of *his* side of the matter. He is expected to follow with a glad mind the admonitions of his seniors. This, in one sense, is sound enough, for he is responsible only for his side of the question and therefore can only accept responsibility on that plane. It is also true, however, that relationships cannot be ideal unless both sides (vicar and curate) know their mutual responsibilities. Obviously a high standard of loyalty and understanding is called for. In answering this question the would-be priest pledges himself in advance never to become the centre of a " curate's party ". The temptation to-day is all too easy and sometimes presents itself in very subtle ways. The new curate usually has youth, keenness and attractiveness on his side. He is straight from College and has all the latest ecclesiastical and theological ideas in his armoury. The vicar may be tired, frustrated, disappointed and cynical. Under such circumstances it is all too easy for well meaning lay people to rally round the curate and to give him quite a wrong sense of his own importance.

It will be seen that although the present situation is widely different from that contemplated in 1550, the questions of the Ordinal raise matters which no clergyman of 1950 can afford to ignore.

Church and State and Present Day Problems

By The Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., D.D., F.R.Hist.S.

TO understand fully the " city " of to-day we must know something of the " town " of yesterday since usually the present is based largely on the past. Similarly it is impossible to deal intelligently with Church and State *to-day* without a short retrospect on Church and State *yesterday*. We must not forget that the English Church is older than the English State. While England was still divided into what was called the Heptarchy there was already one single English Church, and this actually paved the way for a united English nation. For the English nation was formed under the fostering care of the English Church, and centuries before the Conquest Church and State worked together in the closest co-operation. Leading churchmen were usually also statesmen who administered justice on clergy and people alike in the courts of the land. It was a bad day when William I altered this harmonious fellowship by setting up seperate Church Courts. It led to inevitable friction between Church and State because these Church Courts administered, not English Statute Law, but Roman Canon Law with a final appeal to the papal and not to the king's Court. The English bishops had also to take an oath of fealty to the Pope which might and often did conflict with their allegiance to the Crown.

This dual position soon challenged the supremacy of the Crown, with the result that strong churchmen like Anselm and Becket wished

to obey the Pope rather than the King; and this serious contest between King and Pope went on intermittently, but often fiercely, for several centuries till it reached its climax when the Pope refused to annul Henry VIII's marriage with Catherine of Aragon in order to facilitate his marriage with Anne Boleyn. But Henry was not the man to be dictated to by a "Totalitarian" Church and so he determined to be "Master in his own house". He therefore repudiated the Pope's temporal claims over the Church and proclaimed himself "the only supreme Head in earth of the Church of England". Before this time every ordinand had to swear allegiance to the Pope; now this bold action of Henry's created the closest alliance of Church and State which has persisted to this day. But we should be careful to remember that this drastic step did not affect *doctrine*, because Henry, as Bishop Hooper said, had "destroyed the Pope but not popery". In fact, he accepted all the medieval Catholic doctrines, and for his specific condemnation of Luther's opinions the Pope had bestowed on Henry the proud title of "Defender of the Faith".

But this Royal Supremacy at once created an Erastian subjection of the Church to the State. The clergy could no longer enact any Church laws or canons without the King's consent. Instead of being the "Pope's men" they now became the "King's men". Moreover, the Pope could no longer fleece the English clergy by papal procurations, or by selling justice, or by farming English benefices by papal "Provisions"; while *Annates* or First Fruits of benefices had now to be paid to the King instead of the Pope. Bishops were also to be chosen by the King's *Congé d'élire* to the Cathedral Chapter and not by the Pope. Ecclesiastical Appeals were to be decided by the King in a royal Court of "Delegates of Appeal" and not to be taken to Rome. Such, in a short outline, was the *legal* or *political* aspect of the Reformation Settlement of Church and State. Before this revolution the Pope had tyrannised over the clergy by exhorbitant fees and dues, and the clergy over the laity through the priests' exclusive claim to offer propitiatory sacrifices in the Mass and to direct their lives and conduct through the confessional. Now the Crown and even the Parliament claimed the right to order and settle the doctrine and worship of the Church, and it was the Parliament through its Acts which put forth the first English Prayer Book of 1549 and the 42 Articles of Religion which it enforced. In other words, the laity through King and Parliament had revolted against the previous papal and clerical thraldom and thus a truly National Church emerged which was State governed and controlled. The ancient Convocations of the clergy still retained their right to legislate for the Church, but all such legislation had to be authorised by the Crown through an Act of Parliament.

I

What we may call the *liturgical* aspect of Church and State was carried out by the State through Acts of Uniformity (and not by the Convocations), enforcing the exclusive use of a liturgy in which all the services were in *English* and not as before in Latin, which few people then understood. All the medieval superstitious ceremonies were

abolished because " they did more confound and darken than set forth Christ's benefits to us ". For, as Cranmer well expressed it, " Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law, but a Religion to serve God not in bondage of figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit ". The Reformers put forth a Prayer Book in which " nothing was to be read but the very pure Word of God, or that which is agreeable to the same ". Everything untrue, vain or superstitious was carefully excluded. There is no need to emphasise what a valuable aid the Book of Common Prayer has been in building up the spiritual life of the English people for the last four centuries. John Wesley declared that he " knew no liturgy in the world which breathes more of solid Scriptural rational piety than the Common Prayer of England".

But undoubtedly the most important aspect of the Church and State Settlement of Religion was the *doctrinal*. The Reformers aimed at restoring the primitive purity of the Catholic Faith. And they achieved this by authorising, again through Acts of Parliament, their Confession of Faith, the thirty-nine Articles of Religion, described by Prebendary Rogers, its first Commentator, as " the Catholic doctrine of the Church of England ". They were determined to reject what Cranmer called " the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, and the real Presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, and the oblation of Christ made in it by the priest for the salvation of quick and dead ". They rejected this teaching because it could not be justified by their final appeal to Scripture, which was the foundation of their " protest " against Romish errors. I cannot refrain here, in passing, from condemning the ignorant misuse of the word " Protestant " as though it were the opposite of " Catholic ", since the Protestant is the truest Catholic because he witnesses *for* the orthodox Catholic Faith of the ancient Creeds.

The union of Church and State thus consummated by the assertion of the Royal Supremacy over the Church by Henry VIII led in the next reign to the authorisation by the State of a *national religion* which was definitely Protestant and Reformed. We must carefully remember, also, that at this time there was no belief in toleration of different forms of religious faith in *one* State. The principle of nationality was being asserted everywhere, and so it was " one State, one religion ". Consequently every member of the Commonwealth was, as Hooker asserted, automatically a member of the National Church. Dissent was treated as sedition, dangerous to the safety of the State. Such was the position of Church and State down to 1689.

But then a great change was effected by the Toleration Act of that year which destroyed this exclusive theory, because it legalised and " established " nonconformist worship. Dissenters were no longer *in law* churchmen or bound by Church laws and regulations. For instance, the Church rule " that none may be admitted to Communion unless he be confirmed ", no longer applied to a nonconformist as he was not a member of the National Church. Consequently an Occasional Conformity Act had to be passed in 1711 which tried to prevent nonconformists from communicating in the parish churches : yet *not* by definitely forbidding them to receive the sacrament in their parish church but by heavily fining them if during the same year they

dared to attend a conventicle! But although "contracting out" was legalised, the union of Church and State continued, although it was no longer a united, comprehensive "Church-State", but rather a close liaison or partnership of the Church and Realm.

It was in 1689 that the Bill of Rights declared that "it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince". The Bill of Rights also imposed a Coronation Oath on the Sovereign, who has to swear to maintain "the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law". This "Protestant Reformed Religion" was "established" and expressed in the 1662 Prayer Book which was enforced by the State. It can be shortly summarised positively by Article VI, "that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation", and by Article XI that "we are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith and not for our own works or deservings", as well as by the question to the priest at his ordination: "Are you determined to teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?" In other words, "Protestant" Christianity is Bible Christianity, and this is what the State now regards as "the true profession of the Gospel"—a religion based on the Bible and the Gospel of Christ as set forth in the New Testament. This is certainly what we specially need to-day so that people may learn to love their neighbours as themselves, to keep the Ten Commandments, do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with their God. For the acid test of any Gospel is its power to convert evil livers into good livers.

Again, this partnership of Church and State is emphasised by the further question to the priest to "give faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded and as this Church and *Realm* hath received the same". It is worth remembering that it was only in 1662 that the word "Church" was included in this Question. Previously it read, "As this Realm hath received the same", since actually the earlier revisions had never received the official assent of the Convocations.

II

This short historical retrospect sufficiently shows how the Church and State of *yesterday* affects the Church and State of *to-day*. There are still few churchmen who cannot recall the very heated controversy over the Revised Prayer Book in 1927-8 and the indignation of many that this Prayer Book was defeated in Parliament by the votes of *nonconformists*, who, so they asserted, had no business to interfere in a "purely Church question". But such criticism was really ignorant and ill-informed, because so long as the present union of Church and State continues, nonconformists have an equal right to decide what the national worship of "this Protestant Kingdom" is to be. The State, although authorising it, has no wish to dictate the doctrine or worship of the Church of England, but it does rightly insist that if the Church wishes to retain its historic State connection and privileges it must persuade and convince its "partner", the Realm, that any

alteration it desires in its doctrine and worship is consonant with what the Realm can accept as "the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant reformed Religion". This was the extent and burden of its inquiry in 1927-8. To get complete freedom to alter its doctrinal standards as it likes, the Church will almost certainly have to dissolve its age-long association with the State and cease to be an integral part of a Christian State, continuing merely as a Christian Church in a secular or pagan society.

This brings us to the crucial controversial question, What is the value of the present Church and State union? How does it affect the solution of our present day problems? In other words, would disestablishment help the cause of the Gospel in this land? What, in short, does "Establishment" involve? Lord Selborne described it as "the State recognizing and adding certain sanctions to the institutions and laws of the Church". We should remember that Establishment was never formally achieved by one single Act. Church and State *grew* as a unity through the centuries. They were two aspects of the united community; so Establishment in England stands for the spiritual or religious aspect of the State itself and is not merely the secular State *recognizing* religion. It also carries with it the authorization of a Scriptural worship which, as we have seen, the King as "Supreme Governor" of the Church solemnly promises to maintain. It means that the Realm has received the "Protestant Reformed Religion" as *its* teaching and not merely as that of the Church which compiled it. It is "as this Church and *Realm* hath received the same". If the national authorization of this worship ceased it would be a serious blow to Scriptural religion since it stands for a corporate National Religion, to the ethical principles of which the State is expected to conform.

But it is often urged that Establishment involves serious restrictions on the rightful liberties of the Church and that it brings the Church into bondage, since the clergy cannot *legally* vary the services so as to make them more popular and attractive. The cry is for more liberty of action, and many incumbents are illegally taking it and introducing not only 'fancy' services but Romanising ritual and ceremonial and producing liturgical anarchy and chaos. This unhappy situation has stimulated the serious attempt of the Church Self Government League to secure a form of Establishment like that enjoyed by the Church of Scotland, i.e. a nominal State recognition of religion which allows complete freedom to the Church in *spiritual* matters. It is pertinently asked, "If this is possible in Scotland, why not in England?" The Church and State Report (1935) cites the Church of Scotland Act, 1921, as evidence that "a complete freedom is not incompatible with Establishment" (p. 56). But this Report frankly admits that the Scottish Settlement cannot be taken "as an exact model for what should be done in England". The differences between the two Churches are very considerable. For the Scottish Reformation was achieved by the *laity*—the Lords of the Congregation, with John Knox, defeating the Medieval Church party under Mary of Guise and the French. But most important of all, the laity secured an *equal* voice with the clergy in deciding *doctrine* and worship, and they really

controlled both Church and Crown. On the other hand in England, Henry VIII controlled the Church through Parliament, and the laity had no voice in Church questions except through Parliament. Moreover, the Scottish Church is governed by " Articles Declaratory " set forth in its Constitution, and these include a belief not only in the Trinity and the Incarnation and the Bible as the supreme Rule of Faith, but also the acceptance of the Scottish Reformation, the Westminster Confession, the Directory and Presbyterian government with the congregations electing the ministers. But in England the laity still have very little voice in Church matters because the Church Assembly does not adequately represent the laity. " That we represent the laity as a whole is simply not a fact " (Lewis Dibden). So Establishment in England on the lines of the Church of Scotland (i.e. the Church *alone* settling her doctrine and worship) would in practice rule out the voice of the laity through Parliament and leave far more power in the hands of the Bishops.

Consequently, however ideal in *theory* " a Free Church in a Free State " appears, in *practice* disestablishment would be a most serious blow to the cause of Evangelical truth in England because the existing union of Church and Realm does safeguard the " Protestant Reformed Religion " as expressed in the Prayer Book and the 39 Articles. For sadly as churchgoing has declined in recent years it is still true to say that the worship of the parish churches largely moulds the religion of the people. Dr. Henry Townsend declares that the controversial " tension in the Church of England does not contribute to the conversion of England " (*The Claims of Free Churches*, p. 251). But this " tension " would certainly not be healed by dissolving the connection between Church and State. For if disestablishment were achieved, sacerdotalism and a sacerdotal religion would soon be supreme in most parish churches and the Church of England would be in grave danger of becoming little more than an Anglo-Catholic sect like the Church of the Province of South Africa. For the Revised Prayer Book, which at present has neither legal nor canonical authority, could at once be passed, and this would probably so outrage the consciences of numbers of devout Churchpeople as to thus create a schism which would be a serious blow to the cause of Reunion. Free Churchmen often assert that the union of Church and State is a hindrance to Home Reunion, although the Establishment in Scotland presented no difficulty in 1929 to reunion with the United Free Church ! In any case, this ' hurdle ' could be entirely avoided, as the Bishop of Lichfield suggests (*How Stands Reunion* ? p. 31), if the Archbishop of Canterbury's 1946 Proposal for securing full *intercommunion* with the Free Churches were accepted.

III

It was prophesied at the time that Welsh Disestablishment would not only give freedom to the Welsh Church but would produce closer and more harmonious relations with Welsh Free Churchmen. This forecast has not been realised. Instead, the great majority of the Churches have been captured by the Anglo-Catholics and patronage is

now in the hands of Diocesan Boards which are predominantly of that school of thought.

But it is urged that royal or State control over the Church is quite *indefensible*. In a scholarly historical thesis on *The Claims of the Free Churches* Dr. H. Townsend, in a vigorous denunciation of an Established Church, actually asserts that Nonconformists regard the alliance of Church and State " as a betrayal of the Gospel and an hindrance to the spiritual growth of the Nation ". " The Church of Christ," he adds, " cannot fulfil the purpose of God while in bondage to the State " (p. 241). It is singular that so few churchmen are conscious of this Erastian ' bondage ' ! The purpose of their ordination was to preach the Gospel, secure conversions, and shepherd the flock of Christ, and they have *now* equal freedom with Nonconformists to fulfil this sacred ministry. They feel no need, as Dr. Townsend thinks they should, " to seek for Disestablishment to fulfil more effectively ' the Divine ends ' of this ministry ". There is still much to be said for a ' Christian Church in a Christian State ' with an anointed King as its constitutional ' Supreme Governor ', who is committed to maintain the Established religion of the Nation. For as the Church of Scotland declares, " The Church and State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare" (*Church and State Report*, p. 39).

Again, we are told that it is definitely unscriptural for bishops to be appointed by the Crown. But this historic practice could be changed or at least modified without recourse to Disestablishment. Even now the Archbishop is not without some voice or influence in these nominations. However indefensible this practice may be in *theory*, it is only right to add that it has, on the whole, worked well in practice. It certainly has done much to preserve liberty of thought and comprehensiveness in the Church. If Bishops were appointed by Convocation or by Diocesan Conferences there would probably be many ' Gores ' and ' Freres ' but no ' Hensons ' or ' Barnes ', and practically no Evangelicals on the Bench. It is also most doubtful if exclusive Diocesan patronage or even P.C.C. patronage would improve our present system. And, in any case, Disestablishment would destroy the valuable historic association of Church and State. As Bishop Creighton said in 1894, " That an ancient nation like England should deliberately repudiate any organic connection between the basis of its national life and the profession of the Christian Faith seems to me to be a calamity which could never be repaired ".

Few, if any, churchmen would deny that we do badly need a safe and sane revision of the Prayer Book, not only to modernise archaisms in its phraseology so that we do not continue to pray for our ' two hearts ' (" *both* our hearts "), but also to authorise legally more variety in our services. At present, prayers for special occasions and objects are issued and used which mostly are not technically " ordered by lawful authority ", and these, as well as fresh services urgently required, could be secured (if controversial matter was carefully avoided) and be constitutionally legalised under the terms of the Enabling Act. Certainly some proposals involving contentious doctrinal issues which are incorporated in a few of the new Canons now being considered by

Convocation will, if attempted to be authorised without the " consent of the Realm ", or the " King in Parliament ", only produce more strife or schism and not peace and harmony in the Church. Moreover, insofar as they would secure a certain revision of the Prayer Book by circumventing Parliament they would be likely, as Dr. Townsend declares, " to rouse the Nation's anger against the Church " (p. 213), and so precipitate a disastrous Disestablishment campaign.

IV

Evangelical Churchmen believe that England is far more likely to be converted to Christianity by the clear preaching of the Gospel of the New Testament—the Gospel of " Nothing in my hand I bring "—than by the gospel of the ' Altar ', where the priest claims to bring God into the church through the consecrated elements, which are made objects of worship and adoration. It was not by this sacerdotal and mechanical type of religion that the power of the Gospel was manifest in the Reformation days or in the 18th century Methodist Revival or by the similar amazing outpouring of the Holy Spirit in 1859-60. " The grace of God which bringeth salvation " is not purveyed by mere participation in outward rites or sacraments or penances, but by yielding to the inner working of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the contrite sinner.

The severance of the union of Church and State would be a serious spiritual loss to the Nation. As the Church and State Report well remarks, " To many the Establishment is regarded as the symbol of the official acceptance of Christianity as the national religion, and that if England, by Disestablishment, should seem to become neutral in the fight between faith and unfaith in Christianity, that would be a calamity for our own people and, indeed, for the whole world " (p. 49). If this was true in 1935 it is far more so in 1950 with the amazing advance of atheistic Communisn in Eastern Europe. Our ultimate aim should be not to discard our time-honoured National Church but to make it more truly national and comprehensive by including Free Churchmen with their diversities of worship and usage, so that all who in Gospel fundamentals " agree in the truth of God's holy Word " may live and worship outwardly together " in unity and godly love ". Such unity would prove a most powerful appeal to the indifferent non-Christian world of to-day.

THE ANGLICAN DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION—

(*concluded from page* 15).

and phraseology of the Homilies and that of other Lutheran and Reformed documents. In a few points of detail or emphasis slight differences could be discerned, but these are insignificant compared with the substantial agreement. Third, there is a marked stress upon the necessity of good works within a right conception of the Gospel. This is not due to any persistent Anglican Pelagianism, but to the demands of a popular and homiletical statement. Yet even this is of a piece with the whole thought and intention of Reformed theology, which banished works as legal fulfilment, but re-introduced them in superabundant measure as the effect and the outworking of faith.