism in society, against the "priestly elite" and their privileged status. "Church criticism" and "criticism against priests" came together here, Evertsson concludes. With this development, the relatively positive attitude of High-churchmen towards Dissenters tended to change into suspicion. This, naturally, affected the way the Church hierarchy regarded the mission societies. What was at stake, in the long term, it seemed to many, was the relationship of the state and the Church of England. The situation was even more complex, though, as many people felt that "any attacks on the power and influence of the church was also part of the attack on the existing political and social order".[227]

These significant changes in society may have contributed to officials in the Church of England making more of an effort to bring the clergy in the colonies 'in line', or, at least to maintain English influence there, which the government approved of, naturally. The government felt inclined to justify an increase of clergy funding overseas but wanted to reduce this support. The Bishoprics' Fund was thus even more urgently needed.

---

[226] Church Missionary Society, *Principles and Proceedings [1857]*, 2.

Bishop Blomfield of London (in office from 1828-56), aware of the previous neglect of the colonies, adopted the already mentioned American model of **Missionary Bishops** which would help sustain if not increase influence. In conjunction with the missionary societies, the government hoped to establish new structures abroad, and the Oxford Movement approved of the fact that these involved the creation of new bishops, regarded by Evangelicals as missionaries. New dioceses were created in the 1830s, such as Madras, Bombay, Australia, Newfoundland and Toronto. It was telling for the raised profile of episcopacy in general and the colonial episcopacy in particular that in 1847, for the first time ever, the consecration of colonial bishops happened in public, at Westminster Abbey, instead of the privacy of Lambeth Palace Chapel. This, not least, also marked the overcoming of a general suspicion of missionary societies towards the Oxford Movement.[228]

In the hands of the bishops, the Fund was an instrument designed to implement more systematically an English episcopate abroad, securing influence and establishing episcopal control from England. Thus, the Church became itself a player in the expansion politics (Strong: **"Anglican imperial extension"/"Anglican colonial extension"**), by its bishops, now taking an active part in the strengthening of an episcopal leadership – around the world, partly dispossessing the mission societies' lay leadership.[229]

The setting-up of the Fund meant, at least in theory, that the Church emancipated itself from the state in its work abroad, to some extent. In April 1840, Blomfield wrote in a letter to Archbishop Howley, campaigning for governmental

---

[227] Evertsson, *Bishops*, 7 (long quote),21-23 (quotes),31.
[228] Cnattingius, *Expansion*, 108,198ff.,208ff.
[229] Strong, *Anglicanism*, 199,203 (quotes), cf. 198ff.,203.

or, if necessary, ecclesiastical funding of overseas bishoprics ("Whether by the State, as part of the Church, as in alliance with the Church; or by the Church itself as a collective body of individuals, Ministers and members?"):[230]

"[t]he time appears to me to have arrived, at which a great effort is required, on the part of the Church of England, to impart the full benefits of her apostolical government and discipline, as well as of her doctrines and ordinances, to those distant provinces of the British Empire, where, if the Christian religion is professed at all, it is left to depend for its continuance, under the blessing of its Divine Head, upon the energies of individual piety and zeal, without being enshrined in the sanctuary of a rightly constituted Church, the only sure and trustworthy instrument of its perpetuation and efficiency."[231]

Subsequently, the Archbishop held a public meeting to launch the Bishoprics' Fund,

"looking to the defective provisions hitherto made for planting the Church in the distant dependencies of the British Empire, and desiring that an effort should be made to extend to them the full benefit of its apostolical government and discipline".[232]

This added to the delight of members of the Oxford Movement about the **paradigm shift** that the case of 'missionary bishops' set, ending the British government's refusal to create **bishoprics for the 'colonies'**, trying to avoid the impression that "the legal establishment operating in England would be exported wholesale to the colonies". Nevertheless, if the concept of missionary bishops was a measure hoped to consolidate the British 'dominions' abroad, it could only slow down the process. A contemporary quite rightly felt that it might even lead to a more fundamental change of English episcopacy, when, for the time being,

---

[230] At the meeting mentioned below, quote from: France, *Oversea Episcopate*, 10.
[231] Blomfield, *Formation*, 3f.
[232] France, *Oversea Episcopate*, 10.

parliament defeated a bill which would have extended the terms of the 1841 *Bishops in Foreign Countries Act* (originally enacted with regard to the Jerusalem Bishopric), which would have weakened further the involvement of the Crown: "They wish to establish an English episcopate which should not acknowledge the Queen's Supremacy."[233] It was inevitable, in the long term, that this was to happen with a view to the political situation in the former 'dominions' abroad, as was the general legal and ecclesial recognition of 'Anglican' ordinations and consecrations there, undertaken without the Crown's authorization in now **non-British territories** (cf. chapter 2.5).[234]

The formation of **'Anglicanism'** in the second half of the nineteenth century challenged the ecclesiological theory of the Church of England. The authorities in Church and state had accepted that a restrictive policy was not workable any more, but also that a territorial understanding of what once had been the Church of England had ceased to be applicable, even in England itself, with the emancipation of Dissenters. A theological description was equally impossible, given the wide range of theological views. Anglo-Catholicism, at its high point, at the turn from the nineteenth to the twentieth century, advocated a definition of 'Anglicanism' via its historical pedigree which was soon understood as conferring a theological significance and established an understanding of an 'episcopal type' of ministers which was eventually declared by many to be more 'catholic' than 'non-episcopal' ones. Thus, the 'historical' understanding of being 'Anglican' soon transformed into a theological one. The Anglican episcopate, culturally still predominantly English, would gain more and more independence from English governmental control. The Lambeth Conferences, first viewed critically by many

[233] Letter of James Stephen to A. Kinnaird, 2 August 1853, quoted in: Yates, "Missionary", 57.

in England for this very reason, would become an expression of Anglicanism to be a fellowship of 'episcopal' churches (cf. chapter 4.2).

Having bishops was overall accepted, but the (long-term) elevation of the understanding of their significance, however, was not shared by everyone. The Evangelicals at C.M.S. still thought of a man like Bishop **Crowther** *functionally* as "a CMS agent in episcopal orders".[235] Crowther was the first 'native' Anglican bishop to serve in a "native Church" in West Africa, as the C.M.S. Honorary Secretary, Henry Venn, rejoiced. The consecration of the English-educated Samuel Ajayi Crowther at Canterbury in 1864 Venn described as the creation of "an Anglican bishop in non-British territory – sometimes called a 'Jerusalem' bishop, as distinct from the diocesan at home or the colonial bishop on British territory overseas".[236]

> "The license of Her Majesty had been duly promulgated in these terms: 'We do by this our licence under our royal signet and sign manual authorise and empower you the said Reverend Samuel Adjai [sic] Crowther to be Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in the said countries in Western Africa beyond the limits of our dominions.'"[237]

Crowther oversaw an enormous part of West Africa, including uncolonized land. The Christian mission there was intertwined with commercial interests, from which the mission benefitted, as well as suffered.[238] One may suspect that after the abolition of slavery in 1833, the extension of colonial ventures with the help of a 'native' bishop of Evangelical upbringing meant for some a new approach to commercial enterprises abroad. Venn (together with Stowell), one of the brains

---

[234] Ibid., 57ff.
[235] Ibid., 60, referring to Roland Allen.
[236] Venn to Crowther in 1860, quoted in: Ajayi, *Nigeria*, 185.
[237] Page, *Crowther*, 118.
[238] Ajayi, *Nigeria*, 206f.,209ff.

behind the consecration of Crowther, we can assume, was free of such intentions. The "native bishop experiment" for Venn was "the conception of Crowther as a native bishop at the head of a self-supporting, self-propagating Church, as distinct from a missionary wholly dependent on a missionary society." It was an experiment whose continuation struggled, however, due to racial prejudices, as Ajayi suggested.[239]

Henry Venn was looking ahead, trying to establish 'ecclesiastical normality' in the missions abroad, with C.M.S. only preparing the way. In 1799, his father John, one of the founders of C.M.S., had defined the "Church principle" of C.M.S. (as opposed to a "high-Church principle") as the society being controlled by its committee, members of the established Church, not by bishops.[240] In a paper from 1839, adopted by the Committee of C.M.S., Henry Venn

> "shew[ed] that the constitution and practice of the Church Missionary Society are in strict conformity with Ecclesiastical principles, as they are recognized in the constitution and practice of the Church of England. […] For it has been shown, that the Bishops of the Church, under the authority of the law of the land, ordain and send forth our Missionaries – that these Missionaries are licensed and superintended abroad in every case where it is practicable, by Colonial Bishops of the Church of England; as are the other Clergymen of the Church officiating in the same Colony. The Services which the Missionaries perform are in strict conformity with the Ritual and discipline with the Ritual and discipline of the Church. Even in the few cases in which Lutheran Clergymen are employed, this rule is observed; and all the congregations which are gathered into the fold of Christ are trained up as Members of the Church established in this land. […] … Missionary operations are, in their very nature, temporary and preparative… […The Bishop of Barbados held:] 'whenever a district should be brought into the state of an organized Christian community, it should assume entirely the Parochial form, and cease to be occupied as a Missionary Station.'"[241]

---

[239] Ibid., 207,216,219 (quote),231f. Cf. Williams, "Venn", 153ff.
[240] Davidson, "Ecclesiology", 203. Cf. Stock, *History*, 64f.

He emphasized the mutual goodwill of collaboration of the lay leadership with the hierarchy and its policies, namely the Bishop of London with a view to the education and ordination of missionaries, and explicitly mentioning the Bishop of Calcutta, Wilson, who had insisted on licensing missionaries in his diocese.

Stock argues that this new policy must not be understood as Venn having promoted "missionaries of a Church holding the apostolical succession". Such an 'Anglicanization' was rather an unintended by-product of his desire to make the missions part of the established church. "It was not because that they [the founding 'Evangelical brethren' of C.M.S.] could not help it that they formed a Church Society."[242]

> "The aim of the missionary director [Venn], therefore, even while he tried to relate the work of the mission to the existing colonial structures, was to look to the day when they, and the European missionary, would pass from the scene. When the indigenous peoples came into their own, it would be a firmly planted indigenous Christianity which would survive."[243]

This was ultimately to succeed, as we know today. Whether this was anticipated that way by the bishops, however, is doubtful. The establishing of 'missionary bishops' strengthened, in the short term, the influence abroad of the *English* episcopate by 'planting' English, or at least English-educated bishops. This influence remained until the middle of the twentieth century, with the exception of North America, when the majority of bishops in the Anglican Communion still had widely been educated in England.[244] One can suspect that this change then contributed to the increase in 'post-colonial' tensions in the Anglican Communion

---

[241] Venn, *Remarks*, 1,3. Cf. Yates, "Missionary". I am very grateful to Roshan Allpress for supplying me with the original source.
[242] Stock, *History*, 64f.
[243] Yates, *Venn*, 202. Cf. Yates, "Missionary", 54.
[244] Jacob, *Making*, 292ff.

in the second half of the twentieth century. In any case, the established Church had strengthened its influence over the missionary societies, weakening the original lay character.

2.5 *'English Episcopacy' Develops Towards a Marker of (the) 'Anglican Communion'*

The development to create bishops for overseas dioceses or churches, including churches in independent countries, resulted, in the long term, in the development of **'Anglicanism' as a world church**, eventually with interchangeability of ministers with 'non-English' churches.[245] This development supported a self-understanding of the Church of England which was less attached to the English state but increasingly to the community of its offshoots. This is an important factor in the **'theologizing' of episcopacy** as a bond between the churches. In the remaining British overseas territories, the establishment of English bishops sought to strengthen their influence. The government had similar intentions. "After American independence, Pitt's ministry took up the problem of promoting a social structure in Canada which would prevent a similar insurrection there."[246] **'Anglican episcopacy'**, thus, occasionally struggled with the ambiguity of its historic **colonial overtones**.

"*Ecclesia Anglicana* by virtue of its provenance is English in texture and fibre. […] All too often the bishop has become a carbon copy of the English bishop whose office and style has been accommodated to the English culture, particularly the upper-class culture. A classic example is the African bishop being addressed as the Lord Bishop of Cape Coast or Tamale or Freetown. The title reflects an English culture and social structure which are irrelevant to the African situation.

[245] Cf. Strong, *Anglicanism*, 217ff.
[246] Clark, *Society*, 300(ff.).

Thus a major task before the younger dioceses of the Anglican Communion is to work their way out of the captivity… […] While African or Asian or Pacific Anglicans contribute to their own captivity to the Anglo-Saxon *ecclesia Anglicana*, the captivity is also imposed from outside. […] Non Anglo-Saxon dioceses have the English albatross around their necks and need to free themselves from it."[247]

The Dean of Westminster would still hold in 1908: "The ideal function of the Anglican Communion is to express and guide the spiritual aspirations and activities of the Anglo-Saxon race."[248] Similarly, Canon Savage from Halifax, Yorkshire wrote:

"The Anglican Communion is primarily that Branch of the universal Church which is the Church of the Anglo-Saxon race throughout the world. As such it strongly reflects the distinctive character of that race; a character in the development of which it has itself borne no inconsiderable part."[249]

Canon Tomlin from Brisbane enthusiastically promoted in the same year the ideal of ecclesiastical unity of the old and new nations ("All points to the Divine right of nations."): "The ideal of the English Church is *International* Catholicism."[250]

For some, it seems, such rhetoric was the ecclesiastical continuation of the *pax Britannica*, "for there cannot be any question as to the eligibility of the field offered by the *pax Britannica* for the preaching of the Gospel and the building up of the Church".[251]

"Every great statesman and ruler, from Constantine downwards – perhaps one might say from Nebuchadnezzar downwards – has recognized the supreme importance of unity in religion towards the maintenance of unity in empire. We see, alas! before our eyes, in some of our domestic quarrels, the disastrous effects of religious schism upon national life. The best means of averting such schisms in

[247] Pobee, "Dioceses", 395-397.
[248] Robinson, *Communion*, 1.
[249] Savage, Ibid.
[250] Tomlin, Ibid., 1,6.
[251] Collins, *Anglican Communion*.

our empire, and of overcoming them in our country, is to cherish, to emphasize, and to develop, the religious ideals which history has shown to be congenial to the most devout and manly representatives of English religion and English life."[252]

The decision, eventually, to 'plant' English episcopacy to the churches abroad, dependent and independent, had resulted in the creation of a group of 'Anglican', 'Episcopal' churches which, consciously or unconsciously mirrored the Empire (Tucker, *The Spiritual Expansion of England*, 1886, or Barry, *The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England*, 1895).

"'The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England', Bishop Barry had called it [the Anglican Communion] in 1894, echoing the title of a book by Sir John Seely, *The Expansion of England*, written in 1882. For him this was a triumphant development. The creation of the institutional expression of a worldwide Anglicanism can be seen as part and parcel of that expansionism. [… However:] The '[Anglo Saxon] captivity of the church' was to take a cultural rather than an institutional form. […] The growing sense of a worldwide Anglican identity coincided with the age of high imperialism. [….] … churches which had been under missionary supervision achieved autonomy. However, in the period of high imperialism, it was overwhelmingly under the tutelage of a bishop who was British. Even in those colonies which achieved dominion status, with substantial settler populations, clergy from England were chosen, sometimes with no overseas experience at all."[253]

The development towards a theological emphasis on bishops can well be understood from this historical viewpoint. The High-Church-minded American Episcopalians, for example, could not claim a long succession of their sees, nor were they within a framework of a historical, established, national church any more. In their social environment, they would rather prefer to emphasize an origin other than the English state church. The model of 'apostolic descent' provided a theory that suited their purposes. In the nineteenth century, this kind of High

---

[252] Wace, *Communion*, 4.
[253] Ward, *History*, 297,300. Cf. Seeley, *Expansion*. Barry, *Ecclesiastical Expansion*; Tucker, *Expansion*.

Church rhetoric would be used to interpret the ecclesiastical relations between 'Anglican' churches and other 'catholic' churches, although the latter (namely Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches) did not share such an understanding. The 'Anglican' view, however became that **English "[e]piscopacy was now to be the basis for a global Anglicanism"**, to the delight of the Oxford Movement with their romantic, historicist mindset. At first, such an emphasis would also suit many Evangelicals who liked the emphasis on missionary outreach.[254]

The rise of the *theological* model of episcopacy was not solely due to the influence of the Oxford Movement, but their theory of a self-perpetuating, essential episcopal order suited very well the need of the Anglican Communion for a historic and theological self-understanding. What the Oxford Movement did not see happening to a full extent in their own country, however, was the "replace[ing of] the national paradigm of Anglicanism, centred on the Royal Supremacy, with the catholic paradigm, centred on episcopal succession" (Avis about Keble and Pusey's objectives).[255] However, Anglo-Catholicism was able to leave its mark on the ecclesiological reasoning of the expanding Anglican ecclesial community. Biggs concluded in 1914: **"There is that large and growing Anglican Communion which bids fair to realize Archbishop Laud's dream that it should be 'as diffused and Catholic as the Church of Rome'."**[256]

The overall historic development prepared the way for an understanding of episcopacy autonomous from establishment, governmental structures and even the Empire.[257] The former extraterritorial parts of the Church of England were, thus, made fit to maintain a (to some extent still 'British') identity albeit under the

---

[254] Strong, *Anglicanism*, 218.
[255] Avis, *Christian Church [2nd ed.]*, 180.
[256] Biggs, *Comity*, 4.

terms of ‘disestablishment’ and religious plurality.[258] The honorary primacy of the See of Canterbury would still secure at least some post-colonial ecclesiastical influence in both independent ‘Episcopal’ churches as well as in extra-territorial dioceses/churches, at least in theory. Priority was now given to the historical bonds between the churches stemming from the Church of England over the relations to other churches. The model of ‘national orders’ of the Church of England (cf. chapter 1.7) was then transformed into that of ‘episcopal’ orders (not yet generally claimed to be ‘catholic’ though).

> “With regard to episcopacy, the new paradigm of a self-determining and fundamentally episcopal Anglicanism extended to the empire the same episcopal identity, regarded as essential and non-negotiable, that had already been realized in the Church of England in 1662 … Anglicanism needed to understand the empire religiously as a theological missionary imperative…”[259]

With independence from the Crown, each new church had to establish new national structures. There was **no factual uniformity of the ecclesiastical ordering** within the Anglican Communion apart from the historic origin of their ‘episcopacy’. The new individual orderings reflected political views and the intellectual culture of the countries, often by no means monolithic either in political culture nor in religion. Lutherans in ‘republican’ North America, for example, formed “Presbygational” forms of church ordering, avoiding an episcopal structure: “Bishops were seen as arbitrary, oppressive, and ecclesiastical arms of the political power of Britain: when bishops arrive, tyranny escalates, ran the argument”.[260] The ‘Protestant Episcopal Church’ there, similarly, developed

---

[257] Sachs, *Transformation*.
[258] Cf. Kaye, "Pluralism", 291.
[259] Strong, *Anglicanism*, 293f.
[260] Brauer, "Bishops", 86 (quote),88.

an ordering which limited the factual power of their bishops, paying tribute to popular opinion.[261]

"Anglican bishops became the principal symbol in the American mind of the threatened ecclesiastical tyranny. The American Revolution of 1760-75 resulted quite as much from a *religious* as from a political change in the minds and hearts of the people."[262]

In the memoirs of Bishop Alexander Griswold, we find the following anecdote from New England.

"The thought of a Bishop's being brought into the State, they [the Congregationalists, – who then considered themselves as 'the standing order', (in their sense, the established religion of the State)] contemplated with great abhorrence. Indeed, this abhorrence, this strong opposition to Episcopacy of the Dissenters, as they were then called, and the consequent fear of offending them, furnished one of the chief reasons why the British Government, so long as we continued subject to them, would not permit us to have Bishops in these their Colonies. 'As a sample of the dread of Bishops, which among the common people, then prevailed; one of my neighbors, who was born about 1745, told me that, when a child, he was taught that, if Bishops should come into this country, they would take from the people a *tenth* of every thing; children not excepted: and, as he happened to be the tenth child of his parents, it was then, he said, his ardent desire that he might immediately die, in case a Bishop were permitted to set his foot on our shores.'"[263]

A polemic satire of that time plays with colonial fears of this sort, drawing on anti-Catholic resentments:

"Did not the deeds of England's Primate
First drive your fathers to this climate
Whom jails and fines and every ill
Forced to their good against their will?

Say, at what period did they grudge

[261] Podmore, "Tale", 40,70,59 (quote),64; cf. Podmore, "Streams", 15ff.,22.
[262] Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, 20.
[263] Stone, *Griswold*, 116f.

To send you Governor or Judge,
With all their Missionary crew,
To teach you law and gospel too?
They brought all felons in the nation
To help you on in population;
Proposed their Bishops to surrender,
And made their priest a legal tender,
Who only asked, in surplice clad,
The simple tithe of all you had.

In wide-sleeve pomp of godly guise,
What solemn rows of Bishops rise!
Aloft a Cardinal's hat is spread
O'er punster Cooper's reverend head.
In Vardell, that poetic zealot,
I view a lawn-bedizen'd Prelate;
While mitres fall, as 'tis their duty,
On heads of Chandler and Auchmutty."[264]

Many High Church clergy in North America indeed remained loyal to the Crown after independence and were consequently snubbed, although, we may add, rather for political than religious reasons.[265] "[T]he consequences of the Revolution were for a time fatal. Identified by popular prejudice with the royal government, it fell in public opinion with it."[266]

'Anglicanism' changed from a "national communal church" to an "associational and gathered church", and the situation in England was changing as well, as already mentioned:[267] Dissenters ('Nonconformists') were gradually granted more and more rights so that even in the mother country the state church was drifting away from the ideal of a comprehensive, broad church. It became more and more difficult to define the Church of England simply territorially. Consequently, the emergence of the concept and indeed the **term 'Anglicanism'**

[264] In: Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, 332f.
[265] Low, *Seabury*, 7; Mampoteng, "Clergy", 303.
[266] McVickar, *Hobbart*, 78.
[267] Jacob, *Making*, 287.

as well as those of the **Anglican Communion** in the nineteenth century were a result of this internal as well as external pluralisation.[268]

The career of the term is one of the achievements of the Oxford Movements, it seems.[269] Seeley, in 1838, still held:

> "[t]he name *Protestant*, then, let it be remarked, is, by the writers to whom we are adverting, constantly and vehemently abjured. […] The English church is indeed admitted to be a *Reformed* church; but the more favourite denomination is 'the Anglican Church', or 'the Catholic Church'?"[270]

The term *ecclesia anglicana* had been used in the Middle Ages referring to the geographical part of the Christian church situated in England in the sense of "one Church, one king, one nation".[271] In the (early) nineteenth century, the Church of England was referred to as "the Establishment", their proprietary chapels were referred to as "episcopal chapels" (as opposed to "dissenting meeting houses") until the term 'Anglican' became wide-spread.[272]

As far as the appointment of bishops for independent countries was concerned, there was a **legal obstacle** which was to be removed in steps, following the independence of the United States. The Church of England had been defined territorially but also nationally. The legal situation simply did not allow the creation of a world-wide 'Anglicanism' as a denomination yet. Non-English candidates (until the Consecration of Bishops Abroad Act, 1786) would be required to take the Oath of Alliance to the British monarch.

---

[268] Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, 5ff; Harris, *Change*, 5f.,24; Stanley, "Afterword", 345f; Wright, "Anglicanism".
[269] Podmore, *Aspects*, 35.
[270] Seeley, *Essays*, 284 (quote).
[271] Ward, "Communion", 13f.

2.6 The American High Church Movement and Their Zeal for English Episcopacy

The **American High Church movement** antedates the Tractarian influence in America, with the very fact of Seabury's consecration in a succession being a result of a level of a 'catholic' attitude in some Episcopal circles in the United States which would hardly have been found in England at the time.[273] The establishment of episcopacy in a succession was by no means uncontroversial. The foundation stone was laid by ten **Connecticut clergymen**, many of whom had previously been funded by S.P.G., who, after the independence of the United States, secretly elected amongst themselves a bishop in 1783 whom they sent to England in order to be consecrated there.[274] **Seabury**, once a loyalist chaplain to the British armed forces during the War of Independence, imprisoned for a while, was eventually consecrated in Aberdeen in 1784 in the Scottish Episcopal Church, which itself (until the beginning of the nineteenth century) had been in communion only with very few congregations in England, descending from Non-jurors.[275]

Seabury basically made the same experience of rejection of ecclesiastical support by the Church of England which had frustrated the Wesleys.[276] When he approached the authorities in Church and state in London, they were puzzled about his request, apart from the fact that he legally could not be consecrated as a citizen of a dissenting colony, even if he appeared trustworthy in his political convictions. Apart from that, neither had he been commissioned by the American state authorities nor by the laity of Connecticut, as Archbishop Moore pointed out.

---

[272] Podmore, "Idea", 36f.,40ff. The author thanks Colin Podmore for some clarification on the matter.
[273] Cf. White, *Case*, 19f.
[274] Leak, "Seabury".
[275] Chorley, "Election and Consecration", 146f; Podmore, "Tale", 50,52; Thomas, "Unity", 14,18.

Prime Minister William Pitt (the Younger) refused (yet) to put the question of special legislation in front of Parliament.[277] The British authorities advised Seabury to follow the Wesleyan example and continue with 'presbyteral' bishops. This upset the Connecticut clergy who argued against the 'Erastian' *divine right* model of the Church of England, which prevented them from obtaining the English succession, which they felt they needed because of their belief in a succession as ecclesiologically necessary. They held that "it has been the constant opinion of our Church in England and here, that the Episcopal superiority is an ordinance of Christ…" Such a view, in connection with the notion of a personal succession, however, was not generally shared by the English mother church nor by Americans like White (later to become a bishop). In a letter to White in 1783, the Connecticut clergy mocked the latter for his compromising attitude, when he had suggested to adopt a 'succession' if and when possible.[278]

> "But why do you include a general approbation of Episcopacy in your proposed new frame of government? Not because you think bishops a constituent part of an Episcopal Church, unless you conceive they derive their office and existence from the king's authority; for though you acknowledge we cannot at present have bishops here, and propose to set up without them, yet you say no constitutional principle of our Church is changed by the Revolution, but what was founded on the authority of the king. Your motifs … seem, indeed, to be purely political." [279]

Seabury needed an alternative. The second-best alternative would have been the consecration by an English Non-juroring bishop. This, however, would have been controversial amongst his fellow-High-churchmen in America, still loyal to the Church of England, who might have repudiated the validity of such a consecration

---

[276] Burdon, *Authority*, 58.
[277] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 138. Cf. White, "Consecration", 41ff.
[278] White, *Case*, 19f.
[279] Quoted in: Beardsley, *Life of Seabury*, 82f.

by “positively irregular” bishops, Stowe notes. It would also have provoked bad jokes: “‘Where did you get episcopal orders?’ Answer: ‘From your grocer or your druggist.’”[280]

Seabury approached the Scottish Episcopal bishops. In 1784, he noted in a letter: “His Grace of Canterbury apprehended that my obtaining consecration in Scotland would create jealousies and schisms in the [American] Church…”[281] An English consecration of Seabury, however, could well have been perceived as a political offence to the young American republic. On the other hand, in England, it seemed desirable to maintain some influence by supplying consecrations. When the Assistant Secretary of S.P.G. looked back in 1901 on the situation then, he held that “it was desirable that the succession should be conveyed to America through the English Church”. Such a theological interpretation (‘succession’) would hardly have been that of Church of England in the eighteenth century. This is why it is not at all “strange that episcopacy did not at once become an indispensable part of the Colonial system”, as the same author held.[282]

The long-term significance of Seabury’s consecration, followed by that of White and Provoost, was twofold: firstly, these consecrations would enable the American ‘Episcopalians’ to consecrate bishops for themselves in a succession.[283] Secondly, the ordination policy of the Church of England changed in the long term, because the American ‘Episcopalians’ were not only ‘disestablished’ in that they were non-British but they were without any attachment to the civil power, like the Non-jurors, as Seabury himself described his Church it in a letter in 1784:

---

[280] Stowe, "Succession", 322f.,335ff.,342f. (quote).
[281] Chorley, "Election and Consecration", 156,184.
[282] Pascoe, *S.P.G.*, 750,752.

"independent of *any civil power*…, as near as possible to the Primitive Catholic Church, in doctrine and discipline, … to obtain through them [the Scottish Bishops] a free, valid, and purely Ecclesiastical Episcopacy for the Church of Connecticut".

In the nineteenth century, such a view would support an 'episcopal', theological understanding of episcopacy, which would indeed emphasize, like Seabury in his letter, "a free, valid, and purely Ecclesiastical Episcopacy", or a "primitive Episcopacy", seen in independence from state authorities, like the Tractarians wanted later.[284] For the time being, "[t]he Scottish bishops gave Seabury what he and the American Church needed above everything else – a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy."[285]

'Apostolic' or 'historic succession' as such was not yet an approved criterion which would establish a formal link with the mother church. Nevertheless, as Seabury's son defended his father's decision: "the [Episcopal] Church in Scotland was not only a fellow member of the Catholic Church of Christ, but also under the oversight of a line of Bishops which had been received from the Church of England itself."[286] If such a view was held in England, it did not have any legal consequences at the time with a view to interchangeability of ministers, which speaks against such a concept as having been generally accepted. In the long term, however, American independence could hardly be ignored and the British government and church leaders had a strong interest in 'regularising' the relations to the former colonies. The political relations to Scotland, the direct neighbour, were more a complex issue, with the question of episcopacy, again, being intertwined with politics.

---

[283] Beardsley, *History, vol. II*, 9.
[284] Stowe, "Succession", 341.
[285] Ibid., 336.

The mindset which bore Seabury's consecration foreshadowed post-Tractarian Anglo-Catholicism, at a time when High-churchmen in England were still rather 'high and dry', adhering to the Prayer Book with its rubrics and the state establishment.[287] The example of the Connecticut clergy shows that not only republican and 'presbyterian' thought flourished in the United States.

> "For them it was 'no bishop, no Church'. Their one aim was to secure for the Church in America what they called 'a free and valid episcopate'; meanwhile, as they said, 'they would not do nothing without a bishop', for they regarded an apostolic ministry as essential to a valid sacrament."[288]

Such an attitude, however, was at odds not only with a majority of their compatriots, but also with English High-churchmen. Seabury was a former S.P.C.K. missionary with connections to Stevens, one of the Hackney Phalanx, who himself sustained links with the Scottish Episcopal Church.[289] Seabury was a native of Connecticut, who had been educated at Yale and Edinburgh and had been ordained in England. Seabury must have appeared to many Americans as a political reactionary with a suspicious 'popish' taste, who "signed his first official letter to the Connecticut clergy, 'Samuel, by divine permission, Bishop of Connecticut'. His manners were said 'to resemble those of a gentlemen in the reign of Queen Anne'."[290] He was a controversial figure in his church with his "attitudes and credentials", with his extravagant clergy-centred 'catholicism', his English pension and his Scottish consecration.[291] "He was clearly not the man to

---

[286] Seabury, *Seabury*, 243.
[287] Mullin, *Theology*, xiii. Cf. a pamphlet published before the War of Independence which argues against bishops for America without the framework of a state establishment: Chandler, *Appeal*, 150ff.,180ff.
[288] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 136.
[289] Varley, *Mildert*, 20f.
[290] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 139.
[291] Hein/Shattuck, *Jerusalem*, 54.

weld the church together as a national body."[292] The English pension of the "Bishop of all America", as he sometimes referred to himself, was a result of his working as "an 'intelligence officer' for British forces [during the War of Independence], drawing maps to guide their raids, as well as being their chaplain."[293]

It has already been indicated that the republican view might be seen as the more genuinely 'American' position. After all, one needs not to forget that "every major denomination in America had sought refuge in the colonies from the Church of England."[294] The *Chronicles of the Church* lamented in the late 1830s the "hostility to the Episcopal Church" with the first settlers.

> "In short, from the first moment that Episcopacy made its appearance in New England, it was regarded as a deadly enemy, and a most unrelenting foe. […] To join the Episcopal Church, in those days, was to renounce the friendship and good opinion of all former friends, with the certain knowledge, that hereafter they would be regarded only as hypocrities in religion, and enemies to the state."[295]

Nevertheless, there was a stable 'catholic' group who developed an American, pre-Tractarian High Church Movement, sometimes identified as **'Yale' or 'Connecticut converts'**. Prominent examples are Samuel Johnson (1696-1772) of whom Chorley said that he "may be regarded as the first High Churchman in America", with a theology which he resembled of that of the Caroline Divines; and Daniel Brown and Timothy Cutler, who "read themselves from Congregationalism to a surprisingly catholic interpretation of Anglicanism", with Johnson (like the Cambridge Platonist John Scott) believing in the ecclesiastical

---

[292] Olmstead, *History*, 222.
[293] White, "Consecration", 42 (quotes),44.
[294] Peck, "Controversy", 54f.
[295] Churchman, 16 November 1839, quoting *Chronicles of the Church,* cited by: Ibid., 55.

necessity of apostolic succession, without unchurching non-episcopal churches, as Crockett notes.[296] The title of the "first American High Churchmen", together with that of the "apostle of New Jersey", de Mille attributed to the earlier John Talbot (1645-1727).[297] Hardy Jr. traces back the beginnings of the American 'Catholic revival' to 1722.[298]

The nineteenth-century American High-churchmen would carry things further and make catholic attire and ritualism more popular in the Episcopal Church. Crockett compares their situation with that of English 'Anglicans' between 1660 to 1730, who found themselves

> "sandwiched between nonconformist polemic on the one side, and Roman Catholic claims on the other, … [they] were pressed to generate a specifically Anglican definition of the church. This situation parallels in many ways the situation of Anglicans in some parts of the colonies and, of course, later in the 19th century."[299]

Three things, however, are important to note: firstly, the elevated view of church and ordained ministry of the American High-churchmen was in stark contrast to what was commonly believed in both America and England. Secondly, this belief was not a rebellion of the sons against their fathers, by the son's adopting their grandfathers' view. The ecclesiology of most Church of England divines prior to the nineteenth century differed from that of the Tractarians which resembles the view of the Yale or Connecticut Converts. Thirdly, one needs to note the different state-church relationships, ecclesial contexts and political mindsets in both countries:

---

[296] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 136; Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 1.
[297] DeMille, *Catholic Movement*.
[298] Hardy, "Catholic Revival".
[299] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 1.

"Johnson's ancestors, revolting against what they perceived to be heavy-handedness of Laudian episcopacy in England, [had] moved to New England as a way of escaping episcopal tyranny. […] So it is not surprising the Yale converts emphasized an Anglicanism that stood out more starkly from the dominant Congregationalism of the day than that generally espoused by 'cradle' Episcopalians who often would have wanted to emphasize their American identity by de-emphasizing those Anglican doctrines deemed incompatible with the New England ethos. […] Establishment in England was a reality which some high churchmen celebrated but a few, especially after the advent of Tractarianism, began to question. In New England, of course, not only was the Episcopal Church not established, it faced the real hostility of the political and cultural establishment, which was dissenting Protestant. Moreover, the failure of the established church/state in England to look past its own interests and provide the New Englanders with a bishop early surely pushed the New Englanders to look elsewhere than England for the ideal ecclesiology. The paradigm for these New England Anglicans, therefore, was not England but was the early church. For a church struggling against the dissenting Protestant establishment, episcopacy emerges not as the bene esse of the church, but as the esse of the church. As a further corollary, it would seem that for an episcopal church to be situated in a politically and culturally hostile environment, questions of ecclesiology become more pressing, more quickly, than if it is situated in a culturally and politically friendly environment. If this is right, it should not be surprising that some American developments usually explained in terms of the rise and influence of the Oxford Movement in fact emerged early in the Episcopal Church because its situation differed in so many ways from the English church."[300]

One can indeed say that the early and further success of the American High Church movement, as that of the later English Tractarians, was due to their character of a "**countercultural movement"**, persuaded to follow an ancient model of the Christian church on the grounds of their historic reconstructions (which have been questioned not only in our time).[301] Crocket argues in favour of the parallelisation of the developments on both continents and concludes that Tractarianism and ritualism

"faced more opposition from the hierarchy in England than it did in the United States. […] … the *Tracts* were less influential because they met a native catholic

[300] Ibid.
[301] Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, xxi.

movement in the United States that was, in many respects, more sophisticated than that in England."[302]

Thompson remarked: "[i]n Connecticut the churches and clergy were converts from the Puritan churches; and they justified Bishop Hobart's humorous saying, that 'those who get episcopacy by infection have it worse than those who inherited it.'" Nevertheless, he explains that the American Canon 11, introduced soon after the adoption of episcopacy, insisting on episcopal ordination, effectively representing an equivalent to the English *Act of Uniformity*, was directed against the unregulated employment of 'pretenders' and not, as contemporary bishops pointed out, "ministers of other denominations".[303]

The third Episcopal Bishop of New York, John Henry **Hobart** (died in 1830), promoted elements of a High Church ecclesiology with the notion of apostolic succession before the rise of Tractarianism in England (Mullin: "The Hobartian Synthesis").[304] Approaches of such a kind were not unopposed, as one can imagine.[305] Similar to the later Tractarians, Hobart defended his views in his *Apology for Apostolic Order* (1807): "EPISCOPACY rests on DIVINE AUTHORITY. It is the *institution of Christ and his Apostles*." He argued with reference to what he held to be the model of antiquity, being of divine institution. "My banner is, EVANGELICAL TRUTH, APOSTOLIC ORDER."[306]

Like with the old High-churchmen in England, the historic reconstruction of the American 'High' Episcopalians of the ancient, 'catholic' church carried 'anti-Roman' overtones. Bishop **Skinner**, in the preface to McVickar's biography

---

[302] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapters 3f.
[303] Thompson, *Episcopate*, 6 (long quote),8.
[304] Addison, *Episcopal Church*, 96-102; Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 140ff; Doll, *Imperial Anglicanism*, 262; Mason, *Claims*; McVickar, *Hobart*; McVickar, *Hobbart*; Mullin, *Theology*, 60ff.
[305] Arguing against Bishop Onderdonk: Barnes, *Inquiry*, iv,34ff.

of Hobart claims 'episcopal' to be 'Catholic' in the tradition of the pre-Reformation church, but being "cleansed of certain superstitious errors" and having resisted the attempt under Queen Mary to return to "former errors, to bring back into the Church the superstitions which the Church of England had rejected…"

"No – the Church remains the same, although it has been cleansed: as a man remains the same man when his face is clean, as he was before he washed. Naaman the leper still remained the same Naaman after he was cured of his leprosy as he was before. And so the Church remained the same Church, the same divinely incorporated society after its Reformation."[307]

His rejection of the 'Romanists' resembles that of his contemporary Palmer (1803-85) in England, in his *Treatise*.[308] Skinner accuses the Roman Catholic Church in America of "forming a schismatical sect", having established 'rival bishoprics', "in opposition to the previously existing Church of these localities".

"No sooner was this Church ['the Catholic Church established in America, – an emanation from the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of England and Scotland'] established than the Romanists did in America what they had previously done in England: they set up altar against altar; and founded in schism the Romish sect. As the Romish party in England, at the instigation of foreign emissaries, separated itself from the Catholic Church of England in 1570 [with the excommunication of Elizabeth I], thus forming a schismatical sect…"[309]

Otherwise, ironically, Skinner's model of ministry (as *esse* of the church) was very much that of the Counter-Reformation.[310]

---

[306] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 182ff; Hobart, *Apology*, 117,272.
[307] Skinner, "Preface", xvf.
[308] Palmer, *Treatise*, vol. I, 305. Cf. footnote 584.
[309] Skinner, "Preface", xxv.
[310] Congar, "Apostolicité", 84,90,94,98,100,103ff; Kretschmar, "Wiederentdeckung", 300,318f,331f; Wendebourg, "Ämter", 14,16,20,30ff.

"[T]he Episcopal Clergy prove that they are sent by Christ, the first sender; – that they have authority to minister in Christ's name… […] … or, to adopt the words of Mr. Law…: 'If there be no uninterrupted succession, then there are no authorized ministers of Christ, if no such ministers, then no Sacraments; if no Christian Sacraments, then no Christian Covenant, whereof the Sacraments are the stated and visible Seals."[311]

In his popular *Altar Companion* (containing eucharistic meditations and instructions), Hobart derives a theory of the threefold priesthood from that of the Old Testament, not as immediate commission from God but

"through the agency of a set of men … successively transmitting [spiritual authority]. […] The apostles, therefore, were commissioned to be the *prophets*, the *priests*, and the *governors* of the church. That this commission was not temporary, and to die with the apostles; but, on the contrary, was to be perpetuated in the church, is evident [from Matthew 28:20b]."[312]

He held that "where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church by the participation of its ordinances at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood is the prescribed method of salvation." Earlier editions had read "indispensable condition of salvation", which must have raised the question of the status of non-episcopal bodies. Ecclesiastical separation from the "divinely constituted ministry of the church" he could treat charitably "when it proceeds from *involuntary and unavoidable ignorance or error*…"[313] Church unity he defined institutionally, with episcopacy. In a pamphlet, he explained his standpoint again and admitted: "These opinions may not now be popular. And yet they *were* popular… […] Opposition to these opinions is of modern origin."[314]

---

[311] Law, *Call* ; Skinner, "Preface", xf.
[312] Hobart, *Companion*, 149f.
[313] Ibid., 156(f.).
[314] Hobart, *Churchman*, 28.

About the same time of the rise of the Tractarian Movement in England, Episcopalians in America experienced more and more **resentments against 'Catholics'**. The 1830s saw an increasing, suspiciously regarded influx of Irish Roman Catholics and the Tracts were polarizing the existing tensions between High and Low Church Episcopalians, who still were widely regarded by their compatriots as "un-American".[315] In 1839, one could read in *The Episcopal Recorder* a warning of the "present work of the enemy" in the "Oxford Theology which treads every step upon the heels of popery and wanting to reverse the Reformation", in wanting to establish "what our Church describes as the 'stinking puddles' of human tradition" and the "revived and shaded Popery of the men of the *Puseyite* school".[316] Their teaching were "hinder[ing] the progress [of] Orthodox and Evangelical truth" with their

> "semi-popery that is now becoming so rife in England and after which there seems to be a great gasping in some of the professedly Protestant Churches in our land. […] In the United States, however, there exists a tendency to contravene the catholic nature of this remarkable church [the Church of England]."[317]

In a following issue, the editors printed extracts of a popular English book by an anonymous layman (the Evangelical R.B. Seeley) mourning the gradual loss of establishment but also the unscriptural, "false doctrines issued from Oxford" in the Tracts (which Seeley labeled "revived Popery", a "modified system of Popery" or "the follies of Laud"), which had some additional impact on the American High Church movement, but the American editors remarked: "[t]here are more than traces of their appearances in our Church in this country. Indeed we

---

[315] Peck, "Controversy", 50,52,55,62. Cf. Wolffe, "Anti-Catholicism".
[316] D.I.E., "Oxford Theology 1".
[317] D.I.E., "Oxford Theology 2". Boase, "Seeley".

can show evidence of their existence here, before they were proclaimed from Oxford."[318] Seeley had judged: "The *Via Media* then, of the Church of England, is not the *Via Media* of the Oxford Tracts. The first is a wise and just moderation, holding firm to *essentials*."[319] This clearly troubled Low-churchmen on both sides of the Atlantic, who were worried about the Tractarians' unchurching of 'Protestants'.[320]

Peck suggested that the consolidation or perhaps even radicalisation of the American High Church movement was a reaction to the Evangelical/Puritan movement with its emphasis on the experience of conversion, holding up against them the "apostolic origin of Episcopacy as a fact". As a phenomenon, he suggests a parallel to the emerging Mormons.[321]

> "While there may be a tendency to assume that the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints is evangelicalism gone berserk, it is more properly seen as a part of the churchly reaction to evangelicalism with its strong emphasis upon the doctrine of the Church and 'objective' rather than 'subjective' religion. The parallels with High Church Anglicanism ought not to be ignored. The appeal to Catholic Truth, the emphasis upon strong episcopal government, the exclusionist attitude toward those who are not within the orthodox fold of the Church … all have parallels in such a denomination as the Mormons."[322]

---

[318] "Extracts from 'A Layman's Essays on the Church', From the Christian Observer, October 1838, Part 1". Cf. "Review of 'Essays on the Church, By a Layman', 1838", 642; Seeley, *Essays*, 278f.,282,337.
[319] Seeley, *Essays*, 324.
[320] Nockles, "United States", 138,146.
[321] "Extracts from 'A Layman's Essays on the Church', From the Christian Observer, October 1838, Part 2"; Peck, "Controversy", 55,58,61.
[322] Peck, "Controversy", 61.

2.7 The Scottish Episcopal Church

There also was a disestablished 'Episcopal' church in the British Isles which held a peculiar status with regard to the Church of England until the mid-nineteenth century and, similar to the American Episcopalians, developed a 'higher' understanding of episcopacy prior to Tractariansim. When the Scottish Kirk took the opportunity to abolish episcopacy in 1688 (only twenty years after its re-introduction at the Restoration), a group of **Non-jurors** formed the **Scottish Episcopal Church** in 1689/90. They retained allegiance to King James (II of England and Ireland and VII of Scotland) when he was dispossessed by William of Orange.[323] James had been suspected of trying to 'catholicize' the country again. It was a small church, however. "By 1792 its clergy numbered just 4 bishops and 40 priests, and its people about 5 per cent of the Scottish population."[324]

The Scottish Episcopal Church was highly restricted, especially by the *Toleration Acts* (1712 and 1746) and the *Penal Act* (1748), which tried to force clergy to take the Oath of Allegiance and that of Abjuration (of the Stuarts' cause).[325] The pressure on Episcopalians grew after the **Act of Union** of England and Scotland of 1706 (England: 6 Anne c.11; Scotland: Anne c.7), as the *status quo* entailed that the **Kirk** was recognized as the **established Church**. The Act referred to the Kirk as the "true Protestant Religion" and ruled that the "… Presbyterian Government shall be the only Government of the Church within the Kingdom of Scotland" (XXV). New **plans of an ecclesiastical union** fell through, just after the Non-jurors had stirred up the ecclesiastical scene.[326] Nevertheless,

---

[323] Luscombe, *Laurencekirk*, 13.
[324] Lochhead, *Scotland*, 36; Podmore, *Aspects*, 27.
[325] Cf. Luscombe, *Laurencekirk*, 23ff.
[326] Phillimore/Phillimore/Jemmett, *Law*, vol. II, 1760ff.

Newman vented his frustration on the toleration policy towards the Kirk: "[it was] the depression of the Church Catholic … in that country, and the practical recognition of the Kirk by English Protestants."[327] Like with the accession of James to the English throne, it had not been unthinkable that England would adopt a presbyterian government, as Newman acknowledged. He commented on that plan with horror, interpreting its rejection as a success of a theological understanding which hardly played a prominent role yet. On the contrary, the fact that presbyterianism was regarded a realistic option for England indicates how little concern there was about 'succession' but far more about the political and practical implications. For Newman, the significance was that "we have a second time risked the Succession", as it would have meant, in the words of Hallam, "to admit presbyterian ministers into the church without pronouncing on the invalidity of their former ordination…"[328] Given that the Kirk was the established Church in Scotland, however, it is difficult to interpret the Church of England's attitude towards Scottish presbyterianism as presuming invalidity of their ministers and ministrations.

As with the English Non-jurors, the Scottish Episcopalians primarily broke away from their church for political reasons to begin with, but soon 'theologized' their reasons by **elevating their understanding of episcopacy** and, thus, changing their character as a church. The repressions against the Scottish Episcopalians were not directed "against episcopacy as such but against Jacobite episcopacy".[329] In 1792, the Scottish Episcopalians eventually agreed to both the Oath of Allegiance and that of Abjuration. The *Scottish Episcopalians Relief Act*

---

[327] Newman, "Convocation", 377f.
[328] Hallam, *Constitutional History [2nd ed]*, vol III, 235.
[329] Mather, "Church", 540.

(32 Geo. 3 c.63) was passed granting them more freedom. After a transition period, a new generation "to whom the Pretender's cause was an inherited commitment not a living conviction" formally adopted the *Articles* in 1804 at the Synod of Laurencekirk.[330] The new circumstances did not allow any more consecrations like that of Seabury in 1784. "… Seabury had been fortunate enough to find them between kings."[331] These developments meant "a public Testimony of our Conformity in Doctrine & Discipline with the Church of England", as Primus John Skinner put it.

Even though the Scottish Episcopalians had finally decided to conform politically, their emphasis on episcopal succession, from England, meant that they were suspected in Scotland of acting as an "disestablished branch of the Church of England" or the "local branch of the Church of England".[332] They foreshadowed Tractarian opinion in that they "replaced [the Jacobite loyalties] not so much by loyalty to the Hanoverians as by an anti-Erastianism which similarly reduced sympathy for the Church of England, albeit for different reasons."[333] A new generation was concerned "for the church as a divine society, transmitting authority by apostolic succession, and independent from Stuart and Hanoverian alike."[334] Such a view, however, was still alien to most English churchmen, and it amplified the perception of Scottish Episcopalians being at odds not only with presbyterianism but also with the Scottish nation: "Because of their longstanding relationship with the Crown, … they became increasingly perceived as somewhat

---

[330] Luscombe, *Laurencekirk*, 68f; Mather, "Church", 547 (quote). Cf. Stranraer-Mull, *Scotland*, 17ff.
[331] White, "Consecration", 39.
[332] Cant, "Scotland", 442 (quotes); Strong, *Episcopalianism*, 290.
[333] Podmore, *Aspects*, 30.
[334] Mather, "Church", 547.

English and alien in their nature and culture."[335] A church leader noted in 1882: "there is much to justify the idea that we are an English institution, imported by a king, and never heartily accepted by the people".[336]

"Nineteenth-century developments went so far to transform the Episcopal Church, until in externals it is hardly recognizable as an heir of the church established before 1690. Partly in consequence of the union of the non-juring and 'qualified' sections [Episcopalians who after the Toleration Act of 1712 had started to pray for Queen Anne], there was a movement towards conformity with England."[337]

The sometimes difficult circumstances of Scottish Episcopalians influenced the election process of bishops in this small, disestablished church.

"It comes about that by historical accident and because of their tiny size, the Scottish Episcopalians have the only truly elective episcopal appointment system among the three self-governing Anglican Churches in the British Isles, and until 1979, the only one where the entire procedure took place within and at the initiative of the vacant diocese."[338]

Considerably earlier than in the Church of England and comparable to the American Episcopalians who were similarly forced to formulate a **theological identity as a minority church**, the Scottish Episcopalians made an explicit claim of a "preserving [of the] the Episcopal Succession" (Canon 1). With the rise of Tractarianism and social pluralisation, the notion of **succession** became more and more popular in England in the nineteenth century when, eventually, interchangeability with Scottish Episcopalians was enacted. In the introduction to the revised Code of Canons of 1838, the Scottish Episcopalians explained:

---

[335] Keulemans, *Episcopate*, 95. I am grateful to the author for generously sharing the text of his finished thesis with me.
[336] Strong, *Episcopalianism*, 289, quote ibid, from the Scottish Guardian, 27 January, 1882, 43f.

"[i]n one country, a pure Apostolic Church is found to be legally established, amply endowed, and closely incorporated with the State; while in another, forming a part of the same Empire, it is only tolerated by the State; and as to all matters of spiritual concern, derives no support from the Civil Government. Such is precisely the difference of situation between the Established Church of England and Ireland, and the unestablished, the merely tolerated Episcopal in Scotland. In things of a purely ecclesiastical nature, embracing the Doctrine and Government of the Church, the faith peculiar to Christianity, and the mode of transmitting an Apostolic Episcopacy – in these respects the Reformed Episcopal Church is the same in every part of the British Empire."[339]

The fact that Scottish Episcopalians had **no interchangeability of ministers with the Church of England** prior to 1840/64 (cf. chapter 2.8), however, raises questions with a view to the succession argument on the side of the Church of England if claimed as a continuous ecclesiological foundation doctrine (cf. chapter 1.5). There was no doubt, like in the case of American Episcopalians, that their 'disestablished', 'episcopal' pedigrees stemmed from the Church of England. Whereas Roman Catholics could under certain circumstances be received into the Church of England without re-ordination, 'Episcopalians' could not (which the Anglo-Catholic Podmore admits to have been 'ironic'), nor could 'Protestants' (presbyterians from the Kirk, for example). This means, that in this respect, Episcopalians and foreign Protestants were treated alike prior to the mid-nineteenth century, which is important to note in this context.

Podmore suggests that 'episcopal ordinations' had been regarded as 'valid' but that the recognition of 'validity' would "not necessarily imply that churches are in communion". He refers as an example to the Church of England's recognition of Roman Catholic 'orders' as valid, although this does not establish

---

[337] Donaldson, *Church and Nation*, 106.
[338] Keulemans, *Episcopate*, 96(ff.).
[339] Episcopal Church in Scotland, *Canons*, 4.

communion.[340] Today's Church of England can regularize (and always did, as it seems, representing a, purified, proto-type of 'English orders') a converting Roman Catholic minister by receiving him into the Anglican Church without ordination and would possibly be happy to agree interchangeability of ministers (refused by Rome), whereas converting Anglican ministers need to be ordained by the Roman Catholic Church. Podmore's comparison, however, misses the point, as the Roman Church recognises neither the validity nor the regularity of 'English orders' (cf. chapter 4.4). If there is mutual recognition of validity of ministries between two churches, presuming general agreement in theology, there is sufficient theological grounds for communion, even if then, still, communion needs to be formally agreed to 'regularize' the ministers of the partner church, with a view to interchangeability of ministers. In any case, the fact that interchangeability of ministers with 'Episcopalians' was not established by the Church of England until the mid-nineteenth century suggests that a definition of 'validity' and 'regularity' of ministers and their ministrations based *on the* ***criterion of a 'succession'*** **was not (yet) a positive, forceful criterion for defining ecclesiastical relationships and establishing communion** with, for example, Scottish or American Episcopal 'orders', as equal to their own.

Being 'episcopal' was soon to be charged with the notion of a **'historic succession'**. Thus, the ecclesiological self-understanding of the Church of England shifted from the 'Erastian' to the 'apostolic paradigm' (Avis).[341] Avis locates this paradigm shift in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, which is not convincing for the Church of England as a whole (cf. chapter 1.7). It rather appears that the 'Erastian' model was substituted by an 'episcopal' one in the late

[340] Podmore, *Aspects*, 29f. Cf. footnote 356.

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, still not theologically charged but understood institutionally (cf. chapter 4), as a historic attachment to the English Church (which finally recognized 'Episcopal' churches abroad).

2.8 The Church of England's Establishment of Communion with Episcopal Churches and the 'Catholicization' of the Anglican Episcopate in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century

The term and idea of the '**Anglican Communion**', in its modern, institutional sense, goes back to around the year 1847; but the first, rather poorly attended Lambeth Conference, controversial at the time, would not take place until 1867.[342] The concept, possibly first used in America, **"was conceived and nurtured in high-church circles"**. But even in those circles, there had hardly been any contact between American and English 'episcopalians' until the 1820s.[343]

"Comprehension in the eighteenth century sense … [was to] think of Great Britain comprehending politically the United States of America under the Union Jack. [… Only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries] Union and fellowship [became] based on reciprocal recognition…"[344]

Relations with formerly British churches had been loose. Until the second half of the nineteenth century, there was **no general interchangeability of ministries between the Church of England and other 'episcopal' (Episcopal) churches**, not even with the Scottish Episcopal Church, despite its having made considerable concessions towards the government of the Church of England, which was united

---

[341] Cf. Avis, *Christian Church [2nd ed.]*, xivff.
[342] Podmore, *Aspects*, 36. Cf. footnotes 838ff.
[343] Ibid., 7 (quote),26,31,36.
[344] Hunkin, *Ordination*, 155.

with the Church of Ireland between 1800-1870 and with the Church of Wales until its disestablishment in 1920.[345] A Welsh Evangelical once noted:

> "[e]cclesiastically speaking, Welsh Anglicanism as an establishment had been an anachronism for several decades. Its continuance into the twentieth century was entirely due to an ecclesiastical version of English colonialism, witness the fact that a motion of disestablishment in the Parliament of 1886 was lost, even though twenty-eight of the thirty-four Welsh members voted for it."[346]

The suspicion that the Church of England with its policy of 'national orders', as we have labelled it earlier (cf. chapter 1.7), was still continuing colonial practice is not implausible, but the example of the Irish Church demonstrated how fragile this concept was. **Interchangeability of ministers**, until the mid-nineteenth century, was still a matter of **'shared establishment'**, in the sense of being part of or subject to the jurisdiction of the Church of England (with Wales) and Ireland, including its 'colonial extensions', with the Scottish (Presbyterian) Kirk enjoying some kind of 'recognized' status (which made the relations with the minority of Scottish Episcopalians a difficult matter). This model might be, consciously or unconsciously, the origin of today's ecumenical goal of a 'visibly', institutionally, united, episcopal church, allegedly modelled after the primitive church.[347]

Although the Church of England had supplied consecrations for former Church of England dependencies in non-British countries, it bore hardly any practical consequences. From that perspective, one may understand the suspicion towards the 'validity' of Seabury's Scottish consecration by some of his fellow-American Episcopalians (who tended to be loyalists), even those who believed in the significance of a 'succession', not only because of the mutual, not least

---

[345] Luscombe, *Laurencekirk*, 57.
[346] Evans, *Welsh Revival*, 186.

politically motivated dislike between Provoost and Seabury.[348] The idea that a 'succession' united, for example, Scottish Episcopal and English orders, was a concept which would not become popular in England before the end of the nineteenth century, and thus, the American High-churchmen preferred English to Scottish episcopacy.

The second half of the nineteenth century saw a change of policy in the Church of England with a view to the relations with the churches with **'English episcopacy'**. **Interchangeability of ministers** with Scottish Episcopalians was established by parliament in 1864, after the establishment of restricted interchangeability in 1840/43 (cf. the table later in this chapter). Podmore interprets the *Colonial Clergy Act* in 1874 of having established interchangeability of ministers (with the possibility for 'colonial clergy' to hold English benefices) "with other episcopally ordained clergy".[349] This is, however, a specific, ***theological*** **interpretation of the Act** (levelling clergy ordained in colonial or former colonial churches with 'episcopal clergy' in general, as a theological 'type' of ordained ministers *sui generis*), on the grounds of a theological concept of what it means to be 'episcopal'. However, the Act does not state the grounds for the interchangeability of ministers: it refers to the "colonial and other clergy" who could now be received in England to hold a benefice, but mentions neither 'episcopal ordination' nor 'succession' as criteria. Venn, the C.M.S. Secretary, in fact did not understand the Act to establish 'communion'.

"It appears to be an open question whether the decision of an independent church, though in full communion, should bind our church in respect of the states of its

[347] Tanner, "Future", 386ff; Tanner, "Goal", 76ff.
[348] Stowe, "Succession", 322f; Thompson, *Episcopate*, 7; White, "Consecration", 38f.
[349] Podmore, *Aspects*, 29.

own ministers … we are not aware of any declaration of authority to this effect. The Act of Parliament by which Scottish and American Episcopal churches are permitted to officiate in England makes no allusion to 'communion' between the churches nor as far as we know any other law or ecclesiastical authority"[350]

His argument matches our earlier description of the grounds for communion prior to the mid-nineteenth century, that is being essentially part of the English Church. For Venn, communion would need to entail the usage of same liturgy.[351]

The questioning of Podmore's description may appear pedantic. The relevant Acts were certainly made with a view to churches in former colonies with episcopacy stemming from the Church of England. The crucial question, however, turns out to be whether English Churchmen at that time already generally thought of all 'episcopal' ordinations to be equal with English ordinations because of their historic origin, or specifically with a view to a theological quality conferred by a (tactile) succession. Considering the difficulty in the late nineteenth century to establish the model of 'historic episcopate' as a compromise between Low- and High-churchmen which was, at least to begin with, not to embrace an interpretation in the sense of an 'apostolic succession' (cf. chapter 4.1ff.), it is unlikely that almost half a century earlier the same issue had been less controversial, but rather the opposite. Around that time (1874/79), however, a clause was inserted into English Canon Law stating "that in the judgement of the church holy orders have ever been held to be indelible", which carried sacramental overtones, although the same policy is essentially kept by many Protestant churches. The explicit mentioning of 'episcopal ordination' as a criterion for interchangeability would not be introduced into the proposed English

[350] Quoted in: Yates, *Venn*, 88f.
[351] Podmore, *Aspects*, 33.

Canons of 1947.[352] This illustrates the late development of 'episcopal ordination' as a theological concept (as defined by a 'historic succession').

Before the mid-nineteenth century, the crucial criterion appears to have been the **Oath of Allegiance and of Abjuration**, which non-British clergy could not or would not take.[353] It was not the only reason why interchangeability was not necessarily desired by the Scottish Episcopal Church, for example, who eventually accepted the Oath and tended to align rather with the Church of England than with the Kirk (cf. chapter 2.7). Scottish bishops feared that they might lose too many of their clergy to England if they were allowed to take posts there, and English bishops were not pleased about such a prospect either. Mather summarizes a common perception of Scottish clergy as "a set of uneducated, illiterate men".[354]

In any case, it is important to note that 'episcopality' as such, understood in a (quasi-)sacramental way, based on succession, was not a commonly held concept (yet). The point of 'episcopal ordination' was rather about the legal recognition by the established English Church (**'*validitas' canonica*, that is 'regularity', not '*validitas' sacramentalis***). The very fact that *individual* English Roman Catholic clergy, it seems, could be received into the Church of England (after the recantation of Roman Catholic doctrine and obedience to the Pope and the subscription to the Articles and the taking of the Oath) but foreign clergy having been ordained by 'Episcopal' bishops, for example, from Scotland or the United States, *generally* could *not* prior to the second half of the nineteenth century, may illustrate that **establishment** was the main issue here. **Dissenters** as

---

[352] See footnotes 52f.
[353] Cf. Goldie, *History*, 98f.,40f; Mather, "Church", 560; Podmore, *Aspects*, 29f.
[354] Mather, "Church", 556f. (quote),560,570.

well as '**non-English Episcopalians'** were generally under the suspicion of political and social unreliability.[355]

"The difficulty turned on the implications of establishment. As Bishop Horsley explained [in 1790] to the Scots, 'considering the Regal Supremacy in Britain, our Bishops think that they cannot introduce into their Church persons admitted to holy orders by a Bishop in Great Britain, to whose consecration, the King in virtue of his supremacy, had not given his consent'."[356]

With regard to the reception of converting Roman Catholic ministers, the American *Protestant Episcopal Church* followed the same ordination policy as the Church of England. When this policy came to be understood by Anglo-Catholics as being in accordance with the Roman Catholic understanding of 'orders' in 'apostolical succession', it appeared, ironically, to adopt an understanding of ordained ministries which in Roman Catholic Canon Law is the basis of the rejection of 'Anglican orders', as a critic noted in 1889: "She [the American Church] does accept Roman clerics in this way [without (re-) ordination], though, judged, from her point of view, by the canon law which Rome itself accepts, their orders are null and void."[357]

The North American Episcopalians, however, were not an established, state church. In the United States, many **High-churchmen** had held a view comparable to that of the Tractarians, prior to Tractarianism, which would influence the development of the ecclesiological self-understanding of the Church of England in the second half of the nineteenth century, increasingly being in need of a self-definition, challenged by internal as well as external pluralisation.

---

[355] Ibid., 540,553.
[356] Ibid., 560.

"Seabury, Hobart, Doane, Hopkins, had nothing new to learn from Keble and Newman about the apostolic succession… […] It is not surprising, therefore, to find Bishop Stewart of Quebec remarking that he had heard more about the *Tracts* in a three days' sojourn in New York than in a year's residence in London."[358]

Wright claims: "when the Oxford Movement came, the American Church already knew the substance of its message."[359] Dimock mourned in 1896: "We do not marvel at all that the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America made adventures in the direction of undoing somewhat of that which the extreme caution of our Reformers had done in the reign of Edward VI."[360]

The changes in legislation which established interchangeability of ministers with the churches stemming from the Church of England were partly politically motivated, as has been suggested earlier (cf. chapter 2.3ff.). These changes, however, would make it possible to claim later a theological basis for these successive recognitions, although the very fact that this was a gradual development supports the view that an ecclesiological theory (of succession) is only a retrospective interpretation but not its original motivation.

The most significant stages of this development were:[361]

1784: Ordination of Aliens Act (24 Geo.3. sess.2. c.35)[362]	The Bishop of London, or a deputy, can ordain non-British subjects as deacons and priests to serve in non-British territories (only), without them taking the Oath of Allegiance.

[357] Forrester, *Historic Episcopate*, 67.
[358] DeMille, *Catholic Movement*, 41.
[359] Wright, "Movement", 93.
[360] Dimock, "Prayer-Book VI", 261.
[361] Acts to be found in the respective *Statutes at Large [Collection of Legislative Acts]*. Some of these acts have been repealed in the meantime.
[362] Phillimore/Phillimore/Jemmett, *Law*, vol. II, 1807ff.

1786: Consecration of Bishops Abroad Act (26 Geo.3 c.84)	The Archbishops can consecrate non-British subjects as bishops to serve in non-British territories (only), without the Oath of Allegiance.
1800: Act of Union (39&40 Geo.3 c.67/ 40 Geo.3 c.38)[363]	The Churches of England and Ireland are united "into one Protestant Episcopal Church" (Article V) as law-established churches.
1819: Ordination for Colonies Act (59 Geo.3 c.60)	The Archbishops and the Bishop of London can "admit persons into holy orders specially for the colonies".
1840: Scottish Episcopal and Other Clergy Act (3&4 Vict. c.33)[364]	The Act makes, "under certain restrictions", "Certain Provisions and Regulations in respect to the Exercise, within *England* and *Ireland*, of their office, by the Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in *Scotland*", but also of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America and elsewhere, provided the consent of the respective English diocesan bishop was obtained. This Act, still, did not make it possible for "Priests of such Church canonically ordained" to hold an English benefice.[365]

[363] Ibid., vol. II, 1749ff.
[364] Ibid., vol. II, 1762.
[365] Podmore, *Aspects*, 29.

1841: Bishops in Foreign Countries Act (5 Vict. c.6)	Act with regard to the Jerusalem Bishopric (cf. chapter 3.5, with an Anglican bishop in turn with an 'episcopally ordained' Protestant Prussian officeholder, authorized by the British Crown), for the consecration of British or non-British subjects to serve in non-British territories: no requirement of the Oath of Allegiance or Supremacy (for non-British subjects), but also no automatic right to officiate in England and Ireland. Also commonly applied to missionary bishops (usually understood as an Anglican bishop in non-British overseas territory) and colonial bishops (an Anglican bishop in British overseas territory). "Such a bishop … properly speaking, is not Bishop *of* a place, but a Bishop *in* the place."[366]
1852: Colonial and Other Bishops Act (15&16 Vict. c.52/ 16&17 Vict. c.49)	Colonial and other bishops may perform episcopal functions by invitation in the English/Irish Church.
1863: Clergymen Ordained in Foreign Parts Act (26&27 Vict. c.121)	The validity of acts performed by foreign Episcopal clergy is recognized (marriages, for example).

[366] Ajayi, *Nigeria*.

1864: Episcopal Church (Scotland) Act (27&28 Vict. c.94)	Removal of "disabilities" of clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland who now can be licensed in England and Ireland, with the consent of the respective Diocesan.
1874: Colonial Clergy Act (37&38 Vict. c.77)	After the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1871, "colonial and other clergy" can officiate or be licensed for service in England, with permission of the respective Archbishop and Bishop. The candidates need to subscribe to the Articles and the doctrine and liturgy of the Prayer Book and the Ordinal, "so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority". The Oath of Allegiance is not required from this clergy.

The matter of '**English episcopacy'** in former colonies and that of interchangeability of ministers with them and the Church of England was **not merely theological but also a political** one, on both sides. In North America, the High-churchman Seabury had closed his church during the War of Independence because he could not publically pray for the British king. After having been turned down by the Church of England, he accepted consecration by a Jacobite bishop (in favour of a Stuart on the throne) who would certainly not pray for the British king (this is why some of the American clergy were quite unhappy with Seabury's consecration, as already mentioned). "The irony was doubled when White and Provoost, defenders of democracy and republicanism were made bishops in

Lambeth Palace, the very centre of what they saw as prelatical tyranny."[367] Americans were divided. Beardsley mentions a minister who, after the Revolution, one Sunday prayed with the old liturgy for "our excellent King George" but added: "[o] Lord, I mean George Washington".[368]

With Seabury's consecration in 1784, ending a humiliating strife for episcopal ordination in the British Isles, a concordat was agreed which established intercommunion between the United States and the Scottish Episcopalians, but which explicitly excluded English and Irish subjects. A ('historic') 'succession' was not an argument employed to extend interchangeability of ministers to other churches in an alleged 'historic succession', but existed only within 'English' *or* 'Scottish/American episcopacy', not in communion with each other until the second half of the nineteenth century, even though the latter stemmed from 'English episcopacy' and the American line had eventually been 're-anglicised':

> "the mere possession of episcopal ordination was not on its own sufficient grounds for communion. […] Episcopacy is for the ordering of the church, not just its legitimation. [… The 'historic episcopate' therefore] … does not stand, of itself, as a kind of ecclesiastical totem pole guarding the virility and well-being of a denominational tribe. On the strictest reading of tradition the existence of bishops is a necessary but not a sufficient indicator of Anglican identity. The fact that American Anglicans existed for nearly two centuries with the closest bishop 3000 miles away, suggests that other readings are at least possible."[369]

The difference remained that English episcopacy to many appeared to be corrupted by the 'Erastian captivity' of the Church of England. The consecration sermon for Seabury by Skinner is an elaboration of what would later be perceived

---

[367] Thomas, "Unity", 17f. Cf. White, "Consecration", 40.
[368] Beardsley, *History, vol. I*, 313.
[369] Thomas, "Unity", 14f.,19.

as ‘Anglo-Catholic’ ecclesiology, with bishops as successors to the apostolic office, in

“continuance of that divine presence and protection, which he promised to his apostles and their successors… […] Without any of the boasted props of civil establishment, yea, often depressed by the hand of insulting power, it [this powerful promise] has, nevertheless, firmly stood ground, … and … has restored itself to the purity of the primitive standard.”[370]

Both Scottish and American (High Church) Episcopalians saw themselves united that day in the Christian church, Bishop Skinner said in his sermon,

“as a society entirely distinct by itself, without being incorporated into, or any way defended or supported by the state; but as it stood for the first three hundred years after Christ, unprotected, and therefore uncorrupted, by any legal establishment.”[371]

In principle, even an American Low-churchman like White would be content with a, compromised, **episcopal government**, even in the form of English episcopacy, when it became available, despite his own reservations about a ‘succession’.[372] Even though the American Episcopal Church, for example, would conform to the ancient practice of ordinations by a bishop, in some states, Episcopalians were happy for a long time to borrow bishops from other states for ordinations, but seem to have seen bishops as otherwise dispensable.[373] This, still, may seem curious to us, because in doing so, they effectively conformed to the Restoration’s *Act of Uniformity*. The fact that Episcopal bishops in the United States effectively acted as deputies of their Conventions (synods) illustrates, however, that the

[370] Skinner, *Sermon*, 47f., cf. 6f.
[371] Ibid., 9.
[372] Cf. footnote 278.
[373] Cf. Podmore, "Tale", 53.

theological significance of episcopacy was not necessarily that of the High-churchmen. The introduction of episcopacy appears to represent the American version of **'comprehensiveness'** (cf. chapter 2.6). This is why someone like White would accept its introduction or others could conform to the practice of ordination by them, without adopting the High-churchmen's ecclesiological presumptions.

The question of episcopacy remained controversial. Episcopacy still had, for many, the bad taste of colonial control, even though under British rule, there had been no bishops.[374] But the former ties with the colonial power, for a long time to follow, "was a direct source of suspicion toward the Church".[375] However, we may assume with Thomas, that equally desirable for many was a form of leadership which reflected a connection to the 'universal church', even if via England.[376] In the long term, it was a High Church desire for the preservation of the old ordering which had the final word here, although not for purely 'apostolic' reasons but also with a strong taste for the old civil order. Seabury's son wrote:

> "[some clergy's] contention was based upon the simple plea that it [an American Episcopate] was necessary for the preservation of the Church. Their only additional plea appears to have been that the preservation of the Church was essential to the preservation of the existing civil order of civil government in the Colonies; but this was subsidiary to the main point, which was that the Church would soon inevitably become extinct … without resident Bishops. […] So God overruled the malice of those Bishops who, having through their connection with the State been deprived of the opportunity of being the first to transmit the Apostolic succession to the Western World, sought to secure the credit of an action which they had been afraid to perform, by depreciating an Episcopacy which they knew to be valid as their own."[377]

---

[374] Cf. Seabury, *Seabury*, 116,125f.
[375] Peck, "Controversy", 54.
[376] Thomas, "Unity", 11.
[377] Seabury, *Seabury*, 112,251.

This ‘catholic’ connection, however, logically resulting in interchangeability of ministries, had yet to be recognized and did not automatically derive from an episcopal consecration of bishops, as we have seen. ‘Succession’, or a ‘historic episcopate’, was not yet a principal criterion. Such a view (cf. the Lambeth Quadrilateral) must be seen in the context of the **emergent influence of High-church theologians on both sides of the Atlantic in the late nineteenth century**, just when ‘Anglicanism’ had emerged. The result was a **‘Catholicization of Anglican episcopacy’**, embracing Anglo-Catholic and ritualistic influences of the time:

> “the emergence of an international Anglican episcopate gave substance to the High Anglican claim that theirs was a great international episcopal communion, constituting another branch of the Catholic Church besides the Orthodox and Rome.”[378]

Theologians of the English High Church movement as well as of the Scottish Episcopal Church increasingly held up the idea of succession underpinning ecclesiastical authority independently from a divine right claimed by an earthly power.[379] It was only too easy to wed a post-Tractarian High Church understanding of church and ministry, resembling the American High Church ecclesiology, with a model of ‘Anglican orders’ (English, Scottish, American etc.), being interchangeable. This ‘catholicization’ would soon find its expression in the **catholic attire of the ‘Anglican’ bishops**. Bishop Seabury had illustrated his claim of episcopal power by wearing a mitre which had been long out of use in England and was only re-introduced there slowly with Anglo-Catholic ritualism. First, it appears, it was Episcopal bishops outside England who revived such

---

[378] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 69.

ceremonial, maybe to make a claim towards London and Lambeth. Later it was also adopted in England, quite possibly symbolizing a claim towards Rome, as one may assume.[380]

"Though the frontispiece of T. Cranmer's 'Catechism' depicts bishops wearing mitres, this attire was rarely, if ever, used in the C of E from the Reformation to the 19th cent., except at coronations. … [They were] borne at the funeral of bishops."[381]

This explains why Dean Stanley (of Westminster), when he visited America, as Seabury's son reports, was puzzled about such an ecclesial outfit as

"a grotesque survival of antiquated absurdity. The Dean was extremely amused with it. […] The amiable gentlemen had probably never before seen a Mitre except on the recumbent effigies of his ancient Abbey, and he doubtless associated this one with a petrified Christianity."[382]

This episode may illustrate again that the High-churchmen in the United States were far more advanced in their ritualistic practice. In their 'personal' and relatively independent dioceses (effectively churches to begin with), not 'broadened' by establishment, they were relatively free to do what suited them. It may also indicate that the American High Church theologians had a certain desire to demonstrate their 'catholicity' to set themselves apart from non-Episcopalians but perhaps also from their mother church who had suggested to Seabury, and had

---

[379] Cf. Mather, "Church", 547f.
[380] For the history of the ritualist movement in the United States see: Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 359ff.
[381] "Entry 'Mitre'". It is commonly admitted that there is no early evidence for mitres. When the Council of Toledo, in the seventh century, mentions episcopal ornaments, the mitre does not feature there: Barry, *Sacramentals*, 196.
[382] Seabury, *Seabury*, 361-365 (quote).

had to do so, to continue with presbyteral ordinations, as episcopal ordination could not be had from the Church of England at that stage for legal reasons.[383]

Some High-churchmen would be happy to adopt some 'Catholic' ritual to emphasize that the English Church, building up its own world-wide network, was on the same footing with Rome; others would hope to emphasize common grounds. In any case, the 'catholicization' bore fruits within a short period of time. On the official photo of the Lambeth Conference in 1867, the bishops are wearing dark coloured overcoats, whereas they wear the traditional liturgical dress (rochets and chimeres) on the photos from 1878 and 1888 (the conference of the Quadrilateral) onwards.[384] Many portraits of successive diocesan bishops reveal an advancement from this traditional attire.[385] From the late nineteenth century onwards, bishops started wearing 'catholic' attire, which their predecessors would not have had if their portraits were painted in their own lifetime. Such portraits often reflect the change in the self-understanding and self-representation of bishops. Pre-Reformation English bishops would often have mitres in the background, post-Reformation bishops would have the Bible or the Prayer Book depicted with them which often disappear around the Restoration. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, English bishops start wearing pectoral crosses, copes and mitres on portraits. A window from the time of Laud at Christ Church, Oxford, depicts the first bishop of Oxford (1542/1546 to 1558) with cope, staff and mitre, which neither Bishop Robert King nor the Laudians used.[386]

---

[383] Cf. Beardsley, *Life of Seabury*, 82,246.
[384] http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/pages/lambeth-conference.html (last accessed on 1 June 2012)
[385] Cf. footnote 389 and: http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/gallery.php/56/archbishop-of-canterbury-portraits (last accessed on 1 June 2012)
[386] Watson, *Cathedral*, 37.

Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury (1854-69), whom Owen Chadwick calls a "disciple of Dr. Pusey", apparently was the first English post-Reformation bishop to carry a staff. The bishops of Lichfield, Rochester and Oxford (Wilberforce) followed the example. Chadwick notes: "[t]he laity liked the symbol." Lightfoot of Durham refused at first, but eventually accepted it, like so many others.[387] However, a minister from Bath, William Acworth, complained in the *Churchman*: "[a]las, mitres, pastoral staves, episcopal rings, and a timid and subservient clergy have made bishops to be rather 'lords over GOD's heritage than examples to the flock'."[388] Lang, in the first half of the twentieth century, was the first Archbishop of York (and subsequent to that of Canterbury) after the Reformation who wore a mitre and made

> "the cope the normal liturgical dress for bishop or archbishop. Henson [a controversial appointment to the Hereford see, translated to Durham] might still protest in 1932 that he did not even 'possess a mitre' but he could not hold back the catholicizing tide."[389]

The long-term effect of this elevation of episcopal ceremonial was significant, as even the Evangelical successors of these High-churchmen did not even question these innovations, which appear to have been introduced without any formal consultations in England, adopted from Anglicans abroad, as it seems.

> "[At the time of the 1874 *Public Worship Regulation Act*] the dress of bishops was very simple. Purple cassocks and pectoral crosses were still unknown. Bishops wore mitres on their notepaper and on their carriages, but not yet on their heads. It was in Central Africa that things began to change."[390]

---

[387] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 468f., and vol. II, 310f. (quote).
[388] Quoted in: Dixon, *Handbook*, 68.
[389] Hastings, *History*, 198. Cf. Podmore, *Aspects*, 147.

Disraeli had hoped that the *Regulation Act* would destroy the "Mass in masquerade".[391] It seems, however, that the Act rather helped the spreading of ritualism positively by allowing certain practices and negatively by victimizing ritualists who would martyr themselves.[392] Only a few years before the *Regulation Act*, the American Bishop Hopkins had defended "ritual or ceremonial" in his book "The Law of Ritualism" as not being a matter of indifference but a product of "the wisdom of the supreme Lawgiver, when He saw fit to dictate the ritual of the Church established for His own chosen people".[393] He argued ritualism not to be 'popery' but a concept which he saw rooted in the Early Church and "thoroughly authorized in Holy Scripture; … consecrated of old to His service by His express command", as one of his sons noted.[394]

We can **conclude** that just as English Evangelicals after the Second World War would be inspired in their zeal by North American Evangelicals, High-churchmen in the nineteenth century felt inspired by the zeal of their High Church brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, in Scotland and elsewhere, envying their independence from state authorities, despite disapproving of the lay influence in their churches.[395] Newman approvingly quotes one of Seabury's sermons in which he had held "that there is no other way left to obtain a valid commission to act as Christ's minister in His Church, but *by an uninterrupted succession of ordinations from the Apostles*." Newman also quotes another of Seabury's sermons in which

---

[390] Neill, *Anglicanism*, 269.
[391] Quoted in: Butler, "Eighteenth Century to the Present Day", 43.
[392] Bentley, *Ritualism*, 46ff.,121ff.,128,129ff.
[393] Hopkins, *Ritualism*, 1 (quote),95ff.
[394] Hopkins, *Hopkins*, 379.
[395] Newman, "Anglo-American Church", 353f; Soper, *Evangelical*, 37f.

he had defended the classical Roman Catholic view of the Eucharist. "The Eucharist is not only a sacrament, … but also, *a true and proper sacrifice*…"[396]

Samuel Seabury (a High Church editor of the American *Churchman*, not identical with the first bishop) lobbied for the publication of the *Tracts* in America and "was not particularly chagrined by the seemingly pro-Trent stance of Newman's widely denounced Tract 90".[397] Opposing Bishop Seabury's theology, the liberal-catholic Bishop of Vermont, Hopkins, held up the doctrine of the real presence in the Prayer Book, arguing against "Novelties Which Disturb Our Peace" in Tract 90.[398] However, as we shall see in chapter 4, towards the end of the nineteenth century, at the high point of Anglo-Catholicism on both sides of the Atlantic, post-Tractarian High-churchmanship was able to establish the attachment of vital parts of their ecclesiological self-understanding to the norm of episcopal government, ordination and the relatively new interchangeability of ministers between the 'Episcopal' churches and 'English episcopacy' ('Anglicanism'). This was to provide an ecclesiological self-understanding for the emergent Anglican Communion (cf. chapter 4), which essentially was represented by the sharing of the government of an 'English episcopate' (at least in its origin) and whose office-holders had worked very hard to create such a post-colonial ecclesial communion, held together by the communion of its (at least culturally still) English bishops. Strong speaks of a **"new Anglican imperial paradigm"** being enacted with the *Colonial Bishoprics' Fund*, the **"colonial extension of the episcopal Church of England"**.[399]

---

[396] Newman, "Anglo-American Church", 337f.
[397] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 6.
[398] Hopkins, *Novelties*, third letter, 12ff. Cf. Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapters 3,6.
[399] Strong, *Anglicanism*, 198ff.,203.

These bishops were increasingly being influenced by Anglo-Catholicism. In England, Davidson, as "Queen Victoria's private advisor on ecclesiastical appointments" and as Archbishop, influenced episcopal appointments between 1883 and 1928, as he also increased the institutional involvement of the Archbishop in appointment processes. His successor, Lang, had already been "closely involved in episcopal appointments as Archbishop of York since 1908 and was a trusted confidant of Davidson".[400] Thus, a strong Anglo-Catholic tendency on the episcopal bench prevailed and shaped the ecclesiastical developments and their interpretation.

[400] Podmore, *Aspects*, 146f.

3 Anglo-Catholicism as Symptom and Catalyst of the 'Anglicanization' of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century and Its 'Catholic' Elevation of Episcopacy

3.1 The Oxford Movement as 'Catholicizing' Counter-cultural Reaction

The nineteenth century proved to be an age of considerable change for the Church of England, creating far-reaching challenges. Perhaps the most significant internal challenge was the **increasingly multi-denominational and secularized social context within England**; the most significant external challenge was the question of how to define relations with 'Episcopal' churches (independent or still dependent) abroad (cf. chapter 2.1). In order to give space to Dissenters in society, a gradual disestablishment of the Church of England was inevitable.

"The Church of England became a voluntary organization in which there was no longer any sense of external compulsion; it changed from being *the* religion of the English to being simply one denomination among others, though always one with certain privileges."[401]

The result was the development of 'Anglicanism' as a denomination, as opposed to the previous, territorial, self-definition of the Church of England, with its extraterritorial parts. Thus, it is not wrong to suggest: "Anglicanism is a product of modernity and reaction against it. It is a tradition best summarized through its development and its diversity."[402] This had consequences, however. **"Eighteenth-century Christianity had been generally irenic and latitudinarian, the**

[401] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 2.
[402] Sachs, "Review", 160.

nineteenth-century Churches were denominational and sectarian; and for that development the Oxford Movement was in part responsible."[403]

The rise of the **Oxford Movement and Anglo-Catholicism** is to be seen, at least partly, as a symptom of and catalyst for these challenges. Recent scholarship has suggested that the Oxford Movement and its success need to be seen in the context of various streams of aesthetic and academic antiquarianism, medievalism and romanticism, with the Gothic Revival perhaps being the most prominent cultural expression.[404] 'Oxford theology' (the Tractarians, chiefly from Oriel College) met 'Cambridge architecture' (the neo-Gothic Camden Society) and visibly changed parish life in many ways.[405] The Gothic Revival was not simply a result of the admiration of the medieval style but was also preferred as an economic alternative to brick, in an age of population growth, especially in urban and sub-urban areas. The increase in population coincided with a relative wealth of parts of the nation as a result of colonialism and industrialization. This is one of the reasons why this period has left a considerable mark on the outlook of the country. "Gothic architecture excited religious enthusiasm… […] But sometimes the Catholic features of Gothic architecture were omitted intentionally."[406] "Two hundred and fourteen churches were erected as a result of the Church Building Act (1818); and of these a hundred and seventy-four were in a style then described as Gothic…"

Increased piety in some part of the nation corresponded to the secularization of others.

---

[403] Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 121.
[404] Yates, *Victorian*, 40ff.
[405] Yates, *Buildings*; Yates, *Movement*, 4ff.,11ff.

"For churchmen the years in the middle of the nineteenth century were years of spiritual revival. During this time more of the clergy and laity saw their religion in clearer outline and allowed its dogmas to exercise a more direct control over their lives than had possibly been the case since 1700."[407]

However, the established religion overall suffered from the anonymity and increased social liberty which came with urbanization. Congregations did not grow proportionally with the population and 'competition' with Dissenters became more visible. This had consequences for the now emerging *Anglican* self-awareness and identity. Ritualism and the desire for 'Catholicity' in a pure, apostolic religion, promoted by the Tractarians in independence from the Crown, may be seen as having been widely supported by a nostalgic feeling from which the regard of both Church and Crown benefitted, as a symbolic expression of a higher meaning beyond the profane.

"The monarchy represented the timeless quality of what was taken to be a pre-industrial order. In an increasingly urbanized society, it balanced the industrial revolution: the more urban Britain became, the more stylized, ritualized, and popular became its monarchy, for the values which it claimed to personify stood outside the competitive egalitarianism of capitalist society."[408]

The possible sources of Tractarianism appear to be manifold, most prominent perhaps the influential 'Hackney Phalanx' (despite mutual dislike) and other High-churchmen who became increasingly uneasy about 'Erastianism', although not in principle being critical of the establishment.[409]

"The point is that the Oxford Movement was part of a much larger Romantic movement which sought restoration of the church in terms consonant with

---

[406] Clark, *Gothic Revival*, 95f.,105.
[407] Kitson Clark, *Churchmen*, xviii.
[408] Harvie/Matthew, *Nineteenth-century Britain*, 104.
[409] Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, chapter 6; Nockles, "Background", 28ff.,40,42; Varley, *Mildert*, 63ff.,188.

antiquity and, to a lesser extent, the Middle Ages. Not all of this larger movement was Tractarian but it has been easy to slip into the habit of assuming that Tractarianism was responsible for the renovations, writings and controversies generated by this larger cultural, literary, and architectural movement which swept through the nineteenth century, both in the United States and in Europe."[410]

The Oxford Movement has been described as **'counter-cultural'** in many ways, providing a refuge from social changes. The political revolutions in the United States and France and the industrial 'revolution' in Britain had shaken the foundations of society.

"The Agricultural and Industrial Revolutions led to social and economic problems, and an increasing association of political and social reform with the Dissenting Churches. This development was linked with the growing conflict of interest between urban industrialists and rural landowners in which the Nonconformist Churches tended to be identified with the former and the Established Anglican Church with the latter."[411]

Mobility increased and liberalization of policy towards Dissenters became unavoidable.

"[T]he Industrial Revolution, by accelerating the disintegration of the old prescriptive order and abetting the rise of a pluralistic society in England, produced a basic religious division between Church and Chapel to mirror the emerging complexities of the industrialising nation. But denominational religion was a midwife of the new, urbanised industrial society, not an offspring. For the long term concomitant of industrialisation was secularisation, and modern English society is a context in which significant religious commitment is a subcultural phenomenon."[412]

English Christianity suffered from secular scepticism and scholarly criticism, often associated in popular opinion with German universities and the phenomenon of liberalism. Thus, the Oxford Movement was a Romantic revolt against the

---

[410] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 2.
[411] Holmes, *Catholicism*, 19.

ecclesial "high and dry" spirit of rationalism and liberalism of the eighteenth century.[413] Like the Evangelical Movement, the Tractarians were "against Reason as the Age of Reason had understood and used it".[414] In the early years, Tractarianism lacked an anti-evangelical pathos, but the ways parted between 1837 and 1840.[415] Evangelicalism's partial parenthood of Tractarianism, turning from a more charismatic approach to an institutional, Gladstone used as a defence of Anglo-Catholicism against the suspicion that it was heading towards Rome, whilst downplaying the significance and impact of the Evangelical Movement.[416]

> "It [the Oxford Movement] was a reaction against the dry propositional theology of the eighteenth century, whether that took the form of deistic rationalism or Protestant Biblicism or Roman Catholic scholasticism. If this is correct, then one would see as a parallel to the Oxford Movement the new style of German theology associated with Schleiermacher, who stressed feeling and intuition. The comparison would hold only up to a point, for there was a streak of subjectivism in Schleiermacher which is not found in the Oxford Movement, and Schleiermacher also lacked the Oxford apostles' veneration for antiquity."[417]

The dissatisfaction of the Tractarians is evident in the preface to the first volume of the Tracts, mourning, ironically, the "lamentable increase of sectarianism" and indicating the significant theological shifts in their theological agenda.

> "Had he [the awakened and anxious sinner; who goes to a dissenting preacher] been taught as a child, that the Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine Grace; that the Apostolical ministry had a virtue in it which went over the whole Church, when sought by the prayer of faith; that fellowship with it was gift and privilege, as well as a duty, we could not have had so many wanderers from our fold, nor so many cold hearts within it."[418]

---

[412] Gilbert, *Society*, 207.
[413] Crowther, *Church Embattled*, 13ff.,40ff.
[414] Chadwick, *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 12.
[415] Voll, *Pietismus*, 25f.
[416] Ibid., 28,31f. Gladstone, "Parantage", 7ff.,12ff.,19ff.
[417] Macquarrie, "Implications", 14f.

It seems that Pusey, before the formation of the Oxford Movement and his critical study on German 'rationalist' theology in 1828, had been deeply influenced (positively) by his studies in **Germany**, as his correspondence with Tholuck (of the German Revival Movement) suggests.[419] Newman, Gilley observed, saw in Luther his contemporary Evangelical.[420] "He [Luther] found Christians in bondage to their works and observances; he released them by his doctrine of faith; and he left them in bondage to their feelings."[421]

Macquarrie suggested that Schleiermacher's or Kierkegaard's critique of the Christian church had been, similarly, reactions to modernity, albeit in different social contexts, and drawing different consequences. German Lutherans, for example, became less ceremonial in their worship in the nineteenth century and emphasized their academic background by wearing the black preaching gown (introduced in Prussia in 1811, in Bavaria in 1843), replacing mass vestments, surplices and albs, which had become less popular in the eighteenth century.[422] A critic of the unity scheme with German Lutherans at the beginning of the eighteenth century, based on Pufendorf's writings, summarized the arguments of his opponents:

"[b]ut the *Lutherans* were more ceremonious in their Worship, than the Church of *England* [as opposed to Scotland]; that they not only retain'd the Surplice, the Cross at Baptism, God-Fathers and God-Mothers, and Kneeling at Holy Communion… […] Therefore, upon the whole you concluded, that an Union with the *Lutherans* would be more easy to be effected, than could be with the *Scots* or other *Presbyterians*. That indeed you thought there was little or no Difference

---

[418] Newman, *Tracts 1*, iiif.
[419] Geck, "Autorität I"; Geck, "Autorität II"; Geck, "Autorität III"; Geck, "Reception"; Pusey, *Germany*.
[420] Gilley, *Newman*, 174.
[421] Newman, *Justification*, 339.
[422] Gottesdienst-Institut der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Bayern, *Ausstellungskatalog*, 21f; Podmore, *Churches*, 11. Cf. footnote 518.

betwixt them and the *High-Churchmen*… […] You answer'd, that you did not believe there was any essential Difference between us and the *Lutherans*…"[423]

The English Catholic movement can be seen as following the reverse strategy to the Germans in responding to the intellectual challenges to nineteenth-century Christianity, like Bible criticism and natural sciences (although there also was a 'high-Lutheran' 'Liturgical Movement' in Germany, with Löhe et al.). Thus one may judge: "[t]he 'Oxford Movement' is best regarded as the insular version of the ecclesiastical reaction which followed the Napoleonic wars."[424] Newman held:

"… Germany had become rationalistic… [, there] might be a call upon members of our Church to waive their differences with foreign Protestantism and Dissent at home, as if in the presence of a common enemy. But at this day, when the connexion of foreign Protestantism with infidelity is so evident, what claim has the former upon our sympathy?"[425]

Secularization and the rise of natural sciences resulted in an open **challenging of the Church and a decline of her moral authority** in society, stricken by the party divisions which were further undermining the liturgical compromise once held up by the conformity to the Prayer Book. The signs of inner dissolution corresponded to that of the old prescriptive social order which seemed inexorable. Sunday trading became more common.[426] Ecclesial critique was often subject to ridicule. An anonymous Cambridge graduate ostensibly mourned in a lengthy pamphlet in 1860 the deconsecrating of Sunday by a custom so far overlooked by the "Lord's-days Society": shaving, which kept away some of the faithful from

[423] Brett, *Review*, 5f. Cf. Harrab, *Tessaradelphus*, 'To the Reader' and the last two pages.
[424] Henson, *Relation*, 11. Cf. footnote 518.
[425] Newman, *Via Media*, 20. Cf. chapter 3.5.
[426] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 455ff.

attending services timely. “By shaving, we are frittering away the rest of God’s heritage!”[427]

The number of churchgoers overall kept declining, despite the ‘Catholic revival’, which only radicalised the remnant. The religious census in 1851 revealed that only about 35% of the English went to church on a Sunday (with considerable regional variations), but half of these were Dissenters. In 1902/03, only 19% of the London population regularly went to church, mainly from socially superior areas. By then, Dissenters were suffering from decline as well, with the exception of Roman Catholicism which still attracted the Irish working class population. The decline in church-going reflected and perpetuated the decline in influence.

“[I]n the case of Anglicanism, they [non-church-goers] resented a religion so obviously linked to the status and power of the propertied classes. Not going to church, in a society whose articulate members so strongly advocated the practice, was a protest as well as a sign of indifference.”[428]

3.2 Ritualism and the Diocesan and ‘Episcopal’ Revival

Christianity in England reacted to secularization in different ways but overall with a new concentration on what mattered about church. Some retired in ritualistic triumphalism, a ‘high’ understanding of the Church or partisan Protestantism. Reactionary niches seemed a refuge for some mourning the lost moral grounds of the Church which coincided with a concrete decline of the living standard of the clergy. **Ritualism** appears to be not simply a consequence of Tractarianism but as

[427] Theologos, *Shaving*, 43.

one of its preconditions.[429] Leuenberger suspects that many who were perceived being 'Anglo-Catholics' were not really aware of or concerned with the theological programme of the Tractarians but were more concerned with spiritual renewal and the 'cultic beautification' of the liturgy.[430] In any case, resistance grew quickly and the Tractarians fuelled the conflict by being outspoken about their agenda. They themselves were less interested in ritualism. It was actually the generation after the Tracts' writers, in the second half of the nineteenth century, who would lead ritualism to its height, illustrating the (Tractarian) claim that the Church of England was to be more 'Catholic' than 'Protestant'.

Ritualism varied a lot in its origin, forms, expressions and regional distribution. By the end of the nineteenth century, ritualism had become acceptable, especially as an urban phenomenon (cf. the London "biretta belt"). Its 'markers' like the use of vestments, lights, the eastward position and incense (once considered being rather extreme) significantly increased at the turn to the twentieth century.[431]

The rise of ritualism represented a symbolic claim of meaning which otherwise had been called into question. Wingfield-Stratford mocked:

> "[t]he parson was taught to discover not only a new importance, but a new interest in his office. He was invited to exchange the dull Anglican routine – and during the eighteenth century it had become unbelievably dull – for a highly attractive ritual and symbolism. The vista that slowly unfolded itself was one full of colour and variety. A new kind of clerical 'shop' began to be talked – albs and chasubles and dalmatics, prevenient grace and auricular confession, became things of vital moment. The fine old medieval sport of heresy hunting was revived, and the prayer that reverend gentlemen put up at regular intervals for deliverance from

---

[428] Harvie/Matthew, *Nineteenth-century Britain*, 46,92f. (quote).
[429] Selén, *Conflict*, 23. Cf. Knight, "Parishes", 131,137f.
[430] Leuenberger, *Cultus*, 295. "kultische Verschönerung der Liturgie"
[431] Pickering, *Anglo-Catholicism [2008]*, 101ff; Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 155 (quote); Wellings, *Evangelicals*, 10ff.,12.

envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, was blessed with no very obvious response."[432]

Within a few decades, the extent of change had been considerable. One needs to bear in mind that Cosin, in 1628, had been accused of lighting an unnecessarily large number of candles, wearing an *embroidered* cope as prebendary at Durham Cathedral, "ducking" to the Lord's table which he allegedly had called an "altar", singing the Creed and celebrating communion facing east. Carter notes that Cosin indeed displayed an "ardent youthful and almost 'Tractarian' zeal, [in that] he was keenly anxious to revive as much of ancient ritual and ceremony as might be in any way compatible with the Protestant and reformed character of the Church…"[433]

Yates suggests that ritualism was a movement starting in the late eighteenth century, as a rural rather than an urban phenomenon, despite the popular mystic figure of the ritualistic slum priest, transcending the tristesse of labour in the age of industrialization and using ritual as his medium for mission (maybe also with a view to the influx of Irish Roman Catholics, who, however, were not very impressed): "ritualism had had an impact on Anglicanism considerably greater than its numerical strength, which was always limited, might imply."[434] In any case, there was quite a bit of Anglo-Catholic outreach into industrial areas, following successful Methodist ventures there. Traces of more High Church ecclesiastical practice can be detected from the late eighteenth century onwards, perhaps not least due to the impact of the relief struggle of Scottish Episcopalians with the question of allegiance to the monarch as the core

[432] Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 173f.
[433] Carter, "John Cosin", 66,69,71 (quote).
[434] Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 149(ff.),170; Yates, *Victorian*, 88,83ff.,378ff. (quote).

of the conflict about recognition of ministries (cf. chapter 2.7).[435] In the advertisement to the first volume of the "Tracts for the Times", Newman **claims a longer continuity of the 'Catholic' tradition within the English Church**, referring to a

"practical revival of doctrines, which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members… The Apostolic succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the 17th century…"[436]

The new movement provided new patterns of spirituality and church discipline for the new time.

"A technique of saving souls was evolved [by the new High Church party], on the Catholic model, depending less on violent outbursts of spiritual excitement than that of Evangelicals, and more on a patient and calculated discipline, under priestly supervision."[437]

In social terms, the actual and perceived **social status of clergy** was perhaps the most significant change in the nineteenth century Church. Hall had held in 1624: "Stupor mundi clerus Britannicus" ("the wonder of the world [is] the clergy of Britain"): "he meant the scholar princes of the Anglican Church." The ideal of the noble, educated gentleman priest seemed past now. Although, in reality, "applied to the generality of the parish clergy [in Hall's own age] his slogan may sound like a joke in poor taste."[438] But now, even the 'upper class' clergy, in the past only too often serving the upper class only and leaving a good part of their job to a curate, felt that their status was in decline. There had been considerable

[435] Mather, "Church", 568ff.
[436] Newman, *Tracts 1*, A2.
[437] Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 189.

differences in stipends ("[i]n 1854 the Archbishop of Canterbury was paid £19,000 a year; but a curate received only £50 a year").[439] The typical clergyman often had been the "squire's younger brother, the peer's younger son". "It was a vocation of public spirit which a young man might undertake."[440] "In some respects, of course, this [change] was not a bad thing. Its inescapable aura of gentility had been a millstone around the neck of the Victorian Church in its ministrations to the masses of working and lower-middle-class people…"[441]

Pedder, still in 1906, diagnosed a crisis visible in the enormous gap between the 'common people' and the Church, as he saw the typical clergyman to represent a different model, as well as he saw the Church now to be set in a different social context.

> "Go among the poor as much as he may, the clergyman of the Church of England is nothing more than a diver who takes his atmosphere with him. That is the only way he can breathe when he has left his own element, and his element is gentility. […] Up to comparatively recent times the Church possessed … the traditional prestige of actual authority. Her power to punish entitled her to the respect a soldier shows his officers. […] There is another reason. The Church has lost all pretence of exclusive *expertise*."[442]

Liberal religious opinion, as a response to the challenges, including the Oxford Movement, was promoted by the *Churchmen's Union* (after 1928 *Modern Churchmen Union*). But liberalism in the eyes of its critics had the bad taste of indecisiveness. The reputation of clergy was low. Gilbert suggests that Anglicanism, through "minimal religiosity" had become "a cultural expression of national identity, as an obvious if merely nominal concomitant of being

---

[438] Collinson, *Church*, 92f.
[439] Percy, *Clergy*, 71.
[440] Chadwick, *Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 212.
[441] Gilbert, *Making*, 114.
[442] Pedder, "Parson", 716,718.

English".[443] It seemed that the clergy was in danger to share the fate of the dodo.[444]

The Church of England did react, however. A **new emphasis of church membership and sacramentalism** was not only a marker of the post-Tractarian type of High-churchmanship, but partly also due to the identity crisis in the Church of England and to be found amongst all Churchmen and even Dissenters. "As the theory that linked Anglican identity to national identity became finally redundant in the period from 1800 to 1830, a new emphasis began to be placed on the significance of Anglican baptism." Here, the Anglican parish still benefitted from establishment, as the "Anglican baptism certificate functioned very much as a birth certificate".[445]

Around the same time of the rise of the Oxford Movement, the diocesan structures were re-equipped, "with a newly professional cadre of episcopal agents, the rural deans and archdeacons", acting as the eye of the bishop, the *oculus episcopi*, but also with many practical and legislative changes, like the move to strengthen the ties between dioceses and cathedral chapter. "During the crisis years of the early 1830s, moreover, critics singled out cathedrals as havens of laxity and luxury."[446]

This **strengthened the influence** (**and**, for a number of reasons, also the **number**) **of bishops** but also demanded them to be more than representative figureheads of the state church. This played into the hands of the Tractarians who were only too happy to supply their ecclesiology as justification in the "search for an alternative locus of authority after the breakdown of the Divine Right of

---

[443] Gilbert, *Society*, 207.
[444] Percy, *Clergy*, 34.
[445] Knight, *Nineteenth-century*, 25.

Kings."[447] They were only too tired of the Church being regarded "as an ecclesiastical arm of the state. Claiming to be the Church of the Apostles rather than a sub-department of the Home Office, the Tractarians spoke of 'our apostolical descent' [Tract 1]."[448]

Thus, there also was an **'episcopal revival'**, originating more from "the tradition of Orthodox High Churchmanship" than from the Oxford Movement, but certainly benefitting from the latter's success, and **reviving the pastoral side of the office**.[449] Bishop Longley acknowledged the changes in the mid-eighteenth century:

"[f]or in truth I feel, that if the Episcopate is to be regarded by our people generally, not merely as a name, but as a living reality, as a vital energizing principle; then must we, the Bishops of the Church, endeavour to identify ourselves with our clergy and our people; we must throw our hearts and minds into our dioceses, and be known among our flocks, as St. Paul was among his; we must strive to be the friends, the fathers, and the counsellors of the clergy as well as the laity…"[450]

When Wilberforce engaged publically in a diocesan mission, *The Guardian* remarked:

"[f]or the first time, I believe, for centuries, an English Bishop has been seen giving to the earnest parochial clergy of his diocese active personal assistance in rousing the lukewarm, or reclaiming the erring children of her Church and for this purpose bringing to bear on a particular point the full weight of her divine organisation. For a long period the Bishops of the English Church have been too much regarded as Episcopi or overlookers, of the clergy only; or, according to the idea of one of our leading statesmen, as merely ordaining, confirming, Church-consecrating functionaries."[451]

---

[446] Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, 41ff.,143ff.,144 (quote),260(ff.); Knight, *Nineteenth-century*, 14.
[447] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 3.
[448] Hill, "Seeking", 120.
[449] Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, 131ff.,192ff.,209,261f. Cf. Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. II, 328ff.
[450] Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, 209; Longley, *Charge*, 8 (quote).
[451] Quoted in: Ashwell, *Wilberforce*, vol. II, 31.

Likewise, the clergy and the laity alike displayed a **new religious seriousness** in the Church, "after its long Georgian decline".[452] This intention united the Evangelical and Oxford Movements to begin with, even though they differed in their adhered authorities (the latter tended towards an institutional approach with a view to Catholic tradition, the former to a more individual one with a Protestant emphasis on Scripture).[453] This brought the Church of England minister closer to the ideal which Keble described in his 'Christian Year', "the bible of the Oxford Movement … published by Keble six years before that Movement ever began", in a stanza for the nineteenth Sunday after Trinity:[454]

"[t]he Christian Pastor, bow'd to earth
With thankless toil, and vile esteem'd
Still travailing in second birth
Of souls that will not be redeem'd,
Yet steadfast set to do his part,
And fearing most his own vain heart…"[455]

The Church was thus claiming back grounds in society. "By the nineteenth century the Church had resigned the intellectual leadership of the nation without even being aware of the fact."[456]

It seems that the defining of the diocese as basic unit of the Church of England actually owes a lot to the revival of the diocese with a revival of religious and pastoral seriousness. Wilberforce, in Dean Burgon's words, served as "remodeler of the episcopate", settings new standards with his missionary approach and dedication to preaching, pastoral care, visitations, confirmation and

[452] Paz, *Anti-Catholicism*, 23ff.,103 (quote),267ff.
[453] Cf. Marshall, *Theology*, 145ff; Toon, *Theology*, 113ff; Turnbull, "Movement".
[454] Battiscombe, *Keble*, xvi.

ordination preparations.[457] This had not been typical for bishops. Wingfield-Stratford finds, by his standards, admirable words for Wilberforce.

> "The man who did the most to set new standard for the clergy was Bishop Wilberforce, or Soapy Sam, a child in intellect – as his attempts to break a lance with Huxley proved him – but like so many Victorians a giant for work. 'God', he said, 'numbers the Bishop's idle or absent hours', and he laboured tirelessly in his diocese of Winchester to inculcate a high professional standard of clerical duty. […] The new type of parson tended continuously to become more of a clerical specialist and less of a country gentleman."[458]

The new, more active leadership role of the bishops, together with the tendency towards a factual, gradual disestablishment of the Church of England in the nineteenth century **re-defined ecclesiastical authority**. In the revived **Convocations** (1854/59), non-clerics gained a platform of participation, beside Parliament, which remained in charge in principle. A significant indication for the change in authority was the inception of the 'exceptive words', the reference to **"[ordered by] lawful authority"** (N.B., not *the* lawful authority), which were introduced into the English *Declaration of Assent* (*Clergy Subscription Act* of 1865 and the revision of Canon 36 in the same year). Ever since, there have been doubts about the meaning of these words which stem from the earlier *Acts of Uniformity* since 1548. In the second half of the nineteenth century ecclesiastical authority appeared to have become a more dispersed phenomenon in the Church of England (Archbishops, Bishops, Prayer Book, Convocations, Lambeth Conferences, …). It has been argued that these words were "useless or worse than useless … [but] their vagueness is not without convenience".[459] Archbishop

---

[455] Keble, *Christian Year*, 269.
[456] Hawkins, *Nonjurors*, 182.
[457] Carpenter, *Church and People*, 258ff.
[458] Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 188f.
[459] Vaisey, "Authority", 215,218,220 (quote),221.

Davidson is reported to have doubted the exceptive words giving to "the Episcopate some larger authority than existed before".[460] If that had been the intention at the time of introduction, the phrase may just have represented another example of an Anglican institution that was kept through the times but changed significantly what it was standing for, like episcopacy. In any case, the phrase stood for "control, regularity, orderliness", as opposed to "eccentricity, unrestraint, indiscipline, idiosyncrasy".[461] It would be revisions of Canon Law in the second half of the twentieth century which defined more clearly the authorities in charge.[462]

One may need to bear in mind that despite the significant emphasis on bishops, the government of the Church of England is usually described as **"episcopally led and synodically governed"**, which is certainly true ever since the institution of the General Synod in 1970. The *Worship and Doctrine Measure* in 1974 conferred upon the General Synod wide powers for the interpretation of doctrine, although bishops still have a blocking minority in issues of theology and liturgy. It is interesting to note, however, that a report in 1997 on synodical government does not mention bishops in any headline but sublimates the power of bishops as a function on the diocesan level. It tells us that the phrase 'episcopally led and synodically governed was "one of those superficially attractive but ultimately misleading pieces of shorthand", due to the complex foundation (and limitation) of episcopal authority by the synodical ("to be held in a creative dialogue, which may perhaps be summed up by the model of the bishop-in-synod

---

[460] Ibid., 219.
[461] Ibid., 221.
[462] *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical Promulged by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*, section B; Vaisey, "Authority", 222f.

or bishop-in-council").[463] This, however, describes a reality which does not really seem to correlate to the significance attributed to bishops in an alleged historic succession which prevents an 'episcopal' church from 'full' communion with 'non-episcopal' churches. One might quite well argue that this indicates a discontinuity in the ancient understanding of (a monarchical) episcopal government. In any case, it illustrates how variable episcopal government can be even within the group of alleged 'episcopal' churches.

3.3 The Emancipation of Dissenters and the Gradual Disestablishment and the 'Denominational Diversification' of the Church of England

The already mentioned "transition from national [English] Church to denomination" in the nineteenth century "altered the Anglican character of Parliament". This became obvious when Parliament passed the repeal of the *Test and Corporation Acts* in 1828 (9 Geo.4 ch.17), **revoking many privileges of the established religion** with a view to Dissenters' rights (especially the condition of receiving Communion for holders of public offices), reflecting social change.[464] "By 1870 the Church of England could no longer claim to be the Church of the English nation".[465]

"Between 1828 and 1832 the Church of England lost its hegemonic status in England as a result of the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act (which lifted all legal restrictions on Roman Catholics except those relating to succession to the crown) in 1828, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts (which had legally disbarred Dissenters from public office) in 1829, and the Reform Act of 1832,

[463] *Synodical Government in the Church of England: A Review: The Report of the Review Group Appointed by the Standing Committee of the General Synod*, 8f.
[464] Cf. footnote 466.
[465] Knight, *Nineteenth-century*, 201, cf. 24ff.

which for the first time enfranchised a portion of the non-landowning middle classes – the level of society where Dissent was strongest. These were elemental changes to what had been encapsulated in the concept of the 'Protestant constitution', by which Anglicanism, monarchy, and an aristocratic social order provided the prevailing set of ideas that constituted the ideological framework of English political, cultural, and social life throughout the long eighteenth century. Of these forces, Clark argues, Anglicanism constituted the most significant and influential; so much so that he believes England constituted a confessional state during this period in that, while other religious bodies existed and were agreed to exist legally, they were only tolerated and never formally permitted to enter the political institutions and offices of the state."[466]

Strong appears to be wrong about the dates however, as Mark Chapman pointed out to me: the 1661 *Corporation Act* (13 Car.2 st.2 c.1) had excluded dissenters from town corporations. The 1673 *Test Act* excluded them from civil or military offices, with a succession of laws tightening the rules. These Acts were repealed in 1828 (9 Geo.4 c.17). The *Catholic Emancipation Act* was passed in 1829 (10 Geo.4 c.7).[467]

Mackintosh, when reviewing the impressive list of measures which slowly removed the social disabilities of Non-conformists, speaks of a **"gradual disestablishment of the Church of England"**. This, partly, was an achievement of a vivid, sometimes uncoordinated movement working towards equality of Dissenters and a separation of religion and state.[468] It supported, in any case, the **transformation from the national Church to a denomination**.[469] In the past, religious dissent had often simply been ignored. "The clerical habit … is to ignore the entire existence of Nonconformity; to treat it precisely as the Pope now treats the established schism…"[470] Neale said of the "good old", "brave old Church of England":

---

[466] Strong, *Anglicanism*, 213f. Cf. Clark, *Society*, chapter 6; Salter, *Dissenters.*
[467] Cf. Watts, *Tories.*
[468] Mackintosh, *Disestablishment*, xvi.
[469] Gilbert, *Society*, 140ff.,144ff.
[470] Martineau, *Miscellanies*, 415.

"Dissenters are like mushrooms,
That flourish but a day;
Twelve hundred years, through smiles and tears
She hath lasted on alway! […]

The true old Church of England!
She alone hath pow'r to teach:
'Tis presumption in Dissenters
When they pretend to preach:
They may take away her churches,
They might take Her lands away;
But she would be the true Church,
And base intruders they."[471]

On the other end of the theological spectrum, the defying of 'popery' had previously been a strong identity marker of the Church of England, "now [it] seemed full of popish holes. […] … tract warfare was translated into real religious battles in English parishes where High-Church incumbents used their remaining social patronage to discriminate against Wesleyans."[472]

Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics would widely succeed in leaving their ecclesiological mark on the denominational self-understanding of the emerging English 'Anglicanism'.

"The misfortune of nineteenth-century Anglicanism was that the narrowing of ecclesiological theory coincided with the social and political changes which destroyed the basis of Hooker's argument for an episcopal Establishment in the consent of a nation as a whole. […] In much of Britain the Church of England became a minority Church, through the spread either of indifference or of religious dissent. […] Tractarian theological arguments divided more deeply Victorian society, which was deeply divided already, reinforcing the tendency to religious conflict implicit in the social gulf between Church and Chapel."[473]

---

[471] Neale, *Songs*, 3; Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 128.
[472] Hempton, *Methodism*, 166. Cf. Selén, *Conflict*, esp. 191ff.,248ff; Wakefield, "Substitude", 189ff.
[473] Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 123f.,129.

There had been an **increase in number and influence of Non-conformists**. **Historically, Non-conformists** had objected to the establishment and emphasized the (Puritan) focus on Scripture. As a logical consequence of this, they rejected the Prayer Book and the (compromised) sacramental implications of the Ordinal.[474] The rejection of the Prayer Book standard conflicted with the objectives of the ***Act of Uniformity*** **(1662)**. From the seventeenth century onwards, the religious scene beside the Church of England had become more and more plural. Many Dissenters, having been ejected in 1662, would be united in the twentieth century in the *United Reformed Church*, embracing in 1972 the *Presbyterian Church of England* and the *Congregational Church in England and Wales*, joined in 1981 by the *Reformed Association of Churches of Christ*, and in 2000 by the *Congregational Union of Scotland*. All these Churches had been, broadly speaking, mergers of and for Non-conformists.[475]

After the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662, a Non-conformist minister could be fined £100 for the celebration of Communion. Two thousand ministers resigned in protest, which meant a considerable 'brain drain'. The *Conventicle Act* of 1663 rendered more severe punishments and in 1670, hefty prison sentences and monetary fines were given to anyone above sixteen years who took part in Non-conformist meetings. Offenders caught for a third time were ordered by juries to be banished to an American plantation, except New England or Virginia. The 1665 *Five-Mile Act* had banned dissenting ministers from any city, town corporate or borough. The Anglo-Dutch Wars brought some relief to this situation which

---

[474] Roper, *Nonconformity*, 6,8ff.,14,17,21.
[475] Church of England-United Reformed Church Joint Study Group, *Report*, 4ff; Cornick, *United Reformed Church*, 122ff; Sell, *Nonconformist*; Thompson, *Origins*.

was difficult to sustain. The *Act of Toleration* of 1689 partly resolved the tensions (with the ascension of William and Mary).

Subsequently, there was an unstable peace with Dissenters whose legal position was comparable to that of Jews. For Oxford, Moore reports the city mobs destroying meeting-houses repeatedly, and the University placed considerable sanctions upon Dissenters.[476] The *Toleration Act* granted, at least in theory, Dissenters equal rights of worship to the established Church. This was the official starting point of denominations besides the Church of England. Very slowly, they would gain the same civil rights, at least in practice in singular cases. In 1793, Dissenters were allowed to vote, but not to sit in Parliament.[477] Finally, all remaining civil privileges of the Church of England came under attack in the nineteenth century.[478] In 1844, the *Dissenters' Chapel Act* regulated the conditions under which dissenting congregations could legally own public places of worship (7&8 Vict. c.44). As late as 1874, a court had to decide whether a rector in Lincolnshire, seconded by his bishop, had the right to ban a Methodist from using the title 'Reverend' on a tombstone for his daughter (which was granted). "[T]he papers said it was rather from the Anglican than the Wesleyan that the title Rev. ought to be subtracted."[479]

The small Lutheran community in London had been in a better position. Charles II had granted them special protection by Royal Charter as early as 1669, possibly with a view to courting favour with economically important Swedish merchants amongst them.[480] However, despite occasional legal quarrels, since the eighteenth century Anglicans, Baptists, Presbyterians and Independents

[476] Moore, *Oxford*, 4ff.
[477] Harvie/Matthew, *Nineteenth-century Britain*, 19.
[478] Cf. Henriques, *Toleration*, 1-5.

(Congregationalists) had become "a legally recognised part of the social landscape… For those who lived in, or visited the American colonies, the givenness of religious diversity was even greater".[481]

High Church theologians did not necessarily see these developments in an entirely negative light. Some sympathized "with the Scottish ideal of a 'pure spiritual Episcopacy', at a time when those same ecclesiastics were heading the defence of the political privileges of the Church of England against English Non-conformists".[482] This is not without irony as the Scottish Episcopalians were effectively adjusting themselves to the Church of England, although they both tended increasingly towards an ecclesiological understanding that would rest on 'apostolic authority' rather than the *divine right* of the king, given that one saw the slow dismantling of the establishment: "on what are we to rest our authority, when the State deserts us?"[483] On the same note, they more and more tended to dismiss the monarch's right to interfere with the Church in her affairs.[484] Thus, they displayed an almost Lutheran attitude towards a separation but interdependence of Church and state, apparently ignoring that they did so, still, from the safe position of ministers in a state church.

"Scottish influences helped to purify the English high-church ideal. They disentangled the traditional emphasis on clerical authority derived through apostolical succession, which had been part of the intellectual armoury of English high churchmen since at least the end of the seventeenth century, from the trappings of state power and earthly position through which that authority had previously been expressed."[485]

---

[479] Dixon, *Handbook*, 62.
[480] Pearce, *Britain*, 24f; Pearce, *Story*, 10ff.
[481] Hindmarsh, "Oxymoron", 311f.
[482] Mather, "Church", 554.
[483] Newman, *Tracts 1*, Tract 1 (Newman), 2f.
[484] Ibid., Tract 5 (Bowden), 14.

Given our findings in chapter 1.7, we may question the attribution of the 'apostolic succession' model as general ecclesiological High Church attitude to the seventeenth century, but it certainly came into prominence in the nineteenth century.[486] The result of this theological profiling was a 'denominational diversification' of the Church of England and a further drifting apart of what could now be described, thus, as **'parties'**. In the 1850s, William Conybeare described the Church of England as being divided into three 'parties': High, Low and Broad.[487] If he did not even invent the term 'Broad Church', disliked by Maurice, as a collective term for 'liberal' groups within Anglicanism, he certainly made it popular.[488] Besides that, his method proved to be innovative. "It might not be too much of an exaggeration to describe Conybeare's article, with its combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses, as a novel and significant first attempt at a 'sociology' of church party."[489] Conybeare's quantifications may be unreliable but he counted a slightly higher number of High Church clergy in the Church of England than Low Church clergy, as opposed to about half of their respective number in Broad Church clergy. Of the twenty-eight bishops and archbishops he judged thirteen to be High-, ten Broad-Church and five to be Evangelical. He further distinguished different sub-types:[490]

High Church

- Normal type ('Anglican')
- Exaggerated type ('Tractarian')
- Stagnant type ('High and Dry')

---

[485] Mather, "Church", 570.
[486] Cf. footnote 341 and chapter 1.5.
[487] Conybeare, "Church Parties"; cf. Minton, *Reply*.
[488] Sanders, *Movement*, 7ff.
[489] Burns, "Conybeare's 'Church Parties'", 220. Cf. Nockles, *Context*, 43.
[490] Burns, "Conybeare's 'Church Parties'", 357.

Low Church

- Normal type ('Evangelical')
- Exaggerated type ('Recordite')
- Stagnant type ('Low and Slow')

Broad Church

- Normal type (subdivided into 'theoretical' and 'anti-theoretical')
- Exaggerated type (concealed infidels)
- Stagnant type

A tragic side-effect of the rising party spirit, partly a reaction to secularism, was that the Church lost even more credibility in the 'secular' constituency of society, as Owen Chadwick points out (although probably wrongly suggesting that clerics were generally wearing distinct 'collars' already).

"During the 1840s Oxford became obsessed by ecclesiastical and theological intrigue until everyone was sick and tired of it all, and turned away from clergy collars with revulsion. Both Tractarian and Evangelical became popularly identified with backward-looking forces in the Church and society when people were speaking confidently of progress and enlightenment."[491]

3.4 The Catholicization of Liturgy and Theology

From what has been said so far it has become clear that major changes happened in the Church of England in the nineteenth century, reflecting changes in its social and political framework, resulting in an overall '**Catholicization'**. This explains the new emphasis on 'succession' in High Church circles by the end of the nineteenth century, amongst other things.

This was not, however, a unanimous and unopposed development. The Tractarians' attempt to re-shape the Church of England based on their patristic

reconstructions was a controversial issue, and has remained so ever since.[492] Their relative success within a short period is illustrated by the fact that moderate parishes would get high altars, for example, even if not used. Johnson identifies Tractarian influence also on the **architecture, worship and the theology** of dissenting churches. Notably, ten Wesleyan 'Tracts for the Times' were published in the early year of 1842. "The great contribution of the Oxford Movement to English religion had been a revival of church-consciousness, which in particular challenged the exaggerated individualism of Nonconformity."[493] The liturgical impact in terms of the diversification of worship styles was enormous, despite being also ambiguous for the Church.[494]

Maybe it was actually the visibility of the divisive issues (especially ritualism) that both amplified the success (in architecture, for example) as well as the controversial potential of the Oxford Movement, and subsequently of Anglo-Catholicism. In 1898, a critic would hold: "… I will not call [them] the [Oxford] High Church School, but the School of the Counter-Reformation…"[495]

The party divides were far from being superficial. Despite partisanship over ritualism in principle, or fear of 'un-English' 'popery', there was an **underlying real theological conflict between Anglo-Catholics and 'Protestants'**, which had been existent in the Church of England before but became more apparent with the widening (and radicalization) of the theological spectrum in the nineteenth century: the "mechanical versus spiritual religion", also

---

[491] Chadwick, "150 Years On", 80 (quote); Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 448,440; Percy, *Clergy*, 89ff.
[492] Edge, *Appeal*.
[493] Johnson, "English Nonconformity", 93.
[494] Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 4ff.
[495] Wace, *Undergraduates*, 5.

touching the issue of scripture versus tradition.[496] The polemics of the time give, sometimes amusing, witness to this: "'We know what Ritualism means', cried a certain Reverend George Chute; 'it means the defilement of your daughters, the seduction of your wives, and all the other evils that abound on the Continent.'"[497]

The underlying issues touched the classical topics of Catholic-Protestant controversial theology, such as the principle of the authority of antiquity in relation to Scripture, apart from different views on the historicity of particular rituals or doctrines. To the opponents of ritualism, the ceremonial innovations seemed to belong to another world. Their proposition was:

> "[t]hat the Mass, with its Processions, Images, Vestments, Lights, and Adoration, is Unscriptural, subversive of the Reformation, and inconsistent with the Teaching and Laws of the Church of England. […] The Mass was first abolished in 1549; It was restored in 1553; abolished again in 1559; but restored again in 1865. We hope it … will soon be removed by authority."[498]

The official line of the Church of England was to try to accommodate the increasing party spirit. Maurice would supply a model of a 'complementary' ecclesiology which would later result in *plene esse* theologians declaring Anglicanism a providential middle way between Catholicism and Protestantism.[499]

The historic reality of the nineteenth century was less lyrical. 'Parallel worlds' established themselves in worship and theological belief, not without conflicts. "Like Catholicism itself, the Tractarians and their successors were held to have embraced ideals and practices essentially un-English and unmanly."[500]

---

[496] Wellings, *Evangelicals*, 37ff.
[497] Quoted from the satiristic magazine *Punch*: Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 178.
[498] Hunt/Blakeney, *Ritualism*, 32,56.
[499] Thönissen, "Arbeitskreis", 90.
[500] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 108.

The old High-churchmen and Evangelicals alike felt left behind with their adherence to the English Reformation and their anti-Catholic resentments against 'popish corruption' and 'medieval superstition'. In 1867, Cumming delivered lectures at a London Presbyterian church entitled "Ritualism, The Highway to Rome", in which he mourned the virtual abandoning of the Protestant principles in the Church of England which came with the popularity of ritualistic worship as expression of private devotion. His lectures partly reflect the classical patriotic and political resentments against (Roman) Catholicism, alarmed by the apparent success of ritualism. "But hundreds, I fear thousands, trained by these Ritualist priests, some of whom must be Jesuits in disguise, are going over to the Roman Catholic Church."[501]

> "It seems forgotten in these days that Romanism is not merely an erroneous system, but the greatest apostasy foredoomed of God; that not only does it mislead and corrupt, but that on all who court, and caress, and patronize it, sore judgements are denounced from heaven. […] A prodigious effort is being made, I believe, from thorough information, to undo the glorious Reformation in England. Archbishop Manning says he stands by, quietly, and reaps, whilst the Ritualist clergy are sowing so fast that the harvest is becoming heavier than he can well carry home. […] I have … no hostile feeling to Roman Catholics, many of whom I know, and some of whose priests I believe, to be sincere and earnest, but misguided men. … I dread and deprecate the very possibility of this great land coming again under the influence of that deadly superstition."[502]

The Protestant Churchman, And Record of Church Missions to Roman Catholics in Great Britain in 1867 warned of the establishing of the ritualists in the hierarchy.[503]

---

[501] Cumming, *Ritualism*, lecture XI, 32.
[502] Ibid., lecture X, 32 and lecture XII, 32.
[503] "The Work of the Protestant Reformation Society, and the Anti-ritualistic Movement".

"The *Weekly Register* of March 9, 1867, contains the following passage, in reference to the Ritualistic movement: – 'It is still going on, its vigour not decreased in the least, and it, no doubt, will progress UNTIL THE DAY WHEN HIGH MASS WILL ONCE MORE BE SUNG IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.'"[504]

Today's reader, approving or disapproving of it, will hardly be too troubled about sung high mass at Westminster Abbey. The **sung Eucharist** was revived in the 1840s, possibly starting in London.[505] **Sacramental worship** was very much the centre of ritualist thinking, although it would take another century to establish the Eucharist as main Sunday morning worship. Matins as the principal Sunday service in the Church of England is still within living memory in many parishes today. Ever since the sixteenth century, the Church of England had not been liturgically poor, but the Eucharist had typically only been celebrated infrequently.[506] Leftover bread was supposed to feed the priest which implied a Protestant understanding of the 'real presence'; no provisions for reserving 'consecrated' wafers had been made by Cranmer in the Prayer Book.

In 1944, Ernest Southcott (vicar in Halton) supplied the Church of England with a missiological approach to a 'higher sacramentalism', with the parish communion (or even house communions) as a focus, designed as an attempt to connect to people in the new housing estates. Alan Ecclestone's revival of communion in Sheffield very successfully set an example of the Church's (re-) connecting with people in estates and industrial areas. What Southcott describes may sound today like a very peculiar 'fresh expression', combining Evangelical missionary zeal with catholic ceremonial and sacramentalism, not without some triumphalist paternalism.

---

[504] "Romish Objects: Missions of the Protestant Reformation Society", 148.
[505] Mayhew, *All Saints*, 8.

"It was obviously the intention that Sunday worship should be, so to speak, a three-course meal – first course, Matins; second course, Communion; third course, Evensong. In the Church of England to-day some people have made the first course the main part of the meal, some the third course… […] Very slowly and hesitatingly and with very real misgivings we began to have meetings in houses in the morning when we brought the Reserved Sacrament and asked some of the lapsed baptized to come and see people actually receiving Communion and hearing the Scripture and a sermon in that sort of homely friendly surrounding. Gradually it became clear that it was a celebration that was needed…"[507]

Movements like the just mentioned marked the transition to the Sunday Eucharist as the default Sunday worship in the Church of England after the Second World War, often in conjunction with a more venerable and ritualistic celebration. Maybe this was one of the last big successes of the 'Catholic' movement(s) before the decline. Critics objected that it did not always come with a developing of the sense of community. In Evangelical parishes, the Eucharist became more popular after the commitment to a weekly Eucharist service at the National Evangelical Congress at Keele in 1967.[508]

These are developments still in living memory of today's congregations. Not everyone today finds it helpful for today's mission, limiting the "consumer-choice variety" on a Sunday morning, but the impact at the time was remarkable.[509] "The eyes of the Church are on Halton."[510]

"[I]n the Middle Ages and indeed until the end of the 19th Century it was rare for the laity to communicate except infrequently in the Catholic Church, and until the results of the Oxford Movement filtered through the Church of England, the

---

[506] Cf. Yates, *Buildings*, 55ff.,128ff.
[507] Ecclestone, "Experiment", 400; Robinson, "Church", 287f; Southcott, "Church"; Southcott, *Parish*, 27 (quote),59 (quote),75; Cf. Welsby, *History*, 34f.
[508] De-la-Noy, *Portrait*, 159.
[509] "'Consumer Choice'".
[510] Davies, "Reflections", 414; James, "Halton", 61.

eucharist was not frequently celebrated, while there are many instances of non-episcopal churches insisting on frequent celebrations."[511]

The Eucharist had not only been celebrated infrequently, but members of the congregation would often not stay for the Eucharist after Matins, a custom which had "prevailed for a long time", a nineteenth-century pamphlet mourns.[512]

Thus, the 'Catholic' mark which Anglo-Catholicism left on the Church of England is remarkable. Ritualism, at first, had meant wearing a stole and the adoption of the 'eastward position', but it advanced quickly to auricular confession etc.

"Later, the more adventurous sought greater stimulation in the use of incense, bells, vestments and so on. […] During the 1850's and 1860's ritualism, with its accompanying ideal of sacerdotalism, acquired a foothold in a number of parishes. It was scarcely popular, especially since it was very largely a clerical movement. To most Englishmen it was profoundly shocking."[513]

The latter feelings expressed themselves in Victorian satires:

"Let us now make a grand proposition
To unite in a firm opposition
To do all we can
To get rid of a man
Who favours the Eastward position… […]
Though we die in the field.
We will never yield,
To this Ritualistic position."[514]

Church Association Tract 213 charged incense to be "illegal", "unscriptural" and even "unprimitive", arguing with scriptural and patristic evidence.[515] Such

[511] Yule, *Critique*, 6.
[512] Pye, *Reasons*, 5.
[513] Norman, *Anti-Catholicism*, 106.
[514] Quoted from the satirical magazine Punch in: Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 178.
[515] *Incense*.

arguments would not stop ritualists anymore but the practice had been firmly established. The changes towards more ritual were enormous, and more and more clergy began to wear service vestments from the 1840s onwards.[516] Owen Chadwick tells us about "old fashioned country congregations" who would not join the responses, let alone psalms.[517] These would soon seem like stories from a lost world.

The sustaining and wide-spread success in establishing, for example, a strong sacramental tradition in the Church of England or the ecclesiological notion of a succession (cf. chapter 4) illustrates that the Oxford Movement was successful in establishing **"a more 'catholic' flavour … [amongst] even those members of the clergy and of the laity who were not actually members of the Anglo-Catholic wing."**

"To put it in a nutshell, while the majority of German Protestantism moved through Enlightenment and Postmodernism in the second half of the 20th century to a position rather left of Luther, the CofE arrived at the same time in a position rather to the right of Cranmer."[518]

The changes implemented by Anglo-Catholicism and ritualism changed the Church of England beyond recognition for an eighteenth-century Churchman. **"The Oxford Movement changed the external face, and the internal spirit, of English religious life. But these changes were primarily religious, and only afterwards theological."**[519]

---

[516] Mayo, *Dress*, 102ff. Cf. *Illegal Ritual in the Church of England: Being a List of Unlawful Practice with Extracts from the Judgments Relating to Them, and an Index*.
[517] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 517.
[518] Kremkau, "Meissen", 45f.,50. Cf. footnotes 422ff.
[519] Chadwick, *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 58.

"The criteria for identification had changed. In 1850 only ritualist churches would have had lighted candles on the altar, and practices such as the eastward position or the mixed chalice, or even the introduction of a surpliced choir, would have been a clear indicator that the services were being conducted by High-Churchmen. In 1900 all of these practices were widespread in Anglican churches, though only surpliced choirs would have been found in Evangelical ones. Ritualist churches would have been distinguished by their use of vestments, and possibly also incense, and their reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. By 1950 many who would not have described themselves as Anglo-Catholics would have tolerated, and even encouraged, the wearing of vestments or the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, but they would still not have used incense. Anglo-Catholic churches could now be detected by their use of Roman Catholic devotions and their observance of Roman Catholic festivals."[520]

The surprising and rapid success of ritualists and Tractarians was acknowledged by contemporaries. Arnold speaks in 1841 of a "large proportion of clergy" who had adopted their ideas ("Mr. Newman's system is now at the flood; it is daily making converts").[521] An observer in 1838 could hold:

"[n]o one who takes a rapid glance at the state and prospects of the Church of England, some sixty or eighty years back, and compares them with its present condition, can avoid seeing that a vast, and deep, and all important change has taken place, in the course of that period. […] Multitudes, heretofore alienated, offer to confess their belief, that Episcopacy is, on the whole, both scriptural and desirable. But they are told that this is nothing, except they also admit, that presbyterian ordination is invalid, and that the church of Scotland has not the sacraments! […] Half a century back, men would have thought it utterly impossible that in a few short years a system could grow up within the Church of England, so closely approximating to Romanism. Yet this is actually occurring before our eyes; and a brief three or four years has sufficed to develope [sic] a perfect system of modified Popery; not professed by two or three isolated individuals merely, but extensively maintained and taught throughout the empire. We have termed it 'modified Popery'; and it is nothing short of this. […] Tradition is made an essential part of the rule of faith: … [… There is] the constant preference shewn for the Romish apostasy over the reformed churches of Germany, Scotland, &c. We have already seen, that Rome is constantly addressed as our 'mother', 'sister', and the like, and our 'our present separation from it', declared to be '*a grievous calamity*'; while the church of Scotland is likened to Samaria, and even to Israel in a state of utter apostasy."[522]

---

[520] Yates, *Victorian*, 383.
[521] Arnold, *Christian Life*, xv,lvi.

There was also a change in the tendency to understand the **'catholicity' of Anglicanism** not as being part of the 'universal' church, but more specifically as a branch of a group of 'episcopal', 'catholic' churches in a more denominational sense, with the Roman Catholic Church serving as a benchmark.[523] This had hardly been the view of the classical High-churchmen. Neale, generally in favour of "Catholic progress in the English Church", who founded the Society of St Margaret's, East Grinsted, said in a sermon, after one of the 'probationers' had converted to Roman Catholicism: "[w]e may be sure of this: if England ever becomes a Catholic country, it will be by the Church of England, not by that of Rome." He harshly criticized those whom he saw as "the clique which she [the Roman Church] allows to monopolize all her missionary energy in England".[524] In a poem, he had put in a memorable phrase the classical High-church view prior to the Oxford Movement: "And England's Church is Catholic, though England's self be not!" His daughter explained:

> "[i]n his letters the word 'catholic' is used for all that is beautiful and venerable; 'protestant', for all that is mean and unworthy. Thus he stigmatizes, somewhat quaintly, the undignified behaviour of some Portuguese nuns as 'protestant', whilst a beautiful oak wood is described as 'catholic'. Yet this dislike of Protestantism was compatible with a very friendly intercourse with Nonconformists. […] … 'No Popery' [was] a very frequent cry [in his parish]."[525]

From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the Oxford Movement aligned more with the ritualistic movement: "none of the early Tractarians were 'ritualists'". Newman is reported to have celebrated the Eucharist from the North end of the altar, and Pusey, as Canon of Christ Church, did not wear eucharistic vestments,

---

[522] Seeley, *Essays*, 271,279,282,287,311, cf. 284f.
[523] Cf. Ramsey, *Gospel*, 83,217ff.
[524] Neale, "Secession", 177,179,185. Cf. Lockhart, *Secession*.

which his successors there do today.[526] The Tractarians had mixed feelings about the support from ritualists.

"There was a realisation among the Tractarians that some had been attracted to their movement for the wrong reasons; for these people stood more for the holiness of beauty than for the beauty of holiness. […] … Tractarians were characterised by their moderation and caution. … Ritualists in the 1860's shifted this emphasis from caution and moderation, to rashness and fanaticism."[527]

The liturgical changes were followed by **shifts in theological emphasis**. Our findings so far suggest that there was a paradigm shift in 'Anglican' theology in the nineteenth century with a view to its relation to 'non-episcopal' churches. Some may see this as providential, others as accidental. Anglo-Catholics promoted the Tractarians' 'Catholic' understanding of 'apostolic succession', interpreting *theologically* the 1662 norm of episcopal ordination, and denied the significant ecclesiological shifts that there had been previously, claiming a long-standing continuity of their own position instead, as it is reflected in ecclesiological statements today (cf. chapter 1.5). One needs to bear in mind, however, that "the Church of England does have a developed sense of what constitutes lawful ordination but the laws on who may be ordained and the prescribed liturgies have been subject to change."[528]

Our findings suggest that there actually has been less of a consistent continuity in the 'Anglican' understanding of episcopacy and ordination, in the sense of an essentially unbroken tradition going back, allegedly, to the Apostles, than Anglo-Catholics would typically want to admit. This means for the

---

[525] Neale/Lawson, *Letters*, vif.,130.
[526] Chorley, *Men and Movements*, 359(ff.). Cf. Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 16ff.
[527] Herring, *Tractarianism*, 92,iv.
[528] Adam, "Reception", 20.

'catholicity' of Anglo-Catholicism: "[y]et a new accent appeared, Catholicity was not only something to preserve; it was also something to accomplish. On the question of 'how to accomplish it', Newman left the Church of England, ending his quest in Rome."[529]

Thus, it is important to see that the **Tractarians were** not simply the humble servants of a tradition which they wanted to re-establish but they certainly were **active creators of an alleged 'Catholic' tradition of an 'Anglican' type** which, in fact, had not really existed before them. Thus, Gilley calls the Oxford Movement leaders "more than conservatives; in ecclesiastical terms, they were right-wing radicals who transformed the very tradition that they set out to renew."[530]

"[I]t has become part of the Anglican mythology that the Oxford Movement had restored to the church a proper understanding of its role as part of the wider Catholic church as a *via media* between pre-Tridentine Roman Catholicism and the non-episcopal Protestant churches of Europe."[531]

The Oxford Movement successfully re-wrote history, with their Romantic, medievalizing interpretation of patristic literature representing a better state of Christianity and their fiction of an unfragmented 'Catholic' Church in the beginnings. Thus, the 'catholicization' of the Church of England was extended to its memory. The Evangelical Torrance once complained:

"[t]oo often it [the Tractarian Movement] represented a naive and uncritical repristination of medieval Catholicism under an essentially romantic impulse, though against this must be set an increasingly serious revival of biblical and patristic studies. But here in this movement a fateful step was taken in isolating

[529] Tavard, *Catholicity*, 202.
[530] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 62.
[531] Yates, *Victorian*, 45.

from its embodiment in the corporate mission of the Church the episcopate as the one principle which *per se* constitutes the Church and secures its continuity from age to age…"[532]

The appeal to the fathers itself had been subject to change. Quantin concluded that Jewel, for example, made no reference to the 'undivided church', or Hooker did not attribute special authority to antiquity as such. This perhaps explains why the Caroline divines tended to ignore him.

"There was no continuous line of deference to the Fathers in the Church of England. Between the Reformation and the last years of the Restoration, from Jewel to Dodwell, the appeal to the Fathers in the Church of England changed its significance. […] Only after the Restoration did the reference to antiquity become essential to the new synthesis which, by that time, can fairly be called Anglicanism. […] Patristic studies were regarded as a bulwark against enthusiasm…"[533]

In order to claim 'catholic continuity', Tractarians and Anglo-Catholic routinely downplayed the impact of the **English Reformation**. In a recent publication of the (Anglican) Society of Mary, the Reformation is styled "[t]he persecution of the Church in England under King Henry VIII".[534] Froude's *Remains* (edited by Newman, Keble and Mozley) gave unfiltered expression of the Tractarians' dislike of the Reformation which shocked their critics diagnosing "treason within the Church" and a "revival of popery". To the editors, Froude's papers seemed "so valuable, that they feel as if they had no right to withhold such aid from the cause to which he was pledged…" Others found it easier to spot the insults:

"Mr. Froude … frankly avowed his detestation of *Protestantism* itself. His words are: 'Really I hate *the Reformation* and the Reformers more and more' (p. 389).

[532] Torrance, "Mission", 196.
[533] Quantin, *Identity*, 397f.
[534] Ladds, "Mary", 6.

'That *odius Protestantism* sticks in people's gizzards' (p. 322). 'I have been reading a good deal about *the Reformation* […], it is shocking indeed' (p. 325). 'As to *the Reformers*, I think worse and worse of them' (p. 379). 'I am more and more indignant at *the Protestant doctrine on* [of] *the eucharist* [Eucharist]' (p. 391). 'The meagreness of *Protestantism*' (p. 425). 'I wonder […] H. does not get to hate *the Reformers* faster' (p. 434)."[535]

It may not be too far-fetched to suspect that the *Remains* were used by their editors as a vehicle for the publication of polemics in a clarity in which they would have been reluctant to speak. Gilley describes the publication as hurried by Newman's "inner demon": "an event which was to be a disaster for their party, but was a long and deeply meditated one."[536]

Overall, the Oxford Movement has been relatively successful in **'undoing' the Reformation**. When the German Protestant Blum visited England in the late 1950s, he was astonished to come across the fruits of the Oxford Movement and its 'Catholic' ritual, in the framework of a 'comprehensive' church, although only vaguely, institutionally, connected within.[537] As opposed to that, an Italian visitor just after the Restoration had characterized the Church of England as "Parliamentarian Sect of Calvinised Protestants, being intrinsically for the most part Calvinistic, though externally it is almost entirely Lutheran" and its hierarchy as "a mixture of Calvinism and Lutheranism".[538] Henson adds to this example:

"[i]n a popular manual for the instruction of children, of which the 15th edition was published in London in 1828 …, I find the statement that 'the religion established by the laws of England is the Lutheran, or the Episcopal Protestant'. Before the rise of the Tractarians this would have seemed a very proper description."[539]

---

[535] "Treason within the Church III", 367. Cf. "Treason within the Church [I]", 192f. The original has no italiques: Froude/Newman/Keble, *Remains*, vol, I,1, viii (quote).
[536] Gilley, *Newman*, 169.
[537] Blum, *Begegnung*, 23ff.,36ff.,70ff.
[538] Magalotti/Mawman, *Travels*, 414,412. Henson, *Relation*, 86f.

When in 1818 the German theologian Sack characterized the Church of England, he still held it to be essentially 'Protestant' (as indeed many of his English contemporaries did). For Sack, who met up with Pusey, England was 'built on Protestantism' and essentially was a 'Protestant Land'.[540] This was indeed the view of many High-churchmen at the time. Other High-churchmen would not hesitate to describe the Church of England as 'catholic', but understood in accordance with the principles of the 'primitive Church', as it had been purified, by Protestantism, of the 'errors' of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus, "the Reformed Anglican Church" was held to be "essentially Catholic" as well as "essentially Protestant".[541] The objective of such a claim was not least a claim against Rome. "In short, where England dissents from Rome, Rome parts from antiquity", as Ottley (Pusey House, Oxford) re-phrased a thought by Andrewes, in his reply to Cardinal Bellarmine (§53).[542] This was, still, far away from the rather uncritical attitude towards **Roman Catholicism** of the Oxford Movement in the mid-nineteenth century, when Newman seceded. Ramsey, an Anglo-Catholic who, especially in his later years (as Archbishop) was keen on a good balance of 'Protestantism' and 'Catholicism' in Anglicanism, could write about the Tractarians: "their intense sacramental mysticism might easily have grown unevangelical and immanentist".[543]

The outlook of the Church of England certainly swung to the 'Catholic' side in the second half of the nineteenth century, not least due to the visible changes in (neo-Gothic) architecture and the attitudes of leading 'Catholic'

---

[539] Henson, *Relation*, 87.
[540] Sack, *Ansichten*, 15,19. Liddon, *Pusey*, vol. I, 107.
[541] Stephens, *Hook*, vol. I, 66.
[542] Ottley, *Andrewes*, 163. Andrewes, *Responsio*, 70. "Et in quo nos a vobis, vos a Patribus dissentitis."
[543] Ramsey, *Gospel*, 216.

minded clergy, namely bishops, with Evangelicals significantly declining in their influence. Anglo-Catholicism "blur[red] the differences between Anglican and Roman positions", in the sense that 'Roman' positions could now well be held legitimately within the new 'Anglican spectrum'.[544] Major wrote in 1932:

"[t]o-day Martin Luther, the greatest protagonist of the Reformation, is viewed as a vulgar, violent and mistaken man as hostile to humanist culture as he was to social democracy. And the Reformation he achieved is regarded as the parent of a malign progeny which shattered the religious unity of Western Europe and gave rise to a multitude of

'Petulant, capricious sects,
The maggots of corrupted texts.'"[545]

The emerging of Anglican **religious orders,** reviving a pre-Reformation tradition although, in practice, often copying contemporary Roman Catholic forms, was another visible illustration of the success of the Romantic and 'Catholic' tendencies of the time, but also an expression of the earnest piety of those people, lay and ordained, joining a counter-cultural movement in the rather socially prescriptive Victorian society. It cannot be doubted that the Oxford Movement, despite sometimes perhaps being naïve in its historic reconstructions, satisfied a desire for a pious and contemplative life, expressed in the formation of religious 'Anglican' communities. As a side-effect, it definitely undid one aspect of the Henrician Reformation which had met some popular approval at the time but possibly had been largely motivated by practical considerations.

"To wreak easy vengeance upon an unpopular aspect of the old Roman order, but also to fill his coffers for the defence of his beleaguered realm and to reward those

[544] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 3.
[545] Major, "Reformation", 225.

whom Crossley … called *the jackals who dogged the heels of a spendthrift monarch*, Henry closed all the religious houses of England."[546]

The first convents formed themselves as early as the 1830s and 1840s, inspired by Keble, more "a parish parson rather than … University don".[547] This was, at first, regarded with suspicion by the bishops who suspected, not entirely unjustified from their perspective, the rising of "virtually non-conformist bodies".[548] The *Church Association Tract* 317 of 1903 warned of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, founded by Gore, being

"nothing less than a training school for young Romanizers, to be thrust by-and-by on the Church of England. This is another sample of the way in which the Bishops [of Worcester and Wakefield] say they are putting down Ritualism. All they ask for is time, to enable them to train Romanizers."[549]

The rise of the women's religious movements similarly shook the Church of England, not least because it questioned traditional gender definitions and social prescriptions. The deaconesses' movement possibly marked the beginning of a confident women's ministry in the English Church, "finding a way of ordaining women, without ordaining them".[550]

---

[546] Crossley, *Abbey*, 104; Keulemans, *Episcopate*, 43 (quote).
[547] Mayhew, *All Saints*, 2 (quote), cf. 11ff; Ward, "Inheritance"; Williams, *Sellon*.
[548] Allchin, *Rebellion*, 36ff.,45.
[549] *How the Bishops of Worcester and Wakefield Supply Romish Recruits For the Church of England*, 2. Cf. *The Growth of Monkery in the Church of England*; *Playing at Monks: A Day at Painsthorpe 'Priory'*.
[550] Blackmore, *Beginning*, l.

3.5 The Anglo-Prussian Bishopric at Jerusalem as a Marker Between Pre- and Post-Tractarian High-churchmanship

It was hardly a surprise that members of the Oxford Movement strongly opposed ecumenical endeavours with 'non-episcopal' churches in Britain and elsewhere. In 1870, with the backing of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Westminster celebrated a Eucharist for 'Anglicans' and 'non-episcopalians' at the Abbey, marking the beginning of the revision of the Authorized Bible. This caused what Anglo-Catholics called the "**Westminster Scandal**".[551] They organised a note of protest to Archbishop Tait, signed by 1,529 clergymen.[552] This was symptomatic for the new sensitivities of the time, as intercommunion had commonly not been regarded as a problem, not even among the pre-Tractarian High-churchmen who usually were not opposed to Dissenters on dogmatic grounds. The new type of High-churchmen saw things differently. The word of the opposing views of 'Churchmen' versus 'Gospelmen' made the round. "The Tractarian appeared narrowly academic and ecclesiastical, compared with the old High Churchmen."[553]

This development had already become detectable three decades earlier, at the controversy about the joint bishopric in **Jerusalem** of the Church of England and the United Church of Prussia, embracing Lutherans and Reformed.[554] This project had become somewhat a shibboleth between pre- and post-Tractarian High-churchmanship. Prussia sought to establish an ecclesiastical structure for the (compared to the British) relatively small number of Prussian Protestants at Jerusalem, intending to strengthen this presence with the help of England.

---

[551] Cf. Webster, "Order", 84f.
[552] Davidson/Benham, *Tait*, vol. II, 68(ff.).
[553] Cf. Thompson, *Episcopate*, 266ff,; Webster, "Order", 87,92 (quote).

There were four, or five, 'Western' powers which sought to establish a stronger and sustainable influence in the region. The scheme was approved by the 'Quadruple Alliance' of Austria, Russia, Britain and Prussia; France backed the proposal with some reservations. They, thus, created an official Protestant presence in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, previously lacking, represented by the two powerful states of 'Protestant Europe', as Güder/Meyer note. The Prussians may have seen it as a "spiritual penetration of the Levant by Prussian evangelicalism" but all parties involved had manifold interests in connection with the episcopate. Authorities in both England and Prussia saw the scheme as a Protestant joint venture crowning the common political and commercial interests. The initiative, it appears, had come from England. The Prussian king, Frederick William III, who had worked hard to unify Protestantism in his reign, displayed a certain eagerness, as did his son, possibly even hoping for the bishopric to become the "starting point of a great protestant world-church", based on the English and the Prussian Churches.[555]

In Prussia, Newman held, there appeared some willingness to adopt with an episcopal ordering, a 'succession' from England (cf. Frederick William IV's ideal of an 'apostolic constitution').[556] If so, however, it was without attaching a theological or ecclesiological significance to it (as being necessary), but "only as a dignified heirloom from our Christian forefathers."[557] This was controversial in Prussia, however, and the Jerusalem bishopric was an experiment with limitations. The consecrations of the bishop, ordinations and (episcopal) confirmations were

---

[554] Clark, "Prussian Church Union"; Deuschle, "Erweckung und Politik"; Hechler, *Jerusalem*, [28]ff,; McCaul, *Jerusalem*.
[555] Greaves, "Jerusalem Bishopric", 328ff.,330ff.,335ff.,338 (long quote),341,347f. (short quote),350ff; Güder/Meyer, "Jerusalem", 693f.
[556] Ranke, *Briefwechsel*, 53ff.,56f.

to be performed according to the English rite, but ministers thereby ordained would not have the right to officiate in the English/Irish Church (cf. chapter 2.8). Incoming Prussian ministers would needed to have been (re-)ordained, although Güder/Meyer mention a case in which the bishop did not (re-)ordain a Prussian chaplain in the early 1850s.[558] The **"particulars [of] the organization of the see was practically that of an Anglican bishopric"**. In some respect, the terms of the bishopric reflect the tendency of 'Anglicanization' which became apparent in the Indian missions (cf. chapter 2.3), about the time when the bishopric was inaugurated. Although Prussia and England were alternately to appoint the bishop who was primarily under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the latter had the right to veto a German candidate and was to approve the liturgy used by the Prussian congregations. Such terms meant "far reaching concessions" by the German side.[559]

The vigorous **opposition of the new type of High-churchmen** illustrated that change was in the air with a view to a theological understanding what it meant to be 'episcopal'. It embraced an exclusive claim which marginalized 'non-episcopal' churches, even if they 'outwardly' conformed to 'episcopalism'. Being 'episcopal' was understood by the post-Tractarian High-churchmen to be more than an outward form of government but a creedal feature of the church. The prospect of a Prussian, Protestant bishop, even if 'episcopal', overseeing what they still regarded as a 'mixed' diocese at Jerusalem, outraged them. Newman wrote to Keble in October 1841: "[i]t really does seem to me as if the Bishops

---

[557] Greaves, "Jerusalem Bishopric", 331 (quote),341. Cf. Newman, *Apologia*, 236ff; Newman/Mozley, *Letters*.
[558] Güder/Meyer, "Jerusalem", 694f. Cf. Lückhoff, *Jerusalem*, 96f; Newman/Mozley, *Letters*, vol. I, 377.
[559] Meyer, "Jerusalem".

were doing their best to uncatholise us…"[560] The fact that the bishopric had been agreed, however, illustrates that this was not the default view of the time.

"It is clear … that an 'episcopal Church' was a much more elastic term then than many to-day would admit it to be. […] … in the negotiations … [not] a single voice was raised to deny the validity of the authority of the bishops appointed in the Prussian Church in the eighteenth century…"[561]

The young Keble, for example, had been quite positive towards Lutheranism but this seemed forgotten when in 1841 the Prussian-Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem was established. The Oxford Movement was not able to prevent it but quite successfully managed to discredit it.[562]

"[It] marked an outpouring of unqualified Tractarian hostility towards the continental reformed churches hitherto unparalleled in the history of the Church of England. […] Ultimately, the real focus of hostility was Protestantism. […] Traditional High Church defenders of the Jerusalem bishopric regarded it as a unique opportunity to assert the Church of England's claim and vocation to be a standard or model of catholicity, in the best tradition of Laudianism rather than mere 'pan-protestantism'."[563]

The Jerusalem scheme had been prefigured by an initiative in the first half of the eighteenth century of **Jablonski**, a Moravian bishop and Prussian court-preacher. It was an early attempt of Prussia to unite the divided Protestant traditions of the realm (Lutheran and Reformed), under the auspices of the monarch who would remain *summus episcopus*, but with two bishops as "chief court chaplains" ("Oberhofprediger") as his deputies.

---

[560] Newman/Mozley, *Letters*, vol. II, 352.
[561] Wilson, *Inquiry*, 236 (quote),238.
[562] Hope-Scott, *Bishopric*, 3.
[563] Nockles, *Context*, 158,159f.,163.

The new ordering would have allowed the king to exercise more control through the episcopal hierarchy; a *leitmotif* of Prussian ecclesiastical politics. The terms of the unity scheme, envisaged to be a joint venture with the Church of England and possibly Swiss Reformed churches, were never fully developed between Berlin and London, but it seems that Jablonski would have implemented, with the help of English prelates, an episcopal government in Prussia with a united liturgy modelled after the Book of Common Prayer. This could have been seen, from a sympathetic post-Tractarian High Church perspective, a "conversion of a titular into a real episcopate".[564] Such a language, however, does not seem to have been employed by the protagonists. The Prussian minister and diplomat, Bonet, understood the scheme to achieve "conformity … in the Church government", "the government of the Church by bishops".[565]

It seems, that, despite the different views of episcopacy on both sides of the Channel (Jablonski admitted that the English insistence on the institution of episcopacy could be perceived as 'Romish'), there was no major theological controversy between the partners about the theological significance of bishops. It is possible that in England, a few High-churchmen under Queen Anne, "after the somewhat chilling rule of William and Mary", understood the scheme as "bestowal of a valid episcopate on the Protestant churches of Prussia".[566] For political reasons the plan fell through, as Bell notes. Nevertheless: "It is interesting, as illustrating the difference made by the Oxford Movement in the outlook of High Churchmen…"[567]

---

[564] Sykes, *Jablonski*, 14,22,24,27ff. (quote),33. Bahlcke/Korthaase, *Jablonski*; Gritsch, "Episcopacy", 110 (short quotes); Podmore, "Jablonski"; Richter, "Jablonski", 363f.,371ff; Sharp, *Relation*; Thompson, *Episcopate*, 258ff.
[565] Sharp, *Sharp*, vol. I, 403-449,431f. (quotes).
[566] Sykes, *Priest*, 126 (quotes),148.
[567] Bell, *Christian Unity*, 47.

Some Prussian Protestants suspected, alarmed by the increasing success of the Oxford Movement, that the **Jerusalem** Bishopric provided a test case for the introduction of an episcopal structure in Prussia. Greaves thinks that it had been "the view of most orthodox churchmen … [that] the bishopric … would be a means of catholicizing Prussia, that it would promote, in Worcester Palmer's words, 'the increase of sound religion, and the revival of ecclesiastical government in Germany'."[568] The concerns on both sides, however, appear to have been about the **form of government** in the first place. The Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his hope that the bishopric would strengthen the unity "of discipline as well as doctrine between our own Church and the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant Churches of Europe."[569] The Prussian Church was governed, in summary, by superintendents appointed by synods, supervised by a state secretariat (consistory) in Berlin, with a 'General Superintendent' and a juridical president appointed by the Crown.[570] Certainly, there was a political convenience in the plan for Prussia, not least with a view to Anglo-Prussian commercial interests in the region but also in experimenting with a more hierarchical, episcopal government.[571] But the plan also met Romantic ideas of the ancient church and the Holy Land which inspired people on both sides of the Channel in the nineteenth century.

The plan, however, was met with **opposition** from different directions. Roman Catholics like Döllinger (later to become an Old Catholic) attacked the plans from an anti-Protestant position, like Newman did. These voices were seconded by some Protestants with anti-Catholic resentments who criticised the

---

[568] Greaves, "Jerusalem Bishopric", 342,346,347f. (quote).
[569] Güder/Meyer, "Jerusalem", 694.
[570] Foerster, *Entstehung*; Goeters/Rogge, *Geschichte*; Webster, "Order", 94ff.

planned subscription to the English *Articles* of the ministers and to the *Augsburg Confession* (a plan which was dropped), as well as the practice of episcopal ordination and confirmation (which became part of the terms). In Prussia, many people were upset about the unequal terms of the agreement and the obscure theological basis. By the time, the acceptance of the scheme would decline rather than grow. The whole project would ultimately suffer and die a silent death from its ambiguous ecclesiological and legal foundations but also from the unarticulated national interests behind the scheme.[572]

The Tractarians were furious about the whole project which they regarded as illegitimate, promoted by both the Church and the state. Schmidt-Clausen suggests that this was in fact an intended by-product by Archbishop Howley and the Bishop of London, Blomfield, apart from apparently genuine enthusiasm about this visionary ecumenical venture well ahead of its time, although based on practical rather than theological considerations. The project was influenced by idealism, and was promoted by many influential laypeople inspired by the idea of a national church without confessional conformity. The Tractarians, obviously, found that less appealing.[573]

The end of the Jerusalem bishopric came about when it became apparent that this spirit had ceased, having been heavily attacked by the Oxford Movement. The relations between the Prussian and English congregations had become "more and more merely nominal" by the 1880s.[574] The number of Prussians had grown numerically stronger than that of the British and, thus, the Prussian government now objected to the terms of the agreement, unpopular with a number of Prussian

---

[571] Jacob, *Making*, 111.
[572] Lückhoff, *Jerusalem*, 57,65,108,112,114,294ff. Cf. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 84ff.,127ff.
[573] Schmidt-Clausen, *Jerusalem*, 114,188,378ff.

Protestants anyway, as "unduly favouring the Church of England" (Greaves).[575] Güder/Meyer judge the terms of the agreement to have contained 'truly humiliating concessions'. The Prussians asked to alter the agreement and waive the bishop's subscription to the *Articles* and his being episcopally ordained which the English side, at the high point of Anglo-Catholicism, declined.[576] The agreement fell apart in 1886 and the Church of England assumed full control of the bishopric.

If it actually had been the intention of the Church of England authorities to upset the **Tractarians** with the setting up of the scheme, it had worked. Newman styles the Jerusalem Bishopric in his *Apologia* (in chapter 3) one of the "blows which broke me", whereas other Tractarians had a more balanced but ultimately negative view of the scheme, as

> "fraternizing, by their act or by their sufferance, with Protestant bodies, and allowing them to put themselves under an Anglican Bishop, without any renunciation of their errors or regard to their due reception of baptism and confirmation… […] As to the project of a Jerusalem Bishopric, I never heard of any good or harm it has ever done, except what it has done for me…"[577]

The bishopric had been very much a project of the old-style High-churchmen. It served the political interests in the region, as well as pan-Protestant interests, "about the time that Newman's controversial position as tractarian was reaching his height." The first bishop of the united diocese was an Anglican of German origin who had converted from Judaism (Michael Solomon Alexander). When he arrived at Jerusalem, greeted with honour by the Turks, an Englishman could refer

---

[574] Meyer, "Jerusalem".
[575] Greaves, "Jerusalem Bishopric", 352.
[576] Güder/Meyer, "Jerusalem", 694f. "wahrhaft demütigende Konzessionen".
[577] Newman, *Apologia*, 139ff.,142f. (quote),146 (quote); Strong, "Jerusalem", 81(ff.).

to him, as the "first Protestant Bishop", and that was indeed his function, as visibly representing an aspect of the presence of the 'European' powers.[578]

The Tractarians' problem with the bishopric the Evangelical Seeley saw in their having "a double object in view – the introduction of a modified system of Popery into the Church; and the prevention of a vast influx of dissenters into its communion, – a circumstance which had become highly probable."[579] Gladstone, himself some sort of a High-churchman but a promoter of the bishopric, the editor of his correspondence saw having been drawn into "the pietism of Frederick William IV. and Bunsen's [his diplomat] fertility of imagination … [possibly as] origin of the scheme". Gladstone claimed in a letter to Maxwell Scott, about 1841:

"'[t]he unwise proceedings of great and ardent Churchmen' had gradually brought about 'an opinion on the part of the ruling authorities of the English Church that some effort should be made to counteract the supposed excesses of the party, and to confront the tendencies, or supposed tendencies, now first disclosed, towards the Church of Rome, by presenting to the public mind a telling idea of catholicity under some other form.' They found this other forming the Prussian Evangelical Church, and the Jerusalem bishopric provided a field in which to labour for the desired union."[580]

Chadwick, however, once judged that Newman's hostility was partly grounded on ignorance.

"Lord Acton once remarked that the history of the Church of England in the 19th century would have been quite different if Newman had known German. About Luther and Lutheranism Newman could reveal himself astonishingly ill informed (tract 39 makes an embarrassing error about the Confession of Augsburg). He always supposed rationalist theology in Germany to be the fruit of Lutheranism rather than the effect of importing Deism from England."[581]

---

[578] Greaves, "Jerusalem Bishopric", 341 (long quote),345.
[579] Seeley, *Essays*, 278.
[580] Lathbury, *Correspondence*, vol. I, 228f.

Newman saw the scheme as "the unhappy Episcopate at Jerusalem (which GOD may bring to an end!)".[582] The authority he had gained in the Church certainly helped to discredit the project in the eyes of many and, thus, gave him a platform to make his mark in the public discussion. The struggle also helped the Oxford Movement to re-define their position to Roman Catholicism (which had been hostile) and to contemplate theirs to Orthodoxy.[583] This marked their re-definition of the *branch model*, based on the paradigm of national 'catholic' churches to that of the ***Three-branches-Model*** of dispersed 'catholic' denominations. Palmer (1811-79) now presented evidence against the assertion that the Jerusalem bishopric implied that Protestantism could represent a church on the same footing with the 'catholic' Anglican, the Roman and Orthodox churches, referring to the principles of Non-jurors.[584] Unlike Sharp and Jablonski in their eighteenth-century plan to adopt English episcopacy in Prussia, the figureheads of the Oxford Movement ruled that apart from the question of 'succession' as ecclesiologically essential, a mixing with 'Protestants' was inacceptable. They apparently feared that a union with Protestants would impede their agenda to bring the Church of England in communion with Rome.[585] Newman says in his *Apologia*:

"[t]his was the third blow, which finally shattered my faith in the Anglican Church. That Church was not only forbidding any sympathy or concurrence with the Church of Rome, but it actually was courting an intercommunion with Protestant Prussia and the heresy of the Orientals. The Anglican Church might have the Apostolical succession, as had the Monophysites; but such acts as were in progress led me to the gravest suspicion, not that it would soon cease to be a Church, but that (,since the 16th century,) it had never been a Church all along."[586]

---

[581] Chadwick, "150 Years On", 67. Cf. footnotes 420 and 425.
[582] Newman, "Introductory Essay", lxxvii.
[583] Chapman, "Eastern", 225ff.,231ff.
[584] Palmer, *Aids*, 6ff.,77ff.,95ff. Cf. footnote 308ff.
[585] Cf. Bell, *Christian Unity*, 49f.
[586] Newman, *Apologia*, 236ff.,238 (quote).

Not only this marked the **watershed between pre- and post-Tractarian High-churchmanship**. The former's theological, exclusive and excluding ecclesiology was "really a novelty so far as general Anglican teaching was concerned".[587] The Oxford Movement in its refusal of recognition and uncompromising unchurching of 'non-episcopal' 'bodies'

> "took a very different line from that taken by the Church of England in earlier centuries. And it has to be admitted that from that time to the present day this new line had a greater influence in ordinary Anglican thought than the old classic line…"[588]

The uncompromising unchurching of 'non-episcopal' churches, however, was met with **opposition from within the High Church constituency**. The *plene esse* view of episcopacy (compromising the 'invalidity' judgement of 'non-episcopal' churches) would finally lead to the 1920 *Lambeth Appeal* which tried to manage the balancing act of being open to both the Roman Catholic Church as well as to Protestant churches.[589] Facing the ambiguous support of the Tractarian position by biblical and patristic scholarship but also unwilling to perpetuate the Oxford Movement's exclusive claims (cf. the South India Scheme), "the younger Anglo-Catholic theologians would feel the need for more elasticity both on the historical and on the doctrinal side, for less confident affirmations…", especially with regard to the *esse* model of episcopal succession with its principle of physical transmission.[590] They realized the potential of the Tractrian position of endangering not only the ecumenical relations with foreign Protestant churches

---

[587] Bell, *Christian Unity*, 22.
[588] Ibid., 50.
[589] Webster, "Order", 99ff. Cf. footnote 1045.

but also that of the inner-Anglican ‘comprehensiveness’ and the incoherence with one’s own, ‘Protestant’, history.

Even though the Jerusalem bishopric proved not to be a lasting success, the juridical provisions for it were used to create ‘missionary bishops’ (cf. chapters 2.4 and 2.8). “Church/State men like Venn and Tait saw no difficulty either in resorting to the legal means provided by the so-called Jerusalem Bishopric Act of 1841 as a way of providing bishops for territories beyond those administered by the Crown.”[591] This new policy was indeed remarkable as it enabled a bishop consecrated under the terms of the Act (not necessarily British and not required to take the Oath of Allegiance) to ordain clergy, who would have no automatic right to officiate in England.

The Jerusalem bishopric, in some respect, was an early example of something like a *Local Ecumenical Partnership* on the diocesan level but abroad: a platform for more far-reaching ‘experiments’, although not automatically with consequences for the Church as a whole. Nevertheless, it was not only the afterlife of its legal provisions which made it historically and theologically significant, but it had, and has, one in itself.

> “The ultimate failure of the bishopric must not be allowed to obscure the significance of its institution. It was a solemn affirmation in the middle of the nineteenth century of the principle of protestant solidarity which had been affirmed in every previous century since the Reformation.”[592]

---

[590] Mozley, *Tendencies*, 64f.
[591] Yates, "Missionary", 56.
[592] Henson, *Relation*, 90.

3.6 The Tractarian Emphasis on the (Episcopal) Church as Divine and Apostolical Society, as 'Catholic Emancipation' from State Control

The more active leadership role of the episcopate in the Church of England in the nineteenth century was approved of by the Oxford Movement in principle, although it was still closely intertwined with politics. The episcopal attachment to the establishment was only too understandable as this was where the episcopate derived its power from. The Oxford Movement opposed such thinking by claiming a divine origin of **episcopacy**, and, thus, legitimizing it by its own right (**apostolic descent**, as emphasized in Tract 1, as opposed to the *divine right* of the monarch). On those grounds, they also unchurched all 'non-episcopal' churches, denying their 'catholicity'.[593] For the Tractarians, episcopacy was far more than a form of government by choice of the monarch, as it had been for the old type of High-churchmen. Newman complained in 1839: "[f]or One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic [Church], they [the English people] have substituted 'National' or 'by law established'…"[594] What the Tractarians wanted was their own **'Catholic emancipation' from state control**.

The Oxford Movement's institutional view of church, as being perpetuated by the episcopate, found its expression in a high regard of the sacraments and a **sacramental understanding of ordained ministry**. "[T]he Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine Grace…"[595]

"[T]he Tractarian revival of the doctrine of apostolic succession as the (supernatural) basis for the authority of the Church more or less replaced the alternative model of sovereignty – the unbridled authority of the king in Parliament… […] The Episcopate was elevated by the Tractarians to the level of absolute necessity and at the same time acquired a mystical status: in this,

[593] Thomas, "Doctrine", 226.
[594] Newman, "Review Palmer", 357.
[595] Newman, *Tracts 1*, iv.

Tractarianism was a departure from the earlier forms of High Churchmanship… […] Its [the prince's divine right] place was taken by either the divine right Church beloved of the Tractarians and their successors or a form of authority that lay beyond any visible form of sovereignty."[596]

The emphasis on church as 'divine society' came with a more complete agenda to 'catholicize' the Church of England. In 1840, Pusey gave a compact definition of '**Puseyism**', as the Tractarians' teaching was often labelled, not as "peculiar doctrines, but … rather a temper of mind".

(1) "High thoughts of the two Sacraments.
(2) High estimate of Episcopacy as God's ordinance.
(3) High estimate of the visible Church as Body wherein we are made and continue to be members of Christ.
(4) Regard for ordinances, as directing our devotions and disciplining us, such as daily public prayers, fasts and feasts, &c.
(5) Regard for the visible part of devotion, such as the decoration of the house of God, which acts insensibly on the mind.
(6) Reverence for and deference to the ancient Church, of which our own Church is looked upon as the representative to us, and by whose views and doctrines we interpret our own Church when her meaning is questioned or doubtful: in a word, reference to the ancient Church, instead of the Reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church."[597]

As early as 1833, Newman, Keble, Froude and Palmer had agreed to put forward "the doctrine of apostolic succession as a rule of practice", through a personal succession of consecrations.[598] Their approach to the church as a divine, sacramental institution opposed theologically the Evangelical Movement with its emphasis on personal piety. The **Evangelical Movement** had left its mark on the establishment of the Church of England, but had begun to lose its freshness.[599] It had provided a platform for people who otherwise may have been absorbed by

[596] Chapman, *Anglican Studies*, 11f.,23.
[597] Liddon, *Pusey*, vol. II, 140.
[598] Perceval, *Papers*, 12.
[599] Schlossberg, *Conflict*, 59ff.

dissenting churches which, once again, seemed more attractive to some people. Against that, Tractarians would promote with their theology Catholic ritual and traditional forms of worship for spiritual seekers, benefitting from the advances of ritualism.

As a starting point of the visible formation of the Oxford Movement scholars often refer to Keble's Oxford **'Assize Sermon'** at the University Church on 14 July 1833, declaring national apostasy, and setting the model of "Apostolical Succession, so grieviously outraged by the Irish Church Act" (Perceval) against the 'Erastianism' of his days, which, however, now saw Roman Catholics in parliament. His protest was directed against the suppression of Irish bishoprics, once strategically placed, whose incumbents were perceived in Ireland as Evangelical aliens in a still predominantly Roman Catholic country. The suppression was not unreasonable, considering the low numbers of Irish 'Anglicans' but contradicted the ecclesiological paradigm of the Tractarians, not least because it looked to them like a violation of the apostolical element in the Church by state authorities.[600] Although presented "as a sacrilege, … the creation [and suppression] of bishoprics by sovereigns is one of the commonplaces of Church history…"[601]

Like Keble, Newman desired a separation of Church and state, despising the dependence on a lay parliament, although the Tractarians were not yet prepared to put their cards on the table and state that in public, but would rather stay out of politics. This did not mean that they had abandoned their hopes. Froude's *Remains*, as often, is a good source of the Tractarians' opinion:[602] "let us

[600] Chapman, "Bischofsamt und Politik", 451ff; Perceval, "Oxford Movement".
[601] Warre Cornish, *Church*, vol. II, 48.
[602] Podmore, *Aspects*, 20ff.

give up a *national* Church, and have a *real* one."[603] The *Tracts* (supervised by Newman and published anonymously) would successively express the Tractarians' ideas.

"The Tracts were based on the axiom that the Church derives none of its spiritual authority from the State or the Crown, only a right to hold property, and is essentially an independent society governed by the college of bishops whose commission and right to ask for assent rests on succession from the apostles; that is, from the bishop's sacramental role in the life of the Church."[604]

The Tractarians' critical opposition to the establishment of the Church expressed itself in various forms, for example, in the attacking the 'worldly' ranks expressed in holding private pews and boxes in churches, "a mark of Tractarian tendencies as early as the 1830s".[605]

The signs of the times suggested that the Church was facing being ruled by an increasingly secular and Dissenter-friendly government. Had some of the Tractarians previously held a "sacral or mystical theory of the monarch", their theological conviction swung towards the position that the Crown had failed to protect the Church. This led them to seek the legitimization of the Church in its **'catholicity' rather than** in **the *divine right* of the monarch**. "Religious truth had ceased to be bound up with dynastic legitimacy…"[606] Thus, the Tractarians saw themselves forced to battle against secularism and 'Erastianism', holding up, with full confidence, their reconstruction of apostolic truth, often suspiciously similar to medieval practices. Brilioth comments on a Newman passage (from Tract 10): "'I, who speak to you concerning Christ, was ordained to do so by the

---

[603] Froude/Newman/Keble, *Remains*, vol. III, 274.
[604] Chadwick, "150 Years On", 59. For the formation of the publishers' circle cf. Keller-Hüschemenger, *Oxford-Bewegung*, 38ff.
[605] Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 137(ff.).
[606] Nockles, "Politics", 100ff.,104,115 (quote).

Bishop; he speaks in me – as Christ wrought in him and as God sent Christ. Thus the whole plan of salvation hangs together.' We recognise once more the metallic trumpet-note of Tract I."[607]

In his *Apologia*, Newman characterises the Church of England as "a mere national institution", as opposed to "the Catholic Church", "it seemed to me to be the veriest of nonentities", "a momentous arm of political strength, a great national organ".[608] In 1834, he rebelled against the state establishment in refusing a (legal) marriage to an unbaptized Dissenter bride ('Jubber affair'). He also opposed the admission of Dissenters to Oxford. He was subsequently "regarded as an intolerant bigot by the liberals."[609] The press reports were unfavourable and songs were made about "Reverend Ruffian" or "Parson Purblind, alias Pry".

"There's not a rubber
Where *outcast* Jubber
Is not thought an injur'd Woman
There's not a party
Where young Men Hearty
Would not horsewhip Mr Newman."[610]

The new emphasis of a particular theology (in this case a distinctively Catholic) meant an attack of the ('Erastian') foundations of the English Church. "The Church of England has traditionally been held together by its connection with the State and its conception of itself as a great English national institution: not by a theological unity which it does not possess."[611] Tractarians held against this what Brilioth labels "the static view of the church", with the idea of apostolic

---

[607] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 191.
[608] Newman, *Apologia*, 399f.
[609] Blehl, *Newman*, 143f. Cf. Martin, *Newman*, 60ff.
[610] Quoted in: Gilley, *Newman*, 133.
[611] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 72.

succession underpinning the claim of catholicity of the Church of England.[612] Thus, Newman in Tract 1 appealed to the clerics who more and more felt socially outcast in nineteenth-century Britain (cf. chapter 3.1):

"[s]peak out now, before you are forced, both as glorying in your privilege, and to ensure your rightful honour from your people. A notion has gone abroad, that they can take away your power. They think they have given and can take it away. They think it lies in the Church property, and they know that they have politically the power to confiscate that property. […] Enlighten them in this matter. Exalt our Holy Fathers, the Bishops, as the Representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches; and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their Ministry."[613]

Wingfield-Stratford mocked: "[a]n appeal to anyone to magnify his office seldom falls on deaf ears – least of all, on deaf clerical ears."[614] The **opposition to the state by ministers of the established religion** who traditionally had been the moral and ideological supporters of the civil authorities (in fact, the two were closely bound together in many instances), having taken an oath of allegiance to the monarch, must be seen in the context of the **changing world in the nineteenth century**.

"In the 1830s, as is well known, John Keble and others had been greatly disturbed by a reformed parliament, since 1829 open to Jews and Dissenters, laying (as they saw it) unholy hands on the episcopate, specifically reducing the number of bishops in Ireland by parliamentary statute. To the Tractarians (and to the vast number of Anglicans today) it was clear that the authority of bishops lay, not in their legislative relationship to the Crown of England, but in their relationship to the Church and its Head through their consecration. Against a background of Erastianism, Newman and others then exalted the episcopate and its apostolic succession in a development which, for Newman from the later vantage point of the Apologia pro Vita Sua, stemmed from Keble's sermon on 'National Apostasy' of 1833. The episcopate was of divine origin and bishops were the successor of

[612] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 180ff.
[613] Newman, *Tracts 1*, Tract 1 (Newman), 4.
[614] Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 173.

the apostles, without whom the church could not flourish. Newman, who wrote many of the early Tracts, set out his views in Tract 33 'Primitive Episcopacy'."[615]

The Tractarians' ideal of 'apostolic descent' meant an opposition to establishment which, to some degree, was shared by Evangelicals, although coming from different presuppositions (the ideal of personal conversion). In 1838, the *Christian Observer*, being concerned about Tractarian doctrine, could hold that "a most ominous danger to the church at present moment" had been rejected by the British: "that monstrous doctrine of dissent that a nation must begin by renouncing religion in its public capacity, in order that its members may be religious as individuals".[616] At least **to begin with**, the Tractarians were **distant from** what they perceived as the corruptions and innovations of both the **Roman Catholic Church as well as the Protestant** ones, as they were keen on a good distance from the state, although they were happy to benefit individually from being part of the established Church, as they were happy to ignore the authority of bishops who opposed them:

"[Anglo-Catholic clergy] tended to practise a kind of Presbyterianism with an infallible priest-Pope in every parish, loyal not to his immediate bishop but to Catholic Christendom in some vaguer, wider sense. […] Yet the gulf remained between the theory of the Church's authority and Anglo-Catholic practice: you called your bishop an angel of the Church and ignored or defied him; you called your bishop an angel of the Church, and the angel bashed you up."[617]

"… Anglo-Catholics could hardly use liberty of conscience as an excuse to defy successors of the apostles. It was necessary to distinguish between bishops acting

---

[615] Yates, "Missionary", 52f. As Mark Chapman made me aware, Jews were not able to sit in Parliament before *1858*.
[616] "Review of 'Essays on the Church, By a Layman', 1838", 640.
[617] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 67f.

as such and the same men acting in other, lesser capacities."[618] There is a certain tendency amongst Anglo-Catholics, until today, to look for the bishop who, in passing the local, will do what one wants him to do. At the consecration of St Barnabas Church at Oxford in 1869, Bishop Wilberforce found that two bishops, from Nassau and Minnesota, were happy to join a procession through the streets, which he had refused. "It must have been a difficult day for Wilberforce: when he insisted on celebrating at the north end, the design of the elaborate altar made him effectively invisible."[619]

The Tractarians followed their own, Romantic reform agenda, based on their confident reconstruction of ancient Christianity. Perceval, amongst others, published a bishops' list for England and America, to underpin their claims of succession and 'catholicity'.[620] A poem called for the help of the "crown'd Defender", but not referring to the monarch.

"Thus when the infatuate Council, named of Trent,
Clogg'd up the Catholic course of the true Faith,
Troubling the stream of pure antiquity,
And the wide channel in its bosom took
Crude novelties, scare known as that of old;
Then many a schism overleaped the banks,
Genevese, Lutheran, Scotch diversities.
Our Church, though straiten'd sore 'tween craggy walls,
Kept her true course, unchanging and the same;
Known by that ancient clearness, pure and free,
With which she sprung from 'neath the throne of God.

[…]

Let the Priest lift his voice, for, hark,
The everlasting hills their strength unbar,
The whirlwind sounds afar!

---

[618] Reed, *Anglo-Catholicism*, 145.
[619] Ibid., 147.
[620] Perceval, *Apology*. Cf. footnote 791. See also: *Chart of the Episcopacy of England and Wales, Beginning with the Reign of Henry VIII*.

He hath forgot his warrant, to his eyes
In dread Baptismal founts the virtue dies;
From week to week no Eucharistic calls;
From day to day sits Silence in these walls,
Mourning neglected litanies.
How can he lift his voice?

Mitred Apostle, where art thou?
Doth he unread the writing? doth he stand
With the dread key in hand
In a palace hall? hath he his title borne
From them to whom the adored Name is scorn?"[621]

The call for a concentration of the Church on spiritual matters could even be found where it might not be suspected. Wilberforce, when being appointed to the see of Oxford in 1845, received a remarkable letter from the Prince Consort, suggesting with regard to the role of bishops in the Lords:

"[a] Bishop ought to abstain *completely* from mixing himself up with the politics of the day, and beyond giving a general support to the *Queen's Government*, and occasionally voting for it, should take no part in the discussion of State affairs (for instance, Corn Laws, Game Laws, Trade or Financial questions, &c. &c.); but he should come forward whenever the interests of Humanity are at stake, and give boldly and manfully his advice to the House and Country (I mean questions like Negro Emancipation, education of the people, improvement of the health of towns, measures for the recreation of the poor, against cruelty to animals, for regulating factory labour, &c. &c.). As to religious affairs, he cannot but take an active part in them; but let that always be part of a *Christian*, not of a mere *Churchman*."[622]

For the Tractarians the desired separation of state and church was a consequence of their ecclesiology.

"Two emphases center about the doctrine of the church: 1) a high ecclesiology which sees bishops as the *esse* of the church which is a divinely created society; and 2) a sacerdotal priesthood conveying the saving grace of God in divinely created sacramental acts (the emphasis on elaborate ceremonial tended to appear

[621] Williams, "Church".
[622] "Letter of Prince Albert to Samuel Wilberforce, 19 October 1845", 276f.

later). For Tractarianism, the church is a divinely created and ordered society which transcends – or ought to transcend – politics, geography, and time."[623]

The Tractarian type of **'catholicity'**, promoted by the Tracts, rests on the **assumption of historic continuities** which are less straightforward than Anglo-Catholics like(d) to admit:[624] in Elizabeth's time, although she herself appears to have been a religious conservative, the friends of 'the old religion' had been opposed fiercely. "The English authorities regarded them as political offenders."[625] Nevertheless, the Tractarians claimed to have history on their side.

"Yet, as on other questions, it suited the purposes of Tractarian rhetoric to portray their advocacy of apostolical succession as a recovery of an ancient truth lost sight of in the 'deadness' of eighteenth-century Anglicanism. The assumption was made that the focus on apostolical succession in the early Tracts had roused discussion 'on points which had long remained undisturbed'.[626] This assumption [by the *Tracts for the Times*] deserves questioning. […] According to W.N. Molesworth, apostolical succession had been 'indeed familiar to the clergy, not only the orthodox, but of the evangelical schools', but it tended to be regarded as 'a sort of esoteric doctrine about which they were discreetly silent, or at which they just timidly hinted in their sermons[. … Dr. Blomfield, the bishop of London, a man who subsequently showed considerable sympathy with the tractarians, greatly offended them at first by contemptuously remarking, that apostolical succession was a notion that gone out with the non-jurors.]'."[627]

Firminger, in 1894, mentions the criticism that Anglo-Catholics of his age had gone beyond all previous extraordinary attempts to undo the Reformation, associated with names like Andrewes and Laud. "We have been told that the 'Ritualistic party' has no tradition, that in fact it is nothing better than a *fin de*

---

[623] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", introduction.
[624] Cf. footnote 95.
[625] Carpenter, *Church in England*, 315.
[626] Newman, *Tracts 1*, iii.
[627] Nockles, *Context*, 146(ff.),152,150f. (quote). The quote (here amended, from a different edition) is from: Molesworth, *History*, 351f. Cf. Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 1. Cf. also footnote 95 and 664.

siècle novelty and illusion."[628] Nockles assumes that "[a] belief in the divine basis of a threefold ministerial order, an episcopal system of church government and a lineal succession of the episcopate, represented a key component of traditional High Churchmanship." This may need some qualifications. Often, as seen in chapter 1.7, it was rather the belief characterised by 'antiquarianism' or apostolicity in a vague sense, or indeed an 'Erastian' acceptance of the traditional ordering which had left room for the acceptance of 'non-episcopal' ministries in other countries. If the argument of 'succession' was employed, it often simply featured the antiquity argument. The old type of High-churchmen would typically not believe in a mechanical transmission of episcopal authority or in episcopacy as *esse* of the church.

Nockles quotes a 'moderate supporter of apostolical succession' who indeed represents this older 'school', highlighting the difference to the Tractarians (or their intellectual predecessors, such as Non-jurors). It is the Provost of Oriel who wrote in notes to a consecration sermon:[629]

"[t]here are many advocates, in a word, for the Apostolical Succession, and these quoted in the Tracts for the Times, who do not run into the two mistakes common with those who uphold the extreme doctrine; neither assuming, for it is only an assumption, the *necessary* connexion between the office of the Minister and the efficacy of the Sacraments; nor supposing that the arguments which prove Episcopacy, or an Episcopal Succession to be *right*, and much more than right, … prove it also to be *essential*. […] But the principal ground of the mistake … is probably the misapprehension of the difference between the obligation under which we lie to receive an *Ordinance* and to believe a *Revealed Truth*. […] Yet I do not feel myself justified in saying, that without a Bishop there is no Church,– that Presbyterian ordination is not valid,– that without Priests Episcopally ordained, the Sacraments cannot be administered, nor the Gospel preached."[630]

---

[628] Firminger, *Non-episcopal 'Ordinations'*, 6.
[629] Nockles, *Context*, 146,152.
[630] Hawkins, *Apostolical Succession*, 36,39,44. Cf. Hawkins, *Apostolic Order*.

Bishop Tomline of Winchester (1820-1827), "commonly accounted a High Churchman", also did not go as far as the Tractarians.[631] "But though I flatter myself that I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops."[632] As opposed to such voices, Newman wrote in his *Apologia* (chapter 2): "what to me was *jure divino* was the voice of my Bishop in his own person. My own Bishop was my Pope; I knew no other; the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ."[633]

Given that the Tractarians were probably the first popular movement in the Church of England holding a consistent view of **lineal and tactual succession** as the centre of their ecclesiology, it may be legitimate to ask "whether, at any time in the history of the Church, the office of bishop has been so immoderately exalted to the clouds as in these early Tracts."[634] This, however, happened for a purpose. The body of bishops, at least in the Tractarian theory, replaced in their ecclesiological model the authority of the monarch in the English Church, to make it a 'divine society' and free from state influence. "[T]he Tractarians hated Erastianism like a poison, but were not unanimously hostile to any link between the Church and Crown."[635]

By styling the Church of England to be the only legitimate 'catholic' English 'branch', however, the 'early Tractarians', maintained the paradigm of the established Church, as the alternative under the given circumstances did not appeal to them either. "Their [the Tractarians'] ideal was Catholicism without

---

[631] Hunkin, "Episcopacy [Churchman]", 94.
[632] Tomline, *Elements*, vol. II, 400.
[633] Newman, *Apologia*, 51.
[634] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 191f.
[635] Chadwick, "150 Years On", 78.

universal papal jurisdiction."[636] The *de facto* assumption of the Church of England as the established, 'catholic' Church of the nation marks an important factor of continuity between the old and new type of High-churchmen. The latter effectively wanted to see the Church as an independent body from the state, but without inevitably giving up its privileged status, or exchanging it with the claim being the exclusive 'Catholic church' of the nation.

It may also be noted that amongst the Tractarians, there was not necessarily an unequivocal view of episcopacy. They were a "more diffuse phenomenon". Crocket refers to "Pusey's 'low church' views", representing "a kind of organic high churchmanship":

"Pusey was idiosyncratic in a number of ways, frequently frustrated Newman with his academic independence, and stood quite at odds, for example, with the mystical irenicism of John Keble. In point of fact, 'Pusey regularly affirmed his mixed and usually 'low' view of the Episcopacy and its function.' [Griffin][637] He often thought bishops in error and was ready to challenge them when they were — Newman, who took episcopal authority very seriously, habitually shrank from such confrontations. Moreover, he seemed to think that bishops were a form of government that some churches choose and some shed, without implications for their ecclesial status as a church. Contra Newman in particular, he was sceptical of the high church claim that bishops serve as bulwarks of orthodoxy in church history: 'I am not disturbed, because I never attached any weight to the Bishops. It was perhaps the difference between Newman and me: he threw himself upon the Bishops and they failed him; I threw myself on the English Church [the quotation continues: 'and the Fathers as, under God, her support.'].'[638] Thus the charitable construction seems to be that Pusey's ecclesiology is a kind of organic high churchmanship – it is the whole church that is vested with the authority of Christ and the Apostles, not specifically the bishops. The less charitable construction is that Pusey presumed he was right because he was a professional academic whose job was to set the church straight when it erred; he was frequently accused of arrogance. For Newman, of course, as for most of the other Tractarians, bishops were the *esse* of the church, without which it failed to exist at all. In a word, they were prepared to unchurch the dissenting bodies. Furthermore, Pusey was far less exercised by the perception of Erastianism in the English Church than other

[636] Chadwick, *Tradition and Exploration*. (quote); Nockles, *Context*, 181f.
[637] Griffin, "Pusey", 141.
[638] Quoted in: Liddon, *Pusey*, vol. III, 162f.

Tractarians; confident in his scholarship, he was prepared to correct the state as well."[639]

Griffin argues that, despite the label 'Puseyism', there always had been a considerable distance between **Pusey** and the other Tractarians, even in the crucial questions of church and state relations and bishops, where he held a comparatively 'low' view, also applying the adjective 'Protestant' to the Church of England without much hesitation throughout the 1830s and 1840s.

"Pusey never held such a doctrine [of bishops as ecclesiological essential, being successors to the Apostles]. His life indicates that he felt little reluctance in opposing the bishops, and from a doctrinal point of view, he seems to have regarded them as completely dispensable. […] … Pusey did everything on the impressive strength of his will, and the Oxford Movement worked to subordinate the private will to that of the Church and its Bishops."[640]

That the success of Tractarianism was a complex phenomenon is also highlighted by the fact that some of their objectives were approved of by some unlikely allies. As already indicated, the **emphasis on the Eucharist** by Tractarians was met by Evangelicals and even Dissenters (Methodists, for example) who supported more frequent celebrations as part of their emphasis of personal piety, as an expression of new 'religious seriousness'. Where the High-churchmen would communicate in the morning, to receive the sacrament after having fasted the night, the Low-churchmen would celebrate in the evening, for reasons of convenience of their congregation.[641] Knight suggests: "participating in the Eucharist began to be seen as the true badge of church membership by Evangelicals and High Churchmen",

---

[639] Crockett, "Ecclesiology", chapter 8.
[640] Griffin, "Pusey", 137f.,140f. (quote),143,153 (quote).
[641] Yates, *Victorian*, 53f.

now that the society became more and more secular and Dissenters were allowed in public offices.[642]

This new emphasis of the Eucharist was a novelty. The practical impact of the alliance of Tractarianism, ritualism and the 'new religious seriousness' was considerable, as already indicated. Chadwick tells us about a devout layman in the 1830s who would go to church twice on a Sunday but received communion only twice during the first five years after his **confirmation**. Confirmations became more and more common with what we labelled the 'episcopal revival'. "Confirmations were transformed by railways."[643] In the first half of the twentieth century, Archbishop Lang 'canonized' Sunday sacramental worship with incense and vestments in the Church of England.[644] In the second half, the Eucharist became the default Sunday morning worship.[645]

3.7 Bishops as the New Centre of Tractarian Ecclesiology and the Consequences

The success of ritualism in the nineteenth century was complemented by the new, 'Catholic', 'High Church' theological approach of the *Tracts*, even if they did not necessarily draw on the same sources. In the first of the ***Tracts for the Times***, Newman set out that the Tractarians looked up to bishops as "successors of the apostles" and not as "*creatures* of the people", as they saw ecclesial representatives of Dissenter or Protestant churches. They emphasized "our apostolical descent. We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh,

---

[642] Knight, *Nineteenth-century*, 202, cf. 36. Cf. footnotes 507ff.
[643] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 514.
[644] Hastings, *History*, 198.
[645] Cf. footnotes 507ff.

nor of the will of man, but of God."[646] Thus, "OUR APOSTOLIC DESCENT" became the centre of their ecclesiological thinking, focused on the visible church. They declared Christ to have installed and ordained the Apostles who themselves had ordained their successors, amongst whom the bishops, whose "assistants" had been the priests. The main medium of this succession they saw in the laying-on of hands, highlighting this particular aspect of the Ordinal rite. This had preserved the divine commission which had given them assurance of having exclusive, valid ministries and sacramental authority, stated in capitals again: "THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS REALM WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO HIS PEOPLE".

To begin with, the Tractarians still claimed not (entirely) to "unchurch" 'non-episcopal' churches, distinguishing what was "necessary for salvation" (for which 'non-episcopal' churches appear to qualify) and "necessary for Communion" (equally not given with Roman Catholics).[647] This view resembles that of some of the later *plene esse* theologians. Such a concession to 'Protestantism', the Tractarians would soon give up. In Tract 35 they would claim that 'non-episcopal' ministers were only pretending to celebrate communion.[648] Tract 36 holds other faiths to "reject the Truth" and Dissenters to err but "receive and teach a part but not the whole of the Truth". A third category is claimed for "[t]hose who teach more than the Truth" like Roman Catholics (teaching what the Tract holds to be unscriptural doctrines regarding saints, images and the papacy, for example). The Church of England is held to have been persecuted at some

[646] Newman, *Tracts 1*, Tract 1 (Newman), 1f.
[647] Ibid., Tract 4 (Keble), 5f.
[648] Ibid., Tract 35 (Perceval), 3.

stage by each of these "religious sects".[649] Tract 47 speaks of "a sort of gradual scale": "So far from its being a strange thing that Protestant sects are not 'in Christ', in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world that they should lie between us and heathenism."[650] Whereas between Tract 1 and 90 the hiatus to Protestantism widens, the critical distance to the Roman Catholic Church gradually gets lost.

The *Tracts* attribute to the Apostles exclusive power to govern the church (to admit and expel, for example) and consequently they attribute the same powers to the bishops. The Tractarians' understanding of the transmitted "regular unbroken succession" is a sacramental one which even works through 'corrupt' channels of unworthy ('episcopal') ministers.[651] 'Non-episcopal' churches, in the early *Tracts*, are effectively seen as 'defective' (due to a lack of commission and authority), and not as part of the 'Catholic Church'. This view they hold as scriptural and being based on historic facts concerning the "divinely instituted Visible Church".[652] The authors claimed the Church of England to stand in this succession despite the split with Rome whereas they hold Protestants to have lost it because they revolted against their bishops. Even though the Tractarians justified the Anglican split with Rome with the medieval misconduct of office, the Protestant split with their bishops for similar reasons does not qualify in the same way. They dismissed the papal primacy as unscriptural and held the bishops to have the ultimate and sovereign authority in church.[653] In Tract 19, the Tractarians engaged with their critics' accusations concerning the weak historic evidence of their position (basically assuming the identity of functions and offices through the

[649] Ibid., Tract 36 (Perceval).
[650] Newman, *Tracts 2*, Tract 47 (Newman), 3.
[651] Newman, *Tracts 1*, Tract 5 (Bowden), 3ff.,10f.

ages, from the Apostles to the medieval bishops) and accused their critics to lack faith in what they regard as the received, 'orthodox' model:

> "our interpretation is the most probable one… […] … doctrines, which we believe to be most true, and which are received as such by the most profound and enlarged intellects, and which rest upon the most irrefragable proofs, yet may be above *our* disputative powers, and can be treated by us only with reference to our conduct."[654]

This illustrates the overall self-confident, self-assuring and sometimes, frankly, ignorant attitude of the Tractarians who sought to affirm and restore what they (perhaps sometimes quite naively) regarded as the ecclesiastical tradition and practice of the primitive and 'catholic' church – from the perspective of the constitution of the nineteenth-century Church of England. In this, much less rested on their scriptural and historic evidence than they presumed. Their intention was to provide a "via media" between Protestantism and Rome, based on ancient principles.[655]

The ecclesiology of the Oxford Movement offered for the **norm of episcopal ordination**, underpinning the identity of the Church of England and its state establishment, what it traditionally had not had: an authoritative **theological interpretation**. The notion of establishment (at least rhetorically) became the notion of apostolic descent through the (physical) laying-on of hands. Anglicans before the Oxford Movement had certainly spoken in favour of the episcopal system within the establishment of their Church. This objective was perpetuated to some extent in the 'branch' model. The innovation of the Oxford Movement

---

[652] Ibid., Tract 7 (Newman),11,3 (quote).
[653] Ibid., Tract 15 (Newman and Palmer), 3ff.
[654] Ibid., Tract 19 (Newman), 2f.
[655] Ibid., Tract 38 (Newman), 41.

was the insistence on a specific theological theory.[656] With the emphasis on apostolic descent and succession, the ecclesiology of the Church of England was offered a new High Church grounding which it subsequently gradually adopted as identity marker under the new circumstances of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This was not unopposed. The Dean of Ripon in 1852 despised this as an attack of the Church of England by

> "[a] semi-Popish party – the seeds of which have been perpetuated even from the times of the Reformation, and have ever since, at fitting opportunities, germinated with more or less luxuriance and vigour — has recently sprung up in our Church, which would fain limit the ministry of the Christian Church to those who have been ordained by Bishops episcopally consecrated and deriving their episcopal commission through an uninterrupted line of episcopally consecrated bishops from the Apostles, denying to all others the power both of preaching and administering the sacraments; and which maintains, that the Church of Christ, properly speaking, consists only of those who are in communion with ministers so ordained."[657]

Goode held this view to mean a **paradigmatic change in** ecclesiastical **policy** but effectively also in **teaching**.

> "It is to be regretted that our Church has not, in her Articles, spoken more clearly and definitely on the point [of the Doctrine of the Church, with regard to episcopacy and the relations to 'non-episcopal' churches]; though the fact that she has not done so entirely negatives the idea of her holding the 'High-Church' view."[658]

Goode mourned a tendency in some ecclesiastical circles to "magnify their own importance and stretch to the utmost the rights and privileges of their own order" with the consequence of "excommunicat[ing] from the Church of Christ by far the largest portion of its professed Protestant members…, [who were] equally devoted

---

[656] Dalferth, *Weg*, 77.
[657] Goode, *Vindication*, iii.
[658] Ibid.

followers of Him as those who are pronouncing an anathema against them.[659] Against the latter, he held 'non-episcopal' ministries to be fit to be regarded as "perfectly *valid*, though in our view somewhat *irregular*, and ecclesiastical communities [to] be true Churches in real communion with Christ, though not constituted in the best way".[660] The innovations of the Oxford Movement he characterized as expressions of "unbridled arrogance", "a Procrustean standard of ecclesiastical doctrine and polity, … apparently endeavouring, in the total disregard of the manifest tenets of our Church, to force upon it a position and character which the whole history repudiates".[661] Goode reminded his readers of the reception of 'non-episcopal' ministers into the Church of England before the Restoration without (re-)ordination.[662] This practice Laud, as an early prominent example, questioned but nevertheless continued. Contemporaries such as the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Holland, refuted Laud's "novell popish position" as a biographer put it. Archbishop Abbot is reported to have judged Laud to be "a bitter Enemy to the Protestant Religion, … a man cordially addicted to Poperie, and a Papist in heart, keeping the company with those who were most Popishly affected."[663]

Thus, the attitude of Anglo-Catholics in the second half of the nineteenth century meant a **significant theological shift**. On the positive side, they tried to develop a theological understanding of ecclesiology, but as a result of their approach, they promoted the unchurching of 'non-episcopalians'. The "doubtful" evidence (Sykes) of Newman's Tract 74 ("Catena Patrum: Testimony of Writers in the Later English Church to the Doctrine of the Apostolic Succession") would

[659] Ibid., iv.
[660] Ibid.
[661] Ibid., pamphlet I, 43.

finally illustrate how far the Tractarians had advanced from the teaching of the Church of England in the previous centuries, in their failing efforts to prove convincingly the opposite, as illustrated by their efforts in publishing of new editions of (certain) divines of previous centuries and antiquity, such in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology* and the *Library of the Fathers*.[664] Wingfield-Stratford disliked them as he despised the Evangelical reaction.

> "The Evangelicals sought to trump the Tractarian ace, by printing what can fairly claim to be the dingiest and stodgiest collection of printed matter on human record, in the shape of the writings of the English Protestant Fathers. It was the extraordinary air of unreality that hung over the clerical controversies of this time… The Oxford Evangelicals hit upon the counter offensive device of erecting a pretentious memorial to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer [in Gothic style, in proximity to St John's College, once Laud's home, St.W.], on a site where these worthies did not happen to have been burnt, the object being to work up a case against the Tractarians by their certain refusal to subscribe."[665]

The new Anglo-Catholics quoted any vague reference to a fellowship with the Apostles as evidence for the Tractarian, institutional, tactile chain model (rather misleadingly described by Newman as that of "successive ordination").[666] Even a quick reading of Tract 74 reveals that **Newman**'s attention seems to have slipped that the aspect of laying-on of hands bearing a theological quality of ordination and consecration is strangely under-represented (to say the least) in his otherwise admirable reader of 'Anglican' divines. Tract 74 simply does not deliver what Tract 1 once set out as the alleged apostolic model. Thus, academically this Tract was another low point and an own-goal of Newman's. Tract 74 may give some

---

[662] Ibid., pamphlet III, 45ff; Thompson, *Episcopate*, 224ff.,238ff.
[663] Prynne, *Breviate*, 2. Cf. Goode, *Communion*, 26f.
[664] Chapman, *Theology*, 127ff.,43ff; Gassmann, "Apostolische Sukzession", 258; "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theoloy; Library of the Fathers"; Newman, *Tracts 4*; Sykes, *Priest*, 211; Thompson, *Episcopate*, 292ff. See also: Newman, *Tracts 5*. Cf. footnote 627.
[665] "The Oxford Memorial"; Wingfield-Stratford, *Tragedy*, 171f.,174.
[666] Newman, *Tracts 3*, 1.

credit to MacCulloch's judgement of Newman as "most overrated theologian of the 19th century: devious, slippery, manipulative".[667] Sykes and Gilley write about Newman's writing in the years before his conversion: "the rhetoric, buttressed by organic analogies, had now passed a decisive milestone…" They judge with regard to Newman's theory of ministry:

> "[i]t must have been obvious to Newman from the study entailed in his recent correspondence with the Abbé Jager that no such doctrine was commonly maintained by Anglicans in the sixteenth century. It was already plain enough to Keble…"[668]

Pusey's distance to the infamous Tract 90 and his tendency to be more cautious with the sources than his fellow-Tractarians may support such a view.[669] In any case, it gives witness to the tense ecclesiastical atmosphere of those years. Samuel Wilberfore remarked in a 1838 letter: "*Quaere*, have I hardness enough not to be ground to powder between the Evangelical and Newman mills?"[670]

Nevertheless, one of the successes of the Oxford Movement was to transform many of the traditional High-churchmen into '**Anglo-Catholics',** some of whom would from then on take Rome as the benchmark of their catholicity. They would further distinguish themselves between **Anglo-Papalists** and '**Prayer Book Catholics**'. A ritualist like Deamer in his "Parson's Handbook" spent lots of energy on interpreting the rubrics of the Prayer Book, often disregarded by others, in the light of Catholic ritual (thus some nicknamed them "ultra-rubrician"). The Catholic Movement, not least with the secession of some of the Tractarian figureheads to Rome, tried to reverse the Reformation in England which they

---

[667] Quoted in: Whyte, "Church", 19. Cf. Paget, *Introduction*, 120.
[668] Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 131,121f. (long quote). Cf. Keble, *Hooker's Works*, vol. I, Editor's Preface, lxxii.

demonized and marginalized as much as they possibly could.[671] Today's Anglo-papalists refer to papal authority as "the true roots, historically and theologically, of Anglican authority".[672]

The new style of **Catholicism** was consequently **dated back as much as possible**. Anglo-Catholics managed to re-define the meaning of **'Catholicity'** for Anglicanism in that it was increasingly understood in a **denominational sense**, now not just simply meaning 'universal', 'pure'/'ancient' or perhaps 'comprehensive'. Palmer Ladd complained in 1942 with regard the North American Episcopal Church that "the Oxford Movement bequeathed to us an evil heritage. … its leaders turned with longing eyes toward Rome. To a serious degree they were mere copyists and sentimentalists." He mourned their imposing of "vulgar ceremonial" and their "ultramontane ideal of uniformity".[673]

"[The] Oxford Movement men did what their High Church predecessors generally had not done: they declared that in possessing the apostolic ministry of bishops to guarantee the sacramental and spiritual life, the Church of England was Catholic and not Protestant".[674]

The effect for the **party divisions** within the Church of England was disastrous, as now the parties were effectively unchurching each other.

"The older Protestant High Churchmen were marginalised as Anglican Protestantism became an anti-Anglo-Catholic Evangelicalism, and High Churchmanship an anti-Protestant Anglo-Catholicism. … the general tendency of Anglo-Catholicism was towards a repudiation of the Protestant inheritance."[675]

---

[669] Cf. Griffin, "Pusey", 137f.,150.
[670] Ashwell, *Wilberforce*, vol. I, 136.
[671] Dearmer, *Parson's Handbook*; Gray, "Expressions"; "Rome and Its Rites".
[672] *Reuniting Anglicans with Rome: Documents, Issues, Progress*, 0.
[673] Palmer Ladd, "Interleaves", 150f.
[674] Nichols, "Uniatism [2010]", 63.

Consequently only secession or virtual ignorance of the other parties would be the solution. The Tractarians themselves were increasingly giving up hope for the Church of England, which they became to see as incorrigibly corrupt:

"England is Protestant to the back-bone – Protestantism is ingrained into her Constitution, her laws, her social system, and her religious habits. It has all but invaded the Ritual of her Church, as it certainly has full possession of the minds of the vast majority of her clergy; yet England must be Catholicized before we can have the remotest prospect of the restoration of her Church to Catholic unity."[676]

Or: "it is impossible to make England Catholic again; as impossible it would be to change the course of the Thames, or to empty that River into the Wash instead of the Nore."[677]

The uproar at the publication of **Newman's Tract 90** in 1841 finally marked the big divide between Newman and the Church of England, and perhaps the mutual effort to part from each other, as the effect was only too foreseeable. Newman admitted in the conclusion to have attempted "giving the Articles a Catholic interpretation, we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer". The result was therapeutic for Newman but hardly academically persuasive. "The articles taught, this tract showed, a number of doctrines which anyone else but Newman and Keble would have called Protestant… […] The battle over Tract XC ended Newman's usefulness to the Church of England."[678] At Oxford, this was regarded as a serious matter. "Within a week it [Tract 90] had been quoted in the House of Commons as a proof of the University's disloyalty to the Church of England…"[679] Newman, it seemed to many, wanted to write his

---

[675] Ibid., 63f.
[676] Ward, "Re-union", 90.
[677] de Lisle, "Corporate Re-union", 258.
[678] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 183,188.
[679] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 155.

way out of the Church of England. "The proceedings about No. 90 were a declaration of war on the part of the Oxford authorities against the Tractarian party."[680]

Newman retired from public life at Littlemore and finally converted to Roman Catholicism. Keble became the figurehead of the Oxford Movement.[681] "[Tract 90] shattered Newman's self-confidence, and hacked away at those roots in Protestant tradition out of which the Movement had grown."[682] Newman's reaction seems to resemble Faber's description of him in younger years: "… Newman fell back on his customary cushion of self-pity."[683] If the Oxford Movement had been 'counter-cultural', Roman Catholicism (with Ultramontanism) now finally represented an advanced stage of Newman's opposition to contemporary English society.

> "The world of the nineteenth century was opening its mind… […] The Roman Catholic Church of the nineteenth century was occupied in closing its mind. It shrank from this new knowledge. […] It centralised nearly everything under the papacy in Rome. […] Newman … chose to submit his mind to this reaction. Thomas Carlyle said that Newman had not the brains of a moderate-sized rabbit. And Newman boasted of this submission."[684]

Newman's departure from the Church of England found its theological expression in his *Essay on the* ***Doctrine of Development*** (1845) about which Owen Chadwick says:

> "the book does not persuade. It did not persuade Protestants…, it did not persuade Catholics. […] He persuaded himself. […] The question to be answered was narrow: How can a man who sees the life of the Roman Catholic Church as

[680] Church, *Oxford Movement*, 202.
[681] Moorman, *History*, 343ff.
[682] Chadwick, *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 53.
[683] Faber, *Oxford Apostles*, 360.
[684] Chadwick, *Newman*, 1f.

apostolic, but its doctrine as not wholly apostolic, reconcile these incompatibles and become a Roman Catholic with intellectual honesty?'"[685]

At last, it seems, Newman's sense as a historian prevailed, as he had busied himself earlier to prove that his Anglo-Catholic convictions had been warranted by the early church, even though his justification for his conversion did not stand all tests of historical scholarship either. The *Doctrine of Development* helped Newman validating and authorizing Roman practice, assuming the "infallibility of the Church", with a view to its claimed traditions interpreting or supplementing Scripture, even where Roman Catholicism went further than Newman's usually quite generous reconstructions of antiquity. This meant a departure from his original, 'Anglican', approach of taking his historic reconstructions of pure (ancient) Christianity to be the theological and ecclesiological benchmarks, declaring later developments to be departures or corruptions.[686]

"Newman, it was argued, sought to convince himself that the Church of Rome had not corrupted the gospel although she appeared to have changed or added to her teaching; … he accepted, in a general and vague sense, the notions of process and evolution, and applied them to the continuity and history of the Catholic Church. [… A critic objected:] 'It is German infidelity communicated in the music and perfume of St Peter's: it is Strauss in the garment and rope of the Franciscan… Mr Newman is travelling to Germany by the way of Italy.'"[687]

With his model of doctrinal development Newman legitimised for himself the factual historical developments. Thus, he bridged the gap between ancient Christianity and Roman Catholicism. In a way, he was only changing allegiances and swapped his less clearly defined concept of the authority of a patristic-'Anglican' tradition with that of the definition of tradition by the Roman

[685] Ibid., 46ff.
[686] Cross, "Doctrine of Development", 248ff.,251ff; Newman, *Development*, 10f.,78.

Magisterium. Thus, he came to ultimately dismiss the value of historic enquiry for the benefit of the axiom of an infallible teaching of the (Roman) Church. "Newman did more than any man to hamper this swing into obscurantism."[688] Brilioth judged: "The tragedy of Newman's Anglican life is due, at least in part, to his discovery that there was not such a concord between classical Anglicanism and Christian antiquity as he had imagined."[689] Be it as it may, leaving aside the possible conclusion that his Protestant critics could be right, after all, in some of their judgements, Newman went for the option to declare the Roman *Magisterium* to be the legitimate authority to define 'catholicity'.

> "If it is *not conceded* that the papacy is a later development than the episcopate, or if it is still claimed that the Church has always and consciously believed the doctrine of the immaculate conception, then he might as well not have promulgated the doctrine of development. […] Only if you concede the history does the *Essay* matter: and if you start by saying that you only concede the history for the purpose of argument, the *Essay* is puffed away into verbal bubbles. If the papacy is a later development than the episcopate, we need an essay on development."[690]

The dilemma was that Newman's previous historical enquiries, whatever we may think of them from today's perspective, had argued against a submission to papal teaching authority as superior to a historic apostolical standard. Thus, his conversion undermined his reputation as a scholar, who now appeared incapable of buying his own theories.

"At the Birmingham Oratory there survives a copy of the *Essay* in which Newman wrote the sentence which marks the low tide of his defence – 'This is the

---

[687] Chadwick, *Doctrinal Development*, 96f.
[688] Ibid., 194.
[689] Brilioth, *Three Lectures*, 61.
[690] Chadwick, *Doctrinal Development*, 189.

philosophical work of a writer who was *not a Catholic* and did not pretend to be a theologian, addressed to those who were *not Catholics*.'"[691]

The denial of the Reformation and the sympathizing with Roman Catholicism led Anglo-Catholicism to openly questioning the sole **authority** of the Bible, displaying a triumphalist ecclesiology and a theological method, which many liberal Roman Catholics would repudiate.

"If this is to be summarized in an epigram (as it was summarized by Dr. Hawkins of Oriel College in a long and famous sermon of *1818*, preached to a congregation which included the undergraduate Newman) we may say that the Church is to teach, the Bible is to prove."[692]

Newman, on these lines, had approved in 1839 in a review that Palmer "maintains that not the Bible, but the Church is, in matter of fact, our great divinely appointed guide into saving truth, under divine grace, whatever the *abstract* power of sufficiency of the Bible.[693] On the one hand, thus, "[f]or Newman and the leading theologians of the Oxford Movement Scripture was to be subordinated and deprioritised to the church", on the other, scripture was regarded as 'inspired', but subject to the authoritative interpretation by 'the' church (with the help of 'the tradition', no '*sola scriptura*').[694] This is why patristic studies seemed the weapon of choice. The undermining of the sole authority of Scripture, however, many of the old High-churchmen found difficult to approve of as this appeared to withdraw from one of the previous fundamental agreements in the Church of England: "[Mr. Newman and his friends] … exalted the church and Christian

---

[691] Ibid., 185.
[692] Chadwick, *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 37, cf. 146f.
[693] Newman, "Review Palmer", 354.
[694] Leuenberger, *Cultus*, 278ff.,282 (quote). "Für Newman und die führenden Theologen der Oxford-Bewegung musste die Hl. Schrift der Kirche unter- und nachgeordnet werden." Cf. Cross, "Doctrine of Development", 248f.,254.

antiquity… […] They have endeavoured to set those opinions and practices [of the dominant party in the ancient church], under the name of apostolical tradition, on a level with the authority of the Scriptures."[695]

"The appeal to Antiquity was a corner-stone in the Anglican apologetic against Rome. Rome for her part believed that the teachings of the Primitive Church needed to be supplemented by tradition; and Anglican theologians held that while Rome was right *de facto*, she was wrong *de jure*."[696]

The novelty of this shift resembles our earlier observations with regard to the definition of episcopacy, where it also appeared that Anglo-Catholicism drifted apart from a position which could be considered to be a *via media*. Older ecclesiologists had been careful not to exchange the ecclesiological significance of the Pope in Roman doctrine with that of bishops in the teaching in the Church of England.[697] In practice, as we have seen earlier, the Tractarians only obeyed their bishops if those happened to say what was right in Tractarian eyes.

3.8 F.D. Maurice and the Ideal of Institutional Comprehensiveness, Opposing 'Parties' and 'Systems'

F.D. Maurice may not necessarily be well-known to a wider audience today, but he does enjoy a certain veneration as an architect of modern Anglicanism, as charactised by 'comprehensiveness'. Stephen Sykes' criticism of Maurice's (in Wolf's words) as Maurice being "chiefly responsible for shoddy thinking about 'comprehensiveness' and for lamentable Anglican disdain for systematic

[695] Arnold, *Christian Life*, ix,xxi.
[696] Cross, "Doctrine of Development", 249f.
[697] Cf. Henson, *Relation*, 73.

theology" is dismissed by others as "seriously flawed by a curious misunderstanding of Maurice who actually is closer to Sykes' own position than he apparently realizes. Sykes' knowledge of Maurice is largely second hand and contains unfortunate misquotations."[698] Be that as it may, Maurice does not seem to have been influential enough in the longer term for any personal accountability for a major development, but his ideas reflect the dilemma in which the emergent 'Anglicanism' found itself in the second half of the nineteenth century with its party divisions.

It has already been outlined that the Church of England experienced many challenges in the nineteenth century. One diametrically opposed answer to the restorative and triumphant response of the Oxford Movement, soon becoming one of the challenges itself in the rise of party divisions, was the embracing, and, thus, the **'broad'** approach of Maurice's. Maurice, with his Unitarian upbringing, explored in his writings the methodological potentials of 'comprehensiveness'. He realized that competing **'systems'** could not easily be reconciled but increasingly became a "hindrance". Against that, he held that one should aim for a positive agreement on **"principles"**.[699]

This was a suggestion that was only too easy to attack from the safe haven of any party fortress, built on a 'system'. It did not help Maurice's argument that his attack of 'systems' found its expression in a writing style which is sometimes difficult to access. *The Kingdom of Christ*, first published in 1838, the overall sympathetic Morris characterizes as a book with "[m]oments of extraordinary clarity and brilliance [which] are buried in cumbersome paragraphs", with Maurice's arguments often looking "sketchy and incomplete. He gave many

[698] Wolf, "Maurice", 50. Cf. Chapman, *Theology*, 174ff.,178ff; Sykes, *Integrity*, 78f.,81.

hostages to fortune, in the form of misleading generalizations and selectivity of evidence".[700]

Maurice's attempt to set positive, institutional markers for his Church was methodologically a new attempt to formulate a basis of **unity and identity** for the Church of England. The historic theological heritage of the Church of England, as contained in the ***Articles***, providing something like a *bric et brac* of the relevant theological 'systems' of Tudor England, he argued to sustain the co-existence of parties (in his time existing in a new extreme) rather than promoting a genuinely shared basis of an ecclesial identity. After all, he believed to set out basic principles that were genuinely acceptable to everyone and prior to parties, and, thus, beyond suspicion of being a synthesis of different 'systems'.

"[The Articles] … have been thorns in the side of those who have wished to establish an English theological system, fashioned out of the materials which either Romanism or Calvinism supplies; they have encouraged persons of all sects and schools to hope that their principles, in some sense or other, might be contained in them, or by some process or other extracted out of them, or, at all events, not positively denied by them; and yet there is no sect or school, when speaking its sect or school language, which, if it were honest, would not confess that there are clauses and passages in them which it would be glad to get rid of…[701]

Maurice, supplied an ideology which would rate **institutional unity above doctrine**:

"here [in England] the idea of the Church as a Spiritual Polity ruled over by Christ, and consisting of all baptized persons, did, owing to various providential circumstances, supersede the notion of the Church, as a sect, maintaining certain options; or to speak more correctly, the dogmatical side of Christianity was here felt to be its accessory and subordinate side, and the ordinances, which were the

---

[699] Cf. Maurice, *Lectures*, 222. Cf. footnote 752.
[700] Morris, *Kingdom*, 10,12.
[701] Maurice, *Kingdom [1883]*, vol. II, 378. This edition varies considerably from the previous one.

manifestations of it as the law of our social and practical life, were considered the principal side."[702]

His historical analysis, however, is subject to doubt. It is one thing to conclude that the Church of England cannot be described in one, synthetical, coherent theological 'system' and to declare this an advantage. What does not persuade historically, however, is Maurice's conclusion from this in which he styles his Church to be beyond historical and theological criticism from the perspective of 'systems', *existing within* this very Church. This exactly seems to be the point which Sykes made. After all, the existence of the different Church parties suggest that Maurice's disapproval of theological 'systems' needs to be argued for very carefully. Here, Maurice struggles clearly not to contradict himself.

"Elsewhere the defenders of a system may merely form a *school*. In England, because by constitution we are politicians and not systematizers, they must form a *party*. The moment we have adopted a peculiar theory we begin to organize. […] … our faith is not formed by a union of the Protestant systems with the Romish system, nor of certain elements taken from the one and of certain elements taken from the other. So far as it is represented in our liturgy and our articles, it is the faith of a Church, and has nothing to do with any system at all. […] By refusing to unite with them on the ground of any one of their systems, by seeking to unite with them on the grounds of the universal Church, we teach them wherein lies their strength and their weakness…"[703]

It is not self-explanatory, as he seems to assume, that a (or even 'the') 'Church' was neutral ground *per se*, almost as if it was an unchangeable and unchanged institution, not touched by 'systems' but prior to them. Historically it is difficult to style certain ideas which form the basis of a 'system' as 'sectarian' developments, *de facto* being outside the 'Church', whose characteristics needed to be 'catholicized' in order to be incorporated into the Church again. After all, it is

[702] Maurice, *Kingdom [1838]*, vol. II, 338.

aspects of different schools' heritage which characterizes the Church of England. "It can be said that the Tractarians rediscovered the catholic heritage, Maurice rediscovered the Reformation and reclaimed it from the contemporary evangelical deformation of it and the Tractarian contempt for and ignorance of it."[704]

Maurice's approach is characterized by an attempt to be all-embracing and 'holistic'. This is why for him, against the Tractarian ideals, the principle of national comprehensiveness (unity) of 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' incorporated the idea of establishment. The anathematizing of 'Protestants' in England (or of the Germans in the case of the Jerusalem bishopric), he argued against Palmer, would only further divisions.[705]

> "You may anathematize … all Lutherans and Calvinists, and three fourth of your own countrymen; they will only say that you have convinced them that our English air is full of nothing but grating and dissonant notes, and that all who are in want of true and heavenly music must seek it elsewhere."[706]

In the *Kingdom*, Maurice sets out **six signs**, being "traces of a spiritual constitution for mankind": baptism, the creeds, forms of worship, the Eucharist, the ministry (not exclusively focused on the episcopate) and the Scriptures.[707] These are not simply *notae ecclesiae*, but more like elements of an ordering of creation, with the Church, although thought to be a distinct body, effectively forming a centre.

His ideas do not straightforwardly lead into Huntington's **Quadrilateral** model (cf. chapter 4), originally setting criteria for 'home union'. An obvious difference lies in the 'sign' of liturgy, which Huntington consciously avoided to

---

[703] Maurice, *Kingdom [1842]*, vol. II, 521,540f.
[704] Wolf, "Maurice", 58.
[705] Cf. footnote 120.

add to his four points. Apart from that, it seems, that episcopacy, as contained in the fourth Article of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, soon was used as a basis of an 'Anglican system' when it became to be understood to insist on a 'historic succession'.

"It has been ironic that the points of the Quadrilateral which were really 'principles' or 'signs of the Catholic Church' for Maurice have been converted by many latter-day Anglicans into a sectarian system. […] Often we have prided ourselves since the formation of the Anglican Communion on being delivered from being a national or regional sect when all that we have really become is a world sect."[708]

Together with the pre-Tractarian High-churchmen Maurice saw **ordained ministers as agents of the national, established religion**. "He assumed intrinsically the truth of the Anglican position… He read into the position of the national Church elements of national culture and character that were seemingly absolutized…"[709] "[I]t is true that [regarding Roman Catholicism] he was not exactly a sympathetic or informed observer. His natural affinities, despite his broadly High Church understanding of the sacraments and the ministry, lay with Protestantism."[710]

Maurice's approach to ecclesiology is broadly institutional but his 'signs' are understood to transcend the mere institution of the church. **Dissenters** were still effectively regarded by him as schismatic and lacking the full status as belonging to the Church, as he was busy arguing that the different parties within the Church of England were held together by the 'signs'. The result is a high degree of identification of visible and invisible church, "blur[ring] the line

---

[706] Maurice, *Letters*, vii,ix,7 (quote).
[707] Maurice, *Kingdom [1883]*, vol. I, 301.
[708] Wolf, "Maurice", 87.

dividing the divine from the human…", with his six signs effectively marking no less than the establishment of the **Kingdom of Christ** on earth.[711] Thus, Maurice's identification of state and church with the Kingdom of Christ often gives the impression of that of a realized eschatology.[712]

Maurice's rather idealizing explanations often appear more metaphorical than concrete. His critics were sometimes puzzled by "his systematic avoidance of anything like definition or logical deduction", which led Rigg to call him a "Platonic or semi-Platonic Realist". "His teaching is practical, not scholastic or scientific."[713] This becomes quite obvious when reflecting upon the ministry, deducing from his Church to the universal church. "Maurice sees special value in episcopacy as a constant reminder of the supra-national and missionary character of the Church…"[714] But whereas the Church of England is an existing entity, the 'Catholic Church', which he describes, is not, as a matter of fact. This Church stands, he believes, in the historic continuity with the apostolic one, regardless of all difficulties with such a believed historic continuity, even if one could compare concrete bodies here, and, thus, he sets out his 'signs' marking this continuity. In that, he displays a strong tendency towards a divinization of the church, styling it an ordinance of God.

"There has been no break, it [the one Holy Catholic Church of the world] declares, in the line of Church ministers, from the time of the Apostles downwards. The character of the organization is the same. […] The world contains elements of which the Church is composed. In the Church, these elements are penetrated by a uniting, reconciling power. The Church is, therefore, human society in its normal state; the world, that same society irregular and

---

[709] Morris, *Crisis*, 86f.,93 (quote).
[710] Morris, *Kingdom*, 11.
[711] Cf. Storr, *Development*, 346.
[712] Cf. Wolf, "Maurice", 78.
[713] Rigg, *Theology*, 263,269,262 (long quote).
[714] Davies, *Maurice's Theology*, 85.

abnormal. The world is the Church without God; the Church is the world restored to its relation with God, taken back by Him into the state for which He created it. Deprive the Church of its centre, and you make it into a world. If you give it a false centre, as the Romanists have done, still preserving the sacraments, forms, creeds, which speak of the true centre, there necessarily comes out that grotesque hybrid which we witness, a world assuming all the dignity and authority of a Church…"[715]

It is not without irony that, with regard to the notion of a '**succession**', his model tends to resemble more that of the Roman Church than that of modern Anglicans: because he believes his Church to be part of the wider Catholic Church, he seems to assume its standing in a 'true' succession of ministry, and thus, of ministers, not the other way round.[716] For him, the monolithic, national Church is still the starting point of his thinking. His model does not stand or fall with an unbroken chain of consecrations. The details with a view to a succession mattered to him far less than to the Tractarians and he was happy to admit doubts to the historical origins of the developments of episcopacy or the threefold ordering:

"Maurice did not consider that anything essential hung on the outcome of these learned controversies. He did not regard the polity of the Church as made up of a set of three or more offices. The essential question is whether the ministry that was originally enfolded in the apostolate was intended to be permanent."[717]

In his catechetical *Dialogues* (1862) he lets the clergyman interpret the "Anglican theory about the Apostolical succession" in a way which does not make it an ecclesiological essential.

"As a *theory* it is especially disagreeable to me … the conscience of our English people – a conscience remarkably indifferent about theories, always eager to emancipate itself from them. We love the thought of *Succession*. It is linked to the

[715] Maurice, *Essays*, 380,396f.
[716] Newman, "Milman's View", 87.
[717] Cf. Vidler, *Theology*, 141,145 (quote).

deepest, truest convictions of our national mind. We have a continuous history. We are an hereditary people. […] Our hereditary feelings may degenerate into the grossest exclusiveness, the most insolent pretention. […] So little do I believe that the meaning of a Succession is affected by … interruptions. … interruptions might be admirable instruments, in God's Providence, to prevent the feeling of Succession from becoming a chain upon our necks…"[718]

Thus, it seems, **'establishment'** (as continuing the apostolic church) was more important for him than 'sacramental assurance', although his practical conclusions often seem to swing towards the Catholic side, foreshadowing the *plene esse* position of the age after him. This is why it is easy to understand him "reasserting the Church of England's catholicity and apostolicity no less forcefully than the Tractarians."[719] But like with the *plene esse* theologians, it remains unclear what this rather 'institutional catholicity' actually means, as it may be suspected that 'catholicity' widely levels with the ideal of 'comprehensiveness'.[720] It is here that one would wish more of a 'system', instead of providing confusing, maybe even confused, collections of thoughts, without any doubt borne of good intentions, but not necessarily pursing a stringent argument and often based on readings of history and the Bible which were difficult to sustain even in his days.

"One can only lament Maurice's lack of training in historical methodology, because his approach to the Bible is genuinely prophetic and is dependent upon regarding it as the actual history of the people of God. He was prevented, unfortunately, from giving great leadership in his time by his naivete in the exegesis of questionable passages. […] Maurice's style presents a hurdle for the reader. It is often opaque, gristly and confusing."[721]

Maurice for himself came to the conclusion (although the circumstances of his judgement remain obscure) that **his own baptism** by his Unitarian father,

---

[718] Maurice, *Dialogues*, 137f. Cf. Vidler, *Company*, 133f.
[719] Morris, *Crisis*, 29.
[720] Ibid., 72f.,79f. Cf. chapter 1.2.

although using a Trinitarian formula, needed renewal (which he gained at St Mary Magdalen's, Oxford).[722] This is difficult not to see as implying some negative judgement of Dissenters and even their ministrations but the situation appears more complex. In his conclusions it seems that "… Maurice was lumped together with the Tractarians… … in the final analysis he lined up with the Tractarians in defence of the Catholic Church and in sharp opposition to the Latitudinarians, the Evangelicals and the Nonconformists."[723] With regard to **ordained ministry**, he spoke for "the necessity for Apostolic Succession and Episcopal Ordination".[724] This necessity, however, seems to be understood on a symbolic level ('sign'), not in the sense of a sacramental chain of the ministerial orders, which allows him to a more positive attitude to Dissenters and, for example, the recognition of the Lutheran Swedish and Danish Churches, and the approval of the Jerusalem bishopric. The idea of succession simply seems to stand for the **established order of creation, expressed in nation and church**. This is why, in his view, "'the ministry', not the episcopate alone, is the form of the apostolic succession, which witnesses to the inclusive and universal society that is the manifestation of the kingdom of God."[725] For him, it seems, "… Christian ministry is *representative* and not *vicarial*".[726] Episcopacy is the (divinely) received form of government. "Such is our constitution, bearing, we conceive, the marks of a celestial origin…"[727]

---

[721] Wolf, "Maurice", 69,73.
[722] Maurice, *Life*, vol. I, 122f; Vidler, *Theology*, 97. Cf. Morris, *Crisis*, 83.
[723] Christensen, *Divine Order*, 244.
[724] Maurice, *Kingdom [1838]*, vol. II, 112.
[725] Woodhouse-Hawkins, "Maurice", 75.
[726] Vidler, *Theology*, 149,152 (quote).
[727] Maurice, *Kingdom [1838]*, vol. II, 173.

"Now Bishops being as we believe the witnesses and representatives of Christ's universal kingdom, are the very instruments of our communion with other nations. If there be no such institution – no apostleship – in the Church now, then the Church has lost its universal character… … we believe that it [the great universal institution of episcopacy] has been preserved to us in a wonderful manner for the last three centuries, when there was scarcely anything in our minds to make its meaning intelligible; because we believe that all the circumstances of this age are declaring to us its purpose and its necessity."[728]

For Maurice, the crucial aspect about ministry is that it offers a reliable ordering. Episcopacy is the mirror image of the monarchy, and both are forms modelled after the Kingdom of Christ. Thus, he writes about the "episcopal element": "[t]his office is especially the diffusive, *cosmopolitan* part of our system. Take this away, and Christianity becomes a scheme speaking to certain wants of the individual man, – his social and political wants it leaves unsatisfied and unheeded."[729]

Maurice's under-emphasis of the theological significance of episcopacy, in comparison to the Oxford Movement, may be explained with his display of "authentic accents of traditional high-churchmanship of the pre-Tractarian type.[730] "The permanence of the [episcopal] office is the perpetual witness of Christ's presence in the Church."[731] Thus, he can refer to "that absurd question, whether the belief of it [apostolical succession or our commission] is necessary to salvation".[732] This is also why he sees the Jerusalem bishopric as an institutional question, a question of church organization, not primarily as one of changing the theological or ecclesiological status of the 'non-episcopal' partner who in this case

[728] Maurice, *Letters*, 35.
[729] Maurice, *Kingdom [1838]*, vol. II, 180.
[730] Sykes, *Priest*, 215.
[731] Maurice, *Kingdom [1838]*, vol. II, 162.
[732] Ibid., vol. III, 223.

submitted himself to the authority of this ancient form of government, with its historic significance.[733]

Against the high tide of party spirit, Maurice held up the **establishment** of the Church of England as sustaining and requiring the ideal of *actual* comprehensiveness in the national Church, in order to be more than a federation of different parties – much more, in fact. "For him it is an established fact that the creation is coterminous with the Kingdom of God… […] The Establishment is a visible demonstration of the fact that the Church and the nation are coterminous."[734] This, however, had long ceased to be true. He merges not only visible and invisible church but goes even further. Vidler asks, although answering this question negatively: "[d]oes not the Church on this view become coterminous with humanity? Are the Church and the world then simply alternative names for humanity?"[735] The weakness appears to be that this 'over-comprehensiveness' tends to ignore the empirical differences that were more than obvious in Maurice's days (as today) between church and nation and beyond (the wider church, the 'world', creation etc.), being focussed on the unity of society, state and church.

Maurice may not have founded a school, not least because his scholarship was perhaps not so outstanding that it could not possibly be ignored. Owen Chadwick wrote about Maurice's theological method:

"[h]is manner of controversy was characteristic; concede as much as possible to opponents. He let sympathy lead him to the brink and then tottered backwards

[733] Cf. Maurice, *Letters*, 44,55.
[734] Christensen, *Divine Order*, 250,261.
[735] Vidler, *Theology*, 64.

gasping. […] … Platonic moments and fragments of beauty and clouds of obscurity… […] His doctrines were orthodox as they loomed out of the mist."[736]

The ideas he was pursuing, however, are those of the emerging 'Anglicanism' in the second half of the nineteenth century, in danger of being torn apart by the tensions between the triumphalist Anglo-Catholics and ritualists and their opponents. Nevertheless, his presumptions simply never reflected the empirical reality in his defence of the national Church but rather urged an ideal to achieve. He described a vision rather than providing a model.

"There is a contradiction in Maurice's thought between his concept of the kingdom of God as identical with the created universe and encompassing all people, and his concept of the church, established with the sending of the Holy Spirit after the resurrection and ascension, as the realization of the kingdom on earth."[737]

3.9 The Continuing Anglican Dilemma of 'Denominational' Fragmentation, as Reflected by Maurice's Vision for the Mid-nineteenth Century Church of England

As we have just seen, Maurice's approach is still closely wedded to the model of 'catholic', national branches of the older generation of High-churchmen.[738] What perhaps made the *Kingdom* significant until today is that his vision for the internally disunited Church of England could also be applied (as he did) to the state of Christianity and the ideal of the **universal church** *as such*. In that, he prefigures modern Anglican approaches to ecumenism and the ecclesiology of

[736] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol. I, 545f.
[737] Woodhouse-Hawkins, "Maurice", 63.
[738] Cf. footnote 120.

many *plene esse* theologians, as Sykes pointed out.[739] However, it is this extension of Maurice's ecclesiological vision for the Church of England which is even more problematic, firstly on the national level, but also on the international one. It **absolutizes the historical circumstances (or accidents) of the English nineteenth-century situation of a 'denominational co-habitation' in a national Church, styling other churches not to represent 'catholicity'** (or only if they represent a similar type of national church).

On the national level, this found expression in statements like the following. "Anglicanism may not be the faith of all the English people; it is a faith for all the English people." With that notion, Jacques in 1944 defended the *via media* of Anglicanism against confessional theologies and namely the Oxford Movement, which he saw having come to a "dead end" because "it could not resist what a seventeenth-century writer has called the 'meretricious gaudiness of the Church of Rome'".[740] With a view to the international level, McDermott argued "the fathers of Anglicanism were not attempting to manufacture a new variety of religion specially adapted for the English market… […] To be English is an accident and not the essence of Anglicanism."[741] He refuted the negative description of Anglicanism being "an illogical combination of heterogeneous ideas", on the lines of Stephen Sykes' analysis in the second half of the twentieth century who, thus, put his finger on the fact that one cannot simply pretend that Anglicanism was a denomination without historical background, or even no denomination at all. Cant, for example, argued against Jacques that the development of Anglican doctrine had been factual, not systematic, and thus,

---

[739] Cf. Sykes, *Integrity*, 19.
[740] Jacques, "Theology".
[741] McDermott, Ibid., 134.

"essential *occasional*", like Hooker's writings against Puritans' radicalism or "the Carolines' preoccupation with the theory of the divine right of kings".[742]

The co-existence of different streams or parties within Anglicanism has proved, throughout the history of the Church of England since the sixteenth century, to be loose cannons. It would be a misapprehension to apply the 'constitutional' model, regardless of its historic preconditions, to the 'universal Church' (as an ecumenical model, for example). It is also a historic misapprehension to style the Church of England an unfailingly happy example of the co-habitation of different views. There never was a *parity* of all positions, but individual **'parties' have been ruling over the others at times**.

This brings us back to Maurice's criticism of the existence of theological **'systems'** within the Church of England, or 'Anglicanism'. Not a single stream within Anglicanism can claim to represent 'Anglicanism' exclusively, nor must 'Anglicanism' be mistaken for one of these streams. It also needs to be noted that the Church of England does not need to be the national Church in order to maintain its 'comprehensive' spectrum, and, in any case, one cannot turn back the clock to that. Other former state churches in Europe give an example of working alternatives, although with fewer privileges for the respective churches. The difficulty of the plural situation of Anglicanism is, as Sykes noted: "This theory [Maurice's understanding of the complementarity of aspects of the truth], we should notice, enables *any* group of Anglicans to claim that their particular understanding of a theological doctrine should never be compromised."[743] This would prevent any Anglican Church from taking controversial decisions, such as the abolition of slavery (initiated mainly by Evangelicals before the existence of

---

[742] Cant, Ibid.

Anglo-Catholicism), the definition of the 'historic episcopate' as ecclesiological marker (very much an Anglo-Catholic idea) or the admission of women to the presbyterate or episcopate (objected to by some Evangelicals as well as Anglo-Catholics, but for different reasons).

> "The fundamental incoherence of the three-school theory can be seen from the obvious fact that the existence of each one of the schools can be justified only on the assumption that its characteristic theological assertions are true. But in that case the characteristic theological assertions of all three schools must be mutually compatible. […] … it is because each school has *not* been convinced that everything that the others were holding was part of the truth that the schools have remained recognisably distinct."[744]

The result became only too obvious again in more recent years in the archiepiscopate of Rowan Williams who took controversial steps designed to maintain the unity of the Anglican Communion, such as blocking homosexual candidates from episcopal appointments or not inviting certain bishops to the Lambeth Conference. To a group of students in 2012, at the time when the negotiations about the legal framework for women bishops got into its crucial phase and the Church had just published a controversial (negative) statement on 'gay marriage', Williams likened the Church of England's position to "one of those terrible games you get in Christmas crackers sometimes, where you have to get the little silver balls into holes. You always get two of them in, but the other one goes off somewhere else."[745]

Looking at the difficulties of Anglican 'comprehensiveness' it may be argued that Maurice's weakness is that he perhaps underestimated the persistence of theological 'systems' but also the fact that there is no alternative to their

---

[743] Sykes, *Integrity*, 84.
[744] Mascall, "Anglican Theology", 31.

existence, even if they seem to obstruct unity. It is true that Maurice indeed displayed an attitude of **"system-phobia"**, as he himself once admitted in a letter in 1850, not without self-irony. "God's order seems to me more than ever the antagonist of man's systems…"[746] Sykes argued that the advantage of systematical strength is its concentration of inner principles from which consequences are deduced, where Maurice would probably put forward his objective of unity.

Ramsey echoed Maurice in concluding with a view to party spirits: "The result is disastrous."[747] In the light of the divisions of the nineteenth century, Maurice perceived party divisions as an unhelpful fixation on principles. He preferred methods to systems.[748] The party divisions cemented the co-existence of fundamentally different positions which contradict each other in **consequences as well as fundamentals**. These fundamentals are contained in what **Maurice or Huntington** promoted to be uncontroversial, merely **institutional** foundations of 'the Church', like the creeds or, more obviously so, the episcopate or ministry. It turned out to be impossible, though, to define such a list of institutional fundamentals without touching the creedal fundamentals of different denominational 'parties'. This is why they both, without wanting to, ended up with a **synthesis** or **compromise** of the different 'parties'' systems, creating, ironically, something like a **genuinely 'Anglican' theology**, although perhaps lacking the consistency and compelling nature of its sources. Their plea to the different denominational groups for a commonly accepted framework ironically presumes the different parties' existence and effectively their continuance. Like

---

[745] "Women Bishops: 'Little Silver Balls Won't Stay in Their Holes'".
[746] Maurice, *Life*, vol. II, 43f. Some of the following quotes I owe to: Vidler, *Company*, 22f.
[747] Ramsey, *Maurice*, 32.

many Anglicans today, Maurice and Huntington tend to level 'catholicity' with 'comprehensiveness' (embracing Anglican [Anglo-]'Catholicism' and 'Protestantism'). What they wanted to achieve was a concentration of the 'parties' on their common, 'neutral' grounds, and thus, the transcendence of the parties. This was perhaps too optimistic. Maurice wrote:

"… I believe, of late years, against the popular doctrine believe, that the words *Party* and *Church* are essentially hostile to each other; that he who says, 'I will be a Churchman', says, in effect, 'I will *not* be a Party-man'; that places himself under bonds and conditions with which those other bonds and conditions are, in principle as well as in practice, incompatible. […] … an inquirer might draw the conclusion that Protestantism cannot exist without Catholicism. He would not mean by this that … it requires to be balanced by Catholicism; … …this union is the condition of its validity. […] … Catholicism cannot exist without Protestantism."[749]

Maurice's solution to the dilemma was the notion still used today that "our Church is both Protestant and Catholic".[750] But again, he neither meant a synthesis, in the sense of another 'system', nor did he simply speak in favour of a co-existence, unaffected by each other. His vision was to achieve a 'neutralization' of the theological essentials as a basis for (more) unity. He did not argue against 'systems' in order to replace them with another one (although this is effectively what happened). 'Catholic' means 'universal' or 'apostolic' here. In a letter in 1841, he held "a Catholic *system* … [is] one of the greatest enemies of the Catholic *Church*".[751]

Thus, looking at the Anglican understanding of ordained ministry today, we need to conclude that the Anglican adaptation of the typically 'Catholic'

---

[748] Vidler, *Company*, 24ff.
[749] Maurice, *Party*, 7f.,14f. For the circumstances of this pamphlet, see: Vidler, *Company*, 82.
[750] Maurice, *Letters*, 76.
[751] Maurice, *Life*, vol. I, 308.

insistence on an unbroken *personal* succession (which Maurice avoided) prevents 'Protestants' from interchangeability of ministers with Anglican churches. This 'collateral damage' of the 'catholic' understanding of ordained ministry prevents Anglican churches from being 'catholic' in Maurice's understanding of the word. Many Anglo-Catholics' would describe this understanding of ministry, evolved with and in 'Anglicanism' in the late nineteenth century as interpretation of the norm of episcopal ordination, as their condition to remain in the Anglican churches. Thus, the Anglican 'system' suffers from what Maurice described as the dilemma of all 'systems'.

> "But when once a man begins to build a system, the very gifts and qualities which might serve in the investigation of truth, become the greatest hindrances to it. He must make the different parts of the scheme fit into each other; his dexterity is shown, not in detecting facts, but in cutting them square."[752]

Against Maurice, one would need to ask with Sykes whether he was not simply creating more confusion this way in blurring differences and creating more ignorance or even theological indifference. Also, namely with his insistence on episcopacy, he himself took on board patches of particular party systems, not to speak of what Anglicans later made out of this in the quasi-dogma of the *Quadrilateral*, interpreting the fourth article in the light of a notion of succession.

These days, ***Common Worship*** provides alternative liturgies more consistent with *one* of the Anglican theological traditions, rather than just providing one patchy, unifying liturgy like the old Prayer Book did. Thus, it seems, the Church of England has moved on from Maurice's ideals. Unlike Huntington, Maurice stressed the unifying function of the Prayer Book because its

---

[752] Maurice, *Lectures*, 222.

eclectic nature in terms of denominational allegiances exposed the different 'parties' to patches of the historical heritage and theology of the other 'parties'. Others might find this inconsistent or puzzling or indeed unhelpful for building an identity due to the inconsistent nature of the Prayer Book as such, but Maurice saw in this the chance of developing not simply synthesis, confusion or indifference but something like an environment in which something that we may call a genuinely 'Anglican' spirit of comprehensiveness may flourish. Thus, the individual marks/signs like episcopacy or the common liturgy he did not see as 'ecclesiastical totems' to preserve as necessary, but as means for unity, with a view to the mid-nineteenth century Church of England.[753] In a letter from 1849 he says:

> "I do not want to force any one to like it [the Prayer Book]; nor do I care a sixpence for it as a piece of fine composition. I never called it 'an excellent liturgy' in my life, and I hope I never shall. But it has helped me to … feel more hope as to those whom I should naturally regard as foes, than any other book except the Bible. It is my protection and the protection of the Church against Anglicanism and Evangelicalism and Liberalism and Romanism and Rationalism, and till these different devils cease to torment us, I will, with God's help, use this shield against them, whether other people prefer their party prayers to it or not."[754]

[753] Cf. Morris, *Crisis*, 85.
[754] Maurice, *Life*, vol. I, 512.

4 The 'Historic Episcopate' in Its Liberal (Anglo-) Catholic Interpretation Becomes Established Anglican Teaching in the Early Twentieth Century

4.1 Huntington's Quadrilateral, Originally as Model for National, Governmental Ecclesiastical 'Home Union'

As indicated before, Anglicanism was in need of a definition in the nineteenth century. The emergent Anglican Communion's problem was very much the dilemma of the Church of England's, the latter being an established, broad Church in transition: on the one hand, there was need to define 'Anglicanism' in a non-territorial and trans-national way but on the other, a confessional, denominational, definition would mean a challenge to the non-confessional, inclusive and plural character of Anglicanism. In 1886, the House of Bishops of the General Convention of the North American *Protestant Episcopal Church* adopted a study document which became known as the "**Chicago Quadrilateral**". This text was adopted in a slightly modified form as the "**Lambeth Quadrilateral**" by the Lambeth Conference in 1888 (the third ever, after 1867 and 1878).[755] It aligned the Chicago version closer again with the ideas of its originator, the influential American Episcopalian **William Reed Huntington** (1838-1909), probably inspired by F.D. Maurice's 'six signs' in *The Kingdom of Christ* and other influences.[756]

Huntington had attempted to outline principles of a '**home union**' which he envisioned as "the Catholic Church of America" or a "united Church of America"; "a Church of the Reconciliation". With a High Church approach,

---

[755] "The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1886/1888)"; Forrester, *Historic Episcopate*, 10ff.

[756] Gassmann, *Konzeptionen*, 21; Marshall, *Theology*, 215f; Price, "Reflections", 84; Suter, *Huntington*, 162ff.,392ff.,463ff; Woodhouse-Hawkins, "Maurice"; Woolverton, *Unity*, 25,48ff; Wright, "Heritage", 23ff. On the other hand, Brown does not even mention W.R. Huntington: Brown, "Maurice".

Huntington had set out four essentials, creating, as Franklin put it, an "American text, forged out of the national trauma of the American Civil War".[757]

The **American Civil War** (1861-5) had been fought with a violence and a death toll previously unknown. It had been a fight about the abolition of slavery but also about the preservation of the union of the United States. The different churches of all denominations in North America had historically provided bonds of unity across the states, even though different readings of the Bible were applied to argue in favour or against slavery, for example. Now churches split along state borders, North and South. "Almost all the outward and tangible evidences of unity had gone to the winds. In not a single State south of a certain boundary-line was the authority of the General Government acknowledged."[758] Reconciliation, therefore, was a big topic amongst Christians in those days, far from being an academic question. In addition, **European immigrants** to the **industrializing United States** were challenging the religious and cultural scene. As a response,

> "… Huntington envisioned an American Catholic Church that would combine the high church, covenant-apostolic succession arguments with egalitarian evangelicalism. This would be a church with episcopal orders and democratic institutions."[759]

His proposal was about the restoring of "a united Church", but also aiming higher, for **"a United Church of the United States"** (Huntington in 1909).[760] After the Civil War, the prospect of a national church had seemed even more desirable. "Indeed for Huntington belief in the union of the several states was analogous to

---

[757] Franklin, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", 117; Huntington, *Church-idea*, 118,123,126.
[758] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 117.
[759] Antoci, "Ecclesiology", 244.
[760] Huntington, *Four Theories*, 4.

belief in the reality of the universal Christian church."[761] Huntington himself urged, when he saw civil bonds being restored: "The great need of American Christianity is unification. […] It is in the ecclesiastical system alone that we note the mortifying lines of fracture."[762] Thus, he promoted four principles for national, Christian unity. "These four points, like the four famous fortresses of Lombardy, make the Quadrilateral of pure Anglicanism. Within them the Church of the Reconciliation may stand secure."[763]

The Roman Catholic (imperial) model with "one single administrative centre", "a single nerve centre", he despised as "essentially European". To a federal model ("only a union of hearts") he preferred a **"constitutional"**, "however profoundly they [Protestants and Catholics] may differ among themselves as to the methods of the transmission of divine grace or as to the philosophy of Holy Orders".[764]

This desire of national unity, based on religious unity, had been an 'American' concern right from the beginning. The Mayflower settlers already, two months after their departure from England in 1620 and still before arriving in America, designed on the ship a social compact in the spirit of "'just and equal laws' founded upon church teaching, the religious and secular governance of the colony to be in effect indistinguishable. This contract was based upon the original Biblical covenant between God and the Israelites".[765]

The principles of Huntington's Quadrilateral were adopted by the Anglican Bishops in 1888 in order to describe **"a basis on which approach may be, by**

---

[761] Woolverton, *Unity*.
[762] Huntington, *Anglican Communion*, 1.
[763] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 126.
[764] Huntington, *Four Theories*, 6,10ff.
[765] Johnson, *History*, 25.

God's blessing, made towards Home Union".[766] The four articles, however, became soon to be understood to describe more generally the essentials for a union of 'episcopal' churches and of the Anglican Communion. Until the late nineteenth century, such a union was "a belief advocated by high-churchmen rather than an accepted fact".[767] With the emergence of the ecumenical movement, the Quadrilateral was also applied by Anglican churches to ecumenical ventures, as we shall see.[768]

The **four articles** of the Quadrilaterals are:

1 the Scriptures;

2 the Creeds (the Chicago version names the Nicene creed only; Lambeth the Apostles' Creed as baptismal symbol and the Nicaean creed as faith statement);

3 the dominical sacraments of baptism and communion, conducted with the words of institution and their respective elements (water, bread and wine) and

4 "[t]he 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" (with the 1886 and 1888 wording being identical).

Huntington's four principles were remarkable in that they **did not require further uniformity in theology or liturgy** (the Prayer Book in the age of struggle

---

[766] Cf. Morris, *Quadrilateral*, 6.
[767] Podmore, "Idea", 36. Cf. Podmore, *Aspects*, 26,28.
[768] Thomas, "Doctrine", 219.

over ritualism) but rather chose to be minimalistic: "the shutting-out policy has brought us to our present broken estate".[769] He defended variability as a heritage of the early church ("harmony of worship" instead of uniformity). Not free of a self-contradiction he held: "[i]t is true that liturgical worship was universal at the earliest date in the history of the Christian Society of which we have any authentic post-Scriptural record. But it is equally true that the liturgies of that age existed in wonderful variety." His fourth point, "[t]he Episcopate as the key-stone of Governmental Unity" (not a "historic episcopate") was designed to provide flexibility.[770] **"Huntington's view of the ministry was intensely pragmatic"**.[771]

> "As Anglicans we have never wholly liberated ourselves from the shackles of the Act of Uniformity. I have no wish to pose as a Cassandra, but this prophecy I venture, That unless she learns to see her calling and to see it soon, the Episcopal Church in this country will be in great danger, humanly speaking, of being bruised and badly bruised between the upper millstone of the Roman domination and the nether millstone of Protestant Federation."[772]

This suggests: **"Huntington was anything but confessional in his approach."**[773] He tried to overcome High, Broad and Low Church divisions, not only focusing on his fellow-Episcopalians but also "evangelical denominations" as well as the considerable constituency of Roman Catholics in his country, although it has to be said that his "Church-idea" appears to address the problem of Episcopal disunity in the first place.[774] He saw the American Church of his time in "denial of what is confessedly central to the faith" and therefore offered his minimalistic catalogue, which he, most significantly, did not want to be understood as points of an Act of

---

[769] Huntington, *Anglican Communion*, 1 (quote); Huntington, *Talisman*, 17.
[770] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 163,125f.
[771] Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 210.
[772] Huntington, *Four Theories*, 12.
[773] Slocum, "Quadrilateral", 475.

Uniformity, formulating principles of in- and exclusion, although envisioning "governmental unity" in an episcopal structure.[775]

"Because the English State-Church has muffled these first principles [of the Quadrilateral] in a cloud of non-essentials, and has said to the people of the land, 'Take all this or nothing', she mourns today the loss of half her children. Only by avoiding the like fatal error can the American branch of the Anglican Church hope to save herself from becoming in effect, whatever she may be in name, a sect."

Huntington's idea of a "National Church" meant "a declaration of independence from the mother country". His ideal was the 'Americanization' of Episcopalians, not 'pan-Anglicanism' in the first place. "If his nationalism appears to us too simple, even when one takes into account his anti-imperialism, it must be remembered that this nationalism was in fact intimately connected with the 'Americanization' of his denomination."[776]

His position forms a contrast to the two later usages of the Quadrilateral already mentioned (pan-Anglicanism and Anglican ecumenism). It is not without irony that his model was subsequently used to justify an ecumenical type of 'episcopal' churches. Huntington's primary concern was **American, national ecclesiastical unity** (in which he curiously seemed to imitate the Church of England as a national church, but under very different conditions in North America). What is even more surprising from today's usage of the Quadrilateral is that he **avoided a *theological* prescription** of what he tried to promote with the fourth article of the Quadrilateral. "His conclusion was bound to disappoint souls

---

[774] Huntington, *Anglican Communion*, 3f; cf. Woodhouse-Hawkins, "Maurice", 67; Woolverton, *Unity*, 50f.
[775] Huntington, *Anglican Communion*, 1,152.
[776] Woolverton, *Unity*, 53,399 (long quote).

whose ardour extended to investing with divine significance particular orders of the ministry."[777]

Huntington had some first-hand experience with the difficulties of inner-Episcopal unity. When he drafted a revision proposal for a new American Prayer Book in the early 1880s, he was determined not to provoke ritualistic controversies afresh, after the struggles about the **Ritual Canon** of 1874, which had been perceived as legalistic and had brought about the breaking-away of the ***Reformed Episcopal Church*** in 1873. The schism had put American Anglo-Catholics under the general suspicion to be the guilty party, as having elevated rubrics to the level of confessional statements.[778] His revision proposal Huntington defended against his fellow-Episcopalians as an expression of "Americanism".[779] With the split amongst Episcopalians possibly in mind and referring to England, Huntington argued in 1899: "[b]ut the Acts of Uniformity have not been, in the long run, a distinguished success; and it is just possible that by a more permissive line of legislation we in America can sooner secure the desired result, – harmony of worship."[780]

Woolverton characterized Huntington's approach as finding the **"lowest common denominator"**. "The Quadrilateral indeed reflects Huntington's liberalism." This is why the Quadrilateral reflects the High-churchman Huntington's attempt to find a compromise in key areas of ecclesial description, through a "neutralization of territory in the region of sacramental theology". "In the region of dogma, the *crux* is the sacramental theology. […] In the region of

---

[777] Ibid., 67 (long quote),263f.
[778] Woolverton, "Renewal", 175ff.,178,194.
[779] The Churchman, 16 October 1886, 456, cited by: Ibid., 185.
[780] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 165f.

polity, the *crux* is the value of historicity in connection with holy orders. […] In the region of worship, the *crux* is again the sacramental element."[781]

What he envisaged for an "Ecclesia Anglicana" was neither an "unconditional surrender of all to one" (which he saw as the Roman model), nor a "confederation upon equal terms", under which "denominationalism would not cease to be". What he wanted was a "consolidation under one self-consistent and well understood system of polity and doctrine", but allowing diversity. This ambiguous objective, however, meant the challenge of finding a balanced compromise. Thus, he proposed the Quadrilateral as the essence of the Anglican model and unashamedly put it forward as a model for a pan-American church. "One of our denominations, as it happens, has done this very thing already, and is first in the field with its suggestion of the true basis of unity."[782]

> "Huntington's purpose was to neutralize the territory of sacramental theology. There was no other possibility. A *modus vivendi* now obtained in the Episcopal Church between opposing views alike on the subject of the sacraments as on apostolic succession and the historic episcopate. The Quadrilateral was the admission of a fact of life and negative in that sense. It determined that since Episcopalians could not agree among themselves, they could not ask of others a prior theological consensus, at least of a specific nature. […] The difficulty came in the fourth side of the Quadrilateral, for here the appeal to a shared heritage could not be made. If there were to be no theory of episcopate insisted upon but only the thing itself, the fact that 'it worked', then why episcopacy as such? Why not the congregation or the presbytery as the basis for building a church polity?"[783]

Huntington *and* the bishops, on both sides of the Atlantic, at the height of Anglo-Catholicism in England, were well aware of the possible snares of an understanding of **'apostolic succession'** which could be applied to the fourth

---

[781] Huntington, *National Church*, 69 (quote),77.
[782] Huntington, *Peace*, 22f.,37,46.
[783] Woolverton, "Renewal", 189f.

article of the Quadrilateral. This is why they were keen to avoid the phrase, not to endanger the 'modus vivendi' character of the Quadrilateral, although the Anglo-Catholic hallmark of the fourth article cannot be denied. However, one was keen to avoid an emphasis which could be perceived as a stance towards a particular 'party'. "There was no mention of England, Anglicanism, the Reformation, the Thirty-Nine Articles, or the Book of Common Prayer."[784]

"Though in the early days when he [Huntington] wrote *The Church Idea*, he used the term 'Apostolic Succession', he does not seem to have bothered with it except to assert that it was that which linked the present church with the primitive Christian community."[785]

Huntington acknowledged that the Bishops at Lambeth 1888 avoided any statement regarding succession as a theological model (cf. Mascall's characterization of the *plene esse* position as a "fact-but-no-theory" approach).[786] Marshall thus asked: "Is it [the 'historic episcopate'], then, simply a fact and nothing more? If that were so it is hard to see why it should have a place in the quadrilateral at all."[787] Some of the bishops, would actually have said 'yes'.

"[T]he term 'the Historic Episcopate' could not be designed to affirm any doctrine or theory as to apostolic succession or Divine origination, because a number of American Bishops were present in the Lambeth Conference by whom these things are not believed. And certainly we must admit that this expression taken by itself is open to more than one interpretation. It might mean to assert nothing more than the somewhat obvious fact that the Episcopate has existed for a very considerable time. But it may also mean to assert the necessity of the Episcopate to the Church's constitutional self-identity."[788]

Huntington himself affirmed the openness of his model:

---

[784] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 121.
[785] Woolverton, *Unity*, 313 (long quote), cf. 319f.,325,403f.
[786] Mascall, *Unity*, 192.

"All they [the bishops] did was to suggest a *modus vivendi*. Carefully avoiding the well-known phrase 'Apostolical Succession', which would have committed them hopelessly to a particular philosophy of the ministry, and made them the winning of those who hold to the institutional idea impossible, they fastened on certain words, the characteristic of which is, that they express a fact without at all insisting upon any theory of the fact. […] It is a simple falling back on fact. […] Had the Bishops said, 'Take our words for it, there has been no break anywhere in our dynasty'; had they said, 'Be ye sure of this, that unless you company with us there is no grace in you', they would, indeed, as seekers after reconciliation, have made themselves a gazing-stock. But these are the things, be it observed, which they did not say. […] … the Bishops did that for which posterity will thank them, when they took the Historic Episcopate rather than the Apostolic Succession for the key-note of their appeal."[789]

Bishop Vincent of Southern Ohio (at the time not involved in the negotiations of the Quadrilaterals) held:

"[n]othing is said here of Episcopacy as of Divine Institution or necessity, nothing of 'Apostolic succession', nothing of a Scriptural origin or a doctrinal nature in the institution. It is expressively proposed here only in its 'historical character'…"[790]

Against these views, Bishop Stubbs of Oxford, who had already promoted in a few publications the model of apostolic succession and was one of the drafters of the Lambeth Encyclical of 1888, explained in 1890 the 'historic episcopate' to his diocese in a way that suggested that its significance was beyond the 'historic' claim.[791]

"The historic episcopate, not merely as a method of Church government – in which sense it could scarcely be called historic – but as a distinct, substantive and historical transmission of the commission of the apostles, in and by which our Lord formed His disciples through all generations into a distinctly organised body

---

[787] Marshall, *Theology*, 218.
[788] Simpson, *Relation*, 17.
[789] Huntington, *Peace*, 204ff.
[790] Wright, "Heritage", 17 (quote)-23.
[791] Hall, "Apostolic Succession", 114; Stubbs, *Letter*; Stubbs, *Registrum*.

or Church – the historic episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England; and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion."[792]

Against such a view, Bishop Wordsworth had held in 1888 that a reunion with the Scottish Kirk should not be conditional to an *ordinatio sub conditione* of its ministers, considering the practice of the early church, the overall generous attitude of the Church of England with a view to the norm of episcopal ordination in the past and the historic circumstances of the Scottish Church.[793] For him, a succession of some kind was not a primary concern. The superiority of episcopacy primarily was 'historic' (although based on a selective and simplifying view). "As regards the past, Episcopacy has been everywhere known and practised from the time of the Apostles, whereas Presbyterianism had been nowhere known or seen till the sixteenth century."[794]

The Bishop of Albany warned in 1909 that approaching churches with the notion of their ministries being "unlawful, is to propose, not reunion, but absorption; not consideration, but contempt."[795] The American bishops, on the lines of Huntington, were probably more aware of the potential theological and 'diplomatical' implications of anything more than a **'historic', low-key definition of episcopacy**, whereas Anglo-Catholicism in England had spread amongst the bench of bishops. **Huntington's critics** had held "that the Episcopal Church made no real concession in the Quadrilateral, that it was nothing but a plausible devise for persuading non-Episcopalians in America to become Anglicans in ignorance of what they were about…" This was even more a valid point as Huntington

---

[792] Stubbs/Holmes, *Charges*, 130.
[793] Wordsworth, *Union*, 22.
[794] Wordsworth, *Conference*, 7.
[795] The Churchman (New York), 21 November 1909, quoted in: Thompson, *Episcopate*, 12.

seemed naively to assume that the insistence on certain liturgical or institutional features did not come with **theological claims**. In this respect, his attitude is similar to the "fact-but-no-theory" attitude of today's *plene esse* ecclesiologists.[796] Whilst American non-Episcopal critics held that Huntington had basically issued an invitation to **become 'Episcopalians'**, the few English commentators were more positive, as they lived in a context of a national church struggling with creeping disestablishment and pluralisation in society.[797]

More conscious of such sensitivities than Huntington, the Bishop of Kansas, Vail, had, in the late 1870s, promoted the Episcopal Church as being so comprehensive that it could include Protestants of all denominations, even if divided about the issue of the scriptural warrant of a threefold ministry. The Episcopal republican, "strictly and purely democratic" ecclesiastical structure had been designed in analogy to the state, with equal lay and clergy representation.[798] Thus, Vail was putting his model forward on practical grounds. It may remind today's reader of the talk of Anglicanism as providential bridge between, or synthesis of, Protestantism and Catholicism, but Vail's primary focus, like Huntington's, was a **national** one, "a universal Christian and ecclesiastical unity in our country".

"We assert distinctly that in the system of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as it is, there are instrumentalities, diversified and expansive, for the union of all Christian people in 'one body and one spirit'; that is broad enough to maintain in one fellowship, both external and internal, all true disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. We assert that in the Protestant Episcopal Church are the elements of the most exact uniformity, as also of the most extensive variety."[799]

---

[796] Mascall, *Unity*, 192.
[797] Woolverton, *Unity*, 53ff.,57ff.
[798] Podmore, "Tale", 40,70,59,64.

Huntington saw the role of the Episcopal Church in America as that of an (institutional) **'*ecclesia mediatrix*'** (not necessarily to be identified with a dogmatic understanding of a '*via media*', although both ideas can be seen as overlapping), drawing together the ***ecclesia diffusa*** (against an Anglo-Catholic understanding which would not allow the inclusion of Protestant denominations in the 'catholicity' of the Christian Church), but, nevertheless, under the conditions of **separation of state and national church**.[800]

"The establishments took shape according to the temper and bias of their framers. In some of them the principle was accepted that the Church is a society subject to the State, and the creature of its laws. This view of the matter degrades the Christian ministry to the level of what has been satirically called 'a moral police'. In our mother country the better ground was taken that the Church is a society distinct from the State…"[801]

However, this not only made Huntington's model innovative and 'American', it was also the proposed, more 'nominally' (non-monarchical) episcopal structure (which the Episcopal Church had adopted after the Independence), without a specific theological claim attached to episcopacy. Thus, Huntington could go further than many of his fellow-Episcopalians and use 'bishop' interchangeable with 'chief pastor', 'master missionary, 'president' etc. (cf. his *National Church*).[802]

"… Huntington combine[d] the hesitancy of the liberal with the liturgical and sacramental interest of an Anglican. The result was one-sided. […] Huntington was a reforming liberal. His spiritual forebears within Anglicanism are to be found in the Cambridge Platonists and latitudinarians, in their liberalism and in

---

[799] Vail, *Church*, 63ff.,67,70 (quote),72 (long quote),101 (quote),117f. Cf. footnote 906.
[800] Woolverton, *Unity*, 100ff.,142,328f.
[801] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 95f.
[802] Woolverton, *Unity*, 305,310ff.,324.

their lack of doctrinal precision. […] Yet Huntington appreciated the Oxford Movement in its demand for a visible church and a visible unity."[803]

For Huntington, **'comprehensiveness'** aimed "to do equal justice both to the Sacramentalists and to the anti-Sacramentalists". Even if the ideal of 'comprehensiveness' originally was coming from the specific situation of the broad English state Church, it was applicable to the situation of the Episcopal Church in the religiously plural United States, which he hoped to form the all-embracing, "the most comprehensive Church in Christendom".[804]

His constitutional approach, as Woolverton remarked, may be traced back to Huntington's American Whig persuasion that both a constitution and a government was necessary: "he modified his denominational loyalty and substantiated his nationalism".[805] In this respect, Woolverton might be right in suggesting that Huntington and his Quadrilateral proposal combined liberalism and a High Church approach. "But unlike the Tractarians, he did not look to the past, but to the future."[806] The Quadrilateral may be seen as perhaps the most influential product of the

"transition from tractarianism to liberal catholicism in the nineteenth century. […] The historical progression from a frankly reactionary Tractarianism to a measure of accommodation with liberal scholarship ... is of great importance to the articulation of a theory of comprehensiveness."[807]

Huntington's critics, namely the 'Catholic' ones, perceived his approach as part of "the current frenzy for 'undenominationalism'".[808] What Huntington indeed tried

---

[803] Woolverton, "Renewal", 192,194,197.
[804] Huntington, *Talisman*, 17.
[805] Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 203f.,207 (quote).
[806] Woolverton, "Renewal", 198.
[807] Sykes, *Integrity*, 20.
[808] Chase, *Reunion*, 2.

to provide was a model of **institutional rather than confessional unity**, "[r]ejecting conciliarism as well as papalism". "The church of the reconciliation was to follow the political structure of the American nation. … [Huntington] chose to follow territorial boundaries rather than the religious realities of the American scene."[809]

It is telling that he tried to persuade the General Convention in 1907 to remove the ***Thirty-Nine Articles*** from the Episcopal Prayer Book and to insert (effectively) the Quadrilateral into the preamble of the constitution of the Episcopal Church. In his draft preamble, Huntington coined the heart of the fourth article simply "Episcopal ordination".[810] Huntington himself had been prevented from ordination at first because he failed to satisfy the requirements of consent in the examination. He had complained about the pluralistic, comprehensive, nature of the Anglican formulas.[811]

Huntington was determined to overcome with his 'governmental approach' the common Anglican dilemma of internal theological disparity (High and Low Church, liberals versus conservatives etc.). "The Anglican principle insists upon governmental unity as an essential condition of oneness in the Church", with the "episcopate as the key-stone of governmental unity".[812] But he warned of charging it theologically.

"But if we go on insisting that those who are willing to recognize the episcopate as the centre of governmental unity shall also accept it as the sole depository of divine grace, if we go on insisting that those who accept the Sacraments ordained by Christ shall adopt and adhere to one single ritual out of the hundreds which, in the long history of Liturgics, have been evolved for the administration of those

[809] Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 209.
[810] Slocum, "Quadrilateral", 475. Woolverton, *Unity*, appendix I.
[811] Woolverton, *Unity*, 17,96, cf. 74ff.
[812] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 152.

Sacraments, we may indeed continue to maintain our corporate existence, even as the Nonjurors of Scotland and the Jansenists of Holland maintained theirs, but our hope of ever becoming for America the Church of the Reconciliation will have been blasted."[813]

It may be seen as telling that, at the end of the talk just cited, Huntington quotes himself, even omitting the episcopate when he says: "Let us term … the conditions of American Catholicity. They are these: a simple creed, a varied worship, a generous polity."[814] Huntington appears trying to continue the classical 'Anglican' approach to episcopacy as the desirable **form of government**. Questions of 'catholic' purity (union with 'Protestants') like 'sacramental assurance' and concerns about (re-)ordination are not part of his thinking. His position thus resembles that of English pre-Restoration divines.

4.2 Different Usages of the Quadrilateral: as an Authoritative Identity Marker of 'Anglicanism' and as an Ecumenical Model

As we have just seen, Huntington's idea of episcopacy as key-stone of governmental **'home union'** was rather institutional, as opposed to a theological understanding implying ecclesiological 'necessity', for example. The Chicago and Lambeth Quadrilaterals followed the design of his model and goal, but soon this model would be used not only to promote national but also international ecclesiastical unity, amongst 'Anglicans' but also with other denominations and in **multi-denominational contexts**.[815] This happened at the high point of Anglo-Catholicism which had established itself in the hierarchy. There was a tendency to

[813] Huntington, *Four Theories*, 12.
[814] Ibid., 14.
[815] Cf. Chapman, *Theology*, 193; Marshall, *Theology*, 217.

style the 'historic episcopate', defined by a **personal, episcopal succession**, as a matter of confession, as central **identity marker of 'episcopal churches' and as criterion for ecclesiastical union**, increasingly with an emphasis of the **imposition of hands** (the Quadrilaterals do not mention the word 'succession').[816] Sykes and Gilley speak of a "massive reinforcement which Tractarian theology gave to the existence of an episcopate beyond the boundaries of the English Establishment".[817] Effectively, such reasoning gave the Church of England in its **ecclesiological self-understanding independence from the state**. **Disestablishment**, however, seemed to be **less desirable or urgent** to Churchmen at the turn to the twentieth century than to the Tractarians.

The usage of the Quadrilateral as **ecumenical model** may go back to Huntington's tendency of self-promoting his own Church as solution to the confessional problem in the United States. "It is the confident belief of many that the key to the situation lies within that Church which more truly than any other may be said to represent the historical Christianity of the peoples of the English stock."[818] This Woolverton describes as "an example of romantic nationalism given a peculiarly Anglican twist".[819]

The new, 'Catholic' understanding of episcopacy did not remain undisputed, however. In 1889, Forrester argued in favour of an American national church, but holding that "episcopal ordination", understood in a **(quasi-) sacramental** way, had not been a principle of the early church. Therefore he concluded that there was no justification for the practice of receiving Roman

---

[816] Cf. Wrogemann, "Ökumene", 70.
[817] Sykes/Gilley, "Impact", 120.
[818] Huntington, *Book Annexed*, 29.
[819] Woolverton, "Renewal", 195f.

Catholic clergy but (re-)ordaining 'non-episcopalians', as he saw "Rome and Geneva on the same footing".[820]

The strife for 'home union' needs to be seen in the context of attempts to establish or maintain **national churches** as glue of the nations, as **'broad churches'** (not exclusively to associate with Broad-churchmanship). These attempts, however, originally came rather with a loosening than a tightening of dogmatic models, like in the proposals of Maurice and Huntington. Another example are Fremantle's Bampton lectures of 1885: "there can be no question of Church and State, since the nation is itself the truest development of the Church. And this is the actual state of things in England…", being "parochial and national", and not "clerical and congregational", which would make it "a sect instead of a branch or inner circle of the Church".[821]

The notion of a *national* Church of England, in 1883, was more of a restorative vision than a description, of course. People like Fremantle were drawing on the old ideals of an institutional church of and for the nation, but the social conditions had changed. The notion of 'catholicity', as that of national (effectively established) churches ('branches'), the pre-Tractarian High-churchmen had already proposed to compensate for the disintegrating model of a mono-denominational state church and to replace it by the claim of exclusive 'catholicity' in a denominationally fragmented country. Fremantle, in his lectures, tried to widen the focus again towards national and transnational church unity.

"The essence of [Fremantle's] *The World as the Subject of Redemption* is that the church consists primarily of the community of believers – not in the doctrines, rubric, or priesthood of any particular Christian persuasion. […] The Broad

[820] Forrester, *Historic Episcopate*, 67,74f. (quote),78.
[821] Fremantle, *World*, 290f. (long quote),292.

Church party already had a vague, long-standing commitment to the notion of a 'National Church' since the time of Thomas Arnold. Inspired by Richard Hooker's idea that Church and state were but different aspects of a single entity, as well as by Coleridge's notion that a National Church must act as the guardian of English civilization, Arnold's *Principles of Church Reform* (1833) proposed a scheme to reunite Anglicanism and Dissent within a more comprehensive National Church. … involving some inevitable dilutions of doctrine."[822]

Maurice's ideas were of some influence here, as were those of Christian socialists. The obvious danger of the national church model, however, was that of the spiritualization of the state, or even theocratic tendencies. It imitated as its goal the historic model of a mono-denominational church which had long ceased to be enforceable. The consequence of the ideal of the 'nationalization' of the state church would probably have meant in England either the further broadening of the Church of England, being fragmented into parties already, or the de-possessing of it.

Fremantle was hoping for parishes to become 'little nations'; "the ecumenical spirit provided a strategic defence against creeping secularization".[823] Stead, on the other side of the Atlantic, where the idea was also enthusiastically perceived in some circles, spoke of the 'Civic Church' as the "spiritual counterpart of the town council".[824] Thus, Shannon, with regard to England, speaks of

"one of the most characteristic features of the outlook of the Broad school: the idea of a National Church Establishment co-extensive with the nation at large, liberal and comprehensive in doctrine, tolerant and inclusive in its formularies, rooted in the nation's past and expressive of its historic continuity, a spiritual image of the State, the organ of national conscience, national culture, national unity and cohesiveness."[825]

---

[822] Phillips, "Concept", 26f. For more on Coleridge cf: Vidler, *Company*, 205ff.
[823] Phillips, "Concept", 27-28 (quote),29 (long quote).
[824] Ibid., 34; Stead, "Programme", 314 (quote).
[825] Shannon, "Seeley", 236. Shannon provides a good deal of relevant examples for this model in English theological writing of that time.

A national church, **Huntington** had already pointed out, could only be achieved on 'neutral grounds'. He had held that a national church in the United States could be achieved "only when we have stripped Anglicanism of the picturesque costume which English life has thrown around it".[826] He had defended his model as inclusive, not exclusive. Quite on the lines of the Pre-Restoration Church of England, he saw the retaining of **episcopal ordination** to continue a historic practice in the sense of "lawfully ordained clergymen … set apart by the authority of a bishop". Anglo-Catholic notions of succession and laying-on of hands were not part of his argument. His vision was that of institutional Christian unity without (in today's terminology) 'parallel jurisdictions'. He held some churches in the Reformation to have "changed the [ancient] custom". "We simply hold on to a feature of Church discipline which we believe to be essential to Christian unity. […] The Episcopal Church pronounces no judgement upon ordinations other than its own."[827] Lowrie suggested with regard to the model of **'historic episcopate'**: "the word 'historic' was invented in order that it might not weigh too heavily upon those who, having no experience of the episcopate, might fear that the bishop's little finger would prove thicker than the presbyter's loins".[828] The *Evangelical Quarterly* suggested in 1938 that the concept of "Apostolic Succession" prevailed in Anglican theology by a "trick".

"The idea suggested by the word Apostolic has been imported into the idea of the episcopate, as if apostolic and episcopal were almost interchangeable terms. And a

[826] Huntington, *Church-idea*, 124f.
[827] Huntington, *Misconceptions*, 57f.
[828] Lowrie, *Ministers of Christ*, 75. Quoted in: Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 200.

whole theory of the episcopate, historic or otherwise, is built-up on this assumption."[829]

Green (CR) once complained that a 'doctrine of development' had found its way into Anglican teaching. "The appeal to antiquity has become the appeal to history. […] The appeal to antiquity was … originally directed against Rome."[830] Ironically, with the notion of succession, Anglicans adopted an idea which had been directed against Protestantism.[831] Green criticized Norman Sykes' objection to the position of episcopacy as *esse* referring to Anglican history: "the 'appeal to Anglican history' … [is] quite another thing…", although this can be said about Anglican reconstructions of episcopacy as the default ancient model of church ordering as well, when it is used as a model for today's episcopal ordering.[832] After all, the appeal to history and antiquity is made in the model of 'historic episcopate' to avoid a controversial theological stance with a view to the nature of 'apostolic succession', although implications in that sense cannot be avoided. The charm as well as the disadvantage of the **Quadrilateral** appears to be **"its simplicity and lack of professional theological expression"**, which critics marked as 'superficiality'.[833] However, it is fair to say that this is the original intention of the Quadrilateral. Even though decisions and resolutions of Lambeth Conferences are understood only to have moral authority, the Quadrilateral, but in its second career of its Anglo-Catholic interpretation of a personal succession, was more and more **treated as an authoritative formulation of Anglican identity**. It gave the Anglican Communion, in harmony with the prevalent theological view of the time, a 'Catholic' rather than a Protestant outlook:

---

[829] Drummond, "Apostolic Succession", 71.
[830] Green, "History", 295,293 (quote). Cf. footnotes 685ff.
[831] Congar, "Apostolicité", 84,90,94,98,100,103ff.

"the emergence of an international Anglican episcopate gave substance to the High Anglican claim that theirs was a great international episcopal communion, constituting another branch of the Catholic Church beside the Orthodox and Rome."[834]

Thus, the **Anglo-Catholic version of the 'historic episcopate'** effectively became a **specifically Anglican** '**dogma**'.[835] It gave the adjective 'episcopal' a denominational connotation, despite occasional claims that Anglicanism was not dogmatically distinct from other denominations (which Avis quite rightly criticizes as a "mantra").[836] Franklin refers to the Quadrilateral, with regard to the twenty-first century discussions, as **"clearly a short theological covenant"**.[837]

This development of a definition of a Lambeth Conference is quite significant if one bears in mind that in 1867 some, mainly English (Evangelical), bishops had refused to take part in the first **Lambeth Conference**, which had been called for to exchange views on controversial matters at the time.[838] The opponents held that there was no 'Anglican Church' but only a fellowship of churches. The Archbishop of York refused to attend for two reasons, as it appears from his correspondence: "(a) fear of the severance of the ties between Church and State and (b) that such a gathering would take on the character of a General Synod".[839] "Out of a hundred and forty-four bishops invited, only seventy-six attended. The Archbishop of York stayed away, and Dean Stanley refused the use

---

[832] Green, "Review", 431.
[833] Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 201.
[834] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 69.
[835] Wainwright, "Dogma", 174f.
[836] Avis, *Identity of Anglicanism*, 157; Macquarrie, "Reply", 45; Sykes, "Doctrine"; Wand, *Anglicanism*, 227.
[837] Franklin, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", 122.
[838] Chapman, *Theology*, 180ff; Keller-Hüschemenger, *Konferenzen*, 13ff; Podmore, "Streams", 29f.
[839] Gerighty, "Longley-Thomson Correspondence", 432.

of Westminster Abbey for a service in connection with the Conference."[840] Even before the Conference started, some (Evangelical) bishops objected to a formulation in a draft resolution which appeared to put the church, the authority of antiquity (an possibly that of bishops) above Scripture, whereas Anglo-Catholics objected to an alternative formulation which put the sole emphasis on Scripture.[841]

Given the only short and not very successful career of Lambeth Conferences, the approval of the Quadrilateral at the third Conference seemed a promising step towards not only the definition but also the formation of a common 'Anglican' identity, whereas Archbishop Longley had still defined the first Lambeth Conference at the Convocation of Canterbury in 1867 as an informal gathering. He responded there to a petition, calling for the installation of a "Synod of the Bishops of all Churches in communion with the Church of England", as "a regularly-constituted Synod, which is to come to conclusions of a legal kind, propose canons and statutes and the like".[842] Defending his idea against his critics, he pointed out in the Upper House:

> "it should be distinctly understood that at this meeting no declaration of faith shall be made, and no decision come to which shall affect generally the interests of the Church, but that we shall meet together for brotherly counsel and encouragement, in the hope that the bonds which already exist between the Colonial Church and the Mother Church may be strengthened. […] … I should refuse to convene any assembly which pretended to enact any canons, or affected to make any decisions binding on the Church."[843]

It was a long way from such an understanding to that of the Lambeth Conferences as an 'instrument of communion', as they are styled today. In some respect, the

---

[840] Frame, "Unity"; Gray, *Anglican Communion*, 144f. (quote).
[841] Cf. Keller-Hüschemenger, *Konferenzen*, 87f.
[842] *The Chronicle of Convocation [1867], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury*, 646.
[843] Ibid., 807.

fears of the early critics seem to have been realized in our time when the Conferences have come to be understood to be more than a consultative bishops' meeting (without lay representation as such). They are usually organized every ten years by invitation of the *ex officio* chairman, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who exercised his right as host in 2008 not to invite certain bishops. The notorious Resolution 1:10 of Lambeth 1998 on 'Human Sexuality', for example, "has become to be regarded as a touchstone of orthodoxy, a way of defining the limits of change and of curbing provincial autonomy."[844] The way the American Episcopal Church had to justify itself in its acting against Resolution 1:10 and how it was stripped of certain membership rights illustrate the shift in understanding of the Lambeth Conferences. The Anglo-Catholic heritage of the Conferences, as in Anglican theology in general, is to be seen in a tendency to present Anglican teaching as 'evolutionary' albeit 'comprehensive'.[845]

The career of the Quadrilateral was perhaps the theologically most significant success of the Lambeth Conferences. Since the end of the nineteenth century, it transformed from a model for 'home union' into an **ecumenical model** for Anglicanism (with the goal, as defined in our days, of 'organic' union with "reconciled ministries").[846] Compared to such an objective, the original goal of 'home union' had meant for the English bishops something else in 1920, when the *Appeal* was issued.

"By Home Reunion the English Bishops meant the reconciliation of Protestant Nonconformists to the ministry and liturgy of the Church of England, or, in other words, the old ideal of a 'national' church with essential marks of Catholic continuity but including all Christians in one Christian nation in allegiance to the

[844] Ward, *History*, 307f.
[845] Keller-Hüschemenger, *Konferenzen*, 38ff.
[846] Gassmann, "Historisches Bischofsamt", 687.

Crown. The necessary condition was to acknowledge the royal ecclesiastical supremacy…"[847]

This illustrates that the Quadrilateral ever since its official adoption in 1888 has been used in **different contexts** (national, international, inner-Anglican and intra-denominational) with **different objectives** ('home union', inter-communion or communion). These transfers promoted the model of 'historic episcopate' in its fourth article, in its now common, Anglo-Catholic interpretation, to a core doctrine of Anglican identity, promoted from a model proposing institutional unity. The Lambeth Quadrilateral had spoken of the articles as "a basis of union" as opposed to the Chicago version which had held them to be "essential to the restoration of unity".[848] "[A]lthough it was originally intended as a basis for discussion with a view to reunion, it has usually been treated as a **non-negotiable basis for reunion**".[849] This is why the model of 'historic episcopate' from a 'Protestant' perspective can be accused of effecting the opposite of what it was intended to do, now serving more as a **"hindrance to church unity, a device excluding non-episcopal churches"**.[850] This was already pointed out in earlier criticisms of the Quadrilateral as interpreted by Anglo-Catholics. H.M. Gwatkin, Dixie Professor at Cambridge, warned of the potential treatment of the model of 'historic episcopate' as implying an ecclesiological 'episcopal' superiority: "[An] alleged necessity of a mechanical succession does not do well with our Lord's warning against tradition…[,] non-episcopal Churches show no very notable moral inferiority to others."[851]

---

[847] Chadwick, "Quadrilateral in England", 140.
[848] Lacey, *Unity*, 218.
[849] Butler, "Eighteenth Century to the Present Day", 40.
[850] Bradshaw, *Olive Branch*, 177.
[851] Quoted in Sachs, *Transformation*, 189.

Thus, from the historic genesis of the Quadrilateral, its disputed meaning and its different usages, it appears that its alleged normative character today is not grounded in the Quadrilateral itself, nor necessarily in the 'Anglican' tradition (cf. chapter 1.7). Its indiscriminatory usage for different goals, likewise, would need to be questioned as well. The fact is that the Quadrilateral itself is 'historic' and subject to historical interpretation instead of being treated, in co-junction with its Anglo-Catholic interpretation of entailing the concept of a personal succession, as an unquestionable 'Anglican core doctrine'. Mark Santer described the modern usage of the Quadrilateral as a **"check list"** rather than an "agenda of inter-related signs of Christian communion".[852]

"The goals of the Lambeth Conference for the Quadrilateral were an imperial and ethnic unity of English-speaking Christians, while the Chicago General Convention sought a national unity of all Christians. From the beginning, there were differing hopes and goals for the Quadrilateral."[853]

A historical understanding of the Quadrilateral would need to take into account that the question of episcopacy, at the English Restoration, was the origin of the non-theological, ideological separation from Dissenters and foreign 'non-episcopal' churches. **"The unequivocal insistence on bishops at Lambeth 1888 universalized one particular aspect of the 1662 Act of Uniformity".**[854] It also suggested a theological significance of bishops which they were barely held to have in 'Anglicanism' before the nineteenth century:

"some of the ideas that got stuck in the nets have proved rather bigger catches than others. The biggest fish of all is something called 'the historic episcopate[']

[852] Santer, "Forward", 108.
[853] Slocum, "Quadrilateral", 476.
[854] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 122.

… of the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888, which has come to be one of the badges of Anglican identity and theology. […] What emerged was not a strong doctrinal Anglicanism rooted in English formularies, but an extraordinarily inclusive denominational identity, exercised through highly decentralized churches. … Anglicanism had ceased to be explicitly English by 1888."[855]

This lets today's refusal of interchangeability of ministers with 'non-episcopal' churches appear less forceful if it is argued for on theological grounds, with an alleged 'Catholic succession' as default historic and common Anglican position. Thus, the situation appears paradoxical:

"Anglicanism, though it nowhere explicitly declares that episcopacy is of the Church's *esse*, or that only ordination by bishops and celebration of the Eucharist by priests who have been ordained by bishops is valid, is certainly pledged to episcopacy in the sense that it will never join a non-episcopal church."[856]

4.3 The Identification of the Quadrilateral with Its (Anglo-) Catholic Interpretation and the Consequences

Historically, as we have seen, subsequent to the adoption of the Quadrilateral, a particular, 'Catholic', understanding of it was established and carried forward which moved it away from the relative openness which Huntington had originally intended. This meant a significant move towards the **'catholicization'** of Anglican ecclesiology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The consequence of the adopting of the "episcopal paradigm", however, was that it, "in its strong form", "in effect excommunicated large portions of Christendom that lacked the historic succession".[857]

---

[855] Chapman, *Theology*, 3,185.
[856] Gray, *Anglican Communion*, 136.
[857] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 23.

"In the desire for clarity, episcopacy was elevated into the essence of the Church: churches with other forms of oversight could not be embraced by Anglicans as true churches unless they accepted the historic episcopate (by which most meant apostolic succession, even if they did not explicitly say so). This insistence might have come as a surprise to many earlier Anglican authors."[858]

The Quadrilateral has been treated in the twentieth century as an **unquestionable, normative determinator** of what Anglicanism means. However, only the American Episcopal Church explicitly codified legally the *Chicago* Quadrilateral as part of the 1979 Prayer Book in a collection of "Historic Documents of the Church" (which would still need to be interpreted), alongside with, for example, the Definition of Chalcedon, the first Prayer Book Preface and the *Articles.*[859] Canon A5 of the Church of England defines its doctrine as being grounded in the Bible and patristic teaching if not contradictory to Scripture. In particular, the canon continues, such doctrine was to be found in the Articles, the Prayer Book and the Ordinal.[860] Avis, without much reflection or justification of method or internal hierarchy, lists as sources of an Anglican ecclesiology the Bible, tradition ("a notoriously ambiguous term", as he admits), the Articles, the Prayer Book, the Ordinal, the canons, the Quadrilateral, "notable statements of the Lambeth Conferences" and "classical Anglican theologians".[861] His list, despite the air of authority, is arbitrary, as other compilations are possible.[862]

Thus, it seems, the Quadrilateral is granted a position in Anglican teaching which is more assumed by its 'reception' than by conscious decision(s). The

---

[858] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 121.
[859] Hankey, "Canon Law", 210.
[860] *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical Promulged by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*.
[861] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, chapter 6.
[862] Keller-Hüschemenger, *Konferenzen*, 48ff.

argument is circular here in insisting on the authority of episcopacy for Anglicanism which supports the authority of the Quadrilateral stating the authority of episcopacy. Another problem is that Anglicanism is usually presented as being committed to a position at least ***as if*** **the High Church interpretation of the fourth article of the Quadrilateral was normative Anglican theological teaching on episcopacy** and that this position possibly has been the 'Anglican' one since the sixteenth century, in continuation of a standard of the early church. As a result, 'episcopal episcopacy' is styled to represent the *koinonia* of the universal church and a future united church, "required in order to give effect to the visible unity of the Church through the effective sign of apostolicity, the historic episcopate."[863] The emphasis of a laying-on of hands in the twentieth century in connection with the refusal of interchangeability of 'non-episcopal' ministers with reference to a personal succession of 'episcopal' bishops styles the question of episcopacy to be more than a matter of government. Thus, **a particular (Anglo-Catholic) understanding of the fourth article of the Quadrilateral is identified with the article itself** but the authority of both deserves historical questioning.

The point of 'episcopal ordination', according to the preface of the Book of Common Prayer from 1662, was 'originally the securing of **'lawfulness'**. Ever since the late nineteenth century, Anglo-Catholicism has linked episcopal ordination to **the idea of 'historic succession' in a "family-tree style**" which **'theologized' the matter**.[864] This explains how the originally institutional identity marker of 'historic episcopate', securing an orderly vocation of ministers ('lawfulness') or canonical 'validity' (**regularity**), became a doctrinal issue, effectively claiming to secure the (quasi-)sacramental '**validity**' of this act and/or

---

[863] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 79.

its ‘catholicity’. Even though no specific theological theory for the insistence on the ‘historic’ episcopate (as reflected in canon law) has been officially approved in or after the Lambeth Quadrilateral, only an Anglo-Catholic ‘sacramental’ reasoning makes the ecclesiological insistence on an ‘episcopal episcopate’ in a historic, apostolic succession *theologically* plausible.[865]

“The threefold office of bishop, priest and deacon has lost its original historical-biblical legitimation [in modern scholarship]. However, it still is legitimised sacramentally subsequent to Anglo-Catholic tendencies in the Church of England.”[866]

This has complicated ecumenical relations ever since, with the model of ‘historic episcopate’ loved and criticised as **“a sort of fetish”**.[867] What is usually overlooked, however, is the fact that the model of ‘historic episcopate’ was originally designed for institutional church unity in a setting of that of a national church, not as an identity marker of a denomination, or describing a dogmatic matter.

“The net result of this desire to define Anglican identity was that whereas in 1800 the Church of England was very much the Established Church, by 1900 it was much more of a denomination. And one of the defining features of this denomination was the practice of episcopal ministry. […] The focus on the secondary features of church life as being determinative of Anglican identity has meant that it is almost impossible to reform them without being accused of undermining the essence of the Church of England.”[868]

---

[864] Gregg, "Ordination", 213.
[865] Dalferth, *Weg*, 111.
[866] Ibid., 113. “Das dreifache Amt von Bischof, Priester und Diakon hat seine ursprüngliche historisch-biblische Legitimation verloren. Es wird aber im Gefolge anglo-katholischer Tendenzen in der Kirche von England immer noch sakramental legitimiert.”
[867] Chase, *Historic Episcopate*, 1.
[868] Burkill, *Better Bishops*, 11.

This point is illustrated in our days by the discussion about women bishops. Historically, Buchanan suggests, the **Quadrilateral's "reference to the episcopate is purely pragmatic, and not dogmatic"**.[869] That highlights the difference between the original Quadrilateral and its use as instrument of ecumenical ventures.

"The ecumenical significance of the Anglo-Catholic interpretation [of the episcopate] is *that it promotes the 'historic episcopate' not only as a factual/canonical reality of the Church of England but as an ecclesiological criterion for visible unity of the Church in principle*."[870]

Woolverton similarily concluded:

"Huntington's Quadrilateral was an ecclesiological expression of hope for the church at a particular time and under peculiar circumstances. It grew out of some seemingly durable American ideas (and ideals)… […] Indeed Huntington's proposal was all-too-readily contoured to an existing organization, the increasingly self-conscious Anglican communion."[871]

It seems, however, that **denominational identities**, not least within Anglicanism itself, have proved to be persistent. Despite the 'national church ideal' and Huntington's model in particular having had an enormous impact on the making of 'Anglicanism', one must note with Phillips, with a view to its original 'ecumenical' intention: "it is equally clear that it is not a success story in itself. … it was not realized in any country." This is partly due to an apparent consensus amongst the different Anglican Churchmanships and the Dissenters that one did not want "the implied debasement of Anglican dogma" or the "potential erosion

[869] Buchanan, "Apostolic Succession", 29.
[870] Dalferth, *Weg*, 86. "Die ökumenische Bedeutung der anglokatholischen Auffassung besteht darin, *daß sie den historischen Episkopat nicht nur als faktisch-rechtliche Realität der Kirche von England, sondern als ekklesiologisches Kriterium für die sichtbare Einheit der Kirche überhaupt zu betrachten lehrte*."

of their own doctrines in such a union".[872] Accordingly, even the inner-Protestant attempt in Canada of Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists to establish a national church (the *United Church of Canada*) in 1925 struggled over doctrine which turned out to rule over practical advantages. The 'historic episcopate' had proven to be the stumbling block for Anglicans to be part of this union anyway.[873] Likewise, it is clear why Roman Catholicism never seriously engaged with the idea of national churches, as it would mean affirming a model of independent 'catholic' churches. In this respect, *Apostolicae Curae* might be seen as the Roman response to such a model.

The common identification of the Quadrilateral with its Catholic interpretation is a result of the **Anglo-Catholic predominance** at the turn from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries. The bishops promoted their office to be a significant factor in the strife for church unity and 'catholicity' in what had become within less than a century a fellowship of 'Anglican' churches. However, the confidence of the bishops' (Anglo-)'Catholic' self-understanding was soon undermined by *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) and later by the defeat of the revised Prayer Book in England (1927/8). It was only logical that one would try to promote the new Anglican episcopal paradigm with other churches, with the rise of Ecumenism. Ever since, the Quadrilateral, in its 'catholic' interpretation, has been treated as a historic(al) theological consensus which it actually never has been, nor does it express an unanimous historic, theological condition of 'Anglicanism'. It is, thus, important not to treat it as a timeless formulation of

---

[871] Woolverton, "Quadrilateral", 211.
[872] Phillips, "Concept", 35f.
[873] Grant, *Church Union*, 19ff.,29f.,94.

'Anglican' doctrine without any self-interests but as an expression of the theological approach of its time.

"In arguing that ecumenism is a response to ecclesiastical weakness and alienation from the wider society, it is important to recognize that much of the impetus towards union in the modern religious climate comes from those very sections of the Churches involved most actively, and confidently, in evangelization – in attempts to re-Christianize a profane world. Such people see unity as a basis for aggressive outreach, not as a defensive mechanism designed to prolong the survival of a waning sub-culture. […] The Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888, stating the basis on which Anglicanism might co-operate with other Christian bodies, was issued at a time when concern about the 'unchurched masses' was at a peak, and when secular meliorism was beginning to assume definite social programmes and organizational strategies…"[874]

4.4 Different Models of 'Catholicity': Apostolicae Curae (1896)

The Lambeth Quadrilateral with its model of 'historic episcopate' has been used subsequently to 1888 as a model providing criteria for Anglican denominational identity and ecumenical compatibility. The claim of a historical ordering is also used to claim 'apostolicity' and, thus, **'catholicity'**. This is often done, however, with a "superficial identification of the basic structure of the early church with the Anglican church".[875]

The claim of 'authentic', apostolic representation had been and was, after 1888, dismissed again by the **Roman Catholic Church** which saw (and sees) itself as principal heir and representative of **apostolic tradition** in the West,

---

[874] Gilbert, *Making*, 126f.
[875] Cf. Gassmann, "100 Jahre", 306f. "oberflächliche Identifizierung zwischen der Grundstruktur der Alten Kirche ... und der anglikanischen Kirche ..."

defined by and with **papal authority**.[876] The papal primate is seen as "the centre of Catholicity".[877] Apart from that, the Vatican, in the age of Ultramontanism, certainly did not wish to be associated with plans of some parts of the Roman Catholic Church to be absorbed in national church unions. It actually seems that Anglican converts like Newman influenced the definition of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, due to their conviction of a separation of church and state.[878] In turn, the formulation of the Lambeth Quadrilateral can be understood as an anti-Roman polemic (against Ultramontanism) in the first place – after the First Vatican Council and its emphasis on papal authority (1870).[879]

Against what Anglo-Catholics understood the Lambeth Quadrilateral to have stated, Leo XIII declared Anglican orders **"absolutely null and utterly void"** in his bull ***Apostolicae Curae* of 1896**. This was no surprise, however. There had been a few instances of the Roman *Magisterium* declaring the nullity of Anglican ministries, mostly in responding to individual cases. The last official request to the Vatican in this matter had come from Cardinal Manning in 1885 and the Vatican's response foreshadowed the argumentation of *Apostolicae Curae*.[880] Paul IV's two bulls *Praeclara Clarissimae* and *Regimini Universalis* from 1555 had already spelled out that Church of England clergy would have to be **(re-)ordained unconditionally and absolutely**. *Apostolicae Curae* re-stated this judgement, alleging the inadequacy of Anglican ministries in their **form** and in **intention** ("to do what the Church does"). The Bull objects that no clear reference to the mass sacrifice in the Prayer Book was made and that the Ordinal also lacked a clear reference to 'Holy Orders'. That, *Apostolicae Curae* held,

---

[876] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 834f.,837. Cf. Newman, "Milman's View", 87.
[877] Cf. Dulles, *Catholicity*, 127ff.
[878] Gilley, "Review"; Parker/Pahls, *Authority*.

made the Anglican liturgy a "new rite" and consequently, "the true sacrament of orders, as instituted by Christ, lapsed" (§1.7.10). The Ordinal, the Pope held, "clearly manifests" a "native character – or spirit as it is called" ("nativa indoles ac spiritus", §8).[881]

It is possible that the Vatican saw the Oxford Movement as a potential source of danger to the English Roman Catholic Church after Roman Catholics and other 'Dissenters' had gained more freedom after centuries of official repression. It had only been in 1791 that English Roman Catholics were officially allowed to worship in their own chapels.[882] The Vatican made clear that only conversion and submission to papal authority would make the Oxford Movement (Roman) 'Catholic'. Henry Chadwick once suggested that Anglicanism could be perceived

> "in will and deed an alternative and rival Catholicism which, because it has no central organ of control but works through a diffused authority and general consensus, is visibly less inhospitable to liberal humanist reinterpretations of divine revelation and to relativist ideas that in faith and morals nothing is too certain, and in short is open to compromise with modern paganism as authentic Catholicism is not."[883]

Ultramontanism, however, which influenced the actions of the Vatican in the second half of the nineteenth century, did not help Anglo-Catholics to promote union with Rome:

> "thanks to the definitions of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 and of the Papal Magisterium and Infallibility at the Vatican Council in 1870, [Roman

---

[879] Santer, "Forward", 108.
[880] Echlin, *Ministry*, 142ff.,144. Cf. Dalferth, "Amt", 243; Hill/Yarnold, *Orders*, introduction.
[881] Cf. Pope Leo XIII, "Apostolicae Curae", 135,137.
[882] Hill/Yarnold, *Orders*, 5; Mather, "Church", 540.
[883] Chadwick, "Full Communion", 224.

Catholicism] receded still further from the *Consensus Quinquesaecularis*, which had been the *beau ideal* of seventeenth-century English churchmen."[884]

In any case, Franklin might be right in suggesting that it was **theology, not history** which was the crucial question for Rome (not least the question of papal authority).[885] This is why the model of 'historic episcopate' did not make a significant impression at Rome. Chadwick once suspected that the Vatican was hoping for a 'landslide' of converts with *Apostolicae Curae*.[886] It was only a small, educated elite who converted, but many Anglicans subsequently even more vigorously claimed to have preserved the historic, 'catholic' offices of the apostolic church which they saw as being marks of apostolicity as well as divine providence.[887]

"Not only *a* ministry, then, but *the* ministry, is so much a part of the Church's God-given life that its destruction would mean the disappearance of the Church as God founded it through Christ and his Apostles."[888]

Non-Anglican observers as well as Anglicans themselves have judged that Anglicans appear never to have recovered from the rejection by the Vatican. Webster observed a "sore conscience on just this point", and Roberts diagnosed a "mental injury of the identity of Anglo-Catholic clergy".[889] Commentators pointed out that Anglican revisions of the Ordinal have been keen to draw on sacramental theology, quite possibly as a result of *Apostolicae Curae*.[890] This gives the impression of Anglicans sometimes making desperate attempts to ally with Rome

---

[884] Sykes, *Priest*, 208 (quote),228.
[885] Cf. Franklin, "Archives", 8,11ff.,18.
[886] Chadwick, "Diskussion", 303.
[887] Chadwick, *Tradition and Exploration*, 87f.
[888] Fairweather/Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion*, 30f.
[889] Roberts, "Stellenwert", 378: "psychische Verwundung der Identität der anglo-katholischen Amträger"; Webster, "Ministry", 289.

by emphasizing the notion of succession or, for example, pre-dating Anglicanism as the Christian Church of Britain back to earliest, pre-Reformation time.[891] Werner judged: "Before Lambeth 1888, apostolic succession hardly had been emphasized in Anglican circles. The over-emphasis today appears to be a complex of violated honour."[892] Bishop Christopher Hill once suggested: **"An unnoticed consequence of the 'rebuff' was the collapsing of the Anglican ecumenical agenda into the narrow question of orders and succession."**[893]

The English Archbishops issued their response ***Saepius Officio*** **in 1897**, addressed to the "whole body of Bishops of the Catholic Church", followed by a reply by the Roman Catholic Bishops of the Westminster Province.[894] The Archbishops argued that the Anglican formularies had drawn heavily on ancient liturgies. They referred to historical uncertainties with ancient ordination rites in general (cf. §XIXf.). They claimed the laying-on of hands as the '**matter**' of ordination and the prayer for and blessing of the candidates as the '**form**', referring to ancient ordination rites which had not known the notion of sacrifice. In order to argue against the invalidity judgement ('null and void') by the Vatican, the two Anglican Primates' argument adopted the sacramental language and theological framework of Roman Catholic doctrine, drawing upon the more legal than theological definition of authenticity/liceity of sacraments (defined by *forma*

---

[890] Bradshaw, "Consequences", 75; Spinks, "Comments", 59.
[891] Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 173.
[892] Werner, "Unionsbestrebungen", 28. "Eine Betonung der apostolischen Sukzession hatte es im anglikanischen Bereich vor Lambeth 1988 kaum gegeben. Ihre Überbetonung heute erscheint als ein Komplex verletzter Ehre."
[893] Hill, "Orders", 88.
[894] *Anglican Orders (English): The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII., September 13, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 29, 1897*; Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, *Vindication*; Clark, *Defect*; The Archbishops of England, "Saepius Officio", 142f.

and *materia*), emphasizing the due intention.[895] The Roman Catholic position asserts:

"[a] valid sacrament is one capable of producing the effects it is ordered to produce. [… The sacrament of holy orders requires:] (i) *matter* (action)…; (ii) *form* (words)…; its [validly ordained episcopal] *minister*…; (iv) its *recipient* [a baptized man]…; (v) *intention*: the bishop and recipient must intend what the Church intends."[896]

These factors are interrelated and the Roman judgement of Anglican 'orders' has been negative until today, whereas Anglicans have been arguing:

"[i]t is … asserted that the retention of the historic Episcopate in the English Church was not merely the retention of a name and a form, but of a dogmatic theory of the ministry as well. It is not only the historic name but the historic thing."[897]

The Archbishops argued that the fathers of the Anglican Ordinal had "concentrated the parts of the whole rite as it were on one prominent point, so that no one could doubt at what moment the grace and power of the priesthood was given" (§XIX).

Over arguing that the Anglican Ordinal had maintained a 'Catholic' character, the Archbishops failed to address the crucial question which they briefly mention themselves, which is, "what authority the Pope has for discovering a definite form in the bestowal of holy orders" (§XI). The *Churchman* felt that the Archbishops had failed to address the real issue and pointed out that, "whatever gifts may be supposed to accrue to his [the Pope's] successors…", the historicity of an alleged succession would not in itself justify the papal claims.

---

[895] Hughes, *Orders*; Sykes, "Intent", 57ff.
[896] Doe, "Ordination", 407 (quote),422.

"Instead of being grounded as they now are upon an unhistorical legend, they would be grounded upon an unwarranted textual gloss."[898]

Not really engaging with the question of papal primacy and the ecumenical consequences, nor with the question of whether the Roman understanding of a transferring of sacerdotal powers was acceptable for the Anglican churches as a whole, the Archbishops, at the high point of Anglo-Catholicism, argued that Anglican 'orders' ticked the Roman boxes. The *Church Association Tracts* mourned that too many in the Church of England had become "servile imitators of Rome. What can it matter to us what the practice of Rome was?"[899] The Secretary of the Church Association commented: "[b]ut at least we have learned one important lesson from this unfaithful letter. We have found out that we need to expect nothing from our present Archbishops: they are only the puppets of the Romanizing sect…"[900]

The Archbishops adopted fully the Roman Catholic understanding of sacraments that "validity [is] to be known" if the conditions are fulfilled of a "due minister, matter, form and proper intention". This view had been affirmed by Pope Benedict XIV in the eighteenth century, presuming, however, that it was the framework of the Roman Church which ultimately validated the sacrament.[901] For the understanding of **ordained ministry** this means that it **cannot validly and regularly exist if not under the Pope**. This is Roman dogmatic practice until today, even though Vatican II emphasized the collegial exercise of the episcopal office (Cardinal Ratzinger spoke of episcopal collegiality as "one of the main pillars of Vatican II's ecclesiology"), but still understood in dependency from the

---

[897] Simpson, *Relation*, 19.
[898] Pearson, "Encyclical", 643.
[899] Cobham, *Criticism*, 1.

pontiff (*Lumen Gentium*), effectively in a 'sacramental' hierarchy above the priesthood, representing the 'fulness' of powers.[902] This is understood to be in line with the "anti-Gallican aim" of Vatican I which would not allow, for example, a national bishops' conference to overrule a papal judgement. Ratzinger once described papal jurisdiction as "not merely ratify[ing] a process of reception … but [having the right to] issue definite decisions, definite interpretations".[903] Consequently, Vatican II held with regard to papal rulings that they, as a principle, were not dependent on a general approval in the Roman Church: "his definitions, of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly styled irreformable…" ("definitiones eius ex sese, et non ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles…"; *Lumen Gentium* III,25).

> "[T]he bishop as successor to the apostles is fully priest, constituted head of the local church by sacramental ordination, not by delegation. On the other hand, the genuine exercise of this authority is established in and through union with the Roman pontiff and the college of bishops."[904]

The Anglo-Catholic model of **'historic episcopate'** represents a different 'catholicity' paradigm with a view to ecclesial authority. At least in practical terms, in Roman Catholic doctrine it is the submission under the authority of the Pope (believed to have succeeded Peter, installed by Christ) which marks the identity of the (Roman Catholic) Church. As opposed to that, (non-papal) Anglican High Church theologians attribute the divine commission of the Christian church to the 'apostolic' officers (the episcopate, believed to have been installed by Christ or the apostles or their successors). For both, sacramental

---

[900] Miller, *Archbishops' Reply*, 3.
[901] Gurrieri, "Sacramental Validity", 21f.,29,55.
[902] Barratt, "Sacrament of Order", 10ff.,13ff; Ratzinger, *Essays*, 11(ff.).

validity is dependent on these respective institutions. Nevertheless, even though their theological arguments are similar, the Anglican rejection of papal authority marks the very difference, with Anglican post-Tractarian High Church theology effectively having **replaced the authority of the Pope by that of the(ir) bishops** (although this authority seems dispersed), overruling the historic claim of royal supremacy of Henry VIII ('Caesaro-Papalism') and the power of the lay parliament.

Both models developed a similar, **institutional**, understanding of internal as well as 'ecumenical' unity (under the Pope for Roman Catholics, and under their bishops for Anglicans). Dalferth suggests that the Church of England also uncritically adopted the notion of Vatican II of 'fulness' of unity without its presumption, that this **'fulness'** was and is understood by the Roman Catholic Church as being realized in itself, not in other churches.

The model of 'historic episcopate' appears to be an attempt to overcome the Roman judgement of ***defectus ordinis*** but unfortunately results, at least in its High Church interpretation, in the 'unchurching' of 'non-episcopal' churches. Such an ecclesiology which defines itself through its own offices, Dalferth contends, **confuses the episcopate with what it should witness to**.[905] Additionally, this potential Anglican 'bridge' between Roman Catholic and Protestant theology has not proved to be widely successful over the last century. With regard to the **'bridge'** metaphor the Roman Catholic (and former Anglican) Gilley polemically wrote: "[i]t is perhaps sufficient to point out that a bridge is merely a span for traffic across a river or ravine, not a place of residence. No one

---

[903] Fries/Rahner, "Response", 81f.
[904] McMillan, *Ordination*, 247.
[905] Dalferth, *Weg*, 204,211,233f.

in the modern world lives on bridges."[906] Apart from that, the Roman judgement does not hint at any recognition of an Anglican 'bridge' status. Arnold observes: "[t]he Church of England is no longer needed as a 'bridge Church': the RC Church and its Pontiff are busy building their own bridges…"[907] Until today, the official Roman recognition of Anglicanism has been that of an **"ecclesial community"**, with its Eucharist being defect in *forma* und *materia* (*Dominus Iesus*: "the ecclesial communities which have not preserved the valid Episcopate and the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic mystery, are not Churches in the proper sense").[908] The official status of the Roman invalidity judgement of Anglican orders is to be seen as final and infallible, as **"definitive tenenda"** and part of the Roman *depositum fidei*. In 1998, confirming a judgement of Cardinal Ratzinger, the Vatican *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* and Pope John Paul II explicitly mentioned the *defectus ordinis* judgement with regard to Anglican ministries as examples of

> "truths connected to revelation by historical necessity and which are to be held definitively, but are not able to be declared as divinely revealed…: … the declaration of Pope Leo XIII in the Apostolic Letter *Apostolicae Curae* on the invalidity of Anglican ordinations..."[909]

Ever since *Apostolicae Curae*, one can note a distinct tendency in Anglicanism, despite the decline of Anglo-Catholicism, of effectively affirming the Vatican notion of defect in defining the 'catholicity' of a church by comparing it with the Roman Catholic Church as a benchmark of 'catholicity' or by arguing that

---

[906] Gilley, "Ecclesiology", 71; Sykes, *Integrity*, 98f; Thomas, "Doctrine", 230; Thönissen, "Arbeitskreis", 90.
[907] Arnold, "One".
[908] Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, *Dominus Iesus*, para. 17. Cf. Doe, "Ordination", 407f.
[909] Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei/Pope John Paul II, *Commentary*, para. 9,11 (quote); Doe, "Ordination", 408; cf. Schöpsdau, "Dokumentenkunde", 45.

Anglicanism fulfilled the Roman criteria.[910] As opposed to that, the Restoration divines had seen Anglicanism as a *scriptural*, 'catholic' church, purified of Roman errors and corruptions. *Apostolicae Curae*, with its factual emphasis on the **papal authority** to define 'Catholicism' (cf. Vatican I), as opposed to conciliar models with the college of bishops being more important (like in Anglicanism), must be seen as a historic as well as a theological statement. Its theological content has been restated in the just cited note by the Vatican or the recent erection of the Ordinariate. Historically, it may be seen as an expression of the anti-modernist Roman-Catholic identity often displayed in the context of secular and pluralistic societies since the second half of the nineteenth century. It was a strategy against national alliances which might have further endangered the existence of the shrunk Vatican (state) as an international legal subject and its character of a unified, international church under the Pope.

"An antithesis between Liberalism and Ultramontanism replaced the earlier antithesis between the freedom of Ultramontanism and the subjection to the secular power which Gallicanism had too frequently involved. As a result, German Liberal Catholics ceased to be Ultramontane, while French Ultramontanes ceased to be liberal; Ultramontanism became clerical and anti-democratic rather than popular and anti-Gallican.[911]

[910] Cf. Faith and Order Advisory Group, *Priesthood*, 74ff.,94.

4.5 The Kikuyu-Zanzibar Controversy and the Anglo-Catholic Insistence on Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation for (Inter-)Communion

The new 'Anglican' ethos which allows a certain confessional plurality and institutional variation within the boundaries of an episcopal system inspired Anglicans and Episcopalians to become chief promoters of the *Faith and Order Commission* of the emerging *World Council of Churches* in the twentieth century.[912] Originally, ecumenism had been a chiefly Evangelical concern but many liberal Anglo-Catholics were equally inspired by the idea, although one was at odds in Anglicanism about the terms of inter-communion or union. At their second meeting after the first *World Mission Conference* in **Edinburgh (1910)** and only a couple of years after the end of the **First World War** (1914-8), the Anglican bishops issued the **Lambeth "*Appeal to All Christian People*"** (1920), which resulted in England in the approaching of English Free Churches about 'reunion', on the terms of accepting the 'historic episcopate' (the notion of succession was still avoided then). This proposal many perceived as that of a late acceptance of the *Act of Uniformity*, but now with episcopacy understood by many Anglicans in a particular, 'catholic' way.[913] Likewise, plans for a union between 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' churches in **South India** were in the air which caused concerns.[914]

Many Anglo-Catholics saw these ecumenical endeavours critically. Their approach to intercommunion and church union had expressed itself earlier in the ***Kikuyu-Zanzibar*** controversy.[915] The incident happened in **1913**, when Anglo-Catholicism was firmly established in the hierarchy, at an inter-denominational

---

[911] Holmes, *Catholicism*, 111.
[912] Franklin, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral"; Podmore, *Aspects*, 159; Tanner, "Future", 119.
[913] Cf. chapter 4.7.
[914] Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 24ff.

missionary conference at Kikuyu (between 1895 and 1920 in the English *East Africa Protectorate*, then the *Kenya Colony*).[916] It was a conference of

> "all the Protestant missions of the Protectorate – Church of England, Church of Scotland, the [American] Africa Inland Mission, the Friends' Industrial Mission [Quakers], the United Methodists, the Lutheran Mission, and the Seventh Day Adventists. Bishop Willis, of Uganda, was in the chair, and Bishop Peel, of British East Africa, was in a front seat."[917]

Two aspects of *Kikuyu* proved to be controversial. Firstly, the conference had ended with a **Communion service**, with the sacrament being administered by Bishop Peel and with a Church of Scotland minister preaching. The participating Anglican bishops were later formally charged for this by their fellow-bishop Frank Weston of Zanzibar, an Anglo-Catholic, for administering the sacrament to "many members of protestant bodies whose very existence is hostile to Christ's Holy Church…"[918] Secondly, and even more severe seemed to the critics that the conference had passed a **scheme of federation**. "With a view to ultimate union of the native churches, a federation of missionary societies shall be formed", *The Scotsman* reported on 9 August 1913.

The envisaged federal, bottom-up structure had elements that corresponded to parochial councils, presbyteries and a synod, "completed by the Episcopate as the cope-stone – a perfect blending of Bishop and presbyters", as the (Presbyterian) correspondent reported. Mutual pulpit exchange was agreed and the scheme laid down to "duly set apart [ministers] by lawful authority and by the laying on of hands" – in the future. "Meanwhile each society is autonomous

---

[915] Cf. Bell, *Davidson*, vol. I, 690-708.
[916] Cf. Karanja, "Kikuyu".
[917] Maclean, "Contrast".
[918] Bell, *Davidson*, 692ff; Davidson, *Answer*, 2 (quoting Weston); Stephenson, *Anglicanism*, 130.

within its own sphere; only the organisation of the future native Church is to be developed along these lines."

The partners, both 'native' and European, would still have maintained formal autonomy for the time being under the common umbrella of a "Representative Council of the Federated Societies".[919] The terms, however, against what the *Scotsman* reported, appear not to have stated whether the future, native church would have an episcopal government and if so, whether it would be 'episcopal' in the understanding of Anglo-Catholics. There was an understanding, however, that communicant members of one district church would be welcome to communicate in another.[920] The bonds, still, would have been loose. In some respect, the scheme can probably be characterized as a premature model of the later South India scheme (cf. chapter 4.9). The latter effected an immediate, organizational union with interchangeable ministries, with an episcopal government and 'episcopal' episcopacy.

Bishops Peel and Willis, finding themselves under heavy attack, defended *Kikuyu* as not violating the principles of the Quadrilateral and held that the scheme was open for *per saltum* consecrations of overseers of partner churches (without prior deaconing or priesting, as endorsed in Resolution 75, Lambeth 1908), provided the partners were ready to accept such a step.

"That the future African Church in British East Africa will certainly be an episcopal Church it would be impossible at this stage to assert. We can only say that there is very remarkable evidence of desire on the part of many non-episcopal missionaries in the Protectorate to see the establishment of a United Church under definite episcopal government…; that we as Anglican Bishops have made it clear

[919] Willis, *Study*, 19-24.
[920] Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 37ff; Willis, *Study*, 19ff., especially 22f.

that, while quite prepared to *federate* with non-episcopal Missions, we could not *join* any United Church which did not accept the Historic Episcopate…"[921]

Willis would later refer to the "fatal omission" of episcopacy in Kikuyu.

"But while the Anglican delegates had no intention of changing their own form of governing, they did not insist or attempt to insist on imposing it on others. No immediate organic unity was in view, but a federation of autonomous missions… There was no attempt to absorb all into one Church…"[922]

The (Anglican) 'Catholic' critique did not give it the benefit of doubt of good intentions. Kelway, for example, saw the terms of the federation as betrayal of the **principle of episcopal ordination** and as establishing **intercommunion** with all baptized members of the federation (which did not include Roman Catholics). He, thus, criticized the scheme to have violated the requirement of **confirmation as prerequisite for receiving communion** in Church of England congregations, which, as we shall see, was a result of *Kikuyu*, but appears not to have been official policy at the time. Ollard, for example, showed that confirmations ('bishopping') in the practice of the Church of England never actually appeared to have been normative precondition for receiving Communion or unquestionable part of sacramental practice and piety. Concerns over communicating usually related to uncatechized believers, not unconfirmed ones. Confirmations were conducted only "habitual", infrequent and often pastorally "careless" before the nineteenth century and only improved with pastorally more sensitive Evangelicals.[923] In theory, all believers were to be confirmed from the age of fourteen and were required to communicate at the age of sixteen (Canon 112).

---

[921] Peel/Willis, *Reunion*, 28ff.,31 (quote),61.
[922] Willis, "1913", 43.

Attempts to conform to the theory often ended in chaos. A minister reports scenes of "riot and profaneness" at a badly organised confirmation at Cambridge in 1833 which had been "thoughtless and disorderly":

"my natural feelings had been insulted with senseless brutality: that I had been driven about like cattle… […] ... confirmation is looked upon by many as a kind of holiday… [… T]he impression left … is a licentious carnival, from which no spiritual profit can be expected…"[924]

For Kelway, however, *Kikuyu* meant a surrendering of ancient and firm Anglican principles, which had been spelt out again by the Tractarians. In *Kikuyu*, he saw an obstacle to any future attempt of reunion with Rome or Orthodox churches.

"The whole question is not one of optional and local discipline, affecting two or three missionary bishops in distant parts of the world. It is a matter of universal and obligatory principle. As that learned canonist, Mr. Bayfield Roberts, well puts it: 'What is right in Kikuyu cannot be wrong in England: What is wrong in England cannot be right in Kikuyu.'"[925]

Intercommunion with 'non-episcopal' foreign Protestants and Dissenters had been accepted practice in the Church of England until the second half of the nineteenth century, as had been interchangeability of ministers until the late seventeenth.[926] Bishop Gore celebrated in a letter to the Oxford clergy the fairly recent (Anglo-Catholic) **establishment of the Anglo-Catholic understanding of confirmation in the Church of England**, according to "Catholic principles", now understood not merely as a "renewal of vows", but according to

---

[923] Ollard, "Confirmation", 93ff.,99ff.,101 (quote),109ff.,124 (quote),152ff.,175f.,177,201ff., 213ff.,220ff.
[924] Cecil, *Disorder*, 30ff. (quotes),49.
[925] Kelway, *Kikuyu*, 11,22,18 (quote).
[926] Goode, *Communion*, 5ff.,10ff.,23ff.,28ff.

"the primitive and Scriptural idea, according to which the laying-on of hands is the sacramental means for the bestowal of the full gift of the Holy Spirit, which constitutes the recipient a fully equipped member of the Church: it is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual gift thereby given to us. This is what it has meant since the apostles first taught its use and significance in the Church. 'Baptisms and the laying-on of hands' have been thenceforward coupled together as two indispensable parts of the ceremony of Christian initiation. To this primitive idea we have been reverted, so that the bishops of our province to-day desire to replace the dry 'preface' of our present Confirmation Order by a simple and emphatic statement of the sacramental meaning of the rite."[927]

The Evangelical Thomas commented:

"… Bishop Gore's interpretation of the rubric at the end of the Confirmation Office [admission to communion only for people who have been confirmed or desire to be, S.W.] is unwarranted by all that we know of its history. […] From that time [of Archbishop Peckham, died 1292, 'when there was, of course, no question of any other Church but one'] to the beginning of the Tractarian Movement, the rubric was understood to apply inclusively to our own people alone, and Bishop Gore's interpretation has been rejected by some of the most important High Churchmen during the last twenty years. […] With delightful frankness the Bishop says that 'we have to convert a Protestant-minded country'."[928]

Henson seconded the interpretation of the rubric as domestic rule with "no bearing on the issue of intercommunion". A law which was meant to bar Non-conformists from public offices which required occasional taking of Communion (*Test Act*, 1673, 25 Car. II. c.2) had had, under Queen Anne, only a short life.[929]

"The 'Occasional Conformity' of Nonconformists was much discussed in the early eighteenth century, and so generally assumed to be lawful that in 1713 [it appears that it was in 1711, 10 Anne c.6, *S.W.*] an Act was passed to prevent it the practice. The speedy repeal of this Act [in 1719] re-established the Nonconformists in their former liberty."[930]

---

[927] Gore, *Fellowship*, 35f(f.).
[928] Thomas, "Letter", 495,497. Cf. Wilson, *Inquiry*, 210ff.
[929] Cf. footnote 135.
[930] Henson, *Quo tendimus*, 31.

As witnesses for a practice supporting Gwatkins' and his interpretation Henson (like Sykes after him) refers to authorities who can hardly be accused to be notorious Low-churchmen: Archbishop Tait and Bishops Creighton and Stubbs.[931] Bishop Creighton of Peterborough (previously Dixie Professor and later translated to London, whom the *Church Association Tract* 251 accused of tolerating illegal ritual advances) defended a "*historical* interpretation of the Rubric, on the ground that it … did not contemplate the case of nonconformists" and even suggested that the baptism preparation of Non-conformists was to be regarded *as* confirmation.[932] This practice would be illegal in the Church of England today, which re-confirms, for example, presbyterally confirmed Roman Catholics.[933]

In fact, intercommunion perhaps appeared more problematic to many Dissenters, concerned with ecclesiastical 'purity', than to Churchmen. "To the archbishop [Sharp of York, died 1714] it was refusal of occasional communion with the Church of England, not its practice, which was schismatical behaviour on the part of Dissenters…"[934] In any case, it appears, as Calamy (1671-1732) noted, despite some ambiguous feelings about it on both sides,

> "that the communicating with the Church of England, was no new practice among the Dissenters, nor of a late date, but had been used by some of the most eminent of our ministers ever since 1662, with a design to show their charity towards that Church…"[935]

In an Oxford University Sermon on *Kikuyu*, Henson thus warned:

---

[931] Ibid. Hutton, *Letters*, 331; Sykes, *Essay*, 27ff.,34ff.,39ff.
[932] Creighton, *Creighton*, vol. II, 63. *Mass or Communion? Samples of Law-breaking Under the Oversight of Dr. Creighton, Bishop of London*.
[933] Seville, "Meanings", 129.
[934] Sykes, *Essay*, 41.
[935] Calamy, *Account*, vol. I, 473. Cf. Sykes, *Essay*, 39f.

"[t]he University Pulpit is the Confessional of distressed Churchmen. […] If, in spite of our history, our formularies, and our precedents, we are now to elevate Episcopacy into an essential factor of Christianity, then … we are bound … to the dolorous conclusion of complete religious isolation."[936]

The Lady Margaret Professor at Oxford, Sanday, commented on some principal theological and hermeneutical questions of some of Gore's points.[937] A more profound resistance came from Cambridge, from Gwatkin, the Dixie Professor. He protested against the Bishop of Zanzibar, who had worked hard to scandalize *Kikuyu* and who, as Gwatkin summarized, "demands the summary expulsion of those who do not come up to the Tractarian standard of orthodoxy, and even of some whose only offence is that they are willing to work with such persons." Gwatkin protested also against Gore's

"plan, if I [Gwatkin] understand you [Gore] rightly, … to make Tractarianism the official doctrine and the official practice of the Church, exclude unsound persons from ordination, and then – leave it to every man's conscience to say whether he can honourably remain in its ministry."[938]

The *Church Association* had dedicated in 1901 its Tract 306 to the appointment of Gore to the bishopric of Worcester, warning that it meant "the most fatal blow given to the Church since the Reformation, indeed, not only to the Reformation, but to Christianity itself."[939]

Gwatkin pointed out that Gore's theological position was focused on a Catholic interpretation of confirmation and on a Communion practice in the Church of England which was only fairly recent (cf. also chapter 4.6), apart from the scriptural and historical weakness of his position. And: "[i]n your haste to shut

[936] Henson, *Quo tendimus*, 1,22.
[937] Sanday, *Reply*.
[938] Gwatkin, *Letter*, 3.

out Protestants from our Church you shut out also the Greeks, who are not confirmed by a bishop, and the Latins, who have no laying-on of hands."[940]

Gwatkin held against Gore an interpretation of the aforementioned '**Confirmation Rubric**' (admitting people to Communion having been "confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed") as applying to permanent members, but not to respectful 'non-conformist' guests: "[it] implies no general doctrine that Confirmation is indispensable to Communion. Any such doctrine indeed would make Confirmation as necessary as Communion itself…" He reminds his readers that "barring out unconfirmed persons was never seriously maintained till quite lately". He refers to the practice of intercommunion of (exiled) 'Anglicans' abroad, the interchangeability of ministries with Reformed churches prior to 1662 and the communicating of (English and foreign) Non-conformists in the Church of England after 1662 (endorsed by senior Churchmen). Confirmations had been re-enacted by the bishops at the Restoration, but "for our own people only" (a phrase inserted into the 1662 Preface of the Prayer Book). "[A]fter the Restoration only a small proportion of Churchmen were ever confirmed…"[941] In fact, it appears that the 1662 version of the Rubric made access to communion easier. Previously, the Rubric had required for admission that the candidate was able to say the Catechism and be confirmed. The Puritans had objected to that at the Savoy Conference (1661):

"it must be remembered that their [the Puritans'] objections were not that access should be made easier to the Sacrament – rather the reverse. Nor did they object to the rite of Confirmation. They rather protested at the slovenliness and infrequency

---

[939] *Lord Salisbury's Nomination to the Bishopric of Worcester [Gore]*, 8.
[940] Gwatkin, *Letter*, 8.
[941] Wilson, *Inquiry*, 211ff.,212 (quote).

with which it was performed, and objected that ability to say the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed, was no guarantee of spiritual fitness."[942]

The reception of **Communion** was handled as a serious matter and one of discipline (personal and social worthiness). It was a marker of Church membership and of social integrity. It was simply not celebrated often enough to be regarded as a means of salvation to receive wherever and as often as possible but only after personal, and ecclesiastical, examination. Canon 28 of 1604, for example, had ruled that Communion should be received in the home parish church only.[943] The fact that, even after the Restoration, Archbishop Wake (died 1737) did not hesitate to authorize **intercommunion** between the Church of England and the Reformed Church in Zürich highlights that sacramental 'validity' of 'episcopal' sacraments only, or a norm of episcopal confirmation as precondition for receiving the sacrament, was not a theological issue before the nineteenth century.[944] Hunkin notes that a clergyman from the Channel Islands, at the close of the seventeenth century, remarked that since the Reformation no bishop had come to conduct **confirmations**. Eventually, it seems, the next episcopal visit there happened in 1818.[945]

This all illustrates that the **Confirmation Rubric**, as understood by Anglo-Catholics in the nineteenth centry, hardly related to previous ecclesiastical practice characterised by its disregard, as Cawdry noted in 1587, forcing ministers "either to offend God, or the book" (cf. also the lack of bishops in the colonies and the 'occasional conformists').[946] Its disregard was noted not only by Cawdry in the sixteenth century. With an interpretation of the Rubric similar to Gwatkin's,

---

[942] Ibid., 211ff. Cf. Ollard, "Confirmation", 112ff.,144ff.,147.
[943] Bullard, *Constitutions*, 26.
[944] Sykes, "Wake". Cf. Sykes, *Essay*, 30f; Sykes, *Priest*, 152f.

Archbishop Tait had defended intercommunion with dissenters in the second half of the nineteenth century against Phillpotts of Exeter and others.[947]

"It seems historically clear that the rubric was never seriously understood as excluding nonconformists till long after the rise of Tractariansim. It was then a new interpretation, and it was rejected by great churchmen of all schools. Archbishop Tait and Maclagan considered that the rubric was not meant for nonconformists. Bishop Creighton had reached the same position by 1897, and added that Archbishop Benson agreed with him. So too the other great historian on the bench, Bishop Stubbs of Oxford; and Wordsworth of Lincoln, the typical high-churchman of his time, not only rejected the new interpretation, but said to have added the solemn reminder, It is the Lord's Table, not ours."[948]

With a view to the model of episcopacy in a succession, Gwatkin dismissed as "unproved assumptions" alleged strong **historic continuities** with the early church, or its institution by Christ or the Apostles. He concluded that the biblical *episcopoi* "were not bishops in our sense of the word".[949] He mourned the lack of historic consciousness with Anglo-Catholics, against whom he insisted:

"[t]he Church of England draws the distinction deep and clear. In Baptism it says that we are obeying Christ's command, whereas in Confirmation we are only following apostolic example, not any apostolic command, and Infant Baptism is not said to be Christ's institution, but only in accordance with Christ's institution. If, therefore, some churches have abolished Confirmation or Infant Baptism, they may have done very unwisely, but we cannot charge them with disobedience, when we do not maintain that Christ commanded otherwise."[950]

Thus, over the *Kikuyu[-Zanzibar]* controversy, Anglo-Catholics and 'Liberals' fought a fight of principle over the theological (denominational) character of the Church of England and Anglicanism and its denominational allegiances. In a

---

[945] Hunkin, *Ordination*, 96f.
[946] Ollard, "Confirmation", 103f.,177,186; Strype, *Aylmer*, 89 (quote).
[947] Sykes, *Priest*, 215ff.,217.
[948] Gwatkin, *Confirmation Rubric*, 1f. (quote),3 (quote),5,6f. (long quote). Cf. Gwatkin, *Letter*, 8f.
[949] Gwatkin, *Episcopacy I*, 3,7f.
[950] Gwatkin, *Episcopacy II*, 2 (quote),6ff.

sermon at Bath in 1915, a preacher held that the instance of the *Kikuyu* intercommunion service "was only the outcome of a spirit which was pervading the Church very largely, and was especially strong in the Mission field."[951] **Bishop Weston** pointed out what the issue at stake was for Anglo-Catholics:

> "the Kikuyu Conference deals with sacraments in episcopal and non-episcopal societies as if they were practically of one kind and validity… […] The underlying principle of the Kikuyu Conference is that of a practical equality of all religious bodies and their ministries. […] All these proposals are framed in ignorance of, or in opposition to, the catholic doctrine of the Church…"[952]

Such a statement illustrates the mind of Anglo-Catholics of the time. Those who saw themselves as the intellectual heirs of the Puritans, in the *Reformed Episcopal Church* in the United States, for example, saw themselves confirmed in their belief that Anglicanism, at the height of Anglo-Catholic influence, had gone fundamentally wrong.[953] For Weston, a mixing with 'Protestants' was an impossible venture, like it had been for the Tractarians over the question of the Jerusalem bishopric (cf. chapter 3.5). Instead of *Kikuyu*, he presented an alternative, fairly minimalistic proposal of an only consultative "Central Missionary Council".[954]

However, *Kikuyu*, for Weston, was not only about the organization of an African mission. He mourned in an open letter the state of the *ecclesia Anglicana*, with doctrinal standards slipping there, referring to the influence of modernism. Another indication for him was Streeter's questioning of Jesus' bodily resurrection which had resulted in the latter's resignation as chaplain to the

---

[951] Dunn, *Kikuyu*, 2.
[952] Weston, *Kikuyu*, 4,47f.
[953] Reed, *Kikuyu*, 6ff.
[954] Weston, *Proposals*.

Bishop of St Albans. When Streeter was installed as prebendary of Hereford, Weston excommunicated the Bishop of Hereford and all who supported him. The Church Times published the declaration on 1 April 1915.

"Therefore do We, Frank, Lord Bishop of Zanzibar, hereby declare and pronounce that … there can be, and from this day forward there is, no Communion in Sacred Things between ourselves and the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Hereford, nor between Ourselves and any priest within his jurisdiction who shall make known his approval of the false doctrines now officially authorized within the Diocese of Hereford…"[955]

For Weston, it became increasingly doubtful whether "Sacramentalists" and believers in "a Personal Religion" could possibly have space in one church and he openly questioned the possibility of an Anglican synthesis or the fitness of the **Anglican "character of inclusiveness"**.

"A mediating Church, it seems to me, would not include within its borders two men of directly contradictory beliefs: rather it would so modify and adjust the two beliefs until they were seen to be complementary, and then it would help one man to hold them both."[956]

Weston was not exactly a man of moderation. *Church Association Tract* 423 accused Weston, a member of both the *Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament* and the *Society of the Holy Cross*, of being "profoundly obsessed … with the idea of his episcopal importance". The Tract quotes a "Romish manual" in which Weston had prayed that God may "[c]onvert and win to Thee the sinful, fallen, blasphemers, unbelieving, dissenters, wavers, careless, unfriendly" and that the Holy Spirit may "win back into living union with the Catholic Church all protestants in England, all protestants abroad, the unbelieving, the lapsed, the

[955] Weston, "Declaration".

careless."[957] In 1923, as chairman of the second *Anglo-Catholic Congress*, Weston sent a greeting telegram to the Pope in the name of the *Congress*, "humbly praying that the day of peace may quickly break".[958] The interwar years and the *Congress Movement* have been described as "the high noon of Anglo-Catholicism", but the Movement was, literally, ageing (but these years include the year of the *Appeal*, 1920).[959]

Kikuyu frustrated Weston as an example of Anglicanism acting against his Anglo-Catholic convictions, which illustrated for him "the unfitness of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, in her present state, for any serious or permanent mission work". For him it was clear that Anglo-Catholicism was to set the standards for his Church as a whole.

> "Is it not quite clear then that unless the *Ecclesia Anglicana* purge herself of heresy and eschew schism, her missions have no future? […] But if our own position is so chaotic that a Bishop, consecrated for the very purpose, among others, of ordaining priests, may publically communicate with a Church without Episcopacy, the whole purpose of our life and work is gone. […] I have charged the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with heresy in their teaching of the meaning and value of Episcopacy: …. On the day that a Bishop can communicate with a protestant minister, deliberately and of set purpose, one of them is, it seems to me, bound in conscience to surrender the outward form which means so little to him, and yet hinders the work of reunion."[960]

Weston's standpoint illustrates the **claim of Anglo-Catholicism to define the policies of the Church of England and Anglicanism**, with episcopal ordination, consecration and now possibly even confirmation being held to be indispensable, sacramental markers of the 'Catholicism' of Anglicanism and determining the

---

[956] Buchanan, "Apostolic Succession", 20; Weston, *Ecclesia*, 9,21ff.,11 (quote).
[957] *Kikuyu: Dissenters Classed with Blasphemers by the Bishop of Zanzibar*; Weston, *Sacrifice*, 56,52 (quotes).
[958] Hastings, *History*, 199.
[959] Gunstone, *Anglo-Catholics*, 344-348 (quote); Pickering, "Anglo-Catholicism [1986]", 154ff; Pickering, "Sociology", chapter 2.

relations to ‘non-episcopal’ churches. Such a theological judgement would have been alien to most theologians before the nineteenth century, in its *theological* presumptions as well as in its conclusions.

For Willis, Peel and other bishops in Africa, *Kikuyu* was a matter of missionary expedience and less of a principal question. Willis defended the scheme against its critics pointing out that denominationalism under the conditions of an African mission, threatened by so many factors, was counter-productive. The ecumenism envisaged by some at the **‘Edinburgh’ Conference** (1910) was a different objective from that of *Kikuyu*, which had been a compromise to focus all enterprises and ultimately to produce *one native* church.[961] This reflected an understanding of mission which was different to that of an imperial enterprise. In some respect, *Kikuyu* represented a way of collaboration common before the ‘episcopalization’ of the Indian mission in the 1840s (cf. chapter 2.3). It forced, however, **Anglo-Catholics** to develop a stance in the question of **international ecclesiastical unions**, which they developed in analogy to their interpretation of the Quadrilateral, originally providing a model for ‘home union’, but now even insisting on ‘episcopal’ confirmation. With the formation of the Anglican Communion, they now saw the possibility and obligation to implement their beliefs and policies in the churches abroad, which was a novelty in itself.[962]

The article in *The Scotsman* had been written by a Presbyterian eyewitness who had presented a painful interpretation for Anglo-Catholics. The author had (inaccurately) alleged an agreement amongst the partners that “priest and

---

[960] Weston, *Ecclesia*, 17,19f. (quotes).
[961] Willis, *Study*, 4,7ff.
[962] Cf. Smith, *Limits*, 6.

presbyter are one". He had described "the most wonderful gathering I ever saw", "the rising tide of love and unity". He had suggested that the local missions had "solved the problem of how to coalesce Episcopacy and Presbyterianism." – "For on the morrow the issue was to be decided whether Christianity could unite its forces in British East Africa…" The author had seen this as a fruit of the Edinburgh Conference: "… Edinburgh … is now transforming Christianity."[963]

An ecumenical spirit of this kind, uniting the 'Protestants' who had gathered at Edinburgh, had been worrying many Anglo-Catholics and Kikuyu seemed to confirm their fears: "the Anglo-Catholic party was now becoming restless".[964] The High Church Bishop of Winchester clarified in a letter to *The Scotsman* that he did not wish either *Kikuyu* or *Edinburgh* to be understood as an example for the Church of England: "'Edinburgh' was made possible by the explicit condition that questions of union should not be brought before it."[965]

The **outbreak of the First World War** required the main protagonists of the *Kikuyu-Zanzibar* controversy to organize Christian co-operations in new, very practical ways. At the following Kikuyu Conferences after the War, however, a greater emphasis on episcopacy as the default ecclesiastical model was laid by the Anglican partners, conforming to the policy laid out by Archbishop Davidson, cf. chapter 4.6 (with Weston presenting his proposal of accepting episcopacy without a certain theory of it, the "principle of sacramental grace" and "a valid form of Consecration of the Sacrament of the Holy Communion).[966] The report of the 1918 conference, looking back to 1913, referred to the fourth point of the

---

[963] Bell, *Davidson*, 690; Maclean, "Contrast".
[964] Mews, "Kikuyu", 351.
[965] Talbot, "Letter".
[966] Cf. Arthur, "After 'Kikuyu'", 53,56f.,70; Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 45ff; *Report of the United Conference of Missionary Societies in British East Africa: Kikuyu, July 23th-26th, 1918*, 7ff. (quotes),14(ff.).

Quadrilateral as "The Historic Episcopate" and stated with a view to a general policy: "Full intercommunion was, for the present at least impossible."[967]

The War had stopped the open antagonism, but the repercussions of *Kikuyu* had gone far beyond Africa. It had caused a scandal and inspired numerous pamphlets.[968] *Longmans, Green and Company* in London, for example, published a whole series of "Kikuyu Tracts".

4.6 The Gradual Adoption of an (Inter-)Communion Practice in Accordance with an Anglo-Catholic Understanding of the Confirmation Rubric

The Archbishop of Canterbury, **Davidson**, intervened in the *Kikuyu* debate in **1915**. His chaplain, Mason, had published in the previous year an extensive but controversial historical study on ordained ministry and episcopacy in which he defended the thesis of the 'catholic' character of the Church of England and Anglicanism.[969] As a co-biographer of Archbishop Tait, Davidson had told the

---

[967] *Report of the United Conference of Missionary Societies in British East Africa: Kikuyu, July 23th-26th, 1918*, 4f. Cf. Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 37ff. For subsequent developments cf.: Arthur, "After 'Kikuyu'", 63ff.

[968] Taylor, *Miscellany*, 432.

[969] Mason, *Episcopacy*. Mason's choice of sources tends to be selective and interpretations are along the lines of a restrictive view on intercommunion. Cf. also footnotes 93, 100f., 121 and 627. Cf. "Review of 'The Church of England and Episcopacy' by Mason", 99f. "Canon MASON has come to the rescue of the doctrine [of Apostolical Succession. …] The conclusion that he reaches is the conclusion that he set out to reach." Cf. Wilson, "Reply", 824ff. "[There are] many indications that the need is great for believers in the High Anglican view of the ministry to present their case forcibly in the light of present-day historical criticism. [… Mason] confesses in the Preface that he does not profess to be impartial… […] … the giving of strings of quotations is a radically unsound plan. … the book … takes no count of the circumstances under which the works quoted are written." Norman Sykes, on the other hand, although always supported by sources, could be seen as biased in the other, (more) Evangelical/*plene esse*, direction. His conclusions, however, usually appear to be more restrictive than his sources would allow him to be. The Roman Catholic (former Anglican) Allies (who published anonymously) could likewise be accused of being biased. Peck accused Sykes, who had argued against the continual existence of a specific Anglican view of episcopacy, of constructing a "doctrine of historic aphasia" and "detract[ing] from the importance which … [his sources] assign to episcopacy". He thought that Sykes "quotes evidence which tells against his predetermined conclusions… […] It is the ascription … of a divine appointment or a divine sanction to episcopacy which Prof. S. consistently seeks to omit…

story of the 'Westminster scandal' and Tait's endorsement of intercommunion with 'non-episcopally' confirmed (or unconfirmed) Dissenters in 1870.[970] Again, the Archbishop saw himself confronted with protest. A meeting of "catholic-minded clergy", as a contemporary called them, had passed a resolution at a "largely attended" meeting at London, declaring their withdrawal from financial support of missions that may practice intercommunion or pulpit exchange with "separatist bodies".[971] Davidson ruled that whilst ('non-episcopally confirmed') Non-conformists might be admitted to communicate or preach in Anglican churches, **Anglicans should not receive Communion from Non-conformist ministers**. Exceptions he could only approve under unusual circumstances. His opinion, which could be seen as a compromised Anglo-Catholic policy, was confirmed by the *Central Consultative Body*, an advisory body consisting of representatives of the different Anglican provinces, who probably feared that *Kikuyu* could serve as a model of intercommunion in other missionary (or diaspora) situations. Davidson does not refer, however, to the principle of succession but only to the prevalent position of the Church of England [sic] in that "emphasis is laid on the distinction between 'regular' and 'irregular' ordination…"[972]

The *status quo* at the time, as we will see in a moment, was that clergy should not act in Dissenters' 'chapels'. The ruling by the Archbishop, with a view to *all* Anglicans and regarding the receiving of Communion, gave the impression

---

[… Sykes] impose[s] an arbitary and inadequately documented dogma upon the Church of England." Peck, *Re-examination*, 13,22,54,57,62. Cf. footnote 95.

[970] Cf. footnotes 551f.

[971] Dunn, *Kikuyu*, 5.

[972] Bell, *Davidson*, vol. I, 705-708; Davidson, *Kikuyu*, 5ff.,20ff.,30 (quote). Davidson gives the statement of the Central Consultative Body in appendix B. Appendix A lists statements from various other sources. Appendix C highlightens the significance of the Quadrilateral in Lambeth 1888, 1897, and 1908.

that the Church of England in its teaching now tended towards an Anglo-Catholic understanding of a special quality of 'episcopal' ministrations which 'non-episcopal' churches did not have. The proceedings subsequent to *Kikuyu*, in any case, showed that it stood, in today's terminology, for a 'unilateral decision'.

The Archbishop's charge, however, did not go far enough for some Anglo-Catholics who polemicized against the Archbishop, feeding **German/Liberal-Protestant resentments** in their critique, at the height of the First World War. Pullan, for example, laments a "Prussianizing of theology in Great Britain" and, thus, demonizes the Reformation heritage of Anglicanism (styling it an early, bad, German influence), which allegedly had introduced new and false doctrines in the sixteenth century, contradicting the "Catholic and ancient idea" of what constitutes the Christian church.[973]

The judgement of the official hierarchy confirmed a general tendency in the **second half of the nineteenth century** when **intercommunion with Dissenters** had been met with more and more **reservations**. This might be explained with the influence of the Oxford Movement but may also reflect an uneasiness about the gaining of equal rights of Dissenters: "a new exclusive meaning was fastened on the confirmation rubric. […] … the practice of hospitality to non-Anglicans at the Lord's Table was being treated as an anomaly or even an offence".

"And, for a lack of continued custom or firm protest, the Church of England fell into the way of assuming that episcopal confirmation was the absolute *sine qua non* for all attenders at the Lord's Supper. Thus the 1662 exclusive top-tier (no non-episcopal celebrants) was followed by a post-1870 exclusive low-tier (no

---

For the *(Central) Consultative Body*, cf. Lambeth Resolution 44 from 1920.

[973] Pullan, *Principles*, 10,32.

unconfirmed communicants), and the scene was set to present the public front of a total exclusive episcopalianism to the ecumenical world."[974]

Sykes showed that intercommunion with foreign Protestants and Dissenters was practised from the Restoration onwards, as indeed occasional questioning of this practice illustrates. Dissenters were less favourably regarded than foreign Protestants whom Churchmen achnowledged to have abandoned episcopal authority by historic necessity, whereas the Dissenters' disobedience to the religion of the 'godly prince' was seen as unpatriotic.[975] The establishing of a more restrictive admission policy for Communion which would play into the hands of Anglo-Catholics was a gradual development in the late nineteenth century. It may partly also be a result of the increased significance given to the Eucharist, not only by Anglo-Catholics but also by Low-churchmen, in the increasingly secular environment of nineteenth-century society, as a sign of commitment and a reassurance of identity.[976] With the increase in numbers of bishops in the 'episcopal revival' (cf. chapter 2), it actually became 'logistically' possible in the nineteenth century to supply episcopal **confirmations** systematically in a diocese.[977]

"Together, improved communications and commitment permitted the performance of the rite [of confirmation, 'sometimes out of formal religious practice', often in conjunction with a visitation] in parts of the diocese which had not experienced it for many years (if ever)."[978]

This also changed the bishops' visitation practice of diocesan clergy. In the past, "their infrequent contact with their bishop [had] made the occasion of visitation

---

[974] Buchanan, "Full Communion", 43f.
[975] Sykes, *Essay*, 27ff.,34f.
[976] Cf. footnotes 641f.

rather a social than an ecclesiastical event."[979] Pastorally, confirmations often had been, if they happened, "irreverent" occasions.[980] The situation before the nineteenth century had resembled that of the late Middle Ages.

"The … problem of shortage of time [due to political commitments, feudal duties and travel logistics] was largely responsible for the archbishops and bishops confirming candidates for confirmation not by laying hands on them individually as good custom demanded, but in a very abbreviated form and often greatly neglecting to perform it."[981]

Both, confirmations and visitations were institutionalized in the nineteenth century. The new popularity of confirmations, however, was not simply due to an increase in 'catholic' piety or Low-church identity assurance. They became **social occasions** and provided opportunities for 'worldly' celebrations. In one instance, in Lincolnshire in 1837, "attractions included 'lewd women' and dancing as well as drink. In an attempt to restore order, the clergy were obliged to call in the assistance of constables." Some young people, the Tractarians noted, having moved between parishes for reasons of work, were confirmed more than once "in order to make the most of the feasting… […] In Lincolnshire it was widely believed that confirmation was a cure for rheumatism." The person to be touched with the bishop's left hand, however, was believed to be condemned to singleness.

This may illustrate that in **popular religion**, despite efforts to raise the standards in preparation and the actual number of ceremonies, the perception of ecclesial acts such as confirmation was more superficial than the increase in number would suggest. Although civil marriage had been introduced in 1837,

---

[977] Cf. footnote 449.
[978] Burns, *Diocesan Revival*, 132.
[979] Ibid; Sykes, *England*, 138 (quote).
[980] Hill, "Initiation", 189.
[981] Dickinson, *Later Middle Ages*, 30f. (quote), cf. 29f.,169.

many non-churchgoers, like today, preferred a religious ceremony. "Few seem to have taken the Catholic view of regarding marriage as a sacrament; for most it was essentially a civil rite performed within church walls."[982]

The new practice, however, enabled Anglo-Catholics to claim a theological significance of confirmation which they could not possibly have claimed before the nineteenth century, when confirmations had still been less common.

"Confirmation, disregarded in seventeenth-century Scotland, and in England so neglected that in the eighteenth century it was possible to reach the episcopal bench without having been confirmed, was emphasized firstly by non-jurors and then by the Tractarians, and became a prerequisite to admission to Holy Communion. Likewise, from the time of the non-jurors the concept of the exclusive validity of Episcopalian ordinations made headways, despite the fact that the episcopal system had been reintroduced to Scotland under a scheme of compromise which involved the recognition of Presbyterian orders."[983]

In **1887**, the **Convocation** of Canterbury **sanctioned** the "innovation" and "scandal", as some speakers styled it, of **accepting invitations to preach in unconsecrated, "dissenting chapels"**, with those "not in communion with the Church of England", the "true religion", and opposed to its doctrines and discipline (the question of intercommunion was not mentioned).[984] However, this policy was rather an expression of a change of attitude, as the octogenarian William Acworth mourned in the *Churchman*.

"At the utmost verge of life, and with my final summons in view, I wish to express my very poignant regret that a son of Edward Bickersteth [that is E.H. Bickersteth, Bishop of Exeter between 1885-1900], whom I have heard *preach* in

[982] Knight, *Nineteenth-century*, 92(ff.),98(ff.), quotes; Obelkevich, *Society*, 131,273.
[983] Donaldson, *Church and Nation*, 115f.
[984] *The Chronicle of Convocation [1887], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury*, 56-62,157-162.

a dissenting chapel, should have inhibited a clergyman from officiating in his diocese because he had *appeared* at a dissenting service. […] The silencing of good men by our bishops for attending dissenting services is to me somewhat of a novelty. When I was a young man many of the Dons of Cambridge – and among them the Master of Trinity, who was also a bishop – were not unfrequently seen at the chapel of the celebrated Robert Hall, and Archdeacon Dealtry, who entered me at college, told me that when he went to Brighton he often attended the ministry of Mr. Sortain, a Congregationalist."[985]

Whilst the official line now taken in the Church of England suggested segregation, others called for a 'home union' or at least intercommunion with Nonconformists, insisting that conformity was not essential. "The Church … is not one golden candlestick with seven branches; its seven golden candlesticks and the bond of union is 'the Son of Man walking in the midst of them'. […] The difficulty is entirely our own creation…"[986]

As with intercommunion, pulpit exchange had *in theory* been restricted (cf. the *Acts of Uniformity* under Elizabeth I and Charles II), but possibly legal and practised.[987] The *Occasional Sermons Bill* (1871-73) had aimed for a legalization of not 'episcopally ordained' preachers by episcopal dispensation. Effectively, this would not necessarily have meant a 're-opening' of Anglican pulpits but perhaps the opposite, although for some the attempt was only the logical conclusion of the new "principle of Catholicity among Protestant Churches".[988]

If one looks at the discussion in Convocation in 1887 (one year before the Lambeth Quadrilateral), one may find that the issue at stake was not one of succession, as it would have been in the twentieth century, but one of institutional

---

[985] Quoted in: Dixon, *Handbook*, 68.
[986] Bardsley, "Home Union"; Bruce, "Reunion", 186 (quote).
[987] *Historical Enquiry Whether the Ministers of Non-episcopal Churches are Recognised as Ministers of God's Word and Sacraments by the Church of England: And Whether They May Receive Allowance to Preach Occasionally in Her Pulpits*, 44.
[988] *Shall Our Pulpits Be Re-opened to Non-episcopal Preachers, As At the Reformation, and For one Hundred Years Afterwards? Extracted from the Christian Observer for October and November, 1871*, 3f.,22 (quote).

discipline, with a view to churches who opposed the Church of England in "its doctrine and its discipline". The Bishop of Winchester, proposing the motion in the Upper House ("There may have been a century ago practices of this description."), warned of "a denial of the principles of the English Reformation", having restored ancient principles for a national Church. "It is not the case, as has been stated in newspapers and the like, that it is a question of Apostolical succession, or a question of Episcopacy." He argued for the principle of **'national orders'** but refuted its Tractarian theological theory:

"the breaking up into any number of sects is antagonistic to the great principle of the English Reformation. […] The ignoring of all of this, and the treating of every modern sect as on the same footing as the great ancient Church reformed at the Reformation is simple confusion."[989]

A pamphlet in 1830 had been clearer about this policy of segregation, not simply as a matter of theology but as a 'diplomatical' principle:

"between the principles of Dissent and those of the Established Church there can be no communion and no compromise. If *they* are right, there ought to be no Established Church; if *we* are right, there ought to be no Dissenters. [… Their principles are] for the most part negative and metaphysical… The principles of Dissent, therefore, are principles upon which every social institution may be attacked and pulled down, but none built up. As they are inconsistent with any authority in the church, so they are detrimental to all order and Christian obligation to the state; for they will easily break up the relations between subject and king, servant and master, child and parent, as between pastor and flock, church and state. In fine, they are principles by which the devil has succeeded in detaching a great body of God's own people, to work, for his end, unknowingly, in the ranks of the Democrat, the Unitarian, and the Infidel."[990]

---

[989] *The Chronicle of Convocation [1887], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury*, 159ff.,161 (long quote).
[990] *The Church of England Defended From the Attacks of Modern Dissenters*, 3,36.

The Convocations followed the Bishop of Winchester's draft resolution, declaring that Church of England ministers should not take part in worship of "those who are not in full communion with the Church of England", which would be "contrary to the principles of the Catholic Church, as maintained at the English Reformation".[991]

This decision reflects the growing uneasiness between Churchmen and Dissenters and foreign 'non-episcopalians', although **eucharistic hospitality** continued as it had existed, more or less unregulated, throughout the centuries.[992] Nevertheless, the new restriction penetrated the minds of Churchmen. When Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury in 1910 analysed his predecessor's view from the first half of the seventeenth century of the Swedish Church and his positive conclusions with a view to intercommunion, Wordsworth's noted "not without a certain melancholy significance":[993] "[i]t is curious that he [Bishop Davenant] makes no mention of the difference between Episcopalians and Presbyterians as being any difficulty in the way of a project of brotherly communion."[994] Just a few decades earlier, this would hardly have surprised a bishop. Henson (later a controversial appointment to the see of Hereford and subsequently Bishop of Durham), from the perspective of a historian, concluded the *Lee Lecture* in 1911 with an appeal to overcome the gradually introduced and fairly recent restrictions towards 'non-episcopal' churches, counting with Bishop Davenant the Church of England to the 'Reformed Churches'.

---

[991] *The Chronicle of Convocation [1887], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury*, 157-162.
[992] *Intercommunion To-day: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion*, 34.
[993] Henson, *Relation*, 38.
[994] Wordsworth, *Sweden*, 294.

"Meanwhile it is right, and I apprehend also the duty, of every member of the Church of England who values the heritage of spiritual liberty implicit in his membership of a Reformed Church, to communicate with the other Reformed Churches, wherever and whenever the opportunity to do so may be given to him. So doing, he will assuredly be true to the principles and best traditions of his own Reformed Church."[995]

However, the relatively new, more restrictive, *theological* view of Dissenters and 'non-episcopal' churches expressed by Anglo-Catholics at the occasion of *Kikuyu* certainly impaired the relations with the former. It meant a real change which stood in contrast even to the post-Restoration period, in which intercommunion had been continued, with no serious signs of Church of England officials unchurching Protestants in the way we encounter in the early twentieth century.[996] The irony is that the relations to the alleged other, non-Anglican, 'episcopal' churches did not automatically improve. Especially after the rejection of Anglican 'orders' by the Pope in 1896 (cf. chapter 4.4), the 'ecumenical' situation actually appeared to be more absurd than before amongst the churches which Anglo-Catholics recognized as 'fellow-catholics'.

"The Orthodox refuse to give Communion to the Latins, the Latins refuse it to the Orthodox, and both refuse to give it to any who are not of their obedience, while Anglicans have strict rules for withholding it from any who have not been ['episcopally'] confirmed."[997]

The post-*Kikuyu* restrictions were, in practice, subsequently confirmed and tightened by official Anglican statements (cf. chapter 4.7): in **1920 (and 1930), the Lambeth Conference** ruled that **episcopal confirmation was a precondition**

---

[995] Henson, *Relation*, 93.
[996] Ibid., 57ff.,66ff.,70.
[997] Biggs, *Comity*, 4.

for (inter-)communion.[998] In the previous year, the Convocations had discussed allowing pulpit exchange on a restricted basis, and Evangelical churchmen had called at the *Cheltenham Conference* for pulpit exchange and intercommunion with Free Churches and other Protestants, waiving an insistence on (re-) ordinations.[999] Nevertheless, in **1933**, the English **Convocations sanctioned intercommunion with 'non-episcopalians' in both ways** (with the diocesan bishops being able to grant permission for non-Anglicans in special cases), following the principle laid down by Lambeth 1930.[1000] The Convocation of Canterbury in 1933 also affirmed the principle of 'episcopal' ordination as vital to the proposed unity scheme for South India.[1001] In 1948, the Convocations approved exceptions for special, ecumenical occasions.[1002]

The restriction of intercommunion with 'non-episcopalians' was met, however, with 'silent opposition' at least by some ecumenically-minded Anglicans.

"In the winter of 1939 Max Warren, then vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Cambridge, found himself administering communion to Professor Dodd (a Congregationalist), Mrs Dodd (an Anglican) and Franz Hildebrandt (a Lutheran), who were kneeling side by side."[1003]

The policy change, however, looked like a stance of the Church of England towards the Anglo-Catholic position. Retrospectively, it almost looks like a last reaction of Anglo-Catholicism which was beginning to loose influence. However,

---

[998] Cf. footnotes 1032 and 1044.
[999] Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 62ff.,65ff.,72.
[1000] "Resolutions of the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1933 on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930". Cf. footnote 1032.
[1001] *The Chronicle of Convocation [1933], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury*, 26ff.,160ff.,213ff.
[1002] Hunkin, "Intercommunion", 18.
[1003] Hastings, *History*, 307.

the new rules had a lasting impact on Anglicanism. Even an ecumenically-minded bishop like George Bell would welcome in his diocese German Protestant ministers fleeing from Hitler Germany but would not only **(re-)ordain but also (re-)confirm** those **'non-episcopal' ministers**.[1004] Such a practice implied, from the Anglo-Catholic point of view, that 'non-episcopal orders' were somewhat theologically deficient and that ministrations of 'non-episcopal' ministers lacked 'validity'. This view was prominently promoted by *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by Kirk (1946). *The Historic Episcopate*, edited by Montefiore (1954) responded to it promoting the *plene esse* view of episcopacy, which still implies some kind of defect of 'non-episcopal' 'orders'. However, the rising prominence of the *plene esse* model showed that the Anglo-Catholic view was facing a stronger opposition now even from within the High Church constituency. Nevertheless, the policy of re-confirming 'non-episcopalians' has prevailed until today, at least in principle, although perhaps not practised in all cases.[1005] Even if this policy historically is not simply a result of Tractarian teaching, it conformed to the Anglo-Catholic understanding of the exclusive 'validity' of episcopal ministrations.[1006]

It is remarkable therefore that in the early twentieth century a **quasi-sacramental significance** was attributed to ***episcopal* confirmation** which had been rejected in the early eighteenth century when in the **'Lay Baptism Debate'** a theological inferiority of the sacrament of baptism by Dissenters was denied by the Church of England, before confirmations became more common in the nineteenth century. In this debate, some had held that confirmation was a "higher baptism", but the view that "salvation being limited to those in communion with

[1004] Kramm, *Lehre*, 7,49.
[1005] Cf. footnote 4.
[1006] Cf. Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 191.

the episcopally governed visible Church" had been refuted then.[1007] The difference between Dissenters and Churchmen was not defined by the model that only the Church of England alone had "preserved the apostolic succession of Bishops" in England but the regularity of ministers was understood as a matter of adherence to the established Church.[1008] It appears that the model of succession was preferred by Non-jurors in analogy to their adherence to the hereditary monarchical succession, the latter being their main concern. Although they "would insist that they were not papists, … their extreme episcopal principles seemed to leave them no other choice but to reject the Lutheran claimant to the throne." There is a strong argument, however, that it was not an 'extreme episcopal principle' that effected their claim of invalidity of 'lay 'or 'Dissenting baptism' but "a thinly veiled attack on the Hanoverian succession".[1009] When the Lutheran Hanoverian **George I** (who reigned from 1714-27), whom the Non-jurors regarded as not validly baptized, became *supreme governor* of the Church of England, it was accepted that he was never confirmed in the Church of England (like George II or earlier, the Dutch Calvinist William III). Some indeed welcomed the peculiarity of having a king from one of the "*Lutheran* Churches (which are the true Protestant Churches beyond the Seas)", as Pufendorf put it, who hoped for an ecclesiastical union between England and German Lutherans on the basis of his 'collegial model'.[1010]

In **1961**, thirty-two high-profile Anglican theologians complained in an **open letter** to the Archbishops about the restrictive intercommunion policy. They called for eucharistic hospitality and intercommunion, not only in individual

[1007] Cornwall, "Politics", 150,151 (quote).
[1008] Ibid., 153ff.
[1009] Ibid., 159f.,163.

cases. They lobbied for more efforts for and occasions of "corporate acts of Communion" and concelebrating with 'non-episcopalians'. The signatories were senior professors, heads of theological Colleges and senior clergymen. Fifteen of them had at the time a connection to Cambridge, where the *Historic Episcopate* had been edited (cf. chapter 5.1), with the editor and author of its key chapter, Montefiore, being amongst the signatories. They "express[ed] dissent" from what a **Committee Report for Lambeth 1958** had described as general policy:

"… Anglicans conscientiously hold that the celebrant of the Eucharist should have been ordained by a bishop standing in the historic succession, and generally believe it to be their duty to bear witness to this principle by receiving Holy Communion only from those who have been thus ordained. The existence of this conviction as a view held among Anglicans clearly makes it in practice impossible to envisage the establishment of fully reciprocal intercommunion at any stage short of the adoption of episcopacy by the Churches of Presbyterian Order, and the satisfactory unification of the Presbyterian and Anglican ministries. The Committee believes, however, that such a solemn resolve as has been suggested [for the Church of Scotland and the Episcopal Church there] would have the effect of making it possible to regularize, as a general practice, the admission of Presbyterians to communion at Anglican altars."[1011]

The Report summed up: "[t]he Anglican Churches require baptism and episcopal confirmation [for admission to Holy Communion]." Thus, it practically confirmed the policies laid down by the Lambeth Conferences in 1920 and 1930, subsequently adopted by the English Convocations.[1012] The argument now, however, explicitly rested on an alleged **"historic succession"**, on the lines of the *plene esse* view of episcopacy. As opposed to that, the *Appeal* in 1920 had only spoken of a "commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body". Lambeth

---

[1010] Pufendorf, *Principles*.
[1011] The letter quotes the first sentence of: "Church Unity and the Church Universal: Report for Lambeth 1958", 44.
[1012] Ibid. Cf. chapter 4.7.

1930 had explicitly left the interpretation of this open to be applied to the (ancient) form of government *or* the notion of a succession (cf. chapter 4.7).

Regarding the Report, the writers of the **open letter** held: "[w]e do not acknowledge such a duty [to receive communion only from 'episcopally' ordained ministers]…" They argued that there was not only *one* Anglican doctrine of the ministry. "We believe that the Holy Communion is not only the goal of unity, but also an efficacious means of the grace of unity, as of all grace".[1013] Nevertheless, they affirmed the 'historic episcopate' as

> "the best means by which a reunited Church may be given a fitting outward form in which its inward unity in Christ may be manifested. Nevertheless … we recognise that it is our Lord who calls and commissions his ministers, and that he is not tied to any one form of ministry."[1014]

Together with the essay collection *The Historic Episcopate* they affirmed, somewhat inconsistently, their preference of a ministry in a 'historic succession' as well as their belief

> "that our Lord conveys through these ['non-episcopal'] ministries the same grace of the Word and the Sacraments as he bestows through the historic ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, and that he does this, not as an act of uncovenanted mercy, but because they are real and efficacious ministries within the Body of his Church."[1015]

The *Church Times* pointed out a "glaring logical weakness" and suspected as the authors' motivation their disappointment with the refusal of the Convocations to

---

[1013] "Open Letter to the Archbishops: More Liberal Anglican Policy on Intercommunion Requested, Plea by 32 Theologians", 13.
[1014] "Call for More Liberal Church Policy on Intercommunion: Anglican Theologians Send Open Letter to Archbishops"; "Open Letter to the Archbishops: More Liberal Anglican Policy on Intercommunion Requested, Plea by 32 Theologians", 13 (quotes).
[1015] "Open Letter to the Archbishops: More Liberal Anglican Policy on Intercommunion Requested, Plea by 32 Theologians", 13.

fully recognize the South India union (1947). "The signatories seem to lack the courage of their own convictions. […] Clearly if, as the Letter argues, all ministries are of equal authority, there is no point at all in bothering about any unification."[1016]

This paradox is the dilemma of any more liberal or 'charitable', 'catholic' stance with a view to intercommunion with 'non-episcopal' churches, such as that of the ***plene esse*** position, while still, nevertheless, promoting the 'historic episcopate'.

"It is because of their [*plene esse* theologians'] understanding of apostolic succession as not being indispensable for the existence of the church or vouching for its unity that the Anglican requirement [of adopting the 'historic episcopate' as prerequisite of church unions] thus loses its inner stringent plausibility."[1017]

The insistence on succession is plausible, however, from the perspective of Anglo-Catholics who hold confirmation and 'Holy Orders' (if conferred by an 'episcopal' bishop) to be sacraments, although resting on contested historic assumptions. As Lampe pointed out in the discussion in the 1960s, the Anglo-Catholic, sacramental view of ministry tends to conflict with the Anglican confessional formulas in which transubstantiation and the sacrificial priesthood had been rejected.[1018] A contemporary Anglo-Catholic does not seem to have a problem with that and explains:

"[t]here are seven Sacraments: the two dominical Sacraments … and five others… […] We exist within a sacramental economy where the Sacraments are

[1016] Ibid., 3.
[1017] Gassmann, "Apostolische Sukzession", 278f. "Doch da nach ihrem [*plene-esse*-Theologen] Verständnis die Apostolische Sukzession nicht für die Existenz der Kirche unerläßlich ist und nicht deren Einheit verbürgt, verliert die anglikanische Forderung [auf Übernahme des historischen Bischofsamtes] auf diesem Hintergrund ihre innere, zwingende Konsequenz."
[1018] Lampe, *Intercommunion*, 13ff.

indispensable to the complete living of the Christian life. […] The reception of the Sacrament of Confirmation is necessary for the completion of the gift of baptismal grace. […] In the Western Church, the use of the term Confirmation suggested the ratification of Baptism, as completing the process of initiation, as well as the strengthening of baptismal grace. […] … Confirmation is administered by the bishop as the original minister of the Sacrament… […] The effect of the Sacrament is the full outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the fulfilment, a deepening of baptismal grace. It unites us more closely and more firmly to Christ…"[1019]

This illustrates that there, still, is no consensus about the theological (and ecumenical) significance of the insistence on episcopal ordination and confirmation. It seems, however, that the insistence *as such* represents the *status quo*, although the reasons must remain hazy in order to maintain it. Nevertheless, the fact is that 'episcopal ordination' as a description of the qualification of a celebrant of Communion in the Church England and the condition of 'episcopal' confirmation for receiving Communion did not feature in English Canon Law before the proposed Canons of 1947. Before that, the celebrant's qualification was defined by his legal status in the Church of England (parson, vicar or minister, usually ordained by a bishop of the Church of England) but not by his 'type' of ordination (as ordained by a bishop in 'historic succession'). Confirmation is encouraged, but still not mentioned in the proposed Canons of 1947 as condition for receiving Communion (as it says in the Prayer Book), but "notorious offenders" are excluded.[1020] It is Canon B15 of 1972 which makes it a duty of all confirmed to receive Communion regularly and only admits, as a general rule, "episcopally confirmed" on a regular basis.[1021] The *Admission to Holy Communion Measure* of the same year had empowered the General Synod to admit other baptized persons to Communion which the Synod then did in a

[1019] Davage, "Baptism and Confirmation", 11ff.
[1020] Bray, *Canons*, 629f.,586-589.

specific interpretation of the Rubric, implying a sacramental understanding and theological quality of 'episcopal' confirmation, which would have surprised Churchmen still in the mid-nineteenth century. However, the current practice can only be justified if one argues on the lines of a (quasi-)sacramental understanding, in analogy to the *plene esse* view of episcopacy. Members of *Porvoo* and *Meissen* churches, however, where presbyteral confirmation is the norm, are now exempted from the requirement of 'episcopal' confirmation for Communion.[1022]

Although confirmation was the topic of a *Meissen* Conference in 2005, the question of how to define the theological quality of *episcopal* confirmation was curiously absent. Given the practice of the Church of England, however, it cannot surprise the reader of the talks there that Avis, with regard to baptism as complete sacramental initiation, "confidently assert[ed] that officially the Church of England believes no such thing", despite popular opinion, as he admitted. Although asserting that "[b]aptism can never be incomplete" and that confirmation was not ultimately necessary for salvation, he spoke of confirmation as "sacramental act", "sacramental action" and a "means of grace", but not claiming confirmation to be a dominical sacrament.[1023] Seville (CR) partly acknowledged the fact of the renewal of confirmation practice in the nineteenth century, the "ambivalence … as to the sacramental status of the rite" and the "widespread" belief in baptism as complete sacramental initiation, although "it must be challenged". He suggested understanding confirmation as admission to Communion, with a view to its 'confessional'/'testimonial' aspects. With reference to the insistence on 'episcopal' confirmation, he suggested defining

---

[1021] *The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical Promulged by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970*.

confirmation also as reception into the Church of England (as for 'non-episcopally' confirmed Protestants, Roman Catholics and Orthodox). He admitted, however, that the rite was actually "designed for becoming a *Christian*, not an Anglican."[1024]

Lately, a motion at the **General Synod in 2011** sought to remove the requirement of the Confirmation Rubric. Malcolm Halliday, introducing the motion, argued: "[o]nly when the Victorian railways were built, and bishops 'went forth and multiplied', had confirmation before communion become the norm."[1025] The Synod, however, decided after a controversial debate not to vote on this question.

4.7 'Episcopal' Episcopacy and Confirmation as Conditions for (Inter-)Communion, Union and the Notion of Succession

In **1920**, the **Lambeth Conference** endorsed the norm of **episcopal confirmation** as pre-requisite for eucharistic fellowship (Resolution 12B) and affirmed the principle of 'episcopal ordination' for unions. Pragmatically, the phrase **'episcopal ordination'** in the Resolutions is used to describe a type of ordination, in opposition to 'non-episcopal' ministries, which previous statements had usually avoided. The phrase is **understood to paraphrase the requirement of the Ordinal preface**, but, in fact, it is a specific interpretation of its prescription of the usage of the form provided in the Ordinal, as part of an admission process conducted by officers characterized by "lawful authority". Normally, the

---

[1022] Hill, "Initiation", 191. Cf. footnotes 3ff.
[1023] Avis, "Baptism", 63f.,65f.,69f.
[1024] Seville, "Meanings", 124,128f.,141.

candidates would be English and not previously ordained in another church. The exemption of those who "hath had formerly Episcopall Consecration or Ordination", however, is open to interpretation.[1026] In the context of the Restoration, the *Ordinal* is likely to refer to the 'lawful authority' of the re-introduced bishops of the Church of England, by the power of the king, as opposed to Puritan, presbyteral ordinations during the *Interregnum*. Those previously 'episcopally' ordained would simply be those ordained by the pre-Commonwealth bishops. As we have seen in chapter 1.7, however, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the ordination practice endorsed what we have called 'national' orders, with no interchangeability either with 'episcopal' or 'non-episcopal' churches. Only Roman Catholic candidates were accepted without (re-)ordination, after the recantation of Roman doctrine. Their 'orders' were probably regarded as the proto-type of the English ones.[1027] Whereas before the Restoration, 'non-episcopal' ministers had been received as ministers into the Church of England without (re-)ordination, these ministers were treated alike with Puritans and Dissenters soon after the Restoration. Nevertheless, the validity of 'non-episcopal' sacraments was not disputed in the *Lay Baptism Debate* in the early eighteenth century, nor was the practice of inter-communion with them questioned until the nineteenth.

This all suggests that what the Anglican bishops stated in the first half of the twentieth century was based on ideas which only had developed in (and with) Anglicanism in the nineteenth. In any case, it is significant that the phrase

---

[1025] "Attempt to Drop Confirmation Rule Fails". Cf. footnote 643.
[1026] "An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, Resolutions 10-31, Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches and the respective Resolutions of the English Convocations", 7; Brightman, *English Rite*, vol. II, 390f. Cf. footnote 64.
[1027] Cf. Denny, *English Church*, 36ff.

'historic episcopate' was not used in 1920. The Resolutions allowed the bishops to occasionally authorize 'non-episcopal' ministers to preach in Anglican Churches if these men were "working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal…" Thus, no general approval of intercommunion or pulpit exchange with 'non-episcopal' churches was given. The general principles were subsequently adopted by the English Convocations and affirmed in 1933 (ruling that Anglicans should not communicate in 'non-episcopal' churches), and again in 1943.[1028] In 1920, Bell published a collection of documents from clerical meetings and various committees, some of which expressed concerns regarding joint worship with 'non-episcopalians', pulpit exchange, intercommunion or a compromising of the principle of episcopacy; others called for intercommunion.[1029] The *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, published from 1934, became a platform for campainers for intercommunion and reunion.[1030] A committee of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1942/3 urged a review of the restriction of pulpit exchange ("In the last twenty years the ecclesiastical atmosphere has changed."). The Convocation declined but encouraged the granting of episcopal dispensations.[1031] Lambeth **1930** (Resolution 42) had emphasized the local bishop's right to make restrictions or grant exemptions regarding inter-communion in special cases for non-Anglicans.[1032] Unlike the Lambeth Conference in 1920, the bishops in 1930 used the phrase **"Historic Episcopate"**. They defined it as ancient and styled it the unanimous,

---

[1028] "An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, Resolutions 10-31, Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches and the respective Resolutions of the English Convocations", 6f.,100ff; "Resolutions of the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1933 on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930", 64,68.
[1029] Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 59ff.,62ff.,77ff.
[1030] Hodgson, "Intercommunion"; "Intercommunion".
[1031] Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, *Report [1942]*; Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, *Report [1943]*.

default ordering in the ancient church ("the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry") which they identified with 'episcopal episcopacy'. The alleged historic, universal agreement of the Christian church regarding episcopacy is likened in its genesis with the formation of the biblical canon, a comparison which is historically and theologically inaccurate.[1033] More explicit than the previous Conference in 1920, the Conference in 1930 stated that there were two models for understanding the 'historic episcopate'.

> "As an institution it was, and is, characterized by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. […] When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the [its] functions. […] But while we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as necessary element in any union in which the Anglican Communion can take part, … we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union."[1034]

With these Resolutions, the Anglican bishops, still under a strong Anglo-Catholic influence, defined the conditions under which their churches would stretch out their hands towards other churches. In the Church of England, this seemed more desirable than ever, with secularism, unrestricted dissent and party spirit having changed the religious landscape in the previous century. It seemed that the fragmentation of the Church of England might even continue. In 1920, the **Church of** Wales was **disestablished**. The Irish Church had already been disestablished in 1871, acknowledging its weak grounds in Ireland, with many

---

[1032] Davidson, *Lambeth Conferences*, II,XXIII,30; *Intercommunion To-day: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion*, 35ff; *The Lambeth Conference 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports*, 52f. Cf. footnote 1000.

[1033] "Resolutions on the Unity of the Church (Lambeth Conference 1930) and 'The Historic Episcopate' (from the Report of the Committee on 'The Unity of the Church' for the Lambeth Conference 1930)", 8ff. Cf. Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 73.

nominal parishes having ceased regular worship and not having resident ministers any more. Creeping disestablishment seemed a potential danger to many English Churchmen. In Wales, "[d]isestablishment was seen as a golden opportunity to make episcopacy more acceptable and accessible within what had become a highly critical Welsh culture".[1035] The hope was to make *Welsh* bishops more pastoral and thereby more popular. At a previous attempt of disestablishing the Welsh Church in 1870, some critics had styled the established Church "an alien Church forced upon the people by a conqueror and oppressor", as it had indeed been the case in Ireland, as some defenders of the 'Anglican' Church in Wales were happy to admit. In any case, it seemed true regarding the public perception of the Church of Wales that "that mark is branded upon it indelibly".[1036] And even more significantly, Welsh 'Dissent' seemed potentially linked with political separatism.

Despite tendencies to tighten ecclesiastical standards according to Anglo-Catholic principles after *Kikuyu*, to others it seemed that a 'broadening' of the Church of England was desirable for many reasons. People of differing theological convictions became persuaded that disestablishment was unavoidable in the long term and should better be channelized in a controlled way. Unlikely bedfellows like Bishop Henson, who held that "no form of ecclesiastical polity could ever be more than a non-essential, varying from age to age always the creature of time and place", and Bishop Gore, for whom episcopacy had "essential importance" (Henson: "He was ever appealing to 'principle', I to history."), could

---

[1034] "Resolutions on the Unity of the Church (Lambeth Conference 1930) and 'The Historic Episcopate' (from the Report of the Committee on 'The Unity of the Church' for the Lambeth Conference 1930)", 9f.
[1035] Bell, *Disestablishment*, 260ff; Bowen, *Crusade*, 298ff; Keulemans, *Episcopate*, chapter 7, cf. 84 (quote).
[1036] Quoted in: Edwards, *Welsh Church*, 253f.

agree on the urgency of the matter. Thus, the idea of a **national church** got a new 'appeal'. Henson wrote in 1942, looking back to the year 1917:

"I do not think that I describe his position unfairly when I say that he desired Disestablishment in the interest of what he conceived to be the Catholic Church, and wished to employ the interval before the blow fell in making sure that the reconstruction of the disestablished Church should be carried out on Catholic principles. I desired to utilize the interval by so unifying the national Christianity that the Church of England after Disestablishment should be still firmly based on the principles of the Reformation, and *therefore* better qualified to become the corporate expression of the nation's Christianity. '*Not disestablishment, but more establishment*', I used to say, meaning that I would have the Established Church administered in a large and liberal spirit with the definite object of widening its fellowship to include the orthodox Nonconformists, and thus making it more truly in fact what it was in theory, the corporate expression of the nation's Christianity. […] As a bishop he [Gore] was confronted in his own diocese by chaotic individualisms, ceremonial and doctrinal. […] The Kikuyu controversy, which had brought together both the doctrinal and the ceremonial issues, seemed to give a decisive direction to Gore's anti-establishment feeling. […] To organize the Church of England on 'Catholic' lines *before* the crisis of Disestablishment in order to make sure that *after* the crisis that organization, being actually in possession, would be maintained – such appeared to me Gore's programme, unconfessed and largely unsuspected…"[1037]

It seems that ever since the tendencies of 'Anglicanization' and 'episcopalization' in the nineteenth century, there was a growing desire to concentrate on ecclesiastical bonds rather than on the state establishment (thus, the **paradigmatic shift from 'national' to 'episcopal orders'**). In the aforementioned ***Appeal to All Christian People***, the bishops gathered at the Lambeth Conference in 1920 promoted as an ecumenical vision an interpretation of the Quadrilateral with its fourth article described as a **"ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the**

[1037] Henson, *Retrospect*, 208f. For Gore on Kikuyu: Gore, *Fellowship*, 3,7,48. Cf. footnotes 940, 937 and 948.

commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body".[1038] Franklin once suggested that the bishops took the 'historic episcopate' to be a given historic fact.[1039] It seems, however, that they tried, on the line of Huntington's original intention, to keep the ***theological*** **profile** of episcopacy **low**. The argument avoids the phrase of the 'historic episcopate' but also the notion of 'succession', which explains why some conservative Anglo-Catholic bishops despised the *Appeal*.[1040]

The *Appeal*'s (re-)definition of the 'historic episcopate' may indeed appear at first to soften the exclusive and excluding theological character of the fourth article of the Quadrilateral but, in fact, the ***historic*** **claims** of the Quadrilateral were even **amplified**, which had consequences for the theological implications. The re-modelled 'historic episcopate' now claimed a special **dominical authority** for 'episcopal' ministries, derived from the claim of the 'historicity' of the Anglican ecclesiastical offices for the ordained ministry, which, at the end of the day, is only plausible if understood as implying a special theological (quasi-sacramental) quality of the ministries. The test case was the definition of the relationship to 'non-episcopal' ministries. The *Appeal* stated that the bishops did "not … call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate" which "have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace."[1041] Nevertheless they insisted on **(re-)ordination** of 'non-episcopal' ministers in church unions, while claiming that this **would not suggest a repudiation of their**

[1038] Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, *Lambeth Conferences 1867-1930*, 39. Concerning the authorship cf. Jacob, *Making*, 255.
[1039] Franklin, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", 115,118.
[1040] Jacob, *Making*, 255.
[1041] "An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, Resolutions 10-31, Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches and the respective Resolutions of the English Convocations", 3f.

previous ministry.[1042] A sub-committee specified in 1920 that in a church union, the 'non-episcopal' ministers should be recognized in practical terms, but if they were not 'episcopally' (re-)ordained, they would not be able to administer Communion to "those congregations which already possess an episcopal ministry".[1043] Resolution 12A ruled that in ecclesiastical unions, the irregularity of admitting 'non-episcopally' confirmed, baptized members of the church to Communion should be tolerated.[1044]

Regarding the theological view of 'non-episcopal' churches, the *Appeal* seems to **presume**, against the otherwise positive description, **a (quasi-) sacramental defect or invalidity of 'non-episcopal' ministers and ministrations**. It appears that the bishops saw the *Appeal* as "intended for non-Episcopalians but capable of application to Rome … to get over the difficulty [of non-recognition of ministries]" (Bell), or even as applicable to Constantinople.[1045] Buchanan once called such an approach the "facing-all-at-once stance".[1046] The ambiguity of the *Appeal*, however, made it only slightly attractive to 'non-episcopal' churches, seconded by Anglo-Catholics who saw the *Appeal* violating their understanding of the *Quadrilateral* ("perilously rephrased and reworded"), with the *Appeal* tending towards a more diplomatic, *plene esse* position.[1047] The uncompromising insistence on (re-)ordinations, however, hardly left room for an interpretation of episcopacy simply as a preferred form of government (as the old 'Erastian' High Church view had seen it). Others suspected that a rigid practice would also need a rigid theological grounding.

[1042] Ibid., 4f.
[1043] Ibid., 9f.,13f. (quote).
[1044] Ibid., 7.
[1045] Bell, *Davidson*, 1256 (quote); cf. Kemp, "Lambeth 1920", 139; Woods/Weston/Smith, *Lambeth*.
[1046] Buchanan, "Full Communion", 41.

"But now *the complete removal* of the phrase [the historic episcopate] opens the door to the possible abandonment of any traditional, historic, and apostolic ministry. It makes possible tempting and speculative suggestions for ways of equating episcopal and non-episcopal ministries into something novel, but certainly not apostolic."[1048]

The claim that the adoption of the 'historic episcopate', even if the term was avoided in the *Appeal*, did **not mean the adoption of a specific, theological view of the episcopacy** (which does not authoritatively exist in Anglicanism and results in the ambiguous judgement of 'non-episcopal' churches), found its first prominent expression as an ecumenical model at Lambeth 1920 and was finally explicitly stated by the Conference in 1930. It marks the beginning of attempts of the Church of England to 'restore' church unity in the homeland and beyond. To achieve that, Anglicans have been promoting ever since their own model of institutional unity in an episcopal structure while elevating theologically the 'historic' episcopal offices as having a special 'catholic' commission and thereby an authority which 'non-episcopal' churches lacked and had to 'restore'. Patches of Anglo-Catholic ecclesiology have clearly found their way into Anglican teaching here but whereas Anglo-Catholic theologians often simply denied the "spiritual reality" of non-episcopal ministries, which the *Appeal* asserts, the Anglican bishops tried to keep doors open towards both theological streams, the High Church/Roman Catholic view as well as to the Protestant. The result is an ecclesiology which claims equality with Roman Catholic 'orders'. The logical consequence is the promotion of Anglican ecclesiological superiority to 'non-episcopal' churches.

[1047] Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity*, 21f. (quote); Stephenson, *Anglicanism*, 145f.
[1048] Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity*, 22.

That the problem of the '**degree of recognition' of 'non-episcopal' 'bodies'** lay deeper is illustrated by a pamphlet published by Pusey House, Oxford. The *Appeal* seems to recognize all baptized as fellow-members of the "universal Church of Christ which is His Body", either corporately or individually. It seems that the bishops saw as distinct from that the **'Catholic Church'** as manifestation of the fellowship of God, "[b]y God's own act", as an "outward, visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace…".[1049] Thus, one can avoid a rigid unchurching of 'non-catholics'. The distinction creates a **concentric model** with 'non-catholics' in the outer spheres of Christianity. Lacey celebrated this as "method of political diplomacy", by the Spirit, which "broke the bonds of a theory which was strangling the Church, and adherence to which would make reunion impossible".[1050]

The Pusey House publication argues against this distinction that it would not only neglect the formal aspect of the 'apostolic succession' of the ministry but also the dimension of dogmatic agreement, apart from the sacramental implications (the validity of schismatic baptism, the legitimacy of heretics as members of the 'visible church' and its relationship to the 'Catholic Church' in general).[1051] This does not only **un-church** 'non-catholics' (however defined) but effectively even **de-christianise**s them.

The model of **'historic episcopate'** came up again at the following **Lambeth Conferences in 1930, 1948 and 1958** but with different emphases. Likewise, the relation of Scripture/history and tradition has been subject to re-

[1049] "An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, Resolutions 10-31, Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches and the respective Resolutions of the English Convocations", 1.

interpretations as well, depending on the theological convictions of the particular bishops.[1052] Thus it might be fair to say that the model of 'historic episcopate' as an essential for national and international unions is a child of the Lambeth gatherings. To explain the 'Catholic' character of the approach, it is important to note that **the making of an ecumenical policy of Church of England and the Anglican Communion coincided with the high point of Anglo-Catholic influence, namely amongst the English bishops, with only "very little" of an "Evangelical counter-movement"**.[1053] It was only in the second half of the twentieth century that this was to change. The defeat of the new Prayer Book (1928) was perhaps, to some extent, a sign of the awakening of the Evangelical party, seconded by political, secular powers attacking the English establishment, although Hasting notes: "[t]he debate itself [in the Commons] almost justified Establishment."[1054]

Episcopacy remained on the agenda of the Lambeth Conferences after the *Appeal*, not least because the new 'Catholic' ecclesiological character which Anglo-Catholicism had imposed on the Church of England and Anglicanism led to no significant ecumenical break-through. The bishops admitted uncertainties about the historic origin of episcopacy in 1930 and appeared to be making attempts to move closer again to a recognition of 'non-episcopal' ministries in 1948 by affirming the notion of succession (only?) as a "mark" of the Christian church. In 1958, the Lambeth Conference suggested, now more self-critically, that the ministries of the future united church did not necessarily have to have the form

---

[1050] Lacey, *Church*, 53.
[1051] Stone/Puller, *Members*, 7ff.,23,25.
[1052] Cf. Keller-Hüschemenger, *Konferenzen*, 87ff.,90.
[1053] Hastings, *History*, 200ff. (quote); Yates, *Victorian*, 351ff.
[1054] Hastings, *History*, 206.

represented in Anglicanism.[1055] This was after the Church of England had already seen quite a few failings of negotiations with other churches under the uncompromising terms of the 'historic episcopate'. Buchanan judged optimistically in 1961, when he was involved in Anglican-Methodist unity plans (which failed):

"[i]f the high-water mark of Anglo-Catholicism was reached at the 1920 Lambeth Conference, even there, in the plea for a universal episcopate, no greater claim was made for the Anglican Eucharist than that worship could thus be offered 'without any doubtfulness of mind'. That high-water is now past. The mark it made lingers a little."[1056]

One needs to bear in mind that even the question of intercommunion at that time was still controversial. Lampe argued in 1961 with regard to intercommunion:

"no one seriously contends that the Word is null and void where it is preached by a non-episcopally ordained person, yet it is maintained that this is the case in respect of the Sacraments (though even here Baptism is excepted). […] But to subordinate the Word and Sacraments to ministerial order is put the cart before the horse. Today we are generally asked to treat the historic episcopate as the means by which the divided parts of Christendom are to be brought into unity. The reunited Church is to be constituted by the acceptance of the ancient ministerial order. […] The truth seems to be the opposite. The Sacrament of Holy Communion, with the proclamation of the Word, is the means of grace of unity, as of all other grace."[1057]

Ever since 1920, the *Appeal* suffered from the paradox of promoting 'episcopal episcopacy' as an effectively necessary, ecclesiological concept, although 'non-episcopal' churches, without it, were not *per se* unchurched. This paradox reflects, after all, the Church of England's own theological plurality and its history, with 'non-episcopally' ordained men in its service. This historic construct becomes

[1055] Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 41ff.
[1056] Buchanan, "Apostolic Succession", 25.

even more inconsistent when it is claimed to 'authenticate' universal, 'catholic' offices.

"But Anglicanism is unable to offer a consistent theory of its own episcopacy unless it is willing to urge that in every place where there is an Anglican bishop, that bishop and not the Roman Catholic or Orthodox bishop is the true symbol of unity. Since the Anglican church has never claimed that in it alone there is to be found the fulness of the church, it follows that the theological interpretation of *its* episcopate is necessarily the interpretation of a partial and broken symbol of the continuity of faith. Too much Anglican writing about bishops is about the episcopacy of a church which does not exist. […] The question is, what bishop and what church? Can it really be said of the Anglican communion that it 'possesses' the episcopate? In most parts of the world there is more than one bishop. If Anglicans are not saying that there is only one true bishop, and he the Anglican bishop, 'the bishop' … does not exist."[1058]

Nevertheless, ever since the *Appeal* of 1920, official Anglican endeavours, primarily aiming for an, ultimately, institutionally merged church, have been based on the method of the *Appeal*, with an essentially Anglo-Catholic interpretation of the fourth Article of the Quadrilateral. Avis, for example, refers to its criteria as "essential marks of the visibly united Church", with "a universally recognised ordained ministry – the only viable candidate for this being an episcopally ordained ministry".[1059]

4.8 The Failure of Unity Negotiations with Free Churches on the Basis of (Conditional) 'Episcopal Ordination'

In the years between 1920 and the Second World War, the Church of England invited English 'non-episcopal' churches to explore the possibility of ecclesiastical union on the basis of the ***Appeal***. The conversations with English

---

[1057] Lampe, "Episcopacy", 15f.
[1058] Sykes, *Integrity*, 98f.

Free Churches (1922-1925) were the most prominent negotiations and exemplary for the theological difficulties of such endeavours. A first statement of the Free Churches after the *Appeal* had welcomed the Anglican initiative but had hinted at reservations with a view to its "practical proposals", regarding

> "real agreement on what we may call postulates – that is, vital principles regarding the Church, and still more, regarding the Gospel. […] The essentials of the Church are … in the Gospel, not in organisation. The former is that by which the Church *is*: the latter is something which the Church *has* – and, of course, the more perfectly she has it, the better. … we cannot allow any church order or rite, or even the idea of the Church taken by itself, to displace the Gospel as the regulative and … the creative principle of all ecclesiastical doctrine and practice."[1060]

It was to be expected that the *Appeal*'s implied inequality of 'non-episcopal' partners, despite the recognition of 'effective ministries of grace' of 'non-episcopal' churches, would turn out to be a difficulty right from the start. In the year before the *Appeal*, Evangelical churchmen (lay and clergy) at the *Fourth Cheltenham Conference* had stated, when they had called for pulpit exchange and intercommunion "[t]hat no proposal for reunion which would involve the re-ordination of ministers would be welcome or practicable." Other clergy signed a petition declaring that "… Non-Episcopal Churches are not inoperative as means of Grace, but irregular from the point of view of historic Catholic Order."[1061] The Free Churches, at the (second) *Mansfield Conference* in 1920, with members of the Church of England, had just declared that a mutual authorization of ministers

---

[1059] Avis, *Reshaping*, 197.
[1060] *The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal: Being the Report of a Committee Appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council*, 13f.
[1061] Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 65-67,68-71 (quote from 69),77.

in a union between them was not to be understood in the sense of a (re-) ordination.[1062]

A joint conference in 1922 of leaders and theologians of Free Churches and of the Church of England explored again a Free Churches' adoption of 'episcopal ordination' without (allegedly) a certain theory of it but defined as "an outward and visible call and commission by the Church".[1063] A **first** Anglican **Memorandum** (1923) made ambiguous statements on the recognition of 'non-episcopal' ministries, calling them **"real ministries of the Word and Sacrament"**. This statement forms a contrast to a previous one in the same document. **"Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective."**[1064] The authors – all but one of whom were bishops – emphasized that they found it "impossible to regard [Free Church ministries] as 'invalid', that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been Divinely ordained in the Church of Christ."[1065]

It is obvious that the Anglican side tried to avoid an uncompromising judgement similar to that of *Apostolicae Curae*. Franklin explains the paradox of the negative Anglican judgement on 'non-episcopal' ministries with the bishops facing **"the real possibility of an internal Anglican schism if the ordinal's requirement of episcopal ordination were to be set aside or made**

[1062] *The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal: Being the Report of a Committee Appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council*, 18, cf. appendix I(f.). Cf. Bell, *Documents Bearing*, 54ff.,81ff.,88ff.

[1063] *Church Unity: Report of a Joint Conference Held at Lambeth Palace, Together with a Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Moderator of the Council of the Evangelical Free Churches*, 7.

[1064] "Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry: Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6, 1923", 161,159. Cf. Kirk, "Apostolic Ministry", 38ff.42ff.

[1065] "Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry: Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6, 1923", 158f.

optional.".[1066] This appears to confirm our earlier finding that, under the influence of the High Church movement, the (gradual) '**defect**' of 'non-episcopal' ministries is seen now as both possibly a legal ('**irregular**') as well as a theological or spiritual matter (in the sense of 'invalidity'). As we shall see, the question of **'validity'**, implicitly or explicitly, was now dominating the theological debate – and making it more difficult.

The Church of England was clearly in a **dilemma** with regard to the recognition of 'non-episcopal' churches. It had to realize that it had established an ecclesiological **identity** which implied 'episcopal' superiority in relations to 'non-episcopal' churches. This ecclesiological understanding was effectively only shared by its daughter churches, but was vital for maintaining communion with those churches and England's honorary primate in the Anglican Communion. At the same time, it was unlikely that a 'non-episcopal' partner would accept the Anglican terms of union if they implied inequality.

The Council of Free Churches felt that they had to express their dissatisfaction with what the Church of England had offered.[1067] A **second** Anglican **Memorandum** tried to re-define the earlier judgment by emphasizing the **formal** issues but, still, stated that the Free Churches' ordained ministries suffered from a "main defect", a **"lack of this authority"**, the "due authority for the ministry". "Spiritual efficacy is one thing, due authority is another. The latter is not involved in the former. […] And this matter of due authority is to us one of the highest importance."[1068]

[1066] Franklin, "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", 121.
[1067] Cf. Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 193.
[1068] "A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry, Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference, Together with an Appended Note from the Free Churches Members of the Joint Conference, June 19, 1925", 82,79 (long quote).

The Second Memorandum spelled out even more clearly the practical consequences for church unions with regard to the "present requirement of full and unconditional Episcopal Ordination". The authors acknowledged that the insistence on 'episcopal ordination' *as a theological concept* was not necessitated by the history of the Church of England, although they downplayed the point: "[i]t is true … that in the confused times of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exceptions to the rule requiring Episcopal Ordination for Ministry in the Church of England sometimes occurred."[1069] Sykes, himself usually very cautious in his interpretation of the evidence, commented: "the alleged 'confusion of times' was neither intellectual nor theological, since the Tudor and Stuart churchmen in question had a coherent and consistent theory of church polity and order."[1070]

The authors of the memorandum regarded as necessary for church unions either an authorization, with laying-on of hands, or an ***ordinatio sub conditione*** (conditional ordination). Both acts are open to the understanding as supplemental ordination) of 'non-episcopal' ministers ("If thou art not already Ordained").[1071] While both models (amounting to the same thing) could be understood as (re-) ordination and integration into the Anglican episcopal system, the authors saw this as "a very real change in the practice of the Anglican Church" which might be sanctioned "by authorities of that Church". Given the Anglo-Catholic hostility against 'Protestants', even if they accepted 'episcopal' ordination (cf. the Jerusalem bishopric), it may be understandable why at least some Anglicans saw the offer of conditional ordination as a significant concession.

[1069] Ibid., 84,80.
[1070] Sykes, *Priest*, 94, cf. 89,93f.
[1071] "A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry, Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference, Together with an Appended Note from the Free Churches Members of the Joint Conference, June 19, 1925", 81,83;

The concession towards the acknowledgement of '**spiritual efficacy'** of the Free Churches' ordained ministries, whilst uncompromisingly insisting on adopting the 'historic episcopate', did not produce the desired results, not least because of the inconsistency of this position.[1072] The English Free Churches felt that they finally needed to suspend the consultation process in 1925 ("the question of authorization must be answered by some other means than ordination").[1073] In the later conversations with the **Church of Scotland** (1932-1936), the Scottish General Assembly insisted right from the start on a reunion scheme which could "only be based on the recognition of the equal validity of the Orders and Sacraments of both Churches".[1074] These conversations also failed.

Despite these failures, the model of (re-)ordination or *ordinatio sub conditione* effectively remained the model proposed by the Church of England for church unions with 'non-episcopal' churches in the following decades. A working group of the English Archbishops commented in 1930 on the results of the Lausanne meeting of the Conference on Faith and Order in 1927 concluding that 'non-episcopal' ministries did

"not possess the endorsement of the whole of Christendom, are necessarily incomplete, and … stand in need of supplement and regularization. We are agreed that no movement toward such regularization can hope (or deserve) to make progress if it involves repudiation by any minister of his ministry as invalid."[1075]

Turner, "Ordination"; "The Unity of the Church", appendix [on the theory of supplemental ordination], 64-66.

[1072] Cf. Bell, *Christian Unity*, 114ff.

[1073] Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, "Resolutions", 101.

[1074] General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, "Deliverance", 122.

[1075] *Report of the Committee Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Consider the Findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order: Persuant to Resolution of the Church Assembly Passed at the Summer Session, 1928, Together with Various Memoranda*, 24. Cf. Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 193f.,219f.

The last sentence suggests that the terminology of **'validity'** should be avoided for reasons of strategy, but the claim of ecclesiological superiority is maintained. In an appendix, Bishop Palmer expressed this more clearly regarding attempts of organizing a union in South India: **"[The] essence [of our claim] is exclusiveness."**[1076]

Amongst Anglican theologians as well as in official Church documents until today there is an ambiguity about the degree of recognition of 'non-episcopal' ordained ministries, although the 'efficacy' of their ministrations is assumed. Gassmann suggests that this lack of clarity may partly be seen as a political strategy to please different churchmanships, but also to make a dialogue possible in the first place.[1077] This matches the criticism of the High Church theologian Kidd who dismissed the stance of the first memorandum as "a judgement of policy, not of principle".[1078]

Bell judged in 1948 that **'absorption'** was not the way to achieve a national 'ultimate full organic [church] union' but negotiations with single churches about "full fellowship and communion" in the first place.[1079] This would prove to be correct in the second half of the nineteenth century when negotiations would concentrate on the goal of covenants instead of 'organic unions', possibly drawing conclusions from the failings of the *Appeal*. Dogmatically, an integration of Free Churches into the Church of England was not an impossible venture, even if Anglo-Catholics did not like the idea. Many of the Dissenters' classical theological views were effectively similar to convictions held in the Low Church constituency of the Church of England. The term 'Free Churches' had become

[1076] Gore, "South India", 105.
[1077] Cf. Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 197.
[1078] Kidd, "Validity", 28.

prominent in the nineteenth century. Their distance from the Church of England was often characterized **institutionally** to a significant degree, with a view to governmental regulation and interference.[1080] By the beginning of the twentieth century the Church of England presented itself in a different institutional shape in terms of its state relations, not least due to the influence of the Oxford Movement. However, the institutional difference between Free Churches and the Church of England had now, ironically, become a **theological** matter, through the model of **'historic episcopate'**, insisted upon by Anglicans as an ecclesiological essential. The result was that a rapprochement turned out to be just as difficult as before, due to the dilemma that Anglican churches could not abandon their new theological identity marker in order to declare ecclesiological equality with Dissenters. To maintain it, however, meant effectively the unchurching of 'non-episcopal' partners whose ministries were implicitly or explicitly declared 'invalid', and only absorption could rectify them. The Church of England, thus, treats 'non-episcopal' churches as excommunicated parts of the Church (dissenters), but now for reasons which would not have been thought of when the Dissenters were expelled in England at the Restoration. English Dissenters are effectively told that, with their leaving of the Church of England, they had abandoned the 'catholic' church of the country, which guarded the 'historic episcopate'. This undergirding assumption of 'episcopal' superiority, based on Tractarian thinking, must be seen as the reason for the fate of the attempts to achieve ecclesiastical unions with 'non-episcopal' churches after the *Appeal*. "Every attempt to translate the 'Appeal to All Christian People' into appropriate

---

[1079] Bell, *Christian Unity*, 117.
[1080] Cf. Voß, "Freikirchen", 15f.

action has been more effective in arousing suspicion than in facilitating agreement."[1081]

4.9 The 'Validity' Terminology in the Report of the Archbishops' Commission "Doctrine in the Church of England" (1922-38)

In 1922, a couple of years after the *Appeal,* when conversations with national and international ecumenical partners had been setting off, the English Archbishops installed a commission to define the dogmatic groundings of the Church of England. This turned out be a long and difficult process due to the significant differences between Anglican 'Protestants' and 'Catholics'. It fell in the time of the **Prayer Book Controversy** when Parliament twice blocked the draft of a revised Prayer Book **(1927/8)**. Some used it subsequently anyway, with the silent consent of the predominantly 'Catholic-minded' Bishops (a "wholesale illegality countenanced by the Bishops for decades").[1082]

The new Prayer Book sought to provide authorized liturgical alternatives for the modern and more plural times.[1083] The failure of the draft was perhaps not least to the untimely, because overdue, attempt of this venture, after the notorious "triadic party conflict" in the nineteenth century, feeding the "desire for a liturgy broad enough to be acceptable to dissenters, and even to theological convictions of a unitarian variety".[1084] The draft, however, turned out to be an attempt by the House of Bishops, at the time with a "dominance of Centre-High outlook", to allow more 'Catholic' ritualism, moving "the liturgy in the direction of a

---

[1081] Henson, *Church of England*, 251.
[1082] Church of England, *BCP [1928]*; "Rome and Its Rites", quote.
[1083] Woods, *Introduction*.

moderately Catholic expression of worship" but, thus, also making an ecclesiological statement, which clashed with the, still, rather Protestant mind-set of the nation, Maiden suggests.

"By the 1920s Anglican Evangelicalism appeared moribund in comparison to a flourishing Anglo-Catholic party and was in no position to challenge the Centre-High consensus over the direction of revision. […] The rise in sacramental feeling and the resurgence of Anglo-Catholicism in the Church changed the parameters of revision. Furthermore, the ascendancy of the Centre-High ideological consensus in the Anglican hierarchy led to a determination to integrate moderate Anglo-Catholicism into the life of the Church. Whereas the original intention of revision had been to deal with the question of vestments, by the 1920s the task of revising the Prayer Book was bound up with controversial issues such as continuous reservation and the communion rite."[1085]

Dean Inge (who is believed to have wondered in 1938: "[o]h dear, – is there no Protestant worship left?") held the proposed Prayer Book to be "a sort of attempt to suppress burglary by legalizing petty larceny".[1086] Norman Sykes suggested that the defeat by both Evangelical and High Church MPs was also a symptom of the High Church bishops' hubris:

"that book was truly and essentially a Bishops' Book; since its compilation was the work of the episcopate (whose personnel was admittedly not selected primarily with a view to expert liturgical and historical scholarship); and the houses of clergy and laity were required to give their final vote for or against it, without possibility of amendment."[1087]

Thus, the Archbishops' commissioning of a **doctrinal survey** of the Church of England had fallen into a critical time. The Bishop of Oxford, Burge, had promoted the project, and urged the Archbishop of Canterbury in a letter, together

---

[1084] Sykes, "Protestantism", 121.
[1085] Grimley, "Review"; Maiden, *Controversy*, 13,42,35 (quote). Cf. footnote 1170.
[1086] Quoted in: Gere/Sparrow, *Notebooks*, 58f.
[1087] Sykes, "Leviathan", 205; cf. Welsby, "Book".

with co-signatories including nine diocesan bishops, to examine the common doctrinal grounds of the different Church parties. Burge described this in a subsequent letter in 1922 as "a step which will emphasize the importance of closer agreement and which will initiate a more systematic effort to find bases for such agreement…", but not as aiming for a formulation of an official teaching of the Church of England.[1088] The result, finally published sixteen years later as a "contribution", could hardly satisfy any particular Anglican tradition, nor was it a 'synthesis', as perhaps had initially been hoped for.[1089] The title was carefully worded as "Doctrine in the Church of England" (not "of"). "Since it surveyed rather than defined the doctrine of the Church it did little to delineate the permitted limits of theological diversity".[1090]

In their sketch of ecclesiology and "the Ministry", the authors describe the latter in succession of "the Apostolate" as being in a relationship of mutual dependence on the church (p.115f.), with the **"historic episcopate" as "organ for transmitting the ministerial commission"**. It is described as **"a symbol and guarantee of continuity with the Church's origin"** (p.121). The latter sentence appears to combine two concepts ("and") which would actually exclude each other. If a symbol can actually serve as a *guarantee,* then the symbol is essentially identical with what it stands for. 'Symbol' here appears to be deliberately used ambigious, in a 'mediatory', (quasi-)sacramental way, whereas de Saussure, in his classical distinction kept apart *signifiant* (signifier) and *signifié* (signified).[1091] This usage of 'symbol' has prevailed in Anglicanism:

[1088] Bell, *Davidson*, vol. II, chapter 72, 1922ff.,1148 (quote).
[1089] Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine, *Doctrine*, 19,25f; Marshall, *Theology*, 222f.
[1090] Butler, "Eighteenth Century to the Present Day", 41.

"symbols transcend mere signs. […] Symbols effect a connection between the mundane and the transcendent… […] Signs are usually conventional and arbitrary… … there is a continuity between the symbol and what is symbolised. […] All symbols are signs, but not all signs are symbols… […] Symbols, unlike signs, have a reference to transcendent reality and themselves participate in that reality, as Coleridge and Tillich emphasised. … they thus have a mediatory purpose."[1092]

With a view to episcopacy, the German Protestant Schlink used the classical distinction between *signum* (the apostolic succession) and *res* (the apostolic record or tradition, "Überlieferung der Apostel") and concluded:

"[t]he sign of apostolic succession cannot replace the continuously necessary requirement of submission to the historic teaching of the apostles. Neither can it lower the value of the apostolic pastoral office which is exercised without that sign."[1093]

The **ontological implications** are even stronger when the *Report* defines sacraments as "effectual signs … represent[ing] the gifts of grace offered through them … on worshippers who receive them with faith" (p.130, cf. *Article* XXV). While this may sound almost like a Lutheran understanding, the *Report* continues using Roman Catholic sacramental language (especially the categories of **'validity' and 'regularity'**). This might reflect the rejection of Anglican ministries by *Apostolicae Curae* and the *Appeal*'s notion of a special commission of 'episcopal' episcopacy. The usage of the 'Catholic' terminology is even more significant as the authors think of sacraments as the dominical ones in the first place but also "consider with varying degrees of fulness the five rites 'commonly called sacraments'" (p.126), which would include ordination.

[1091] de Saussure/Bally/Sechehaye, *General Linguistics*, 67.
[1092] Avis, *Creative Imagination*, 106.
[1093] Schlink, *Traditionen*, 194. "Das Zeichen der apostolichen Sukkzession kann weder die immer wieder neu notwendige Unterwerfung unter die historische Lehre der Apostel ersetzen noch den

The Roman Catholic *Magisterium* judges other churches' ministries lacking '*validitas sacramentalis*' due to the lack of '*validitas canonica*' (regularity). It is effectively the context of the Roman Catholic Church (communion with/obedience to the Pope) which validates sacraments. Similarily, Anglo-Catholics deduce from the regularity of a sacrament to its validity, with the validity of the celebrant's ministry being vital. The logical conclusion is an **uncompromising 'invalidity' judgement of 'non-episcopal' ministers and ministrations** which, however, many Anglo-Catholics avoid. Some Anglo-Catholics charitably recognize 'non-episcopal' ministries and sacraments in their **efficaciousness**, although this weakens their argumentation.[1094] The concept of validity is a 'black-and-white' concept. **"Something irregular can be made regular whereas something not valid cannot be made valid by human means."**[1095] Kidd, for example, criticized Gore's description of 'validity' in the sense of being 'secure', as this would mean that one could describe **'invalidity'** in the sense of **'precarious'** whereas Kidd himself suggested '**nullity',** due to the alleged lack of authority of 'non-episcopal' ministries. He, nevertheless, wanted to keep a door open with regard to the (in his eyes) invalid "Orders, or Sacraments in general", "without due commission", as being efficacious. "And this is the principle of objectivity of the Sacraments, or their validity as distinguished from their efficacy".[1096]

The very definition of the 'objectivity' of the sacraments, however, appears to be dependent on one's presumptions. The notion of 'efficaciousness',

---

ohne dieses Zeichen geschehenden apostolischen Hirtendienst entwerten." Cf. Schlink, "Sukzession", 113.

[1094] Kirk, *Apostolic Ministry*, 37f.

[1095] Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 146. "Was irregulär ist, kann regular gemacht werden, während das, was nicht valid ist, durch menschliche Mittel auch nicht valid gemacht werden kann." Cf. Peck, *Re-examination*, 77.

also used in the *Report*, helps avoid exclusive and excluding claims which would usually come with the sacramental terminology used (p. 131f.):

'**regular**' sacrament	"if it is performed in accordance with general rules laid down by competent authority for the due administration of the sacraments"
'**valid**' sacrament	"wherever the special appointed conditions constituting the sacrament are duly and intentionally fulfilled"
'**efficacious**' sacrament	"in so far as it actually effects the purpose for which it was instituted"

Whereas in Roman Catholic doctrine **'regularity'**, understood as '**ecclesiality**', validates a sacrament (although allowing irregular but valid emergency baptisms by laypeople *in extremis*), the *Report* refers to a "**competent authority**" recognizing 'regularity' (without implying an automatic judgement on 'validity' or 'efficaciousness'), which would be defined by ecclesiastical law.[1097] This would also mean that a sacrament could be 'regularly' administered but may not be regarded as efficacious, for example, if it was not received in faith, adding to condemnation (p.131), with "the spiritual fitness of the recipient" determining the efficacy of the sacrament.[1098]

The recognition of 'irregular' but 'efficacious' ministrations provided an interpretation of what had been stated in the **conversations with the Free Churches** with regard to their ministrations. The Anglican bishops had offered conditional ordination without an obligation to 'believe' in 'episcopal ordination', **insisting on 'episcopal ordination' to satisfy the requirements of an Anglo-Catholic sacramental understanding which would actually invalidate such ordinations without the due intention to receive it.**

[1096] Kidd, "Validity", 26f.
[1097] Gurrieri, "Sacramental Validity", 57.

In any case, the concept of **'efficaciousness'** of a sacrament (which "actually effects its purpose") **short-circuits the concept of regularity constituting validity**. It provides a back door, to be able to declare something as 'effectively' 'valid', although not being 'regular', which avoids the Anglo-Catholic deduction from the invalidity of ministries to the invalidity of ministrations.

This move is underpinned in the *Report* with reference to the **Doctrine of Intention/Exterior Intention** (cf. Cranmer's 'receptionism').[1099] Hooker presumed that sacraments served "inwardly the purpose of the Church of God" if serious intention and the 'outward marks' were given (cf. p.135f. and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* V,lviii,3).[1100] The *Report* thereby appears to **redefine and soften the implications of the terminology borrowed from Roman Catholic doctrine**. The authors admit that this theory is not generally recognized, especially not by Roman Catholics. Unsurprisingly, they are reluctant to give preference to *one* dogmatic model of the sacraments (neither *ex opere operato* nor *ex opere operantis*, p.131, emphasizing both the due performance as well as the recipient's spiritual disposition, p.129).

In this context, it worth noting that the systematical usage of the concept of sacramental '**validity**' was introduced rather late into **early modern Roman Catholic teaching**. Gurrieri argues that this terminology (and its concept) is often used anachronistically and too quickly read into earlier sources such as Augustine or Aquinas. He suggests that the legal terminology of 'validity' was officially adopted only very slowly, even long after the Reformation (when Luther claimed

---

[1098] Cf. Gassmann, *Bischofsamt*, 146.
[1099] Chapman, *Short Introduction*, 29.
[1100] Hooker, "Ecclesiastical Polity".

that the crucial aspect of a sacrament was not the minister's intention but the recipient's). While Luther's idea was rejected by Pope Leo X, the term 'validity' had still not found its way into Roman Catholic magisterial teaching. The term is not used by the Council of Trent.[1101] It was **Pope Benedict XIV** who adopted this legal term in the early **eighteenth century** for the *Magisterium*'s teaching, making the **validity and liceity** of a sacrament more **dependent on its regularity** according to the ***Magisterium***'s approval. In contrast, Augustine had held that the 'validity' of a sacrament was dependent neither on the conducting minister's nor on the recipient's worthiness.[1102] Similarly, 'Anglican champions' like Hooker or Laud had been suspicious of too legalistic a definition of sacramental 'validity'. Hooker actually used the term but, of course, before Pope Benedict XIV.[1103]

The ***Report***'s reference to the **defining authority** makes a crucial point, taking into account the **subjectivity of the perspective**, actually describing '**ecclesiality' rather than ('objective') 'validity'**. The Roman Catholic default position levels **'authorisedness'** (regularity) with the **believed reality of a sacrament** (validity and, thus, 'efficaciousness'), as only validly ordained ministers can actually celebrate sacraments (emergencies aside).[1104] The *Report* effectively deduced from a faithful intention "to do what the Church does" (*Apostolicae Curae* §9) to its efficaciousness at least *in the sense of* 'validity', using Roman Catholic terminology but modifying its meaning.

This discrepancy can also be observed in the *Report*'s statements on **episcopacy**: ordination ("conferring of Holy Orders") requires prayer as 'form' and the laying-on of hands as 'matter' (cf. *Saepius Officio*), "by a minister who is

---

[1101] Gurrieri, "Sacramental Validity", 30,32,36,44,46,48.
[1102] Ibid., 55f.,33f.
[1103] Ibid., 41f.

recognised as having the necessary authority to do so" (p.199). "In the consecration of bishops authority for pastoral oversight is given."

It remains unclear how ordination and 'consecration' are understood here and whether 'authority' implies the concept of ontology. The terminology seems to imply a 'Catholic' understanding. So does the Anglican practice of insistence on 'episcopal ordination' or the fact that the special authority to confirm and ordain remains with a bishop after retirement from office. However, Henry Chadwick insisted that Anglicanism did not know *episcopi vagantes* ('valid' but 'irregular' bishops).[1105] However, if one adopts a legalistic understanding of 'validity' of 'orders', one ends up with a fairly mechanical pedigree model of ordination, similar to that of the Roman Catholic Church – according to which one may claim valid (but irregular) 'orders' for Anglicans, at least perhaps via their Old Catholic ecumenical partners.[1106] However, even if so, the Vatican would maintain that the intention and form of the Ordinal is insufficient for handing them on (cf. *Apostolicae Curae*).[1107] Historically, the model of unbroken chains of consecrations from earliest times is doubtful and popes occasionally granted presbyteral ordinations.[1108]

In any case, the Anglican concept of **validity** is not identical with the Roman Catholic:[1109]

"whilst the Church of England does not have a doctrine of validity or otherwise of holy orders it does have a developed doctrine of what constitutes

---

[1104] Cf. Quick, "Validity", 65.
[1105] Chadwick, "Diskussion", 302.
[1106] Hughes, *Orders*, appendix 2; Hunwicke, "Anglican Orders"; Lenox-Conyngham, "Kirchengemeinschaft", 29. Cf. Leonard, "Personal Contribution", 316f.
[1107] Hughes, *Orders*, 192ff.
[1108] Barratt, "Ordination", 70; Kretschmar, "Wiederentdeckung", 300.
[1109] Cf. Galot, *Priesthood*, 186f.

lawful ordination and systems for ascertaining whether or not the orders of other Churches can be recognized as being interchangeable with its own."[1110]

That would mean that Anglicans have legal definitions of regularity for their own Church but no authoritative teaching of (theological) validity. The difficulty is accomodating the Anglo-Catholic desire not to lose credibility with Orthodox churches or Rome whilst not unchurching all other churches.

"… Anglo-Catholics must seek to over-persuade them ['Catholic theologians'] by showing that there is no reason to question the validity of Anglican sacraments… […] Thus it comes about that the Anglo-Catholic theologian adheres strictly to the theory that the possession of valid sacraments is in such wise a credential of the 'visible' Church, that the validity of sacraments cannot be derived from their authorization by that Church, but is rather what gives to the Church its visible character."[1111]

Anglo-Catholics emphasize that the Ordinal states that ministers were ordained "in the Church of God" (not the Church of England), as if such a self-claim proved anything. "Stated bluntly, the Anglican position is that Holy Orders are expressly *not* 'Anglican forms of ministry'. Rather, they are *true* orders, and therefore part of the Apostolic Succession."[1112] However, the Ordinal's reference to the "Church of God" could quite well have been a simple anti-Roman statement at the time. "The phrases 'Church of God', 'Church of Christ', Church of England are apparently interchangeable and used without qualification!"[1113]

Quick once suggested that all ministries would need to be seen as incomplete, as they lacked full authorization in the whole, because divided,

---

[1110] Adam, "Reception", 4.
[1111] Quick, *Sacraments*, 137f.
[1112] Jones, "Visibility", 345f.
[1113] Werner, "Sukzession", 597. "Die Begriffe ‚Church of God', ‚Church of Christ', Church of England sind offensichtlich auswechselbar und werden ohne Qualifizierung gebraucht!"

Christian church.[1114] Fuller writes, similar to an analysis of Newman: **"Episcopalians generally tend to think that a valid ministry validates the church. For Roman Catholics and Orthodox it is the other way round. They would say that since theirs is a 'true church', they have a valid ministry."**[1115] As opposed to both these views, Protestants would describe ministries not in the terms of 'validity' but functionally as "church-serving", not "church-defining".[1116]

It must be legitimate to question at this point the Anglican hope that the claim of their ministries to be 'valid' or 'catholic' will ever lead to the goal envisioned: the 'reconciliation of ministries' (cf. the *Meissen Declaration*, A,iii and B,vi).[1117] The Anglican model tries to solve the ecumenical problem, allegedly, with only little theological and ecclesiological theory attached to their understanding of ordained ministry. However, like the Vatican, **Orthodox** churches regard unity in the fundamentals of faith to be prerequisites of unity.[1118] Afanasiĭ Bulgakoff, in his commentary on *Apostolicae Curae* and the Archbishops' reply pointed out that for Orthodox, like for the Roman Catholic Church, the recognition of Anglican ministries was not a question of technical recognition of a succession (like in the sense of a 'historic episcopate'), but of unity in (true) faith, hierarchy and sacraments.

"For the reunion of the Anglicans with those Christian bodies which have a hierarchy of unbroken Apostolical succession, before all things, the restoration by the Anglicans of the true faith – that is to say the teaching of the ancient universal Church – is necessary."[1119]

[1114] Cf. Quick, *Sacraments*, 146,150.
[1115] Fuller, "Unity", 164. Cf. Newman, "Milman's View", 87.
[1116] Cf. Bradshaw, *Olive Branch*, 178.
[1117] Church of England/Federation of the Evangelical Churches in the German Democratic Republic of Germany/Evangelical Church in Germany, "'Meissen Declaration' and 'Agreement'".
[1118] Fouyas, *Orthodoxy*, 101ff.,105f; Larentzakis, "Einheit", 183ff.

For the Anglican-Orthodox dialogue this bears conflicts regarding "the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism, the extreme ambiguity of Anglican formularies, the wide variety of interpretations which these formularies permit".[1120] Sergei (Sergius) Bulgakov (Boulgakoff), called in the 1930s for partial intercommunion (only) within the meetings of the *Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius*, on the ground of dogmatic understanding and agreement. He proposed as a means a special authorization by the individual Orthodox and Anglican bishops of the *Fellowship* members, with a special "sacramental blessing" which could be understood as a validation of Anglican orders, as the *Fellowship* in its critical response noted.[1121]

Bulgakov's pragmatic suggestion aimed to reverse the classical 'Catholic' model of the Eucharist as *expression* of unity rather than a *means*. Both classical markers of Orthodox unity, apostolic succession and doctrinal agreement, he tried to bring into a balance which aimed towards an Orthodox recognition of Western Churches as schismatic (not heretical), as a first and important step towards unity. This he anticipated through conditional recognition on an individual (not corporate) basis, to begin with, as a consequence of fellowship and an acknowledgement of plurality in Christendom. "First of all – the unity of the Church and Her uniqueness are axioms. There must be no place for a conception that there exist two or three 'Churches' or their 'branches', also that neither of them is the true and only one."[1122] His pragmatic approach is based on his historic dismissal of the **ideal of a united early church**, which one often finds with

---

[1119] Bulgakoff, *Orders*, 44.
[1120] Ware, *Orthodox*, 321.
[1121] Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius, *Response*; Gallaher, "Bulgakov"; Geffert, "Bulgakov".
[1122] Boulgakoff, *Outlines*, 10 (quote),14,20,22.

contemporary Anglican authors, forming part of their claim of superiority of their 'orders', or even simply their validity as opposed to Protestant ministries.[1123]

"It appears to be a well-established fact, that apparently there never existed a time in the life of the Church without some sort of internal discord leading to the formation of heresies and schisms, beginning from the times of the Apostles (Simon the Magician, the Nicolaites)."[1124]

The concept(s) of 'validity' of ordained ministries, overall, appeared more to highlight ecumenical disparities than to overcome them. The next challenge of that sort was the union of the **Church of South India** in 1947, of 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' churches. It required the Church of England to develop a stance on the recognition of the ministries of this church. Unlike the ecumenical method of the Church of England, the partners there did not perform conditional or supplemental ordinations but chose an immediate recognition of ministers for the initial period of thirty years, with all new ordinations and consecrations to be performed 'episcopally' (the bishops of the new church were created by 'episcopal' consecrations *per saltum*, that means without previous deaconing or priesting).[1125] The scheme explicitly rejected an authoritative interpretation of its ordination practice.[1126] Whereas the Lambeth Conference in 1948 recommended the recognition of the Church of South India on those terms, the Church of England refused. Anglo-Catholics feared a violation of the diachronic 'catholic' principle of succession. Others felt that the rejection meant a violation of the

---

[1123] Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*; Greenslade, *Schism*, 16f; Keller-Hüschemenger, *Anglikanismus*, 83f; O'Collins, "Continuity", 139. Wilken, 1971 #925@158ff. (quote)}Wilken, *Myth*, 158ff.
[1124] Boulgakoff, *Outlines*, 2.
[1125] Gibbs, *India*, 375; Hollis, "Ministry", 12; Neill, "South India", 94. Cf. Headlam, *Scheme*, 7.
[1126] Aldenhoven, "Südindien", 57.

synchronic, spatial principle of catholicity.[1127] This dilemma resulted in a more systematic re-statement of the *plene esse* view of episcopacy in the essay collection *The Historic Episcopate*, opposing the earlier Anglo-Catholic book *The Apostolic Ministry*.[1128] The controversy highlighted the dilemma which became apparent in the discussion about the validity or invalidity of 'non-episcopal' ministries.

"It is true that what the Church of England decides about the Church of South India will *eventually* determine to a large degree her attitude towards the Nonconformists in this country. […] … we will never get reunion with Nonconformists in this country … until we can show the Nonconformists a *theological* interpretation of episcopacy which does not involve a denial of their own past."[1129]

[1127] Broomfield, "Anglo-Catholic View", 152,154; Gore, "South India"; House of Bishops of the Church of England, *South India*, 4; Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, *Report*, 7f; Neill, "Notwendigkeit", 752; Newbigin, *Reunion*, 187; Podmore, *Aspects*, 89ff.
[1128] Carey, *Historic Episcopate*; Fairweather, *Episcopacy Re-asserted*; Kirk, *Apostolic Ministry*; Neill, *'Apostolic Ministry'*; Peck, *Examination*; Sykes, *Integrity*, 20.
[1129] Carey, "Introduction", 5-8.

5. Conclusion and Outlook

5.1 The Notions of 'Catholicity' and 'Apostolicity' and 'Sign' and 'Symbol' in the Church of England in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century

The purpose of this study has been to examine the **exaltation of episcopacy *as a theological model* in the nineteenth century**. We have seen that this exaltation, out of historic necessity, has given Anglicanism a **denominational profile**, often styled 'catholic' (due to the predominant Anglo-Catholic influence of the time) but effectively being idiosyncratically 'Anglican'. One of its consequences was the ecclesiological distancing from the so-called 'non-episcopal' churches, although the Anglican model of **'catholic orders'** is not recognized by the alleged other 'catholic', 'episcopal' churches (Roman Catholic and Orthodox).

The origin of the present 'official' Anglican ecclesiological teaching (episcopacy as *plene esse*) is the historic situation in the nineteenth century, in the ***via media* between Low Churchmanship/Evangelicalism on the one side and ritualism/Tractarianism on the other**, despite all, partly justified, efforts to date it further back. Its weakness is its lack of theological consistency as a genuine position. Newman polemically described the underlying dilemma:

> "Protestantism and Popery are real religions…: but the *Via Media*, viewed as an integral system, has never had existence except on paper; it is known … not in its own properties; and can only be described as a third system, neither the one nor the other, but with something of each, cutting between them, and, as if with a critical fastidiousness, trifling with them both, and boasting to be nearer Antiquity than either."[1130]

It is ironic to read this analysis from Newman's pen, as he was one of the main protagonists whose influence forced the Church of England in the late nineteenth

and early twentieth century into committing itself theologically to this '**third way**'. On the other hand, this development in itself marks the remaining success of the Oxford Movement in that it became much more than "picturesque but fleeting by-products of the history" of the "Anglican religion", as Henson suspected in 1918. "Few things are more curious in the history of religion than the rapid transformation of Anglicanism during the last two generations."[1131] This is certainly true regarding the nineteenth-century Anglican claim of a personal **'succession'**.

> "While it is true that Anglicans have consistently defended the retention of episcopacy for a variety of reasons, it is an innovation to suggest that Anglicans have regarded any particular theological interpretation of episcopacy as essential."[1132]

The current ecclesiological teaching, with the uncompromising insistence on a *personal succession*, fails to persuade as a *middle* position, which is a problematic ideal anyway, as a Mirfield brother once pointed out:

> "it does not follow either that catholic truth is always to be found precisely midway between these two poles [Rome and Geneva], or that such a *via media* automatically places the Church of England in the very centre of the ecumenical picture…"[1133]

Historically, the emphases of apostolic origin and of succession served the purpose of distancing from the state and its authority in the nineteenth century and the forging of a trans-national, denominational identity. As an ecclesiological foundation in connection with a 'succession', however, it did not only unchurch

---

[1130] Newman, *Via Media*, vol I, 16.
[1131] Henson, "Version", 104,98.
[1132] Sykes, *Integrity*, 84.

Dissenters as 'religious competitors' in England but also 'non-episcopal' **ecumenical partners**. The concept of **'validity'** put Anglicans before the embarrassing situation of having to draw clear theological conclusions from the requirement of episcopal ordination since the Restoration, which before the nineteenth century had not been treated as a theological norm. The balancing act ever since not to recognize the regularity but the validity or efficacy of ministries of other, national or international 'non-episcopal' churches has reduced the embarassment but is a diplomatic cul-de-sac. It was a consequence of the adoption of the Anglo-Catholic claim of *institutional* 'apostolic descent'. This claim had evolved when the model of *divine right* seemed to have lost its persuasive power in and for Church and state in the nineteenth century, in an effectively secular society.

The notion of **'unity'**, **'catholicity'** and **'apostolicity'**, interpreting the 'historic' claim and significance of episcopacy, widely replaced that of 'validity' in the **second half of the twentieth century** (episcopacy as **sign** or **symbol**).

"Contemporary Anglican explanation of episcopacy in part has already shifted from arguments based on historic succession to the signification of catholicity. Bishops are said to be 'signs' of both diachronic and synchronic catholicity [*Niagara Report*, paragraph 7]."[1134]

Yet, this shift does **not represent a significant move away from the assumption of 'episcopal' ecclesiological superiority**, but the change in terminology, ambiguous as it is, allows at least a more friendly judgement of 'non-episcopal churches'. Bell once judged:

[1133] Green, "Review", 431.
[1134] Anglican-Lutheran International Continuation Committee, "Niagara"; Hill, "Seeking", 123 (quote).

"[i]t is not simply that a scheme without the Historic Episcopate would end all hope of ultimate union with Rome and the East. There is a weightier reason. It would seem that precisely where non-episcopal ministries are defective is in their catholicity, their universality. They are diverse both in theory and in fact, and they represent a break with the discipline of the Church in the first centuries, a consideration which has always had great force with Anglicans."[1135]

However, the re-definition opened the way towards (regional) **covenants** with 'non-episcopal' partners in the second half of the twentieth century, or even the recognition of Scandinavian Lutherans as 'episcopal' (*Porvoo*). The new (intermediate) goal thereby has become '***full (and) visible* unity**'.[1136]

One has to acknowledge that such a move would probably have been impossible in the early twentieth century, although it has to be noted that the Lutheran partners in *Porvoo* do not share the Anglican view of the meaningfulness of 'episcopal episcopacy'.[1137] However, structural "full, visible unity" is "not just the official ecumenical policy of the Church of England, but also that of the Anglican Communion, endorsed by the Lambeth Conferences of 1988 and 1998." It is understood to aim for a united church without parallel jurisdictions of bishops, although it permits the understanding of agreements as "temporary anomalies" of intermediate stages of unity.[1138] For the *Meissen* process, for example, the joint commission in 1986 warned on the lines of the Anglican position that "interim stages on the way to unity can become ends to themselves". Instead, the partners expressed their desire of "growth in reconciliation", moving beyond "common witness and action" towards **"full visible unity"**, defined as (institutional) "organic unity", anticipating the

[1135] Bell, *Christian Unity*, 177. Cf. footnote 1045.
[1136] Cf. Dalferth, *Weg*, 204ff; Fairweather, *Episcopacy Re-asserted*, 7.

'reconciliation of ministries' (*Meissen*).[1139] Be that as it may, even if it was a self-delusion, the model of **'unity by stages'**, towards 'organic unity' now permits pursuing less ambitious ecumenical alternatives ('stages').[1140]

Considering the difficulties which come with the Anglican internal diversity ('comprehensiveness') one may be more sympathetic towards the Anglican struggling to fully recognize any so-called 'non-episcopal' partner in an ecumenical venture in the twentieth century. Thus, one perhaps should not underestimate the signs of a **tendency to move on slowly from an uncompromising and exclusive/excluding 'high' view of episcopacy**. The more recent covenants such as *Meissen* have allowed at least the dispensation from the general rule of 'episcopal' confirmation as prerequisite of inter-communion, which Anglo-Catholicism established in the early twentieth century in the Church of England. Mary Tanner wrote: "[a]ll too often, however, historic episcopal succession has been lifted out of the context of the life of the Church and made the sole determinative element of continuity."[1141]

"The ecumenical debates on apostolic succession, for example, have helped to free Anglicans from a narrow view of tactile succession and to concentrate rather on faithfulness to the apostolic teaching and mission symbolized in the succession of bishops."[1142]

Thus, one can suspect that the notion of episcopacy of **'sign'/'symbol'** fulfils the purpose, not least with a view to the contested historic and theological

---

[1137] Dutton, "Northern Rites", 18; "Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the Conference of Bishops in the Anglican Communion, 1922", 187f.,189 (quote).
[1138] Podmore, *Aspects*, chapter 6, quotes from 94f.
[1139] "Bericht der 8. Theologischen Konferenz zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England vom 8.-11. April 1996 auf Schloß Schwanberg", 93.
[1140] Cf. Avis, "Unity by Stages".
[1141] Tanner, "Porvoo", 118.
[1142] Tanner, "Future", 387. Cf. footnotes 77 and 1158.

presumptions of any formal succession model, to "encourage that generosity which allows churches which in the past have not preserved the historic episcopal succession to embrace it, without having to pretend, prior to such an embracing, they were not apostolic."[1143]

The dilemma is that the alleged presumption (episcopacy as a 'symbol'/'sign') does not necessitate the conclusion drawn (the insistence on the necessity of the symbol). This suggests that the **meaning and usage of 'sign'/'symbol'** here **is ambiguous** in a way which is perhaps not untypical for Anglicanism due to its 'comprehensiveness'. This concept, thus, is like a Russian doll (some might suggest, a Trojan horse).[1144] One cannot insist on a sign being necessary without giving the *signum* (laying-on of hands *in a succession*) an importance which makes the *res* incomplete (oversight) without the former.[1145] As things stand, the notion of 'symbolism' of the 'historic episcopate' in a succession (cf. *Porvoo*) effectively serves as an objective, outward criterion of 'catholicity' or 'apostolicity' and, thus, forms the crucial condition for interchangeability of ministries, establishing an 'episcopal type' of ministries. The fact that the 'symbol' of succession is regarded as indispensable, at least for sacramental worship (which is significant in itself, cf. *Meissen*), is illustrated by the fact of its indispensability in every single case of interchange with a minister from another church, even if not working in or for the Church of England on a permanent basis but as a guest. *Porvoo* speaks of the "catholicity of the whole church" (§36ff.), although it appears that it is effectively still made dependent on the "sign of episcopal succession", understood as a personal succession of the episcopate.

[1143] Pettersen, "Review", 125.
[1144] Tanner, "Porvoo", 120f.

Nevertheless, the notion of symbol may signify a **transition** which means a balancing act for Anglican 'comprehensiveness'. If Anglicans nowadays define "the bishop is a sign, minister and instrument of apostolicity, catholicity and unity", it can free them to understand "historic succession … [as] intended continuity". Although the Anglo-Catholic Podmore (the new Director of *Forward in Faith*) acknowledges the change of emphasis, he insists that episcopacy was **"more than *episcope*":** not only "what they [bishops] do (overseeing, uniting), but also … what they are".

This exactly marks the elusive element in the usage of the "symbol" notion. Podmore, Avis's successor as ecumenical officer at Church House, holds that **"the sign effects what it signifies"**, it simply seems to be a relapse into (quasi-)sacramentalism, probably for the sake of the Anglican 'comprehensiveness'. Stevenson, for example, wrote: "symbols are manifestations of prevenient grace… […] … symbols are theophanies…"[1146] Jones told the *Meissen* partners:

"[f]or the Church of England, the expression 'sign of the conferring of Holy Orders' carries far more weight than simply 'indication' or even 'gesture'. On the contrary, 'sign' has a binding quality, in which respect, in some way, it is *graceful*. […] … ministry is an expression of apostolicity and unity not in an 'ontological' sense – I recognise that I am using the language crudely here – but rather *semantically*. […] The more I consider 'expression', the more I realise that it is for Anglican theology *more than* solely a semantic signpost. On the contrary, it *is* something 'ontological'…"[1147]

Such statements are legitimate as personal accounts in the sense of a doctrine of reception of sacraments, but they are problematic as normative descriptions of

---

[1145] Schlink, *Traditionen*, 194. This is why Schlink's plea for the adoption of the 'sign' ultimately fails to persuade.
[1146] Podmore, "Understanding", 175f.,177f; Stevenson, "Lex", 184. Cf. Dalferth, "Amt", 257f.

'symbols'. Thus, Dalferth seems right when he concludes: **"[i]n its status and function Porvoo's theology of sign is on the same level as the Anglo-Catholic pipeline theory, except that the latter has one advantage of the former – it is clearer."**[1148] He once suspected that modern Anglican ecclesiology had **replaced the Anglo-Catholic notion of the episcopate being necessary for the *esse* of the church with its being necessary for (symbolizing) the visible unity of the church (or its 'catholicity')**.[1149] Thus, it seems that the ecumenical practice of Anglicanism still rests on the post-Tractarian *Three-Branches-Theory*. Bell once claimed:

> "[w]hat they ['non-episcopal churches'] lack is not ordination, but the special link with the Apostolic ministry. This is an utterly different thing from 're-ordination'. In other words, their consecration of bishops of any one or more of the Churches with the Apostolic Succession would both give them that particular link, and also supply the authorisation, which is not theirs at present, to minister in all those other Churches which compose the united Church."[1150]

It remains unclear, however, how this ecclesiological **'defect'** would not affect the spiritual 'efficaciousness'. In this respect, the Anglo-Catholic model's dismissal of 'non-episcopal' ministries appears indeed to be more logical – presuming that Anglicans also accepted its unsustainable historic and theological assumptions.

[1147] Jones, "Visibility", 346,349.
[1148] Dalferth, "Amt", 34.
[1149] Dalferth, *Weg*, 130ff. "Die anglokatholische These, der historische Episkopat sei für das *Sein der Kirche* unverzichtbar, ist ... durch die neuanglikanische These ersetzt, er sei für das *Sichtbarsein* der *Einheit* der Kirche unverzichtbar." (140) Das "[amtskirchliche Einheitsverständnis] verwirft die anglokatholische Begründung, hält aber am Begründeten fest." (134f.)
[1150] Bell, *Christian Unity*, 184. Not bold in the original.

5.2 Tendencies of a Reversal of the 'Catholicization' of Anglicanism?

It has been argued in this thesis that the principle of 'episcopal' episcopacy *in succession* became an integral part of Anglican ecclesiology under Anglo-Catholic influence effectively only in the twentieth century. The consequence of an ecclesiological marginalizing of 'non-episcopal' churches is, nevertheless, now deeply embedded in the identity concept which Anglicanism adopted then. The notion of the 'catholicity' of Anglican churches resulted in the preference of 'catholic'/'Catholic' ecumenical partners.

In reality, it appears that even ecumenical agreements on the basis of 'episcopal' episcopacy do not necessarily represent nor produce closer ecumenical fellowship. Anglicans agreed in ***Porvoo*** on the interchangeability of ministries with certain Lutheran partners whom they effectively recognised as 'episcopal', but with the institutional consequences not significantly going beyond *Meissen* (in the sense of binding, joint policy making), as illustrated by the irritations caused by the consecration of a homosexual bishop in a *Porvoo* church recently. When in 2009 the legalisation of homosexual marriage became an issue in the Swedish Lutheran Church (which has women bishops), the chairmen of the *Council for Christian Unity* and the *Faith and Order Advisory Group* of the Church of England wrote to the Archbishop of Uppsala contemplating "negative ecumenical consequences" with a view to "an impairment of the relationships between the churches, with particular implications for the limitations of the inter-changeability of ordained ministry".[1151]

Thus, despite the achieved interchangeability of ministers, even in the *Porvoo* fellowship it appears illusory to think that one was close to the abolition

of **parallel jurisdictions**, even if intended by all partners. The member churches are autonomous and consultations about policies are informational and not binding. Thus, an ecumenical focus on institutional questions (episcopacy) can be deceptive. Bishop Newbigin (South India) suggested in 1958: "[m]y plea, then, is that Anglicanism should acknowledge the fact that … frank recognition of other churches, without hedging or reservation, is the only possible basis upon which any real work for reunion can be built."[1152]

As we have seen, the understanding of episcopacy and of ecumenical policies have been subject to change in the Church of England and Anglicanism, but discreetly, as a change in emphasis: **"development in Anglican ministry is not radical reform, but [is presented as] a legitimate modulation of common tradition"** – namely with a view to the alleged other two branches of 'catholicism' (Roman and Orthodox).[1153] This appears to match a common cultural attitude of British culture, as foreign observers cannot help noticing, but also underpins the claim of 'catholicity' and that of being the established religion in England and holding an honorary primate in the Anglican Communion. This principle, it seems, also serves as the 'glue' of comprehensiveness in the English national church.[1154] "The Church of England is the most striking example in European history of the capacity of institutions to maintain an unbroken, almost complete, continuity in structure while undergoing a thorough change in spirit."[1155]

Like the monarchy, which transformed from 'King-in-Parliament' to a constitutional monarchy, the Church moved on within that framework to a more

---

[1151] Hill/Hind, "Reply".
[1152] Newbigin, "Anglicans", 226.
[1153] Woodruff, "Orders", 79.

synodical form of government. This all happened with the typical English way of transforming institutions (almost) without a revolution. "In all ecclesiastical matters Englishmen have favoured a policy of conservatism combined with concession", Dicey remarked in 1905.[1156] English episcopacy transformed its basis of *divine right*, jointly claimed with the monarchy, to the concept of historic establishment. "The Convocations had originated under the Plantagenet kings. […] At the Reformation the Convocation exchanged the authority of the Pope for the authority of the Crown." The Restoration and the *Act of Uniformity* would attempt to establish national religious unity; the Revolution of 1689

> "marked the end of the Sovereign's exercise of significant personal influence over Church affairs and the development of constitutional monarchy meant that the Crown's supremacy was effectively superseded by the supremacy of the Parliament".[1157]

As the view that Parliament represented the laity of the Church of England could not be sustained from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the power of the revived Convocations grew and finally led to the institution of a General Synod in 1970.

To weaken the claim of ecclesiastical **historic establishment** and the authority of a historic, ecclesiastical order in England and the Anglican Communion could mean to risk historic alliances and privileges, which today can easily be questioned on the basis of factual developments. A fresh attempt of an ecumenical opening of the Church of England would not necessarily be successful, as most English 'Non-conformists', including the Roman Catholic

---

[1154] Blum, *Begegnung*, 29.
[1155] Powicke, *Reformation*, 134f.
[1156] Dicey, *Lectures*, 316.

Church, would probably dismiss and refuse the vision of a unified national Church, as Anglo-Catholics would do, seconded by conservative Evangelicals, each following an ideal of 'purity' but not the same one.

It may happen in the future that Anglicans will strengthen the 'symbolic' understanding of episcopacy. When *Porvoo* emphasizes the continuing of the **'historic episcopal succession' *in intention***, as opposed to an understanding in a strict physical sense, it is done in order to provide a means of bridging potential gaps in the consecration line in the time of the Reformation (*Porvoo*, para. 52). It means a less literal understanding of the importance of succession, in a physical sense. Avis concluded, similar to the statement of Tanner in the previous chapter: "the Porvoo agreement between the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches has made it possible for Anglicans to take a less literalistic view of what historical succession means."[1158] Such an understanding could become a means for Anglicans in the future to recognize the eighteenth-century presbyteral ordinations and consecrations of John Wesley, for example, and the ministries of other 'non-episcopal' churches' 'catholicity', as a 'modulation' of the Anglican interpretation of episcopacy.

On the other hand, the change of terminology amplifies the theological confusion of Anglican ecclesiology, out of historical and practical necessities. This, however, we may optimistically see as an result of Anglicanism struggling with its own comprehensiveness, **indicating a very slow move away from its exalted view of episcopacy** with its disastrous implications for its relations with what has been labelled by Anglicans the 'non-episcopal' part of Christianity,

---

[1157] *Synodical Government in the Church of England: A Review: The Report of the Review Group Appointed by the Standing Committee of the General Synod*, appendix I,121f. (quotes).
[1158] Avis, *Anglican Understanding*, 71. Cf. footnote 1142.

which they effectively have been unchurching for far too long. Avis concluded that there had been a tendency of a shifting from the ('episcopal') 'apostolic paradigm' to a 'baptismal paradigm' ('communion-through-baptism'). If this is correct, it may give reason for hope from the perspective of 'non-episcopal' partners of Anglicans. "In this important development of Anglican thinking about the historic succession [as expressed in *Porvoo*], we see a concentration on the spirit rather than on the letter: it is the intention of the Church that counts, rather than the mechanics of succession."[1159] Avis himself, however, still identifies the 'episcopal' Anglican position with the ecumenical model of the future. "There is an emerging ecumenical consensus that any united Church of the future will have bishops in the historical succession and that they will be regarded as symbols of unity."[1160] From that statement, Dalferth's pessimism may seem justified.

"It may be significant but, in itself, ecumenically without consequences if the historic episcopate is not regarded as necessary any more for the *esse* or *bene esse* [*plene esse*?] the church, and thereby as constitutive for the *unity* of the church and its *fulness*, but 'only' necessary for the *visibility*, or *increased visibility*, of this unity, understood as constitutive for *full, visible unity*. As the interchangeability of ministers and the equality of ministries is made dependant on the historic episcopate, from the Anglican perspective (but not from the Protestant!), there cannot be full and unhindered church unity [Kirchengemeinschaft] without it."[1161]

However, today's Anglo-Catholics despise *Porvoo* for the tendency described: "'Porvoo' appears to be based on the truism that the ritual of 'tactile' episcopal

[1159] Ibid., 71f.
[1160] Ibid., 22ff.,28, cf. 78f.
[1161] Dalferth, *Weg*, 208f. "Es ist zwar eine deutliche, aber für sich genommen ökumenisch aber folgenlose Veränderung, wenn der historische Episkopat nicht mehr als notwendig für das *esse* oder das *bene esse* der Kirche und damit als konstitutiv für die *Einheit* und deren *Fülle* angesehen wird, sondern ‚nur noch' als notwendig für das *Sichtbarsein* bzw. *Sichtbarersein* dieser Einheit und damit als konstitutiv für *volle, sichtbare Einheit*. Da an ihm aus anglikanischer (nicht evangelischer!) Sicht die ‚Austauschbarkeit der Pfarrer' und die Gleichwertigkeit der Ämter hängt, kann es ohne den historischen Episkopat keine volle und eingeschränkte Kirchengemeinschaft geben."

succession is not the be-all and end-all of what the Apostolic paradosis means in the life of the Church…"[1162] Hunwicke (now ordained in the Ordinariate) suspected frustratedly in 2011:

> "the Church of England … committed itself [in *Lima*, *Meissen*, *Porvoo*, the *Anglican-Methodist Covenant* etc.] … to accepting that its own Orders were not essentially different from those of non-episcopal Reformation denominations. Like bearers of a horrible mutation of avian flu, those distant chickens have now come home to roost. To put the final icing on the cake, women bishops will soon mean that we have nothing, just nothing, to look forward to but a bleak future 'unity' with liberal Protestantism and feminism. And this is happening just at the moment when Rome and Orthodoxy are in a striking phase of rapprochement."[1163]

It is difficult to say whether or not the slow correction of the nineteenth-century over-emphasis of episcopacy as 'historic' and 'apostolic', on the lines of Tractarian ecclesiology, will eventually lead to an end of the situation of the *de facto* unchurching of the alleged 'non-episcopal' churches. So far, the so-called 'non-episcopal' ecumenical partners of Anglicans have been showing patience with this situation for about a century. After all, with the ordination of women and possibly with their consecration eventually to follow in England, the Church of England has shown in the past that acts *can* be introduced which could possibly be perceived as 'unilateral' within an alleged 'catholic' league, possibly modelled, allegedly, on the churches represented at the 'Ecumenical Councils' before 1054.[1164] Avis once suggested, although not regarding the 'episcopal' structure: "[t]here is nothing controversial about particular churches or communions of

---

[1162] Hunwicke, "Anglican Orders", 60. Cf. In the same issue: *Reuniting Anglicans with Rome: Documents, Issues, Progress*, 2.
[1163] Hunwicke, "Path", 126f.
[1164] Cf. Alfeyev/Rose, *Mystery*, 101f.,237.

churches making changes in the structure of their ministry. Church order is not fossilized."[1165]

It may be that, if the Church of England will eventually establish something like an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* (like a **third province**, extending the already existent *Alternative Episcopal Oversight*) for the so-called 'traditionalists' who object to episcopal oversight by women and possibly also by men who ordain or consecrate women. The Church of England may find it easier then to agree on interchangeability of ministers with 'non-episcopal' churches, although this might only inspire some Anglo-Catholics amongst the 'traditionalists' to join the Ordinariate. In the eyes of Anglo-Catholics, only something like a third province (even if shared with conservative Evangelicals) would maintain 'catholic orders', as the 'orders' of the other two provinces would soon be corrupted by persons who, in their eyes, only believe that they are priests or bishops, or, as 'traditionalist' Evangelicals would say, who should not be priests or bishops. Consequently, it is only a matter of time before at least the Anglo-Catholics of a third province would need to refuse interchangeability with the other two provinces. It would only be a way of separating without splitting, without losing the privileges of the established Church and parish property.[1166]

"[T]he whole basis of the orthodox position is that it is not possible for women to be consecrated as bishops. […] It is that we shall have persons referred to as bishops in law who are not bishops in reality. For the first time since the Dark Ages, large parts of England will be without the ministrations of a bishop at all, except by way of an authority delegated by an individual, described by the law as a bishop, who is not one in reality. […] … women who have gone through the form of legal 'consecration', not being bishops in reality, will not be part of the episcopate. […] This will have profound practical implications. The ordinary worshipper, attending a service described as holy communion, will not be able,

[1165] Avis, *Identity of Anglicanism*, 128.
[1166] Doe, "Anglicanorum Coetibus", 41f.,46; Cf. Fittall, *Ordinariate*, 3ff.

without obtaining a sort of pedigree of the ordination of the presiding clergyman, to tell whether he is participating in a genuine sacrament or a mummers' play."[1167]

In any case, neither the Roman Catholic nor Orthodox churches recognize Anglican ministries nor an alliance of 'catholic' churches after the Anglican 'episcopal' model. Ratzinger once wrote, reminding his readers of the necessary "ecclesial context" of 'valid' ordinations, only to be found in 'the [that is the Roman] Church' (and Orthodox 'sister churches'):

"[t]he high-church movement that was introduced into some forms of Protestantism in the nineteenth century was unable fully to understand this [viz. the Roman] Catholic concept of holy orders and the related symbolism of the imposition of hands but rather obfuscated it in many respects. This movement undoubtedly stems from a nostalgia for the sacrament… […] … there are, today, a number of persons holding … ministries whose succession is, if I may so phrase it, apocryphal. Wherever such 'high-church' ordinations are conferred or received thus 'apocryphally', the fundamental nature of the imposition of hands has been totally misunderstood. Regardless of the positive reasons that occasion it, it expresses, in such cases, either a liturgical romanticism or a canonical tutiorism. These churches want a formally assured legitimacy and tend toward an archaizing liturgical model (often, too, toward an equally archaizing dogmatic model), but they accomplish all this without venturing to revise the ecclesial context in anything but rite. Where this occurs, however, the sacrament is, in fact, restricted to a liturgical-juridical formalism. […] In truth, the imposition of hands with the accompanying prayer for the Holy Spirit is not a rite that can be separated from the [Roman] Church or by which one can bypass the rest of the Church and dig one's own private channel to the apostles. […] It is nothing without the Church – an imposition of hands that is not an entering into the existential and traditional context of the Church is not an ecclesial imposition of hands. […] As an ecclesial sacrament, the sacrament of the imposition of hands is, at the same time, an expression of the traditional structure of the Church. It binds apostolicity and Catholicity together in the unity of Christ and the Spirit, which is represented and completed in the eucharistic community."[1168]

It has been argued in this thesis that it is important to gain a historic understanding of the model of 'historic episcopacy', adopted at the high point of Anglo-Catholicism at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth

[1167] McKie, "Letter".

centuries, culminating in the *Appeal* 1920 and the subsequent, unsuccessful, conversations with 'non-episcopal' Free Churches.[1169]

"By the 1920s, Anglo-Catholicism was in the ascent within the Church of England. Historians have used grandiose phrases such as 'golden age' and 'triumphal period' to describe the era. […] No non-liberal Evangelicals were elevated to a bishopric until 1939… The isolation of Evangelicals from the life and activities of the Church was part imposed and part chosen. It could be that the full restoration of conservative Evangelicals to their Church did not occur until the National Evangelical Anglican Conference at Keele at [sic] 1967…"[1170]

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, despite many visible and practical remains of the past Anglo-Catholic predominance still in place, it is the Evangelical unease about ethical questions which causes concerns, reflecting theological and hermeneutical divisions.[1171] The old compromise of orthopraxy, as provided by canon law and liturgy ('*lex ordandi, lex credendi*') has long lost its moral and actual force. Sedgwick once suggested that the **'catholicization'** of the essentially Protestant ecclesiology prior to Tractarianism had been paralleled in Anglican moral theology since the Oxford Movement.

"… Anglican moral theology since the Oxford Movement provides a coherent vision of the Christian moral life but its understanding does not represent a singular and undivided understanding that begins with the Caroline Divines [McAdoo's 'thesis of the notable consistency of the spirit of Anglicanism both in its application and its effect']. Rather, Anglican moral theology's claim to express what is normative for Anglicanism rests on theological and philosophical grounds which are those of the intellectualist framework of pre-Vatican II moral theology. This framework has been found wanting."[1172]

[1168] Ratzinger, *Principles*, 245-247.
[1169] Maiden, *Controversy*, 108ff. Cf. chapters 4.7f.
[1170] Ibid., 47,67. Cf. footnote 1085.
[1171] Stevenson, "Lex"; Sykes, *Integrity*, 5,47.
[1172] Sedgwick, "Revising", 140 (quote), cf. 136,132-135. Cf. McAdoo, *Structure*, 144.

The High-churchman Cosin, in the seventeenth century, demonstrated that the *plene esse* view of episcopacy is not incompatible with a positive judgement of 'non-episcopal' churches, when he defended the practice of intercommunion and interchageability of ministries with them.[1173] As his case illustrates, this was in line with the overall attitude of High-churchmen even before the Restoration and beyond (with some notable exceptions), whose theological outlook indeed was institutionally and theologically very 'anti-Roman'.[1174] It may, therefore, be reasonable to suggest that the ecclesiology of the Church of England, as expressed by the Quadrilateral which soon was promoted only in its Anglo-Catholic interpretation, appears to have been kept in a 'post-Tractarian High Church captivity' for more than a century now, promoting a specific theological interpretation of the 1662 requirement of episcopal ordination. This was still not the case when the Quadrilateral was adopted by the Lambeth Conference in 1888, but, as Huntington himself noted, it implied no particular theory of succession.[1175]

Some may regard the subsequent development as providential, others as erroneous. Historically it seems a move to an extreme position which had not been reflected in the previous teaching and the practice of the Church of England. It was implemented by Anglo-Catholic influence in the hierarchy and is still being perpetuated. In this respect, *Porvoo* may mean a small step towards a re-adjustment of the theological claims made ever since, regarding a succession. If this is true, *Porvoo* may have achieved what Henson hoped in 1911, not least with a view to the then ultimately unsuccessful negotiations with Sweden, that

---

[1173] Cosin, "Letter to Cordell", 403.
[1174] Cf. McAdoo, *Spirit*, 24ff.,316ff.,356ff.
[1175] Cf. footnote 789. Cf. McAdoo, *Spirit*. See also chapter 5.

"it may well be found that the historical character of the Church of England as essentially one with 'the other Reformed Churches' will finally assert itself. […] The emphasis on the Succession of the Bishops is a new factor in the religious diplomacy of Reformed Christendom. It may disguise, but it cannot alter, the true character of the policy on which the Church of England has entered."[1176]

Despite his hopes then it seems that a view of episcopacy, firmly established in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, still dominates the picture, still being promoted by influential Anglicans as *the* 'apostolically' prescribed model, effectively without alternative. Thus, it may be suggested that the Church of England today needs to face the question whether it is legitimate to sustain a claim of ecclesiastical necessity of an episcopal ordering *in a particular* (historically unproven) *succession* for a Christian church, insisting that its ecumenical partners effectively need to adopt its ordering, although having its own history (and also reality) against it.[1177]

[1176] Henson, *Relation*, 92f.

[1177] This is the ecumenical dilemma which has also prevented the *Lima* Declaration by the World Council of Churches (***Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, BEM, 1982**) from making a significant practical impact on ecumenical relations. BEM's ambiguous definition of episcopal succession and *koinonia* probably reflects the Anglican influence on the *Faith and Order* process. BEM's understanding of apostolicity has a strong emphasis on ministerial succession as a "sign" or "powerful expression" (§35), "to be found in the apostolic tradition of the Church as a whole" (which we can take to embrace both 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' churches). If one takes this seriously, it is illogical to insist on 'non-episcopal' churches embracing this sign, as BEM suggests and Anglicans do. The ambiguity about possible sacramental implications is reflected in the German text which even speaks of "wirksamer Ausdruck" ('effectual expression'), which implies an ontological dimension of the sign (in the sense of the sign itself effecting something). This would suggest that 'non-episcopal' churches were defective in their apostolicity without it, which would call into question the earlier statement about the apostolicity of the whole church. Cf. Gassmann/Gassmann, *Taufe*; Wenz, "Amtstext", 286; World Council of Churches, *BEM*.

The statement of the *Faith and Order* Commission meeting at **Accra (1974)**, preparing BEM, had held in a statement submitted to and subsequently endorsed by the Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Nairobi that "[t]he Church is called to be a visible sign of the presence of Christ…" Nevertheless, the document displayed a tendency to identify the universal church or any particular church with its ordained ministers. At a meeting of the Commission, a more promising understanding of ordained ministry had been proposed on a "charismatic, eucharistic-communal basis in order to overcome the post-reformation polemic dispute between Rome and the reformers". World Council of Churches, *Faith and Order 1974*, 93,33.

The draft of BEM submitted to member churches still had "a Mutually Recognized Ministry" in its title. This, however, did not reflect very well the proposed adoption of 'episcopal episcopacy' for 'non-episcopalians'. "The orderly transmission of the ministry is, therefore, both a visible sign of the continuity of the whole Church and of the effective participation of the ministry in it and contribution to it. Where this orderly is lacking a church must ask itself whether its apostolicity can be maintained in its fullness." (§29) The draft summarised the considerable

However, we have recently seen again that a minority in the Church of England can block change. In 2012, the General Synod was unable to agree on a legislation which would have introduced women bishops, despite forty-two out of forty-four dioceses having consented in general.[1178] And, it needs to be admitted, the alternative to the current policy of 'episcopal' episcopacy may not be entirely comfortable, as it might mean

---

historical doubts about the universality of episcopacy and the difficulties in generalizing it, not least in the sense of default ordering throughout the ages and in all places, and the identification of 'historic episcopacy' with a certain principle of transmission (§30ff). Thus, the document put forward a certain "openness to diverse and complementary expressions of this apostolic ministry [viz. of the historic episcopate]". (§33) The paper acknowledged the dilemma of two variants of the 'episcopal' position. On the one hand it diagnosed a tendency amongst theologians of "certain churches which have preserved the historic episcopate to interpret episcopal succession as an effective sign, not a guarantee, of the continuity of the Church in apostolic faith and mission…" (§34a) On the other hand, the paper acknowledged that others "value the succession of ministries that have the fullness of *episcope* as a gift of God, which they must preserve." (ibid.)

The overall recommendation of the paper appeared to withdraw from the idea of 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' complementarity and a mutual recognition of ministries by proposing an adoption of 'episcopal episcopacy' which lacked the attempt of a balance of 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' principles, understanding 'historic episcopacy' as a personal episcopal succession. Despite referring to it as a 'sign', the conclusions drawn go beyond that of a merely symbolic representation of ecclesiality if not apostolicity, with a view to the respective churches as a whole: "churches without episcopal succession … do not have the fullness of the *sign* of apostolic succession. If the full visible unity is to be achieved, the fullness of the sign of apostolic succession ought to be recovered." (§104) World Council of Churches, *One Baptism*, 5,36f.,56.

A **memorandum of the Faith and Order Commission** of **1979**, reacting to member churches' responses to the *Accra* text, adapted an unambiguous and uncompromising 'catholic' view when it clarified that the Commission did not understand the ordained ministry to be a "creation of the Church", or when it rejected the position that "the Church's ministry is prior to the ordained ministry. These views cannot be maintained." Nevertheless, the Commission refused a straightforward identification with the *ius divinum* model of ordained ministry (as opposed to the *ius humanum* position).

Curiously, the historical analyses of the memorandum and the annexed papers seem not to support the conclusions drawn by the Commission, when functional discontinuities in the development from the Apostles to the (monarchical) episcopate are acknowledged but bridged (and 'divinised') by referring to the working of the Holy Spirit, for example, or when the understanding of 'apostolic succession' is held to be a more wider idea than that of episcopal succession only, however understood (with the imposition of hands having an "effective" function or with this view being rejected as "too mechanical an understanding of apostolic succession"). This undermines the authority of the final recommendation to the effect that 'non-episcopalians' should adopt "the sign of transmission through episcopal ordination" (although not "offer[ing] any guarantee for maintaining the truth"), as it lets the usage of the word 'sign' appear confused and fails to avoid to "give the impression of disavowing the ministry of earlier generations [of 'non-episcopal' ordained ministers]", despite suggesting that 'presbyteral' ministries represented "a kind of succession", "though perhaps in an irregular way". World Council of Churches, *Episkopé and Episcopate*, vf.,1f(f).,5,12, cf. 15ff.

I thank Andrew Pierce for drawing my attention to the *Accra* document and the memorandum.

“an extension of the traditional Anglican understanding of episcopacy as a matter indifferent, but one shorn of its defence in the divine right of the king. Ultimately this depends, however, on the possibility of living without any form of absolute sovereignty and with the consequent openness and provisionality.”[1179]

[1178] "After the Vote, What Next?"; Brown, "Reform"; Dimmick, "Letter"; Moore, "Arm"; Taylor, "Tactics".
[1179] Chapman, *Anglican Studies*, 29.

Cited Literature

Acton, John Emerich Edward Dalberg (ed), *The Cambridge Modern History, volume 2: The Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.

Adam, Will, "The Reception, Recognition and Reconciliation of Holy Orders". *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 8, no. 36, 2005: 4-20.

Addison, James Thayer, *The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

"After the Vote, What Next?" Church Times no 7810, 23 November 2012, 16.

Ajayi, J.F. Ade, *Christian Missions in Nigeria, 1841-1891: The Making of a New Élite*. London: Longmans, 1965.

Aldenhoven, Herwig, "Kirchliche Chronik: Die Kirche von Südindien". *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* 48, no. 1, 1958: 56-58.

Alfeyev, Hilarion and Jessica Rose (ed), *The Mystery of Faith: An Introduction to the Teaching and the Spirituality of the Orthodox Church*. London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2002.

Allchin, A.M., *The Silent Rebellion: Anglican Religious Communities, 1845-1900*. London: SCM Press, 1958.

Allen, J.W., *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Methuen, 1928.

Allen, W.O.B. and Edmund McClure, *Two Hundred Years: The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898*. London/New York: SPCK/E. & J.B. Young, 1898.

Allies, Thomas William and Martin L. Rule, *Apostolical Succession Not a Doctrine of the Church of England: A Historical Essay*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1870.

Andersen, Wilhelm, *Towards a Theology of Mission: A Study of the Encounter Between the Missionary Enterprise and the Church and Its Theology*. London: SCM Press, 1955.

Andrewes, Lancelot, *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini, 1610*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1851.

Andrewes, Lancelot and Pierre Du Moulin, *Of Episcopacy: Three Epistles: Translated for the Benefit of the Publike*. London, 1647.

———, "Responsiones ad Petri Molinæi Epistolas tres, una cum Molinæi Epistolis", in: *Opuscula quaedam posthuma [first published 1629]*, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1852, 173-216.

Anglican-Lutheran International Continuation Committee, "The Niagara Report: Report of the Anglican-Lutheran Consultation on Episcope, 1987", in: *Anglican-Lutheran Agreements: Regional and International Agreements 1972-2002*, ed. Sven Oppegaard and Gregory Cameron, Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 2004, 87-128.

Anglican Orders (English): The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII., September 13, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 29, 1897. London: SPCK, 1932.

Antoci, Peter M., "An Episcopal Ecclesiology of Apostolicity: Covenanted Charity and Unifying Generosity in the Writings of Thomas Bray and

William Reed Huntington". *Anglican Theological Review* 84, no. 2, 2002: 239-250.

"An Appeal to All Christian People from the Bishops Assembled in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, Resolutions 10-31, Suggestions of the Sub-Committee on Reunion with Non-Episcopal Churches and the respective Resolutions of the English Convocations", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 1, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1924, 1-12, 13f., 100-103.

Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine (ed), *Doctrine in the Church of England: The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922*. London: SPCK, 1938.

Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate, *Episcopal Ministry: The Report of the Archbishops' Group on the Episcopate ['Cameron Report']*. London: Church House Publishing, 1990.

Arnold, Jonathan, "That They May Be All Be One: Review of 'Celebrating a Century of Ecumenism', edited by Radano". Church Times no 7803, 5 October 2012, 27.

Arnold, Thomas, *Christian Life, Its Course, Its Hindrances, and Its Helps: Sermons, Preached Mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School*. London: B. Fellowes, 1841.

Arthur, J.W., "After 'Kikuyu'", in: *Towards a United Church, 1913-1947*, ed. J.J. Willis *et al.*, London: Edinburgh House Press, 1947, 52-74.

Ashwell, A.R., *Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.* London: J. Murray, 1880ff.

"Attempt to Drop Confirmation Rule Fails". Church Times no 7739, 15 July 2011, General Synod Supplement, 10.

Avis, Paul, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction*. London: SPCK, 2000.

———, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*, 2nd ed. London: T.&T. Clark, 2002.

———, "Episcopacy in Relation to the Foundation and Form of the Church", in: *Einheit bezeugen: Witnessing to Unity: Ten Years After the Meissen Declaration: Zehn Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Beiträge zu den theologischen Konferenzen von Springe und Cheltenham zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Paul Oppenheim, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2003, 121-134.

———, *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.

———, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*. London: T.&T. Clark, 2007.

———, "Is Baptism 'Complete Sacramental Initiation'?" in: *Bereits erreichte Gemeinschaft und weitere Schritte: 20 Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Communion Already Shared and Further Steps: 20 Years After the Meissen Declaration: Beiträge zu den Theologischen Konferenzen von Frodsham/Foxhill (2005) und Düsseldorf/Kaiserswerth (2008) zwischen der Kirche von England und der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, ed. Christopher Hill *et al.*, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2010, 63-70.

———, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*. London: T.&T. Clark, 2005.

———, *Reshaping Ecumenical Theology: The Church Made Whole?* London: T.&T. Clark, 2010.

———, "The Revision of the Ordinal in the Church of England 1550-2005". *Ecclesiology* 1, no. 2, 2005: 95-110.
———, "Seeking Unity by Stages: New Paths in Ecumenical Method", in: *Einheit bezeugen: Witnessing to Unity: Ten Years After the Meissen Declaration: Zehn Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Beiträge zu den theologischen Konferenzen von Springe und Cheltenham zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Paul Oppenheim, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2003, 219-234.
Bahlcke, Joachim and Werner Korthaase, *Daniel Ernst Jablonski: Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
Bardsley, Joseph, *Apostolic Succession: Or, The Teaching of the Church of England on the Alleged Necessity of Episcopal Ordination*. London: Hatchards, 1883.
———, *Church of England Principles Viewed in Relation to the Ministry of Non-episcopal Communions*. London: William Macintosh, 1872.
———, "Home Union". *The Churchman*, no. 112 (196), 1896: 169-174.
Barnes, Albert, *An Inquiry Into the Organization and Government of the Apostolic Church: Particularly with Reference to the Claims of Episcopacy*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1855.
Barratt, Anthony, "The Sacrament of Order and the Second Vatican Council: The Presbyter-bishop Relationship Revisited". *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 2, no. 2, 2002: 7-27.
———, "What is Ordination? A Roman Catholic Perspective". *Ecclesiology* 3, no. 1, 2006: 57-79.
Barry, Alfred, *The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England in the Growth of the Anglican Communion: The Hulsean Lectures for 1894-95*. London: Macmillan, 1895.
Barry, William James, *The Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church, or: Flowers From the Garden of the Liturgy*. London/Derby: Richardson and Sons, 1879.
Battiscombe, Georgina, *John Keble: A Study in Limitations*. London: Constable, 1963.
Bauer, Walter, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
Beardsley, Eben Edwards, *The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, Volume I, From the Settlement of the Colony to the Death of Bishop Seabury*, 2nd ed. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1869.
———, *The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, Volume II, From the Death of Bishop Seabury to the Present Time*. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1868.
———, *The Life of Samuel Seabury*. London: John Hodges, 1884.
Bell, George K.A., *Christian Unity: The Anglican Position*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948.
———, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
——— (ed), *Documents Bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship, 1916-1920*. London: SPCK, 1920.
Bell, P.M.H., *Disestablishment in Ireland and Wales*. London: SPCK, 1969.
Bennett, William James E., *The Principles of the Book of Common Prayer Considered: A Series of Lecture-sermons*. London: W.J. Cleaver, 1845.

Bentley, James, *Ritualism and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Attempt to Legislate for Belief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

"Bericht der 8. Theologischen Konferenz zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England vom 8.-11. April 1996 auf Schloß Schwanberg", in: *Die Meissener Erklärung: Eine Dokumentation*, ed. Klaus Kremkau, Hannover: Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, 1993, 89-96.

Bernard, G.W., "The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way". *The Historical Journal* 41, no. 2, 1998: 321-349.

Biggs, C.R. Davey, *Comity, Concord, and Communion: An Appeal to Anglicans: With a Note on the Proceeding at Kikuyu*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1914.

Blackmore, Henrietta, *The Beginning of Women's Ministry: The Revival of the Deaconess in the Nineteenth-century Church of England*. *Church of England Record Society 14*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.

Blehl, Vincent Ferrer, *Pilgrim Journey: John Henry Newman, 1801-1845*. London: Burns & Oates, 2001.

Blomfield, Charles James, *A Letter to to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Upon the Formation of a Fund for Endowing Additional Bishoprics in the Colonies*. London: Fellowes, 1840.

Blum, Georg Günter, *Begegnung mit der Kirche von England*. Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1959.

Boase, George Clement, "Entry 'Seeley, Robert Benton'", in: *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 51, London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1897, 193f.

Boettcher, Reinhard, *The Diaconal Ministry in the Mission of the Church*. Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 2006.

Boulgakoff, S., *Outlines of the Teaching About the Church: Address Given at the Orthodox & Anglo-Catholic Conference*. Oxford: Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius, 1927.

Bowen, Desmond, *The Protestant Crusade in Ireland, 1800-70: A Study of Protestant-Catholic Relations Between the Act of Union and Disestablishment*. Dublin/Montreal: Gill and Macmillan/McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978.

Bradshaw, Paul F., "The Liturgical Consequences of Apostolicae Curae for Anglican Ordination Rites", in: *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae, 1896-1996*, ed. R. William Franklin and Hugh Montefiore, London: Mowbray, 1996, 75-86.

Bradshaw, Tim, "Episcopal Ministry". *Anvil* 8, no. 2, 1991: 109-120.

———, *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1992.

Bragg, Melvyn, *The Book of Books: The Radical Impact of the King James Bible, 1611-2011*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2011.

Bramhall, John, "Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy From the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, As it Is Managed by Mr. Baxter in His Treatise on the Grothian Religion, 1672", in: *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, John Bramhall*, vol. 3, Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1844, 497-586.

Brauer, Jerald C., "Bishops and Lutherans in the United States", in: *Concordat of Agreement: Supporting Essays*, ed. Daniel F. Martensen, Minneapolis/Cincinnati: Augsburg/Forward Movement Publications, 1995, 79-92.

Bray, Gerald Lewis, *Documents of the English Reformation*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1994.

——— (ed), *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947. Church of England Record Society* 6. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998.

Bray, Thomas, *Apostolick Charity, Its Nature and Excellence Consider'd in a Discourse Upon Dan. 12. 3, Preached at St. Pauls, Decemb. 19, 1697. At the Ordination of Some Protestant Missionaries to be Sent into the Plantations: To Which is Prefixt, A General View of the English Colonies in America, With Respect to Religion: In Order to Shew What Provision is Wanting for the Propagation of Christianity in Those Parts*. London: W. Downing, for William Hawes, 1698.

Brett, Thomas, *A Review of the Lutheran Principles: Shewing, How They Differ from the Church of England, and that Baron Puffendorf's Essay for Uniting of Protestants, Was not Design'd to Procure an Union Between the Lutherans and the Church of England, As is Insinuated in the Title of the Late Edition of That Book: In a Letter to a Friend, with a Postscript*, 2nd ed. London: Henry Clements, 1714.

Bridenbaugh, Carl, *Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Brief Statement of Some Objections Entertained by Certain Members of the Church to Portions of the System and Practice of the Church Missionary Society: By a Clerical Member of the Society. London: Rivington/Hatchard and Son, 1841.

Brightman, F.E., *The English Rite: Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd ed. London: Rivingtons, 1921.

Brilioth, Yngve, *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement*. London/New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.

———, *Three Lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement, Together With a Lecture on the Theological Aspect of the Oxford Movement, and a Sermon Preached in Fairford Church on 11 July 1933*. London: Oxford University Press/H. Milford, 1934.

Broomfield, Gerald W., "An Anglo-Catholic View", in: *Towards a United Church, 1913-1947*, ed. J.J. Willis *et al.*, London: Edinburgh House Press, 1947, 151-175.

Brown, Andrew, "Reform Is Surely Now Unstoppable". The Guardian, 22 November 2012, 19.

Brown, C.G., "Frederick Denison Maurice in the United States, 1860–1900". *Journal of Religious History* 10, no. 1, 1978: 50-69.

Bruce, Robert, "Reunion, Uniformity, and Unity". *The Churchman*, no. 109 (193)ff., 1896: 9-20, 66-77, 175-186.

Buchanan, Claudius, *Colonial Ecclesiastical Establishment: A Brief View of the State of the Colonies of Great Britain, and of Her Asiatic Empire, In Respect to Religious Instruction*, 2nd ed. London: Cadell and Davies, 1813.

Buchanan, Colin O., "The Church of England and Apostolic Succession". *The Churchman* 75, no. 1, 1961: 16-30.

———, "Full Communion and the Historic Episcopate", in: *Fellowship in the Gospel: Evangelical Comment on 'Anglican-Methodist Unity' and 'Intercommunion Today'*, ed. J.I. Packer, Appleford: Marcham Manor Press, 1968, 39-64.

Bulgakoff, Afanasiĭ Ivanovich *The Question of Anglican Orders*. London: SPCK, 1899.
Bullard, John Vincent, *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical 1604: Latin and English*. London: Faith Press, 1934.
Burdon, Adrian, *Authority and Order: John Wesley and His Preachers*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
Burkill, Mark, *Better Bishops*. Sheffield: Reform, 2009.
Burns, Arthur, "Critical Edition of William Conybeare's 'Church Parties'", in: *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany*, ed. Stephen Taylor, Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999, 213-385.
———, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England, c. 1800-1870*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
Butler, Perry, "From the Early Eighteenth Century to the Present Day", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 28-47.
Calamy, Edmund, *An Historical Account of My Own Life, With Some Reflections on the Times I have Lived in (1671-1731)*. London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1829.
"Call for More Liberal Church Policy on Intercommunion: Anglican Theologians Send Open Letter to Archbishops". The Times no 55228, 2 November 1961, 7.
Campbell, J. McLeod, *Christian History in the Making*. London: Press & Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1946.
The Canons of the Church of England: Canons Ecclesiastical Promulged by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970, 6th ed. London: Church House Publishing, 2008.
Cant, R., "Confessional Theology and the Anglican Church [in Response to J.H. Jaques]". *Theology* 47, no. 287, 1944: 110-113.
———, "The Episcopal Church in Scotland". *Theology* 50, no. 330, 1947: 441-446.
Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, *A Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ': A Letter on Anglican Orders*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1898.
Carey, Kenneth M., "Introduction [to the First Edition]", in: *The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church: Seven Essays by Priests of the Church of England*, ed. Kenneth M. Carey, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954, 5-9.
——— (ed), *The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church: Seven Essays by Priests of the Church of England*. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954.
Cargill Thompson, W.D.J., "Anthony Marten and the Elizabethan Debate on Episcopacy", in: *Essays in Modern English Church History: In Memory of Norman Sykes*, ed. G.V. Bennett and John D. Walsh, London: Black, 1966, 44-75.
Carpenter, S.C., *Church and People, 1789-1889: A History of the Church of England from William Wilberforce to 'Lux mundi'*. London: SPCK, 1933.
———, *The Church in England, 597-1688*. London: J. Murray, 1954.
Carter, C. Sydney, "John Cosin". *The Churchman* 55, no. 3, 1946: 65-71.
Catechism of the Catholic Church. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 2000.
Cecil, William, *A Solemn Appeal to the Right Reverend the Bishop, and to the Reverend the Clergy of the Diocese of Ely, on the Disorder and*

Profaneness, Exhibited at the Parish Church of St. Michael's, Cambridge, on Occasion of the Confirmation Held There, June 20, 1833. Cambridge: W. Metcalfe, 1833.
Chadwick, Henry, "Die Diskussion um die anglikanischen Weihen in der modernen anglikanischen Theologie". *Concilium* 4, 1968: 299-303.
———, "Full Communion with Other Episcopal Churches". *The Churchman* 95, no. 3, 1981: 218-226.
———, "History of the Oxford Movement: 150 Years On", in: *Lift High the Cross: The Oxford Movement Sesquicentennial*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1983, 46-81.
———, "The Quadrilateral in England", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Ohio/London/Oxford, 1988, 140-155.
———, *Tradition and Exploration: Collected Papers on Theology and the Church*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1994.
Chadwick, Owen, *From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
———, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. London: A. & C. Black, 1960.
———, *Newman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
———, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement : Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
———, *The Victorian Church*, 3rd ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971.
Chandler, Thomas Bradbury, *An Appeal to the Public, In Behalf of the Church of England in America*. New-York: James Parker, 1767.
Chapman, Mark D., *Anglican Theology*. London: Continuum, 2012.
———, *Anglicanism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
———, "Bischofsamt und Politik: Zur Begründung des Bischofsamtes in der anglikanischen Kirche". *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 97, 2000: 434-462.
———, *Bishops, Saints and Politics: Anglican Studies*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2007.
———, "The Oxford Movement, Jerusalem and the Eastern Question", in: *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Peter Benedict Nockles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 221-235.
Chart of the Episcopacy of England and Wales, Beginning with the Reign of Henry VIII. London: R. Gilbert, 1835.
Chase, Henry Leverett, *The Anglican Communion: Possibilities of Reunion with Separated Bodies. Pan-Anglican Papers SF.II.c*. London: SPCK, 1908.
———, *The Anglican Communion: The Historic Episcopate and What It Connotes Which is Impossible to Surrender. Pan-Anglican Papers S.F.II.d*. London: SPCK, 1908.
Chatterton, Eyre, *A History of the Church of England in India Since the Early Days of the East India Company*. London/New York/Toronto: SPCK, 1924.
"The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (1886/1888)", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Ohio/London/Oxford, 1988, vii-ix.
Child, Gilbert William, *Church and State under the Tudors*. London: Longman, Greens and Co., 1890.

Chorley, E. Clowes, "The Election and Consecration [of Samuel Seabury]". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 3, no. 3f, 1934: 146-191, cf. 229-261.

———, *Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church*. New York: Scribner, 1946.

Christensen, Torben, *The Divine Order: A Study in F.D. Maurice's Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

The Chronicle of Convocation [1867], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury. London: Rivingtons, 1867.

The Chronicle of Convocation [1887], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury. London: National Society's Depository, 1887.

The Chronicle of Convocation [1933], Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury. London: SPCK, 1933.

Church Missionary Society (ed), *A Brief View of the Principles and Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society*. London: Church Missionary Society, 1857.

——— (ed), *A Brief View of the Principles and Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society*. London: Church Missionary Society, 1862.

——— (ed), *A Brief View of the Principles and Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society [1882]*. London: Church Missionary House, 1882.

——— (ed), *A Brief View of the Principles and Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East*. London: Church Missionary Society, 1840.

Church of England-United Reformed Church Joint Study Group, *General Synod: Relations With the United Reformed Church: A Report by the Council for Christian Unity/Healing the Past, Building the Future: Report of a Church of England-United Reformed Church Study Group*. *GS 1841*. London: Church House Publishing, 2012.

Church of England (ed), *The Book of Common Prayer: With the Additions and Deviations Proposed in 1928*. Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Church of England, Federation of the Evangelical Churches in the German Democratic Republic of Germany and Evangelical Church in Germany, "The 'Meissen Declaration' (1988/91) and 'Agreement' (1991), Jointly Published as the 'Meissen Common Statement'", in: *Einheit bezeugen: Witnessing to Unity: Ten Years after the Meissen Declaration: Zehn Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Beiträge zu den theologischen Konferenzen von Springe und Cheltenham zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Paul Oppenheim, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2003, 524-533 (German), 534-544 (English).

The Church of England Defended From the Attacks of Modern Dissenters. London: Seeley and Sons, 1830.

Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

"Church Unity and the Church Universal: Report for Lambeth 1958", in: *The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops Together with the Resolutions and Reports*, vol. 2, London/Greenwich, Connecticut: SPCK, 1958, 19-60.

Church Unity: Report of a Joint Conference Held at Lambeth Palace, Together with a Preliminary Statement by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York

and the Moderator of the Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. London: SPCK, 1922.
Clark, Christopher, "Confessional Policy and the Limits of State Action: Frederick William III and the Prussian Church Union 1817-40". *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 4, 1996: 985-1004.
Clark, Francis, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*. London: Longmans, 1956.
Clark, J.C.D., *English Society, 1660-1832 : Religion, Ideology and Politics During the Ancien Regime*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
———, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics During the Ancien Regime*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Clark, Kenneth, *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste*, 3rd ed. London: J. Murray, 1974.
Cnattingius, Hans Jacob, *Bishops and Societies: A Study of Anglican Colonial and Missionary Expansion, 1698-1850*. London: SPCK, 1952.
Cobham, Alex W., *Some Criticism by the Council of the Church Association on the 'Answer' to the Pope Leo Made by Archbishops Maclagan and Temple*, 2nd ed. *Church Association Tract 236*. London: Church Association, 1897.
Cobham, J.O., "Readers and Deacons". *Theology* 56, no. 394, 1953: 122-130.
Collins, John N., *Deacons and the Church: Making Connections Between Old and New*. Leomister/Harrisburg: Gracewing/Morehouse, 2002.
———, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
Collins, William Edward, *The Anglican Communion*. *Pan-Anglican Papers 6*. London: SPCK, 1907.
Collinson, Patrick, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion (ed), *The Lambeth Conferences 1867-1930: The Reports of the 1920 and 1930 Conferences, With Selected Resolutions from the Conferences of 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897 and 1908.* London: SPCK, 1948.
Congar, Yves M.-J., "Apostolicité de ministère et apostolicité de doctrine", in: *Volk Gottes: Zum Kirchenverständnis der katholischen, evangelischen und anglikanischen Theologie: Festgabe für Josef Höfer*, ed. Remigius Bäumer and Heimo Dolch, Freiburg: Herder, 1967, 84-111.
Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, *Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church*. *CTS Church Documents*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 2000.
Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei and Pope John Paul II, *Doctrinal Commentary on the Concluding Formula of the Professio Fidei*. Vatican City: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1998.
'"Consumer Choice"'. Church Times no 7797, 24 August 2012, 13.
Conybeare, William J., "Church Parties". *Edinburgh Review* 98, no. 200, 1853: 273-342.
Cornick, David, *Under God's Good Hand: A History of the Traditions Which Have Come Together in the United Reformed Church in the United Kingdom*. London: United Reformed Church in the United Kingdom, 1998.
Cornwall, Robert D., "Politics and the Lay Baptism Controversy in England, 1708-15", in: *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832: Essays in Honour*

of James E. Bradley, ed. James E. Bradley, Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson, Farnham: Ashgate, 2010, 147-163.
Cosin, John, "Letter to Cordell, 'Who Scrupled to Communicate with the French Protestants Upon Some of the Modern Pretences', 7 February 1650", in: *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Cosin*, vol. 4, ed. J. Sansom, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1851, 400-409.
Creighton, Louise, *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.
Crockett, Larry, "The Oxford Movement and the 19th-Century Episcopal Church: Anglo-Catholic Ecclesiology and the American Experience". *Quodlibet Online Journal of Christian Theology and Philosophy* 1, no. 5, 1999.
Cross, Arthur Lyon, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*. New York/London/Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.
Cross, F. L., "Newman and the Doctrine of Development". *Church Quarterly Review* 115, no. 230, 1933: 245-257.
Cross, F.L. and Paul Elmer More, *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated From the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*. London: SPCK, 1935.
Crossley, Frederick Herbert, *The English Abbey : Its Life and Work in the Middle Ages*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1935.
Crowther, M.A., *Church Embattled: Religious Controversy in Mid-Victorian England*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1970.
Cumming, John, *Ritualism, the Highway to Rome: Twelve Lectures*. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1867.
D.I.E., "Oxford Theology, Part 1". Episcopal Recorder no 43, 19 January 1839, 169.
———, "Oxford Theology, Part 2". Episcopal Recorder no 44, 26 January 1839, 174.
Dalferth, Ingolf U., "Amt und Bischofsamt nach Meissen und Porvoo: Evangelische Anmerkungen zu einigen ungeklärten Fragen", in: *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight: The Second Theological Conference Held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany*, London: Church House, 1997, 9-48, 231-273.
———, *Auf dem Weg der Ökumene: Die Gemeinschaft evangelischer und anglikanischer Kirchen nach der Meissener Erklärung*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2002.
———, "Sichtbare Einheit und Bischofsamt", in: *Einheit bezeugen: Witnessing to Unity: Ten Years After the Meissen Declaration: Zehn Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Beiträge zu den theologischen Konferenzen von Springe und Cheltenham zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Paul Oppenheim, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2003, 198-206, 207-215.
———, "Sichtbare Einheit und sichtbare Gemeinschaft", in: *Einheit bezeugen: Witnessing to Unity: Ten Years after the Meissen Declaration: Zehn Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Beiträge zu den theologischen Konferenzen von Springe und Cheltenham zwischen der EKD und der Kirche von England*, ed. Ingolf U. Dalferth and Paul Oppenheim, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2003, 327-334, 335-342.
Davage, William, "Baptism and Confirmation", in: *Annual Report and Journal 2010-11*, Oxford: Pusey House, 2011, 11-14.

Davidson, Allan K., "Culture and Ecclesiology: The Church Mission Society and New Zealand", in: *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 198-227.

Davidson, Randall Thomas, *Kikuyu*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1915.

———, *The Missionary Conference in East Africa: The Archbishop of Canterbury's Answer to the 'Formal Appeal' Made by the Bishop of Zanzibar*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914.

——— (ed), *The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920*. London: SPCK, 1929.

Davidson, Randall Thomas and William Benham, *Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1891.

Davies, J.G., "Theological Reflections on the House Church". *Theology* 60, no. 448, 1957: 412-416.

Davies, Julian, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Davies, Walter Merlin, *An Introduction to F.D. Maurice's Theology: Based on the First Edition of 'The Kingdom of Christ' (1838) and 'The Faith of the Liturgy and the Doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles' (1860)*. London: SPCK, 1964.

Dawson, Jane E.A., *Scotland Re-formed, 1488-1587*. *New Edinburgh History of Scotland 6*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

De-la-Noy, Michael, *The Church of England: A Portrait*. London: Simon & Schuster, 1993.

de Lisle, Ambrose L.M., "Corporate Re-union", in: *Essays on the Re-union of Christendom, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental and Anglican Communions*, ed. Frederick George Lee, London: J.T. Hayes, 1867, 225-273.

de Saussure, Ferdinand, Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye *et al.* (ed), *Course in General Linguistics*. New York/London: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Deacons in the Church: The Report of a Working Party Set Up by the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry. London: Church Information Office, 1974.

Deacons in the Ministry of the Church: A Report to the House of Bishops of the General Synod of the Church of England. *GS 802*. London: Church House Publishing, 1988.

Dearmer, Percy, *The Parson's Handbook: Containing Practical Directions Both for Parsons and Others as to the Management of the Parish Church and Its Services According to the English Use as Set Forth in the Book of Common Prayer*. London: Grant Richards, 1899.

DeMille, George, *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church*, 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Church Historical Society, 1950.

Denny, Edward, *The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches*. London: SPCK, 1900.

Deuschle, Matthias A., "Erweckung und Politik: Zur preußischen Religionspolitik unter Friedrich Wilhelm III." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 106, no. 1, 2009: 79-117.

Dicey, Albert Venn, *Lectures on the Relation Between Law & Public Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century*. London: Macmillan, 1905.

Dickens, A.G., *The English Reformation*. London: Batsford, 1964.

Dickinson, J.C., *The Later Middle Ages: From the Norman Conquest to the Eve of the Reformation: An Ecclesiastical History of England*. London: A. & C. Black, 1979.
Dimmick, Robert, "Letter to the Editor". The Guardian, 22 November 2012, 39.
Dimock, N., "The History of Our Prayer-Book as Bearing on Present Controversies, Part VI". *The Churchman*, no. 125 (209), 1896: 257-268.
Dixon, P.H., *Protestant Episcopal Layman's Handbook: Containing an Explanation of the Innovations of the Last Half-century: Together with a Short Account of the English Inquisition of the 17th Century*, 2nd ed. New York/Toronto: Baker & Taylor/Hart & Co., 1891.
Doane, George Washington, "The Missionary Bishop: A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Jackson Kemper, D.D., 1835". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 4, no. 3, 1935: 180-194.
Doe, Norman, "The Apostolic Constitution Anglicanorum Coetibus: An Anglican Juridical Perspective". *One in Christ* 44, no. 1, 2010: 23-48.
———, "Ordination, Canon Law and Pneumatology: Validity and Vitality in Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue". *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 8, no. 39, 2006: 406-424.
Doll, Peter M., *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity: Imperial Anglicanism in British North America, 1745-1795*. London: Associated University Presses, 2000.
Donaldson, Gordon, *Scotland: Church and Nation Through Sixteen Centuries*, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1972.
———, *Scotland: James V - James VII*. *Edinburgh History of Scotland 3*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1978.
Drummond, Robert J., "Apostolic Succession". *The Evangelical Quarterly* 10, no. 1, 1938: 71-75.
Duffy, Eamon, "The Shock of Change: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Elizabethan Church of England", in: *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003, 42-64.
Dulles, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
Dunn, James, *Kikuyu: A Sermon [on Jude 5:3]: Preached at the Church of St. John Baptist, Bathwick, on the 24th Sunday after Trinity, 1915*. Bath/London: Gregory/Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1915.
Dutton, Edward, "Northern Rites: The Impact of Women Bishops". Church Times no 7611, 30 January 2009, 18f.
Ecclestone, Alan, "Experiment in the Parish". *Theology* 61, no. 460, 1958: 398-401.
Echlin, Edward P., *The Story of Anglican Ministry*. Slough: St. Paul, 1974.
Edge, William John, *An Earnest Appeal to the Readers and Admirers of 'Ancient Christianity' [by I. Taylor]; Being a Humble Attempt to Point Out Some of Its False Statements*. London: Rivington, 1840.
Edwards, Alfred George, *Landmarks in the History of the Welsh Church*. London: J. Murray, 1912.
Elkins, Caroline, *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya*. New York: H. Holt, 2005.
English Committee of the Meissen Commission (ed), *The Meissen Information Pack*. London: Council for Christian Unity (Church of England), 2005.

"Entry 'Mitre'", in: *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingstone, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, 1096f.

Episcopal Church in Scotland, *The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: As Revised, Amended and Enacted*. Edinburgh/Aberdeen: Robert Grant & Son/A. Brown and Co., 1838.

Etchells, Ruth, "The Ministry of Bishops", in: *Has Keele Failed? Reform in the Church of England*, ed. Charles Yeats, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1995, 142-154.

Evans, Eifion, *The Welsh Revival of 1904, With a Foreword by Martyn Lloyd-Jones*. Bridgend: Evangelical Press of Wales, 1969.

Evans, G.R. and J. Robert Wright, *The Anglican Tradition: A Handbook of Sources*. London: SPCK, 1991.

Evertsson, Jakob, *Bishops, Politics and Anti-clericalism in Nineteenth Century England and Sweden: An Analysis of the Debate of the Political Role of the Anglican Bishops During the 1830s Parliamentary Reform Debate in Comparison to Sweden*. Falun: Högskolan Dalarna, 2005.

"Extracts from 'A Layman's Essays on the Church', From the Christian Observer, October 1838, Part 1". Episcopal Recorder no 45, 2 February 1839, 178.

"Extracts from 'A Layman's Essays on the Church', From the Christian Observer, October 1838, Part 2". Episcopal Recorder no 46, 9 February 1839, 182.

Faber, G.C., *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement*. London: Faber and Faber, 1933.

Fairweather, Eugene R., *Episcopacy Re-asserted: A Rejoinder to 'The Historic Episcopate'*. London/New York: A.R. Mowbray/Morehouse-Gorham, 1955.

Fairweather, Eugene R. and Richard F. Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion*, 1st English ed ed. London: Mowbray, 1953.

Faith and Order Advisory Group, *The Priesthood of the Ordained Ministry*. London: Board for Mission and Unity of the Church of England, 1986.

Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England, "Resolutions Adopted by the Annual Assembly, September 21-3, 1925", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 2, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1925, 98-102.

Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius, *Response to Sergius Bulgakov's Proposal for Limited Intercommunion*. Oxford: Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius, 1933.

Firminger, Walter Kelly, *The Attitude of the Church of England to Non-episcopal 'Ordinations': Two Essays*. London/Oxford: James Parker, 1894.

Fittall, William (ed), *The Roman Catholic Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham: Some Questions and Answers on the Legal Implications for the Church of England*. *GS Misc* 979. London: General Synod, 2011.

Fleetwood, William, *The Judgment of the Church of England in the Case of Lay-baptism and of Dissenters Baptism: By Which It appears, That She Hath Not, By Any Publick Act of Hers, Made or Declared Lay-Baptism to be Invalid: With an Additional Letter from Dr. John Cosin, Afterwards Bishop of Durham, to Mr. Cordel, who Scrupled to Communicate with the French-Protestants, Upon Some of the Modern Pretences*, 2nd ed. London: Ann Baldwin, 1712.

Fleming, I.P., *The Church of England is Protestant: Historical Testimony to the Protestantism of the Church of England From Her Articles, Formularies,*

Constitution, High Church Authorities and Convocation. *Church Association Tract 49*. London, 1876.

Foerster, Erich, *Die Entstehung der Preußischen Landeskirche unter der Regierung König Friedrich Wilhlem des Dritten, nach den Quellen erzählt: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kirchenbildung im deutschen Protestantismus*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1905f.

For Such a Time As This: A Renewed Diaconate in the Church of England: A Report to the General Synod of the Church of England of a Working Party of the House of Bishops. London: Church House Publishing, 2001.

Ford, Alan, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-modern Ireland and England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Forrester, Henry, *Christian Unity and Historic Episcopate*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1889.

Fouyas, Methodios, *Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism*. London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Frame, Tom, "Unity in the Anglican Communion: A Critique of the 'Virginia Report'". *St Mark's Review*, no. 183, 2001: 24-32.

France, Walter Frederick, *The Oversea Episcopate: Centenary History of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, 1841-1941*. London: Colonial Bishoprics Fund, 1941.

Franklin, R. William, "The Episcopal Church in the USA and the Covenant: The Place of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", in: *The Anglican Covenant: Unity and Diversity in the Anglican Communion*, ed. Mark D. Chapman, London/New York: Mowbray, 2008, 101-122.

———, "The Opening of the Vatican Archives and the ARCIC Process", in: *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae, 1896-1996*, ed. R. William Franklin and Hugh Montefiore, London: Mowbray, 1996, 8-29.

The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal: Being the Report of a Committee Appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1921.

Fremantle, W.H., *The World as the Subject of Redemption: Being an Attempt to Set Forth the Functions of the Church as Designed to Embrace the Whole Race of Mankind: Bampton Lectures 1883*, 2nd ed. London: Longman, Greens, and Co., 1895.

Frenz, Albrecht (ed), *Hermann Gundert: Quellen zu seinem Leben und Werk*, vol. 2. Ulm: Süddeutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1993.

Frere, Walter Howard and C.E. Douglas (ed), *Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt: With a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572*. London: SPCK, 1954.

Fries, Heinrich and Karl Rahner, "A Catholic Response to ARCIC", in: *Tracts for Our Times, 1833 to 1983: St. Mary's Annual for 1983*, ed. Tom Sutcliffe, London: St. Mary's, 1983, 69-84.

Froude, Richard Hurrell, John Henry Newman, John Keble *et al.*, *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*. London: Rivington, 1838.

Fuller, Reginald, "Lutheran-Episcopal Unity: The Proposed Concordat". *Sewanee Theological Review* 40, 1997: 158-164.

Gallaher, Brandon, "Bulgakov and Intercommunion". *Sobornost* 24, no. 2, 2002: 9-28.

Galot, Jean, *Theology of the Priesthood*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1984.

Garbett, Cyril, *The Claims of the Church of England*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947.
Gassmann, Günther, "100 Jahre Lambeth-Quadrilateral: Die anglikanische Einheitscharta und ihre ökumenische Wirkung". *Ökumenische Rundschau* 37, 1988: 301-311.
———, "Apostolische Sukzession und Einheit der Kirche in der anglikanischen Theologie". *Kerygma und Dogma* 10, 1964: 257-283.
———, *Das historische Bischofsamt und die Einheit der Kirche in der neueren anglikanischen Theologie*. *Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie 15*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
———, "Entry 'Das historische Bischofsamt'", in: *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 6, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1980, 682-689.
———, *Konzeptionen der Einheit in der Bewegung für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung 1910 - 1937*. *Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie 39*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
Gassmann, Günther and Ursula Gassmann (ed), *Taufe, Eucharistie und Amt. Konvergenzerklärungen der Kommission für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung des Ökumenischen Rates der Kirchen [translated by Ursula and Günther Gaßmann]*. Frankfurt am Main/Paderborn: Lembeck, 1982.
Geck, Albrecht, "Autorität und Glaube Edward Bouverie Pusey und Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck im Briefwechsel (1825–1865), Teil 1". *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte (Journal for the History of Modern Theology)* 10, no. 2, 2003: 253-317.
———, "Autorität und Glaube Edward Bouverie Pusey und Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck im Briefwechsel (1825–1865), Teil 2". *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte (Journal for the History of Modern Theology)* 12, no. 1, 2005: 89-155.
———, "Autorität und Glaube Edward Bouverie Pusey und Friedrich August Gottreu Tholuck im Briefwechsel (1825–1865), Teil 3". *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte (Journal for the History of Modern Theology)* 13, no. 1, 2006: 41-124.
———, "Pusey, Tholuck and the Reception of the Oxford Movement in Germany", in: *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Peter Benedict Nockles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 168-184.
Geffert, Bryn, "Sergii Bulgakov, the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, Intercommunion and Sofiology". *Revolutionary Russia* 17, no. 1, 2004: 105 - 141.
General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, "Deliverance, etc. on the Provisional Report of Committee on Conferences Held with Representatives of the Church of England, May 1933", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 3, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1933, 122-131.
Gere, John A. and John Sparrow (ed), *Geoffrey Madan's Notebooks: A Selection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
Gerighty, Terrence, "Canterbury and York in Disaccord: A Failure at the First Lambeth Conference: The Longley-Thomson Correspondence and the First Lambeth Conference". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42, 1973: 429-435.

Gibbs, Mildred E., *The Anglican Church in India, 1600-1970*. Delhi: ISPCK, 1972.
Gilbert, Alan D., *The Making of Post-Christian Britain: A History of the Secularization of Modern Society*. London: Longman, 1980.
———, *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change, 1740-1914*. London: Longman, 1976.
Gilley, Sheridan, "The Ecclesiology of the Oxford Movement: A Reconsideration", in: *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman & the Oxford Movement*, ed. Paul Vaiss, Leominster: Gracewing, 1996, 60-75.
———, *Newman and His Age*, Pbk ed. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2003.
———, "Review of 'Authority, Dogma, and History', edited by Parker and Pahls". Church Times no 7679, 21 May 2010.
Girdlestone, Edward, *Apostolical Succession: Neither Proved Matter of Fact, Nor Revealed in the Bible, Nor the Doctrine of the Church of England: A Sermon*. Bristol/London: Chillcott/Hatchard, 1857.
Gladstone, W.E., "The Evangelical Movement; Its Parentage, Progress, and Issue". *The British Quarterly Review* 70, no. 139, 1879: 1-26.
Goeters, J.F. Gerhard and Joachim Rogge (ed), *Die Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche der Union: Ein Handbuch*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1992–1999.
Goldie, Frederick, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland: From the Restoration to the Present Time*, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: St Andrew Press, 1976.
Goode, William, *Brotherly Communion With the Foreign Protestant Churches: Desired and Cultivated by the Highest and Best of the Divines of the Church of England: An Address Delivered at Cambridge at a Private Meeting of Some of the Senior Members of the University, and Published at Their Request*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1859.
———, *The Case As It Is: Or, a Reply to the Letter of Dr. Pusey to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury: Including a Compendious Statement of the Doctrines and Views of the Tractators as Expressed by Themselves*, 2nd ed. London: J. Hatchard, 1842.
———, *Some Difficulties in the Late Charge of the Lord Bishop of Oxford: Respectfully Pointed Out in a Letter to His Lordship*, 2nd ed. London: Hatchard and Son, 1842.
———, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches: In Three Pamphlets on the Subject*. New York: A.D.F. Randolph, 1853.
Gore, Charles, *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith and Organization: An Open Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford*. London: Mowbray & Co, 1914.
———, "The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India: Comments on these Proposals by Bishop Gore", in: *Report of the Committee Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Consider the Findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order: Persuant to Resolution of the Church Assembly Passed at the Summer Session, 1928, Together with Various Memoranda*, London, 1930, 100-111.
Gottesdienst-Institut der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Bayern (ed), *Evangelisch betucht: Ausstellungskatalog zu Gottesdienstgewändern und*

Amtstracht. Nürnberg: Gottesdienst-Institut der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in Bayern, 2010.
Grant, John Webster, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union*. London: Lutterworth, 1967.
Gray, Donald, "When Old Expressions Work, Too". Church Times no 7732, 27 May 2011, 15.
Gray, George Francis Selby, *The Anglican Communion: A Brief Sketch*. London: SPCK, 1958.
Greaves, R.W., "The Jerusalem Bishopric, 1841". *The English Historical Review* 64, no. 152, 1949: 328-352.
Green, H. Benedict, "Apostolic Succession and the Anglican Appeal to History". *The Church Quarterly Review* 163, no. 3, 1962: 293-304.
———, "Review of 'Old Priest and New Presbyter' by Norman Sykes". *Sobornost* 3, no. 20, 1956/7: 431-436.
Green, I.M., *The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 1660-1663*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
Greenslade, S.L., *Schism in the Early Church*, 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1964.
Gregg, William, "'By Solemn Prayer and the Laying-on of Episcopal Hands': Ordination and Implementing Full Communion". *Sewanee Theological Review* 40, no. 2, 1997: 313-227.
Griffin, John R., "Dr. Pusey and the Oxford Movement". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 42, 1973: 137-153.
Griffith Thomas, W.H., "The Church of England in Relation to Other Reformed Communions". *The Constructive Quarterly* 2, no. 3, 1942: 604-616.
Griffiths, Leslie and Dudley Coates, "Ordination Issues". Methodist Recorder no 8027, 27 October 2011, 6, 4.
Grimley, Matthew, "Review of 'National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927-1928' by John Maiden". *Journal of Anglican Studies* 9, no. 2, 2011: 247-249.
Gritsch, Eric W., "Episcopacy: The Legacy of the Lutheran Confessions", in: *Concordat of Agreement: Supporting Essays*, ed. Daniel F. Martensen, Augsburg, Minneapolis: Forward Movement Publications, 1989, 101-112.
The Growth of Monkery in the Church of England. *Church Association Tract 322*. Birmingham: Hammond & Co., 1903.
Grundy, Malcolm, *Leadership and Oversight: New Models of Episcopal Leadership*. London: Continuum, 2011.
Güder, Eduard and Philipp Meyer, "Entry 'Jerusalem, das anglikanisch-deutsche Bistum St Jakob in'", in: *Realenzyklopädie für Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 8, ed. Albert Hauck, Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1900, 693-695.
Gunstone, John Thomas Arthur, *Lift High the Cross: Anglo-Catholics and the Congress Movement*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2010.
Gurrieri, John A., "Sacramental Validity: The Origins and Use of a Vocabulary". *Jurist* 41, no. 21, 1981: 21-58.
Gwatkin, Henry Melvill, *The Bishop of Oxford's [Charles Gore] Open Letter: An Open Letter in Reply*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1914.
———, *The Confirmation Rubric: Whom Does It Bind? Kikuyu Tracts*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.
———, *Episcopacy: I. In Scripture*. *Kikuyu Tracts*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.
———, *Episcopacy: II. In the Church of England*. *Kikuyu Tracts*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.

Haigh, Christopher, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Hall, Joseph, "A Defense of the Humble Remonstrance, Against the Frivolous and False Exceptions of Smectymnuus, Wherein the Right of Liturgy and Episcopacy is Clearly Vindicated from the Vain Cavils and Challenges of the Answerers", in: *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, Joseph Hall, D.D., Successively Bishop of Exeter and Norwich: Now first Collected, With Some Account of his Life and Sufferings, Written by Himself*, vol. 9, ed. Josiah Pratt, London: Whittingham, 1808, 639-704.

———, "An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, By a Dutiful Son of the Church", in: *The Works of Joseph Hall, D.D., Successively Bishop of Exeter and Norwich: With Some Account of his Life and Sufferings, Written by Himself*, vol. 10, Oxford: Talboys, 1837, 273-286.

Hall, Noel, "Apostolic Succession". *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11, no. 2, 1958: 113-133.

Hallam, Henry, *The Constitutional History of England, From the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II.*, 2nd (London) ed. Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1829.

Hankey, W.J., "Canon Law", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 200-215.

Hardy, Edward Rochie Jr., "The Catholic Revival in the American Church, 1722-1933", in: *Northern Catholicism: Centenary Studies in the Oxford and Parallel Movements*, ed. Norman Powell Williams and Charles Harris, London: SPCK, 1933, 75-116.

———, "Kemper's Missionary Episcopate: 1835-1859". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 4, no. 3, 1935: 195-218, cf. 219-244.

Harrab, Thomas, *Tessaradelphus, or: The Four Brothers: The Qualities of Whom are Contayned in This Old Riddle*, 1616.

Harris, Mark, *The Challenge of Change: The Anglican Communion in the Post-modern Era*. New York: Church Publishing, 1998.

Harvie, Christopher and H.C.G. Matthew, *Nineteenth-century Britain: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Haselmayer, Louis A., *Lambeth and Unity*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co, 1948.

Hastings, Adrian, *A History of English Christianity, 1920-1990*, 3rd ed. London: SCM, 1991.

Haugaard, William P., "From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 3-28.

Hawkins, Edward, *The Apostolical Succession: A Sermon Preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Sunday, February 27, 1842, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Ashurst Turner, Lord Bishop of Chichester*, 2nd ed. London/Oxford: B. Fellowes/J.H. Parker, 1842.

———, *The Nature and Obligation of Apostolic Order: A Sermon*. London/Oxford: B. Fellowes/J.H. Parker, 1842.

Hawkins, Lucy Mary, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution*. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1928.

Headlam, Arthur C., *The Proposed Scheme of Union for South India: Notes on the Schemes for 1935, 1936, Compared with that of 1929*. Gloucester: Minchin and Gibbs, 1938.

Heber, Amelia, *The Life of Reginald Heber*. London: John Murray, 1830.
Heber, Reginald, "Letter to the Reverend Deocar Schmidt: In Answer to His Letter on the Re-ordination of Lutheran Ministers, December 23d, 1825", in: *Narrative of a Journey Through the Upper Provinces of India, from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825, With Notes Upon Ceylon: An Account of a Journey to Madras and the Southern Provinces, 1826, and Letters Written in India*, vol. 2, ed. Amelia Heber, London: John Muray, 1828, 426-429.
Hechler, William Henry (ed), *The Jerusalem Bishopric: Documents with Translations: Chiefly Derived from 'Das evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem', 1842*. London: Trübner & Co., 1883.
Hein, David and Gardiner H. Shattuck, *The Jerusalem*. *Denominations in America 11*. Westport/London: Praeger Publishers, 2004.
Hempton, David, *Methodism and Politics in British Society, 1750-1850*. London: Hutchinson, 1984.
Henderson, G.D., *The Claims of the Church of Scotland*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
Henriques, Ursula R.Q., *Religious Toleration in England, 1787-1833*. *Studies in Social History*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
Henson, Hensley, "The Anglican Version of Christianity", in: *The Church of England: Its Nature and Its Future*, ed. Hensley Henson *et al.*, London: University of London Press, 1919, 51-112.
———, *The Church of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939.
———, *Quo tendimus? The Issue of Kikuyu: A Sermon: Preached Before the University of Oxford in S. Mary's on February 1st, 1914: With an Appendix*. London: Macmillan, 1914.
———, *The Relation of the Church of England to the Other Reformed Churches: Robert Lee Lecture, 1911*. Edinburgh/London: Blackwood & Sons, 1911.
———, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life, vol. 1: 1863-1920*. London: Oxford University Press, 1942.
Herring, George William, *Tractarianism to Ritualism: A Study of Some Aspects of Tractarianism Outside Oxford, From the Time of Newman's Conversion in 1845, Until the First Ritual Commission in 1867*. Oxford: DPhil Thesis, 1984.
Hickman, Henry, *Apologia Pro Ministris in Anglia (vulgo) Non-conformistis, Anno 1662. Aug. 24. Die Bartholomæo dicto, ejectis. Adversus argutiolas putidasque calumnias, Durelli, Ellisii, aliorumque. Per Irenæum Eleutherium A.M. ex Academia Cantab.*, 2nd ed. Eleutheropoli [London?], 1665.
Hill, Christopher, "Anglican Orders: An Ecumenical Context", in: *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae, 1896-1996*, ed. R. William Franklin and Hugh Montefiore, London: Mowbray, 1996, 87-95.
———, "'The Church of Jesus Christ': An Anglican Perspective with Reference to the Meissen Process", in: *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight: The Second Theological Conference Held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany*, London: Church House, 1997, 405-411.
———, "Mary Tanner's Contribution to the Ecumenical and Faith and Order Work of the Church of England", in: *Community - Unity - Communion: Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner*, ed. Colin Podmore, London: Church House Publishing, 1998, 17-25.

———, "The Minister of Confirmation", in: *Bereits erreichte Gemeinschaft und weitere Schritte: 20 Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Communion Already Shared and Further Steps: 20 Years After the Meissen Declaration: Beiträge zu den Theologischen Konferenzen von Frodsham/Foxhill (2005) und Düsseldorf/Kaiserswerth (2008) zwischen der Kirche von England und der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, ed. Christopher Hill *et al.*, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2010, 182-193.

———, "Seeking the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church: Do Bishops Exhibit or Obscure It?" in: *Paths to Unity: Explorations in Ecumenical Method*, ed. Paul Avis, London: Church House, 2004, 107-128.

Hill, Christopher and John Hind, "Reply to the Archbishop of Uppsala, Regarding the Matter of Same-sex Relationships and the Swedish Marriage Legislation". Council for Christian Unity/Faith and Order Advisory Group, 26 June 2009.

Hill, Christopher and Edward Yarnold, *Anglican Orders: The Documents in the Debate*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1997.

Hindmarsh, Bruce, "Is Evangelical Ecclesiology an Oxymoron? A Historical Perspective". *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 7, no. 4, 2007: 302-322.

Historical Enquiry Whether the Ministers of Non-episcopal Churches are Recognised as Ministers of God's Word and Sacraments by the Church of England: And Whether They May Receive Allowance to Preach Occasionally in Her Pulpits. London: Watts, 1859.

Hobart, John Henry, *An Apology for Apostolic Order and Its Advocates, Occasioned By the Strictures and Denunciations of the Christian's Magazine: A Series of Letters, Addressed to the Rev. John M. Mason, D.D., the Editor of That Work*. New York: T.&J. Sword, 1807.

———, *The Churchman: The Principles of the Churchman Stated and Explained, In Distinction from the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, and From the Errors of Certain Protestant Sects*. New York: T.&J. Swords, 1819.

———, *A Companion for the Altar; or: Week's Preparation for the Holy Communion*, 4th ed: New York, 1819.

Hodges, George, *The Validity of Non-episcopal Ordination*. Mysore: Wesleyan Mission Press, 1919.

Hodgson, Leonard, "Intercommunion: Notes of an Address to the Council of the Friends of Reunion in Opening a Discussion on the Proposal of the Executive Committee that Two Open Communion Services should be held at the Annual Conferences". *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, no. 12, 1938: 2-7.

Hollis, A.M., "A Universally Acceptable Ministry". *Reprint of an article from the National Christian Council Review*, no. 6f, 1957.

Holmes, J. Derek, *More Roman than Rome: English Catholicism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Burns & Oates, 1978.

Hooker, Richard, "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity", in: *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of his Life and Death, by Isaac Walton*, ed. John Keble, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836

Hope-Scott, James Robert, *The Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem, Considered in a Letter to a Friend*. London: C.J. Stewart, 1841.

Hopkins, John Henry, *The Law of Ritualism, Examined in Its Relation to the Word of God, to the Primitive Church, to the Church of England, and to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States*. New York, 1866.
———, *The Novelties Which Disturb Our Peace: Four Letters*. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker, 1844.
Hopkins, John Henry Jr., *The Life of the Late Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins, First Bishop of Vermont, and Seventh Presiding Bishop: By One of His Sons*. New York: F.J. Huntington, 1873.
House of Bishops of the Church of England, *Relations with the Church of South India*. London: C.I.O. Publishing, 1984.
House of Bishops' Working Party on Women in the Episcopate, *Women Bishops in the Church of England? ['Rochester Report']*, 2004.
How the Bishops of Worcester and Wakefield Supply Romish Recruits For the Church of England. *Church Association Tract 317*. London: Norman & Son, 1903.
Howe, J.W.A., "The Diaconate", in: *Lambeth Essays on Ministry: Essays Written for the Lambeth Conference, 1968*, ed. Michael Ramsey, London: SPCK, 1969, 62-74.
Hughes, John Jay, *Stewards of the Lord: A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1970.
Hunkin, Joseph Wellington, "The Anglican Pattern of Episcopacy". *The Churchman* 62, no. 2, 1948: 89-94.
———, "The Anglican Pattern of Episcopacy", in: *The Office of a Bishop*, ed. M.A.C. Warren, London: Church Book Room Press, 1948, 25-31.
———, *Episcopal Ordination and Confirmation in Relation to Inter-communion and Reunion: A Collection of Anglican Precedents and Opinions*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1929.
———, "Intercommunion and the Interchange of Preachers: The Present Situation". *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, no. 30, 1948: 16-18.
Hunt, Arnold, "Obituary: Professor Patrick Collinson". Church Times no 7754, 28 October 2011, 29.
Hunt, James and Richard P. Blakeney, *Ritualism: The Discussion Between the Rev. J. Hunt, M.A. and the Rev. R.P. Blakeney, LL.D. at the Victoria Rooms, Clifton, on Tuesday, April 17, 1866, on the Ritualism of the Church of England*, 2nd ed. Bristol: I.E. Chillcott, 1866.
Hunter, John, *'Apostolical Succession': Not a Doctrine of the Church of England*, 2nd ed. London/Bath: Nisbet & Co./Hamilton, Adams & Co./Godwin, 1843.
Huntington, William Reed, *The Anglican Communion: Our Ideals*. *Pan-Anglican Papers SF.I.b*. London: SPCK, 1908.
———, *The Book Annexed [to the Report of the Joint Committee on the Book of Common Prayer]: Its Critics and Its Prospects, 3 Papers*. New York, 1886.
———, *The Church-idea: An Essay Towards Unity*, 4th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
———, *The Four Theories of Visible Church Unity*. New York: J.H. Smith, 1909.
———, *A National Church*. New York, 1899.
———, *The Peace of the Church*. *Bohlen Lectures*. London: Nisbet, 1891.
———, *Popular Misconceptions of the Episcopal Church*, 2nd ed. New York: J. Pott & Co, 1891.
———, *The Talisman of Unity: A Sermon*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1899.

Hunwicke, John, "Anglican Orders Revisited/Documents Relating to the Participation in Anglican Episcopal Consecrations by 'Old Catholic' Bishops". *The Messenger of the Catholic League*, no. 254, 1994: 52-60, 61-65.

———, "Unity's Winding Path", in: *Anglicans and the Roman Catholic Church: Reflections on Recent Developments*, ed. Stephen E. Cavanaugh, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011, 125-132.

Hutton, William Holden (ed), *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901*. London: Constable, 1904.

Hylson-Smith, Kenneth, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century*. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1993.

"Identitätsbewusste Kirchen im pluralen Europa: Bericht der Meissen Kommission der Kirche von England und der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (2007 – 2011)". epd-Dokumentation no 23, 5 June 2012.

Illegal Ritual in the Church of England: Being a List of Unlawful Practice with Extracts from the Judgments Relating to Them, and an Index. *Church Association Tract 259*. London, 189-.

Incense, 2nd ed. *Church Association Tract 213*. London: Church Association, 189-.

"Intercommunion". *Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, no. 33, 1949: 2-4.

Intercommunion To-day: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion. London: Church Information Office, 1968.

Jacob, W.M., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide*. London: SPCK, 1997.

Jacques, J.H., "Confessional Theology and the Anglican Church". *Theology* 47, no. 285, 1944: 51-55.

James, Eric, "What is Going On at Halton?" *Theology* 60, no. 440, 1957: 61-65.

Jenkins, Paul, "The Church Missionary Society and the Basel Mission: An Early Experiment in Inter-European Cooperation", in: *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 43-65.

Johnson, Dale A., "The Oxford Movement and English Nonconformity". *Anglican and Episcopal History* 59, no. 1, 1990: 76-98.

Johnson, Paul, *A History of the American People*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1997.

Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, *The Church of South India: Being the United Report of the Two Joint Committees of the Convocations*. London: Church Information Board, 1955.

Jones, Gareth, "Visibility as Ecclesiological Criterion", in: *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight: The Second Theological Conference Held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany*, London: Church House, 1997, 343-356.

Jüngel, Eberhard, *Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith: A Theological Study With An Ecumenical Purpose*. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 2001.

Kammer für Theologie der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (ed), *Der evangelische Diakonat als geordnetes Amt der Kirche*. *EKD-Texte* 58. Hannover: Kirchenamt der EKD, 1996.

Karanja, John, "The Role of Kikuyu Christians in Developing a Self-Consciously African Anglicanism", in: *The Church Mission Society and World*

Christianity, 1799-1999, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 254-282.

Kaye, Bruce, "From Anglican Gaol to Religious Pluralism: Re-casting Anglican Views of Church and State in Australia", in: *Church and State in Old and New Worlds*, ed. Hilary M. Carey and John Gascoigne, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011, 287-305.

Keble, John, *The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays Throughout the Year*. London/New York: George Routledge & Sons, 1878.

———, *The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas Wilson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1863.

——— (ed), *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of his Life and Death, by Isaac Walton*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1836.

Keller-Hüschemenger, Max, *Die Lehre der Kirche im frühreformatorischen Anglikanismus: Struktur und Funktion*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn 1972.

———, *Die Lehre der Kirche im Urteil der Lambeth Konferenzen*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1976.

———, *Die Lehre der Kirche in der Oxford-Bewegung: Struktur und Funktion*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1974.

Kelway, Albert Clifton, *The Story of Kikuyu and Some Considerations Arising Therefrom*. London: Cope & Fenwick, 1915.

Kemp, Eric, "Lambeth 1920 and Christian Unity", in: *Community - Unity - Communion: Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner*, ed. Colin Podmore, London: Church House Publishing, 1998, 133-140.

Keulemans, Michael, *The Development of the Anglican Episcopate in Mainland Britain: With Special Reference to Current Perceptions and Expectations of the Episcopal Role by Bishops, Clergy and Key Laity in Four Dioceses of the Three Countries*. Cardiff: DMin thesis, University of Wales, 2009.

Kidd, B.J., "Validity: Name and Thing". *Theology* 34, 1937: 19-28.

Kikuyu: Dissenters Classed with Blasphemers by the Bishop of Zanzibar. *Church Association Tract 423*. London: Church Association, 1914.

King, Benjamin, "Review of 'The Sacramental Church' by Nash". *Sewanee Theological Review* 55, no. 2, 2012: 227f.

Kirk, Kenneth E., "Apostolic Ministry", in: *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*, ed. Kenneth E. Kirk, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946, 3-52.

——— (ed), *The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and the Doctrine of Episcopacy*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946.

Kitson Clark, G.S.R., *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, 1973.

Knight, Frances, "The Influence of the Oxford Movement in the Parishes c.1833-1860: A Reassessment", in: *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman & the Oxford Movement*, ed. Paul Vaiss, Leominster: Gracewing, 1996, 127-140.

———, *The Nineteenth-century Church and English Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Kramm, Hans-H., *Bischof, Pastor und Gemeinde: Die lutherische Lehre vom Amt, gesehen vom Standpunkt eines deutschen Lutheraners in England*. *Luthertum 13*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1954.

Kremkau, Klaus, "20 Years of Ecumenical Fellowship Through Meissen", in: *20 Jahre Meissen Kommission: Die Entstehung der Meissener Erklärung: Berichte von drei Zeitzeugen*, ed. Leslie Nathaniel and Matthias Kaiser, Hannover: Meissen Ausschuss der EKD, 2011, 43-47, 48-52.

Kretschmar, Georg, "Die Wiederentdeckung des Konzeptes der 'Apostolischen Sukzession' im Umkreis der Reformation", in: *Das bischöfliche Amt: Kirchengeschichtliche und ökumenische Studien zur Frage des kirchlichen Amtes*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999, 300-344.

Lacey, T.A., *Unity and Schism: The Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1917*. London: Mowbray, 1917.

———, *The Universal Church: A Study in the Lambeth Call to Union*. London: Mowbray, 1921.

Ladds, Robert, "Popular Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in England: An Historical Perspective", in: *Mary: A Focus for Unity for all Christians? Sermons and Conference Talks Presented Both at Lourdes and at Nettuno in 2008*, ed. [Anglican] Society of Mary, East Harling: Society of Mary, 2009, 5-10.

The Lambeth Conference 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports. London/New York: SPCK/Macmillan, 1930.

The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports. London/New York: SPCK/Seabury Press, 1968.

Lampe, G.W.H., *An Anglican Approach to Intercommunion and Reunion*. London: SPCK, 1962.

———, "Episcopacy and Reunion". *The Churchman* 75, no. 1, 1961: 7-16.

Larentzakis, Grigorios, "Welche kirchlich-theologische Einheit strebt die Orthodoxe Kirche an? Grundkonzept und Perspektiven im neuen Europa", in: *Ost- und Westerweiterung in Theologie: 20 Jahre orthodoxe Theologie in München*, ed. Theodor Nikolao, St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 2006, 175-192.

Lathbury, D.C. (ed), *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*. London: John Murray, 1910.

Law, William, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life: Adapted to the State and Condition of All Orders of Christians*, 10th ed. London: G. Robinson, 1772.

Leak, Adrian, "Apostolic Quest: Samuel Seabury Overcame Political Barriers to Obtain Episcopal Orders". Church Times no 7756, 11 November 2011, 17.

Lenox-Conyngham, Andrew, "Kirchengemeinschaft oder Kircheneinheit? Ökumenische Zielvorstellungen aus anglikanischer Perspektive". *Materialdienst des Konfessionskundlichen Instituts Bensheim* 54, no. 2, 2003: 28-31.

Leonard, Graham, "Personal Contribution", in: *The Path to Rome: Modern Journeys to the Catholic Church, new edition*, ed. Dwight Longenecker and Cyprian Blamires, Leominster: Gracewing, 2010, 303-320.

"Letter of Prince Albert to Samuel Wilberforce, 19 October 1845", in: *Life of the Right Reverend Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.*, vol. 1, ed. A.R. Ashwell, London: J. Murray, 1880, 276-278.

Leuenberger, Samuel, *Cultus Ancilla Scripturae: Das Book of Common Prayer als erweckliche Liturgie: ein Vermächtnis des Puritanismus*. Basel: PhD thesis, University of Stellenbosch (RSA), published by F. Reinhardt, 1986.
"Library of Anglo-Catholic Theoloy; Library of the Fathers". The Oxford University, City, and County Herald no 1809, 30 January 1841, 1.
Liddon, Henry Parry, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 2d ed. London/New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893-97.
Lochhead, Marion, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*. London: John Murray, 1966.
Locke, Kenneth A., *The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
Lockhart, William, *Secession or Schism: A Review of the Late Dr. Neale's Sermon on Secession; With an Appendix on the 'Altar Bread Controversy'*. London: Burns, Oates & Co., 1868.
Longley, Charles Thomas, *A Charge Addressed to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, At His Primary Visitation, In September 1857*. Durham: George Andrews, 1857.
Lord Salisbury's Nomination to the Bishopric of Worcester [Gore]. Church Association Tract 306. London: Norman & Son, 1901.
Lovett, Richard, *The History of the London Missionary Society, 1795-1895*. London: Henry Frowde, 1899.
Low, Adrian, "Letter to the Editor". Church Times no 7758, 25 November 2011, 13.
Low, John L., *Scottish and American Churches: Consecration of Bishop Seabury*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: J.M. Carr, 1885.
Lowrie, Walter, *Ministers of Christ*. New York: Seabury Press, 1964.
Lückhoff, Martin, *Anglikaner und Protestanten im Heiligen Land: Das gemeinsame Bistum Jerusalem (1841-1886)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998.
Luscombe, Edward, *Steps to Freedom: Laurencekirk 1804*. Edingburgh: Scottish Episcopal Church, 2004.
MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Building a Godly Realm: The Establishment of English Protestantism 1558-1603*. London: Historical Association, 1992.
———, "The Myth of the English Reformation". *The Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 1, 1991: 1-19.
———, "Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture". *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Sixth Series)* 15, 2005: 75-95.
Mackintosh, William H., *Disestablishment and Liberation: The Movement for the Separation of the Anglican Church from State Control*. London: Epworth Press, 1972.
Maclean, Norman, "A Great Day in British East Africa: The Problem of Church Union - A Contrast". The Scotsman, 9 August 1913, 9.
Macquarrie, John, "Theological Implications of the Oxford Movement", in: *Lift High the Cross: The Oxford Movement Sesquicentennial*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1983, 13-29.
———, "What still Separates Us from the Catholic Church? An Anglican Reply". *Concilium* 6, no. 4, 1970: 45-53.
Magalotti, Lorenzo and Joseph Mawman (ed), *Travels of Cosmo the Third, Grand Duke of Tuscany, Through England, During the Reign of King Charles the Second (1669): Translated from the Italian Manuscript in the Laurentian*

Library at Florence: To Which is Prefixed a Memoir of His Life. London: J. Mawman, 1821.
Maiden, John G., *National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927-1928*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009.
Major, Henry Dewsbury Alves, "The New Reformation". *Modern Churchman* 22, no. 5-7, 1932: 410-421.
———, "The Reformation: Old and New". *Modern Churchman* 22, no. 5-7, 1932: 225-228.
Mampoteng, Charles, "The New England Anglican Clergy in the American Revolution". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 9, no. 4, 1940: 267-304.
Marshall, William, *Scripture, Tradition and Reason: A Selective View of Anglican Theology Through the Centuries*. Dublin: Columba Press/APCK, 2010.
Martin, Brian, *John Henry Newman: His Life and Works*. London: Continuum, 2000.
Martineau, James, *Miscellanies*. Boston/New York/Cambridge: Crosby and Nichols/Francis and Co, 1852.
Mascall, Eric L., *The Recovery of Unity: A Theological Approach*. London: Longmans, Green, 1958.
———, "Whither Anglican Theology?" in: *When Will Ye Be Wise? The State of the Church of England*, ed. Anthony Kilmister, London: Blond & Briggs, 1983, 30-49.
Mason, Arthur J., *The Church of England and Episcopacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
Mason, John Mitchell, *The Claims of Episcopacy Refuted in a Review of the Essays of Bishop Hobart and Other Advocates of Diocesan Episcopacy: With an Introduction and Appendix by John Blackburn*. London: Jackson & Walford, 1838.
Mass or Communion? Samples of Law-breaking Under the Oversight of Dr. Creighton, Bishop of London. Church Association Tract 251. London: Church Association, 189-.
Mather, F.C., "Church, Parliament and Penal Laws: Some Anglo-Scottish Interactions in the Eighteenth Century". *The English Historical Review* 92, no. 364, 1977: 540-572.
Maurice, Frederick Denison, *Dialogues Between a Clergyman and a Layman on Family Worship*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1862.
———, *The Kingdom of Christ, or: Hints to a Quaker, Respecting the Principles, Constitution, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church*, 3rd ed. London: Macmillan, 1883.
———, *The Kingdom of Christ, or: Hints to a Quaker, Respecting the Principles, Constitution, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. London: Rivington, 1842.
———, *The Kingdom of Christ: Or, Hints on the Principles, Ordinances and Constitution of the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. London: Darton and Clark, 1838.
———, *Lectures on the Ecclesiastical History of the First and Second Centuries*. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1854.
———, *The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters*, 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1884.
———, *Reasons for Not Joining a Party in the Church*. London: Rivington, 1841.
———, *Theological Essays*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1853.

———, *Three Letters to the Rev. W. Palmer, On the Name 'Protestant'; on the Seemingly Ambiguous Character of the English Church; and on the Bishopric at Jerusalem*, 2nd ed. London: John W. Parker, 1842.
Mayhew, Peter, *All Saints: Birth and Growth of a Community*. Oxford: Society of All Saints, 1987.
Mayo, Janet, *A History of Ecclesiastical Dress*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1984.
McAdoo, Henry R., *The Spirit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1965.
McAdoo, Henry R., *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1949.
McCaul, Alexander, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*. London: Hatchard and Son, 1845.
McDermott, R.P., "Confessional Theology and the Anglican Church [in Response to J.H. Jaques]". *Theology* 47, no. 288, 1944: 133-137.
McGrath, Alister E., *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
McKie, S.P., "Letter to the Editor". Church Times no 7809, 16 November 2012, 17, 37.
McMillan, Sharon L., *Episcopal Ordination and Ecclesial Consensus*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2005.
McVickar, John, *The Early Years of the Late Bishop Hobart*. New York: Protestant Episcopal Press, 1836.
———, *The Professional Years of Bishop Hobbart*. New York: Protestant Episcopal Press, 1836.
"Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry: Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6, 1923", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 1, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1924, 156-163.
Mews, Stuart, "Kikuyu and Edingburgh: The Interaction of Attitudes to two Conferences", in: *Councils and Assemblies: Papers Read at the Eighth Summer Meeting and the Ninth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, 345-359.
Meyer, Philipp, "Entry 'Jerusalem, Anglican-German Bishopric in'", in: *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. 6, New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1910, 137f.
Miller, Henry, *The Archbishops' Reply to the Pope's Bull: What Is to Be Done?*, 2nd ed. *Church Association Tract 235*. London: Church Association, 1897.
Minter, R.A., *Episcopacy Without Episcopate: The Church of England in Jamaica before 1824*. Cambridge/Upton-upon-Severn: R.A. Minter, 1990.
Minton, Samuel, *The Evangelicals and 'The Edinburgh': A Reply to the Article on 'Church Parties'*, 2nd ed. Liverpool/London: Deighton and Laughton, 1854.
Molesworth, William Nassau, *The History of England from the Year 1830*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1871.
Moore, James J., *Earlier and Later Nonconformity in Oxford*. Oxford: John Jakeman/Broken Hayes, 1875.
Moore, Suzanne, "How can the Church of England Continue as an Arm of the Law When It Has Shown Such Prejudice in Voting Against Women Bishops?" g2 (Supplement of The Guardian), 22 November 2012, 5.

Moorman, John R.H., *A History of the Church in England*, 3rd ed. London: A. & C. Black, 1973.
Morris, Alfred E., *The Lambeth Quadrilateral and Reunion*. London: Faith Press, 1969.
Morris, Jeremy N., *F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
———, *To Build Christ's Kingdom: F.D. Maurice and His Writings*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007.
Mozley, John Kenneth, *Some Tendencies in British Theology from the Publication of Lux Mundi to the Present Day*. London: SPCK, 1951.
Müller, Hans Martin, "Evangelisches Amtsverständnis im ökumenischen Kontext". *Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht* 50, 2005: 325-338.
Mullin, Robert Bruce, *Episcopal Vision/American Reality: High Church Theology and Social Thought in Evangelical America*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1986.
Muthuraj, Joseph Gnanaseelan, *We Began at Tranquebar, vol I: SPCK, the Danish-Halle Mission and Anglican Episcopacy in India (1706-1843)*. Delhi: ISPCK, 2010.
Neale, John Mason, "Sermon XX: Secession", in: *Sermons Preached in a Religious House*, vol. 1, ed. Joseph Haskoll, London: Joseph Masters, 1869, 174-191.
———, *Songs and Ballads for the People*. London: J. Burns, 1844.
Neale, John Mason and Mary Sackville Lawson, *Letters of John Mason Neale*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910.
Neill, Stephen, *Anglicanism*, 3rd ed. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.
———, "Church Union in South India", in: *Towards a United Church, 1913-1947*, ed. J.J. Willis *et al.*, London: Edinburgh House Press, 1947, 73-148.
———, "Die Notwendigkeit des Bischofsamtes: Anglikanische Fragen und Antworten". *Concilium* 8, no. 12, 1972: 748-753.
———, *The Ministry of the Church: A Review by Various Authors of a Book Entitled 'The Apostolic Ministry'*. London: The Canterbury Press, 1947.
Newbigin, Lesslie, "Anglicans and Christian Reunion". *Theology* 61, no. 456, 1958: 223-227.
———, *The Reunion of the Church: A Defence of the South India Scheme*. London: SCM Press, 1948.
Newman, John Henry, "The Anglo-American Church", in: *Essays: Critical and Historical*, vol. 1, London: Basil Montagu Pickering, 1872, 308-385.
———, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of His Religious Opinions*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908.
———, "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church [1840]/Note on Essay IX [for the re-publication]", in: *Essays, Critical and Historical, vol. 2*, London/New York: Basil Montagu Pickering, 1872, 1-73, 74-111.
———, "The Convocation of Canterbury", in: *Historical Sketches III*, London/New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909, 341-421.
———, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 14th ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
———, "Introductory Essay", in: *Essays on the Re-union of Christendom, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental and Anglican Communions*, ed. Frederick George Lee, London: J.T. Hayes, 1867, xxv-lxxxv.
———, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, 9th ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.

———, "Milman's View of Christianity", in: *Essays, Critical and Historical, vol. 2*, London/New York: Basil Montagu Pickering, 1872, 186-248.
———, "Review of 'Treatise on the Church of Christ' by Palmer". *The British Critic* 24 (48), no. 4, 1839: 347-372.
———, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church: Illustrated in Lectures, Letters and Tracts Written Between 1830 and 1841*, 3rd ed. London: Basil Montagu Pickering, 1877.
——— (ed), *Tracts for the Times, vol. 1: 1834-5 (Tracts 1-46)*. London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1836.
——— (ed), *Tracts for the Times, vol. 2: 1834-5 (Tracts 47-70)*. London: Rivington, 1840.
——— (ed), *Tracts for the Times, vol. 3: 1835-6 (Tracts 71-77)*. London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1839.
——— (ed), *Tracts for the Times, vol. 4: 1836-7 (Tracts 78-82)*. London: Rivington, 1840.
——— (ed), *Tracts for the Times, vol. 5: 1838-41 (Tracts 83-88.89-90)*. London: Rivington, 1840.
Newman, John Henry and Anne Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church: With a Brief Autobiography*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.
Nichols, Aidan, "Anglican Uniatism: A Personal View". *The Messenger of the Catholic League*, no. 292, 2010: 55-76.
Nijenhuis, Willem, *Adrianus Saravia (c. 1532-1613): Dutch Calvinist, First Reformed Defender of the English Episcopal Church Order on the Basis of the Ius Divinum*. *Studies in the History of Christian Thought 21*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.
Nockles, Peter B., "'Church and King': Tractarian Politics Reappraised", in: *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman & the Oxford Movement*, ed. Paul Vaiss, Leominster: Gracewing, 1996, 93-123.
———, "The Oxford Movement and the United States", in: *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Peter Benedict Nockles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 133-150.
———, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
———, "The Oxford Movement: Historical Background 1780-1933", in: *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986, 24-50.
———, "Survivals or Arrivals? The Oxford Movement and the Nineteenth-century Historical Construction of Anglicanism", in: *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003, 144-191.
Norman, Edward R., *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1968.
O'Collins, Gerald, "Did Apostolic Continuity Ever Start? Origins of Apostolic Continuity in the New Testament". *Louvain Studies* 21, no. 2, 1996: 138-152.
Obelkevich, James, *Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Oddie, Geoffrey A., "India: Missionaries, Conversion, and Change", in: *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 228-253.

Ollard, S.L., "Confirmation in the Anglican Communion", in: *Confirmation: Or, The Laying On of Hands*, vol. 1, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1926, 60-245.

Olmstead, Clifton Earl, *History of Religion in the United States*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

"Open Letter to the Archbishops: More Liberal Anglican Policy on Intercommunion Requested, Plea by 32 Theologians". Church Times no 5151, 2 November 1961, 1, 3, 24, with the text of the open letter on 13, 15.

Oppegaard, Sven and Gregory Cameron (ed), *Anglican-Lutheran Agreements: Regional and International Agreements 1972-2002*49. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 2004.

Ottley, Robert L., *Lancelot Andrewes*. London: Methuen & Co., 1894.

Owen, James and Daniel Williams, *A Plea for Scripture Ordination: Or, Ten Arguments from Scripture and Antiquity Proving Ordination by Presbyters Without Bishops to be Valid*. London: A. Salusbury, 1694.

"The Oxford Memorial". Supplement to the Oxford University, City, and County Herald no 1809, 30 January 1841, 1-3.

Padley, Kenneth, "Early Anglican Ecclesiology and Contemporary Ecumenism". *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 9, no. 1, 2009: 3-16.

Page, Jesse, *Samuel Crowther: The Slave Boy of the Niger*. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1890.

Paget, Francis, *An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.

Palmer Ladd, William, "Prayer Book Interleaves: Some Reflections on How the Book of Common Prayer Might Be Made More Influential in Our English-speaking World, 1942", in: *Readings From the History of the Episcopal Church*, ed. Robert W. Prichard, Wilton/Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow, 1986, 147-151.

Palmer, William, *Aids to Reflection on the Seemingly Double Character of the Established Church, With Reference to the Foundation of a 'Protestant Bishopric' at Jerusalem, Recentlu Announced in the Prussian State Gazette*. Oxford/London: John Henry Parker'Rivington, 1841.

———, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ: Designed Chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology*. London: J.G. & F. Rivington, 1838.

Parker, Kenneth L. and Michael J.G. Pahls, *Authority, Dogma, and History: The Role of the Oxford Movement Converts in the Papal Infallibility Debates*. Bethesda/Dublin/Palo Alto: Academica Press, 2009.

Pascoe, C.F., *Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G.: An Historical Account of the Society For the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1900, Based on a Digest of the Society's Records*. London: S.P.G, 1901.

——— (ed), *Classified Digest of the Records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1892*. London: S.P.G.F.P., 1893.

Paz, D.G., *Popular Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Victorian England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Pearce, Augur, "Interchangeability of Ministers Between the Church of England and the Member Churches of the EKD: The Present Legal Position", in:

Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight: The Second Theological Conference Held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany, London: Church House, 1997, 5-8.

Pearce, Edward George, *The Lutheran Church in Britain*. London: Concordia Publishing House, 1953.

———, *The Story of the Lutheran Church in Britain Through Four Centuries of History*. London: Evangelical Lutheran Church of England, 1969.

Pearson, A., "The Papal Encyclical". *The Churchman*, no. 120 (204), 1896: 635-643.

Peck, Arthur L., *Anglicanism and Episcopacy: A Re-examination of Evidence: With Special Reference to Professor Norman Sykes' Old Priest and New Presbyter: Together With an Essay on Validity*. London/New York: Faith Press/Morehouse-Gorham, 1958.

———, *This Church of Christ: An Examination of Certain Presuppositions in 'The Historic Episcopate'*. London: Mowbray, 1955.

Peck, Kenneth M., "The Oxford Controversy in America: 1839". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 39, no. 2, 1964: 49-63.

Pedder, D.C., "The Parson and His Flock". *Contemporary Review* 89, no. 1, 1906: 714-722.

Peel, William George and John Jamieson Willis, *Steps Towards Reunion: A Statement for the Consultative Committee*. London: Longman, Green and Co, 1914.

Perceval, A.P., *An Apology for the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession: With an Appendix, on the English Orders*, 2nd ed. London: Rivington, 1841.

———, *A Collection of Papers Connected With the Theological Movement of 1833*. London: Rivington, 1842.

———, "On the Oxford Movement: To the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal". The Oxford University, City, and County Herald no 1809, 30 January 1841, 2.

Percy, Martyn, *Clergy: The Origin of Species*. London: Continuum, 2006.

Perowne, J.J. Stewart, "The Church of England and Non-episcopal Ordination". *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* 45 (1 of the special English edition), no. 1, 1890: 146-153.

Pettersen, Alvyn, "Review of 'Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy' by Allen Brent". *Ecclesiology* 7, no. 1, 2011: 124-126.

Philip, T.V., *Edinburgh to Salvador: Twentieth Century Ecumencial Missiology: A Historical Study of the Ecumenical Discussions on Mission*. Delhi: CSS & ISPCK, 1999.

Phillimore, Robert, Walter George Frank Phillimore and Charles Fuhr Jemmett, *The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England*, 2nd ed. London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1895.

Phillips, Paul T., "The Concept of a National Church in Late Nineteenth-century England and America". *Journal of Religious History* 14, no. 1, 2007: 26-37.

Pickering, W.S.F., *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity*, new ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

———, "Anglo-Catholicism: Some Sociological Observations", in: *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986, 153-172.

———, "Sociology of Anglicanism", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 364-375.
Pinnington, John Ernest, "Anglican Openness to Foreign Protestant Churches in the Eighteenth Century: A Gloss on the Old Priest and New Presbyter Thesis of Norman Sykes". *Anglican Theological Review* 51, no. 2, 1969: 133-148.
———, "Church Principles and the Early Years of the Church Missionary Society: The Problem of the 'German' Missionaries". *Journal of Theological Studies* 20, no. 2, 1969: 523-532.
Playing at Monks: A Day at Painsthorpe 'Priory'. Church Association Tract 323. London: Norman & Son, 1903.
Pobee, John S., "Newer Dioceses of the Anglican Communion: Movement and Prospect", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 393-405.
Podmore, Colin, "The Anglican Communion: Idea, Name and Identity". *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 4, no. 1, 2004: 34-49.
———, *Aspects of Anglican Identity*. London: Church House Publishing, 2005.
———, "The Church of England", in: *Called to Witness and Service: The Reuilly Common Statement, With Essays on Church, Eucharist and Ministry: Conversations Between the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the French Lutheran and Reformed Churches*, London: Church House Publishing, 1999, 60-65.
———, "The Church of England's Understanding of Episcopacy". *Theology* 109, 2006: 173-181.
———, "Daniel Ernst Jablonski, die Böhmischen Brüder und die Kirche von England", in: *Daniel Ernst Jablonski: Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke and Werner Korthaase, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008, 319-329.
———, *The German Evangelical Churches: An Introduction Following the Meissen Agreement*. London: Council for Christian Unity, 1992.
———, "A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of the Episcopal Church and the Church of England". *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 10, 2008: 34-70.
———, "Two Streams Mingling: The American Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion". *Journal of Anglican Studies* 9, no. 1, 2011: 12-37.
Pope Leo XIII, "Apostolicae Curae (1896, English version)", in: *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae, 1896-1996*, ed. R. William Franklin and Hugh Montefiore, London: Mowbray, 1996, 127-137.
Powicke, F.M., *The Reformation in England*. Oxford University Press: London, 1961.
Price, Charles P., "Whence, Whither, and What? Reflections on the Hundredth Anniversary", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Evanston: Anglican Theological Review, 1988, 79-97.
Prynne, William, *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud*. London: Michaell Sparke Senior, 1644.
Pufendorf, Samuel, *A View of the Principles of the Lutheran Churches; Shewing How Far They Agree With the Church of England: Being a Seasonable Essay Towards Uniting of Protestants Upon the Accession of of His*

Majesty King George to the Throne of These Kingdoms: Translated from the Latin by Theophilus Dorrington. London: John Wyat, 1714.
Pullan, Leighton, *Missionary Principles and the Primate on Kikuyu: Three Addresses, With Some Observations on the Present German Movement in the Church of England*. London: Mowbray, 1915.
Pusey, E.B., *An Historical Enquiry Into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character Lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany: To Which is Prefixed, a Letter from Professor Sack, upon the Rev. J. Rose's Discourses on German Protestantism; Translated from the German*. London: Rivington, 1828.
Pye, Henry John, *A Few Words as to the Reasons Why All the Congregation Ought to Remain in Church Until the End of the Service Whether They Communicate or Not*. London: Hayes, 1866.
Quantin, Jean-Louis, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Quick, Oliver C., *The Christian Sacraments*. London: Nisbet, 1927.
———, "Meaning and Conditions of Validity", in: *Report of the Committee Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Consider the Findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order: Persuant to Resolution of the Church Assembly Passed at the Summer Session, 1928, Together with Various Memoranda*, London, 1930, 62-66.
Ramsey, Michael, *F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology*. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
———, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 2nd ed. Longmans, Green and Co, 1956.
———, "What is Anglican Theology?" *Theology* 48, no. 1, 1945: 2-6.
Ranke, Leopold von (ed), *Aus dem Briefwechsel Friedrich Wilhelms IV. mit Bunsen*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1874.
Ratzinger, Joseph, *Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology*. Slough: St Paul, 1988.
———, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1987.
Reardon, Bernhard M.G., "The Thirty-nine Articles and the Augsburg Coinfession". *Lutheran Quarterly* 3, 1989: 93-106.
Reed, Edward T., *The Trumpet and the Battle; or: The Kikuyu Conference: What Will It Lead to?* London: Headley Brothers, 1914.
Reed, John Shelton, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*. Nashville/London: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.
"Reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden to the Conference of Bishops in the Anglican Communion, 1922", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 1, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1924, 185-195.
Report of the Committee Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Consider the Findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order: Persuant to Resolution of the Church Assembly Passed at the Summer Session, 1928, Together with Various Memoranda. London: Church of England, 1930.
Report of the United Conference of Missionary Societies in British East Africa: Kikuyu, July 23th-26th, 1918. Nairobi: Stationers Ltd., 1918.
"Resolutions of the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1933 on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930", in: *Documents*

on Christian Unity, vol. 3, ed. George K.A. Bell, London: Oxford University Press, 1948, 64-67 (cf. 67ff.).

"Resolutions on the Unity of the Church (Lambeth Conference 1930) and 'The Historic Episcopate' (from the Report of the Committee on 'The Unity of the Church' for the Lambeth Conference 1930)", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 3, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1948, 1-7, 7-10.

Reuniting Anglicans with Rome: Documents, Issues, Progress. *The Messenger of the Catholic League 254*. London: The Catholic League, 1994.

"Review of 'Essays on the Church, By a Layman', 1838". *Christian Observer, Conducted by Members of the Established Church* 10 (new Series), no. October, 1838: 640-653.

"Review of 'The Church of England and Episcopacy' by Mason". *Expository Times* 26, no. 12, 1914: 99-101.

Rhenius, C.T.E., *A Review of a Work Entitled 'The Church; Her Daughters, and Handmaidens, Her Pastors, and People, &c.'* Tinevelly: Mission Press, 1834.

———, *Union of all Christians: An Address to all Christians, Especially to all the Ministers of the Gospel*. Tinevelly: Mission Press, 1834.

Rhenius, J., *Memoir of C.T.E. Rhenius: By His Son*. London: Nisbet, 1841.

Rhoden, Nancy L., *Revolutionary Anglicanism: The Colonial Church of England Clergy During the American Revolution*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999.

Richey, Russell E. and Thomas Edward Frank, *Episcopacy in the Methodist Tradition: Perspectives and Proposals*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2004.

Richter, Manfred, "Unerledigte Anregungen Daniel Ernst Jablonskis für die Kirche und Ökumene: Ein Rückblick und Ausblick aus evangelischer Perspektive", in: *Daniel Ernst Jablonski: Religion, Wissenschaft und Politik um 1700*, ed. Joachim Bahlcke and Werner Korthaase, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008, 361-381.

Rigg, James Harrison, *Modern Anglican Theology: Chapters on Coleridge, Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, and Jowett, and on the Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*, 3rd ed. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1880.

Roberts, Richard H., "Der Stellenwert des kirchlichen Amtes im ökumenischen Gespräch aus anglikanischer Sicht unter Berücksichtigung der Leuenberger Konkordie und der Lima-Erklärung". *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 83, no. 3, 1986: 370-403.

Robinson, A.T., "The House Church and the Parish Church". *Theology* 53, no. 362, 1950: 283-289.

Robinson, Joseph Armitage [Dean of Westminster], *The Anglican Communion: What It Is. Pan-Anglican Papers SF.I.a*. London: SPCK, 1908.

Rogerson, Barry, "The Diaconate: Taking the Ecumenical Opportunity?" in: *Community - Unity - Communion: Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner*, ed. Colin Podmore, London: Church House Publishing, 1998, 204-215.

"Rome and Its Rites". Church Times no 7759, 2 December 2011, 14.

"Romish Objects: Missions of the Protestant Reformation Society". The Protestant Churchman, New Series no 10, April 1867, 148-150.

Roper, Henry Isaac, *Nonconformity in Its Present Reasons, or, Why we are Dissenters*. *Bristol Bicentenary Papers 4*. London/Bristol: John Snow/William Mack, ca. 1862.

Rowell, Geoffrey, "Anglican Identity: Historical, Ecumenical and Contemporary Reflections". *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 4, no. 18, 1996: 454-461.

Runcie, Robert, "Mary Tanner", in: *Community - Unity - Communion: Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner*, ed. Colin Podmore, London: Church House Publishing, 1998, 7-16.

Sachs, William L., *Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———, "Review of 'The Anglican Tradition: A Handbook of Sources', edited by Evans and Wright". *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 64, no. 1, 1995: 159-160.

———, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Sack, Karl Heinrich, *Ansichten und Beobachtungen über Religion und Kirche in England*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1818.

Salter, F.R., *Dissenters and Public Affairs in Mid-Victorian England*. London: Dr. William's Trust, 1967.

Sanday, William, *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism: A Reply to the Bishop of Oxford's Open Letter on the Basis of Anglican Fellowship*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1914.

Sanders, Charles Richard, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement: Studies in S.T. Coleridge, Dr. Arnold of Rugby, J.C. Hare, Thomas Carlyle and F.D. Maurice*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1942.

Santer, Mark, "The Way Forward", in: *Communion and Episcopacy: Essays to Mark the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral*, ed. Jonathan Draper, Oxford: Ripon College Cuddesdon, 1988, 107-117.

Saravia, Hadrianus, *De diversis ministrorvm evangelii gradibvs, sicvt a Domino fuerunt instituti, & traditi ab Apostolis, ac perpetuo omnium ecclesiarum usu confirmati, liber vnus: cvi duo alij additi, alter de Honore qui debetur Ecclesiarum Pastoribus, alter de Sacrilegijs & Sacrilegorum poenis*. London: Georgius Bishop & Radulphvs Nevvberie, 1590.

Sasse, Hermann, "Die Weltkonferenz für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung: Deutscher amtlicher Bericht über die Weltkirchenkonferenz zu Lausanne, 1927", Berlin: Furche-Verlag, 1929

Savage, Henry E., *The Anglican Communion: In Itself. Pan-Anglican Papers SF.I.f.* London: SPCK, 1908.

Schlink, Edmund, *Der kommende Christus und die kirchlichen Traditionen: Beiträge zum Gespräch zwischen den getrennten Kirchen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

———, "Die apostolische Sukzession". *Kerygma und Dogma* 7, no. 2, 1961: 79-114.

Schlossberg, Herbert, *Conflict and Crisis in the Religious Life of Late Victorian England*. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers, 2009.

Schmidt-Clausen, Kurt, *Vorweggenommene Einheit: Die Gründung des Bistums Jerusalem im Jahre 1841*. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1965.

Schöpsdau, Walter, "Was verlautbart Rom wie? Katholische Dokumentenkunde in der Praxis". *Materialdienst des Konfessionskundlichen Instituts Bensheim* 61, no. 3, 2010: 44-47.

Seabury, William Jones, *Memoir of Bishop Seabury*. New York/London: Edwin S. Gorham, 1908.

"A Second Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry, Presented on Behalf of the Church of England Representatives on the Joint Conference, Together with an Appended Note from the Free Churches

Members of the Joint Conference, June 19, 1925", in: *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 2, ed. George K.A. Bell, Oxford: OUP, 1930, 77-86.
Sedgwick, Timothy F., "Revising Anglican Moral Theology", in: *The Future of Anglican Theology*, ed. M. Darrol Bryant, New York/Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984, 131-141.
Seeley, John Robert, *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1883.
Seeley, Robert Benton, *Essays on the Church, By a Layman*, new ed. London: Seeley & Burnside, 1838.
Selén, Mats, *The Oxford Movement and Wesleyan Methodism in England 1833-1882: A Study in Religious Conflict*. Lund: Lund University Press, 1988.
Sell, Alan P F., *Nonconformist Theology in the Twentieth Century*. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2006.
Seville, Thomas, "Meanings of Confirmation in the Church of England", in: *Bereits erreichte Gemeinschaft und weitere Schritte: 20 Jahre nach der Meissener Erklärung: Communion Already Shared and Further Steps: 20 Years After the Meissen Declaration: Beiträge zu den Theologischen Konferenzen von Frodsham/Foxhill (2005) und Düsseldorf/Kaiserswerth (2008) zwischen der Kirche von England und der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, ed. Christopher Hill *et al.*, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 2010, 116-143.
Shall India Bow to English Idols? Church Association Tract 268. London: Church Association, 189-.
Shall Our Pulpits Be Re-opened to Non-episcopal Preachers, As At the Reformation, and For one Hundred Years Afterwards? Extracted from the Christian Observer for October and November, 1871. London: Hodgson and Son, 1871.
Shannon, R.T., "John Robert Seeley and the Idea of a National Church", in: *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark*, ed. Robert Robson, London: Bell & Sons, 1967, 236-267.
Sharp, Thomas, *The Life of John Sharp*. London: Rivington, 1825.
——— (ed), *Relation des Mesures qui furent prises dans les années 1711, 1712. et 1713. pour introduire la liturgie anglicane dans le Roiaume de Prusse et dans l'Electorat de Hanover &c.* London: Richardson/Clark, 1767.
Simpson, William John Sparrow, *The Relation of the English Church to the Non-episcopal Communions*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.
Skinner, John, *The Nature and Extent of the Apostolical Commission: A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of the Right Reverent Dr Samuel Seabury, Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, by a Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*. Aberdeen: J. Chalmers & Co, 1785. Reprint, Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 3, 1934, 3, 193-209.
———, "Preface", in: *The Early Life and Professional Years of Bishop Hobart*, ed. John McVickar, Oxford: Talboys, 1838, i-xxvii.
Slocum, Robert B., "The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral: Development in an Anglican Approach to Christian Unity". *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 33, no. 4, 1996: 471-486.
Smith, Henry (ed), *The Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem: Its Origin and Progress, From the Official Documents Published by the Command of the King of Prussia, and From Other Authentic Sources*. London: Wertheim, 1847.

Smith, Philip Vernon, *The Limits of Ritual and Ceremonial in the Anglican Communion*. London/New York/Bombat: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and Its Connection with the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and the English Church Union. Church Association Tract 217. London: Church Association, 1895.

Soper, J. Christopher, *Evangelical Christianity in the United States and Great Britain: Religious Beliefs, Political Choices*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994.

Southcott, Ernest William, "The House Church". *Theology* 56, no. 395, 1953: 167-171.

———, *The Parish Comes Alive*. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1956.

Spinks, Bryan D., "An Unfortunate Lex Orandi? Some Comments on Episcopacy Envisioned in the 1979 ECUSA Ordinal". *Journal of Anglican Studies* 2, no. 2, 2004: 58-69.

Spivey, James Travis, *Middle Way Men, Edmund Calamy, and the Crises of Moderate Nonconformity (1688-1732)*. Oxford: DPhil thesis, 1986.

Spottiswood, John, *The History of the Church and State of Scotland, Beginning the Year of our Lord 203, and Continued to the End of the Reign of King James the VI.*, 4th ed. London: R. Royston, 1677.

Spurr, John, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1991.

Stanley, Brian, "Afterword: The CMS and the Separation of Anglicanism from 'Englishness'", in: *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 344-352.

Statutes at Large [Collection of Legislative Acts].

Stead, William Thomas, "The Work of the Civic Church: A Programme in Outline". *Review of Reviews* 8, no. 9, 1893: 313-319.

Stephens, W.R.W., *The Life and Letters of Walter Farquhar Hook*. London: R. Bentley & Son, 1878.

Stephenson, Alan M.G., *Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences*. London: SPCK, 1978.

Stevenson, W. Taylor, "Lex Orandi - Lex Credendi", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 174-188.

Stillingfleet, Edward, *The Mischief of Separation: A Sermon Preach'd at Guild-Hall Chappel, May II. MDCLXXX*. London: H. Hills, 1709.

Stock, Eugene, *The History of the Church Missionary Society: Its Environment, Its Men and its Work*. London: Church Missionary Society, 1899.

Stone, Darwell, "Letter to H.W. Hill, 23 January 1914", in: *Darwell Stone: Churchman and Counsellor*, ed. F.L. Cross, London: Dacre Press, 1943, 244.

———, "Letter to J.V. Bartlet, 31 December 1911", in: *Darwell Stone: Churchman and Counsellor*, ed. F.L. Cross, London: Dacre Press, 1943, 235f.

———, "Letter to T.B. Strong, 3 May 1914", in: *Darwell Stone: Churchman and Counsellor*, ed. F.L. Cross, London: Dacre Press, 1943, 245.

Stone, Darwell and F.W. Puller, *Who are Members of the Church? A 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 Occational Papers 9*. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1921.

Stone, John S., *Memoirs of the Life of the Rt. Revd. Alexander Viets Griswold, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Eastern Diocese*. Northampton: Hopkins, Bridgman & Co, 1854.

Storr, Vernon F., *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 1800-1860*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913.

Stowe, Walter Herbert, "The Scottish Episcopal Succession and the Validity of Bishop Seabury's Orders". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 9, no. 4, 1940: 322-348.

Stranraer-Mull, Gerald, *A Church for Scotland: The Story of the Scottish Episcopal Church*. Edingburgh: Scottish Episcopal Church, 2006.

Strong, Rowan, *Anglicanism and the British Empire c.1700-1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———, *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: Religious Responses to a Modernizing Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———, "The Oxford Movement and the British Empire: Newman, Manning and the 1841 Jerusalem Bishopric", in: *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Peter Benedict Nockles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 78-98.

Strype, John, *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer, Lord Bishop of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: Wherein are Explained Many Transactions of the Church of England; and What Methods Were Then Taken to Preserve It, With Respect Both to the Papist and Puritan*, new ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821.

Stubbs, William, *The Apostolical Succession in the Church of England: A Letter to a Russian Friend*. London: Gilbert and Rivington, 1866.

———, *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum: An Attempt to Exhibit the Course of Episcopal Succession in England, From the Records and Chronicles of the Church*. Oxford: University Press., 1858.

Stubbs, William and Ernest Edward Holmes, *Visitation Charges Delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Dioceses of Chester and Oxford*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1904.

Suter, John Wallace the Elder, *Life and Letters of William Reed Huntington: A Champion of Unity*. New York/London: The Century Co, 1925.

Swainson, Charles Anthony, *The Parliamentary History of the Act of Uniformity, 13 and 14 Charles II. Cap. 4*. London/Cambridge: George Bell and Sons, 1875.

Sykes, Norman, "Archbishop Wake and Intercommunion". *Theology* 51, no. 335, 1948: 176-178.

———, *Church and State in England in the 18th Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

———, *The Church of England and Non-episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Essay Towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake*, 2nd ed. *'Theology' Occational Papers, New Series 11*. London: SPCK, 1949.

———, *Daniel Ernst Jablonski and the Church of England: A Study of an Essay Towards Protestant Union*. London: SPCK, 1950.

———, "Drawing Out the Leviathan With a Hook: An Archbishop's Fears for the Future". *Theology* 53, no. 360, 1950: 201-209.
———, "The Ideal of a National Church", in: *The Church and the Twentieth Century*, ed. George Leonard Hunton Harvey, London: Macmillan and Co., 1936, 1-49.
———, *Old Priest and New Presbyter: Episcopacy and Presbyterianism Since the Reformation With Especial Relation to the Churches of England and Scotland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
Sykes, Stephen, "Anglicanism and Protestantism", in: *England and Germany: Studies in Theological Diplomacy*, ed. Stephen Sykes, Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982, 113-127.
———, "Anglicanism and the Anglican Doctrine of the Church", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Ohio/London/Oxford, 1988, 156-177.
———, "The Genius of Anglicanism", in: *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, Wantage: Ikon, 1992, 227-241.
———, *The Integrity of Anglicanism*. London/Oxford: Mowbrays, 1978.
———, "'To the Intent that these Orders May Be Continued': An Anglican Theology of Holy Orders". *Anglican Theological Review* 78, no. 1, 1996: 48-63.
Sykes, Stephen and Sheridan Gilley, "'No Bishop, No Church!' The Tractarian Impact on Anglicanism", in: *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986, 120-139.
Synodical Government in the Church of England: A Review: The Report of the Review Group Appointed by the Standing Committee of the General Synod. London: Church House Publishing, 1997.
Talbot, Edward, "Letter to the Editors: Missions in East Africa". The Scotsman, 28 August 1913, 7.
Tanner, Mary, "The Anglican Position on Apostolic Continuity and Apostolic Succession in the Porvoo Common Statement", in: *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight: The Second Theological Conference Held under the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany*, London: Church House, 1997, 108-119.
———, "The Anglican Position on Apostolic Succession in the Porvoo Common Statement". *Louvain Studies* 21, no. 2, 1996: 114-125.
———, "The Ecumenical Future", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 379-393.
———, "The Goal of Unity in Theological Dialogues Involving Anglicans", in: *Einheit der Kirche: neue Entwicklungen und Perspektiven: Festschrift Harding Meyer*, ed. Günther Gassmann and Peder Nørgaard-Højen, Frankfurt am Main: Lembeck, 1988, 69-78.
Tavard, George H., *The Quest for Catholicity: A Study in Anglicanism*. London: Burns & Oates, 1963.
Taylor, Francis John, "The Sacred Regiment of Bishops: Towards an Anglican Definition", in: *The Office of a Bishop*, ed. M.A.C. Warren, London: Church Book Room Press, 1948, 25-31.

Taylor, Jerome, "Strong-arm Tactics vs[.] Misplaced Niceties: How the Legislation Was Sunk". The Independent no 8150, 22 November 2012, 11.
Taylor, Stephen, *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Church of England Miscellany*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999.
The Archbishops of England, "Saepius Officio (1897, English version): Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations", in: *Anglican Orders: Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae, 1896-1996*, ed. R. William Franklin and Hugh Montefiore, London: Mowbray, 1996, 138-149.
Theologos, *Shaving: A Breach of the Sabbath and a Hindrance to the Spread of the Gospel*, 2nd ed. London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1860.
Thomas, Griffith, "Bishop Gore's Open Letter". *The Churchman* 28, no. 103, 1914: 487-500.
Thomas, Philip H.E., "Doctrine of the Church", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 219-231.
———, "Unity and Concord: An Early Anglican 'Communion'". *Journal of Anglican Studies* 2, no. 1, 2004: 9-21.
Thompson, David Michael, *Where Do We Come From: The Origins of the United Reformed Church*. London: United Reformed Church, 1996.
Thompson, Robert Ellis, *The Historic Episcopate*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1910.
Thönissen, Wolfgang, "64. Arbeitstagung des Ökumenischen Arbeitskreises evangelischer und katholischer Theologen im Exerzitien- und Bildungshaus Schloss Hirschberg vom 7.-10. April 2003", in: *Das kirchliche Amt in apostolischer Nachfolge*, vol. 1, ed. Theodor Schneider and Gunther Wenz, Freiburg im Breisgau/Göttingen: Herder/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004, 68-90.
Tomlin, James, *The Anglican Communion: In Itself. Pan-Anglican Papers SF.I.d*. London: SPCK, 1908.
Tomline, George, *Elements of Christian Theology: Containing Proofs of the Authenticity and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; A Summary of the History of the Jews; A Brief Statement of the Contents of the Several Books of the Old and New Testaments; A Short Account of the English Translations of the Bible and of the Liturgy of the Church of England; A Scriptural Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion: Designed Principally for the Use of Young Students in Divinity*. London: Cadell and Davies, 1815.
Tomlinson, J.T., *The Attitude of the Church of England Towards the Ministry of Non-episcopal Churches*. *Church Association Tract 424*. London: Church Association, 1914.
Toon, Peter, *Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979.
Torrance, T.F., "The Mission of Anglicanism: 2", in: *Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism*, ed. David M. Paton, London: SCM Press, 1958, 194-208.
"Treason within the Church [I]". *Frazer's Magazine for Town and Country* 18, no. 104, 1839: 187-195.
"Treason within the Church [II]". *Frazer's Magazine for Town and Country* 18, no. 108, 1839: 751-758.
"Treason within the Church III". *Frazer's Magazine for Town and Country* 19, no. 111, 1839: 367-370.

Tucker, H.W., *The English Church in Other Lands, or: The Spiritual Expansion of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1886.
Turnbull, Richard, "The Origin of the Evangelical Movement". *Supplement to the Newsletter of Wcliffe Hall, Oxford, Hilary Term*, 2011.
Turner, H.E.W., "The Theory of Supplemental Ordination". *Theology* 52, no. 344, 1949: 44-50.
"The Unity of the Church", in: *The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letters, Together with Resolutions and Reports*, London: SPCK, 1948, part II (Reports of Committees), 40-80.
Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury (ed), *Report of the Committee on Interchange of Preachers (Anglican and Non-episcopal Communions). Report* 636. London: Church of England, 1942.
——— (ed), *Report of the Committee on Interchange of Preachers (Anglican and Non-episcopal Communions). Report* 636A. London: Church of England, 1943.
Vail, Thomas Hubbard, *The Comprehensive Church; or, Christian Unity and Ecclesiastical Union in the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 2nd ed. New York: D. Appleton & Co, 1879.
Vaisey, Harry Bevir, "'Lawful Authority': A Memorandum", in: *The Canon Law of the Church of England: Being the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law, Together with Proposals for a Revised Body of Canons*, ed. Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law, London: SPCK, 1947, 215-222.
Varley, E. A., *The Last of the Prince Bishops: William Van Mildert and the High Church Movement of the Early Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Venn, Henry, *Remarks on the Constitution and Practice of the Church Missionary Society, With Reference to Its Ecclesial Relations [Adopted by the Committee of the Society, and ... printed as an Appendix to the 39th Report]*. London: Church Missionary Society, 1839.
Vidler, A.R., *F.D. Maurice and Company: Nineteenth Century Studies*. London: SCM. Press, 1966.
———, *The Theology of F.D. Maurice*. London: SCM, 1948.
Voll, Dieter, *Hochkirchlicher Pietismus: Die Aufnahme der evangelikalen Traditionen durch die Oxford-Bewegung in der zweiten Hälfte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des neueren Anglikanismus*. München: Kaiser-Verlag, 1960.
Voß, Klaus Peter, "Freikirchen in Deutschland und die Vereinigung Evangelischer Freikirchen: Eine konfessionskundliche Einführung", in: *Rechtfertigung in freikirchlicher und römisch-katholischer Sicht*, ed. Walter Klaiber and Wolfgang Thönissen, Paderborn/Stuttgart: Bonifatius/Edition Anker, 2003, 15-23.
Wace, H., *The Anglican Communion: Its Special Position*. *Pan-Anglican Papers SF.I.g*. London: SPCK, 1908.
Wace, Henry, *The Evangelical Pastorate for Undergraduates at Oxford: [An] Address*. Oxford: Vincent, 1898.
Wainwright, Geoffrey, "Is Episcopal Succession a Matter of Dogma for Anglicans? The Evidence of Some Recent Dialogues", in: *Community - Unity - Communion: Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner*, ed. Colin Podmore, London: Church House Publishing, 1998, 164-179.

Wakefield, Gordon S., "'A Mystical Substitude for the Glorious Gospel'? A Methodist Critique of Tractarianism", in: *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986, 185-198.

Walls, Andrew, "The Evangelical Revival, The Missionary Movement, and Africa", in: *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*, ed. Mark A. Noll, D.W. Bebbington and George A. Rawlyk, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, 310-330.

Wand, J.W.C., *Anglicanism in History and Today*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1961.

Ward, Benedicta, "A Tractarian Inheritance: The Religious Life in a Patristic Perspective", in: *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference Papers*, ed. Geoffrey Rowell, London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986, 214-225.

Ward, Kevin, "The Development of Anglicanism as a Global Communion", in: *Anglicanism: A Global Communion*, ed. Andrew Wingate *et al.*, London: Mowbray, 1998, 13-22.

———, *A History of Global Anglicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Ward, Perceval, "The Difficulties of Re-union", in: *Essays on the Re-union of Christendom, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental and Anglican Communions*, ed. Frederick George Lee, London: J.T. Hayes, 1867, 88-117.

Ware, Timothy [Metropolitan Kallistos of Diokleia], *The Orthodox Church*. London: Penguin, 1997.

Warre Cornish, Francis, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Macmillan, 1910.

Watson, Edward William, *The Cathedral Church of Christ in Oxford*. London: Tuck, 1935.

Watts, Duncan, *Tories, Conservatives and Unionists 1815-1914*. *Access to History*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1994.

Webster, A.B., "Church Order and Reunion in the Nineteenth Century", in: *The Historic Episcopate in the Fullness of the Church: Seven Essays by Priests of the Church of England*, ed. Kenneth M. Carey, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954, 84-104.

Webster, John, "Ministry and Priesthood", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 285-231.

Wellings, Martin, *Evangelicals Embattled: Responses of Evangelicals in the Church of England to Ritualism, Darwinism and Theological Liberalism 1890-1930*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.

Welsby, Paul A., "'A Bishop's Book'?" *Theology* 53, no. 362, 1950: 303f.

———, *A History of the Church of England 1945-1980*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Wendebourg, Dorothea, "Das Amt und die Ämter". *Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht* 45, 2000: 5-38.

Wenz, Gunther, "Die Einheit der Vielen: Erwägungen zum Amtstext des Limadokuments aus der Perspektive lutherischer Theologie", in: *Kirchengemeinschaft - Anspruch und Wirklichkeit: Festschrift für Georg*

Kretschmar zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. Wolf-Dieter Hauschildt, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1986, 275-295.
Werner, Hermann, "Anglikanische Unionsbestrebungen". *Lutherische Monatshefte* 2, no. 1, 1963: 27-32.
———, "Die apostolische Sukzession im anglikanischen Amtsbegriff". *Lutherische Monatshefte* 4, 1976: 593-603.
Weston, Frank, "The Bishop of Hereford's Appointments: Important Declaration by the Bishop of Zanzibar". Church Times no 2723, 1 April 1915, 365.
———, *The Case Against Kikuyu: A Study in Vital Principles*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1914.
———, *Ecclesia Anglicana: For What Does She Stand? An Open Letter to Edgar, Bishop of St Albans*. London/New York, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co., 1914.
———, *The Holy Sacrifice: A Short Manual of Worship and Prayer for Use at the Holy Communion Service*. London: Methuen and Co., 1898.
———, *Proposals for a Central Missionary Council of Episcopal and Non-Episcopal Churches in East Africa*. London: Longmans, Gree & Co, 1914.
White, Gavin, "The Consecration of Bishop Seabury". *The Scottish Historical Review* 63, no. 1, 1984: 37-49.
White, William, *The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered*. Philadelphia: David C. Claypoole, 1782.
Whyte, William, "The Church: 'Appalling, Yet Wonderful'". Church Times no 7643, 11 September 2009, 19f.
Wilberforce, Samuel, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America*, 2nd ed. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1846.
Wilken, Robert L., *The Myth of Christian Beginnings: History's Impact on Belief*. London: SCM Press, 1971.
Williams, Isaac, "The Church in England", in: *Thoughts in Past Years*, Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1838, 262-264.
Williams, Peter, "'Not Transplanting': Henry Venn's Strategic Vision", in: *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799-1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Richmond, Surrey: Eerdmans Publishing/Curzon Press, 2000, 147-172.
Williams, Rowan, "Address at the Joint Church of England and United Reformed Church Service of Reconciliation and Commitment, Held at Westminster Abbey". Lambeth Palace Press Office, 7 February 2012.
Williams, Thomas Jay, *Priscilla Lydia Sellon: The Restorer After Three Centuries of the Religious Life in the English Church*, Revised ed. London: SPCK, 1965.
Willis, John Jamieson, "The Kikuyu Conference, 1913", in: *Towards a United Church, 1913-1947*, ed. J.J. Willis *et al.*, London: Edinburgh House Press, 1947, 17-51.
———, *The Kikuyu Conference: A Study in Christian Unity: Together with the Proposed Scheme of Federation Embodied in the Resolutions of Conference*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913.
Wilson, Daniel, *A Defence of the Church Missionary Society Against the Objections of the Rev. Josiah Thomas*, 3rd ed. London: Wilson, 1818.
Wilson, H.A., "The Church of England and Episcopacy: A Reply to Canon A.J. Mason". *The Churchman* 28, no. 107, 1914: 823-834.

———, *Episcopacy and Unity: A Historical Inquiry Into the Relations Between the Church of England and the Non-episcopal Churches*. London: Longman, Green and Co., 1912.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé, *The Victorian Tragedy*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1930.

Wolf, William J., "Frederick Denison Maurice", in: *The Spirit of Anglicanism: Hooker, Maurice, Temple,* ed. William J. Wolf, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982, 49-98.

Wolffe, John, "Anti-Catholicism and Evangelical Identity in Britain and the United States, 1830-1860", in: *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990,* ed. Mark A. Noll, D.W. Bebbington and George A. Rawlyk, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, 179-197.

"Women Bishops: 'Little Silver Balls Won't Stay in Their Holes'". Church Times no 7789, 29 June 2012, 2.

Women in Ministry: A Study: Report of the Working Party Set Up Jointly by the Ministry Committee of the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry and the Council for Women's Ministry in the Church. London: Church Information Office, 1968.

Woodhouse-Hawkins, Michelle, "Maurice, Huntington, and the Quadrilateral: An Exploration in Historical Theology", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Ohio/London/Oxford, 1988, 61-78.

Woodhouse, H.F., *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603*. London: SPCK, 1954.

Woodruff, Mark, "Anglican Orders - Recognised or Received?" *The Messenger of the Catholic League*, no. 292, 2010: 77-100.

Woods, Frank Theodore, *The Prayer Book Revised: An Introduction to the Book Referred to in the Prayer Book Measure, and Approved by the Convocations on March 29, 1927, For Submission to the Church Assembly and to Parliament*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927.

Woods, Frank Theodore, Frank Weston and Martin Linton Smith, *Lambeth and Reunion: An Interpretation of the Mind of the Lambeth Conference of 1920*. London/New York: SPCK, 1921.

Woolverton, John Frederick, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984.

———, "Huntington's Quadrilateral: A Critical Study". *Church History* 39, no. 2, 1970: 198-211.

———, "W.R. Huntington: Liturgical Renewal and Church Unity in the 1880's". *Anglican Theological Review* 48, no. 2, 1966: 175-199.

———, *William Reed Huntington and Church Unity: The Historical and Theological Background of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral*. New York: PhD thesis, Columbia University, 1963.

Wordsworth, Charles, *Ecclesiastical Union Between England and Scotland: A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Lambeth Conference, July 1888*. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1888.

———, *The Lambeth Conference and Church Reunion: A Charge Delivered at the Annual Synod of the United Diocese of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, at St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth, on Wednesday, Aug. 29, 1888*. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1889.

Wordsworth, John, *The National Church of Sweden: The Hale Lectures, 1910*. London: Mowbray, 1911.
"The Work of the Protestant Reformation Society, and the Anti-ritualistic Movement". The Protestant Churchman, New Series no 10, April 1867, 145-147.
World Council of Churches (ed), *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. *Faith and Order Paper* 111. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982.
——— (ed), *Episkopé and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective: A Consultation Convened by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches*. *Faith and Order Paper* 102. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1980.
——— (ed), *Meeting of the Commission on Faith and Order: Held at the Mensah Sarbah Hall, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana, July 23-August 4, 1974: Minutes and Documents*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1974.
——— (ed), *One Baptism, One Eucharist, and a Mutually Recognized Ministry: Three Agreed Statements*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1975.
Wright, J. Robert, "Anglicanism, Ecclesia Anglicana, and Anglican: An Essay on Terminology", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 424-429.
———, "Heritage and Vision: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral", in: *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1886/88-1986/88*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Ohio/London/Oxford, 1988, 8-46.
———, "The Oxford Movement and the American Church", in: *Lift High the Cross: The Oxford Movement Sesquicentennial*, ed. J. Robert Wright, Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1983, 82-110.
Wrogemann, Henning, "Ökumene in der Perspektive einer Theorie der Toleranz - Vom Umgang mit konkurrierenden religiösen Wahrheitsansprüchen aus toleranztheoretischer Sicht", in: *Ökumenische Konzeptionen und Perspektiven*, ed. Udo Hahn and Hans Krech, Hannover: VELKD, 2007, 41-75.
Wykes, David L., "Religious Dissent, the Church, and the Repeal of the Occational Conformity and Schism Acts, 1714-19", in: *Religion, Politics and Dissent, 1660-1832: Essays in Honour of James E. Bradley*, ed. James E. Bradley, Robert D. Cornwall and William Gibson, Farnham: Ashgate, 2010, 165-183.
Yates, Nigel, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain, 1830-1910*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
———, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican churches 1600-1900*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
———, *The Oxford Movement and Anglican Ritualism*. Oxford: Davenant Press, 2000.
Yates, T.E., "Anglicans and Mission", in: *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John E. Booty, London/Philadelphia: SPCK/Fortress Press, 1988, 429-441.
———, "The Idea of a 'Missionary Bishop' in the Spread of the Anglican Communion in the Nineteenth Century". *Journal of Anglican Studies* 2, no. 1, 2004: 52-61.
———, *Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad: The Missionary Policies of Henry Venn and Their Repercussions Upon the Anglican Episcopate of the*

Colonial Period 1841-1872. Uppsala/London: Swedish Institute of Missionary Research/SPCK, 1978.

Yeo, Geoffrey, "A Case Without Parallel: The Bishops of London and the Anglican Church Overseas, 1660-1748". *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44, no. 3, 1993: 450-475.

Yule, George, *A Critique of the Working Paper by Prof. Henry Chadwick: 'Full Communion with Other Episcopal Churches'*: World Alliance of Reformed Churches: Department of Theology, ca. 1980.