

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

The Kikuyu Pronouncements.

WHILE we are profoundly thankful that the Archbishop's judgment gives at least a qualified approval of the main proposals of the Kikuyu Federation Scheme, which were so violently assailed by the Bishop of Zanzibar, yet as Churchmen we recognize that the opinions and mere assertions of even a Primate or of an eminent body of Bishops cannot of themselves alter the real teaching of our Church on any subject. We are careful to receive these statements with the respectful consideration due to their author's exalted positions, but unless they are supported by good and sufficient evidence we are not necessarily bound to regard them as conclusive or as carrying legal authority.

Therefore, when the Consultative Committee tells us that for Churchmen, isolated from their own communion in the mission-field, to communicate in a non-Episcopal Church "is inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England," we are entitled to examine the authorized teaching, as well as the past history and practice, of our Church to discover whether such a statement will bear the test of such examination. In other words, we refuse to believe, simply on the unsupported "dicta" of a few individual Bishops, that our Church teaches her members to refrain from obeying her Lord's dying command and to neglect thus a precious means of grace where there is a godly, even though non-Episcopal, minister of Christ prepared to administer it. Let us then appeal to facts!

We are a Reformed Church, so we will naturally begin by consulting the attitudes and opinions of our chief Reformers—the men, be it remembered, who compiled the very formularies we now use. We may safely say that it is not at all likely that Cranmer, the man who was mainly responsible for drawing up our present Liturgy, would have condemned a non-Episcopal administration of the Sacrament, since he himself laboured earnestly to secure "one common harmony of faith and

doctrine" between the Anglican and Continental non-Episcopal Reformers, and also welcomed to Divinity Chairs at our Universities such prominent foreign Reformers as Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and Paul Fagius! It is also certain that the leading Elizabethan Bishops who rejoiced, as Bishop Jewel declared, that the English Church did not differ from the doctrines of the Swiss Reformed Churches "by a nail's breadth," must have often, while in exile abroad, gathered round the Lord's Table with their Swiss brethren, by whom they were so hospitably entertained. Bishop Horn's assertion that "they held throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrines as the Swiss"¹ was fully demonstrated in 1581 by the compilation of a "Harmony of the Confessions of Faith" of all Protestant Churches, including, on behalf of the English Church, Jewel's famous "Apology"; and Bishop Andrewes later on appealed to this "Harmony" to convince Cardinal Bellarmine that the English and all the Reformed Churches held "one faith."² Bishop Vaughan of London in 1604, in gladly accepting the patronage of the French congregations, had also declared them "to be of the same faith with our own."³

That these were no formal professions is evident when we remember that throughout Elizabeth's reign Calvin's "Institutes" were regarded as the recognized text-book at both our Universities, while Convocation had ordered Bullinger's "Decades" to be studied by every incumbent below the degree of M.A. Again in 1607 Archbishop Bancroft's chaplain wrote his exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles with the express purpose of demonstrating by a careful comparison of the teaching of each Article with the "Harmony of Reformed Confessions," "that they were agreeable both to the Word of God and to the extant Confessions of all neighbour Churches Christianly reformed."⁴

It is scarcely possible that our Church *then* could have

¹ "Zurich Letters," pp. 100, 135.

² "Responsio ad Bellarminum," p. 36 (1851).

³ Strype's "Annals," vol. iv., p. 394.

⁴ Rogers, "The Catholic Doctrine of Church of England," pp. 2, 24.

endorsed the opinion of the Consultative Committee that a "united" Communion service is "subversive of Church order" when Peter du Moulin, a celebrated French divine, tells us, in defending his own Reformed Confession as in harmony with the English discipline, that "we assemble with the English in their churches we participate together in the holy supper of our Lord; the doctrine of their Confession is wholly agreeable to ours."¹ We know also that the learned Archbishop Usher expressed his willingness, if abroad, to communicate with both the Dutch and French Reformed Churches²; and that Bishop Hall declared about the same time that "the Church of England accords in every point of doctrine with her sisters of the Reformation, without the least variation."³

This close doctrinal harmony and real fellowship with foreign "Presbyterian" divines proves at least that although our Reformers retained episcopacy as Scriptural, practically expedient, and as the most ancient and catholic form of Church polity, they could not have regarded it as a *necessary* note of a true Church and valid ministry. Cranmer, indeed, describes as "gross ignorance" "and arrogant boldness" the Popish contention that "no Church could be the true Church of God" but that standing by "the ordinary succession of Bishops in such pompous and glorious sort as now is seen";⁴ while Hooper declared that the Church was "not bound to any ordinary succession of Bishops or priests" longer than they taught "the doctrine contained in the Scripture."⁵

There can, therefore, be no question that the careful and judicious scheme of co-operation with non-Episcopal Missionary Churches approved by Bishops Willis and Peel is far more in accord with these known principles and attitude of our Reformers than is the Bishop of Winchester's definition of the Church of England as a kind of isolated *tertium quid* "standing

¹ Quoted Bingham's Works, vol. viii., p. 32 (1829).

² Elrington's "Life of Usher," pp. 258, 260.

³ Works, vol. v., p. 56 (1811).

⁴ Cranmer's "Remains," p. 11 (P.S.).

⁵ "Early Writings," p. 81.

midway between Rome and Protestant Christendom.”¹ The Act of 1570, for instance, whatever its design, was certainly interpreted and employed to permit foreign non-Episcopal divines to exercise their ministry in our Church *without re-ordination*, by merely subscribing the Articles. For this Act to supply the churches “with pastors of sound religion” declared that every person who “pretended to be a priest or minister of God’s Holy Word and Sacraments, by reason of any *other form* of institution, consecration, or ordering” than the forms set forth by authority under Edward VI. and Elizabeth “should declare his assent and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion.”²

There is, moreover, absolutely conclusive proof that the *Tulchane* or titular Bishops existing in the Scotch Church in 1603 were merely Parliamentary officials in *Presbyterian orders only*, and that, therefore, Canon 55 in exhorting us to pray for the Churches of England, *Scotland*, and Ireland, “*distinctly recognized a Church possessing only Presbyterian orders as a branch of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church.*” This clear testimony to the validity of Presbyterian orders was further affirmed when Archbishop Bancroft refused to re-ordain as “deacons and priests” the ministers who were consecrated as Bishops for the Scotch Church in 1610, on the ground that “where Bishops could not be had” Presbyterian ordination “must be esteemed lawful”; otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.³ Bishop Morton, a little later on, also similarly refused the Archbishop of Spalato’s request to re-ordain a foreign Reformed divine who was to minister in England, maintaining “that it could not be done but to the scandal of the Reformed Churches in which he would have no hand” since ordination was “the *jus antiquum* of presbyters.”⁴

Besides the sufficient testimony of such representative Churchmen as Lord Chancellor Clarendon, Bishops Burnet, Cosin,

¹ At the Edinburgh Conference, 1910.

² Prothero, “Statutes and Const. Documents,” p. 64 (1894).

³ Spotiswood, “History of the Church of Scotland,” book vii., p. 514.

⁴ Neal, “History of the Puritans,” vol. ii., p. 353.

and Fleetwood, that these foreign Reformed clergy were given cures of souls in England without further ordination, and were therefore *required* as part of their ministerial duties to administer the Communion to Episcopalians, we have well attested individual examples of this practice. Wittinghame, an Englishman, ordained at Geneva, was Dean of Durham for years, while Archbishop Grindal's licence to John Morrison, the Scotch Presbyterian divine, to exercise his ministry "throughout the Province of Canterbury" is still preserved.¹ We find further that many French Reformed clergy ministered in English Churches in the Channel Isles without re-ordination.²

It may, of course, be urged that the new rule enacted in 1662, enforcing the necessity of episcopal ordination for all clergy ministering in our Church, completely changed this previous friendly intercourse and fellowship; but there is good evidence to show that this new departure was not aimed at *the Continental Reformed divines at all*, and it is *these*, and not the English "Separatists" at the time, who afford a parallel case to any co-operation with non-Episcopal Missions in heathen lands to-day. It is fairly obvious that the new requirement in 1662 was designed as a *domestic* rule, involving a somewhat natural, if vindictive, act of retaliation towards the English Separatists for the sufferings which the Anglicans had endured under the Commonwealth régime. For in this connection we must carefully bear in mind that, *at this time*, practically all the Reformed Churches believed firmly in the intolerant tenet of allowing *one and only one* form of national worship and discipline. In other words, the victorious Anglicans in 1662 determined that this *cujus regio ejus religio* principle should henceforth be rigorously enforced. For we must also remember that the English "Sec-taries" had always been regarded as wilful schismatics from the national religion, and thus as on a totally different footing to the foreign non-Episcopal clergy, since they deliberately neglected episcopacy where it could be had. This universal application

¹ Strype, "Life of Grindal," p. 402.

² See Hole's "Church History," p. 278.

of an exclusive State form of worship did not, therefore, necessarily, involve any fresh theory of the *essential* value of episcopacy. Nay, more, it seems evident that no such new theory could have been intended when we remember that several of the very men who laid down the rule concerning episcopal ordination in 1662 had themselves acted, while in exile, as *ministers* of the Reformed "Presbyterian" Churches.¹ We know for a fact that Bishop Cosin, one of the revisers in 1662, did not consider it contrary to "the principles of the Church of England" for exiled Anglicans, deprived of the ministrations of their own communion, to partake of the Sacrament in a non-Episcopal church; for when in France he definitely gave this advice to a friend, and also urged all his fellow-Churchmen "to acknowledge and join in communion" with the Huguenot Churches, and "make no schism between our churches and theirs," even though "we approve not some defects that may be seen among them."² He apparently desired also our Church to possess a permanent declaration of this close relationship, for during the revision of the Prayer-Book he actually proposed that a new preface to the Confirmation service should definitely state that the English Church was "by the grace of God numbered among the Reformed Churches."³ Moreover, it is not always remembered that a special clause in the Act of Uniformity (1662) had exempted the members of the foreign Reformed Churches in England from the penalties imposed on English non-Episcopal ministers presuming to celebrate the Lord's Supper in the parish churches.⁴ Dean Henson also cites Dr. Sprott's assertion that a French Reformed divine was after 1662, admitted to a benefice in Kent without *re-ordination*;⁵ and we know that the committee of Bishops and eminent divines at the "Jerusalem Chamber" Conference in 1689 proposed as one of the terms of their "Comprehension" Scheme, that

¹ Cf. Henson, "Relation of the Church of England to other Reformed Churches," p. 54; and Mason, "Church of England and Episcopacy," p. 170.

² Cosin, Works, ii., p. 337.

³ Cosin, "Correspondence," part ii., p. 69.

⁴ Gee and Hardy, p. 610.

⁵ Cf. Henson, U.S., p. 70.

foreign Reformed divines should be allowed to minister in England without further ordination.¹ Archbishop Bramhall indignantly denied that Anglican divines desired "to unchurch" the foreign Reformed Churches; and Archbishop Sharp declared his willingness when abroad to communicate with them.

There is a striking illustration of this close alliance and harmony with the foreign Reformed Churches to be found in the learned Joseph Bingham's remarkable treatise entitled "The Apology of the French Church for the Church of England," published in 1706. For appealing to the Huguenot refugees not to associate themselves with the English Separatists, Bingham compares the authorized Confessions of the English and French Reformed Churches, and affirms that by joining with the Anglican Church the French Protestants will maintain *all their own* principles of Church discipline and government; since the *different* customs were "not of that moment as to authorize any man to make a separation." "Our Articles and Homilies," he declares, "contain no other doctrine but what is publicly taught in the Articles and Homilies of the French Church."²

Although from varying causes there was less intercourse between the English and Continental Churches during the eighteenth century, there are sufficient illustrations to prove that the same amicable relationship was maintained. Even as recently as 1841 the scheme for a joint Lutheran and Anglican bishopric of Jerusalem furnishes evidence that there was still the same desire to maintain this close affinity; since its unfriendly reception by a section of Anglican clergy only served to demonstrate the violently changed sentiment which the Tractarian movement was producing. Even after this date, however, Archbishop Sumner asserted that he did not imagine "that two Bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty," would deny the validity of Scotch presbyterian ordinations,³ a statement which the present Primate would certainly not be

¹ Birch, "Life of Tillotson," p. 168.

² Bingham's Works, vol. ix., pp. x, xi (1829).

³ Cf. Blakeney's "Interpretation of the Prayer-Book," p. 592.

able to corroborate! Not only, therefore, do the official acts and past history of our Church give no shadow of support to the amazing assertion of the Bishop of Zanzibar that "the very existence" of non-Episcopal communities is "hostile to Christ's Holy Church,"¹ but surely they also contradict the decision of the Consultative Committee, that "it is not consistent with the principles of the Church of England" for our own members, temporarily isolated from their own communion, to communicate in a non-Episcopal church? Neither can we find any justification for their condemnation of occasional "united" communions, as "subversive of Church order"; for, as the Bishop of Durham recently declared, if such intercommunion be pronounced heretical "a new epoch of vital importance will enter into the history of the Church of England. It will be officially avowed for the first time that we have no part or lot with the non-Episcopal churches."²

Surely the most practical and convincing evidence, especially in the midst of heathenism and Mohammedanism, of the real spiritual unity that exists between the different members of "Christ's Holy Catholic Church"—*i.e.*, "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world,"³ is their joint occasional or periodic participation in that one service which is both a "sacrament of their redemption" and the best "sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one toward another"! It is impossible to imagine that the cause of Christian reunion can be advanced on the one-sided and apparently uncharitable basis of the sufficiency of our own Sacramental communion for non-Episcopalians, but the insufficiency of theirs for ourselves!

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

¹ "Open Letter," p. 12.

² Letter to *The Times*, December 12, 1913.

³ Bidding Prayer.

